1945 6 NOV

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 91—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1945, TO FEBRUARY 23, 1945
(PAGES 1 TO 1402)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1945

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1945

The 3d day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

HENRY A. WALLACE, of Iowa, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, Light of all that is true, Strength of all that is good, let the cloudless noontide of Thy radiance make clear our path toward high and holy endeavor. The gateway of an old year has noiselessly closed behind us: What we have written we have written. May mistakes and failures be left in the merciful shadows of the past. For this new year of decision and destiny give us patience and forbearing. Grant that those who by the people's choice have been called to high places of state, in this fateful day assuming responsibilities as heavy as the servants of the Commonwealth have ever borne, may be filled with Thy spirit, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of knowledge, and the fear of Thee. In an hour when such vast issues are at stake, may those who here serve, conscious of the great tradition in which they stand, rise to greatness of vision and soul as the anxious eyes of all the nations are upon this Chamber. Maintain in us the fidelity of those to whom much has been given and from whom much will be required. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

CREDENTIALS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I present the credentials of the Senator-elect from Indiana, Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read by the Chief Clerk, John C. Crockett, and were ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944 HOMER E. CAPEHART was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Indiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1945.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Henry F. Schricker, and our seal hereto affixed at Indianapolis, Ind., this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1944.

By the Governor:

HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor.

Attest:

[SEAL] RUE J. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I present the credentials of the newly elected Senator from the State of Missouri, the Honorable FORREST C. DONNELL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read by the Chief Clerk, and were ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to cerify that on the 7th day of November 1944 FORREST C. DONNELL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Missouri a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1945.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, FORREST C. DONNELL, and our seal hereto affixed at Jefferson City, Mo., this 29th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1944.

FORREST C. DONNELL,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] GREGORY C. STOCKARD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to present the credentials of my new colleague, Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, elected a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read by the Chief Clerk and were ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Little Rock, November 24, 1944.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944 J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1945.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Homer M. Adkins, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock, Ark., this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1944.

HOMER M. ADKINS,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the credentials of all newly elected Senators to the Seventy-ninth Congress have now been presented and are on file.

The clerk will call the names of the newly elected Senators in groups of four, and they will present themselves at the desk to take the oath.

The legislative clerk, Emery L. Frazier, called the names of Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CAPEHART.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of——

The VICE PRESIDENT. At this moment it is not in order to make a statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to make a statement with reference to the Senator-elect from Indiana. I want to ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to take the oath without prejudice.

Mr. WHITE. That is, without prejudice to him or to the rights of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Without prejudice to him or to the rights of the Senate. Probably, technically, as I have not as yet been sworn in, I cannot make this request. I will ask the Senator from Tennessee if he will make it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will make the request with pleasure. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator-elect from Indiana be permitted to take the oath without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the names of the newly elected Senators, and called the names of Mr. DONNELL, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. FULBRIGHT.

The Senators whose names had been called (with the exception of Mr. DONNELL and Mr. DOWNEY) escorted by Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. McCLELLAN, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. WILSON, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. LUCAS.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. BROOKS, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of

office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCMAHON, and Mr. MILLIKIN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSES, Mr. MYERS, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. PEPPER.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. OVERTON), escorted by Mr. CORDON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. GUFFEY, and Mr. MURRAY, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. REED, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. SALTONSTALL), escorted by Mr. CAPPER, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, and Mr. BARKLEY, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. WILEY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE, respectively, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to make an announcement for the record. Senator-elect LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, is still holding office as Governor. His term expires tomorrow at noon. He will be here the early part of next week to take the oath of office.

Mr. GREEN. I desire to state to the Senate that the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is ill and confined to a hospital in Meriden, Conn. For that reason I had the honor of escorting the Senator-elect from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] when he was sworn in.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the swearing in of the newly elected Senators been consummated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Green
Austin	Capehart	Guffey
Bailey	Capper	Gurney
Ball	Chavez	Hatch
Bankhead	Connally	Hayden
Barkley	Cordon	Hickenlooper
Bilbo	Ellender	Hill
Brooks	Ferguson	Hoey
Buck	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Bushfield	George	Johnston, S. C.
Butler	Gerry	Kilgore
La Follette	Myers	Thomas, Utah
Langer	O'Mahoney	Tobey
Lucas	Pepper	Truman
McCarran	Radcliffe	Tydings
McClellan	Reed	Vandenberg
McFarland	Revercomb	Wagner
McKellar	Robertson	Walsh
McMahon	Russell	Wheeler
Magnuson	Shipstead	Wherry
Maybank	Smith	White
Millikin	Stewart	Wiley
Morse	Taft	Willis
Moses	Taylor	Wilson
Murdock	Thomas, Idaho	
Murray	Thomas, Okla.	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is absent on the business of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—John H. Bankhead and Lister Hill.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Ernest W. McFarland.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—Hiram W. Johnson and Sheridan Downey.*

Colorado.—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

Connecticut.—Francis Maloney and Brien McMahon.

Delaware.—James M. Tunnell and C. Douglass Buck.

Florida.—Charles O. Andrews and Claude Pepper.

Georgia.—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

Idaho.—John Thomas and Glen H. Taylor.

Illinois.—Scott W. Lucas and C. Wayland Brooks.

Indiana.—Raymond E. Willis and Homer E. Capehart.

Iowa.—George A. Wilson and Bourke B. Hickenlooper.

Kansas.—Arthur Capper and Clyde M. Reed.

Kentucky.—Alben W. Barkley and Albert B. Chandler.

Louisiana.—John H. Overton* and Allen J. Ellender.

Maine.—Wallace H. White, Jr., and Owen Brewster.

Maryland.—Millard E. Tydings and George L. Radcliffe.

Massachusetts.—David I. Walsh and Leverett Saltonstall.*

Michigan.—Arthur H. Vandenberg and Homer Ferguson.

Minnesota.—Henrik Shipstead and Joseph H. Ball.

Mississippi.—Theodore G. Bilbo and James O. Eastland.

Missouri.—Harry S. Truman and Forrest C. Donnell.*

Montana.—Burton K. Wheeler and James E. Murray.

Nebraska.—Hugh Butler and Kenneth S. Wherry.

Nevada.—Pat McCarran and James G. Scrugham.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Charles W. Tobey.

New Jersey.—Albert W. Hawkes and H. Alexander Smith.

New Mexico.—Carl A. Hatch and Dennis Chavez.

New York.—Robert F. Wagner and James M. Mead.

North Carolina.—Josiah W. Bailey and Clyde R. Hoey.

North Dakota.—William Langer and John Moses.

Ohio.—Robert A. Taft and Harold H. Burton.

Oklahoma.—Elmer Thomas and E. H. Moore.

Oregon.—Guy Cordon and Wayne L. Morse.

Pennsylvania.—Joseph F. Guffey and Francis J. Myers.

Rhode Island.—Peter G. Gerry and Theodore Francis Green.

South Carolina.—Burnet R. Maybank and Olin D. Johnston.

South Dakota.—Chan Gurney and Harlan J. Bushfield.

Tennessee.—Kenneth McKellar and Tom Stewart.

Texas.—Tom Connally and W. Lee O'Daniel.

Utah.—Elbert D. Thomas and Abe Murdock.

Vermont.—Warren R. Austin and George D. Aiken.

Virginia.—Carter Glass and Harry Flood Byrd.

Washington.—Mon C. Wallgren and Warren G. Magnuson.

West Virginia.—Harley M. Kilgore and Chapman Revercomb.

Wisconsin.—Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and Alexander Wiley.

Wyoming.—Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Edward V. Robertson.

*Not sworn.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a

*Not sworn.

quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHITE the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. GREEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, the 6th day of January, 1945, at 1 o'clock postmeridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHITE advanced in the center aisle and Mr. BARKLEY said: Mr. President, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to act in conjunction with a similar committee on the part of the House to notify the President that the Congress is now in session and ready for business has performed its duty with dispatch, and I have the honor to report that the President asks me to say that he is highly pleased to have the Congress back in session, and that he will be ready and happy to communicate his annual message to a joint session of the two Houses to be held on Saturday next. He will not deliver his message in person, but will send it up to be read to the joint session which is to be held for the counting of the electoral votes, as provided for in the concurrent resolution just adopted.

I may say while I am on my feet that it has always been customary for the two Houses to take no action of any kind, beyond organization, until the President has delivered his message. That has been construed to mean that neither bills nor resolutions, nor other matters of a legislative nature, are to be presented to the Senate until the President has delivered his message. In view of that fact, I see no occasion for the Senate to meet between now and Saturday; and when we conclude our business for the day I shall move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Saturday next.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PRESENTATION OF BUST OF HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Hon. Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, has been Secretary of State of the United States for the past 12 years. Prior to that time he had a long and distinguished service in the House of Representatives, and later in the Senate. Those of us who served with him in the Congress will recall vividly that he was always a great student of foreign affairs, that he worked constructively and long in this important field of legislative endeavor, and that he rendered very outstanding service in considering and furthering legislation by the Congress which had to do with our relations with other nations of the world.

During his tenure of office as Secretary of State Cordell Hull has carried with him this same enlightened and constructive outlook in world affairs. He has been our Secretary of State in times of depression and in times of recovery, in times of peace and in times of war; but always, I think, even his critics will concede that he worked with marked singleness of purpose to further friendly relations between this Nation and all the other nations of the earth. He has been particularly successful on the whole in welding the nations of the Western Hemisphere into a great family of friendly countries; and, considering the difficulties involved, the achievement of that task, if there had been no other achievement, would have stamped him as one of the greatest in the list of American Secretaries of State.

However, in the troublous days of war which recently have come upon our country, he has continued wherever opportunity offered to carry on the work, so well performed in the Western Hemisphere. This he has done not only among our allies on the war front but as well among other nations not actively engaged in the war. He has been a stalwart defender of the right. He has tried to promulgate among nations the humanitarian attributes which we like to think are a part of the nature of the people of the United States.

Most men do not receive any credit for their service until after the mantle of death has been wrapped about them; but it is a happy circumstance that in this instance so outstanding is his contribution to his country and the world that we are not to wait to see his long and splendid record recognized by the people of America. Two great newspapers of my State, the Evening Times of Cumberland and the Sunday Times of Cumberland, recognizing the outstanding service of this great American, have caused to be sculptured and cast the beautiful bronze bust which now stands in front of the Vice President's desk and which represents a striking likeness of our former colleague and our recent Secretary of State. I have the happy and signal honor to present to the Nation and to the Capitol of the United States this bust, coming from the Evening Times and Sunday Times of Cumberland, and executed by Sculptor Conlon, also of the city of Cumberland, Md. It will be a constant reminder to all that in Cordell Hull the Nation had a preeminent Secretary of State and that his great and tireless efforts to promote peace and the welfare of humanity have been abundantly recognized and that his name will ever live on the brightest pages of the world's history.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On behalf of the Senate, it gives the Chair very great pleasure to accept this bust.

The Chair may say that when the President of the Senate was approached with regard to the presentation, it was discovered there was no precedent for anything of the sort. The Chair may also say that there is no precedent for Cordell Hull.

Inasmuch as the Senate has always made its own rules, the Chair felt no hesitation whatsoever in saying that he was sure what rule the Senate would make with regard to this situation. So, with that in mind, the Chair rules that this presentation may be made, and on behalf of the Senate, accepts the bust.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT TO SATURDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, have all the formalities incident to the opening of the Seventy-ninth Congress been performed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. All the formalities have been completed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Saturday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Saturday, January 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 3, 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

T. Hoyt Davis, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the middle district

of Georgia, vice Hon. Bascom S. Deaver, deceased.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be Interstate Commerce Commissioners for the terms expiring December 31, 1951. (Reappointments:)

J. Haden Alldredge, of Alabama.

Charles D. Mahaffie, of the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Harry D. White, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of the Honorable John L. Sullivan, whose resignation was effective November 30, 1944.

SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa, to be a member of the Surplus Property Board for a term of 2 years from October 3, 1944.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Paul A. Porter, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1942, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. James Breakenridge Clearwater, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from August 4, 1944.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

Second Lt. Clinton Fort Matthews, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 20, 1942.

TO INFANTRY

Second Lt. Robert McNeely Peden, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from January 19, 1943.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Weston Fisher Maughan, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from December 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Carl Smith Doney, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Fay Brink Prickett, Field Artillery (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Calvin DeWitt, Jr., Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Lucien Samuel Spicer Berry, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Victor William Beck Wales, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Earl Chambers, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Joseph Merit Tully, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James deBarth Walbach, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Warner William Carr, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Hugh Mitchell, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert LeGrow Walsh, Air Corps (temporary major general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Richard Mar Levy, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).

To be first lieutenant, with rank from January 1, 1945

Second Lt. Ralph Bassett Martin, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Shook, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from January 17, 1945.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Stanley William Matthews, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from January 17, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

To be captain

First Lt. Paul Victor Kiehl, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from January 2, 1945.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Clarence Constantin Olson, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from January 10, 1945.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be first lieutenant

Second Lt. Kenneth Bradley Johnson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from January 9, 1945.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Perry Orlando Wilcox, United States Army, with rank from January 19, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Richard William Jungfer, Jr., United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from January 6, 1945.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Charles R. Sanderson, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps on the retired list, with the rank of brigadier general, for temporary service, from the 23d day of December 1944.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following boatswains to be chief boatswains in the United States Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of March 1942:

John H. Reeder	Lars A. Sande
Roland M. Sykes	Ludwig Ehlers
Charles H. Bartlett	Viktor Svensson
Ashley H. Calder	Thomas F. Sullivan
Theodore A. Bratz	William U. Fulcher
Elmer M. Chandler	Floyd D. Overhauser
John Donnelly	Edward J. Williams
Robert Chivas	John M. Joseph
William M. Prentiss	Charles Ehmann
Ora Doyle	Leonard M. Cannon
Walter A. DeVine	Ragnar Anderson
Alexander C. Cornell	Neils C. M. Johnson
Roy Stockman	Hans A. Jensen
Elroy B. Dunphy	George M. Walker
Marion M. Mitchell	Elmer J. Uebel
Thomas A. Cosgrove	Frank Bronski
Michael J. Seibert	George H. Lybrand
Charles W. Radke	Arthur I. Roberts
Almer T. Hovland	Ray Thorp
William E. Long	William J. Dongian
Joel A. Osterberg	Thomas J. Lusk
Norman D. MacLellan	Sheldon A. Russell
Olaf L. Laveson	

The following gunners to be chief gunners in the United States Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of March 1942:

Louis E. Rattan	Leonard T. Toner
Robert L. Addy	Winfield S. Nevins

Electrician Rolla W. Sicafoose to be chief electrician in the United States Coast Guard to rank from the 1st day of March 1942:

The following machinists to be chief machinists in the United States Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of March 1942.

Wilmer R. Bomberger, Jr.	Ralph J. Davidson
	Francis E. Harris
Chester M. Galutia	Harry J. Reynolds
Harry V. Winebar	

Carpenter George A. Merritt to be chief carpenter in the United States Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of March 1942.

The following pay clerks to be chief pay clerks in the United States Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of March 1942:

John R. Harris	John C. Collins
Richard Hewitt	Linnie Thompson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1945

This being the day fixed by the twentieth amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. South Trimble.

PRAYER

The Chaplain of the Seventy-eighth Congress, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose glory hath shone above us in the revelation of Thy advent, we praise Thee that in Thy light all life is made more holy. Refreshed by the tenderness and eagerness of innocent childhood, our homes have become more blessed and humanity calls to us in Thy holy name; purify our spirits and make manifest Thy truth through us. That we may build a future altogether worthy of our traditions, keep us free from the selfish urge of gold, pride, and personal gain. Grant that those who, through the madness of war, feel its stillness, the spell of loneliness, and the pain of unbroken sorrow may remain our twin spirits in deep sympathy and most helpful service.

O God, the scorched earth, with its patches of sunlight and shade, is barren from the lust of power. Yet great gifts are here so full of meaning and promise; O stay Thou the footfall of wicked men ere it reaches nearer its defeated destiny. Uncover its living splendor woven in love and wisdom, that we may behold Thy overshadowing presence as we went our ways through the unknown future. As men and women with a defined and positive sense of responsibility, may we put our talents on the altar of our country that the spirit of our Lord may find full fruition in all our labors. Grant that Thy gracious care may attend our President, our beloved Speaker, the leaders and all Members, the officers, employees, and the pages. Make us all wise to know the right and strength to perform it. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.

Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL BY STATES

The CLERK. Representatives-elect, this is the day fixed by the Constitution for the meeting of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and, as the law directs, the Clerk of the House has prepared the official roll call of the Representatives-elect. Certificates of election covering the 435 seats in the Seventy-ninth Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth

Congress, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the law of their respective States or the United States will be called. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of States, beginning with the State of Alabama, the Representatives-elect will please answer to their names to determine whether there is a quorum present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States, and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

Boykin	Hobbs	Manasco
Grant	Rains	Sparkman
Andrews	Jarman	Patrick

ARIZONA

Harless	Murdock	

ARKANSAS

Gathings	Cravens	Norrell
Mills	Hays	Harris

CALIFORNIA

Lea	Gearhart	King
Engle	Elliott	Doyle
Johnson	Outland	Holifield
Havenner	Voorhis	Hinshaw
Welch	Healy	Sheppard
Miller	Douglas	Phillips
Tolan	McDonough	Izac
Anderson	Patterson	

COLORADO

Gillespie	Hill	Rockwell

CONNECTICUT

Kopplemann	Geelan	Talbot
Woodhouse	Luce	Ryter

DELAWARE

Traynor

FLORIDA

Peterson	Cannon	Rogers
Price	Hendricks	

GEORGIA

Peterson	Ramspeck	Wood
Cox	Vinson	Brown
Pace	Tarver	
Camp	Gibson	

IDAHO

White	Dworshak	

ILLINOIS

Dawson	Church	McMillen
Rowan	Reed	Simpson
Kelly	Mason	Howell
Gorski	Allen	Price
Sabath	Johnson	Vursell
O'Brien	Chiperfield	Bishop
Link	Dirksen	Douglas
Gordon	Arends	
Resa	Sumner	

INDIANA

Halleck	Johnson	Springer
Grant	Landis	Ludlow
Gillie	LaFollette	
Harness	Wilson	

IOWA

Martin	Cunningham	Hoeven
Talle	Dolliver	
Gwynne	Jensen	

KANSAS

Cole	Winter	Hope
Scrivner	Rees	Carlson

KENTUCKY

Gregory	Chelf	Bates
Clements	Spence	Robsion
O'Neal	May	

LOUISIANA

Hébert	Brooks	Larcade
Maloney	McKenzie	Allen
Domengeaux	Morrison	

MAINE

Smith	Fellows	

MARYLAND

Roe	Fallon	Beall
D'Alesandro	Sasscer	

MASSACHUSETTS

Heselton	Bates	Curley
Clason	Lane	McCormack
Philbin	Goodwin	Wigglesworth
Holmes	Gifford	Martin
Rogers	Herter	

MICHIGAN

Sadowski	Wolcott	O'Brien
Michener	Engel	Rabaut
Shafer	Woodruff	Lesinski
Hoffman	Bradley	Dondero
Jonkman	Hook	

MINNESOTA

Andresen	Starkey	Andersen
O'Hara	Judd	Pittenger
Gallagher	Knutson	Hagen

MISSISSIPPI

Rankin	Abernethy	McGehee
Whitten	Winstead	
Whittington	Colmer	

MISSOURI

Arnold	Bennett	Sullivan
Schwabe	Short	Ploeser
Cole	Carnahan	Cochran
Bell	Cannon	

MONTANA

Mansfield	O'Connor	

NEBRASKA

Curtis	Buffett	Miller

NEVADA

Bunker

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Merrow	Adams	

NEW JERSEY

Wolverton	Case	Sundstrom
Hand	Thomas	Kean
Auchincloss	Canfield	Norton
Powers	Towe	Hart
Eaton	Hartley	

NEW MEXICO

Anderson	Fernandez	

NEW YORK

Sharp	Celler	Kearney
Hall, Leonard W.	Baldwin	Byrne
Barry	Marcantonio	Taylor
Roe	Dickstein	Kilburn
Delaney, James J.	Bloom	Fuller
Delaney, John J.	Torrens	Hancock
Pfeifer	Powell	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Keogh	Lynch	Taber
Heffernan	Rabin	Cole
Rooney	Buckley	Rogers
O'Toole	Quinn	Wadsworth
Rayfiel	Gwinn	Andrews
	Gamble	Elsaesser
	Bennet	Reed
	LeFevre	

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner	Durham	Ervin
Kerr	Clark	Bulwinkle
Cooley	Burgin	Weaver
Folger	Doughton	

NORTH DAKOTA

Lemke	Robertson	

OHIO

Elston	Ramey	Lewis
Hess	Jenkins	Kirwan
Gardner	Vorys	Feighan
Jones	Huber	Crosser
Clevenger	Griffiths	Bolton
McCowen	Thom	Bender
Brown	McGregor	

OKLAHOMA

Schwabe	Boren	Wickersham
Stigler	Monroney	
Stewart	Johnson	

OREGON

Mott	Angell	Ellsworth
Stockman		

PENNSYLVANIA

Barrett	Fenton	Morgan
Granahan	Hoch	Graham
Bradley	Gillette	Tibbott
Sheridan	Rich	Kelley
Green	McConnell	Rodgers
McGlinchey	Simpson	Campbell
Wolfenden	Kunkel	Corbett
Gerlach	Walter	Eberharter
Kinzer	Gross	Weiss
Murphy	Brumbaugh	
Flood	Snyder	

RHODE ISLAND

Forand

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers	Hare	Richards
Riley	Bryson	McMillan

SOUTH DAKOTA

Case

TENNESSEE

Reece	Courtney	Cooper
Kefauver	Murray	Davis
Priest		

TEXAS

Patman	Thomas	Thomason
Combs	Mansfield	Russell
Beckworth	Poage	Worley
Rayburn	Lanham	Mahon
Johnson, Luther A.	Gossett	Kilday
	Lyle	Fisher
Pickett	West	

UTAH

Granger	Robinson	

VERMONT

Plumley

VIRGINIA

Bland	Drewry	Robertson
Daughton	Burch	Smith
Satterfield	Woodrum	Flannagan

WASHINGTON

De Lacy	Holmes	Horan
Savage		

WEST VIRGINIA

Randolph	Ellis	Hedrick
Bailey	Kee	

WISCONSIN

Smith	Biemiller	Hull
Henry	Murray	O'Konski
Wasielewski	Byrnes	

WYOMING

Barrett

The CLERK. The roll call discloses the presence of 397 Members. A quorum is present.

The Clerk states that credentials, regular in form, have been filed showing the election of E. L. BARTLETT, as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska, and of JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, as Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii. A Resident Commissioner to the United States from the Commonwealth of the Philippines was elected, CARLOS P. ROMULO. The Clerk has also received certificate of election signed by the Governor of Puerto Rico showing the election of JESUS T. PIÑERO, as Resident Commissioner here for a term of 4 years, beginning January 3, 1945.

The Clerk is happy to state that since the regular election of Representatives to the Seventy-ninth Congress no deaths or resignations have occurred changing the representation of any State.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next business in order is the election of a Speaker of the House, and nominations are now in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Clerk, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress the name of Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Clerk, by authority, and by direction, and by unanimous vote of the Republican conference, representing a minority in this House, I nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts to the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The CLERK. Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, and Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, have been placed in nomination. Are there any further nominations?

There being no further nominations, the Clerk appoints the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] to act as tellers.

The roll will now be called and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice. The tellers will please take places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker. The following is the vote in detail:

[Roll No. 2]

RAYBURN

Abernethy	Fisher	May
Allen, La.	Flannagan	Miller, Calif.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Flood	Mills
	Folger	Monroney
Andrews, Ala.	Forand	Morgan
Bailey	Gallagher	Morrison
Barrett, Pa.	Gardner	Murdock
Barry	Gathings	Murphy
Bates, Ky.	Geelan	Murray, Tenn.
Beckworth	Gibson	Norrell
Bell	Gordon	Norton
Biemiller	Gossett	O'Brien, Ill.
Bland	Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.
Bloom	Granger	O'Connor
Bonner	Grant, Ala.	O'Neal
Boren	Green	O'Toole
Boykin	Gregory	Outland
Bradley, Pa.	Hare	Pace
Brooks	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Brown, Ga.	Harris	Patrick
Bryson	Hart	Patterson
Buckley	Havenner	Peterson, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Hays	Peterson, Ga.
Bunker	Healy	Pfeifer
Burch	Hébert	Philbin
Burgin	Hedrick	Pickett
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Poage
Camp	Hendricks	Powell
Cannon, Fla.	Hobbs	Price, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.	Hoch	Price, Ill.
Carnahan	Holifield	Priest
Celler	Hook	Quinn, N. Y.
Chelf	Huber	Rabaut
Clark	Izac	Rabin
Clements	Jarman	Rains
Cochran	Johnson, Luther A.	Ramspeck
Colmer		Randolph
Combs	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Cooley	Kee	Rayfiel
Cooper	Kefauver	Resa
Courtney	Kelley, Pa.	Richards
Cox	Kelly, Ill.	Riley
Cravens	Keogh	Rivers
Crosser	Kerr	Robertson, Va.
Curley	Kilday	Robinson, Utah
D'Alesandro	King	Roe, Md.
Daughton, Va.	Kirwan	Roe, N. Y.
Davis	Kopplemann	Rogers, Fla.
Dawson	Lane	Rogers, N. Y.
De Lacy	Lanham	Rooney
Delaney, James J.	Larcade	Rowan
	Lea	Russell
Delaney, John J.	Lesinski	Ryter
	Link	Sabath
Dickstein	Ludlow	Sadowski
Domengeaux	Lyle	Sasscer
Doughton, N. C.	Lynch	Satterfield
Douglas, Calif.	McCormack	Savage
Douglas, Ill.	McGehee	Sheppard
Doyle	McGlinchey	Sheridan
Drewry	McKenzie	Smith, Va.
Durham	McMillan, S. C.	Snyder
Eberharter	Mahon	Sparkman
Elliott	Maloney	Spence
Engle, Calif.	Manasco	Starkey
Ervin	Mansfield, Mont.	Stewart
Fallon		Stigler
Feighan	Mansfield, Tex.	Sullivan
Fernandez	Marcantonio	Tarver
Thom	Walter	Wickersham
Thomas, Tex.	Wasielewski	Winstead
Thomason	Weaver	Wood
Tolan	Weiss	Woodhouse
Torrens	West	Woodrum, Va.
Traynor	White	Worley
Vinson	Whitten	
Voorhis, Calif.	Whittington	

MARTIN

Adams	Gillespie	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Merrow
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillie	Michener
	Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Mott
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
	Griffiths	O'Hara
Andrews, N. Y.	Gross	O'Konski
Angell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Phillips
Arends	Gwynne, Iowa	Pittenger
Arnold	Hagen	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Baldwin, N. Y.		Powers
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Ramey
Bates, Mass.		Reece, Tenn.
Beall	Halleck	Reed, Ill.
Bender	Hancock	Reed, N. Y.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hand	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Rich
Bishop	Hartley	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bolton	Henry	
Bradley, Mich.	Herter	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Heselton	Rockwell
Brumbaugh	Hess	Rodgers, Pa.
Buffett	Hill	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hinshaw	Schwabe, Mo.
Campbell	Hoeven	Schwabe, Okla.
Canfield	Holmes, Mass.	Scrivner
Carlson	Holmes, Wash.	Shafer
Case, N. J.	Hope	Sharp
Case, S. Dak.	Horan	Short
Chiperfield	Howell	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Jensen	Smith, Maine
Clevenger	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Ill.	Springer
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Stockman
Cole, N. Y.	Jones	Sumner, Ill.
Corbett	Jonkman	Sundstrom
Cunningham	Judd	Taber
Curtis	Kean	Talbot
Dirksen	Kearney	Talle
Dolliver	Kilburn	Taylor
Dondero	Kinzer	Thomas, N. J.
Dworshak	Knutson	Tibbott
Eaton	Kunkel	Towe
Ellis	LaFollette	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	Landis	Vursell
Elsaesser	LeFevre	Wadsworth
Elston	Lemke	Welch
Engel, Mich.	Lewis	Wigglesworth
Fellows	Luce	Wilson
Fenton	McConnell	Winter
Fuller	McCowen	Wolcott
Gamble	McDonough	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gearhart	McGregor	Wolverton, N. J.
Gerlach	McMillen, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gifford	Martin, Iowa	

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 394, of which Hon. SAM RAYBURN received 224, and Hon. JOSEPH MARTIN, Jr., 168; and present, 2.

Therefore, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, having received a majority of all the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will please conduct the Speaker-elect to the chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. My colleagues, we meet today in a solemn period in the world's history. Men and women are fighting and dying on many far-flung battlefields for the continuance of our form of government. Their sacrifices impress us with the seriousness of our responsibility to the people of this country and the world.

This meeting of a new Congress is a symbol of the functioning of popular government. It shows a people can have popular government and still fight a great world war. It dramatizes the continuance of the two-party system of government, which has been tested through the years.

The great Divinity which shapes the destinies of men and nations has decreed we of the Republican Party shall be the opposition party in these crucial, trying years ahead. It may well be that this may be the more important role. To us has been given the task of protecting the freedoms and the rights of the people and effectively establishing a proper check upon the majority. We shall not fail—we dare not fail—in carrying out effectively this great assignment.

It is good for us to pause a few minutes and recall the splendid traditions of Congress. Men and women come to Congress, on both sides of the aisle, as an opportunity for service to mankind and country. We, naturally, do not always share the same views but there are very few, on either side of the aisle, who are not inspired in their work by a genuine desire for that which will make for a better America and a better world. While Congress is often ridiculed, often attacked and abused, it still stands out as the institution in which the people place their confidence and trust for the protection of their rights and liberties. May we continue to justify that great faith.

My task today is a simple one. It is to present to the Members of the House their newly elected Speaker. If, and I am sure you on the Democratic side will understand this natural use of the word—if it is necessary for me to present a Democratic Speaker, I know of no other I would prefer to present. Our Speaker is a man of high character and substance; he can be depended upon to give full parliamentary justice to the humblest Member of this House; he is a fine, upstanding American. Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you your Speaker and my Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Martin, I am deeply grateful to you for your gracious words in presenting me to my colleagues of the House of Representatives. To all of my colleagues in the House who have been honored by membership in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I say to you, after the action of today, from my heart I thank you. For the fourth time you have done me this great honor.

It is a rare privilege to stand in this high station and play a part with you in this House at any time. When I first took this office by election I said to each and every one of you that it would be my purpose, my unvarying and unyielding purpose, to preserve, protect, and defend the rights, the privileges, and the honor and the power of the House of Representatives. That pledge I make to you again. I love this life. It has been my life for nearly 32 years. Next to home and family and friends, it is my love. If any action of mine at any time should lower the standards of those who have served here or reflect in any fashion upon this great institution, I would to my dying day hang my head

in shame. It is a great thing; it is a great honor. Let me repeat, it is a great privilege to be elected by a constituency to be a Member of the popular branch of the legislative body of a great government like yours and mine. As long as people are vigilant to preserve their liberty, there will always be a House of Representatives.

In times like these our thoughts must run to terrible things. At this hour, civilization, in the broader sense, stands at the cross-roads. Today we are being tested here and there as to whether or not free government will live upon the face of the earth, yea, even if civilization itself will continue to exist. To each of us here, may I bespeak again as I did more than a year ago, my hope for unity, not only here but out there among our more than 130,000,000 people. Let us not act here today, tomorrow, or throughout the coming years in any fashion so that any returning soldier may have reason to think that we have not, while he was offering the supreme sacrifice, that we have not, let me repeat, done our full, our total duty. Let me again say to you, as I have said in the past, beware of dangerous men and women in this country who preach disunity. We must be a united people. What is the history of some of the countries which we have liberated? What was the matter? Disorder and disunity existed in those countries. Men of good will and men of vision were not at the helm of state in those countries which have felt the tread of a terrible enemy. We are engaged, let me repeat, in the greatest war which has ever shocked civilization. I say to you, my beloved friends, that civilization itself cannot stand a shock like that which it is now undergoing every 25 years and still be a civilization worthy of the name. Our boys are out there, our girls are out there with their backs to bloody walls, mocking at death, that you and I may be free people. They are doing their part. They know what it is about now and they will know what it is about and what it has been about after this war is over. A wise man once said, "Men fight better with ideas at the end of their bayonets." These men know what it is about. They know what they are fighting for because they were reared and nurtured in a country where liberty has been secure and where democracy has been safe. We are fortunate people, even though we are engaged in this terrible war, that the tread of a foreign soldier has not been heard upon our shores, and it will not be, because of the bravery and the fortitude of the men who pushed them away from our shores.. But when I think of some of the countries of the earth where millions of men, women, and children, homeless, ragged, starving, treading, like Saul, blind across the face of the earth, I think then how thankful you and I should be because we are the most fortunate people, we in the Western Hemisphere.

We will win this war some day because we must. I have never been an optimist, I might say to you, like some people, in ever having thought the war was going to be over in 1943 or even in 1944. I think, my friends, there is a lot of hard fighting both to the east of us and to the west of us before we come to victory. We must all join, every soul of us, between these oceans and the northern and southern borders to do everything we can to bring this war to a close at the earliest possible moment.

And after the war, then what? Then what? I was not proud of my country and its actions after the close of the last war. We walked out on the rest of the world and came home, stuck our head in the sand and said: "Let the rest of the world go by; we can live here unto ourselves." Sadly we found out that could not be done. Many people in public life ran away after the last war was over. My conscience is clear on that; there has not been an hour in 25 years—and I have spoken it from many stumps—when I did not say that if I had been a Member of the Senate of the United States I would have voted to adhere to the Treaty of Versailles, including the League of Nations. In my opinion, Woodrow Wilson had a dream of world cooperation, world concord, and world peace, unsurpassed by any man who has walked this earth since the lowly Galilean walked the shores 20 centuries ago preaching peace on earth, good will to men.

After the blood and the carnage, what then? What are we and other peace-loving nations going to do about it? There will then be called the greatest parliament of men and women ever assembled in all the tide of time. They will truly sit in the seats of the mighty; they will stand upon the flaming hilltop of terrifying and terrible greatness; their responsibility will be above and beyond that of any group of men and women who ever met together in all history. I do not hate people, I do not hate individuals, but I shall despise the people here and there, the individual here and there, who do anything to thwart the effort to bring about an ordered world and a permanent peace. Let me repeat: Upon the action of these men and women in this great parliament will depend the fate of civilization. If we do not win that battle as our fighting forces are winning the battle now, we shall have failed. We are using force now, we are using force to the limit. Some people may be content. I am not, when I talk or think about what we should do after this war is over. We are using force now, let me repeat, and if it is necessary to preserve the peace of the world, and never let man witness the carnage and the death that we witness today, I am willing to join with the democracies of the earth and other peace-loving people and use all the force that is necesary to bring about an ordered world.

God helping us and sustaining us, I trust, I pray, I hope that we will not fail the world. I thank you.

The Chair will ask his distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to administer the oath of office.

Mr. SABATH then administered the oath of office to Mr. RAYBURN.

SWEARING IN OF THE MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. If the Members will rise in their place, the Chair will administer the oath of office to all.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I know five Members whose certificates of election are on file who were unavoidably prevented from answering the roll call. Are those Members entitled to be sworn in at this time?

The SPEAKER. If they are present only.

Mr. KEEFE. I mean, if they are present.

The SPEAKER. They will be. No one except those present will be sworn in at this time.

Mr. KEEFE. I am referring to a Member whose name does not appear as answering the roll call but who is present in person at the time the oath will be taken.

The SPEAKER. If the Member is present he may take the oath.

The Members and Delegates-elect rose, and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That South Trimble, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Kenneth Romney, of the State of Montana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Finis E. Scott, of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be divided and that a vote first be taken on the election of Chaplain, after which I shall offer a substitute resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the election of the Chaplain of the House.

The question was taken; and the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, D. D., was unanimously elected Chaplain of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute resolution for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

The Clerk read the substitute resolution, as follows:

Substitute resolution offered by Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

"*Resolved*, That John Andrews, of the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

"That W. F. Russell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

"That James P. Griffin, of the State of New Jersey, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

"That Frank W. Collier, of the State of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, elected Postmaster of the House of Representatives."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute resolution.

The substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the original resolution offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. South Trimble, Mr. Kenneth Romney, Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, Mr. Finis E. Scott, and Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., appeared at the bar of the House, and the oath of office was administered to them by the Speaker.

NOTIFICATION OF SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, has been elected Speaker, and South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, has been elected Clerk; and that the House is ready for business.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Pursuant to the foregoing resolution, the Vice President appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHITE members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session on Saturday, January 6, 1945, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF SPEAKER AND CLERK

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 4), as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, Speaker, and South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, Clerk, of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 5), as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the Seventy-eighth Congress be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: After the word "Congress", at the end of the resolution, strike out the period, insert a comma, and insert the following:

"That rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding after clause 40a of the first paragraph a new clause to read as follows:

"'40b. On un-American Activities, to consist of 9 members.'

"Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding after clause 40a two new clauses to read as follows:

"'40b. To un-American activities—to the Committee on un-American Activities.

"'40c. The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"'The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together wtih such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"'For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.'"

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the object of this amendment is to extend the life of the Committee on Un-American Activities, usually referred to as the Dies committee, and to make it one of the standing committees of the House.

It also provides for giving that committee the right to report legislation in order that its recommendations may be brought to the floor of the House for consideration in the regular way.

The Dies committee, or the Committee on Un-American Activities, was created in 1938. It has done a marvelous work in the face of all the criticism that has been hurled at its chairman and at its members. I submit that during these trying times the Committee on Un-American Activities has performed a duty second to none ever performed by any committee of this House.

Today, when our boys are fighting to preserve American institutions, I submit it is no time to destroy the records of that committee, it is no time to relax our vigilance. We should carry on in the regular way and keep this committee intact, and above all things, save those records.

There have been more than 5,000 different occasions in which various agencies of this Government have come to this committee for information on un-American activities. That means the Department of State, the Department of War, the Navy Department, the Army Intelligence, the Navy Intelligence, the Department of Justice, and the F. B. I. They have all come to search those records, and have found in them a wealth of information that has gone far toward protecting this Nation from saboteurs of all kinds.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman for introducing his amendment. I shall vote for it. As a member of the Dies committee, myself, I know that under the proper chairman such a permanent committee as the gentleman from Mississippi proposes can render a great public service.

Now I would like to ask a question. If the resolution is adopted, as I hope it will be, is it provided that the extensive and highly important records now held by the Dies committee will be turned over to the new committee?

Mr. RANKIN. It is understood that those records will be turned over to this

committee. Of course, they are now in the possession of the House. I want to say to you that our policemen in the House Office Building deserve a vote of thanks from this House for protecting those records in the last few days.

The passage of this amendment will not interfere with any orderly procedure, and I do not see how any man in this House can vote against this amendment. I hope it passes unanimously.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a committee appointed on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, has performed its duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to communicate with the House in writing.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House a few weeks ago appointed a special committee for the purpose of studying the rules of the House governing its procedure, I move that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER. That is not a proper motion, the Chair will say, at this time, because there is an amendment to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois which is pending and which must be disposed of.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order. An amendment cannot be referred to a committee. That is out of order. An amendment to a pending motion cannot be referred to a committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds that the amendment must be disposed of.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I arise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt but that the amendment is in order, but under the ordinary procedure of the House resolutions creating committees are introduced and referred to the Committee on Rules. This applies to standing committees as well as select committees. There an opportunity is given for a hearing to determine the advisability of bringing the resolution before the House.

What does this resolution to the rules do? In creating the standing committee it likewise provides for the type of legislation that the committee will consider. At the present time legislation of that character is considered by one of the most outstanding committees of this House, the Judiciary Committee.

Much has been said about the preservation of the records of the Dies committee. That is not an issue here in this amendment because there is absolutely nothing in the amendment that provides for placing the records of the Dies committee under the control of the standing committee which the amendment seeks to create.

To place the records of the Dies committee in the hands of a standing committee of the House it would be necessary for the House to pass a resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to turn the records over to that committee.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that the Dies committee to a certain extent did perform a real public service. That was at a time when all the members of the committee were participating in its deliberations and agreeing upon the procedure that the committee should follow. Later on the committee ceased to function in this way, or at least that charge was made by members of the committee who maintained that the chairman seemed to assume entire responsibility and that statements credited to the committee were issued that members of the committee had never seen or approved. It is no secret that some members of this committee resigned because of their displeasure at the manner in which the committee was being operated.

Every Member of this House is aware that there was an outstanding disagreement between the Department of Justice and the chairman of the committee. Efforts were made to settle this disagreement without success. After the war started the committee was not in full cooperation with the intelligence branches of the Army, Navy, and State Departments, but as time went on this was ironed out. The committee had a tremendous number of names in its files and almost daily the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Intelligence Divisions of the Army, Navy, and State Departments would check the files in search of information relative to individuals they were investigating.

The last time the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Dies, appeared before the Committee on Accounts, asking for an additional appropriation, he advised that committee that there was complete harmony between his committee and the Department of Justice and the State, War, and Navy Departments. Today these four agencies of our Government are investigating subversive activities. Millions of dollars have been appropriated for that purpose, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Intelligence Branches of the State, Army, and the Navy. The Representatives of those agencies can continue checking the records of the Dies committee, with the approval of the Clerk of the House.

In all about $675,000 of the taxpayers' money has been spent by the Dies committee. Offices were opened in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, and also in Texas.

In recent years the Dies committee has been a one-man committee. Outside of one investigation, meetings were seldom held during the past 2 years. One member of the committee came to me and said he had asked for the names of the employees of the committee of which he was a member, the salaries they were receiving, and the duties that they were performing. He, a member of that committee, said he was denied that information. I told him he could get part of the information if he asked for it. He said that he did ask for it. I said to him then that he should ask again. Then he asked me for it, and I gave the names of the employees and their salaries, but I had no knowledge of what their duties were. I consider the expenditure of public funds a public record, and so long as I am chairman of the Committee on Accounts, unless this House passes a resolution to the contrary, Members of this House can always learn how the money they appropriated is being expended.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. To say, in defense of the chairman of that committee, right along the lines about which the gentleman has spoken, that I know of no time when I served on that committee, and that was some 6½ or 7 years, when a member of the committee could not find out at all times just who was employed, and how much that employee was being paid, and I just cannot understand how any member of that committee, even though he might be a new dealer, could ask such a question and not get the answer.

Mr. COCHRAN. And I say to the gentleman that I have the utmost confidence in the Member I refer to and that he came to me and told me that he could not get the information.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I have inquired many times, and I never asked the Dies committee for information in its possession that I did not get it. The War Department never asked the Dies committee for information in its possession that it did not get it; the F. B. I. never asked for information of the Dies committee; the Naval Intelligence never asked the Dies committee for information, the Department of Justice and the Department of State never asked the Dies committee for information within its possession that they did not get it right then and there; and at this moment representatives of the State Department and other departments of the Government, are over there getting information from those files to protect us and to protect this Government for which our boys are fighting.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi that what he enumerates at the moment is correct; but I know that year after year the gentleman from Texas refused the departments the gentleman from Mississippi has named, information they requested.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I have to deny that statement. That statement, I am sorry, is not true; it is a misstatement.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield to the gentleman from New Jersey. I will let his denial stand but again say there was a time when the chairman of the committee refused to cooperate with the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. There never was a time when we did not give to the departments everything they wanted.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, we have a rule that provides—and the Speaker has so held—that 3 days after the beginning of a new Congress, and that is today, the records of the Dies committee and every other committee of the House, standing and select, shall be turned over to the Clerk of the House. Further than that, we have a law which provides how the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall handle those records. He has the power to place those records in the Library of Congress. They are valuable records because they contain a tremendous number of names. And how did they get those names? They confiscated mailing lists of so-called subversive organizations they suspected of violating the laws of this country. I have been receiving for years, and every other Member of this House has been receiving, from organizations literature of every type. I would not have received that literature had my name not been on such a mailing list. So, if they confiscated the mailing lists of some of these organizations that have been sending out literature over this long period of years, undoubtedly my name is on the list; and so is yours. But that does not mean I was a member of the organization or organizations. I say this matter should be properly handled by the Committee on Rules of this House. If a proper showing can be made to that committee that the rules of the House should be amended and that they should create a standing committee or that a select committee should be provided, the Committee on Rules have the power to report a resolution. Let us proceed in an orderly way as we have done in the past. I hope this amendment will be voted down and then if the gentleman from Mississippi so desires he can offer a resolution that will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What would be the effect of the adoption of this amendment so far as the finances of the committee are concerned?

Mr. COCHRAN. The committee would have no right to financial assistance other than for a clerk or two because the amendment contains no provision for any special expenses. Certainly if the House creates a standing committee it will give that committee a clerk or two as it does all standing committees.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further on that point.

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the past the special resolution creating the Dies committee or the Committee on Un-American Activities, has itself carried an authorization for certain appropriations; is not that correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; but the Accounts Committee also feels if the House creates a select committee it is a mandate to allow expenses. It has always carried out the mandate but this is not providing for a select committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was done by an accompanying resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; the Accounts Committee would bring in a resolution. The Dies committee ends today; there will be no Dies committee after today unless the House creates such a committee. The gentleman from Mississippi desires not to extend the life of the Dies committee but to create a new standing committee of the House. That is what he seeks to do. This new standing committee of the House will have no assistance whatsoever until the Appropriations Committee provides the assistance.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the committee were created as a standing committee of the House by the adoption of the amendment proposed, would it not be true that then its funds would have to come through the Appropriations Committee rather than the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; it would go to the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman said "standing committee"?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. It would go to the Appropriations Committee. The Accounts Committee does not handle that appropriation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If this amendment is adopted, which I am sure it will be, then this committee will be provided with funds just as any other committee of the House is provided with funds.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Coming from the Legislative Appropriations Committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. But not with any money for expenses such as was allowed the Dies committee.

Mr. RANKIN. It would come to the House for funds to carry on its activities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In that case, then, it would be up to the Appropriations Committee to recommend whatever amount it wanted to give them?

Mr. COCHRAN. I say that under the rules of the House the Legislative Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee would recommend a clerk or two clerks or whatever it desired and it would be carried in a deficiency bill; but there would be no money in a lump sum voted for the standing committee of the House under the amendment that the gentleman has offered.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If this amendment is adopted we will be establishing a standing committee which heretofore has been a select committee, am I correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is true to the extent it would have the jurisdiction provided in the amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as most Members of the House know, I have for a little over a year been a member of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. In my opinion, this is certainly the wrong time to bring up the question as to renewal of the same type of committee.

This is a most controversial question. It is a question that every Member wants to consider at length. It is a question which should take perhaps 2 or 3 days of debate. It is a question involving very, very many important problems and many important decisions.

I call the attention of the Members to the fact that up until the date of the expiration of this committee it required a personnel of 13 employees, which cost thousands of dollars a month. If you are now going to establish a committee to carry on the same kind of activities, you are practically authorizing the expenditure of anywhere from $75,000 to $200,000 a year, and I say this is no time to do anything of that sort.

I may say also that up to the present time I have not seen a piece of paper in the form of any tentative report that is supposed to be presented to the House of Representatives, and I am a member of that committee. If your action today prolongs the committee and it continues to proceed in that manner, I think it is the commencement on the first day this House is in session of a procedure that will lead to disunity. We want to start out in harmony and follow the advice of the Speaker in an endeavor to work in unity and cohesion and to use important reasons for any action we take—not go ahead on passion, prejudice, and on unreliable matter.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment should be defeated if for no other reason than to give us time to think over the question and let us all decide for ourselves. I was under the impression that the minority leader and the minority party had agreed that the further activities of committees of this sort would not be sanctioned in the new Congress.

I hope that the Republican Members as well as the Democratic Members of the House will vote against this amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the minority leader, as his name has been mentioned.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has quoted me as being in some agreement about some of these committees being continued. May I inform the gentleman that I have not made any agreement with anyone on any committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not say that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader, had entered into any agreement, but I said it was my understanding, and I will say this, that I have seen

published reports in the newspapers to the effect that he would have no objection to the discontinuance of the activities of the Dies committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] for an observation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to participate in this discussion, but I would feel ashamed of myself if I did not take the opportunity to publicly express a very deep appreciation of the work done by the so-called Dies committee. Much has been said with reference to the large expenditures made by the committee. As for that, may I say that, in my judgment, the House never made a wiser or a better investment than it made in the setting up of that committee and providing it with funds to carry on its activities.

I feel very deeply about this thing. Frankly, I am not enthusiastic about the setting up of special investigating committees during the new Congress. With respect to what has been said about agreements, let me say that there have been no agreements, but a tacit understanding in certain circles that as few of these committees would be set up as might be possible. The argument that this is a matter for consideration of the Committee on Rules is, in my judgment, not quite——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. COX. I did not mean to include anybody on this side as being a party to any kind of understanding.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is all right, then.

Mr. COX. As to the argument that this is a matter that should first go to the Committee on Rules, may I say that maybe that would be the wiser course to take, but still to me the argument does not seem entirely valid. The Committee on Rules is the creature of this House, and any recommendation or proposal that that committee might see fit to offer would have to come back to the House. The question raised in the pending amendment is an all-important question, and it is one upon which this House must make a decision sooner or later. Make no mistake about that. The people of this country are very much aroused on this whole question, and they are deeply concerned. They are not willing that the work started by the Dies committee come to an end. In some of the press there has been much shouting over the demise of the Dies committee, but let me say that in the hearts of the people there is a desire that the Congress, at least, meet its responsibility by the setting up of some kind of an agency to stand guard for America.

This decision has to be made. This House may accept this resolution, or it may be rejected. If you turn it down, you may expect a resolution back here to set up another investigating committee, and such a resolution will carry by an overwhelming majority in this body.

If it should be pleasing to the gentleman from Mississippi to withdraw his amendment and let the matter come first to the Committee on Rules, and let a new record be developed, I would make no objection, but as for hearings, hearings have been held and the record is now in the keeping of this House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If I were to take that course these valuable records that probably involve the fate of this Nation, the safety of the American people, would be dissipated.

Mr. COX. You know the source from which comes this denunciation of the Dies committee. Let me make this observation. There is a world-wide conspiracy—there is a campaign against constitutional government going on all over the world. The people who are engineering and participating in the furtherance of this campaign are the people who are most often denouncing the work of the Dies committee.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the greatest of American institutions is the American Legion. I hold in my hand the memorial of the American Legion, adopted in Chicago, Ill., on September 18, 1944, memorializing the Congress of the United States to "continue and make permanent the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities."

Mr. COX. May I say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Missouri very kindly yielded to me, and I must not further transgress upon his courtesy.

I do not know what the House may do, but sooner or later decision on this question must be made, and made by this House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress. I hope that on this day we will view this amendment from the angle of reason and from the angle of the legislative history of the very body of which we are Members. I do not know when in the history of our country the National House of Representatives has ever provided by rule for a permanent investigating committee. Mark what we are doing. This is not a question of establishing an investigating committee to investigate conditions that arise from time to time; it is a question of amending the rules of the House to provide for a permanent standing committee that does not consider legislation, but has one subject, one field, the field of investigating and making a report.

The amendment provides:

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

You will note, not legislation, recommendations.

Then, further:

The Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole or by subcommittee is authorized to make from time to time investigations.

We are not considering a resolution out of the Committee on Rules for the appointment of a special committee to investigate for the continuance of this session.

We are considering by this amendment the establishment of a permanent committee, a standing committee of the House. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. I hope that the House will not accept this amendment. The merits of it cannot be discussed today. It is a question of whether or not the House shall provide for a standing committee or shall refer this to the Committee on Rules for consideration. I am confident the Committee on Rules will forthwith report a resolution continuing for this Congress the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. If that is done, I can assure the gentleman from Mississippi that immediately upon that resolution being reported out, if the House takes such action today, I shall put it on the program for immediate consideration. There is a big difference between establishing a standing committee to investigate and establishing a special investigating committee for a particular Congress. If this amendment is adopted, as far as I know, it will be the first time in the history of this body that a committee of this kind was ever established as a permanent or standing committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to the fact that this is to be a standing committee. It is to be a legislative committee with powers to make these investigations. This would amend rule 11 of the Rules of the House by adding after clause 40 (a) two new clauses. Section 11 is the one which says to what committees legislation shall be referred, and getting down to this amendment it says:

To the Committee on Un-American Activities—

That is, the legislation which refers to un-American activities to be referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities. Of course, it is a legislative committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. What type of legislation, that is the question. There is a question of jurisdiction of committees, of other permanent and standing committees. Certainly the existing rules provide the type of bills or resolutions that are referred to a standing committee. This resolution establishing a standing committee, assuming it can recommend legislation, does not set forth the type of legislation.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. What assurance can the majority leader give the House that the records of the Dies committee will not be destroyed, as charged by the gentleman from Mississippi, if the resolution is defeated?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's question is a very proper one.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield, the Clerk of the House is a sworn officer of the House, and not only the Rules of the

House, but the law of the land, provide that they shall be put into his hands and what shall be the disposition of such records. The Chair thinks that answers the question of whether or not these papers are going to be destroyed.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we have a penal statute which provides that if the Clerk of the House or any other individual destroys those files, or even takes the files away, he can be sent to the penitentiary.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am not discussing the merits of this because I voted for the Dies resolution every time it came up. I hope my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, will withdraw it. I am urging the House to realize that a vote against this is not a vote against a special investigating committee. It is a vote against the procedure that in one-hundred-and-fifty-odd years of constitutional history, no Congress, no membership of this body, has ever followed to establish a permanent committee of this kind. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My inquiry has been partly answered by the statement of the Chair, but I now ask, What is the status of the records of the Dies committee at the present time and what will be their status if this amendment should be adopted?

The SPEAKER. This amendment does not change the status of the papers of the Dies committee at all, unless further action of the House is taken. For the information of the House the Chair will read two rules.

First:

RULE XXXVII

PAPERS

The clerks of the several committees of the House shall, within 3 days after the final adjournment of a Congress, deliver to the Clerk of the House all bills, joint resolutions, petitions, and other papers referred to the committee, together with all evidence taken by such committee under the order of the House during the said Congress and not reported to the House; and in the event of the failure or neglect of any clerk of a committee to comply with this rule the Clerk of the House shall, within 3 days thereafter, take into his keeping all such papers and testimony.

Also:

RULE XXXVIII

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS

No memorial or other paper presented to the House shall be withdrawn from its files without its leave, and if withdrawn therefrom certified copies thereof shall be left in the office of the Clerk; but when an act may pass for the settlement of a claim, the Clerk is authorized to transmit to the officer in charge with the settlement thereof the papers on file in his office relating to such claim, or may loan temporarily to an officer or bureau of the executive departments any papers on file in his office relating to any matter pending before such officer or bureau, taking proper receipt therefor.

Those are the rules of the House. The law provides in title II, United States Code, section 147, as follows:

The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to deliver to the Librarian of Congress all bound volumes of original papers, general petitions, printed matter, books, and manuscripts on June 6, 1900, in, or that may thereafter have come into or may come into, the files of the House, which in his judgment are not required to be retained in the immediate custody of the file clerk; and it shall be the duty of the Librarian of Congress to cause all such matter so delivered to him to be properly classified by Congress and arranged for preservation and ready reference. All of such matter to be held as a part of the files of the House of Representatives, subject to its orders and rules.

The majority leader of the House, with the minority leader and myself, held a conference about these papers and it was decided that they would remain in the committee until today, and be transferred as the rules and law provide unless the House should take further action. So far as the preservation of the papers is concerned, they are in the custody of the Clerk of the House. The Clerk of the House is a sworn officer and he knows his duty.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. Just a moment. Does the gentleman want to state a point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. COX. Not against, though.

Mr. RANKIN. Not against.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like very much to complete the statement the Chair started to make.

The House will remember that the McCormack committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities, wound up its work and recommended legislation. Its papers were taken possession of by the Clerk and filed in the Library of Congress. They were looked into by resolution of the Congress. That is the usual method, and it can be done at any time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the pending amendment, was any order given to the Librarian of Congress with respect to the disposition of these papers?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman heard the amendment read.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was rather involved in references and at the time it was impossible to tell. The citation the Chair last read from the law stated that the papers would be subject to the order of the House; and I was wondering if the House was proposing to give an order.

The SPEAKER. That is a statutory law, not a rule of the House.

The Chair does not see anything in the pending amendment that makes any disposition whatever of the papers of the so-called Dies committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, let me say in that connection, in reply to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], that some of the men who went over there to look over those papers were prepared to remove them and said they would like to throw them into the Potomac River. I want to see that these records are kept; that is one thing I am striving for.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered; and, further than that, as far as the occupant of this chair is concerned these papers have been kept intact.

Mr. RANKIN. I am speaking of the ones who went there to look them over.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—yeas 134, noes 146.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that two or three Members with certificates on file with the Clerk were not here when the other Members were sworn in, were unable to get here at the hour of meeting on account of late trains. At least two such Members are here now.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those detained by late trains. I took the oath of office but I was not here in time to answer to the first roll call.

The SPEAKER. The statement of the gentleman from South Dakota will stand.

Mr. LE COMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LE COMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I was not present at the roll call but I was present and took the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will stand.

The Members who have not taken the oath of office will present themselves in the well of the House and all others will clear the well of the House.

Mr. GORSKI and Mr. STEFAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin who is now addressing the Chair were not here when the roll was called but were present and took the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. The statement of the gentleman will stand.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a statement be made as to what we are voting on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is endeavoring to put the question and will state it if he is allowed to.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. A roll call has been ordered. Those in favor of the amendment will, when their names are called, answer "yea" and those opposed "nay." The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 208, nays 186, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—208

Abernethy	Gifford	Mott
Adams	Gillespie	Mundt
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Gillie	Murray, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Norrell
	Gossett	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	O'Konski
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ala.	Pace
	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.
Andrews, Ala.	Griffiths	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gross	Philbin
Angell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Phillips
Arends	Gwynne, Iowa	Pittenger
Auchincloss	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser
		Powers
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Price, Fla.
Bates, Mass.		Randolph
Beall	Halleck	Rankin
Beckworth	Hancock	Reece, Tenn.
Bell	Hare	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Hartley	Rees, Kans.
Boykin	Hébert	Rich
Bradley, Mich.	Hendricks	Richards
Brown, Ga.	Henry	Riley
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Rivers
Brumbaugh	Hill	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bryson	Hinshaw	
Buffett	Hobbs	Robertson, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Robsion, Ky.
Camp	Hoffman	Rockwell
Campbell	Hope	Rodgers, Pa.
Cannon, Fla.	Horan	Roe, Md.
Carlson	Howell	Rogers, Fla.
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins	Rogers, Mass.
Chiperfield	Jensen	Russell
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Sasscer
Clason	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Mo.
Clevenger	Johnson, Okla.	Schwabe, Okla.
Cole, Kans.	Jones	Scrivner
Cole, Mo.	Jonkman	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Short
Colmer	Kearney	Simpson, Ill.
Cooper	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Corbett	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Cox	Kilday	Springer
Cravens	Kinzer	Stefan
Cunningham	Knutson	Stewart
Curtis	Landis	Stigler
D'Alesandro	Lanham	Sundstrom
Daughton, Va.	Larcade	Taber
Davis	LeCompte	Talbot
Dolliver	LeFevre	Talle
Domengeaux	McConnell	Thomas, N. J.
Dondero	McCowen	Tibbott
Drewry	McGehee	Vorys, Ohio
Dworshak	McGregor	Vursell
Eaton	McKenzie	Wadsworth
Elliott	McMillan, S. C.	West
Ellis	McMillen, Ill.	White
Ellsworth	Mahon	Whitten
Elsaesser	Maloney	Wickersham
Elston	Manasco	Wigglesworth
Fallon	Martin, Iowa	Wilson
Fellows	Martin, Mass.	Winstead
Fenton	Mason	Winter
Fisher	May	Wolcott
Fuller	Michener	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gamble	Miller, Nebr.	Wood
Gathings	Mills	Woodruff, Mich.
Gearhart	Morrison	Worley
Gibson		

NAYS—186

Anderson, N. Mex.	Case, N. J.	Fernandez
	Celler	Flannagan
Arnold	Chelf	Flood
Bailey	Clements	Folger
Baldwin, N. Y.	Cochran	Forand
Barrett, Pa.	Combs	Gallagher
Barry	Cooley	Gardner
Bates, Ky.	Crosser	Geelan
Bender	Curley	Gerlach
Bennet, N. Y.	Dawson	Gordon
Biemiller	De Lacy	Gorski
Bland	Delaney, James J.	Granahan
Bloom		Granger
Bolton	Delaney, John J.	Green
Bonner		Gregory
Boren	Dickstein	Hagen
Bradley, Pa.	Dirksen	Hand
Buckley	Douglas, Calif.	Harris
Bulwinkle	Douglas, Ill.	Hart
Bunker	Doyle	Havenner
Burch	Durham	Hays
Burgin	Eberharter	Healy
Byrne, N. Y.	Engel, Mich.	Hedrick
Canfield	Engle, Calif.	Heffernan
Cannon, Mo.	Ervin	Herter
Carnahan	Feighan	Heselton
Hoch	Mansfield, Mont.	Rooney
Holifield		Rowan
Holmes, Mass.	Mansfield, Tex.	Ryter
Holmes, Wash.	Marcantonio	Sabath
Hook	Merrow	Sadowski
Huber	Miller, Calif.	Satterfield
Hull	Monroney	Savage
Izac	Morgan	Sheppard
Jarman	Murdock	Sheridan
Johnson, Calif.	Murphy	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Luther A.	Norton	Snyder
	O'Brien, Ill.	Sparkman
Kean	O'Brien, Mich.	Spence
Kee	O'Connor	Starkey
Kefauver	O'Neal	Stevenson
Kelley, Pa.	O'Toole	Stockman
Kelly, Ill.	Outland	Sullivan
Keogh	Patman	Tarver
Kerr	Patrick	Taylor
King	Patterson	Thom
Kirwan	Pfeifer	Thomas, Tex.
Kopplemann	Pickett	Thomason
Kunkel	Plumley	Tolan
LaFollette	Poage	Torrens
Lane	Powell	Towe
Lea	Price, Ill.	Traynor
Lemke	Priest	Vinson
Lesinski	Quinn, N. Y.	Voorhis, Calif.
Lewis	Rabaut	Walter
Link	Rabin	Wasielewski
Luce	Rains	Weaver
Ludlow	Ramey	Weiss
Lyle	Ramspeck	Welch
Lynch	Rayfiel	Whittington
McCormack	Resa	Wolverton, N. J.
McDonough	Robinson, Utah	Woodhouse
McGlinchey	Roe, N. Y.	Woodrum, Va.
Madden	Rogers, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—40

Baldwin, Md.	Doughton, N. C.	Neely
Barden	Earthman	Rizley
Blackney	Fogarty	Sharp
Brehm	Fulton	Sikes
Brooks	Gavin	Simpson, Pa.
Buck	Gore	Slaughter
Butler	Hale	Smith, Ohio
Chapman	Harless, Ariz.	Somers, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Heidinger	Sumner, Ill.
Clark	Jackson	Sumners, Tex.
Coffee	Jennings	Trimble
Courtney	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Weichel
Crawford		Zimmerman
Dingell	Latham	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call the ayes are 208, the nays 186.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (S. Con. Res. 1), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, the 6th day of January 1945, at 1 o'clock postmeridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint the tellers later.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 6), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 7), as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Accounts: John J. Cochran (chairman), Missouri; Frank M. Boykin, Alabama; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Donald L. O'Toole, New York.

Appropriations: Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; Clifton A. Woodrum, Virginia; Louis Ludlow, Indiana; Malcolm C. Tarver, Georgia; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; J. Buell Snyder, Pennsylvania; Emmet O'Neal, Kentucky; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Butler B. Hare, South Carolina; Albert Thomas, Texas; Joe Hendricks, Florida; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; John M. Coffee, Washington; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; James M. Curley, Massachusetts.

Military Affairs: Andrew J. May (chairman), Kentucky; R. Ewing Thomason, Texas; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; John J. Sparkman, Alabama; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; Carl T. Durham, North Carolina; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; John Edward Sheridan, Pennsylvania; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; Paul Stewart, Oklahoma; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; John J. Rooney, New York.

Naval Affairs: Carl Vinson (chairman), Georgia; Patrick H. Drewry, Virginia; Lyndon B. Johnson, Texas; Michael J. Bradley, Pennsylvania; Ed. V. Izac, California; Lansdale G. Sasscer, Maryland; James J. Heffernan, New York; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Emery H. Price, Florida; William A. Rowan, Illinois.

Rules: Adolph J. Sabath (chairman), Illinois; E. E. Cox, Georgia; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; J. Bayard Clark, North Carolina; John J. Delaney, New York; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; Roger C. Slaughter, Missouri.

Ways and Means: Robert L. Doughton (chairman), North Carolina; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; John D. Dingell, Michigan; A. Willis Robertson, Virginia; Milton H. West, Texas; Wilbur D. Mills, Arkansas; Noble J. Gregory, Kentucky; A. Sidney Camp, Georgia; Walter A. Lynch, New York; Aime J. Forand, Rhode Island; Thad F. Wasielewski, Wisconsin; Paul H. Maloney, Louisiana; Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania; Cecil R. King, California; Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Schuyler Otis Bland (chairman), Virginia; Robert

Ramspeck, Georgia; Joseph J. Mansfield, Texas; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; Ralph H. Daughton, Virginia.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 8), as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the hour of daily meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING AND BINDING

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 9), as follows:

Resolved, That the standing committees of the House of Representatives and the floor leaders are hereby authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be actually necessary for the transaction of their official business during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed by unanimous vote of that caucus to announce the election of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] as majority leader of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I have been directed to notify the House officially that the Republican conference has elected the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., as minority leader of the House.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the House Office Building Commission the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] to serve with himself.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. BLACKNEY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD on another subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Charles W. Briggs, of St. Paul, Minn., entitled "The Relation of the Federal Government to Sovereignty." This deals with international questions as well. I have an estimate from the Public Printer, because the article will exceed the space permitted under the House rules, that the cost will be $225.40. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George E. Sokolsky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain speeches and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Harry Emerson Wildes, of Valley Forge, Pa., commemorating the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Anthony Wayne.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members were not in the city at the time the roll call was had but were here in time to be sworn in. What is their status?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has sworn in quite a number of Members since the roll was called.

Mr. KNUTSON. They were sworn in but the RECORD does not show that they were here.

The SPEAKER. If any Member says he was here at the time of the swearing in, the Chair will take his statement for it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Joseph Leib, vice commander, Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by United States Attorney Alexander M. Campbell before the Kiwanis and Quest Clubs of Fort Wayne, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I make four unanimous-consent requests to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD: First, to include a poem; secondly, to include an editorial; and lastly, to include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous-consent requests. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the platform of the National Grange together with my remarks, and also to insert in the RECORD an extension of remarks and include a certain excerpt on irrigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

THE LATE J. MITCHELL CHASE

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of the House, J. Mitchell Chase, of Clearfield, Pa., died on New Year's Day at his home in that city.

A member of one of Pennsylvania's finest families, Mr. Chase was well and favorably known in the great Keystone State for his marked ability as a lawyer and his active participation in veterans' affairs in the State and Nation. He was elected as State commander of the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion in 1924, and served with honor and distinction.

"Mitch" Chase, as he was affectionately known to thousands of veterans throughout the Nation, enlisted for service in World War No. 1 in 1917 in the United States Air Service and served until 1919, 17 months of which were spent with the American Expeditionary Force in France. He was pardonably proud of the fact that his only son, Technical Sgt. Henry Hughes Chase, is upholding the traditional military accomplishments of the Chase family by stellar service in the present war as a member of the United States Army Air Corps, having been awarded the Purple Heart decoration and the Air Medal with nine Oak-Leaf Clusters which indicate nine additional awards of the same decoration.

Hon. J. Mitchell Chase was elected to Congress on March 4, 1927, and served in the Seventieth, Seventy-first, and Seventy-second Congresses representing the old Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, then comprised of Cameron, Centre, Clearfield, and McKean Counties. His reelection for a third term in Congress was the first time since Civil War Gov. Andrew Gregg Curtin enjoyed the distinction and honor of serving that particular district in Congress for three successive terms.

The death of "Mitch" Chase is a distinct loss to the great State of Pennsylvania and closes the career of a brilliant lawyer and a sincere and conscientious legislator, while the veterans of all wars have lost an able champion, a stanch ally and a real friend.

May he rest in peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HARLESS of Arizona, for 12 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. CRAWFORD (at the request of Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan), for 1 week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 4, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a rule regulating criminal appeals by the United States under the act of May 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 271) (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting annual report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, transmitting first report of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, as of January 1, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 9); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting Rules of Criminal Procedure for the District Courts of the United States (H. Doc. No. 12); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Administrator, War Food Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as required by paragraph (e) of that section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting copy of a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8. A letter from the Acting Administrator, War Food Administration, transmitting the report on receipts, expenditures, and results of cooperative agricultural extension work for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting five tables covering the determinations of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget during the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945 of the number of employees required by the executive departments and agencies for the proper and efficient exercise of their respective functions; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans Administration, transmitting a copy of the information furnished the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of making a determination of the Veterans Administration personnel requirements for the third quarter of the 1945 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

11. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting revision No. 1 of the estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1945, for salaries and aeronautical charts, and geodetic control surveys, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

12. A letter from the third vice president, Panama Railroad Company, transmitting on behalf of the United States Offices of the Panama Railroad Company, a revised report of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements; for the quarter ending March 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

13. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting the information with respect to the number of persons needed for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Bureau of the Budget for the quarter ending March 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

14. A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report on the operation of section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

15. A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting its eleventh annual report, covering the activities of the Authority during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, and ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

16. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, concerning the special helium-production fund; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

17. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

18. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the reports of inspection, 2,125 in number, of the records and accounts of disbursing officers of the Army, made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, by officers of the Inspector General's Department or others detailed for that purpose; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

19. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report of transactions during the fiscal year 1944, for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

20. A letter from the Army and Navy Munitions Board, transmitting a report on strategic materials, which is submitted to the Congress by the Army and Navy Munitions Board; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

21. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report showing officers and administrative offices delinquent in rendering or transmitting accounts; and officers delinquent in payment of final balances, for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

22. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting certificates from the executives of Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Maine, New York, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin, certifying to the appointment of the electors for President and Vice President in these States on November 7, 1944; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

23. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Fort Peck

project, Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

24. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

25. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 15, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Santee River, N. C. and S. C., with a view to determining whether any flood-control improvement of the Reedy River, S. C., is advisable at this time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 2, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

26. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the financial statement of the Bonneville Administrator for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, made under the provisions of section 9 (c) of the Bonneville Act (Public, No. 329, 75th Cong., approved August 20, 1937); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

27. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

28. A letter from the president of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting herewith the Seventeenth Annual Report of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

29. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the preceding fiscal year as to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library; to the Committee on the Library.

30. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the Eighth Report of the Attorney General, covering the period from August 26 through December 15, 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

31. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of Dane D. Morgan against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

32. A letter from the Acting Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 2, 1944, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims; to the Committee on Claims.

33. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc., against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

34. A letter from the Administrator of War Food Administration, transmitting the report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

35. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report of the Comptroller General of the United States of the work of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

36. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of the law in the cases of 245 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1. A bill to provide disability benefits for honorably discharged veterans under certain circumstances; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2. A bill providing for Government ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 3. A bill to restore standard time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4. A bill to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 5. A bill to make available specialized services and facilities to States, areas, counties, and communities in developing recreation programs for the people of the United States in the transition period from war to peace and beyond, designed to aid in the speedy rehabilitation and absorption of war veterans and their families into normal and satisfying community life; to provide a variety of wholesome leisure-time activities available to all youth to the end of aiding in the building of better health, physical well-being, character, and citizenship, stimulating intellectual and desirable avocational pursuits, and reducing and preventing accidents, delinquency, and crime; and making communities more attractive and desirable as places in which to live and conduct business; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 6. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States during the present war, of certain transportation expenses of members of the armed forces returning home on furlough from service overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 8. A bill to amend a law known as Public Law 603 (77th Cong., 2d sess., ch. 404), and entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 9. A bill for improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Key West, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 10. A bill to adjust the basis of compensation for overtime service of certain employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 11. A bill to authorize the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prepare estimates and plans for improvement of certain river and harbor projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 12. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Finneys Creek, Accomac County, Va., and the channel connecting with Wachapreague Inlet and the Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 13. A bill for the improvement of Gargathy Inlet, Accomac County, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 14. A bill to provide for preliminary examination and survey of Jackson Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., and the channel connecting with the Potomac River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 15. A bill for preliminary examination and survey of Taskmers Creek, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 16. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Dyer Creek, Mathews County, Va., and the channel connecting with the Chesapeake Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 17. A bill for preliminary examination and survey of Deep Creek, Accomac County, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 18. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Bonum Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., and the channel connecting with the Potomac River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 19. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Kings Creek, Northampton County, Va., and the channel connecting with Cherrystone Channel, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 20. A bill to provide for an examination and survey of Farnham Creek, Richmond County, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 21. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and surveys of Parrotts Creek, Middlesex County, Va., and the channel connecting with Rappahannock River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 22. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Davis Creek, Mathews County, Va., and channel connecting same with Mobjack Bay, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 23. A bill for preliminary examination and survey of Browns Bay, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 24. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Bransons Cove, in the lower Machodoc River, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 25. A bill for a preliminary examination and survey of the southwest side of the Rappahannock River in the vicinity of Bowlers Wharf, Essex County, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 26. A bill to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 27. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Rehoboth-Assateague National Seashore in the States of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 28. A bill to provide that the fund for the relief of sick and disabled and destitute seamen belonging to the United States merchant marine service shall also be for the relief of sick, disabled, destitute, or needy dependents of deceased seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 29. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Cas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 30. A bill to compensate Prince William County, Va., and York County, Va., for certain of their public roads and highways seized by the United States for the use of a permanent Marine Corps post at Quantico, Va., and a Navy mine depot at or near Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBES:

H. R. 31. A bill to amend Public Law No. 228 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 32. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 33. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 34 A bill to punish the willful injury, destruction, or defective manufacture of property used or intended for use in the preparation for or carrying on of war or national defense and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 35. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 36. A bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 37 A bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 38 A bill making it unlawful for any person, firm, association, or corporation not expressly excepted from the operation of the act by the provisions thereof, to use the mails to solicit or effect insurance or collect or transmit insurance premiums in any State without complying with the insurance laws thereof; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 39. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 40 A bill to permit all litigation in the courts of the United States without the requirements of deposits of money, and to make it unlawful to require the printing of the record and other papers on appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 41. A bill to provide for the recording of the proceedings in one of the courtrooms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia by sound-recording equipment; and for the reproduction of the sounds of such proceedings in whole or in part, in the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals and in the Supreme Court of the United States upon the review of any such case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 42. A bill to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 43. A bill to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 44. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government"; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

H. R. 45. A bill to provide that, in disposing of lands which have been acquired by the United States for national defense or war purposes, a preference shall be given to the former owners of such lands or their successors in interest; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 46. A bill to provide for the acquisition and maintenance of a home for Capitol pages; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 47. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 48. A bill to make the United States Merchant Marine Academy Library a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 49. A bill to amend Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 50. A bill to improve the facilities for transcontinental motor transportation; to provide additional facilities for the national defense; to aid in the relief of unemployment; to promote the public safety; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 51. A bill to insure the maximum production of oil during the war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 52. A bill to facilitate smaller war plants in reconversion to peacetime production; to assure the effective participation of Smaller War Plants Corporation in the reconversion period; to stimulate the development of new enterprises; to amend Public Law 603 (77th Cong.); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 53. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 54. A bill to amend section 10 of the act of Congress approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the retired pay of certain persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 55. A bill to prohibit interstate common-carrier pipe lines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 56. A bill to amend section 1001, title X, of the Social Security Act (Public Law No. 271, 74th Cong.), to include needy individuals who are permanently crippled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 57. A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 58. A bill authorizing negotiations and providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of an interoceanic canal over Nicaraguan territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 59. A bill to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 60. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 61. A bill increasing the amount which the United States may contribute to any State for old-age assistance in respect of any individual from $20 to $30 per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 62. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a differential in pay for night work in the Postal Service" so as to include custodial employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 63. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 with respect to the apportionment of fees collected by clerks of certain courts in naturalization proceedings; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 64. A bill relating to the income tax of members of the armed forces for the year in which they entered upon active service in such forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 65. A bill to encourage beneficiaries of old-age and survivors insurance under the Social Security Act to be gainfully employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 66. A bill to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 67. A bill to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 68. A bill to grant temporary commissioned rank to certain male nurses serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 69. A bill to repeal the automobile-use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 70. A bill to extend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 71. A bill to provide retirement benefits for certain emergency officers of World War No. 1; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 72. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act with respect to premiums on war-damage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 73. A bill to grant additional compensation to certain veterans pursuing vocational training under part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 74. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 75. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans Administration regional office building in Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 76. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans Administration hospital in Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 77. A bill to return the receipts in excess of lawful payments of a public housing agency to the Authority and to the political subdivision in which the project of such agency is situated in the same proportion to their respective contributions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 78. A bill to incorporate the World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 79. A bill amending the Social Security Act to provide for the reimbursement of

municipalities and other governmental units for expenses incurred in connection with the burial of insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 80. A bill to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 81. A bill to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 82. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, to certain employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 83. A bill to increase the compensation of employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 84. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 85. A bill to promote the economic welfare of the countries of North and South America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 86. A bill to establish Divisions of Air Warfare, the Navy, and the Army as coequal divisions under a Department of National Defense; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 87. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify terminal railway post offices," approved June 14, 1934, in order to provide higher grades for certain clerks in terminal railway post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 88. A bill to provide a pension for persons who served in the United States military or naval service who were injured in line of duty and who are now past 65 years of age; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 89. A bill relating to the classification of substitute driver-mechanics in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 90. A bill providing for the issuance of nonnegotiable United States bonds to Federal Reserve banks and terminating the authority of the Treasury to issue other interest-bearing obligations of the United States to commercial banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 91. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the Saratoga National Historical Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 92. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers' retirement benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 93. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the memory of Will Rogers; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 94. A bill to prevent monopoly and to promote a high level of production in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 95. A bill to transfer Government activities in connection with domestic rabbits to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 96. A bill for the relief of certain persons occupying lands of the United States within the drainage of the Arroyo Seco, Angeles National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 97. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 98. A bill to protect the foreign relations and to promote the trade and commerce of the United States, to require the disclosure to the United States of information affecting such trade and commerce, and to safeguard the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 99. A bill to enable disabled veterans to accept employment during the war period without deductions from their pension or compensation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 100. A bill to establish community and county committees of farmers to administer those phases of all Federal programs involving farm contact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 101. A bill to improve practices of Government procurement agencies with regard to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 102. A bill to amend subsection (i) of part II of section 4 of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 103. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 104. A bill to grant veterans judicial review against the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 105. A bill to define "unemployability" under law administered by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 106. A bill to provide liberalized definitions of permanent total disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 107. A bill to amend the act approved March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations for Government employees, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 108. A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 109. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 110. A bill to regulate the eligibility of war veterans for public housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 111. A bill to grant free postage to veterans, soldiers, sailors, or marines while being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 112. A bill to remove certain discriminations against Government employees in the payment of overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 113. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 114. A bill providing for the payment of direct Federal old-age assistance to citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 115. A bill providing for the issuance of documentary evidence of United States citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 116. A bill to extend the benefits of the Social Security Act to certain legally adopted children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 117. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 118. A bill to provide for the erection of memorial stones in national cemeteries for certain servicemen determined to be missing or missing in action, or buried at sea; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 119. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery at St. Cloud, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 120. A bill amending the Social Security Act to provide for the matching of administrative costs of State old-age assistance plans with Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 121. A bill to extend eligibility for benefits, under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, to individuals who are ineligible only by reason of the time of separation from service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 122. A bill to amend sections 2720 (a) and 3260 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the transfer tax, and the tax on manufacturers and dealers, in the case of certain small-game guns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 123. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with reference to the transactions in regard to watches containing works of foreign manufacture; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 124. A bill to cancel, to the extent of $100, the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces for the taxable year ending immediately prior to their entering the service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 125. A bill to recognize the high public service rendered by soldiers who volunteered and served in trench-fever experiments in the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 126. A bill to increase the monthly rate of service pension payable to certain widows or remarried widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 127. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 128. A bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 129. A bill to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 130. A bill to amend section 4 of the Act of December 29, 1941, so as to make the provisions of said act applicable to officers or employees certifying to pay rolls of the Selective Service System for payment by Army

disbursing officers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 131. A bill to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee prime contractors or of other subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 132. A bill providing for an excise tax on retail stores; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 133. A bill to provide for the disposition of unclaimed deposits in national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 134. A bill to provide for redemption of certain cotton certificates issued under the Bankhead Cotton Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 135. A bill to prevent manufacturers of products from offering for sale and selling the same at retail in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 136. A bill to extend rights under title II of the Social Security Act to veterans of the Second World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 137. A bill to authorize payment of compensation or pension for partial service-connected disability plus such percentage of the amount of pension payable for his permanent total disability, nonservice connected, as is equal to the difference between 100 percent and the degree of his service-connected disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 138. A bill to provide for a statutory award of $10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 139. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 140. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 141. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 142. A bill to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 143. A bill to provide for the dollar-for-dollar matching by the United States of savings by enlisted men in the armed forces through the sale of Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines Savings bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 144. A bill to provide for erection of an appropriate memorial to the men who engaged in the defense of Wake Island against the Japanese; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 145. A bill to promote the mutual understanding and insure the continental solidarity of the peoples of the American republics by the interchange of students and teachers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 146. A bill to amend the act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 147. A bill to provide funds for the prosecution of the war and to relieve the American people of unnecessary interest burden; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 148. A bill to prohibit the employment of persons by the United States at a compensation of $1 a year, and to provide that persons employed by the United States shall be compensated on a reasonably adequate basis; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 149. A bill to amend section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 150. A bill to authorize such procedure as to the adjudication of claims for benefits administered through the Veterans Administration as is designed to assure an equitable evaluation of all facts and factors pertinent to the claim, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 151. A bill to establish more equitable procedure governing the determination of service connection of diseases or injuries alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 152. A bill to authorize such procedure as to the adjudication of claims for benefits administered through the Veterans Administration as is designed to assure an equitable evaluation of all facts and factors pertinent to the claim, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 153. A bill to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and to regulate its value as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; to improve the banking system; to aid in maintaining or restoring full employment and production; to reduce the public debt; and to provide a stable currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 154. A bill to provide that the education and training provided for by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 shall be made available to veterans on an equal basis without regard to their age; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 155. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons transporting and receiving certain stolen dogs in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 156. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 157. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of St. Marys River, at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 158. A bill providing for an examination and survey of Au Train River Harbor, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 159. A bill authorizing the construction of certain hydroelectric power facilities on the St. Marys River, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 160. A bill providing for delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

H. R. 161. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 162. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 163. A bill prescribing certain offenses relating to the keeping, injuring, and destroying dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 164. A bill to provide safety in aviation and to direct an investigation of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 165. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the development and improvement of devices for the propulsion of aircraft, for national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 166. A bill to amend section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to consolidations, mergers, and acquisitions of control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 167. A bill to amend section 1 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to permit joint action by common carriers subject to part I, II, III, or IV, respectively, in connection with procedures related to the establishment of rates and the taking of other action; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 168. A bill to restore benefits for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 169. A bill to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes," approved July 13, 1943; to the Committee on Roads.

H. R. 170. A bill to authorize a National Mississippi River Parkway and matters relating thereto; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 171. A bill to aid merchant seamen and to provide for payment of mustering-out pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 172. A bill to amend chapter 16 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 173. A bill to authorize the naturalization and the admission into the United States under a quota of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 174. A bill relating to the compensation of certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 175. A bill to amend Public Law No. 603, Seventy-seventh Congress (ch. 404, 2d sess.), entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 176. A bill to increase compensation of Members of Senate and House, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 177. A bill to repeal the act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 178. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 179. A bill to provide adequate compensation for dependents of agents and inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 180. A bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 181. A bill to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 182. A bill to repeal Public, No. 252, an act to prevent pernicious political activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 183. A bill to extend the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to certain women between the ages of 20 and 35; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 184. A bill to revise the administrative procedure of Federal agencies; to establish the Office of Federal Administrative Procedure, to provide for hearing commissioners, to authorize declaratory ruling by administrative agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 185. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of certain aliens who have lawfully entered the United States upon visitors' permits and are refugees from or unable to return to their country of origin by reason of the emergency created by the existing war in Europe; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 186. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 187. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 188. A bill to amend the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 189. A bill to provide temporary increase of salaries for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 190. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees killed or injured while performing work of a hazardous nature incident to law-enforcement activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 191. A bill to increase the compensation of employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 192. A bill to remove certain discriminations against Government employees in the payment of overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 193. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 194. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 195. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish firing squads, color guards, and buglers for funerals of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 196. A bill to confer military status upon certain persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 197. A bill to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 198. A bill to provide for the promotion of moral, temperance, and character education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education; and to provide for cooperation with the States in preparation of teachers of moral, temperance, character, and good-citizenship subjects; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 199. A bill providing for the erection of a monument at Hammondsport, N. Y., in commemoration of the contribution of Glenn Hammond Curtiss in the development of aviation; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 200. A bill to authorize the appropriation, for expenditure by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, of certain amounts received from services of conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 272. A bill to amend section 3360 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 273. A bill to permit individuals to deduct for income-tax purposes from gross income the depreciation on their residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 274. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 275. A bill to provide for Federal aid to the several States in carrying out plans for industrial rehabilitation in the counties thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 276. A bill to amend the Customs Administrative Act of 1938; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 277. A bill to change the name of Bladensburg Road in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 278. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 279 (by request). A bill to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein, during other than a period of war, equivalent to 90 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 280. A bill to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to permit exemption of security issues not exceeding $300,000 from the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 281. A bill extending classified civil service to clerks or assistants in certain post offices of the third class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 282 (by request). A bill to amend section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 283. A bill relative to certain annuities; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 284. A bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 285. A bill providing for the rendering and publication of opinions by the Attorney General with respect to Executive orders of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 286. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 287. A bill to provide for Federal aid to the States for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 288. A bill to terminate certain monetary powers of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 289. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 290. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 291. A bill to terminate the President's authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 292. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to conduct a preliminary examination and survey of Pillar Point at Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 293. A bill to provide, in the case of wage and salary payments made in contravention of the Stabilization Act of 1942, that the lawful portion of such payments shall be allowed as costs or expenses of the employer; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 294. A bill to amend provisions of the Social Security Act and related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to coverage of employees engaged in processing and packing of dried fruits and dried vegetables and certain other commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 295. A bill to provide for the discovery, introduction, breeding, and testing of agricultural crops for utilization in industry and manufacturing and for replacement of surplus agricultural crops through cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture and the several State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 296. A bill to amend section 6 of an act of Congress entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1924; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 297. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territory; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 298. A bill providing for waiver of prosecution by indictment in certain criminal proceedings in the courts of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 299. A bill to amend the act relating to manifests in Alaskan and insular trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 300. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 301. A bill relative to annual labor on mineral claims in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 302. A bill to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 303. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relative to the fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 304. A bill to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 305. A bill to amend Public Law No. 304, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 306. A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act, to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 307. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 308. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary and other

election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH:

H. R. 309. A bill to increase deceased war veterans' burial allowances to $150; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 310. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 311. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia for use by the Children's Museum of Washington, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 312. A bill amending the act of March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations to Government employees, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 313. A bill to provide a uniform allowance for members of the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 314. A bill to provide for the Federal employment of qualified persons whose physical condition is considered to constitute a bad risk for a civil-service retirement fund by exempting such persons from the provisions thereof, by making them subject to the provisions of title II of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 315. A bill to eliminate the income limitation as to eligibility for pensions to the widows of certain World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 316. A bill to amend the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, so as to permit an award of compensation for death, and payment of burial expenses, without regard to the lapse of time between the injury and death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 317 (by request). A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 318 (by request). A bill to redefine the powers and duties of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, to establish a Department of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 319. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 320. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 321. A bill to amend section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 322. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds collected by the District of Columbia examining, licensing, and other boards and commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 323. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets, of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 324 (by request). A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 325 (by request). A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 326. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Metropolitan Police Department Band, District of Columbia, and to provide funds therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 327. A bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent Nurse Corps in the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 328. A bill to increase the death compensation rates to World War widows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 329. A bill to declare a portion of the Illinois and Michigan Canal an unnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 330. A bill to declare a portion of the Illinois and Michigan Canal an unnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 331. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to the duty on waterleaf paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 332. A bill to authorize payments in lieu of taxes to counties and other political subdivisions in which property acquired for military purposes has been leased for other use; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 333. A bill to equalize overtime compensation for employees of the field services of the War Department for employment during 1942; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 334. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 335. A bill to extend pension benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to certain employees for services rendered outside the United States and to increase the amount of pension payable to pensioners under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 336. A bill to provide that the Railroad Retirement Board may award disability annuities to totally and permanently disabled individuals who have completed a period of service within a reasonable time of 30 years' service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 337. A bill to further amend the act approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 338. A bill to amend the act approved October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to aid in the prevention of inflation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 339. A bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 340. A bill to provide for the return home on leave of absence or furlough of certain members of the armed forces on duty outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 341 (by request). A bill relating to the status of Keetoowah Indians of the Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 342. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law making exceptions to the prohibition with respect to the prosecution of claims against the United States by former Government employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 343. A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 344. A bill to reduce the interest on loans on United States Government life (converted) insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 345. A bill to provide for the orderly disposition of surplus Army materials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 346. A bill to secure to the producers of agricultural commodities a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 347. A bill to promote farm ownership by providing for Government-insured loans to veterans to enable them to become owners of farm homes through long-term low-interest-rate loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 348. A bill providing for the refund of penalties paid with respect to marketing excess wheat for the 1941 marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 349. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 to provide for payment of the Government's contribution to dependents of enlisted men for any period of active service prior to the date of filing application for a family allowance; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 350. A bill to extend the time in which application for servicemen's monthly family allowance may be filed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 351. A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 352. A bill providing for the refund of penalties paid with respect to marketing excess wheat for the 1941 marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. R. 353. A bill to increase the maximum monthly payment made by States to individuals for old-age assistance which will be matched by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 354. A bill to prohibit aliens from voting in labor organizations or acting as their officers or agents; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 355. A bill to promote the national defense and to facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment and essential to domestic requirements through safe and adequate inland waterways, by the immediate authorization of the construction of the New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 356. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel in the land or naval forces and to Army and Navy nurses certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 357. A bill to grant veterans of the present war base pay, and family allowances

or allowances for quarters, for 1 year after their separation from the service or release from active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 358. A bill excepting certain persons from the requirements of paying fees for certain census data; to the Committee on the Census.

H. R. 359. A bill to provide for emergency disability compensation for members of the land, naval, or air forces separated from service, pending settlement of their claims by veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 360. A bill granting pensions to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the World War equivalent to pensions granted to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the War with Spain; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 361. A bill to provide a pension for certain physically handicapped veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 362. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 363. A bill to provide additional pay for enlisted men of the Army assigned to the Medical Corps who are awarded the Medical Corps valor badge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 364. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow the Silver Star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 365. A bill to create and expand employment and opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 366. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of run-away, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 367. A bill relating to social-security taxes of the employer in the case of employment of an employee by two or more employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 368. A bill to provide duplicate posthumous awards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 369. A bill to provide for a 25-percent increase in annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 370. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pan-American center at Miami, Fla., for the coordination of commercial and cultural relations between the American republics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 371. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 372. A bill to authorize and direct the Veterans Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation and assistance in securing suitable employment for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof, and feasible therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 373. A bill to exempt from certain retailer's excise taxes articles sold by domiciliary members of Veterans Administration facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 374. A bill to provide for a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 375. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal contribution to the States shall be in lieu of requiring repayment from recipients of old-age assistance and to prevent requiring liens for repayment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 376. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act to December 31, 1945, and to authorize the President to make an additional extension of not more than 6 months after such date; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 377. A bill to establish a National Service Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 378. A bill authorizing an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 484), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 379. A bill to provide for the repair, restoration, or alteration of dams constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds under Federal emergency relief programs and appropriations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 380. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 381. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 382. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenue; and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 383. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 384. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 385. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 386. A bill to amend the law relating to the authority of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant in certain cases and to search vehicles within certain areas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 387. A bill to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 388. A bill to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138–1139; 8 U. S. C. 601); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 389. A bill to reduce time to plead and to regulate service of process in proceedings to cancel naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 390. A bill to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 391. A bill to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 392. A bill to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 393. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 394. A bill to provide additional compensation for veterans of the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 395. A bill to provide for the general welfare; to alleviate the economic hazards of old age, premature death, disability, sickness, unemployment, and dependency; to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act; to establish a unified national social insurance system; to extend the coverage, and to protect and extend the social-security rights of individuals in the military service; to provide insurance benefits for workers permanently disabled; to establish a Federal system of unemployment compensation, temporary disability, and maternity benefits; to establish a national system of public employment offices; to establish a Federal system of medical and hospitalization benefits; to encourage and aid the advancement of knowledge and skill in the provision of health services and in the prevention of sickness, disability, and premature death; to enable the several States to make more adequate provision for the needy aged, the blind, dependent children, and other needy persons; to enable the States to establish and maintain a comprehensive public assistance program; and to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 396. A bill to provide for the presentation of a suitable medal to members of the President's Cabinet, and Members of the Congress, during the wartime Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 397. A bill for the creation of a Commission of Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 398. A bill to reestablish the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, to re-create the office of the members of said Board, and to transfer functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration from the National Housing Agency to said Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 399. A bill to create a Joint Legislative Staff Service for the Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

H. R. 400. A bill to expand the facilities of the General Accounting Office by creating a Federal Efficiency Service; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 401. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 402. A bill to establish the Office of Power Administration for the coordinated administration of all Federal functions pertaining to the generation, distribution, and sale of electricity and the regulation of electric utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 403. A bill to aid the war effort by the purchase of newspaper space for publicizing the sale of United States War bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 404. A bill to amend the Banking Act of 1876, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 405. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 406. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 407. A bill to provide for the placing of a copy of the Constitution of the United States and of the Declaration of Independence in each United States post office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 408. A bill to create and establish a Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 409. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 410. A bill to authorize the War Food Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust boundary disputes by settling claims to certain so-called Sebastian Martin grant lands, in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 411. A bill to extend to members of the armed forces certain privileges with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 412. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit credit unions to make payments in connection with the redemption of United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 413. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for the establishment of a uniform classification and uniform scale of class rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 414. A bill to reduce immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 415. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to expedite the issuance of certain documents to naturalized citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 416. A bill to provide adequate markets and fair prices for agricultural commodities produced in the United States, to eliminate the necessity for mandatory reductions in crop production, to provide a method for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities for products of foreign countries on a basis mutually advantageous to agricultural and manufacturing interests in the United States, and to such foreign countries, to promote foreign trade in the interest of friendly and peaceful relations among nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 417. A bill to provide adjustments in the retirement classification and pay of officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 418. A bill providing for the issuance of appropriate insignia to rejected or deferred registrants for military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 419. A bill to protect investments made for wartime production of strategic and critical minerals, to prevent dumping after the war and a post-war market collapse, and to provide a stock pile of these minerals for future emergencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 420. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include certain employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 421. A bill to furnish conscientious objectors a special form of honorable discharge from the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 422. A bill to repeal the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act relating to political contributions by labor organizations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 423. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 424. A bill to provide additional compensation for enlisted personnel of the Medical Department of the Army who serve in combat areas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 425. A bill to provide for the erection of memorial stones in national cemeteries for certain servicemen determined to be missing or missing in action, or buried at sea; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 426. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery at St. Cloud, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 427. A bill amending the Social Security Act to provide for the matching of administrative costs of State old-age assistance plans with Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 428. A bill to protect employees engaged in war production; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 429. A bill to aid in the preservation of constitutional government in the United States of America; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 430. A bill to amend the Social Security Act approved August 14, 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 431. A bill to provide for the admission on motion of certain members of the armed forces and merchant marine to practice law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 432. A bill to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of date November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., St. Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 433. A bill to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 434. A bill to provide that nationals of the United States shall not lose their nationality by reason of voting under legal compulsion in a foreign state; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 435. A bill to amend the United States Arbitration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 436. A bill to amend the United States Arbitration Act of February 12, 1925, in order to permit departments and agencies of the Government to use the procedures established by such act in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 437. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for an annuity for total and permanent disability after 10 years' service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 438. A bill to provide that retired personnel of the Regular Army called into active military service under the provisions of the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940, shall be restored to active duty with the rank held by them on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 439. A bill to restore to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 440. A bill to authorize the designation of retired Justices for service on the Supreme Court of the United States when necessary to obtain a quorum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 441. A bill to amend section 403 (i) (1) (B) of the sixth supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 442. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 443. A bill relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of judges and retired judges of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 444. A bill to provide for the office of public defender for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 445. A bill to provide a larger Federal contribution for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 446. A bill making an appropriation for building a road and bridge on Watts Bar Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 447. A bill relating to through rates in the case of certain property of the United States manufactured or processed in transit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 448. A bill to amend the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 449. A bill relating to the original jurisdiction of district courts of suits or proceedings arising under section 20 (11), 20 (12), 219, or 413 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and to the removal of such suits and proceedings from State courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 450. A bill to create a board to be known as the National Symphony Orchestra Trust Fund Board, to define the duties of said board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 451. A bill to authorize the continued operation of certain airport traffic-control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 452. A bill to authorize the designation of retired justices for service on the Supreme Court of the United States when necessary to obtain a quorum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 453. A bill making an appropriation for building a road and bridge on Chickamauga Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 454. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 455. A bill designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 456. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 457. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 458. A bill to amend section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 3469 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 459. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, providing for exemption from estate tax of the estates of persons in the military service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 460. A bill to provide an additional allowance for military and naval personnel in computing net income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 461. A bill to provide for free postage on mail to members of the armed forces; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 462. A bill to amend section 451 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 463. A bill to provide that a general assignment for benefit of creditors shall not constitute an act of bankruptcy unless connected with some other act of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 464. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 465. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks, terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 466. A bill granting annual and sick leave to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 467. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 468. A bill to prohibit the registration of trade-marks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 469. A bill to amend Revised Statutes, section 876, as amended, relating to issuance of subpenas in civil cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 470. A bill to amend the act approved June 25, 1938, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 471. A bill to create the Office of Law Revision Counsel in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

H. R. 472. A bill to amend section 28 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 473. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes to subordinate tax claims of the United States to wage claims in State insolvency proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 474. A bill authorizing and adopting the improvement of East River, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 475. A bill to provide for the appointment of a personal bailiff for each district judge in a United States district court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 476. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.," approved June 14, 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 477. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire certain lands in the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 478. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 479. A bill to provide for loans to enable veterans of World War No. 2 to pay debts existing at the date of their discharge from the service; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 480. A bill to abolish the United States Park Police force in the District of Columbia, to transfer the personnel of the United States Park Police to the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 481. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 482. A bill to amend the act approved March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations for Government employees, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 483. A bill to grant temporary commissioned rank to certain male nurses serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 484. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Government of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 485. A bill to remove certain discriminations against Government employees in the payment of overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 486. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 487. A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 488. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 489. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, approved February 3, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 490. A bill to authorize the undertaking of the initial stage of the comprehensive plan for the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 491. A bill to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia and providing a penalty for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 492. A bill to provide for additional individual income-tax exemption for persons who served in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 493. A bill to increase by 15 percent the retired pay provided for the armed services in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 494. A bill to assist the armed forces to provide manpower for harvesting, timbering, canning, and other essential activities in seasonal emergencies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 495. A bill to abolish and correct unfair practices and substandard working conditions and to raise living standards among the employees of the United States Veterans Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 496. A bill to define the crime of lynching, to prescribe punishment therefor, and to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the facts in connection with lynchings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 497. A bill to create a Federal Industrial Commission to aid in the stabilization of employment in industry, agriculture, and commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 498. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to widows of recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 499. A bill for the repeal of Public Law 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 500. A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 501. A bill to provide for the entry on the service record of each member of the land or naval forces of the United States a statement of prior service as a member of any home defense force; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 502. A bill to suspend until termination of hostilities the compulsory retirement age of employees subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 503. A bill to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 504. A bill to establish a Department of Air Defense, to establish the United States Air Forces as a separate branch of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 505. A bill to aid the program for the conservation of food; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 506. A bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide double credit for enlisted service outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 507. A bill to suspend until termination of hostilities the compulsory retirement age of employees subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 508. A bill relating to the exemption from the tax on transportation of property of amounts paid for such transportation by States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 509. A bill relating to withholding of tax at source on wages in the case of community income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 510. A bill granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 511. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 512. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 513. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the Allied countries during the Second World War or otherwise assist in the Allied war effort, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 514. A bill to provide for the permanent establishment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Joint Secretariat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 515. A bill to provide military or naval training for all male citizens who attain the age of 18 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 516. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 517. A bill designating the reservoir created by the construction of the Norfolk Dam in Baxter County, Ark., as Lake John Morrow; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 518. A bill to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of flood-control and navigation improvements, including dams, reservoirs, and allied structures, in the basins of the Arkansas and White Rivers, and for the disposition of surplus electric energy generated by the Federal flood-control and navigation improvements in the basins of such rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 519. A bill to prevent pollution of the waters of the United States and to correct existing water pollution as a vital aid to public health, economic welfare, healthful recreation, navigation, the support of invaluable aquatic life, and as a logical and desirable post-war public works program; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 520. A bill to facilitate settlement of returning veterans on farms in projects constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 521. A bill for the equalization of pay of letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 522. A bill to restore former basis of compensation and allowances of postmasters and postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 523. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 524. A bill to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 525. A bill to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 526. A bill to promote the principle of equal pay for equal work; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 527. A bill providing for the option to repurchase by the seller of any lands or buildings, or both, or any right or interest therein, sold to the United States of America, together with any improvements made thereon, when not needed for public use; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 528. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 529. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States, during the present war, of certain transportation expenses of enlisted members of the armed forces while on emergency furlough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 530. A bill to amend the Declaratory Judgments Act of June 14, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 531. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, to provide compensation for disability or death of air-carrier employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 532. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 533. A bill authorizing the State of Minnesota Department of Highways to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hastings, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 534. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 535. A bill to define loss of use of an eye for the purposes of granting the statutory award of $35 per month under the provisions of subparagraph (k), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 536. A bill to provide that a veteran's compensation, pension, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 537. A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 538. A bill to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil- and water-conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 539. A bill to prohibit any Government agency from entering into any construction contract with an alien or with any corporation, partnership, or other business association any officer of which is an alien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 540. A bill directing the Secretary of Commerce, through the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, to make a survey of the need for a system of airports throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 541. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 542. A bill to authorize the naturalization of certain Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 543. A bill to provide for the gift of war dogs to the servicemen who trained them for their war tasks; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 544. A bill to prohibit aliens from acting as officers or agents of corporations or business associations engaged in interstate commerce, or of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 545. A bill to prohibit the entry into the United States of quota immigrants until the expiration of 5 years after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 546. A bill to provide for the deportation of aliens who do not diligently attempt to become citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 547. A bill to authorize payments in lieu of taxes to local governmental units in which manufacturing plants owned by the United States are located; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 548. A bill to establish a Division of Aviation Education in the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 549. A bill to establish a Department of Air Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 550. A bill to establish a Department of Defense, to consolidate therein the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 551. A bill to amend paragraph 3, part VII, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, so as to establish a uniform vocational rehabilitation allowance in certain cases; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 552. A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 553. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 1 year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 554. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 555. A bill to authorize payment of the compensation or pension for a veteran's partial service-connected disability, plus such percentage of the pension payable for his permanent total disability, nonservice connected, as is equal to the difference between 100 percent and the degree of his service-connected disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 556. A bill to provide for uniform definitions of parents of veterans under all laws administered by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 557. A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the act of June 28, 1934 (Public Law No. 484, 73d Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 558. A bill to repeal the income limitation as to payment of death compensation to dependents of deceased service-connected disabled World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 559. A bill to restore World War service connection granted by special review boards under Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, June 16, 1933; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 560. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 561. A bill to repeal all limitations as to the amounts of compensation or pension otherwise payable to the dependents of a deceased veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 562 (by request). A bill to extend to all service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof and feasible therefor eligibility for vocational rehabilitation under laws administered by the Veterans Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 563 (by request). A bill to provide pension for unemployed and unemployable veterans of a recognized war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 564. A bill to authorize the Veterans Administration to correct erroneous adjudications; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 565. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 566. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 567. A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 568 (by request). A bill to amend section 33 of Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 28, 1934; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 569 (by request). A bill to provide compensation or pension for the widows and children of deceased veterans of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 570. A bill to amend section 603, title VI, Public Law 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 8, 1940; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 571. A bill to increase deceased war veterans' burial allowances to $150; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 572 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the Schedule of Disability Ratings, 1925, as amended, and make same applicable to ratings of veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 573. A bill to make temporary disability ratings of World War veterans permanent after 10 years; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 574. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 575 (by request). A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 576. A bill to amend subparagraphs (a) and (d) of paragraph 1 of part 111 of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 577. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 578. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 579. A bill repealing certain taxes with respect to oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 580. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the Schedule of Disability Ratings, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 581. A bill to increase to $60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 582. A bill to establish a uniform definition of "child" for the purposes of laws granting pension or compensation, or accrued amounts thereof, administered by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 583. A bill to create a United States Civil Service Board of Appeals; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 584. A bill to provide permanent and total disability rating in active pulmonary tuberculosis cases; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 585. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of forest products pilot plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 586. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey for improvements at the head of Penobscot Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 587. A bill to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 588. A bill to create a joint legislative staff service for the Congress; a Joint Committee on Appropriations; a Joint Committee on Executive Agencies and Procedures; a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 589. A bill creating an Office of Military Research and Development in the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 590. A bill to authorize the erection of a Veterans Administration general medical and surgical hospital and domiciliary facility in the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 591. A bill to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 592. A bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 593. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 594. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 595. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 596. A bill to amend subdivision (e) of subsection (4) of section 3540 of chapter 33 A, title 26, of the Internal Revenue Code, known as the Use Tax Stamp Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 597. A bill to amend section 14 (a) of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 233, first session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 598. A bill to clarify the provisions of law relating to the display of service flags and the wearing of service lapel buttons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 599. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, to prohibit the requirement of the taking of the so-called pauper's oath by certain applicants for hospital treatment or domiciliary care; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 600. A bill to amend subsection (e) of section 2000, subchapter A, chapter 15, title 26, of the Internal Revenue Code, known as the luxury tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 601. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 602. A bill to prevent the mutilation, desecration, or use of the flag for advertising purposes, and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 603. A bill to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 604. A bill to incorporate the Mothers of World War No. 2, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 605. A bill to equalize State old-age assistance payments and to provide burial allowances under title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 606. A bill to provide for the acquisition and toll-free operation by the United States of the interstate bridges at Cascade Locks and Hood River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 607. A bill to authorize completion of alterations to a bridge over the Columbia River, made necessary by Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 608. A bill to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 609. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the Saratoga National Historical Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 610. A bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 611. A bill to provide for grants to the States for assistance in the rehabilitation of disabled persons incapacitated for normal employment; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 612. A bill to provide grants to the States for needy disabled adults; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 613. A bill to regulate private employment agencies engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 614. A bill to provide that credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be allowed for certain service with the city of Manila, P. I.; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 615. A bill to authorize uniform recognition of service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in the computation of retirement and longevity pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 616. A bill to provide pensions for widows and children of deceased officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 617. A bill providing for an additional naval academy in the San Francisco Bay area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 618. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 619. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 620. A bill relating to the compensation of certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 621. A bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 622. A bill to provide for the permanent establishment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Joint Secretariat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 623. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 624. A bill to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 625. A bill to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 626. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 627. A bill to vest title to the United States ship *Wolverine* (ex-*Michigan*) in the Foundation for the Original United States Ship Michigan, Inc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 628. A bill to provide a joint legislative staff service for the Congress and to provide for appropriate continuous review by committees of the Congress of the exercise by executive agencies of powers granted by the Congress and the carrying out of the intent of Congress as expressed in legislative enactment and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 629. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total nonservice-connected disabilities from $40 to $60 per month; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 630. A bill to amend an act entitled "To extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes" approved July 1, 1941; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 631. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 632. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 633. A bill to confer to certain persons who served in a civilian capacity under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 634. A bill to provide that employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine shall be restored to their positions upon the termination of such service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 635. A bill to increase the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 636. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 637. A bill to provide that during the existing emergency deductions shall not be made from insurance benefits payable to any person under title 11 of the Social Security Act by reason of such person rendering service for wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 638. A bill to amend the Revenue Act of 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 639. A bill to amend Public Law 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 640. A bill relating to price fixing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 641. A bill to provide for certain Presidential appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 642. A bill to enable the mothers, fathers, and widows of deceased members of the armed forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 643. A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before the courts, departments, and offices of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 644. A bill for the relief of certain widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 645. A bill to permit individuals to deduct from gross income for income-tax purposes certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 646. A bill to provide that abstracts and other evidences of title held by any department or agency relating to real property of the United States shall be given to grantees of such property; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 647. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark the honorary burial places of deceased members of the armed forces who are buried at sea, in foreign lands, or at unknown places; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 648. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with relation to the telegraph, telephone, etc., tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 649. A bill to grant burial allowances in cases of certain deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment who served in a recognized campaign, expedition, insurrection, or occupation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 650. A bill to provide the same privileges for hospitalization and domiciliary care for campaign and expedition veterans as are now applicable to World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 651. A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 652. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 653. A bill to provide for certain payments to States and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 654. A bill to authorize an examination and survey with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along the coast of New Jersey from Sandy Hook to Cape May; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 655. A bill to amend the act approved May 7, 1934, granting citizenship to the Metlakahtla Indians of Alaska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 656. A bill to provide further for the appointment of postmasters for fourth-class post offices in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 657. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 658. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, relating to the insurance of deposits of public funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 659. A bill to provide for the issuance and award of a Civil Air Patrol Medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 660. A bill providing for an examination and survey of channel and harbor at Everglades, Collier County, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 661. A bill authorizing and adopting a project for the improvement of Miami Harbor, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 662. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to authorize the payment of Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits to certain individuals who become permanently and totally disabled before attaining the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 663. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 664. A bill to revise the method of determining the payments to be made by the United States to the several States with respect to conservation lands subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 665. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 666. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 so as to guarantee to persons after their period of military service certain rights with respect to employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 667. A bill relating to the disposition of mineral rights to any land acquired by any Federal land bank or by the Land Bank Commissioner through the foreclosure of any mortgage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 668. A bill to reclassify and adjust salaries of postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 669. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 670. A bill providing for transportation home during furlough for members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to provide for the carry-back of net operating losses resulting from reimbursement of vendees for unconstitutional processing taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to create a Committee on Federal and State Relations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to provide additional research personnel for the committees of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Administrative Review; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution authorizing and directing Commodity Credit Corporation to distribute certain money received by it in connection with its 1943 raisin-variety grape purchase and resale program to increase production of raisins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; to the Committee on the Library.

H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of citizens of the United States 18 years of age or older to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to treaty ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to provide for the recognition by the United States Government of the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to permit retailers to combine in negotiating purchases from suppliers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution on establishing an Air Policy Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first day of each new year as "Good Neighbor Day" for the purpose of setting an example in neighborliness on the first day of the year, to serve as an inspiration and a standard for all the days to follow, leading to better relations at home, in all the Americas, and throughout the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to provide for the participation of the United States in the Florida Centennial and Pan-American Exposition to be held in the State of Florida during the year 1945; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution to authorize the use of space in ships returning to the United States for the transportation of wives and children of American soldiers, for the purpose of their admission into the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the making of treaties; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to removal of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the birthday of Madame Sklodowska Curie by proclaiming a national War on Cancer Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 34 (by request). Joint resolution to give effect to article 11 of the Convention between the United States of America and other powers for the protection of industrial property signed at The Hague, November 6, 1925 (treaty series No. 834); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the method of ratification of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the tenure of office of President of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any celebration of the termination of hostilities with Germany would hamper the war effort and give aid and comfort to the Japanese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for

men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriot's Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to continue in full force and effect Patent No. 1,628,098; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit persons 18 years of age to vote in all elections for Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to relieve members of the armed forces of the United Nations of the transportation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing for payments for the purpose of equalizing, as between the different regions or territories of the United States, freight charges for the transportation of defense materials during the existing emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution relating to Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and providing for the refund of all penalty taxes collected and for the cancelation of all uncollected penalty taxes on so-called excess wheat for the years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution to repeal Public Law 403, and reinstate standard time provided in the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to terminate the effectiveness of the act of January 20, 1942, which established daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution establishing the joint responsibility for the peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution for congressional representation at the peace table; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Economy and Efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution to repeal Public Law 403, and reinstate the standard time provided in the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to declare a governmental policy in relation to industrial readjustments during and after the present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to invite foreign governments to participate in an international constitutional convention to draft a constitution providing for an international government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Res. 10. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, to study and investigate matters related to air commerce and air navigation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 11. Resolution to empower the Judiciary Committee of the House to study, investigate, and examine into the trial and punishment of the Axis war criminals; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 12. Resolution authorizing a select committee to study, investigate, and report to the House upon the purposes and effects of the present tax rates and benefits authorized under the Social Security Act, as amended, and all acts relating thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 13. Resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the practice of purchasing tickets for railroad, Pullman, and other transportation for purposes of resale; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 14. Resolution to investigate practices and policies of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transfer certain records not necessary in current business to the Archivist of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 16. Resolution that the Congress recommend and urge the President and the Secretary of State to use their offices in effecting the establishment of emergency shelter in Palestine for persecuted Jews of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 17. Resolution to provide for the temporary admission of political or religious refugees of continental Europe into areas within the United States to be known as free ports for refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 18. Resolution to investigate whether the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended, and regulations promulgated thereunder have been violated; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 19. Resolution to amend clause 24 and clause 40, of rule XI, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAY:

H. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 21. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for three chaplains instead of the present one; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 22. Resolution to investigate the meat situation in the city of New York; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 23. Resolution to investigate the meat and food industries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 24. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Res. 25. Resolution to authorize the Territories Committee to investigate the Hawaiian Islands' political, economic, and social conditions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 26. Resolution to provide for continuing review of the work of executive agencies by standing commmittees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 27. Resolution to create a committee of the House to investigate the petroleum industry and problems of petroleum supply; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Res. 28. Resolution granting the subpena power to the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 29. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 12, 1942, submitting a review of reports on harbors of Cape Charles, Va., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with illustrations, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 30. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 12, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal, Fla., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. Res. 31. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House to provide for a report and question period at which heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government are requested to appear and answer questions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. Res. 32. Resolution providing for an investigation of bureaucracy and unconstitutional trends of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 33. Resolution to create a Committee on Fiscal Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. Res. 34. Resolution to amend rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 35. Resolution to investigate the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and laws administered by it; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 36. Resolution in support of the policy of the United States in promoting free choice of government by all nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 37. Resolution expressing the approval of the House of Representatives of certain resolutions adopted at Santiago, Chile, on April 15, 1944, looking toward the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 38. Resolution to continue the investigation by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries begun under House Resolution 281, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 39. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Miami River, Fla., and subsequent correspondence relative thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 40. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 16, 1942, submitting a review of reports on Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed with two illustrations, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 41. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers,

United States Army, dated April 11, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Shipyard River, S. C., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 42. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 3, 1941, submitting a review of reports on Redwood Creek, Calif., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with illustration, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 43. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1942, submitting a review of reports on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 44. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 27, 1942, submitting a review of reports as the Intracoastal Waterway from Mobile, Ala., to New Orleans, La., including the Violet Canal Route, La., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with two illustrations, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor to conduct and investigate the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local government and private agencies to the physically handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 201. A bill for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 202. A bill for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 203. A bill for the relief of the Plainview-Rover School District No. 7, of Yell County, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 204. A bill for the relief of W. P. Dodds; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 205. A bill for the relief of Steve Hlass; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 206. A bill for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 207. A bill for the relief of Edgar Kaigler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 208. A bill for the relief of Marion Contracting Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 209. A bill for the relief of David B. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 210. A bill for the relief of Jack Williams and Mrs. Lora Sally Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 211. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Rainger, Diane Rosser and Roberta Rosser, W. H. Baker, and Mrs. Katherine D. Wert; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 212. A bill for the relief of Werner Zaiss; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth C. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 214. A bill for the relief of California Aircraft Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 215. A bill for the relief of Virginia Packard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 216. A bill for the relief of John Seferian and Laura Seferian; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 217. A bill for the relief of James E. Monaghan as administrator of the estate of Katherine Monaghan, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 218. A bill for the relief of Florence E. Bower, Hulda Bower, and Christopher Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 219. A bill for the relief of Samuel Stacey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 220. A bill to correct the naval record of Carlo Solone; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 221. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bellia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 222. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Tracey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 223. A bill for the relief of Pietro Rocco Capodilupo; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 224. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sapienza; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 225. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 226. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sapienza; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 227. A bill for the relief of Mundo Barchi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 228. A bill for the relief of Robert June; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 229. A bill for the relief of Michael Francis Spillane; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 230. A bill for the relief of Thomas Callanan, Jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 231. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie M. Elben; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 232. A bill to provide for the restoration to active duty of Capt. Walter S. Strange, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 233. A bill for the relief of Hamsah Omar; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 234. A bill for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 235. A bill for the relief of Edward Higgins Doyle; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 236. A bill for the relief of William Thomas Doyle; to the Committee on Immigratioh and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 237. A bill for the relief of Mack Skaggs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 238. A bill for the relief of William M. Silk and Henrietta Silk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 239. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernest H. Stark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 240. A bill for the relief of Dr. James M. Hooks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 241. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruby H. Hunsucker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 242. A bill for the relief of Ruben M. Herren; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 243. A bill for the relief of Mose Lee Hogan and Mary Alen Hogan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 244. A bill for the relief of Adell Brown and Alice Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 245. A bill for the relief of the board of trustees, Summerville Consolidated School District, Chattooga County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 246. A bill for the relief of L. S. Strickland and Mrs. Marguerite Boggs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of E. D. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 248. A bill granting an increase of pension to Robert Wornic Denny; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 249. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 250. A bill for the relief of James Fleming; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 251. A bill granting a pension to Neva Dobbins; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 252. A bill for the relief of James T. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 253. A bill granting a pension to Barbara Oertel; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 254. A bill for the relief of William A. Hallett; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 255. A bill granting a pension to Edna P. Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 256. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 257. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 258. A bill for the relief of H. Dale Madison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 259. A bill for the relief of Leo Gottlieb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 260. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank Easterwood; to the Commitee on Claims.

H. R. 261. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jethro Humphrey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 262. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Wikle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 263. A bill for the relief of the county of Talladega, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 264. A bill for the relief of R. Heine; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 265. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada H. Keith and others; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 266. A bill for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 267. A bill for the relief of Jack Scarton or John Skarton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzenski; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 268. A bill for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 269. A bill for the relief of Charles Molnar; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 270. A bill for the relief of John Damacus; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 271. A bill for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, patient yet fearless, tender yet strong, we would gather at the altar of prayer. In the name of our Saviour who came into this world to die that Thou mightst save it, while others sought to redeem it by the words of men, clothe us with the heart of love and with the spirit of steel. Thou who reachest

the way to the Father of all truth whose holy credentials none can dispute, make us to stand before our country and the whole world as the divine fulfillment of the true measure of righteous men and women.

Blessed Lord, as conflicting motives baffle and unwise appeals approach and seek to dominate, then sustain us with the courageous arm of goodness, with the virility of virtue, and the regnancy of honesty. O Master, let us walk with Thee; forever lure us by the elements of true, upright conduct, persuading us that forgiveness is a higher law of Christian character than resentment; when Thou hadst all power to crush aggression, Thy life was marked with absolute gentleness. As we face the crumbling debris of a world trembling in the palsy of wicked war, let us rejoice that Thou art the unfailing friend of man; emerging from all the surroundings of mystery, Thou art still our strength and shield:

With grateful hearts, the past we own,
The future all to us unknown;
Thy goodness all our hopes shall raise,
Adored, through all our changing days.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 28, 1944.*

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have this day submitted to the Honorable Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, my resignation as Representative at Large from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to become effective at noon Tuesday, January 2, 1945.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM I. TROUTMAN.

APPOINTMENT OF TELLERS TO COUNT THE ELECTORAL VOTE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair appoints as tellers to count the electoral votes the following Members on the part of the House: Messrs. WORLEY and GAMBLE.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are present Members-elect whose certificates of election in proper form are on file in the office of the Clerk who were delayed yesterday on account of slow transportation. Those Members-elect will present themselves at the bar of the House and now take the oath of office.

Thereupon Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. COFFEE, Mr. GAVIN, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. BUCK took the oath of office.

LYNCHINGS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the Congress and every constituent will rejoice in the announcement that in the year 1944 there was only one lynching in the United States.

While two deaths by violence have been referred to as lynchings, one was, the other was not.

At Pikeville, Tenn., a 17-year-old trusty at the Tennessee State Training and Agricultural School, a reformatory, murdered the wife and daughter of the superintendent of the reformatory after attempting to rape the daughter, who was the wife of a lieutenant in the United States Army Air Corps. There was no question of his identity or guilt. He was taken from the jail and shot to death by a mob.

The other case grew out of a dispute as to the ownership of a farm. Six men, three of whom had a tax title, went to the farm and ejected the man in possession, claiming title otherwise, and his son. During the argument that ensued, they shot and killed the father. All six were indicted by the grand jury of Amite County, Miss., for murder. One of them has already been tried; the others await trial.

While, of course, the crime of lynching, even in one case, should not be approved or condoned, no matter how great the provocation, yet we are glad to note that lynching has been reduced practically to the vanishing point.

It must be borne in mind that this reduction, the most rapid in the history of any crime, has been accomplished in the only possible way, by intelligent and local creation, maintenance, and application of local public sentiment.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] was delayed in arriving. If he will present himself in the well of the House, he may take the oath at this time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a newspaper article in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the program for Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The opening and counting of the electoral college vote will take place on Saturday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And only incidental business?

Mr. McCORMACK. I expect a message in writing from the President of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I presume there will be a resolution introduced which will take care of the papers now in the Dies committee so that they may be turned over to the special committee that the House created yesterday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not get the inquiry of the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will be necessary to have a resolution introduced this week which will take these papers that the Dies committee now has and turn them over to the special committee; otherwise they will go into possession of the Librarian?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a matter that can be disposed of on that day. In view of the action of the House yesterday, I agree that some action should be taken and, of course, the House can take whatever action it wants to even under the statute. My suggestion would be, if I may say so, that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and others interested, try to agree on a resolution which will pass the House without controversy.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is my intention to present a resolution to the House, which I understand will be privileged, and to which I do not think any one will object, to hold these files intact and to turn them over to the newly created Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in complete agreement that something like that should be done and something like that is perfectly proper and a reflection on no one. In view of the action of the House yesterday those files should be held intact for the chairman and members of the new committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that had to be done before Saturday or by Saturday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and that is perfectly agreeable to me, and even if it were not a privileged matter I think we should take action on it anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the program for today?

Mr. McCORMACK. Whatever special orders there might be, that is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman, does he intend to follow the practice of skipping legislative days that the House might be in session during the coming 2 or 3 weeks?

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that the probabilities of any legislation during the next month, as the gentleman knows from experience, is remote. There will be some bills, perhaps, but not enough of them to keep the House continuously in session. As far as I am concerned, the House may meet every day

or if there is no business adjourn over for 2 or 3 days at a time. Naturally, any time I propound a unanimous-consent request I have conferred with the leadership on your side of the aisle. So it is reasonable to assume that during the next 2, 3, or possibly 4 weeks requests of that kind will be made. The gentleman knows that I never make a request of that kind without conferring with the leadership on his side and certainly if I have advance notice of Members having special orders on a certain day I would not make a unanimous consent request the result of which would be to wipe out those orders.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman will take notice of the fact that there will be requests for special orders. I have a few to make myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows that I try to cooperate with all the Members of the House on matters of this kind as completely as I can.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered before the Bronx Board of Trade.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a debate over the radio entitled "How Can We Best Implement Dumbarton Oaks?" I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of the article will be $364.

I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech I delivered over the radio entitled "Palestine—Hope Deferred"; and to insert a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

O. P. A. CEILING ON CATTLE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am this day offering a bill to amend the Price Emergency Act to enable the Administrator of the O. P. A. to put a ceiling on cattle on the hoof. We face a very difficult situation in the industrial areas where retail meat dealers, because of ceilings placed on retail prices, are compelled to sell meat products at an absolute loss. At times, as a result of ceilings on retail meat, butchers have been compelled to sell at 5 and 6 cents loss per pound. They are justified in striking and closing their doors. The provisions for subsidies to packers and slaughterers has proved abortive. It is like putting money into a sack open at the bottom. It is utterly useless. It may be difficult to put a ceiling on cattle on the hoof, but where there is a will there will be a way. It does not make sense to have a roof over cattle products all along the line and not at the source. You cannot limit and hamstring slaughterers, distributors, and retail purveyors and leave ranchers and cattle breeders to roam unmolested. You must have sauce for the goose and the gander.

Ceilings on cattle will be difficult to carry out and administer. Such difficulties are present on many other commodities.

It was suicidal to leave cattle on hoof to open competition. For the duration cattle must be controlled and all cattle products as well.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a series of articles by Mr. Ralph Nicholson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I have been worrying a bit, and I would like to direct a question to my good friend from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Mr. RICH, in view of his vote yesterday afternoon for the amendment to the House Rules to add a permanent committee which is to continue the Dies committee. I am wondering where we are going to get the money to pay for it.

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, HENRY J. LATHAM was elected to Congress from the Third District of New York last November. He is a lieutenant in the Navy, and was at that time, and is now, on duty in the far Pacific. He will not be able to return to this country to be sworn in until the month of February. I feel, in justice to his constituents, that I should make this announcement at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, January 8, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and that I may have the same privilege on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders previously entered for today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes to answer the question asked me a few moments ago by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes to explain the bill I introduced for the encouragement of small business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include part of an editorial entitled "What Does America Want?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article from a Boston newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, on three subject matters and to include in one an editorial from the Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I notice by this morning's paper that Mr. Bowles has admitted that the O. P. A. made a very serious mistake in invalidating the stamps a few weeks ago. I am sure the women of the Nation will agree with him. Nothing has happened in many years that has shaken the faith and trust of the American housewives in the Government as the unreasonable and arbitrary action of the O. P. A. a short time ago in ordering an invalidation of many food stamps. If this had been necessary for the benefit of the armed forces nobody would have complained. I am glad that Mr. Bowles has justified the public statement which I made at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to divert and ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who addressed the House about 2 minutes ago, whether or not he introduced the bill about which he spoke at the request of Mr. Bowles? There are thousands of cattle producers and feeders in the country who would like to know whether Mr. Bowles and his associates favor an order fixing a ceiling price on live cattle as provided in his bill.

The gentleman from New York fails to answer.

I presume he has left the Chamber. Should he chance to read this statement and cares to advise me I should be glad to know.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the conversation that took place a moment ago between the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and myself, regarding the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I have prepared this resolution:

Resolved, That the records and files of the former Committee on Un-American Activities be held intact in the rooms formerly occupied by the said Committee on Un-American Activities and turned over to the newly created Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman from Mississippi has conferred with me about this. I think the action should be taken. I think it is wise to take it today. We might as well do it today as Saturday. The House acted yesterday. Certainly the papers should be kept intact for the standing committee which the House provided for in its vote of yesterday. As far as I am concerned, it is perfectly agreeable to dispose of the matter today. The resolution is worded in a manner that certainly is not controversial, and it carries out the action the House took yesterday.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I have just read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 46) as follows:

Resolved, That the records and files of the former Committee on Un-American Activities be held intact in the rooms formerly occupied by the said Committee on Un-American Activities and turned over to the newly created Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, while I have absolutely no objection, I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] whether he has carefully read the statutes, not the Rules of the House, to see if this is in any way in conflict with the statute.

Mr. RANKIN. It is not in conflict with the statute.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I have not read all the statutes of the United States, but I have read the statute and the rules concerning this proposition. This is within the power of the Congress, and it is the duty of the Congress. As far as that is concerned, it is a privileged resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. The statute provides that the Clerk of the House shall place in the Library of Congress certain files.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand; but that is in the absence of any action by the House of Representatives. If this action is taken it will amount to a mandate that will be carried out.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Indianapolis Star written by Maurice Early.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. JENNINGS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House Resolution 31, to amend the rules of the House to provide for a report and question period in which heads of departments, agencies and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government are requested to appear on the floor of the House to make reports and answer questions. With some modifications, this resolution is the same as House Resolution 327 which I introduced on October 19, 1943, and which was widely discussed by Members of Congress and in the press of the Nation during the last Congress.

THE PROPOSAL

In House Resolution 31, I have proposed that we have a report and question period on the floor of the House of Representatives at least once every 2 weeks, but not more often than once a week. The session shall not last more than 2 hours. During this report and question period a particular member of the Cabinet or the head of an agency

would be invited to appear on the floor of the House and answer written questions, which had already been prepared and submitted to him by the legislative committee issuing the invitation. This procedure would give the chief administrators an opportunity of preparing answers to the questions and the legislative committee would thus be able to direct the course the discussion is to follow. The last half of the question period would be taken up with questions by Members from the floor of the House. The time for questions from the floor would be under the control of the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee which issued the invitation. The Rules Committee of the House would fix the length of time for the period which in any case would not be more than 2 hours and the Rules Committee would also fix the priority of appearances in the event more than one invitation is pending at any one time. The oral questions must be germane to the preceding discussion.

I believe that much good would result if administrators were brought face to face with representatives of the people under an orderly procedure in order that the country may have the benefit of a free and open consultation between them.

An examination of House Resolution 31, which I filed on yesterday, and House Resolution 327, which was before the last Congress for consideration, will reveal that I made four changes in the resolution which I submitted to this Congress for consideration. The changes are:

First. The session is called a report and question period instead of question period as originally provided in House Resolution 327.

Second. In House Resolution 327 I intended the definition of "heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments" to cover such agencies as War Production Board, War Stabilization Board, and others. Some question was raised as to whether they were in fact included. I therefore redefined the executive agencies included as "heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments."

Third. In House Resolution 327 it was contemplated that the oral questions during the latter half of the period would be germane to the preceding subject matter. I think it better to make specific provision for this purpose in the resolution and therefore in the new resolution I have specifically provided that the oral questions shall be germane.

Fourth. In discussing House Resolution 327 with experts both in and out of the Government, it was called to my attention that in some exceptional cases the Members of the House might prefer to have information from an Under Secretary or an Assistant Secretary instead of the Cabinet member or head administrator. In the current resolution I have provided that by agreement with the legislative committee which issued the invitation a principal assistant might appear in place of the Cabinet officer or administrator. This, by agreement, would make it possible for administrators such as the Chief of Staff, Chief of Naval Operations, the Under Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of State, or an Assistant Secretary to appear before the House.

In order to reacquaint the old Members of the House with the details of this provision, and that the new Members of the House may become more thoroughly familiar with it, I have asked for this time to explain the way the resolution would operate and the desirability of its enactment. A similar resolution is being introduced in the Senate by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, who will be vigorous in the sponsorship of the resolution in the Senate. The changes which I have above outlined have been worked out in consultation with Senator FULBRIGHT. This resolution was enthusiastically supported by many Members of the House during the last Congress and more than 350 leading daily newspapers of the country editorialized favorably upon the plan. Insistent requests were made for a hearing but we were never able to secure consideration of the resolution durin the past session of Congress. There is an increasing necessity and demand for a strengthening of congressional methods and for securing better information by Congress. The American people demand a strong Congress. This is one of the definte methods by which we can meet that demand. I am very thankful that the last Congress saw fit to create the Maloney-Monroney committee. I have been given assurance that the committee will consider this proposal. At the pleasure of the committee, many witnesses will appear before it in support of the resolution.

The plan set forth in House Resolution 31 is intended to make for better, more responsible government. It is intended to be of benefit to Members of the House, to the Executive, and to the public.

NONPARTISAN ISSUE

This is in no sense a party measure, it appeals to no partisan interest, it awakens no party spirit. It is not intended to interfere with, to lessen, or increase the rights and prerogatives of the majority or of the minority.

Before drafting this resolution I consulted with many thoughtful members of both parties. The plan is highly recommended by Democratic and Republican newspapers in all sections of the country. It is strictly a nonpartisan effort to enable us to improve the machinery with which we do business.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I gladly yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested in this proposition; I have long favored such a thing myself. While Mr. Hoover was President I worked for the passage of a bill of similar nature which had his deep interest, and I discussed it many times with him. Particularly in war it is very important to have those who are in charge of the conduct of the war appear before the Congress. I believe it has been very valuable in England. One reason why England has been strong and able to sacrifice as much as she has is because she has been told hard facts. Last November I asked the Speaker if he would invite General Marshall and Admiral King to come before us and describe conditions on the battle fronts. We should be told the truth. Of course under present law they could not appear before the House while it was in session, but they certainly could appear if we were in recess, or they could talk to Members at the Congressional Library. I hope and believe General Marshall and Admiral King will appear before us. I renew the request for their appearance.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am delighted to have this expression of support of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I have known for a long while that she was in favor of the idea. I recall reading a letter from Mr. Hoover to Congressman Clyde Kelly heartily endorsing this plan.

Under the resolution as now presented it would be possible to have the Chief of Staff and the Chief of Naval Operations appear before the House. Many of us present today will recall that in October of 1943 the membership of the House was invited to the auditorium in the Congressional Library to hear Secretary Stimson, General Marshall, and several other military men. We were there like a bunch of school boys, an audience in the auditorium listening to what they had to tell us. In spite of the handicaps of the session, what they had to say was of tremendous interest and importance to the Members of the House; yet we had no opportunity of directing the discussion or asking questions or trying to find out from them about particular matters in which we were interested. Even if this provided nothing more than a session of that kind it would give us an opportunity of seeing these men face to face and hearing what they were doing, what their plans were, how they were carrying out the laws we enacted, and to report on what their departments were doing.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield with pleasure to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman if he has weighed this matter, the joy of the minority party to embarrass the administration when given their opportunity to ask questions in that manner?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman for that question. I have weighed that question very carefully and considered it. In reply, I may say that this does not upset the balance between the majority and the minority in any way whatsoever. The original questions which will be asked during the first half of the period are prepared by the legislative committee which issues the invitations. The last half of the time would be divided equally between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee which has charge of the period. It is provided in the resolution that the questions must be germane to the preceding discussion. Let me say in the first place that I do not believe any Member of Congress wants to heckle an administrator just for the fun of heckling. The whole matter is entirely voluntary. If the Executive were asked an improper question—first, it must be germane—but if it were an improper ques-

tion, since he came voluntarily he could and should refuse to answer it if he thought it would do damage to the Government; and in the second place, I have great confidence in the Members of the House doing the right thing. The people of the country are dead serious about this business of government, and if any Member tried to inject something into the discussion that was not proper, he would be condemned by public opinion; so I have no fear about the dignity of these sessions. My experience with the minority, whether Republican or Democratic, has convinced me that its criticism has been constructive and helpful. I believe the minority should have the opportunity of asking questions for the purpose of constructive criticism of plans and proposals of the administration in power.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much what the gentleman has said. The gentleman from Tennessee has stated that the Monroney-Maloney committee that will make a study of congressional procedure is considering this proposal. It may develop that because of the wide scope of the study the committee will undertake that it would be a few months before a report could be made. I feel that the proposal of the gentleman is extremely important in this the very beginning of perhaps the most crucial Congress in the history of the country, and I am wondering if the gentleman and others interested might press for hearing before the Rules Committee without awaiting a report from the Monroney-Maloney committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the observations of my friend from Tennessee. I want to pursue whatever plan that will be most expeditious in giving the House a chance to vote on this proposal. I may say that during the last year and a half nobody could have pressed more vigorously or insistently than I have for a hearing before the Rules Committee.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to say to my friend that as a member of the Committee on Rules I know of no opposition in the committee to giving the gentleman a hearing on his proposal. I have discussed this matter with the gentleman, and very frankly may I say that I am favorably impressed, yet I can understand the importance of the suggestion.

There is one thought comes to me, and that is that we would not want to put the matter of making the program under such control as would take away from the membership the right to propound what individual Members think would be pertinent questions in reference to any pending issue; nor would we want to enter into any sort of a combination or agreement which would make possible the Cabinet members or their representatives coming up here and lecturing the House. My thought is that one of the most important questions, one of the most important things this House should do is to exercise itself to the limit in the recapturing of powers that have already been filched away from it.

The gentleman is in great earnestness about the suggestion he makes. I know he has given it a lot of thought. I know he has canvassed the best public opinion throughout the country. I am sure that the chairman of the Rules Committee, along with members of that committee, will be very happy to arrange for the gentleman and his colleagues having a full and fair hearing on this resolution at a very early date. I hope this will take place soon because I think a record on the matter should be made for the information of the Congress and the country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. May I say that I appreciate the very thorough and patient consideration the gentleman from Georgia has given this proposal? I have had the pleasure of talking with him about it on many, many occasions. In referring to the effort to secure a hearing before the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia has always taken the position that he now takes—that he wants us to have a hearing—and he has been most sympathetic and fair in evaluating this proposal. He has expressed interest in hearing the leading students of government all over the country to see what their opinion is on this proposal. In my comments about the Rules Committee, may I say that while I have been most anxious to get hearings on the resolution, I do not mean any personal reflection, of course, on anyone?

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has made extraordinary efforts on behalf of the resolution which he introduced during the last session and which he is reintroducing in this one. He seems to be of the opinion that the Rules Committee did not treat him fairly and did not give the consideration to which the resolution was entitled. I may say to the gentleman that the thought uppermost in my mind during the last session of Congress was to expedite the legislation that was needed for aiding our war effort. No Rules Committee in the history of the Congress has reported more rules and resolutions than did the Rules Committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman in the last session. I hope that it will be possible very shortly, and we will be delighted, to give him a hearing. But it is impossible to hear everybody at the same time, especially when we have from 50 to 100 resolutions pending.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman. May I say that the gentleman has been very kind to let me make my request for a hearing, with an opportunity of presenting some of the most eminent men in the United States before the Committee on Rules on this proposition, to try to convince the members or to try to point out the pros and cons of the proposition? May I say further to the gentleman that I think nothing can be of more benefit in the prosecution of the war than an understanding between the Members of the Congress and the heads of the executive departments as to our war program and how it is being prosecuted? And this resolution, under its operation, would certainly make for that. Of course, the Rules Committee has been very busy, and I have a high regard for its capable chairman and for the members of the committee.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. May I ask the gentleman if they gave any consideration to the fact that under the parliamentary system in Europe the members of the Cabinet, so called, are selected from the House of Commons, the members of which are elected by the people? In this case, of course, you can have a Cabinet officer come before the House who has been selected, but many of whom could not be elected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is right.

Mr. REED of New York. I say that without reflection. They are not close to the people at all. I think that is something that this Congress ought to consider very seriously. If you had a Cabinet system by which they were selected from the House that, I think, would be very different, because they would be coming directly from the people.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. May I say in answer that all the good things that we could get from the British system and fit into our own congressional system, we have tried to include them, but our system of Government is so different that not much benefit is to be derived when considering this measure by comparing the question-hour of the British House of Commons with the proposal here. It is true, as the gentleman says, that Ministers of Government in Britain are members of the House of Commons. They derive their authority there, and they are on the floor and they have to make good or they can be discharged. But the proposal of House Resolution 31 is largely for the purpose of securing information and finding out what the Cabinet members are doing. They would come up to the House for a particular purpose, of giving information; they would give information and answer questions and they would be here for no other occasion. Of course, the gentleman is thoroughly familiar with the fact that in the first Congress, in setting up the Treasury Department, it was provided that the Secretary of the Treasury may be required to make a report in writing or orally at any time he may be called on by the Congress. We require the Secretaries to make written reports. All we are doing here is to ask that in addition to filing these voluminous reports, which none of us read and which none of us have time to give consideration to, that we invite them on purely a voluntary basis to come here for the particular purpose of telling us what they are doing and what they plan to do in connection with the laws that we pass, give us their answers, let us see what we think of what they are doing,

and then they are not expected to remain on the floor. It is purely a matter of giving information on a voluntary basis.

Mr. REED of New York. I think we could do that before the proper committees without having them come before the House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I say in connection with committee matters the trouble is we can hardly keep up with matters before our own committees. I cannot keep up with everything before my committee. Maybe the gentleman can be fully informed of all matters before his. He is an exception if he can.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish I could.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But many matters have important appeal to the whole membership of the House, and not just some particular committee; the big matters of state transcend the interest of any one committee. On questions of foreign affairs, on price stabilization, and all these great issues, where they run administrators from one committee to another, the membership of the House never gets the whole picture, and I think it would be much better for the whole membership if the committee having jurisdiction could invite the Cabinet member up here to explain the whole situation to the House. It would just really amount to doing part of the committee's work on the floor of the House and giving the Members of the House at least a workable knowledge of the subject matter.

The gentleman very well knows, too, unless the bill is reported favorably, other Members of the Congress never have an opportunity of reading the committee hearings, and it may be months and months afterward in that case before they have an opportunity to read the hearings. It is a post mortem. A bill is brought in here. The hearings are frequently 2,000 pages long, in fine print. Nobody is expected to and nobody could possibly read all of the committee hearings on the legislation that is considered, so we want them to come here and give us the essential facts about their departments and their plans and how they are carrying out the laws we pass.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Personally, if I do not commit myself by what I am saying now, I am pretty thoroughly convinced that our system has worked admirably for 150 years. I am not one of those who are inclined to try something new all the time. I think that when we get a written report from a Cabinet officer, every Member of the House has an opportunity to examine it thoroughly. Then it is a matter of public record. I think that system is preferable to having men come up here and indulge in a lot of oratory before the House on something on which certainly 435 Members of the House are not each going to have an opportunity to ask the questions they would like to ask. I believe the present system has worked pretty well.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I hope the gentleman will study this matter further before he decides against it.

Mr. REED of New York. I intend to do that.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it has merit, and many Members of the House do, too.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Since our system does not provide, as the gentleman from New York suggested, for the selection of Cabinet members from among the elected representatives of the people, and since it is rather important that Cabinet members be in close touch with the people for the best administration, would not this proposal in some sense compensate for the fact that they are not elected by the people, by bringing them in closer touch with the representatives of the people?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. Every Cabinet office is set up by Congress. We have a right to have their reports and know what they are doing. I think we owe it to ourselves to get first-hand information from the departments which are established by this Congress as to what they are doing and how they are administering the laws we pass. And through us they would have an opportunity of keeping in closer touch with the desires of the people as the gentleman suggests.

NO CHANGE IN BALANCE OF POWER OR OF TRADITION

I avow at the outset that this resolution is not intended to infringe on the spirit of our Constitution. It is not intended to upset the balance of power between the divisions of our government. It does not interfere with the so-called separation of powers. I do not seek to substitute, now or eventually, the parliamentary system, or any other system, for ours. I do not seek to either aggrandize or impair the Executive power as defined in the Constitution and vested in the President. I do not seek to give the Congress any undue or unconstitutional power over the Cabinet members and heads of departments. The Cabinet members are selected by the President and their service can be discontinued by the President. It is not the intent of this resolution to alter their legal relations either to the President or to the Congress.

The resolution only seeks to confer upon them a privilege and a duty. The privilege is to give them an opportunity to explain their departments, their problems, and to give us their advice. The duty is to give us current facts and expert information face-to-face, which will help us with our problems, which will enable us to legislate with better information and, therefore, more intelligently.

The report and question period provided for in the resolution is intended to be an occasion which will be carried out in an orderly fashion—an occasion of benefit to the Members of the House and to the executives alike. I do not want the executives to be subjected to heckling or improper questioning. I am sure this will not occur on these occasions. I am certain that these periods will be most useful and that proper decorum will be maintained by all parties concerned.

WOULD BE OF ASSISTANCE TO COMMITTEES

What this resolution really proposes, is to enable the committees to do an important part of their work on the floor of the House. As matters now stand, there is no adequate procedure where the average Member of Congress can get a necessary working knowledge of the organization of the big executive departments. We have no workable way of learning about the problems or of ascertaining the make-up of the various divisions of the bureaus. We have no way of keeping currently advised of the manner and method they pursue in administering the laws we pass. Better information along these lines is necessary if we are to legislate intelligently. Under this proposal a committee could make its work easier if it had this means of informing the entire membership of the House of the organization and problems of the departments over which it ordinarily has jurisdiction in legislative matters.

If nothing else is done than to have the committees bring in the heads of the departments to explain to the membership of the House the organizational plan of the departments, what the various divisions do, what laws they would administer, how much personnel they have, how they deal with the public, the difficulties they encounter, and their general problems in trying to do a good job, I feel that the resolution would be justified. Certainly we have no easy method of getting this information under our present set-up.

For instance, several committees are interested in the problem of disposing of surplus property and war plants when the war is over. Mr. Jones was on the Hill several times in one week to discuss this matter with various committees. This is a problem that transcends the jurisdiction of any one committee; it has ramifications in which every committee is interested and the subject matter is one of importance to every Member of the House. So, why wouldn't it be well for us to make it possible for some committee to invite Mr. Jones to appear on the floor of the House and explain the matter to all of us? It would certainly save him a lot of time and his analysis of the facts and of the alternatives in meeting the problem would enable the membership to have an easier grasp of the issues and of how they should be solved.

HOUSE MEETING WITH SECRETARY STIMSON

I have been thinking about this matter a great deal. Many of you will recall that on October 19, 1943, the membership of the House was invited to the auditorium in the Congressional Library to hear reports from Secretary Stimson, Under Secretary Patterson, and General Marshall. What they had to say was valuable and interesting. As I recall, the session lasted from about 9:30 until 12:30. The Members of the House had no opportunity to ask questions or to direct the course of the discussion. We were there to listen to what was said. Most Members of the House were interested in particular and special problems but we had no machinery for bringing out the facts about them. I thought how much more valuable it would have been

if the discussion could have been under direction of the appropriate House committee and on the floor of the House, and if machinery had been established so that the committee, and even a Member of the House, could have participated. It was on that date that I filed the resolution now under consideration.

MUST CONSIDER NEEDS OF AVERAGE CONGRESSMAN

The average tenure of a Member of the House is a fraction over two terms, so over a course of years the majority of votes cast by the House are by men who have been here slightly over two terms. We must consider, in determining whether our machinery is adequate or not, the question of whether that machinery enables the second-term Congressmen to become acquainted with the ramifications of the departments, the policies of the departments, and to find out whether they are doing their job as was intended by Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very much interested in the proposal of the gentleman. But having been here for quite a few years, I have always noted, particularly has it been true during the last 12 years, the strong control that the Executive has over the majority party. That was particularly true during the first 10 years of the present administration. A good many pieces of legislation came up here from the Executive which went to the committees where they were not given much consideration, and were passed in the House here without a great deal of consideration or explanation. It seems to me that what the gentleman proposes will, in a large measure at least, attempt to eliminate that pressure, and the lack of understanding on legislative matters submitted by the administration. Of course, that would break down the administration's control over the majority party.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman that the resolution is not intended to interfere with the rights or prerogatives of the executive departments. I think this is true, speaking very frankly, that we would have much better executive departments and more capable heads of departments under this system because, in the first place as the matter now stands, the executive heads have their press conferences and that is about the only time they reveal what they are doing.

If a head of a department or a Cabinet member were faced with the responsibility of coming up here on the floor of the House and of testifying what he intends to do, human nature would cause him to be more careful in the decisions he makes. Human nature would require them to follow more closely the congressional intent in administering the laws which we pass because they would be here at the place where the money comes from and they would want to make a good showing, both before us and before the public, or they would be liable to stand in bad public repute. Another thing which it would accomplish with respect to the executive departments is that they would have to make policy decisions before they came here. In many cases, I know—and it has always happened; I am not talking about this administration only—you never can find out exactly what the policy of an administrator is on a particular subject. It may be one thing today and something else tomorrow; and perhaps different branches of the bureau will have different policies. So when they come here to define their policies and to stand at the bar of public opinion they are going to have to make their definite policy decisions. They are going to have to be men and women who understand the departments they administer and they are going to have to have the full facts in order to give us a clear report. I think it would be a great benefit to the Congress. It would greatly restore the prestige of Congress to have considerable information about the decisions of executive branches given here. I do not think it would necessarily interfere in any way, except in a healthy way, with the relationship between the party in power and the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with what the gentleman has had to say, that it would put these policy makers on guard, but would the gentleman go a step further and institute the parliamentary system, wherein if these officials did not follow the intent of Congress, a vote in Congress would throw them out of office?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Not at all. I would not want to institute any such policy. However, if these men did not make a showing, then public opinion would remove them, and the Congress would take care of them in the matter of appropriations, so that we would not need the power of dismissal.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would they have to come here?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under this provision, it is a voluntary matter. There is a constitutional question as to whether you can make it mandatory on a Cabinet member to come before Congress. Apparently the First Congress did have that idea, that it could be made compulsory. But, in any event, they would come so long as they were treated properly, and they would be treated properly. What position would a Cabinet member be in, if he was in good faith asked to come here to give a report on some matters that the Congress was interested in and the public was interested in, if he refused to come? His political life would not last long.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it the gentleman means along the line of an occurrence during recent months, where a committee of Congress wanted certain information, and a representative from an executive department replied to the committee that he was precluded from giving that information because of executive edict. Assuming that it was a matter in respect to the war, for instance, and that the Congress asked the Administrator, or the Secretary having charge of that matter to appear before the Congress and the representative of the executive department said no, that he did not want to do that, because that was a matter about which the Congress should not be advised at the time, because it might interfere with carrying on the war.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say that those occasions would happen very infrequently, and the power of public opinion would provide a solution. If it were some matter that cannot be stated publicly, I am sure the House would not want the question to be answered. If it were a question that should be answered publicly, and there was no reason for not doing so, and the administrator would not answer it, then he would fare very badly in public opinion. The dignity of this proposed session, the fact that it is public, and that it is a matter in which the whole Congress, the House of Representatives is calling for information, unless it were something that could not be stated, I think there would be no difficulty. Further, if it were a matter of secret information we could have an executive session of the House under the general rules of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to be understood as opposing the gentleman's resolution, because I think there is much good in it, even if nothing comes from it further than what has already transpired. I think the effort has been worth while, because we notice by the press this morning that this action, and similar action on the part of the House and the Senate in asserting themselves, is bringing about a condition in which the executive has advised they are willing to talk through Mr. Byrnes, or somebody else, so that there may be no misunderstanding between the Congress and the executive about these things in which the people are interested.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no question but what the executive has established the precedent. I recall from Clay's Notes of the first session of the Senate of the United States the Executive, President Washington, attended one of the meetings at the invitation of the Senate but left in disgust. In substance he stated that from that point on each of the branches of government should confine itself to its particular sphere of operation. That is observation No. 1.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary

and one of the really great historians of the United States in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Unquestionably, as suggested by the gentleman, the writers of our Constitution anticipated that heads of the departments would come to the Capitol and advise with and report orally to the Senate and to the House. There is no real argument about that because in the very first Congress, in which sat many, many members of the Constitutional Convention, and of course the President of the United States, George Washington, had also been President of the Constitutional Convention; in the very first Congress, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, President Washington went personally to the Senate to advise with the Senate on a treaty with the Creek Indians. He went on a Friday. He was kept sitting around all day Friday, all day Saturday, and was asked to come back Monday. He was treated rather coolly and he vowed he would never come back there. But the writings of Washington clearly indicate that he thought it unfortunate that direct oral liaison was not carried out as intended by the fathers. But it was lost on that occasion and it was very unfortunate. I will say further to the Members of the House that we have some 24 records of appearances by members of the Cabinet before one or the other of the legislative bodies during the First Congress; and, of course, the first law setting up the Treasury Department intended that the Secretary of the Treasury would sometimes be called upon to come before the Congress and make oral reports, but on account of the incident I have referred to the procedure was abandoned by the First Congress just as Jefferson stopped addressing the Congress in person on the state of the Union. That was not revived until the time of Wilson. I believe this would be a very good time to revive this matter of the appearance of Cabinet members.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. First of all, I wish to compliment the gentleman on the great work he has done. I, like the gentleman from Michigan, am not opposed to the gentleman's proposition, but will the gentleman answer this question: In view of the delegated powers given by this Congress to the Executive, and in view of the fact that many of those powers have not been returned to the Congress, have we any standing with the members of the Cabinet to invite them here? Are they not secure in their legal standing and position in view of the powers heretofore delegated to them?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is true we cannot discharge a Cabinet member for he is selected by the President and can be discharged only by the President. It is in our power, however, to abolish the office, and it is in our power to invite them to appear; and they would appear.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. In the event we should invite them here and they crossed our threshold and then talked us down, would we have lowered the dignity and standing of our own group, the House of Representatives?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It will work out so that we shall have greatly increased the dignity and standing of the House of Representatives, because these gentlemen will have to make a good impression. The big news of the Nation would come from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Have we not great power in our control over the purse of the Nation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. We have great control through what the law says.

Mr. GRAHAM. And through control of the purse strings.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We can exert further control by refusing to appropriate. I have no fear but what they would cooperate to the fullest extent and in coming up here would give us full information. I thank the gentleman for his questions.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who has been very vigorous and effective in sponsoring a plan similar to this for many years.

Mr. THOM. I may say that the success of the system we are proposing depends largely on the questions. The questions must be fair, they must be free of accusation, they must be free of suspicion of the motives of any Cabinet officers. In the English Parliament the question must first pass the muster of a clerk. Certain standards have been set for the questions, and they must comply with those standards. The whole proposition is to see to it that partisanship is excluded and that you have a true question propounded in good faith.

H. R. 327 VASTLY DIFFERENT FROM PENDLETON PLAN

A recent Gallup poll showed that 72 percent of the people interviewed are in favor of the plan set forth in this resolution. Only 7 percent were against it. Yet, in Congress, I know there is a larger adverse percentage. The trouble I have had is that some Members are inclined to be against this idea because they have in mind the old resolutions on this subject and they have carried over their prejudices against the old ones to this one.

This proposal is so different from that presented by Congressman Pendleton and by President Taft that I doubt the value of comparing it to these previous plans and yet the prejudice is there—based upon the Pendleton-Taft proposals. Also, since it may be charged that this idea is not in keeping with our precedents, it is at least of interest from a historical point of view to examine these precedents.

PRECEDENTS FOR PLAN

Our founding fathers never intended that the three divisions of our Government should work in watertight compartments. Rather, I think our Constitution intended that some consultative custom be worked out. There is nothing in the Constitution to prohibit this being done. The branches of the Government are separate but each branch affects the workings of the other branch. It was never intended by our Constitution makers that the divisions of Government should be kept separate in a strict and actual sense. The founding fathers, I think, intended that some procedure like this should be inaugurated. In the law organizing the Treasury Department, passed in 1789, it made it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to "make reports and give information to either branch of the legislature, in person or in writing—as he may be required—respecting all matters which may be referred to him by the Senate or House of Representatives or which shall appertain to his office."

In the debate on that bill it was expressly objected to that it might lead to the introduction of all the Secretaries on the floor but the bill was nevertheless passed and without so much as a denial, that such would be the result.

Nor has history been without illustration of the necessity and of examples of this practice. In the early days of the Government the Secretaries were repeatedly called to the presence of either House for consultation, advice, and information.

Wednesday, July 22, 1789: The Secretary of Foreign Affairs (Mr. Jefferson) attended, agreeably to order, and made the necessary explanations. (Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., vol. 1, p. 51.)

Saturday, August 22, 1789: The Senate again entered on executive business. The President of the United States came into the Senate Chamber, attended by General Knox (Secretary of War), and laid before the Senate the following statement of the facts, with the questions thereto annexed, for their advice and consent. (Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., vol. 1, p. 66.)

And again on the Monday following the President and General Knox were before the Senate.

Friday, August 7, 1789: The following message was received from the President of the United States, by General Knox (the Secretary of War), who delivered therewith sundry statements and papers relating to the same. (Proceedings of House of Representatives, Annals of Congress, vol. 1, p. 684.)

Monday, August 10, 1789: The following message was received from the President by General Knox (Secretary of War), who delivered in the same, together with statement of the troops in the service of the United States. (Proceedings of House of Representatives, Annals of Congress, vol. 1, p. 689.)

There are about 14 instances when a member of the Cabinet appeared before the Senate during the First Congress. There are 8 instances cited in the Congressional Globe of appearances before the House. The record is not clear as

to just what took place on most of these occasions. It is fair to say that in most instances the Cabinet member acted largely as a courier.

WASHINGTON, CHAIRMAN OF CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, BELIEVED IN CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS

Historians usually say that Washington did not like the treatment he received before the Senate on one occasion and decided he would not go back. The record shows that he was kept waiting 2 days on one occasion when he was asked to appear. This may have been one reason for his discontinuing the practice of consulting with the Senate. It is clear, however, that Washington thought the practice in line with the Constitution and with our form of government.

In the Executive Journal of the Senate, volume 1, page 55, it appears that on August 4, 1790, President Washington sent a message to the Senate communicating the draft of a secret article to be incorporated in a treaty with an Indian tribe. The message closed with these words:

If the Senate should require any further explanation, the Secretary of War will attend them for that purpose.

This, mind you, was a message from the Father of our Country, the man who presided over the Constitutional Convention.

In the debate over the establishment of the Treasury Department no one objected to the provision which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to report in person to either branch of the legislature if the legislature chooses, on the grounds that this provision violated the Constitution or was not in keeping with our precedents. Mr. Madison was there and raised no objection to this provision. Later on, when Mr. Hamilton, the Secretary of the Treasury, had a report for the funding of the national debt which he wanted to make in person to the House of Representatives, a lengthy debate over his proposed appearances took place. This was during the Second Congress. It was decided to have Mr. Hamilton submit his report in writing. The decision was made principally on the ground that since the report was detailed and dealt with many figures, that it would be of more benefit to the Members of the House if delivered in writing. Perhaps the real reason Hamilton was not allowed to present the report in person was due to the antagonism between Hamilton and his followers and the followers of Madison.

PERSONAL REPORT ON STATE OF UNION PARALLEL IN HISTORY

A parallel in our history is that President Jefferson discontinued the practice of addressing Congress in person. When this practice was revived by President Wilson, a considerable stir was raised on the theory that personal appearance was not in keeping with our tradition. It was not a violation of any tradition at all; President Wilson was merely reviving a good policy which had been abandoned for more than 100 years. It was a policy open to the President under the Constitution. In the same manner the proposal here is a device open to us by the wisdom of the men who wrote our basic law.

EXPERIENCE OF CONFEDERATE STATES

It is of historical interest to review the action taken by the outstanding men who wrote the Constitution of the Confederate States. I think we are far enough away from the Civil War so that we from the South can be grateful that the Union was preserved, and those from the North can appreciate the ability and genius of some of the leaders of the Confederacy, such as Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and Alexander Stephens. Alexander Stephens, in spite of ill health, was one of the great statesmen and brains of his times. In the convention to adopt a constitution for the Confederate States, Mr. Stephens was chairman of the committee on rules The provisional government of the Confederacy adopted a resolution reported by Mr. Stephens that the heads of departments be admitted to the floor of Congress both in secret and in open session.

The idea was later written into the permanent Constitution of the Confederate States, in the following language:

Article 1, section 6 (2): No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he is elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the Confederate States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments of which have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the Confederate States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office. But Congress may, by law, grant to the principal officer in each of the executive departments a seat upon the floor of either House, with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department.

The Confederate Constitution was very similar to the Constitution of the United States. It followed the idea of the three separate powers. Its framers did not believe it would adversely affect the functions of the three separate divisions.

The Confederate Constitution was unanimously approved by a group of outstanding Americans—delegates were there from all the States of the Confederacy. Mr. J. L. M. Curry, a distinguished member of the convention from the State of Alabama, in his book Civil History of the Confederate States, tells the reason why this innovation was put in the Confederate Constitution:

Anyone familiar with public life in Washington knows that, under some administrations, there has been an injurious lack of sympathizing intercourse between the executive and legislative departments, and especially between members of the Cabinet and committees of Congress, concerned in matters of mutual interest. The absence of facility of communication often proves a bar to the easy and better working of the Government.

One of the outstanding authorities on government of those days was Alexander Stephens, of the State of Georgia. In his opinion the lack of consultation and coordination between the executive and legislative branches was one of the weaknesses of the Federal Government. He makes a very strong argument for the plan adopted in the Confederate Constitution in the excellent book which he later wrote. The improved procedure had been actually practiced under the provisional Federal Government of 1861, but because of conditions created by the war the plan was never fully carried out. Jefferson Davis, in his book The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, stated:

This wise and judicious provision, which would have tended to obviate much delay and misunderstanding, was never put into execution by necessary legislation.

PENDLETON RESOLUTIONS

In 1864 a bill to permit the heads of the executive departments to occupy seats on the floor of the House was reported unanimously by a select committee headed by Mr. Pendleton, of Ohio, The urgency of the Civil War rendered it difficult to secure attention to the subject, although the debate revealed strong support for the measure by many distinguished legislators such as Mr. Garfield, afterward elected President, and Mr. Blaine, afterward Speaker of the House. Later, during the forty-sixth session of the Congress, a resolution was introduced by Mr. Pendleton, then a Senator, to make it possible for heads of executive agencies to appear on the floor of the Senate. This resolution was referred to a select committee of seven, which unanimously reported the resolution. The committee was composed of three Democrats and four Republicans and its membership was made up of men whom it would be difficult to surpass for ability and statesmanship. The signers of the report were Senator Pendleton, at one time Democratic candidate for Vice President; Senator James G. Blaine, who was twice Secretary of State and later a Republican candidate for President; Senator W. B. Allison, who was for 35 years a Member of the Senate; General M. C. Butler, a Confederate veteran and a major general of the Spanish-American War; Senator James T. Farley; Senator John J. Ingalls; and Senator Orville H. Platt.

I could give you hundreds of recommendations by former Members of Congress, executives, historians, and other prominent Americans, urging favorable consideration of this means of communication. I will name only a few of our leaders who have advocated this procedure and will read short extracts from some of their statements in favor of it. These men are good authorities upon whom we can rely. In their statements are found many good reasons for the adoption of this system.

CONTEMPORARY SUPPORT

President Howard Taft, in his message to Congress made December 19, 1912, made a forceful argument for adoption of this proposal. He said in part:

There has been much lost motion in the machinery of Congress due to the lack of cooperation and interchange of views face to face between the representatives of the Executive and the Members of the two legislative branches of the Government. It was never intended they should be separated in the sense of not being in constant effective touch and relationship to each other. The legislature and Executive each perform its own appropriation functions, but these functions must be coordinated. I do not think that I am mistaken in saying that the presence of the members of the Cabinet on the floor of each House would greatly contribute to the enactment of helpful legislation.

Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes, in 1924, when Secretary of State, said:

It ought to be possible for Cabinet officers to take part in debate in both Houses on matters touching their departments and thus be able to give exact information and to defend themselves against unjust attacks. Under the present arrangement a Cabinet officer often hears of misunderstandings and of an outpouring of mistaken notions which a brief statement from him would have corrected, but the misapprehension has been voiced and has gone through the country perhaps never to be overtaken.

We can preserve the advantages of stability and enhance the opportunity of executive leadership, not by overriding the cherished prerogatives of the Congress or by attempting to gain an illicit advantage for the leadership but having a recognized contact through the regular admission of Cabinet officers to the floor of the House of Congress.

The late Elihu Root wrote, April 20, 1935:

It has long seemed clear to me that we ought to have some arrangement under which Congress would have the benefit of more prompt and authoritative information as to the action of the executive department.

On the other hand, I think that a sense of liability of prompt explanation has a very good effect upon the head and the leading members of an executive department.

The Honorable John W. Davis wrote, March 19, 1936:

I have always thought it would be a good thing if members of the Cabinet were given the privilege of the floor of either House of Congress.

Congress, having control of its own procedure, can undoubtedly inaugurate such a system if it wants to. I am not sure that each House could not do it on its own account. One of the greatest advantages of the attempt is that it could be abandoned if it proves a failure, without any permanent amendment to the Constitution.

I do not remember that I have ever discussed the subject in any public address, but I am quite willing to be quoted in favor of the experiment.

President James A. Garfield said:

Who does not know that the enactment of such a law will tend to bring our ablest men into the Cabinet of the Republic? Who does not know that if a man is to be responsible to his executive acts and also be able to tell why he proposes new measures, and to comprehend the whole scope of his duties, weak men will shirk from taking such places? Who does not know that it will call out the best talent of the land, both executive and parliamentary? It is the silent, secret influence that saps and undermines the fabric of republics, and not the open appeal, the collision between intellects, the array of facts. I hope that this measure will be fairly considered. If it does not pass now, the day will come, I believe, when it will pass. When that day comes I expect to see a higher type of American statesmanship, not only in the Cabinet but in legislative halls.

On another occasion President Garfield said:

I have long believed that the official relations between the Executive and Congress should be more open and direct. They are now conducted by correspondence with the presiding officers of the two Houses, by consultation with committees, or by private interviews with individual Members. This frequently leads to misunderstanding, and may lead to corrupt combinations. It would be far better for both departments if the members of the Cabinet were permitted to sit in Congress and participate in the debates on measures relating to their several departments—but, of course, without a vote. This would tend to secure the ablest men for the chief executive offices; it would bring the policy of the administration into the fullest publicity by giving both parties ample opportunity for criticism and defense.

President Woodrow Wilson, Committee or Cabinet Government? Overland Monthly, volume 3, third session, January 1884, page 25, said:

Cabinet government would, moreover, put the necessary bit in the mouth of beast caucus, and reduce him to his proper service, for it would secure open-doored government. It would not suffer legislation to skulk in committee closets and caucus conferences. Light is the only thing that can sweeten our political atmosphere—light thrown upon every detail of administration in the departments. * * *

It cannot be too often repeated that while Congress remains the supreme power of the State, it is idle to talk of steadying or cleansing our politics without in some way linking together the interests of the executive and the legislature. So long as these two great branches are isolated, they must be ineffective just to the extent of the isolation. Congress will always be master, and will always enforce its commands on the administration. The only wise plan, therefore, is to facilitate its direction of the Government and to make it at the same time responsible, in the persons of its leaders, for the acts of control and for the manner in which its plans and commands are executed. The only hope of wrecking the present clumsy misrule of Congress lies in the establishment of responsible Cabinet government. Let the interests of the legislature be indissolubly linked with the interests of the executive. Let those who have authority to direct the ccurse of legislation be those who have a deep personal concern in building up the executive departments in effectiveness, in strengthening law, and in unifying policies; men whose personal reputation depends upon successful administration, whose public station originates in the triumph of principles, and whose dearest ambition it is to be able to vindicate their wisdom and maintain their integrity.

Committee government is too clumsy and too clandestine a system to last. Other methods of government must sooner or later be sought, and a different economy established. First or last, Congress must be organized in conformity with what is now the prevailing legislative practice of the world. English precedent and the world's fashion must be followed in the institution of cabinet government in the United States.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and one of our greatest authorities on American government, in his excellent book, Is America Worth Saving? at page 60 had this to say:

The business of National Government has become so huge and so complex that the sharp separation of the executive and the legislative powers to which we have been accustomed for 140 years, is now distinctly disadvantageous. It brings in its train lack of coherence and of continuity in public policy; it conceals from the people much that they should know, and it prevents effective and quick cooperation between the Congress and the executive departments, both in times of emergency and in the conduct of the ordinary business of government. There is a way to overcome these embarrassments and difficulties without in any way altering the form of our Government or breaking down the wise safeguards which the Constitution contains. That is to provide by law, as may be done very simply, that the members of the Cabinet shall be entitled to occupy seats on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives, with the right to participate in debate on matters relating to the business of their several departments, under such rules as the Senate and House, respectively, may prescribe. Such an act should further provide that the members of the Cabinet must attend sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives at designated times, in order to give information asked by resolution or to reply to questions which may be propounded to them under the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Were such a custom to be established an almost certain result would be the selection as heads of the great executive departments of men of large ability and personal force—men able to explain and to defend their policies and measures before the Congress of the United States in the face of the whole country. It would also follow that the Nation's Legislature would be enabled to exercise a more intelligent and a more effective control over the executive departments than is now the case, as well as to render them more intelligent and more effective aid in the form both of appropriations and of positive law.

When Representative Clyde Kelly, of Pennsylvania, became the champion of the proposal, in the course of his campaign for it he asked the views of Mr. Hoover, then a Cabinet member. In replying, June 23, 1922, Mr. Hoover said he believed this one of the most constructive steps that could be taken in furthering the development of our political machinery.

There are in my mind overwhelming arguments that can be introduced in favor of this change in our traditions. I do not believe that any fundamental criticism can be directed against it except by those who would deliberately exaggerate it as an attempt to establish a form of parliamentary government. Anyone who understands the basis of such European organization will at once recognize that the step you propose has no relation whatever to this form of government.

Dr. Charles A. Beard, the noted historian, stated:

This (requiring Cabinet members to attend Congress) should have a wholesome influence on both departments of government. Again and again Congress enacts laws in vague and general terms, leaving interpretation and application to executive authority. In such cases it frequently happens that the administrator departs, or seems to depart, from the intention of the legislation, assuming that it was ever clearly formulated. The Members of Congress attack the administration on the floor and the administration fires volleys through the press at Members of Congress. Not an edifying spectacle. More than that, it delays, confuses, and hampers the transaction of business. Every issue of this character should be defended on the floor of Congress with the parties in interest face to face, the press watching, and the country informed.

Justice Story, The Constitution, section 869, said:

The heads of the departments are, in fact, thus precluded from proposing or vindicating their own measures in the face of the Nation in the course of debate, and are compelled to submit them to other men who are either imperfectly acquainted with the measures or are indifferent to their success or failure. Thus that open and public responsibility for measures which properly belongs to the executive in all governments, and especially in a republican government, as its greatest security and strength, is completely done away. The executive is compelled to resort to secret and unseen influences, to

private interviews, and private arrangements to accomplish its own appropriate purposes, instead of proposing and sustaining its own duties and measures by a bold and manly appeal to the Nation in the face of its representatives. One consequence of this state of things is that there never can be traced home to the executive any responsibility for the measures which are planned and carried at its suggestion.

Another consequence will be (if it has not yet been) that measures will be adopted or defeated by private intrigues, political combinations, irresponsible recommendations, and all the blandishments of office, and all the deadening weight of silent patronage.

H. R. 327 AVOIDS MANY OBJECTIONS MADE TO PENDLETON PLAN

Before drafting this measure I read all the congressional debate in the various Congresses on the so-called Pendleton-Taft plan. That plan, set forth by bills and resolutions, simply provided that heads of agencies and departments should have a right to sit on the floor of the House and participate in debate affecting their departments. The plan also provided that on certain days they should be required to appear in the House or Senate and answer questions.

The principal objections to the Pendleton-Taft plan were that it required attendance by the administrators. Many felt they would interfere with the work of Congress by being on the floors of Congress a great part of the time. Some felt the plan would exalt Congress over the executive. Others felt it would take too much time of the executives. Other Members felt the plan would supplant committees. Some felt it would give the executives too much influence over Congress. Some felt it would be the entering wedge of the parliamentary system. Others were fearful that the sessions would not be orderly and might be used for partisan or heckling purposes.

I feel that many of the arguments against the Pendleton-Taft plan had some merit, so in drafting this proposal I tried to meet the objections that had been made. You will observe that attendance under H. R. 327 is voluntary. The administrators come to the floor of the House for a particular purpose and it is not expected that they will be there at any other time. The sessions will not be an undue burden because they are limited to one a week and only one administrator will appear at one session. An administrator only comes when called by a congressional committee. He only comes to give information. The resolution also endeavors to establish an orderly procedure which will avoid heckling or personal embarrassment.

The need of closer collaboration between Congress and the administration has frequently been felt and voiced in the course of our national history. So long as the United States was half empty, prosperous, and well protected by broad oceans, the old idea of the balance-of-power system was tolerable. But now that the Nation is crowded, harassed by serious social and economic problems, and deeply involved in world affairs, better teamwork between the legislative and executive branches of our National Government is essential to our welfare and security. No item on the present agenda of democracy has a higher priority than that of inducing closer, stronger, steadier cooperation between the President and the Congress in promoting the welfare of the people of the United States and the United Nations.

Effective cooperation between the two great political branches is indispensable for successful government, which is what we need in these crucial times—government equally effective for the waging of war and the organizing of peace.

We are coming into the most important, complex, and challenging period of world history. The problems of government are not going to become easier—they will become more complicated. If we are to keep pace with the executive departments, if we are to legislate intelligently, and if we are to meet the great domestic and international issues coming before us, we must improve our system of securing information, keeping up with the administration of laws, and we must find a way of having closer teamwork between the executive and the legislative departments, particularly in the field of foreign affairs.

ANNUAL REPORTS NOT SUFFICIENT INFORMATION

The way we are supposed to keep up with what the departments are doing, under the present system, is by reading their annual reports. These reports are voluminous—those who write them tell us, to some extent at least, what they want us to know. With all the duties on a Member of Congress, very few of us have time to read these reports. Besides, they do not keep us currently informed. I think no one will argue that these reports are sufficient.

PRESENT COMMITTEE SYSTEM NOT SUFFICIENT

It is said that we have necessary contact through the committees. I find it very difficult to attend all the meetings of the one committee of which I am a member. Under the rules, we cannot join in the work of the other committees, and, besides, it is physically impossible to do so. Frequently 10 or 12 committees will be having hearings on the same day. It is said that committee reports should keep us currently advised. This we know is not true, because, in the first place, the committee reports are only about legislation on a particular bill. There are many things about which we need information not covered in any committee reports. We need information about the departments, the administration of laws, whether the intent of Congress is being followed, and above all, we need to be kept currently informed in the field of foreign affairs.

If a bill is not favorably reported by a committee, the hearings may never be printed. Even if they are printed, it is humanly impossible for any Member to read all the hearings. They are voluminous, contain many tables, and the hearings on an appropriation bill are frequently more than 2,000 pages in length.

The present committee system tends to make the members of a particular committee experts on the subject matter handled by that particular committee. The system does not operate to give the Members necessary facts needed for passing on national or international problems. What is needed is a system like the one proposed here to supplement the committee procedure, which will give the Members a better picture of the big over-all issues which we are confronting. This would tend to make the Members more nationally and internationally minded.

I asked the Library of Congress to give me information during the Seventy-seventh Congress on the number of resolutions for investigations filed during that Congress. The number they reported is 217; the requests for specific information from departments, and so forth, 37; and we have continued 16 special investigating committees. They say that probably they did not get all of them. The 217 requests for investigating committees certainly show that the Congress is in bad need of expert, detailed information. I am sure the necessity for a lot of these committees would be obviated if we could have the administrators up here, find out what they are doing, and get them to tell us about their plans and let them know what we think about it.

The present committee system, as it operates in considering big matters of general importance, works a hardship on the administrators. Several committees will be inquiring into the same matter and each committee will call the head of the department before them and he will give substantially the same statement to each committee. Mr. Jeffers appeared before five committees during 1 week. Mr. Nelson and Mr. McNutt were before several House committees and gave substantially the same testimony during 1 week. One appearance on the floor of the House in each of these cases, in which the administrator would explain the war-production problem, the war-manpower problem, or the rubber problem—as the case may be—should have been sufficient. One House hearing would have reached all the Members of the House, whereas several hearings before several committees only reached a small percentage.

Dozens of resolutions for the creation of investigating committees are filed during each session of Congress. The fact that these resolutions are filed shows that the Members are seeking information and it shows a desire for knowledge of facts. During the last Congress we authorized the appointment of several select committees to make special investigations into the way executive departments are carrying out their functions. After a law is passed, we have no direct method of ascertaining whether the intention of Congress is being carried out. The Smith committee made a special investigation of the instances in which the intention of Congress was not followed in the administration of laws. The necessity for most of the investigating committees would be obviated if we could invite the administrators into this forum and here, face to face, ask them to give an account of the stewardship of their departments.

IMPORTANCE OF CONGRESS WOULD BE STRESSED

A procedure would be inaugurated, if this resolution were passed, which would establish the importance of Congress in the public mind. At present executive administrators hold press conferences. These press conferences are given more play in the newspapers and over the radio than action taken

by Congress on important measures. If the plans and proposals for the administration of laws are brought out on the floor of the House, pursuant to questions from Members, the important news would arise from what was said on the floor and not what was said at some press conference.

EXECUTIVES WOULD DERIVE GREAT BENEFITS

This procedure would be beneficial to the Cabinet members and heads of the departments. In the first place, the President in making appointments would have to take into consideration that they would be called upon to appear on the floor of the House. The President's administration would be judged to a considerable extent by the impression these administrators made. He would be doubly sure that he secured outstanding men as heads of the executive agencies of the Government. The procedure would enable the administrators to obtain the people's view as expressed directly by the people's representatives. The administrators would consider more deliberately their decisions if they knew they would be called upon to give an account of what they were doing before the House. There could be no ghost writing. These men would have to know their departments and be able to give facts.

It frequently happens that rumors or unjust criticism are spread about executive officers. If this criticism comes from a Member of the House, the executive officer has no opportunity to answer except through the newspapers. Under this procedure he would be given an opportunity of appearing and explaining his side of the controversy.

POLICIES WOULD HAVE TO BE DECIDED BY EXECUTIVE

In a complex society such as we have today it is necessary to concentrate great and far-reaching power in the executive. This condition will continue regardless of the administration in power. One of the great values of having Cabinet members and administrative agents report in person to the Members of the House is that such appearances would necessitate clear definitions of policy on the part of the executive. Some Cabinet members and heads of agencies do not know what the President's policy is on certain particular matters under their jurisdiction. This is no reflection on the present administration, as the same condition has always existed. Before an administrator appeared at a question period he would naturally call upon the Chief Executive to clearly define the policy of the administration in regard to the matters about which he would be questioned. Also, many questions of policy which should be decided by the administrator himself remain undetermined. Faced with the invitation of making a personal report to Congress, the administrator would be running a great risk if he did not settle those undetermined matters of policy affecting his department before submitting himself to the House Members for interrogation.

Would not it be of great help to the Members of the House if Mr. Byrnes and others were given an opportunity of explaining their thinking and the original ideas of their committees relative to demobilization? After the war we may have to have some kind of international currency agreement. How many Members of Congress know the details of the various plans proposed or the intricacies of the problems of international currency? Would not it be of interest if the Banking and Currency Committee would invite some administrator to the floor of the House to tell all of us what is being thought of and planned in the matter of international currency?

OBJECTIONS TO PLAN ANSWERED

In this discussion I have answered some of the objections that have been or may be made to this proposal. It is said that allowing executives to consult with Members on the floor is not in keeping with our tradition or with the spirit of our Constitution. Under the Constitution each House makes its own rules. There is ample precedent in the early days of the Republic for this kind of thing. Each House admits a chaplain to open the proceedings with prayer. By the act of 1817 each Territory has a right to send a Delegate to the House who can participate in debate. This Delegate is not a Member of the House. I do not see how the presence of the Delegates adversely affects the tradition of the House. I think it is very wholesome to have them here to tell of the needs and problems of the Territories. The House admits contestants in election cases to present their claims on the floor. It has even admitted their attorneys.

Some Members claim that this should not be adopted because it is something new. Can no progress be made because we are afraid to try new methods?

Remember, this can be done by a simple change in the rules of the House. If the practice does not meet our expectations we can repeal the rule. In that case the Nation would at least give us credit for trying to improve the tools with which we work. The people want us to do that. They want a strong Congress—one able to hold its own with the executive departments; one which will secure the available facts before it legislates on any issue.

BALANCE OF POWER NOT AFFECTED

It is claimed by some that this might upset the balance of power or the so-called separation of powers. It will do nothing of the sort. It is only a means of securing information which is open to us under the Constitution. The departments now do not work in watertight compartments. Each division of the Government affects and has considerable influence over the others and it was never intended that we should not communicate and exchange information and advice for the good of the country.

"APING ENGLAND" ARGUMENT RIDICULOUS

Another argument always effectively used against any plan of this kind is that it might be "aping England." Our system of government is so different from the English system that a comparison is of little benefit. Yet, when the Pendleton plan was about to be adopted in 1864, Congressman Cox of Ohio put on a show as to how we would be copying the English and the measure was defeated. Under the parliamentary system the ministers lose their seats when Parliament does not sustain their position. Under our system the right to select and discharge Cabinet officers is solely in the President. Furthermore, we can never have the parliamentary system, in view of the constitutional provision which says that no Member of the Congress can hold any executive position. In England, however, the ministers, as you know, are members of Parliament.

Every representative form of government except ours has some direct means of communication between the executive and congress. It might as readily be said that we are copying any of these other systems. Besides, if we can get a good idea from the British, or any other nation, which we can fit into our system, I think we should accept it. After all, the English common law, the Bill of Rights, and habeas corpus were great institutions, and they have meant much to the American people.

It is said that the annual reports of the departments are sufficient. We know as a practical matter that this is not true. What would you think of a corporation if the directors and stockholders could only communicate with the management officials in writing? We would rate this kind of set-up as foolish and inefficient.

It is said that the committee system gives us necessary contacts. As presently operated, I know that it does not. If supplemented with this resolution, so as to give the committee an opportunity to acquaint the whole House with the organization, personnel, and problems of the departments, the committee system would be capable of filling the bill.

Under this resolution there would be no opportunity for the Cabinet members to exert undue influence over the Members of Congress. They would come on the floor of the House for the specific purpose of giving information. They would only be here during that time. If they have a good plan and can persuade us that it is good, I cannot see how any harm is done, and, likewise, if we do not agree with them after giving them a hearing, no harm is done.

WOULD NOT BE HECKLING PERIOD

It is said by some that this would resolve into a heckling period. Those who say this, I think, overlook the fact that every Member of the House is here for a good purpose and wants to do his best to represent his country and his district. The people now are dead serious about this business of better government, and they will not long countenance any Member using this occasion for political or improper purposes.

The press of the Nation, as evidenced by more than 350 favorable editorials, is on the whole strongly for this improvement and the press would deal harshly with any improper use by a Member of the House. Furthermore, I think the resolution has ample safeguards to prevent heckling. If more are needed, I am in favor of adding them.

Furthermore, the procedure set up in H. R. 31 is wholly voluntary. The administrator does not have to appear in the first place unless he wants to. Since his appearance is voluntary, he could, by the same token, refuse to answer an improper question. Furthermore, if any substantial part of the membership of the House should become so devoid of decorum as to try to make these appearances

heckling sessions, the administrator would not be expected to appear. The public would certainly not want him to under such circumstances.

CONCLUSION

To sum up—if Congress wants to hold its authority, if the House wants to keep pace with the executive departments, if the House wants to meet the expectations of the people of this country, we must improve our machinery. I think this plan is worth trying. I think it would work to the benefit of Congress, the departments, and the people. If it does not, the committees do not have to issue any invitations and, furthermore, if we do not like the way the system works, we can repeal the rule. Let us at least give it a trial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may follow the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STATE OF THE NATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to wish all of you and your families and all the people who are associated with you a very happy New Year. Many of you may be a little bit fooled with that statement because you thought I was going to first ask you, "Where are you going to get the money?"

It is certainly a very great question, I assure you.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I stood in the well of this House to address the Members I made my farewell address. At that time I thought I would never be privileged to return to the House of Representatives because I had served 12 years, which is about one-sixth of a man's lifetime and that that was sufficient service for me, but events have taken such a turn that I am returning here as a Member of the Congress again; a great privilege and a great honor. I have been sent back by the people of the Fifteenth District of the State of Pennsylvania. I have made no promises of any kind to any citizen. I did not ask for any favors in coming here, so that I am free to do that which I believe is for the best interests of this great country of ours, and for all of our people, of all classes, of all religions and faiths.

I come here for the sole purpose, God being my helper, of keeping this country under the form of government which our forefathers have established and which they have asked us to perpetuate for our children and for our children's children. I realize full well that this country today is in the most serious position it has ever been in all its history. We have a great responsibility, a great job on our hands. We are at war and I do not want to do anything, I do not want to say anything, that will hinder the war effort or an agreement on peace by which we can bring our boys back to America at the very earliest moment. That will be my responsibility and purpose. However, in order to successfully conduct the affairs of this country and the war in which we find ourselves, we need to do the things in our country that will preserve the democracy which we have all loved for so long and which we want to perpetuate. It is the greatest heritage that we as Americans have, it is our great privilege to have liberty, independence, and freedom for America, and for the American people.

I hope that nothing will interfere so that our liberties will get away from us. But I am so exercised in the things that have transpired in the last 12 years that I am afraid our liberties are getting away from us very, very fast. I say with all the sincerity that I know that the form of government which we knew 10 or 12 years ago is getting away from us, and if we do not look out we are going to have a form of government such as you and I would not want to possess. If such a thing were to happen that our form of government be changed you may say, "Oh, I did not want that form of government. I do not know why it has come about." I say that the reason it has come about—because I have lived with it during those years—is due to the things that you do here in the House of Representatives; a little bit here and a little bit there on each one of these bills, giving power to the Chief Executive that should be retained in the hands of the Congress of the United States and to the citizens of this great Nation of ours. Permitting law by Executive order rather than laws of the Congress.

I hold in my hand the statement of the United States Treasury dated January 1, 1945. It shows that today we are in debt $232,163,996,653.87. When I left the Congress 2 years ago that indebtedness was $57,838,123,096.94, on December 31, 1941. In other words, you have increased the indebtedness of this Nation of ours $174,225,873,556.93 in 2 years. That means over $7,000,000,000 a month in the red—I say to you where are you going to get the money?

Let me go back and just look at the statements that were made by the Chief Executive in 1932. I am only going to read one, but I have a book here that is filled with them, sound statements, statements that are good, but today only water over the wheel—broken promises. They have not been carried out. May I read one statement that was made in Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932, by the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt?

> The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.
>
> If government lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Now that was a fine statement, a true statement, a wise statement.

Why did he forget it so soon when in 1934 they started to spend and spend and spend and elect, elect, and elect?

Oh, what a shame—oh, what a mockery and scandal it has become.

I say that we are on the road to bankruptcy today. I am sorry, but some of you might say, "Oh, that is because of the war." Oh, no, no, no. For 9 years before the war this administration had a deficit of from one and one-half billion to five billion dollars a year, and it did not do anything about it then, notwithstanding the promises that were made by the Chief Executive. I have nothing personally against the Chief Executive. I have nothing personally against anybody. But I do not like a man to say one thing and do another. If I did that, I know what you Members would say about me. I have tried to be honest with you and I am going to be honest with you, and I am going to start right in at this session just where I left off 2 years ago. I have not been sorry for anything I voted for in those years. I did it because I believed it was right and just.

I am going to vote that way now, but I do not believe in sitting idly by, because I came to Congress, and permitting things to go on in this Government that are going to wreck us or that are going to tear us down or that are going to make us lose our form of government, and we are doing it and doing it every day. You know it, but you do not stop it nor prevent it.

Marvin Jones, as reported in this morning's paper, says we have to raise more food not only for our own people and our own Army but for the other peoples of the world. Mr. Byrnes says we are going to draft the boys that are on the farms. Where is there any sense in that? How can you produce more foodstuffs on the farms with less people to work the farms?

You may say, "Where are you going to get the men to fight the war?" If you need food, you need men on the farms to raise the food to furnish it to the people who need it. You may say, "Where are you going to get these people?" I would start right here in the Government offices in Washington and I would get some of the people in the offices of Government, and get them mighty quick, and I would send them back on the farms or in industry or war work, and let them do something that would be worth while for the winning of this war.

Let me show you now what happened with respect to the employees on the Government pay roll. All the time I have been here in Government, notwithstanding the statements that were made by the Chief Executive—and he said before he was elected that he would consolidate the bureaus and eliminate them—he has established more offices and bureaus; he has built up the greatest political machine that was ever known in the history of the world out of Government employees all over this land and in every State of the Union. He has done that for no other purpose, in my judgment, after seeing what has happened, than to have workers all over

the United States in order that he might have this political machine. True, they do work for the Government, but I contend there are too many worthless jobs. The end does not justify the means.

When he went into office on March 4, 1933, we had 563,847 Government employees. That does not include the Army or the Navy. Today we have over 3,250,000. We have established all kinds of bureaus in this city. In the Labor Department alone, whenever one bureau did not function we established another, until we have gotten more bureaus in that Department than are necessary by any stretch of the imagination. We have them in the Department of Agriculture, we have them in the Department of the Interior, and we have them in every other department of government.

If the Members of Congress would try to do what is right and do it quickly we would send these people back into industry, and agriculture that is going to help win the war, and get them out of Washington. You can hardly go to a restaurant and get a meal; there are so many people here they are falling all over themselves.

I realize there are many people in Government who are working hard, but there are many things in Government that are unnecessary at this time. When Mr. Roosevelt took office in 1933 it cost about $6,000,000,000 a year to run the Government, and we took in about $4,800,000,000. It is costing us today over $97,000,000,000 a year to run Government, and we are taking in about $44,000,000,000. I am speaking here in round figures. I am not trying to give you the actual data; I will give you that later on before the year is over. When we know we are doing everything we can to win this war, and when we know we have so many functions of government that are unnecessary, we should strip this Government to the core of all unnecessary bureaus, and get these people back on the farms or back in industry, where they can do something to help win the war. That is your job and it is my job and I am ready to do it. What do you say?

I want to say to you men now, I have listened to some of the men who made tours of the foreign countries, both in the Pacific and Europe and Asia. If the people of this country knew what was going on, many of us would sit here and just shudder for the things that we are doing which are not consistent with winning this war. Then when I think today of the promises which were made by labor that we would have no strikes, and when strikes are happening all over the country, and when we have the radical labor leaders today who are out trying to foment strikes just because perhaps some manufacturer did not give them the tools that they wanted, and they call a strike I shudder. Let them wait until the soldiers return and things will happen, but it may be too late.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Strikes today should have no place in our Government, even though they might be what some people term, worthy strikes. "Arbitration" is the term of the day. But there are so many of them that are just created by conditions which are not consistent with good, sound business on the part of labor or on the part of management. When you think of what these boys are going through, who are lying in foxholes, giving up their lives to defend the democracy which we have, it seems to me that everybody should do what they can to aid them. That means everybody; it means you men in Congress and it means the men on the assembly lines in industry, and it means the farmers and the mechanics, and it means the people in shops. Nobody should be excluded today from doing their duty to their country. All loyal Americans will cooperate.

I have only been given 5 minutes but I will be here again. The gentleman from Connecticut a while ago called my attention to something while I was talking to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] and he wanted to know why I voted for the bill yesterday to make a permanent committee to discover subversive activities in this country. My reason was to keep America American and get rid of all subversive activities against our Government.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. No; the question was, Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. RICH. Oh, the question was, "Where are we going to get the money?" Oh, excuse me. Well, I have tried my best to show you by economy in government where you can get a lot of it, but it has fallen on ears that have been deaf. The money necessary for this committee will be good, sound business and will save us much money. In the past when I wanted you to economize in government operation my words fell on the ears of many people who think of nothing but spend, spend, spend. It seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives should have a meeting with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and get together and decide how much we are going to have to spend before we spend it. It is up to you Members of Congress; it is up to each and every one of you when you think here of voting for things that you are going to put into effect, as to whether this Nation can stand it without going into bankruptcy. I will say to you this, that all the bombs that have been dropped on those cities in France or in Germany or in some other foreign country are going to be calm alongside of the bomb that is going to be dropped on this Nation whenever we find out that with all the money to finance not only our own Government, not only our own war, but the entire war and all the things that all the nations in the world are expecting of us; it will be a bomb that will rock the world, when we fall financially. When our people are going out and promising the people of all nations things that we are going to be unable to fulfill and going to be unable to cope with, we have to be mighty careful. We have got to be honest. That is the thing we ought to bring home here to every Member of Congress. Do not spend foolishly if you have not anything to spend. Do not commit yourselves to something you cannot do. Stop squandering. It is time to be frugal; it is time to think; it is time to act.

If you are not honest with yourself, if you are not trying to do the best for this country, then, you ought to resign and get out—I do not care whether you come from the Democratic side or the Republican side, or whom you may be. I say this to you, and it is the last thought I have today, that if I were the Speaker of this House, with the majority leader, whether it be on the Republican or the Democratic side, I would try to find some means whereby we could have a roll call before the Chaplain asks divine blessing. I would have in here Jewish rabbis, Catholic priests, our own Chaplain, who would cooperate with them; I would have in ministers of other denominations, and I would ask the Members to get themselves in the right spirit of brotherly love and kindness. If we are going to solve the problems that are coming before us, I think there is nothing more essential to the welfare of the world than to ask God's divine guidance and his aid and assistance in this great time and this great trouble that now faces us. A good prayer meeting will help us all, it will help you and it will help me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the financial bankruptcy of the Government, about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] spoke, is bad enough, but there is something worse than that, and that is the moral bankruptcy toward which our people have been drifting, into which they have been forced by this administration and its political allies.

All during the campaign, and for some time before—yes; for 2 years or more—repeated attempts were made to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives. This campaign of vilification was carried on by the Daily Worker, the New Masses, by other communistic publications, by the New Republic, PM, the Chicago Sun, and others who are apparently working to perpetuate the New Deal. Practically all of their propaganda was made up of untruthful statements, though once in a while they would wiggle in a half-truth.

Yet, yesterday, when the question of setting up a permanent committee to continue to investigate subversive activity came up in the House, there were those who said that it was nothing but an act of bigotry, the result of prejudice. In this noon's issue of the Washington Daily News, under the name of Thomas L. Stokes, I find the following, among other statements:

Then the dedicatory spirit of the opening of Congress was spoiled by one of those actions bespeaking the prejudices among us that seem to come boiling to the top in time of war.

This was when Representative RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, shoved through a change in rules which will perpetuate the Dies committee as a regular standing committee of the House. It was done despite the defeat of three members of the old committee, in elections in which the issue was raised, and the voluntary retirement of Representative Dies himself; despite an apparent agreement among leaders not to revive the committee, and despite public reaction against the character-smearing of that committee.

No one was ever more mistaken in his conclusions. Those who voted to establish that committee are neither bigoted nor prejudiced, but they do believe it is their duty to keep those who would destroy constitutional government from boring from within. They know of no reason why left-wingers, parlor pinks, New Dealers—who advocate the remaking of America, who prophesy the destruction of private business and hope the procedure will be bloodless; any or all of those who do not believe in constitutional government—should be permitted to carry on their program in secrecy. If the people want their program, all well and good; but let us have it out in the open, so we all know what we are doing.

Congressmen have been through three elections since the attack began on the Dies committee, and if anyone knows what his constituents are thinking about, what the people of the Nation are thinking about, it is the fellow who stands up on election day to be counted in or out. Most of those who voted for the resolution yesterday know what it is all about. Even the majority leader said he would vote for the establishment of a special committee. Those of us who have been anonymously lied about, falsely accused of a lack of patriotism, believe it no more than fair that the source of the money which pays for those lies, the men who originate and circulate them, should be known. If they are honest citizens, no harm has been done. If they are convicts or ex-convicts, the people are entitled to know the source of the publicity.

Yesterday, when the House determined to make that committee a permanent standing committee of the House—not to extend the life of the Dies committee as one or two radio commentators said—we did what our people wanted us to do, but what the Communists, the New Dealers, the P. A. C., and some racketeers in the C. I. O. did not want; and that fact is shown by the C. I. O. publications.

In the issue of PM which was on the newsstands this morning there was a story which was captioned "Dies' ghost already stalks new House."

The story continued:

The Seventy-ninth Congress was off to a dreary start today.

In its first order of business, the House, by a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats, voted to set up a new standing Committee on Un-American Activities whose authority and scope will exceed that of the discredited and repudiated Dies committee, long since presumed dead.

It was an appalling congressional opening for hopeful citizens who had concluded that the new House would be better than the last. The debut gave dire promise of what was to come when the legislative session really gets under way.

The truth is that the action yesterday was brought about by a coalition of Members who believe in constitutional government, who are all fed up with the mouthing of the Communists; the misstatements and the downright lies set forth in publications like PM.

The action was a demonstration that this Congress does not propose to be either kicked around or led around by the nose by a small group whose chief interest lies in other countries, who wish to transplant from the dead or dying civilization of the Old World, the seeds of that decay.

The action is a promise that at least here in America there has been set up a permanent organization in the House which will let in the light of publicity upon the activities of those who heretofore have desired to work in secret—in the dark.

The vote would have been much larger in favor of the resolution, had it been brought up by resolution to create a special committee. Not a few on both sides of the Chamber preferred to have a special committee created rather than to have a standing committee, but the patriotic drive was so strong that it overrode the administration and the majority leadership of the House.

The Reds and the radicals can yell their heads off but there is a possibility, yes, a probability, that from now on they will be made to answer for their lying, sneak attacks and that the disunity that results from their vicious propaganda will be laid on their own doorstep, where it belongs.

It is all right to take 20,000,000 young Americans and send them across the seas, many of them never to return; yes, that is all right in the minds of some, but it is wrong to let the people know who is wrecking our war efforts, preaching racial prejudice, creating disunity, and why that is being done. Carrying on a war is one way to fight subversive activities; but when this House proposes to establish and keep in existence here a committee to watch these fellows here at home who originate and carry on these subversive movements, expose those who would destroy this Government, the organizations—one of which, like the P. A. C.—that is the organization that boasts it is going to control Congress and stated in its official publication that it had 101 members, I think it was, in the present Congress, the Seventy-ninth Congress—I am on the list of those it is going to get next time, although they failed twice to get me—an organization that is headed by a Russian-born man who, if he says what he means and what he writes, does not believe in the Constitution at all, does not believe in our way of doing things—cry that the Congress should not expose the men behind it.

The people of the Nation, if I get their sentiments right, will rejoice in the fact that the House yesterday established that committee, in spite of all that criticism, as a permanent committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman aware that the Russian Government recently approached a large American shipbuilding concern and offered them a big contract providing they would sign up with the C. I. O.?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I saw it in the press, and the press ordinarily—and I am now drawing a distinction between columnists and news reporters—the press ordinarily in its news reporting is accurate, reliable; seldom does it make a mistake.

Then Mr. Stokes goes on and says:

The vote was close but bigotry won the day.

Well, Mr. Stokes better go and read a little—he might start in with the Bible, then come on down to the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution. He will learn some things he should know—more accurately remember some things he does know. Now, Mr. Stokes knows that the 207 Members of the House who voted for the resolution are not bigots. He knows very well that the minority leader is not a bigot. Stokes was just slinging words around and that right carelessly.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry; I have not time. Yes; I will, at the request of the gentleman from Minnesota, yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman. Does not the gentleman believe it is setting a dangerous precedent to make permanent committees of that character? There is no telling how many investigating committees may be strung out

during the years, committee after committee of this same nature, made permanent committees of the House. If it could be done in this instance, it could be done in others. Does not the gentleman also believe that in this matter of controversial issues it would have been far wiser had there been longer study and debate before the vote was taken?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In reply to the gentleman's question about the time, I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania—I believe it was Mr. EBERHARTER—state on yesterday that we ought to have more time to study this matter, but in the next breath he said he had been studying it for a year and a half. If a person cannot make a decision in a year and a half, then there is no use in putting it off longer. Moreover, the House can abolish the committee at any time.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a minute. We have committees on this, that, and the other subject, permanent committees. We have a permanent committee on the disposal of what is it—waste paper?

Mr. KNUTSON. Useless papers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Useless papers. Right now saboteurs who were abroad in the land are in custody. Discovered only the other day were two Nazi spies who landed on the coast of Maine. Throughout this country not a day goes by that there is not a stoppage of work by strike in a war industry. Do you think Congress should sit here and let the Communists in any organization work underground or in the open without any action on our part to stop them or expose them?

Then we have this move to bring the farmers back from the service and put them on the farm and the talk about drafting the IV–F's for war work. What I am wondering is, if the organization which supported the gentleman from Alabama in his reelection, the P. A. C., which claimed to be responsible for his return to Congress, which has promised to defeat me at the next election, having failed in two previous ones, I am wondering whether that organization which seems to have a voice in the administration here, if we bring back the farmers, if we put the IV–F's in service, I am wondering whether that organization is going to demand that they become members of the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. before they go to work in war industries; whether it is going to demand that the Army, as the C. I. O. today in Chicago is demanding, collect from the employees of Ward's $1 a month for 13 months as past dues so that the P. A. C. and the C. I. O. may turn over a part of those dues taken by force out of the pockets of the workers for a campaign fund, as they did in the last election for the reelection of the present occupant of the White House, will insist that the farm boys, the IV–F's, join up, pay up, before they go to work making guns? Should not the House have a committee—yes, legislation—to make it possible for the father, the mother of a soldier, to work in a war plant without being required to pay tribute to a political organization?

Now, so far as Avery is concerned, I hold no brief for him. One of these fellows asked the other day, Are they going to bring that man Avery back and put him under the draft law—reclassify him? What service could he render to the war effort? Bring them all back in, then put them under the jurisdiction of the political organization controlled, as it is, by Communists. That would be the result of their program.

Mr. Speaker, there is every reason in the world why we in Congress should forestall any action of that kind by that organization or any other. The official declaration of that organization, and I do not refer to the P. A. C., I refer to its controlling element, the Communists, denounces religion and declares there is no Deity. It states that the ministers and the priests are hyprocrites and frauds. Do you not think it is time that we get after and keep watch of those organizations which attack Christianity? Name the members, officers, and the sources of their income and how expended. Would you wipe off the dollar that old motto "In God We Trust"? Would you not open the House with prayer? If you follow the Communists in the P. A. C. you would do away with the churches. The time to fight those organizations is now. We let them run on for 2, 4, and 6 years and they have grown ever stronger. They have taken control of the majority party and they have frightened the daylights out of a large number of Republicans who would like to oppose them. In a year or two you will find in this House only those who always vote with them. They have turned on Members of this House who have gone along day after day with them. Well do I remember the gentleman from Pennsylvania who served in the last war as a major, who was criticized by them, and another Member on the majority side because of one vote cast in the House. In a publication put out by the C. I. O. there was the statement that they had more respect for me because I had always opposed them than they did for the two "double-crossers" who had failed them. But those gentlemen were honest and patriotic, and they at no time double-crossed the C. I. O. They had gone along with the C. I. O. time and time again, they went along with them until the day came when their conscience and their patriotism told them they had to vote against legislation sponsored by that organization. They did. What did they get? What did Members on this side get in the last election? There were men who had gone along with the C. I. O. month after month. What did the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] on our side get? He got opposition at the polls as a reward. What did 40 or 50 other Members who had stood up for the C. I. O. get? Nothing but bitter lying opposition. No; they want someone to always go along; and if you do not go along with them, and perchance they change after you vote for them, you are still in the wrong column. You are the victim of their hate, their political opposition.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The State Department permitted a great many Germans to go back to Germany. In this morning's paper the statement is made that this was done against the wishes of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the F. B. I. Why should such action like that be taken, why should there be conflict between two great branches of this Government if there were not in these branches of the Government certain people who need watching by the committee that we set up here yesterday to continue the investigation of these subversive activities?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know why those men were permitted to go back or why they were sent back. I do know that high-ranking members of the administration are continually fighting each other. I do know that the majority of us who opposed the P. A. C., who fought the Communists and the New Deal during the last 2, 4, and 6 years, were lied about and vilified throughout the past campaign.

And I do know that most of the false propaganda that was put out was intended to destroy the confidence of the people in us and that it was anonymous—much of it in violation of State laws, because the name of the author was not given.

Those campaign documents were conceived in secret, born and circulated in the dark. They were so rotten, so vicious, that no decent man or woman could be induced to put his name upon them as the author or the sponsor.

I do know that in my own district the P. A. C. had a man for months living in the district, controlling and directing the campaign, and up until the last Friday before election in the headquarters of the largest county, which gave one-third of the votes in the district, in the Democratic headquarters, there had not appeared a single piece of Democratic campaign literature. It was all P. A. C., every bit of it. They covered that district from house to house, the rural routes as well as city deliveries.

They published 6 different pieces of propaganda filled with their lies and falsehoods—one a 16-page illustrated pamphlet on book paper; others, full-page ads in the newspapers; and just the Friday before election, a 4½-page mimeographed release, 42 lines on each page, was delivered from house to house and thrown about the streets of the towns and cities in the district during the nighttime. It contained deliberate falsehoods. It questioned my loyalty. It set forth that the people have begun to wonder "just how big a bulldozer and a 'booby' he may be." It viciously attacked Mr. Hoover, Mr. Dewey, and others, and the only signature on it was "The People's Democratic Committee."

I am well satisfied that it was never put out by any Democratic organization in the district, and no one has been able to trace the source from which it came nor who circulated it, for it was thrown

about in the doorways and on the sidewalks—yes, in the public highways—during the darkness of the night.

And the people answered all that propaganda by giving the Republican candidate for Congress a majority 5,000 votes greater than that received in any prior election. All of which PM and any publication or group engaged in the spreading of subversive propaganda might note shows the people's desire that the activities of the Dies committee be continued.

The Dies committee may have made mistakes; it may have issued some statements which were not truthful, which were erroneous. But its record of accuracy, of truthfulness, will compare at least favorably with that of the O. P. A. or the administration.

The Dies committee was able to put the finger on subversive propaganda and its authors and if, at times, it could not locate the membership cards of some who were charged with being Communists, we might well excuse it, as we recall that at the moment no one seems able to locate the Atlantic Charter, to tell us who signed what.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why should they have Democratic literature in the headquarters? They have taken the Democratic Party over. Why duplicate their efforts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Perhaps I should not criticize the P. A. C. or the Communists for doing that. That is natural. That is a part of their customary deception. That is a part of their fraudulent practices. My only point is that the time has come to fight those who are fighting us and fighting America.

Thank God for the Dies committee, for the disclosures it made, for the good it wrought, and thank God and Congress for establishing a permanent committee of the House to search out, detect, and expose subversive activities, subversive propaganda, and those who make possible its publication and circulation by financial contributions.

The action of the House yesterday in adopting the Rankin resolution was a distinct contribution to the war effort and will, by the people, be so regarded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from General Reybold.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle, and in the other to include the remarks of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs at Vatican City, December 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I delivered on Christmas day over Station WNOE, New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

SHOULD CONGRESS INVESTIGATE ANTI-DEMOCRATIC ACTIVITIES IN AMERICA?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to discuss the same subject that has been spoken of by two previous speakers in the House today. My task is a bit more difficult than theirs was, because I think a profound problem faces the Congress in connection with the action that was taken on yesterday, just as I think a profound problem confronts our country in connection with this whole matter of the proper effective defense of democracy in America.

America is engaged in the greatest war in all the annals of history. She is pouring out her blood in that war, as well as her treasure. The American people have fought wars before. Being an American, I may be prejudiced, but it is my honest belief that America has fought to a much greater extent than any other nation in the world for ideals, and less for national gain.

If I interpret the feeling of the American people correctly today, I think their main hope is that by the victory which ultimately will be won in this war we will win for ourselves and for the world an era of justice and freedom and lasting peace. I believe that the American Nation wants to see all nations free to choose their own governments, without outside interference by any nation. On another occasion I would like to address the House on that subject. I am not going to speak about it today.

I think further than that that America is fighting this war in order to prevent a great danger from engulfing the world, a danger which threatened it and almost overcame it, and which at one stage but for the dogged courage of millions of unheralded and unsung people in the slums of London and other English cities might have dominated this world. That danger was that philosophy of government which held that a clique in power in the nation had a right to ride roughshod over the religious beliefs, the political desires, the economic welfare, and everything else in the individual lives of their people; that same clique claiming the right not only to dominate their own people but the right to ride roughshod over nations weaker than themselves.

It is against that philosophy of government, the philosophy of a concentration of power so intense as in the course of time to become, we feared, almost irresistible, that America fights this war.

What are the fundamental things we seek to preserve? Constitutional democratic government. What does that mean? It means government by majority rule. Yes; but it means government by majority rule, always checked and guided by the right of minority opposition. It means a government of elected officials who from time to time—and to us it may seem rather frequent—go before the bar of the opinion of the people of their districts or the Nation, as the case may be, in order that those people may decide whether those particular officials shall continue to serve or not.

Constitutional government means something else. It means that there are certain fundamental rights which each citizen has a right to claim and which the highest authority of government itself cannot take away from him. It means the right to worship as one sees fit. It means the right to hold freely one's religious beliefs in order that one may hold them sincerely and earnestly, because only when a person holds them freely do they mean anything to him. It means the right to economic liberty, the right to economic opportunity free of monopoly control or domination from any source.

Finally, it means political liberty. It means the liberty of a man who does not happen at the moment to agree with the majority of opinion to hold views contrary to that majority of opinion and still be considered a patriotic citizen of the Nation. You cannot sweep away any of these liberties without ultimately imperiling every last one of them.

All human progress, everything America is or stands for, is the result of the courage and the vision and the willingness to suffer of pioneers, pioneers in the settlement of land heretofore unsettled, pioneers for religious freedom, for political freedom, for economic emancipation. Those men were reviled and persecuted in their day. It was Thomas Jefferson who once said a good many years ago, speaking of money in this Nation:

> The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government, where it belongs.

That was Jefferson. For views like that and other views about the rights of man, Jefferson in his day was condemned and vilified, only to see in our own day, as I believe he does, his great name enshrined perhaps higher than almost any other in all the annals of American political philosophers and statesmen.

Therefore, I am concerned that, since the House on yesterday, by the vote of the majority thereof, voted to establish a standing committee to investigate un-American activities, that job should be done in the way it ought to be done. I voted against the motion on yesterday. I voted against it for several reasons. First, because I believed it premature

because I thought we should have taken time to profit from past experience and to start the work in as effective and careful a way as possible. Second, because I believe that a committee of this particular sort ought not to be a standing committee of the House. My reason was not that I felt that there was any objection to having this work continuously carried on but rather that it seems to me that work of the character of this committee will be called upon to do is primarily concerned not with legislation but with exposure. The House from time to time ought to have opportunity to pass judgment upon the work of such a committee and decide whether or not it believes the work is being well done, a thing it will not have the opportunity to do in the case of a standing committee. Furthermore, I emphatically do not subscribe to the idea that, in the hands of the leadership of this House, there was the slightest danger of anything happening to the records of the Dies committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I was one who voted for that resolution and I, too, am like the gentleman from California in feeling that this should not have been a permanent standing committee. Although I feel that it is so essential to have a committee of that kind continue the work at this particular time since we, as the Congress, can do away with that committee whenever we find that there is no work for it to do.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is all water over the dam. The House has spoken and I want to speak about the situation as we now confront it, not as I might believe it should have been. There is one thing that such a committee has to be extremely careful not to do. If such a committee of the House can ever be accused of an attempt to interdict freedom of political thought in the United States, that committee and the House that created it will be striking a blow at the fundamentals of political democracy in these United States. Young people, especially, have got to explore; they must adventure; they must think, and they ought not to be made to feel, as long as they think freely and frankly, openly, sincerely, and honestly, that they are doing anything that is not patriotic. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, when this war shall finally have been won, when 11,000,000 men, mostly mighty young men, come back to this country, unless we do our job remarkably well in preparing for their return, unless we really see that the American market is adequate to consume all the goods that they and others can produce, they are going to think, and they are going to think freely and fearlessly; and they are going to have a right to do so.

I used to be a member of the Dies committee. I voted for the Dies committee, I think, three times; and I voted against it twice. The first time I voted against it was the first time it came up for renewal. Subsequent to that vote, the then Speaker of the House, Hon. William B. Bankhead, appointed me a member of the committee. I served on the committee until January of 1942. Then I voted against the continuance of the committee for reasons that I thought ample and sufficient, and still do, and I resigned from it. But I am not going into those questions except by indirection today.

Having said what I have so far, I want to make this point. There is a fundamental principle we never can forget. That principle is that any American citizen has a fundamental, moral, and constitutional right to hold any economic, social, or political views he may see fit to hold, whether or not they accord with those of the majority; and the holding of such dissident views does not constitute an un-American activity so long as they are openly and honestly held and so long as the ends sought to be accomplished by such persons are pursued only by open, peaceful, democratic, constitutional means and within the framework of constitutional democracy and majority rule.

That is the first half of the principle. The second half of the principle is as follows:

> That freedom of political thought and action is to be distinguished from the actually subversive activities of those who might seek by unconstitutional, undemocratic, and violent methods to undermine constitutional democratic government and substitute, by methods of force, the irresponsible dictatorial rule of a minority.

These latter activities are the things that this committee should concern itself with. But what I greatly fear—and I might as well state it now, because I have seen it happen and I have heard things in this Chamber that have led me to wonder whether it might not happen again—what I frankly fear is that such committee might be used by people not sufficiently informed about the differences between the legitimate exercise of political liberty on the one hand, and subversive activity on the other. I fear that such people might seize such a committee as a convenient method of attempting to identify the honest political views of political opponents with un-American activities, and I say should such a thing take place, it would, in my judgment, render the work of such a committee of little effect in dealing with the real subversive activity it is set up to deal with, and would also constitute a prostitution of what I believe to be a legitimate function of the Congress in a way that I think would be disastrous.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. COX. In expressing the gentleman's fears of the function of this new committee that is to be set up, does he not think he is lodging a serious and grievous indictment against his fellows in this body?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not say these things were going to happen. I earnestly hope they never will happen. I said I was afraid of the consequences if they did. I am frank to tell the gentleman that I am making this speech today because I want to make the speech before the personnel of that committee is named, because I want my remarks to be absolutely objective and impersonal, because I feel I have had some experience in this field, and in it I have worked hard, and because I know there are pitfalls that are hard to avoid. Now may I say, Mr. Speaker, as a progressive, that I think it is just as bad for a progressive to accuse an honest conservative of being a Fascist, as it is for a conservative to accuse an honest progressive of being a Communist, and I think either of those things is an extreme danger to American political life.

Mr. COX. I am taking no serious exception to any observation made by the gentleman. I do wish to say, however, that if there is anyone in this House that has complete confidence in the noble purposes of the gentleman from California, it is myself.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate what the gentleman says.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has a profound understanding of these problems, and I am always tremendously impressed by anything the gentleman has to say. The gentleman, I think, is rendering a good service right now.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In a moment. Most of the Members will realize that I said it would be due to Members not being adequately informed as to the fundamental distinction I tried to make that this thing might happen. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not have to tell the gentleman from California of my profound reverence for him, and his conscientious attitude on all questions of legislation. But the gentleman awhile ago spoke of men who conscientiously entertain these subversive views.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, no, I did not. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I will say to the gentleman that there are some who are subversive who probably think they are just as conscientious, and who are just as fanatical in their subversive attitude, probably, as members who are devoted to the cause of constitutional government in America are for their patriotic convictions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have no doubt that is true.

Mr. RANKIN. So I do not believe the gentleman ought to leave this proposition up to what appears to be the conscience of every man who wants to undermine and destroy American institutions. He may be a conscientious fanatic or an enemy sympathizer.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not leave it there, I may say to the gentleman; I leave it on this basis: I leave it on the basis that on the one hand American citizens have the right to freedom of political opinion so long as they pursue their ends and hold their opinions in a frank and open fashion and so long as they seek to accomplish those ends only by the free democratic constitutional method of majority rule that our Constitution provides. I tried to draw a distinction between that on the one hand and on the other hand methods that are not open and aboveboard, methods which do not appear upon the surface, methods

which do seek to undermine constitutional democracy by means of force and violence, to interpose in place of majority rule and democracy a dictatorship by force and the rule of the minority. That was the distinction I drew.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Let me just say this, that I am going to yield to all three gentlemen I see standing and then I am going to ask to proceed, because my speech is not going to make good sense unless I finish it, and I have some things here I want to round it out with if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. RANKIN. Very well; go ahead.

Mr. RICH. I just wanted to ask one question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right.

Mr. RICH. Under the guise of liberty of thought and action is it right and just for an individual to do things that are contrary to our Constitution? When the Dies committee was formed, and the gentleman from California was one of the Members of that committee, they investigated the German Bund. If the committee had never done another thing its investigation of that organization has justified the creation of the committee many times. If they had not shown up the intent and purposes of the Bund that organization would have overthrown this Government. I congratulate the gentleman and his committee for exposing them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Now if I may proceed——

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would let me proceed; my time is running out.

Mr. JENNINGS. I will ask that the gentleman be given more time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like about 3 more minutes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will not need that much.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask that the gentleman's time be extended 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. We all subscribe to the truism that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; and we all, I believe, are sufficiently well informed to know that there is a ceaseless, unremitting, intelligent attack upon the fundamentals of our Government by a set of subversive people in this country. They are like Carter's little liver pills, they work while we sleep. Does not the gentleman believe that when we are confronted with that kind of attack upon our Constitution there ought to be a standing committee of this House always in position to turn the spotlight of publicity upon them and stop them before it is eternally too late, and save this, the best country on earth?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe, as I said before, that this kind of work is different from the kind of work that should be entrusted to a standing committee of the House. A standing committee of the House is different from a special committee. With all due respect I think this work could better be entrusted to a special committee. It is a job of investigation primarily rather than one of developing and reporting legislation. Legislative committees cannot pass legislation, they can only bring it before the House. But an investigating committee need not get the House's approval. Its work consists of its reports. If the committee is a standing committee the House never will have opportunity to pass judgment upon the work of its committee at all. The creature could become, though I earnestly hope it will not become, greater than the body that created it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to proceed.

Mr. CHURCH. But the gentleman was given more time and he said he would yield to me.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right; I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is doing a fine piece of work. I respect the gentleman's judgment; but does not the gentleman from California believe that Mr. Browder and his kind have a purpose and have in mind the using of force if necessary to accomplish their purpose, and that they have merely postponed that purpose until after this war is over? Essentially do not Mr. Browder and his kind believe in using the force the gentleman has just spoken of? Should not such a committee as this be there to watch that effort?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it should be. But I do not stop there. I will answer that question honestly. I believe it is a fundamental tenet of the Communist and Fascist philosophies that when the critical time comes force will be used to seize power. I think the task of such a committee is to watch both.

Democratic government, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. RANKIN. I will get the gentleman more time if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call attention to this situation, which is most disturbing to me: A subversive organization or individual can go out, raise money by the shake-down method, and go into every congressional district in the primary and in the general election and corruptly attempt to defeat Members or to elect unworthy individuals in order to control the Congress of the United States.

I think it is the most dangerous thing I have ever seen attempted or threatened in the whole history of the country. I was one of the men who favored the unseating of Vare and the unseating of Newberry for corrupt expenditures of money, as I believed them, to get in the Senate of the United States. I am not willing for any subversive outfit to adopt the same policies and attempt, by corrupt methods, to control the Congress of the United States.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to comment on what the gentleman from Mississippi just said, then I shall refuse to yield further.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes in addition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in answering the gentleman from Illinois, I should have said, in addition to what I did, that I believe it is also a fundamental tenet of every antidemocratic philosophy to use force at a certain point when necessary to seize power.

Mr. CHURCH. Of course, your committee did a wonderful piece of work in going into both the Fascist principles and the Communist principles.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Referring to what the gentleman from Mississippi said, I am as opposed as anybody to any coagulation of political power in the hands of any private group in this Nation. May I say to the gentleman, in my own campaign there was an awful lot of money collected and spent, too. That money came from certain sources which were opposed to me, largely, I believe, because of my opposition to monopoly power. My district was blanketed four different times, every home in that district, with literature that told as many untruths about me as were told about the gentleman or any other Member of this House. I am opposed on principle to any organization of any particular group which may seek to control either a political party or the Government of the United States. I am opposed to whoever tries to exercise it. May I say further, however, that just because somebody was against me for Congress does not make that person a subversive or un-American force. They have a right to be against me for Congress; they have the right to spend money to beat me for Congress; they have a right to beat me, if they can. That I do not think is the test. As far as dominating the Government or dominating a political party or anything like that is concerned, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to proceed.

Mr. RANKIN. I will get the gentleman some more time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman, that was a subversive activity. I do not care whether it is a banker or Communist, I would vote to unseat

LAW LIBRARY FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

any Member of this House if it were true that the election had been bought or corruptly controlled by either crowd.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, by their very nature democratic governments must accord political liberty, and such liberty is meaningless unless it extends to minority groups which are out of agreement with the majority and the accepted modes of any given period of time. On the other hand, what is a democratic society supposed to do about people who take advantage of the freedom which it affords in order to destroy that freedom by means other than legitimate democratic political processes? The best answer to this problem that I know lies not in attempts to suppress political thought for such a policy does violate the tenet of democracy itself, and if used against one group it can equally as easily be applied against others. Suppression would ultimately lead almost certainly toward a situation where majorities would resort to it as the easiest method of dealing with minority opposition. It is a type of fire which a democratic government cannot play with. But there is another method which is certainly completely in accord with democratic principles. For the very strength of democracy is to be found in having the people of the Nation fully informed and enabling them to make their political decisions on the basis of all the facts. Therefore it is evident that in attempting to deal with really subversive movements—by which I mean those seeking to substitute totalitarian government by force for democratic government—the obvious method for democracy to use is the method of full exposure of all the facts regarding such movements. The political theory upon which such exposure rests is that if the people know what is going on and what the real purposes of such movements are they will themselves decide against them and thus any advantage which such movement might expect to gain from under-cover activities and secretive methods will be effectively counteracted.

The Congress of the United States is probably the best agency in the Nation to investigate and expose antidemocratic political forces in the United States. It has to be careful that in so doing it does not interdict freedom of political thought, criticism of the status quo, or attempts to improve it.

In my judgment—and I want to be sure I get this in before I close—there are several rules of procedure which such a committee should adopt in order to safeguard its action and to make certain that it does not fall into practices which are going to hurt, mind you, not only this House, not only that committee, but hurt the very effort to separate truly subversive activities on the one hand from perfectly legitimate political activities on the other, and thus play directly into the hands of totalitarian groups themselves. Here are the proposed rules:

First. The committee shall hold regular executive meetings at least once each week.

Second. No public statements, press releases, communications, or reports involving the work and responsibilities of the committee shall be issued or released by any member thereof excepting after such statements, releases, communications, or reports have been submitted to the entire committee and approved by a majority thereof.

Third. Positive effort shall be made by the committee to call before it persons accused of engaging in un-American activities by any witness or member as soon as possible after accusation to this effect has been made.

Fourth. Members of the committee shall make no speeches or public utterances during the course of an investigation which deal with matters currently under investigation; nor shall any charges or predictions as to future findings of the committee be made unless and until substantiated by evidence.

Fifth. The committee shall let the evidence speak for itself. It is unnecessary, unwise, and dangerous for members of a committee of this sort to attempt to dramatize or exaggerate any situation which its investigation may cover.

Those rules are relatively simple. But this power that will be entrusted to this committee may be a power of life and death over the political thinking of American people. It can be as powerful as that. It can be an influence of tremendous weight in political campaigns and elections. If this work is done carefully in accordance with the principles I have tried to lay down, it becomes the most logical answer of a democratic society to dangers from antidemocratic movements which seek gain of power by undemocratic methods. Abused, it will boomerang and defeat its own purpose and utterly and abysmally fail, at the same time bringing danger upon America's fundamental political and constitutional liberties.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. In sustaining the statement last made by the speaker, may I call attention to the fact that this committee was established by almost unanimous vote of the House and turned over to Mr. Dies, in whom we all had absolute confidence. There is no indictment intended by me against Mr. Dies. I merely suggest that evidently while he was in charge the effort was like Phaéthon trying to command the sun chariot and that can happen to a standing committee just as well as it did to a committee specially appointed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman for making the statement that when you have a committee that agrees among its members, that information should not go out without the consent of the committee. But I am going to make this observation that I have been on the committees of the House of Representatives when things were going on in executive session, and I no sooner got out and picked up an evening paper until those things were advertised. I think that no Member of the Congress who is on a committee that is supposed to be in executive session, where matters are discussed that should be kept secret within that committee, has a right to divulge that information; that as to those things that are said there by the Members, I do not have much confidence in any Member of Congress who goes and tattles it all over until the chairman of that committee is authorized to make the statement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I make the observation that the statement of the gentleman from Alabama was a half-handed compliment paid to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Dies. As a matter of fact, it was a stab in the back of the absent Mr. Dies. I am ashamed that the gentleman would take advantage of this situation to make this sort of criticism of a former Member of this body, of whom we are all proud.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Referring to the gentleman's statement awhile ago about muzzling—he did not call it muzzling, but that is what it amounted to—the members of this committee. They ought to have the same freedom, and must have the same freedom, to speak out as members of any other committee. These hearings ordinarily are not held in executive session. If so, the members are honor bound to keep quiet until the proceedings are officially revealed. But where they are open hearings, I see no reason for muzzling the members of this committee any more than you would the members of the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Rules.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If they are open hearings, it would be obviously impossible for this thing to apply. I am not talking about things that happen in open hearings. What I am talking about is this. I am talking about a report that comes in to this committee from some source, a source perhaps not checked carefully by the committee because in the nature of the case it could not be properly checked. I am talking about a report that deals with a certain individual, where that individual has not been heard nor has any evidence on his side of the case been considered. I am talking about the possibility that an individual member of this committee, before there have been any hearings or anything else, can take that report out of the files of the committee, come on the floor of the House, perhaps, and using that unchecked and uncorroborated evidence as the basis of his speech, make an attack on somebody. I do not think that ought to happen. That is what I am talking about.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that there is no quarrel between him and me on that point. I do not believe, and I have never believed, in smear campaigns, and I am not in favor of an individual giving out reports that are supposed to be reports of the committee. What I hope we will have is a committee of sound, American-thinking Congressmen who will keep their feet on the ground and who will protect these records and help to protect American institutions, and not try to make it a one-man show or make it an opportunity for self-laudation or publication. I hope we may have a committee that will go to the very root of every one of these subversive activities and expose them to the House, so that we can drive their perpetrators from American soil.

I cannot close without paying my tribute to Martin Dies. Whatever mistake he may have made, this Republic will always owe him a lasting debt of gratitude for his great services as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate the patience of the House in listening to me this afternoon. As I said before, I have made this speech only because I feel this is a very important question, and because I believe unless the points I have made are heeded, the action of the House on yesterday may lead to serious consequences.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman knows how much I think of him. I want to praise him highly, but I cannot resist saying that we Republicans would probably sit rather quietly in regard to this matter. That kind of people did not support us.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is there not a danger that the power that will be conferred upon this committee may, under certain conditions, be abused and made an instrument of oppression?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I think it might.

Mr. WHITE. Should not care be exercised to see that the law protects the individual?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the whole point of my speech. That is what I have been talking about this afternoon.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is not my opinion that Members on this side of the aisle were supported by subversive people in being elected to Congress. I hope the gentleman did not mean to imply that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I say to you, "You clean house." That is what I say. Everybody knows which party profited by this kind of people. I think you people will clean house and do desire to clean house. You did not want their support, but you had it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to make one comment at that point. Certainly I think any attempted infiltration of any subversive forces into my party or any other party must be combated with all our strength. So far as my own campaign was concerned, I started it out by saying I did not want the support of any group which expected to dictate to me after it was over. In my district there were not any paid people from any organization who were working there on my side of the fence at any rate. I fought my own campaign on its merits, and as far as my having received support from anybody who might be accused of being subversive, that just did not happen.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I think the word "subversive" is used just like the word "Communist" and sometimes like the word "demagog." A demagog is just the other man making a speech.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. And sometimes some of those other words are used in that same way.

Mr. RAMEY. And in the same fashion, they apply them to anyone.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. May I briefly relate this story? A high-school boy came to see me not very long ago and said, "You know, I get the impression that a Communist is a man who is interested in the under dog because I hear people accused of that all the time, who seem to have such an interest." Now I say to the House, that is a very dangerous idea to have implanted in the young man's mind. It is a very dangerous thing for him not to be able to make a distinction in that respect. But it certainly is no fault of his. When names like that are used, they ought to be used extremely carefully, to mean precisely what they actually do mean, instead of being bandied about purely for political campaign purposes.

Mr. RAMEY. When a man is too lazy to think, he calls people demagogs, Fascists, and Communists, and things like that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Precisely. The gentleman from Ohio has supplied at least as effective a conclusion to my speech as I could have done myself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO SWEAR IN A MEMBER

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 49), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas JAMES V. HEIDINGER, a Representative-elect from Illinois, from the Twenty-fourth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said JAMES V. HEIDINGER, at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said JAMES V. HEIDINGER.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

NO PARTISAN POLITICS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is one time in the history of the Nation that we should have less partisan politics than we have had heretofore. At this very minute upon the 55 battle fronts of the world we have American soldiers. The sun does not set on the American soldier today. We have over 6,000,000 fighting men in foreign lands and upon the high seas. They are offering to give their last drop of blood in order to save our country during this, the greatest war in all history. It is my hope that we will lay aside, as much as possible, partisan politics during this awful conflict. Let us hope that we will have the kind of unity that the Speaker of the House pleaded for on yesterday.

For that reason I am willing to not only give, but I am willing to take. I am not willing to engage in any carping criticism or any other devastating criticism of our allies and friends, who are fighting shoulder to shoulder with our boys upon the battlefields of the world. I do not think this is any time for us to try to tell Mr. Stalin, or Mr. Churchill, or Mr. Roosevelt as to exactly how they should not only run the war during the war but as to what they should do after the war is won. I think we should first devote our entire time and attention, with as little disunity as possible, in working with all of our allies to win the war, and then try to obtain a lasting peace.

I enjoyed the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. He is one of the ablest and most sincere Members of this body. I also enjoyed the speeches made by our friends on the other side of the aisle, although some parts of their speeches involved or included criticisms. The time, I hope, will never come in a democracy when we should try to prevent criticism. I think we should always have it. Constructive criticism should always be welcome, and I hope while this war is going on we will be careful with our words of criticism, and make sure they are based on facts, and not half truths.

KEEP DOWN EXPENDITURES

I invite attention to the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], whom we are all glad to welcome back as a Member of this body, and who often gives a thought-provoking suggestion which we appreciate and enjoy, a while ago mentioned some things I am afraid might go out to the public in such a way that some people will misunderstand them. Possibly I am not able or qualified to criticize his statements, so I am not going to criticize them, but am going to comment upon them. He said that we should keep down the amount of expenditures. I agree with him on that.

We should keep them down just as much as possible. We should not spend one dime or one penny of the taxpayers' money that is not absolutely necessary. We should not permit the waste of one penny. So I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. He said we should abolish all unnecessary boards and commissions. With that I agree. We should have just as few employees as possible. He said also that we should do everything we can to win this war. I agree with him in that, and that we should practice economy in government.

CANNOT BALANCE THE BUDGET DURING WAR

I do not agree, as he inferred we should, that we should absolutely balance the Budget during this war, because that cannot be done. There is where I take issue with him. I invite attention to the fact that 97 cents of every dollar that is authorized to be expended and appropriated by the Congress during this war has been used for war purposes, and only 3 cents used in our domestic affairs and in government.

CONGRESS COSTS 1½ CENTS PER PERSON PER MONTH

A lot of people talk about the enormous expense of the National Congress, the lawmaking body. I invite your attention to the fact that the cost of the entire lawmaking body—that is, including the House, and Senate, and our investigation committees, all committees, and clerks, and all legislative expenses of every kind and nature, including all salaries and expenses—amounts to only 1½ cents per person per month. So when you come to balance the Budget with things like that, you cannot do it. When you analyze other expenditures, you run into the same difficulty. You cannot balance a hundred cents on the dollar with only 3 cents to go on. Therefore, we should not expect to absolutely balance the Budget during this war.

HIGHER TAXES WOULD BE JUSTIFIED

I believe in higher taxes right now, and I would vote for higher taxes.

I think it is right that we should pay as much of the cost of this war as we go along as it is possible. Every dollar that is not paid now is borrowed on long-term bonds, and the history of long-term bonds is that by the time you have paid the long-term bonds you have paid a dollar in interest for every dollar you have borrowed; so I believe in paying just as much of this debt as we go along as possible, because every dollar we pay now is the equivalent of paying $2. So why should not we be for it? Furthermore, it is unfair to the 11,900,000 fighting men to have them go upon the battlefields of the world and save our country and then come back and have to pay double the cost of winning the war themselves. It is unfair to them. We should therefore pay every dollar it is possible to pay as we go along.

Another reason why we should pay is that we have tens of billions of dollars of excess purchasing power floating around, the most serious menace, from an inflationary standpoint, facing our country today; and the more taxes we pay as we are able to pay them the more money we are siphoning off in the form of dangerous dollars that will assist us in preventing inflation. There are three good reasons why I believe we should pay just as much of the cost of this war as we go as it is possible for us to pay.

COUNTRY CANNOT GO BANKRUPT

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said that our country was drifting into bankruptcy. I know we often use a word like that loosely, and I have probably used it in a loose way myself in years gone by; but in truth and in fact our country cannot go bankrupt; it is absolutely impossible. Bankruptcy presupposes inability to pay a debt or debts. The time will never come when this Government will not be able to pay its debts. The problem is the value of the money with which the Government will pay those debts; there is the point we should watch; there is the problem we should solve, the value of that money.

PRICE CONTROL HAS WORKED

Today, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in history we have a program that has actually worked to prevent inflation. I know it has caused some irritations, annoyances, and sometimes hardships and troubles, but it has actually worked—price control. We made a mistake by not putting it into effect long before we did, but we certainly did the right thing by putting it into effect when we did; and, inconvenient and troublesome as it may have been in its enforcement in many ways, irritating and annoying as it may have been, our country would have been absolutely ruined without it.

DUTY OF CONGRESS TO FAMILIES OF FIGHTING MEN

We owe a duty not only to the people who work for wages and salaries, and whose livelihood depends upon fixed incomes from any source, to keep that dollar as stable as possible so it will purchase for them a decent living for a reasonable number of dollars, but we also owe a duty to those 11,900,000 men whom we have caused to go forth to war. Many of them have left wives and children back here at home and dependent fathers and mothers. After they go to war, if we have uncontrolled prices and ruinous inflation, and the amount of money that we have provided for the protection of their families while they are gone, the allowances they make, supplemented by what the Government gives by an act of Congress, if we do not protect those war dollars to the extent that that amount of money will purchase for that soldier's family a decent standard of living, we are falling down on our job to that serviceman. It is our duty, therefore, not only in the interest of the people of this country but in the interest of the dependents and loved ones of those men who are fighting our battles in the war today to keep the cost of living down to the extent that the money they have will buy for them an adequate and decent standard of living. So we owe that obligation.

PEOPLE WILL NOT WORK FOR WORTHLESS MONEY

Now, we will not have bankruptcy; we as a nation will always pay our debts; but if we pay them with cheap money, we destroy our country; we destroy the purchasing power of the people. Inflation can cause us to lose this war if we keep on putting too much money in circulation, adding to the stock of money until the money is practically worthless and will not buy anything if price control should break down. Do you think the workers are going into the factory and work 8 or 12 hours a day for money that is no good? Of course they will not.

If we do not protect the dollar and the cost of living, we can cause the war to be lost right here at home. There is our problem—not bankruptcy, because we as a nation will not go bankrupt if we protect our dollars to the extent that a dollar will buy what it should, what people want to buy for the benefit of themselves.

YES; PRODUCE FOOD FOR OUR ALLIES

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] said that we are called upon to raise food for our allies. I know that statement has been made sometimes in a critical way, ridiculing the administration and those of us who are trying to encourage the production of food, because some of it is to go to our allies.

Let us analyze this situation briefly. Do we want to produce food for our allies? Of course we do. We are anxious to. We have good reasons for doing it. Let me tell you what those reasons are. The farmers of this country have done a magnificent job with labor shortage, machinery shortage, and everything else confronting them and handicapping them in their effort. In spite of all this they have produced 25 percent more food last year than ever before in the history of our country.

Why do we want that food? In the first place, these 12,000,000, approximately, fighting men must have the finest and best food on earth. Each one of them must have an average of 4,500 calories of food each day, about twice as much as the average civilian consumes; 5½ pounds of food per day, twice as much as the average civilian consumes. That means that we must set aside 65,000,000 pounds of food every day for the benefit of our fighting men in order to give them the finest and best food on earth, the kind of food that will fill the stomachs and stick to the ribs of the men, the best food in the world.

In order to do that, rationing was and is absolutely necessary. Then we have to feed the civilian population. We do not want a few people hoarding certain foods like sugar and requiring the other people to pay 35 cents and 50 cents a pound for it like they had to do in the First World War. We want to divide it up and give each person an opportunity to have enough food in order to protect the health of the people and prevent the morale of the people of the country from being broken down. Rationing was necessary for that purpose. Then if some is left we send it to our allies. Why should we not send it to our allies? Every time you furnish food to China, and a Chinaman takes that food, goes out and kills a Jap, there is one less Jap to kill an American soldier. Every time we send food over to Russia and a Russian takes that food and goes out and kills a German there is one less German to kill an American soldier. So that through our lend-lease policy and through our policy of furnishing food to

our allies we have saved the lives of American boys and more American boys will return to the vacant chairs in the homes and before the firesides here in America. So it is absolutely justified, needed, desirable; every one should want to do it; yes, raise food for our allies, because every time we do we save the lives of American boys.

DEBT BIG BUT CASUALTY LIST COMPARATIVELY LOW

It was further mentioned that our debt was awfully big. One member stated it looked like we would never be able to pay back that debt. I do not agree with him at all. It can be paid with honest dollars. The higher it gets the harder it will be to pay, but it will not be hard if we can keep our national income up. If we do not keep our national income up, it will be awfully hard to pay. Remember this, that the people paid more in taxes in 1944 than the entire aggregate national income was in 1932, so they can pay a debt like it is today easier, with less inconvenience, than they could have paid the low debt of 1932 during the year 1932. Please do not accept that as an argument for a high debt. I am just analyzing the situation as it actually exists.

Let me tell you something more about this big debt. When this war started there were some people in this country who would have liked to have had a cheap war; use men, save dollars. Fortunately the other side prevailed. The other side was that we should spend dollars and save men. That is what this Congress has done. That is what this administration has stood for. That is what I am for. Save every man you can, regardless of how much it costs us. We can replace dollars, but we cannot replace men. So the people who wanted a cheap war were overruled, and those who wanted to spend every cent they could spend for armor, for ammunition, for equipment which would help us bring back those fighting brave men and save those lives, although it cost money, pursued that course. That is what we want to do. In other words, our policy was never send a man to do a dangerous job when a machine could be sent to do the same job, although that machine cost money. Yes; we have a high national debt, but our casualty lists have been comparatively low by reason thereof.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. I am astonished at the gentleman's statement that there were people in this country that wanted to fight a war that would be cheap in money and costly in human life. May I ask the gentleman to elucidate?

Mr. PATMAN. I said there were people in this country who wanted a cheap war, and I think you can read the newspapers today and see criticism of the war expenditures and you cannot come to any other conclusion but what they are willing to have a cheaper war and it might cost the lives of American boys.

Mr. LEWIS. Would the gentleman care to name some of those people?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no. I am not here to discuss personalities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I would not care to impugn the motives of any person by reason of any statement he makes. I am certainly not going to impugn the motives of any Member of this House. I have great respect for every Member of this body, and the gentleman has never heard me question the motives of any Member of this body, and I never shall. It is the duty of every Member here who represents about 300,000 people himself to represent them in the way and manner he thinks he should represent them. It is not for me to criticize him and I never shall. It is for him to decide. Yes; over 3,000,000 Federal employees, but how many unnecessary?

There was another statement made here today about the number of Federal employees, to the effect there were more than 3,000,000 so employed. That is a true statement; there is no question about that. What if we have more than 3,000,000 employees? But let it be said that all those employees are necessary. Maybe there are some unnecessary ones. If there are, they should be discharged; we do not want them; we do not need them. But of these 3,000,000 employees over 1,000,000 are working for the Army, doing absolutely necessary work, including the making of arms and ammunition. If they were not in the civil service among these 3,000,000 doing war work, we would have to induct other people to take their jobs. Is it not better that they remain as they are, doing vital, necessary work, although not in uniform, than to induct people to do their work? So there are 1,000,000 working for the Army that are necessary of these 2,000,000 Federal employees.

Another 1,000,000 of those 3,000,000 are working for the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps, and doing other just as necessary work. There are 2,000,000 of those 3,000,000 right there, two-thirds that no person would say should be discharged; not one. So when we talk about 3,000,000 employees, we should stop and consider that we have a war on and that two-thirds of these employees we know are absolutely necessary in war work, and we would not discharge one of them.

Now, what about the other million? We have about 400,000 in the Postal Service. Do you want to discharge them? No, they are necessary. We have several hundred thousand others in our Government service who are just as necessary as the Postal Service, including doctors, nurses, Veterans Administration employees and others. You would not discharge them. When you get right down to the point of which ones you are going to discharge, the number in dispute is not very large.

Still, I insist, if we have any unnecessary employees in any agency of our Government, they should not continue to receive the taxpayers' money, but that does not mean that we have 3,000,000 unnecessary employees, often referred to as stooges and bureaucrats, and any other name that happens to come to the mind of the person who is trying to condemn them. They should not be condemned in wholesale, and they are not entitled to be, because they are engaged in fine work that is necessary in the prosecution of this war. Many of them are remaining in Government service during the war at a great personal sacrifice.

May I state in conclusion that I express the hope that in this session of the Congress which has just commenced, in view of the serious situation that is confronting the people of this country and our fine brave fighting men, we should have just as little partisan politics as possible, preferably none.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

ALLIED WAR AIMS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the various messages that were delivered here this afternoon and the sincerity with which they were delivered by the various Members. I cannot help but honestly believe that there is a far graver problem facing this Congress than any that has been mentioned thus far. No one will deny that there is confusion throughout the United States of America and I might say throughout the entire world, vast confusion as to just exactly what our war aims are, especially pertaining to the European theater of operations. That confusion has come to a state where it has almost resulted, in my judgment, in chaos. The recent sad fate of Poland, one of our most gallant allies, and the recent scuttling of the Atlantic Charter, in my judgment, have brought about a condition where chaos prevails throughout the world as to just what the war aims of the Allied Nations are supposed to be.

As a result of those two sad incidents, the scuttling of the Atlantic Charter and the carving up of Poland, one of our most gallant allies, I have received and I know every Member of this Congress has received letters from wives, mothers, parents, sisters, and brothers of the boys who have given their lives, asking this question, "Just what did they die for?" pertaining, of course, to the European theater of war.

I have done a little thinking on that subject and a little research, and I am of the honest judgment that the Seventy-eighth Congress has failed in its duty and its responsibility. I have learned, for instance, by intensive study that it is not the duty or responsibility of anybody or any organization or any other department of our Government to declare the aims of war, other than the Congress of the United States of America, according to our Constitution. I

have heard for the past 2 years much criticism here by Members of Congress denouncing the President of the United States, that his war aims are not clear.

I have heard a lot of criticism here on both sides of the aisle, denouncing our State Department, that our war aims are not crystal clear. But we have not denounced ourselves, where the responsibility lies. The power to declare war lies solely and sacredly in the hands of the Congress of the United States of America. With that power also goes the responsibility and sacred obligation to tell what it is that we are fighting for. So in answer to these hundreds of letters I am receiving and which other Members of Congress are receiving as to the statement of our war aims, I have introduced today a resolution, meeting that responsibility of this Congress, a resolution which definitely and concretely and concisely states what our war aims are. I submit to you, that if the Members study my resolution, and if you see fit to support it, I will appreciate it and I know millions of boys and girls who are risking their lives will appreciate it also, if we tell them just what it is all about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Saturday, January 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

37. A letter from the Secretary, Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting the records omitted from the copy of the fifteenth bimonthly report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

38. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, dated December 18, 1944, forwarding statements of the cost of manufacture at the armory and arsenals named therein, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

39. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from the General Accounting Office, the Library of Congress, the War Relocation Authority, and Headquarters Army Service Forces, relative to moneys received during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, which were not paid into the general fund of the United States Treasury, and the payments, if any, made from such moneys during such fiscal year; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

40. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 16); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

41. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting certificates from the executives of 31 States, certifying to the appointment of the electors for President and Vice President in these States on November 7, 1944; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

42. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting certificates from the executives of Arizona and California certifying to the appointment of the electors for President and Vice President in these States on November 7, 1944; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

43. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting his report on all operations under the act of April 5, 1944 (Public Law No. 290), authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels for the period July 1 to December 31, 1944; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

44. A letter from the Chairman of the Board for the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report of expenditures for the 12 months ended November 30, 1944, of funds derived from the sale of bonds under section 15c of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

45. A letter from the secretary of state of Maryland, transmitting a certified copy of the Governor's proclamation declaring the election of Representatives in the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States from the six congressional districts of Maryland; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

46. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 10, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan, with a view to the establishment of a harbor at the most suitable site, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

47. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 14, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Manokin River, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 4, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

48. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Murphy & Wischmeyer against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

49. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a classified report showing the permits and licenses issued by the Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, the parties thereto, the terms prescribed, the moneys received, if any, and an account thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

50. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

51. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

52. A letter from the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944, both inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective compensations, including clerks to Members; the expenditures from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; to the Committee on Accounts.

53. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing refunds of internal revenue in excess of $500 during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 671. A bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 672. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 673. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 674. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 675. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act, 1942, with respect to maximum prices in the case of cattle on the hoof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 676. A bill to exempt persons in the military and naval forces of the United States from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 677. A bill to suspend the immigration of aliens into the United States from the end of hostilities of the present war until the number of unemployed persons, including United States war veterans, within the United States is less than 1,000,000; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 678. A bill to provide the same exemptions from distraint and sale with respect to Federal taxes as are allowed under the applicable State laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 679. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 680. A bill to provide for grants to the States for assistance to needy incapacitated individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 681. A bill to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 682. A bill to increase certain allowances provided by law for members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 683. A bill to provide that Federal grants for old-age assistance shall match State contributions four to one; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 684. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 685. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to

permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 686. A bill relating to the labeling of boric acid for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 688. A bill to amend the joint resolution of January 27, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to become an adhering member of the Inter-American Statistical Institute"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 689. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 690. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to prohibit financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States," approved April 13, 1934; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 691. A bill for the relief of certain widows of Foreign Service officers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 692. A bill to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the British Government for and on behalf of John Bailey, former stoker of His Majesty's ship *Orion*, in full and final settlement of a claim arising as a consequence of injuries inflicted by John Ittner, United States Navy, at Seattle, Wash., on July 16, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 693. A bill to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 694. A bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 695. A bill to extend to veterans the right to appeal their claims within 2 years after denial; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 696. A bill to provide for judicial determination governing the discontinuance of insurance granted on account of permanent total disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 697. A bill relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 698. A bill to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 699. A bill to amend paragraph 682 of title 16 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 700. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 701. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who have participated in the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 702. A bill to provide that nominal income from personal services may be disregarded in computing payments to be made as old-age assistance and aid to the blind under the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 703. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to extend the time within which veterans may apply for the loan benefits provided by such act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 704. A bill to amend title III, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 705. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 706. A bill to extend to 2 years the time for filing applications for review of claims on appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 707. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 708. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the control of rents for business accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 709. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing that citizens of former neutral countries shall become eligible for military service when their countries cease to be neutral; making eligible for naturalization aliens who claimed exemption as citizens of neutral countries and who subsequently serve honorably in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 710. A bill making it a Federal offense to alter the inner surface of the hand for the purpose of preventing identification by the use of fingerprints; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 711. A bill to require certain naturalized and derivative citizens of the United States to take an oath of allegiance; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 712. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 713. A bill for the creation of medical academies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 714. A bill to facilitate the admission to the United States of husbands, wives, and children of United States citizens, men and women, who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during the present World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 715. A bill to provide the transfer by the Secretary of War of the Roseburg rifle range, Douglas County, Oreg., to the Defense Plant Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 716. A bill to amend the joint resolution of July 29, 1941, relating to the removal of officers from the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 717. A bill to extend certain benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, to husbands and widowers of insured wives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 718. A bill to provide for the extension of patents for a period equal to the period during which owners are unable to derive benefits from them on account of the war emergency; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 719. A bill for the purpose of conserving the coal resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 720. A bill to prohibit certain subsidy, indemnity, and other payments with respect to short staple cotton and commodities manufactured from such cotton; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 721. A bill to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the rating schedules so as to provide total ratings for the most severe functional nervous diseases or psychoneurotic states; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 722. A bill to provide for judicial determination governing the discontinuance of insurance granted on account of permanent total disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 723. A bill to repeal the automobile-use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 724. A bill to permit individuals to deduct from gross income for income-tax purposes certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 725. A bill to provide for retirement as chief warrant officer, upon retirement for disability after 20 years' service or after 30 years' service, of those enlisted personnel who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War No. 1 and No. 2 and who held commissions during those wars and later reverted to their enlisted status; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 726. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 727. A bill to provide for the delivery of mail on rural free delivery routes on holidays other than Sundays; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 728. A bill to provide for the loss of the United States nationality under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 729. A bill to increase by 20 percent the rates of pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans Administration to veterans who served on foreign soil or in foreign waters in any war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 730. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability, prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 731. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 732. A bill to permit civilian defense volunteers to retain on the cessation of civilian defense activities certain equipment issued by the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 733. A bill to provide that World War veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 734. A bill to provide pensions for disabled unemployable veterans who served in a war, campaign, expedition, or insurrection beyond the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 735. A bill to provide monthly payments for unemployed veterans of the present war for a limited period after separation from the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 736. A bill to authorize the acceptance by Federal agencies of a certification from the records of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as to place and date of birth of a veteran; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 737. A bill to insure appropriate noncommissioned rank and retirement privileges to certain enlisted persons of the Regular Establishment who serve during the present war in a temporary commissioned status and who return to enlisted status; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 738. A bill to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 739. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits under certain conditions to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 740. A bill to amend the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934, as amended, with respect to the authority of the Attorney General to compromise suits on certain contracts of insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 741. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 742. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 743. A bill to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 744. A bill authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 745. A bill to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public, No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 746. A bill to reclassify and adjust salaries of supervisors in the first- and second-class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 747. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conservation of national soil resources and to provide an adequate and balanced flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 748. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 749. A bill to amend section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 750. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide annuities for individuals who are totally and permanently disabled and have completed 20 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 751. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 752. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice and gambling in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 753. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 754. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 755. A bill to increase the maximum amount of any deposit or trust fund which may be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 756. A bill amending section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, in order to provide for the maintenance and operation of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 757. A bill to provide for the discharge and cancelation of certain loans made by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purchase of capital stock in agricultural credit corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 758 (by request). A bill to provide for the development of better diets and an improved nutritional status for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 759. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 760. A bill relating to certain proceedings in the district courts of the United States where property is requisitioned under the act of October 16, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 761. A bill to increase the period of limitation on actions against railroad carriers for recovery of overcharges from 2 to 4 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 762. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drainage works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 763. A bill to amend Public Law No. 257, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 4, 1939, so as to provide pensions to peacetime veterans of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard suffering from arrested tuberculosis contracted while in the service; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 764. A bill to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 765. A bill to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 766. A bill granting equipment allowance to postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 767. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowances for railway postal clerks, acting railway postal clerks, and substitute railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 768. A bill to authorize the naturalization of native-born Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States and Filipinos who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War No. 1; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 769. A bill creating an Office of Naval Research and Development in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 770. A bill to establish a National War Memorial Auditorium Commission, to provide for construction and maintenance of a National War Memorial Auditorium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 771. A bill to amend section 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 by revising the basis and rate of retired pay of members of the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 772. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act with regard to taxation of real property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 773. A bill to authorize State and local taxation of land, improvements, and appurtenances thereto, and all machinery disposed of by the Government in any manner whatsoever; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 774. A bill to make permanent the rate of postage on mailable matter of the first class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 775. A bill to provide an increase in pay for the personnel of the military and naval forces engaged in actual combat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 776. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipincs; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 777. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims for damages for personal injury or death or for damage to or loss or destruction of property caused by service personnel or civilian employees or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 778. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 779. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to prepare plans for the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary in 1946 of the signing and publication of Washington's Farewell Address; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to state war aims of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution establishing the joint responsibility for the peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution providing for restoration of property confiscated by the Axis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution declaring it to be un-American to participate in activities to create racial or religious disunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution proposing an equal rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the passage of bills after Presidential veto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to correct an error in section 342 (b) (9) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by the act of September 27, 1944; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to terminate the state of war between Italy and the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 47. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to make an investigation of the present system of taking, producing, canning, processing, marketing, transporting, and distributing of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 48. Resolution to create a special committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of race relations in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. Res. 50. Resolution authorizing the Commitee on Appropriations to conduct studies and examinations of executive agencies to assist it in the determination of matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 51. Resolution creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to study the question of the feasibility of conferring upon the Price Administrator the power to fix rentals for the occupancy of business premises in defense-rental areas; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 52 Resolution to authorize the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to study the basic problems affecting post-war immigration and naturalization; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 53. Resolution to provide for the temporary admission of political or religious refugees of continental Europe into areas within the United States to be known as free ports for refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. Res. 54. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. Res. 55. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 780. A bill for the relief of Vonnie Jones, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 781. A bill for the relief of Douglas Charles McRae, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 782. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in New Mexico to Henry Lopez; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 783. A bill for the relief of Karl E. Bond; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 784. A bill for the relief of Maja Platzer; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 785. A bill for the relief of the widow of William A. Nelson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 786. A bill for the relief of D. T. George; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 787. A bill for the relief of Murray B. Latimer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 788. A bill for the relief of the city of Red Wing, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 789. A bill for the relief of Rev. and Mrs. E. F. Wachholz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 790. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 791. A bill for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R 792. A bill for the relief of the Fair Haven Yacht Works; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 793. A bill expediting the naturalization of Pierre Lecomte du Nouy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 794. A bill expediting the naturalization of Mary Lecomte du Nouy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 795. A bill for the relief of Marie A. Atanasio; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 796. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and for Charles L. Stover; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 797. A bill for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 798. A bill for the relief of Carrol I. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 799. A bill for the relief of Pauline Smallwood; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 800. A bill for the relief of Frank Carter, father of Frank Carter, Jr., a minor; and K. Kenneth Keithley, father of Donald Keithley, a minor; and K. Kenneth Keithley and Coleman H. Keithley, trading as Keithley Bros. Garage, Joppa, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 801. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H.R. 802. A bill for the relief of Camp No. 1, Alaska Native Brotherhood, Sitka, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 803. A bill to expedite the naturalization of Monica Warfield; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 804. A bill for the relief of Alvin W. Twigg; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 805. A bill granting a pension to Nina G. Givens; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 806. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Mabel K. Young; the Hagerstown Hosiery Co., Inc.; John R. Fisher; and the Central Insurance Co. of Baltimore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 807. A bill for the relief of John Burl Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 808. A bill for the relief of James F. Mellon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 809. A bill granting a pension to Alice G. Townsend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 810. A bill for the relief of Maria Stern, Arpad Stern, Elizabeth Spitz, Maximilian Spitz, and Claude Marguerite Spitz; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 811. A bill for the relief of Hans Oppenheimer and his wife Marga; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of Moses Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 813. A bill for the relief of Mor (Morris) Honig, his wife Franciska (Francesca), and their sons, Vilmos (William) and Pal (Paul); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 814 (by request). A bill authorizing the appointment of James T. Simpson as major in the Chaplain Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 815. A bill for the relief of Frederic Gruder and family; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of Morris Burstein and Jennie Burstein; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 817. A bill for the relief of Merril M. Marks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 818. A bill to extend emergency officers' retirement benefits to Raymond B. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 819. A bill for the relief of John Fleckstein; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 820. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Riverside St. Clair Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 821. A bill for the relief of Gussie Hart and Louis Hart; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 822. A bill for the relief of Horace W. Goodsmith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 823. A bill for the relief of William Beyer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 824. A bill for the relief of Antonino Capello; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 825. A bill for the relief of Mendel Hoffmann and his wife Rosa Hoffmann; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 826. A bill for the relief of Markus Preminger, his wife Josefa, and son Ingwald; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 827. A bill for the relief of Clarence Mulligan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 828. A bill for the relief of Manuel Maiz y Humara; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 829. A bill for the relief of John J. Berton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 830. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Emma Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 831. A bill for the relief of Eisik Goldmann, Czarne Goldmann, Lilly and Guidon

Goldmann, Hersz Arbermann Hausman, Augusta Laura Hausman, Joseph Hausman, and Edgar David Hausman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 832. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Bial, Brete Bial, Ernest Bial, and Ottilie Bial; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 833. A bill granting an increase of pension to Walter Clement Haigh; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 834. A bill granting a pension to Sophie Pincus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 835. A bill granting a pension to Isiah J. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 836. A bill granting a pension to Sarah Foxton Judson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 837. A bill for the relief of Michael Abarno; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 838. A bill for the relief of Herman Gelb; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 839. A bill for the relief of Sarah Zimmerman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 840. A bill for the relief of Toby Lena Rosenberg, alias Maria Louisa Nasco, alias Alejandrino Nasco Echegaray; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 841. A bill for the relief of Lander H. Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R 842. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadie L. Dance, Michigan Millers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., and State Farm Fire Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 843. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Hanley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 844. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R 845. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 846. A bill for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 847. A bill for the relief of S. H. Kress & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 848. A bill for the relief of the dependents of John Richard Schulz, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 849. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Medal to Albert W. J. Johnsen, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Oscar R. Steinert; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 852. A bill for the relief of Betty Jane Ritter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 853. A bill for the relief of David Cowan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 854. A bill for the relief of Isabel Carlson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 855. A bill for the relief of Marion S. Buckley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 856. A bill for the relief of Frances Biewer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 857. A bill granting an increase of pension to Forrest E. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 858. A bill for the relief of H. Ward Eaton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 859. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Dardas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 860. A bill granting an increase of pension to Agnes Tannery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 861. A bill granting an increase in pension to Maryette Vannatta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 862. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 863. A bill granting a pension to Isabelle Walton Prentice; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 864. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jessie McManus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 865. A bill for the relief of Edgar D. Sebring and Jay Purple; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 866. A bill granting a pension to Clarinda E. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 867. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Knickerbocker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 868. A bill granting a pension to Jesse Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 869. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha K. Holcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 870. A bill for the relief of the Elmira Area Soaring Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 871. A bill granting a pension to Anna L. Sweeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 872. A bill for the relief of H. J. Hickman and P. G. Hickman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 873. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 874. A bill for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 875. A bill for the relief of Nannie Bass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 876. A bill for the relief of L. A. Holcombe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 877. A bill for the relief of Lamar Porter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 878. A bill for the relief of the York Products, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 879. A bill for the relief of Ed Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 880. A bill to grant an honorable discharge certificate from the military service of the United States to Lyle Edwin Dew; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 881. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 882. A bill for the relief of Valley Savings Bank; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 883. A bill for the relief of John F. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 884. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to Horace Leslie Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 885. A bill for the relief of Domenic Salvi; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of Domenic Salvi; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 887. A bill for the relief of Joseph Oshansky; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Joseph Oshansky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN;

H. R. 889. A bill to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arens and David Arens, of New York City, doing business under the name of Dee Jay Hat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 891. A bill to provide for the issuance of a duplicate adjusted-service certificate to Andrew J. Bissinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Madeline J. MacDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 893. A bill to incorporate the Moms of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 894. A bill for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 895. A bill to provide for the appointment of Julius P. Uihlein 3d, as a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 896. A bill for the relief of Charles Myers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 897. A bill for the relief of Athan Peter Brakoulias; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 898. A bill for the relief of the Allentown Airport Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 899. A bill authorizing the President to bestow the decoration of the Purple Heart upon Thomas Anthony Deleo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 900. A bill to correct the record of Ralph Everett Crawshaw; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 901. A bill for the relief of John H. Bonney, the legal guardian of Daniel R. Bonney, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 902. A bill for the relief of William H. Rouncevill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of Myles Perz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 904. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Fred Lower; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 905. A bill for the relief of Paul T. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of Blanche E. Broad; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 907. A bill for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 908. A bill for the relief of the City Service Transit Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 909. A bill for the relief of Marion Contracting Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 910. A bill for the relief of David B. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Edgar Kaigler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOCH:

H. R. 912. A bill for the relief of William H. Shultz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 913. A bill for the relief of Ruth Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 914. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 917. A bill for the relief of the Harbor Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 918. A bill for the relief of William Ralph Jenkins; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 919. A bill for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 920. A bill for the relief of Bertha Ebersbach; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 921. A bill for the relief of the estate of Renzie Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 922. A bill for the relief of Charles Palmer Cornwell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 923. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catharine Ribel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 924. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Primm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 925. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 926. A bill granting an increase of pension to Alice Dunfee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 927. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 928. A bill granting an increase of pension to Adabelle Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 929. A bill granting an increase of pension to Judah A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 930. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Hopkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 931. A bill for the relief of Verne V. Gunsolley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 932. A bill for the relief of Nellie A. Ridings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 933. A bill for the relief of Margaret Gudzin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 934. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 935. A bill for the relief of Andreas Andersen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 936. A bill for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 937. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amanda Townsend; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Winfred Alexander; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 939. A bill for the relief of William A. Hammond; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 940. A bill for the relief of J. S. Kirby; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 942. A bill granting a pension to Bell D. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 943. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Julia Hinton; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 944. A bill for the relief of the San Pedro Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 945. A bill for the relief of Fred Clouse; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 946. A bill for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 947. A bill to reinstate E. Lewis Field, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 948. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 949. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 950. A bill for the relief of F. V. Johnson, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 951. A bill for the relief of Chester R. Dukas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr LEMKE:

H. R. 952. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 953. A bill for the relief of Pedro Garcia Casanova Melquiades Rojas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 954. A bill for the relief of Charles Albert Goetz; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 955. A bill for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. of Indianapolis, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 956. A bill granting an increase of pension to Catherine J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 957. A bill for the relief of Margaret Dunn; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 958. A bill for the relief of Joe Koor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 959. A bill for the relief of Harold H. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 960. A bill to correct the military record of Thomas J. Parrott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 961. A bill for the relief of Smith Hayden; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Henry O. Heuer; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 963. A bill for the relief of Marie Vickers and Irene Outten; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 964. A bill for the relief of William H. Bailey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 965. A bill for the relief of John K. Carey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 966. A bill for the relief of Henderson Stewart; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 967. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Washington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 968. A bill for the relief of Fred McGarrahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 969. A bill granting an increase of pension to Florence S. McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 970. A bill to confirm the claims of Charles Gaudet under Spanish patents to section 18, township 11 south, range 5 east, and section 21, township 12 south, range 5 east, St. Helena meridian, Parish of St. James, State of Louisiana, together with all accretion; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Philomene Paasch; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 972. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Justine Englert Dolan and the legal guardian of Frederick S. Englert, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 973. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Smith and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 974. A bill for the relief of the members of the crew of the United States dredge *Galveston;* to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 975. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 976. A bill for the relief of Chet Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of John August Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 978. A bill for the relief of Ralph J. Herrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 979. A bill for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 980. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Stout; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 981. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 982. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 983. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 984. A bill for the relief of June I. Gradijan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 985. A bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 986. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 987. A bill for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 988. A bill for the relief of Bernice B. Cooper, junior clerk-typist, Weatherford, Tex., rural rehabilitation office, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of Ralph P. Aiello; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 990. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 991. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 992. A bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 993. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen C. Burnett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 994. A bill granting an increase of pension to William E. McIntosh; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 995. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Herbert E. Brodie and Leo Murray, and their resultant dismissal, and to reinstate Herbert E. Brodie and Leo Murray as privates, Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 996. A bill for the relief of Elisha Mack Rabon, Mrs. E. S. Gasque, and Dottie Elaine Gasque; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 997. A bill for the relief of A. L. Pauls Planograph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHENER:
H. R. 998. A bill granting an increase of pension to Almira Hemingway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of California:
H. R. 999. A bill for the relief of Lily L. Carren; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:
H. R. 1000. A bill for the relief of the Eastern and Western Cherokee Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:
H. R. 1001. A bill granting an increase of pension to Albert Steinhauser; to the Committee on Pensions.
H. R. 1002. A bill for the relief of Marvin Sachwitz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:
H. R. 1003. A bill for the relief of Martin V. Fay; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1004. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Olsen, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1005. A bill for the relief of Elvera Galasso; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1006. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:
H. R. 1007. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Brown Waggoner; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriette E. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1009. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1010. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund, State of California; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1011. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Eugene Allen and Mrs. Gail Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PACE:
H. R. 1012. A bill for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Etheridge; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1013. A bill for the relief of the Williams Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1014. A bill for the relief of the Williams Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1015. A bill for the relief of G. H. Moore, of Butler, Taylor County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:
H. R. 1016. A bill for the relief of Capt. Millard L. Treadwell; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1017. A bill for the relief of Richard Macleod Hull; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1018. A bill granting a pension to J. L. Parish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1019. A bill for the relief of John R. Page; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1020. A bill for the relief of Frank Burgess Bruce; to the Committee on War Claims.
H. R. 1021. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Daniel A. Brinson; to the Committee on Pensions.
H. R. 1022. A bill for the relief of F. J. Rozier; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1023. A bill for the relief of Ludvig Vingerhagen; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1024. A bill for the relief of Gus Smith; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1025. A bill for the relief of Wallace L. Edenfield; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1026. A bill for the relief of Hosea Aldred; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1027. A bill for the relief of B. B. Stevens; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1028. A bill for the relief of Henry Burch Montford, Jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:
H. R. 1029. A bill granting a pension to Katherine R. Salmon; to the Committee on Pensions.
H. R. 1030. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1031. A bill for the relief of Mathew Mattas; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1032. A bill for the relief of Nellie Brown; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1033. A bill for the relief of Marion Hobbs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLOESER:
H. R. 1034. A bill for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1035. A bill for the relief of the Royal Exchange Assurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1036. A bill for the relief of the Stiers Brothers Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:
H. R. 1037. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hortense Arnow, J. M. Rogers, and Mrs. Willie L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMEY:
H. R. 1038. A bill for the relief of Daniel B. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1039. A bill for the relief of Leonard M. Gluck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:
H. R. 1040. A bill for the relief of William D. McCauley; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1041. A bill to permit naturalization of Mrs. Susie Demeter; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Monongalia County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1043. A bill for the relief of Allen P. Pitsenbarger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York:
H. R. 1044. A bill for the relief of Marlin-Rockwell Corporation with respect to the jurisdiction of The Tax Court of the United States to redetermine its excessive profits for its fiscal year ending December 31, 1942, subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
H. R. 1045. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1046. A bill granting an increase of pension to Edith M. Link; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1047. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1048. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lorena M. Haskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1049. A bill granting an increase of pension to Agnes Hitchcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1050. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Millspaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1051. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
H. R. 1052. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jenettie E. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFER:
H. R. 1053. A bill for the relief of the Clark Memorial Masonic Association of Kalamazoo, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1054. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Karalis and Nicholas Kavalaris; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1055. A bill for the relief of the Realty Bond and Mortgage Co. and Robert W. Keith; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1056. A bill for the relief of the city of Battle Creek, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:
H. R. 1057. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:
H. R. 1058. A bill for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1059. A bill for the relief of Leonard D. Jackson and Elsie Fowkes Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:
H. R. 1060. A bill for the relief of S. B. Norton & Son; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1061. A bill for the relief of Reed Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of Alfred P. Paquin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
H. R. 1063. A bill for the relief of Marie Valida Antonia Michaud; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
H. R. 1064. A bill granting an increase of pension to Cornelia Hunton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRINGER:
H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of Bart B. Pigman; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1066 (by request). A bill to provide for a money grant to Harriet F. Wright in recognition of the valuable services rendered to the United States by her late husband; to the Committee on Education.
H. R. 1067. A bill for the relief of the estate of, and/or the heirs at law of, Frank D. Howells, former treasurer of the city of Richmond, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1068. A bill for the relief of James W. Kiplinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:
H. R. 1069. A bill for the relief of Sidney B. Walton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:
H. R. 1070. A bill for the relief of Elmer C. Hadlen; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1071. A bill for the relief of John Taylor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of Henry R. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1073. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Verbarg; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1074. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Person; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1075. A bill for the relief of Sprague B. Wyman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:
H. R. 1076. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
H. R. 1077. A bill granting a pension to Marjorie Scott, widow of the late Rear Admiral Norman Scott, United States Navy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH:
H. R. 1078. A bill for the relief of James J. Orme; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Ray L. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1080. A bill for the relief of Annie L. Nesbitt and others; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 1081. A bill to correct the military record of Herbert Horrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
H. R. 1082. A bill granting a pension to Dellar Milam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISS:
H. R. 1083. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:
H. R. 1084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Celia Ellen Ashcraft; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1086. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1087. A bill for the relief of Eddie Bessire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of the Eastern Contracting Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1089. A bill for the relief of Albert Cantalupo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 1090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret McWilliams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1091. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Grim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 1092. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Devo; to the Committee oh Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. R. 1093. A bill to award the Distinguished Service Cross posthumously to First Lt. Clovis Moomaw; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, who art love and light and truth, we turn unfilled to Thee. In a world where the very foundations seem to be shaken and the mad fury of battle assails our senses and tears our hearts, we cherish this hushed and hallowed moment which so long ago the founding fathers set apart as an altar of prayer at the day's beginning. Here, bowing with contrite hearts, we would be sure of Thee and of spiritual resources before we go to meet the high solemnities of waiting tasks.

Enlarge our sympathies. Deepen our compassion and our pity. Save our sacred cause from the poison of misunderstandings. Forbid that fogs and shadows rising out of the fever and panic of these tense times should dim our unity. When we are tempted by petty annoyances, by despondency, by resentments, and by the angry emotions of the world, may we gaze tenderly at the gaping wounds of our Allies and remember with gratitude that in our favored land not one steeple has fallen, not one temple has been demolished, not one home is in ruins. Ennoble our spirits so that through us may be preserved for all mankind the ideals of the Republic, to the glory of the God who hath made and preserved us a nation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 3, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

OWEN BREWSTER, a Senator from the State of Maine; STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire; and HIRAM W. JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of California, appeared in their seats today.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled; that Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker; and that South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, had been elected Clerk of the House of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The message announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) providing for a joint session on Saturday, January 6, 1945, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

The message notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, supra, the Speaker had appointed Mr. WORLEY and Mr. GAMBLE tellers on the part of the House to ascertain and count the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States.

FINAL ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate three letters from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the certificates of the Governors of the States of Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President in their respective States at the election of November 7, 1944, which, with the accompanying papers, were ordered to lie on the table.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES AND RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, the 6th day of January 1945, immediately following the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President, as provided for in Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the concurrent resolution provides for a joint meeting following the counting and announcement of the result of the electoral votes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. We discovered that the joint session provided for in the concurrent resolution adopted Wednesday to take place at 1 o'clock today was for the purpose only of counting the electoral votes. Without the concurrent resolution now presented by me the Senate and House could not remain in joint session officially for the purpose of receiving the President's message. It is for that purpose that the resolution is offered.

Mr. WHITE. Then, for the joint meeting for the purpose of counting the electoral votes, we are proceeding under statutory authority and a concurrent resolution is not required for that?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate has just received a message from the House announcing its concurrence in the Senate concurrent resolution providing for counting the electoral votes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the matter of counting the electoral votes the Senate is proceeding under Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. That resolution has already been agreed to by the Senate and by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has already been agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that is all taken care of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 the Chair appoints the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] as tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has action been taken on the concurrent resolution submitted by me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No action has been taken as yet. Without objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), submitted by the Senator from Kentucky, is agreed to.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, by direction of the Democratic conference, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 4), as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March 1890 on the subject.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move to strike from the resolution "KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee" and to insert in lieu thereof "ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a Senator from the State of Michigan." I move the adoption of the amendment, and on that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Murray
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Hoey	Robertson
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Connally	McMahon	Vandenberg
Cordon	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Wheeler
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
George	Moses	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is absent on the business of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], on which he has asked for the yeas and nays. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that, if present and voting, all the Senators whose absences I have announced would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is absent on the business of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business.

All these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—24

Aiken	Capper	Robertson
Austin	Cordon	Shipstead
Ball	Ferguson	Taft
Brewster	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Millikin	White
Bushfield	Morse	Wiley
Butler	Reed	Willis
Capehart	Revercomb	Wilson

NAYS—37

Bailey	Byrd	Fulbright
Bankhead	Chavez	George
Barkley	Connally	Gerry
Bilbo	Ellender	Green
Guffey	McCarran	Stewart
Hatch	McFarland	Taylor
Hayden	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	Murdock	Truman
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Wagner
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Kilgore	Pepper	
Lucas	Russell	

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Langer	Scrugham
Brooks	McClellan	Smith
Buck	McKellar	Tobey
Burton	Magnuson	Tunnell
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Eastland	Mead	Vandenberg
Glass	Moore	Wallgren
Gurney	Moses	Walsh
Hawkes	Myers	Wherry
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	
Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

So Mr. WHITE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this result is not entirely unexpected. As a matter of fact, I am used to it. This is my fourth experience. But I have a very great consolation. In the good old days when Republican sanity and wisdom were in control of the Senate, the late Senator Pittman, who subsequently was President pro tempore of the Senate for many years, was defeated four times before. There was a Democratic majority which finally elected him, and he always used to say to me in his later victorious years when he was the one who plowed me under, "Wait for the fifth time."

Mr. President, the fifth time will be 1946. I give it to you as a prophecy. [Laughter.]

In the presence of this painless defeat I wish to subscribe to the very heartfelt sentiment that I could not have been defeated by one for whom I have a higher regard than the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. If there is a Member of this body who has earned any distinction that he can receive from it in return for as faithful service as was ever rendered by any public servant in this Chamber, it is my very dear friend from Tennessee. I very much hope that his election will be made unanimous.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Michigan I am prompted to suggest that while he may have been in the past opposed to four terms, he is not opposed to four candidacies or even to a fifth, so that he will be in no position hereafter to oppose a fifth candidacy on the part of anybody. [Laughter.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Kentucky has his philosophy slightly mixed, or at any rate the interpretation of it. I am the living example of the wisdom of four defeats rather than four victories, and I recommend that to the President.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and

the minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], to escort to the desk the President pro tempore-elect of the Senate, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Thereupon Mr. MCKELLAR, escorted by Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHITE, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath was administered to him by the Vice President.

CONTINUATION OF OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the precedents of the Senate, all other officers of the Senate hold their offices during the pleasure of the Senate, the Senate being a continuous body. That includes the Secretary, Colonel Halsey; the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Doxey; the Chaplain, Dr. Harris; the secretary to the majority, Mr. Biffle; and the secretary to the minority, Mr. Loeffler. So it is not necessary to go through the formality of electing them. They hold their offices until the Senate sees fit to make a change.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE—JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, ordinarily we would have a morning hour at this time; but inasmuch as in a few minutes the Senate must go over to the Hall of the House to participate in joint session in the counting of the electoral votes, I wish to say that following the reading of the President's message, provided for in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2, which takes place following the counting of the electoral votes, the Senate will reassemble in its Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that upon the Senate reassembling it may transact the morning hour's business for the introduction of bills, resolutions, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are required to leave the Chamber not later than a quarter to 1 o'clock, I ask that the Senate stand in recess until that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 12:45 o'clock p. m., when it reassembled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) providing for a joint session to receive communications from the President of the United States.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES AND PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives, and that immediately following the conclusion of the reading of the President's message the Senate return to its Chamber for further business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, its Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States, and of receiving such communications as the President of the United States might be pleased to make to them.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate, having returned to its Chamber at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m., reassembled, and the Vice President resumed the chair.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, representatives of the Senate met with representatives of the House of Representatives and counted the votes of the Electoral College for President of the United States and for Vice President of the United States, and have delivered a report to the President of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report of the state of the vote will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, of the State of New York, has received for President of the United States 432 votes;

Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, has received 99 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

HARRY S. TRUMAN, of the State of Missouri, has received for Vice President of the United States 432 votes;

John W. Bricker, of the State of Ohio, has received 99 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the twentieth day of January 1945, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be spread upon the Journal of the Senate.

(For tabulation of electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States, see House proceedings of this day, p. 91.)

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The annual message of the President of the United States, which was this day read to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress, is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In considering the state of the Union, the war, and the peace that is to follow, are naturally uppermost in the minds of all of us.

This war must be waged—it is being waged—with the greatest and most persistent intensity. Everything we are and have is at stake. Everything we are and have will be given. American men, fighting far from home, have already won victories which the world will never forget.

We have no question of the ultimate victory. We have no question of the cost. Our losses will be heavy.

We and our allies will go on fighting together to ultimate total victory.

We have seen a year marked, on the whole, by substantial progress toward victory, even though the year ended with a set-back for our arms, when the Germans launched a ferocious counterattack into Luxembourg and Belgium with the obvious objective of cutting our line in the center.

Our men have fought with indescribable and unforgettable gallantry under most difficult conditions, and our German enemies have sustained considerable losses while failing to obtain their objectives.

The high tide of this German effort was reached 2 days after Christmas. Since then we have reassumed the offensive, rescued the isolated garrison at Bastogne, and forced a German withdrawal along the whole line of the salient. The speed with which we recovered from this savage attack was largely possible because we have one supreme commander in complete control of all the Allied Armies in France. General Eisenhower has faced this period of trial with admirable calm and resolution and with steadily increasing success. He has my complete confidence.

Further desperate attempts may well be made to break our lines, to slow our progress. We must never make the mistake of assuming that the Germans are beaten until the last Nazi has surrendered.

And I would express another most serious warning against the poisonous effects of enemy propaganda.

The wedge that the Germans attempted to drive in western Europe was less dangerous in actual terms of winning the war than the wedges which they are continually attempting to drive between ourselves and our allies.

Every little rumor which is intended to weaken our faith in our allies is like an actual enemy agent in our midst—seeking to sabotage our war effort. There are, here and there, evil and baseless rumors against the Russians—rumors against the British—rumors against our own American commanders in the field.

When you examine these rumors closely you will observe that every one of them bears the same trade-mark—"made in Germany."

We must resist this divisive propaganda—we must destroy it—with the same strength and the same determination that our fighting men are displaying as they resist and destroy the panzer divisions.

In Europe, we shall resume the attack and, despite temporary set-backs here or there, we shall continue the attack relentlessly until Germany is completely defeated.

It is appropriate at this time to review the basic strategy which has guided us through 3 years of war, and which will lead, eventually, to total victory.

The tremendous effort of the first years of this war was directed toward the concentration of men and supplies in the various theaters of action at the points where they could hurt our enemies most.

It was an effort, in the language of the military men, of deployment of our forces. Many battles—essential battles—were fought; many victories—vital victories—were won. But these battles and these victories were fought and won to hold back the attacking enemy, and to put us in positions from which we and our allies could deliver the final, decisive blows.

In the beginning, our most important military task was to prevent our enemies, the strongest and most violently aggressive powers that ever have threatened civilization, from winning decisive victories. But even while we were conducting defensive, delaying actions, we were looking forward to the time when we could wrest the initiative from our enemies and place our superior resources of men and materials into direct competition with them.

It was plain then that the defeat of either enemy would require the massing of overwhelming forces—ground, sea, and air—in positions from which we and our allies could strike directly against the enemy homelands, and destroy the Nazi and Japanese war machines.

In the case of Japan, we had to await the completion of extensive preliminary operations, operations designed to establish secure supply lines through the Japanese outer-zone defenses. This called for overwhelming sea power and air power—supported by ground forces strategically employed against isolated outpost garrisons.

Always, from the very day we were attacked, it was right militarily as well as morally, to reject the arguments of those short-sighted people who would have had us throw Britain and Russia to the Nazi wolves and concentrate against the Japanese. Such people urged that we fight a purely defensive war against Japan while allowing the domination of all the rest of the world by nazi-ism and fascism.

In the European theater, the necessary bases for the massing of ground and air power against Germany were already available in Great Britain. In the Mediterranean area we could begin ground operations against major elements of the German Army as rapidly as we could put troops in the field, first in north Africa and then in Italy.

Therefore, our decision was made to concentrate the bulk of our ground and air forces against Germany until her utter defeat. That decision was based on all these factors; and it was also based on the realization that, of our two enemies, Germany would be more able to digest quickly her conquests, the more able quickly to convert the manpower and resources of her conquered territory into a war potential.

We had in Europe two active and indomitable allies—Britain and the Soviet Union—and there were also the heroic resistance movements in the occupied countries, constantly engaging and harassing the Germans.

We cannot forget how Britain held the line, alone, in 1940 and 1941; and at the same time, despite ferocious bombardment from the air, built up a tremendous armaments industry which enabled her to take the offensive at El Alamein in 1942.

We cannot forget the heroic defense of Moscow and Leningrad and Stalingrad, or the tremendous Russian offensives of 1943 and 1944 which destroyed formidable German armies.

Nor can we forget how, for more than 7 long years, the Chinese people have been sustaining the barbarous attacks of the Japanese and containing large enemy forces on the vast areas of the Asiatic mainland.

In the future we must never forget the lesson that we have learned—that we must have friends who will work with us in peace as they have fought at our side in war.

As a result of the combined effort of the Allied forces, great military victories were achieved in 1944: the liberation of France, Belgium, Greece, and parts of the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia; the surrender of Rumania and Bulgaria; the invasion of Germany itself and Hungary; the steady march through the Pacific islands to the Philippines, Guam, and Saipan; and the beginnings of a mighty air offensive against the Japanese islands.

Now, as this Seventy-ninth Congress meets, we have reached the most critical phase of the war.

The greatest victory of the last year was, of course, the successful breach on June 6, 1944, of the German "impregnable" sea wall of Europe and the victorious sweep of the Allied forces through France and Belgium and Luxemburg—almost to the Rhine itself.

The cross-channel invasion of the Allied armies was the greatest amphibious operation in the history of the world. It overshadowed all other operations in this or any other war in its immensity. Its success is a tribute to the fighting courage of the soldiers who stormed the beaches—to the sailors and merchant seamen who put the soldiers ashore and kept them supplied—and to the military and naval leaders who achieved a real miracle of planning and execution. And it is also a tribute to the ability of two nations, Britain and America, to plan together, and work together, and fight together in perfect cooperation and perfect harmony.

This cross-channel invasion was followed in August by a second great amphibious operation, landing troops in southern France. In this, the same cooperation and the same harmony existed between the American, French, and other Allied forces based in north Africa and Italy.

The success of the two invasions is a tribute also to the ability of many men and women to maintain silence, when a few careless words would have imperiled the lives of hundreds of thousands, and would have jeopardized the whole vast undertakings.

Those two great operations were made possible by success in the Battle of the Atlantic.

Without this success over German submarines, we could not have built up our invasion forces or air forces in Great Britain, nor could we have kept a steady stream of supplies flowing to them after they had landed in France.

The Nazis, however, may succeed in improving their submarines and their crews. They have recently increased their U-boat activity. The battle of the Atlantic—like all campaigns in this war—demands eternal vigilence. But the British, Canadian, and other Allied Navies, together with our own, are constantly on the alert.

The tremendous operations in western Europe have overshadowed in the public mind the less spectacular but vitally important Italian front. Its place in the strategic conduct of the war in Europe has been obscured, and—by some people, unfortunately—underrated.

It is important that any misconception on that score be corrected now.

What the Allied forces in Italy are doing is a well-considered part in our strategy in Europe, now aimed at only one objective—the total defeat of the Germans. These valiant forces in Italy are continuing to keep a substantial portion of the German Army under constant pressure—including some 20 first-line German divisions and the necessary supply and transport and replacement troops—all of which our enemies need so badly elsewhere.

Over very difficult terrain and through adverse weather conditions, our Fifth Army and the British Eighth Army—reinforced by units from other United Nations, including a brave and well-equipped unit of the Brazilian Army—have, in the past year, pushed north through bloody Cassino and the Anzio beachhead, and through Rome, until now they occupy heights overlooking the valley of the Po.

The greatest tribute which can be paid to the courage and fighting ability of those splendid soldiers in Italy is to point out that although their strength is about equal to that of the Germans they oppose, the Allies have been continuously on the offensive.

That pressure, that offensive, by our troops in Italy will continue.

The American people—and every soldier now fighting in the Apennines—should remember that the Italian front has not lost any of the importance which it had in the days when it was the only Allied front in Europe.

In the Pacific during the past year, we have conducted the fastest-moving offensive in the history of modern warfare. We have driven the enemy back more than 3,000 miles across the Central Pacific.

A year ago our conquest of Tarawa was a little more than a month old.

A year ago we were preparing for our invasion of Kwajalein, the second of our great strides across the Central Pacific to the Philippines.

A year ago General MacArthur was still fighting in New Guinea, almost 1,500

miles from his present position in the Philippine Islands.

We now have firmly established bases in the Mariana Islands from which our Superfortresses bomb Tokyo itself and will continue to blast Japan in ever-increasing numbers.

Japanese forces in the Philippines have been cut in two. There is still hard fighting ahead, costly fighting. But the liberation of the Philippines will mean that Japan has been largely cut off from her conquests in the East Indies.

The landing of our troops on Leyte was the largest amphibious operation thus far conducted in the Pacific.

Moreover, these landings drew the Japanese Fleet into the first great sea battle which Japan has risked in almost 2 years. Not since the night engagements around Guadalcanal in November–December 1942, had our Navy been able to come to grips with major units of the Japanese Fleet. We had brushed against their fleet in the first battle of the Philippine Sea in June 1944, but not until last October were we able really to engage a major portion of the Japanese Navy in actual combat. The naval engagement which raged for 3 days was the heaviest blow ever struck against Japanese sea power.

As the result of that battle, much of what is left of the Japanese Fleet has been driven behind the screen of islands that separates the Yellow Sea, the China Sea, and the Sea of Japan from the Pacific.

Our Navy looks forward to any opportunity which the lords of the Japanese Navy will give us to fight them again.

The people of this Nation have a right to be proud of the courage and fighting ability of the men in the armed forces—on all fronts. They also have a right to be proud of American leadership which has guided their sons into battle.

The history of the generalship of this war has been a history of teamwork and cooperation, of skill and daring. Let me give you one example out of last year's operations in the Pacific.

Last September Admiral Halsey led American naval task forces into Philippine waters and north to the East China Sea, and struck heavy blows at Japanese air and sea power.

At that time it was our plan to approach the Philippines by further stages, taking islands which we may call A, C, and E. However, Admiral Halsey reported that a direct attack on Leyte appeared feasible. When General MacArthur received the reports from Admiral Halsey's task forces, he also concluded that it might be possible to attack the Japanese in the Philippines directly—bypassing islands A, C, and E.

Admiral Nimitz thereupon offered to make available to General MacArthur several divisions which had been scheduled to take the intermediate objectives. These discussions, conducted at great distances, all took place in 1 day.

General MacArthur immediately informed the Joint Chiefs of Staff here in Washington that he was prepared to initiate plans for an attack on Leyte in October. Approval of the change in plan was given on the same day.

Thus, within the space of 24 hours, a major change of plans are accomplished which involved Army and Navy forces from two different theaters of operations—a change which hastened the liberation of the Philippines and the final day of victory—a change which saved lives which would have been expended in the capture of islands which are now neutralized far behind our lines.

Our over-all strategy has not neglected the important task of rendering all possible aid to China. Despite almost insuperable difficulties, we increased this aid during 1944. At present our aid to China must be accomplished by air transport—there is no other way. By the end of 1944, the Air Transport Command was carrying into China a tonnage of supplies three times as great as that delivered a year ago, and much more, each month, than the Burma Road ever delivered at its peak.

Despite the loss of important bases in China, the tonnage delivered by air transport has enabled General Chennault's Fourteenth Air Force, which includes many Chinese flyers, to wage an effective and aggressive campaign against the Japanese. In 1944, aircraft of the Fourteenth Air Force flew more than 35,000 sorties against the Japanese and sank enormous tonnage of enemy shipping, greatly diminishing the usefulness of the China Sea lanes.

British, Dominion, and Chinese forces together with our own have not only held the line in Burma against determined Japanese attacks but have gained bases of considerable importance to the supply line into China.

The Burma campaigns have involved incredible hardship, and have demanded exceptional fortitude and determination. The officers and men who have served with so much devotion in these far-distant jungles and mountains deserve high honor from their countrymen.

In all of the far-flung operations of our own armed forces—on land, and sea, and in the air—the final job, the toughest job, has been performed by the average, easygoing, hard-fighting young American who carries the weight of battle on his own shoulders.

It is to him that we and all future generations of Americans must pay grateful tribute.

But it is of small satisfaction to him to know that monuments will be raised to him in the future. He wants, he needs, and he is entitled to insist upon, our full and active support—now.

Although unprecedented production figures have made possible our victories, we shall have to increase our goals even more in certain items.

Peak deliveries of supplies were made to the War Department in December 1943. Due in part to cut-backs, we have not produced as much since then. Deliveries of Army supplies were down by 15 percent by July 1944, before the upward trend was once more resumed.

Because of increased demands from overseas, the Army Service Forces in the month of October 1944, had to increase its estimate of required production by 10 percent. But in November, one month later, the requirements for 1945 had to be increased another 10 percent, sending the production goal well above anything we have yet attained. Our armed forces in combat have steadily increased their expenditure of medium and heavy artillery ammunition. As we continue the decisive phases of this war, the munitions that we expend will mount day by day.

In October 1944, while some were saying the war in Europe was over, the Army was shipping more men to Europe than in any previous month of the war.

One of the most urgent immediate requirements of the armed forces is more nurses. Last April the Army requirement for nurses was set at 50,000. Actual strength in nurses was then 40,000. Since that time the Army has tried to raise the additional 10,000. Active recruiting has been carried on, but the net gain in 8 months has been only 2,000. There are now 42,000 nurses in the Army.

Recent estimates have increased the total number needed to 60,000. That means that 18,000 more nurses must be obtained for the Army alone, and the Navy now requires 2,000 additional nurses.

The present shortage of Army nurses is reflected in undue strain on the existing force. More than a thousand nurses are now hospitalized, and part of this is due to overwork. The shortage is also indicated by the fact that 11 Army hospital units have been sent overseas without their complement of nurses. At Army hospitals in the United States there is only one nurse to 26 beds, instead of the recommended 1 to 15 beds.

It is tragic that the gallant women who have volunteered for service as nurses should be so overworked. It is tragic that our wounded men should ever want for the best possible nursing care.

The inability to get the needed nurses for the Army is not due to any shortage of nurses. Two hundred and eighty thousand registered nurses are now practicing in this country. It has been estimated by the War Manpower Commission that 27,000 additional nurses could be made available to the armed forces without interfering too seriously with the needs of the civilian population for nurses.

Since volunteering has not produced the number of nurses required, I urge that the Selective Service Act be amended to provide for the induction of nurses into the armed forces. The need is too pressing to await the outcome of further efforts at recruiting.

The care and treatment given to our wounded and sick soldiers have been the best known to medical science. Those standards must be maintained at all costs. We cannot tolerate a lowering of them by failure to provide adequate nursing for the brave men who stand desperately in need of it.

In the continuing progress of this war we have constant need for new types of weapons. For we cannot afford to fight the war of today or tomorrow with the weapons of yesterday. For example, the American Army now has developed a new tank with a gun more powerful than any yet mounted on a fast-moving vehicle.

The Army will need many thousands of these new tanks in 1945.

Almost every month finds some new development in electronics which must be put into production in order to maintain our technical superiority—and in order to save lives. We have to work every day to keep ahead of the enemy in radar. On D-day, in France, with our superior new equipment, we located and then put out of operation every warning set which the Germans had along the French coast.

If we do not keep constantly ahead of our enemies in the development of new weapons, we pay for our backwardness with the life's blood of our sons.

The only way to meet these increased needs for new weapons and more of them is for every American engaged in war work to stay on his war job—for additional American civilians, men and women, not engaged in essential work, to go out and get a war job. Workers who are released because their production is cut back should get another job where production is being increased. This is no time to quit or change to less essential jobs.

There is an old and true saying that the Lord hates a quitter. And this Nation must pay for all those who leave their essential jobs—or all those who lay down on their essential jobs for nonessential reasons. And, again, that payment must be made with the life's blood of our sons.

Many critical production programs with sharply rising needs are now seriously hampered by manpower shortages. The most important Army needs are artillery ammunition, cotton duck, bombs, tires, tanks, heavy trucks, and even B–29's. In each of these vital programs, present production is behind requirements.

Navy production of bombardment ammunition is hampered by manpower shortages; so is production for its huge rocket program. Labor shortages have also delayed its cruiser and carrier programs, and production of certain types of aircraft.

There is critical need for more repair workers and repair parts; this lack delays the return of damaged fighting ships to their places in the fleet, and prevents ships now in the fighting line from getting needed overhauling.

The pool of young men under 26 classified as I–A is almost depleted. Increased replacements for the armed forces will take men now deferred who are at work in war industry. The armed forces must have an assurance of a steady flow of young men for replacements. Meeting this paramount need will be difficult, and will also make it progressively more difficult to attain the 1945 production goals.

Last year, after much consideration, I recommended that the Congress adopt a National Service Act as the most efficient and democratic way of insuring full production for our war requirements. This recommendation was not adopted.

I now again call upon the Congress to enact this measure for the total mobilization of all our human resources for the prosecution of the war. I urge that this be done at the earliest possible moment.

It is not too late in the war. In fact, bitter experience has shown that in this kind of mechanized warfare where new weapons are constantly being created by our enemies and by ourselves, the closer we come to the end of the war, the more pressing becomes the need for sustained war production with which to deliver the final blow to the enemy.

There are three basic arguments for a national service law.

First, it would assure that we have the right numbers of workers in the right places at the right times.

Second, it would provide supreme proof to all our fighting men that we are giving them what they are entitled to, which is nothing less than our total effort.

And, third, it would be the final, unequivocal answer to the hopes of the Nazis and the Japanese that we may become half-hearted about this war and that they can get from us a negotiated peace.

National service legislation would make it possible to put ourselves in a position to assure certain and speedy action in meeting our manpower needs.

It would be used only to the extent absolutely required by military necessities. In fact, experience in Great Britain and in other nations at war indicates that use of the compulsory powers of national service is necessary only in rare instances.

This proposed legislation would provide against loss of retirement and seniority rights and benefits. It would not mean reduction in wages.

In adopting such legislation it is not necessary to discard the voluntary and cooperative processes which have prevailed up to this time. This cooperation has already produced great results. The contribution of our workers to the war effort has been beyond measure. We must build on the foundations that have already been laid and supplement the measures now in operation, in order to guarantee the production that may be necessary in the critical period that lies ahead.

At the present time we are using the inadequate tools at hand to do the best we can by such expedients as manpower ceilings, and the use of priority and other powers, to induce men and women to shift from nonessential to essential war jobs.

I am in receipt of a joint letter from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, dated January 3, 1945, which says:

> With the experience of 3 years of war and after the most thorough consideration, we are convinced that it is now necessary to carry out the statement made by the Congress in the joint resolutions declaring that a state of war existed with Japan and Germany: That "to bring the conflict to a successful conclusion all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States."
>
> In our considered judgment, which is supported by General Marshall and Admiral King, this requires total mobilization of our manpower by the passage of a national war-service law. The armed forces need this legislation to hasten the day of final victory, and to keep to a minimum the cost in lives.
>
> National war service, the recognition by law of the duty of every citizen to do his or her part in winning the war, will give complete assurance that the need for war equipment will be filled. In the coming year we must increase the output of many weapons and supplies on short notice. Otherwise we shall not keep our production abreast of the swiftly changing needs of war. At the same time it will be necessary to draw progressively many men now engaged in war production to serve with the armed forces, and their places in war production must be filled promptly. These developments will require the addition of hundreds of thousands to those already working in war industry. We do not believe that these needs can be met effectively under present methods.
>
> The record made by management and labor in war industry has been a notable testimony to the resourcefulness and power of America. The needs are so great, nevertheless, that in many instances we have been forced to recall soldiers and sailors from military duty to do work of a civilian character in war production, because of the urgency of the need for equipment and because of inability to recruit civilian labor.

Pending action by the Congress on the broader aspects of national service, I recommend that the Congress immediately enact legislation which will be effective in using the services of the 4,000,000 men now classified as IV–F in whatever capacity is best for the war effort.

In the field of foreign policy, we propose to stand together with the United Nations not for the war alone but for the victory for which the war is fought.

It is not only a common danger which unites us but a common hope. Ours is an association not of governments but of peoples—and the peoples' hope is peace. Here, as in England; in England, as in Russia; in Russia, as in China; in France, and through the continent of Europe, and throughout the world; wherever men love freedom, the hope and purpose of the people are for peace—a peace that is durable and secure.

It will not be easy to create this peoples' peace. We delude ourselves if we believe that the surrender of the armies of our enemies will make the peace we long for. The unconditional surrender of the armies of our enemies is the first and necessary step—but the first step only.

We have seen already, in areas liberated from the Nazi and the Fascist tyranny, what problems peace will bring. And we delude ourselves if we attempt to believe wishfully that all these problems can be solved overnight.

The firm foundation can be built—and it will be built. But the continuance and assurance of a living peace must, in the long run, be the work of the people themselves.

We ourselves, like all peoples who have gone through the difficult processes of liberation and adjustment, know of our own experience how great the difficulties can be. We know that they are not difficulties peculiar to any continent or any nation. Our own Revolutionary War left behind it, in the words of one

American historian, "an eddy of lawlessness and disregard of human life." There were separatist movements of one kind or another in Vermont, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Maine. There were insurrections, open or threatened, in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. These difficulties we worked out for ourselves as the peoples of the liberated areas of Europe, faced with complex problems of adjustment, will work out their difficulties for themselves.

Peace can be made and kept only by the united determination of free and peace-loving peoples who are willing to work together—willing to help one another—willing to respect and tolerate and try to understand one another's opinions and feelings.

The nearer we come to vanquishing our enemies the more we inevitably become conscious of differences among the victors.

We must not let those differences divide us and blind us to our more important common and continuing interests in winning the war and building the peace.

International cooperation on which enduring peace must be based is not a one-way street.

Nations like individuals do not always see alike or think alike, and international cooperation and progress are not helped by any nation assuming that it has a monopoly of wisdom or of virtue.

In the future world, the misuse of power, as implied in the term "power-politics," must not be a controlling factor in international relations. That is the heart of the principles to which we have subscribed. We cannot deny that power is a factor in world politics any more than we can deny its existence as a factor in national politics. But in a democratic world, as in a democratic nation, power must be linked with responsibility, and obliged to defend and justify itself within the framework of the general good.

Perfectionism, no less than isolationism or imperialism or power politics, may obstruct the paths to international peace. Let us not forget that the retreat to isolationism a quarter of a century ago was started not by a direct attask against international cooperation, but against the alleged imperfections of the peace.

In our disillusionment after the last war, we preferred international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see and think exactly as we did. We gave up the hope of gradually achieving a better peace because we had not the courage to fulfill our responsibilities in an admittedly imperfect world.

We must not let that happen again, or we shall follow the same tragic road again—the road to a third world war.

We can fulfill our responsibilities for maintaining the security of our own country only by exercising our power and our influence to achieve the principles in which we believe and for which we have fought.

In August 1941, Prime Minister Churchill and I agreed to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, these being later incorporated into the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942. At that time certain isolationists protested vigorously against our right to proclaim the principles—and against the very principles themselves. Today, many of the same people are protesting against the possibility of violation of the same principles.

It is true that the statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and every one of this war-torn world's tangled situations. But it is a good and a useful thing—it is an essential thing—to have principles toward which we can aim.

And we shall not hesitate to use our influence—and to use it now—to secure, so far as is humanly possible, the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We have not shrunk from the military responsibilities brought on by this war. We cannot and will not shrink from the political responsibilities which follow in the wake of battle.

I do not wish to give the impression that all mistakes can be avoided and that many disappointments are not inevitable in the making of peace. But we must not this time lose the hope of establishing an international order which will be capable of maintaining peace and realizing through the years more perfect justice between nations.

To do this we must be on our guard not to exploit and exaggerate the differences between us and our allies, particularly with reference to the peoples who have been liberated from Fascist tyranny. That is not the way to secure a better settlement of those differences or to secure international machinery which can rectify mistakes which may be made.

I should not be frank if I did not admit concern about many situations—the Greek and Polish, for example. But those situations are not as easy or as simple to deal with as some spokesmen, whose sincerity I do not question, would have us believe. We have obligations, not necessarily legal, to the exiled governments, to the underground leaders, and to our major allies who came much nearer the shadows than we did.

We and our allies have declared that it is our purpose to respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. But with internal dissension, with many citizens of liberated countries still prisoners of war or forced to labor in Germany, it is difficult to guess the kind of self-government the people really want.

During the interim period, until conditions permit a genuine expression of the peoples' will, we and our allies have a duty, which we cannot ignore, to use our influence to the end that no temporary or provisional authorities in the liberated countries block the eventual exercise of the peoples' right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as freemen, they are to live.

It is only too easy for all of us to rationalize what we want to believe and to consider those leaders we like responsible and those we dislike irresponsible. And our task is not helped by stubborn partisanship, however understandable, on the part of opposed internal factions.

It is our purpose to help the peace-loving peoples of Europe to live together as good neighbors, to recognize their common interests, and not to nurse their traditional grievances against one another.

But we must not permit the many specific and immediate problems of adjustment connected with the liberation of Europe to delay the establishment of permanent machinery for the maintenance of peace. Under the threat of a common danger, the United Nations joined together in war to preserve their independence and their freedom. They must now join together to make secure the independence and freedom of all peace-loving states, so that never again shall tyranny be able to divide and conquer.

International peace and well-being, like national peace and well-being, require constant alertness, continuing cooperation, and organized effort.

International peace and well-being, like national peace and well-being, can be secured only through institutions capable of life and growth.

Many of the problems of the peace are upon us even now while the conclusion of the war is still before us. The atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding and determination to find a common ground of common understanding, which surrounded the conversations at Dumbarton Oaks, gives us reason to hope that future discussions will succeed in developing the democratic and fully integrated world security system toward which these preparatory conversations were directed.

We and the other United Nations are going forward, with vigor and resolution, in our efforts to create such a system by providing for it strong and flexible institutions of joint and cooperative action.

The aroused conscience of humanity will not permit failure in this supreme endeavor.

We believe that the extraordinary advances in the means of intercommunication between peoples over the past generation offer a practical method of advancing the mutual understanding upon which peace and the institutions of peace must rest, and it is our policy and purpose to use these great technological achievements for the common advantage of the world.

We support the greatest possible freedom of trade and commerce.

We Americans have always believed in freedom of opportunity, and equality of opportunity remains one of the principal objectives of our national life. What we believe in for individuals we believe in

also for nations. We are opposed to restrictions, whether by public act or private arrangement, which distort and impair commerce, transit, and trade.

We have house cleaning of our own to do in this regard. But it is our hope, not only in the interest of our own prosperity but in the interest of the prosperity of the world, that trade and commerce and access to materials and markets may be freer after this war than ever before in the history of the world.

One of the most heartening events of the year in the international field has been the renaissance of the French people and the return of the French Nation to the ranks of the United Nations. Far from having been crushed by the terror of Nazi domination, the French people have emerged with stronger faith than ever in the destiny of their country and in the soundness of the democratic ideals to which the French Nation has traditionally contributed so greatly.

During her liberation, France has given proof of her unceasing determination to fight the Germans, continuing the heroic efforts of the resistance groups under the occupation and of all those Frenchmen throughout the world who refused to surrender after the disaster of 1940.

Today, French armies are again on the German frontier, and are again fighting shoulder to shoulder with our sons.

Since our landings in Africa, we have placed in French hands all the arms and material of war which our resources and the military situation permitted. And I am glad to say that we are now about to equip large new French forces with the most modern weapons for combat duty.

In addition to the contribution which France can make to our common victory, her liberation likewise means that her great influence will again be available in meeting the problems of peace.

We fully recognize France's vital interest in a lasting solution of the German problem and the contribution which she can make in achieving international security. Her formal adherence to the declaration by United Nations a few days ago and the proposal at the Dumbarton Oaks discussions, whereby France would receive one of the five permanent seats in the proposed Security Council, demonstrate the extent to which France has resumed her proper position of strength and leadership.

I am clear in my own mind that, as an essential factor in the maintenance of peace in the future, we must have universal military training after this war, and I shall send a special message to the Congress on this subject.

An enduring peace cannot be achieved without a strong America—strong in the social and economic sense as well as in the military sense.

In the state of the Union message last year, I set forth what I considered to be an American economic bill of rights.

I said then, and I say now, that these economic truths represent a second bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

Of these rights the most fundamental, and one on which the fulfillment of the others in large degree depends, is the "right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation." In turn, others of the economic rights of American citizenship such as the right to a decent home, to a good education, to good medical care, to social security, to reasonable farm income, will, if fulfilled, make major contributions to achieving adequate levels of employment.

The Federal Government must see to it that thsee rights become realities—with the help of States, municipalities, business, labor, and agriculture.

We have had full employment during the war. We have had it because the Government has been ready to buy all the materials of war which the country could produce—and this has amounted to approximately half our present productive capacity.

After the war we must maintain full employment with Government performing its peacetime functions. This means that we must achieve a level of demand and purchasing power by private consumers—farmers, businessmen, workers, professional men, housewives—which is sufficiently high to replace wartime Government demands; and it means also that we must greatly increase our export trade above the pre-war level.

Our policy is, of course, to rely as much as possible on private enterprise to provide jobs. But the American people will not accept mass unemployment or mere makeshift work. There will be need for the work of everyone willing and able to work—and that means close to 60,000,000 jobs.

Full employment means not only jobs—but productive jobs. Americans do not regard jobs that pay substandard wages as productive jobs.

We must make sure that private enterprise works as it is supposed to work—on the basis of initiative and vigorous competition, without the stifling presence of monopolies and cartels.

During the war we have guaranteed investment in enterprise essential to the war effort. We should also take appropriate measures in peacetime to secure opportunities for new small enterprises and for productive business expansion for which finance would otherwise be unavailable.

This necessary expansion of our peacetime productive capacity will require new facilities, new plants, and new equipment.

It will require large outlays of money which should be raised through normal investment channels. But while private capital should finance this expansion program, the Government should recognize its responsibility for sharing part of any special or abnormal risk of loss attached to such financing.

Our full-employment program requires the extensive development of our natural resources and other useful public works. The undeveloped resources of this continent are still vast. Our river-watershed projects will add new and fertile territories to the United States. The T. V. A., which was constructed at a cost of $750,000,000—the cost of waging this war for less than 4 days—was a bargain. We have similar opportunities in our other great river basins. By harnessing the resources of these river basins, as we have in the Tennessee Valley, we shall provide the same kind of stimulus to enterprise as was provided by the Louisiana Purchase and the new discoveries in the West during the nineteenth century.

If we are to avail ourselves fully of the benefits of civil aviation, and if we are to use the automobiles we can produce, it will be necessary to construct thousands of airports and to overhaul our entire national highway system.

The provision of a decent home for every family is a national necessity, if this country is to be worthy of its greatness; and that task will itself create great employment opportunities. Most of our cities need extensive rebuilding. Much of our farm plant is in a state of disrepair. To make a frontal attack on the problems of housing and urban reconstruction will require thoroughgoing cooperation between industry and labor, and the Federal, State, and local governments.

An expanded social-security program and adequate health and education programs must play essential roles in a program designed to support individual productivity and mass purchasing power. I shall communicate further with the Congress on these subjects at a later date.

The millions of productive jobs that a program of this nature could bring are jobs in private enterprise. They are jobs based on the expanded demand for the output of our economy for consumption and investment. Through a program of this character we can maintain a national income high enough to provide for an orderly retirement of the public debt along with reasonable tax reduction.

Our present tax system, geared primarily to war requirements, must be revised for peacetime so as to encourage private demand.

While no general revision of the tax structure can be made until the war ends on all fronts, the Congress should be prepared to provide tax modifications at the end of the war in Europe designed to encourage capital to invest in new enterprises and to provide jobs. As an integral part of this program to maintain high employment, we must, after the war is over, reduce or eliminate taxes which bear too heavily on consumption.

The war will leave deep disturbances in the world economy, in our national economy, in many communities, in many families, and in many individuals. It will require determined effort and responsible action of all of us to find our way back to peacetime, and to help others to find their way back to peacetime—a peacetime that holds the values of the past and the promise of the future.

If we attack our problems with determination, we shall succeed. And we must succeed. For freedom and peace cannot exist without security.

During the past year the American people, in a national election, reasserted their democratic faith.

In the course of that campaign various references were made to "strife" between this administration and the Congress, with the implication, if not the direct assertion, that this administration and the Congress could never work together harmoniously in the service of the Nation.

It cannot be denied that there have been disagreements between the legislative and executive branches—as there have been disagreements during the past century and a half.

I think we all realize, too, that there are some people in this Capital City whose task is, in large part, to stir up dissension and to magnify normal, healthy disagreements so that they appear to be irreconcilable conflicts.

But—I think that the over-all record in this respect is eloquent: the Government of the United States of America—all branches of it—has a good record of achievement in this war.

The Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary have worked together for the common good.

I myself want to tell you, the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, how happy I am in our relationships and friendships. I have not yet had the pleasure of meeting some of the new Members in each House, but I hope that opportunity will offer itself in the near future.

We have a great many problems ahead of us and we must approach them with realism and courage.

This new year of 1945 can be the greatest year of achievement in human history.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five can see the final ending of the Nazi-Fascist reign of terror in Europe.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five can see the closing in of the forces of retribution about the center of the malignant power of imperialistic Japan.

Most important of all—1945 can and must see the substantial beginning of the organization of world peace. This organization must be the fulfillment of the promise for which men have fought and died in this war. It must be the justification of all the sacrifices that have been made—of all the dreadful misery that this world has endured.

We Americans of today, together with our allies, are making history—and I hope it will be better history than ever has been made before.

We pray that we may be worthy of the unlimited opportunities that God has given us.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 6, 1945.*

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 5) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another resolution on the same subject, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 6) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF T. HOYT DAVIS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, January 15, 1945, at 2:30 p. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee Room, upon the nomination of T. Hoyt Davis, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia, vice Hon. Bascom S. Deaver, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate certain departmental reports and other communications received since the adjournment of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which will be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL FUND, PARIS, FRANCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized report of transactions for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund for the fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 1)

A letter from the Secretary of War, president, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE FOR DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to the act of May 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 271; U. S. C. 18, sec. 682), a rule of procedure prescribed by the Supreme Court for district courts regulating criminal appeals by the United States under said act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to the act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 688; U. S. C. 18, sec. 687), rules of criminal procedure prescribed by the Supreme Court for district courts governing proceedings prior to and including verdict, finding of guilty or not guilty by the court or plea of guilty (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SURVEY OF MARINE AND FRESH WATER FISHERY RESOURCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, requesting an extension of time within which to submit the report on a survey by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the marine and freshwater fishery resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Commerce.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

ACQUISITION OF INDIAN LANDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINES, ETC., FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Fort Peck project, Montana (with an accompanying paper); to the Committe on Indian Affairs.

OPERATIONS UNDER SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS ACT (S. DOC. NO. 3)

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of operations for the period July 1 to December 31, 1944, under the act approved April 5, 1944, on the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Secretary, showing credits, disbursements, and the balance on hand in the special helium-production fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RELIEF OF DESTITUTE NATIVES OF ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering expenditures made from the appropriation "Education of Natives of Alaska, 1944–1945" for the relief of destitution of natives of Alaska during the fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the receipts, expenditures,

and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the United States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC MATERIALS

A letter from the Army and Navy Munitions Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report and recommendations on stock-piling of strategic minerals and metals (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS OF FEDERAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing officers and administrative offices of the Government delinquent in rendering or transmitting their accounts to the proper offices in Washington during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, and during prior years whose delinquencies were not manifested until during the fiscal year 1944, and whether the delinquency was waived, together with a list of officers who, upon final settlement of their accounts, were found to be indebted to the Government and who failed to pay moneys into the Treasury of the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

CLAIM OF LAWRENCE MOTOR CO., INC., *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation concerning the claim of the *Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.*, v. *the United States* (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

CLAIM OF MURPHY & WISCHMEYER *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation concerning the claim of *Murphy & Wischmeyer* v. *the United States* (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

A letter from the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, transmitting, pursuant to law, his first report, as of January 1, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

A letter from the members of the Surplus Property Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report of the Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the members of the Surplus Property Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Surplus War Property Administration, Office of War Mobilization, for the period prior to the organization of the Surplus Property Board on January 2, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on recepits, expenditures, and results of cooperative agricultural extension work for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, address, and amount of compensation of each person receiving $1,000 or more under the 1943 agricultural conservation program and the 1942 crop parity payment program administered under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938, as amended, with supplemental report of payees under 1942 programs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh report of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, covering operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for that fiscal year (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

A letter from the secretary of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting certain data omitted from the fifteenth report of the Corporation transmitted to the Senate by the Chairman of the War Production Board on December 12, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 2)

A letter from the Acting Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 2, 1944, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

FURNISHING OF WAGE RECORD INFORMATION TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AGENCIES

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage-record information to State unemployment compensation agencies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the activities of the Veterans Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report covering the activities of the Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF SECTION 13 OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

A letter from the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report on the operation of section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FUNDS DERIVED FROM SALE OF BONDS BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT OF 1933

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of expenditures for the 12 months ended November 31, 1944, of funds derived from the sale of bonds under section 15c of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twenty-eighth annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the operation of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Library.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of his determinations during the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945 of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies of the Government (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

Letters with estimates of personnel requirements, transmitted, pursuant to law, by the following:

Estimates for the quarter ending March 31, 1945: Department of Justice; Department of State; Treasury Department; Department of the Interior; Department of Labor; Federal Trade Commission; Veterans Administration; Federal Communications Commission; Bureau of the Budget, of the Executive Office of the President; Office of War Information; Office of Price Administration; Smaller War Plants Corporation; Office of Strategic Services; National Housing Agency; Federal Security Agency; and American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas;

Revised estimates for the same quarter: Department of Commerce; and United States Offices of the Panama Railroad Co.; and

A revised estimate for the quarter ending December 31, 1944: Department of the Interior (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury (4), War (5), Justice (2), Post Office (4), Navy (10), Interior (2), Agriculture, and Commerce (3); Office of Defense Transportation, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Security Agency,

National Housing Agency, and War Manpower Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by New York Typographical Union No. 6, New York City, favoring amendment of the Social Security Act so as to reduce the retirement age of all workers to 60 years; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by members of the Waverly Place Methodist Sunday School of Nashville, Tenn., favoring a truce and the initiation of peace parleys; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Women's Emergency Conference, Downers Grove, Ill., favoring the making of a definite outline of the war aims of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Affairs Committee of the Colorado State Chamber of Commerce, Denver, Colo., favoring prompt ratification of a pending treaty with Mexico concerning the use of the waters of border streams; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the city council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation amending and supplementing the Federal Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as heretofore amended and supplemented, so as to include in such act authority to defray the cost of right-of-way with Federal aid funds; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA—NOTICE OF CONTEST

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter and telegram from O. E. McKaine, of Columbia, S. C., relating to his contest of the seating of OLIN D. JOHNSTON as a Senator from the State of South Carolina, which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

EFFECTS OF CEILING PRICE ON LIVE CATTLE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a telegram I have received from Gov. Andrew Schoeppel, of Kansas, protesting against the proposal of the Office of Price Administration to place a price ceiling on live cattle of $17.50 a hundred pounds.

Governor Schoeppel's protest is perfectly justified. It is not exactly clear what the O. P. A. expects to accomplish by the proposed price ceiling. One result will be to squeeze the cattle feeders in the Corn Belt between high prices paid for cattle to feed and high production costs, and the effect of the ceiling price on the prices they would receive on the cattle after feeding.

All the information I have received from the men who are in the business, and know how it is conducted, leads to the conclusion that fewer cattle will be fed to the higher weights in the feed lots.

That means that cattle which are grass-fed, from the ranges of the West and Southwest, will be sold immediately for slaughter, instead of being sold to feeders in the Corn Belt for fattening.

The War Food Administration wants to slaughter 35,000,000 head of cattle this year. But the War Food Administration wants to have about half of those animals corn-fed in order to obtain the increased tonnage of beef required for the armed forces and the civilian population.

If 15,000,000 of those animals which should be fed to increase the weights an average of 200 pounds were slaughtered as thin cattle, instead of fat cattle, it will mean 3,000,000,000 pounds less beef for the armed forces and civilians in the coming year.

I understand the War Food Administration whose personnel knows the food needs of the country for the coming year better than O. P. A., and also knows better what the loss in tonnage will be if beef animals are not fed to the higher weights, is unalterably opposed to the O. P. A.'s proposed price-ceiling order.

Thanks in large part to the O. P. A. policies of 1943 and 1944 on hogs, the supply of pork this year will be about 25 percent short. The only way the meat shortage can be made up is through feeding cattle to the heavier weights. There is plenty of feed for this purpose, thanks to huge feed-grain crops of 1944. There is need for the meat. The O. P. A. should be cooperating with the W. F. A. to get increased meat production, instead of apparently trying to get less meat. The order probably will increase the packers' profits, put many cattle feeders out of business, provide less meat for our people to eat, and demoralize the cattle industry.

I also am informed that another effect of the order, through requiring all packers to process all kinds of cattle, will hit the small packers heavily, while helping the large packers. That is not desirable.

Mr. President, I am not saying that the O. P. A. is not acting in good faith, but I am saying that, in my judgment, this order will be a great mistake. I hope that Judge Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, will take the advice of the War Food Administration and refuse to approve the order, instead of heeding the insistence of the Office of Price Administration.

The War Food Administration knows what this is all about. The Office of Price Administration, very frankly, does not.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the telegram to which I have referred, from Governor Schoeppel, and also a telegram on the same subject from J. C. Mohler, secretary of the State Board of Agriculture of Kansas.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *January 2, 1945.*

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate:

Live-cattle ceiling prices, as proposed by O. P. A., will, it seems, do two things, both deleterious, adversely affect markets for feeder cattle and result in decreased tonnage of beef by shipping of lightweight cattle for slaughter. With abundance of feeds that can be marketed in no other way except on the hoof, stockmen should be permitted to feed out and market fat cattle for maximum production. The bane of the livestock industry is uncertainty occasioned by such proposals as this of O. P. A., which disrupts long-established practices and long-range plans that the beef industry must operate under. The nature of the business is such that it cannot quickly adjust without demoralization and loss. If proposed ceiling prices are designed to increase tonnage of beef being offered retailers by packers in metropolitan centers, it is manifestly unfair to arbitrarily set figures that makes it impossible for producers to complete present feedings at a profit.

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Governor of Kansas.

TOPEKA, KANS., *December 31, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Proposed O. P. A. ceiling prices on live cattle will seriously affect feeders who in good faith stocked their feed lots this fall and will impair the war effort for maximum beef production, because cattlemen won't know what to expect next in way of Bureau directives. This uncertainty is utterly demoralizing to a business that can operate only on long-time schedules. The Government needs a definite long-time policy that fits the character of the cattle industry and which will challenge its capacity to produce.

J. C. MOHLER.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have before me a communication from the public service committee of the advisory council to the mayor of Milwaukee, addressed to the advisory council to the mayor of Milwaukee, together with a copy of a resolution which has been recommended for adoption by the advisory council to the mayor of Milwaukee. The purpose of the resolution is to aid "in the passage of Federal legislation which will bring about immediate consideration of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project." I ask unanimous consent that the communication and the recommended resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the communication and recommended resolution were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 29, 1944.

To the Advisory Council to the Mayor of Milwaukee.

GENTLEMEN: The public service committee of the advisory council was directed on Wednesday, January 12, 1944, to review and make recommendations relevant to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and its relative potentialities to the port of Milwaukee, and to make recommendations to bring about its realization if the project were in keeping with the best interest of the city of Milwaukee.

Your committee has diligently pursued its assignment. It has reviewed the history of the controversy which dates back to the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It has reviewed the opinions of the various Great Lakes port authorities. Your committee has also collected the statements and opinions of the United States Senators and Congressmen who have given their expressions to this enterprise. They have also interviewed several Members of Congress.

Your committee has also considered the expressions of various interested parties representing industry, labor, transportation (both maritime and rail), local and State officials and the military and naval departments of the Federal Government. Your committee has taken full cognizance of the more than four decades of controversy during which the people of both the United States and Canada, and especially in the regions of the Great Lakes and upper Mississippi Valley have been evaluating the benefits of bringing the ocean to the doorway of the Middle West.

The proposed St. Lawrence seaway project consists of—

(1) Twenty-seven-foot navigation in reaches of the St. Lawrence River where shipping is now restricted to vessels which can use 14-foot canals, enabling ocean cargo vessels to reach all Great Lakes ports.

(2) Two million two hundred thousand horsepower of the most economical power on the continent, to be developed at the navigation dam in the International Rapids section of the river. Half of this power will belong to the United States and half to Canada.

(3) The net cost to the United States of providing oceangoing navigation into the Great Lakes after deducting what the State of New York would pay for power development will not exceed $200,000,000, which includes 25 percent for contingency. These estimates are from the United States Army engineers.

The current motivating force now sponsoring this project centers around the enabling legislation known as the Aiken-Pittenger bill (S. 1385) jointly introduced by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, and Congressman PITTENGER, of Minnesota. Much of the discussion in Congress evolves around the issue whether the act should be consummated by treaty which requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate or by Executive agreement which requires a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

The committee is of the opinion that the St. Lawrence seaway should not be viewed as a narrow and sectional demand. What is good for the Great Lakes region is good for the Nation as a whole. If the prosperity and commerce of the Great Lakes region recognize the economic benefit of projects such as the T. V. A., Boulder Dam, and Grand Coulee, which we have helped to finance, we ask that other parts of the Nation recognize the national benefits to be derived from the St. Lawrence project.

The committee is convinced that had the St. Lawrence seaway been available at the opening of World War No. 2, the military efforts of the United States and Canada would have been far more effective and the war could have been undoubtedly shortened. Despite the fine harbors, the great industrial plants, and the shipbuilding equipment of this area, less than 2 percent of the tonnage constructed in the United States has been built in the Great Lakes Basin. Had the seaway been available, 10,000 cruisers and Liberty ships could have been constructed in sheltered Great Lakes harbors and sent directly into service. Great economies in the national-defense efforts could have been achieved through mass movement of raw materials and finished equipment via the seaway. The future safety of our country requires that national defense industries be located in interior areas, and this further emphasizes the need of the seaway for mass transportation of raw materials and finished goods. Stock piles of strategic materials could be concentrated in Great Lakes harbors if the seaway were open to permit their movement in mass quantity.

The committee is of the opinion that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway during the immediate post-war period will aid in providing tens of thousands of jobs in useful and productive work and the favorable economic effects of the seaway will undoubtedly create thousands of additional jobs in harbor cities of the Great Lakes region. The project, therefore, is a necessity to assure full revival of post-war employment.

The committee concludes, and is unanimous in its opinion, that the St. Lawrence seaway will be a great and lasting benefit to the United States of America and to each and every portion thereof; that the areas of and adjacent to the Great Lakes and the upper Mississippi Valley will be benefited by having a sea road and removing its present landlocked limitations; that the port of Milwaukee and its metropolitan area will be afforded immeasurable foreign-trade opportunities. It will benefit through the removal of restraints upon the transportation of raw materials and products by excessive freight charges. It presents great possibilities for shipbuilding and drydock facilities in this area. It will provide full use of our natural harbor. It will provide efficiency in distribution for our commerce on a world-wide competitive basis. It will provide Milwaukee with new employment and economic benefits in this city's position as one of the outstanding ports of a territory which is considered the industrial and agricultural heart of the Nation.

The committee therefore concludes and unanimously recommends that the advisory council to the mayor of Milwaukee adopt the resolution.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMITTEE,
B. H. BARG, *Chairman.*
ARTHUR G. APLIN, *Vice Chairman.*
HARRY SCHACHTSCHNEIDER.
WALDEMAR STECHER.
O. V. HANSEN.
CHAS. E. BALDWIN.
CHESTER V. SALOMON, *Ex Officio.*

Be it resolved, That the advisory council to the mayor of the city of Milwaukee hereby endorses without reservation the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and recommends that the Honorable John L. Bohn, mayor of Milwaukee, shall exercise the authority and influence of his office to aid in bringing about enabling legislation in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the interested Senators and Congressmen be advised of this action and that they be encouraged to exercise the authority of their office in consummating this project, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this report and resolution be printed and be placed in the hands of the delegates to the advisory council and other interested parties for the purpose of aiding in the passage of Federal legislation which will bring about immediate consideration of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMITTEE,
B. H. BARG, *Chairman.*
ARTHUR G. APLIN, *Vice Chairman.*
HARRY SCHACHTSCHNEIDER.
WALDEMAR STECHER.
O. V. HANSEN.
CHAS. E. BALDWIN.
CHESTER V. SALOMON, *Ex-officio.*

PART-TIME EMPLOYEES OF COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate reports in response to Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-eighth Congress, relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, agreed to August 23, 1944, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 6, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of Department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John F. Feeney	1425 Rhode Island Ave. NW	General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.	$6,400
Harold E. Merrick	966 Aspen St. NW	do	4,800
Thomas J. Scott	3500 14th St. NW	Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.	4,800
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave	District of Columbia government	3,500

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Acting Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

JANUARY 3, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of Department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Theodore B. Stothart	3801 Fourth St. SE	War Department, Adjutant General's Office	$1,800
Amy J. Tishendorf	4434 First St. NE	War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief of Staff.	2,000
Col. Lewis Sanders	1911 R St. NW	War Department	6,000
Col. David A. Watt	Clinton, Md	do	6,000

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS, *Chairman.*

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

JANUARY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of Department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Boyce, Virginia W	3810 W St. SE., Washington, D. C	Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C	$1,800
Gertler, Ann S	5721 35th St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Heslep, Hope C	2 East Maple St., Alexandria, Va	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C	2,000
Larson, C. Theodore	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C	5,600
Manuel, Fritzie P	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C	3,800
McConkey, Darel	R. F. D. Box 153, Alexandria, Va	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	4,600
Moen, Cora L	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	2,000
Oleksy, Elizabeth H	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,600
Rosenberger, Francis C	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	4,600
Schimmel, Herbert	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington D. C	8,000

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
January 1, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.
By CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Charles A. Murray,
Executive Secretary.

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Kurt Borchardt	6007 34th Pl. NW., Washington, D. C	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington D. C	$5,600
Ann Cheatham	4000 South Capitol St. SE., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Bertram M. Gross	613 South Quincy St., Arlington, Va	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	6,500
Doris Phippen	40 Plattsburg Court NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,100
Omer Regnier	209 Franklin Ave., Silver Spring, Md	Farm Security Administration, Washington, D. C	3,800
Edna Rubin	1243 Holbrook Terrace NE., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	2,300

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

JANUARY 2, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of Department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (AA), U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	1,512

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

JANUARY 2, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of Department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	5305 41st St. NW., Washington, D. C	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$2,400
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,400
Yeoman (2d cl) Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2134 R St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	1,152
Yeoman (2d cl) Loretto F. Jochman, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	1,152

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on Naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

DECEMBER 28, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis J. Meyerle	612 Bennington Drive, Silver Spring, Md	Veterans Administration	$5,060

JAMES M. TUNNELL, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

December 31, 1944.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum).

CARL A. HATCH,
Chairman.

Memorandum from Senator MCCARRAN, chairman, Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration and Use of Certain Public Lands.

To: Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The following persons are detailed from the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, to assist with the work of the above subcommittee:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF–12; basic salary, $5,000 per year.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk CAF–5; basic salary, $2,000 per year.

DECEMBER 31, 1944.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY
PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
January 2, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name an . address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

By DEWEY ANDERSON,
Executive Secretary.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

JANUARY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December 1944, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of Department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Cheney, Brainard	3418 Highwood Drive SE., Washington, D. C	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C	$6,500
Crivella, Agnes E	1408 Buchanan St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,700
Devitt, Emerald G	2425 27th St. South, Arlington, Va	do	2,000
Digges, Elsie A	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C	do	1,800
Evans, Harry J	3010 Gainsville St. SE., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	6,500
Forbes, F. Preston	510 Four Mile Rd., Alexandria, Va	Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C	4,600
Fuller, Carol M	2101 S St. NW., Washington, D. C	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	2,100
Gray, Scott K., Jr	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	4,600
Groeper, Stella J	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,600
Heckard, Dorothy M	Shreve Rd., Falls Church, Va	do	2,000
Kimball, Kathleen	1701 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000
Lucas, Elizabeth P	1730 North Quincy St., Arlington, Va	do	1,800
Miller, Lois M	3120 Massachusetts Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	do	2,600
Nelson, John W	1445 Ogden St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	5,600
O'Mullane, Vernice M	Alcott Hall, Washington, D. C	do	1,620
Purdy, Grace F	230 Rhode Island Ave. NE., Washington, D. C	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C	3,200
Silverman, Arthur G	719 D St. NE., Washington, D. C	do	5,600
Soule, Lt. (Jr. Gr.), George H	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	2,000
Spicer, Lillian Evelyn	1433 Decatur St. NW., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	2,600
Steckman, Frederick W	4000 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	4,600
Strubel, Margie L	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	1,800
Thurman, Allen G	201 E. Shepherd St., Chevy Chase, Md	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	6,500
Van Tassel, Alfred J	1622 Mount Eagle Pl., Alexandria, Va	War Production Board, Washington, D. C	6,500
Yelencsics, Olga	2400 13th St. NW., Washington, D. C	do	2,000

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 2, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3. A bill to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 4. A bill to enact the Aviation Salvage at Sea Convention into statute law in the United States;

S. 5. A bill authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; and

S. 6. A bill to provide adequate aeronautical training for the youth of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 7. A bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 8. A bill to provide for the use of 10 percent of the receipts from national forests for the making of range improvements within such forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 9. A bill providing for the reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce several bills dealing with some of the problems mentioned in the President's message of today regarding free enterprise and free opportunity. One bill deals with cartels, and another deals with corporations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills introduced by the Senator from Wyoming will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 10. A bill providing for the issuance of certificates of statutory compliance with certain national standards to certain corporations and trade associations engaged in or affecting commerce; and

S. 11. A bill to protect the foreign relations and to promote the trade and commerce of the United States, to require the

disclosure to the United States of information affecting such trade and commerce, and to safeguard the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 12. A bill to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 13. A bill to provide for the replanning and rebuilding of slum, blighted, and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such areas in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease, and for other purposes;

S. 14. A bill to create the National Capital Metropolitan Water Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 15. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia," approved January 30, 1925 (43 Stat. 798, ch. 115, Public Law 348, 68th Cong., 2d sess.);

S. 16. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; and

S. 17. A bill to prohibit the issuance of alcoholic beverage licenses in certain localities in the District of Columbia, to prohibit advertising the price of such beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 18. A bill to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, and for other purposes;

S. 19. A bill to provide for Senate ratification of foreign trade agreements;

S. 20. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; and

S. 21. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code by providing a deferred maintenance deduction for carriers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 22. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 23. A bill providing for the transfer to the reclamation fund and waiving of interest upon Government-owned bonds, notes, and other obligations of drainage, irrigation, and reclamation districts;

S. 24. A bill for the relief of the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District;

S. 25. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation;

S. 26. A bill to permit defendants to waive prosecution by indictment;

S. 27. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; and

S. 28. A bill to incorporate the American Women's Voluntary Services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 29. A bill to provide for loans to enable veterans of World War No. 2 to pay debts existing at the date of their discharge from the service; and

S. 30. A bill to provide for the issuance of awards for service in the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 31. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act for the purpose of providing for greater participation by district advisory boards in administration of the act;

S. 32. A bill relating to certain lands released to the United States by carriers by railroad pursuant to section 321 (b) of the Transportation Act of 1940; and

S. 33. A bill relating to the management and administration of national forest grazing lands; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 34. A bill to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. BAILEY also introduced Senate bill 35, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. BAILEY (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 36. A bill to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 37. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] wished to be present today, but he is snowbound in western New York. He has requested me to introduce several bills, for appropriate reference, in his behalf.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills introduced by the Senator from New York for his colleague [Mr. MEAD] will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. WAGNER (for Mr. MEAD):

S. 38. A bill for the relief of Marlin-Rockwell Corporation with respect to the jurisdiction of the Tax Court of the United States to redetermine its excessive profits for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1942, subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 39. A bill establishing wage differential for leadingmen and quartermen at all naval establishments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 40. A bill to increase the compensation of employees in the Postal Service; and

S. 41. A bill to extend to assistant postmasters and supervisory employees of the field service of the Postal Service overtime payments for services performed daily in excess of 8 hours; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 43. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, New York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 44. A bill to provide for the cancelation of certain notes acquired by the Farm Credit Administration as a result of the activities of the Federal Farm Board; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 45. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alphonsine Nordgren; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 46. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, to provide for the appointment of five additional inspectors, and to provide for adjustments in salaries; and

S. 47. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 48. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark the honorary burial places of deceased members of the armed forces who are buried at sea, in foreign lands, or at unknown places; and

S. 49. A bill to amend the acts authorizing the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the armed forces, so as to provide that such payments shall not be less than $1,000 in any case; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 50. A bill to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 51. A bill to provide for conveying to the State of Montana, for public-park purposes, certain lands near the city of Havre, Mont., known as the Beaver Creek Park; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 52. A bill authorizing conveyance of the Seger Indian School to Colony Union Graded School District No. 1, Colony, Okla.;

S. 53. A bill for the relief of the Cherokee Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; and

S. 54. A bill to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes, and to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 55. A bill for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims;

S. 56. A bill relating to the acquisition and use of certain motor vehicles by the various agencies of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 57. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia; to the Committee on Claims;

S. 58. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 59. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zamora; Mrs. Antonio Zamora; Antonio Zamora, Jr.; Mrs. Juan Chavez; John Chavez, Jr.; Roland Chavez; Selso Trujillo; and Dr. M. G. Wright; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 60. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Harding, Colfax, and Mora Counties, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 61. A bill providing for the incorporation of the Federated Organizations for Bataan Relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 62. A bill to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to permit exemption of security issues not exceeding $300,000 from the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 63. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial, cultural, or educational programs; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 64. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert B. Linsey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 65. A bill repealing subsection (c) of section 1001 of the Revenue Act of 1932, relating to the determination of the class of post offices; and

S. 66. A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain classes of unsolicited merchandise; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 67. A bill to authorize the participation of States in certain revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas under the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; and

S. 68. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 69. A bill for the relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.;

S. 70. A bill for the relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz;

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Ruiz; and

S. 72. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ruiz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 73. A bill to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; and

S. 74. A bill to provide for the formulation of a national fertilizer policy and program; as a step in said program, to provide for adequate reserves for a phosphate plant heretofore authorized for construction at or near Mobile, Ala.; to specify certain policies for the public operation of said plant and to provide a basis for its operation by private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 75. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Locke;

S. 76. A bill for the relief of John T. Cooper;

S. 77. A bill for the relief of Lindon A. Long;

S. 78. A bill for the relief of Frances Eubanks Oates;

S. 79. A bill for the relief of J. H. Kerr; and

S. 80. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hal S. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 81. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for the establishment of a uniform classification and uniform scale of class rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; and

S. 82. A bill to supplement the national transportation policy and to aid in achieving such policy; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 83. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Jefferson County, Ala.;

S. 84. A bill to provide for a Department of Armed Forces, Secretary of the Armed Forces, Under Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air, and for other purposes; and

S. 85. A bill to provide for universal service and total mobilization during any war in which the United States is now engaged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 86. A bill to authorize a payment to the widow and minor children of the late Commander Howard W. Gilmore, United States Navy, as a token of the appreciation of the people of the United States for his heroic sacrifice of his life; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 87. A bill granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. MEAD):

S. 88. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of clarifying its provisions with respect to its application to certain officers in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill dealing with the planning of rural electrification projects, and for other purposes, and request unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the appropriate standing committee, and that a copy thereof be referred to the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, the chairman of which is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois will be received and appropriately referred, and a copy thereof will be referred to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, as requested.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 89. A bill to provide for the planning of rural electrification projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 90. A bill for the relief of Della O'Hara; and

S. 91. A bill for the relief of the village of Stone Park, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 92. A bill relating to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Marggraf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 94. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, to certain employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 95. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; and

S. 96. A bill for the relief of Annie L. Nesbitt and others; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. WILLIS:

S. 97. A bill to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 98. A bill to provide for the replanning of blighted and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such areas in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease, and for other purposes; and

S. 99. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia for use by the Children's Museum of Washington, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 100. A bill to authorize an exchange of certain lands with William W. Kiskadden in connection with the Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. AIKEN) introduced Senate bill 101, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 102. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil service status under such act; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. TAFT also introduced Senate bills 103 and 104, which were referred to the appropriate committees, and appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 105. A bill to amend Public Law 603 (77th Cong., 2d sess., ch. 404), which is entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes"; and

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. SCRUGHAM:)

S. 106. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 107. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines caused to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 108. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh judicial district;

S. 109 (by request). A bill to create a board to be known as the National Symphony Orchestra Trust Fund Board, to define the duties of said Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

S. 110. A bill to incorporate the American Veterans Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 111. A bill to revise the method of determining the payments to be made by the United States to the several States with respect to conservation lands administered by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 112. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 113. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the provisions of a contract for the purchase of a power plant for use in connection with the San Carlos irrigation project; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 114. A bill authorizing payments to San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry; and

S. 115. A bill to modify section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to certain funds collected in connection with the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 116. A bill to confer authority on the Secretary of the Interior with regard to certain reclamation repayment contracts; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 117. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nellie L. Fickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 118. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Gila reclamation project, Arizona, to the University of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, I introduce 12 bills for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills introduced by the Senator from Mississippi will be received and referred to the appropriate committees.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 119. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

S. 120. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia;

S. 121. A bill to redefine the powers and duties of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, to establish a Department of Public Welfare, and for other purposes;

S. 122. A bill to amend an Act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets, of the Dis-

trict of Columbia; and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1921, as amended;

S. 123. A bill to amend section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended;

S. 124. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia', approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes", approved June 4, 1924;

S. 125. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds collected by District of Columbia examining, licensing, and other boards and commissions, and for other purposes;

S. 126. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Metropolitan Police Department Band, District of Columbia, and to provide funds therefor; and

S. 127. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for better registration of births in the District of Columbia and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 128. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength", approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306); and

S. 129. A bill to remove certain restrictions relating to the appointment of retired commissioned officers to civilian positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 130. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 131. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the United States fish hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon;

S. 132. A bill to authorize the payment of a maintenance allowance to the owner of a bridge over the Columbia River for navigation facilities not required; and

S. 133. A bill to authorize completion of alterations to a bridge over the Columbia River, made necessary by Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 134. A bill for the relief of Ida E. Laurie and Zella Rickard;

S. 135. A bill for the relief of the Aetna Insurance Co.;

S. 136. A bill for the relief of the Oregon Caves Resort; and

S. 137. A bill for the relief of the Contracting & Sales Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 138. A bill granting a pension to Frank P. Tebbetts; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 139. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of an additional military academy and an additional naval academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 140. A bill providing for the adjudication of entitlement to disability compensation and other benefits before discharge from the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUFFEY (for himself and Mr. MYERS):

S. 141. A bill to clarify the law relating to the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 142. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army, with accompanying papers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 143. A bill to provide that commissioned and warrant officers placed in St. Elizabeths Hospital or certain United States Public Health Service hospitals shall be liable to pay such rate per day as may be prescribed from time to time by the President, and to authorize the heads of the several agencies to deduct such sum from their pay and to transmit it to St. Elizabeths Hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 144. A bill for the relief of M. E. Cafferata and John Granata; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 145. A bill creating an Office of Naval Research, Development, and Patents in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. SCRUGHAM and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 146. A bill authorizing the promotion of Rear Admiral Harold Gardiner Bowen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 147. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Russel-Majors-Waddell National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution establishing a committee to provide for the formation of a Pan-American Legislative Union; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution providing for awards of honor for agricultural production; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in Springerville, Ariz., of a memorial to Gustav Becker; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution urging the institution of Americans-All—Immigrants-All program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on the Library.

NATIONAL AIRPORT PROGRAM

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced provides for a national airport system and program throughout the United States. It is the result of a study which has been the subject of much consideration by those who are interested in aviation in America. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an explanatory statement bearing on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The bill I have just introduced provides for a national airport program upon which $1,000,000,000 would be expended by the Federal, State, and local Governments. This program would allow construction or improvement of the 6,000 airports which the Civil Aeronautics Administrator's recent national airport plan has announced as necessary for post-war aviation's needs. Such an airport program would give civil aviation a real chance to expand rapidly after the war and would, in addition, provide a ready-made public-works program of Nation-wide proportions which can be undertaken immediately after the end of the war so as to provide thousands of jobs for war workers during the period of reconversion from war work to civilian industry.

This bill effects a compromise between those who advocate an airport program on a Federal-State basis and those who support the Federal-city basis which has been used so successfully in developing in this country the greatest system of civil airports in the world. It is my thought that we should not be too hasty in wholly discarding the successful Federal-city basis of the past, and that it will take some time for the States who have done relatively little airport work up to the present time to secure the necessary legislation and financing for such a substantial program. I have accordingly divided the program one-half to the States and one-half to cities and counties. This is accomplished by assigning to States the the construction of small airports with the larger airports to be handled on a Federal-city basis.

I have given attention to the airport problems of this Nation for many years and have introduced legislation upon various phases of this subject on several occasions in the past. The present bill may require extensive change to meet the present airport needs of the Nation. I ask all who are interested in airports to give this bill their earnest study to the end that the Congress may formulate legislation which will best serve the public interest of this great Nation. Any suggestions, criticisms, ideas, or proposals which are forwarded to me will receive my most careful consideration.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 2: The definitions are intended to avoid unnecessary repetition in the body of the bill of the meaning intended by the use of certain terms. It is believed that each definition clearly expresses the connotation intended by its use so individual definitions will not be explained in detail here.

Section 3: The "airport service" provided in this section gives definite statutory recognition to this most important part of C. A. A.'s work.

Section 4: This section gives the C. A. A. Administrator the necessary power to make grants of Federal funds to the States and cities for airport development. The program is divided equally on a Federal-city and a Federal-State basis by the creation of a "State program" and an "urban program."

Section 5: Authorizes a Federal appropriation of $100,000,000 per year for 5 years, which when matched by an equal amount of State and city funds, will provide the billion dollars needed to carry out C. A. A.'s national airport plan. I realize that technically the C. A. A. plan calls for a slightly different amount but believe that we can amend this figure to conform to the C. A. A.'s plan before final adoption of this legislation. I also provide for a 5-year program instead of the 10-year program recommended by C. A. A., as I firmly believe that the sooner we get this program completed, the faster our civil aviation industry will grow. We should push rather than delay civil aviation so our Nation

may speedily enjoy the great benefits of air travel. In allocating 50 percent of the program to the urban program and 50 percent to the State program, I again realize that the C. A. A. figures are slightly different and again state that such technical changes in amount as seems desirable can be inserted later. The $3,000,000 appropriation for preliminary planning and surveys is made immediately available, as I believe that such work should start at the earliest possible moment so as to have this program ready to go at once upon the end of the war. I have used the acceleration provision adopted in the post-war highway legislation so that the airport program can start even before the technical end of the war if such seems desirable.

Section 6: This section provides the legislative basis for the preparation and constant revision of a national airport plan. This plan will be the basis of all airport development work upon which Federal funds are expended.

Section 7: By this section the C. A. A. is required to specify all projects which are to be developed in the urban program in a request to the Congress for funds with which to carry out this part of the national airport program. This gives the Congress an opportunity to review the Administrator's determination. The funds not appropriated in the urban program are then to go to the State program.

Section 8: Apportions the Federal airport aid funds among the States, one-half on the basis of population, one-half on the basis of area.

Section 9: This section covers submission and approval of projects in the State and urban programs. It contains authorization for public agencies other than States to sponsor projects in the State program if the State is unable or unwilling to go forward. Subsection (b) contains a provision designed to eliminate the "land grab" motive by requiring that no project shall be approved unless the site for the airport is wholly owned by a State or a public agency.

Section 10: Provides the procedure for payment of Federal funds to States and cities for airport work undertaken pursuant to the bill.

Section 11: This section, covering method of construction, minimum wages and minimum hours, and provision giving employment preference to veterans and to local residents, is self-explanatory.

Section 12: The various requirements for eligibility of States as set up in this section are suspended for a period of 3 years in order that the States will have an opportunity to adopt the necessary legislation for participation in the program and in order that the States may have time within which to work out the necessary financial problems involved in raising the necessary State funds for this program. During this 3-year period any project in the State program may be sponsored by any public agency in the same manner as projects are to be sponsored under the urban program. This means that a State having funds to expend on one airport project can sponsor that project. A city wishing to sponsor an airport project which is within the State program may do that during this 3-year period. Existing State airport laws would be utilized by the State and cities so that the airport program can go forward at once rather than wait for the adoption of new State laws and the raising of State funds to conform to the program proposed in this bill.

Section 13: The project sponsorship provisions are in general believed to be reasonable although a reasonable attitude by the C. A. A. Administrator is required on the accounting provisions.

The provision on maintenance is believed to be a proper one from a safety viewpoint.

Section 14: I understand that some States and cities have trouble acquiring land for airport purposes under their existing condemnation laws. This provision makes Federal condemnation powers available to State and cities but only upon their specific request.

Section 15: The provisions for use of Government-owned land are in substance the same as those found in similar legislation.

Section 16: The section on reimbursement for damage to public airports by the Army or Navy is believed to be a proper and desirable one. It is my understanding that neither the Army or Navy now have funds available for this purpose and in reason they should have. The C. A. A. is best able to evaluate the amount of such damage.

Sections 17 to 20: These sections on reporting to Congress, false statements, the existing airport programs, and the effective date of the legislation are self-explanatory.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors. The bill was prepared by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is absent, but who requested me to present it. But I am informed that he has not as yet taken the oath. Therefore, I will send the bill forward in my name, with the understanding that the name of the Senator from Louisiana may be inserted as the introducer and author of the bill, whenever he returns to the city and takes the oath.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat his statement of the subject matter of the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. It is the old river and harbor bill, somewhat changed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Carolina will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce a bill on fair employment practices.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In connection with the bill which I have just introduced, I should like to make a brief statement. I shall detain the Senate only for a moment.

In today's message on the state of the Union, from the President to the Congress, the President made the following observation:

> In the state of the Union message last year, I set forth what I considered to be an American economic bill of rights.
>
> I said then, and I say now, that these economic truths represent a second bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

Further, Mr. President when the Democratic National Convention was held at Chicago, Ill., the following resolution, among others, was adopted:

> We assert that mankind believes in the "four freedoms."
>
> We believe that the country which has the greatest measure of social justice is capable of the greatest achievements.
>
> We believe that racial and religious minorities have the right to live, develop, and vote equally with all citizens and share the rights that are guaranteed by our Constitution. Congress should exert its full constitutional powers to protect those rights.

Mr. President, when the Republican National Convention was held at Chicago, Ill., the following resolution relating to the matter of fair employment practices was adopted:

> We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

During the campaign both candidates for the office of President of the United States spoke in favor of a permanent fair employment practice committee. I know there are millions of persons in the United States who would like to have the Congress take appropriate action, and who feel that those pronouncements by the conventions representing the two great political parties of the country and the corresponding statements made by the candidates were not merely political oratory. I hope that in the near future the Senate will take action on the bill I have just introduced.

The bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. AIKEN), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REDUCTION OF DEPOSIT INSURANCE PREMIUMS UNDER NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the National Housing Act by reducing the insurance premiums to be paid for deposit insurance by building and loan associations throughout the Nation. The rate at the present time is one-eighth of 1 percent, and this bill reduces this rate to the same rate which is now paid by banks, namely, one-twelfth of 1 percent.

The experience of building and loan associations during the past 10 years amply justifies this reduction.

The bill also provides that hereafter no dividends shall be paid on the stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Dividends which have already accrued are ultimately to be paid.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 103) amending the National Housing Act with respect to dividends and insurance premiums, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REIMBURSEMENT OF PROPERTY OWNERS FOR WAR DAMAGE IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for prompt reimbursement to property owners in the Philippine Islands for loss or damage resulting from enemy attack, including loss or damage caused by American or Allied forces in expelling the enemy from the Philippine Islands. This would include damage from any Japanese scorched-earth policy as the Japanese forces retreat.

This result is to be accomplished by providing automatic insurance for war damage through the War Damage Corporation. Federal insurance laws already cover damage suffered prior to July 1, 1942, but after that time payment of premiums became impossible because of Japanese occupation and there is no way in which losses can be reimbursed. The War Damage Corporation has about $220,000,000 in unencumbered cash from premiums collected and it is estimated that the property loss in the Philippines will be less than this amount.

By giving the job to the War Damage Corporation it is hoped that factories, sugar mills, mines, and other activities may be immediately rebuilt so that the economic life of the Philippine people can be promptly resumed. If the matter were left for the usual post-war settlement through the filing of damage claims, it would probably drag along for many years. The War Damage Corporation, operated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is expected to handle claims as promptly as private fire-insurance companies, sending its agents with the occupying armies.

The bill does not include reimbursement for public property, which will be the subject of negotiation with the Philippine government, nor does it include reimbursement of property owned by aliens or alien companies. No reimbursement is to be made to Filipinos who are found to have collaborated with the enemy.

I believe that the Philippines are a part of the United States and entitled to the same reimbursement for war damage as if their citizens had been able to insure their property.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 104) further amending section 5 (g) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, relating to the War Damage Corporation, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF INSURANCE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution directing the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to explore the entire question of coverage, benefits, and taxes in respect to social security, contemplating in that connection the creation of an advisory council for the assistance of the joint committee in its very important work. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Finance Committee.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of old-age and survivors insurance, under the Social Security Act, in respect to coverage, benefits, and taxes related thereto. The joint committee shall report to the Congress not later than October 1, 1945, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

SEC. 2. The joint committee is hereby authorized, in its discretion, to appoint an advisory committee of individuals having special knowledge concerning matters involved in its study and investigation to assist, consult with, and advise the joint committee with respect to such study and investigation. Members of the advisory committee shall not receive any compensation for their services as such members, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in connection with the performance of the work of the advisory committee.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties under this resolution, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the joint committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman.

INTERROGATION BY THE SENATE OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—AMENDMENT OF THE RULES

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 7), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That rule X of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"3. There shall be held in the Senate on at least 1 day in each period of 2 calendar weeks, but not oftener than 1 day in any 1 calendar week, a 'report and question period,' which shall not consume more than 2 hours, during which heads of departments, agencies, and independent establishments in the executive branch of the Government are requested to answer orally written and oral questions propounded by Members of the Senate. Each written question shall be submitted in triplicate to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such question, and, if approved by such committee, one copy shall be transmitted to the head of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, with an invitation to appear before the Senate, and one copy to the Committee on Rules with a request for allotment of time in a report-and-question period to answer such question. Subject to the limitations prescribed in this paragraph, the Committtee on Rules shall determine the time for, and the length of time of, each report and question period, and shall allot the time in each period to the head of a department, agency, or independent establishment who has indicated his readiness to deliver oral answers to the questions transmitted to him. All written questions to be propounded in any one period shall be approved by one committee. With the consent of the committee which has approved the written questions to be propounded in any period, the head of a department, agency, or independent establishment may designate to represent him in such period the head of a principal division of such department, agency, or independent establishment, and, in the case of a department, the head thereof may designate the Under Secretary or an Assistant Secretary of such Department. The latter half of each period shall be reserved for oral questions by Members of the Senate and answers thereto, one-half of such time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee which has approved the written questions propounded in such period and one-half by the ranking minority member of such committee. Each oral question shall be germane or relevant to the subject matter of at least one of the written questions propounded in such period; and all questions of relevancy of questions under this paragraph, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate. The time of each report and question period and the written questions to be answered in such period shall be printed in two daily editions of the RECORD appearing before the day on which such period is to be held, and the proceedings during such period shall be printed in the RECORD for such day."

SEC. 2. Rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Any person who is to answer questions during a report-and-question period held under paragraph 3 of rule X shall be admitted for such period."

STATEMENT OF PEACE AIMS

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 8), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States, in order to affirm our faith in the uncompromised principles of the Atlantic Charter, and in the integrity of its coauthors and 35 or more signatories, and in order that the ideals which sustain and guide our role in the present conflict shall continue to strengthen a victorious hope in the hearts of the suffering peoples of the world, a noble magnanimity of purpose within the United Nations, and an enduring bulwark of unity among the people of these United States; and in order to avert the further loss of the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys as well as those of our Allies, the wastage of our natural resources and the further break-down of the moral fiber of our people.

Proposes the following statement of peace aims believing them to represent the aspirations of the American people and the essential features of a just and lasting peace:

1. The adoption of a universal bill of rights to safeguard the inalienable rights of every individual regardless of race, class, or religious belief.

2. The assured survival and extension of democratic principles and institutions and the preservation here of our American way of life.

3. The immediate creation of a United Nations political council to provide for the democratic settlement, in harmony with the

principles of the Atlantic Charter, of territorial questions that have arisen in Europe and that may arise elsewhere.

4. Free plebiscites under international supervision in all liberated countries to choose their own form of government and leadership, the time and procedure to be determined by the United Nations political council.

5. The immediate creation of a United Nations economic and social council "to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security."

6. With a view to assuring the security of all nations, large or small, victor or vanquished, and promoting the earliest possible peace and rehabilitation of Europe and the world, the United States Senate favors the creation of a general federation of European nations at the earliest possible date, within which disarmament and economic unification will be combined with sovereign equality and cultural self-determination.

AUTHORIZATION FOR STANDING COMMITTEES TO HOLD HEARINGS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I send forward a resolution in the usual form, giving the Committee on Commerce power to take evidence and subpena witnesses.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In connection with the resolution of the Senator from North Carolina, authorizing the Commerce Committee to employ a stenographer to take testimony, I should like to make the suggestion that it has been customary at the beginning of each session of Congress for the chairman of each standing committee to offer a separate resolution granting such authority. It occurred to me that if one resolution were offered authorizing each committee to employ a stenographer, there would be a considerable saving. Upon inquiry of the printing clerk, I find that it will save approximately $700. For that reason, I should like to offer a consolidated resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thought the Senator from North Carolina had concluded.

Mr. BAILEY. I yielded to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I have referred be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina object to having the resolution read?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 9), as follows:

Resolved, That from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, each standing committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000 for each committee) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me inquire whether I am correct in my understanding from what the Senator has said that the resolution is simply a consolidation of all resolutions of like purpose which usually are submitted by the chairmen of the several committees of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly correct.

For the further information of the Senate, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a tabulation of the amounts expended for hearings by standing committees during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to December 31, 1944.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amounts expended for hearings by standing committees during the Seventy-eighth Congress to Dec. 31, 1944

Agriculture and Forestry	$1,882.50
Appropriations	12,431.80
Audit and Control Contingent Expenses of the Senate	62.37
Banking and Currency [1]	7,079.89
Civil Service	678.04
Claims	None
Commerce	7,096.91
District of Columbia	1,371.95
Education and Labor	1,828.13
Enrolled Bills	None
Expenditures in the Executive Departments	223.30
Finance	3,595.78
Foreign Relations	1,626.74
Immigration	297.07
Indian Affairs	519.04
Interoceanic Canals	None
Interstate Commerce	6,857.52
Irrigation and Reclamation	506.61
Judiciary	2,491.91
Library	None
Manufactures	None
Military Affairs	9,768.82
Mines and Mining	371.53
Naval Affairs	1,758.55
Patents	270.90
Pensions	46.37
Post Offices and Post Roads	393.75
Printing	84.24
Privileges and Elections	759.38
Public Buildings and Grounds	243.43
Public Lands and Surveys	376.84
Rules	19.25
Territories and Insular Affairs	2,000.12
Total	74,642.74

[1] Includes services of clerk.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me inquire why the date fixed in the resolution is February 1. Has provision already been made for the operations of committees up to that time?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; such provision has been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Arizona.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY subsequently said: In view of the fact that the Senate has agreed to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution which I submitted in behalf of the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from North Carolina is withdrawn.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS, COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 10), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be, and it is hereby authorized to employ during the Seventy-ninth Congress an assistant clerk and an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rates, respectively, of $3,600 and $1,800 per annum.

CONTINUATION OF WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That, effective February 1, 1945, the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 198, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944, and Senate Resolution 288, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 25, 1944 (authorizing the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs to investigate war contracts, termination of war contracts and related problems), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES—RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 12), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the standing rules of the Senate be, and they are hereby, amended by adding after rule XX a new rule, relating to river and harbor projects, as follows:

"Rule XXI. When a rivers and harbors authorization bill is pending, a point of order may be made against the authorization of any project in any form not formally recommended to the Congress in an official report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors."

STABILIZATION OF CURRENCIES AND EXCHANGE VALUES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That a special committee of nine Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study of proposals designed to stabilize currencies and their exchange value, including proposals for substituting any type of "credits" for gold in settlement of international balances, for establishment of a system of bimetalism, and any other proposal involving international agreement with a view to facilitating international exchange and promoting international trade. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study

and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF CIVIL AIRCRAFT AND ITS USE IN WORLD AIR COMMERCE

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Whereas it is imperative that the United States maintain its proper sphere in world air commerce during the immediate postwar period of development; and

Whereas immediately following the end of World War No. 1 it became necessary to readjust aircraft production to civil needs of the United States; and

Whereas immediately following the end of the present war it will be necessary to establish a civil aviation program for the United States for both domestic and foreign air commerce; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 specifically provides for the encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense; and

Whereas the time to determine international air rights for civil air transport to establish a charter for freedom of the air is during peace treaty negotiations; and

Whereas it is desirable and necessary to accumulate and compile adequate data prior to such peace treaty negotiations; and

Whereas such data have been heretofore accumulated by various and sundry interdepartmental committees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the chairman of such committee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to (1) the feasibility of adapting current types of aircraft used in the war effort to use in civil-air transport; (2) the feasibility of incorporating in the construction of civil aircraft such features as will make them readily adaptable for immediate conversion and use for war purposes; (3) the feasibility of using world air transport as an international air police force to enforce peace terms; (4) the program of training and providing a reserve of skilled aircraft personnel, including ground crews and operations personnel for the immediate mobilization of civil air forces to adequately meet war emergencies, as well as preliminary training of personnel to be directly available to the War and Navy Departments in a war emergency; (5) the provision for world-wide weather observation facilities for forecasting weather over all civil airways, both domestic and foreign; (6) the provision for adequate landing and refueling facilities for world air commerce; (7) the planning, development and construction of aircraft which will assure to the United States at all times its proper sphere in world air commerce; (8) the coordination of civil air transport with other means of transportation; and (9) any other matters which such committee or subcommittee may deem it necessary to investigate for the purpose of obtaining adequate information to enable it to make recommendations for the supremacy of the United States in world air commerce, The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth and succeedings Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents, and other records, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFECT UPON INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF CENTRALIZATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 190, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to December 21, 1943 (relating to the investigation of the effect upon interstate commerce of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $25,000.

STUDY OF AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the date for submission of the report called for by Senate Resolution 252, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 30, 1944 (relating to a study into the legal and constitutional authority for the issuance of Executive orders of the President and of departmental regulations), is hereby extended to not later than the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; that the authority contained in such resolution is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and that the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $10,000.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 206, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to November 16, 1943 (relating to the investigation of the alcoholic beverage industry), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $25,000.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF USE OF PUBLIC LANDS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and Senate Resolution 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 8, 1941, and Senate Resolution 39, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1943, and Senate Resolution 294, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 23, 1944 (relating to the investigation of the use of public lands), is hereby continued and may be exercised during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures under such resolutions is hereby increased by $10,000.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL AVIATION AND AERONAUTICS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is hereby amended by inserting after the seventeenth line of paragraph 1 the following:

"Committee on Civil Aviation and Aeronautics, to consist of 13 Senators."

PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE OF GOLD AND SILVER IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 187, agreed to August 16, 1935, as amended by motion on January 16, 1939, increasing the membership of the committee to nine Senators instead of five, and as further amended by Senate Resolution 261, agreed to June 29, 1942, authorizing a special committee of nine Senators to confer with the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the administration, and the economic and commercial effect in the United States and abroad, of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1178), and to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the production, or the lack of production, of gold and silver in the United States and its Territories, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

COMPENSATION FOR LANDS SOLD TO THE UNITED STATES BY THE CHEROKEE INDIANS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the report of the Comptroller General on compensation for lands sold to the United States by the Cherokee Indians, printed as Senate Document No. 288, November 25, 1942, be referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate for examination and report.

The Judiciary Committee is hereby authorized to report to the Senate whether any readjustment of the accounts is necessary in order to fulfill the pledges made in compensation of the lands sold to the United States by the Cherokee treaty, and whether or not a fair and just settlement has been made in accordance with the treaty through which the sale was made. The committee is authorized to obtain further evidence, if found advisable, and report any facts and precedents pertinent thereto to the Senate

for its full information. If the committee find necessary, as a matter of justice, it shall submit a suitable resolution for the readjustment of the accounts and the ultimate liquidation of any balances found due.

HATTIE L. LAMBERT

Mr. BILBO submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Hattie L. Lambert, sister of John E. Lambert, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INVESTIGATION OF GASOLINE SHORTAGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BILBO submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the present gasoline shortage in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of ascertaining the causes of such shortage and the person or persons responsible therefor. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $2,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS BY WIRE AND RADIO—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. WHITE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to October 19, 1943 (providing for an investigation of international communications by wire and radio), as supplemented by Senate Resolution 268, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 29, 1944, is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures of the committee for such purposes is hereby increased by $10,000.

CHRISTMAS ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Christmas address by the President of the United States, broadcast to the people of the United States on Christmas eve, December 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Use of Statistics in the Formulation of a National Full-Employment Policy," delivered by the Vice President at a meeting of the American Statistical Association, held at Washington, D. C., on December 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW WORLD OF BUSINESS—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a condensation of an address entitled "The New World of Business," delivered by the Vice President before the Progressive Businessmen, Inc., at a meeting in New York City on November 2, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER AT NATIONAL LAWYERS' GUILD DINNER

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WAGNER at a dinner meeting of the National Lawyers' Guild, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on December 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FRATERNALISM, A SOURCE OF ADEQUACY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Fraternalism, a Source of Adequacy," delivered by him before the Grand Lodge of Maryland, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, at the Maryland Casualty Co. auditorium, Baltimore, Md., on December 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO EDWIN A. HALSEY BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the Secretary of the Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey, written by Mr. Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star of December 28, 1944, which, with further remarks by Senator MCKELLAR, appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BERNARD M. BARUCH AT "FEDERATION DAY" BREAKFAST MEETING, NEW YORK CITY

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Bernard M. Baruch at the "Federation Day" breakfast meeting, held at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on December 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY BEFORE ALABAMA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Don't 'Buy Business,'" published in the Onancock (Va.) News, relative to a speech delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley before the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, at Birmingham, Ala., which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMERCIAL-RENT CONTROL—LETTER BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relating to the subject of commercial-rent control, addressed by him to the Governor of New York, and joined in by Senator MEAD, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRAGEDY OF ONE-MAN RULE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, entitled "Tragedy of One-Man Rule," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RENEGOTIATION ACT—LETTER FROM R. E. WERNER

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from R. E. Werner, manager of the Equipment Co., of Detroit, Mich., on the subject of the Renegotiation Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—EDITORIAL FROM LEWISTOWN (MONT.) DEMOCRAT-NEWS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial advocating the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, published in the Lewistown Democrat-News, of Lewistown, Mont., which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S WAR AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the address which I made last evening over the radio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Like all good Americans, I want to win this war in the quickest possible time. Like many of you, I have sons in the armed services. And like you, I feel the American people are entitled to the truth.

Truth is always the first casualty of war. The opiates that have been poured down the throats of the American people for the past several years by the self-appointed propaganda peddlers fortunately are now wearing off. For several long years Americans have been fed the proposition that this is a "people's war." But now an ever-growing number of us realize that about all the peoples of every nation have had to do with this war is the fighting, the suffering, and the dying it exacts. We have been sold the idea that this war was a "war of liberation." Now we ask ourselves in deep dismay the question, "A war of liberation to whom and to what?"

Since August 16, 1941, our Government leaders, even the highest of them, have dangled the principles and purposes of the Atlantic Charter, both in toto and in tantalizing tidbits, before our eyes. It is, they said, a "war of liberation from an old world with all its ancient ills to the brave new world already being erected on the Atlantic Charter's universal principles. And now we despair of such a promise, not that the Atlantic Charter is dead, but that as a document, it never lived.

The conflict of fears, which is an inevitable aftermath of a loss of faith in propaganda, has created deep confusion on the American scene. Personally, I have always trusted the American people with the facts. I have every confidence in their innate sense of decency and justice. I have considered it my most solemn duty as a Senator to give the American people all the facts in my possession, together with the truth about them, as I see it. Therefore, tonight I make not even the pretense of an apology for the position I have held both before and during this war. Furthermore, as I see my duty tonight, it is to give the American people such facts as are in my possession and the truth as I see it concerning these facts.

Let us not mince words. America tonight faces a grave crisis in this war and an impasse in international diplomacy. Since no real agreement could be reached among the Big Three about the future United Nations organization contemplated in the Moscow Declaration and advocated by the United States—Dumbarton Oaks is a grim hoax. No nation today trusts the other nation sufficiently to warrant a single gesture toward risking its security on the success of an international organization. This distrust runs so deep among the Allies themselves that they have not dared to create a United Nations political council such as was promised in the Moscow Declaration of over a year ago. After 5 years of fighting the unspeakable Hitler on the European continent, and after 3 years of American participation in the struggle, the precious "unity" of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States cannot produce a common statement of purpose toward Europe. They cannot even agree on a common policy toward Asia. At this very moment, while Americans are doing 70 percent of the fighting on the western front, 50 percent of the fighting in Italy, and almost 100 percent of the active fighting in the far Pacific, our much-vaunted allies are now engaged primarily in consolidating and extending their influence into ever-widening spheres in a bloody game of power politics which, if continued, cannot help but blow up in a third world war. And while this war goes on, the continent of Europe, whose social, economic, and political foundations have already been torn up by the roots, is being further battered into a veritable chamber of horrors.

Actually, Europe has become a seething furnace of fratricide, civil war, murder, disease, and starvation. And while this process goes on, the President is urged to call for a National Service Act; our Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, seeks to inspire fear in the hearts of the American people by drawing verbal pictures of the robot horrors of the next war, and our Under Secretary of State further panics the public mind by threatening that the next aggressor will wreak his wrath on the United States as the first victim of the third world war. Amer- i is being subjected to a psychology of fear, of insecurity, of a lack of faith in the effectiveness of the normal processes and principles of international law, a part of which process is revealed in the current administration drive to saddle upon the American people before this war is over a war psychology and a war economy in the form of peacetime military conscription. At a time when there is not a stable government left in Europe or in Asia, when unity between ourselves and our allies is threatened to its foundation, when millions of men and women are suffering the tortures of the damned, there has not yet appeared a single curative or creative idea around which to rebuild either Europe or the world. What is the answer? I am convinced that the majority of the American people believe with me that it is imperative that a United Nations political council be immediately set up to see that the present series of disgraceful unilateral peace settlements now taking place in Europe stops. Only in this way can the inevitable conflict arising out of the creation of two spheres of influence in Europe be averted. Here is the finest opportunity in the world for those who have been preaching international coperation in behalf of the Big Three to prove by their acts their willingness to settle these new problems around a conference table rather than at the point of a bayonet. If Russia continues to insist that the fate of Finland, of Poland, of Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Jugoslavia, and even Norway, is to be left entirely to her discretion, and if Britain insists that the only answer to Russia's acts lies in her mimicking Russia's methods in her relations with the nations of western Europe all the way from Scandinavia to Greece, there is no point whatsoever in talking about a "World Security League" or political councils and world courts for the settlement of international disputes in the future. It will be too late.

Secondly, the Big Three must formulate some creative idea around which Europe can be rebuilt. Europe has always been the powder keg of world conflicts. It has already taken us into two wars in a generation and even now threatens a third one. In 1923 I spent 5 months visiting almost every country in Europe, including Russia. I have been there many times since then. And from that day to this I have been convinced that the only salvation for Europe, and the only basic cure for her ancient ills lies in the creation of a United States of Europe. This idea is not original with me, of course. It has been advocated by outstanding European statesmen, including Briand of France, Schuschnigg of Austria, and many others. Let us consider the basic idea underlying our own United States of America. Suppose each of our 48 States maintained its own exclusive sovereignty, with tariff barriers and business restrictions; suppose our sectional customs, social problems and ideals; suppose our regional economic and industrial interests; suppose our 48 State militias yielded allegiance to no higher authority than their State or local government; we know full well our history would have been burdened with the shame and grief of more than one civil war. If ever the people of Europe had a cause or were ever in the condition to reorient and reorganize their interests and their loyalties around a more creative and secure ideal than they have ever known before, it is in this hour of their anguish. Furthermore, the acceptance of this remedy for their suffering will provide the core of reality to which the faltering unity among the Big Three can attach itself in all the vigor of a new-found vision. I am convinced that only in this way can we avert a far worse catastrophe than this war in the years ahead. Europe is now in such a state of demoralization that the middle class has been virtually eliminated, and a leveling-down process has brought the masses of its peoples to their very knees. Without some higher ideal to discipline and guide them, Great Britain, Russia, and the United States with the very best of intentions, will be sucked into such a moral, social, political, and economic vacuum that they will end up in a struggle to seize control over whatever is left of Europe until they find themselves at each other's throats.

Russia says she must seize and maintain control of these Eastern European nations into which she has marched in order to protect and secure her western border. But, I ask, where does this process stop? And I would answer, not until it reaches open conflict with other spheres of influence. Say what we like about Britain's intervention in Greece, unless I am terribly mistaken, this is the first of many clashes of interest that will inevitably follow, when both Russia and Britain apply this principle. If, on the other hand, Russia and Great Britain will join with the United States in a sincere experiment in international collaboration in that part of the world that constitutes their own back yard, I would be willing to support an international organization that would guarantee on the basis of the principles of the Atlantic Charter the security and integrity, not only of the United States of Europe, but of Russia as well. But I shall oppose any world organization designed to put the United States in the position of holding the draw strings of an international grab bag while Britain and Russia connive or fight for the spoils. No one yet has found a way to save his birthright by selling it for a mess of pottage.

I would conclude by urging, with all the seriousness at my command, that the American people demand the abandonment by their Government and their allies of the brutal and costly slogan of "unconditional surrender." Until this is effected, we shall go on blowing Europe and our own boys to bits without rhyme or reason. And I am convinced that with the establishment of a United States of Europe in which disarmament and economic collaboration are combined, any threat to the security of either Russia or Britain would be eliminated and the task of restoring Germany as a respected member of the society of nations will have been largely begun. I would be and I am sure the majority of Americans also would be unwilling to sanction a peace of vengeance. I am unwilling and I am certain again that the vast majority of Americans are also unwilling that America's sons police the world. We must make a peace that will not require it, a peace we shall be willing to support with all our heart and soul, not only now but 10 or 20 years from now.

Certainly, if we are not fighting this war to transfer the control of Europe from Hitler to Stalin or to Stalin and Churchill, if we are not fighting this war in the far Pacific merely to return to their old masters the people we liberate, we ought now, once and for all, so to record our intentions.

If power politics in Europe cannot be stopped now, if a free federation of Europe cannot be worked out now, then it does not matter where the American armies stop, our boys will have died in vain—the war will have been lost. No slogans, no fine worded phrases can change this result.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, while I am on my feet I wish to read to the Senate a statement which was given out by Mr. Stettinius and reported in this morning's United Press. The statement is as follows:

Whatever the intention of the speaker, Senator WHEELER's attack upon the unconditional-surrender principle agreed to by the British Government, the Russian Government, the Chinese Government, and our own, will be understood in Germany and Japan as meaning that if these countries can resist long enough, and can kill enough American soldiers, the will of the American people to achieve a complete victory will be broken and a negotiated peace can be secured.

The people of Germany and Japan do not know, as the people of the United States do know, that Senator WHEELER speaks not for the American people but for a discredited few whose views have been overwhelmingly rejected by their fellow citizens of every party. Senator WHEELER's statement is, therefore, profoundly regrettable.

Mr. President, in answer to the statement which I have just read, I wish to say that if anything could be regrettable it would be Mr. Stettinius' statement. He speaks of a few discredited people in this country. I made the statement that the demand for unconditional surrender was a mistake. I assert, without fear of contradiction, that the statement recently made by Mr. Morgenthau in which he said that we should enslave the German people, which statement, according to the press, had been placed in the hands of every German soldier and read over the radio by Goebbels in Germany, has cost the lives of many American boys.

Mr. President, not only have I said that the demand for unconditional surrender was a mistake, but thousands of other people of high intelligence and of the class who could be called interventionists, if you please, or internationalists, have also made similar statements.

Mr. Stettinius says that I do not speak for the American people. Of course, I do not speak for all the American people; but I will venture the assertion that I speak for more people than does Mr. Stettinius, because he has never had to face a constituency. He may be expressing the views of the big interests whom he has heretofore represented in this country; but he does not represent the great rank and file of the American people. When Mr. Stettinius refers to "a discredited few," he is not speaking for the mothers and fathers of America whose sons are dying upon the far-flung battlefields of the world.

Unconditional surrender and a negotiated peace! Mr. President, I thought that Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points had a great deal to do with the saving of the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys. I feel now, as I have felt for some time, that if we would inform the German people of the peace conditions upon which we would insist, that they should get rid of Hitler, Goebbels, and Himmler, set up a democratic government, agree to a United States of Europe, in connection with which we would be willing to help provide democratic governments on that continent—not under the domination of England and not under the domination of Russia—it would save the lives of a great many young men of this country.

Mr. Stettinius knows that polls have been taken and submitted to the State Department. The polls show that the overwhelming majority of the American people feel and believe that we are being kicked around by our allies. Mr. Stettinius knows, and I know that he knows, that, notwithstanding the fact that we have the greatest armies of the greatest fighting forces in the world, we are in a position today where we have to submit to the dictates of Russia on the one hand and England on the other. When I say that Mr. Stettinius knows that, I say it advisedly.

A negotiated peace! I have never advocated a negotiated peace, but what I have said is that if we should lay down the terms and conditions of peace and the German people were willing to accept them, that would not be a negotiated peace but would be a dictated peace; and, as a matter of fact, no peace has ever been made in the history of the world without some negotiation.

Our Russian allies through a committee sponsored and approved by them have repeatedly broadcast to the German people a statement to the effect that they wanted to see a strong Germany, an independent Germany. They have repeatedly said that they did not want to destroy German industry and did not want to destroy the German Army, but the United States has said that only unconditional surrender would be accepted.

Let me ask any Member of the Senate, If somebody should say to you, "If I get into your room, I am going to kill you; I am going to enslave you; I am going to destroy your industry," what would you do? Would you let him in or would you say, "If you are going to kill me if you get in here, then I am going to take chances and fight to keep you from killing me if I can."

I repeat, without any hesitation whatsoever, that, in my judgment, unconditional surrender is an asinine policy. Not only have I made that statement as to unconditional surrender but some of the highest authorities in the church world have indicated the same thing. I refer particularly to the statements which have been made by His Holiness the Pope of Rome. Other church leaders all over this country have made similar statements. Are these church leaders discredited? Do they represent only a few discredited people throughout the world? All peace-loving people throughout this country and throughout the world are hoping and praying that the war may come to a speedy end and that peace may reign again upon this earth. Furthermore they are hoping and praying that democracy may be set up in Europe, and that the unilateral treaties which are now being made, contrary, if you please, to the Teheran Conference, contrary to every principle upon which this Government has stood, may be abandoned and no further efforts made along that line.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senate is aware of the fact that I was one of the Senators who opposed recently some of the personnel of the State Department who may have represented the recommendations of the Secretary of State. Had I been President of the United States I might or might not have chosen the Secretary of State for the high office which he occupies, but now he is Secretary of State of the American people and the American Government and I shall support him.

I must say that I agree with the sentiment expressed by the Secretary of State that it is extremely unfortunate if anybody, public or private in character, in this country says or does anything which indicates the slightest weakening of the will of the American people to crush Germany as our enemy until she is utterly impotent.

Obviously, Hitler has no hope save a weakening not in the armies but in the morale of the United Nations. If he can divide the United Nations, if he can tire us of war, if he can make us begin to doubt whether another day or another month or another year is worth what it will cost, then, of course, he is achieving the success of the weapon upon which he has depended principally in all his conquests, the weapon that weakens the will of his enemies.

I am sure the Secretary of State did not intend to reflect in any sense of the word upon the able Senator from Montana in his personal capacity, but I do say that we should weigh our words most carefully if they might be construed even by our foes as indicating that we are willing to quibble or to debate about their surrender or about the terms of it. Surely, if they think there is any hope of that, they will fight longer and put up a braver front in the hope that we will make greater concessions. I believe that we can weaken the will of the German people more by letting them know that they must accept unconditional surrender, that there is nothing else in store for them, and that the sooner they accept it the more lives they will save. On the other hand, if hope is held out to them that they can get better terms by a longer war, that will be the policy they will pursue, thus causing the sacrifice of an even greater number of the sacred lives of our countrymen.

While, of course, there are honest differences of opinion, I am sure, referring to the matter of policy and not to personality, that the sentiment expressed by the Secretary of State is the sentiment of our armed forces and of the people of the country.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, answering my distinguished colleague from Florida, first I wish to say that we are now told that we must not say anything whatsoever affecting American interests, because if we do, we are contributing to division and stirring up disunity in this country.

I call attention to the fact that there is no such "hush-hush" propaganda being spread in England. I have before me a clipping under a London date line, with the heading "London paper assails F. D.'s peace terms." It reads:

LONDON, November 3.—The Weekly Economist—

The Weekly Economist is one of the best-edited and best-known London papers, recognized as one of the great liberal publications of England—

The Weekly Economist today made a broadside attack against the unconditional surrender policy of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill.

Pointing out that Churchill recently clarified the only peace condition yet laid down before Germany when he said "unconditional surrender in the sense of no bargaining with the enemy still is the policy of His Majesty's government," the Economist declared: "If this could have been said when the unconditional surrender slogan first was put forward at the Casablanca conference, much quite needless argument and disunity would have been avoided and the war might well have been shortened.

"Unconditional surrender, if it is to be taken literally (and no other interpretation was encouraged), is obvious nonsense.

"It is an unworkable policy which encourages the enemy to fight till the last gasp and provides opportunities which Dr. Goebbels has used to the full.

"No German will surrender until he knows, or thinks he knows, what surrender involves. A refusal to bargain is sensible; refusal to give some indication of terms—if any terms exist—at this stage of the war is to miss the finest chance yet presented for effective psychological warfare.

"The mischievous phrase 'unconditional surrender' now admitted to be misleading, has been a barrier to sound policy. It should be buried."

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Democratic conference on yesterday authorized the majority steering committee to fill vacancies on standing committees of the Senate. It will be impossible for the steering committee to

complete its duty in the filling of these vacancies so as to report them to the Senate before next Wednesday. I hope that by that time we will be able to report to the Senate the new committee assignments, along with those of the minority, so that we can complete the membership of the committees. For that reason there is no occasion for the Senate to meet prior to next Wednesday, and therefore I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned to Wednesday, January 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou glorified Lord, born in a stable, cradled in a manger, and buried in a borrowed tomb, we rejoice that Thou art the son of man. We pray that a stricken, reluctant humanity, welling up with its bitter cries, may call out to Thee in triumphant confidence. With many yearnings the human soul asks: "Is there a balm in Gilead?" We wait for light, but behold obscurity; for brightness, but we walk in darkness. O forgive us, Father, when in these experiences we permit doubts, suspicions, and fears to weigh down our spirits. O help us to lift our eyes unto the hills; our strength cometh from the Lord.

When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him. We praise Thee that these floodtimes in life are not ordained to destroy or engulf us, but Thou wilt subdue their distresses and mitigate their pangs. How many there are who wander to and fro; who will show us any good? In every age Thou hast breathed Thy spirit upon hearts that sought Thee; O lead us all to find truth in things eternal. Take away every root of bitterness, all alienations, and all those separations which so often lead to disunity. O spirit of the Most High, gird our souls, cling round our finest ambitions, and give us an everliving faith. May we not take pride in our immunity, but look with tenderness and compassion upon all who suffer. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 4, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatlin, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses of Congress on Saturday, January 6, 1945, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of the Navy.
6. Post Office Department.
7. Department of the Treasury.
8. Department of War.
9. Federal Security Agency.
10. Federal Trade Commission.
11. National Housing Agency.
12. Office of Defense Transportation.

The message also announced that pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, providing for a joint session on Saturday, January 6, 1945, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President, Mr. GREEN and Mr. AUSTIN were appointed tellers on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Department of War.
7. War Manpower Commission.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES V. HEIDINGER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Resolution 49, he did, on Friday, January 5, 1945, administer the oath of office to the Honorable JAMES V. HEIDINGER at Bethesda, Md.

AUTHORITY TO DECLARE RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the day the Speaker may declare a recess or recesses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM OF THE DAY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a moment. I think the House would like to know what the program of the day is, particularly the hour at which certain things will happen.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state the hours when they will happen.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the resolution provide that the Senate shall come here to the House Chamber at 1 o'clock, and that the reading of the President's message will follow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair had a conversation with the President on yesterday. The message will be read immediately on the completion of the counting of the electoral ballots, which should be around 1:20 or 1:25 p. m.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ACCEPTANCE OF OATH OF OFFICE

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 56) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, Whereas JAMES V. HEIDINGER, a Representative from the State of Illinois, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed the oath of office before the Speaker, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said JAMES V. HEIDINGER as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

BIRTHDAY OF THE SPEAKER

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is the birthday of our beloved Speaker, and I wish to extend to him the warmest felicitations of the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle and to wish for him many, many years of health and happiness.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the spontaneous manifestation of friendship of the Members of the House, without regard to party, following the congratulations of our distinguished friend from Massachusetts the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN] to the Speaker on his birthday anniversary shows the love and affection every Member of the House entertains for our beloved and distinguished Speaker.

I appreciate, as majority leader, and personally, the expressions of congratulations that came from the leader of the minority party in the House and express to him, and through him to his party, our thanks. I join with him in congratulating the Speaker; and in conveying to the Speaker the very best wishes of the Democratic Members of the House, the hope that he will continue for many years to come to be Speaker of the National House of Representatives.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 57) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members and Delegate be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Accounts: Leo E. Allen, of Illinois; Frank L. Sundstrom, New Jersey; Dean M. Gillespie, Colorado.

Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; D. Lane Powers, New Jersey; Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; Albert J. Engel, Michigan; Karl Stefan, Nebraska; Francis Case, South Dakota; Frank B. Keefe, Wisconsin; Noble J. Johnson, Indiana; Robert F. Jones, Ohio; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; Walter C. Ploeser, Missouri; Harve Tibbott, Pennsylvania.

Military Affairs: Walter G. Andrews, New York; Dewey Short, Missouri; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts; J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Thomas E. Martin, Iowa; Charles H. Elston, Ohio; Forest A. Harness, Indiana; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; J. Leroy Johnson, California; Clare Boothe Luce, Connecticut; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Naval Affairs: James W. Mott, Oregon; W. Sterling Cole, New York; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; William E. Hess, Ohio; Jack Z. Anderson, California; James Wolfenden, Pennsylvania; William W. Blackney, Michigan; Robert A. Grant, Indiana; Margaret Chase Smith, Maine; James V. Heidinger, Illinois; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Rules: Leo E. Allen, Illinois; Earl C. Michener, Michigan; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio.

Ways and Means: Harold Knutson, Minnesota; Daniel A. Reed, New York; Roy O. Woodruff, Michigan; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Bertrand W. Gearhart, California; Frank Carlson, Kansas; Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey.

The resolution was agreed to.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are several Members whose certificates are on file with the Clerk, who have not taken the oath of office. If they will present themselves at the bar of the House they may take the oath of office at this time.

Messrs. HALE, RIZLEY, BREHM, and SMITH of Ohio appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

READING OF MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Saturday, the sixth day of January 1945, immediately following the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President as provided for in Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of the regular order of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be allowed to address the House for 45 minutes to discuss the Burma Road.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at two points in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include in one an editorial from the Baltimore Sun, and in the other a petition from the Baltimore branch of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

JACKSON HOLE MONUMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to repeal what is known as the Antiquities Act. It was under this act that a large portion of the Jackson Hole country in Wyoming was set aside as a monument. This act was passed by the Congress for the purpose of preserving monuments of scientific and historical value against vandalism, and so forth, but it is now being used as a way to bypass Congress to create parks that Congress has refused to set aside as parks. In this particular instance it was used to create an addition to the Teton National Park which will ultimately be added to the Yellowstone National Park. Now I have lived by the Yellowstone National Park for many years and I love that great scenic territory. I would do anything to protect it and I want to see it kept as it is now, but I do not want to see it enlarged in the manner that is sought by this procedure. We Representatives of the West have seen for years a gradual encroachment by the Federal Government upon our territory by one way or another initiated in the first instance by fanatics on the theory that they wanted to preserve something for the future. As it appears to me, this whole scheme revolves around the efforts of the Interior Department and the National Park Service to enlarge the scope of their activities to the greatest extent possible regardless of reason, law, and Congress, and regardless of the injuries to the private land owners. Now Congress will always be in session and can always be appealed to in setting aside Government land for the protection of actual monuments of scientific and historical value and that I have no objection to. But I want to see the Congress put a stop to the acquisition of territories for park purposes under the theory that it is to preserve a monument. It is doing something indirectly that the law says cannot be done directly.

Now I have gone over all of the territory involved in the Jackson Hole country. I am familiar with it. My district lies nearly adjacent to it. There is not a single thing of historical or scientific value in that territory to preserve. It is true that around a cabin in which it is claimed a horse thief was shot, they have built a fence to keep away the curious and have put on top of this cabin a roof that will remain there for some time. Living in an adjoining State, where horses were the only means of transportation and meant life or death to the explorer, the hunter, and the early miner, it is true that horse thieves in numberless numbers bit the dust. I am apprehensive that when all of these facts become known and publicized that this fanaticism for parks and monuments might ultimately result in the setting aside of my State to preserve the places where the horse thieves were shot. Clearly the President has been imposed upon and misled.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by Lee McCardell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

WAR SURPLUS DISPOSAL BILL

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of Congress when the war surplus disposal bill was under consideration, I proposed an amendment to the bill calculated to save the war industries in the various towns and cities in the United States for the communities where the same had been established, but the amendment was defeated.

In yesterday morning's Times-Herald, I read a report by one of the columnists that "some 350 war plants acquired by the Government will be dismantled and shipped to China, with photographs showing how to reassemble them."

I stated at the time that I introduced my amendment that I was of the opinion that these war plants would be dismantled and lost to the communities where the same had been established, unless my amendment was adopted, and this report bears out my prediction.

Mr. Speaker, I am again calling this matter to the attention of the Members of the Congress.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan and Mr. HOFFMAN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a prayer by Edgar H. Bierly, of Emporium, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a message from the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner dated January 4.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States, relative to making treaties, which would eliminate existing provisions whereby it requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate only on all matter wherein treaties are involved and provides that "hereafter treaties shall be made by the President by and with the advice of both Houses of Congress."

Mr. Speaker, the whole question involved is whether or not the House of Representatives should participate in the making of treaties and whether or not by a majority vote of the House of Representatives and the Senate treaties should be made. In other words, is it advisable for a majority of the Congress to pass upon treaties wherein every citizen and individual of the United States is involved, or to retain the long antiquated principle of requiring a two-thirds vote of only the Senate?

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the two-thirds requirement of the Senate has long since served its purpose. It was only a step in a long and heated struggle which had been going on for several years prior to 1787, and which had been threatening and endangering the union of the States. By an expression of a majority of Congress, both the Senate and House of Representatives do we get a better expression of the people of the United States; by an expression of a majority of the Congress we carry out the fundamental principles of democratic action. If we are to become more and more truly a democratic Nation carrying out the fundamental principles upon which our Government was established, I believe this important step should be taken and it is for this reason that I urge this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Experience has shown us the two-thirds rule in matters involving the making of treaties not only delays and impedes, but sometimes defeats, the very functions of Government in foreign affairs. A majority of both Houses would prevent such another tragic experience, I believe, and at the same time would protect the democratic rights and privileges of the people of this great country of ours.

Furthermore, the average citizen of the United States is today more informed and better read on matters involving treaties and foreign affairs of our Government and by adopting the policy of a majority of both branches of Congress, we could get a better and more correct expression of the will of the majority of the people we represent. Means of communication by newspapers, radios, and various other ways, keeps our people well informed and never in the history of the world has a citizenship been so intensely interested in the foreign affairs of its Government as the people of this country today. I urge, Mr. Speaker, in the name of democracy that the expression of the people of this country be permitted to prevail in these important problems to be settled, affecting the destiny of the world for many, many years to come.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the adoption of my resolution creating a permanent Committee on Un-American Activities, I am receiving messages of congratulations from patriotic Americans everywhere, and especially from patriotic organizations; from the Daughters of the American Revolution to the American Legion.

I am going to read you a telegram that I have just received from the national commander of the American Legion.

It comes from Calexico, Calif., and reads as follows:

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Member of Congress from Mississippi, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of American Legion, thank you for your great and successful fight for the American people in making the Dies committee a permanent House committee. This is a victory for all of our people who are indebted to you as an outstanding American with the best interests of our country foremost. Look forward to seeing you soon.

Regards,

EDWARD SCHIEBERLING,
National Commander, American Legion.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] be permitted to address the House on January 16 for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, as you have observed, I have not opposed the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi to re-create the Committee on Un-American Activities. I merely felt that it should take its course for reference and consideration by the Committee on Rules which committee has jurisdiction to pass on investigating resolutions.

Nearly all of the older Members, I am sure, remember and are aware that I was instrumental in having the first committee to investigate un-American and subversive activities created. That was in 1934, and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was appointed as chairman, and the committee did a very good job in bringing to light activities of subversive elements that were inimical to our Government. As a result of this investigation, needed and beneficial legislation was enacted.

I again advocated and reported a similar resolution in 1938, and being informed by Mr. Dies that his record would show that he combatted the Ku Klux Klan in his own district and that he was unafraid to investigate un-American and subversive activities, I gladly joined with others in urging and actually agreed to his appointment as chairman of the new committee. There was a need for investigation then because of the rampant Nazi, Fascist, and communistic activities in all sections of our country.

Shortly after Mr. Dies' appointment as chairman and the committee had begun to function I stated to him on the floor and suggested in a letter addressed to him, that I felt he was being influenced by the very persons and groups whose activities Congress actually intended to investigate. His committee, instead of investigating the Fascist and Nazi propagandists under the leadership of Pelley, the Silver Shirt, now serving time in a penitentiary, and others misled by Sylvester Viereck and Fritz Kuhn, head of the German bund, devoted most of its time to investigate so-called communistic activities of many progressive and labor organizations, whose members the chairman alleged were connected with so-called communistic organizations. This reckless accusation of many reputable and outstanding men and women of being Communists or having communistic tendencies, without giving them an opportunity to deny or refute such charges, created opposition as to the conduct of the investigation on the part of these hundreds and thousands of well-meaning and patriotic Americans.

The hearings and the record will disclose that 80 percent of the speeches and releases of the chairman were devoted to attacking progressive and labor organizations, and so-called nonexistent communistic activities. The hearings will also show that only 20 percent of the proceedings of the committee were devoted to Nazi, Fascist, seditious, and subversive activities. Therefore, I felt obliged from time to time to call attention to the need for investigation and to urge that the chairman and the committee should penetrate the activities of the Goebbels Nazi agents and Sylvester Viereck and his stooges who were then creating discord and disunity in our country. A great deal of credit has been claimed by the committee's two master-minded investigators, Matthews, the ex-Communist, and Stripling, the chief investigator, who have devoted most of their time in issuing releases carrying unwarranted attacks in order to gain publicity for the committee and for the purpose of detracting attention from the Nazi-Fascist activities.

Every few days we read in the press of activities of Nazi saboteurs and I am sure that even the gentleman from Mississippi or anyone else cannot point out a single act on the part of the so-called Communists where they have not shown complete loyalty and cooperation in the winning of the war. Therefore, it is my hope that this committee will be composed of members who will investigate actual un-American and subversive activities and that the committee will not go witch hunting, and will not be misled by the shrewd conniving Nazi propagandists who are still in our midst seeking to create racial and sectional hatred and discord. I am in favor of a committee, but it must be fair and have the interests of the American people at heart, and work in accordance with the long-recognized precedents of this House.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the kind we are going to have.

Mr. SABATH. I hope so; and I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not control it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Illinois will not control it either. I will tell him that. He will not control it any more than he controlled the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate that because I have not the following among the Republican Members to the extent that the gentleman from Mississippi has.

Mr. RANKIN. Nor any other following.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess until 12:55 p. m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess until 12:55 p. m.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTE

At 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, headed by the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States, have met in joint session for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedent, unless a motion shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been made that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers, Mr. GREEN and Mr. AUSTIN, on the part of the Senate, and Mr. WORLEY and Mr. GAMBLE, on the part of the House, took their places at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hands to the tellers the certificates of the electors for President and Vice President of the State of Alabama, and they will count and make a list of the votes cast by that State.

Mr. GREEN (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of the State of New York, received 11 votes for President, and HARRY S. TRUMAN, of the State of Missouri, received 11 votes for Vice President.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in an alphabetical order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the Congress, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the Vice President.

The tellers delivered to the Vice President the following statement of the results:

The undersigned, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and WARREN R. AUSTIN, tellers on the part of the Senate, EUGENE WORLEY and RALPH A. GAMBLE, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice Presi-

dent of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1945:

Electoral votes of each State	States	For President		For Vice President	
		Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York	Thomas E. Dewey, of New York	Harry S. Truman, of Missouri	John W. Bricker, of Ohio
11	Alabama	11		11	
4	Arizona	4		4	
9	Arkansas	9		9	
25	California	25		25	
6	Colorado		6		6
8	Connecticut	8		8	
3	Delaware	3		3	
8	Florida	8		8	
12	Georgia	12		12	
4	Idaho	4		4	
28	Illinois	28		28	
13	Indiana		13		13
10	Iowa		10		10
8	Kansas		8		8
11	Kentucky	11		11	
10	Louisiana	10		10	
5	Maine		5		5
8	Maryland	8		8	
16	Massachusetts	16		16	
19	Michigan	19		19	
11	Minnesota	11		11	
9	Mississippi	9		9	
15	Missouri	15		15	
4	Montana	4		4	
6	Nebraska		6		6
3	Nevada	3		3	
4	New Hampshire	4		4	
16	New Jersey	16		16	
4	New Mexico	4		4	
47	New York	47		47	
14	North Carolina	14		14	
4	North Dakota		4		4
25	Ohio		25		25
10	Oklahoma	10		10	
6	Oregon	6		6	
35	Pennsylvania	35		35	
4	Rhode Island	4		4	
8	South Carolina	8		8	
4	South Dakota		4		4
12	Tennessee	12		12	
23	Texas	23		23	
4	Utah	4		4	
3	Vermont		3		3
11	Virginia	11		11	
8	Washington	8		8	
8	West Virginia	8		8	
12	Wisconsin		12		12
3	Wyoming		3		3
531	Total	432	99	432	99

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Tellers on the part of the Senate.

EUGENE WORLEY,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, of the State of New York, has received for President of the United States 432 votes;

Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, has received 99 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Harry S. Truman, of the State of Missouri, has received for Vice President of the United States 432 votes;

John W. Bricker, of the State of Ohio, has received 99 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the twentieth day of January, 1945, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen, the purpose for which the joint session of the two Houses of Congress has been called, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, having been accomplished, the Chair declares the joint session dissolved.

The Senate will remain in the House Chamber pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, and receive a message from the President of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

STATE OF THE UNION

The SPEAKER laid before the joint session the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

In considering the state of the Union, the war, and the peace that is to follow, are naturally uppermost in the minds of all of us.

This war must be waged—it is being waged—with the greatest and most persistent intensity. Everything we are and have is at stake. Everything we are and have will be given. American men, fighting far from home, have already won victories which the world will never forget.

We have no question of the ultimate victory. We have no question of the cost. Our losses will be heavy.

We and our allies will go on fighting together to ultimate total victory.

We have seen a year marked, on the whole, by substantial progress toward victory, even though the year ended with a set-back for our arms, when the Germans launched a ferocious counter attack into Luxemburg and Belgium with the obvious objective of cutting our line in the center.

Our men have fought with indescribable and unforgettable gallantry under most difficult conditions, and our German enemies have sustained considerable losses while failing to obtain their objectives.

The high tide of this German effort was reached 2 days after Christmas. Since then we have reassumed the offensive, rescued the isolated garrison at Bastogne, and forced a German withdrawal along the whole line of the salient. The speed with which we recovered from this savage attack was largely possible because we have one Supreme Commander in complete control of all the Allied armies in France. General Eisenhower has faced this period of trial with admirable calm and resolution and with steadily increasing success. He has my complete confidence.

Further desperate attempts may well be made to break our lines, to slow our progress. We must never make the mistake of assuming that the Germans are beaten until the last Nazi has surrendered.

And I would express another most serious warning against the poisonous effects of enemy propaganda.

The wedge that the Germans attempted to drive in western Europe was less dangerous in actual terms of winning the war than the wedges which they are continually attempting to drive between ourselves and our allies.

Every little rumor which is intended to weaken our faith in our allies is like an actual enemy agent in our midst—seeking to sabotage our war effort. There are, here and there, evil and baseless rumors against the Russians—rumors against the British—rumors against our own American commanders in the field.

When you examine these rumors closely, you will observe that every one of them bears the same trade-mark—"Made in Germany."

We must resist this divisive propaganda—we must destroy it—with the same strength and the same determination that our fighting men are displaying as they resist and destroy the panzer divisions.

In Europe, we shall resume the attack and—despite temporary set-backs here or there—we shall continue the attack relentlessly until Germany is completely defeated.

It is appropriate at this time to review the basic strategy which has guided us through 3 years of war, and which will lead, eventually, to total victory.

The tremendous effort of the first years of this war was directed toward the concentration of men and supplies in the various theaters of action at the points where they could hurt our enemies most.

It was an effort—in the language of the military men—of deployment of our forces. Many battles—essential battles—were fought; many victories—vital victories—were won. But these battles and these victories were fought and won to hold back the attacking enemy, and to put us in positions from which we and our allies could deliver the final, decisive blows.

In the beginning, our most important military task was to prevent our enemies—the strongest and most violently aggressive powers that ever have threatened civilization—from winning decisive victories. But even while we were conducting defensive, delaying actions we were looking forward to the time when we could wrest the initiative from our enemies and place our superior resources of men and materials into direct competition with them.

It was plain then that the defeat of either enemy would require the massing of overwhelming forces—ground, sea, and air—in positions from which we and our allies could strike directly against the enemy homelands, and destroy the Nazi and Japanese war machines.

In the case of Japan, we had to await the completion of extensive preliminary operations—operations designed to establish secure supply lines through the

Japanese outer-zone defenses. This called for overwhelming sea power and air power—supported by ground forces strategically employed against isolated outpost garrisons.

Always—from the very day we were attacked—it was right militarily as well as morally to reject the arguments of those short-sighted people who would have had us throw Britain and Russia to the Nazi wolves and concentrate against the Japanese. Such people urged that we fight a purely defensive war against Japan while allowing the domination of all the rest of the world by nazi-ism and fascism.

In the European theater, the necessary bases for the massing of ground and air power against Germany were already available in Great Britain. In the Mediterranean area we could begin ground operations against major elements of the German Army as rapidly as we could put troops in the field, first in north Africa and then in Italy.

Therefore, our decision was made to concentrate the bulk of our ground and air forces against Germany until her utter defeat. That decision was based on all these factors, and it was also based on the realization that, of our two enemies, Germany would be more able to digest quickly her conquests, the more able quickly to convert the manpower and resources of her conquered territory into a war potential.

We had in Europe two active and indomitable allies—Britain and the Soviet Union—and there were also the heroic resistance movements in the occupied countries, constantly engaging and harassing the Germans.

We cannot forget how Britain held the line, alone, in 1940 and 1941, and at the same time, despite ferocious bombardment from the air, built up a tremendous armaments industry which enabled her to take the offensive at El Alamein in 1942.

We cannot forget the heroic defense of Moscow and Leningrad and Stalingrad, or the tremendous Russian offensives of 1943 and 1944 which destroyed formidable German armies.

Nor can we forget how, for more than 7 long years, the Chinese people have been sustaining the barbarous attacks of the Japanese and containing large enemy forces on the vast areas of the Asiatic mainland.

In the future we must never forget the lesson that we have learned—that we must have friends who will work with us in peace as they have fought at our side in war.

As a result of the combined effort of the Allied forces, great military victories were achieved in 1944: The liberation of France, Belgium, Greece and parts of the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia; the surrender of Rumania and Bulgaria, the invasion of Germany itself and Hungary; the steady march through the Pacific islands to the Philippines, Guam, and Saipan, and the beginnings of a mighty air offensive against the Japanese islands.

Now, as this Seventy-ninth Congress meets, we have reached the most critical phase of the war.

The greatest victory of the last year was, of course, the successful breach on June 6, 1944, of the German "impregnable" sea wall of Europe and the victorious sweep of the Allied forces through France and Belgium and Luxembourg—almost to the Rhine itself.

The cross-channel invasion of the Allied armies was the greatest amphibious operation in the history of the world. It overshadowed all other operations in this or any other war in its immensity. Its success is a tribute to the fighting courage of the soldiers who stormed the beaches—to the sailors and merchant seamen who put the soldiers ashore and kept them supplied—and to the military and naval leaders who achieved a real miracle of planning and execution. And it is also a tribute to the ability of two nations, Britain and America, to plan together, and work together, and fight together in perfect cooperation and perfect harmony.

This cross-channel invasion was followed in August by a second great amphibious operation, landing troops in southern France. In this, the same cooperation and the same harmony existed between the American, French, and other Allied forces based in north Africa and Italy.

The success of the two invasions is a tribute also to the ability of many men and women to maintain silence, when a few careless words would have imperiled the lives of hundreds of thousands, and would have jeopardized the whole vast undertakings.

These two great operations were made possible by success in the Battle of the Atlantic.

Without this success over German submarines, we could not have built up our invasion forces or air forces in Great Britain, nor could we have kept a steady stream of supplies flowing to them after they had landed in France.

The Nazis, however, may succeed in improving their submarines and their crews. They have recently increased their U-boat activity. The Battle of the Atlantic—like all campaigns in this war—demands eternal vigilance. But the British, Canadian, and other Allied Navies, together with our own, are constantly on the alert.

The tremendous operations in western Europe have overshadowed in the public mind the less spectacular but vitally important Italian front. Its place in the strategic conduct of the war in Europe has been obscured, and—by some people, unfortunately—underrated.

It is important that any misconception on that score be corrected—now.

What the Allied forces in Italy are doing is a well-considered part in our strategy in Europe, now aimed at only one objective—the total defeat of the Germans. These valiant forces in Italy are continuing to keep a substantial portion of the German Army under constant pressure—including some 20 first-line German divisions and the necessary supply and transport and replacement troops—all of which our enemies need so badly elsewhere.

Over very difficult terrain and through adverse weather conditions, our Fifth Army and the British Eighth Army—reinforced by units from other United Nations, including a brave and well-equipped unit of the Brazilian Army—have, in the past year, pushed north through bloody Cassino and the Anzio beachhead, and through Rome until now they occupy heights overlooking the valley of the Po.

The greatest tribute which can be paid to the courage and fighting ability of these splendid soldiers in Italy is to point out that although their strength is about equal to that of the Germans they oppose, the Allies have been continuously on the offensive.

That pressure, that offensive, by our troops in Italy will continue.

The American people—and every soldier now fighting in the Apennines—should remember that the Italian front has not lost any of the importance which it had in the days when it was the only Allied front in Europe.

In the Pacific during the past year, we have conducted the fastest-moving offensive in the history of modern warfare. We have driven the enemy back more than 3,000 miles across the Central Pacific.

A year ago, our conquest of Tarawa was a little more than a month old.

A year ago, we were preparing for our invasion of Kwajalein, the second of our great strides across the Central Pacific to the Philippines.

A year ago, General MacArthur was still fighting in New Guinea, almost 1,500 miles from his present position in the Philippine Islands.

We now have firmly established bases in the Mariannas Islands from which our Superfortresses bomb Tokyo itself, and will continue to blast Japan in ever-increasing numbers.

Japanese forces in the Philippines have been cut in two. There is still hard fighting ahead—costly fighting. But the liberation of the Philippines will mean that Japan has been largely cut off from her conquests in the East Indies.

The landing of our troops on Leyte was the largest amphibious operation thus far conducted in the Pacific.

Moreover, these landings drew the Japanese Fleet into the first great sea battle which Japan has risked in almost 2 years. Not since the night engagements around Guadalcanal in November–December 1942, had our Navy been able to come to grips with major units of the Japanese Fleet. We had brushed against their fleet in the first battle of the Philippine Sea in June 1944, but not until last October were we able really to engage a major portion of the Japanese Navy in actual combat. The naval engagement, which raged for 3 days, was the heaviest blow ever struck against Japanese sea power.

As the result of that battle, much of what is left of the Japanese Fleet has been driven behind the screen of islands that separates the Yellow Sea, the China Sea, and the Sea of Japan from the Pacific.

Our Navy looks forward to any opportunity which the lords of the Japanese Navy will give us to fight them again.

The people of this Nation have a right to be proud of the courage and fighting

ability of the men in the armed forces on all fronts. They also have a right to be proud of American leadership which has guided their sons into battle.

The history of the generalship of this war has been a history of teamwork and cooperation, of skill and daring. Let me give you one example out of last year's operations in the Pacific.

Last September Admiral Halsey led American naval task forces into Philippine waters and north to the East China Sea and struck heavy blows at Japanese air and sea power.

At that time it was our plan to approach the Philippines by further stages, taking islands which we may call A, C, and E. However, Admiral Halsey reported that a direct attack on Leyte appeared feasible. When General MacArthur received the reports from Admiral Halsey's task forces, he also concluded that it might be possible to attack the Japanese in the Philippines directly—bypassing islands A, C, and E.

Admiral Nimitz thereupon offered to make available to General MacArthur several divisions which had been scheduled to take the intermediate objectives. These discussions, conducted at great distances, all took place in 1 day.

General MacArthur immediately informed the Joint Chiefs of Staffs here in Washington that he was prepared to initiate plans for an attack on Leyte in October. Approval of the change in plan was given on the same day.

Thus, within the space of 24 hours, a major change of plans was accomplished which involved Army and Navy forces from two different theaters of operations; a change which hastened the liberation of the Philippines and the final day of victory; a change which saved lives which would have been expended in the capture of islands which are now neutralized far behind our lines.

Our over-all strategy has not neglected the important task of rendering all possible aid to China. Despite almost insuperable difficulties, we increased this aid during 1944. At present our aid to China must be accomplished by air transport; there is no other way. By the end of 1944 the Air Transport Command was carrying into China a tonnage of supplies three times as great as that delivered a year ago, and much more, each month, than the Burma Road ever delivered at its peak.

Despite the loss of important bases in China, the tonnage delivered by air transport has enabled General Chennault's Fourteenth Air Force, which includes many Chinese flyers, to wage an effective and aggressive campaign against the Japanese. In 1944 aircraft of the Fourteenth Air Force flew more than 35,000 sorties against the Japanese and sank enormous tonnage of enemy shipping, greatly diminishing the usefulness of the China Sea lanes.

British, Dominion, and Chinese forces together with our own have not only held the line in Burma against determined Japanese attacks but have gained bases of considerable importance to the supply line into China.

The Burma campaigns have involved incredible hardship, and have demanded exceptional fortitude and determination. The officers and men who have served with so much devotion in those far-distant jungles and mountains deserve high honor from their countrymen.

In all of the far-flung operations of our own armed forces—on land, and sea, and in the air—the final job, the toughest job, has been performed by the average, easy-going, hard-fighting young American who carries the weight of battle on his own shoulders.

It is to him that we and all future generations of Americans must pay grateful tribute.

But it is of small satisfaction to him to know that monuments will be raised to him in the future. He wants, he needs, and he is entitled to insist upon, our full and active support—now.

Although unprecedented production figures have made possible our victories, we shall have to increase our goals even more in certain items.

Peak deliveries of supplies were made to the War Department in December 1943. Due in part to cut-backs, we have not produced as much since then. Deliveries of Army supplies were down by 15 percent by July 1944, before the upward trend was once more resumed.

Because of increased demands from overseas, the Army Service Forces in the month of October 1944 had to increase its estimate of required production by 10 percent. But in November, 1 month later, the requirements for 1945 had to be increased another 10 percent, sending the production goal well above anything we have yet attained. Our armed forces in combat have steadily increased their expenditure of medium and heavy artillery ammunition. As we continue the decisive phases of this war, the munitions that we expend will mount day by day.

In October 1944, while some were saying the war in Europe was over, the Army was shipping more men to Europe than in any previous month of the war.

One of the most urgent immediate requirements of the armed forces is more nurses. Last April the Army requirement for nurses was set at 50,000. Actual strength in nurses was then 40,000. Since that time the Army has tried to raise the additional 10,000. Active recruiting has been carried on, but the net gain in 8 months has been only 2,000. There are now 42,000 nurses in the Army.

Recent estimates have increased the total number needed to 60,000. That means that 18,000 more nurses must be obtained for the Army alone, and the Navy now requires 2,000 additional nurses.

The present shortage of Army nurses is reflected in undue strain on the existing force. More than a thousand nurses are now hospitalized, and part of this is due to overwork. The shortage is also indicated by the fact that 11 Army hospital units have been sent overseas without their complement of nurses. At Army hospitals in the United States there is only 1 nurse to 26 beds, instead of the recommended 1 to 15 beds.

It is tragic that the gallant women who have volunteered for service as nurses should be so overworked. It is tragic that our wounded men should ever want for the best possible nursing care.

The inability to get the needed nurses for the Army is not due to any shortage of nurses. Two hundred and eighty thousand registered nurses are now practicing in this country. It has been estimated by the War Manpower Commission that 27,000 additional nurses could be made available to the armed forces without interfering too seriously with the needs of the civilian population for nurses.

Since volunteering has not produced the number of nurses required, I urge that the Selective Service Act be amended to provide for the induction of nurses into the armed forces. The need is too pressing to await the outcome of further efforts at recruiting.

The care and treatment given to our wounded and sick soldiers have been the best known to medical science. Those standards must be maintained at all costs. We cannot tolerate a lowering of them by failure to provide adequate nursing for the brave men who stand desperately in need of it.

In the continuing progress of this war we have constant need for new types of weapons. For we cannot afford to fight the war of today or tomorrow with the weapons of yesterday. For example, the American Army now has developed a new tank with a gun more powerful than any yet mounted on a fast-moving vehicle. The Army will need many thousands of these new tanks in 1945.

Almost every month finds some new development in electronics which must be put into production in order to maintain our technical superiority—and in order to save lives. We have to work every day to keep ahead of the enemy in radar. On D-day, in France, with our superior new equipment, we located and then put out of operation every warning set which the Germans had along the French coast.

If we do not keep constantly ahead of our enemies in the development of new weapons, we pay for our backwardness with the life's blood of our sons.

The only way to meet these increased needs for new weapons, and more of them, is for every American engaged in war work to stay on his war job—for additional American civilians, men and women, not engaged in essential work, to go out and get a war job. Workers who are released because their production is cut back should get another job where production is being increased. This is no time to quit or change to less essential jobs.

There is an old and true saying that the Lord hates a quitter. And this Nation must pay for all those who leave their essential jobs—or all those who lay down on their essential jobs for nonessential reasons. And, again, that payment must be made with the life's blood of our sons.

Many critical production programs with sharply rising needs are now seriously hampered by manpower shortages. The most important Army needs are artillery ammunition, cotton duck, bombs, tires, tanks, heavy trucks and even B–29's. In each of these vital programs, present production is behind requirements.

Navy production of bombardment ammunition is hampered by manpower

shortages; so is production for its huge rocket program. Labor shortages have also delayed its cruiser and carrier programs, and production of certain types of aircraft.

There is critical need for more repair workers and repair parts; this lack delays the return of damaged fighting ships to their places in the fleet, and prevents ships now in the fighting line from getting needed overhauling.

The pool of young men under 26 classified as I–A is almost depleted. Increased replacements for the armed forces will take men now deferred who are at work in war industry. The armed forces must have an assurance of a steady flow of young men for replacements. Meeting this paramount need will be difficult, and will also make it progressively more difficult to attain the 1945 production goals.

Last year, after much consideration, I recommended that the Congress adopt a national service act as the most efficient and democratic way of insuring full production for our war requirements. This recommendation was not adopted.

I now again call upon the Congress to enact this measure for the total mobilization of all our human resources for the prosecution of the war. I urge that this be done at the earliest possible moment.

It is not too late in the war. In fact, bitter experience has shown that in this kind of mechanized warfare where new weapons are constantly being created by our enemies and by ourselves, the closer we come to the end of the war, the more pressing becomes the need for sustained war production with which to deliver the final blow to the enemy.

There are three basic arguments for a national service law.

First, it would assure that we have the right numbers of workers in the right places at the right times.

Second, it would provide supreme proof to all our fighting men that we are giving them what they are entitled to, which is nothing less than our total effort.

And third, it would be the final, unequivocal answer to the hopes of the Nazis and the Japanese that we may become half-hearted about this war and that they can get from us a negotiated peace.

National service legislation would make it possible to put ourselves in a position to assure certain and speedy action in meeting our manpower needs.

It would be used only to the extent absolutely required by military necessities. In fact, experience in Great Britain and in other nations at war indicates that use of the compulsory powers of national service is necessary only in rare instances.

This proposed legislation would provide against loss of retirement and seniority rights and benefits. It would not mean reduction in wages.

In adopting such legislation, it is not necessary to discard the voluntary and cooperative processes which have prevailed up to this time. This cooperation has already produced great results. The contribution of our workers to the war effort has been beyond measure. We must build on the foundations that have already been laid and supplement the measures now in operation, in order to guarantee the production that may be necessary in the critical period that lies ahead.

At the present time we are using the inadequate tools at hand to do the best we can by such expedients as manpower ceilings, and the use of priority and other powers, to induce men and women to shift from nonessential to essential war jobs.

I am in receipt of a joint letter from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, dated January 3, 1945, which says:

> With the experience of 3 years of war and after the most thorough consideration, we are convinced that it is now necessary to carry out the statement made by the Congress in the joint resolutions declaring that a state of war existed with Japan and Germany; that "to bring the conflict to a successful conclusion, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States."
>
> In our considered judgment, which is supported by General Marshall and Admiral King, this requires total mobilization of our manpower by the passage of a national war-service law. The armed forces need this legislation to hasten the day of final victory, and to keep to a minimum the cost in lives.
>
> National war service, the recognition by law of the duty of every citizen to do his or her part in winning the war, will give complete assurance that the need for war equipment will be filled. In the coming year we must increase the output of many weapons and supplies on short notice. Otherwise we shall not keep our production abreast of the swiftly changing needs of war. At the same time it will be necessary to draw progressively many men now engaged in war production to serve with the armed forces, and their places in war production must be filled promptly. These developments will require the addition of hundreds of thousands to those already working in war industry. We do not believe that these needs can be met effectively under present methods.
>
> The record made by management and labor in war industry has been a notable testimony to the resourcefulness and power of America. The needs are so great, nevertheless, that in many instances we have been forced to recall soldiers and sailors from military duty to do work of a civilian character in war production, because of the urgency of the need for equipment and because of inability to recruit civilian labor.

Pending action by the Congress on the broader aspects of national service, I recommend that the Congress immediately enact legislation which will be effective in using the services of the 4,000,000 men now classified as 4–F in whatever capacity is best for the war effort.

In the field of foreign policy, we propose to stand together with the United Nations not for the war alone but for the victory for which the war is fought.

It is not only a common danger which unites us but a common hope. Ours is an association not of governments but of peoples—and the peoples' hope is peace. Here, as in England; in England, as in Russia; in Russia, as in China; in France, and through the continent of Europe, and throughout the world; wherever men love freedom, the hope and purpose of the people are for peace—a peace that is durable and secure.

It will not be easy to create this people's peace. We delude ourselves if we believe that the surrender of the armies of our enemies will make the peace we long for. The unconditional surrender of the armies of our enemies is the first and necessary step—but the first step only.

We have seen already, in areas liberated from the Nazi and the Fascist tyranny, what problems peace will bring. And we delude ourselves if we attempt to believe wishfully that all these problems can be solved overnight.

The firm foundation can be built—and it will be built. But the continuance and assurance of a living peace must, in the long run, be the work of the people themselves.

We, ourselves, like all peoples who have gone through the difficult processes of liberation and adjustment, know of our own experience how great the difficulties can be. We know that they are not difficulties peculiar to any continent or any nation. Our own Revolutionary War left behind it, in the words of one American historian, "an eddy of lawlessness and disregard of human life." There were separatist movements of one kind or another in Vermont, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Maine. There were insurrections, open or threatened, in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. These difficulties we worked out for ourselves as the peoples of the liberated areas of Europe, faced with complex problems of adjustment, will work out their difficulties for themselves.

Peace can be made and kept only by the united determination of free and peace-loving peoples who are willing to work together—willing to help one another—willing to respect and tolerate and try to understand one another's opinions and feelings.

The nearer we come to vanquishing our enemies the more we inevitably become conscious of differences among the victors.

We must not let those differences divide us and blind us to our more important common and continuing interests in winning the war and building the peace.

International cooperation on which enduring peace must be based is not a one-way street.

Nations, like individuals, do not always see alike or think alike, and international cooperation and progress are not helped by any Nation assuming that it has a monopoly of wisdom or of virtue.

In the future world, the misuse of power, as implied in the term "power-politics," must not be a controlling factor in international relations. That is the heart of the principles to which we have subscribed. We cannot deny that power is a factor in world politics any more than we can deny its existence as a factor in national politics. But in a democratic world, as in a democratic nation, power must be linked with responsibility, and obliged to defend and justify itself within the framework of the general good.

Perfectionism, no less than isolationism, or imperialism, or power politics may obstruct the paths to international peace. Let us not forget that the retreat to isolationism a quarter of a century

ago was started not by a direct attack against international cooperation, but against the alleged imperfections of the peace.

In our disillusionment after the last war, we preferred international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see and think exactly as we did. We gave up the hope of gradually achieving a better peace because we had not the courage to fulfill our responsibilities in an admittedly imperfect world.

We must not let that happen again, or we shall follow the same tragic road again—the road to a third world war.

We can fulfill our responsibilities for maintaining the security of our own country only by exercising our power and our influence to achieve the principles in which we believe and for which we have fought.

In August 1941, Prime Minister Churchill and I agreed to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, these being later incorporated into the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942. At that time certain isolationists protested vigorously against our right to proclaim the principles—and against the very principles themselves. Today, many of the same people are protesting against the possibility of violation of the same principles.

It is true that the statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and every one of this war-torn world's tangled situations. But it is a good and a useful thing—it is an essential thing—to have principles toward which we can aim.

And we shall not hesitate to use our influence—and to use it now—to secure, so far is humanly possible, the fulfilment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We have not shrunk from the military responsibilities brought on by this war. We cannot and will not shrink from the political responsibilities which follow in the wake of battle.

I do not wish to give the impression that all mistakes can be avoided and that many disappointments are not inevitable in the making of peace. But we must not this time lose the hope of establishing an international order which will be capable of maintaining peace and realizing through the years more perfect justice between nations.

To do this we must be on our guard not to exploit and exaggerate the differences between us and our allies, particularly with reference to the peoples who have been liberated from Fascist tyranny. That is not the way to secure a better settlement of those differences or to secure international machinery which can rectify mistakes which may be made.

I should not be frank if I did not admit concern about many situations—the Greek and Polish, for example. But those situations are not as easy or as simple to deal with as some spokesmen, whose sincerity I do not question, would have us believe. We have obligations, not necessarily legal, to the exiled governments, to the underground leaders and to our major allies who came much nearer the shadows than we did.

We and our allies have declared that it is our purpose to respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. But with internal dissention, with many citizens of liberated countries still prisoners of war or forced to labor in Germany, it is difficult to guess the kind of self-government the people really want.

During the interim period, until conditions permit a genuine expression of the people's will, we and our allies have a duty, which we cannot ignore, to use our influence to the end that no temporary or provisional authorities in the liberated countries block the eventual exercise of the people's right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as freemen, they are to live.

It is only too easy for all of us to rationalize what we want to believe, and to consider those leaders we like responsible and those we dislike irresponsible. And our task is not helped by stubborn partisanship, however understandable, on the part of opposed internal factions.

It is our purpose to help the peace-loving peoples of Europe to live together as good neighbors, to recognize their common interests and not to nurse their traditional grievances against one another.

But we must not permit the many specific and immediate problems of adjustment connected with the liberation of Europe to delay the establishment of permanent machinery for the maintenance of peace. Under the threat of a common danger, the United Nations joined together in war to preserve their independence and their freedom. They must now join together to make secure the independence and freedom of all peace-loving states, so that never again shall tyranny be able to divide and conquer.

International peace and well-being, like national peace and well-being, require constant alertness, continuing cooperation, and organized effort.

International peace and well-being, like national peace and well-being, can be secured only through institutions capable of life and growth.

Many of the problems of the peace are upon us even now while the conclusion of the war is still before us. The atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding and determination to find a common ground of common understanding, which surrounded the conversations at Dumbarton Oaks, gives us reason to hope that future discussions will succeed in developing the democratic and fully integrated world security system toward which these preparatory conversations were directed.

We and the other United Nations are going forward, with vigor and resolution, in our efforts to create such a system by providing for it strong and flexible institutions of joint and cooperative action.

The aroused conscience of humanity will not permit failure in this supreme endeavor.

We believe that the extraordinary advances in the means of inter-communication between peoples over the past generation offer a practical method of advancing the mutual understanding upon which peace and the institutions of peace must rest, and it is our policy and purpose to use these great technological achievements for the common advantage of the world.

We support the greatest possible freedom of trade and commerce.

We Americans have always believed in freedom of opportunity, and equality of opportunity remains one of the principal objectives of our national life. What we believe in for individuals, we believe in also for nations. We are opposed to restrictions, whether by public act or private arrangement, which distort and impair commerce, transit, and trade.

We have house cleaning of our own to do in this regard. But it is our hope, not only in the interest of our own prosperity but in the interest of the prosperity of the world, that trade and commerce and access to materials and markets may be freer after this war than ever before in the history of the world.

One of the most heartening events of the year in the international field has been the renaissance of the French people and the return of the French Nation to the ranks of the United Nations. Far from having been crushed by the terror of Nazi domination, the French people have emerged with stronger faith than ever in the destiny of their country and in the soundness of the democratic ideals to which the French Nation has traditionally contributed so greatly.

During her liberation, France has given proof of her unceasing determination to fight the Germans, continuing the heroic efforts of the resistance groups under the occupation and of all those Frenchmen throughout the world who refused to surrender after the disaster of 1940.

Today, French armies are again on the German frontier, and are again fighting shoulder to shoulder with our sons.

Since our landings in Africa, we have placed in French hands all the arms and material of war which our resources and the military situation permitted. And I am glad to say that we are now about to equip large new French forces with the most modern weapons for combat duty.

In addition to the contribution which France can make to our common victory, her liberation likewise means that her great influence will again be available in meeting the problems of peace.

We fully recognize France's vital interest in a lasting solution of the German problem and the contribution which she can make in achieving international security. Her formal adherence to the declaration by United Nations a few days ago and the proposal at the Dumbarton Oaks discussions, whereby France would receive one of the five permanent seats in the proposed Security Council, demonstrate the extent to which France has resumed her proper position of strength and leadership.

I am clear in my own mind that as an essential factor in the maintenance of

peace in the future, we must have universal military training after this war, and I shall send a special message to the Congress on this subject.

An enduring peace cannot be achieved without a strong America—strong in the social and economic sense as well as in the military sense.

In the state of the Union message last year, I set forth what I considered to be an American economic bill of rights.

I said then, and I say now, that these economic truths represent a second bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all, regardless of station, race, or creed.

Of these rights, the most fundamental and one on which the fulfillment of the others in large degree depends is the "right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation." In turn, others of the economic rights of American citizenship such as the right to a decent home, to a good education, to good medical care, to social security, to reasonable farm income, will, if fulfilled, make major contributions to achieving adequate levels of employment.

The Federal Government must see to it that these rights become realities—with the help of States, municipalities, business, labor, and agriculture.

We have had full employment during the war. We have had it because the Government has been ready to buy all the materials of war which the country could produce; and this has amounted to approximately half our present productive capacity.

After the war we must maintain full employment with Government performing its peacetime functions. This means that we must achieve a level of demand and purchasing power by private consumers—farmers, businessmen, workers, professional men, housewives—which is sufficiently high to replace wartime Government demands; and it means also that we must greatly increase our export trade above the pre-war level.

Our policy is, of course, to rely as much as possible on private enterprise to provide jobs. But the American people will not accept mass unemployment or mere makeshift work. There will be need for the work of everyone willing and able to work, and that means close to 60,000,000 jobs.

Full employment means not only jobs but productive jobs. Americans do not regard jobs that pay substandard wages as productive jobs.

We must make sure that private enterprise works as it is supposed to work—on the basis of initiative and vigorous competition, without the stifling presence of monopolies and cartels.

During the war we have guaranteed investment in enterprise essential to the war effort. We should also take appropriate measures in peacetime to secure opportunities for new small enterprises and for productive business expansion for which finance would otherwise be unavailable.

This necessary expansion of our peacetime productive capacity will require new facilities, new plants, and new equipment.

It will require large outlays of money which should be raised through normal investment channels. But while private capital should finance this expansion program, the Government should recognize its responsibility for sharing part of any special or abnormal risk of loss attached to such financing.

Our full-employment program requires the extensive development of our natural resources and other useful public works. The undeveloped resources of this continent are still vast. Our river-watershed projects will add new and fertile territories to the United States. The T. V. A., which was constructed at a cost of $750,000,000—the cost of waging this war for less than 4 days—was a bargain. We have similar opportunities in our other great river basins. By harnessing the resources of these river basins, as we have in the Tennessee Valley, we shall provide the same kind of stimulus to enterprise as was provided by the Louisiana Purchase and the new discoveries in the West during the nineteenth century.

If we are to avail ourselves fully of the benefits of civil aviation, and if we are to use the automobiles we can produce, it will be necessary to construct thousands of airports and to overhaul our entire national highway system.

The provision of a decent home for every family is a national necessity, if this country is to be worthy of its greatness, and that task will itself create great employment opportunities. Most of our cities need extensive rebuilding. Much of our farm plant is in a state of disrepair. To make a frontal attack on the problems of housing and urban reconstruction will require thoroughgoing cooperation between industry and labor, and the Federal, State, and local governments.

An expanded social-security program, and adequate health and education programs must play essential roles in a program designed to support individual productivity and mass purchasing power. I shall communicate further with the Congress on these subjects at a later date.

The millions of productive jobs that a program of this nature could bring are jobs in private enterprise. They are jobs based on the expanded demand for the output of our economy for consumption and investment. Through a program of this character we can maintain a national income high enough to provide for an orderly retirement of the public debt along with reasonable tax reduction.

Our present tax system geared primarily to war requirements must be revised for peacetime so as to encourage private demand.

While no general revision of the tax structure can be made until the war ends on all fronts, the Congress should be prepared to provide tax modifications at the end of the war in Europe, designed to encourage capital to invest in new enterprises and to provide jobs. As an integral part of this program to maintain high employment, we must, after the war is over, reduce or eliminate taxes which bear too heavily on consumption.

The war will leave deep disturbances in the world economy, in our national economy, in many communities, in many families, and in many individuals. It will require determined effort and responsible action of all of us to find our way back to peacetime, and to help others to find their way back to peacetime—a peacetime that holds the values of the past and the promise of the future.

If we attack our problems with determination we shall succeed. And we must succeed. For freedom and peace cannot exist without security.

During the past year the American people, in a national election, reasserted their democratic faith.

In the course of that campaign various references were made to strife between this administration and the Congress, with the implication, if not the direct assertion, that this administration and the Congress could never work together harmoniously in the service of the Nation.

It cannot be denied that there have been disagreements between the legislative and executive branches—as there have been disagreements during the past century and a half.

I think we all realize, too, that there are some people in this Capital City whose task is in large part to stir up dissension, and to magnify normal, healthy disagreements so that they appear to be irreconcilable conflicts.

But I think that the over-all record in this respect is eloquent: The Government of the United States of America—all branches of it—has a good record of achievement in this war.

The Congress, the Executive, and the judiciary have worked together for the common good.

I myself want to tell you, the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, how happy I am in our relationships and friendships. I have not yet had the pleasure of meeting some of the new Members in each House, but I hope that opportunity will offer itself in the near future.

We have a great many problems ahead of us and we must approach them with realism and courage.

This new year of 1945 can be the greatest year of achievement in human history.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five can see the final ending of the Nazi-Fascist reign of terror in Europe.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five can see the closing in of the forces of retribution about the center of the malignant power of imperialistic Japan.

Most important of all—1945 can and must see the substantial beginning of the organization of world peace. This organization must be the fulfillment of the promise for which men have fought and died in this war. It must be the justification of all the sacrifices that have been made—of all the dreadful misery that this world has endured.

We Americans of today, together with our allies, are making history—and I hope it will be better history than ever has been made before.

We pray that we may be worthy of the unlimited opportunities that God has given us.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 6, 1945.*

The SPEAKER. The joint session of the two Houses is now dissolved.

At 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m. the Senate retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the President's message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair directs that the electoral vote be spread at large upon the Journal of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr RAMEY, of Ohio, for 1 week on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 8, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

54. A letter from the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, transmitting, in compliance with the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress (H. Doc. No. 17); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

55. A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a copy of the requests for personnel needs during the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945, as placed before the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

56. A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements, for the quarter ending March 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

57. A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

58. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the Federal Trade Commission for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

59. A letter from the Director of the Office of Strategic Services, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Strategic Services; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

60. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945 for the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

61. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting information which specifies the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Department of Labor and its bureaus for the quarter beginning January 1, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

62. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Department to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, reflecting the number of employees estimated to be required during the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

63. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting reports in connection with the personnel requirements of the Federal Communications Commission for the quarter ending March 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

64. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

65. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

66. A letter from the Surplus Property Board, transmitting the first report of the Surplus Property Board; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

67. A letter from the Surplus Property Board, transmitting an interim report under section 19 (b) of the Surplus Property Act; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

68. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, transmitting herewith the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending March 31, 1945, for the bureaus and offices of this Department; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

69. A letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion for the quarter ending March 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

70. A letter from the Director of the Office of War Information, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Information covering the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

71. A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission for the period ending March 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

72. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380); to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

73. A letter from the Director of the Office of Censorship, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending March 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

74. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the various ceiling units of the Department of Commerce for the period January-March 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

75. A letter from the Chairman and General Manager of Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945, presented in compliance with instructions of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

76. A letter from the Under Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, transmitting herewith copies of revised estimates of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

77. A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1945; to the Commitee on the Civil Service.

78. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage record information to State unemployment compensation agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

79. A letter from the Secretary, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the report of the United States Maritime Commission for the period ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

80. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Public Buildings and Grounds.

81. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the preliminary report of the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

82. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a request that an extension of not to exceed 60 days be granted which will enable the Fish and Wildlife Service to complete the necessary illustrations and prepare copies of the report in proper form for submission to the Public Printer; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

83. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

84. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of reports relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

85. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report to Congress of all cases where special contracts are made with railroad companies for the transportation of the mails and the terms and reasons therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

86. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering expenditures made from the appropriation "Education of natives of Alaska, 1944–45," for the relief of destitution of natives of Alaska during the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in

North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1096. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1097. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 1098. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1099. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1100. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1101. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, to further protect the rights, privileges, and immunities extended to citizens by State and Federal election laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1102. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Acts, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 1103. A bill amending the Classification Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 1104. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1105. A bill authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Thirty-second Division; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 1106. A bill to provide that the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 and the act of December 22, 1942, increasing the pay and allowances of Army and Navy nurses shall take effect as of December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1107. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of death compensation benefits to widows and children of World War veterans under Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1108. A bill to establish uniform procedure relative to the proof of age, place of birth, or of death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1109. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 1110. A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1111. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Fort Peck project, Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1112. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1113. A bill to include insurance paid by a private agency or organization among the exemptions from the annual income limitations governing payment of death compensation under Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and pension under part III of Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 1114. A bill to broaden the coverage of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for State aid to all needy orphans and other needy children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1115. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service provided for by the act of December 17, 1943; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 1116. A bill to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 1117. A bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 1118. A bill amending the Hatch Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1119. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1120. A bill providing that on and after the date of enactment of this act, for pension purposes, any person who served under contract with the War Department as acting assistant or contract surgeon between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, shall be considered to have been in the active military service of the United States for the period of such contract service between those dates; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 1121. A bill to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1122. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for candidates for admission to the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1123. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 1124. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed to January 2, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1125. A bill to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1126. A bill to authorize improvements in the South Canal of St. Marys River, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 1127. A bill to exempt certain furs from the war-tax rates on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1128. A bill to incorporate the Regular Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 1129. A bill to authorize the construction of the Umatilla Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg., and Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1130. A bill to repeal Public Law No. 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution expressing the thanks of Congress for the contribution to the victory effort being made by the Nation's children; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to repeal Public Law No. 403, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 7, second session, and reinstate the standard time provided in the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding any State or political subdivision thereof to deny or abridge the right of any citizen to vote on account of failure to pay a poll tax or property tax assessed against him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution, providing for the administration and protection of Territories and possessions of the United States by the Navy Department; to the Committee on Territories.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of suitable living accommodations for rental to Members of Congress, legislative employees, and their families; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. Res. 57. Resolution to continue the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. Res. 58. Resolution to abolish the standing committee of the House of Representatives known as the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 1131. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Hondros; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1132. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zenobia Mershon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Eric L. Reeser; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of J. L. Horton, James Horton, Fred Bird, John Dowdell, Martin Dowdell, Harrison Trent, Charles Clark, Obed Crutcher, Nannie Horton, Virgil Funk, Lubie Bailey, Della Stone, Cowley Heiss, Arthur Car, Lonnie Wise, E. B. Meyers, Nellie Meyers, Leo Wise, Clyde A. Meyers, W. C. Masters, Gertie Stone, Caskmears Atcher, Josephine Clark, Alexander Gidgon, Mrs. J. T. Eubanks, Mrs. Harrison

Basham, Harry Yates, and G. S. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1135. A bill for the relief of Gus A. Vance; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1137. A bill granting a pension to Julia Lyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1138. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Blacketer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1139. A bill granting a pension to Rebecca J. Tilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1140. A bill granting a pension to Louise F. Mansfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1141. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Quattlebaum; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Carl Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 1143. A bill for the relief of Clarence T. Summer, the Prosperity Depository, and D. H. Hamm; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1145. A bill for the relief of Ben W. Colburn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1146. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1147. A bill for the relief of the Sheehan Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1148. A bill for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1149. A bill for the relief of Dane D. Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1150. A bill for the relief of Murphy & Wischmeyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of James Lemuel Muzzall and James M. Muzzall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1152. A bill for the relief of the parents of Dorothy White; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Adney W. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of Winston Cann; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Leo Joseph Berry; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1156. A bill to correct the record of Ralph Everett Crawshaw; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Barbara Healy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1158. A bill for the relief of Fannah A. Fuller; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands petitioning the Congress of the United States to extend to the American citizens and voters of the Virgin Islands the right to participate in the national elections and permit them to vote for a President and Vice President of the United States of America; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2. Also, memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands petitioning the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for a Resident Commissioner; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, upon earth we praise Thee that in a sin-stained world our souls find peace and forgiveness at Thy holy altar. In this communion Thy children rise clarified in vision and with an aspiration above the "common clod." We pray that we may put aside every disappointment, every wound, and every suggestion of failure and give to our fellow countrymen noble examples of unity and unsullied devotion to our country's need. O help us to do the right, to deal justly, and to abound in industry and bend our whole soul to a serious understanding of our high calling.

We are grateful that in our land the individual need never lose his halo; here through our fellowship we may give service that will rescue from want, woe, and fear. The world is too big in which to be small, too lovely in which to be unlovely, and Thou art too great a friend for us to be friendless. Dear Lord, across the waters the gods of war are raging and pouring out their curses and bitterness upon generations unborn. May nothing scar our obligations to the enslaved peoples, the victims of lust for power that withers whatever it touches. O Lord, give us wisdom for the problems of the hour as we meet the responsibilities of service, and may our citizens of every walk and rank heed the call and commit themselves as loyal stewards of our Government. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 6, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 6):

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. Those Members-elect present who have not taken the oath of office will appear at the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Thereupon Mr. BARDEN, Mr. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CHENOWETH took the oath of office.

FRANK W. COLLIER

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, it was a beautiful, sunny, and an auspicious day exactly 37 years ago today that one of the most trusted employees of the House of Representatives arrived in the city of Washington to become a messenger in the House post office. I refer to my friend of many years' standing, Mr. Frank W. Collier, one of the minority clerks of this House.

I first became acquainted with Mr. Collier when he was proprietor of a pharmacy in the city of La Crosse, Wis., my home city. In my daily rounds as a newsboy, I used to drop in Frank's store to get warm on cold winter days when the mercury dropped to 30 and 40 below zero, as it so often does in Wisconsin.

I missed Frank Collier when he left La Crosse for that big city in the East, the Capital of our country. But we in the home town kept close watch of Frank's progress in Washington, and we were very happy to learn 2 years after he left us that he had been promoted to chief page of the House of Representatives. To us back home in Wisconsin that was proof that our fellow townsman was rising in his new work and was recognized as a leader in the Nation's Legislative Halls.

And then when Frank was appointed to the position of postmaster of the House of Representatives in 1921 his friends in La Crosse knew that he had arrived. Mr. Collier held that position of honor and trust and respect until in 1933, when the Republican Party became the minority party. Since that time Frank Collier has been with us here as a minority clerk of the House. Frank has won the good will and respect of all the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. Whenever any of us, whether members of the majority or minority party, wants any information, a document, extra copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or if there is any favor we desire, we have found Frank Collier here in the House always ready to serve us graciously and with a smile.

I extend to Frank Collier my sincere congratulations on this his thirty-seventh anniversary as a trusted employee of the House of Representatives. He has been connected with the House of Representatives longer than any present Member of Congress. I wish him continued good health and happiness and hope he will be with the House for many more years of trusted service. Frank Collier, I salute you.

HOUSING FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making an announcement which will be of interest to all Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say especially to the new Members of

the Seventy-ninth Congress that in December the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and myself received certain inquiries and some complaints from Members of the House relative to suitable living quarters during their tenure in office in the present Seventy-ninth Congress. As chairman of the House District Committee, I at that time called representatives of the War Housing Center, the Washington Hotel Association, and others for a conference. It was decided that we would have the officials of the War Housing Center address a letter to each new Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Eighty-eight communications were sent to those Members and 30 replies were received. Until last week, 10 of those 30 have been placed in apartments or houses. The Speaker of the House is interested in this matter. Unofficially, I am acting for the District Committee in helping any of those Members who still are in difficulty. For this reason we have called an informal meeting of the committee this afternoon at 3 o'clock in room 345 of the Old House Office Building. I trust the new Members, and those old Members who have some particular housing problem that we might assist, will be at the appointed place.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad the gentleman has taken the floor to explain this situation to the new Members. This also applies to many of the old Members who have been unable to obtain suitable quarters. It will be recalled that, 5 years ago, I introduced a resolution in the House asking for an appropriation to build an apartment building for Members and their employees so that they might have the opportunity of obtaining suitable quarters at a fair and reasonable price and not be held up and robbed. I have reintroduced that resolution in the present session, and I would like to know whether the gentleman does not think that prompt action should be taken in order to take care of many of the Members who are being held up by the hotels and owners of apartment buildings. Some even now have not suitable quarters. They are obliged to live in Virginia, Maryland, and other places at this time. Does not the gentleman believe that matter should be given some consideration?

BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 6, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052a), I have designated Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER, Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON, Hon. JOHN H. KERR, Hon. D. LANE POWERS, and Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL, members of the Committee on Appropriations, as members from this committee to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy for the Seventy-ninth Congress.

With assurances of my regard, I am,
Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of public law, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission to Consider a Site and Design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia the following Members of the House: Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. LANHAM, and Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois.

CONFIDENTIAL MEETING OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND GENERAL OF THE ARMY GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL OF THE FLEET ERNEST J. KING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, acting with the approval of the President, are planning to invite the Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress to a confidential meeting at which General of the Army George C. Marshall and Admiral of the Fleet Ernest J. King will make an off-the-record report on the war.

The purpose of this meeting is to give the membership a factual background of the latest information on our fighting forces in all theaters of war.

It seems to me that this meeting will come at a particularly appropriate time. From now on this body will be faced with decisions of the gravest importance to our war effort. It will be invaluable to all of us to have first-hand facts from General Marshall and Admiral King.

As I have said, this will be an off-the-record meeting. The representatives of the Army and the Navy plan to tell us facts which, for security reasons, cannot be told publicly at this time. Because of the confidential nature of the meeting, only Members of Congress, in person, will be admitted. It will be impossible for us to take with us any member of our families or our staffs, or to delegate anyone to attend in our behalf.

I am deeply impressed by the importance of this meeting and the good which can result from it. I therefore urge every Member of the Senate and the House to arrange his time so that he may attend. Because of the confidential nature of the meeting, only Members of the Congress will be admitted, and no one else.

I might say that this meeting will take place sometime during the week of January 22. The exact date has not yet been decided but when it is, I will advise the membership of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I suggest to the majority leader that he invite them to hold that meeting in the Hall of the House of Representatives. It would be much more convenient to the majority of the Members than any place you could find downtown, and there would be a larger attendance.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will keep that suggestion in mind. I might also say that we had one such meeting, as I remember, in the last session. The Members of the House were invited, and every Member kept his word as to whatever was said off the record. I was proud of the fact that after that meeting no Member of the House violated the confidence—and I am speaking about the House in particular—and that there were no wild stories afterward of what actually was said or took place, because every Member respected and kept the confidence that was reposed in him.

IV-F'S

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, as the result of the President's very splendid suggestion that we implement the method of securing the cooperation of all sections of our population in the war effort, there has been some disposition on the part of individuals and publications alike to disparage the present position of the IV–F's. I think it is only fair that we call attention to the fact that those men who are suffering from physical handicaps which have made it impossible for them to serve in the armed forces at this time are not deferred because of their own wishes but because of the regulations of the Army, and they should not be looked upon in any way as being slackers or unpatriotic. It is not their fault that they are in that position. It is too bad that the Army has not heretofore seen fit to provide a practical method of using their services.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman may remember that the Committee on Military Affairs as early as last March recommended a relaxation of those physical requirements by the War Department.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. I think the committee was right. I have no criticism of anyone except to call attention to the fact that those men who have sometimes been unthoughtedly criticized are in that position through no choice of their own, and we should not look upon them as unpatriotic or unwilling to fight for their country. You cannot join Uncle Sam's Army unless the Army will take you. In the past the Army has refused to take these men. I am glad it now wants them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the Dies committee died, but it was immediately resurrected as a standing committee of the House under new leadership. The English expression that covers this phenomenon is, "The King is dead! Long live the King!" I had expected to conduct a post mortem, or autopsy, over the dead body, but obviously that is impossible now. As a member of the Dies committee during most of its turbulent career, I wish to make the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, a proper evaluation of the accomplishments of this committee can only be made by a careful analysis of the work that the committee has done—entirely aside from the sensational and somewhat spectacular publicity given to the hearings of the committee during its turbulent career, most of which centered around its colorful chairman. The cold hard facts are as follows:

(a) The committee has accumulated in its files the most valuable reservoir of information on subversive activities that exists in the Nation today.

(b) This reservoir of information in itself is worth all the money spent by the committee during its 7 years.

(c) Since December 7, 1941, the F. B. I., the Naval Intelligence, the Military Intelligence, the Secret Service, and other branches of the Government have been using the files of the Dies committee almost daily to secure evidence upon which many convictions have been secured.

(d) The action of the House in establishing a Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities as one of the standing committees of the House makes certain that the valuable files of the Dies committee will be preserved, and also makes certain that they will continue to be available to any department of the Government that may need the information contained therein.

Mr. Speaker, because an article written by David Lawrence, entitled "Dies Group Revival Laid to P. A. C. Itself," gives a true picture of the reason for the action of the House, and, in my opinion, justifies that action, I include the article as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 5, 1945]

DIES GROUP REVIVAL LAID TO P. A. C. ITSELF—LEFT-WINGERS FAILED TO REALIZE OPPOSITION STRENGTH, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

The revival of the so-called Dies committee, which comes as a surprise to the left-wingers, ought not to be a surprise at all, for they are the ones who are responsible for it.

The Dies committee, which has been investigating un-American activities, would never have been renewed, nor would such a decisive margin been cast for making the committee permanent in the House of Representatives, if it had not been for the extreme tactics of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. in the last year. It is an excellent example of how extremists, sometimes even with the best of intentions, overreach themselves.

For several years now the left-wingers have been attacking the Dies committee either by ridicule or with words of vitriolic condemnation. But these attacks have only served to make more and more suspicious those elements in the House of Representatives which are truly fearful that certain left-wing tendencies in this country and communism are so close together as to constitute a real menace to the future of American institutions.

Actually the amount of subversive activity in America is probably no greater today than 10 years ago, and maybe there are lots of people today who see things under the bed which are not really there. The greatest impetus, however, to the fear that communistic philosophies might be applied to undermine constitutional government in America came from the amazing tactics of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. in the last campaign.

GOMPERS' ADVICE IGNORED

These ignored entirely the advice which the late Samuel Gompers and other leaders of the American Federation of Labor have long tendered to the workers of America, namely, that they should not make themselves an instrument of either political party, but support or oppose candidates of both parties on their merits.

During the last year the C. I. O.-P. A. C. concentrated almost entirely on Republicans, and also on those Democrats in the South who had had the temerity to oppose some of the left-wing concepts. Thus Representative Dies, chairman of the committee, did not seek reelection, and Representatives Starnes, of Alabama, and Costello, of California, were defeated in Democratic Party primaries through the concentration of effort by the C. I. O.-P. A. C. in those three districts.

But the C. I. O.-P. A. C. made the mistake of thinking that the Dies committee consisted of just a few individuals. It failed to realize that back of the Dies committee was very powerful support, which could at almost any time command majorities in the House of Representatives.

An examination of the various votes taken either to authorize funds or to continue the Dies committee during the last 4 years reveals that the committee was in every case upheld by an overwhelming majority. The opposition in votes was always surprisingly small.

TRUE REASON FOR STRENGTH

What is the true reason for the strength of the Dies committee or its successor, which has now been made a permanent part of the committee structure of the House of Representatives? The truth is, as everybody who understands Washington politics realizes, that the forces behind the coalition in the House of Representatives derive their strength from the American Legion, the American Federation of Labor, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and other patriotic societies, and a not inconsiderable element in the Catholic church whose opposition to communism or anything that even remotely suggests it is very well known.

The American Federation of Labor has always fought communism, and when the C. I. O.-P. A. C. movement started and critics said that in that movement were a number of Communists, the American Federation of Labor stood apart, and many of the leaders of A. F. L. and some of the railroad brotherhood unions predicted that what the C. I. O.-P. A. C. had done in the 1944 political campaign would rise to plague that organization for many years to come.

Again and again the C. I. O.-P. A. C. has thought it had the Dies committee movement beaten, but it did not realize perhaps that its own pressure to defeat it was largely responsible for the countersupport given to the committee this week by a vote of 207 to 186. Maybe if the left-wingers had let the Dies committee alone, it would have died a natural death long before this.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permission to address the House today for 25 minutes that was granted me last week be carried over to a later date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

INDUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS BETWEEN THE AGES OF 18 AND 26

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, press reports on the announcement of War Mobilization Director Byrnes as to the induction of agricultural workers between the ages of 18 and 26 have caused great consternation in my district, and particularly among the dairy interests.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to append to my remarks the contents of a letter on the subject from the Dairymen's League Co-Operative Association, Inc., 11 West Forty-second Street, New York, addressed to Hon. Marvin Jones, Administrator, War Food Administration, and to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., January 5, 1945.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
Administrator, War Food Administration, Washington, D. C.

Maj. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director of Selective Service, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: Press reports on Director Byrnes' order on the drafting of farm labor indicates that all farm men between the ages of 18 and 26 will be inducted by local draft boards.

It is my understanding that these newspaper headlines do not correctly portray the intent of the order. Its purpose, as I understand it, is to cause local draft boards to review the classification of farm men in this age class to screen out only those who are not vital to food production.

There is grave danger that under the urgency of manpower needs for the armed forces some local draft boards will fail to heed the provisions of the Tydings amendment and will induct farm workers who are vital to the production of critical foods, such as milk and dairy products.

The winning of the war is of first concern to all of us. To do this in the shortest time possible we must continue to maintain an adequate food supply, particularly such nutritious and vital foods as milk and dairy products.

The War Food Administration and Selective Service have indicated that they are deeply concerned regarding the maintenance of production of milk and dairy products. Despite Herculean efforts on the part of dairy farmers, milk production during the years 1940 to 1944 has fallen far short of demand. As you know, the storage of butter, cheese, and evaporated milk is at a dangerously low level. Production of milk and dairy products during these critical years since the war began, in spite of night and day efforts of dairymen, has lagged behind the production of most other agricultural commodities, as the following table clearly indicates:

Percent of increase for 1944 over 1935–39 average

Product:	
Oil crops	236
Food grains	53
Feed grains (including hay)	30
Truck crops	39
Meat animals (including poultry and poultry products)	50
Dairy production	13

The failure of dairy production to keep pace with that of other agricultural products has been due in part to the fact that encouragement to increase milk production was withheld to a greater extent and for a longer period than for other agricultural products. Price relationships and the exacting labor requirements for production of milk account for the lag, as compared with production of meat, poultry, and most crops.

The smallest farm labor force of record has produced during 1944 the largest volume of agricultural products in our history—33 percent more than the 1935–39 prewar volume. Yet, the production of milk and dairy products is still far below requirements.

Interpretation along the lines indicated by the headlines of newspapers by local draft boards of Director Byrnes' order will further deplete the scanty supply of skilled young men working on family size farms. I understand that the age of the average farm operator in this State is 59 years. During September their average work day was 12.6 hours, while industrial employees in this State and the Nation averaged to work less than 7.5 hours per day. The operation of dairy farms calls for continuous work—a 7-day week—a 365-day job. No doubt the hours worked on family-size dairy farms are well above the average of all farms of the State. Efforts of the Government to alleviate the farm-labor situation by the use of temporary or migratory labor are commendable and have been of much assistance to certain types of agriculture. Production of milk and milk products, however, does not lend itself to the use of mass or seasonal labor or labor imported from Jamaica, Mexico, or prisoners of war, or migratory workers. Milk production requires skilled year-round workers.

Unless local draft boards give full consideration to the Tydings amendment in its relation to needed dairy production and unless they continue to defer skilled, willing, productive farm workers who cannot be replaced, many herds in this milkshed will have to be disposed of and many farms will have to lie idle. This would result in a disservice and would tend to prolong the war and delay victory.

Very sincerely,

FRED H. SEXAUER,
President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by William P. Kennedy that he has prepared for the Minnesota State Historical Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

POINTS AND CHARTERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago today, while the Nation was at war, Woodrow Wilson stood before this body and sketched his famous Fourteen Points as a foundation for world peace. About 9 months later, these were supplemented by the Five Points which he presented at a meeting in New York. These are interesting not only as part of the history of a troubled period in our national life but as comparative literature as we contemplate the anxiety and concern which today dwells in the common heart over the status of the Atlantic Charter and the broad principles which it sets forth. On this anniversary occasion, it would appear appropriate to refresh ourselves on the provisions in the Fourteen Points, the Five Points, and the Atlantic Charter, and I ask unanimous consent that they be incorporated as a part of these brief observations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The matters referred to are as follows:

THE 14 POINTS

(From President Wilson's address to Congress, January 8, 1918)

The program of the world's peace, therefore, is our program, and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

1. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace, and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guaranties given and taken that the national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government whose title is to be determined.

6. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly 50 years, should be righted in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontier of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated, occupied territories restored, Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea, and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along their topographically established lines of allegiance and nationality, and international guaranties of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guaranties.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of according mutual guaranties of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

THE FIVE POINTS

(From President Wilson's address at the Metropolitan Opera House, New York, September 27, 1918)

1. The impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favorites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned.

2. No special or separate interests of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

3. There can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations.

4. And more specifically—there can be no special selfish economic combinations within the League and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

5. All international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world.

TEXT OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Fourth. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

Fifth. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

Sixth. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Seventh. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Eighth. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

UNFAIR PUBLIC COMPETITION

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Members of the House to a very interesting editorial which appears in a publication called the Union, a labor publication of northwestern Pennsylvania. The editorial is entitled "Unfair Public Competition." It calls to our attention that in the State of Oklahoma they have an unusual and extreme case of the investor-owned Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., which has a tax bill of 4.588 mills per kilowatt hour, being compelled to compete with a tax-free Government project which sells electric power at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. If the public plant were taxed, it would have to sell its power at 8.588 mills per kilowatt-hour. In other words, the total gross rate of the Government power project is not even enough to pay the taxes levied against its competitor, the privately owned company. Now I ask how long can private enterprise compete against a situation of this kind? Certainly an unfair situation as this must be corrected if private enterprise is to exist.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial to which I refer is as follows:

UNFAIR PUBLIC COMPETITION

Uncle Sam's taxing power has become something of enormous importance. He now requires huge revenues with which to carry on the wars against Germany and Japan; and in the post-war era and for many long years afterward, he will need huge revenues to meet the interest on the war debt, to begin to pay off part of that indebtedness, to take care of our returning soldiers, and to carry on the ordinary business of his Government.

Therefore, anything that interferes with the right of the Federal Government, the 48 individual States, and the municipalities of the Nation to tax any business, must be removed. For example, the whole theory that Government projects should be exempt from all kinds of taxation is wrong. Only the true business of Government, that is, the carrying on of the actual government of Nation, State, or municipality, should be exempt from taxation. Such exemption should not be applied to any property or activity of Government when it is engaged in the business of producing goods or services for sale. When Government does this, it should be on exactly the same footing as any private enterprise engaged in similar activities.

When the Government activity is competitive and is bidding against private enterprise for the patronage of clients, it is an injustice that private enterprise should be taxed and the public enterprise go free; but even worse than that, it all too often so hamstrings private enterprise as to drive it eventually out of business, thus coddling public enterprise and depriving it of all incentive to efficiency.

For instance, and this is not an unusual or extreme case, the investor-owned Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. has a tax bill of 4.588 mills per kilowatt-hour. It is expected to compete with a tax-free Government project which sells electric power at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. If the public plant was taxed, it would have to sell its power at 8.588 mills per kilowatt-hour. In other words, the total gross rate of the Government power project is not even enough to pay the taxes levied against its competitor, the privately owned company.

One does not have to be a certified public accountant or a mathematical wizard to see that unless this unfair situation is changed, the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. is doomed to close up shop, the only question being as to how long it will be able to continue in business in the face of such odds.

But even more serious than this unfairness to private investors is that at a time when governments need every dollar of revenue they can collect, the Federal Government sets itself up in various businesses, exempts them from taxation, and cuts off important sources of revenue.

We always have opposed Government going into business, either in competition with or to the exclusion of private enterprise. This country has had so many striking evidences of the superior efficiency of private enterprise, of its ability in many cases to meet unfair, untaxed Government competition, that we perpetually marvel that there is still one single American propagandizing to put the Government into business.

But, if we must have these Government projects, then every dictate of fairness decrees that they should operate under the same rules and regulations that govern private enterprise. And if one has no disposition to be fair, then purely selfish motives should demand taxation of Government businesses in order to provide the tax revenues so badly needed now and in the future.

This making sheep of Government enterprises and goats of private enterprises works an injustice not only to the stockholders of the privately owned companies, but also, in the final analysis, to the stockholders (the taxpayers) of Uncle Sam, Inc.

THE LATE MRS. RUTH HANNA SIMMS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on December 31 of last year, this Nation suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of Mrs. Ruth Hanna Simms in Billings Memorial Hospital in Chicago. Mrs. Simms was a former Member of this body, having served in the Seventy-first Congress as Congresswoman at large from the State of Illinois. Her surviving husband, Albert G. Simms, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., is also a former colleague, having represented the State of New Mexico in the same Congress.

On last Thursday, January 4, I attended the funeral services for Mrs. Simms which were held in Albuquerque. Mrs. Simms, while a legal resident of the State of New Mexico, had many interests in Colorado, and spent much of her time supervising a large cattle and sheep ranch located near Fort Garland in my district known as the Trinchera Ranch. She established the Fountain Valley School near Colorado Springs and was a director at the time of her death. This is one of the outstanding boys' schools of the country, and attracts students from many States.

Mr. Speaker, I consider Mrs. Simms one of the outstanding women of this age. She made a most valuable contribution to our social and political life. She gave most generously of her time and means to the advancement of those programs which she thought would make this country a better place in which to live. It was a high privilege for me to know her and to enjoy her friendship.

The eulogy to Mrs. Simms was delivered by Hon. Sam G. Bratton, of Albuquerque, judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. Judge Bratton is a former Member of the United States Senate, having resigned from that body to accept appointment to the bench. Judge Bratton, as a friend and neighbor of Mrs. Simms, had the opportunity to appraise her qualities, work, and influence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the eloquent tribute to Mrs. Simms delivered by the Honorable Sam G. Bratton at her funeral service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EULOGY TO MRS. RUTH HANNA SIMMS

(By Sam G. Bratton)

The ages are replete with vainglorious funerals, marble arches, towering, silent pyramids, and even attempts at deification, but surpassing all of these have been the words of living survivors, embedded in the treasure houses of recorded history, eternally fresh and pregnant with life, encouragement, and hope for the future. If the scientists and philosophers are correct in telling us that no form of life or energy fails to register itself, that the pebble dropped in the placid pool spreads in a symmetrical circle to expansions of unknown ends; and that the fragrance of the modest violet pervades the universe, surely a life of unremitting toil attended by courage, charity, gentleness, and kindliness must continue through the channels of remembrance to blossom and bear fruit again in the thoughts and acts of the oncoming generations. The darkness of the valley of the shadow of death surrounds us and obscures our vision, but we unite in the firm belief that the sweetness and gentleness of nature, the charm of personality, the kindliness of manner, the readiness of sympathy, and the unbounded love for husband and children, always present in the life of Mrs. Simms, will find attunement in the life of others, even those who come after her.

Mrs. Simms acquired an academic and classical education in private schools in New York and Connecticut. She bore the unparalleled distinction of being the daughter of a United States Senator from Ohio, the wife of a United States Senator from Illinois, a member, herself, of the House of Representatives from Illinois, and later the wife of our own fellow citizen who had served in the House of Representatives from New Mexico. For many years she occupied a commanding position in the national councils of her political party, and she always was an active figure in the political councils of the State of her residence. Her objectives in politics were to maintain the best traditions of her party and the highest levels of public service. It was her consistent philosophy that the more weighty the issue, the more serious the debate; the wider the margin for honest and scientific research, the greater the opportunity for public service. Her life was one of devotion to American ideals. She was a painstaking student of her country's history, and she was thoroughly familiar with the origin of our Government and the foundation principles on which it rests. To her, our essential liberties were a heritage which should be defended at all costs. Her horizon took in all the circumstances and needs of the country with remarkable understanding. She had a rare insight into our social problems, and in her quest for their solution she sought to make an intelligent adaptation to the needs of her time. Throughout her life, and more particularly in recent years, she was deeply interested in an effort to maintain peace among the nations, and it is safe to say that if her life had been spared longer she would have rendered conspicuous service in our effort toward the establishment of a world order in which controversies among nations will be settled by means other than resort to war.

Mrs. Simms was deeply interested in industrial and civic matters. She was active in the Women's Trade Union League, business and professional women's clubs, and other like concerts of action; and she was among the pioneers in the long and successful struggle for legislation affecting child labor. She was publisher of a paper in Illinois, operated a large cattle ranch in Colorado, and, together with her husband, established Los Poblanos, one of the outstanding stock farms of the Southwest. More than anyone else, she sponsored the Little Theater in Albuquerque and the June music festival. And she was wholeheartedly interested in education. She established and maintained the Fountain Valley School in Colorado and the Sandia School and the Manzano Day School in Albuquerque. In addition, she devoted much of her interest to the field of art. Los Poblanos Gallery was widely known and brought deep enjoyment to many lovers of art. Unpublished and almost secretive, her benefactions to mankind were varied and innumerable; and she unfailingly responded in generous measure to every need of community life.

Though her achievements were many in number and magnificent in kind, the personal qualities of her life rose transcendently above them. Modesty, simplicity, and unobstrusiveness were keynotes in her daily life. She was sensitive and retiring, but her strong personality made her a compelling influence in any company or concert of action. And to her the breath of sustained friendship was as incense, sweetening, inspiring, and strengthening her life. But, along with her gentleness of manner, she had an incisiveness of perception, an integrity of mind, a fixedness of purpose, and a courage of steel which knew not how to yield in the unfaltering pursuit of truth. She permitted nothing to weaken the influence or tarnish the luster of truth in the edifice of life, and she never wavered in her unflagging support of an ideal.

The search for the source of these qualities in the life of our departed friend is not difficult. It was faith. It was her steadfast faith in the power of good to triumph over evil; her abiding faith in the capacity of her fellow man for self-government; her deep faith in the perpetuity of our institutional arrangements; her gripping faith in the efficiency and adequacy of constitutional government to safeguard the rights and liberties of men in all walks of life; her unbounded faith in the brotherhood of man; and her unshakable faith in God. These were the qualities which dominated her life and welded together her faculties into a harmonious whole. These were the attributes which attuned her life with a resonant melody of hope and charity. These were the constituent elements which directed her unswerving path until the tender voice of Divine Providence summoned her from labor to rest, from solicitude to peace, summoned her to a well-earned and exceeding reward.

The death of Mrs. Simms was a tremendous shock. The city, the State, and the Nation suffered an irreparable loss. Those engaged in the fields of industry, education, culture, and social advancement lost a gallant helper and benefactor. The surviving husband lost a devoted life companion, the daughters lost a fountain of love, other relatives lost one whose place cannot be filled, and we lost a friend. As best we can, we share with them a sense of emptiness, and we extend to them sympathy. Steeped in loss, but enriched by the friendship and nobility of character of a gracious lady who came our way, we think we can hear the echo of her voice repeating softly the words of Tennyson:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea.
For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to meet my Pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the tribute to a former member of this body, the late Ruth Hanna McCormick Simms, which has been presented by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], expresses better than words of mine can do the great respect in which this distinguished lady was held by the citizens of my State.

Mrs. Simms has been brought home to New Mexico to find there a final resting place. She will lie there surrounded by many testimonials to her generosity toward the community and to her capacity as a builder, particularly in educational lines.

Near at hand in Colorado is the Fountain Valley School for Boys which she built into a fine institution. In Albuquerque is the Manzano School; and when the war is over we hope there will again be the Sandia School for Girls, which became in a period of a few years one of the Southwest's outstanding educational institutions.

In the development of the farm near Albuquerque, she was of tremendous assistance and inspiration to her husband, also a former Member of this House, the Honorable Albert G. Simms. Into that property, known as the Los Poblanos ranch, went their plans and their dreams for the agricultural development of the Middle Rio Grande Valley. Part of the ranch home was devoted to the housing of the Los Poblanos Art Gallery, which already has proved of value to the artists in the Southwest.

Without regard to our party affiliations, all citizens of New Mexico recognized in Mrs. Simms an outstanding citizen who was willing to give of her time and her money for the development and future welfare of our State. Her passing will be a tremendous loss to my home community and to my State, and I join with the gentleman from Colorado in paying tribute to her many accomplishments.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced House Joint Resolution 16, including a proposed amendment to the Constitution em-

powering the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties provided a majority of the Members in each House concur.

Changing the present antiquated method of treaty ratification is one of the most important issues before the Congress. Late in the last session the Committee on the Judiciary, after extensive hearings, reported favorably a resolution similar to the one I introduced on the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Committee action came so late in the Seventy-eighth Congress that a rule for the consideration of the measure on the floor could not be obtained. I hope that the Judiciary Committee will act immediately upon this question; that the Rules Committee will allow the issue to reach the floor at the earliest opportunity; and that the House will vote to present the amendment to the State legislatures.

Time is a most vital factor. Over 40 of the State legislatures are meeting this year. If the Congress acts promptly the proposed amendment striking from the Constitution the obstructive two-thirds rule can become operative within a few months. It is the duty of Congress to give the State legislatures an opportunity to act on the proposed amendment while they are in session this year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement I made on January 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LIVING QUARTERS FOR MEMBERS OF REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, it is generally well known that I speak here quite often on behalf of minorities. I believe I belong to the largest minority in the country—the Republican Party. In good faith, and in all good humor, I wish everybody had been so concerned about seating and finding living quarters for the new Republicans who came in 2 years ago as they are concerned about seating the new boys who are coming in now, when so many of them are from the majority party. So, in the future, just remember, if the minority attains such proportions as to almost become the majority, we have to live and eat and sleep just like anyone else.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE MANPOWER SITUATION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the country, as well as the Congress, was gratified to see the President in his message emphasize the seriousness of this war and take cognizance of seriousness of the manpower situation. For several weeks I have been working on a bill which I have today introduced, and which I think would go a long way toward meeting the problem.

Briefly, the bill would set up another branch of the military forces to be known as the supply forces. All persons subject to the provisions of selective service, who are in a deferred status, would automatically be included in a pool known as the supply forces and be placed on inactive status subject to the call of the President as Commander in Chief to render such service as is considered essential to the war effort. When the services of such a person so deferred were needed for the war effort, he would be called from inactive status to active status in the supply forces. The provisions of the bill would apply to, first, those persons presently deferred because of physical disability, the so-called IV-F's, who are not presently engaged in essential war work and who could pass a prescribed physical examination; second, those persons not engaged in an occupation essential to the war effort; third, those persons who are enjoying occupational deferment but who strike or leave their jobs; fourth, those persons who were engaged in a job essential to the war effort who acquired a record, after the passage of this bill, of willful absenteeism for which there was no reasonable justification, and, fifth, all other persons subject to the provisions of the selective service law not herein enumerated who are not specifically exempt by law.

The bill also provides that net profits on war contracts in excess of $10,000 shall be limited to 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, time will not permit a full discussion of the bill. I do want to say, however, that the bill is not aimed at the so-called IV-F's—boys who have been deferred through no fault of their own but because of some physical disability. Neither is it aimed at any group or segment of our people but rather is an honest effort to completely mobilize the manpower of the Nation and to limit the profits of the war contractors. We have been hearing a great deal about the people of the country not appreciating the gravity of the war. Sometimes I wonder if the people are not ahead of the statesmen. I believe that the people of the country are ready and willing to see steps taken to fully mobilize the manpower of the country and give the boys on the fighting fronts the support to which they are so justly entitled. I realize full well that there are those who will oppose the provisions of this bill, but can we as Members of Congress who drafted these young men into service on the global battle fronts deny them the necessary ships, planes, ammunition, guns, and other sinews of warfare necessary to bring this war to a victorious conclusion and to stop at the earliest moment the slaughter upon the battle fronts of the world? As a matter of fact, you and I know that these young people whom we have called into the armed service of the country and their bereaved loved ones are the only segments of our people who have made any real sacrifices in this war effort. As a matter of fact, the average American citizen is now more prosperous than ever before. We are in two tragic wars of serious implications and of what promises to be long duration. We must become realistic if we would hasten an early and victorious end to these wars.

I hope we may have early hearings and consideration of this bill by the Committee on Military Affairs. Time is of the essence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial that appeared in yesterday's Washington Star on the President's annual message on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a press release from the Maritime Commission showing ship construction for the years 1936 through 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE FARMERS AND THE DRAFT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much surprised that the War Mobilization Director's order of last Wednesday has not invoked a stronger protest from the agriculturalists of the country than it has. Perhaps the multitude of orders and directives recently coming from Mr. Byrnes' office has everyone a bit confused.

Nevertheless that directive ordering the induction of farm workers in the 18–26 age group seems to me to bear close investigation and consideration.

Only last Friday the President told his press conference that the shipping of food to Italy was soon to be materially stepped up with 15 to 29 more ships to be soon devoted to this purpose. And food for Italy, of course, is only a drop in the bucket to the needs of our armed forces and the conquered countries and peoples we are feeding and will have to continue to feed.

I understand that the production of food in Europe and Australia, whence a very large proportion of the subsistence supplies for the United States armed forces have come, is expected to be materially reduced due to severe floods in

Europe—the worst in 100 years, and severe droughts in Australia. Wheat production in Australia is expected to be less than half of last year's crop, which is necessitating the slaughter of large numbers of sheep because of the shortage of fodder.

Now with no less an authority than Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, stating, as he did in an address in New York the 2d of the month, that the food outlook for 1945 "is on the lean side" with "less meat, butter, sugar, and certain processed foods" available; I think it is an ill-timed occasion to disrupt and disturb the American farmer who has been producing so well. Even if not one single farm hand is taken, the fact that the statement has been made that they are going to be taken will, I think, have the effect of seriously retarding and delaying the planting of much-needed crops, because no farmer is going to plant something that he might not have the help to harvest. It seems inconsistent to me that the whisky-distilling industry should be given a holiday from the production of war alcohol thereby diverting manpower, materials, and transportation facilities and thereby using up our grain stocks, and at the same time, by this recent directive, embarking on a program which can only further materially lessen those food stock piles.

As long as we are determined to be the bread basket of the world, we should protect the source of our supply. The return to rationing of so many food items would suggest to the average layman that more and not less food was in order. If manpower is as seriously needed as Mr. Byrnes seems to think it is, I would suggest combing the gambling and liquor industries and the many hotel, restaurant, and bar employees, most of whom are able-bodied young men, for additional manpower, and leave the farmers and livestock producers alone. A warring and working nation needs food.

We cannot spare, in my section of the country, any farm help from production of farm and livestock commodities. Our help in that regard has been drained white. Many farms and livestock ranches are today being operated and the work done by aged men and women, young children and girls. The aged persons are too old to continue this work. Many farms will go idle and production will be decreased if there is any further call for farm help for industrial or Army or Navy help. The condition on the farms is more serious than anyone could imagine unless they have first-hand information. Personally, I own and operate a ranch and small farm, and I have personal knowledge of the situation I am talking about, as well as having seen this condition herein outlined all over my district.

APPROPRIATE SUGGESTION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following column appeared in the Shawano (Wis.) County Journal of January 4, 1944. In reading the many county weekly and daily papers of my district I find many, many words of wisdom that could be and should be taken to heart by every citizen.

The editor of the Shawano County Journal is Mr. Harold Meyer. Mr. Meyer is chairman of the Shawano County Republican Club. He is one of the most active, and, I might also say, one of the most militant county Republican chairmen in our State during campaign time.

The column reads as follows:

JEST-A-MINUT'

(D. C. H.)

We have met one or two, and we have mail from one or two more, of our New Deal friends, who seem to be considerably bothered because we have not taken a shot at their party's policies in recent issues of this column.

The explanation is simple: When the populace had voted, we, being American, proposed to abide by the decision of the majority. The New Dealers didn't elect their President; they elected our President, and until the war is over we propose to lend our efforts toward its winning.

We realize that our scope of influence is extremely narrow, yet we wouldn't want to think that even one person had reduced his efforts toward winning the war one iota because of anything we had written in this column.

So, for the duration, we aren't Republican, nor are we New Deal; we're just one of millions of Americans doing his unified bit to end the war and bring the boys back home.

Until those ends are attained, nothing else matters.

Although this county was carried by a large majority by Governor Dewey, this comment indicates the sentiment of all the thinking people of our district. It is a privilege and an honor to serve a constituency that puts first things first. The people do not want bickering—they do not want to tolerate programs that are based on political expediency, sectional or class favoritism, nor do they want "quickie" advancement in the military itself. They want unity and unity of purpose to accomplish the task ahead. Every bill brought before this House should be subjected to one analysis on its first appraisal and that is, Will this legislation help or retard the winning of the war?

Our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, is entitled to the unity he asked for the opening day of our session. The administration forces, however, must accept the responsibility of proposing and passing legislation that will create and maintain this unity of purpose.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an article on Alaska and Governor Gruening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reply to the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on the 4th of January, entitled "No Partisan Politics," and the privilege of showing him the difference between partisan politics and constructive criticism. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the conclusion of other special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

INDUCTION OF FARM BOYS INTO THE MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, over the week end I visited my district in southeastern Pennsylvania and personally contacted several hundred people. I find them very much alarmed and excited over the fact that deferred farm boys are going to be called into the military service. Not only are the farmers disturbed and annoyed but the people generally, realizing there is a pending food shortage, look forward to food rationing far beyond anything yet experienced here.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to address the House in reference to this matter in greater detail in a very short time. This is a very serious situation that should be given more consideration. Food is all important. Had we met our commitments in liberated countries, maybe the British soldiers would not now have to be fighting the Greeks.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD

and to include therein an item on the strength of the Nation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a very fine editorial from the New York Herald Tribune regarding the late Mrs. Simms, a great American and a former able colleague in this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE BETWEEN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND GENERAL MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL KING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that at last my request that General Marshall and Admiral King come before the Congress to give us the facts regarding the conduct of the war has been granted. There may be some things that the country at large cannot be told at the moment on account of military reasons. However, I wish that meeting could be divided into two parts and that one-half of it might be attended by the press to hear what is said. America should be told the truth.

I know that the country as a whole does not realize what we face on our far-flung battle fronts. It is incredible that there should be a shortage of nurses at this time, some 29,000, if the 9,000 is counted which the Veterans Administration urgently needs for nursing care of our disabled of all wars. We cannot let the men that we send to fight for us die on account of lack of care. The same thing applies to industry. We cannot allow production to be curtailed on account of a lack of workers.

Mr. Speaker, if the people would be told the truth in this country, we would not have shortages in the war effort anywhere. It is quite obvious that the Germans for some time have known very much more about our affairs than we have ourselves.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders which may have heretofore been entered I may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow or at the next meeting of the House, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

Baldwin, Md.	Corbett	Hall,
Baldwin, N. Y.	Courtney	Edwin Arthur
Barrett, Pa.	Crawford	Hall,
Barry	Curley	Leonard W.
Bates, Mass.	Delaney,	Harless, Ariz.
Beall	James J.	Harness, Ind.
Bell	Dickstein	Hays
Bender	Dingell	Heffernan
Bennet, N. Y.	Dolliver	Heidinger
Bloom	Doughton, N. C.	Hoeven
Bolton	Drewry	Jackson
Bradley, Mich.	Durham	Jensen
Bradley, Pa.	Earthman	Johnson,
Brumbaugh	Eberharter	Lyndon B.
Buckley	Elsaesser	Judd
Bulwinkle	Fellows	Kearney
Byrne, N. Y.	Fogarty	Kefauver
Campbell	Fuller	Kelley, Pa.
Case, N. J.	Fulton	Keogh
Case, S. Dak.	Gamble	Kilburn
Celler	Gardner	Kilday
Chapman	Gerlach	Kirwan
Clark	Gillie	Kunkel
Coffee	Gore	Latham
Cole, N. Y.	Granahan	Lesinski
Cooley	Green	Luce
Lynch	Price, Fla.	Smith, Va.
McGehee	Quinn, N. Y.	Somers, N. Y.
McGlinchey	Rabin	Spence
Marcantonio	Ramey	Stefan
Morgan	Rayfiel	Taylor
Murphy	Reece, Tenn.	Tibbott
Neely	Rees, Kans.	Torrens
Norton	Roe, Md.	Towe
O'Konski	Roe, N. Y.	Trimble
O'Toole	Rooney	Weichel
Outland	Rowan	Weiss
Peterson, Fla.	Sadowski	Wigglesworth
Pfeifer	Satterfield	Wilson
Philbin	Shafer	Winter
Plumley	Sheridan	Wolcott
Powell	Short	
Powers	Sikes	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 307 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. COOPER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY and Mr. CELLER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter written to Judge Vinson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a broadcast by Cedric Foster.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will state the grounds on which he claims the floor on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the Congress, as is well known, I offered an amendment to the rules to create a permanent Committee on Un-American Activities. That amendment was adopted by vote of the House.

This morning there appears in the Washington Post, a locally published newspaper, a statement reading as follows:

Lawyers Guild assails RANKIN as "anti-unity."

That is the headline.

The body of the article reads in part as follows:

The National Lawyers Guild last night urged the House to thwart the disruptive plan of Representative JOHN RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi) to perpetuate the Dies committee by appointing to the new Committee on Un-American Activities bipartisan Members of unimpeachable devotion to the war effort.

Martin Popper—

To whom I shall refer in a moment—

the organization's executive secretary, said in a letter to all members of the Ways and Means Committee that RANKIN has "long disgraced himself by an anti-United Nations,

anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, anti-labor, and other anti-unity activities."

An article appearing in other papers quotes this same Popper as saying that "RANKIN is one of the most dangerous men in the United States."

I submit, without further quotation, Mr. Speaker, that those defamatory remarks violate the Rules of the House and entitle me to answer them on a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes that the gentleman from Mississippi has stated a question that involves the privileges of the House, it being an attack on his integrity as a Member of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a great American once said:

A farmer stuck a pitchfork into a hay bin. One prong of the fork went through a rat. The rat squealed.

I have no apologies for my activities in helping to perpetuate the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is one of my greatest services to my country.

This letter, by the way, was written by this man Popper to the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House in order to try to induce them to stack the Committee on Un-American Activities with Members they think are under the control or the influence of this organization, which is one of the most dangerous Communist fronts in the world.

Before I go further, let me show you who this man Popper is, and I will read from a speech delivered on March 9, 1944, on the floor of this House by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Martin Dies.

In that connection I want to say now that the name of Martin Dies will live in the history of this Republic long after these Communists have been driven to cover.

Martin Dies rendered a service to this Nation that few men in its history have surpassed, in bringing to light the subversive activities of these elements that are now grasping and trying to get control of the Congress of the United States, and insulting 100 or more of you Members by seeking to control you because they allegedly contributed to your campaign funds. The quicker those Members repudiate those claims the better it will be for them.

On that day Mr. Dies said:

First, let me deal with the Lawyers Guild so that I may dispose of it and let the House know the character of the men who have made this attack upon me and these other gentlemen of the House.

This same Popper was out attacking Mr. Dies then. Mr. Dies is not here to defend himself; but I want to serve notice on the House now that Mr. Dies has many friends in this House who believe in his patriotism and who are here ready to defend him against any attack, and your humble servant is one of them.

Continuing, Mr. Dies said:

From time to time we have exposed the Lawyers Guild as a Communist-dominated organization. When we first exposed the Lawyers Guild as controlled by the Communist Party, we were bitterly assailed, and yet immediately thereafter Robert Jackson, who was then Attorney General, now upon the Supreme Court, withdrew his membership from the organization because, as he said, it was clearly controlled by Communists and he would have nothing to do with it.

That was during the time that Robert Jackson was Attorney General of the United States. He is now on the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Dies continued:

Mr. Adolf Berle, an outstanding liberal, likewise withdrew his membership from the organization for the same reason. Judge Pecora also denounced the organization as Communist-controlled, and stated that he could no longer affiliate himself with it.

In that connection, I want to call the name of another man, one of the great liberal progressives of the State of New York, who has now passed away. I refer to my friend, Frank Walsh. Mr. Walsh took the chairmanship of the Lawyers Guild many years ago, and invited me to address them. At that time nobody had suspected that it was Communist-dominated, or would be. Later, when Mr. Walsh found out just what these gentlemen found out, he withdrew from the organization and repudiated it as Communist.

In this speech Mr. Dies goes on to say:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most conclusive proof of the nature of this organization which has so many representatives in key positions in this Government as I shall show in the course of my speech is for us to consider for a moment the national president of the organization and the national executive officer. Robert W. Kenny is national president of the guild. Martin Popper is national executive secretary. Surely these two men may properly be considered the ones who hold the key positions in the guild. Now, look at the facts. Martin Popper was a member of the seditious and potentially treasonable American Peace Mobilization group.

Does any man deny that that was a subversive organization? If so, let him rise now or forever hold his peace. Do not go in the cloakroom and denounce Martin Dies and JOHN RANKIN. You are going to do your talking on the floor of the House, if you do.

Let me repeat that sentence of Mr. Dies, that great courageous Texan who was abused and maligned, and whose wife and children these Communists threatened to murder:

Martin Popper was a member of the seditious and potentially treasonable American Peace Mobilization group.

This is the same Martin Popper who writes this letter to the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means and probably to the members of the Republican committee on committees, urging them not to pay any attention to me. What he wants them to do is to stack this committee with men of his own choosing.

Continuing, Mr. Dies said:

He was present as a delegate at the Chicago convention which launched the American Peace Mobilization movement.

Does anybody deny that that was a Communist front; a subversive front? If so, rise now and say so, or forever hold your peace.

Continuing, Mr. Dies said:

From the convention he sent a telegram to the President of the United States in which he denounced the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill as "unconstitutional and as representing a violent upheaval in the social, political, and economic life of our country."

Think of that, at the time when Japan was plotting the Pearl Harbor attack, at the time when war was raising its grim visage in the Atlantic, to send that kind of a message down here against a conscription bill, which a majority of the Members of Congress felt was necessary in order to protect this Nation in its perilous hour.

Further quoting Mr. Dies:

That telegram was obviously the voice of the Communist Party couched in the language which the party was speaking at the time. I do not need to say more at this time on the Communist affiliations of Martin Popper, although his Communist record is a much more extensive one.

Robert W. Kenney, national president of the Lawyers Guild, was a member of the national committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy. The seditious and potentially treasonable character of the American League was fully exposed by our committee many years ago.

Does any man in this House deny that that was a subversive group, a Communist-front organization designed to destroy our form of government? If so, rise and say so now, and if not, forever hold your peace.

The league's platform included the following plank. Said Mr. Dies:

To work toward the stopping of the manufacture and transport of munitions in time of peace or war, and in time of war the transport of all other materials essential to the conduct of war through mass demonstrations, picketing, and strikes.

Does anybody doubt that that was subversive? Suppose that policy had been carried out. The embarrassment our brave boys are now experiencing on the western front because of the lack of munitions as a result of these sit-down strikes and other slow-downs in our munitions industries would be nothing as compared with the pitiable plight they would be in if Mr. Popper's outfit could have had their way.

My recollection is that this same outfit was picketing the White House before Russia got into the war, at a time when our distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] was ridiculing them by peeling potatoes in their presence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the crowd which writes this letter denouncing me. That is the same Popper.

There are a few columnists who have gone out of their way to criticize me; but the press, as a rule, has been decent to me in this matter. The passage of my amendment hit a responsive chord at the fireside of millions of American homes because they realize this danger. What will it profit us, if you please, for our boys to win the war abroad and then for Congress to sit here and let our country be destroyed at home? Among other attacks, one of them, speaking about me, says:

One of his heroes is David Crockett, the Tennessee frontiersman, from whom he claims collateral descendancy. Crockett, too, served in the House, but not for long. He fought the administration of his day and was in turn licked by it.

I think it is a pretty sad come-off, when 109 years after Colonel Crockett gave his life that Texas might be free, to have an article like that appear in the Washington Post in order to smear or discredit me. Colonel Crockett was my great grandmother's brother. Whatever fault he may have had he gave a glorious account of himself, and he has for 109 years been acclaimed as one of America's great heroes; until this smear bund takes a notion to go back and take a slap at him in order to slap me, because he disagreed with an administration at that time.

Here is another one. We have a little fellow here—I will not deign to mention his name—who jumps on my war record. In the first place, he says the Political Action Committee "gave $1,500 to two candidates for running for RANKIN'S seat," and he adds, "they might as well have poured the money down a rat hole."

Well, that is about what they did with a good deal of it. They poured more money than that into my district to try to defeat me in the primary, but failed ingloriously.

Now, if the time has come when Members of Congress have to be humiliated by having Sidney Hillman run around saying, "I have got my stamp on their back," then Congress might as well fold up. God bless you, he will never put that kind of stamp on me. But I will get to him in a moment.

This slimy little columnist goes further and does what other columnists have done in the past. He attacked my war record. Now, I have never claimed, and I do not now claim, credit for having won the First World War, although some of the members of my battery said when that question arose when we were being discharged, "The deuce we did not win it. Soon as the Kaiser heard that we were coming he threw up his hands and quit."

In the summer of 1918 this Government called for professional men who had had trigonometry. I do not pretend to be any mathematical genius, but I did pass an examination in trigonometry in college. I responded to that call. They said they needed 60,000 additional artillery officers to help blast the way to Berlin in the spring of 1919.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that I, too, answered that call because I had the mathematical foundation at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. I answered the call and was taken down with influenza. I got up from the flu one Wednesday and went to the Army the next. I joined the Field Artillery at Camp Taylor, Ky. I did not hunt a soft place and I did not find one. I did more work, more hard, honest labor during the first week that I was at Camp Taylor, Ky., than Sidney Hillman and Popper and this fellow Gaer, who calls himself "Gaer," whom I will refer to in a moment, who wrote this insulting book about the Congress called The First Round—I did more hard work the first week than they have done since they were run out of Russia.

We stayed there until the war closed. When the war closed they notified us we would be discharged. But long before the war closed the battery met, at the request of one of the lieutenants, and elected officers. They elected me president of that battery without even consulting me about it. I have the names of those 206 men in my files. I will put them in the RECORD at a future date. A finer group of Americans never lived.

Just across the hill from me in another battery was a distinguished Member of this House who has now passed to the Great Beyond. I refer to the Honorable John Jacob Rogers, of Massachusetts, whose wife now represents the district he represented at that time. He and I talked about old Camp Taylor days many times. Another one who later came to Congress was Philip Swing, of California, and there are doubtless men here today, probably the gentleman from Illinois, who served in Camp Taylor. And yet every time this smear bund wants to lie about me they go back and lie about my war record. The War Department has never questioned it. If there was anything wrong with it they certainly would have let me know. I bring you this information in order to show you the kind of smear they used on Martin Dies and the kind of smear they are now using on me.

But I want to tell you that on this rock of Americanism I establish my political church, and, as the Bible says, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

I find here they are jumping on Republicans, saying I am leading the Republicans. All I have to say is that there has been a much worse group led a much longer distance than I ever led the Republicans. Besides, they said awhile ago that Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson were both Republicans. If that be true, probably I am getting in line with Jefferson and Jackson.

Remember, today is the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of Jackson's great victory at New Orleans.

But the Philadelphia Record says this about you:

> For a majority of Republicans to vote to reestablish this committee and to accept the leadership of Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, in doing so shows that they would much rather spend their afternoons playing back of the gas works than in the library.

You know who is editor of that paper? A man named Dave Stern. He has never lost an opportunity to smear me and to smear Martin Dies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer some of the charges. In this connection let me quote from what the commander of the American Legion said, according to an Associated Press report, on January 5 in Palm Springs, Calif. He said:

> I am proud of the Seventy-ninth Congress for making the Dies committee a permanent organization.

The article says he said he had sent Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, a congratulatory message upon hearing the news. "The Legion has been actively behind the Dies committee since its inception," he said.

But this bunch tells you that I am dangerous. I admit, Mr. Speaker, so far as my abilities go, I am dangerous to every enemy of my country, and I am so dangerous that I am going to expose them whenever I have the opportunity.

Another paper says that I am a reactionary, in addition to being dangerous. No real American who knows my record and philosophy and my background and my convictions will ever call me dangerous to American institutions. But this group that is dedicated to and is designed to overthrow and destroy our form of government proceeds to tell members of the Ways and Means Committee that I am dangerous. But they say also that I am reactionary.

They did not say that back in the old days when I stepped into the breach and saved the T. V. A. in its inception; when I saved the T. V. A. and guaranteed not only its creation but its completion; during all the days that I fought that battle on the floor I was not called reactionary; I was not called reactionary when I took the floor here in the interest of the development of the great Columbia River and prevented their cutting the Grand Coulee Dam off and making it a low dam and forever destroying that vast wealth of additional power that those people will receive for the next five hundred or a thousand years.

I was not called reactionary when I joined my distinguished friend and colaborer from Nebraska, George W. Norris—God bless his sacred memory—in helping to develop the water power of the Loup River as well as the tri-county project for the benefit of the people of Nebraska.

I was not called reactionary when I took the lead in developing the rural-electrification program.

I was not called reactionary in 1938 here, when I bucked the leader of my own party and forced through the amendment for the first hundred million dollars for rural electrification that is today being reflected in a million farm homes of America.

I was not called reactionary back in the old days of the Coolidge administration. Do you know what they called me then? They called me the fiery Mississippian, the radical RANKIN from Mississippi. Why? Because I wanted to pay the soldiers adjusted compensation, and because I wanted to take care of the disabled veterans and their widows and orphans. They did not call me reactionary when I opposed the vicious provisions of the economy bill that sent many a poor disabled veteran to his grave broken-hearted because he knew they had shut the door of hope in the face of his widow and children.

I was not called a reactionary when I was fighting all the years I have been chairman of the Veterans' Committee to take care of disabled veterans and their widows and orphans.

Last year I was denounced as a radical, not a reactionary, by some of them because of my amendment raising the pay of the men now in the service to $50 a month.

I have no apology for those acts. I would do the same things again.

Mr. Speaker, these same elements that are attacking me are attacking Great Britain. Read their literature. I can show you some here from a well-known commentator—I do not mean favorably

known—who has been maligning me over the radio and who comes out and denounces the British Empire.

Great Britain is our ally and she is an ally on whom we can depend. Let one of our aviators be shot down anywhere in the world and when his feet touches the soil of any English-speaking country he knows he is in an atmosphere of friendship and will be fed and housed at the nearest cabin.

Great Britain has been fighting a battle to protect her life line. I knew she would do that. Yet, this element that attacks me goes on the radio and through the radical press and elsewhere and denounces, bemeans, and abuses Great Britain for doing just exactly what we knew she would do. She will protect her life line at all costs. If she did not, God pity her.

Mr. Speaker, I want it distinctly understood that I am not criticizing any of our allies, but I am defending our great ally, Great Britain, which means the British Association of Nations.

As I have said before, these very forces that are attacking the Anglo-Saxon governments of the world are the same ones whose views are reflected by this left-wing radical group. What do they mean by Anglo-Saxon governments? They mean my government and yours. They mean the Government of the British Empire, they mean the Governments of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

I was one man in public life who did everything I could to prevent the outbreak of this war in the beginning, because I realized that the brunt of it would ultimately fall upon the English-speaking peoples of the world. We will never stand for the Japanese overrunning and destroying or dominating the white people of Australia or of New Zealand. Everyone knows that. Whenever Great Britain is attacked, why, of course, we want her to be right, but you know the feeling in the United States for the British Empire, and I am just an average American citizen who admires the British in a thousand ways, and who would not hesitate to criticize them in time of peace, at a time when it would not endanger the war effort. As I said, I have no criticism of other nations, but it makes me sick and tired to hear men on the radio, some Members of Congress, abuse Great Britain for taking that salutary step to preserve her life line in the Mediterranean. Cut that life line and Great Britain will fold up. She has no gas, no oil, and little or no water power in the British Isles. She has little or no raw materials. Her people are crowded. She has about 500 people to the square mile in Scotland, Wales, and England. Suppose you cut that life line, you not only knock Great Britain out of this war but knock her out probably as a permanent factor in the future civilization of mankind. I say now without any hesitation that no nation that has ever lived has contributed more to that civilization than have the people of the British Isles, from which my people came. As long as we are in this war together, we must stand together.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman was referred to as a reactionary. Here is the statement of a man who over the radio on December 10, broadcasting to millions of Americans, speaking as well to the people of the British Empire, made these statements:

> But if your policy is the reactionary one of your Government, you must go your way alone.

Mr. RANKIN. Who was that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Walter Winchell.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, well.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is another quotation from this gentleman who assumes to speak for America—who, safe here in America, presumes to tell our allies what they should do. He said:

> Why did you offer British troops to disarm Belgian patriots—people, whom you called noble allies only a month before? Frankly, we feel your Government must answer before history for breaking its word to the Belgians.

He also said, after referring to other acts of the British Empire:

> All of these policies are of the same ignominious pattern—but in Greece, to be frank, we believe your Government has stained it with blood.

And then he continued:

> What is wrong about a Greek loving Greece as much as an Englishman loves England?

That was Walter Winchell, who apparently grew black in the face, worked himself into hysterics, became almost incoherent, when he demanded that we aid Britain, get into the war.

That is the same Walter Winchell who befouled the air over a national hook-up with his vile, false charges against Americans who ventured to love America as a Greek loves Greece, as an Englishmen loves England.

Is Winchell attempting to lower the morale of the men who, on the battle front, are fighting shoulder to shoulder with the soldiers of the Empire when he criticizes the policies of Great Britain? Winchell's friend, William Power Maloney, who procured the indictment of the so-called seditionists here in Washington for what he called a conspiracy to undermine the morale of our troops, might well ask Winchell whether he was attempting to create unity or disunity by criticizing Churchill and those who are determining the policy of Britain.

Will the gentleman say something about those quotations?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that Walter Winchell does not speak for me or any other American that I know anything about. His criticism, over the radio, of Great Britain at this time, when her boys are fighting and dying by the side of ours, so far as it goes, is most dangerous to Allied unity.

But this Popper letter goes on to say that I am an anti-Jew. Those patriotic American Jews who have come over here, or who were born here, and who are trying to help save America have never had any criticism at my hands; but I am not going to except one when I find he is a Communist trying to undermine and destroy this Government, and I am not going to pass him over merely because he happens to be a member of the Jewish race. The decent Jewish people do not want me to do it. They are alarmed at some of the things these radical members of their race are doing.

He says I am anti-Negro. That is what this Communist said, that I am anti-Negro. I live in a section of the country that has had Negroes for 300 years. I have told you before that my people were slaveholders. They did not reduce the Negroes to slavery. They helped elevate them from the position of savage in which they were found to that of servants. Those people are still there.

Last year I saw an old Negro walking along the road down in my county. I stopped my car and told him who I was. He rushed over and grabbed me with both hands. He belonged to my great-grandfather. That is the way the decent white people of the South are regarded by the decent Negroes. He said another thing I will never forget. He said:

> When your grandfather—
>
> My great grandfather—
>
> lived when we got old he took care of us. Now, I am old and got nothing and don't know where to go.

Let me say to some of you Members who are trying to use the Negroes for political purposes, you are doing them an irreparable injury. You are creating friction between them and the white people among whom they live that is likely to prove disastrous.

What have you ever done to feed and clothe the hungry Negroes of the South, as we white people have done in the years that have passed and are doing now? I am a better friend of theirs than any of these crackpot, radical, red agitators who go around over this country abusing the white people of the South in order to secure the Negroes' vote.

I remember one time De Priest, who was then a Member of Congress from Illinois, on the Republican side, came to me with a Negro from Tuskegee, Ala. They wanted some additional beds for the Negro veterans' hospital over there. I told them we had provided for them in the past, and would take care of their needs. Which we did. De Priest said one thing to me that I will never forget. He said:

> Mr. RANKIN, you know I was a Negro before I was a Republican.

They tell you that I am anti-United Nations. Where did they get that? I supported Mr. Cox in 1920 when we had the League of Nations in our platform. This Popper letter says I am antilabor. That is ridiculous, as everyone knows. But I am opposed to those racketeers who would prey upon the laboring people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest insults that has come to the Congress is this book which has been sent to every Member called The First Round. The first round in what? The first round in the destruction of our Government?

They published the statement that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee had 110 Members of this House who were responsible to them for their election,

They put this stamp on their backs and go out and brag about it. Sidney Hillman has been going over Europe bragging about how much power he has over the Congress of the United States. I would advise you Members who are on his list to repudiate that statement at once and give the world to understand you are not taking orders from Sidney Hillman and his gang. If you do not do it, you are going to find that stigma more painful and more embarrassing to you than the poisoned robe of Nessus, and more devastating in its ultimate results than the leprous cloak of Gehazi.

They bring out this book, The First Round, and I want you to read it. Let us see who wrote it. It was written by a man who calls himself Joseph Gaer. This book was sent to you by the C. I. O.-P. A. C., and purports to be an account of the accomplishments of the P. A. C.; that is, the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. That is exactly the way Hitler started; that is exactly the way Mussolini started; that is exactly the way other dictators have started in Europe.

At this time I should like to inform the House of the background of Joseph Gaer, the author of this book. Joseph Gaer is not his name. Whenever you come to me, always give me your real name. If you are known by two or three names, please give all of them. Joseph Gaer is not his name. He was born Eli Josef Fishmne in 1897 in Bessarabia, Russia. He came to the United States in 1916. He was naturalized in 1926, at which time he adopted the name of Joseph Gaer instead of Eli Josef Fishmne.

The C. I. O.-P. A. C. sent money into my district to try to defeat me. When the decent Americans I represent heard all this slush spouted over the radio, the resentment was so great that I was elected by the largest majority I ever received, and carried my opponent's home town 7 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, they call this their first round. I hope it is their last one.

The first round in the establishment of this Republic took place on the battlefield of Bunker Hill. Another round was when Thomas Jefferson and John Adams and those other great patriots of the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence. Another round was when George Washington and Benjamin Franklin and Alexander Hamilton and James Madison and others adopted the Constitution of the United States, which we are all sworn to uphold.

I for one expect to carry out that promise as long as I am a Member of Congress.

Now this committee must not be stacked. These Reds are reckoning without their host, if they think the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means are going to fall for that kind of propaganda.

We must elect a committee of real Americans who are not opposed to the policies and purposes for which it was created, in order that we may carry on this great work of protecting American institutions at home while our brave boys are fighting to protect them abroad.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment or two to defend the name of the gentleman from California mentioned by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to speak for a minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I desire also to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the limited time allotted will not permit me to take the well of the House in a detailed discussion of the charges raised by the gentleman from Mississippi, nor am I here to repudiate whatever support I may have had from organizations or individuals, but inadvertently or otherwise, the name of one of the most outstanding citizens of the State of California has been mentioned after a fashion that would lead people not fully informed to believe that the Honorable Robert W. Kenny, the attorney general of the State of California, was associated with subversive and un-American activities. I believe that it is not only right and proper for me, but incumbent upon any Californian, to make known, under these circumstances, to the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Robert W. Kenny is one of the most respected citizens of our State.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman tell me whose name that was?

Mr. KING. Mr. Robert W. Kenny.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought it was Philip David Swing. I was going to say I was complimenting him.

Mr. KING. Mr. Robert W. Kenny, Mr. Speaker, has held the distinction of occupying many offices of the State of California and is at the present time attorney general of that State. I have personally known him for 15 years; he is a member of the bar; a former municipal court judge of the city of Los Angeles, former superior court judge of the county of Los Angeles, was the senator representing the great county of Los Angeles in the Legislature of California; declined appointment to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and at the primary election in 1942 was nominated by both the Republican and Democratic Parties at the polls by one of the greatest votes ever accorded a man for this office, to the office of attorney general of our great State. Such a record of public confidence surely belies any possible connection with un-American or subversive activities.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. We have a list of special orders for Members who have already obtained permission to speak this afternoon, for a period of 1 hour and 45 or 50 minutes. If there is no objection by any of the Members who have already been recognized to speak later the gentleman may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of information. I have introduced a resolution for the repeal of what is known as the Rankin amendment which created a standing committee commonly known as the Committee on Un-American Activities. I believe, as a matter of policy, this Congress should not set itself up as setting the standards of individuals or organizations, but should concern itself with legislation. It is not a question of whether the right-wing group control the committee and investigate the left-wing group, or the left-wing group investigate the right-wing group. I do not believe that the Congress of the United States should be established as an investigating agency to investigate individuals or organizations as such because in my opinion that is the purpose of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of the Army and Navy Intelligence Services. I hope that we do not establish a permanent investigating committee of this kind because we have had a very disturbing experience, to say the least, with the so-called Dies committee which has died a natural death because of the fact that the first step which was taken when the Gestapo in Germany was instituted was to investigate and then persecute certain citizens who did not believe in the philosophy of the Gestapo. I hope that does not happen in this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business on Thursday of this week, and after other special orders heretofore entered have been completed, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

HIGHWAYS AND BRIDGES IN DEFENSE AREAS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the last Congress authorized an appropriation of a billion and a half dollars for postwar highway construction. No part of this vast sum is specifically allocated to defense areas, a provision which should be a primary justification of such a huge appropriation.

History will develop that one of the principal reasons for the loss of the first Battle of France, which brought on Dunkerque, was a lack of adequate highways to meet military requirements in that country. History will also show that the hard fight in defense of their homeland that the Germans have been able to put up has been largely due to the remarkable system of superhighways with which that country is interlaced. This has cost thousands of American casualties. Those roads are so constructed as to avoid bottlenecks and dead ends. They do not end at the city limits of large urban centers but carry through such areas with the same type of superhighways to be found in all of their defense areas. This has provided for mobility of operation so that troops have been effectively moved throughout Germany in the speediest possible manner to and through defense areas. Mr. Speaker, one need not be a military or a road expert to know these things, for they were referred to and were illustrated in American magazines before the war.

This is the very type of highway and bridge construction that we have neglected in the past and have further neglected to specifically provide for in the legislation authorizing appropriations for post-war highway construction. In many of our defense areas it can prove a tragic mistake unless it is rectified in time.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a strong advocate of the construction of major highways and bridges, for they are the arteries that give mobility to national defense in time of emergency, and they insure our economic well-being in time of peace. Inadequate bridges create bottlenecks in highways. A bridge is an integral part of a highway whether it crosses a creek, a river, or an arm of the ocean, as do the great Golden Gate and San Francisco-Oakland Bridges.

Among the very first States to embark on a campaign for more and better highways was the State of California. As long ago as 1907, Gov. James N. Gillett, a former Member of this House of Representatives, sent a message to the State legislature recommending a bond issue of $18,000,000 for highways to be submitted to the voters of the State for their approval. I was a member of the California State Senate at that time and actively supported Governor Gillett's proposal without reservation, both in the State senate and in the following State-wide campaign. Many rural sections of the State were opposed to the proposal, and the bond issue would have been defeated if it were not for the enormous majority it received in the great seaport city of San Francisco.

In 1915 I was elected to the board of supervisors, which is the legislative body of the city and county of San Francisco. I continued my interest in highway and bridge construction by immediately starting a campaign to connect San Francisco, which is built on the tip of a peninsula, with its natural hinterlands, the San Joaquin, Sacramento, Livermore, Napa, Sonoma, Santa Clara, and Salinas Valleys, and the great redwood empire, by a comprehensive system of highways and bridges.

In 1919, with the cooperation of Gov. William D. Stevens, who also served in this body, I initiated the successful State highway bond issue for $40,000,000. At that time there was only a single highway and an antiquated ferry system serving the city of San Francisco, with a population of some 700,000 people.

My interest in adequate highways and bridges prompted me to initiate the Golden Gate Bridge by introducing the original resolutions in the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, one of which secured the original grant from the War Department to span the Golden Gate. This great bridge, costing $35,000,000, was built at the depth of the depression without one dollar of Federal funds and with very little help from the State of California. From its inception to the present time I have continuously been a director of this publicly owned enterprise.

When officials of the War and Navy Departments opposed the construction of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, I personally appealed to President Hoover for his support. He responded favorably by appointing a commission which, after exhaustive study and investigation, unanimously approved a plan which found its climax in making this bridge a reality.

To further coordinate and increase highway and bridge facilities while chairman of the Committee on Highways, Bridges, and Streets of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I secured the enactment by the California State Legislature of laws permitting the union of two or more counties to form bridge and highway districts. It was this legislation which made possible the construction of such highways on the San Francisco peninsula as the Sky Line Boulevard, the Bay Shore Boulevard, and the reconstructed El Camino Real—the King's Highway. The hilly terrain of this area has made new highway construction a difficult engineering problem with consequent enormous relative costs.

Mr. Speaker, I speak of San Francisco and the San Francisco Bay area in particular because throughout more than 40 years of public service I have been directly and intimately associated with the problems of this important defense area and their relationship to our national defense. Highways and bridges are among the most important of these problems. The San Francisco Bay area is a major defense area; it is the key to the defense of our Nation along the entire Pacific coast, and as such it is imperative that sufficient highways and bridges shall be built to adequately meet any demands of military and naval necessity, either the rapid movement of troops or the huge movement of military and naval supplies.

I have previously called attention to the importance of the San Francisco Bay area and have referred to the testimony of high military and naval authorities before congressional committees on this matter.

In this present struggle San Francisco is one of the world's greatest ports of embarkation and the tremendous military and naval activity now taking place in that area would astound the imagination.

I called the attention of the last Congress to these facts when the Federal-Aid Road Act was under consideration, but specific provision was not made to meet this situation from the national viewpoint. Instead it has been left entirely within the hands of the various State agencies.

In the important San Francisco Bay defense area are located some of the most important permanent military and naval establishments in the United States. They include the Presidio Military Reservation, one of the largest in the country and one which was established during the Spanish regime; Fort Funston, Fort Mason, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Miley, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, Mare Island Navy Yard, Hamilton Field Bombing Base, Alameda Naval Air Base, Oakland Naval Supply Base, San Francisco Air Base—Mills Field—used by both the Army and the Navy; Moffett Field, the United States Coast Guard Air Station at South San Francisco, the great naval base at Hunters Point, now one of the world's greatest naval repair bases, as well as a host of other war industrial establishments. In addition, a large percentage of food supplies and materials necessary to sustain our forces on the Pacific are produced in the Sacramento, Napa, and Sonoma Valleys, and in the great redwood empire, all adjacent to San Francisco Bay. They are brought into San Francisco over the Golden Gate Bridge.

Mr. Speaker, due to its geographical location and strategic importance it is imperative that adequate highways and bridges be constructed to provide for the heavy traffic continuously flowing between all of these military and naval establishments. Under the terms of the post-war Federal-Aid Road Act, California will be allocated $67,000,000. At the present time it is essential that plans be prepared and carried forward for the construction of another bridge to connect San Francisco peninsula with the eastern approaches to San Francisco Bay. It should provide for automobile, bus, and railroad traffic and thus forge the link now missing in the flow of traffic between many of these permanent military and naval establishments. It should be of sufficient size to provide several lanes of traffic and thus not only relieve the heavy traffic now traversing the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, which reached its capacity at rush hours before the Second World War began, but it will also greatly shorten the distances between many of these important national-defense establishments with consequent saving in time. This bridge should be built from a point adjacent to Hunters Point to Bay Farm Island on the eastern side of the Bay.

Likewise, at least one other wide freeway should be constructed up the San Francisco Peninsula into the city proper. Plans have been made for this projected freeway, but through lack of specific provisions in the Federal-Aid

Road Act passed by the last Congress allocating funds for defense areas, this legislation fails to encourage its construction into a completed project.

A third important project that should be undertaken at the earliest possible moment is to build the Sausalito freeway to the northern end of the Golden Gate Bridge in Marin County. This freeway or superhighway is needed to provide adequate approach to the Golden Gate Bridge from the north and to connect the extensive war industrial establishments which have come into being on the northern and northwestern shores of San Francisco Bay.

The experience of the present war indicates that more highways and bridges are necessary in defense areas—they are necessary for our national defense and for our peacetime economic well-being. Congress should see to it that funds from these appropriations, when made, are definitely earmarked to defense areas in sufficient amounts to guarantee our national defense. Otherwise it will not be done.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of the last Congress to specifically provide for highways in defense areas in the billion-and-a-half-dollar post-war Federal-Aid Road Act should not influence the judgment of the United States Public Roads Administration in its final determination of any road or bridge project on which Federal funds are used. When necessary, it should use its good offices to encourage national defense thinking in determining road projects on the part of State highway commissions in submitting their recommendations and should insist that projects be undertaken in all defense areas to insure our future security.

In addition, in those States, like California, where State laws require that highways be made a part of the State system before State or Federal aid can be given, steps should be immediately taken by State legislatures to place highways and bridges necessary to national defense in the State highway system.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I desire to commend the gentleman from California for bringing this matter before the Congress and to say that I previously served in the legislature as a member of the committee on highways, and consequently I know definitely not only the urgency of the matter which the gentleman is bringing before us, but I know his own contributions in the past to this subject. May I say further that I know of the help which has always been given by the San Francisco area to the road-building programs of the State, and I hope now that the gentleman's recommendations will be listened to by the Congress.

Mr. WELCH. I appreciate my colleague's observation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from California on his thoughtful and timely statement. It should be noted here that the Golden Gate Bridge is really the culmination of a dream of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] and other Californians. On November 12, 1918, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], as a member of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, introduced a resolution that the feasibility of bridging the Golden Gate be investigated. To make a long story short, the plan to bridge the Golden Gate was found practical and the great bridge was built. It cost $35,000,000 and will be entirely paid for by the people of California who reside in the Golden Gate Bridge Authority, which includes the county of Napa, in my district. This bridge was and is an important link in the defense system of northern California. It is part of the great highway system leading in and out of the metropolitan area comprising San Francisco Bay.

It should also be remarked that the construction of defense highways into a great defense area such as the San Francisco Bay area should be a Federal obligation. For almost 100 years we have had the Presidio of San Francisco and for centuries to come it will be the heart of the great system of defense installations in and around San Francisco. Needless to say, great highways must be a part of this defense set-up and as national defense is purely a Federal obligation, it should carry a part of the collateral obligation of providing a proper system and network of highways which will make the defense area most useful in the event of a need for defense. The suggestions of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], with his wealth of experience and understanding of this problem, should not only be given careful consideration but should be carried out.

Mr. WELCH. I appreciate the observation made by my colleague from California.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts and articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan,

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, American boys, who fight today around the globe, have earned the right to come home to an America of individual opportunity. But will these men come back to a land where the individual citizen can start a business, with a fair chance of success? Will they be able to found a little enterprise, with a few neighbors as stockholders, without having the cards stacked against them by government itself?

"No, they will not," is the answer to these questions, under present conditions. For small corporate enterprises have been steadily disappearing from the American scene, under the impact of taxes, tax regulations, restrictions, and rulings. And that disappearance means that opportunity for individual initiative and personal independence is vanishing at an equal rate.

In the late political campaign, both parties agreed on restoration of opportunity for small business. President Roosevelt said at Boston:

> We are going to see to it that those [veterans] who hope to establish businesses have a legitimate and fair opportunity to do so.

In his message to Congress last Saturday the President endorsed the principle of tax modification with which this discussion is concerned. Other powerful groups, such as the American Legion and labor, have given support to this restoration.

Despite official bipartisan support, what is the actual picture? Here are the statistics of new corporations in four leading States—New York, Illinois, Delaware, and Maine: In the bad year of 1932 there were 34,320 incorporations in these States. Despite general recovery from that depression low, the birth rate of new businesses has continued to decline. It reached an all-time low of 10,895 in 1943. But only a part of this alarming decrease can be blamed on the war, because in 1936, the banner peacetime recovery year, only 27,108 new corporations were organized in these States.

Similar evidence of the sterilization of new business is shown in the records of my own State, Nebraska. In the year 1929, 523 new corporations were organized. Likewise, by 1936, this number had declined over one-half to 253 new firms. By the year 1943 the strangling effect of governmental fiscal policies, plus the war, had reduced the number of new corporations to 92, less than 18 percent of the number organized in 1929. No Fourth-of-July oratory can obscure the decline in American opportunity and initiative portrayed in these figures.

The disappearance of individual enterprise is likewise clearly shown by the report on new businesses of all types, corporate, partnerships, and proprietorships, since 1933. From 1921 through 1932, there was an average of, roughly, 484,000 new business firms started each year. Yet that period was restricted by the consolidation craze, considered a major cause of the 1929 depression.

But from 1933 through 1943, only an average of 368,000 new businesses annually have opened. Here is an average annual decline of 116,000 firms, or 24 percent, for the years since 1933. In 1943, the total number of new businesses in the Nation was only 178,506, less than one-half of the 364,901 new firms in dismal 1932.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In connection with the number of corporations that were created, is it not also a fact that the corporations created were larger than those in the previous period?

Mr. BUFFETT. I do not have the figures as to the actual size of the corporations, but I have some other figures that I shall give later in this discussion on that very point.

This fact is noteworthy: Not since 1930 have as many new firms opened as in 1930, when 451,708 commenced operation. Yet that was the year after the 1929 crash. The best record in later years was in 1936, when 441,189 new firms opened their doors.

WHERE INCREASED INCOME GOES

But where is all our war-generated income going? The national income has increased from $83,300,000,000 in 1929 to $147,900,000,000 in 1943. Perhaps the best place to get a true picture is in the statistics of retail trade.

Total retail sales in 1929 are reported as $48,459,000,000. By 1942 they had increased to $57,684,000,000, a gain of 19 percent.

But the increase in retail sales has generally gone to the colossal chain and mail-order firms, as the following typical examples will show.

Sears, Roebuck & Co., retail sales (round figures):	
1929	$403,000,000
1942	915,000,000
Montgomery Ward & Co., retail sales (round figures):	
1929	267,000,000
1942	632,000,000
Safeway Stores, Inc., retail sales (round figures):	
1929	213,000,000
1942	611,000,000
Walgren Stores, retail sales (round figures):	
1929	46,000,000
1942	95,000,000

The foregoing mammoth corporations show average increases of much over 100 percent. From these figures, for example, it seems certain that Sears, Roebuck is handling the retail purchases that formerly would have been made from hundreds of independent merchants. Those small enterprises diffused economic power and created individual opportunity for hundreds of people. Retail trade is one business where, by the nature of things, the maximum of opportunity should exist for small operators. Capital requirements are low and personal service and management are particularly effective.

But the opportunity for a new small enterprise to go into competition successfully with these giant corporations is practically nonexistent under present tax laws. While the large firm has other advantages, the unfair handicap of present tax laws on new small concerns is a decisive obstacle. The colossal chain-store corporation solves the difficulties, created by multitudinous and ever-changing tax laws and regulations, with regularly employed legal and accounting talent. Similar services are too costly for the individual small enterprise.

Frequently the obstacle created by the legal and accounting overhead required by tax laws and regulations is more discouraging than the taxes themselves. New enterprises must be set up to operate on a small overhead and with a minimum of employees. Present tax regulations make expensive legal and accounting service practically compulsory, even before the new business opens, before it has a single customer or has made a single sale.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is making a very fine statement, and a timely one. Does not the gentleman agree that the time has passed, as a result of the policies that have been followed during the past 12 years or so, when a young man can start out on a shoestring and get into business for himself?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes, sir. That situation does not exist today.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is becoming increasingly difficult for a young man to become established unless he has a large amount of money?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to say the gentleman is making a very fine contribution and his legislation certainly points in the right direction. There must not be forgotten the very wholesome effect upon labor of what the gentleman is advocating. Its effect upon employment will be to increase employment. Whenever we have a situation where young men and others, wanting to start a new business, go into that business, they step aside and make a job for somebody else. If their new business succeeds they provide more jobs. As long as we continue the present policy of discouraging people from going into business we add to the number of people hunting jobs and we detract from the number of jobs available and we are doing a disservice to the laboring people of America.

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I presume the gentleman, who is making a fine speech, noticed in yesterday's Star the tabulation made by someone referring to Jesse Jones, where he estimated the number of operating business firms in 1939 and 1943, showing that in 1939 there were 3,316,700 firms in business and in 1943 there were 2,780,300 firms in business, showing we have a loss of 536,400 business concerns in this country. I think that is a terrible condition when we realize that this Government is not encouraging small business but is putting the Government into business when we should let the individuals operate the business of this country, because I believe it is a wise thing to have freedom and liberty in the small business enterprise rather than to have Government regulation until they strangle them out.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course small business is being strangled by excessive taxation made necessary by wasteful spending of this administration.

Mr. BUFFETT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. We hear a great deal about what we are going to do for the boys when they come home from the war. We are setting up a condition here under the bad fiscal policies of this administration, are we not, where it will be almost impossible, notwithstanding the fact that the Government is willing to lend money to put the boys back into business after they have sacrificed so much, to keep this country free, yet they will not have an opportunity to go into business because small business is going out instead of being maintained in this country. When they come home, possibly as part of their sacrifices will be to have more big business and less opportunity for the little man to go back into business.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is right. I cover that a little later on in my remarks, if I may proceed.

FISCAL POLICY VICIOUSLY OPPOSES NEW VENTURES

These conditions are explained by Peter F. Drucker, in the Saturday Evening Post, September 23, 1944, in the article entitled "Your Stake in Business Profits," when he said:

> The shortsightedness of our present fiscal policy is most vicious in the case of new ventures—new plants or new processes. New enterprises are a more important national asset than our coal or oil, for we might find means to replace natural resources, but we would never be able to utilize what we have without initiative.
>
> New ventures are the children in our economic system. Like children, they need special protection, but without them our economic system would soon die of old age. Never before has it been as important for this country to have an adequate supply of new enterprises as it will be when we switch from war to peace and when we shall have to find employment for the returning soldier.
>
> If the grown and strong business needs some provision that enables it to set aside profits against future losses over a long period of years, the young and growing business needs special privileges—a lighter tax burden, maybe complete exemption from taxes on profits during the first 5 or 10 years of its life; the right to offset losses against profits over an extended period and to make unlimited provisions for depreciation, development expenses and emergency reserves, and so on. For it is only common sense to make the starting of a new venture as attractive as possible, and to make it easy for a new venture to grow healthily.

HEAVIEST BURDENS PLACED ON NEW FIRMS

> Actually, our fiscal policy looks as if we had set out on purpose to make it unattractive to start a new business, and all but impossible to build one up. We give no special privileges at all to a new venture. We impose the same taxes on it that we impose on an old business—about as sensible as to put a soldier's heavy pack on the shoulders of a 3-year-old. We do not allow it to build up any reserves or any development fund.
>
> Worst of all, we punish people for taking the risk of a new venture and reward them for investing their money unproductively. It would be very optimistic these days to count on a higher net profit than 2 percent on the invested capital from a new venture—what with the present tax rates and with

our unique system of double taxation, under which both the business and the recipient of its profits pay full income and surtaxes. And this 2 percent would have to cover all the risks inevitably inherent in any economic enterprise, but particularly in a young one. At the same time, we offer a riskless and taxless return of about 2 percent on Government bonds.

Thus, it is actually less profitable to invest even in a reasonably successful new business than to buy bonds—especially for the rich man. Of course, during the war we want people to buy War bonds rather than invest in industry. And to offer Government bonds as a safe investment for savings, for life-insurance funds, and so on, is perfectly sound.

But if we want new enterprise after the war, we must make it possible for the capital that has been accumulated by individuals and corporations as a result of past profits to assume the risks of an investment in the future. And that means that risk-taking must be rewarded and riskless investment discouraged.

As Drucker clearly points out, our tax laws have reached the stage where they crush and destroy the creative energies of our citizens. Spontaneous efforts to employ men by new firms are still-born. Let us face this situation honestly. A land where no new economic seed is able to germinate and flourish must soon become a Fascist or Socialist state. That means slavery and serfdom for all, except the politicians and bureaucrats. It is the fearful, but not improbable prospect, unless free opportunity is restored.

WET-NURSE SCHEMES WILL FAIL

Legislative efforts to solve this problem can take one of two courses: One method is to remove the shackles that have destroyed the incentives to start new businesses. The other method is via the route of governmental loans, bureaus of assistance, and other wet-nurse schemes, which have about the reviving effect on the true entrepreneur as a dose of strychnine. Practically, there is only the first method—that of removing the restraints that do not allow a new enterprise to be born and prosper.

Toward this purpose I introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress H. R. 5411—reintroduced the first day of this session as H. R. 365—a bill to create and expand post-war employment and opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small business. The bill provides this encouragement by the very simple device of freedom from taxes and tax regulations, until the new business has had approximately 3 years to get on its feet.

To prevent this plan from being used for tax-evasion purposes, I have included a number of clauses designed to prevent its abuse. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that hearings will develop additional necessary safeguards. Likewise, it should not give inordinate advantages to new businesses as against existing enterprises. Under the terms of the bill, dividends and salaries would be restricted. Unless earnings were used to build up the enterprise, the firm would be ineligible for the benefits of the bill. The aids provided by this bill would go far toward the successful reestablishment of many firms that have been home-front casualties of this war.

From the standpoint of immediate Federal revenue collections, the effect of this proposal would be negligible. The reason is plain. From Pearl Harbor to the end of 1943 there was a net decline of over 500,000 firms in America. Unless new businesses are founded, tax collections, regardless of rates imposed, will eventually decline seriously.

By encouraging the creation of small business, this Congress would be providing for an increase in revenues as new firms prospered and exemptions expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman from Nebraska is making a very fine, logical, and useful statement. One of the difficulties today is that the investor dare not invest. If he is asked to invest, the ordinary investor says, "Well, I have worked hard for my money. How long will it be before this enterprise will pay a dividend?"

The promoter will say, "Perhaps it will be 5 years."

The investor will say, "How much of my dividend will I get after paying taxes at the end?"

And the reply is, of course: "Under present tax laws, you will not get anything."

The result is the investor does not invest and your enterprise does not start.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is correct. My own experience of 16 years in the investment business has conclusively demonstrated the discouraging conditions facing investors.

PROPOSAL WILL ENCOURAGE WAR-VETERANS

Prompt action on legislation of this type should be encouraged by the increasing number of veterans returning to civil life. The loan provisions of the G. I. bill are designed to assist veterans to get into business. These business loans will be helpful only if the creation of new concerns is encouraged by sensible tax policies. Likewise this proposal would facilitate opportunity and jobs for civilians previously in war work.

The greatness of America has been founded on individual economic opportunity. For some years we have moved steadily toward the centralization of economic power that makes inevitable the centralization of political power. To reverse this fatal trend we must uncover and eliminate the governmental policies which accelerate the concentration of power.

A few days ago a Senate subcommittee commented:

> As measured against the background of our economic needs, the post-war laws that have been enacted add up to very little. The balance sheet shows that the Seventy-eighth Congress never came to grips with the problem of providing an economic substitute for war production.

The truth of the foregoing self-criticism is generally acknowledged. This Congress can remove this economic road block by restoring the chance for a small business to be organized with fair opportunity for success.

If this needed legislation is to be properly considered, we must do so on our own initiative. The men who would start these new businesses obviously are unorganized and scattered. The only organized pressure would be on the other side, composed of corporations benefiting from Government policies that now encourage bigness and monopoly.

A recent War Department survey among soldiers found that "jobs without bosses" are the post-war preferences of the men in uniform. Only if the soldier can start with reasonable equality of opportunity can this hope be realized. That is one purpose of this bill. That objective deserves the earnest study of every Member of Congress. Our older generation was handed the priceless American heritage of individual opportunity, while this generation has fought to preserve it. So, we must recreate a climate for initiative and opportunity for them, else their battle against statism and totalitarianism abroad will be lost by those of us at home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in his speech to Congress last Saturday the President made these statements:

> We should also take appropriate measures in peacetime to secure opportunities for new small enterprises and for productive business expansion for which finance would otherwise be unavailable.
>
> While no general revision of the tax structure can be made until the war ends on all fronts, the Congress should be prepared to provide tax modifications at the end of the war in Europe designed to encourage capital to invest in new enterprises and to provide jobs.

I am hopeful that with the encouragement that comes from his high office this Congress will get busy on the objective of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include the bill H. R. 365 at the end of my discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

H. R. 365

A bill to create and expand employment and opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small businesses.

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 421 the following new supplement:

"SUPPLEMENT V—NEW CORPORATE ENTERPRISES

"SEC. 430. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"(a) In general: The tax imposed by this chapter, and subchapters B and E of chapter 2, shall not apply with respect to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in subsection (b)) for any taxable year beginning not later than 30 months after the organization of such enterprise if—

"(1) Limitation on amount of capital: The invested capital of such enterprise for such taxable year does not exceed $100,000. For

the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (3), the invested capital shall be determined as provided in subchapter E of chapter 2, except that borrowed capital shall be included at 100 percent thereof in lieu of 50 percent thereof, and no reduction in average invested capital shall be made on account of inadmissible assets.

"(2) Limitation on character of income: 90 percent or more of the gross income (as defined in section 22) of such enterprise for such taxable year consists of income other than: dividends, interest, rents, royalties, gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets, or income which constitutes personal holding company income under section 502 (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f).

"(3) Limitation on dividends: The dividends paid or declared during such taxable year do not exceed in the aggregate 6 percent of the invested capital of the enterprise for such year.

"(4) Limitation on interest paid on borrowed funds: The interest paid, either directly or indirectly, to any shareholders, is not at a rate greater than 6 percent per annum.

"(5) Limitation to individual shareholders: At all times during the taxable year not less than 80 percent of the voting stock of the enterprise, and not less than 80 percent of the stock of all other classes, is bona fide owned by individuals, or by estates or trusts by reason of the death of former shareholders.

"(6) Limitations on salaries paid: There is no portion of the compensation paid to any employee during such taxable year which would not be allowable as a deduction under section 23 (a) (1) (A).

"(7) Limitation on character of assets: At no time prior to the close of such taxable year has the enterprise acquired, directly or indirectly, substantially all of the assets of another corporation or of a partnership or trust, or substantially all of the assets which were used in a trade or business carried on by an individual: *Provided, however,* That this limitation shall not operate against a new corporate enterprise acquiring the assets of a business discontinued as a direct result of the war.

"(8) Limitation of leases, etc.: At no time during the taxable year has the enterprise paid, or been required to pay, to any other person, pursuant to a lease, contract, or other arrangement, any amount which is determined with reference to the profits, income, or receipts of the enterprise and which constitutes gross income in the hands of such other person.

"(9) Taxable year to end December 31: The taxable year does not end on any date other than December 31.

"(b) Definition of 'New corporate enterprise': As used in this section, the term 'new corporate enterprise' means a domestic corporation which is organized, and actually embarks upon the active conduct of a trade or business, at any time after the date upon which this supplement becomes effective until the expiration of the 18-month period beginning with the month following the month in which the President proclaims the termination of hostilities in the present war."

SEC. 2. Chapter 6 of the Internal Revenue Code (capital stock tax) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 1208. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"The tax imposed by section 1200 shall not apply to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in sec. 430) with respect to a year ending on any June 30 if such enterprise is exempt under section 430 from the tax imposed by chapter 1 for its income-tax taxable year ending on December 31 of the calendar year in which such June 30 occurs."

SEC. 3. Part II of subchapter A of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (employers' tax under Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 1412. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"The tax imposed by section 1410 shall not apply to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in section 430) for any calendar year for which the enterprise is exempt under section 430 from the tax imposed by chapter 1."

SEC. 4. Subchapter C of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 1612. Temporary Exemption of Certain Small New Corporate Enterprises.

"The tax imposed by section 1600 shall not apply to any new corporate enterprise (as defined in section 430) for any calendar year for which such enterprise is exempt under section 430 from the tax imposed by chapter 1."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman, by his instructive remarks, has just given a demonstration of how those who have recently taken their seats in this body can help some of us who have been here for a longer period and who it may be have dropped into a rut in our thinking.

I am familiar with the custom of the House and more especially the custom which formerly prevailed in the other body of frowning upon new Members who are anxious to take an active part in the proceedings of Congress.

To my mind there never was any justification for any such practice. Every Member in the House represents a constituency. His people elect him to represent them in Congress and unless I am grievously mistaken they expect him to do it.

Moreover, coming direct from the people unhampered by any of the red tape which prevails here in Washington or by the fixed opinions of bureaucrats and unaccustomed to taking orders, a new Member can give us many a constructive thought which will be of value to every Member of the House.

Well do I recall the day when in my first term I was admonished by a colleague who had served here for years, that when I had been here longer I would know more. I conceded his point as being well taken but I also told him that if he would go home once in a while, he could better represent his people; that he would speak more in accord with current issues. We were both right. So let me again thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] who has today introduced a bill which I hope will be favorably considered by the committee to which it is referred and later by the House.

It is my hope that during the coming session every Member of this body will take an active part in the discussions on the floor, in the committee work, and in legislation which he deems of interest to his district and the country.

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Sunday Telegram captioned "America must be American to remain great." It is well written, timely, and logical.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 10 minutes.

A REPUBLICAN ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today should bring to Republicans new courage, new determination to serve with ever-increasing vigor the interests of their country.

One hundred and ten years ago there was a Republican celebration in the city of Washington. A dinner was served at Brown's Hotel at which some two hundred and fifty guests attended. The Vice President of the United States, the members of the President's Cabinet, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, many Members of the Senate and of the House, as well as distinguished officers of the Army and the Navy were present.

Andrew Jackson did not attend the dinner held in his honor, the dinner held to celebrate the victory at New Orleans and the payment of the last dollar due on the national debt. He remained at home, but sent down by messenger the following greeting:

Payment of the public debt. Let us commemorate it as an event which gives us increased power as a Nation, and reflects luster on our Federal Union, of whose justice, fidelity, and wisdom, it is a glorious illustration.

From the Washington Globe we learn that Thomas H. Benton officiated as President of the day; that he was assisted by Vice President James K. Polk, of Tennessee; William R. King, of Alabama; Henry A. Muhlenberg, of Pennsylvania; Silas Wright, Jr., of New York; J. M. Wayne, of Georgia; Isaac Hill, of New Hampshire; Bedford Brown, of North Carolina; Thomas Morris, of Ohio; Ratliff Boon, of Indiana; John Y. Mason, of Virginia; E. K. Kane, of Illinois; Philemon Dickerson, of New Jersey; and Joseph Hall, of Maine.

Also present at the meeting and addressing the meeting was Postmaster General Barry, Secretary of War Cass, and Vice President Van Buren, all of Andrew Jackson's political family.

Of the six counties in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, three bear the names respectively of Barry, Cass, and Van Buren.

The Globe of this city carried the following notice of the celebration:

REPUBLICAN CELEBRATION

The subscribers for the public dinner in this city, to be had this day, in honor of the extinguishment of the national debt, and commemoration of the Battle of New Orleans, are requested to call for their tickets at Brown's Hotel, prior to 5 o'clock p. m., this day.

The dinner will be served at precisely 6 o'clock, at Brown's Hotel, at which time and place invited guests and subscribers are re-

quested to attend. By order of the Committee of Arrangements. Thursday, January 8, 1835.

At the dinner Mr. Benton was the first speaker. I quote:

Gentlemen, we have met for the commemoration of two great events—the anniversary of the victory at New Orleans, and the extinguishment of the national debt.

Both events are worthy of celebrations, and must ever remain as eras in the history of our country.

The celebration of great national events is an obligation of duty and of policy. They do honor to the past and service to the future, paying the annual installments of an impayable debt of honor and of gratitude to those who have gone before, while planting the seeds of emulation in the bosoms of those who are to come after.

The immortal victories of Greece and Rome; did each, in its turn, save those republics but once? Or rather, did not each victory save the country many times, by the enthusiasm it excited, and the emulation it inspired? So of the great victory whose anniversary we now celebate. Its memory shall fire the souls of the latest posterity and animate successive generations to the emulation of its heroic achievement and deathless fame.

The extinction of the national debt is an event of a different kind, more rare, but not less deserving of endless commemoration in the life of nations. How seldom can two such commemorations go together. Wars create debt; peace and economy extinguish them. The laureled general shines in the career of arms that loads his country with debt; the civil statesman pays off the encumbrance of military glory. How great, then, the felicity of him who, uniting in his own person the function of general and statesman, pays off in peace the debt of war. How many great nations, at this moment illustrated by victories, are yet loaded down with debt and with taxes. Our America, young, free, vigorous, is the grand and solitary exception. Her national debt has ceased to exist. The debt of two wars is paid off. And this beneficent consummation takes place under the civil administration of him whose career, connecting itself with both wars, furnishes the most brilliant event of our military annals. The national debt is paid. This month of January 1835, in the fifty-eighth year of the Republic, Andrew Jackson being President, the national debt is paid and the apparition, so long unseen on earth—a great nation, without a national debt—stands revealed to the astonished vision of a wondering world. At home, this great and rare event, the consummation of all hopes, the exaltation of all hearts, is also the admonition to sacred duties. It admonishes to the practice of economy. The reduction of burthens abroad, it is the exhibition of power. A nation without debt exhibits in the very fact of that disencumbrance the imposing force of a hundred thousand men in arms and a hundred line-of-battle ships at sea.

Now mark you, gentlemen, the celebration was a Republican celebration. It was a celebration of a great victory. It was a celebration of the wiping out of the national debt. What a contrast between that day and the day of the New Deal. It has been the New Deal fashion to attribute the depression of the early thirties to President Herbert Hoover, whereas in truth and in fact that depression was but the logical result of the false prosperity which followed the war which came during President Wilson's administration.

It is quite true that when Mr. Hoover left off we had a stupendous national debt, but during the peace years which followed and under the policies of the New Deal and a President who had promised economy and retrenchment and a reduction of the national debt, that debt soared to astronomical proportions. It was increased by billions of dollars and the net result, after 7 years of public wasteful spending, was a nation with approximately 10,000,000 unemployed, and millions of others doing work which was being paid for out of public funds extracted from taxpayers.

But let us go back to the dinner of January 8, 1835. Mr. Polk delivered an address during which among other things he said:

Freed from debt, with abundant revenues to meet all the wants of government; relieved from the overstanding and corrupting influence of a moneyed corporation that has sought to sap and undermine the public liberty; in no apprehension from foreign enemies; and with a country enjoying at this moment a higher state of prosperity than at any former period, may we not, on an occasion like this, be permitted to felicitate ourselves and the great Republican Party of which we are members, for the support which we and they have strictly given to a course of public measures which have produced these great results.

Note these significant words. I quote again:

The great Republican Party of which we are members.

Up to that time there had been no national conventions. The Democratic Party was yet unborn. Thomas Jefferson called himself a Republican. In an early message, referring to political divisions, he said, "We are Federalists. We are Republicans." Madison, Monroe, and Andrew Jackson were Republicans. John Quincy Adams called himself a National Republican when the Federalists passed away.

The Democratic Party appeared during the Van Buren campaign in 1836 and then began its policy of claiming to be the offspring of everything that was good and great.

Since the Van Buren campaign in 1836, the Democratic Party has claimed Jefferson and Jackson as its godfathers.

It was in the gray dawn of January 8, 1815, that Jackson's band of deer hunters, hidden in the old canal on the battlefield at New Orleans, administered to Great Britain its greatest military defeat. The British lost 2,000 men, including General Pakenham. The Americans lost 21—8 killed and 13 wounded. That was an example of the greatest efficiency and economy in the military history of the world up to that time.

What a contrast between the thrift, the economy, the sound business principles of Andrew Jackson and the fiscal policy during peacetime of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Dealers.

A few days ago a gentleman who resides here in Washington, Francis N. Stacy, brought to my office a statement which so clearly contrasts the policies of Jackson and those of the New Dealers who now carry the banner of the Democratic Party that it is printed herewith. That statement in the language of Mr. Stacy follows:

SWIFT ECONOMIC EXPANSION FOLLOWING DEBT EXTINGUISHMENT, 1835–40

The appeal to the imagination of Europe was instantaneous and epoch-making. It was an appeal both to labor and capital, and world-wide.

A nation without a national debt and with almost no direct Federal taxes. A nation possessed of a billion acres of fertile wilderness in which a home seeker could buy an acre at the price of 1 day's labor and where a farmer could buy 100 acres at the cost of a half year's work. A beacon to the homeless of a debt-ridden world.

Immigration quadrupled as early as 1840. Gold imports increased by 160 percent for investment and American settlement.

From Britain and Ireland within the decade came 283,000 homemakers with $60,000,000 in gold from the Bank of England. There were Irishmen for every city job, including Tammany Hall. Irish lassies furnished the womanpower to start the cotton mills, and New England cotton mills by 1840 were turning out a product valued at $40,000,000 with a threefold increase of cotton goods for export.

From Germany, France, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and the Swiss Republic came 208,000 settlers to take up farms in the Middle Atlantic States and lay the foundation for the Middle West.

When the first agricultural census was taken in 1839, 4 years after debt extinguishment started the west-bound caravans of farm seekers, wheat crops of the United States swiftly jumped to 84,923,000 bushels, the corn crop to 377,531,000 bushels, and the livestock to 14,971,000 cattle, 19,311,000 sheep, and 26,301,293 hogs.

Will New Dealers please note: In the philosophy of Andrew Jackson there was no killing of 6,000,000 little pigs to produce prosperity by making pork scarce, but farm prosperity jumped by raising 26,301,293 full-grown hogs with ham and bacon for every home and millions for export to porkless Europe.

Andrew Jackson, instead of plowing under the hogs and cotton and piling up the debt and taxes, adopted the opposite philosophy. He doubled the production of hogs and cotton in 5 years, and well-nigh abolished the debt and taxes.

Instead of plowing under 10,000,000 acres of cotton, Andrew Jackson increased the cotton production from 732,000 bales in 1830 to 1,347,000 bales in 1840, and cotton exports jumped from 298,000,000 pounds in 1830 to 743.9 million in 1840. In 5 years after Jackson lifted the debt burden from American free enterprise, he doubled both production and domestic exports, while reducing the interest burden on public debt to 1 cent per capita.

In the second year of debt extinguishment, the assessed valuation of New York City realty increased 100 percent by reason of the home building and factory building to provide for the new immigration.

In the third year of debt extinguishment, the commerce of New York Harbor increased by 100 percent through fleets of crowding ships.

On January 8, 1836, just 1 year after abolition of American public debt, a Pittsburgh newspaperman counted in Pittsburgh Harbor, where the Allegheny and Monongahela join to form the Ohio River, 37 Mississippi River steamboats loading freight and passengers for the new migration into the Middle West. Mississippi Valley doubled its population by 1840.

Illinois in Jackson's day was a frontier State. In 1832, Illinois cast only 21,468 votes for President. In 1840, after two White House terms of debt extinguishment and farm expansion, Illinois cast 93,17' votes for President—a 600-percent gain in 8 years of free enterprise.

Levi Woodbury of New Hampshire was Jackson's Secretary of the Treasury and ex-officio United States Land Commissioner. He had a billion acres of public land to settle with home and farm seekers. In Illinois he opened 10 United States land offices. Note what happened when the immigration flood broke loose in 1835 when the public debt was lifted.

In 1834, the year before debt extinguishment, Illinois land sales were only 354,000 acres. In 1835, the sales immediately jumped to 2,096,600 acres, and in 1836 to 3,199,700—a ninefold gain in 2 years.

In 1835, Woodbury opened a land office in Chicago. In 2 years Chicago land sales reached 806,000 acres—which laid the foundation for Chicago. In 4 years, by 1839, Chicago's lake traffic in west-bound freight and passengers and east-bound wheat employed a fleet of 49 steamboats and 363 sailing vessels. The population of Illinois grew from 157,000 in 1830 to 475,000 in 1840, and 851,000 in 1850—and Chicago became the emporium of the Middle West.

Michigan Territory, which in 1830 had only 31,639 people, was admitted into the Union as a State by act of Congress of June 23, 1836, approved January 26, 1837, with 212,267 citizens in 1840—a sevenfold gain within 5 years after debt extinguishment brought labor and capital to develop mines, lumber, and farm lands—and Detroit came on the economic map. General Cass, of Michigan, was Jackson's Secretary of War.

Missouri, whose Senator Thomas H. Benton presided at the first Jackson Day dinner at Brown's Hotel, increased its population from 140,455 in 1830 to 383,700 in 1840, and 682,000 in 1850—and St. Louis, followed by Kansas City, came on the United States map as the gateway to the far West.

The 14 States bounding the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and the Great Lakes—the agricultural and industrial empire which in marked degree owes swift development to the westward trek, inspired by payment of the public debt—have, with only 2 exceptions, a Jackson County as a tribute to their far-visioned founder. Within 5 years after January 8, 1835, their aggregate population increased by 3,070,000, or approximately 60 percent. In striking contrast, the same States in the recent decade 1930–40 increased their aggregate population under a mounting public debt and tax burden by only 6 percent. Even numerically, after 100 years of population growth, the 1930–40 decade of mounting debt and taxes has added no more people to these 14 States than in the pioneer days of Jackson's debt extinguishment in 1830–40.

Both American shipbuilding and American railways owe their great expansion to the Jefferson-Jackson financial program which brought the needed cash capital from Europe, as well as the needed immigration and commerce.

In 1830, 5 years before payment of the public debt, United States had only 23 miles of operating railway, and American ships built that year grossed only 58,580 tons.

In 1840, 5 years after lifting the public debt, operating railroad mileage increased one hundredfold, to 2,818 miles, then to 9,021 miles in 1850, and 18,374 in 1855, and the United States soon led the world in transportation by rail.

Our shipbuilding doubled to 121,203 tons in 1840, doubled again to 279,255 tons in 1850, then doubled again in 1855 to 583,450 gross tons, which was the highest shipbuilding record of the nineteenth century.

Railway building, which received its first great impetus from the capital brought from London and Amsterdam by the lifting of the public debt, was followed by the development of America's iron, steel, and coal industries.

American pig iron production rose swiftly from 165,000 tons in 1830 to 286,903 in 1840, 563,755 in 1850, and 700,150 in 1855—more than quadrupling within 20 years after the first Jackson Day dinner in honor of the extinguishment of the national debt.

Exports of American iron and steel manufactures increased tenfold during the same period after the famous Republican celebration.

Coal production made a like advance: Only 285,779 tons in 1830, rising to 1,848,249 tons in 1840, 6,266,233 in 1850, and 11,541,672 in 1855—a fortyfold development in the first 20 years after the 250 guests at the first Jackson Day dinner rose and cheered Andrew Jackson's toast—"Payment of the public debt."

In 1836, the very first year after the public-debt purge, the first American labor union was formed and the first wage boost was granted.

In the agricultural census of 1860, 25 years after that dinner at Brown's Hotel, the value of American farms and farm property, including $1,089,000,000 of livestock, exceeded $9,000,000,000—approximately four times the farm value on the first Jackson Day—and the boys in blue and gray on the Civil War front the next year had 848,000,000 bushels of corn in the crib and 33,512,000 hogs in pen to furnish pork and corn pones—no little pigs plowed under.

THE REVELATION AND THE EXODUS OF JANUARY 8, 1941

For 105 years up to and including January 8, 1940, the Democratic Party celebrated from year to year the Jackson Day dinner of January 8, 1935, at Brown's Hotel in blissful ignorance of the historic significance of the event. On January 8, 1940, the celebration rose to the magnificence of a dinner at $100 a plate at the Mayflower, with the President and his Cabinet and all Democratic leaders in attendance, full dress.

Then, as January 8, 1941, approached and after the official announcement was published, the hideous news broke:

1. That they had been celebrating the extinguishment of the national debt during the preceding 8 years, while piling up the debt threefold in peacetime.

2. That they were celebrating the Battle of New Orleans, where the American loss was only 21, while the loss of the British, their present allies, had been 2,000, including the British commanding general.

3. And, most astounding of all, they, for 105 years, had been holding what Andrew Jackson and his committee of arrangements had officially termed a "Republican celebration."

Then came shuffling of dates, the manufacture of sudden alibis, and the exodus from high places in Washington, D. C.

On January 8, 1941—11 months before Pearl Harbor—the President and every Democratic Member of his Cabinet were from 1,000 to 3,000 miles away from Washington.

The Commander in Chief and his aides de camp, Attorney General Jackson and Harold L. Ickes, boarded the yacht *Potomac*, the Commander's flagship, and hastened for the Gulf of Mexico, where they took refuge in a bay off the coast of Florida.

Postmaster General Walker and Secretary of Commerce Jones likewise had a yearn for the Gulf of Mexico. Madam Perkins flew 2,000 miles to New Mexico. Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., the guardian of the public debt and the Treasury deficit, took the longest flight of all and did not land until he reached the cactus groves of Tucson, Ariz. These flights were followed by an amazed American press. What could it mean?

When Jackson Day, 1941, arrived the only members of the Cabinet in Washington were the Republican members. They possibly remained because Andrew Jackson had declared the day a Republican celebration. They, moreover, had had no hand in piling up the debt. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., evidently took the longest flight of all because he had just asked Congress to extend the debt limit to $65,000,000,000, or four times the debt of 1932.

The Commander in Chief was in the worst plight of all. A poet had one time said: "Up from the South at break of day, the affrighted air with a shudder bore, etc.—and Sheridan 50 miles away." And here, on Jackson Day, the Commander is 1,000 miles away—and he did not come back for a week or so.

In a safe place down in the Florida Everglades, where no newspaperman could interview and harass, he made a speech—without reference to Andrew Jackson, or to the Battle of New Orleans, and without responding to Jackson's toast:

"Payment of the public debt: Let us commemorate it as an event which gives us increased power as a Nation, and reflects luster on our Federal Union, of whose justice, fidelity, and wisdom, it is a glorious illustration."

Since Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, the Democratic Party may be forgiven for the nonobservance of Jackson Day. As war expenders and allies of the British the administration naturally is excusable for forgetting Jackson Day. But the January 8, 1941, celebration in the Florida Everglades was 11 months before Pearl Harbor, and, presumably, was not in the cards. Or, was it? And, did Harold Ickes have ready a smear oration on "isolationists"?

What will be the future of Jackson Day in American history? It is safe to say: (1) That it will not be celebrated until this war is over, (2) that it will not be celebrated then by the New Deal Party.

Appropriately, it might be celebrated by the Jefferson-Jackson Democrats who are now out of power. Appropriately, likewise, it might be celebrated by the Republican Party. Reduction of the public debt, and the avoidance of Treasury deficits, has been the pride of Republican administrations since the Civil War. The debt of the last World War was reduced from $26,000,000,000 in 1920 to $16,000,000,000 in 1932.

Therefore, it may well be that when the fourth and/or fifth terms are over, and war no longer can be prolonged, Jackson Day may be restored to its time-honored place in American history under a Republican administration of which Jefferson-Jackson Democrats are members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement relative to universal training.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday I addressed the House, having waited here until half-past 2. When I finished I took occasion to get a bite to

eat, and while I was having my lunch the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], one of my congenial friends in the House, made certain remarks about me. I always believed that when one Member intended to say something in reference to another Member he ought to invite that Member to be present on the floor of the House if possible. I am therefore very glad that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is present at my invitation this afternoon.

The gentleman's speech was captioned "No partisan politics." In that connection, may I say to the gentleman from Texas that so far as partisan politics are concerned there is not a Member of the House nor a man who has ever been a Member of the House who does not know that I am a real ripsnorting Republican. I take great pride in that fact. I have always felt a lot of satisfaction in supporting Republican policies and principles, believing them best for our country. However, above all else I want to be a good American. Regardless of what your politics may be on that side of the House, whether Democrat or New Deal, it is for you to decide when it comes to doing the things that are for the best interest of this Government. I want to do what is the best for our country. As long as I am a Member of the House the time will never come when I shall bury myself just because something I may say or do might hit the New Deal. I will criticize anyone when I believe he or she is wrong. I will not let them go unchallenged.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to do or say anything that will in any sense interfere with the winning of the war, and I am going to be very careful about that, because I am as much interested in that as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] or any other Member of the House. As I stated, I would be most reluctant to say or do anything that will in any way hinder our war effort or that might prevent us from winning the war and bringing our boys back as soon as possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. For a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said he is proud of being a Republican. That is not anything new for people to be proud of. Way back on January 8, 1835—that is 110 years ago—Polk, speaking here in Washington, said that he was proud to be a Republican, in substance, and he referred to the great Republican Party and all of those present at that dinner said they were Republicans. In one of his messages Thomas Jefferson called himself a Republican and said, "We are Federalists, we are Republicans." Madison, Monroe, and Andrew Jackson were Republicans. The gentleman has a long, long list of great men to follow.

Mr. RICH. I have a long list of great men behind me in the Republican Party and I hope a great many good Republicans will be here in years to come as President, as Speaker, and as Members of the House, and all departments of Government. Yes; I say good Republicans.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. If I can have additional time, Mr. Speaker, I will yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no request pending before the Chair at this time. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. SABATH. In 1862 the party which was then known as the Republican Party changed its name and became a real democratic party. It became the Democratic Party. All those that the gentleman designated as Republicans were in heart and principle Democrats.

Mr. RICH. You know I believe in the principles of Jeffersonian democracy. But I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Is he a New Dealer or a Democrat? I like Jeffersonian Democrats.

Mr. SABATH. I am a Democrat and a New Dealer because a Democrat stands for the New Deal and a New Dealer stands for democratic principles.

Mr. RICH. I have no time for the New Deal. It is wrecking American democracy, destroying our Constitution, taking away our liberties, and enslaving our people.

Mr. SABATH. I am going to help the people——

Mr. RICH. I do not yield for any New Deal theories.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. SABATH. I ask for order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman who does not know whether he is a New Dealer or a Democrat is interrupting. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to any length of time, but I just want the gentleman to know that I will give him notice today that I do expect to comment on some of his remarks so that he will be present. I thought the other day he would be here, because he was here when I received consent, and he remained here quite a long time, and I did not anticipate he would leave. I am very sorry that I did not give him notice then, but I will give him notice now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I will be present to hear the gentleman from Texas. I call attention first to the item in Mr. PATMAN's remarks entitled "Cannot Balance the Budget During the War." May I say to the gentleman from Texas that I did not say the Budget should be balanced at this time. I realize that when we take in about fifty-five billion and we are spending close to one hundred billion it would be just foolhardy for anyone to suppose that that could be done. That would not be sound business, and I hope that I left no impression on the mind of anyone here that it could be done.

However, I do call your attention, Mr. PATMAN, and the Members of the House, to this, that for 10 years I tried to get you gentlemen over on this side of the House to economize in government, at a time when the President of the United States made some of the finest statements that any man ever made—that we ought to have economy in government. But instead of trying to economize and instead of trying to consolidate bureaus and eliminate offices, as he promised, you went out on a splurge of spending such as was never known in the history of this Nation and established more bureaus, and every year since Mr. Roosevelt has been in office you have been in the red from a billion and a half to five billion dollars in peacetime. Look where you are going since we started in the war; spending over $7,000,000,000 a month more than our receipts. It is terrible. It is going into bankruptcy.

May I call attention to the statement that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made here, "The country cannot go bankrupt." If you will read the statement that I quoted in the RECORD from Mr. Roosevelt's speech, when I talked on last Thursday, referring to the speech that he made on October 19, 1932—and I will insert that in the RECORD here again:

> The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.
>
> If government lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

So that regardless of anything that the gentleman from Texas might say, notwithstanding to the contrary, we are on that road. The point I want to make is this: I want to stop reckless expenditures of Government funds, and if you gentlemen on that side do not try to economize now in the operation of Government, it is going to be the most serious thing that has ever happened to this Nation of ours. Our financial structure will topple over.

Again I quote the gentleman from Texas: "The country cannot go into bankruptcy. In truth and in fact our country cannot go bankrupt. It is absolutely impossible." Now, that is the gentleman's own statement. "Bankruptcy presupposes inability to pay a debt or debts. The time will never come when the Government will not be able to pay those debts. There is the point we should watch. There is the problem we should solve, the value of that money." I am surprised. I am really surprised the gentleman from Texas would make such a foolish and, to me, ridiculous statement. Do you know what happened to Germany after the last World War? Why, it got so you could buy German marks for 2 cents, then you could buy German marks for 1 cent. A lot of our people bought them. After a while you could buy a million marks for a cent and a short time after that a billion marks for 1 cent. You could get a whole bushel of them for a cent. They were never worth it. So Germany went bankrupt; and so will the

United States of America if we do not be frugal, if we are not careful in what we do and how we do it. The New Deal is and will be responsible for it, so make no mistake about that point.

That same thing can happen to America as long as you try to go on that way. I do not believe in any such a thing that we cannot go in bankruptcy. I do not think we can ever spend ourselves into prosperity, as was said here a few years ago, by this administration, "Spend, spend, spend; elect, elect, elect." That is what you have been doing.

I believe in a sound dollar, a sound monetary value, a sound economic system. You can have that only when you work and receive an honest dollar for your work, when you do something and are paid in honest dollars. When we obligate ourselves for something we expect to get something in return for that obligation whether it is work or merchandise or service rendered.

I do not think you can pay men for doing nothing. That is what this administration started to do. It started to pay the farmers for not raising foodstuffs; it started to pay men for not working, for not doing this, and for not doing that. That is an unsound economic system. I believe in work, I believe in earning, I believe in saving, and I believe in a sound monetary value.

Last Thursday I commented on the fact that Marvin Jones says we must have more foodstuffs to feed our allies and our own people. I agree with that and am in sympathy with it. I want to do it. But then Mr. Byrnes says we are going to take men off the farms. That just does not make sense. I am a farmer. I have a farm, and I know that if I want to produce I either have to get out there myself and work or have someone else do the work. I am not thinking about my own farm; I am thinking about the farmers who are out from daylight to dark expending every ounce of energy and effort they have to produce the foodstuffs that Marvin Jones wants: to milk the cows and furnish butter and milk. If you take the men off their farms so they cannot milk their cows, you will have to get rid of the dairy herds. If you do not have enough men on the farms to plow the soil and put in the crops you will not reap, because you must sow if you are going to reap. Therefore, in order to do that, you either have to let the men stay on the farms or get the IV-F's or men in nonessential industries and enterprises and put them on the farms. The point I want to make is this, and I have said it before and repeat it now. You have to work. You cannot take men off the farms if you want to produce.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter dated January 5 I have received from the president of the Dairymen's League. That will show the Members of the House just what I mean.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the letter reads as follows:

DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE,
CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, January 5, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed herewith is a letter addressed to War Food Administrator Marvin Jones and Director of Selective Service Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

Anything which you can do to protect the dairy industry against the drafting of too many of these men will be of vast service not only to farmers but to the Nation as well. The broad terms in which this announcement has been made and the newspaper publicity which has accompanied it will undoubtedly cause many local draft boards to go far beyond the intention of Mr. Hershey or Mr. Byrnes and very far beyond the intent of the Tydings amendment.

Already information is coming to us regarding farmers who are becoming panicky and are preparing to dispose of their herds. As you so well know, the peculiarities of dairy production do not lend themselves to unskilled transient or seasonal labor.

The full effect of draft boards' actions on dairy farm help will not be felt for several months and by that time the damage will be irreparable. The terms of and the publicity accompanying the announcement are extremely unfortunate, and, we are informed, do not convey the actual intention of the Administrators, but the effect will be the same.

Anything which you may be able to do to get this matter clarified so far as dairy farming is concerned, which is more than one-half of agriculture of this area, will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRED H. SEXAUER,
President.

The fourth thing I want to talk about today is nonpartisan politics and constructive criticism. I have tried to show you that the various organizations of government ought to get together before giving things out to the public. Sometimes I think you know nothing about the operations of the Government. I called your attention last Thursday to the fact that we ought to know definitely what we are going to do about spending before we bring any bill into the House. I claim that the New Deal organization or the Democratic Party right now is weaker than weak because it does not coordinate its Committee on Ways and Means, the Speaker of the House, and the majority leader, and the Appropriations Committee. You might also take into account the minority leader. He is a great man over here and ought to be consulted on various bills, because if he is right he can advise all the Republicans and they will come along, at least they will give consideration. The Republicans will vote for things that are good and sound and sensible. We are here today to win this war and we dare not get into a rumpus; but you dare not overlook the fact that you have to get a little common sense into the organization you have here. You have to get a little business ability into the operation of your party if you are going to succeed in the winning of this war. So I appeal to you before any legislation is passed. Consider, is it necessary, is it worth while, does it have to be passed now? Will it help win the war? Do we have the money to make it effective?

Statements have been made to the papers lately about winning the peace when the Great Three, as we call them—Mr. Stalin, Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Roosevelt—are at loggerheads about some things they are going to do. They should get their heads together on how we are going to settle these affairs. Look at the situation in Poland, in Greece. Mr. Roosevelt says we want a just peace. I want a just peace, but I want to know how they are going to get it. I want to know what Mr. Roosevelt's aims are in his foreign policy. I should like to know what he is going to try to do and what those other nations want to do—if they want us to follow them. I am first, last, and all the time for America. Then I am willing to help all these foreign countries and use our good offices in any way we can if it is possible for us to do so. I want to help them all, but I do not want to help them when I know it is going to wreck America, because I do not think it is necessary to wreck America. I am here, sent here by my people, to try to guard against that very thing. And you can rest assured I will not let the New Deal get me to do otherwise. We have no time to fool away, no time to do the wrong thing, so beware. Be on guard at all times. All I can say now is be American.

What are we doing? We are sending our boys over there to fight for the purpose of trying to keep America safe and sound and secure. We are trying to help and aid and assist all of our constituents and all of our people and make this a great country and keep it a great country. We have had a great country. Now let us not permit radical individuals in this country who want to tear it down and want to make it become communistic get control of it. I am against communism. I am like JOHN RANKIN here awhile ago when he says, "Let first things be first." I do not want The First Round. Sidney Hillman is not the fellow I want to follow, nor the C. I. O., nor the P. A. C., in the way they are trying to come in here and domineer this country of ours and make it communistic by electing radicals, by being communistic.

Whenever I have to clear my remarks with Sidney Hillman, and I hope that time will never come, but when, if I have to do it, it will be at the point of a gun or a sword. And further, I want to say communism is coming to this country fast. Whenever that time comes, God save America. I will show you some of the literature Sidney Hillman put out against me in this last campaign. He got some dandy literature out. It is published by the Citizens Political Action Committee, 314 Court Street, Williamsport, Pa. I do not feel as if he did something wrong to me. He can publish those things. He can lick me at the polls if he gets the votes. But the people sent me down here nevertheless. I am not Sidney Hillman's tool and I am not going to do what Sidney Hillman wants me to unless Sidney Hillman and Browder and these Communists who are working for that organization feel that they can get control of this country, then they might compel me at the point of a sword; that is the only way they are going to do it.

Now, I realize here when you talk about politics and getting into politics, I noticed before I came back here, that anything that a Republican says there are always three or four Democrats here ready to get up and challenge him. Well, that is all right from the Democratic side, but I hope that the Republican Party will look after the Republicans on this side of the House. I am sure they will, with JOE MARTIN and the other fellows with them.

We are going to look after our boys and we are going to take care of them. But we want our boys on this side to be sound, to be conscientious, to be honorable, and to be true to their convictions and true to this Constitution of ours which they have sworn to uphold and support. If we do that same thing on that side of the House we will get together, Mr. PATMAN, and we will do what you would like to see done, get out and win this war and bring the boys back home. I know you want that. I know that all the fellows on this side, all the Members of Congress, want that, and the quicker we do it the better. But let us get ourselves in shape by trying to not misquote people. I do not intend and do not want to be misquoted. I am not going to take it. I shall battle anybody, I do not care who he is, who gives a wrong inference to anything that I may have to say.

I came here to work. It is an easy thing for me this afternoon to quit and get out of here. I could go out. But it takes a little bit of time and a little bit of our ability and a little bit of ingenuity and a little bit of common sense, and we have got to have that, and lots of it. So, with that, I hope that in the future any comment that is made will be made with the idea of constructive criticism. I hope that you fellows on that side of the House will take it in the way in which it is intended to be given and that in the future the things we do here and the things we say here and the things we stand for will be for true, sound Americanism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 50) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees thereof appointed by the chairman of such committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized, effective January 4, 1945, to conduct such studies and examination of the organization and operation of any executive department or any other executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as the committee may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction.

For the purposes of this resolution, such committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WARTIME FINANCIAL AND BUSINESS DIFFICULTIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was not my purpose to misquote the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If he would point out where in any respect I have misquoted him in the statements that I have made I shall be very glad to make necessary corrections. I do not think, however, that he can point it out.

Regarding the bankruptcy of a nation, no nation can go bankrupt which has the power to issue the money to pay its debts. That is the problem we must guard ourselves against, printing-press money and unlimited supplies of money. The gentleman put his finger on it when he referred to Germany. In Germany at one time it required whole wheelbarrows full of printing-press money in order to buy a morning paper. Germany did not go bankrupt. Germany paid her debts; but she paid her debts with worthless money. That is what we want to avoid. That is the reason I said it is not a question of bankruptcy, it is a question of cheap money, ruinous inflation, runaway inflation, worthless money for which people in this country will not work.

Before I comment on the statements made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] I wish to say a few words about the statements made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT]. The gentleman from Nebraska made a very interesting speech. I am not going to question a single fact he told us. He has the information, I do not, concerning the things about which he spoke. But I do want to suggest that possibly some people might get the wrong impression about certain statements he made and I want to invite it to his attention For instance, he said that in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and one or two others from 1932 to 1943 the number of corporations doing business was reduced from 34,000 to about 10,000. On its face that looks like a very alarming and disturbing statement. Doubtless it is true, the gentleman looked it up. Yet it might possibly not mean a thing in the world for the reason that under our tax laws that he discussed a corporation under the Constitution of the United States is a citizen, and whenever you set up a citizen between you and your money that citizen that you create artificially must pay taxes to the United States Government and in addition you must pay taxes on your dividends from the corporation. It is in your interest therefore to take that citizen away and do your own business. For this reason, in a number of States many corporations have been converting to partnerships as fast as they could. They save enormous taxes that way, it is good business. I do not blame them for it, it is perfectly all right. But if they want to be protected from personal liability they set up this artificial citizen between them and personal liability. They are now willing to remove that artificial citizen and save the taxes because taxes are so high. So, alarming as that statement seems, possibly only a few corporations went out of business but converted to partnerships.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I quoted figures awhile ago showing that the number of industries that were in business in 1939 as given in the Sunday Star——

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I read that statement.

Mr. RICH. Quoting from Mr. Jones, that there was a loss in the number of businesses of 536,400 from 1939 to 1943.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is greatly disturbed about that, but I am not a bit in the world and I will tell you why. Normally there are a thousand new businesses going into operation every morning, and normally a thousand businesses close their doors every night. Normally we gain a thousand and lose a thousand every day. That is in normal times. In wartimes we have been losing a lot but have not been gaining any. We are therefore getting ready for the post-war period. That is the reason for that great loss. On its face it sounds like a very disturbing statement, but when you come to analyzing it, it turns out not to be so disturbing after all except to cause us to be on our toes to try to do something in the post-war period that will reestablish those small businesses.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is the gentleman operating any kind of business today?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not engage in personal interrogation.

Mr. RICH. I beg the gentleman's pardon and will withdraw the question. In its place I will make this statement: I happen to be in business and I know that it is most difficult to do business today and people are getting out of business rather than operate because of high taxes and the troubles of asking bureaucrats whether you dare buy this, whether you dare sell it, and how much you can get for it. You do not run your own business at all, it is run here in Washington. The result is that thousands are getting out of business.

Mr. PATMAN. Since the gentleman has mentioned the matter and said he was in business himself, I will ask him this question: Has the gentleman's business been better the last 12 years than it was the previous 12 years? And how did his business in 1944 compare with his business in 1932?

Mr. RICH. I wish to say this to the gentleman——

Mr. PATMAN. I just want an answer to that simple question.

Mr. RICH. Very favorably.

Mr. PATMAN. In other words, they have not hurt the gentleman at all.

Mr. RICH. No; I do not think they have.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has been making plenty of money, even though he is a small businessman.

Mr. RICH. We run a good business, try to be conservative, economical, and run our business on sound principles; and we look after the people who work for us, because they are the very heart of our industry.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is getting off onto something else. How does it compare today with what it was in 1932?

Mr. RICH. Let me answer that.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will just give me time.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can get time in his own right.

Mr. RICH. I will tell the gentleman of an experience I had this week with O. P. A.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am sorry. I do not want to get into that field.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that borrowed prosperity is always good for a while; that a man can live better off the borrowings than off the income from it?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman does not refer to this as borrowed prosperity; in wartime there is no borrowed prosperity. In wartime the situation is not at all normal.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the point; it is not normal.

Mr. PATMAN. We are doing things today that we would not even think of doing in peacetime; we are submitting to rules and regulations and even to regimentation gladly and willingly because it is in the interest of the war effort, things we would not even think of doing in times of peace. It is not just a question of comparing expenditure of public funds now with any time during peace periods. It is quite different.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will give me 2 minutes, I will relate something that happened in my business, since he asked me, and I am sure he will agree with me that I am right.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can always get time because we are always anxious to hear him.

Mr. RICH. I would like to put it in the RECORD in the gentleman's speech.

Mr. PATMAN. So far as O. P. A. is concerned, the gentleman would not have had any business if it were not for the O. P. A. You can talk about the O. P. A. all you want to and say it is annoying and irritating and that you do not like it, but without it we would not have anything on earth.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman misjudges me. I think he would enjoy this incident I want to relate.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is in favor of rationing and price control?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I am in sympathy with that.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman must expect some mistakes. Does he know how many prices are fixed? Eight million. There are 8,000,000 different prices fixed by the O. P. A. It is a marvelous job they are doing. I could not do it. I do not know whether the gentleman could or not. Generally, they have done an excellent job. Of course, there have been hardships and injustices, but corrections have been made, and under Mr. Bowles they have been made just a little bit quicker than they have been made in the past. I think the people are pleased when all things are considered.

Mr. RICH. When Mr. Brown was there they had an excellent man. No finer man ever lived than Brown. He tried to do it, but certain people harassed him so. He did not get the support of the administration, and he could not do the job. I think they are doing a better job now than they did formerly because they never gave the support to Brown they should, and there never was a finer man living than Brown from Michigan.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. It took a long time for the O. P. A. to get in the right channel and get everything done just right, and the reason was because so many prices had to be fixed.

The gentleman from Nebraska mentioned some other things about taxes on small business, and he put his finger on the very thing we are going to have to deal with in the post-war period. We have got to encourage private enterprise, initiative, and competition in business, and discourage monopoly. I think he is exactly right about that, and I will join him in any effort to do that. There is not one bit of an issue between the two parties on that. During the last campaign Mr. Roosevelt made it plain he was for private enterprise, the profit system, the competitive system, and small business. Mr. Dewey, the leader on the other side, made it plain he was in favor of the same thing. So there is no difference between the two parties on that question and we should all work shoulder to shoulder, we should all work together, in order to try to accomplish those things.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania always makes an interesting speech, and I am always glad to listen to him, but if he would spend more time on remedies than on diagnoses, I think he would be a little more helpful to all of us. If the gentleman will present his remedy for these things, something we can put on the table and say, "Here is what Congressman RICH says will correct this situation," then I will be glad to join him in trying to correct them; but to get up here and say that there are 3,000,000 employees of the Government, and there are, and say that a lot of them should be dismissed, is something different. Maybe they should, but he does not say which ones. That does not help us a bit. The gentleman should get down to introducing a bill which would provide that we should repeal certain laws and we should discharge certain people. If he will do that, he will find I will support him if I am sure that he is right.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman should just take the statement that was made by Senator BYRD and follow that up. He gave you a fair idea. You put that into effect and you will be doing what I would like to see done. I could not give you any better illustration than to just take the recommendations that Senator BYRD made to the Senate and put those into effect. Get behind him and the gentleman will be doing the country the greatest good that any man could possibly do.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman would be serving his cause better and he would be doing his cause more good if he would get down to specific recommendations. You know a lot of what Senator BYRD stated was rather general and not specific. I would like to see something specific, a real program. The gentleman has often talked about the New Deal and how bad it has been so far as the farm program is concerned, just as he mentioned awhile ago. Now, there are 28 New Deal laws, and I venture to say that if you would go back and look at the RECORD you would find a majority of our friends on the Republican side voted for every one of those laws. I will venture the further statement that there are not many Members on the Republican side who would vote to repeal one of them. I have not heard the gentleman say he was in favor of repealing any of them. I have heard him talking about the New Deal and condemning the New Deal generally, but I have not heard of any New Deal laws he was trying to repeal, and I refer to the so-called New Deal laws that were supported by both Democrats and Republicans. There has been a lot of talk about them, but nobody proposes to repeal them. Which law would the gentleman propose to repeal?

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For an answer to that question, yes.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman saw the letter that Mr. Biggers, of Texas, wrote about repealing the various alphabetical agencies and those he would repeal. Take any one of them or all of them, start in there, and the gentleman would be doing the country a lot of good.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is very general in his answer.

Mr. RICH. I will take the time and read a lot of them to the gentleman if he prefers.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman is going to base his argument upon what Mr. Biggers said, he is liable to get into trouble, because he had agencies on that list that do not exist and have not existed for 10 or 12 years. If the gentleman is going to O. K. everything Mr. Biggers said, he might find himself in difficulty. May I ask the gentleman, out of the 28 New Deal laws which have been passed, which ones would the gentleman openly advocate repealing? The gentleman talks about Mr. Biggers and Senator BYRD.

Mr. RICH. Let me talk about the Chief Executive.

Mr. PATMAN. No; do not talk about him. Just talk about the law.

Mr. RICH. These Executive orders that he made are called laws by the bureaucrats down here.

Mr. PATMAN. Which one is the gentleman in favor of repealing?

Mr. RICH. I would repeal a whole lot of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Name one of them.

Mr. RICH. I would repeal a lot of these directives in reference to the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. PATMAN. All right; introduce a bill.

Mr. RICH. I would start right there.

Mr. PATMAN. Introduce a bill. Has the gentleman introduced a bill to do that?

Mr. RICH. I could not get the gentleman's support.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not need my support.

Mr. RICH. Oh, you have 50 more Members over there. You are responsible for the legislation, and we have to point these things out to you and we will point these things out to you from time to time.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman was rather successful the other day with a solid Republican minority and a few on this side. He was successful in carrying his point.

Mr. RICH. And that was a grand thing to do.

Mr. PATMAN. How does the gentleman know that he could not carry his point on what he is attempting to do?

Mr. RICH. We are here to try to cut useless expenditures of Government funds, and we are going to work at it as hard as we know how.

Mr. PATMAN. I am anxious to know how many so-called New Deal laws the gentleman would repeal, and if he will insert them in the RECORD at this point or any other point I will appreciate it very much.

Mr. RICH. We will point them out.

Mr. PATMAN. Because I have heard so much talk about these New Deal laws and nobody has ever mentioned any New Deal laws that they would repeal.

Mr. RICH. This is the first time I was ever asked that question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman talks about how hard the people were against the New Deal, on these farm projects and all of that. The people have passed on it four different times; in 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and breaking all precedents since 1936, with the same man running. You all know how the people have spoken on this. In 1932 you—the Republican Party—received 59 electoral votes out of 531. In 1936 you received 8; in 1940 you received 82. The other day right here, when we witnessed the count, you received 99 electoral votes out of 531, and if you were allowed to cast all the electoral votes you received in 4 Presidential campaigns you would not receive enough electoral votes to elect a President at one time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman just said that the Republican candidate of 1944 was not for any different program than Roosevelt.

Mr. PATMAN. On one point.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How does the gentleman know what the people are for?

Mr. PATMAN. On one point. There are hundreds of different issues. That is just one issue.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman just said "all the issues."

Mr. PATMAN. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon. She is mistaken. I am sorry the lady was not listening.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was trying to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] which laws he would repeal. I say repeal all the laws that are harassing the people. Those, however, are not laws. Those are directives. Those are the creatures of the bureaus giving power to the President.

Mr. PATMAN. Take gasoline rationing, which is harassing a lot of people, would the gentleman repeal that?

Mr. GROSS. I would at least hold it in check and make it reasonably sensible, because some of the directives are not within the jurisdiction of the Congress to repeal.

Mr. PATMAN. That is rather a general statement to make.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that rationing is being done perfectly?

Mr. PATMAN. No; nothing is being done perfectly. There is no such thing as exact justice, and we do not expect it.

Mr. GROSS. And do not call these directive laws, because they are not.

Mr. PATMAN. Go over to the Supreme Court Building and look at the inscription as you walk up the steps. You do not see "Exact justice" written there. You see "Equal justice under law." People are given equal justice, but they cannot be given exact justice. That is like condemning any party, like yours, because certain people are members of it; in other words, picking out the exceptional cases and saying they are the general rule. You can take any church or any organization, whether it is political, religious, fraternal, or regardless of what it is, and pick out certain members and say they represent the general rule, and you can condemn practically all organizations. We must not do that. We must consider the majority and not just the exceptional cases.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I would like to give the gentleman a few of these bureaus that I would repeal right away: Home Owners' Loan Corporation, National Archives Council, National Labor Relations Board, United States Housing Authority, Civil Works Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, Agricultural Marketing Service, Work Projects Administration. I could name a dozen of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer a few at a time. Do not read off a list of a hundred.

Mr. RICH. I am afraid the gentleman will not give me time to name a number of them.

Mr. PATMAN. I will take the first one, Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Here is an organization that has accomplished as much good for the people of this Nation as any other agency of Government. It has served its purpose and it is now being liquidated in a satisfactory way, and the Government will not lose any money. Just see what the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has done. It has reduced interest rates and saved millions of homes. Instead of having a half dozen mortgages, one, two, three, four, or five mortgages on one home, they just have one mortgage and pay one low rate of interest.

Do you know what the difference is under H. O. L. C. from what was the normal procedure before we had it? On a $5,000 home, on 20 years' time, if you paid for it under the old system before H. O. L. C. you would pay $1,600 more by the time you had paid for it in 20 years than what you would pay under the policy adopted by H. O. L. C.

The H. O. L. C. is in liquidation. It is going out just as fast as it can. It is not going to lose any money. It has saved millions of homes for the American people. I am proud of it, and I hope the gentleman will not say that he is against it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. How many home owners did you close out after you took this over? Can the gentleman give us those figures, and put them in his speech right here?

Mr. PATMAN. They did not close out any. They saved every home that could be saved.

Mr. RICH. No; they did not.

Mr. PATMAN. They saved millions. Was the gentleman opposed to the H. O. L. C.? Of course, he was not opposed to it.

Mr. RICH. Clean it out.

Mr. PATMAN. What is the gentleman's objection? It is being liquidated. The Government will get every dime of its money back.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman said a moment ago it had outlived its usefulness.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not say it has outlived its usefulness. I said it did a good job and had served its purpose. It is not necessary now and it is being liquidated.

Mr. GROSS. Why did the gentleman oppose its liquidation?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not oppose its liquidation. I am for it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, the gentleman did. He has opposed the liquidation of every agency ever set up.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman mentioned the Commodity Credit Corporation. In order to induce the farmers to grow the necessary food and fiber, Congress very wisely put into the commodity credit law as a part of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act the provision the gentleman read awhile ago, that during this war and for 2 years thereafter the farmers shall be guaranteed a fair price for what they produce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Why did the Congress do that? In order to induce these people to produce with the knowledge that they would be adequately taken care of. If they were not given that promise and that assurance, they would not have produced 25 percent more last year than they ever produced in the history of this Nation. Therefore it was one of the wisest and best laws that was ever passed by the American Congress. Yet the gentleman is bold enough to say it should be repealed.

Mr. RICH. Yes. I say that honestly, because, instead of the Federal Government's paying for all these things and taking it out of the Treasury, I want to see the fellow that purchases that commodity pay for it. I want it to pay its own way and save this great deficit we are creating.

Mr. PATMAN. It is paying its own way.

The gentleman has picked out two of the finest examples of using Government credit in the interest of the common, general welfare, without loss to the Treasury of the United States, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation. When they are both liquidated the Government of the United States, I predict, will not be out any money, yet it has saved millions and millions for the people.

Mr. RICH. I disagree with the gentleman that when they are liquidated it will not cost the Government one penny. It is costing the Government plenty. If the gentleman will give me time, I should like to discuss it right now. I cannot do it in just a word.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope it will not take too long, as I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. I will give it briefly with reference to the commodity with which I am most familiar—wool. I am a woolen manufacturer. When the Government took over the wool for this period and set the price on domestic wools, it embarked upon an operation under which the Government is today accumulating all the domestic wools. The foreign wools are coming into this country, and all we can do is buy foreign wools, because the domestic wools are 18 to 20 cents a pound more than the foreign wools. The fact is that the Government is holding the bag now. We are not using domestic wools. All the manufacturers are buying foreign wools because they can buy them more cheaply.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about the situation to which the gentleman is referring.

Mr. RICH. The only way they can use domestic wools is in connection with Government contracts where domestic wools are specified.

Mr. PATMAN. Maybe a mistake is being made; I do not know. I am not going to cuss the Government because it makes 1 mistake out of 8,000,000 prices. There are 8,000,000 different commodities.

Mr. RICH. We show you these things and we want you to try to correct them.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly; introduce a bill.

Mr. RICH. How far would any bill I introduced on this side of the House get? It would not get to the committee. They would not listen to it because it would have the name "RICH" tacked onto it. They would say, "He is a Republican. We do not want any Republican bills."

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that. I am sure the Members of the House would give sympathetic consideration to any proposal introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I know that I would. So I hope in the near future that instead of paying too much attention to all these things about the number of methods and about the different things that are worrying the country, I just hope he will give us constructive proposals, including necessary and proper adjustments.

Mr. RICH. I will submit them to you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

NEED OF AMMUNITION AT THE FRONT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, when the Military Affairs Committee of the House returned from its inspection trip overseas recently the newspapers carried back to France a brief story of a visit which I made to the German front in the company of one of the officers of the Army engineers. This story referred to the fact that I had met five soldiers on the front within a short distance of Duren, Germany, who were engaged in laying communication lines to the Infantry. I asked these men where the enemy was, and they pointed to a church steeple ahead about one-half mile. "That is a German observation post," they said. I asked why they did not do something about it, and they replied that they would do something about it if they had the ammunition.

This morning I received the following letter:

GERMANY, *December 23, 1944.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are the Signal Corps soldiers of whom you made reference in the enclosed clipping. For the sake of posterity, we would like you to know that we are field artillerymen and were engaged in wire-laying operations on the day you saw us. Subsequently, we used that German observation post for one of our own.

We sincerely hope that you have been successful in convincing the people back home that we are in dire need of more shells.

We continue well and happy, but wouldn't 30 days in the States be like heaven on earth.

Sgt. ROBERT ROSOWSKY, *New York, N. Y.*
Cpl. BRAXTON LOVETTE, *North Carolina.*
T/5 ROBERT M. RANDELL, *North Carolina.*
T/5 WARREN E. FERRELL, *New Jersey.*
Pvt. ROBERT W. HICKS, *North Carolina.*

[Enclosure]

HOUSE GROUP, BACK IN UNITED STATES, WILL REPORT TO GENERAL MARSHALL

WASHINGTON, December 21.—Members of the House Military Committee, back from a month-long tour of the western and Italian fronts, reported today that they found "everything going well, although more ammunition could be used." Representative OVERTON BROOKS (Democrat, Louisiana) said the committee was "satisfied" with things in general, although "some shortage" of shells was noticeable. On one occasion, he said, the group was less than a mile from a German observation post when a Signal Corps soldier commented, "If we had enough shells we could get that lookout."

Once the party was within rifle shot of German soldiers at Duren.

Although the Congressmen declined to discuss in detail what they had seen until they had conferred with General Marshall and Secretary of War Stimson, they left these impressions with interviewers, the Associated Press reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LAFOLLETTE for 30 days, beginning January 10, 1945, on account of necessary business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 9, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

87. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting a statement showing the names and compensation of the members and employees of the Federal Power Commission as of June 30, 1944, pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Power Act, approved August 26, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

88. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of certain legislation, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States,

approved June 22, 1936, which requires that all laws enacted by the municipal councils in the Virgin Islands shall be reported by the Governor to the Secretary of the Interior and by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

89. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting copies of the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

90. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

91. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting statements showing the names for whom work has been performed, the nature of the services rendered, the price charged for these services, and the manner in which the moneys received were deposited or used; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

92. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

93. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

94. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the eleventh report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended September 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 21); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

95. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a report of contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law No. 46 cumulative for the period beginning January 1, 1944, and ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

96. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co., a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York, which the War Department recommends to be enacted into law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 29. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 12, 1942, submitting a review of reports on harbors of Cape Charles, Va., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with illustrations, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 30. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 12, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Atlantic-Gulf ship canal, Florida, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 39. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Miami River, Fla., and subseqent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 40. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 16, 1942, submitting a review of reports on Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed with two illustrations, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 41. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Shipyard River, S. C., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 42. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 3, 1941, submitting a review of reports on Redwood Creek, Calif., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 43. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1942, submitting a review of reports on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 44. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 27, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the Intracoastal Waterway from Mobile, Ala., to New Orleans, La., including the Violet Canal route, Louisiana, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with two illustrations, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 50. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct studies and examinations of executive agencies to assist it in the determination of matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1159. A bill to provide for the total mobilization of the Nation's manpower in the present war by the creation of a third branch of the national defense forces, to be known as the Supply Forces; to prescribe liability for training and service therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 1160. A bill to grant to personnel in the military or naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leaves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 1161. A bill to provide eligibility for adjusted compensation to provisional, temporary, and probationary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1162. A bill to provide for issuance of a duplicate adjusted-service certificate to any veteran who establishes that the original has been lost or destroyed, or is being withheld or concealed from him, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 1163. A bill to authorize a survey of the military route of Gen. Anthony Wayne during the Indian wars, with a view to constructing a national parkway to be known as the General Anthony Wayne Memorial Parkway; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1164. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1165. A bill providing free laundry and dry-cleaning service to members of the military and naval forces while on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1166. A bill to confer on the district courts of the United States jurisdiction of certain cases involving children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1167. A bill to confer on the district courts of the United States jurisdiction of certain proceedings involving support for children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1168. A bill to abolish the War Damage Corporation and to provide for the refund of unabsorbed premiums for war-damage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1169. A bill to give veterans preferential rights to purchase jeeps and other military vehicles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1170. A bill to exclude from income tax the compensation of persons in the military or naval service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1171. A bill to provide for a United States air-mail postal card; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 1172. A bill to raise the minimum wage rate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1173. A bill prescribing new postal rates for air mail other than the first class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 1174. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 1175. A bill granting annual and sick leave to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1176. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1177. A bill to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the merchant marine who serve after September 26, 1941, and during the present war as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who serve during the present war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1178 (by request). A bill to remove foreign patenting as a bar to United States patent unless such foreign patenting occurred more than 12 months prior to application for United States patent; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 1179 (by request). A bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 1180. A bill to permit the occupancy of vacant living accommodations in national defense housing projects by certain wives of members of the armed forces and by war veterans with wives or children; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 1181. A bill to provide for renewal of certain copyrights; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1182. A bill to eliminate the income limitation as to eligibility for pensions to the widows of certain World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1183. A bill to amend section 1 (c) of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 28, 1934, as amended by Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939, and section 11 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 13, 1943; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1184. A bill to authorize Slater Branch Bridge and Road Club to construct, maintain, and operate a free suspension bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Williamson, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1185. A bill to prohibit the sale or other disposition of certain naval property without specific authorization by the Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1186. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1187. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of Alsea Bay, Oreg., with a view to constructing a harbor of refuge; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1188. A bill to authorize the Director of the Census to issue certifications of birth records; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1189. A bill to reclassify and adjust salaries of supervisors of the first- and second-class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 1190. A bill to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents in the case of persons who serve in the land or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 1191. A bill to provide for the assignment after the war of certain patent rights of the United States to the servicemen who made the inventions and discoveries patented; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1192. A bill granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1193 (by request). A bill to provide a night differential for employees of the Government of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 1194. A bill to prescribe 48 hours as the standard workweek during the present war; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1195. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H. R. 1196. A bill to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1197. A bill to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1198. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1199. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1200. A bill to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States district courts of the State of Oklahoma and conveyances in the State of Oklahoma where Indian lands of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians are involved; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1201. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1202. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress (pocket vetoed); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1203. A bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1204. A bill to change the time of the appointment of Presidential electors and the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. R. 1205. A bill to enable intervention by a State in any suit in any court of the United States in which it has an interest, involving the constitutionality, construction, or application of an act of Congress or an act of a State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1206. A bill to prescribe fair standards of administrative procedure and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1207. A bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1208. A bill providing for the incorporation of The National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, organized December 10, 1847; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1209. A bill to establish uniform procedure relative to the proof of age, place of birth, or of death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1210. A bill to authorize the erection of a Veterans Administration general medical and surgical hospital and domiciliary facility in eastern Pennsylvania; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 1211. A bill to authorize revision of the tribal roll of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1212. A bill authorizing the State of Texas, acting through the State Highway Commission of Texas, or the successors thereof, to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Laredo, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 1213. A bill to provide that credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be allowed for certain service in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 1214 (by request). A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1939 (Public Law No. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1215. A bill providing for veterans' rehabilitation, preventing unemployment, chaos, and confusion at the end of the war and promoting individual, productive enterprise by enabling the returned veterans to engage in such enterprises and employ themselves in place of asking for jobs that do not exist; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1216. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon certain United States commissioners to try misdemeanors committed on Federal reservations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that no Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected or within 2 years after the expiration of such time, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize the passage of legislation, notwithstanding a Presidential veto, by a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to create a joint committee from the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate and report as to how the Federal Government may get relief from the overburden of its governmental responsibilities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Res. 59. Resolution to provide for the payment of expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution No. 10; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 60. Resolution authorizing the continuation of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Res. 61. Resolution to establish an Office of Fiscal Investigations as an agency of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

H. Res. 62. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to investigate the progress of the defense housing program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 63. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on Education of the effect

of certain war activities on colleges and universities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 64. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. Res. 65. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House so as to grant to standing committees the power of subpena; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. Res. 66. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Civil Service to investigate various activities in the departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 67. Resolution to investigate the Bank of International Settlements; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 1217. A bill for the relief of Hutchinson's Boat Works, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHARP:

H. R. 1218. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Merrick, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1219. A bill for the relief of Bruns Kimball & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of the Channel Boat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1221. A bill for the relief of the Mount Desert Boat Yard, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of the Fair Haven Yacht Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1223. A bill for the relief of the Harbor Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1224. A bill for the relief of the San Pedro Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1225. A bill for the relief of the Channel Boat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 1226. A bill for the relief of Reed Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1227. A bill for the relief of S. B. Norton & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1228. A bill for the relief of Kam N. Kathju; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1229. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary M. Wolf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1230. A bill for the relief of Donna May McNulty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1231. A bill for the relief of Henry S. Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1232. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edward B. Formanek; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1233. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to Laban P. Hilton, in recognition of his valor in saving from drowning eight of his fellow citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Percy Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1235. A bill for the relief of John Bell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1236. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to quit claim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the County of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1237. A bill for the relief of Albert K. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Father Peter B. Duffee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1239. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1240. A bill to provide a pension for Mrs. James Gardiner Conroy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1241. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. Meersman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 1242. A bill for the relief of W. S. Dean; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1243. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. J. Rhea, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1244. A bill relative to the military record of Charles C. Rascoe, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1245. A bill for the relief of John F. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1246. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Hinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1247. A bill granting a pension to Emma Hellwig; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1248. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Caisse; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1249. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Frazee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 1250. A bill for the relief of Roy S. Councilman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1251. A bill for the relief of the Irvine Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1252. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1253. A bill to permit the naturalization of Raymando Gonzales, Santa Ana, Calif.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1254. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. A. McDowell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1255. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Minta P. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1256. A bill for the relief of the persons named; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1257. A bill for the relief of George C. Tyler and Doris M. Tyler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1258. A bill for the relief of Cecil Atkinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 1259. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to present a decoration of the Purple Heart and a silver victory button to Charles A. Pratt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1260. A bill for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1261. A bill for the relief of Ina Young Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1262. A bill for the relief of W. E. Noah; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1263. A bill for the relief of E. E. Armstrong; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1264. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John P. Maher, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1265. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Reynold O. Gilks; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1266. A bill for the relief of the Transit Investment Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1267. A bill for the relief of the estate of Archie S. Woods, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 1268. A bill for the relief of Baxter Campbell and Glestie Campbell Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1269. A bill for the relief of Virge McClure; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1270. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of the First Suczawaer Sick and Benevolent Society to bring about the realization and intent of the Balfour Declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of employees of the city of Reading, Pa., urging that social security legislation be adopted to extend social-security benefits to municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5. Also, resolution of the City Council of the City of Reading, Pa., urging that social-security legislation be adopted to extend social-security benefits to municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of 941 citizens of Vermont protesting against any further prohibition legislation by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7. By Mr. SHAFER: Resolution of the Michigan Council of Church Women disapproving conscription of 17-year-olds and urging appointment of a woman as member of the peace commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution passed by the County Supervisors Association of California in the matter of preventing further acquisition of real property by the people of the Japanese race; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, city of Chicago, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the Federal Aid Road Act; to the Committee on Roads.

10. Also, petition of Local Union No. 1111 of the United Mine Works of America resolving that it is unanimously on record that since the Miner's Legislative and Political Action Committee is not their representative, the members of this local union propose to do everything in their power to abolish this committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11. Also, petition of the secretary, Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, petitioning consideration of their

resolution with reference to the fish and game resources on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

12. Also, petition of the Vancouver Sales & Appraisers, Ltd., protesting against undue delay in the payment of just claims submitted to the United States Public Roads Administration by the above-mentioned petitioner; to the Committee on Claims.

13. Also, petition of Rabbi Moses Reingewirtz requesting the publishing of his works on Daas H'Totah; to the Committee on the Library.

14. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Butler County Pomona Grange, No. 17, Pennsylvania, opposing compulsory military training in peacetime; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

15. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. O. W. Hutson and 26 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging favorable action on the Peterson bill, H. R. 5477; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

16. By Mr. JARMAN: Fifteen petitions of 324 citizens of the Sixth District of Alabama protesting against the consideration by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

17. By Mr. TAYLOR: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Saratoga County, N. Y., January 9, 1945, registering its opposition to the creation of a seaway through the St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes and the development and construction of electric power facilities at tremendous cost to the Government, fully unwarranted and unjustified; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Saviour of mankind, to whom our unexpressed hopes are plain and the throbs of our hearts are audible, consider and hear our prayer. We are humbly aware of our low estate and pray that we may come to the riches of the goodness and grace of the Divine as taught by the Teacher of Nazareth. Thou who knowest us altogether, forgive our sins of thought, of imagination, of strength, and of weakness; consume the dross in any unworthy ambitions.

Heavenly Father, many there are who have left our shores and have looked upon our glowing and receding skies for the last time. Fill their cup of loneliness and sorrow with great peace and with the assurance of work well done. God Himself is making the wrath of these sons of liberty to praise Him and become a redemptive force in the affairs of this world. While they are being tested to the last extremity of perils which gather with piercing power, enable us to nerve the centers of our wills against all fears and doubts. O God, give us a larger portion of Thy spirit that we may complete the task entrusted to us in self-surrender, sacrifice, and courage We pray that we may be made worthy of the tremendous price of freedom, and with the blessed hope of eternal life may face not the night but the morning. In the holy name of Him whose scepter is love we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 8, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that some Members-elect are present who have not taken the oath of office. If they will present themselves at the bar of the House, they may take the oath of office now.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON and Mr. ALVIN F. WEICHEL took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—1946 BUDGET

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed:

BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the Budget for the fiscal year 1946 as fighting all over the globe reaches a climax of fury. We on the home front must back our fighting men and women to the limit. That is our supreme duty. At the same time we must look ahead. We must be ready to throw our whole effort into the campaign against Japan as fast as the war in Europe permits. And finally, we must begin plans to transform an all-out war economy into a full-employment peace economy whenever demobilization becomes possible. Programs for all these developments must be considered in budget planning for a period that extends over 18 months.

We must make sure that our armed forces can plan their procurement programs for continuing global war. I shall transmit detailed recommendations for war appropriations by early spring, in time for the Congress to act on these requests before the beginning of the new fiscal year. I estimate now that 73 billion dollars of appropriations and authorizations will be needed for war purposes for the fiscal year 1946.

If the war develops favorably, unobligated balances of war appropriations no longer required for authorized purposes will be placed in reserve and reported to the Congress for repeal or other action under the provisions of present law.

Actual expenditures of the Federal Government depend largely on the course of the war. I have not made in the past, and I shall not now make, any prediction concerning the length of the war. My only prediction is that our enemies will be totally defeated before we lay down our arms. Depending on various assumptions which may reasonably be made with respect to the course of the war, estimates of war expenditures for the fiscal year 1946 range from less than 60 to more than 80 billion dollars. I propose to use 70 billion dollars as a tentative estimate of war expenditures for the fiscal year 1946. I repeat, however—the rate of actual spending must depend on developments on the battle fronts.

For purposes other than war, I am recommending appropriations, in general and special accounts, to cover estimated expenditures of 13 billion dollars.

Total appropriations and authorizations (including reappropriations and permanent appropriations) for war and other purposes reached a peak of 128 billion dollars for the last complete fiscal year that ended June 30, 1944; 97 billion dollars have been appropriated for the current fiscal year; and I estimate now that 87 billion dollars will be recommended to the Congress for the next fiscal year.

Total expenditures for war and other purposes (in general and special accounts and net outlays of Government corporations, excluding debt retirement) were 95 billion dollars during the fiscal year 1944; they are now estimated at 100 billion dollars for the current fiscal year; and, on the basis of the tentative estimates of war expenditures, they will be 83 billion dollars during the fiscal year 1946.

I propose no substantial change in tax legislation at this time. Revenues are expected to decline somewhat under the influence of the estimated decline in expenditures. The Federal debt is estimated to reach 252 billion dollars on June 30, 1945, and 292 billion dollars 12 months later.

The 1946 Budget is summarized in charts and tables following this Message. In the subsequent sections I comment on appropriations, expenditures, and revenues under existing legislation, and make suggestions for future legislation.

THE WAR PROGRAM

EXPENDITURES FOR THE WAR PROGRAM

Early in the war we had the threefold task of building up a new munitions industry in this country, producing the equipment and means of transportation for our expanding armed forces, and aiding our Allies in their resistance against the aggressors. The record today shows that we have spent 28 billion dollars since July 1, 1940, to build munitions factories, cantonments, depots, hospitals, war housing, and for other war construction. Three times the total strength of our Army and Navy at the time of Pearl Harbor is now fighting or deployed overseas. Thirty-six billion dollars of lend-lease aid have been furnished in goods and services to our Allies, who in turn have aided us with approximately 4.5 billion dollars' worth of goods and services.

We have now substantially completed our war construction. Expenditures for war construction, which in the fiscal year 1943 reached a peak of 12.7 billion dollars, are now down to an annual rate

of about 2.5 billion dollars. The development of new weapons and increased need for ammunition still require some new plants and equipment, but total outlays for war construction are declining, as shown in the following table:

WAR EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1941–45

Including net outlays of Government corporations

[In billions]

Type of expenditure	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945 [1]
Munitions, including ships	$2.3	$12.7	$42.3	$55.6	$53.8
War construction and war plant:					
Industrial plant and equipment	0.8	4.1	6.7	2.6	1.3
Nonindustrial and military construction	1.4	3.5	6.0	2.0	.9
Total war construction and war plant	2.2	7.6	12.7	4.6	2.2
Pay, subsistence, and other nonmunitions [2]	2.2	8.0	20.1	29.5	33.0
Total war expenditures	6.7	28.3	75.1	89.7	89.0

[1] Revised estimate.
[2] Including agricultural lend-lease and other civilian war activities.

We have also substantially completed the initial equipment of the Army and Navy and their Air Forces. Although we have now a Merchant Marine four times its pre-war tonnage, the terrific strain of global war makes necessary some further addition to the cargo and tanker fleet.

Our forces engaged in battles in Europe and Asia expend munitions at a prodigious rate. The main job now is that of replenishing equipment and supplies and of providing our fighting men with the most up-to-date weapons which can be contrived. Some weapons of which we had sizable inventories only a few months ago must now be produced in increased quantities. More than one-fourth of present war production is in critical items. Untimely relaxation in war production spells greater sacrifice in human lives and delays victory.

Expenditures for pay and subsistence of the armed forces still are increasing because of the higher pay for a larger number of soldiers and sailors stationed overseas. Expenditures for mustering-out payments are also increasing as a result of the considerable turn-over in our forces.

The war expenditure estimate for the fiscal year 1946 also provides for continuance of subsidies paid out of funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assure war output and to stabilize the cost of living. It excludes payments of the Department of Agriculture for the farm price support and related agricultural programs which are discussed elsewhere in this Budget. No allowance is made either for possible addition of new subsidy programs or for discontinuance or reduction of existing programs, although I hope that a reduction will become possible. In accordance with legislation enacted by the last Congress, I shall submit detailed recommendations for these programs at a later date.

War expenditures are expected to decline in the fiscal year 1946; our war construction and initial military equipment are substantially complete, and our supply lines have been filled. The extent of that decline depends on the course of the war. The composition of war expenditures will change considerably in any case.

There has been overoptimistic speculation about the possible cut in war expenditures when major hostilities in Europe end and our main efforts are concentrated on the Japanese campaign. We should make a great mistake if, in our military and budgetary planning, we underestimate the task of defeating Japan. Japan now occupies twice the area which was held by the Nazis in Europe at the peak of their power, an area as large as the continental United States. The population now under Japanese control is more than three times the population of the United States.

The supply lines to the Pacific and Asiatic theater are two and three times the distance to Europe, and the turn-around time for ships has been two-thirds greater. As the battle against Japan mounts, more cargo will have to be shipped over greater distances.

Our task in Europe will not end with the cessation of hostilities there. The war will not be won unless we accept our share of responsibility for the administration of occupied territories and for relief and rehabilitation in the liberated areas. Expenditures for these tasks are part of the war Budget.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE WAR PROGRAM

The uncertainties of war require that the budgets of the military agencies be sufficiently large and flexible to permit them to meet all demands that may arise. Adequate appropriations and contract authorizations enable the war agencies to make commitments and to place procurement contracts far enough ahead for industry to plan the various stages of production. On the other hand, we should, of course, also be prepared to adjust our war programs downward if the development of the war allows.

The Congress has placed administrative controls in the Executive Office of the President by granting authority, under legislation expiring June 30, 1945, to limit personnel in the Federal agencies and has reinforced them by requesting reports on unobligated balances of war appropriations.

There is a considerable time lag between the legislative authorization or appropriation for war supply, the obligation or placement of orders with contractors, and the final payment on delivery of finished munitions. The huge authorizations and appropriations voted by the Congress in the early years of the war enabled the war agencies to place munitions contracts for later delivery. We are now paying for deliveries under these contracts. Unliquidated obligations for the war program totaled 100 billion dollars at the beginning of the fiscal year 1944; they had been reduced at the end of November 1944 to about 66 billion dollars by payment or, in some cases, by cancelation.

Appropriations and authorizations for war purposes, in the general and special 120 billion dollars. For the fiscal year 1945, they declined to 85 billion dollars, and for the fiscal year 1946 are now tentatively estimated at 73 billion dollars. accounts, for the fiscal year 1944 were These totals include reappropriations and contract authorizations required for new obligations. The total war program, measured by such appropriations and authorizations together with net commitments of Government corporations for the fiscal years 1941 through 1946, will total 450 billion dollars, as shown in the following table:

THE WAR PROGRAM

[In billions]

Description	Cumulative from July 1, 1940, to—	
	June 30, 1945	June 30, 1946
Authorizations:		
Appropriations	$362.7	$423.4
Unliquidated contract authorizations	13.1	11.1
Net commitments of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliates [1]	16.5	15.2
Total authorizations	392.3	449.7
Expenditures:		
General and special accounts	$279.4	$348.8
Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliates (net)	9.4	10.0
Total expenditures	288.8	358.8
Unobligated balances and unliquidated obligations at end of period	103.5	90.9

[1] Gross commitments less withdrawals and cancelations, and less receipts from rents, repayments, and sales.

The estimated appropriations and authorizations for war for the fiscal year 1946 are composed of 59 billion dollars of new appropriations and authorizations, and 14 billion dollars of reappropriations of funds previously appropriated for war but not yet obligated. Unobligated balances of prior-year appropriations and authorizations to the Maritime Commission are adequate to carry out the merchant ship construction program as now approved. Detailed recommendations for most war activities will be transmitted in the spring.

These tentative estimates of appropriations include provisions for continuing lend-lease aid to our Allies. They are based on the assumption that the Lend-Lease Act will be reenacted prior to its expiration on June 30, 1945.

About one-sixth of present war outlays are for lend-lease and for relief and rehabilitation. We shall continue to provide lend-lease, and our Allies to provide reciprocal aid, to the full extent necessary to win the war. Lend-lease has been and will be an instrument of war; it will be liquidated with the end of the war. But when the war draws

to a close in any theater, it may become urgently necessary for us to assist in relieving distress in the liberated areas. Appropriations to the War Department make some provision for civilian supply in territories occupied by the Army, but only to the extent necessary in the interest of military operations. For relief and rehabilitation after the battle lifts, the Congress has already authorized 1,350 million dollars as the contribution of the United States to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. To date, appropriations of 450 million dollars and transfer authorizations from lend-lease of 350 million dollars have been made as our share for immediate needs under this program. If the appropriated amount proves inadequate, we must take additional measures, in cooperation with the other United Nations, to make sure that the peoples of the liberated countries have essential relief from the devastation of war.

APPROPRIATIONS AND EXPENDITURES FOR OTHER THAN WAR ACTIVITIES

AFTERMATH-OF-WAR

In last year's Budget Message, I indicated the inevitable increase of expenditures in the aftermath-of-war category, particularly expenditures for war veterans, interest on the public debt, and tax refunds. Total expenditures for these purposes are increasing from 1.6 billion dollars in 1939 to an estimated 7.2 billion dollars in the current fiscal year, and will probably amount to 9.8 billion dollars in the next fiscal year. This increase arises directly out of the war. The 1946 total is larger than the whole Federal Budget 5 years ago.

Veterans' pensions and benefits.—Although the full impact of the veterans' program will not be felt until the years following demobilization, the total estimated requirements for 1946 of 2,623 million dollars represent about 20 percent of the total appropriations for other than direct war purposes. They are more than double the total appropriated for the veterans' program in the current fiscal year.

Additional appropriations for the current fiscal year will become necessary to cover increased pension costs occasioned by losses in service; to conform with recent legislation increasing coverage and liberalizing payments to veterans of former wars and to their dependents; and to carry out the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustments Act of 1944. The estimated supplemental appropriations include these items.

Pension costs during the fiscal year 1946 are expected to increase sharply to a total of 1,080 million dollars, and the costs of education, readjustment allowances, and loan guarantees to 295 million dollars. In addition, 1,000 million dollars are provided for losses resulting from the hazards of the war among holders of national service life insurance policies and 85 million dollars for construction and reconditioning of hospital facilities. This hospital construction program (shown in the Budget under General Public Works), together with Army facilities later to be made available to the Veterans' Administration, may ultimately provide 300,000 beds.

The time and rate of demobilization will greatly affect the expansion of education, readjustment allowance, loan guarantee, and rehabilitation activities of the Veterans' Administration. The number of veterans of the present war will increase until at full tide these veterans will constitute one-tenth of the population and almost one-fourth of the labor force. The responsibility which we are assuming for their jobs, education, medical care, and financial assistance makes it increasingly essential that these programs for veterans be integrated with other programs of like nature affecting the whole Nation.

Interest.—Interest on the public debt is estimated to rise next year by 750 million dollars to 4,500 million dollars. This rise reflects entirely the current increase in the outstanding debt. No change is anticipated in the low interest rates at which the war is being financed.

Tax refunds.—Refunds of taxes are expected to require a total of 2,725 million dollars, an increase of 556 million dollars over the fiscal year 1945. About 1 billion dollars of this total will consist of repayments to wage and salary earners of withholdings in excess of tax liabilities. Another billion dollars reflects the issuance of post-war bonds which cover the refundable 10 percent of the excess profits tax. Other corporate tax refunds are due to the recomputation of the special amortization allowances for emergency facilities certified to be no longer necessary for war production, and to the carry-back provisions of the corporate income and excess profits tax laws. The refunds arising from these provisions for corporate tax relief will reach full volume only in future years.

AGRICULTURE

Agricultural production has continued at record levels for 3 successive war years. Farm income has been more than 135 percent of parity throughout the period. To assure continued production at a high level, I recommend appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, including the War Food Administration, of 512 million dollars. Although this is considerably less than has been appropriated in the fiscal year 1945, the amount available, after adjustment for unused balances, reappropriations, and transfers, will not be substantially less than the amount being used for agricultural purposes in this fiscal year. The appropriations include provision for the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farm Security Administration, the exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, the administration of the Sugar Act, and research and other long-established functions of the Department of Agriculture. They do not include provision for potential net expenditures of either the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Of the 512 million dollars recommended, 10 million dollars for the War Food Administration are designated for war activities and 10 million dollars are for General Public Works.

Anticipating the needs of returning war veterans and the desirability of providing adequate assistance to small, low-income farmers, I recommend that the borrowing authority of the Farm Security Administration be increased from 67 to 125 million dollars for rural rehabilitation and from 15 to 50 million dollars for the tenant purchase program. I recommend that the borrowing authority of the Rural Electrification Administration be increased from 25 to 150 million dollars in order to permit the extension of electricity to at least part of the 6 million rural families now without such service. I have already given my approval to a recommendation of the War Food Administrator for an increase of 2 billion dollars in borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I shall recommend appropriations for financing the revived program for crop insurance in the very near future.

This agricultural budget is a wartime budget. It does not fully reflect desirable long-time objectives. In the future, we must develop a program to eliminate malnutrition and rural poverty. The Government is committed to support agricultural prices to farmers at a fair level for 2 years after the war. Farmers and the Nation as a whole must be protected from heavy fluctuations in agricultural prices and income, and this must be accomplished without the accumulation of unmanageable surpluses. So long as a large number of people have an inadequate diet, we cannot have a true surplus of agricultural production. We can have only too much of the wrong things.

SOCIAL SECURITY, RETIREMENT, AND EDUCATION

Social security.—Appropriations for administration and grants under the social security program are estimated at 494 million dollars for the fiscal year 1946, an increase of 14 million dollars over the fiscal year 1945. This increase is largely for higher grants to match payments of the States under the Social Security Act.

I hope that the Congress will give early consideration to extension and improvement of our social security system and will reexamine the financial basis of the program.

Retirement funds.—Appropriations for the Government employees' retirement funds are estimated at 247 million dollars for the fiscal year 1946, an increase of 50 million dollars over the current fiscal year. This will reduce the previously accrued liabilities of the Government to these trust funds and will also provide for an increase in the number of employees currently acquiring benefit rights.

Education.—As a part of the Budget for the fiscal year 1946, I am recommending reorganization of the basic

structure of the Office of Education. This reorganization will facilitate service to the States in the development of more adequate educational programs with proper emphasis on all the various aspects of education.

The training and educational programs of the Army, the Navy, and civilian agencies during this war have broadened our conception of the role that education should play in our national life. The records of selective service reveal that we have fallen far short of a suitable standard of elementary and secondary education. If a suitable standard is to be maintained in all parts of the country, the Federal Government must render aid where it is needed—but only where it is needed. Such financial aid should involve no interference with State and local control and administration of educational programs. It should simply make good our national obligation to all our children. This country is great enough to guarantee the right to education adequate for full citizenship.

PUBLIC WORKS

Recommended appropriations under the General Public Works Program in the fiscal year 1946 total 279 million dollars, 93 million dollars more than appropriated for the current year. Balances brought forward from public works appropriations of several years ago are about used up. Even with the recommended new appropriations, the program as a whole will be limited; actual construction will continue to be restricted to those projects which contribute to the war effort. Because of the completion of some of this war-related construction, expenditures are estimated to decrease slightly in the next fiscal year.

I recommend, however, appropriations for the planning of public works which the Congress has already authorized. We must continue to stock up a shelf of meritorious construction and development projects to be undertaken as manpower and material become available. By the end of the current fiscal year, detailed plans will be ready for about 1.5 billion dollars of Federal public works, and also will be substantially ready for a billion-dollar program of Federal-aid highways, half of this road program to be financed with State funds. We need a larger shelf of detailed plans in order to be prepared for the post-war period. Hence, appropriations for 1946 are recommended to make possible the completion of additional plans for highways, flood control, river development, stream pollution control, power transmission, reclamation, hospital, and other construction, as authorized by law. Further requests for funds for detailed planning of Federal projects will be made on Congressional authorization.

Plans have been completed or are in the design stage for about 3 billion dollars of State and local public works, excluding Federal-aid highways. The War Mobilization and Reconversion Act authorizes funds for Federal loans and advances which would make it possible to place further projects on the shelf of planned public works. The extent to which Federal funds are needed to enable States and localities to plan adequately for useful public works is now being reexamined, and I shall soon transmit a new recommendation concerning funds for these purposes.

In addition, programs are being developed for Federal loans and guaranties to stimulate private construction after the war. Guaranties and loans already available under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act will encourage residential, commercial, and farm building.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

The civil departments and agencies of the Federal Government have been fully geared to the war effort. Appropriations for other than direct war or war-related activities have been reduced to rock-bottom. When the war situation permits a reduction in the war program, it will also be possible to reduce war activities of the civil departments. Such activities should be curtailed wherever possible. The Bureau of the Budget has been instructed to review currently the activities of the various Government agencies and to recommend such changes as become desirable in light of changing war requirements.

Agencies which will play a leading role in the peace effort must begin preparations for a progressively larger job. I recommend, for instance, an increase in the appropriations for the Department of State in order that it may be more adequately staffed at home and abroad. To prepare for the expected increase in workload, increases in appropriations are recommended for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, and a few other agencies.

Recommended appropriations for general Government for the fiscal year 1946 are slightly below those enacted for the current fiscal year. If supplemental appropriations for overtime pay are adopted, requirements for general Government may be somewhat above those for the current year.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS—OTHER THAN WAR ACTIVITIES

Receipts of Government corporations (excluding war activities) will exceed expenditures for purposes other than debt retirement by 27 million dollars in the fiscal year 1946, and by 244 million dollars in the current fiscal year.

The operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with the farm and food programs require net outlays of 1 billion dollars during the current fiscal year. This assumes a supplemental appropriation of 256 million dollars to restore impaired capital of the Corporation. The estimate for the fiscal year 1946 provides for net expenditures of 572 million dollars which will absorb practically all the funds available to the Corporation under its present maximum borrowing authority of 3 billion dollars. If the Congress approves the pending recommendation for a further increase in the borrowing authority, increased operations of the Corporation may result in additional net expenditures in the fiscal year 1946.

Activities of other Government corporations are expected to show smaller net receipts than during the fiscal year 1945. Liquidation of pre-war loans and other assets will probably taper off. Some expansion in the nondefense lending activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is also anticipated. The net receipts of Government corporations, in both the fiscal years 1945 and 1946, reflect substantial transfers of funds necessary to retire outstanding obligations of the Federal land banks.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Most of the Federal civilian employees are engaged in essential war work and must stay on the job as long as the war lasts. Government war services have suffered in recent months by departure of personnel, partly because of overoptimism about early victory, partly because of concern about employment opportunities after the war.

The total number of paid Federal employees in the continental United States in November 1944 was slightly under 2,900,000, of whom 2,040,000 were in the War and Navy Departments and other war agencies and 836,000 in the Post Office and other peacetime establishments. The total has declined 126,000 below the peak of June 1943. There will be further reductions as the course of the war permits, but our main concern at the present moment is to keep essential Government personnel on the job.

Anticipated supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 include about 500 million dollars as an approximation of the additional cost of overtime pay and other salary adjustments, assuming enactment of such pay legislation as the Congress may authorize to replace those present acts which expire June 30, 1945. This allowance has not been allocated among the detailed war and other appropriation estimates to which it relates. The Budget estimates of personnel needs, expressed in "man-years," do, however, assume continuance of the present workweek, generally 48 hours. Under the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943, salaried employees are compensated for hours worked in excess of 40 a week. With but minor exceptions, basic salary rates have not been increased during the war.

In contrast to salaried employees, the skilled and unskilled workers, such as those in navy yards and arsenals, have had wage adjustments which have approximately kept pace with wage rates for comparable work in private industry. They have also received overtime pay at true time and one-half rates.

The third large category of Federal employees—the postal workers—in addition to receiving overtime compensation at straight-time rates, has been granted a wartime bonus.

Prior to the expiration of the overtime pay law, the Congress should reexamine the entire subject of hours of work and

pay. Regardless of the progress of the war in Europe, many Federal employees will continue to be needed on a 48-hour work schedule, and provision must be made for their overtime compensation. I recommend that the Congress enact permanent legislation which would authorize overtime compensation at true time and one-half rates.

When at some future date it becomes possible for most Federal employees to go on a 40-hour workweek, their earnings will be materially reduced. A situation of hardship and unfairness will then exist unless an increase in basic salary rates has been granted in recognition of the rise in the cost of living. I recommend a prompt reexamination of Federal salary rates with a view to making adjustments consistent with the national stabilization policy.

BUDGET TOTALS

The discussion of expenditures for the war and for all other purposes lays the basis for presenting the Budget totals and for an analysis of the impact of the Federal Budget on the national economy as a whole.

EXPENDITURES

Of the total estimated expenditures, including net outlays of Government corporations, of 83 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1946, 84 percent are for direct war purposes; 12 percent are for veterans, interest on the public debt, and tax refunds; and only 4 percent for all other activities of the Federal Government. Expenditures in this last group of "other activities" are estimated at 3.3 billion dollars, somewhat less than for the current fiscal year; they are only about one-half of what they were in the years before the start of the defense program—largely because of the reduction in work relief, aids to youth, and general public works.

NET RECEIPTS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1946 UNDER EXISTING LEGISLATION

Net receipts in general and special accounts under existing legislation are expected to decline from 45.7 billion dollars in the current fiscal year to 41.3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1946. This development reflects, in large part, the 17-billion-dollar decrease in expenditures estimated in this Budget. Such a decrease in expenditures before full reconversion to civilian production will mean smaller individual incomes and corporate profits. This, in turn, will bring a decrease in receipts from individual income taxes and from corporate taxes. Because the present law will expire June 30, 1945, receipts from recovery of excessive profits from renegotiated war contracts will taper off during the fiscal year 1946. I recommend that the Congress extend the authority to renegotiate war contracts.

Receipts from excises and customs are expected to continue at about the same level in the fiscal year 1946 as in the current fiscal year. Sales of surplus Government-owned war supplies and property are beginning to yield substantial amounts. These receipts will be still larger in later fiscal years.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TAX LEGISLATION

Wartime taxes must be maintained as long as large-scale war expenditures are necessary. There is no justification for tax reductions as long as we are engaged in a major war. When a favorable development of the war allows a major decline in war expenditures, minor tax adjustments will become possible and desirable. I am pleased that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is studying the tax problems of the transition and post-war period.

BORROWING IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1946

Borrowing requirements during the fiscal year 1946 will amount to an estimated 40 billion dollars, compared with 51 billion dollars in the current fiscal year. Federal trust funds will have 5 billion dollars available for investment in Government securities, thus leaving 35 billion dollars to be borrowed from individuals and financial and other institutions. These estimates assume that the Treasury general fund balance, which amounted to 20 billion dollars at the end of the fiscal year 1944, will be reduced by 5 billion dollars during the current fiscal year, and by 2 billion dollars during the fiscal year 1946. They also assume that retirement of guaranteed obligations of Government corporations held outside the Treasury will be almost completed by June 30, 1945.

These large borrowing operations will require a further rise in the public debt to 292 billion dollars on June 30, 1946. Before the debt reaches this figure, a further increase in the 260-billion-dollar debt limit will be necessary.

Management of the public debt has become one of the major financial operations of the Government. To assure effective discharge of these responsibilities and, in particular, to maintain the present low rates of interest, ample powers must be available to the monetary authorities. I shall later recommend legislation reducing the present high gold-reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks.

The management of the public debt is bound to have a profound influence on the economy for a long time to come. Retaining high taxes on the masses of consumers for general reduction of debt held by financial institutions may destroy purchasing power and create unemployment. But the use of progressive taxes for the redemption of bonds held by millions of individual savers may have a stabilizing influence on incomes and employment. I favor a policy of orderly but steady debt reduction, consistent with the objectives of long-run economic policy. The mistakes in debt management and tax policy after the last war should not be repeated.

ECONOMIC CONTROLS AND RECONVERSION

RECONVERSION

As long as we are at war—at war against two powerful enemies or against only one of them—we will give unqualified priority to all war production and to all manpower needs of war. Nevertheless, some reconversion of war industries may become possible, dependent on the progress of the war.

The foundation for dealing with the main reconversion problems has been laid by the Contract Settlement Act, the Surplus Property Act, and the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act; the machinery for the administration of these acts is being put in operation. Still, a great many problems remain to be solved if we are to be ready for successful reconversion. We may have a scarcity of manpower in certain industries and regions, while temporary unemployment may develop in others. We may have surpluses of some commodities and a downward tendency in certain prices, particularly of raw materials, while scarcities cause a continuing upward pressure on other prices.

The human side of reconversion requires effective organization to aid each discharged war veteran and war worker to find his way back into productive peacetime employment. As far as veterans are concerned, the basis is laid by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. I have already emphasized the need to strengthen our social security program. With respect to the reconversion period, I am particularly concerned over the fact that broad categories of workers are not covered by present legislation and that present standards for unemployment compensation are not adequate in many States. To promote employment opportunities and to assure the proper occupational adjustment of returning veterans and war workers, a strong, integrated system of public employment offices is a basic necessity. We can best accomplish this objective by the establishment, through permanent legislation, of an effective national employment service with adequate coverage throughout the Nation. For the reconversion period we should provide assistance for travel and retraining of war workers.

We must also see to it that our administrative machinery for the adjustment of labor disputes is ready for the strains of the reconversion period. We must apply some of our wartime lessons in labor-management cooperation in working out a sound long-range labor policy implemented by permanent mediation machinery for the adjustment of labor disputes.

The material side of reconversion should also be conducted with a view toward the long-range objectives of economic policy. Surplus property disposal should contribute to filling the needs of production, domestic and foreign. It should be carried on with full recognition of the objectives of price stability.

Every effort should be made to achieve full civilian use of plants built for war purposes when they are no longer needed for war production and to facilitate their rapid transfer to private industry for productive use. If prompt transfers of ownership cannot be made, temporary lease arrangements may facilitate early

productive use while permanent arrangements for transfer are being worked out.

Statistical information concerning business activities and markets, employment and unemployment, incomes, expenditures, and savings is urgently needed as a guide for economic policies during the remainder of the war and during the reconversion and post-war periods. I recommended appropriations for this purpose to the last Congress. I shall transmit recommendations in the near future for those essential parts of the program on which the Congress took no action. Business, agriculture, labor, and the Government need to know the basic economic facts if each is to play its role with maximum effectiveness during the months and years ahead.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL PROGRAMS

As the war progresses, we must hasten our plans to secure world-wide economic cooperation in both the transition period and the post-war period. We have learned that just as the United States cannot afford to be isolationist in its political philosophy, neither can it stand the malignant effects of economic isolationism.

Last July the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference formulated articles of agreement for the establishment of an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These institutions will be integral parts of a broad program for cooperation among the United Nations in those areas of economic contact where failure to adopt common policies will result in economic "spite fences," economic waste, and economic warfare.

A concrete program for international monetary and financial cooperation at an early date is essential. In the first place, all countries agree that a solution must be found for the evils that stem from the unstable and destructive exchange practices which the Fund is designed to eliminate. Second, the need for international investment is already becoming acute. The liberated countries will require loans for the reconstruction of their industry, their transport, their cities, their agriculture, and their trade. The International Bank will make direct long-term loans out of its capital or from borrowed funds, and particularly will guarantee private loans for these purposes. While the proceeds of these loans will be spent to procure equipment in the countries where it is available, the risks of lending will be spread equitably among all member countries.

It is therefore imperative that both the Fund and the Bank be established at once in order that they may be properly staffed and equipped to cope with problems which are already developing as the countries in Europe are liberated. Accordingly, I urge acceptance of the agreements and recommend the enactment of legislation which would permit the United States to make its proportionate investment in the Fund and the Bank.

In addition to the operations of the International Bank, there will continue to be many types of foreign investment in which a national financial institution such as the Export-Import Bank should participate, especially during the next few years when the foreign demand for our products will be particularly heavy. The Export-Import Bank will provide short- and medium-term credits to finance our exporters. It will also undertake long-term lending for reconstruction and development in cases where special American purposes are to be served and other countries may not wish to participate. In collaboration with private banks, manufacturers, engineers, and exporters, the Export-Import Bank has had 10 years of successful experience in these fields. At present its resources available for new operations are very limited. In order that it may play its part in the reconstruction period, I recommend early expansion of its lending power.

At present our foreign investment programs are impeded by legislation which restricts loans to those countries which are in default on loans arising out of the first World War. For both the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank to operate effectively, as well as to achieve an adequate flow of private investment, it is essential that these restrictions be removed.

NATIONAL INCOME, PRODUCTION, AND ECONOMIC CONTROLS

The American Nation has almost doubled its total output of goods and services under the impact of the war program. Slightly less than one-half of this total output is purchased by the Federal Government. What is left for civilian consumption has been sufficient to provide most of us with better living standards than prevailed before the war.

The national economy is operating at extremely high levels of income and expenditure. Despite wartime taxes and large wartime savings, consumers and business have sought to buy more than the available supply of goods and services. Nevertheless, prices have been substantially stabilized through vigorous application of our stabilization program and the cooperation of the American people. Whereas the cost of living has increased by between 25 and 30 percent since 1939, it has risen only about 2 percent since the "hold-the-line" order of April 1943. Holding the line on prices and wages has prevented, and is still preventing, inflationary developments.

The reduction in war expenditures, which I hope the progress of the war will permit during the next fiscal year, will result in somewhat lower wartime incomes, even if wage ceilings are adjusted upward to avoid reduction in average hourly rates when overtime is curtailed. Nevertheless, the demand for goods and services will undoubtedly still be great and we can be sure of eager buyers for whatever durable goods industry might produce.

When war production is extensively reduced some of the controls which were needed in an all-out war economy can be relaxed, although other controls must be continued to assure necessary war production and orderly reconversion. For example, we must avoid speculation in inventories such as contributed to the inflation after the last war. The fact that many businesses and individuals have ample funds for a buying spree necessitates caution in relaxing controls. The balance between incomes, savings, and expenditures will still be precarious during the reconversion period. It will therefore be necessary to retain the machinery for allocation and price controls as long as certain materials and finished goods are in short supply. I therefore recommend extension of the Economic Stabilization Act before its expiration on June 30, 1945.

In general, it will be our policy to hold the over-all cost of living and to permit only such adjustments as are conducive to the full utilization of available resources and compatible with the general objective of economic stabilization. As long as we are engaged in a war with desperate and resourceful enemies, war controls are needed, but they must be readjusted to changing levels of war production and civilian production.

DEMOBILIZATION AND POST-WAR FULL EMPLOYMENT

Large-scale demobilization can hardly be expected to begin during the period covered in this Budget. Nevertheless, as we continue to mobilize for a long, hard war, we must under no circumstances be caught unprepared for peace.

Under the impact of a huge war program, we are employing 52 million men and women either in war production or in production and service for civilian purposes, while another 12 million are serving in the armed forces. After the war many of them will retire or resume their schooling or devote themselves to their homes and families. But such reduction in the civilian labor force will be more than offset by demobilization of our armed forces and by the natural growth of the population of working age. Thus, before long there may be 60 million men and women to be employed. Huge war expenditures have brought full employment, more than full employment. What will be the outlook when Federal expenditures are 50 and 25 billion dollars in the period of demobilization and thereafter?

The following table shows the operations of our national economy—the Nation's Budget—in the calendar year 1939 with considerable unemployment, and the same operations in the calendar year 1944 when we had moved to a much higher level of incomes, expenditures, and savings, involving more than full employment under the stress of war. Manifestly, full employment in peacetime can be assured only when the reduction in war demand is approximately offset by additional peacetime demand from the millions of consumers, businesses, and farmers, and by Federal, State, and local governments. And that means that

consumers' expenditures and business investments must increase by about 50 percent, measured in constant prices, above the level of the year 1939 if full employment is to be provided by private enterprise.

THE GOVERNMENT'S BUDGET AND THE NATION'S BUDGET

Calendar years 1939 and 1944

[Current prices,[1] in billions]

Economic group	Calendar year 1939			Calendar year 1944		
	Receipts	Expenditures	Excess (+), deficit (−)	Receipts	Expenditures	Excess (+), deficit (−)
CONSUMERS						
Income after taxes	$67.3			$132.8		
Expenditures		$61.7			$97.0	
Savings (+)			+$5.6			+$35.8
BUSINESS						
Undistributed profits and reserves	$8.3			$12.3		
Gross capital formation		$10.9			$2.6	
Excess of receipts (+) or capital formation (−)			−$2.6			+$9.7
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT						
Receipts from the public, other than borrowing	$8.9			$10.4		
Payments to the public		$9.1			$8.8	
Excess of receipts (+) or payments (−)			−$0.2			+$1.6
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT						
Receipts from the public, other than borrowing	$6.5			$47.9		
Payments to the public		$9.3			$95.0	
Excess of receipts (+) or payments (−)			−$2.8			−$47.1
Less: Adjustments[2]	*$2.4*	*$2.4*		*$5.9*	*$5.9*	
TOTAL: GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT						
Receipts	$88.6			$197.5		
Expenditures		$88.6			$197.5	
Balance			0			0

NOTE.—For details and explanation see appendix 10, pp. 830-831.

[1] Prices in 1944 were between 25 and 30 percent above 1939.

[2] Mainly Government expenditures for other than goods and services.

Consumers' purchases of durable goods, business nonwar investments, and capital outlays of the governments for nonwar purposes have been so low during recent years that a large backlog of demand will be carried over into the post-war period. Individuals, however, will buy the new car or build the new home only if they feel secure in their jobs; businessmen will expand plant and buy new machinery only if they feel confident of profitable markets for additional products.

The American people have learned during the war the measure of their productive capacity, and they will remember that experience in the peace to come. It is the responsibility of business enterprise to translate market opportunities into employment and production. It is the responsibility of the Government to hold open the door of opportunity and to assure sustained markets. Then and only then can free enterprise provide jobs.

Full employment after the war is not only a matter of immediate self-interest, but also part of our stake in world stability and prosperity. Other countries are anxiously awaiting the development of our policy and will be more willing to make international commitments if they are assured of high post-war employment in the United States. They are fully aware that international cooperation cannot succeed unless the United States is prosperous.

We must attack the employment problem on every front.

For instance, we must overhaul the wartime tax structure to stimulate consumers' demand and to promote business investment. The elements of such a tax program should be developed now so that it can be put into effect after victory.

We must make sure that there are opportunities for new and growing business. The national and international policies which we adopt now—affecting trade, credit, investment, and competition and monopoly—largely determine future business and employment opportunities.

We must develop the human standards and material resources of the Nation, which in turn will tend to increase our productivity and most effectively support business expansion and employment. Our program should include provision for extended social security, including medical care; for beter education, public health, and nutrition; for the improvement of our homes, cities, and farms; and for the development of transportation facilities and river valleys. We must plan now so that these programs can become effective when manpower and material are available.

I shall from time to time submit to the Congress recommendations for legislative measures to implement our demobilization program and to assure jobs for all returning war veterans and discharged war workers.

Our productive achievements during the war have demonstrated once and for all the progress which this Nation can support, the progress which will be required if all our resources are to be put to adequate peacetime use. The war, however, will also leave us deep distortions in our economic life which must be overcome. We owe it to those who give everything that we set our sights as high for peace as we set them for war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 3, 1945.

NATIONAL PATENT PLANNING COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Patents and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Second Report of the National Patent Planning Commission.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1945.*

COMMITTEE ON SELECTIVE SERVICE OCCUPATIONAL DEFERMENT OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Selective Service Occupational Deferment of Officers and Employees of the Legislative Branch of the Government the following Members of the House: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. ANDREWS of New York.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 50 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or committees thereof appointed by the chairman of such committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized effective January 4, 1945, to conduct such studies and examination of the organization and operation of any executive department or any other executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as the committee may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction.

For the purposes of this resolution, such committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the ranking Republican Member of the Committee on Rules, the usual 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard the reading of the resolution. I shall only briefly explain the need for immediate action on it.

Originally, it was contemplated on the part of the leadership of the House that we would not extend or create any new investigating committees, but in view of conditions, here being several outstanding committees which already have the power to investigate and which have rendered the House and the country a real service, we came to the conclusion that some of the committees such as this committee, Mr. WOODRUM'S committee, and also Mr. PATMAN'S Small Business Committee, Mr. RAMSPECK'S Civil Service Committee, and Mr. COLMER'S Post-war Policy and Planning Committee, should be granted extensions, as well as granting the Committee on Education the opportunity to finish its work within the next 30 days, in accordance with a resolution introduced by the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

I repeat that many of the investigating committees have rendered the House and the country great service. I am pleased to say that the Committee on Appropriations has rendered an extraordinary service. Before the Committee on Rules favorable action on this resolution was urged by three watchdogs of the Treasury, the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. When these three gentlemen appeared in behalf of the resolution, the membership of the Committee on Rules felt that it had a real duty to perform, and should comply with the unanimous request of the Committee on Appropriations.

I myself feel that we should not extend the life of a committee or create new committees unless conditions actually warrant it.

Of course, unlike my friend from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Accounts [Mr. COCHRAN], I have favored investigations. I think some investigations have brought real results. Some have not because the committees have not confined their investigations within the terms of the resolution under which they were created and have proceeded beyond the intent of the Congress. But some day in the future I will speak on that point. In view of the message which we have just heard read by the Clerk, and especially in view of the tremendous sums which will be required for war and other purposes, I do not feel that we should spend a single dollar unnecessarily. But on the other hand I think it is bad policy to be pennywise and pound-foolish in curtailing or not authorizing investigations which result in savings to government. In this case the committee still has over $50,000 left from the original appropriation.

Mr. CELLER. Which committee?

Mr. SABATH. The Committee on Appropriations. That is the committee of which I am speaking.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. The committee has not a cent because it expired at the end of the last Congress and the money reverted to where it belonged.

Mr. SABATH. Then I stand corrected with respect to that. I will say this, the committee has not expended more than one-half of the amount which the gentleman from Missouri and his committee originally recommended and which the House authorized.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say I was not here when it was voted.

Mr. SABATH. I presume if you had been here you would have joined with the other members of your committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I would not have.

Mr. SABATH. I have the utmost confidence in the gentleman's desire to safeguard the expenditures and interests of the Government. I have always recognized and appreciated the great services he has rendered by which he has saved thousands upon thousands of dollars in investigation expenditures which were not necessary. But as I said in this case, and in the four or five other cases which I mentioned, I think there should be no objection, and that the extension should be granted because a real service has been performed by these committees.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman explain to the House how this proposal can be deemed consistent with the position of the so-called Monroney committee which seeks to streamline the activities of the House?

Mr. SABATH. Because that committee may not report for some time while this committee has, I think, 11 or 12 members who are waiting to be authorized to continue its investigation, and in addition, the Committee on Appropriations is waiting for the report from these experts of the committee which the Monroney resolution aims to create, so that they may effect the saving of a great deal of money to the Government. I am informed that the expenditure of the $50,000 by the Committee on Appropriations has saved the Government millions upon millions of dollars. I hope that when the committee will continue again it will examine into the expenditures of the War Department with respect to the number of civilian employees and as to the needs of many officers who are stationed here and who may be seen at all hours of the day and night in hotel lobbies, cocktail lounges, restaurants, and places of entertainment. I think we can lop off a good many millions of dollars if these officers are assigned to the field, and civilians perform the clerical work now being done by these officers of high and low rank.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot resist yielding to my old friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. You referred to the President's message. Did you see anything in it where he suggested economy? The gentleman heard the great amount of money asked for—$83,000,000,000. Do you not think it would be a matter of economy to let the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and other members of this committee try to find out how they can cut down on this great amount that the President has recommended? It seems to me that the recommendation is unwise for these expenditures because he does not say one word as to where you are going to get the money.

Mr. SABATH. I expected that question and I would have been really disappointed if the gentleman had not raised the question of "Where are we going to get the money?" But in view of the fact that the country is so prosperous, everybody having more money than they ever had before in the history of the country, I think the income will increase and the money will be forthcoming. I hope the gentleman will not worry so much in the future as to where we will get the money. We are going to get it without doing any injury to the great surpluses and reserves of corporations throughout the land.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield further. I promised other gentlemen some time and also time to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Illinois promised me 10 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry I cannot yield at this time. I am trying to keep my word to give time to all who desire to be heard on this side.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the ranking minority member. I am pleased to have him here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution should take but a few minutes of the time of the House. As you know, last year we gave the Appropriations Committee power to investigate the war efficiency and war economy among the Government departments.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in fact, the entire membership of the Appropriations Committee favor this resolution, favor continuation of this authorization. This work has been conducted in a nonpartisan way and I believe there should not be a vote against the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. This is merely to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to investigate the governmental agencies for which its appropriations are made.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Nothing whatsoever.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] a question. He said we were going to have all the funds necessary to take care of these obligations. The President, however, in his annual message stated that the national debt on June 30, 1945, will be $292,000,000,000. The President over the past few years, especially when I was away from here, repeatedly requested a raising of the debt limit. It finally was raised to $260,000,000,000 and now he requests that you raise the debt limit to we know not what point. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], or anyone else who has any regard for the welfare of the Nation and keeping it out of bankruptcy does not realize that in the future we must try to take care of the country's debt, then neither he nor I know anything about finances whatsoever.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that one of the purposes of this resolution is to bring about greater efficiency and economy in the executive departments.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my genial friend, the watchdog of the Treasury, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] 10 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, everyone is agreed that this House must have a division of fiscal investigation to secure information in reference to appropriations and the necessity for authorizations that will enable all our committees to assail the appropriation requests of the executive branch of the Government. I also believe it is necessary for us to have an outstanding research division to assist the Members of the House as well as the committees of the House. With these we will be able to increase our value as public servants.

The objective of this resolution, if it is to bring about a savings in expenditures, cannot be assailed but the question is: What is the best way to reach the objective?

I contend we do not need this resolution to accomplish what is desired. The Committee on Appropriations is in a position at any time to bring in a resolution providing for an appropriation to set up an investigating division, an investigating division not only to serve the Committee on Appropriations but the entire Congress.

If there is one problem that must be approached by the Monroney-Maloney committee it is this subject as well as establishing a research division.

I have in my hand the Budget and Economy Act of 1921. Those responsible for that act had the thought in mind that Congress should have an investigating committee, and they embodied in that act a provision authorizing an investigation division in the Comptroller General's office. The Comptroller General's office, as you know, represents the Congress, not the executive branch of the Government. This is law now.

I quote from the Budget and Accounting Act, paragraph B of section 312:

(b) He—

Meaning the Comptroller General—

shall make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures. The Comptroller General shall also, at the request of any such committee, direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request.

This law also gives the power to the Comptroller General to secure the information. I quote section 313:

SEC. 313. All departments and establishments shall furnish to the Comptroller General such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of their respective offices as he may from time to time require of them; and the Comptroller General, or any of his assistants or employees, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department or establishment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I cannot yield unless the gentleman gets me some more time.

All the Appropriations Committee has to do is to bring in a resolution appropriating money and instructing the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, with whom the majority of the Members served in this House, to follow out the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, and set up an efficient investigating division.

If you do that, all the Appropriations Committee, or any other committee of the House, has to do is to call Mr. Warren over the telephone and instruct him to send down 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, or 12 investigators to the committee for assignment to conduct investigations. Under the law, he, as our agent, must and will respond.

Mr. Warren appeared before members of the Appropriations Committee. The chairman was present with other members of that committee. I arranged the conference. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who has shown an interest in this matter for several years, was also present. We discussed this subject for several hours, and I thought when I left the room that we sold the Appropriations Committee on the idea of giving Mr. Warren money to carry out the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act and set up an investigating division.

In that same act there is provision for the Director of the Budget, an agent of the President, to set up an investigating division in his office. What have you, the Appropriations Committee, done? You have given the Director of the Budget several hundred thousand dollars annually for a number of years to set up this investigating committee. It is functioning today and has been for some time. The money for that purpose is carried in the annual appropriation bill. Think of it. You give the money to the executive branch of the Government to investigate, then you deny the Congress money for an investigating division. There is the situation that exists at the present time.

The Appropriations Committee undoubtedly needs such service. I am willing that you get it, but there are other committees of this House that are entitled to the same consideration; and if the Appropriations Committee will give Mr. Warren the money to set up a division of investigation, my committee and any other committee of the House can call Mr. Warren on the telephone and get his investigators to remain until they have completed the job assigned to them. As I have shown, the provisions of the law instruct Mr. Warren to detail to committees of this House and the Senate investigators when called upon to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee made a report to the House, which I think will be found in the last issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Congress just closed, on expenditures during the last Congress. Less than half of the money that the committee spent—and it spent around $50,000—was used to employ men and also to pay their expenses for traveling and subsistence. The balance of the money was spent—listen to this—to reimburse Government departments and agencies that detailed their employees to

the Committee on Appropriations. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations secured assistance from the executive branch of the Government, part of which it was investigating, to make an investigation. I do not say, because I do not know, that they had men come from, say, the War Department when it was investigating the War Department, but it did have employees of the executive branch of the Government detailed to the committee to make investigations. Therefore, if they are satisfied with the employees of the executive branch to make investigations for them, why should they not be satisfied to have men under the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General detailed to them when those men would be subject to the will of the Congress and not the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. Speaker, I realize it is probably a waste of time on my part to fight the great Rules Committee and the 45 members of the Appropriations Committee; nevertheless, I want to see this job done right and I say to you that the way to do it is for the Appropriations Committee to give Mr. Warren $300,000 or $400,000 to set up a real investigating committee in the Comptroller General's office, then let the Appropriations Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, the Committee on Expenditures, Civil Service, in fact all committees that have had special appropriations in order to make investigations call upon Mr. Warren to send down his investigators, detail them to that committee and make the investigations that are required.

I know I have demonstrated over a long period of years my desire to do the job that you seek to do in part under this resolution. I know it would have been better if you had done so years ago. If you provide special investigators for one committee other committees will be seeking the same assistance. I want to stop that.

For nearly 15 years I sat alongside of Lindsay Warren on a committee. I was the ranking member of that committee. I know him and know he would render you wonderful service if you ask him to do so. All the older Members know Mr. Warren. They know the service he rendered in this House. It was his outstanding service in this House that brought him to the attention of the President who pleaded with him to accept the position of Comptroller General; a 15-year appointment. I know he did not want to leave this House but the President insisted. He cannot be reappointed. He is under the control of nobody but the Congress. So I say, if you give him the money to set up a real investigating committee, he will do a real job for you.

Mr. Speaker, in going over the RECORD hurriedly since this Congress assembled, I have noticed where there are dozens of resolutions introduced requesting investigations of almost every character. Most of the committees, both select and standing committees, that were granted special authority with money to make investigations in the Seventy-eighth Congress seek to have their committees extended.

I think the country is fed up on special investigations. I know there has been editorial criticism by the leading metropolitan papers of the country as well as by columnists and commentators about the duplication of work by the House and the Senate. We criticize the executive branch of the Government for waste and extravagance and duplication of effort. It seems to me that we are subject to criticism when the Congress follows the same practice. I think the Rules Committee should be extremely careful in bringing resolutions of this character to the floor.

I do not know just how many special committees there are in the Senate, but I do know that there are Senate committees doing practically the same work that House committees have done. Time and again it has been pointed out that the generals of the Army and admirals of the Navy appear before a House or Senate committee one day and go before a Senate or House committee the next days on the very same subject. At a time when they are needed at their desks to prosecute the war, this should not be permitted.

We had committees investigating small business in both the House and the Senate. We had committees investigating Federal personnel in both branches. We had committees investigating expenditures of the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, public housing, and all phases of agriculture; in fact, every subject was being investigated on both sides of the Capitol. If one body is going to make an investigation, then it seems to me that the other branch should leave that investigation to the first committee that is organized.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution that we are now considering will not be a precedent as to what the Rules Committee proposes to do in the future. I am not going to vote for this resolution for the reasons that I stated at the outset of my remarks. My outstanding reason being that we are not justified in placing at the disposal of one committee of this House a special investigating division, but what we should provide for is either, as I said, an investigating division in the Comptroller General's office or a division controlled by the Congress, investigators, and research men, who will serve every committee of the House.

I feel confident that if this resolution was defeated that there would immediately follow some sort of an investigating set-up that would render efficient service to every committee of the House.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I shall favor this resolution. I am satisfied that the only way the House of Representatives can get service in an investigatorial capacity so that it will be really effective is to have that service under the direct control of representatives of the House of Representatives. I have seen joint committees work. I have seen joint staffs work. I have seen dependency upon agencies of the Government. I am satisfied that they do not provide us with the sort of thing we need to effectively get somewhere in solving the problem of cutting down our appropriation bills where they require cutting down.

It has been the practice of the chairmen of that committee, under whose control this investigation last year was placed by the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and myself, to draw from other agencies of the Government insofar as we were able to, agencies that were not affected by the investigation before us to get men of the very best capacity and experience to support and aid our own investigators and our own programs. We reimbursed those agencies that we drew on for the salaries of the employees we took. We paid their expenses when they had to travel. Sometimes it was a case of going into an agency and finding out whether or not it was run on business principles and whether the employees were properly working. For that we needed a business executive from a department.

Frankly, we took what we felt was the best set-up along that line, the head of an agency that is recognized all over the country as one of the best run of the lot, and the result we obtained was very, very satisfactory in a great many cases. We did not succeed in every investigation that we attempted in establishing what some of us felt were the facts, but we did succeed in obtaining information that enabled us to revamp the appropriation bills in a way that would save money for the people's Treasury.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. In view of the fact that rule XI sets up a standing committee, that is, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which has all of the authority and more than the adoption of this resolution would confer upon a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, is not this subcommittee a duplication, and does it not interfere and infringe upon the responsibility of the committee the name of which I have just mentioned?

Mr. TABER. Not in the slightest. We make our investigation with reference to the pending appropriations and estimates that are submitted to us. They make their investigation with reference to past expenditures. That is the difference. If we are to keep up with the parade, we have to have the tools to work with.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this resolution should be adopted, even if in the minds of some of us it be adopted as a temporary or makeshift meeting of the problem. Personally, I feel that the Committee on Appropriations very properly should have more tools to work with than this resolution will provide. We are now engaged in hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill. This morning there were and again this afternoon there will

be agencies before our subcommittee with more men than the staff of the entire Committee on Appropriations. The responsibility which the members of the committee seek to meet is to interrogate these different agencies as they come in, one, two, or three a day, possibly, in an effort to get behind the picture that they have spent months to develop. They have their men who spend most of their time preparing, from one Budget estimate to the next.

If there is anything on which this resolution should be criticized it is that it does not go far enough, but the statement has already been made here that a committee of the House has been contemplated for studying the needs of the House. I assume that committee will give some consideration to the larger problem involved.

It is undoubtedly true that there is some weakness in going to the various branches of the Government and borrowing personnel from them. It is true that the committee, on the other hand, has sought to protect against any weakness in that respect by getting someone from a different agency than the one which it is supposed to investigate.

We have deluded ourselves somewhat by thinking that there might be a saving of pay roll in that respect because such investigation as I have been able to make would indicate that when we do take over the pay roll of an individual for his work with the committee the money for him in the salary budget of that agency is spent anyway. We do not get a report of an unspent balance at the end of the year. They use that money to take care of promotions or something else.

In that respect, it seems to me it would be far better if the committee were financed adequately enough to secure its own personnel without borrowing from the departments. It is not intended, and the committee has never sought, to invade the prerogatives or the fields of any special investigating committees that might be set up by the House. The course the committee has followed has been solely that of investigating contemplated expenditures, or I should say the estimates and requests of the various agencies, in relation to the way they have handled their money in the previous appropriation. For the job that is to be done, this resolution proposes a minimum approach.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri referred to the interest of the Committee on Rules in adoption of this resolution. I should like to make the observation that the Committee on Rules is not campaigning for the passage of the resolution. Mr. Speaker, it is easy for me to concede the force of the argument made by the gentleman from Missouri, which was to the effect that when parties to a controversy submit their case to a jury made up of the family of one of the contenders the verdict usually is already written before the evidence is taken. That leads me to suggest that I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that it would be better if the Committee on Appropriations might find it possible in the selection of their advisers to draw from sources other than administrative circles. However, the Committee on Appropriations was acting under the stress of the moment and I dare say had neither time nor opportunity to canvass the entire field for people of knowledge and experience that could be of any assistance to them, and therefore was compelled to go to the different departments of the Government to get the men it used. It is probably true that this is the only source of getting first-class men at this time—and so, as easy as it is for me to concede the force of the argument of the gentlemen from Missouri, it is likewise easy for me to accept the judgment of the members of the Committee on Appropriations on this question. They tell us that tremendous savings have been effected as a result of what they have done, using people whom they have obtained from different departments, and I, of course, believe what they say. Further, as has been observed, this is something of a temporary expediency. I hope that the House may find it agreeable to accept the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would dislike to be accused of being extravagant in the expenditure of Government funds. I am sure I could not be so accused. But when I served on the Committee on Appropriations, I realized the value of investigation by the committee itself into the various Government departments. When these departments come before the committee they generally have 8 or 10 witnesses and we have 4 or 5 members on the subcommittees. They are always prepared with everything, and with various reasons why they need this money. Some good and some not so meritorious. It seems to me that unless the Committee on Appropriations has someone who can investigate the requests, the Appropriations Committee will not get the information they need. For that reason I think for every dollar you spend on this committee right now you ought to be able to save hundreds of thousands of dollars. Not only that, I am very much interested in having a subcommittee set up for each one of these committees an investigator, as was suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] several years ago. You could not further the interest of the Congress and the people of this country more in saving funds, in my judgment, than to have a bill of that kind adopted, notwithstanding the fact that my good and genial friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is desirous of having this responsibility placed in the Bureau of Accounts under Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, who is one of the finest men I have ever sat with in the House. But it seems to me you could do well now to put this committee into effect until the other procedures recommended by any other committee have the opportunity to function. I am very much in sympathy with this. I am going to vote for it for the reason that I know every dollar you will spend here will mean a saving of a million dollars, or that is my hope. I am for this resolution as a matter of economy.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of the legislative business today and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, personally I have not thought that this resolution affords an adequate solution of the problem before us. It will be 3 years next month since I first introduced a measure in this body to create as an agency of the House of Representatives an office of fiscal investigations. It would be absolutely and directly our own agency, independent of any executive department or organization.

I have believed that this is the proper approach to the economy which we all desire, and to the ascertaining of the information and data upon which that economy can be predicated. Such an agency would be at the disposal of the various committees of this body, just as our office of legislative counsel is now at our disposal with reference to the preparation of various measures for our consideration.

Let me call it to your attention that one important feature and element of the promotion of economy arises before the measure ever reaches the Committee on Appropriations. In other words, many of these appropriations might not be authorized, or they might be reduced in amount, if the committees giving initial consideration to the bills before them could have the advantage of an office of fiscal investigations in order that they could determine accurately just what sum of money might be necessary in the way of expenditure to accomplish any proper purpose. Such an agency also could investigate and detect any duplication, waste, or extravagance in the use of funds previously appropriated. That, I think, would point the way to very substantial economy.

Though this resolution may be necessary in some respects for the Committee on Appropriations, I certainly think it inadvisable to go into the family of the executive departments to have them pass upon the needs of one another. I sometimes think that many of them have more or less of a feeling of hostility toward the Congress of the United States, and perhaps especially toward this body in which the appropriation bills originate. It may become more or less a matter of "You scratch my back and I will scratch your back; you are going to investigate me and I am going to investigate you; let us see where we can get together."

I believe we ought to start from the beginning when these various bills that authorize appropriations come before

the respective committees, and have those committees properly staffed through an office of fiscal investigations that will place at their service some competent authority to determine the merits of the measures that are pending before them.

I have no objection, of course, to the Committee on Appropriations having whatever it may need to carry on its own investigations, but I believe that such services as they may require can very easily be a part of the functions of such an office of fiscal investigations. We now have a select committee appointed to report to the Congress a reorganization of the various methods of procedure and a restaffing to the extent that may be essential. It seems to me we are beginning to get the cart before the horse in determining so many of these matters before that committee has made its studies and completed its deliberations and reported its findings. But I believe now, as I have believed since I first introduced this measure almost 3 years ago, that it is important for these committees of the Congress in a proper consideration of the measures before them to have an independent agency of the Congress to conduct for them any necessary investigation that would get such factual data as might properly be required of them when they come before this body to request the passage of various bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana to make a unanimous-consent request.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order of 45 minutes given to me on next Monday may be extended to 1 hour, at which time I wish to make a report to the House of my mission to China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article on Alaska that was issued.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have frequently had occasion to address the House on this very important subject. I am in substantial agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Texas that we ought to set up facilities that could be utilized by the legislative committees of the House as well as the Committee on Appropriations. This resolution, however, deals specifically with the work of the Committee on Appropriations and does not touch the work of the legislative committees of the House.

While I am in complete sympathy with the objectives sought to be obtained by this resolution, I have some doubts in my mind that I would like to have resolved while this matter is under discussion. I wonder if the chairman of the committee will advise me and the House as to whether I am inaccurate in my thinking as to the real procedure in the event this resolution is adopted.

In the first place, the resolution provides that "the Committee on Appropriations acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees thereof appointed by the chairman for the purposes of this resolution is authorized effective January 4, 1945, to conduct such studies and examinations," and so forth. Am I correct in the assumption, Mr. Chairman, that if this resolution is adopted the investigation would have to be conducted by the full Committee on Appropriations or a subcommittee or subcommittees to be appointed by the chairman for that specific purpose? Or would the investigations be conducted with respect to the departments of the Government for which appropriations are scanned by the regular subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman should be thoroughly familiar with the system. It has been in operation for 2 years. Every member of the Committee on Appropriations is familiar with it and its operation. For 2 years it has functioned most successfully. Not a single objection or criticism has ever been offered against it from either side of the House in committee or on the floor. We have saved, literally, millions of dollars by the use of the very small amount provided here.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is not answering the question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would be very glad to answer any question the gentleman may ask.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to get an answer to the question. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the same as the gentleman is, and I am quite familiar with the procedure that is indulged in now; but I do not want this record to show that if the pending resolution is adopted we are merely agreeing to the procedure that has been indulged in heretofore by the Appropriations Committee. If this resolution does not go further than that, I would not support it. I assume, and this is the reason I ask the question, that the subcommittee, for instance, in charge of the Labor and Social Security appropriations will be the subcommittee designated by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee under this resolution to make the investigation required to determine whether or not the department covered by that appropriation is asking for the proper sum of money or is properly expending the money that is appropriated by the Appropriations Committee. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Under the present system, to which the gentleman referred, all that we have is the right of the subcommittee, the chairman, and the ranking member, to appoint investigators to go down, investigate a Budget estimate, and report back to the subcommittee. If this resolution is adopted, the subcommittee will have the right to subpena witnesses before that subcommittee and put them under oath; is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the committee so desires. Under its authority, it has that right.

Mr. KEEFE. If the resolution is adopted, it is a very material extension beyond the power that the committee now has, is it not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is the same resolution identically that was adopted 2 years ago. It has been in force for 2 years. We have not changed a single line or word or punctuation mark in it. It is the same resolution under which the Appropriations Committee has in the last 2 years saved millions of dollars.

Mr. KEEFE. I shall be glad if the gentleman in connection with his remarks will give us a bill of particulars showing where those savings have taken place. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would be very much interested to find where the result of these special investigators has saved millions, millions, and millions of dollars. I am going to support the resolution but I would like to know something about how it is going to operate in reality. My own experience as a member of the committee is that any reports submitted came to the attention of the chairman and ranking Republican in the full committee and possibly to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee. Some of the reports of the investigators were referred to in the hearings. This procedure does not meet the issue. The members of the subcommittee should know who the investigators are in order to evaluate their reports. They should be available to members of the subcommittee while the hearings are in progress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations faces a prodigious task. The message that has just been read to us, and which is the first of many estimates to follow, comprises 758 pages of closely printed matter requiring consideration by the committee. While it does not include appropriations for the Army and Navy and the war agencies, it does indicate the approximate amount that will be required. In round figures the message

which has been read this morning recommends expenditures aggregating $77,500,000,000, in comparison with the current year for which similar direct appropriations have been made amounting to $67,615,000,000. In other words, we have a stupendous job ahead and will need all the assistance we can get in screening the vast amount of evidence that will have to be scrutinized in the process.

Let me say, in order to clear any misapprehension of the situation, that this is not a new thing. It is merely the continuation of an authority and a system which has been in force for 2 years. For 2 years we have operated under a precisely similar resolution—under exactly the same procedure, and no man in the committee, including my good friend who has just spoken, has risen in the committee and offered any criticism or objection or proposed any supplement to it. It has been satisfactory in every respect and it has saved billions of dollars.

For example, we had a proposal from the Budget Bureau to appropriate $58,764,000 for a war-training program by the National Youth Administration. Investigations by our staff, under this resolution, showed that such an expenditure would provide for a duplication of activities and was unnecessary, and on the testimony submitted by our operators we eliminated an expenditure which undoubtedly would otherwise have been authorized by the Congress.

Again, as another of many instances, the Central Administration Services, which had been in use for many years, was investigated under this resolution and found to be superfluous and was eliminated at a savings of approximately $2,700,000. Many other instances could be given of material savings in the last 2 years through the operation of the system provided by this resolution—savings which could not have been effected without the information and data supplied by our investigators.

For the last year columnists and radio broadcasters have made the welkin ring with inflammatory statements to the effect that the Committee on Administrations was working blindly and wasting vast sums through lack of a system of securing information independent of that supplied by the departments. It is merely illustrative of the careless and unauthoritative space-fillers purveyed through the syndicated columns of the papers and thrown on the air by the professional gossipers of the day.

A perverse lack of information on the part of Members of the House itself has been evidenced here on the floor from time to time. A striking feature of the debate today is that the few who oppose the pending resolution have invariably prefaced their remarks with approval of the objective sought to be achieved by the resolution. Then they proceed to take issue with the method of attaining that objective. They want to substitute for our system a permanent staff. And in most instances they have already agreed on the salaries of such a staff, running on one list as high as $10,000 per man per annum. And some of the personnel they recommend to handle this important work in the administrations of the national finances have not been sufficiently successful in the administration of their personal finances to always have the rent ready on the 1st of the month.

May I remind the Members of the House that this is a going concern. It has been in actual operation for the past 2 years. It has been tested and tried under every possible situation. Let me quote the statement made in this connection in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 19, 1944, as follows:

> Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit the final report on the expenditures by the research staff of the Committee on Appropriations for the Seventy-eighth Congress.
>
> The staff has conducted investigations covering every inquiry submitted by any member of the committee and any Member of the House who subcommitted inquiries through the members of the committee under House Resolutions 69 and 116, for the approximate period of the last 2 years.
>
> Millions of dollars have been saved through application of the information thus secured and although reference to the operations of the staff has been repeatedly made in the committee and on the floor, no criticism or dissatisfaction with the staff or its work has been expressed at any time.
>
> One of the features of these investigations is the economy with which they have been handled. As will be noted, less than half the original $100,000 appropriated for this purpose has been expended after supplying every request for data and the sum of $50,250.84 is turned back—a record for volume of accomplishment at minimum cost unsurpassed in the history of congressional investigations.
>
> The following tabulation reflects obligations incurred since March 8, 1943, under House Resolutions 69 and 116:

Obligations from Mar. 8, 1943, through Dec. 31, 1944

Personal services:	
Regular members of the staff	$18,448.82
Salaries of personnel on loan from executive departments:	
Treasury	3,116.35
Civil Service Commission	5,509.96
Interstate Commerce Commission	258.31
Agriculture	4,561.57
Federal Works Agency	374.89
Veterans Administration	2,364.74
Commerce	1,622.83
Federal Security Agency	2,164.19
Labor	1,178.10
Office of Censorship	1,870.21
Justice	1,994.63
Office of War Information	346.01
Total personal services	43,810.61
Other expense items:	
Travel expense	5,705.48
Communications services	10.68
Supplies and materials	222.39
Total other expenses	5,938.55
Total obligations	49,749.16

Permit me to earnestly point out, in the few remaining minutes of the time allotted for debate, the many and conclusive reasons why the system practiced under this resolution is preferable to any permanent staff, permanent agency, or permanent committee or joint committee which can be established for this purpose.

In the first place, the system is elastic. If a dozen investigations in a dozen different departments are necessary on short notice, any number of operatives required for them are instantly available. No job is too big or too fast. We can have any number of highly trained men up here ready to go to work tomorrow morning. In a permanent agency the number and size of the investigations would necessarily be limited and time would be vital consideration. On the other hand, if we have only one investigation on schedule—or none—we do not have a single superfluous employee, whereas with a permanent staff most of your men would be sitting around doing nothing but drawing their salaries three-fourths of the time. And that is a considered statement based on long experience and observation.

Again this system provides exactly the character of operative need for any specific investigation. If you need a scientist, you can find no one better qualified than, for example, a man supplied by the Federal Bureau of Standards. If you need a physician, where can you find one better qualified than one from the Public Health Service? Or, if an engineer is required, where in the world can you get a better qualified engineer than from the Board of Engineers of the War Department? In case you want to use a detective, where will you get a better one than from the Secret Service of the Treasury Department—or from the Federal Bureau of Investigation? If we need an auditor or an accountant we can get them in any department, including the General Accounting Office. No permanent staff would have ready at hand experts of all these exceptional qualifications on instant call. In fact the General Accounting Office, which is sometimes suggested as an agency to do this work, is an aggregation of bookkeepers. In many of these investigations a bookkeeper would be of no particular value. In fact, when we were considering planning our system of investigation—and it was under consideration for many months—we asked the General Accounting Office for an estimate on the cost of establishing such an agency in the G. A. O. and they submitted an estimate of approximately $1,000,000 per annum to do the work we have been doing under this system at an annual cost of $25,000 a year; and I am convinced it has been done better and with greater expedition than it could have been done by any other agency.

It has been suggested by someone here today—evidently unfamiliar with the fundamental principles of budgetary administration—that if personnel from one department were detailed to investigate another department, they would cover up any discrepancies found on the theory that a like service would be rendered if employees from that department ever investigated their own offices. In our entire experience we have never been detailed a man of such low caliber as to render such a practice even remotely

probable. And our method of requiring statistical and documentary evidence in support of reports would practically preclude such dereliction of duty even if attempted. Furthermore, under the national budgetary system the first estimate is as to the over-all amount of money available for the expense of the Government for the fiscal year. There is just so much money to be made available, and in providing for the expenses of the various departments, the coat must be cut from the cloth at hand. If one department gets more, another department must perforce get less. For this reason there can be no community of interest under which all departments could be allotted larger funds. The idea that one department would cooperate in getting more money for another department than its legitimate needs warranted are absurd. As a matter of fact you will not find any committeeman of the 43 members of the Committee on Appropriations who believes that anything of the kind has occurred in the 2 years in which we have been making these investigations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There are, are there not, pending at the present time a large number of investigations that the committee has initiated with reference to the Budget estimates that were sent up here today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; I am glad the gentleman mentioned that.

Mr. TABER. They need to be followed up right away, ahead of the committee hearings.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. Our hearings are about half finished. We have 12 or 15 men who are at work in the departments on pending estimates. We had to discontinue all such work at midnight on the 31st day of December as our authority to investigate and our funds for that purpose lapsed as of that date. Unless we get this authority now, our men cannot complete these investigations. Our subcommittees are meeting across the hall every day now preparing the first appropriation bills for the session. We shall be greatly handicapped if this resolution is not adopted.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Did the gentleman state that the N. Y. A. was to be given an appropriation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. A budget estimate for $58,764,000 to be expended in a military training program, was eliminated on testimony secured through our research agency.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will it be the purpose of this committee aside from examining into appropriations to examine into the policy-making powers of the various departments?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will read the resolution, he will note that it provides only for the investigation of matters within our jurisdiction.

In conclusion, I submit a statement made on the floor of the House in this connection, on December 21, 1943, categorically detailing the advantages of the established system of investigation employed by the Committee on Appropriations as follows:

The advantages of the system are:

First. It is economical. The employees are on the House pay roll only as long as needed. If a permanent staff were employed the entire force would be drawing salaries whether the committee was conducting an investigation or not. But under this system a man is called from the department and placed on the House roll, at the same salary he is drawing in his present position. As soon as the assignment is completed he is returned to the department and goes off the House roll and back to his original roll. His salary canot be raised by the committee and he is not paid a day longer than required for the assignment.

Second. Men especially qualified for the particular investigation involved are secured. In some investigations an auditor is needed, in some a lawyer, in some a chemist, in some an efficiency expert, in some a detective, etc. Accordingly, the man best fitted for the assignment is requisitioned. If an auditor is needed the General Accounting Office may be asked to supply the man. If a chemist, the Bureau of Standards; if a lawyer, the Department of Justice; if a civil-service expert, the Civil Service Commission; if a detective, the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Secret Service of the Treasury Department. By way of rotation auditors are also available from the Army, Navy, S. E. C., R. F. C., W. P. B., O. P. A., and Tariff Commission, chemists from Agriculture, Treasury, and others, and lawyers from the legal staffs of all departments, etc. No other system yet suggested will so promptly and so exactly supply just the precise character of qualification needed for any specific investigation.

Third. The system is elastic. It supplies 1 man or 10 men on short notice. There are 10 subcommittees. If only 2 order an investigation, a half dozen men will suffice. But if all 10, or any considerable number of the 10, simultaneously request investigations, the requisition jumps to 50 or 60 men. Then during vacation, when only 1 or 2 subcommittees are investigating, the number drops again. But for any investigation or number of investigations, this system meets the emergency. It supplies just the number needed and no more—and for the time required—and no longer.

Fourth. The system supplies men of rare qualification. For such investigations the departments assign their best operators. These men are experienced. They are trained. They are tried and tested. They have come up through the ranks. They have demonstrated their fidelity and capacity. There are among them no tyros or amateurs. They are the ablest and most dependable men that are to be secured and incomparably superior to the men to be had by political selection of a permanent House staff. Furthermore, they are active and alert. Men on permanent staffs grow old and inert with the passage of the years, but the departments are a never failing fountain of youth and energy.

Fifth. The constant change in operatives sends into the departments men unknown and unacquainted in the bureaus which they investigate. They have had no opportunities to establish cordial relations. They are new faces and new brooms—and they sweep clean.

Sixth. The only interest of the operator is to secure the facts as quickly and as economically as possible and get back to his own office. Under the average committee of investigation the employee is likely to be swayed by two dominant interests: First, he wishes to prolong and perpetuate his job. He is drawing a better salary than he can get anywhere else and he wants to make it last as long as conditions permit. Second, he feels tht he must justify his employment by "making his case" and "getting his man."

There is no such incentive under this system. Congressional committees of investigation now operating have expended vast sums—as high as half a million dollars—with little visible results. The Committee on Appropriations conducting investigations in many departments for the larger part of the year has spent less than $20,000 and secured invaluable results.

Seventh. The system cannot be used for the publicizing or aggrandizement of the chairman or any member of the committee. Requests submitted by the subcommittees are for facts. Opinions are not admitted. The investigators receive written assignments and make written reports, and from those facts reported the members of the committee deduce their own opinions, although the committee may request, through the staff, an analysis of the data by an expert not connected with the original investigation. Results of the investigations are not released to the newspapers. The department which has been investigated does not itself know what the investigator has reported and as a result must be on its toes ready for any development when its representatives appear before the committee in the hearings on the Budget estimates.

Eighth. On the other hand, the system cannot be used as an instrument of persecution. The fact that a department is investigated is in no way to its discredit. Investigations are routine and are expected and as a rule welcomed by the departments. While many instances have been reported which justified heavy retrenchments, there have been occasions when on the basis of the reports submitted by the investigator the appropriation was increased over the Budget estimate. The system makes for efficient administration as well as economical administration. And it is effective even when not in use. It is like the shotgun behind the door. The very knowledge that it is there is a deterrent—even though not in use. The mere fact that Congress can investigate, and is supplied with effective machinery for investigation, exerts a salutary influence.

On the whole, the system has proven remarkably successful. It has met every requirement. In fact, it is difficult to imagine a system which would be more responsive to our needs and more economical and effective in its operation and results.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DRAFT OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, alarmed by recent steps being taken by the War Manpower Commission, I have introduced the following resolution:

Whereas due to the recent sweeping order of the Director of Selective Service, there is a danger of the draft boards throughout the country going far beyond the intent of the Tydings amendment which restricts the draft

of essential persons engaged in agricultural occupations; and

Whereas such future indiscriminate action on the part of the draft boards by drafting essential persons in the dairy industry and other agricultural pursuits will practically stop the vital production of milk, butter, cheese, and other dairy and agricultural foods to our armed forces, our civilian population, and our allies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs is directed to determine if, and the extent to which, such order is contrary to the policy of Congress with respect to selective-service registrants engaged in agricultural occupations, as expressed in section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and to report its determination thereon to the House within 10 days after the adoption of this resolution.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, and further to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ARMY AGRICULTURAL CORPS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcements by War Mobilization Director Byrnes and the Selective Service System in regard to manpower and the drafting of additional men for the armed forces and industry, I am today reintroducing my bill to establish an Army Agricultural Corps for service in the Army of the United States. When I introduced this bill on April 22, 1943, in the Seventy-eighth Congress, I stated that it was my opinion that food and dairy products were essential for the armed forces and the civilian population, and that food was just as essential to the armed forces as ammunition. All of us remember what Napoleon and Washington had to say in this respect.

My bill would provide for inducting in the armed forces all men and women engaged in, or qualified for agricultural work, and I am still of the opinion that the creation of this new branch of the service would help to solve the present situation. There are other branches of the services which are noncombatant such as the Quartermaster Corps, the Provost Marshal branch, the Services of Supply, Signal Corps, Adjutant General branch, Transportation, Medical, Public Relations, Chaplains, Judge Advocate, and other branches of the armed forces.

I have also called to the attention of the War Manpower Commission to the fact that thousands of men had been rejected in the draft on account of flat feet and illiteracy.

I personally know of hundreds of fine physical specimens who have been rejected on account of flat feet who, in my opinion, could be used in the Army. In the last war, thousands of illiterates were used in labor battalions, and performed magnificent work in the loading and unloading of ships and whose services were utilized in many ways. As a matter of fact, the Army service courses and schools teach the average soldier to read and write in approximately 2 months. Thousands of men in civilian Government employ could be inducted in the armed forces.

While all of us desire to do all things which are necessary to win the war, there is considerable anxiety on the part of agriculture as to the announcement of the drafting of farm and dairy workers, and I am of the opinion that, if the details could be properly worked out, my bill would be a means of solving this situation. My bill would place thousands of farm and dairy workers in uniform where most of them would prefer to be, and food production would not be reduced. In my district, had it not been for prisoner-of-war labor, we would never have been able to save the rice, sugarcane, and other food crops; and this year this problem will be more acute than ever.

Mr. Speaker, in any event, I trust that those in charge of these programs will take the necessary time and give full consideration to these matters, and that all of them will not commence to issue contradictory, confusing, and constantly changing statements, rules, and regulations as was done in 1943, when no one was able to intelligently determine the status or future of those subject to these orders and directives. They should make up their minds.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to extend my own remarks in connection with Government employees, and the other to extend my own remarks in connection with the F. B. I.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article from the Baltimore News-Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to extend my remarks and insert an article on the punishment of war criminals, and secondly, to extend my remarks by inserting a brief editorial which appeared in the New York Times of January 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the January 9, 1945, issue of the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune and from the Chicago American.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the all-girl orchestra.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the so-called Un-American Committee, I make the following suggestions for their investigation:

First. Is it un-American to get up on the left side of the bed in the morning? If so, should all bedrooms in America be rearranged to avoid this subversive tendency?

Second. Is it un-American for Santa Claus to wear a red suit? Does he just wear those white whiskers to fool the kids?

Third. Is it un-American to be caught walking on the left side of any thoroughfare? If so, is any excuse valid? Should miscreants be thrown in the cooler?

Fourth. Is it un-American for the letters Z and K to look so crooked? Are these the American version of the hammer and sickle?

Fifth. Is it un-American to tie red bows on bird cages?

Sixth. Is it un-American to crawl into one—after a bout with the Un-American Committee?

Seventh. Is it un-American to sit on a tuffet? If so, should we deport Miss Muffet?

Eighth. Is it un-American for that dollie to go on dancing with the hole in her stocking? What happened to the crack in her head? Is it true that thousands of unidentified characters entered the United States through that yawning cavern on each Walpurgis Night?

Ninth. Is it un-American to tint smorgasbits pink? Is this an imported foreign deception?

Tenth. Is it un-American for Joe's delicatessen to substitute ersatz caviar

for corned beef on rye? Is this a paid propaganda stunt?

Eleventh. Who is Roger? What is he?

Twelfth. Is it un-American for W. C. Fields to have a bulbous and red nose?

Thirteenth. Is it un-American for Westbrook Pegler to succumb to the comfort of red flannel underwear?

Fourteenth. Is not it un-American to use red herrings?

Fifteenth. Is it un-American for Skelton to call himself "Red"? Should he be forced to change it to Passionate Purple Skelton?

Sixteenth. And Little Red Riding Hood? What was she thinking of, tearing around in that outfit? Were there really eggs in that basket or was it the Communist manifesto cut up into a jig-saw puzzle? Was it really a wolf or Joe Stalin in a new snow suit?

Seventeenth. Is it un-American for the mocking bird, the accepted bird of Mississippi, to go on mocking? Why cannot the committee train it to whistle Yankee Doodle?

Eighteenth. It all adds up to one thing. We must eliminate the source of all these vexatious problems. The little red schoolhouse must go.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a telegram from the North Dakota Farmers Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by Mr. L. Reid of the Renville Star Farmer, of Renville, Minn., relative to the manpower problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. ROBERT HALE at Portland, Maine, on American foreign policy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, following other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation and a copy of a telegram directed to the War Food Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article by Joseph Leib.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

FARM LABOR AND THE DRAFT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and revise and extend my remarks by including a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, farmers in my district are very much exercised about the recent order requiring the reclassification under the Selective Service Act of boys who are now on farms and doing actual farm work. My farmers do not urge, and in fact do not want any exemption or deferments for boys who are not genuine farmers and doing a real farm job. Our farm boys are not draft dodgers. They are doing vitally essential work on the home front.

Mr. Speaker, I am this day in receipt of a letter from a constituent which states the case in clear, concise language. It tells the facts as they are, better possibly than I can tell them. The writer of the letter lives on a farm and knows the problems of agriculture. The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1945.

DEAR MR. MICHENER: Yesterday over the radio it was announced that Director Byrnes wanted all farm workers' deferments canceled. He said boys between the ages of 18 and 25 were best fighters. Do you not know that these few farm boys are the backbone of our Nation? It is these boys who are producing the food to feed the country.

How could the men in service, the war workers, and all other civilians work if they did not have the food?

Farming is no easy task, and these young boys are the only ones who can do this heavy work. It is the boys who are born and raised on the farm who are not afraid of hard work. They farm the soil, feed the stock, and milk the cows, take care of the stock when sick. It takes years of training to get the knowledge to farm and produce as the boys are doing today.

A man or woman of 50 years or older can go in the factory and work at war work. You can learn that in a few weeks. Their work is steady but not hard. The hours are not long like farm boys' work. Farm boys who have stock to care for are in the barns at 6 o'clock in the morning and work in the fields till 6 at night or later if necessary, then take care of the stock. It is 8 o'clock or later before they come in.

You have never known a farmer to strike or quit like his town or city friend does when he thinks he should have more pay.

The farmer at the age of 50 is worn out from hard work. And their sons or sons-in-law must take over the work. They can do the managing and business part, same as your generals, majors, and captains do in the Army, but they cannot do the heavy work.

There is not an extra hand available to hire. The foreign labor is no good. All they want is big pay and little work. One has to be with them in order to get any work done, for they know nothing about farming.

Your farm would not be worked if it was not for the 21-year-old boy who is working it with his father's help and knowledge. Most of our boys are working from 150 acres to 300 acres of land and feed a lot of livestock. Our older men are working from 40 to 60 acres today, and it takes that amount for a family to live. So you can see that one young boy produces more food than four to six older men do.

You, Mr. MICHENER, as a Member of Congress, may read this letter before Congress and show them that it will ruin our country to take any more of our farm boys. Who can fight and work without food? I can say our farm boys of today are doing their part.

The city folks think milk comes from a bottle and meat from a butcher shop, but it takes our boys to put it there.

Yours truly,

MRS. CHARLES GOETZ,
A Farm Wife.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a canner in my district who sets forth the ideas of most thinking people on the manpower shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a broadcast by Hon. Raymond Gram Swing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me today be postponed to the same place on the calendar for Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two other unanimous-consent requests. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Hon. Jesse Jones concerning small business which appeared in the Washington Star last Sunday. In addition I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement on the accomplishment of the Committee on Small Business of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to preface the remarks I purpose to make by saying that they are made in the greatest humility. I am studying about the war, thinking about the men and the boys who today, as we are engaged in our necessary pursuits, are fighting, many of them dying, for us. I am proceeding upon the assumption that something may be accomplished under the idea that all progress is made here a little, there a little, rather than on the egotistical assumption that I know a lot nobody else does. I believe our lives are made up of here a little and there a little, line upon line, precept upon precept. Begging you to consider my remarks against this background I proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I trust none of us will, because some progress is now being made by our armed forces, begin predicting immediately total victory.

I am not one of those who thought or said that the war in Europe would be ended in 1944. I do not have to answer for that. I am sorry for those who do have to carry in their bosoms the realization that by talking such they rendered no service to their country.

Mrs. Hattie Caraway, retiring from the Senate, said: "Senators talk too much." Senators are not the only ones who talk too much. Too few people have learned that silence can be golden; and not many have drawn a lesson from the injunction: "Be sure you are right and then go ahead." There is a far too prevalent disposition not to look before you leap. I think much of this is due to a pitiable desire for personal publicity and self-advertising. The tragedy of that is that it is no contribution to the public good, nor is it finally valuable to the person engaging in such puerile pastime. Our first duty is to win this war, and do it quickly. This responsibility is on all of us—each of us.

To those of us who are not called to bear arms, the responsibility is greatest. It is not just an imagined phrase or conjured thought that the hope of Germany is to divide and conquer. This is one of the most powerful forces they recognize as most effective to the winning of the war.

In unity there is strength. The opposite of that is a truth also: Where there is not unity there can be no strength. Divisions among the peoples of a Nation strongly tend to produce divisions between or among the nations themselves. Already, without doubt, divisions, bickerings, and strifes, with sprinklings of jealousies and envies, have caused loss of the lives of many thousands of our own soldiers. Whoever, therefore, while the war is on, indulges in any of these things is guilty of manslaughter, or murder in the second degree, or murder in the first degree, depending only on the degree of that person's mentality. We must be as comrades in arms, or we shall be those who divide and contribute to our own sufferings and to the prolonging of this war.

The man who, by word or deed or neglect, prolongs this war can scarcely lay claim to patriotism or to concern for our soldiers on the fields of battle. I realize that these are terrible indictments; but if they are well founded, they ought to be made. What I mean to say is that the winning of this war at the earliest possible time is the responsibility of every one of us and is by far the most important thing we have to do.

How many years do you think are encompassed in 6 months at war to the man who, day after day, must take his place in the front lines and then at night sleep on the ground with his pack for a pillow? This war is not over, either in Europe or in the Pacific. To an alarming degree, the question of its prolonging depends on the behavior of those on the home front—on us. There is no escape from this fact.

We may, as a secondary consideration, give thought to the post-war period, as to economic stability and a lasting peace; but we cannot allow these things to become first considerations. We have to fight against the fact that the love of money is the root of all evil. There may be truth in the belief that set-backs in the last few weeks or months which we have suffered were due in a very large measure to the scramble for reconversion that people might make money and, likely, in order that some economic advantage might be gained by some over others. "The love of money is the root of all evil," you know. What I am trying to say is that the winning of this war, with a just and lasting peace, is, far and wide, beyond and above every other obligation we are under. The peace and security of our country, and the world, and the preservation of the lives of those noble men and women who are called on to fight and suffer and, if need be, die for the cause, compel our every effort and sacrifice toward speeding the victory. To one who throws a stumbling block in the unity so necessary in this awful struggle, but with his lips professes loyalty to the cause, I must say, "I cannot hear what you say because your actions speak too loud"—maybe because of what I know you to be.

I am talking for our soldiers in arms and for the fathers and mothers of this land and other lands. When reckonings shall come, it will not be for us to say, "I didn't know." It is our business to know.

Coming to the present, I must urge that all materials for battle be provided in the greatest abundance. It is and will be a thousand times better to say we provided too much than to have to cry, "too little and too late." Let anxiety for reconversion come only when we know there is not the slightest danger that our provisions for the war should be found to be too little or too late. Hope for the best, but prepare for the worst. That is the only policy we can afford.

One of the most disturbing things we see is the assumption of one that he knows a great deal about foreign or international affairs and is anxious to give vent to a feeling that he knows a whole lot and must tell the world what to do and what not to do; when in truth he knows very little and what he thinks he knows is based on uncertain information that is like unto the warning that "a little learning is a dangerous thing." If I think I am smart, I am not smart; and, speaking to anyone, if you think you are smart, you are not smart. Not the arrogant but the meek shall inherit the earth. All we have a right to say is, "Come let us reason together."

Benjamin Franklin said that in his youth he was dogmatic. He would say, "This is so; that is not so." An old friend of his told him he might become a valuable man if he would say, "I think this is so. I suggest this for your consideration." Franklin was convinced and became, I think, one of the wisest and most valuable men the world ever knew, and one of the most convincing.

As I glance at the newspaper headlines I find that, " 'President fails to leadership in foreign affairs,' critics say." What a pity. There arises a difference of opinion. Or is it a difference of attitudes? In my judgment, the President's message was the grandest assurance of wisdom and statesmanship and understanding we have had in a generation. Wise in what he did not say as well as in what he did say. I am afraid somebody just wants to appear smart, regardless of what effect their pronouncements may have on our country and its fortunes. Just to criticize the President.

For the sake of our country, in remembrance of the sacrifices of our soldiers, let us put first things first. Let us stand together. Again, "United we stand; divided we fall." There is no doubt a contribution that each one of us may make to the successful prosecution of the war. Some may make a little; others may make much. It is to be hoped that each one of us will consider his own responsibility and instead of being free with adverse criticisms, endeavor to meet his own responsibility. There is nothing I know of that is of more importance than this. Perfection in no one is expected, but a faithful endeavor to make contribution to our country's cause in these fateful times is surely not too much to hope for.

We do well to seek unity among ourselves at home, and we shall do well to work and hope for unity among those nations who, with us, fight for liberty and freedom. One has said that because of the resistance to German aggression of Poland, France, Great Britain, Russia, the Low Countries, Norway, Yugoslavia, and Greece, the United States was vouchsafed time in which to prepare, and that in fighting for themselves our allies were thus fighting for us, even as we today, with them, are fighting for ourselves and for them. This should make us careful not to divide, but to remain united in the common cause.

"Work, fight, and give to make democracy live" is not a bad slogan for us, but one that each of us may well accept and employ in these days of terrible responsibility.

May we, each one of us, in Congress and out of Congress, realize that our obligations and duties, well considered, are to our country and the peace of the world, seeking, above all things, to estab-

lish good will on earth and peace among men everywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What are our war aims? Who knows? About all we are told by the President is that we must not have a negotiated peace and must stop at nothing less than unconditional surrender. Shall we, the American people, continue to remain imprisoned between two such clichés?

What does the term "negotiated peace" mean? If it means a peace dictated by Germany, then nobody in America that I know of favors it. Certainly those of us who resist with all our might dictation by any American President would be the first to start and the last to stop resisting dictation by any alien. If, on the other hand, what the new dealers object to is a peace arrived at through negotiation with the enemy, why the New Deal leader, President Roosevelt himself has repeatedly negotiated peace and truly said that it saved American lives. For example, with Darlan to secure entrance into Africa. Likewise, with Bagdolio to secure the surrender of Italy. The fact seems to be that armies do not surrender without some preliminary negotiation. Then why are we expected to humble ourselves, quaking like savages before these taboos, "negotiated peace" and "unconditional surrender"? Why is it considered a sin to be for a "negotiated peace" or against "unconditional surrender"?

There is in the Congressional Library an objective book by Rudin published by the Yale University Press in 1943, called Armistice 1918. Thoroughly documented, it contains enough memoranda of conferences between leaders in both Germany and the United States during the fall of 1918 to be instructive. Though written for quite another purpose, it serves to indicate how the clichés "negotiated peace" and "unconditional surrender" managed to grow into a bete noir.

The German general, Ludendorff, had become convinced that a military victory was impossible. Therefore a German foreign secretary admitted it in the Reichstag. A peace resolution was introduced. A leading German newspaper proclaimed that Germany desired no territorial expansion beyond pre-war boundaries and advocated having combatant countries submit peace terms to some neutral government in order to ascertain whether there might not be some common basis for agreement. Thereafter, the minority opposition party in the Reichstag demanded election and parliamentary reforms on the ground that President Wilson's speeches had warned that government by the people in Germany must be a condition precedent to peace. A German vice chancelor publicly stated that Germany would be agreeable to peace terms based on pre-war boundaries, providing Finland, Poland, and the Baltic states should not be delivered back to Russia, but remain independent so as to furnish a bulwark against the spread of Russian bolshevism. Austria and Bulgaria made peace overtures. After an official survey the German Foreign Office reported confidentially that to secure peace from the Allies there must first be a new cabinet with broad, popular representation. That the new cabinet thus formed at the opportune moment should approach President Wilson, rather than any neutral country, suggesting that he call a conference of Allies for the restoration of peace, the opportune moment to be determined by the Army officials. The Kaiser approved the plan.

The new cabinet was duly organized. The information that the Army considered a military victory impossible leaked out, causing a panic in Berlin, the people having been thoroughly confident of victory. A note was sent to President Wilson saying, "the German Government accepts as a basis for negotiation" the terms mentioned in President Wilson's public statements, particularly the one containing the now famous Fourteen Points.

The Allies, though not consulted by the American President, protested the negotiations. A Republican Senator, McCumber, of North Dakota, introduced a resolution saying there must be no cessation of hostilities unless and until Germany should unreservedly surrender. Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, who was the acknowledged leader of the so-called isolationists, wrote former President Theodore Roosevelt:

I am living in a constant anxiety now of a sudden plunge of the administration for a negotiated peace. At this point if we make an armistice we have lost the war and we shall leave Germany about where she started. I am sure that the American people want a complete victory and an unconditional surrender. They want to win this fight on German soil and every man who comes here who has been fighting on the western front says the soldiers are determined to go into Germany and would resent it bitterly if they were to be held back.

Colonel House, in his diary, said:

I found the President's viewpoint had changed during the night. * * * He did not seem to realize before the nearly unanimous sentiment in this country against anything but unconditional surrender. He did not realize how war-mad our people have become.

But President Wilson bravely sent the German Government a reply inquiring whether it was meant that the terms were accepted so as to leave for discussion only the practical details of their application. He demanded in this note a further condition not previously mentioned in his speeches—that the Central Powers consent to withdraw immediately from invaded territory. His note was denounced by some leading Germans, who declared that it virtually demanded unconditional surrender. While in the United States, on the other hand, it was denounced because it did not demand unconditional surrender. Senator Lodge told the press:

I believe in a dictated not a negotiated peace.

Former President Roosevelt said:

I believe our sole aim should be to win the war and not discuss the peace terms with the enemy until the war has been won.

Senators read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters from constituents echoing the demand for unconditional surrender. The French and British were also objecting to the negotiations, but on other grounds.

The German Government replied, agreeing to the terms President Wilson had demanded in his note. The German Government voluntarily halted the unpopular submarine warfare although a shocking sinking off the Irish coast almost upset the negotiations. According to Colonel House, President Wilson did not desire a vengeful peace. Nor did he desire to have the Allies ravage Germany as Germany had ravaged other countries, insisting "No stain of this sort should rest upon the Allied arms." Wrote Colonel House:

He is very fine in his feeling and I am sorry he is hampered in any way by the Allies and the vociferous outcry in this country. It is difficult to do the right thing in the right way with people clamoring for the undesirable and impossible.

The New York Times, according to Mr. Rudin, protested the negotiations in an editorial entitled "Ferocity Asks for Peace." Former President Theodore Roosevelt, in a message to the American people in the New York Times demanded that negotiations be stopped, declaring President Wilson should demand unconditional surrender. He concluded, "Let us adopt as our motto unconditional surrender." The New York Times adopted the motto in an editorial, writing, "Surrender, not an armistice, must be the condition precedent to any talk of peace." Senator Lodge introduced a Senate resolution prohibiting further communication with the German Government upon the subject of an armistice or conditions of peace, except a demand for unconditional surrender.

The intrepid President Wilson, nevertheless, sent to Germany a favorable reply, but making the additional demands called by Ludendorff a demand for unconditional surrender, that during the armistice Allied supremacy must be guaranteed and that there must be a discontinuance of various acts of inhumanity. He also made the following further demand which the puzzled Germans finally interpreted as a demand for abdication by their Kaiser:

The destruction of every arbitrary power anywhere that can separately, secretly, and on its single choice disturb the peace of the world; or if it cannot be presently destroyed, at least its reduction to virtual impotency.

This salutary war aim, by the way, though it is probably a sine qua non of durable world peace, was not incorporated by Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt among their ideals as expressed in the Atlantic Charter, now become a scrap of paper.

The German Government continued to accept every new demand made by President Wilson. The negotiations caused German morale to disintegrate. German sailors, learning that the German Navy secretly planned to "negotiate with

arms" and secure better terms for Germany through a new naval offensive, mutinied, because they did not want to jeopardize the negotiations for peace. Last July, German soldiers, led by high-ranking officers, revolted against Hitler. But we, unlike the Russians, failed to cooperate with these anti-Hitlerites, and instead, held out for the meaningless unconditional surrender and thus helped Hitler revivify his leadership.

Looking back at our experience in World War No. 1, who can believe that fighting bloodily and blindly on until unconditional surrender would have secured better peace terms than were achieved by President Wilson? Certainly, through his negotiated peace, he secured from the Germans every concession he asked. The important thing that nobody seems to understand is that when you obtain everything you demand, you have dictated the peace whether or not it is negotiated. Why then does our President in this war condemn negotiated peace and insist upon nothing less than unconditional surrender? According to the press, it was President Roosevelt who insisted at Casablanca that Mr. Churchill agree that the peace terms should be unconditional surrender. But why? Why?

Of course, it is not because Theodore Roosevelt's motto has become a family motto—that would be facetious. Surely it is not because the American people today are hampering and making it difficult to do the right thing in the right way by demanding the undesirable and impossible, because they are not. Newspapers and columnists have flayed and ridiculed the unconditional-surrender policy. Today the American people are not war mad. I doubt if they ever were. Neither are our soldiers. It is well known that the unconditional-surrender policy encourages increasing and continuing resistance. In World War No. 1 members of the German Government were completely agreed that if negotiations failed they would fight on and never surrender.

Why, then, does our President insist upon the unconditional-surrender policy advocated in World War No. 1 by so-called isolationists? The President knows that every single leader of the so-called isolationists of today hates the unconditional-surrender policy since experience and common sense demonstrate that it costs American lives unnecessarily.

The unconditional surrender policy is an anachronism. What reason can there be for it? If it is because the President does not know what terms he wants to impose upon Germany, then multitudes of American soldiers may die needlessly because the President has not made up his mind what our soldiers are fighting for.

Recently we saw German resistance stiffen because of the revelation of the Morgenthau plan. But the American people have not been told that the reason was because it seemed to confirm the devilish Nazi dogma which says that unconditional surrender means the shattering of Germany into Communistic revolutionary chaos with middle-class people being killed or carried off into Russian slavery. Germans are seeing neighboring countries liberated only to fall into the hands of Stalin through internal revolution. They know that Stalin's army killed or carried into slavery worse than death, great numbers of anti-Nazi Poles and Lithuanians. They know that they, the German people themselves—the hated enemy—need expect a fate no better and probably worse.

If Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt intend to impose upon the German people a fate less harsh than chaos, death, and slavery worse than death, they owe it to our gallant fighting men to spare our servicemen needless suffering by saying so plainly, unequivocally, and reliably. Can they? Unfortunately, President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, to say nothing of Stalin, have not kept to the high moral level of trustworthiness as did Woodrow Wilson. Their evasive dealings with Polish and Yugoslavian agreements and the Atlantic Charter have greatly discredited them. Therefore, the task is perhaps the most difficult, though, perhaps, also the most important they have yet undertaken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

EFFECTIVE USE OF MANPOWER—INDUCTION OF QUALIFIED IV-F DRAFTEES FOR LIMITED SERVICE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. It provides in substance that all male citizens classified in the category of IV-F under examinations given for the purpose of inducting men into the armed forces and not engaged in essential war activity be reexamined with a view of giving such men who are physically and mentally capable of doing so the opportunity to perform noncombatant or limited duties and activities that are now being performed by members of the armed forces.

During the past 2 years the attention of this body, and in fact the attention of the entire Nation, has been directed to the tremendous waste of one of our most precious but seemingly unlimited resources—manpower. I have always considered the waste of manpower a disgrace to this country. I realize a certain amount of it cannot be helped, but of all places it ought to be at a minimum in the armed forces and on the civilian pay rolls of the Federal Government.

Our newspapers and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS are replete with findings of the House Civil Service Committee, upon which I have the honor of being a member, also the Byrd committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress, the War Investigating Committee, not to mention the findings of individual Members of Congress, all pointing to the waste of funds and manpower in Government activities. Much of it is due to duplication, multiplication, and unnecessary activities, lack of organization, especially by our civilian departments of government. And yet with all of this waste of manpower, the selective service has found it necessary to draft workers from the farms of the Nation and from the war plants in order to meet draft quotas.

Now we find a demand for national-service legislation to serve manpower problems of the Nation. Before taking such drastic action it seems to me that we should first give consideration to the hundreds of thousands of men in the IV-F category engaged in nonessential activities who, through no fault of their own, have been prevented from becoming members of the armed forces and who could and are willing to render such service if given a chance to do so. Last week the President of the United States made the following statement:

> Pending action by the Congress of the broader aspects of national service, I recommend that the Congress immediately enact legislation which will be effective in using the services of the 4,000,000 men now classified as IV-F in whatever capacity is best for the war effort.

It seems to me the suggestions that have been offered with respect to the IV-F group is contrary to American principles of fair play and common decency. Under the legislation I have submitted, I am proposing the induction of IV-F's who are not now engaged in essential war activities. I do not believe that they should be inducted in enforced labor battalions without the rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to other members of the armed forces whether they see military action or not. I do not believe that such method is the way to solve the manpower problem in an American way, especially as it affects this particular group of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have never believed that service in our great Army or Navy ought to be used as a club over any citizen in the United States. It has always been considered an honor and a privilege to be a member of the armed forces of the United States. I resent the idea that any citizen, whether his body be less physically perfect than his brother's or not, should be subjected to the humiliation of being discriminated against in the manner that has been suggested from certain sources. I say, let their services be utilized in the armed forces just as far as may be done.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few men in the IV-F category who have been rejected because they desired it. Many of the Members of this House have received correspondence asking how men on the borderline may get into the military service. There are many others who have been commissioned as officers in the Army and Navy who might today be in the category of IV-F except they are not used in combat service.

Mr. Speaker, the IV-F group have no lobby or organization to express their views as to what should be done with about 4,000,000 men of draft age. Of course, they should be doing war work, and a lot of them are in war work at the present time. But those capable of performing duties now performed by members of the armed forces ought to have a chance to do it.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing the waste of manpower in the departments of our Government, and further recognizing there are hundreds of thousands of noncombatant activities that are being performed by the military and naval personnel of the armed forces, such as clerks, accountants, lawyers, chemists, public relations men, investigators, auditors, personnel, teachers, waiters, chauffeurs, mechanics, clean-up men, and so forth, who have been inducted in the general military service; I have introduced an amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1940 to completely utilize as far as can be done all of the IV–F's not now engaged in essential war activities and place them in noncombatant activities which can easily be performed by them without denying them the rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to other military personnel.

This amendment definitely provides that no claim can be made by reason of any physical deficiency that such person might have when he joins the service. The Government is definitely protected against any additional burden because such inductee might not be as physically fit as those qualified as combat troops.

Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to draft essential men from the farms or from war plants of this country and before starting to organize labor batallions, we ought to give these men a chance to serve in the armed forces where they are qualified to do so. It is estimated on good authority that at least 1,000,000 of these men in the IV–F classification can be utilized in the performance of duties that are now being performed by members of our armed forces who have passed the regular physical requirements.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think that before taking drastic action with respect to this particular group, it would be well to utilize the services of thousands of civilian employees who are performing services that are not absolutely essential in the war effort. There are such services as also many thousands of others who are not needed because of duplication and multiplication of effort.

Mr. Speaker, it is my proposal that only those who are physically qualified to do so may be used to perform services in the armed forces, and that thereby no additional burden be placed on the Government by reason of their induction, anymore than from other members of the armed forces. The Government can be amply protected in this respect. There is no reason, in my judgment, why the services of a million men, if needed, cannot be used in our armed forces, and at the same time prevent the discrimination against men who can perform such services and are anxious to do so. Putting them into labor batallions is not the American way of handling the problem.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Military Affairs give immediate consideration to the proposal I have submitted.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What about the million or more persons on the Federal pay roll whose services might be dispensed with and placed in essential war work? That is a serious problem. If we are going to draft labor and not touch this other problem, it seems to me we are failing in our duty.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I have always maintained on the floor of the House and in the Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, that our own Government is one of the biggest wasters of manpower. We understand that in order to carry on the many functions and to perform the many duties a tremendous number of workers is required. But even at that, we are employing more people than necessary because many activities are being carried on that are not absolutely necessary at this crucial time. The Government is doing things that are not necessary at the present time under war conditions; furthermore, we have much duplication, and, as I said a moment ago, multiplication in the performance of Government duties that we are wasting manpower and using more than is necessary. This should not be permitted. The Government should be the first one to set the pace in the saving and utilization of manpower.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have an additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that in connection with the drafting of nurses the Veterans' Administration must be amply protected, The nurses must not be taken from the Veterans' Administration and put into the Army or Navy. It would be very tragic to take nurses from the Veterans' Administration that has the care of the men when they come there. There are enough nurses to go around, and certainly the Veterans' Administration should be included in any draft legislation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has given careful study to this question, as she does to all matters for the protection of the service men and women of this country. She knows the problem and her views on that particular question would command the highest respect of the membership of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am perfecting an amendment to cover the situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include as a part of my remarks an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'HARA addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, from January 10 to January 15, 1945, on account of business in probate court.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article entitled "E Pluribus Unum," a trade-barrier discussion by R. J. Goode, for which I have an estimate from the Government Printer of $130. I ask that this article may be included notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article and also a letter I received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if it is contemplated allowing Members of the Congress to question General of the Army Marshall and Admiral of the Fleet King, when they come before the Congress? I would like very much to ask questions concerning the transportation of supplies.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, speaking as an individual, would think that the first time General Marshall and Admiral King come before the Congress it might be better if we allowed them to go along without interruption and decide that question later.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it would be extremely helpful if we could ask questions that I am sure the whole country is interested in.

I have a lot of faith in my colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.)

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

97. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries for the quarter ending April 1, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

98. A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill to relieve the housing manager of three Federal Public Housing Authority projects of financial responsibility for the loss of public funds and to authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to credit in the account of said housing manager, the sum of $4,762.97, for which he is accountable; to the Committee on Claims.

99. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the fifty-eighth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission to Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

100. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act, copies of final valuations of properties of certain carriers subject to the act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

101. A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1271. A bill to amend section 7 of the act approved December 31, 1941, entitled "An act to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1272. A bill to require the establishment of a classification of freight and a scale of class rates, for application to transportation of property by railroad, so adjusted as not to discriminate among regions or territories in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1273. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1274. A bill to extend veteran-preference benefits with respect to employment by the United States to certain persons, and their wives or widows, who served in the Texas National Guard during the World War; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1275 (by request). A bill to authorize construction of a film-servicing building and vaults; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1276. A bill to establish an Army Agricultural Corps for service in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1277. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 so as to provide for the notification of insured individuals and beneficiaries of the right to elect a certain mode of payment of insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 1278. A bill to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1279. A bill to provide for the expatriation of certain nationals of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1280. A bill to provide a program for the release for combat duty of members of the armed forces qualified for such duty who are now performing limited duty and their replacement by men who are not qualified for combat duty but who are qualified for limited duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1281. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the memory of Will Rogers; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1282. A bill to extend veterans' preference under the civil-service laws and rules; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1283. A bill relating to the traveling expenses of members of the armed forces transferred from one hospital to another at their own request; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1284. A bill to insure adequate medical care for the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1285. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1286. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1938; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1287. A bill to provide that a veteran's compensation, pension, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1288. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to the taxation of retirement annuities paid to certain retired employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Company; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1289. A bill to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, to authorize certain hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men of the armed forces who are peacetime veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1290. A bill to amend section 3475 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1291. A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension payments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 percent for every 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first 6 months of 1940, as computed each 6 months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1292. A bill providing for payments to the State of Wyoming and for rights-of-way, including stock driveways, over and across Federal lands within the exterior boundary of the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1293. A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1294. A bill to provide that the pension, compensation, or retirement pay of veterans of the War with Spain shall not be reduced during hospitalization or receipt of institutional or domiciliary care; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1295. A bill providing for the payment of mileage for certain employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue when traveling on official business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 1296. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1297 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of the Congress that the President accurately stated the principles in the national policy of the United States in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate Federal Government competition with private business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. Res. 68. Resolution to investigate the housing shortage in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 69. Resolution to prevent violation of Selective Service Act in respect to drafting persons engaged in agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. Res. 70. Resolution providing an allocation from the contingent fund of the House to the Committee on Appropriations for expenses of studies and examinations under House Resolution 50; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in the form of a resolution in recognition, appreciation, and gratitude to His Excellency

Charles Harwood, Governor of the Virgin Islands of the United States, for his firm effort and persistence in securing for the Virgin Islands a Federal Public Works authorization for an appropriation of $10,800,000; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Franklin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Morris Fine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1301. A bill for the relief of Madeline Winter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1302. A bill for the relief of Ethel Newton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1303 A bill for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1304. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nettie Peters; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1305. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. Oliver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1306. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 1307. A bill for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1308. A bill for the relief of Sam Swan and Aily Swan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1309. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1310. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Emily Hamilton and Mrs. Kay Graziano; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Rosa Natalia Christopher; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1312. A bill for the relief of John Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Lester B. McAllister and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1314. A bill with reference to certain loans made under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 and to grant certain relief to Florida Citrus Exchange, the Growers Loan & Guaranty Co., and the Guaranty Operating Co.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of B. Pendino; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mattie Lee Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1317. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Crawford Marston; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1318. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eugene Edwin Field; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1319. A bill for the relief of Claybron Holcomb; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1320. A bill for the relief of M. Elizabeth Quay; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1321. A bill for the relief of W. P. Richardson, as successor and assignee of W. P. Richardson & Co., of Tampa, Fla., a partnership composed of W. P. Richardson, George W. Hessler, and L. C. Park, by reason of certain claims arising within the World War period; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1322. A bill for the relief of the Marine Engine Works & Shipbuilding Corporation, of Tarpon Springs, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1323. A bill for the relief of Mark D. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1324. A bill for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1325. A bill for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1326. A bill for the relief of J. Dale Gentry; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1327. A bill for the relief of William Henry Bergmann; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia M. Tonner; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1329. A bill for the relief of William W. Adams, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1330. A bill for the relief of the county of Bergen, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1331. A bill for the relief of the Hatheway Patterson Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1332. A bill for the relief of Jeannette D. Christie; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1333. A bill for the relief of J. P. Haring; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose approval we seek above the hollow applause of men, we pause in the midst of thronging duties and confused issues that Thou might lift upon us the light of Thy countenance. We pray for Thy mercy and Thy cleansing pardon, that a right spirit may be renewed within us, and that we may yearn for spiritual integrity above all the tinsel of material things. Deliver us from the selfishness which shrinks the soul, from the hatred which eats like a canker, from the impurity which blinds eyes to Thee and the Godlike, and from the unbelief which dims the splendor of the glory life may hold.

Save us from the distorted vision which magnifies the mote in our neighbor's eye and ignores the beam in our own and so condemns in others that which we condone in ourselves. May the shining crown for which we strive and for which we gladly give our all be not fame nor riches nor unbridled power, but humility and compassion and unselfish love. So may we come, ascending this hill of solemn responsibility and standing in this holy place of public trust, with clean hands and pure hearts, not lifting up our soul to vanity nor swearing deceitfully. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 6, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator-elect from Massachusetts, Gov. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, is present and prepared to take the oath of office. I request that he be permitted to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I announce that my colleague, Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, reelected to the Senate last November, is present and ready to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senators-elect from Massachusetts and Louisiana will present themselves at the desk, the oath will be administered to them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL, escorted by Mr. WALSH, and Mr. OVERTON, escorted by Mr. ELLENDER, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

RESIGNATION FROM A JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask to be relieved from further service on the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I regret to make this request, and in making it I am fully aware of the importance of the work of the committee; but in view of other committee assignments which I have, and in the light of anticipated additional committee work in conjunction with the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I am regretfully making this request.

THE MANPOWER AND LABOR SITUATION

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I have a very interesting letter from the vice president and general manager of the Beech Aircraft Corporation, at Wichita, Kans., which has to do with manpower and labor. I should like permission to have the clerk read the letter to the Senate, if I may. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the letter to the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

BEECH AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
Wichita, Kans., January 2, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Vice President-elect of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRUMAN: We again see discussions in the public print about war manpower mobilization by directive or executive decrees, or even by possible congressional action. Because there seems to be a school of thought in certain circles in Washington which contends that war production would be benefited by forced recruitment of war workers, we wish to respectfully submit our opinions based upon practical experience.

During the months of October and the early part of November, we experienced great difficulty in retaining our working force at a constant level. Terminations increased far beyond previous levels, and an analysis of these terminations indicated that many of them were for the purpose of taking post-war jobs. We consider that this was an entirely natural development which was caused directly by the over-optimistic statements

made by many of the most prominent individuals in positions of high authority among the Allied Nations, with regard to the anticipated early termination of the European war. The public press at that time carried almost nothing but statements about post-war reconversion, cancelation of contracts, termination, cutbacks, and post-war planning. The Government officially acted through its various agencies to continually warn the manufacturer of these factors, and to prepare him for these anticipated events.

It is no wonder that this strong emphasis on the early termination of hostilities should have produced the result which it did produce, that of inducing people to leave war industries to seek peacetime jobs. The reaction was entirely normal for people with American traditions of self-reliance. Our people felt that they could look out for themselves better than any Government agency could look out for them, and therefore they took it upon themselves to find new post-war jobs, even though such jobs paid much less income than the jobs that they were leaving. Anyone who admires the spirit of self-reliance must admit that the action of these people was reasonable and correct under the circumstances then existing.

It was impossible for us to controvert the statements which were published in the newspapers and which were attributed to such persons as General Eisenhower, Winston Churchill, and others of comparable rank, regarding the early termination of hostilities. There was too much weight of reputation behind these statements to permit any counterstatement to carry any important weight in the minds of our employees.

Although we stated that our war contracts were of such a nature that they would continue without interruption, our people simply did not believe that we knew what we were talking about.

The recent reverses in Europe have entirely changed public psychology among war workers. They now know that the former optimistic statements were mistaken and the problem of personnel terminations has been reduced correspondingly. It is our opinion that no drastic manpower controls are necessary under present circumstances, and that the invocation of such drastic controls would do more harm than good.

It should be remembered that there is a certain inertia to governmental opinion and action. It always follows the event by a considerable period of time. This fact is caused by the necessary delay in collecting and correlating statistics, and the development of opinion based upon such statistics. In other words, the Washington opinion of today is based upon the events of October and November, which in turn were caused by unwise public statements made by impressively prominent individuals. We feel that it would be unwise to take action upon the question of drastic manpower controls until a sufficient time has elapsed to actually study the situation which exists at this time and which is steadily improving. On the other hand, we approve of the restrictions which have been put upon nonessential and nonproductive activities, such as race tracks and dog tracks and other activities which produce nothing and which are for amusement only.

It is our opinion that voluntary effort and voluntary cooperation is always far more effective than any form of coerced effort or activity. This was proved in an interesting way about a year ago when we found considerable dissatisfaction among our working force with the regulations concerning the necessity for a formal release from the employer for anyone who wished to take another job. Because we felt that an unwilling employee was not worth keeping, we published a policy statement on all bulletin boards that anyone who did not wish to work for us could obtain a release at once after an interview to determine the causes of his or her dissatisfaction, if any. The percentage of voluntary terminations of employment decreased instead of increased after the publication of this statement; which has been in effect ever since.

We wish to thank you for the opportunity of bringing our opinions to your attention, and hope that they will be of some value to you in connection with consideration of these matters at the Washington level.

With warmest personal regards and with best wishes for a successful and happy new year, we are

Sincerely yours,

BEECH AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
JOHN P. GATY,
Vice President-General Manager.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, it was my privilege, while acting as chairman of the Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, to visit nearly every aircraft factory and nearly all the other factories in the country, and in the factory referred to in the letter just read we found higher morale, from the standpoint of production, labor, and management, than in any other factory. Several other Senators were with us when we made visits on several occasions, and the statement which Mr. Gaty makes in this letter I think is of extreme value in the situation which we are now facing.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PATENT PLANNING COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Patents:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Second Report of the National Patent Planning Commission.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1945.*

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting the Budget for 1946, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the President's Budget message has been transmitted to the Senate, and inasmuch as it was read yesterday in the House, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD of today.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the Budget for the fiscal year 1946 as fighting all over the globe reaches a climax of fury. We on the home front must back our fighting men and women to the limit. That is our supreme duty. At the same time we must look ahead. We must be ready to throw our whole effort into the campaign against Japan as fast as the war in Europe permits. And finally, we must begin plans to transform an all-out war economy into a full-employment peace economy whenever demobilization becomes possible. Programs for all these developments must be considered in budget planning for a period that extends over 18 months.

We must make sure that our armed forces can plan their procurement programs for continuing global war. I shall transmit detailed recommendations for war appropriations by early spring, in time for the Congress to act on these requests before the beginning of the new fiscal year. I estimate now that 73 billion dollars of appropriations and authorizations will be needed for war purposes for the fiscal year 1946.

If the war develops favorably, unobligated balances of war appropriations no longer required for authorized purposes will be placed in reserve and reported to the Congress for repeal or other action under the provisions of present law.

Actual expenditures of the Federal Government depend largely on the course of the war. I have not made in the past, and I shall not now make, any prediction concerning the length of the war. My only prediction is that our enemies will be totally defeated before we lay down our arms. Depending on various assumptions which may reasonably be made with respect to the course of the war, estimates of war expenditures for the fiscal year 1946 range from less than 60 to more than 80 billion dollars. I propose to use 70 billion dollars as a tentative estimate of war expenditures for the fiscal year 1946. I repeat, however—the rate of actual spending must depend on developments on the battle fronts.

For purposes other than war, I am recommending appropriations, in general and special accounts, to cover estimated expenditures of 13 billion dollars.

Total appropriations and authorizations (including reappropriations and permanent appropriations) for war and other purposes reached a peak of 128 billion dollars for the last complete fiscal year that ended June 30, 1944; 97 billion dollars have been appropriated for the current fiscal year; and I estimate now that 87 billion dollars will be recommended to the Congress for the next fiscal year.

Total expenditures for war and other purposes (in general and special accounts and net outlays of Government corporations, excluding debt retirement) were 95 billion dollars during the fiscal year 1944; they are now estimated at 100 billion dollars for the current fiscal year; and, on the basis of the tentative estimates of war expenditures, they will be 83 billion dollars during the fiscal year 1946.

I propose no substantial change in tax legislation at this time. Revenues are expected to decline somewhat under the influence of the estimated decline in expenditures. The Federal debt is estimated to reach 252 billion dollars on June 30, 1945, and 292 billion dollars 12 months later.

The 1946 Budget is summarized in charts and tables following this Message. In the subsequent sections I comment on appropriations, expenditures, and revenues under existing legislation, and make suggestions for future legislation.

THE WAR PROGRAM

EXPENDITURES FOR THE WAR PROGRAM

Early in the war we had the threefold task of building up a new munitions industry in this country, producing the equipment and means of transportation for our expanding armed forces, and aiding our Allies in their resistance against the aggressors. The record today shows that we have spent 28 billion dollars since July 1, 1940, to build munitions factories, cantonments, depots, hospitals, war housing, and for other war construction. Three times the total strength of our Army and Navy at the time of Pearl Harbor is now fighting or deployed overseas. Thirty-six billion dollars of lend-lease aid have been furnished in goods and services to our Allies, who in turn have aided us with approximately 4.5 billion dollars' worth of goods and services.

We have now substantially completed our war construction. Expenditures for war construction, which in the fiscal year 1943 reached a peak of 12.7 billion dollars, are now down to an annual rate of about 2.5 billion dollars. The development of new weapons and increased need for ammunition still require some new plants and equipment, but total outlays for war construction are declining, as shown in the following table:

WAR EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1941–45

Including net outlays of Government corporations

[In billions]

Type of expenditure	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945 [1]
Munitions, including ships	$2.3	$12.7	$42.3	$55.6	$53.8
War construction and war plant:					
Industrial plant and equipment	0.8	4.1	6.7	2.6	1.3
Nonindustrial and military construction	1.4	3.5	6.0	2.0	.9
Total war construction and war plant	2.2	7.6	12.7	4.6	2.2
Pay, subsistence, and other nonmunitions [2]	2.2	8.0	20.1	29.5	33.0
Total war expenditures	6.7	28.3	75.1	89.7	89.0

[1] Revised estimate.
[2] Including agricultural lend-lease and other civilian war activities.

We have also substantially completed the initial equipment of the Army and Navy and their Air Forces. Although we have now a Merchant Marine four times its pre-war tonnage, the terrific strain of global war makes necessary some further addition to the cargo and tanker fleet.

Our forces engaged in battles in Europe and Asia expend munitions at a prodigious rate. The main job now is that of replenishing equipment and supplies and of providing our fighting men with the most up-to-date weapons which can be contrived. Some weapons of which we had sizable inventories only a few months ago must now be produced in increased quantities. More than one-fourth of present war production is in critical items. Untimely relaxation in war production spells greater sacrifice in human lives and delays victory.

Expenditures for pay and subsistence of the armed forces still are increasing because of the higher pay for a larger number of soldiers and sailors stationed overseas. Expenditures for mustering-out payments are also increasing as a result of the considerable turn-over in our forces.

The war expenditure estimate for the fiscal year 1946 also provides for continuance of subsidies paid out of funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assure war output and to stabilize the cost of living. It excludes payments of the Department of Agriculture for the farm price support and related agricultural programs which are discussed elsewhere in the Budget. No allowance is made either for possible addition of new subsidy programs or for discontinuance or reduction of existing programs, although I hope that a reduction will become possible. In accordance with legislation enacted by the last Congress, I shall submit detailed recommendations for these programs at a later date.

War expenditures are expected to decline in the fiscal year 1946; our war construction and initial military equipment are substantially complete, and our supply lines have been filled. The extent of that decline depends on the course of the war. The composition of war expenditures will change considerably in any case.

There has been overoptimistic speculation about the possible cut in war expenditures when major hostilities in Europe end and our main efforts are concentrated on the Japanese campaign. We should make a great mistake if, in our military and budgetary planning, we underestimate the task of defeating Japan. Japan now occupies twice the area which was held by the Nazis in Europe at the peak of their power, an area as large as the continental United States. The population now under Japanese control is more than three times the population of the United States.

The supply lines to the Pacific and Asiatic theater are two and three times the distance to Europe, and the turn-around time for ships has been two-thirds greater. As the battle against Japan mounts, more cargo will have to be shipped over greater distances.

Our task in Europe will not end with the cessation of hostilities there. The war will not be won unless we accept our share of responsibility for the administration of occupied territories and for relief and rehabilitation in the liberated areas. Expenditures for these tasks are part of the war Budget.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE WAR PROGRAM

The uncertainties of war require that the budgets of the military agencies be sufficiently large and flexible to permit them to meet all demands that may arise. Adequate appropriations and contract authorizations enable the war agencies to make commitments and to place procurement contracts far enough ahead for industry to plan the various stages of production. On the other hand, we should, of course, also be prepared to adjust our war programs downward if the development of the war allows.

The Congress has placed administrative controls in the Executive Office of the President by granting authority, under legislation expiring June 30, 1945, to limit personnel in the Federal agencies and has reinforced them by requesting reports on unobligated balances of war appropriations.

There is a considerable time lag between the legislative authorization or appropriation for war supply, the obligation or placement of orders with contractors, and the final payment on delivery of finished munitions. The huge authorizations and appropriations voted by the Congress in the early years of the war enabled the war agencies to place munitions contracts for later delivery. We are now paying for deliveries under these contracts. Unliquidated obligations for the war program totaled 100 billion dollars at the beginning of the fiscal year 1944; they had been reduced at the end of November 1944 to about 66 billion dollars by payment or, in some cases, by cancelation.

Appropriations and authorizations for war purposes, in the general and special accounts, for the fiscal year 1944 were 120 billion dollars. For the fiscal year 1945, they declined to 85 billion dollars, and for the fiscal year 1946 are now tentatively estimated at 73 billion dollars. These totals include reappropriations and contract authorizations required for new obligations. The total war program, measured by such appropriations and authorizations together with net commitments of Government corporations for the fiscal years 1941 through 1946, will total 450 billion dollars, as shown in the following table:

THE WAR PROGRAM

[In billions]

Description	Cumulative from July 1, 1940, to—	
	June 30, 1945	June 30, 1946
Authorizations:		
Appropriations	$362.7	$423.4
Unliquidated contract authorizations	13.1	11.1
Net commitments of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliates [1]	16.5	15.2
Total authorizations	392.3	449.7
Expenditures:		
General and special accounts	279.4	348.8
Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliates (net)	9.4	10.0
Total expenditures	288.8	358.8
Unobligated balances and unliquidated obligations at end of period	103.5	90.9

[1] Gross commitments less withdrawals and cancelations, and less receipts from rents, repayments, and sales.

The estimated appropriations and authorizations for war for the fiscal year 1946 are composed of 59 billion dollars of new appropriations and authorizations, and 14 billion dollars of reappropriations of funds previously appropriated for war but not yet obligated. Unobligated balances of prior-year appropriations and authorizations to the Maritime Commission are adequate to carry

out the merchant ship construction program as now approved. Detailed recommendations for most war activities will be transmitted in the spring.

These tentative estimates of appropriations include provisions for continuing lend-lease aid to our Allies. They are based on the assumption that the Lend-Lease Act will be reenacted prior to its expiration on June 30, 1945.

About one-sixth of present war outlays are for lend-lease and for relief and rehabilitation. We shall continue to provide lend-lease, and our Allies to provide reciprocal aid, to the full extent necessary to win the war. Lend-lease has been and will be an instrument of war; it will be liquidated with the end of the war. But when the war draws to a close in any theater, it may become urgently necessary for us to assist in relieving distress in the liberated areas. Appropriations to the War Department make some provision for civilian supply in territories occupied by the Army, but only to the extent necessary in the interest of military operations. For relief and rehabilitation after the battle lifts, the Congress has already authorized 1,350 million dollars as the contribution of the United States to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. To date, appropriations of 450 million dollars and transfer authorizations from lend-lease of 350 million dollars have been made as our share for immediate needs under this program. If the appropriated amount proves inadequate, we must take additional measures, in cooperation with the other United Nations, to make sure that the peoples of the liberated countries have essential relief from the devastation of war.

Appropriations and Expenditures for Other Than War Activities

AFTERMATH OF WAR

In last year's Budget message, I indicated the inevitable increase of expenditures in the aftermath-of-war category, particularly expenditures for war veterans, interest on the public debt, and tax refunds. Total expenditures for these purposes are increasing from 1.6 billion dollars in 1939 to an estimated 7.2 billion dollars in the current fiscal year, and will probably amount to 9.8 billion dollars in the next fiscal year. This increase arises directly out of the war. The 1946 total is larger than the whole Federal Budget 5 years ago.

Veterans' pensions and benefits.—Although the full impact of the veterans' program will not be felt until the years following demobilization, the total estimated requirements for 1946 of 2,623 million dollars represent about 20 percent of the total appropriations for other than direct war purposes. They are more than double the total appropriated for the veterans' program in the current fiscal year.

Additional appropriations for the current fiscal year will become necessary to cover increased pension costs occasioned by losses in service; to conform with recent legislation increasing coverage and liberalizing payments to veterans of former wars and to their dependents; and to carry out the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. The estimated supplemental appropriations include these items.

Pension costs during the fiscal year 1946 are expected to increase sharply to a toal of 1,080 million dollars, and the costs of education, readjustment allowances, and loan guarantees to 295 million dollars. In addition, 1,000 million dollars are provided for losses resulting from the hazards of the war among holders of national service life insurance policies and 85 million dollars for construction and reconditioning of hospital facilities. This hospital construction program (shown in the Budget under General Public Works), together with Army facilities later to be made available to the Veterans' Administration, may ultimately provide 300,000 beds.

The time and rate of demobilization will greatly affect the expansion of education, readjustment allowance, loan guarantee, and rehabilitation activities of the Veterans' Administration. The number of veterans of the present war will increase until at full tide these veterans will constitute one-tenth of the population and almost one-fourth of the labor force. The responsibility which we are assuming for their jobs, education, medical care, and financial assistance makes it increasingly essential that these programs for veterans be integrated with other programs of like nature affecting the whole Nation.

Interest.—Interest on the public debt is estimated to rise next year by 750 million dollars to 4,500 million dollars. This rise reflects entirely the current increase in the outstanding debt. No change is anticipated in the low interest rates at which the war is being financed.

Tax refunds.—Refunds of taxes are expected to require a total of 2,725 million dollars, an increase of 556 million dollars over the fiscal year 1945. About 1 billion dollars of this total will consist of repayments to wage and salary earners of withholdings in excess of tax liabilities. Another billion dollars reflects the issuance of post-war bonds which cover the refundable 10 percent of the excess profits tax. Other corporate tax refunds are due to the recomputation of the special amortization allowances for emergency facilities certified to be no longer necessary for war production, and to the carry-back provisions of the corporate income and excess profits tax laws. The refunds arising from these provisions for corporate tax relief will reach full volume only in future years.

AGRICULTURE

Agricultural production has continued at record levels for 3 successive war years. Farm income has been more than 135 percent of parity throughout the period. To assure continued production at a high level, I recommend appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, including the War Food Administration, of 512 million dollars. Although this is considerably less than has been appropriated in the fiscal year 1945, the amount available, after adjustments for unused balances, reappropriations, and transfers, will not be substantially less than the amount being used for agricultural purposes in this fiscal year. The appropriations include provision for the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farm Security Administration, the exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, the administration of the Sugar Act, and research and other long-established functions of the Department of Agriculture. They do not include provision for potential net expenditures of either the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Of the 512 million dollars recommended, 10 million dollars for the War Food Administration are designated for war activities and 10 million dollars are for General Public Works.

Anticipating the needs of returning war veterans and the desirability for providing adequate assistance to small, low-income farmers, I recommend that the borrowing authority of the Farm Security Administration be increased from 67 to 125 million dollars for rural rehabilitation and from 15 to 50 million dollars for the tenant purchase program. I recommend that the borrowing authority of the Rural Electrification Administration be increased from 25 to 150 million dollars in order to permit the extension of electricity to at least part of the 6 million rural families now without such service. I have already given my approval to a recommendation of the War Food Administrator for an increase of 2 billion dollars in borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I shall recommend appropriations for financing the revived program for crop insurance in the very near future.

This agricultural budget is a wartime budget. It does not fully reflect desirable long-time objectives. In the future, we must develop a program to eliminate malnutrition and rural poverty. The Government is committed to support agricultural prices to farmers at a fair level for 2 years after the war. Farmers and the Nation as a whole must be protected from heavy fluctuations in agricultural prices and income, and this must be accomplished without the accumulation of unmanageable surpluses. So long as a large number of people have an inadequate diet, we cannot have a true surplus of agricultural production. We can have only too much of the wrong things.

SOCIAL SECURITY, RETIREMENT, AND EDUCATION

Social security.—Appropriations for administration and grants under the social security program are estimated at 494 million dollars for the fiscal year 1946, an increase of 14 million dollars over the fiscal year 1945. This increase is largely for higher grants to match payments of the States under the Social Security Act.

I hope that the Congress will give early consideration to extension and improvement of our social security system and will reexamine the financial basis of the program.

Retirement funds.—Appropriations for the Government employees' retirement funds are estimated at 247 million dollars for the fiscal year 1946, an increase

of 50 million dollars over the current fiscal year. This will reduce the previously accrued liabilities of the Government to these trust funds and will also provide for an increase in the number of employees currently acquiring benefit rights.

Education.—As a part of the Budget for the fiscal year 1946, I am recommending reorganization of the basic structure of the Office of Education. This reorganization will facilitate service to the States in the development of more adequate educational programs with proper emphasis on all the various aspects of education.

The training and educational programs of the Army, the Navy, and civilian agencies during this war have broadened our conception of the role that education should play in our national life. The records of selective service reveal that we have fallen far short of a suitable standard of elementary and secondary education. If a suitable standard is to be maintained in all parts of the country, the Federal Government must render aid where it is needed—but only where it is needed. Such financial aid should involve no interference with State and local control and administration of educational programs. It should simply make good our national obligation to all our children. This country is great enough to guarantee the right to education adequate for full citizenship.

PUBLIC WORKS

Recommended appropriations under the General Public Works Program in the fiscal year 1946 total 279 million dollars, 93 million dollars more than appropriated for the current year. Balances brought forward from public works appropriations of several years ago are about used up. Even with the recommended new appropriations, the program as a whole will be limited; actual construction will continue to be restricted to those projects which contribute to the war effort. Because of the completion of some of this war-related construction, expenditures are estimated to decrease slightly in the next fiscal year.

I recommend, however, appropriations for the planning of public works which the Congress has already authorized. We must continue to stock up a shelf of meritorious construction and development projects to be undertaken as manpower and material become available. By the end of the current fiscal year, detailed plans will be ready for about 1.5 billion dollars of Federal public works, and also will be substantially ready for a billion-dollar program of Federal-aid highways, half of this road program to be financed with State funds. We need a larger shelf of detailed plans in order to be prepared for the post-war period. Hence, appropriations for 1946 are recommended to make possible the completion of additional plans for highways, flood control, river development, stream pollution control, power transmission, reclamation, hospital, and other construction, as authorized by law. Further requests for funds for detailed planning of Federal projects will be made on Congressional authorization.

Plans have been completed or are in the design stage for about 3 billion dollars of State and local public works, excluding Federal-aid highways. The War Mobilization and Reconversion Act authorizes funds for Federal loans and advances which would make it possible to place further projects on the shelf of planned public works. The extent to which Federal funds are needed to enable States and localities to plan adequately for useful public works is now being reexamined, and I shall soon transmit a new recommendation concerning funds for these purposes.

In addition, programs are being developed for Federal loans and guarantees to stimulate private construction after the war. Guarantees and loans already available under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act will encourage residential, commercial, and farm building.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

The civil departments and agencies of the Federal Government have been fully geared to the war effort. Appropriations for other than direct war or war-related activities have been reduced to rock-bottom. When the war situation permits a reduction in the war program, it will also be possible to reduce war activities of the civil departments. Such activities should be curtailed wherever possible. The Bureau of the Budget has been instructed to review currently the activities of the various Government agencies and to recommend such changes as become desirable in light of changing war requirements.

Agencies which will play a leading role in the peace effort must begin preparations for a progressively larger job. I recommend, for instance, an increase in the appropriations for the Department of State in order that it may be more adequately staffed at home and abroad. To prepare for the expected increase in workload, increases in appropriations are recommended for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, and a few other agencies.

Recommended appropriations for general Government for the fiscal year 1946 are slightly below those enacted for the current fiscal year. If supplemental appropriations for overtime pay are adopted, requirements for general Government may be somewhat above those for the current year.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS—OTHER THAN WAR ACTIVITIES

Receipts of Government corporations (excluding war activities) will exceed expenditures for purposes other than debt retirement by 27 million dollars in the fiscal year 1946, and by 244 million dollars in the current fiscal year.

The operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with the farm and food programs require net outlays of 1 billion dollars during the current fiscal year. This assumes a supplemental appropriation of 256 million dollars to restore impaired capital of the Corporation. The estimate for the fiscal year 1946 provides for net expenditures of 572 million dollars which will absorb practically all the funds available to the Corporation under its present maximum borrowing authority of 3 billion dollars. If the Congress approves the pending recommendation for a further increase in the borrowing authority, increased operations of the Corporation may result in additional net expenditures in the fiscal year 1946.

Activities of other Government corporations are expected to show smaller net receipts than during the fiscal year 1945. Liquidation of pre-war loans and other assets will probably taper off. Some expansion in the nondefense lending activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is also anticipated. The net receipts of Government corporations, in both the fiscal years 1945 and 1946, reflect substantial transfers of funds necessary to retire outstanding obligations of the Federal land banks.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Most of the Federal civilian employees are engaged in essential war work and must stay on the job as long as the war lasts. Government war services have suffered in recent months by departure of personnel, partly because of overoptimism about early victory, partly because of concern about employment opportunities after the war.

The total number of paid Federal employees in the continental United States in November 1944 was slightly under 2,900,000, of whom 2,040,000 were in the War and Navy Departments and other war agencies and 836,000 in the Post Office and other peacetime establishments. The total has declined 126,000 below the peak of June 1943. There will be further reductions as the course of the war permits, but our main concern at the present moment is to keep essential Government personnel on the job.

Anticipated supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 include about 500 million dollars as an approximation of the additional cost of overtime pay and other salary adjustments, assuming enactment of such pay legislation as the Congress may authorize to replace those present acts which expire June 30, 1945. This allowance has not been allocated among the detailed war and other appropriation estimates to which it relates. The Budget estimates of personnel needs, expressed in "man-years," do, however, assume continuance of the present workweek, generally 48 hours. Under the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943, salaried employees are compensated for hours worked in excess of 40 a week. With but minor exceptions, basic salary rates have not been increased during the war.

In contrast to salaried employees, the skilled and unskilled workers, such as those in navy yards and arsenals, have had wage adjustments which have approximately kept pace with wage rates for comparable work in private industry. They have also received overtime pay at true time and one-half rates.

The third large category of Federal employees—the postal workers—in addition to receiving overtime compensation at straight-time rates, has been granted a wartime bonus.

Prior to the expiration of the overtime pay law, the Congress should reexamine the entire subject of hours of work and pay. Regardless of the progress of the war in Europe, many Federal employees will continue to be needed on a 48-hour work schedule, and provision must be made for their overtime compensation. I recommend that the Congress enact permanent legislation which would authorize overtime compensation at true time and one-half rates.

When at some future date it becomes possible for most Federal employees to go on a 40-hour workweek, their earnings will be materially reduced. A situation of hardship and unfairness will then exist unless an increase in basic salary rates has been granted in recognition of the rise in the cost of living. I recommend a prompt reexamination of Federal salary rates with a view to making adjustments consistent with the national stabilization policy.

BUDGET TOTALS

The discussion of expenditures for the war and for all other purposes lays the basis for presenting the Budget totals and for an analysis of the impact of the Federal Budget on the national economy as a whole.

EXPENDITURES

Of the total estimated expenditures, including net outlays of Government corporations, of 83 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1946, 84 percent are for direct war purposes; 12 percent are for veterans, interest on the public debt, and tax refunds; and only 4 percent for all other activities of the Federal Government. Expenditures in this last group of "other activities" are estimated at 3.3 billion dollars, somewhat less than for the current fiscal year; they are only about one-half of what they were in the years before the start of the defense program—largely because of the reduction in work relief, aids to youth, and general public works.

NET RECEIPTS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1946 UNDER EXISTING LEGISLATION

Net receipts in general and special accounts under existing legislation are expected to decline from 45.7 billion dollars in the current fiscal year to 41.3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1946. This development reflects, in large part, the 17-billion-dollar decrease in expenditures estimated in this Budget. Such a decrease in expenditures before full reconversion to civilian production will mean smaller individual incomes and corporate profits. This, in turn, will bring a decrease in receipts from individual income taxes and from corporate taxes. Because the present law will expire June 30, 1945, receipts from recovery of excessive profits from renegotiated war contracts will taper off during the fiscal year 1946. I recommend that the Congress extend the authority to renegotiate war contracts.

Receipts from excises and customs are expected to continue at about the same level in the fiscal year 1946 as in the current fiscal year. Sales of surplus Government-owned war supplies and property are beginning to yield substantial amounts. These receipts will be still larger in later fiscal years.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TAX LEGISLATION

Wartime taxes must be maintained as long as large-scale war expenditures are necessary. There is no justification for tax reductions as long as we are engaged in a major war. When a favorable development of the war allows a major decline in war expenditures, minor tax adjustments will become possible and desirable. I am pleased that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is studying the tax problems of the transition and post-war period.

BORROWING IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1946

Borrowing requirements during the fiscal year 1946 will amount to an estimated 40 billion dollars, compared with 51 billion dollars in the current fiscal year. Federal trust funds will have 5 billion dollars available for investment in Government securities, thus leaving 35 billion dollars to be borrowed from individuals and financial and other institutions. These estimates assume that the Treasury general fund balance, which amounted to 20 billion dollars at the end of the fiscal year 1944, will be reduced by 5 billion dollars during the current fiscal year, and by 2 billion dollars during the fiscal year 1946. They also assume that retirement of guaranteed obligations of Government corporations held outside the Treasury will be almost completed by June 30, 1945.

These large borrowing operations will require a further rise in the public debt to 292 billion dollars on June 30, 1946. Before the debt reaches this figure, a further increase in the 260-billion-dollar debt limit will be necessary.

Management of the public debt has become one of the major financial operations of the Government. To assure effective discharge of these responsibilities and, in particular, to maintain the present low rates of interest, ample powers must be available to the monetary authorities. I shall later recommend legislation reducing the present high gold-reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks.

The management of the public debt is bound to have a profound influence on the economy for a long time to come. Retaining high taxes on the masses of consumers for general reduction of debt held by financial institutions may destroy purchasing power and create unemployment. But the use of progressive taxes for the redemption of bonds held by millions of individual savers may have a stabilizing influence on incomes and employment. I favor a policy of orderly but steady debt reduction, consistent with the objectives of long-run economic policy. The mistakes in debt management and tax policy after the last war should not be repeated.

ECONOMIC CONTROLS AND RECONVERSION

RECONVERSION

As long as we are at war—at war against two powerful enemies or against only one of them—we will give unqualified priority to all war production and to all manpower needs of war. Nevertheless, some reconversion of war industries may become possible, dependent on the progress of the war.

The foundation for dealing with the main reconversion problems has been laid by the Contract Settlement Act, the Surplus Property Act, and the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act; the machinery for the administration of these acts is being put in operation. Still, a great many problems remain to be solved if we are to be ready for successful reconversion. We may have a scarcity of manpower in certain industries and regions, while temporary unemployment may develop in others. We may have surpluses of some commodities and a downward tendency in certain prices, particularly of raw materials, while scarcities cause a continuing upward pressure on other prices.

The human side of reconversion requires effective organization to aid each discharged war veteran and war worker to find his way back into productive peacetime employment. As far as veterans are concerned, the basis is laid by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. I have already emphasized the need to strengthen our social security program. With respect to the reconversion period, I am particularly concerned over the fact that broad categories of workers are not covered by present legislation and that present standards for unemployment compensation are not adequate in many States. To promote employment opportunities and to assure the proper occupational adjustment of returning veterans and war workers, a strong, integrated system of public employment offices is a basic necessity. We can best accomplish this objective by the establishment, through permanent legislation, of an effective national employment service with adequate coverage throughout the Nation. For the reconversion period we should provide assistance for travel and retraining of war workers.

We must also see to it that our administrative machinery for the adjustment of labor disputes is ready for the strains of the reconversion period. We must apply some of our wartime lessons in labor-management cooperation in working out a sound long-range labor policy implemented by permanent mediation machinery for the adjustment of labor disputes.

The material side of reconversion should also be conducted with a view toward the long-range objectives of economic policy. Surplus property disposal should contribute to filling the needs of production, domestic and foreign. It should be carried on with full recognition of the objectives of price stability.

Every effort should be made to achieve full civilian use of plants built for war purposes when they are no longer needed for war production and to facilitate their rapid transfer to private industry for productive use. If prompt transfers of ownership cannot be made, temporary lease arrangements may facilitate early productive use while permanent ar-

rangements for transfer are being worked out.

Statistical information concerning business activities and markets, employment and unemployment, incomes, expenditures, and savings is urgently needed as a guide for economic policies during the remainder of the war and during the reconversion and post-war periods. I recommended appropriations for this purpose to the last Congress. I shall transmit recommendations in the near future for those essential parts of the program on which the Congress took no action. Business, agriculture, labor, and the Government need to know the basic economic facts if each is to play its role with maximum effectiveness during the months and years ahead.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL PROGRAMS

As the war progresses, we must hasten our plans to secure world-wide economic cooperation in both the transition period and the post-war period. We have learned that just as the United States cannot afford to be isolationist in its political philosophy, neither can it stand the malignant effects of economic isolationism.

Last July the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference formulated articles of agreement for the establishment of an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These institutions will be integral parts of a broad program for cooperation among the United Nations in those areas of economic contact where failure to adopt common policies will result in economic "spite fences," economic waste, and economic warfare.

A concrete program for international monetary and financial cooperation at an early date is essential. In the first place, all countries agree that a solution must be found for the evils that stem from the unstable and destructive exchange practices which the Fund is designed to eliminate. Second, the need for international investment is already becoming acute. The liberated countries will require loans for the reconstruction of their industry, their transport, their cities, their agriculture, and their trade. The International Bank will make direct long-term loans out of its capital or from borrowed funds, and particularly will guarantee private loans for these purposes. While the proceeds of these loans will be spent to procure equipment in the countries where it is available, the risks of lending will be spread equitably among all member countries.

It is therefore imperative that both the Fund and the Bank be established at once in order that they may be properly staffed and equipped to cope with problems which are already developing as the countries in Europe are liberated. Accordingly, I urge acceptance of the agreements and recommend the enactment of legislation which would permit the United States to make its proportionate investment in the Fund and the Bank.

In addition to the operations of the International Bank, there will continue to be many types of foreign investment in which a national financial institution such as the Export-Import Bank should participate, especially during the next few years when the foreign demand for our products will be particularly heavy. The Export-Import Bank will provide short- and medium-term credits to finance our exporters. It will also undertake long-term lending for reconstruction and development in cases where special American purposes are to be served and other countries may not wish to participate. In collaboration with private banks, manufacturers, engineers, and exporters, the Export-Import Bank has had 10 years of successful experience in these fields. At present its resources available for new operations are very limited. In order that it may play its part in the reconstruction period, I recommend early expansion of its lending power.

At present our foreign investment programs are impeded by legislation which restricts loans to those countries which are in default on loans arising out of the first World War. For both the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank to operate effectively, as well as to achieve an adequate flow of private investment, it is essential that these restrictions be removed.

NATIONAL INCOME, PRODUCTION, AND ECONOMIC CONTROLS

The American Nation has almost doubled its total output of goods and services under the impact of the war program. Slightly less than one-half of this total output is purchased by the Federal Government. What is left for civilian consumption has been sufficient to provide most of us with better living standards than prevailed before the war.

The national economy is operating at extremely high levels of income and expenditure. Despite wartime taxes and large wartime savings, consumers and business have sought to buy more than the available supply of goods and services. Nevertheless, prices have been substantially stabilized through vigorous application of our stabilization program and the cooperation of the American people. Whereas the cost of living has increased by between 25 and 30 percent since 1939, it has risen only about 2 percent since the "hold the line" order of April 1943. Holding the line on prices and wages has prevented, and is still preventing, inflationary developments.

The reduction in war expenditures, which I hope the progress of the war will permit during the next fiscal year, will result in somewhat lower wartime incomes, even if wage ceilings are adjusted upward to avoid reduction in average hourly rates when overtime is curtailed. Nevertheless, the demand for goods and services will undoubtedly still be great and we can be sure of eager buyers for whatever durable goods industry might produce.

When war production is extensively reduced some of the controls which were needed in an all-out war economy can be relaxed, although other controls must be continued to assure necessary war production and orderly reconversion. For example, we must avoid speculation in inventories such as contributed to the inflation after the last war. The fact that many businesses and individuals have ample funds for a buying spree necessitates caution in relaxing controls. The balance between incomes, savings, and expenditures will still be precarious during the reconversion period. It will therefore be necessary to retain the machinery for allocation and price controls as long as certain materials and finished goods are in short supply. I therefore recommend extension of the Economic Stabilization Act before its expiration on June 30, 1945.

In general, it will be our policy to hold the over-all cost of living and to permit only such adjustments as are conducive to the full utilization of available resources and compatible with the general objective of economic stabilization. As long as we are engaged in a war with desperate and resourceful enemies, war controls are needed, but they must be readjusted to changing levels of war production and civilian production.

DEMOBILIZATION AND POST-WAR FULL EMPLOYMENT

Large-scale demobilization can hardly be expected to begin during the period covered in this Budget. Nevertheless, as we continue to mobilize for a long, hard war, we must under no circumstances be caught unprepared for peace.

Under the impact of a huge war program, we are employing 52 million men and women either in war production or in production and service for civilian purposes, while another 12 million are serving in the armed forces. After the war many of them will retire or resume their schooling or devote themselves to their homes and families. But such reduction in the civilian labor force will be more than offset by demobilization of our armed forces and by the natural growth of the population of working age. Thus, before long there may be 60 million men and women to be employed. Huge war expenditures have brought full employment, more than full employment. What will be the outlook when Federal expenditures are 50 and 25 billion dollars in the period of demobilization and thereafter?

The following table shows the operations of our national economy—the Nation's Budget—in the calendar year 1939 with considerable unemployment, and the same operations in the calendar year 1944 when we had moved to a much higher level of incomes, expenditures, and savings, involving more than full employment under the stress of war. Manifestly, full employment in peacetime can be assured only when the reduction in war demand is approximately offset by additional peacetime demand from the millions of consumers, businesses, and farmers, and by Federal, State, and local governments. And that means that consumers' expenditures and business investments must increase by about 50 percent, measured in constant prices, above the level of the year 1939 if full employment is to be provided by private enterprise.

THE GOVERNMENT'S BUDGET AND THE NATION'S BUDGET

Calendar years 1939 and 1944

[Current prices,[1] in billions]

Economic group	Calendar year 1939			Calendar year 1944		
	Receipts	Expenditures	Excess (+), deficit (−)	Receipts	Expenditures	Excess (+), deficit (−)
CONSUMERS						
Income after taxes	$67.3			$132.8		
Expenditures		$61.7			$97.0	
Savings (+)			+$5.6			+$35.8
BUSINESS						
Undistributed profits and reserves	$8.3			$12.3		
Gross capital formation		$10.9			$2.6	
Excess of receipts (+) or capital formation (−)			−$2.6			+$9.7
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT						
Receipts from the public, other than borrowing	$8.9			$10.4		
Payments to the public		$9.1			$8.8	
Excess of receipts (+) or payments (−)			−$0.2			+$1.6
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT						
Receipts from the public, other than borrowing	$6.5			$47.9		
Payments to the public		$9.3			$95.0	
Excess of receipts (+) or payments (−)			−$2.8			−$47.1
Less: Adjustments[2]	*$2.4*	*$2.4*		*$5.9*	*$5.9*	
TOTAL: GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT						
Receipts	$88.6			$197.5		
Expenditures		$88.6			$197.5	
Balance			0			0

[1] Prices in 1944 were between 25 and 30 percent above 1939.
[2] Mainly Government expenditures for other than goods and services.
NOTE.—For details and explanation see appendix 10, pp. 830-831.

Consumers' purchases of durable goods, business nonwar investments, and capital outlays of the governments for nonwar purposes have been so low during recent years that a large backlog of demand will be carried over into the post-war period. Individuals, however, will buy the new car or build the new home only if they feel secure in their jobs; businessmen will expand plants and buy new machinery only if they feel confident of profitable markets for additional products.

The American people have learned during the war the measure of their productive capacity, and they will remember that experience in the peace to come. It is the responsibility of business enterprise to translate market opportunities into employment and production. It is the responsibility of the Government to hold open the door of opportunity and to assure sustained markets. Then and only then can free enterprise provide jobs.

Full employment after the war is not only a matter of immediate self-interest, but also part of our stake in world stability and prosperity. Other countries are anxiously awaiting the development of our policy and will be more willing to make international commitments if they are assured of high post-war employment in the United States. They are fully aware that international cooperation cannot succeed unless the United States is prosperous.

We must attack the employment problem on every front.

For instance, we must overhaul the wartime tax structure to stimulate consumers' demand and to promote business investment. The elements of such a tax program should be developed now so that it can be put into effect after victory.

We must make sure that there are opportunities for new and growing business. The national and international policies which we adopt now—affecting trade, credit, investment, and competition and monopoly—largely determine future business and employment opportunities.

We must develop the human standards and material resources of the Nation, which in turn will tend to increase our productivity and most effectively support business expansion and employment. Our program should include provision for extended social security, including medical care; for better education, public health, and nutrition; for the improvement of our homes, cities, and farms; and for the development of transportation facilities and river valleys. We must plan now so that these programs can become effective when manpower and material are available.

I shall from time to time submit to the Congress recommendations for legislative measures to implement our demobilization program and to assure jobs for all returning war veterans and discharged war workers.

Our productive achievements during the war have demonstrated once and for all the progress which this Nation can support, the progress which will be required if all our resources are to be put to adequate peacetime use. The war, however, will also leave us deep distortions in our economic life which must be overcome. We owe it to those who give everything that we set our sights as high for peace as we set them for war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 3, 1945.

PROPOSED CONGRESSIONAL APARTMENT BUILDINGS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received by me from Mr. N. C. Hines, executive director of the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 9, 1945.*

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate:

Will you kindly announce to the Members of the Congress that the builder members of this association officially offer to build the two proposed congressional apartment buildings in any size and amount with private capital. As has been emphatically pointed out at the previous committee hearings private builders can and will build better housing for less money with more speedy completion, will pay all District and Federal taxes, and will rent under O. P. A. ceilings. All that the Government is asked to do is to give the necessary go-ahead signal, which includes priorities the same as would be asked for the National Housing Authority.

N. C. HINES,
Executive Director, Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington.

MASS SEDITION TRIAL IN WASHINGTON

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on the 8th day of September 1944, I called the attention of the Senators to the mass sedition trial. Unfortunately, it seemed to be one of those subjects which were taboo, and I not only received no support upon the floor of the Senate but various newspapers and individuals criticized me, including even a minister of the gospel at Baltimore.

In view of the criticisms, it is particularly refreshing to note the editorial contained in this week's Saturday Evening Post, published on January 6. The editorial speaks for itself, and is as follows:

LET IT BE OUR LAST MASS TRIAL

It is probable that the Department of Justice long ago realized that the sedition trial in Washington was a particularly obstreperous white elephant, but it was not until the death of the trial judge, Edward C. Eicher, that the Department had the opportunity to cut its losses and save its face. For our part, we hope that this is the last time that American justice is made to look silly by an effort to emulate Nazi-Communist propaganda trials.

The so-called sedition trial was an effort to lump in one basket the sins and irregularities of a variety of cranks and dissenters, ranging all the way from Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling to the late Elmer J. Garner, age 83, who died during the trial in a Washington rooming house, leaving, according to Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, 40 cents as his sole assets. The 30 defendants were accused of various manners and degrees of sedition, but there was no reason to try them en masse, since their alleged unrelated offenses were committed in places as far apart as New York and California. The idea seems to have been to stage a patriotic rally in a courtroom.

Months ago, the Washington Post, which has done its share in ferreting out evidence of actual sabotage, reached the conclusion that the case would "stand as a black mark against American justice for many years to come." A touch of courage in Washington—a willingness to defy the asinine charge that an end to the farce indicated sympathy for traitors and appeasers—would have disposed of the long-drawn-out indignity before it reached the depths of absurdity. As things were, however, only the death of Judge Eicher availed to release American justice from an exhibition far more appropriate to the courtrooms of Berlin and Moscow than to those of the United States of America.

The fact that only the death of the trial judge could put an end to the show must stand as a warning to every citizen that the right to a full and fair trial as an effort to render justice, and not as a means of making a good show to stimulate morale or for some other extraneous purpose, is one which can be maintained only by constant vigilance and labor. The protection of American justice from such showmanship ought to rest on more secure ground than the mortality of Federal judges. Perhaps the poor reception enjoyed by the Washington performance will make its repetition less likely.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am anxious to address the Senate for not more than 30 minutes. I understand that we are in the midst of the morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed at this time, because I have to go to keep other engagements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan that he be permitted to proceed although the Senate is in the midst of the morning hour? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be very glad to yield for the transaction of routine business.

At this point the following routine morning business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL PURSUANT TO SECTION 205, PUBLIC LAW 458, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting pursuant to section 205, Public Law 453, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved October 3, 1944, a preliminary report of the Attorney General (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SPECIAL CONTRACTS WITH RAILROADS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF THE MAILS

A letter from the Postmaster General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report of all cases where special contracts are made with railroad companies for the transportation of the mails, and the terms and reasons therefor; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PURCHASE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR HOME AND OTHER SITES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

SPECIAL STATISTICAL STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of services rendered and funds received to defray cost of special statistical studies, compilation, etc., and the manner in which the moneys received were deposited or used (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

EXPENDITURES OF UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the original of the detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifty-eighth annual report of the Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

FINAL VALUATIONS OF PROPERTIES OF CERTAIN CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of final valuations of properties of certain carriers subject to the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

RELIEF OF FRANCIS X. SERVAITES

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Francis X. Servaites (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

RELIEF OF JAMES M. HILER

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of James M. Hiler (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION—CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO OR MODIFIED

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contracts entered into or modified under Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, cumulative for the period beginning January 1, 1944, and ended December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh report of the Administration covering the period ended September 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth annual report of the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

NAME AND COMPENSATION OF PERSONS EMPLOYED BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the name and compensation of the members and employees of the Federal Power Commission as of June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

A letter from the national corresponding secretary, American War Mothers, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the transactions of the American War Mothers for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1943, and ended September 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Estimates of personnel requirements by various agencies of the Government for the quarter ending March 31, 1945, and estimates and revised estimates for the quarter ended December 31, 1944, and revised estimates for the quarter ended September 30, 1944, by a department of the Government; to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A resolution by the Imperial County Democratic Central Committee, El Centro, Calif., protesting against ratification of the so-called United States-Mexican border water treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, favoring amendment of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands so as to provide for a Resident Commissioner; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, favoring the enactment of legislation to extend to American citizens and voters of the Virgin Islands the right to participate in national elections and to permit them to vote for President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands in recognition, appreciation, and gratitude to Hon. Charles Harwood, Governor of the Virgin Islands, for his firm effort and persistence in securing for the Virgin Islands a Federal public works authorization for an appropriation of $10,800,000; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

WAGE ADJUSTMENTS—RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution relative to wage adjustments which was introduced in the Council of the City of New York by Mr. Sharkey, vice chairman of the council, and was adopted by the Council of the City of New York on December 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 15, 1944.

Resolution 100

Amended resolution relative to wage adjustments

By the vice chairman, Mr. Sharkey:

Whereas wage earners engaged in the production of front-line war materials, principally steel, planes, tanks, machines, and electrical and radio instruments, have petitioned the National War Labor Board for an increase

in wages to meet the increased cost of living; and

Whereas these wage earners have achieved unprecedented records of production for our victorious armed forces by personal sacrifice and by scrupulously living up to the no-strike policy in the interests of a United Nations victory; and

Whereas the compensation of wage earners in other fields has also lagged considerably behind the increase in the cost of living; and

Whereas the rise in the cost of living has been seriously felt by our workers in the city of New York; and

Whereas without a wage-rate adjustment, the reduced buying power of these wage earners will affect their welfare and the welfare of their families; and

Whereas it must also be recognized that it is vital for the welfare of all in this country that further inflation be prevented: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council of the city of New York does record itself as favoring the application of the aforesaid workers for a wage adjustment to meet increased living costs now pending before the National War Labor Board to the fullest extent that such increase can be granted without inducing a further rise in the cost of living and stimulating the menace of inflation; and be it further

Resolved, That the view of this council be conveyed to the Members of Congress from the city of New York, to the National War Labor Board and to the President of the United States.

Adopted December 12, 1944.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 148. A bill granting an increase of pension to Claude Hathorn; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 149. A bill for the relief of William M. Greene;

S. 150. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Dr. R. N. Harwood," approved June 10, 1935;

S. 151. A bill for the relief of the Rent-A-Car Co.;

S. 152. A bill for the relief of John B. Dow;

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Thompson & McKinney;

S. 154. A bill for the relief of N. F. Clower and Elijah Williams;

S. 155. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.

S. 156. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

S. 157. A bill for the relief of Janie McCord Watson, James Scott Howell, Alice Ruth Howell, and Houston Thomas Howell;

S. 158. A bill for the relief of Joe D. Dailey;

S. 159. A bill for the relief of Claudia F. Banks and Edna B. Towner;

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Drs. W. S. Davis, P. A. Palmer, H. S. Oakes, and J. M. Ousley;

S. 161. A bill for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton;

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Walter S. Faulkner;

S. 163. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Lindsay;

S. 164. A bill for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 165. A bill for the relief of Davis-Mize & Co., Inc.;

S. 166. A bill for the relief of the Lauderdale County Highway Commission;

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 168. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased;

S. 169. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson;

S. 170. A bill for the relief of the Canal Dredging Co.;

S. 171. A bill for the relief of the surviving directors of the Chesboard Co., a dissolved Maryland corporation;

S. 172. A bill for the relief of T. H. Richardson;

S. 173. A bill for the relief of the State of Tennessee;

S. 174. A bill for the relief of the estate of Beatrice Withers, deceased, and Mary M. Withers;

S. 175. A bill for the relief of the city of Harriman, Tenn.;

S. 176. A bill for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., and Memphis Park Commission; and

S. 177. A bill for the relief of Oscar Griggs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

S. 178. A bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bills 179 and 180, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 181. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 182. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 183. A bill to authorize the carrying of obligations of the United States, owned by banks, trust companies, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies, at their par value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 184 (by request). A bill to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage record information to State unemployment compensation agencies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE):

S. 185. A bill to assist in the effective prosecution of the war; to improve the health, efficiency, and morale of the civilian population and the armed forces; and to provide for a more equitable distribution of food supplies through a food allotment plan; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MOSES:

S. 186. A bill for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself, I introduce and send to the desk a bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River. I respectfully suggest that the bill be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. REED, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 187. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. GURNEY. I offer a bill to provide military and naval training for the postwar period. This is the bill sponsored by the American Legion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 188. A bill to provide military or naval training for all male citizens who attain the age of 18 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate bill 190, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. BURTON):

S. 191. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

(Mr. BILBO introduced Senate bill 192, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BILBO also introduced Senate bill 193, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. MAYBANK. I introduce a claims bill, and also another bill which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is similar to a bill that was pending before the committee last year.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 195. A bill to provide for the more efficient utilization of the agricultural resources of the Nation during peace and war; to regulate the production and distribution of margarine, a product of certain agricultural commodities, in interstate commerce; to remove certain obstructions to the distribution of such product in interstate commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 196. A bill for the relief of the village of Cold Spring, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 197. A bill authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 198. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 199. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recrea-

tional, or wildlife-refuge purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 200. A bill to provide for Federal assistance in the maintenance, expansion, and operation of school lunch and school milk programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 201. A bill for the relief of the estates of William F. Bacon, Myrtle Jackson, Catherine Smith, and Tibbie Spencer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 202. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 203. A bill for the relief of Margery Anderson Bridges; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 204. A bill to amend the National Defense Act, as amended, with respect to the minimum age limit for persons appointed as second lieutenants in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 205. A bill granting a pension to Sally Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 206. A bill to provide for the delivery of mail on rural free delivery routes on holidays other than Sundays; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for Mr. BURTON):

S. 207. A bill for the relief of Yeichi Nimura (Tomizo Miki); to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 208. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

S. 209. A bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 210. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938;

S. 211. A bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. A bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941;

S. 213. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States Naval Ordnance Plant at Canton, Ohio;

S. 214. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943;

S. 215. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944;

S. 216. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.;

S. 217. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine;

S. 218. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California;

S. 219. A bill to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy;

S. 220. A bill to vest title to the United States ship *Wolverine* (ex-*Michigan*) in the Foundation for the Original United States Ship Michigan, Inc.; and

S. 221. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE (for Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 223. A bill to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 224. A bill to permit Federal employees to serve as election officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 225. A bill to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 226. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; and

S. 227. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the Treaty with Spain of December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been granted; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 223. A bill for the relief of Ruth Grossman; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 229. A bill granting a pension to George H. Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 230. A bill to amend Public Law 518, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 20, 1944; and

S. 231. A bill to extend for 1 additional year the reduced rate of interest on Land Bank Commissioner loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 232. A bill to establish accountability for personnel actions in the various departments and independent establishments of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 233. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River; and

S. 234. A bill authorizing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Yellowstone River near Fairview, Mont.; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 235. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, to prohibit the requirement of the taking of the so-called pauper's oath by certain applicants for hospital treatment or domiciliary care; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 236. A bill to permit all people from India, residing in the United States to be naturalized; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 237. A bill to prevent nepotism in appointments to governmental offices and positions; and

S. 238. A bill to prohibit the appointment of residents of the same State to certain offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 239. A bill to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1175), in order to give credit for active duty performed by enlisted men subsequent to transfer to the Fleet Reserve, in computing their retainer or retired pay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE (for Mr. TYDINGS):

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced S. J. Res. 9 and 10, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the composition of the President's Cabinet; and

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates, by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK AND HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce two bills for appropriate reference, and ask that a statement relating to the proposed amendments to the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement of the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. WAGNER were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. 179. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; and

S. 180. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended.

The statement presented by Mr. WAGNER is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER, OF NEW YORK, ON INTRODUCTION OF TWO BILLS AMENDING THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT AND THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Section 1 would provide that the Federal home-loan banks may make advances to their member institutions on the security of any mortgage or obligation which is insured under the National Housing Act or for which

a commitment to insure has been made under that act, or as to which the member institution has insurance under that act. No such advance could exceed 90 percent of the unpaid principal of the mortgage or obligation offered as collateral for the advance.

Under existing law the Federal home-loan banks have a limited power to make advances on mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, but the member institutions cannot put up as collateral for such advances loans which they have made with the insurance protection provided in title I of the National Housing Act but for which they have not taken mortgage security. Also, they cannot use for this purpose mortgages insured under title II which have more than 20 years' unexpired maturity. It is believed that, insofar as these types of loan are deemed worthy of insurance under the National Housing Act, they should be acceptable as collateral security for advances by the Federal home-loan banks.

Section 2 deals with the base for the issuance of consolidated Federal home-loan bank debentures, which are the joint and several obligations of all the Federal home-loan banks. At present, such debentures may not be issued in excess of five times the total paid-in capital of all the Federal home-loan banks nor in excess of the notes or obligations of member institutions held by all the banks and secured under section 10 (a) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act. However, no provision is made for including in the debenture base secured advances made under other provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act or for including therein obligations of or fully guaranteed by the United States which are owned by the Federal home-loan banks. The present section would include these items, but would retain the existing provision that such debentures may not in any event be issued in excess of five times the total paid-in capital of the Federal home-loan banks.

Section 3 is the most important section of the bill. It would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Federal home-loan banks and of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, up to a limit of three times the capital stock, reserves, and surplus of the banks or the insurance corporation, as the case may be. The Secretary of the Treasury would have entire discretion as to such purchases, being merely authorized and not required to make them.

The Federal home-loan banks (which provide reserve-credit facilities for nearly 3,800 members, comprising savings and loan associations and similar institutions, savings banks, and insurance companies) and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (which insures, up to $5,000 for each investor in each institution, the safety of accounts in approximately 2,400 savings and loan associations and similar institutions) are designed to stabilize local savings and home-financing institutions and thus to aid in protecting the whole financial structure. Under ordinary conditions the banks and the insurance corporation will have no difficulty in obtaining necessary funds in the open market. However, the provision here proposed is essential as a bulwark in times of stress, when they might not be able to market their obligations to the public on reasonable terms. Its enactment would be in accordance with other measures for Government purchase or guaranty of obligations of Federal agencies, as in the case of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Public Housing Authority, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and other agencies which have this protection.

Section 4 deals with examinations of the Federal home-loan banks. The existing law requires that they be examined "at least twice annually." The present section would change this to read "at least annually." Thus the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration would not be required to examine the banks oftener than once a year, but would still have authority to examine them more often if it saw fit to do so. It is believed that the section would make possible some economy in money cost and in personnel, while preserving all essential authority.

Section 5 is the usual separability provision.

AMENDMENTS TO HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

This bill, which consists of only one section, would make two changes in section 5 (c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, dealing with the lending and investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations.

At present, a Federal savings and loan association may make real-estate loans only on first liens of not over $20,000 on homes or combinations of homes and business property within 50 miles of its home office, except that not over 15 percent of its assets may be loaned on first liens on "other improved real estate" without regard to these limitations. The present section would change the words "other improved real estate" to "any improved real estate," so as to negative any construction that homes and combination home and business properties are excluded from the 15 percent provision.

In addition, the bill would provide that a Federal association may invest its funds in any mortgage or obligation as to which the association is protected by insurance under the National Housing Act, or for which a commitment to insure has been issued under that act. Federal associations would thus be able to make use of the provisions of title I of the National Housing Act insuring financial institutions with respect to alteration, repair, and improvement loans made without the expense and delay incident to title searches and the taking of mortgage security. These associations would in this way be enabled to participate more fully in the war housing program, which has recognized the need for the prompt supplying of additional family units in defense areas through the conversion of existing dwellings into a greater number of family units and the restoration and rehabilitation of dwellings now unsuitable or uninhabitable.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. MURRAY. I offer a bill to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish a national institute of dental research, and for other purposes. I ask that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, and that a statement explaining the purposes of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Montana will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 190) to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of conducting researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; assisting and fostering similar research activities by other agencies, public and private; and promoting the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results, with a view to the development and prompt widespread use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, there is hereby established in the National Institute of Health of the United States Public Health Service a Division which shall be known as the National Institute of Dental Research (hereinafter referred to as the Institute).

SEC. 2. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (hereinafter referred to as the Surgeon General) is authorized and directed for the purposes of this act and subject to its provisions, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Dental Research Council hereinafter established—

(a) To conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

(b) To promote the coordination of researches conducted by the institute and similar researches conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

(c) To provide fellowships in the institute from funds appropriated or donated for such purpose;

(d) To secure for the institute consultation services and advice of persons who are experts in the field of dental diseases and conditions from the United States and abroad; and

(e) To cooperate with State health agencies in the prevention and control of dental diseases and conditions.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created the National Advisory Dental Research Council (herein referred to as the Council), to consist of six members to be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, and of the Surgeon General, ex officio, who shall be chairman of the Council. The six appointed members shall be selected from leading dental, medical, or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of dental diseases and conditions in the United States, and at least four of these members shall be dentists. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of appointment, two at the end of the first year, two at the end of the second year, and two at the end of the third year after the date of the first meeting of the Council. No appointed member shall be eligible to serve continuously for more than 3 years, but shall be eligible for reappointment if he has not served as a member of the Council at any time within 12 months immediately preceding his reappointment. Each appointed member shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 per day during the time spent in attending meetings of the Council, and for the time devoted to official business of the Council under this act, and actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while away from his place of residence upon official business under this act.

SEC. 4. The Council is authorized—

(a) To review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, and certify approval to the Surgeon General, for prosecution under section 2 (a) hereof of any such

projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

(b) To collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through the appropriate publications for the benefit of health agencies and organizations (public or private), physicians, dentists, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

(c) To review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research projects relating to dental diseases and conditions, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

(d) To recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 6; and

(e) To make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of section 2 all appropriate provisions of section 301 of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General.

SEC. 6. The Federal Security Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States gifts made unconditionally by will or otherwise for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, and maintenance of premises, buildings, and equipment for the institute. Conditional gifts may be accepted by the Administrator if recommended by the Surgeon General and the Council. Any such gifts, if in money, shall be held in trust and shall be invested by the Administrator in securities of the United States, and the principal or income thereof shall be expended by the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, for the purposes prescribed by this act, subject to the same examination and audit as provided for appropriations made for the Public Health Service by Congress. Donations of $50,000 or over in aid of research under this act shall be acknowledged permanently by the establishment within the institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $1,000,000 for the erection and equipment of a suitable and adequate building and facilities for the use of the institute in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable and adequate site or sites in or near the District of Columbia for such building and facilities, and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities when funds are made available. No permanent building shall be erected with funds authorized to be appropriated under this section until after the end of the war.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $730,000 for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act (except subsection (a) hereof). Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection may be expended in the District of Columbia for personal services, stenographic recording, and translating services, by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses (including the expenses of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General); rental, supplies and equipment, purchase and exchange of medical and dental books, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding (in addition to that otherwise provided by law); and for all other necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appointed in the Public Health Service, in accordance with applicable law, such commissioned officers as may be necessary to aid in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(b) This act shall not be construed as limiting (1) the functions or authority of the Surgeon General or the Public Health Service under any other act or of any other officer or agency of the United States relating to the study of the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; or (2) the expenditure of money therefor.

(c) The Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(d) The Surgeon General shall include in his annual report for transmission to Congress a full report of the administration of this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements.

(e) This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

(f) The term "dental diseases and conditions" shall mean diseases and conditions affecting teeth and their supporting structures and other related diseases of the mouth.

(g) This act may be cited as the National Institute of Dental Research Act.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

Mr. President, I have just introduced a bill to provide for a dental research institute in the United States Public Health Service.

Dental diseases and conditions are the most common ailments of man. They cause untold suffering and harm. Selective Service examinations showed that defects of the teeth and other dental diseases and conditions were a most common cause of rejection even among the younger men.

In spite of the tremendous advances of science, the causes of dental decay are partly or largely unknown. The methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment for many dental conditions are still limited or uncertain in value.

Modern dentistry is just about 100 years old. In the course of that century, dentistry has made tremendous progress. American dentistry is second to none in the world. Still our dental profession and our public health leaders are not satisfied. They are anxious to speed up the progress of scientific knowledge, so that dentists and other health professions will be able to do vastly more than they can do today in preventing dental diseases and curing what cannot be prevented. One of the most important and promising ways to progress is through well-equipped research.

The dental profession of the United States strongly supports the proposals of this bill. I am sure that many other professional groups that are interested in the improvement of health will also support it as a much-needed and useful step. To the public, this dental research program offers the hope of bringing, in the future, immeasurable relief from suffering, and tremendous improvement of positive health, in return for expenditures that would be relatively trivial.

My bill proposes that there should be established a National Institute of Dental Research, as a division of the National Institute of Health in the United States Public Health Service. The dental research that is already being done by the Public Health Service and other agencies, public or private, would be greatly increased under arrangements that assure coordination of the new and the old activities.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is to direct the new institute and its work. To assist him, there would be created a national Advisory Dental Research Council, to include—in addition to the Surgeon General who will be chairman—six appointed members—at least four of whom shall be dentists—to be selected from leading authorities.

The institute is to conduct and aid research on the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; to promote coordination of dental research; to provide fellowships in the institute and make grants-in-aid to universities and other institutions; to secure the consultation services of other experts; and to cooperate with State health agencies.

The institute is authorized to receive gifts from private sources.

The Surgeon General is required to make a full report to Congress each year.

To give effect to this program, the bill proposes that Congress should authorize appropriations, up to a maximum of $1,000,000, to erect and equip a suitable building after the war; and up to a maximum of $730,000 a year to provide a budget to carry out the program.

Dental diseases and conditions, in damage to health and working power, now cost untold amounts every year, amounts which are probably to be measured in billions of dollars, to say nothing of human suffering and unhappiness. In addition, the people of the United States spend several hundred million dollars a year on dental services, even though they are receiving only a minor part of the dental care they really need. It is, therefore, good economy and good sense that we should invest an amount equal to a very small fraction of these sums in learning more about the causes of dental diseases, in inventing new and better methods of treatment, and in improving the efficiency and economy of dental care.

This is a bill proposing that we should make a good investment in the future health of the people. It should be promptly enacted by Congress.

ADDITIONAL MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, with the strong recommendation of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, and with the overwhelming sentiment of the American people, I think I am justified in saying that it is a foregone conclusion that the Seventy-ninth Congress will enact a law providing for universal military training for at least 1 year of all the young men of the Nation between the ages of 18 and 23 years.

There are approximately one and one-half million boys reaching the age of 18 annually, so it is safe to estimate that within 6 or 7 years we will have a potential Army and Navy of 10,000,000 young men with 1 year's training for the armed service of our country, and the size of

our potential Army of men with 1 year's training will continue to increase from year to year.

If the occasion should ever arise that this large army of men with 1 year's training had to be called into combat service, their greatest handicap would be the lack of officers trained and experienced. It is evident to anyone who will stop to analyze the situation that our two great service schools at West Point and Annapolis are totally inadequate to train anything like the number of officers we must have, and we must have them, because no matter how well the men in the ranks are trained, they are practically helpless in combat without officers of experience and training to give the orders and do the directing in any military effort or campaign.

In 1941 I visualized the war in which we are now engaged, with over 12,000,000 men in service, and believing that such a fate was in store for my country I introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress Senate bill 2029, providing for the establishment of two additional military academies and two additional naval academies.

Now, in the face of universal military training I am reintroducing these measures in two bills, one providing for the two military academies and one providing for two naval academies. It is my honest judgment that these additional service schools are imperative if we are going to have universal military training, because it will do very little good in preparing for the defense of our country as a means of securing peace to have soldiers and sailors trained, without thoroughly trained and experienced officers to command.

I introduce the two bills referred to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills introduced by the Senator from Mississippi will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 192) to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of two additional military academies was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 193) to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of two additional naval academies was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SUFFRAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA — PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am today reintroducing in the Senate the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would make it possible for the people of the District of Columbia to participate with their fellow Americans in the Government of our country.

This proposal is an enabling provision to be added to the Constitution which will permit the application, in the case of the people of the District of Columbia, of the fundamental principles of our form of government. I hold that all Americans, wherever they reside in our country, should possess the right and privilege of participating in the legislation of the Nation through legislators of their own choosing. I also hold that all such Americans are justly entitled to participate, through their duly chosen electors, in the election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

With the single exception of those Americans permanently residing in the District of Columbia, the way is open for all to participate. However, the peculiar situation affecting the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia is that the Congress, which under the Constitution has the broad power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the seat of the Government, lacks the power to correct this fundamental defect. The people of the District of Columbia labor under serious handicap and humiliation through being denied the exercise of these fundamental American rights.

Mr. President, nothing has so emphasized this injustice as the plight of the fighting men from the District of Columbia, who continued voteless while their comrades in arms from the States were permitted to vote by absentee ballot. While the soldier-vote bill was under consideration in the Senate, I called attention to the fact that "fighting side by side with the men from your State and mine are the fighting men from the voteless and unrepresented District of Columbia. They are the men who volunteered or were drafted, just like the boys from your State and mine. They are in the thick of the fight in all theaters of the war. They are shedding their blood and giving their all for their country and its democratic institutions, in which they do not fully share.

Stripped of its formal setting in the joint resolution, I propose to add to the Constitution of the United States the following simple amendment:

> The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal.

Enactment of this amendment would not in the slightest detract from the power of Congress over the Federal District. It would, however, so broaden the power of Congress as to enable it to correct this grievous wrong for the correction of which the District citizens have for half a century petitioned the Congress.

The amendment would merely empower Congress to provide national representation for the permanent residents of the District of Columbia, leaving the details of such representation to be worked out by the Congress. Full power is given to Congress through amendment and repeal either to withdraw or modify the form of representation which may be provided by subsequent legislation.

Mr. President, by long and intimate asscciation with the people of the District of Columbia, I consider myself fully competent to testify to their fine, patriotic, and public-spirited qualities. They are the equals of the best among those in the States whose votes sent us to Congress. It has always been a source of mortification and shame for me to reflect that in actual practice these fine Americans are politically only the subjects of the United States, and by no means the political equals of the citizens of the States. However, under the law they are recognized fully as the equals of the people of the States in the possession of the duty, right, and privilege of bearing all the burdens of American citizenship which fall alike upon all citizens of the Republic.

I think the time is ripe to give prompt and favorable consideration to this proposal. If we believe that the peoples of all of the nations of the world should enjoy the same privileges and rights as their fellow countrymen, why is this not a good time to apply this principle to our fellow Americans of the District of Columbia?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Kansas will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF PRESIDENTIAL TERM OF OFFICE—PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I again introduce a proposed constitutional amendment which would make two terms the limit for any one person to hold office as President of the United States.

I believe such an amendment should be adopted. It would obviate for the future the temptation for any person holding that office to try to mold events so as to make himself a candidate for a third term.

A precedent having been established that a President can have himself nominated and elected for more than the traditional two terms, human nature is such that future Presidents might well be expected to attempt to have themselves reelected again and again and again.

On the other hand, if the Constitution provided for a limit of two terms, that temptation would be removed. I believe that would be a good thing for the Nation and the public welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Kansas will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of President of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit an amendment providing for an investigation of certain harbor conditions in South Carolina intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 35, the river and harbor bill.

On behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHN-

STON] and myself I also send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed by us jointly to the same bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and ask that it be considered in the committee with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments submitted by the Senator from South Carolina will be received, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and printed.

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS IN THE POST-WAR ERA

Mr. RADCLIFFE (for Mr. TYDINGS) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Governor of each of the 48 States and the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto, Rico, and the Virgin Islands, respectively, are hereby requested to transmit to the Congress at the earliest convenient date detailed reports showing the roads, streets, curbs, bridges, schools, hospitals, sewers, waterworks, ferries, tunnels, docks, and other needed public works and improvements, which should be constructed within such State, Territory, or insular possession during the 10-year period immediately following the termination of the war, together with estimates of the manpower and materials necessary for each such project, as well as information concerning amounts appropriated or proposed to be appropriated or made available for such purposes by such State, Territory, or insular possession and its political subdivisions.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS IN THE POST-WAR ERA

Mr. RADCLIFFE (for Mr. TYDINGS) also submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is directed to transmit to the Congress at the earliest possible date a report showing (1) the nature and location of all flood-control projects which should be undertaken in the United States (including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) during the period immediately following the termination of the present war; (2) the estimated costs of such projects; (3) the manpower necessary in connection therewith; (4) information concerning the relative urgency of the various projects recommended; (5) the amount of land which would be permanently flooded in connection with such projects, the value of such land, and the annual value of products therefrom, as compared with the amount and value of the land, and the annual value of products therefrom, which would, in the absence of such project, be subject to recurrent floods; (6) the average annual damage from floods to the area which would be protected by each such project as compared with the annual interest, amortization, and maintenance costs of such project; (7) the extent of damage to wildlife involved in each proposed project; (8) the estimated time that would elapse before reservoirs constructed in connection with such projects would become silted up; and (9) all other pertinent data which should be available to the Congress for its consideration in the formulation of a post-war flood-prevention program.

FIELDS OF TAXATION, ETC., IN THE POST-WAR ERA

Mr. RADCLIFFE (for Mr. TYDINGS) also submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Governor of each of the 48 States is hereby requested to transmit to the Congress at the earliest convenient date his recommendations for the post-war period with respect to—

(1) Proper fields of taxation as between the Federal Government and State and local governments;

(2) Proper division of authority as between the Federal Government and State governments with respect to the regulation of commerce;

(3) Proper percentages of contributions to be made by the Federal Government and by State and local governments toward the financing of post-war work, welfare, and social programs; and

(4) The functions of government which should be exercised exclusively by the Federal Government, those which should be exercised exclusively by State and local governments, and those which may be combined or exercised jointly.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate

Resolved, That resolution No. 44, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Manufactures to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress at the rate of $2,040 per annum.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 26), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That resolution No. 35, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress at the rate of $2,040 per annum.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS, ETC.

Mr. WAGNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 27), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to sit during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress at such times and places as it may deem advisable, to make investigations into all matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary, and to report in due course to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ such expert, stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the expenses incurred in pursuance hereof (which shall not exceed $10,000) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF STUDY AND SURVEY OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY, as chairman of the Special Committee to Study and Survey the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises, submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, as agreed to October 8, 1940 (providing for study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), and continued by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, as agreed to January 25, 1943, is hereby further continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

SEC. 2. That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, and continued by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by $100,000.

CONDEMNATION OF BLOCS AND REGIONAL GROUPS AFFECTING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on December 7 of last year I submitted a resolution which became Senate Resolution 348, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the formation or existence of any bloc or regional group of nations for military purposes, except in conjunction with and with the approval of a general world security organization, is inimical to international peace and security.

I submit a similar resolution, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in connection with it the statement which I made on December 7, when I submitted Senate Resolution 348.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the statement presented with it will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 29) is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the formation or existence of any bloc or regional group of nations for military purposes, except in conjunction with and with the approval of a general world security organization, is inimical to international peace and security.

The statement presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

For fear of precipitating a debate which might cause the use of harsh words in the direction of one of our allies, I have hesitated to present the resolution. I for one have always been unwilling to pursue a course that may lead to disunity among the United Nations. Today, on the eve of victory in Europe over Germany, Great Britain is taking the lead in causing disunity among the Allies, not only by words but by actual deeds. I am not surprised, because Great Britain is running true to form. She is a past master in the art of world politics and

she has always been able to make weaker nations bow to her terms and to obtain the help of other nations to maintain her power.

In a speech delivered by me on the floor of the Senate on June 25, 1942, I said then, and I now repeat, that many of the decisions made by the British in the course of this war were based on political isues, rather than upon strategy that would lead to early decision. It will be recalled that on two occasions the British came near clearing north Africa of every vestige of territory held by our enemies. Instead of pursuing the enemy in north Africa when he was on the run, half of the British forces in that area were sent to aid helpless Greece. Churchill and his followers went to the aid of Greece against the advice of Britain's military and naval leaders. What was the reason for that action? It was in order to fulfill a promise made by Churchill to King George of Greece, all to the end that the British could look to the King of Greece for help around the peace table.

Several weeks ago the Russians had virtually driven the enemy from Greece and made that country no longer tenable for the Germans. In spite of that, the British saw fit to send an army to obtain control of that helpless country. Today Great Britain is engaged, by force of arms, in dictating to the Greek people whom they shall select as their leader. She is pursuing a similar course in Italy. She is causing much concern in Ethiopia by refusing to evacuate that country and by proclaiming that she intends not only to occupy a portion of Ethiopia during the war but to retain certain territory there. My belief is that Great Britain will persist in that attitude of seeking to expand her now vast empire and to form blocs of nations here and there all over the world so as to help her to maintain her pre-war world-wide domination, unless we in America take a hand. With a navy larger than the combined navies of all other countries in the world, and with a respectable army, it would seem to me that we should be able to force the British to see the light.

I pose this question: Why should Great Britain maintain armies in reconquered Greece, in reconquered Ethiopia, and in other reconquered territories, when those armies could be used to advantage against the western wall of Germany?

To digress for a moment, Mr. President, I ask Senators to take a look at the map indicating the battle line in western Europe, and they will note that the British occupy a few miles on the northern end of the line, while we are bearing the brunt of this holocaust of war.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that, while we are shedding our precious blood, while we are dissipating our irreplaceable natural resources, the British are pursuing a course which is diametrically opposed to the objects and purposes for which we in America are fighting. We want to free the peoples of the earth and permit them to govern themselves.

As has been expressed on the floor of the Senate on many occasions, we as a nation do not desire more territory, except that which it may be necessary for us to obtain or control in order to prevent future wars. I shall not now attempt a discussion of that problem, but will reserve it for future debate.

Mr. President, the resolution which I have read is simple in its language and should not require much study to understand. It is simply a warning to Great Britain, and in fact to all other nations, that we as a nation propose to help formulate a world-security organization whose purpose it shall be to maintain peace; that we are desirous of letting the world know that this organization is not to be looked upon with suspicion or as a make-believe organization, but, instead, as an organization upon which every nation, be it large or small, can depend to be the instrumentality by which and through which world peace can be maintained. I do not want any nation, no matter how large or small, to fail to have the utmost confidence in the ability of this organization to maintain the peace of the world. I do not want any nation to feel that it is necessary for it to join in an alliance with the British or to join in an alliance with the Russians or an alliance with us in order to maintain peace. Let us keep the organization open, free, and aboveboard.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago that eminent statesman from Great Britain, David Lloyd George, was asked the question:

"What was the Allies' greatest mistake in dealing with Germany after the last war?"

Rather grimly and without hesitation, he replied:

"America. If they had kept to their bargains instead of backing out and leaving the League of Nations, things would have gone differently."

That may be only partially true, but, if the truth were known, President Wilson failed to carry out his 14 points because of the existence of secret treaties, alliances, and agreements among the nations with which he was dealing. In the near future I expect to address myself further to that subject.

Mr. President, my hope is that when the United Nations of the World sit around the peace table for the purpose of working out plans in order to maintain a lasting peace, each can without hesitation state to the world that it has not made any secret treaties, that it has no alliances of any kind, but that the organization in contemplation shall be and will be the instrumentality through which peace throughout the world shall be maintained.

NEW YEAR'S EVE ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a New Year's Eve radio address delivered by him under the auspices of the United Nations Educational Committee, on December 31, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Leadership in Foreign Policy," delivered by Senator SMITH before the Kiwanis Club of Atlantic City, N. J., on January 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MANPOWER SITUATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, More on Manpower, published in the Washington Post of January 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Humanity Will Not Permit Our Failure," published in the Chicago Sun, and an editorial entitled "State of the Union," published in the Washington Star of January 7, 1945, both commenting on the President's annual message which appear in the Appendix.]

ABOLITION OF JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Minority Rule," from the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier of January 1, 1945; one entitled "Wiping Out Wyoming," from the Charleston News and Courier of January 3, 1945, and one entitled "President Sets Judgment Above Congress and People," from the Los Angeles Times of December 30, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

EULOGY OF SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on Wednesday, December 20, 1944, eulogizing the Seventy-eighth Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN THE NEW WORLD PEACE—ESSAY BY ROBERT C. PFEILER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay entitled "Freedom of the Press in the New World Peace," written by Robert C. Pfeiler, and published in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Sunday Journal and Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate less than 30 minutes. I desire to speak about some phases of foreign policy. Because of the solemnity of the subject itself I ask the indulgence of my colleagues that I be permitted at least to make my preliminary statement without interruption.

Mr. President, there are critical moments in the life of every nation which call for the straightest, the plainest, and the most courageous thinking of which we are capable. We confront such a moment now. It is not only desperately important to America. It is important to the world. It is important not only to this generation which lives in blood. It is important to future generations if they shall live in peace.

No man in his right senses will be dogmatic in his viewpoint at such an hour. A global conflict which uproots the earth is not calculated to submit itself to the dominion of any finite mind. The clashes of rival foreign interests, which have motivated wars for countless centuries, are not likely suddenly to surrender to some simple man-made formula, no matter how nobly meditated. Each of us can only speak according to his little lights—and pray for a composite wisdom that shall lead us to high, safe ground. It is only in this spirit of anxious humility that I speak today. Politics, in any such connection, would be as obnoxious at home as they are in manipulations abroad.

Mr. President, we still have two major wars to win. I said "We." That does not mean America alone. It means the continued and total battle fraternity of the United Nations. It must mean one for all and all for one; and it will mean this, unless somewhere in this grand alliance the stupid and sinister folly of ulterior ambitions shall invite the enemy to postpone our victory through our own rivalries and our own confusion. The United Nations, in even greater unity of military action than heretofore, must never, for any cause, permit this military unity to fall apart. If it does, we shall count the cost in mortal anguish, even though we stumble on to a belated, though inevitable victory. And, getting down to what Mr. Churchill would call the bare bones of the matter, this is an obligation which rests no less upon our allies than upon us, and no less upon us

than upon our allies. First things must come first. History will not deal lightly with any who undermine this aim ere it is achieved. Destiny will one day balance any such ghastly accounts.

We not only have two wars to win, we also have yet to achieve such a peace as will justify this appalling cost. Here again an even more difficult unity is indispensable. Otherwise we shall look back upon a futile, sanguinary shambles and—God save the mark—we shall be able to look forward only to the curse of World War No. 3.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the morale of unity in war is often threatened by sharply clashing and often disillusioning disclosures which threaten this unity in peace. The two considerations cannot be dissociated. President Roosevelt correctly said in his annual message that "the nearer we come to vanquishing our enemies the more we become inevitably conscious of differences among the victors." He also correctly said that "nations like individuals do not always see alike or think alike, and international cooperation and progress are not helped by any nation assuming that it has a monopoly of wisdom or of virtue." That applies to us. It applies to each of our allies. But when "differences among the victors"—to use the White House phrase—when "differences among the victors," before they have clinched their victory, threaten both the victory and the peace, the hour cannot much longer be postponed when any such trends shall be reversed. We shall not reverse them by our silence upon the issues that are clearly involved; nor, and I say it with great respect, shall we reverse them merely by a generalized restatement of the high aspirations revoiced in the recent Presidential message. Certainly we shall not reverse them by a snarling process of international recrimination in which every United Nation's capital tries to outdo the other in bitter back-talk about the infirmities of each. Such bickering is dangerous—over there or over here. It is water on the Axis wheel. Again I agree wholeheartedly with President Roosevelt when he says:

> We must not let such differences divide us and blind us to our more important common and continuing interests in winning the war and building the peace.

On the other hand, I hold the deep belief that honest candor, devoid of prejudice or ire, is our greatest hope and our greatest necessity; and that the Government of the United States, above all others, is called at long last to exercise this honest candor not only with its allies but also with its own faithful people.

I hesitate, even now, to say these things, Mr. President, because a great American illusion seems to have been built up—wittingly or otherwise—that we, in the United States, dare not publicly discuss these subjects lest we contribute to international dissension and thus encourage the very thing we all need to cure. But I frankly confess that I do not know why we must be the only silent partner in this grand alliance. There seems to be no fear of disunity, no hesitation in Moscow, when Moscow wants to assert unilateral war and peace aims which collide with ours. There seems to be no fear of disunity, no hesitation in London, when Mr. Churchill proceeds upon his unilateral way to make decisions often repugnant to our ideas and our ideals. Perhaps our allies will plead that their actions are not unilateral; that our President, as Bevin said, has initialed this or that at one of the famous Big Three conferences; that our President, as Churchill said, has been kept constantly "aware of everything that has happened"; in other words, that by our silence we have acquiesced. But that hypothesis would only make a bad matter worse. It would be the final indictment of our silence—the final obituary for open covenants. We, of course, accept no conception that our contribution to unity must be silence, while others say and do what they please, and that our only role in this global tragedy is to fight and die and pay, and that unity for us shall only be the unity which Jonah enjoyed when he was swallowed by the whale.

I hasten to say that any such intolerable conception would be angrily repudiated by every American—from the President down to the last citizen among us. It has not been and is not true. Yet it cannot be denied that our Government has not spoken out—to our own people or to our allies—in any such specific fashion as have the others. It cannot be denied, as a result, that too often a grave melancholy settles upon some sectors of our people. It cannot be denied that citizens, in increasing numbers, are crying: "What are we fighting for?" It cannot be denied that our silence—at least our public and official silence—has multiplied confusion at home and abroad. It cannot be denied that this confusion threatens our unity—yes, Mr. President, and already hangs like a cloud over Dumbarton Oaks. So I venture to repeat, with all the earnestness at my command, that a new rule of honest candor in Washington—as a substitute for mystifying silence or for classical generalities—honest candor on the high plane of great ideals—is the greatest contribution we can make to the realities of unity at this moment when enlightened civilization is our common stake.

Let us not mistake the meaning of unity. Unity does not require universal and peremptory agreement about everything. It does not demand a meeting of all minds now in respect to all the minutiae of a post-war world which will take years to stabilize. The President is wholly right in pleading for tolerance upon this score and in warning that we must not expect what he calls perfectionism overnight. Here in the Senate we do not have perpetual agreement between the two sides of the aisle, but we have never failed to have basic unity when crisis calls. The unity I discuss is the over-all tie which must continue to bind the United Nations together in respect to paramount fundamentals. We had it once in the original spirit of the Atlantic Charter, and we must get it back again before it is too late.

When Mr. Churchill spoke in the British Parliament last December 15, defending his own current course in Greece and Mr. Stalin's proposed partition of Poland, he said:

> There is no doubt that when the time comes the United States will make its own pronouncement upon these matters, bearing in mind, as it will, the practical aspects which these matters assume and also how much failure on the part of the three greatest powers to work together would damage all our hopes for the future structure of a world government which, whatever else it might fail to do, will at any rate be equipped with all powers necessary to prevent outbreak of future war.

I do not like one of the implications in this quotation. It seems to say that unless we acquiesce in these self-serving unilateral arrangements now being made by great European powers, we shall be the scapegoats to be made responsible for the next war. I would respond categorically to any such abortive thesis by saying that, regardless of the future structure of a world government, an unjust peace, built upon the age-old frictions of international power politics, is the most fatal of all threats which our hopes for the future can possibly confront. But that is not the reason I use the quotation at this point. Of even greater importance is the other implication—namely, that the United States has not spoken; that her official attitude is not dependably recorded; and that, until she does speak, the world cannot find its bearings.

> There is no doubt—
>
> Says Mr. Churchill—
>
> that when the time comes the United States will make its own pronouncement.

When the time comes. Mr. President, is the time not here right now?

If it is, Mr. President, what shall we say that we have not already said in the Connally resolution in the Senate and the Fulbright resolution in the House and in the Presidential utterances?

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the first thing we must say, beyond misunderstanding, is that we have not altered our original commitments; that we have not lowered our sights; that we have not diluted our dedications; that we are not fighting to pull ancient chestnuts out of alien fires; that the smell of victory is not an anaesthetic which puts our earlier zeals to sleep. We still propose to win this war, come what may. We are fighting to defend America. We still propose to help create the post-war world on a basis which shall stop aggressors for keeps and, so far as humanly possible, substitute justice for force among freemen. We propose to do it primarily for our own sake. We still propose also, to substitute justice for force—if we can—in writing the peace which terminates this war when we deal with the victims of Axis tyranny. That is the road to permanent peace. We still propose that none of the United Nations shall seek aggrandizement, territorial, or otherwise—though conceding that all change is not necessarily aggrandizement. We still propose, outside the Axis, that there shall shall be no territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. Similarly we still propose to respect the right

of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. We still propose to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them, if it lies within our power.

In a word, Mr. President, it seems to me that the first thing we must do is to reassert, in high places, our American faith in these particular elemental objectives of the so-called Atlantic Charter, which was officially issued as a signed document by the State Department on August 14, 1941; which was officially communicated to the Congress as a signed document by the President of the United States in his message of August 21, 1941; which was embodied in a joint resolution of all the United Nations on January 1, 1942; which was commemorated by the President on August 14, 1943 in a proclamation on the second anniversary of its "signing"—his word—which had a tragic sinking spell when its formal authenticity was amazingly depreciated in a White House press conference a fortnight ago, but which the President reembraced in his message of January 6, 1945.

I am sure the President did not anticipate the shocking results of his recent almost jocular, and even cynical, dismissal of the Atlantic Charter as a mere collection of fragmentary notes. It jarred America to its very hearthstones. It seemed to make a mere pretense out of what has been an inspiringly accepted fact. It seemed almost to sanction alien contempts. It seemed to suggest that we have put too much emphasis upon a fighting creed which did not deserve the solemnity which we have been taught to ascribe to it. Coming at a particularly critical moment when these pledges seemed to be at least partially paralyzed in Moscow—and when even Mr. Churchill's memory about the charter was proving to be admittedly fickle—the President's statement was utterly devastating in its impact. He has since sought to repair this damage. I hope he has succeeded. With justification he reminds us in his annual message that there are no rules of easy application—of the charter—to each and every one of this war-torn world's tangled situations. He now says correctly and bravely, "We shall not hesitate to use our influence—and use it now—to secure so far as is humanly possible the fulfillment of these principles." That is the indispensable point. These basic pledges cannot now be dismissed as a mere nautical nimbus. They march with our armies. They sail with our fleets. They fly with our eagles. They sleep with our martyred dead. The first requisite of honest candor, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest, is to relight this torch.

The next thing we need to do, Mr. President, if I may be so bold, in this spirit of honest candor, is to appeal to our allies, in the name of reason, to frankly face the post-war alternatives which are available to them and to us as a means to preserve tomorrow's peace for them and for us. There are two ways to do it. One way is by exclusive individual action in which each of us tries to look out for himself. The other way is by joint action in which we undertake to look out for each other. The first way is the old way which has twice taken us to Europe's interminable battlefields within a quarter century. The second way is the new way in which our present fraternity of war becomes a new fraternity of peace. I do not believe that either we or our allies can have it both ways. They serve to cancel out each other. We cannot tolerate unilateral privilege in a multilateral peace. Yet, that seems to be the fatalistic trend today. I think we must make our choice. I think we must make it wholly plain to our major allies that they, too, must make their choice.

I hasten to make my own personal viewpoint clear. I have always been frankly one of those who has believed in our own self-reliance. I still believe that we can never again—regardless of collaborations—allow our national defense to deteriorate to anything like a point of impotence. But I do not believe that any nation hereafter can immunize itself by its own exclusive action. Since Pearl Harbor, World War No. 2 has put the gory science of mass murder into new and sinister perspective. Our oceans have ceased to be moats which automatically protect our ramparts. Flesh and blood now compete unequally with winged steel. War has become an all-consuming juggernaut. If World War No. 3 ever unhappily arrives, it will open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate. I propose to do everything within my power to keep those laboratories closed for keeps. I want maximum American cooperation, consistent with legitimate American self-interest, with constitutional process and with collateral events which warrant it, to make the basic idea of Dumbarton Oaks succeed. I want a new dignity and a new authority for international law. I think American self-interest requires it. But, Mr. President, this also requires whole-hearted reciprocity. In honest candor I think we should tell other nations that this glorious thing we contemplate is not and cannot be one-sided. I think we must say again that unshared idealism is a menace which we could not undertake to underwrite in the post-war world.

Now, I am not so impractical as to expect any country to act on any final motive other than self-interest. I know of no reason why it should. That is what nations are for. I certainly intend that intelligent and loyal American self-interest shall be just as vigilantly and vigorously guarded as is amply obvious, from time to time, in their own behalf by the actions of our allies. The real question always becomes just this: Where does real self-interest lie?

Here, Mr. President, we reach the core of the immediate problem. Without remotely wanting to be invidious, I use one of many available examples. I would not presume, even under these circumstances, to use it except that it ultimately involves us. Russia's unilateral plan appears to contemplate the engulfment, directly or indirectly, of a surrounding circle of buffer States, contrary to our conception of what we thought we were fighting for in respect to the rights of small nations and a just peace. Russia's announced reason is her insistent purpose never again to be at the mercy of another German tyranny. That is a perfectly understandable reason. The alternative is collective security. Now, which is better, in the long view? That is the question I pose. Which is better, in the long view, from a purely selfish Russian standpoint: To forcefully surround herself with a cordon of unwillingly controlled or partitioned states, thus affronting the opinions of mankind, as a means of post-war protection against a renaissance of German aggression, or to win the priceless asset of world confidence in her by embracing the alternative, namely, full and wholehearted cooperation with and reliance on a vital international organization in which all of us shall honorably participate to guarantee that Axis aggression shall never rise again? Well—at that point, Russia, or others like her, in equally honest candor, has a perfect right to reply, "Where is there any such alternative reliance until we know what the United States will do? How can you expect us to rely on an enigma?"

Now we are getting somewhere. Fear of reborn German aggression in years to come is at the base of most of our contemporary frictions. It is a perfectly human and understandable fear on the part of all neighboring nations which German militarism has twice driven to the valley of the shadow within one generation. Fear of reborn German aggression in years to come is the cause assigned to unilateral plans for Russian post-war expansion. Fear of reborn German aggression is the reason assigned to the proposed partition of Poland. Fear of reborn German aggression gave birth to the Anglo-Soviet agreement of 1942, the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement of 1943, the Franco-Soviet Treaty of 1944, and to similar unilateral and bilateral actions inevitably yet to come. Fear of reborn German aggression is our apple of discord. This second World War plagues the earth chiefly because France and Britain did not keep Germany disarmed, according to contract, after World War No. 1. In other words, when we deal with Europe's fear—her justified fear—of another rebirth of German military tyranny in some future post-war era, we are at the heart of the immediate problem which bedevils our Allied relationships.

I propose that we meet this problem conclusively and at once. There is no reason to wait. America has this same self-interest in permanently, conclusively, and effectively disarming Germany and Japan. It is simply unthinkable that America, or any other member of the United Nations, would allow this Axis calamity to reproduce itself again. Whether we Americans do or do not agree upon all the powers that shall reside in all ultimate international council to call upon us for joint military action in behalf of collective security, surely we can agree that we do not ever want an instant's hesitation or doubt about our military cooperation in the peremptory use of force, if needed, to keep Germany

and Japan demilitarized. Such a crisis would be the lengthened shadow of the present war. It would be a direct epilog to the present war. It should be handled as this present war is handled. There should be no more need to refer any such action back to Congress than that Congress should expect to pass upon battle plans today. The Commander in Chief should have instant power to act, and he should act. I know of no reason why a hard-and-fast treaty between the major allies should not be signed today to achieve this dependable end. We need not await the determination of our other post-war relationships. This problem—this menace—stands apart by itself. Regardless of what our later decision may be in respect to the power that shall be delegated to the President to join our military force with others in a new peace league—no matter what limitations may commend themselves to our ultimate judgments in this regard, I am sure we can agree that there should be no limitations when it comes to keeping the Axis out of piracy for keeps. I respectfully urge that we meet this problem now. From it stem many of today's confusions, doubts, and frustrations. I think we should immediately put it behind us by conclusive action. Having done so, most of the reasons given for controversial unilateral and bilateral actions by our allies will have disappeared; and then we shall be able, at least, to judge accurately whether we have found and cured the real hazard to our relationships. We shall have closed ranks. We shall have returned infinitely closer to basic unity.

Then, in honest candor, Mr. President, I think we have the duty and the right to demand that whatever immediate unilateral decisions have to be made in consequence of military need—and there will be such even in civil affairs—they shall all be temporary and subject to final revision in the objective light of the post-war world and the post-war peace league as they shall ultimately develop. As President Roosevelt put it in his annual message:

> During the interim period, until conditions permit a genuine expression of the peoples' will, we and our allies have a duty, which we cannot ignore, to use our influence to the end that no temporary or provisional authorities in the liberated countries block the eventual exercise of the peoples' right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as free men, they are to live.

I agree to that. Indeed, I would go further. I would write it in the bond. If Dumbarton Oaks should specifically authorize the ultimate international organization to review protested injustices in the peace itself, it would at least partially nullify the argument that we are to be asked to put a blank-check warrant behind a future status quo which is unknown to us and which we might be unwilling to defend.

We are standing by our guns with epic heroism. I know of no reason why we should not stand by our ideals. If they vanish under ultimate pressures, we shall at least have kept the record straight; we shall have kept faith with our soldier sons; and we then shall clearly be free agents, unhampered by tragic misunderstandings, in determining our own course when Berlin and Tokyo are in Allied hands. Let me put it this way for myself: I am prepared, by effective international cooperation, to do our full part in charting happier and safer tomorrows. But I am not prepared to guarantee permanently the spoils of an unjust peace. It will not work.

Mr. President, we need honest candor even with our foes. Without any remote suggestion of appeasement—indeed, it seems to me that it is exactly the contrary—I wish we might give these Axis peoples some incentive to desert their own tottering tyrannies by at least indicating to them that the quicker they unconditionally surrender the cheaper will be unconditional surrender's price. Here again we need plain speaking which has been too conspicuous by its absence, and, upon at least one calamitous occasion, by its error.

Mr. President, I conclude as I began. We must win these wars with maximum speed and minimum loss. Therefore we must have maximum Allied cooperation and minimum Allied frictions. We have fabulously earned the right to be heard in respect to the basis of this unity. We need the earliest possible clarification of our relations with our brave allies. We need this clarification not only for the sake of total Allied cooperation in the winning of the war but also in behalf of a truly compensatory peace. We cannot drift to victory. We must have maximum united effort on all fronts. We must have maximum united effort in our councils. And we must deserve the continued united effort of our own people.

I realize, Mr. President, in such momentous problems how much easier it is to be critical than to be correct. I do not wish to meddle. I want only to help. I want to do my duty. It is in this spirit that I ask for honest candor in respect to our ideals, our dedications, and our commitments, as the greatest contribution which government can now make to the only kind of realistic unity which will most swiftly bring our victorious sons back home, and which will best validate our aspirations, our sacrifices, and our dreams.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me say that I am greatly cheered by the Senator's address, which I regard as one of the most important addresses to the people of America, to our allies, and especially to our enemies that I have ever heard. What I want to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan is, Does he not believe that the conception of policing the enemy, which he has so clearly pictured to us today, was envisioned in the draft of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal and expressly referred to in chapter 12, entitled "Transitional Arrangements," and paragraph 2, which reads:

> No provision of the charter should preclude action taken or authorized in relation to enemy states as the result of the present war by the governments having responsibility for such action.

That is my question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very happy to respond. First I want to thank my able friend from Vermont for his generous comment. I totally agree that the Dumbarton Oaks agreement contemplates the precise thing I am talking about, The point I am undertaking to make this morning is that obviously it is going to be perhaps many months before Dumbarton Oaks arrives at a finality. Even the preliminary draft in the words of its own authors is only 80 percent concluded, and the final 10 percent is the most difficult of all. I agree that the Dumbarton Oaks agreement and the proposed international organization under it contemplates the precise responsibility to which I have referred. Since we now see with our own eyes and hear with our own ears that it is the asserted fear of reborn militarism in Germany after our victory which drives our allies into unilateral and bilateral action to protect themselves, and since it seems to me that we ought to be able to agree upon this much of a compact instantly, the point I make is only that we should not wait final perfectionism, to borrow the President's word, to achieve this purpose, but that we should do it right now in full measure and full faith for the purpose of clearing the track.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. On the practical procedure in arriving at that very much desired objective, does not the Senator regard the bilateral agreements made between Russia and Great Britain, between Russia and Czechoslovakia, and between Russia and France as steps advancing toward that objective, and that the United States can well afford to associate itself with the countries that surround Germany in the organizations of the nations that are competent to keep the enemies of peace under control and in obedience to law?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I agree with the able Senator completely that the three bilateral treaties to which he has referred are in no sense incompatible with the thing we are talking about, and that they are in no degree at odds with the contemplated Dumbarton Oaks formula. But the Senator well knows—and I do not care to survey the field in detail for obvious reasons—that, in addition to these particular bilateral agreements which are the subject of our present colloquy, there have been unilateral actions which in no sense conform either with the dedications to which we gave our original war faith or to the peace aspirations which we hope we may culminate. It occurs to me, if I may reply further to the Senator, that the three bilateral agreements to which he refers merely emphasize the point I make that apparently the predominating motive in the minds of our allies is as quickly as possible to find some way to cinch for themselves protection against the renaissance of German militarism

after this war is done; and I am saying that, rather than for us merely to associate ourselves with these bilateral affairs, I think it would be far more effective if we stepped right up to the line tomorrow and took this particular problem, which, obviously, from the record is of major importance to our allies as well as to us, and undertook to answer it beyond any possibility of peradventure now.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I agree with him entirely on that proposition, and I am very glad that he has made clear the distinction between policing our enemies and arranging for a general-security organization which has reference to policing our friends and policing ourselves.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in the remarks of the eminent Senator from Michigan. I shall not at this time undertake to make any comprehensive reply to or comment on his address. I wish to say to the Senator, however, that it occurs to me that, however desirable his suggestion about settling certain aspects of the international situation at the moment may be, I am sure that any mind would conceive that it would be a very difficult thing, with the great multitude of phases and angles of international affairs, ever to induce our allies to segregate and settle parts of these matters at the present time. It seems to me inevitable that most of these issues cannot be settled at the moment but must wait the definitive treaty of peace.

The President has repeatedly said in public that he has made no commitments with regard to these matters. The President is expected to have a conference with Stalin and Churchill at a very early date, and it would seem very well and very appropriate for us to withhold too much discussion, at least, on these matters until that meeting can take place.

The Senator from Michigan makes a very acute suggestion, that if we could settle the question of disarmament with Germany and with Japan immediately, we would take away from our allies their anxiety about the arrangements which they hope to make to protect themselves.

Let me say to the Senator that the greatest inducement we can offer and the greatest guaranty we can give to our allies, and they, in turn, can give to the peace of the world, is the assurance by the United States that we are going to stand by the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, and its improvement by the high officials of the United Nations who will convene at an early date.

It occurs to me that if there is any unrest among our allies as to what may happen in the post-war period it arises from a fear that the United States may not ratify the treaty establishing an international organization for peace, just as we failed to ratify one at the end of the First World War. I wish to say to Senators that criticisms and evidences of disunity here at home are not going to enhance the assurance in the minds of the nations across the sea that we in fact intend to ratify and stand by the creation of an international organization for peace.

I was glad to note that the Senator from Michigan made it clear that in his own mind no nation, in the conditions of modern development of warfare, can of its own edict, of its own will, immunize itself from the horrors and tragedies of war, once the world is engulfed in war. Mr. President, there is no automatic machinery which shuts the door any more against international conflict and war, whether we wish it or whether we do not. We did not wish the present war, yet when Pearl Harbor occurred, with all its tragedy and all its blood, we were inevitably engulfed in the World War, because, so soon as we assumed the right to repel the attack of the Japanese, Germany, of her own volition, because of her alliance with Japan, made a declaration of war against the United States.

So we might as well conclude now that either we go back to the old order, with all its dangers, with all its horrors, with all its blood, and with all its tragedy, or there must be the creation of an international organization, in which we, with the ideals which are spoken of so loftily, shall take the leadership, and say to the world that we are willing to stand by that sort of an organization.

Mr. President, the organization will not be perfect. There will be some places where the critic's sword can find a weak spot. It is out on the frontier, it is in virgin territory, it is more or less experimental; but we shall trust to the genius of those who follow in the years to come, with the right to modify it and adjust it and to add chapters in this rapidly moving world. But it is worth the effort.

No great accomplishment was ever brought about except after conception, and an effort to achieve it. The Thirteen Original States were engulfed in chaos and uncertainty under the Articles of Confederation until a few daring souls assumed to undertake the establishment of the Constitution of the United States. We may say the Constitution was not perfect. Three thousand amendments to the Constitution of the United States have been offered in the Senate. Because there was something about it here and there which men did not like was no reason for its rejection, or for its abolition.

Mr. President, one other word and I shall conclude. I hear much talk about our foreign policy. Orators thrust their hands in their bosoms, columnists grasp their fountain pens and put their typewriters to work and say, "The United States has no foreign policy," and they want to know what our foreign policy is.

When they make such statements and propound such inquiries they are unconsciously comparing what they call our foreign policy with the foreign policy of some foreign country. We have no foreign policy in the sense that we are all over the earth trying to grab territories here, there, and elsewhere. We have no foreign policy if the idea is to seek preferential trade agreements and advantages all over the earth. But we do have a foreign policy which is known to all who want to know it. It is known to all except a few critics.

Mr. President, is there any doubt among all the peoples of the earth that the United States is earnestly devoted to international peace? I think not, and I hope we shall evidence our devotion to it here in the Senate when we ratify the structure of an international organization for peace.

Is there any idea among the peoples of the earth that we entertain ambitions for forcible accession of territory to the United States? We had Cuba under our control, and in the Platt amendment we said to Cuba, "Take your freedom, establish your own free government. We will retain only such jurisdiction, of an advisory character, as is necessary to see that you are protected in your right to have free government." We later repealed even the Platt amendment. The Philippines belonged to us, and we said to the Filipino people, "If you set up a free government of your own choosing, you may have your liberty from United States rule."

Is there any doubt about that being an element of our foreign policy? Is there any doubt that we have adhered to the principle of arbitration, that we have submitted to numberless arbitrations international quarrels to which we were parties? Is not that an evidence of international peace idealism? Is not that an evidence of a definite foreign policy? When Mr. Monroe gave to the world the Monroe Doctrine, we stated something about our foreign policy. We have a foreign policy, of course we have, and those who desire to know what it is have but to read the brilliant pages of history of the past.

I did not intend to project these remarks to this length, but I do wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that I shall reexamine his speech with care. I realize his interest in international peace, and the construction of an international organization. He has been giving the matter very assiduous attention for more than 2 years in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I have every hope that, consulting fully his reason, as he always does, and forming his conclusions from the inevitable situation of the world, when the test comes in the Senate the Senator from Michigan will be voting for and advocating the adoption of an international organization in behalf of peace.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to consummate the appointment of Members to committees, which is now ready for submission to the Senate?

Mr. WILEY. I was going to ask unanimous consent to address the Senate at this time in connection with the subject heretofore under discussion. I will be happy to yield to the majority leader, however, for the purpose he has indicated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that out of order I may present a resolution dealing with standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that this is a privileged matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I realize that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) was read as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of 20 Senators.

"Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 25 Senators.

"Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to consist of 8 Senators, to which shall be referred all resolutions directing the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same: *Provided*, That any such resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

"Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 20 Senators.

"Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 10 Senators.

"Committee on Claims, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Commerce, to consist of 20 Senators.

"Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 15 Senators.

"Committee on Education and Labor, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on Enrolled Bills, to consist of 3 Senators, who shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives, and which, or some one of which, shall examine all bills or joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

"Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 8 Senators.

"Committee on Finance, to consist of 21 Senators.

"Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 23 Senators.

"Committee on Immigration, to consist of 14 Senators.

"Committee on Indian Affairs, to consist of 14 Senators.

"Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to consist of 8 Senators.

"Committee on Interstate Commerce, to consist of 21 Senators.

"Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to consist of 17 Senators.

"Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on the Library, to consist of 10 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

"Committee on Manufactures, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Military Affairs, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on Mines and Mining, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Naval Affairs, to consist of 18 Senators.

"Committee on Patents, to consist of 8 Senators.

"Committee on Pensions, to consist of 11 Senators.

"Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to consist of 19 Senators.

"Committee on Printing, to consist of 8 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

"Committee on Privileges and Elections, to consist of 17 Senators.

"Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to consist of 14 Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives.

"Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to consist of 15 Senators.

"Committee on Rules, to consist of 13 Senators.

"Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to consist of 17 Senators."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of the resolution offered by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I take it the resolution deals with the regular standing committees of the Senate, and that no change is made in the number of Senators represented on them.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the usual resolution adopted at the beginning of each Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority, and in response to the direction of the steering committee thereof, I send to the desk a list of members of the committees as provided for by the resolution just agreed to, and ask that the Senators, as their names are read, be assigned to the committees designated.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to the majority leader that I now submit the minority representation upon the committees, and that we act on them both together?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is entirely so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in behalf of the minority, and with the authority of the Republican conference of the Senate, I send to the desk the names of the minority members proposed for the various committees covered by the resolution just agreed to, and ask that the Senate agree to the designations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the lists of committee assignments on behalf of the majority and the minority, and, without objection, they will be considered together.

The Chief Clerk read the majority and minority assignments, which, in the form of an order, were agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Seventy-ninth Congress:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Thomas of Oklahoma (chairman), Wheeler, Bankhead, Bilbo, Ellender, Lucas, Stewart, Russell, Connally, Downey, Hoey, Moses, Capper, Shipstead, Willis, Aiken, Bushfield, Wilson, Butler, and Cordon.

On Appropriations: Messrs. Glass (chairman), McKellar, Hayden, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tydings, Russell, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Green, Maloney, Chavez, Mead, Maybank, Bridges, White, Gurney, Brooks, Reed, Burton, Ball, Willis, and Ferguson.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: Messrs. Lucas (chairman), Tydings, Hayden, Scrugham, Maybank, Tobey, Brooks, and Wherry.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. Wagner (chairman), Glass, Barkley, Bankhead, Maloney, Radcliffe, Downey, Murdock, Scrugham, McFarland, Taylor, Fulbright, Tobey, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Butler, Capper, Buck, Millikin, and Hickenlooper.

On Civil Service: Messrs. Downey (chairman), McKellar, George, Byrd, Mead, Scrugham, Langer, Burton, Aiken, and Hickenlooper.

On Claims: Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Tunnell, O'Daniel, Kilgore, Eastland, Taylor, McMahon, Johnston of South Carolina, Capper, Wiley, Wherry, Wilson, and Morse.

On Commerce: Messrs. Bailey (chairman), Overton, Bilbo, Maloney, Radcliffe, Pepper, Mead, O'Daniel, McCarran, Chandler, McClellan, Magnuson, Johnson of California, Vandenberg, Brewster, Burton, Wiley, Robertson, Cordon, and Brooks.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. Bilbo (chairman), Glass, Tydings, McCarran, O'Daniel, Hoey, Moses, Johnston of South Carolina, ——— ———, Capper, Bridges, Burton, Buck, Smith, and Saltonstall.

On Education and Labor: Messrs. Murray (chairman), Walsh, Thomas of Utah, Pepper, Ellender, Hill, Chavez, Tunnell, Guffey, Johnston of South Carolina, Fulbright, La Follette, Taft, Aiken, Ball, Smith, Morse, and Donnell.

On Enrolled Bills: Messrs. Andrews (chairman), Truman, and Reed.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Messrs. Hill (chairman), Barkley, Green, McClellan, McMahon, Aiken, Ferguson, and Hickenlooper.

On Finance: Messrs. George (chairman), Walsh, Barkley, Connally, Bailey, Byrd, Gerry, Guffey, Johnson of Colorado, Radcliffe, Lucas, McMahon, La Follette, Vandenberg, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Butler, Millikin, Brewster, Bushfield, and Hawkes.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Connally (chairman), George, Wagner, Thomas of Utah, Murray, Pepper, Green, Barkley, Guffey, Glass, Tunnell, Hatch, Hill, Lucas, Johnson of California, Capper, La Follette, Vandenberg, White, Shipstead, Austin, Bridges, and Wiley.

On Immigration: Messrs. Russell (chairman), Maloney, Andrews, Radcliffe, Maybank, Eastland, Fulbright, Hoey, Johnson of California, Burton, Ball, Buck, Ferguson, and Donnell.

On Indian Affairs: Messrs. O'Mahoney (chairman), Wheeler, Thomas of Oklahoma, Hatch, Chavez, McFarland, Moses, Taylor, La Follette, Shipstead, Langer, Bushfield, Moore, and Robertson.

On Interoceanic Canals: Messrs. Stewart (chairman), Pepper, Downey, Chandler, Magnuson, Bushfield, Hawkes, and Saltonstall.

On Interstate Commerce: Messrs. Wheeler (chairman), Barkley, Truman, Johnson of Colorado, Stewart, Tunnell, McFarland, Hoey, Johnston of South Carolina, Myers, McMahon, White, Austin, Shipstead, Tobey, Reed, Gurney, Hawkes, Moore, and Capehart.

On Irrigation and Reclamation: Messrs. Bankhead (chairman), McCarran, Overton, Hatch, O'Mahoney, Chavez, Downey, McFarland, O'Daniel, Magnuson, Johnson of California, Gurney, Thomas of Idaho, Butler, Millikin, Langer, and Cordon.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. McCarran (chairman), Hatch, O'Mahoney, Chandler, Kilgore, Murdock, McFarland, Wheeler, Andrews, Eastland, Moses, Wiley, Langer, Ferguson, Revercomb, Wherry, Moore, and Smith.

On the Library: Messrs. Barkley (chairman), McKellar, Thomas of Oklahoma, Bilbo, Radcliffe, Green, Brewster, Hawkes, Cordon, Saltonstall.

On Manufactures: Messrs. Overton (chairman), Russell, Gerry, Guffey, Mead, McClellan, ———, ———, La Follette, Millikin, Ball, Buck, and Capehart.

On Military Affairs: Messrs. Thomas of Utah (chairman), Johnson of Colorado, Hill, Downey, Chandler, Truman, Kilgore, Murray, O'Mahoney, Wagner, Stewart, Austin, Bridges, Gurney, Revercomb, Wilson, Thomas of Idaho, and Burton.

On Mines and Mining: Messrs. Guffey (chairman), Thomas of Utah, Johnson of Colorado, Chandler, Kilgore, Maybank, Scrugham, ———, Reed, Millikin, Revercomb, Robertson, and Morse.

On Naval Affairs: Messrs. Walsh (chairman), Tydings, Russell, Byrd, Gerry, Andrews, Ellender, McClellan, Eastland, Magnuson, Myers, Johnson of California, Tobey, Willis, Brooks, Brewster, Robertson, and Saltonstall.

On Patents: Messrs. Pepper (chairman), Lucas, O'Mahoney, Myers, ———, White, Hawkes, and Capehart.

On Pensions: Messrs. Tunnell (chairman), Wheeler, Walsh, Thomas of Utah, Bilbo, McFarland, Myers, Shipstead, Aiken, Moore, and Donnell.

On Post Offices and Post Roads: Messrs. McKellar (chairman), Hayden, Bailey, Chavez, Ellender, Mead, O'Daniel, Scrugham, Eastland, McClellan, Taylor, Reed, Langer, Buck, Hickenlooper, Capehart, Morse, Saltonstall, and Donnell.

On Printing: Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Walsh, Truman, Pepper, Maybank, Willis, Ball, and Donnell.

On Privileges and Elections: Messrs. Green (chairman), Connally, Hatch, Mead, Stewart, Chandler, Tunnell, Kilgore, Murdock, Johnston of South Carolina, Bridges, Ferguson, Moore, Revercomb, Wilson, Smith, and Capehart.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Messrs. Maloney (chairman), Tydings, Walsh, Connally, Truman, Andrews, Green, Fulbright, Taft, Revercomb, Wherry, Wilson, Smith, and Morse.

On Public Lands and Surveys: Messrs. Hatch (chairman), Wagner, O'Mahoney, Murray, McCarran, Andrews, Murdock, Johnson of Colorado, Taylor, Gurney, Thomas of Idaho, Willis, Robertson, Cordon, and Hickenlooper.

On Rules: Messrs. Byrd (chairman), McKellar, Andrews, Lucas, Bankhead, Maybank, Gerry, Bilbo, Vandenberg, White, Wiley, Shipstead, and Bushfield.

On Territories and Insular Affairs: Messrs. Tydings (chairman), Hayden, Wheeler, Gerry, Chavez, Murdock, Ellender, Eastland, ———, ———, Vandenberg, Austin, Taft, Brewster, Butler, Tobey, and Brooks.

REGULATION OF BEEF PRODUCTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the past few weeks there has been before various departments in Washington for consideration a matter of real concern to the people of America, especially farmers and producers of beef. I understand, although I have not seen the official text, that the order which was released this morning places a ceiling on the prices of live cattle. In that connection I have a few words to say at this time.

I regret to learn that the Stabilization Director has approved the O. P. A. suggestions as to ceiling prices on choice beef cattle, and other changes in the regulations affecting the production of beef. There can be but one result, namely, less beef at a time when more beef is critically needed. Again the O. P. A. managers have violated the confidence of the American people, this time amending the rules covering the production of beef after having encouraged the farmers to fill their feed lots in the belief that no changes were being considered.

About 139,000 cattle were offered for sale in the 12 leading livestock markets of the country last Monday, the largest number on any January day on record. This in itself indicates that feeders are being forced to limit their losses by immediate shipment of their feed-lot cattle. This movement will continue, much to the detriment of the war-food program. Instead of encouraging the production of more beef to relieve a bad market situation, the O. P. A. is discouraging the production of a critical item. Farmers do not want inflationary prices, but they do want and are entitled to cost of production plus a small margin of profit. With an abundance of feed available, this is the wrong time to discourage its use in the production of meat. Under the new regulations we shall probably see corn and other feed grains piled up and turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation for storage when they should stay on farms to be used in manufacturing food for humans. Producers and feeders of experience, with the support of many Members of Congress, have done their utmost to avoid this error on the part of O. P. A., but to no avail. Congress should perhaps quickly enact legislation guaranteeing prices to producers of beef for a period of time following the close of the war, as we have already done with respect to some other items.

THE AMERICAN CHARTER OF TODAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on December 20, 1944, I delivered an address before the Washington chapter of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution. The subject of this address was the Bill of Rights—a Guiding Star.

This subject proved a stimulus to my own subsequent thinking. It set in motion a train of thought which has led to the comments I shall make on the floor today. Therefore, as a preface to my remarks to follow, I ask, at this time, unanimous consent that my speech on the Bill of Rights be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS—A GUIDING STAR

The history of man is of his quest for guiding stars. It is of his eternal longing for prophets who would give him direction, and principles which would illuminate his way. Man, of himself, has felt eternally inadequate. He has despaired of the apparent aimlessness of his days and the obvious dangers of his existence. He has quailed before the fury of the elements, of wild animals and of his fellow men. He has yearned for leaders and thoughts which would give him purpose and power.

In pursuit of his quest for guiding stars, man has put himself often in the wrong. He has crucified his redeemers and bestowed honors upon his enslavers. He has done homage to principles of evil and has done violence to principles of good.

But always man has sought for more light, and when he has hungered sufficiently, a star—a guiding star like the star of Bethlehem, has appeared.

On at least five distinct occasions in human history, man has lifted his eyes aloft, has seen in the sky a guiding star, and has become filled with its light. Each of those occasions is forever signalized by immortal documents or speeches which embodied that light.

I wonder how many of us can guess which those five documents and speeches were.

The first began: "I am the Lord, thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." And then, "Thou shalt have no other God before me."

This, of course, was the Ten Commandments which Moses brought on a tablet from Mount Sinai only to dash to the ground in disgust at the sight of the people's worship of the golden calf. But ultimately those commandments were to be accepted universally.

The second began: "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

This, of course, was the Sermon on the Mount which the Saviour delivered to His disciples.

The third began: "John, by the grace of God * * * Know that we, having regard to God and the safety of our soul and those of all our ancestors and heirs, to the honor of God and the exultation of Holy Church and the betterment of our realm, by the advice of our reverend fathers, and others of our faithful men * * *."

This was the elaborate introduction to the Magna Carta, wrung from an unwilling king by the nobles of England.

The fourth began: "When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

This was the Declaration of Independence proclaimed by the Thirteen Colonies in the face of another arrogant king.

The fifth began: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

This was the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States. These 10 great laws were the natural supplement and fulfillment of the original 7 articles of the Constitution. Together with the latter, they constitute an indivisible unity. Together, they amply justify Gladstone's description of the Constitution: "The most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect."

These, then, are the five great milestones of speech and writing in the history of man. The first two of these wondrous works are of divine origin; the last three are of mortal hands but of divine inspiration.

It is altogether fitting and proper that on this occasion I speak exclusively on the last of these works—the Bill of Rights.

First, it is appropriate because your proud organization is dedicated to the living memory of those immortal patriots who gave of their life's blood that such a document might some day become the law of the land.

Second, it is because your organization, through its Bill of Rights Commemorative Committee, has devoted its able efforts to maintaining vivid in the eyes of all Americans the shining glory of that Bill of Rights.

Third, it is because 5 short days ago marked the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the day when the Bill of Rights was ratified by Virginia, the eleventh and last State necessary for this noble work to become the legal amendments to the Constitution.

Fourth, it is because, had it not been for the promise of a Bill of Rights, we might have had no Constitution at all. For, as originally drafted in 1787, the Constitution contained no guaranty to the people of any inherent rights of freedom. Many States were, therefore, reluctant to ratify the Constitution. It was the promise of the framers of the Constitution to add amendments guaranteeing the citizens' privileges and immunities, which influenced many of the States to act favorably on ratifying the seven articles.

These, then, are my reasons for turning to the Bill of Rights tonight.

Now, would it not be well to recall for a few moments the history of this great work?

In that history, citizens of the State of Virginia figure in remarkable prominence.

It was a Virginian, George Mason, who drafted the first State Bill of Rights which was adopted by the Virginia convention 3 weeks before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, on June 12, 1776. An eminent historian said of that State document: "This Bill of Rights may be called not only the Magna Carta of Virginia but of America."

It was the spirit of George Mason that inspired another great Virginia patriot, James Madison, to propose a national Bill of Rights to the First Congress assembled under the Constitution. For it was on May 4, 1789, just 4 days after the inauguration of George Washington, that Madison gave notice to the House of Representatives assembled at Federal Hall, New York City, that he intended "to bring on the subject of amendments to the Constitution on the fourth Monday of this month."

The way for James Madison's action had been paved by President George Washington, who was both an intimate friend of George Mason and his close neighbor in Mount Vernon. In his inaugural address on April 30, 1789, President Washington pointed to the advisability that a Bill of Rights be framed. After referring to the fifth article of the Constitution regarding amendments, and after reassuring Congress of his confidence in its judgment, our first President went on to say:

"For I assure myself that whilst you carefully avoid every alteration which might endanger the benefits of a united and effective Government, or which ought to await the future lessons of experience, a reverence for the characteristic rights of free men, and a regard for public harmony, will sufficiently influence your deliberations on the question how far the former can be more impregnably fortified, or the latter be safely and advantageously promoted."

Madison's fight for a Bill of Rights encountered the obstacle of the alleged priority of many other laws and constitutional amendments, rather than actual opposition. The new Congress faced a vast number of pressing and practical problems, each demanding long days of undivided attention and lawmaking. A new government had to be completely organized, based on the new Constitution. Altogether, 90 separate amendments were formally introduced in the first session of the First Congress at Federal Hall.

But on August 13, 1789, Richard Bland Lee, of Virginia, moved "that the House now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole" to consider the amendments proposed by James Madison. The motion was carried. This was indeed an auspicious moment, for thereupon began an historic debate on the amendments.

It was a month and a half later, on September 25, 1789, that the Senate resolved, "that the Senate do concur in the amendments proposed by the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate." This was the final act of Congress in officially adopting the proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The House then resolved "that the President of the United States be requested to transmit to the executives of the several States which have ratified the Constitution, copies of the amendments proposed by Congress; and like copies to the executives of the States of Rhode Island and North Carolina."

On September 28, the original engrossed copy of the proposed amendments was signed by Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and John Adams, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate. Today this original copy is in The National Archives here in Washington.

To ratify an amendment to the Constitution takes a vote of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, after it has been passed by the Congress. Since Vermont had been added to the Union in 1791, the approval of 11 States was necessary to complete the ratification of the Bill of Rights. New Jersey was the first State to ratify, on November 20, 1789. Two years and one month later, December 15, 1791, Virginia, the eleventh State, ratified, and the Bill of Rights became law.

There were 12 amendments in the original draft of the Bill of Rights passed by Congress on September 25, 1789, but only 10 of these amendments were ratified by the necessary three-quarters of the States. The first 2 amendments, which were rejected by the States, were: One which related to the apportionment of representatives in Congress and one concerning compensation of members of that body. Today there are altogether but 21 amendments to the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights.

We might well ask ourselves why the great patriots of that day, like Washington, Madison, and Patrick Henry, were so determined to have a Bill of Rights in the Constitution. It was because those men were realists. They read and heeded the lessons of history and the experiences of their own lives. Those lessons and experiences pointed to this inescapable conclusion: Power centralized in the hands of one man or a few men inevitably becomes autocratic.

As a result they created a constitutional republic such as never existed before in all of history. This constitutional republic was a government of checks and balances, of limited power. And they insured that within the Constitution was a definitive statement of the inalienable rights of all citizens.

Why, then, has the Constitution with its Bill of Rights endured through all these 153 years? There are several reasons.

First, because it was so flexibly written that it could be applied in spite of all the changes of the succeeding years. It has ever new applications to the needs of this growing Nation.

Second, because no single man or group of men was completely identified with it and, therefore, it was above repudiation for personal reasons. We may mark this well in these days when the principles of a vital proclamation such as the Atlantic Charter become too closely associated in our minds with one or two men.

Third, because it is so firmly rooted in the needs of man. The Bill of Rights enumerated essential safeguards of his life; such as his right to bear arms, his right to a jury trial, his right not to be put in jeopardy twice for the same crime, and not to receive a cruel or inhuman punishment. Both from the aspect of safeguarding human life and from the aspect of implying human dignity, it was in full keeping with the immortal principles of Him whose blessed birthday we are soon to celebrate. For it was Christ who said: "I have come that ye may have life and have it more abundantly."

Is it not fitting then that the Bill of Rights should take its proud place alongside both the Saviour's words and the words of the other milestone documents?

Is it not appropriate that we should give humble thanks that two of the five great works—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution with the Bill of Rights—should have originated in America? Yet, they, like the word of God in the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, and, indeed, the word of God through man in the Magna Carta, are the property of all mankind.

And is it not inspiring that in this hallowed birthday season, the golden rays of the guiding star of the Bill of Rights should blend with the golden rays of the guiding star of Bethlehem?

There never was a period in man's history when these "stars" were more needed to guide him. There never was a period when man was so called upon to be adequate to his great responsibilities and challenges.

Let us all, therefore, so act that future generations may say to us: "They lived adequately. They lived gallantly. They ably guarded the great values handed down to them in trust for us. They transmitted our heritage to us, vital and unimpaired. They held to a true course in following their great guiding stars."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the subject of my present remarks is The American Charter of today. After listening to the dynamic speech by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], I am sure anyone could speak, even without notes or outline, in relation to the foreign policy situation. I believe he expressed in large measure the hopes and the fears of the American people.

There is just one thing I wish to say before I take up the subject of my thoughts. It is that America has never failed the world. While she did not join the League of Nations, she did join the Nine Power Pact; and when Japan went into Manchuria and the League of Nations was a functioning organization in Europe, it was America that suggested to the other nations that they invoke the power of the Nine Power Pact to stop Japan in Manchuria. America did not fail. It was the other nations that failed.

I again call attention to the fact that when Hitler first violated the Versailles Treaty and went into the Rhine area, we were not a member of the League of Nations. But Britain, France, and other nations were. However, Britain and France could not get together then with respect to stopping Hitler. Had they done so or had they "played ball" with us when we suggested stopping the Jap in Manchuria, the world situation of today would not be what it is. I mention these matters only because in the debates to follow there will be a tendency to blame America because of the failure of the League.

Last night I sat at dinner, in his home, with a former Senator from my State. He told me a historical fact. He said it was President Wilson who defeated the League. He said that Viscount Grey, the then British Ambassador to the United States, had written a letter in which Britain agreed to the reservations, but nevertheless President Wilson told his Democratic associates in this Chamber to vote against the resolution with the reservations. That is a historical fact.

In these early days of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the eyes of the world are upon our two great legislative Chambers; the ears of the world are strained to hear our opening deliberations; the

minds of the world are geared to note the direction in which this Congress is to move. Would it not be well that we announce to the world the spirit of this occasion? I believe in large measure that the speech of the senior Senator from Michigan was the very heart and essence of that spirit. May I, therefore, as a humble Member of the United States Senate, venture my conception of that spirit?

It is my belief and my hope that the Seventy-ninth Congress is today embarking upon its course in the spirit of what may be called the American Charter. This charter is written and unwritten. It is as old as the Nation itself, and even older. It is the mellow blend of all the great recorded documents, and all the experiences and time-proven teachings of the American past.

It is this spirit of the American Charter which I should like to set forth now, for of late we have heard on every lip only the parallel words, the "Atlantic Charter." We have watched the rising and falling fortunes of that proclamation with great concern. Yet it has become quite obvious that, regardless of its ultimate fate—and God grant that its fate be a kindly one—America needs a restatement of its own charter. It needs to have presented anew the historical guiding principles of our domestic affairs. It needs to see again vividly as "a sign in the sky" the American credo. Moreover, it needs a Congress, this Congress, to apply and fulfill the American Charter as never before.

And so, may I offer to this great body my brief interpretation of the American Charter or, as the modernists would put it, "The American Charter of today"? I offer these thoughts on it in all humility. Let every loyal citizen of this land interpret the legacy of America according to his lights, as I have. Let every citizen, including every schoolboy and schoolgirl, devote a part of his time to a study of the very essence of this charter.

No one need trouble himself about whether the American Charter is a signed document, for it is composed partly of many signed documents. But what is more important, it is engraved in the hearts of our Congress, our judges, our worthy leaders, and our people.

Having just recently gone through a political campaign, I digress here to state that the House in adopting the Fulbright resolution and the Senate in adopting its resolution months before the holding of the campaign, definitely indicated by almost unanimous vote, in this body, at least, their position in relation to collaboration. All the smoke screens since must have been for some diabolical purpose. The utilization of such methods has contributed to the confusion of American thinking, as has the recent attitude of newspapers of Great Britain which thought it was a part of their obligation to publish certain articles and editorials.

No one need trouble himself about the American Charter's authors, for they were the great public servants and ordinary citizens of the past. No one need trouble himself about its effect. It can do naught but insure eternal vigilance for the preservation of the values which made this Nation great, and which will make it greater yet. A restatement thereof can do naught but reset aright our national compass. Where are we going? Where are we heading? When we get there, what are we to find? A restatement can do naught but stabilize us and end our political jitterbugging in every direction. No one need trouble himself that the American Charter conflicts with the Atlantic Charter, for it complements that charter on the home front.

Mr. President, you may ask, What is this charter? You interpret it for your children. You interpret it for yourself. I am giving my interpretation of it because, as in every other activity of human life, it is well to take a refresher course; it is well to be tuned up; it is well to get a shot in the arm.

Here, then, is the American Charter of today:

First. Our heritage: We Americans proclaim our undying reverence for the ideals expressed in the great documents of the Republic—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, Washington's Farewell Address, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. We proclaim our undiminished respect for the lessons learned and taught in the lives of our forefathers. We proclaim our unyielding faith in the eternal religious truths upon which our Nation was founded. We proclaim our continued pride in the physical magnificence of our land and the cultural wonders of our peoples of many origins.

We reject the cynicism, the skepticism, the materialism which violate the cherished loves, traditions, and beliefs of previous generations of Americans.

Second. Our challenge of the present: We Americans proclaim our unswerving determination to win this war quickly and decisively. At the same time, we declare our intention to so strengthen the foundations of the Nation as to insure an unqualifiedly joyous homecoming for our millions of service men and women.

We spurn all bitter quarrels which would lead to disunity in war, and to paralysis in peace.

Third. Our opportunity of the future: We Americans proclaim our confidence in the dynamic, progressive future of our growing Nation and in its unlimited economic, political, and spiritual frontiers.

We decline defeatism; we forsake fear as to our national destiny. We look to our native ingenuity and our free initiative to result in such research and other achievements in production and distribution as will bring about an abundance of comforts and necessities for all.

Fourth. Our way of life: We Americans proclaim our consecration to the American home and the American family with their traditional tranquillity, independence, freedom, and richness.

We refuse to allow any invasion or weakening of these basic units of our national life through arbitrary action or restraint by government.

Fifth. Our social justice: We Americans proclaim our intention to insure for each toiler—the farmer, the laborer, the miner, the middleman, the manager, the professional—a just portion of the fruits of his labor, not of the labor of anybody else, but of his own labor. We desire that each toiler shall freely advance and prosper according to his individual merit. We desire that in the event of economic misfortune, handicap, or disability, and in his declining years he shall have the appropriate security which he deserves.

We will not deny or take unjustly from any man the bread or pleasure he has earned by the sweat of his brow or the toil of his brain. Nor will we, by conscienceless hand-outs impair the character of any man by depriving him of his initiative and independence.

Sixth. Our Government: We Americans proclaim our desire for courteous, efficient, and economical administration at and between all levels of government. We proclaim our belief in a government of checks and balances, with its mutual safeguards and mutual stimuli. We proclaim our desire for leaders, and, indeed, for citizens, of vision, courage, practicality, and independence.

We will not allow our Government to be our master, rather than our servant. We will not allow it to be a law-unto-itself with extravagance, arrogance, and inefficiency. We absolutely reject communism, fascism, and every other form of stateism which trades liberty for supposed security or power, and ultimately gives neither.

Seventh. Our middle way: We proclaim our faith in our fundamental system of private enterprise. We endorse cooperative endeavor wherever it is desired by our citizens. We believe in Government participation as an operator in the economic field only when absolutely necessary, and then under conditions of fair and helpful dealings to private enterprise.

We refuse to allow public enterprise to swallow up private enterprise by crippling it with arbitrary restrictions, driving it to the wall by ruinous competition or through other devious measures.

Eighth. Our relations with one another: We Americans proclaim our recognition of our responsibilities as citizens, as partners, and as brothers. We will live up to standards of openness, fairness, and reasonableness in all our intercourse with other citizens and other groups.

We forswear the use of physical force, or verbal weapons such as misrepresentation, character assassination, smoke screening, hysteria, or other base means in the relations between management and labor, between political groups, between different income groups, between regions of the Nation, and between members of the public.

Ninth. Our defense: We Americans proclaim our intention to be adequately prepared for every future military contingency. After two world wars we have our eyes open; the blinders have been removed, and I do not want any unsound reasoning in this body to put those blinders back. We will not allow our military defenses to deteriorate and another Pearl Harbor to occur.

Tenth. Our relations with foreign nations: We Americans proclaim our willingness to discharge fully our world obligations, which have increased since Pearl Harbor, to the end of serving inter-

national justice, peace, and prosperity. We announce we will pursue this end with the same realism, sympathy, and understanding we will practice on the home front.

We reject a double standard for our conduct in home and foreign affairs. We want no dealing under the table. We have become a part of the international picture whether we like it or not, and we are asking of all those with whom we collaborate that there be no double dealing, that the cards be put on the table. We no more desire stealth or injustice by our leaders abroad than we do at home. All the blessings we desire for ourselves, we wish for all other peoples. But we will not arbitrarily intrude in any other peoples' enjoyment of their way of life. Nor will we allow any other people to intrude in our way of life. Nor will we allow our own way of life to be radically changed in order to please any other government or people.

Mr. President, these, then, are what I believe to be the essences of the American charter of today and of our spirit in this newly convened body.

It is my fervent hope that the ideas contained in the American charter of today—however it be faithfully interpreted—may prove a guiding star. May this star shine brightly for ourselves here in Congress, for our people, for our children and our children's children, as we blaze new trails along the American way. May this star be particularly visible through the long night of war and postwar to all the men and women in the Halls of Congress, in our homes, our fields, our factories, our farms, and in all our theaters of military training and combat.

It is my firm belief that there is no problem which can arise in this land which cannot be solved quickly and satisfactorily if we apply the principles of the American charter and the great documents, deeds, and words which provided its origin.

It is my earnest conviction that, by applying these principles, we may be able to fulfill that great counsel, "Be ye adequate."

It is my sincere prayer that the revitalized American charter may inspire every American here and elsewhere to say unto his fellow American:

"I am thy brother. I am thy keeper and thou art mine. Let us join our hands in proud labor and our hearts in proud faith and, under God, we shall make of this land the Eden it was intended to be."

Mr. President, this concludes my remarks on the subject of the American charter. Now I should like to make a few personal comments which pertain to the field of international relations.

Last week I was honored by my Republican colleagues by being selected as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and that appointment was approved a few moments ago by the Senate. At this time I wish publicly to express my gratitude for this honor. Coming as it does at a time of great international crisis, this assignment presents me with a high challenge and a high opportunity. Th challenge is to lend my humble efforts to help guide our ship of state, this beloved America, through the treacherous shoals of disunity within ourselves and with our allies during and after this war. The opportunity to lend my humble efforts to help bring our ship of state safely into a harbor of peace and security.

I enter upon this task with an open mind, not an isolated mind. My vision is not clouded. I have been a student of history; I know something about the human mind, and I am aware of the obstacles; but I have faith that if we make a supreme effort to insure lasting peace we will accomplish it.

I enter upon this task with no grudge, no hatred, no prejudice. I enter upon it with a calm and rational conviction that in the contracted world of today and tomorrow America must not fail to find the way to world peace. Since peace is not a unilateral matter but a multilateral undertaking for the Big Five at the beginning and for all nations later on, you and I know, Mr. President, that all nations, especially the Big Five, must play ball together. Every boy knows what that means. The phrase means there must be collaboration in purpose, in mind, in will, in desire, and in the effort to put back of the objective the economical and physical strength necessary to accomplish it. Another Kellogg-Briand pact, or the like, will not do the job. We attempted once to outlaw war. There must be back of the pact, or treaty, or authority, as I have stated, the desire, the purpose, the will of the nations to live up to their obligations. Are the nations ready for this?

Mr. President, I enter upon this task with no desire other than to safeguard the interests of my country first, last, and always, and, through so doing, to advance the interests of all other like-minded nations.

Mr. President, lest there be any doubt as to where I stand on issues of world cooperation, I ask unanimous consent at this time that excerpts from statements I have made during previous years, and recent news releases issued by me, be printed as a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SENATOR WILEY'S STATEMENTS ON FOREIGN POLICY

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, 1939, volume 84, part 2, page 2078:

"I do not believe in turning the hands of the clock back and sacrificing the international law the centuries have builded. I do not believe in resurrecting the buccaneers and pirates, national or individual, of yesterday.

"International law and order and good will and common sense are part of the world's heritage of which we are custodians. Let us not, as did Esau of old, sell our heritage for a mess of pottage. There is no need for us to play the traitor to the future."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1939, volume 84, part 5, page 4679:

"This country demands and has a right to have 100 percent political allegiance from all of us; and the way to keep our allegiance unsullied and keep America alone in our thoughts is to think American. At this time of crisis each individual in this Nation has the responsibility of building national unity, and that is not built by meddling in foreign affairs."

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 85, part 2, page A308 (remarks before the Interparliamentary Union in Oslo, Norway, August 1939):

"From every land in Europe America has drawn her bloodstream. Your culture has enriched our lives. Your music, your literature, your drama, your great ideas in economics, philosophy, religion, we have made our own. But, Mr. President, you have something we do not want. I refer to those large barriers of fear, hatred, and distrust erected between your nations by centuries of fear, hatred, and distrust. Yes; we owe you much. We know the world is small. We are neighbors. We want to help you, but your problems are so intricate. There are so many equations that we do not understand. I say we want to help, but we want to help you to help yourselves to the end that your problems may find solution through you. We want to be helpful, but America does not want to meddle in Europe. The role of a meddler I do not crave for my country."

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 85, part 2, page A309:

"Our job is to see that a foreign policy is created which will protect and defend America."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 8, 1941, volume 87, part 9, page 9509:

"America has been attacked in a dastardly manner and war declared on her by Japan. This is undoubtedly pursuant to the tripartite agreement between the Axis Powers, Germany, Japan, and Italy.

"We as a people did not want war; it has been brought to us. Now we will take care of the job. There is no division in our ranks now. The criminal attack on Hawaii and Guam and elsewhere has made America one. We have but one purpose, and that is to win the war and preserve our American way of life.

"Let us now have:

"(a) Less loose talk and more action but no underestimation of Japan's strength.

"(b) More defense production and more for our money.

"(c) Extension of the workday for everyone. This is no time for hysteria or complacency; no time for life as usual.

"(d) No grafters or racketeers should be permitted now in government or in industry.

"Japan asked for it. We will, with God's help, carry through to victory."

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 89, part 10, page A1674:

"The world has been contracted through science and discovery, and this makes it vital that we have cooperation and collaboration. * * * We can set up machinery to control nations in an effort to prevent war; we can establish treaties, we can write peace pacts, we can make agreements; we can do all these things in an effort to achieve a lasting peace. But none of these things will have eliminated the causes of war. If we are to build for lasting peace, we must first restore order and recovery to the world by (1) dealing justly with the problems which involve the political, economic, territorial, and ideological phases; (2) we must create some sort of instrumentality with power to preserve the peace."

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 89, part 11, page A3322 (speech at Republican convention at Appleton, Wis., June 27, 1943):

"The Republican Party recognizes that as one of the major nations of the earth, the United States must accept a major share in helping to restore and preserve international law and order in the post-war period. The Republican Party proposes that a strong America shall be a strong champion of international justice; that a purposeful America shall help weave the pattern of durable international peace and order; that an America, aware and confident of her own

great state, shall help relight the lamps of freedom for the groping nations of men."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1943, volume 89, part 6, page 7535 (telegram sent to Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG at Mackinac Island Conference, September 6, 1943):

"United States must cooperate actively with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve world peace. World peace can be best assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty, and their own essential interests, find common ground on which to work together. This common ground can be found only by clearing away existing differences, particularly among the major Allied Nations, and building on the basis of definite common purposes a new international order. Until such time as international relationships become beyond all question orderly and secure" (the people of this country want us to keep our eyes open. They know that in this matter we are dealing with international poker players who have been playing the game for 1,000 years and they believe that) "the United States should maintain such armaments as will not only enable us to discharge our international obligations but will assure our national security." (The people believe that the United States should secure adequate air and naval bases to assure our national security.)

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 89, part 11, page A3774 (speech before Kiwanis State convention, Milwaukee, Wis., August 2, 1943):

"Our real problem in international affairs is the same as on the domestic front—how to attain the unity that alone makes peace possible * * * unity between States and nations is not a matter of legislation only. It is a matter of learning how to live and work together. * * * There is much talk about a new world order. We know until the spirit of cooperation dwells among men, until that time arises, mere government forums will not do the job."

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 89, part 11, page A4041 (speech before the Catholic Knights of Wisconsin, September 9, 1943):

"Theirs—the major powers—is the major task of post-war reconstruction. Theirs is the major obligation, building up a new international order of law and justice and fraternal freedom. They should invite the cooperation not only of all their associates; they should invite the cooperation of all the peoples and states which pledged to work for peace and law. It is not necessary to build some superstate to accomplish a new reign of world law. Talk of such only creates confusion and distrust. We have learned to our bitter cost that mere constitutions, that mere treaties and convenants, are meaningless unless the will and purpose which give them sanction, are present."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 4, 1943, volume 89, part 7, page 9082 (voting for S. Res. 192):

"We have demonstrated by the passing of this resolution that we are willing to cooperate by all honorable means to achieve peace. Resolutions do not contain magic power. No resolution we adopt will have magic power over our allies or over our enemies. * * * We have been burned in two world wars. * * * We know that making another Locarno Pact, or another Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war, does not do the job unless there is the will of the contracting parties to enforce and keep the peace."

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 90, part 8, pages A129–A130:

"As a matter of fact and as a matter of common sense, there is nothing at all contradictory in free and equal and sovereign states organizing to promote world peace and world justice * * * it should be obvious beyond all question that only Americans who believe in our own system without reservations, hidden or open, should be entrusted with the important task of protecting and promoting legitimate American interests in the four corners of the earth."

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 90, part 8, pages A195–A196:

"The United States not only has a historic interest in these islands—the Carolines, the Marianas, and the Marshalls—we have a much more direct and immediate interest as a matter of national security. * * * As outer defenses of our west coast, as stepping stones and lines of communication with the densely populated lands of southwestern Asia and its islands, the three-ocean groups are of major importance to this country. * * * They should be incorporated definitely in the American system."

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 90, part 8, page A330:

"Just as no single state is powerful enough to achieve its own total security, so no single state or group of states can undertake to set up a system of world security without recognizing the reasonable security of the small as well as the great, the weak as well as the strong."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1944, volume 90, part 2, page 2206:

"There must be back of all pacts or treaties or organizations not only the desire to carry on, not only the desire of like-minded people and like-minded public officials to cooperate, but there must be the will to carry through the mandate, the pact, the treaty. * * * But if the nations begin double dealing, if they begin playing international politics, if they begin to sell each other out and fail to keep faith with each other, then all the 10 commandments in international law will not result in the peace being kept."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, 1944, volume 90, part 3, page 3388:

"Let there be no mistake about it. We must have international world planning. We live in a contracted world. We cannot escape our obligations. We will be false in our trust if we did not endeavor to participate in some kind of thinking which would insure that our children and our children's children shall not again travel along dreary roads to armed international conflict."

From the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 90, part 11, pages A4675–A4676:

"So it is possible for many sincere people to reach the conclusion that Vice President WALLACE stated a few months ago when he said that the people of the world were not ready for the League of Nations. That is the issue now. Are the people now ready to enter into a league or any other international authority and live up to the obligations of the written instrument? If they are, then I believe that some form of effectual peace can be accomplished for generations to come.

"It is very clear that the men who sat in conference at Dumbarton Oaks realize that this war has not in it any element that makes for peace, that if peace does come, it must come by a rebirth in the hearts and minds of the people and the leaders of the people to seek the way that will make for peace. The idea here was to draft a charter, not for a perfect world which would need no security league but an imperfect world in which even the large powers have different approaches to the security problem."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 15, 1944, volume 90, part 6, page 7783:

"In connection with the subject of what power should be lodged in the organization or the league or the authority which is being contemplated, necessarily a great number of questions arise. So far as we are concerned, the question is, What authority can Congress confer? Can Congress, if it sees fit, confer blanket authority upon its representative on the council to vote to use military force to preserve the peace? The Constitution provides that Congress alone has authority to declare war. We know that down through our history the Executive has used the armed forces of this country to preserve the peace in the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere without congressional authority, as was demonstrated clearly the other day by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

"There is, perhaps, no clear line of demarcation between instances in which the President has used force to preserve the peace, and actual war, requiring a declaration by Congress. However, it would seem that when a treaty is made, and approved by Congress, which includes provisions for the preservation of world peace, authority might be conferred which would be somewhat analogous to the constitutional power of the President, but not in derogation thereof, to preserve the peace and enforce treaty obligations short of making war.

"It has been said that the American people would not consent to confer upon an international authority the power to declare war, involving the need of American military forces outside the Western Hemisphere; but I repeat that there are numerous instances of military force being used, under constitutional Executive authority, which did not require a declaration of war by the Congress. Of course, speaking from a strictly constitutional viewpoint, such a power to declare war could not be conferred by Congress. It would require a constitutional amendment. However, there is a difference between 'declaration of war' and conferring power in a treaty 'to enforce the peace.' That is the idea with respect to which Americans must be clear. As a result of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and other conferences among the representatives of this Nation and other members of the Big Four or Big Five, which will soon include France, I trust that before long a definite policy will be laid before this body. Then we can thresh out this whole subject."

[News release of December 28, 1944]

WILEY SUBMITS QUESTIONS TO AMERICAN PEOPLE ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

I should like to present to the American people three sets of questions, the answers to which, I believe, will point the way for our intelligent participation in the world community.

I present these questions now because Americans are experiencing the first shock of disillusionment over possibilities of post-war harmony and justice. The cause of this shock is what Americans feel to be the contradiction between, on the one hand, the high-sounding principles of the Atlantic Charter, and on the other hand, the actions of Britain in Greece and Italy together with the United States-British agreement to the partitioning of Poland. The shock has been aggravated by the heart-rending news of high American casualties resulting from the German counteroffensive.

In this dark and forbidding picture, we must find new sources of light unto our feet. Where else can we find such light than by probing within our own God-given intellects and consciences?

The three sets of questions are as follows:

1. Is not Europe still the Europe of old?

Is not its system still poisoned by thousands of years of national hatreds, class hatreds, religious hatreds, fear and suspicion? Has not war further polluted Europe's lifestream rather than purified that stream

Do not the answers to these questions and the civil war in Greece signify that the nations of Europe still have not learned to play ball together as a team, either within or outside their boundaries? Do not these answers give the lie to those who said that it was America's unwillingness to cooperate with

Europe after the First World War that was responsible for the death of the League of Nations and of the peace? Do not those answers signify that we have previously misinterpreted history on America's alleged guilt and that we ought now to open our eyes to Europe's past record of self-inflicted woes?

2. Does not Europe need a realistic America?

Do not the facts that Europe is still the Europe of old and that it is now in its most desperate agony signify that we must keep our feet firmly on the ground in all our dealings with it?

Do they not signify that we must be a good Samaritan to Europe, helping it to help itself, rather than a Santa Claus, bountifully donating our treasures only to be inevitably abused when we cease our donations? Do not those answers signify that we must act coolly, rationally, and logically, rather than with one-track hysteria or mealy-mouthed promises?

Is not each nation actually still fearful for its self-preservation? Will it not be our primary job to sell the idea that preservation of any one nation depends largely on the preservation of its sister nations? And yet should not we, while we are doing this, be on our constant guard that we ourselves suffer no political Pearl Harbors, national or international?

3. Is not the only ultimate and lasting solution of the problems of the world a spiritual rebirth?

Can the same force of arms which will undoubtedly win the war also win the peace? Can we legislate the millenium by international treaties or agreements? Or, will not the world achieve enduring peace only when it has accepted and begun actually to live the principles of the Prince of Peace whose birthday we have just celebrated? Is it not just as true with nations as with individuals: It is not enough to believe in righteousness for the other fellow; it must be lived by ourselves each day of our lives?

Can there be any hope of lasting peace until the Golden Rule becomes the international rule? Is not the form of post-war international peace organization secondary to the primary necessity for morality, faith, vision, and courage on the part of all peoples?

I believe that if the American people honestly and sincerely answer these questions (as I know they will) and then act upon the implications of those answers, America will be able to fulfill that ancient counsel to all the world, "Be ye adequate."

[News release of December 31, 1944]

SENATOR WILEY URGES CONFIDENCE IN SENATE AND IN AMERICA

In these days of momentous foreign relations "baiting the Senate" has become a favorite indoor sport in certain quarters. What is behind all the smearing of this great chamber of our legislative branch?

Why is the old moth-eaten hobgoblin of alleged Senate isolationism waved before the American people? Has not the Senate joined with the House in passing a resolution favoring international cooperation?

Why is the Senate vilified for its role in the nonratification of America's entrance into the League of Nations? Was it not Woodrow Wilson, himself, who instructed his friends not to vote for the ratification resolution with reservations?

Why is the Senate directly blamed (and through it, America indirectly blamed) for the failure of the League of Nations? Was not the League of Nations a going concern for many years? But did not our own Vice President state that the League ultimately failed because "the nations of Europe were not ready for it"?

Why is the Senate abused for not stating itself specifically to the American people on our foreign policy? Does not the Constitution confer upon the President the role of formulating foreign policy and does it not confer upon the Senate the role of passing upon such policy? Has the President made known anything more than the dim outlines of our international policy? Has he submitted any specific proposals to the Senate?

Why is the Senate denounced for not being open-handed on the international question? Have any of the United Nations (who are long-schooled in the poker game of diplomacy) shown their hands? Are our allies ready to enter formally into and live up to some international arrangement for peace? If so, where is such an arrangement?

Let's stop baiting the Senate. Let's show some confidence in it and in America. Let's maintain our national legislative branch strong and independent.

[News release of January 2, 1945]

SENATOR WILEY URGES MENTAL DISCIPLINE FOR ALLIES

Now is the time for all good citizens of America to come to the aid of our foremost objective—winning this war quickly. Now is the time for us to put first things first and quit indulging in the folly of ally-baiting. Victory in war and the security of the world in peace depend on the Allies demonstrating unity.

The newspaper, the London Economist, has just let loose a blast against the United States. With a chip on its shoulder, blood in its eye, and venom on its tongue, it has made its miserable contribution to the cause of Allied disunity. (In this respect, this newspaper has done only what some of our own newspapers have done.) Now a lot of right-thinking Americans will see red over this British criticism and will let loose a tirade of their own. Then a whole series of recriminations will follow.

Let us put a stop to this incessant bickering with our allies by behaving ourselves here at home and asking our brethren across the seas to mind their manners also. We would not allow generals or privates on the battlefield to start hurling mud at their United Nations comrades in arms. Why, then, should we do this at home or tolerate our allies to do it in their own countries?

Why can't we and our allies practice mental discipline through measures such as these:

1. Consider issues from the other nation's viewpoint before criticizing it. Put ourselves in the other fellow's shoes and feel what is causing his complaint.

2. First find the common ground between ourselves and the Allies and then the contested ground, rather than vice versa. Seek out first the things that unite us rather than divide us, that strengthen the bond between us rather than weaken that bond.

3. When we have found an issue on which there is genuine and honest difference of opinion, discuss it with our allies without prejudice, without hysteria, without breast-beating. Let us give and take rationally, logically, and calmly.

4. Develop poise, not poison, within ourselves, humility not bravado, restraint not rashness, perspective not poor-sightedness.

In these trying war days and in the days ahead when we will seek to make a just and lasting peace, each of us—public officials and citizens alike—must have the stature of great statesmen.

CHRISTMAS MESSAGE OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of Senators to the Christmas message of His Holiness Pope Pius XII. I particularly urge every Member of the Congress to study it, for, as the Pope rightfully stresses—

A clear appreciation of the purposes assigned by God to every human society, joined to a deep sense of the exalted duties of social activity, can put those in power in a position to fulfill their own obligations in the legislative, judicial, and executive order with that objectivity, impartiality, loyalty, generosity, and integrity without which a democratic government would find it hard to command the respect and the support of the better section of the people.

The deep sense of the principles underlying a political and social order that is sound and conforms to the norms of right and justice is of special importance in those who in any kind of democratic regime have, as the people's delegates, in whole or part, the power to legislate.

And since the center of gravity of a democracy normally set up resides in this popular assembly from which political currents radiate into every field of public life—for good or ill—the question of the high moral standards, practical ability, and intellectual capacity of parliamentary deputies is for every people living under a democratic regime a question of life and death, of prosperity and decadence, of soundness or perpetual unrest.

LEGISLATORS SHOULD BE CONSCIENTIOUS

To secure effective action, to win esteem and trust, every legislative body should—as experience shows beyond doubt—gather within it a group of select men, spiritually eminent and of strong character, who shall look upon themselves as the representatives of the entire people and not the mandatories of a mob, whose interests are often unfortunately made to prevail over the true needs of the common good—a select group of men not restricted to any profession or social standing but reflecting every phase of the people's life; men chosen for solid Christian convictions, straight and steady judgment, with a sense of the practical and equitable, true to themselves in all circumstances; men of clear and sound principles, with sound and clear-cut proposals to make; men above all capable, in virtue of the authority that emanates from their untarnished consciences and radiates widely from them, to be leaders and heads especially in times when the pressing needs of the moment excite the people's impressionability unduly, and render it more liable to be led astray and get lost; men who—in periods of transition, generally stormy and disturbed by passion, by divergent opinions and opposing programs—feel themselves doubly under the obligation to send circulating through the veins of the people and of the state, burning with a thousand fevers, the spiritual antidote of clear views, kindly interest, a justice equally sympathetic to all, and a bias toward national unity and concord in a sincere spirit of brotherhood.

Members of this body will be interested in the emphasis and importance His Holiness attaches to the role of a legislative body and its membership.

I believe this message of the Pope will rank alongside Rerum Novarum and Quadragesima Anno as one of the great social utterances of the Holy See. I hope it will do for the promotion of right thinking with respect to democracy and peace what the two great social encyclicals did for the promotion of intelligent thought with respect to the problems of labor and social policy.

Those who have criticized this message as an utterance of sentimental appeasement should restudy the document, and should be sure that, in criticizing the contents of the message, they do not also criticize some of the fundamental tenets of American democracy.

I ask unanimous consent that the Pope's Christmas message be printed in

the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The goodness and kindness of God our Saviour appeared. (Epistle to Titus iii: 4.)

For the sixth time since the opening of the dreadful war, the Christmas liturgy again hails with these words, redolent of peaceful serenity, the coming into our midst of God our Saviour.

The humble, mean cradle of Bethlehem, by its wonderful charm, focuses the attention of all believers. Deep into the hearts of those in darkness, affliction, and depression there sinks and pervades a great flood of light and joy.

Heads that were bowed lift again serenely, for Christmas is the feast of human dignity, "the wonderful exchange by which the Creator of the human race, taking a living body, deigned to be born of a Virgin, and by His coming bestowed on us His divinity." (First Antiphon of First Vespers for the Feast of the Circumcision.)

But our gaze turns quickly from the Babe of the crib to the world around us, and the sorrowful sigh of John the Evangelist comes to our lips: "And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it." (John i: 5.)

For alas! for the sixth time the Christmas dawn breaks again on battlefields spreading ever wider, on graveyards where are gathered the remains of victims in ever-increasing numbers, on desert lands where a few tottering towers tell with silent pathos the story of cities once flourishing and prosperous, and where bells fallen or carried off no longer awaken the inhabitants with their jubilant Christmas chimes.

They are so many silent witnesses to denounce this blot on the story of mankind which, deliberately blind to the brilliance of Him who is the splendor and light of the Father, deliberately straying from Christ, has descended and fallen into chaos and into the denial of its own dignity.

Even the little lamp is out in many majestic temples, in many modest chapels, where before the tabernacle it had shared the watches of the Divine Guest over a world asleep. What desolation! What contrast! Can there then be still hope for mankind?

DAWN OF HOPE

Blessed be the Lord. Out from the mournful groans of sorrow, from the very depths of the heart rending anguish of oppressed individuals and countries there arises an aura of hope. To an ever-increasing number of noble souls there comes the thought, the will ever clearer and stronger, to make of this world, this universal upheaval, a starting point for a new era of far-reaching renovation, the complete reorganization of the world.

Thus, while the armed forces continue to engage in murderous battles with weapons ever more deadly, the statesmen, responsible leaders of nations, meet for talks, for conferences to determine the fundamental rights and duties on which should be built a community of states, and to blaze the trail toward a better future, more secure and more worthy of mankind.

A strange paradox this, of a war whose bitterness bids to reach the limits of paroxysm, and of the notable progress made in aspirations and proposals for a solid and lasting peace. Undoubtedly one may well discuss the worth, the feasibility, the efficacy of this or that proposal; judgment may well be suspended in their regard, but it remains nonetheless true that the process has begun.

THE PROBLEM OF DEMOCRACY

Moreover—and this is perhaps the most important point—beneath the sinister lightning of the war that encompasses them, in the blazing heat of the furnace that imprisons them, the peoples have, as it were, awakened from a long torpor. They have assumed, in relation to the state and those who govern, a new attitude—one that questions, criticizes, distrusts.

Taught by bitter experience, they are more aggressive in opposing the concentration of dictatorial power, that cannot be censured or touched, and call for a system of government more in keeping with the dignity and liberty of the citizens. These multitudes, uneasy, stirred by the war to their innermost depths, are today firmly convinced—at first perhaps in a vague and confused way but already unyieldingly—that had there been the possibility of censuring and correcting the actions of public authority, the world would not have been dragged into the vortex of a disastrous war, and that to avoid for the future the repetition of such a catastrophe we must vest efficient guaranties in the people itself.

In such a psychological atmosphere, is it to be wondered at, if the tendency toward democracy in capturing the peoples and winning a large measure of consent and support from those who hope to play a more efficient part in the destinies of individuals and of society?

It is scarcely necessary to recall that, according to the teaching of the church, "it is not forbidden to prefer temperate, popular forms of government, without prejudice, however, to Catholic teaching on the origin and use of authority," and that "the church does not disapprove of any of the various forms of government, provided they be per se capable of securing the good of the citizens." (Leo XIII, Encyclical "Libertas," June 20, 1888.)

If, then, on this feast day which commemorates both the benignity of the Incarnate Word and the dignity of man (both in its personal and social aspects) we direct our attention to the problem of democracy, examining the forms by which it should be directed if it is to be a true, healthy democracy answering the needs of the moment, our action shows clearly that the interest and solicitude of the church looks not so much to its external structure and organization—which depend on the special aspirations of each people—as to the individual himself, who, so far from being the object and, as it were, a merely passive element in the social order, is, in fact, and must be and continue to be, its subject, its foundation, and its end. Given that democracy, taken in the broad sense, admits of various forms, and can be realized in monarchies as well as in republics, two questions come up for our consideration: First, what characteristics should distinguish the men who live under democracy and a democratic regime? Second, what characterization should distinguish the men who hold the reins of government in a democracy?

I. CHARACTERISTICS PROPER TO CITIZENS IN A DEMOCRATIC REGIME

To express his own views of the duties and sacrifices that are imposed on him; not compelled to obey without being heard; these are two rights of the citizen which find in democracy, as its name implies, their expression.

From the solidity, harmony, and good results produced by this between the citizens and the Government one may decide which democracy is really healthy and well balanced, and what is its life energy and power of expansion.

If, then, we consider the extent and nature of the sacrifices demanded of all the citizens, especially in our day when the activity of the state is so vast and decisive, the democratic form of government appears to many as a postulate of nature imposed by reason itself.

When, however, people call for democracy and better democracy, such a demand cannot have any other meaning than to place the citizen ever more in the position to hold his own personal opinion, to express it and to make it prevail in a fashion conducive to common good.

PEOPLE AND "THE MASSES"

Hence follows a first conclusion with its practical consequence. The state does not contain in itself and does not mechanically bring together in a given territory a shapeless mass of individuals.

It is and should in practice be the organic and organizing unity of a real people. The people and a shapeless multitude (or as it is called "the masses") are two distinct concepts.

The people lives and moves by its own life energy; the masses are inert of themselves and can only be moved from outside. The people lives by the fullness of life in the men that compose it, each of whom—at his proper place and in his own way—is a person conscious of his own responsibility and of his own views.

The masses, on the contrary, wait for the impulse from outside, an easy plaything in the hands of anyone who exploits their instincts and impressions; ready to follow, in turn, today this flag, tomorrow another.

From the exuberant life of a true people, an abundant rich life is diffused in the state and all its organs, instilling into them, with a vigor that is always renewing itself, the consciousness of their own responsibility, the true instinct for the common good.

The elementary power of the masses, deftly managed and employed, the state also can utilize; in the ambitious hands of one or of several who have been artificially brought together for selfish aims, the state itself, with the support of the masses, reduced to the minimum status of a mere machine, can impose its whims on the better part of the real people, the common interest remains seriously and for a long time injured by this process, and the injury is very often hard to heal.

Hence follows clearly another conclusion: the masses, as we have just defined them, are the capital enemy of true democracy and of its ideal of liberty and equality.

In a people worthy of the name the citizen feels within him the consciousness of his personality, of his duties and rights, of his own freedom joined to respect for the freedom and dignity of others.

In a people worthy of the name all inequalities based not on whim but on the nature of things, inequalities of culture, possessions, social standing—without of course prejudice to justice and mutual charity—do not constitute any obstacle to the existence and the prevalence of a true spirit of union and brotherhood.

On the contrary, so far from impairing civil equality in any way, they give it its true meaning, namely, that, before the state, everyone has the right to live honorably his own personal life in the place and under the conditions in which the designs and dispositions of providence have placed him.

As against this picture of the democratic ideal of liberty and equality in a people's government by honest and farseeing men, what a spectacle is that of a democratic state left to the whims of the masses:

Liberty, from being a moral duty of the individual, becomes a tyrannous claim to give free rein to a man's impulses and appetites to the detriment of others.

Equality degenerates to a mechanical level, a colorless uniformity, the sense of true honor, of personal activity, or respect for tradition, of dignity—in a word all that gives life its worth—gradually fades away and disappears.

And the only survivors are, on the one hand, the victims deluded by the specious mirage of democracy, naively taken for the genuine spirit of democracy with its liberty and equality; and on the other the more or less numerous exploiters who have known

how to use the power of money and of organization in order to secure a privileged position above the others, and have gained power.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF MEN HOLDING POWER IN A DEMOCRATIC STATE

The democratic state, whether it be monarchical or republican, should, like any other form of government, be entrusted with the power to command with real and effective authority.

The absolute order itself of beings and purposes, which shows that man is an independent person, namely the subject of inviolable duties and rights, who is the source and end of his own social life, comprises the state also as a necessary society endowed with authority, without which it could neither exist nor live.

And if men, using their personal liberty, were to deny all dependance on a superior authority possessing coercive power, they could by this very fact cut the ground from under their own dignity and liberty, by violating, that is, the absolute order of beings and purposes.

As they are established on this same foundation the person, the State, the Government with their respective rights, are so bound together that they stand or fall together. And since that absolute order, in the light of right, reason, and in particular of the Christian faith, cannot have any other origin than in a personal God, our Creator, it follows that the dignity of man is the dignity of the moral community willed by God; the dignity of political authority is the dignity deriving from its sharing in the authority of God.

No form of State can avoid taking cognizance of this intimate and indissoluble connection—lease of all a democracy. Accordingly, if those in power do not see it, or more or less discount it, their own authority is shaken and social morality and that specious appearance of a purely formal democracy may often serve as a mark for all that is in reality least democratic.

Only a clear appreciation of the purposes assigned by God to every human society, joined to a deep sense of the exalted duties of social activity, can put those in power in a position to fulfill their own obligations in the legislative, judicial, and executive order with that objectivity, impartiality, loyalty, generosity, and integrity without which a democratic government would find it hard to command the respect and the support of the better section of the people.

The deep sense of the principles underlying a political and social order that is sound and conforms to the norms of right and justice is of special importance in those who in any kind of democratic regime have, as the people's delegates, in whole or part, the power to legislate.

And since the center of gravity of a democracy normally set up resides in this popular assembly from which political currents radiate into every field of public life—for good or ill—the question of the high moral standards, practical ability and intellectual capacity of parliamentary deputies is for every people living under a democratic regime a question of life and death, of prosperity and decadence, of soundness or perpetual unrest.

To secure effective action, to win esteem and trust, every legislative body should—as experience shows beyond doubt—gather within it a group of select men, spiritually eminent and of strong character, who shall look upon themselves as the representatives of the entire people and not the mandatories of a mob, whose interests are often unfortunately made to prevail over the true needs of the common good—a select group of men not restricted to any profession or social standing but reflecting every phase of the people's life; men chosen for their solid Christian convictions, straight and steady judgment, with a sense of the practical and equitable, true to themselves in all circumstances; men of clear and sound principles, with sound and clear-cut proposals to make; men, above all, capable, in virtue of the authority that emanates from their untarnished consciences and radiates widely from them, to be leaders and heads especially in times when the pressing needs of the moment excite the people's impressionability unduly and render it more liable to be led astray and get lost; men who in periods of transition, generally stormy and disturbed by passion, by divergent opinions and opposing programs, feel themselves doubly under the obligation to send circulating through the veins of the people and of the State, burning with a thousand fevers, the spiritual antidote of clear views, kindly interest, a justice equally sympathetic to all and a bias toward national unity and concord in a sincere spirit of brotherhood.

Peoples whose spiritual and moral temperament is sufficiently sound and fecund find it themselves and can produce the heralds and implements of democracy who live in such dispositions and know how effectively to put them into practice.

But where such men are lacking, others come to take their places in order to make politics serve their ambition, and be a quick road to profit for themselves, their caste and their class, while the race after private interests makes them lose sight of completely and jeopardize the true common good.

STATE ABSOLUTISM

A sound democracy, based on the immutable principles of the natural law and revealed truth, will resolutely turn its back on such corruption as gives to the state legislature an unchecked and unlimited power and moreover, makes of the democratic regime, notwithstanding an outward show to the contrary, purely and simply a form of absolutism.

State absolutism (not to be confused, as such, with absolute monarchy, of which we are not treating here) consists in fact in the false principle that the authority of the state is unlimited and that in face of it—even when it gives free rein to its despotic aims, going beyond the confines between good and evil—to appeal to a higher law obliging in conscience is not admitted.

A man penetrated with right ideas about the state and authority and the power that he wields as guardian of social order will never think of derogating the majesty of the positive law within the ambit of its natural competence. But this majesty of positive law is only inviolable when it conforms—or at least is not opposed—to the absolute order set up by the Creator and placed in a new light by the Revelation of the Gospel.

It cannot subsist except insofar as it respects the foundations on which human personality rests, no less, than the state and the government. This is the fundamental criterion of every healthy form of government, including democracy. It is the criterion by which the moral value of every particular law should be judged.

III. NATURE AND CONDITIONS OF AN EFFECTIVE PEACE SETTLEMENT, UNITY OF MANKIND, AND SOCIETY OF PEOPLES

We were anxious, beloved sons and daughters, to take the occasion of Christmastide to point out along what lines a democracy befitting human dignity can, in harmony with the law of nature and the designs of God as manifested in Revelation, secure happy results. Indeed we are deeply convinced of the supreme importance of this problem for the peaceful progress of mankind.

But we also realize the exalted claims that this form of government makes on the moral maturity of the individual citizen; a moral maturity to which he could never hope to attain fully and securely if the light from the cave of Bethlehem did not illumine the dark path along which the peoples are going forward through the stormy present toward a future which they hope will be more serene.

But how far will the representatives and pioneers of democracy be inspired in their deliberations by the conviction that the absolute order of beings and purposes, of which we have repeatedly spoken, comprises also, as a moral necessity and the crowning of social development, the unity of mankind and of the family of peoples?

On the recognition of this principle hangs the future of the peace. No world reform, no peace guaranty can abstract from it without being weakened and without being untrue to itself.

If, on the other hand, this same moral necessity were to find its realization in a society of peoples which succeeded in eliminating the structural defects and shortcomings of former systems, then the majesty of that order would regulate and inspire equally the deliberations of that society and the use of its instruments of sanction.

For this reason, too, one understands why the authority of such a society must be real and effective over the member states, in suchwise, however, that each of them retains an equal right to its own sovereignty. Only thus will the spirit of sane democracy be able to pervade the vast and thorny ground of foreign relations.

AGAINST WARS OF AGGRESSION AS SOLUTION OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

There is a duty, besides, imposed on all, a duty which brooks no delay, no procrastination, no hesitation, no subterfuge: it is the duty to do everything to ban once and for all wars of aggression as legitimate solution of international disputes and as a means toward realizing national aspirations.

Many attempts in this direction have been seen in the past. They all failed. And they will all fail always, until the saner section of mankind has the firm determination, the holy obstinacy, like an obligation in conscience, to fulifil the mission which past ages have not undertaken with sufficient gravity and resolution.

If ever a generation has had to appreciate in the depths of its conscience the call: "War on war," it is certainly the present generation.

Having passed, as it has, through an ocean of blood and tears in a form perhaps never experienced in past ages, it has lived through the indescribable atrocities with an intensity such that the recollection of so many horrors must remain stamped in its memory, and even in the deepest recesses of its soul, like a picture of a hell against which anyone who cherishes a sense of humanity desires more than anything else to close the door forever.

FORMATION OF A COMMON MEANS TO MAINTAIN PEACE

The decisions already published by international commissions permit one to conclude that an essential point in any future international arrangement would be the formation of an organ for the maintenance of peace, of an organ invested by common consent with supreme power to whose office it would also pertain to smother in its germinal state any threat of isolated or collective aggression.

No one could hail this development with greater joy than he who has long upheld the principle that the idea of war as an apt and proportionate means of solving international conflicts is now out of date.

MONSTROUS MEANS OF CONDUCTING HOSTILITIES

No one could wish success to this common effort, to be undertaken with a seriousness of purpose never before known, with greater enthusiasm than he who has conscientiously striven to make the Christian and religious

mentality reject modern war, with its monstrous means of conducting hostilities.

Unquestionably the progress of man's inventions, which should have heralded the realization of greater well-being for all mankind, has instead been employed to destroy all that had been built up through the ages.

But by that very fact the immorality of the war of aggression has been made ever more evident. And if now, to the recognition of this immorality there is to be added the threat of a judicial intervention by the nations and of chastisement inflicted on the aggressor by the society of states, so that war will always be subject to the stigma of proscription, always under surveillance and liable to preventive measures, then mankind, as it emerges from the dark night in which it has been so long submerged, will be able to hail the dawn of a new and better era of its history.

ITS CONSTITUTION EXCLUDING UNJUST IMPOSITION

But only on one condition, namely, that the peace settlement which should be strengthened and made more stable by mutual guaranties and, where necessary, economic sanctions, and even armed intervention, should not give definite countenance to any injustice, does not imply any derogation of any right to the detriment of any nation (whether it be on the side of the victors, the vanquished, or the neutrals), and does not impose any perpetual burden which can only be allowed for a time as reparation for war damage.

That any people to whose government—or perhaps even partially to themselves—the responsibility for the war is attributed should have for a time to undergo the rigors of security measures until the bonds of mutual trust, violently broken, should be gradually welded together again is quite understandable from a human point of view, and in practice will in all probability be inevitable.

Nevertheless, even these peoples must have a well-founded hope, commensurate to their effective collaboration in the work of reconstruction, of being able, together with the other states, with equal consideration and with the same rights, to be associated with the great community of nations.

To deny them that hope would be the reverse of far-seeing wisdom; it would be to assume the grave responsibility of barring the way to a general liberation from all the disastrous consequences—material, moral, and political—of the gigantic cataclysm which has shaken the poor human family to its very foundations, but which, at the same time, has shown it the road to new goals.

THE STERN LESSONS OF SUFFERING

We will not renounce our confidence that the peoples who have all passed through the school of suffering will be able to retain the stern lessons learned.

And in this hope we are strengthened by the words of men who have had a greater share in the sufferings of the war and who have found generous words to express, together with the insistence on their own need of security against any future aggression, their respect for the vital rights of other peoples, and their aversion to any usurping of those rights.

It would be vain to expect that this sage judgment, dictated by the experience of history and a high political sense should be—while men's spirits are still burning white hot—generally accepted by public opinion, or even by the majority.

Hatred and the impossibility of mutual understanding have given rise in peoples that have fought against each other to a mist too dense to hope that the hour has already come when a ray of light may shine out to clear the tragic panorama on either side of its dark wall.

But one thing we know: That the moment will come, perhaps sooner than the people think, when both sides realize that, all things considered, there is only one way of getting out of the meshes in which war and hate have wrapped the world, namely, a return to the solidarity, too long forgotten, a solidarity not restricted to these or those peoples, but universal, founded on the intimate connection of their destiny and rights which belong equally to both.

THE PUNISHMENT OF CRIMES

No one certainly thinks of disarming justice in its relations to those who have exploited the war situation in order to commit real and proved crimes against the common law, and for whom supposed military necessity could at most have offered a pretext, but never a justification.

But if justice presumed to judge and punish not merely individuals but even whole communities together, who could not see in such a procedure a violation of the norms which guide every human trial?

IV. THE CHURCH AS GUARDIAN OF MAN'S TRUE DIGNITY AND LIBERTY

At a time when the peoples find themselves with duties such as perhaps they have never met before in the course of their history, they feel deeply in their tortured hearts the desire, impatient and almost instinctive, to take the reins of their destiny in their own hands with more independence than heretofore, hoping that thus they will find it easier to defend themselves from the periodic invasions of violence which, like a boiling lava torrent, spares nothing of all that they hold sacred and dear.

Thank God, one may believe the time has passed when the call to moral and gospel principles to guide the life of states and peoples was disdainfully thrust aside as unreal.

The events of these war years have given ample evidence to confute, in a harder way than one could ever have imagined, those who spread such doctrines.

The disdain that they affected toward this supposed unreality has been changed into stark reality; brutality, iniquity, destruction, annihilation.

If the future is to belong to democracy, an essential part in its achievement will have to belong to the religion of Christ and to the church, the messenger of our Redeemer's word which is to continue His mission of saving men. For she teaches and defends supernatural truths and communicates the supernatural helps of grace in order to actuate the divinely established order of beings and ends which is the ultimate foundation and directive norm of every democracy.

By her very existence the church rises before the world as a shining beacon to remind it constantly of that divine order. Her history reflects clearly her providential mission. The struggles, which coerced by the abuse of power, she has had to sustain in defense of the liberty given her by God, were at the same time struggles for man's true liberty.

The church has the mission to announce to the world, which is looking for better and more perfect forms of democracy, the highest and most needed message that there can be: The dignity of man, the call to be sons of God. It is the powerful cry, which from the manger of Bethlehem to the farthest confines of the earth resounds in the ears of men at a time when that dignity is tragically low.

The holy story of Christmas proclaims this inviolable dignity of man with a vigor and authority that cannot be gainsaid—an authority and vigor that infinitely transcends that which all possible declarations of the rights of man could achieve.

Christmas, the great feast of the Son of God who appeared in human flesh, the feast in which Heaven stoops down to earth with ineffable grace and benevolence, is also the day on which Christianity and mankind, before the crib, contemplating the goodness and kindness of God our Saviour, become more deeply conscious of the intimate unity that God has established between them.

The birth of the Saviour of the world, of the restorer of human dignity in all its fullness, is the moment characterized by the alliance of all men of good will. There to the poor world torn by discord, divided by selfishness, poisoned by hate, love will be restored, and it will be allowed to march forward in cordial harmony, toward the common goal, to find at last the cure for its wounds in the peace of Christ.

V. CRUSADE FOR CHARITY

We do not want to close this Christmas message without addressing a word of heartfelt gratitude to all those—states, governments, bishops, and peoples—who at this time of untold misfortunes have lent us valiant aid as we hearken to the cry of suffering which reaches us from so many parts of the world and give a helping hand to so many of our beloved sons and daughters whom the misfortunes of war have reduced to extreme poverty and misery.

And in the first place it is but just to record the immense work of assistance achieved in spite of the extraordinary difficulties of transport, by the United States of America and, with regard to Italy in particular, by his excellency the personal representative of the President of the Union.

It is a pleasure for us to express equal praise and gratitude for the generosity of the head of the state, the Government and people of Spain, and the Governments of Ireland, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Italy, Lithuania, Peru, Poland, Rumania, Slovakia, Hungary, and Uruguay who have vied with one another in noble rivalry of brotherly love and charity, of which the echo will not resound in vain through the world.

While men of good will are endeavoring to bridge the gulf and bring the peoples together, this purely disinterested act of charity assumes an aspect and a value of unique importance.

When—as we all wish—the dissonance of hate and discord that dominates the present moment will be but a tragic memory, the good effects of this victory of active and magnanimous charity over the poison of selfishness and enmity will ripen into even a larger harvest of good.

May all who have had a share in this crusade of charity receive as an incentive and a token of gratitude our apostolic benediction and the thought that on the feast of love from numberless hearts in anguish, but not forgetful in their anguish, there rises to heaven the grateful prayer for them: Deign to reward, O Lord, all those who do good to us for your name's sake with eternal life!

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, my new colleague, Gov. FORREST C. DONNELL, is now present and is ready to take the oath of office as a Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-elect will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. DONNELL, escorted by Mr. TRUMAN, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the time has come for the Senate to clarify its views, in the interest of national unity, on a strong, effective foreign policy.

The Senate should adopt a resolution embodying a clear minimum statement of principles to which every Senator can subscribe who believes enduring peace depends on teamwork.

I have drafted such a resolution, but I am withholding it from formal presentation pending conference with some of my colleagues, in the hope that they will join me in presenting and supporting it.

I shall welcome support and sponsorship from both sides of the aisle for this proposed Senate resolution:

Be it resolved, That the Senate of the United States, exercising its right and responsibility under the Constitution to advise the President in treaty-making regarding foreign policy; and

Fearing that a third world war would mean the destruction of civilization and freedom everywhere; and

Believing that a strong, clear, and unified United States foreign policy is a practical imperative for the molding of an enduring peace, does hereby declare:

1. That the United States favors the formation, at the earliest possible moment, of a United Nations organization, along the lines tentatively drafted at Dumbarton Oaks.

2. That the United States is prepared to accept its share of responsibility, to the use of force if necessary, to act within the framework of such an organization to keep the peace and prevent aggression.

3. That the United States stands unreservedly on its historic American principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter, and intends to do its utmost to bring about the application of such principles throughout the world.

4. That the United States will formulate its post-war policies along diplomatic and economic lines which will exert its full influence toward universal application of these principles.

5. Pending final ratification by treaty of a permanent United Nations organization, the United States favors the immediate formation of a United Nations Council to supervise, when necessary, the life of liberated territories until stable governments can be set up by the free choice of the people involved, and to deal with other diplomatic and political issues that may arise and cannot wait until a permanent United Nations organization can be formally ratified.

Mr. President, the hope for an enduring peace will stand or fall, depending on whether the people of the peace-loving nations of the world can find a channel through which they can merge their desires and their efforts to prevent future wars. That channel must be an international organization. It must be an organization established and operating on a basis that is practical and realistic. It must also have its roots deep in the principles of justice and freedom and decency that motivate men of good will in all countries.

The United States of America must take the lead if we are not to run the grave risk that the hopes of preventing a third World War are to crumble away within our grasp. The United States must obviously have a foreign policy of its own, etched so clearly that no one—no one in this country and no one in any other country—can misunderstand it; a foreign policy which has as its aims, first, to win the war, and, second, to set up an enduring peace. To further these aims, our foreign policy should embody a program to set up, at the earliest possible moment, a United Nations organization, to pledge that we will, this time, accept and carry out our share of the responsibility for enforcing that peace, to do our utmost to bring about the application throughout the world of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and to serve notice on other nations that those who are to receive the full post-war economic collaboration of the United States must live up to those principles to a reasonable degree.

Foreign policy is the joint responsibility of the President of the United States and the Senate. It is the responsibility of the President, so far as major treaty-making decisions are concerned, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

Those who drafted the Constitution of the United States did not limit the Senate's part in this picture to a veto power. They imposed on the Senate also the solemn responsibility to advise the President as to his course. In recent years that responsibility has not, in my opinion, adequately been met.

The Senate, of course, cannot approve a treaty before it is presented or even written. And without the advice of the Senate, the President cannot give assurances that the treaty he is negotiating will be acceptable to the Senate. Is this constitutional division of powers, then, to be an excuse for other nations to say they are forced to return to the old power-politics, spheres-of-influence way of doing business which has always in the end led to war, and which if it leads to another great war may lead to the end of freedoms and even civilization itself?

I do not think there is any need for this to happen. But if we here are to be certain it will not happen through any fault of ours, then we must exercise full responsibility under the Constitution—not only half of our responsibility to consent or refuse to consent by a two-thirds vote after the President has negotiated a treaty, but the other half also, to advise the President, in broad but specific terms, what the Senate of the United States believes our foreign policy should be.

We should discharge our responsibility under the Constitution, clarify our position beyond doubt, as specifically and plainly as is now possible, and then call on the President to discharge his.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan lead me to wonder if he does not think that from the standpoint of collaboration and obtaining results on the home front as well as the international front, it would be a very good thing for the President of the United States to select one or more members of the Foreign Relations Committtee of the Senate to accompany him when he participates in conferences with representatives of other nations?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think that would be wisdom. However, in the past on similar invitation Members of the Senate have declined to go. I think in a few cases there have been resignations of Members of Congress in order that they might fill positions to deal with foreign relations.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has in mind that Members of Congress have resigned so as to act as plenipotentiaries?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. That was not my question, Mr. President. My question related to preliminary meetings, where preliminary understandings are had. In view of the fact that we have heard much talk about the lack of collaboration between the Senate and the President, it occurred to me that it would be a very wise thing if the Chief Executive should see fit to take as members of his delegation say, for instance, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and probably a Republican member of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to answer that question by saying that, in my judgment, cooperation between the President and the Senate cannot be too close. Anything that will result in advising the Senate as to what is going on, and anything that will result in advising the President as to what the Senate believes should be done, should be effected at an early date, so that there may be unity back of our foreign policy. The people, as was said in the President's message to Congress on last Saturday, must get back of the war which we are now fighting and back of the peace which will come, and the people, speaking through not only the Senate but through the President, should have an opportunity to say what they desire the foreign policy of America to be.

REFERENCE OF EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Mr. BARKLEY. As in executive session, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on calendar days of the present session of Congress when no executive session is held, nominations or treaties received from the President of the United States may, where no objection is interposed, be referred, as in executive session, to the appropriate committees by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing an international agreement), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WITHDRAWAL BY THE PRESIDENT OF AGREEMENT ON PETROLEUM

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which

was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Senate of the United States:

Pursuant to the recommendation of the Secretary of State, on August 24, 1944, I transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification an agreement on petroleum between the Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland which was signed in Washington on August 8, 1944.

At that time I considered that the agreement constituted an important step forward in removing possible causes of friction in international trade in petroleum and promoting cooperation among the nations in the development of that trade. I have not changed my opinion in this respect. However, I am informed that fears have been expressed as to the scope and effect of the document, as now worded; some voicing concern lest it authorize acts by the petroleum industry inconsistent with the provisions of existing law, others lest it hold potentialities harmful to the industry. It is my belief that these fears are without foundation. Certainly no such possibilities were intended or designed by the American representatives who negotiated the agreement.

Since there is general accord that an understanding on international trade in petroleum between the United States and the United Kingdom is desirable and in the public interest, it would be unfortunate if this should be delayed, if not prevented, through a misunderstanding as to the purpose and scope of a particular document.

The Secretary of State, accordingly, has recommended that I request the Senate to return the agreement in order that consideration may be given, in consultation with the Government of the United Kingdom, to whatever revision appears to be necessary to achieve its objectives and to remove grounds for misunderstanding. I, therefore, request that the agreement be returned for this purpose.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1945.*

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, there is no legislative business on the Senate calendar, and there may not be any on the calendar for a number of days. We cannot anticipate how long it will be before committees begin to function and report legislation. Until that happens there is no legislative business the Senate can dispose of. Therefore it is my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, and from tomorrow until Monday. How long the situation justifying 3-day adjournments will continue I cannot say. I make the statement so that Senators may know that so far as I can tell there will be no legislative business this week at least and until the calendar has legislative business upon it resulting from reports of committees.

Therefore, if there is nothing further, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 11, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

Robert L. Buell, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Walworth Barbour, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Reed Sharp, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee. Mr. Sharp is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 12, 1944.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Hattie W. Caraway, of Arkansas, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from March 15, 1943. (Vice John J. Keegan, deceased.)

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Nigel D. Campbell, of Chicago, Ill., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Ross E. Brown, of Holland, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

To be assistant surgeons effective date of oath of office:

George P. Hand, Jr.
James L. Hart

Assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons effective dates indicated:

John F. Flynn, Jr., January 17, 1945.
William D. Hazlehurst, January 29, 1945.
Robert T. Potter, December 15, 1944.
Edward W. Kunckel, January 19, 1945.
Selwyn H. Drummond, July 1, 1944.
John W. O'Donnell, July 10, 1944.

Passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons effective dates indicated:

Bert R. Boone, November 16, 1944.
Michael J. Pescor, November 1, 1944.
Don S. Cameron, November 16, 1944.
Ralph R. Braund, September 1, 1944.

Surgeon to be senior surgeon effective July 6, 1944:

Fletcher C. Stewart.

Assistant surgeon to be temporary passed assistant surgeon effective December 1, 1944:

Arthur Kornberg.

Surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons effective December 1, 1944:

Ralph R. Braund
Francis J. Weber
Leslie McC. Smith

Passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons effective December 1, 1944:

Esta R. Allen — John D. Porterfield
William B. Hoover — Jack C. Haldeman

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Blynn T. Shafer, of Ohio, for appointment as Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. The compensation to be paid Mr. Shafer will be $5,600 per annum.

Angus J. Gallagher, of Ohio, for appointment as administrative officer in the Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. The compensation to be paid Mr. Gallagher will be $6,500 per annum.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM AUGUST 26, 1944

Capt. Victor Bradley Vare, Jr., Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Chaplain Robert D. Workman, United States Navy, to have the rank of Rear Admiral in the Navy, while serving as Chief of Chaplains under the Chief of Naval Personnel.

Rear Admiral George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of January 1943.

Rear Admiral Willard A. Kitts 3d, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of January 1943.

Capt. James D. Boyle, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be a pay director with the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of April 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

D. Luther Yarbrough, Athens, Ala., in place of C. W. Sarver, deceased.

Sadie B. Thomas, Citronelle, Ala., in place of M. S. Jefferies, resigned.

ARIZONA

Lena M. Morrell, Florence, Ariz., in place of N. E. Guild, retired.

ARKANSAS

Grace V. Webb, Plumerville, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CALIFORNIA

Eugene L. Graffenstein, Di Giorgio, Calif. Office became Presidential October 1, 1944.

Charles A. Miller, Gridley, Calif., in place of C. R. Pierce, deceased.

Manuel C. Joseph, Irvington, Calif., in place of M. C. Joseph. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1940.

William Lais, Perkins, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph Venolia, Spadra, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

COLORADO

Ruby H. Schroeder, Gypsum, Colo., in place of E. M. Stanley, resigned.

Edward Termer, Sugar City, Colo., in place of L. F. Houston, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

John J. Shea, Colchester, Conn., in place of J. M. Clifford, deceased.

FLORIDA

George C. G. Hopkins, St. Augustine, Fla., in place of O. P. Goode, deceased.

GEORGIA

Grady Richardson, Donaldsonville, Ga., in place of H. C. Cherry, removed.

ILLINOIS

James L. Westfall, Crossville, Ill., in place of H. O. Given, transferred.

Kenneth A. Elmore, Quincy, Ill., in place of H. J. Swope, deceased.

INDIANA

Esther Wolford, Linton, Ind., in place of C. L. Wolford, deceased.

IOWA

William F. Hulburd, Dow City, Iowa, in place of J. L. Buss, transferred.

Walter H. Peters, Ireton, Iowa, in place of John Moeller, transferred.

Florence Goss, Lawler, Iowa, in place of D. P. O'Connor, retired.

Jeneva G. Parker, McIntire, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KANSAS

Reuben J. Wilhelm, Bazine, Kans., in place of Carey Olson, transferred.

Harold V. Luginbill, Greensburg, Kans., in place of Frank Barker, deceased.

Joseph Lillard Johnson, Osawatomie, Kans., in place of M. V. Dunlap, retired.

Wade H. McDowell, Paola, Kans., in place of J. W. Sheridan, deceased.

Gordon Alvis, Seneca, Kans., in place of W. L. Kauffman, resigned.

Charles S. Smith, Westmoreland, Kans., in place of W. D. McKimens, transferred.

KENTUCKY

J. Logan Warren, McHenry, Ky., in place of E. E. Warren, deceased.

Henry B. Rappolee, Smithland, Ky., in place of C. L. Hollingsworth, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Esther B. Dunn, Slaughter, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Leola B. Parrino, Westwego, La., in place of I. A. Currault, resigned.

MAINE

Susie O. Carver, Beals, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lucy E. Wilson, Gray, Maine, in place of E. F. Wilson, deceased.

Albert H. Butterfield, Standish, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William P. MacDonald, Vassalboro, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MICHIGAN

Emma Keating, Allen, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marie L. Mottes, Alpha, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ernest E. Hawes, Applegate, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alice M. Bishop, Bannister, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Coral D. Porter, Bath, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary L. Myers, Berrien Center, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Henry H. Sibole, Breedsville, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gunile Heldmann, Chatham, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Dell Merry, Clarklake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Henry J. Stein, Clinton, Mich., in place of Livingstone Latham, resigned.

Clara M. Bevier, Flat Rock, Mich., in place of L. M. Griffith, removed.

Thomas J. Kaufman, Hubbell, Mich., in place of P. J. Scanlan, retired.

William J. Wheeler, Walled Lake, Mich., in place of R. J. Tuttle, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Peter E. Kopacek, Danube, Minn., in place of O. H. J. Zorn, transferred.

Peter C. Gravel, Onamia, Minn., in place of C. E. Gravel, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Leonard B. Robinson, Moss Point, Miss., in place of W. M. Alexander, resigned.

MISSOURI

Ruth C. Fossett, Mount Vernon, Mo., in place of Robert Stemmons, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Hazel L. Porter, Eagle, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Albin E. Rodine, Stromsburg, Nebr., in place of A. E. Rodine. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Gould S. Richmond, Orford, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Mabel F. McGrath, Paulsboro, N. J., in place of J. F. Dempsey, transferred.

NEW YORK

Elliott McClung, Campbell Hall, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Naomi C. S. Garritt, Cragsmoor, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Albert W. Rogers, Franklinville, N. Y., in place of J. J. McClory, resigned.

Charles Riccardi, Glasco, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mildred E. Kraack, Lake Huntington, N. Y., in place of B. D. Calkin, deceased.

C. Everett Scott, Morristown, N. Y., in place of G. H. Bogardus, transferred.

Patrick K. Fleming, Plattekill, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ralph A. Varney, Schuylerville, N. Y., in place of D. J. Falvey, deceased.

Belle Ernes, Selden, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katherine C. Slattery, Trudeau, N. Y., in place of R. J. Slattery, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Allie Graham Carr, Watha, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

Richard Brooks, Bradford, Ohio, in place of Fred Durr, transferred.

John W. Martin, Cadiz, Ohio, in place of S. F. Dickerson, deceased.

Josephine A. Ginnan, Jacksonville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vera E. Schaller, Jenera, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elizabeth C. Brown, North Madison, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alta O. Sharp, Pleasant Plain, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Flora W. Brown, Smithville, Ohio, in place of C. W. Gerig, removed.

OKLAHOMA

Walter W. Hunter, Checotah, Okla., in place of J. W. King, resigned.

Hester E. Hathaway, Grant, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Juanita I. Taylor, Marland, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William M. Etter, Oktaha, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sarah L. Stanton, Putnam, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Oda Smith, Reed, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

PENNSYLVANIA

Stewart A. Heffley, Boswell, Pa., in place of S. A. Heffley. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1940.

Jessie D. Houck, Cairnbrook, Pa., in place of G. H. Houck. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1941.

Clifford F. Steinmetz, Catasauqua, Pa., in place of S. H. Hauser, removed.

Elizabeth A. McBride, Centerville, Pa., in place of A. D. Boyle, removed.

Margaret E. Walsh, Lopez, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Joseph Doyle, Mildred, Pa., in place of G. C. McMahon, resigned.

Myrtus P. Spangenberg, Waymart, Pa., in place of M. L. McMahon, declined.

William A. Thompson, Waynesboro, Pa., in place of A. R. Warner, resigned.

Morris A. Shaffer, Windber, Pa., in place of O. J. Shank. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.

RHODE ISLAND

Walter Joseph Allaire, Esmond, R. I., in place of R. H. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1939.

TEXAS

Maggie M. Burkett, Andrews, Tex., in place of E. W. Burkett, deceased.

Jennie Joe Barnett, Paradise, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bertha K. Martin, Tatum, Tex., in place of F. W. Scott, transferred.

UTAH

Emma M. Russell, Roy, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Frank H. Duffy, Jr., Rutland, Vt., in place of H. C. Brislin, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Mabel C. Crockett, Bishop, Va., in place of B. B. Turley, resigned.

Emma P. Heath, Esmont, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lulu L. Griffis, Midway Island, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ruth E. Thornton, War, W. Va., in place of W. H. Johnson, retired.

WISCONSIN

Erwin E. Wiffler, Arcadia, Wis., in place of Albert Hess, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Love Divine, an ever-present Helper, we are moved by Thy most gracious mercies and by the precious promises of Thy Holy Word. We pray that we may be willing to lose our lives for some truth, for some benevolence, and for some duty that will lift us nearer to our God. Grant that the things of this world which seduce, which suppress and distress shall be done away and men shall carry the sacred flame in their breasts, full of zeal which defies tyrants, dares armies, and sets nations free.

We breathe a prayer for those who are never applauded, for those quiet workers in office, shop, field, and mine; for those silent mothers whose names seldom fall on the ears of men. The happiness and security of the world are dependent upon these uncalendared hosts. O teach us to know the absolute value of human life in the common ways of this world; its simplicity and sincerity call for loud praise and gratitude, shielding us from those ordeals and tragedies which have shipwrecked nations and men of old. Dear Lord, may we be unified, may our conduct show forth the rule of Jesus. We rejoice that our Father's house is large enough for knowledge, friendship, and liberty for all. In the name of Him who taught men to pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. TRIMBLE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Justice Byrnes on the subject of streamlining Congress. This article exceeds the space in the RECORD

permitted under the rules. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost $130. I ask that the article be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

RETURN TO THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, when he was compelled under Japanese attack to leave the Philippines, General MacArthur said, "I will be back." I think it well for the House to pause for a moment today to realize the full import of the fact that General MacArthur is back in the Philippines, back with an 800-ship convoy which landed on the island of Luzon in one of the most successful landing operations in military history. The soil of the Philippines will be free before long, we earnestly hope and pray. I think I express the feelings of every Member of this House when I say we do honor to the gallant men of all branches of the service who made this possible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial published in the San Francisco Examiner on the ship-air transport issue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DRAFTING OF IV-F's

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have received dozens of letters from my constituents expressing themselves regarding the compulsory drafting of IV-F's or putting them into labor battalions.

The following letter is a typical example, which I think merits your attention. It is from a physician. It reads as follows:

JANUARY 8, 1945.

MY DEAR DOCTOR: Too bad that the IV-F's and the farm boys do not have a union so that they could become vocal and make the politicians tremble. Note the attitude of Congress toward drafting Political Action Committee.

There are several hundred thousand crooners, band men, night-club entertainers, yachtsmen and their crews, baseball and football artists who seem young and healthy and certainly unessential. Why not put them in the front lines and let the IV-F cripples take up the entertainment business. They might perform and sing unusually well. Then the farm boys could stay put and there would be no shortage of food for the soldiers.

Another instance of the old adage that the "Powerful always oppress the weak."

Yours truly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the services of Dr. Andrew F. McBride, of Paterson, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that will be decided by the Seventy-ninth Congress is, Shall we have peacetime military conscription in the United States? In Plymouth, Mich., in my congressional district, there is a public forum. Plymouth is a typical American community made up of self-respecting, God-fearing, and independent-thinking citizens. They debated this question on the 2d of January. There were 51 ballots cast, and the executive secretary of that organization, Mr. Roy Pursell, sent the ballots to me. He says 70 percent of the time was given to those who favored this idea, yet the vote was against it. Of the 51 ballots cast, there were 19 ballots for conscription and 32 ballots against conscription. He says that thus, Plymouth, Mich., is not average-going according to the Gallup poll.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, about the reddest thing I know of is the Federal Treasury statement. You know, we in school, used to have the children ask us a question: What is black and white and read all over? Well, I think the best thing to illustrate that is this Federal Government financial statement. Yesterday we had the request made by the President for $83,000,000,000 for the budget for the next year. That is going to mean $602, at least, for every citizen of the United States. That is going to mean $50 a month for every citizen of the United States in order to meet that great obligation. Our spending at the present time is $270,000,000 a day. We take in at this time in taxes about $112,000,000 a day, which means we are short about $158,000,000 a day. We are in the red that amount—that is the reason I say the Federal statement is very red. Does that not seem quite a sum to the average Member of Congress? I want to drive this point home to you as Members of Congress. Whenever appropriation bills come in here for the spending of funds that are not absolutely essential to the winning of the war, do you not believe that it is your duty and obligation to eliminate that bill for the present and wait until we can get our feet on the ground and try to save this Nation from going into bankruptcy? I think it is; and I ask that every day now we weigh these questions and give our best attention to the spending of funds to see that we do nothing extravagantly—waste that which we should conserve. It is so important, it is so necessary, and it is most vital. Will you, Mr. Congressman, give your best attention to economy in government. $83,000,000,000 for a budget is really some budget. Where are you going to get the money?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I listened very intently to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Six hundred and two dollars for the price of liberty. Do you begrudge it? Are you not willing to pay something toward the cost of this war in which we are engaged? Or are we to hear, sir, from time to time again, the same talk about the money expended? One-twelfth of the amount of the Budget, if you would count it all, is for the ordinary operating expenses of the Government; one-twelfth of the $602 the average citizen of the United States will pay for good government. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object to that? Or is the gentleman from Pennsylvania still thinking, as he did when he was here before, more about expenditures than freedom and liberty for the American people?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next I may address the House for 20 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 30 minutes after disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted permission to extend my remarks and include an article on Alaska. I am advised by the Public Printer that it will take two and two-thirds pages; that it exceeds the limit. Notwithstanding this I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the gentleman's request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short address delivered by myself; and to extend my remarks and to include therein a report of the advisory council to the mayor of the city of Milwaukee on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a newspaper article and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO ADJOURN OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn until Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, all of us were thrilled this morning as the gentleman from California said, by the news of the marvelous advance made by our fighting men in the Philippines. It was a glorious achievement.

I wish to call attention to the fact that we are also making great gains in Europe.

About a year ago the smear bund in Washington and New York tried to destroy Gen. George S. Patton by the most dirty and contemptible attacks I have ever known. I was the only man in either House to rise and defend General Patton against those attacks at that time. Today the American people may thank God that we had General Patton in command of the Third Army at the time Rundstedt's drive came.

As I said a year ago, General Patton is manifesting the daring and brilliance of Nathan Bedford Forest, the genius of Stonewall Jackson, and the bulldog tenacity of U. S. Grant. He is one of the greatest soldiers of the world, and I thank God that the smear bund was not successful in their attempts to destroy him last year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely glad the gentleman from Mississippi has spoken for so long in such glowing terms of Gen. George S. Patton, Jr. He is a Massachusetts man. Heaven only knows what the allies would have done without him these past months. Feared by Hitler, General Patton is admired by his men for his fighting spirit and inspired leadership. He is admired and feared for his genius in battle throughout the world. I had the privilege of an hour's talk with him at his Third Army headquarters when I was in France in September. From the wounded and from men on the field of battle I heard of his prowess. I rejoice with the gentleman from Mississippi that General Patton is at last receiving part of the credit that is due him.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not know what State General Patton was from, but I did know that he was a great American, brave and patriotic, and an able soldier. We are all proud of him. I congratulate the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts on having him as one of her distinguished citizens.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He was a Californian originally but now lives in my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and his wife was born in Lowell, Mass., and lived there as a child. Massachusetts claims them both.

Mr. SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein, because I feel it should be a part of the permanent records of Congress, a very strong and very wonderful statement made yesterday by General Bradley in connection with the fighting that has been going on and is going on now in Europe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DIRECTION TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION TO COMPLETE ITS STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 592

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (H. Res. 63; Rept. No. 11), directing the Committee on Education to complete certain studies, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education is authorized and directed (a) to complete during the month of January 1945 the study, originally authorized by House Resolution 592, Seventy-eighth Congress, of the effect upon colleges and universities throughout the United States of (1) reduction in enrollment and in faculties as a result of service by students and faculty members in the armed forces of the United States or in other war activities, and (2) recent curtailment and prospective further curtailment of Army and Navy training programs in such colleges and universities; with a view to determining means by which such effects may be alleviated.

(b) To formulate, as soon as practicable, for consideration by the House, such legislation as the committee deems appropriate for the purpose of alleviating such effects.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee (a) may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it finds necessary; (b) may, with the consent of the head of any department or agency of the United States, utilize the services, facilities, and personnel of such department or agency; and (c) may request such information and assistance as it deems desirable from individuals, organizations, and agencies, both within and outside of government.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is no objection to House Resolution 63 I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House Resolution 63 authorizing the Committee on Education to complete during the month of January 1945 the study, originally authorized by House Resolution 592 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, of the effect on colleges and universities of the Army and Navy training programs.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read House Resolution 63.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman, does this take in a survey for all the colleges with the idea and purpose of trying to see what they need now on account of the fact that the young men are taken away from the colleges, the colleges are out of students, and they want some relief from the Federal Government?

Mr. SABATH. They do not want any relief. This committee sought to obtain information and see what possible aid could be given to the colleges and universities in order to take care of the young men who have not been able to enter these colleges and universities. The committee has done splendid work. All this resolution aims to do is to give them until February 1 to make a report on their activities. I understand that the committee has had the advice and cooperation of the greatest educators in the United States and it really has done

a splendid job. All it seeks is an additional few days to enable it to file a report.

Mr. RICH. Might this committee go into the question of whether it is possible for the Army to continue with less expense to the Government so far as sending students to these colleges is concerned in order that we may help these universities to carry on?

Mr. SABATH. This committee has concluded its investigation, it is ready to prepare a report and this is merely for the purpose of giving them additional time to make that report.

Mr. RICH. Have they made a survey to find out whether it might be possible for the Army or the Navy to continue these educational facilities for the benefit of the Army or the Navy?

Mr. SABATH. I will be candid with the gentleman, I do not know what the survey shows, but I am informed that they have made a thorough study and that they had the cooperation of the best educators in the United States assisting them in making it possible to furnish the House with a report that will throw light on the subject and give us information upon which action may be taken later on.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as the gentleman has so well stated, all this resolution does is to permit this committee to have until February 1 so that it might make its report. At the time it makes its report, or later, the matters reported and about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has inquired, may be thoroughly discussed and understood?

Mr. SABATH. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it seems to me that the Rules Committee ought to abide by the rules of the House. These resolutions should lay over for 1 day in order that opportunity may be given somebody to read what is in them. I know what this resolution provides, as the gentleman stated, but there is more to it than that. They are going to come in and ask for an additional amount of money. How much are they going to need in order to close up?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, at all times it is my desire to live up to the rules of the House; consequently I asked unanimous consent of the House for immediate consideration of the pending resolution. If there is objection on the part of anyone, I shall be glad to withdraw my request. But believing this committee should be enabled to conclude its report by February 1, I felt it should be taken up immediately so that the committee could not come in later on and say, "We lost 4 days" or "We lost a week." In view of the fact that they have concluded their work, I am anxious that they make their report by the 1st of February.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not going to object to this resolution, but I am going to object if any of the others are brought in here that the gentleman spoke about yesterday that his committee intends to report. Let them go over for 1 day to give us an opportunity to be prepared.

Mr. SABATH. I always do so, with few exceptions, now and then, when I think the entire House is in favor of it, which saves time. This slight extension will involve little expense, in which factor I know the gentleman from Missouri is always interested.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, if the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. It will be. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I submitted a statement for printing in the RECORD in the extension of my remarks which I fear slightly exceeds the two-page limit by the Committee on Rules. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the additional cost, that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

ELIZABETH T. RABBITT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 71), as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Elizabeth T. Rabbitt, widow of Frank O. Rabbitt, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Frank O. Rabbitt.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DRAFTING THE IV–F'S

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I notice in the press that one of the committees of the House intends to hold hearings on the question of what might be termed universal conscription. As I get it, it is proposed to draft the IV–F's into the service of the Government, then put them, as one paper has it, into labor battalions, and assign them to jobs, but deny to them the benefits that go with military service in other branches of the armed forces. It is my hope that the committee which has this matter in charge, which is holding hearings on the bill, will inquire of its sponsors, of administration spokesmen, as to whether there are to be any restrictions or limitations put upon those who are drafted into this service; whether they will be required to become or be members in good standing of any organization if they are drafted.

Quite recently the Army assigned officers and men to the duty of taking over the Montgomery Ward retail stores throughout the Nation. From that action on the part of the administration I gather that those Army men are not needed in the war effort, otherwise they would not have been assigned to duties which are strictly civilian in their nature. If the administration or if the President as Commander in Chief has so many men, so many officers and privates that he can, to further the interests of a union, assign those officers and those privates to the duty of taking over and operating retail stores, and collecting dues for unions, it occurs to me that our need for the drafting of everyone is not so acute as some are led to believe. I would like to know, too, just what duties these Army men, officers and privates, who are in charge of Ward's stores will be required to perform. And will the clerks in bobby-socks become members of the armed forces and will they be drafted into the service if they refuse to cooperate. One of the first demands made by the C. I. O. through its officials in the cities of Detroit and Chicago was that the Army official in charge force the employees of Ward's to pay dues which were in arrears for 13 months. The union demanded that all of the employees of Ward's, who belonged to the union be required to pay all back dues—that is that the Army become the collecting agency for the union. I have read that the N. L. R. B. recently handed down a decision in which it stated that the demand of the union that nonunion members be required to pay dues would not be enforced by an order of the Board. But in any event, the union asked the Army officer in charge, to compel the employees to pay out of Ward's funds or out of the employees' checks, the monthly dues, the ones that was in arrears for 13 successive months.

When this Ward matter was up, Mr. Davis, of the War Labor Board, said that Montgomery Ward & Co. had refused to adopt the wage scale ordered by the Government. He stated in substance that Ward's employees were underpaid, and implied that they could not get other jobs. That statement was not accurate, for the reason that in Detroit there is a manpower shortage. There are jobs at high wages in the industrial plants in the Detroit area. If the employees of Ward's are underpaid, they can go over

to these factories, because being in a nonessential business, from a war standpoint, they are not restrained by any order which limits the place where they may be employed. They can go over to these other factories and get jobs at higher pay. But is it not more than passing strange that the President should order the seizure of a civilian business, and then when it is seized, along should come the officials representing, if they do represent these employees, and ask that the Government, through the Army, compel them to kick in that dollar or dollar and a half, or whatever it was each month in order to hold their jobs?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is there any reason why the Government should force Montgomery Ward & Co. to pay more for the same kind of work than any other competitive business pays?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know anythink about the wage scale. I am not talking about the adequacy or the inadequacy of the wage. That is not my point. My point is that there is no reason why we should draft men into labor battalions and put them under the domination of any other organization, whether it be religious, fraternal, or labor. That is the point I am trying to make.

The War Labor Board insists upon a maintenance-of-membership clause when demanded by a union. What I would like to know is this. I had always supposed that the Ways and Means Committee of the House was the body which originated tax measures. I know of no authority under the Constitution or an act of Congress which gives any organization, religious, fraternal, or labor, the authority to levy a tax upon an American worker. What the administration proposes to do is to draft these men and bring them under Government control, tell them where to work, tell them what they are going to receive for their work, and I want to know whether when it does that it is also going to follow the present policy of this administration and tell them through the maintenance-of-membership clause—and I do not care however you twist it, the result is the same, it forces them into the union one way or another—tell them that they must join the union, tell them that they must pay the initiation fee, that they must pay their monthly dues, and that if a special assessment is asked, as it was during the last campaign, for political purposes, they must pay that political assessment.

If that is true, then we have an administration conducting a political campaign which says to the Congress, "We want these men forced into the armed services," which then says to them through the War Labor Board, "You are in the armed services, you are going to work in factory A, you are going to receive a dollar and this or that per hour, and out of that the Government is going to deduct so much per month, and from that so much per month which goes into the union treasury from the employee's pay envelope the union may say we are going to take so much out of that deduction for our campaign for a certain political party for certain candidates for political office."

Is that one of the purposes or will it, if you prefer, be one of the results of the drafting of IV-F's? I am in favor of a policy which will make everyone do his part. As long as 2 years ago the 25th of this month I dropped into the hopper a bill which provided in substance that if a man went on strike, if he slowed down on his job, or if he loafed or quit, he should within 10 days get himself another job in a war industry; that if he could not or did not within 10 days get a job in a war industry, automatically, regardless of age or physical condition, he would be inducted into the armed services, and that the area Army commander in the district where he lived should assign him a job.

He could assign him to a job in a factory or in a store or on a farm or in a camp anywhere where he would be useful, where he would not be a slacker. But a provision in that bill was that when so inducted, that man who refused to work in a war industry would receive the same compensation and, in addition, the same benefits which are received by the men in the service. Now, is there anything wrong with that? You take a young man and you lift him right out of his home. You take him away from his family. You send him anywhere you want to send him, and he works and he fights and he does all that his commanding officer tells him to do. Is there any reason, then, that being true, why the man who stays here at home and who lives with his family and who lives in a warm home, sleeps in a warm bed, and gets three good meals a day and high wages, is there any reason why he, too, should not serve his Government? I think not. But having inducted him into service, I would not turn him over to some organization, in all too many instances controlled and operated by some fellow who is a racketeer or an ambitious labor politician, and permit it to compel him to pay whatever it might demand and thus in the aggregate collect millions of dollars and then use a million of it for political campaigns. By the way, I noticed last night in one of the local papers the withdrawal of two large C. I. O. unions, one in Baltimore, from the C. I. O. because the union would not go along with the communistic ideas, views, and policies of the State president of that organization. So it is true, as we all know, some—by no means all; no, not even a majority of these organizations—are controlled by Communists, by left-wingers, or by just ordinary racketeers. Again, my question of this administration or the majority party: If we go along and if these men are drafted from all walks of life into the Government service, are you going to strike off the chains which heretofore have bound them to these organizations? Will you free them from the W. L. B. and its political ally? Are you going to permit them to work in the service of their country unhampered by restrictions imposed by unions, the W. L. B., or anyone else, and free them from demands of a man who holds them up for union dues and union assessments?

Now, I will go back to the argument under which the President and the War Labor Board acted in this Ward case in Detroit. There was a strike. It went on for days. The strike was unsuccessful. The customers continued to go to the stores and the employees continued to serve them. So what happened? Flying squadrons from other C. I. O. unions in the city of Detroit went into the stores, took possession, and destroyed thousands of dollars worth of merchandise. They created a state of violence, and it might have developed into a civil war if the violence had continued. Then representatives of upwards of 100 C. I. O. unions in that area held a conference and they decided and publicly announced that if the Government did not force Wards to comply with the demands of Wards' C. I. O. local, they in the war industries would call out their members on strike and a tie-up in war production would have followed. So the Government, because sympathy strikes in war industries were threatened in violation of the no-strike pledge, took over a civil business and now is operating those stores through Army officers and men in compliance, in part at least, with the unions' demands. The Army takes money out of the treasury of the company or the Treasury of the Government and meets the demands of that one particular union. Now, argument used to justify the seizure of Wards amounts to this: If a man is going down the highway and is held up and a policeman comes along and says to the highway robber: "Here, you cannot do that." "Yeah?" says the robber. "Listen, brother officer, if you make me quit, if this fellow does not turn over his dough, I have a half dozen pals in other parts of the city who are going to start a series of sympathetic robberies. You interfere with me and my pals will go to work on a few—maybe a lot—of other citizens."

That is what it amounts to. That is a rather crude way of stating the situation, but that is what the argument of the Government logically comes to if you follow it out. So because the C. I. O.-P. A. C., which claims that they elected the President, threatened to do—that is hold up production for war by sympathetic strikes—if the President did not make Wards comply with their demands. They were going to call other strikes and tie up war production in the city of Detroit, in the county of Wayne, if the administration did not force Wards to grant these demands. So the administration gives proof, if proof were needed, once and for all that even war production must clear through Sidney; that Sidney gives the orders and the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, if you please, does what the C. I. O. tells him to do.

A shameful spectacle in this, the land of the "four freedoms"—the home of democracy, so-called—where citizens are forced by the Army, acting on the orders of the Commander in Chief, to pay tribute to union bosses, when the Commander in Chief seizes and operates a private civil business.

If that makes you feel good, if that makes you proud of the present administration, of the Americanism of that

administration, if that stands for freedom and independence, all right. I cannot see it that way.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CANCELATION OF RATION POINTS BY O. P. A. JUSTIFIED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Chester Bowles was forced to cancel back ration stamps Christmas week-end, he had an unfortunate and painful job to do. Like a good public servant, Mr. Bowles did his duty, which was to insure that the rationing program fulfilled its function of fair distribution of foods in limited supply.

Of all Mr. Bowles' virulent critics, none has had the temerity to say that rationing is unnecessary or not a part of the war effort. Therefore, when this program was threatened with a crisis, Mr. Bowles should not be attacked for doing the thing he did, but rather he should be praised for his courage.

Canceling the back ration stamps was a painful necessity, forced on the O. P. A. by shortages of meat, butter, sugar, and processed foods, and the increased demands due to the changed war status. To do anything less would have been a direct blow at the welfare of American consumers and would have resulted in even more serious shortages later on this year for both civilian and military groups.

Yet the O. P. A. and Mr. Bowles were subjected to a campaign of vilification in the press and over the radio that is distinctly reminiscent of the lower points of the late Republican campaign for the Presidency.

One of our distinguished colleagues in this House, a member of the minority party from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], according to the press, was the author of a statement which flatly accused the O. P. A. and its Administrator of a fraud and a swindle on the American people.

This statement, which received a great deal of publicity, could not have been based on any study of the real situation, particularly since it was issued within a few hours after the O. P. A. announcement was made. It was obviously designed to take partisan advantage of the difficult spot Mr. Bowles found himself occupying.

Perhaps the most flagrant partisan advantage taken of this situation was heard over the radio, in the broadcasts of one Fulton Lewis, Jr. Mr. Lewis' broadcasts on this as on other subjects seem designed to undermine, at whatever cost of the national welfare, the whole policy of rationing and of price and rent control. Mr. Lewis evidently wishes to continue his partisan broadcasts of the recent campaign.

Let me call to your attention the broadcast of this commentator on December 26. I would like to quote from a part of his statement. Mr. Lewis said:

First of all the O. P. A., after begging for the cooperation of the housewife on combating price violations and not buying from black markets, and asking her to cooperate in numerous other things, has now broken its own promise to the housewife and that is a very dubious public relations move in anybody's language. But more important, it would be the inevitable result of this whole thing. It seems that hereafter the housewife is going to cash in every red and blue point that she has just as fast as they become valid. She's going to use them whether she needs the goods or not and store the goods in the pantry so that she won't get caught again.

And again, on December 27, Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., said, after talking about the fact that O. P. A. had made this decision for better or for worse, and I quote:

The average housewife seems to be just about unanimous in her agreement that it was for the worse. As you well know, she resents the cancelation, particularly in view of the fact that the O. P. A. promised repeatedly that those back stamps would be good indefinitely. The housewife takes the position that because she was not greedy, because she complied with the appeals of the O. P. A. not to use any more than she actually needed of rationed materials and to try to make substitutions wherever substitutions were possible, using nonrationed materials, she now is penalized in order that a larger share may be given to her neighbor who was greedy and who did not comply with the O. P. A. appeals and who did cash every red and blue ration point as fast as it became valid and put the actual cans of goods on the pantry shelf.

This, I submit, is a deliberate and wholly slanderous attack on the patriotism and the good sense of the American housewife. It is more even than that. It is a deliberate attempt to incite patriotic American women to do the very things that would most quickly undermine all rationing and price control. It ignores the basic principle of rationing which proposes to equitably divide existing supplies among the consumers by adjusting downward as well as upward the point values of commodities.

Mr. Lewis first attempts to build up resentment against rationing. Then he urges his listeners to hoard scarce foods. He calls for an utterly reckless use of ration coupons regardless of the need of the consumer or of the Nation. He tries to put the brand of naïveté and stupidity on patriotic restraint in the buying of food.

Now, as to the facts behind the cancelation of back ration coupons—Mr. Fulton J. Lewis, Jr., has given us the fantasy—fantasy à la Goebbels. Perhaps we can enlighten him here with the truth that he so carefully avoids.

The ration coupons had to be canceled because there were too many of them outstanding for fair distribution of the limited supply of rationed foods available. During the summer and fall, when a very small portion of our food supply was rationed, many families accumulated large supplies of ration points. They accumulated these supplies of ration points because for various reasons they did not need to expend them, among which was the previous removal of ration points from many of the heretofore rationed commodities.

Many of them were people who had Victory gardens and thereby added to their own supply of food. They did not need to rely entirely on the commercial rationed varieties. Nor did their standard of living suffer because they had not used all of their coupons. I think we may take it as almost self-evident that such people lived at least as well and probably better than did those who were forced to rely entirely upon rationed goods. It is wholly unreasonable to assume that they are going to stop their Victory garden activities in the future. They will continue to make the same patriotic contribution they have made in the past and in so doing will continue to have less need for rationed commodities than will their fellow consumers who must rely entirely upon commercial goods.

Mr. Fulton Lewis would have you believe that these people have been seriously hurt by the O. P. A. action. To me this seems ridiculous. They have lived, as I have already said, at least as well and probably better than those who have relied entirely on rationed goods. They will continue to live as well or better in the future, and they will not use all of their coupons this next year. Any feeling of deprivation they may have will, I am certain, be completely compensated by their more satisfying feeling of having made a patriotic contribution to the supply of food and to the home-front war effort.

Now I would like to turn to another group who also had surplus ration currency affected by this decision. Here I am referring to people who, for one reason or another, have found it advantageous to eat some of their meals in restaurants. These people generally live in urban communities. They are relatively well along on the income scale, and because they have supplemented their consumption by "eating out" they have not found it necessary to spend all of their ration currency in the past.

This is another group that Mr. Lewis would have us feel has been seriously discriminated against by the recent announcement. I confess, for my own part, that I am not greatly agitated about their position. These people for various reasons have supplemented their diet by eating in restaurants in the past. I do not see in this recent announcement anything so catastrophic as to force a complete reversal of their eating habits. They will continue to eat in restaurants as they have done in the past. By doing so they will continue to be in a better position than those who cannot do this. They will continue to have a surplus of ration currency. How they are discriminated against I cannot understand.

There is another group, too, which has accumulated unspent ration currency. This is the group which, because their income position permitted them to do so, has always preferred to consume fresh fruits and vegetables rather than the processed varieties. It has cost them more to do so but they could afford it. How their position will be completely reversed in the future, I do not understand.

It seems to me they will continue to prefer the fresh fruits and vegetables and will continue to buy them. In so doing, they also will continue to have a surplus of unused ration currency.

I could go on taking up the case of each of those who allegedly have been hurt by this decision. Most of them, upon examination, would be found really to have suffered very little. There may be a few who, for the moment, will find some minor readjustments necessary or will suffer some small inconveniences. However, when these things are weighed against the greater good, against the fairness and equity which will continue to mark our rationing program, they will have little quarrel with the decision which has been made.

These are the facts behind the decision of the O. P. A. to invalidate back ration stamps. It was a decision taken only because it was necessary in view of changed conditions and one that was made in the interests of all consumers and of the war effort.

Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., is, and I am being very charitable in this statement, guilty of irresponsibility in the distorted broadcasts he has made on this situation. They were a distinct disservice not only to the American housewife, who finds herself seriously misrepresented if not actually maligned by them, but to the war on the home front.

It seems to me that irresponsible and patently partisan press releases by Members of Congress and broadcasts by biased radio commentators tend to create disunity and retard the war effort on the home front.

At a time when our heroic fighters are meeting the Germans and the Japanese in bloody combat, the least we can do at home is to preserve the national unity that helps to speed victory.

[Office of the Price Administration release for Sunday, December 31, 1944]

Following announcement of the return of most canned vegetables and meats to rationing, Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration today gave the reasons for O. P. A.'s action in canceling the order ration stamps previously good for buying these foods and for buying sugar.

"No one regrets the cancelation without notice more than O. P. A.," Mr. Bowles said, "but the simple fact is that the supplies of canned food and sugar for 1945 were too low on December 1 to permit spending the large backlog of stamps which would have occurred when the new point values were announced.

"The only alternative would have been to take a large slice of the rationed foods away from the many people who do not have unspent stamps and who are on a current basis.

"It is important that American consumers understand the reasons for our action in canceling certain ration currency. Those who do, and most are beginning to, are in wholehearted support of it.

"I want to say to every American housewife," Mr. Bowles continued, "that we genuinely wanted to give them advance notice of stamp cancelation, as we had expected to do. We had to act without notice for very real and compelling reasons. The public is entitled to know what these reasons were.

"In a survey made several weeks ago, we found that the average ration-book holder had 2½ months' supply of blue stamps good for buying canned foods, about the same quantity of red stamps good for buying rationed meats, and a 2-month supply of sugar stamps and home-canning coupons.

"The supplies of canned foods and of sugar for 1945 were too low by December 1 to permit the use of this large backlog of excess ration currency without depleting stocks to the point of critical shortages. Rationing was necessary to spread stocks of canned goods evenly over the several months remaining before the new pack of fruits and vegetables are available next summer. But even with rationing, the use of outstanding surplus ration currency would have cleaned out the canned food stocks from many a store several months before new packs would reach grocers' shelves next fall. Thus the families who must depend on canned goods for an important part of their food supply would have suffered a real hardship.

"This could have been prevented only by placing point values on canned fruits and vegetables high enough to soak up excess points in consumers' hands. But to do this would mean point values so high that families needing each month's stamps as they are issued would not have been able to buy nearly as much as they needed.

"In its simplest terms, our problem as we faced the new year was that, with a tight 12-month supply of certain food in prospect, we had a 14½ months' supply of ration currency to absorb unless we canceled the backlog of unspent stamps. Our conclusion was that, in the interest of the general good, we had to cancel.

"Our survey showed that the surplus stamps were held mainly by four kinds of families.

"One was the family producing a good deal of its own food from a garden, such as a suburban family or rural family with a Victory garden or the farm family. Families of this kind which didn't need all of their ration stamps in 1944 probably will go right along adding in an important way to the Nation's food supply by producing a large share of their own food. They likely will wind up the next year again with a lot of unused ration stamps. None of these people will think it a hardship to begin the new year on an even basis with all other families.

"Another kind of family had some accumulated ration stamps on hand for the simple reason that they felt the thing to do was to draw on the Nation's limited wartime food supply to as little extent as possible. These people will continue to act in that fashion. They will not feel unhappy at the thought that in buying rationed foods in 1945 they will have for use only the stamps to be made good in 1945, and are sharing equally with all others in these supplies.

"A third large group of families holding accumulated stamps was made up of people, war workers for example, whose wartime way of living demands that they eat a good many meals in restaurants. This same way of living is still open to them, and this group, like the others, will not deem it a hardship to have to depend only on 1945 ration currency to buy 1945 foods.

"Still another group was made up of people who had been saving stamps to buy a roast, or a ham, or a can of pineapple for use on some special occasion. For the moment, these people will feel a keen disappointment. We sympathize with them. But had we not wiped out the old currency, and had a buying spree developed, this very same housewife probably would not have been able, after all, to get the roast or the ham or the can of fruit. While our action seemingly deprived her of the special item she wanted at the moment, actually it preserved for her the opportunity to meet her day-to-day needs for rationed foods in an orderly way through the months ahead.

"These, then, are the types of families who feel the momentary disappointment of canceled stamps. In each case, however, we believe as Americans they would have us make no other decision.

"We have looked at the four types of families who appeared to lose by this cancelation. We ought not to overlook the many who would have been placed under severe hardship had we not canceled these unused stamps. If we had raised point values or had cut the value of stamps, families wholly dependent on current stamps simply would not have had the food they needed.

"Again had we failed to cancel, a rush of heavy buying was a distinct probability, since the published facts on food supplies with the return of many foods to rationing, would have stimulated buying by those holding excess stamps. This would make more difficult the job of distributing the scarce supplies available. It would deprive many small families and city families of food they will need during the winter and spring.

"Faced with the alternative of advance buying by some, with resulting hardship for others, we believed that the general good of the public would be served best by canceling stamps validated before December, leaving in consumers' hands only the most recent stamps.

"With sugar, consumers in some parts of the country were having difficulty in finding it available in the stores. Immediately ahead is a much tighter sugar supply situation than that of the last year. Old sugar stamps and 1944 home-canning coupons in consumers' hands represented between five hundred and six hundred million pounds. We reasoned that when the story on the 1945 sugar supply was published, advance buying of sugar beyond current needs would be stimulated, depleting stocks already low. The result would have been more stores out of sugar and unable to meet consumers' immediate needs as the year advanced.

"This too was a difficult step for O. P. A. to take. We regret being compelled to take it. But the fact is the public welfare demanded it.

"In the meat program our problem is somewhat the same. We are convinced that the greatest good can only result from getting surplus ration currency out of circulation, broadening rationing control, and thus giving each consumer an equal opportunity to share.

"We feel that all who stop to consider the reasons behind what seems to be an unpleasant action will agree that as Americans they are glad to face cheerfully whatever personal sacrifices are involved."

Mr. RICH. The gentleman directed his remarks to a newspaper article in reference to our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that the gentleman should have checked to see whether the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] really made that statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has been standing in the back of the hall. He had occasion to speak for himself.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does not the gentleman think that nothing creates greater disunity than for the Government of the United States or its high officials to deliberately break their promises to the people?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It sometimes becomes necessary to make changes during the war, as we found out recently on the battle front in Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. When it does become necessary, I think the welfare of the war effort on the home front and on the battle front justifies a change in regulations which, after all, are for the purpose of making a successful home front and battle front.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from California if he does not think that the greatest error was not in what was done but the greatest error was in the manner in which it was done; that if the O. P. A. in their announcement had told the reason why it was necessary to do this before they made the announcement, the people, the housewives, would have taken it with much more grace than they did under the circumstances.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not care to comment on the wisdom of the manner used, with this exception, that unless action like that is taken promptly we have found from past experience that a run occurs on the market and defeats the very purpose for which such announcement was made.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, but when the announcement was made, there was no reason given. It should have been made more explicit as to why it was necessary to do it, that is the point I make.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There was an announcement made. Mr. Bowles issued a letter, which I have in my pocket here, in which he fully explained the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this letter as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Have not the people been led to believe that we had a lot of food that we did not have? I have heard it said many times on your side by Mr. Louis Bromfield—I do not know Mr. Bromfield, and he had a right to give his opinion as to the food supply—we have been led to believe that we had a lot of food that we did not have, and by giving us that picture I think that is what caused the disturbance.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not think so. I think the survey actually shows that we have more food in the United States today than we have ever had at any point in our history. But we now face war conditions which have made shortages imminent which heretofore were surplus, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I realize that price regulation is very essential.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. RICH. But when Mr. Bowles issued that statement, is it not a fact that we had two holidays; that the statement was issued at the end of a business day and then we had two holidays, and probably the letter that the gentleman refers to did not give some people the opportunity that they thought they should have had. I think there is a great deal in that, and I think if Mr. Bowles takes that in consideration in issuing his orders in the future, he will probably have the confidence of the people a whole lot better than he would otherwise.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am very sympathetic with the gentleman's concern for the American people and their supply of food over the holidays, but I might point out to the gentleman that there is a more important matter involved here. There were no holidays on the battle front on that week end.

CALIFORNIA PROVIDES JOBS FOR WAR VETERANS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, there has been a universal discussion relative to the placing of war veterans in jobs upon their return and rehabilitation for occupational purposes. With reference to information recently supplied by Mr. Harry T. Kranz, regional director of the twelfth region of the United States Civil Service Commission, we find California leads the Nation with jobs for war veterans.

During the month of November, 3,159 veterans were placed in jobs in the Federal Government in California under civil service. This is an all-time high mark and makes the sixth consecutive month that California has led every other State in the Nation when the figures released by the Washington office were recently compared.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman's efforts in that direction have received favorable consideration and favorable action from the department, and I congratulate him on the work he has done in that respect.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman, and appreciate his contribution. I assure him that the departments in Washington have been cooperative toward the program advanced by the State of California in cooperation with them to place war veterans in wartime industry.

New York State was second with 1,661 veterans placed. The 7 other leading States in order are: Washington, 994; Pennsylvania, 729; Texas, 638; New Jersey, 607; Virginia, 549; Illinois, 63; Massachusetts, 348.

California, which is a part of the twelfth region, placed more veterans during this period in Federal jobs than any one of the other entire civil service regions, which are composed of from 2 to 6 States each. California also placed more veterans in November in Federal jobs than 6 complete regions composed of 25 States all put together.

An interesting fact about this record is that 97 percent of the 3,159 veterans given jobs in the Federal Government in California during the month of November were employed by the War and Navy Departments.

This statement was made by Clare McCord, regional veterans' Federal employment representative in this region.

As a representative of the great State of California, it gives me a great deal of pride to be able to advise the House that California is actively and definitely going forward with a studied plan to see our returning veterans are given proper opportunities upon their return from military service. I think it should be noted that it is also indicative of the attitude of the servicemen who, after being honorably discharged from military service, want to continue to help the war effort by working in a War or Navy Establishment until the job of winning the war has been completed. In my opinion, the veterans are setting an example that could well be followed by many of our civilians who to date have not been interested enough in our war material producing program.

These veterans having been through the rigors of war activities realize what it means to have wartime production functioning to its *n*th degree and are applying themselves accordingly. The war is not over and in my opinion no one can foresee the definite date when the war will be terminated; hence, it is obvious every person within this Nation should diligently apply himself to wartime jobs in order that men and women who are doing such a splendid job may be supplied with every possible necessity which their combat activities require.

GOVERNMENT EXPENSES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was speaking earlier this afternoon in reference to the expenses of Government. It seems that I kind of needled some of the boys. They do not like it. I want to show you just what has happened since I came to Congress, and it ought to needle everybody. I hope it does. I hope it needles

you so badly you will try to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing the limitation on borrowing under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BULWINKLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

Limitation on borrowing under Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended

1932	
Dec. 31, 1932:	
Bonds (limitation on issues)	[1] $28,000,000,000
Bills and certificates (limitation on outstanding)	[2] 10,000,000,000
Notes (limitation on outstanding)	[2] 7,500,000,000
Total	45,500,000,000
1934	
Jan. 30, 1934: Amending section 13 (48 Stat. 343) increased authority for notes outstanding to	[2] 10,000,000,000
1935	
Feb. 4, 1935:	
Amending section 1 (49 Stat. 20) limited bonds outstanding (establishing revolving authority to)	[2] 25,000,000,000
New section 21 added (49 Stat. 21), consolidated authority for certificates and bills (sec. 5) and authority for notes (sec. 18).	
Same aggregate amount outstanding	[2] 20,000,000,000
New section 22 added (49 Stat. 21), authorized United States Savings bonds within authority of section —.	
1938	
May 26, 1938: Amending sections 1 and 21 (52 Stat. 447) consolidated in section 21, authority for bonds, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills and notes (outstanding bonds limited to $30,000,000,000). Same aggregate total outstanding	[2] 45,000,000,000
1939	
July 20, 1939: Amending section 21 removed limitation on bonds without change total authorized outstanding of bonds, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills and notes	[2] 45,000,000,000
1940	
June 25, 1940: SEC. 302. Section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting "(a)" after "21." and by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph, as follows:	
June 25, 1940—Continued. "(b) In addition to the amount authorized by the preceding paragraph of this section, any obligations authorized by sections 5 and 18 of this act, as amended, not to exceed in the aggregate $4,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time, less any retirements made from the special fund made available under section 301 of the Revenue Act of 1940, may be issued under said sections to provide the Treasury with funds to meet any expenditures made, after June 30, 1940, for the national defense, or to reimburse the general fund of the Treasury therefor. Any such obligations so issued shall be designated 'National Defense Series' "	[3] $4,000,000,000
1941	
Feb. 19, 1941: Amending section 21 to read *"Provided,* That the face amount of obligations issued under the authority of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate $65,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time." Eliminates separate authority for $4,000,000,000 of National Defense Series obligations	[2] 65,000,000,000
1942	
Mar. 28, 1942: Amending section 21 increasing limitation to $125,000,000,000	[2] 125,000,000,000
1943	
Apr. 10, 1943: Amending section 21 increasing limitation to $210,000,000,000	[2] 210,000,000,000
1944	
June 9, 1944: Amending section 21 increasing limitation to $260,000,000,000	[2] 260,000,000,000

[1] Limitation on issue.
[2] Limitation on outstanding.
[3] Limitation on issues less retirements.

I call your attention to the following:

In 1932 you, the Congress and President, had a debt limit of $45,500,000,000. In 1934 you increased that by $10,000,000,000.

In 1940 you, the Congress and President, increased it an additional $4,000,000,000.

In 1941 you, the Congress and President, made the debt limit $65,000,000,000.

In 1942 you, the Congress and President, increased the debt limit to $125,000,000,000.

In 1943 you, the Congress and President, raised the debt limit to $210,000,000,000.

Now remember, all that time you are bringing your spending up to the point where you had to boost the debt limit in order to get the money. In 1944 you, the Congress and the President, increased that debt limit to $260,000,000,000. In accordance with the message given by the President yesterday he says that our national debt on June 30, 1946, will be $292,000,000,000. Now in order to bring that debt limit to the point that he says is going to be necessary you, the Congress and the President, will have to increase this debt limit from $260,000,000,000 to where we do not know. Now, if anybody can get any satisfaction out of the fact that we do not have to cut down our expenditures—not our war spending we will not keep this war effort back a penny, but the regular spending of the Government—and when you realize that last year the expenditures of the Government for things not directly or vitally affected by the war was increased $3,535,000,000 then somebody ought to be needled besides the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], who questioned the fact a few moments ago when I told him that meant $602 for every man, woman and child, and Congressman in the United States, in the amount of money that we are going to spend next year. I think it is a situation which needs the very deep attention of every Member of Congress. Now the people back home are helpless when this Congress spends the money. Then you go and put taxes on them and they have to pay these taxes. They pay or bust.

Your people back home are getting to the point where they think they cannot pay any more taxes and they are going to rebel and the Congress is going to be at fault. Now we can finance this war and we are going to do it. We want to do it. I am not saying anything about war spending, but I am bringing it to your attention as long as I am a Member of Congress and the people back in my district send me here, I am for economy in government. If the people back in my district do not want me down here to try to have economy in government, I am perfectly willing to stay at home. When I come here the people do not want me here to sit down in my seat and say, "Let things go by the board," and take the path of least resistance and do nothing. They sent me down here to try my best to keep this country solvent. They send me down here to do my best to try to see that we enact laws to make this country a better place in which to live. They send me down here for the purpose of trying to see that we live under our Constitution. They want me to continue our form of government. They send me down here for the purpose of seeing that we will not let any "isms" come in here and destroy this country. That is my job. I am going to keep Americanism to the front to the best of my ability. And if some fellows do not like my preaching Americanism and economy then they can just lump it as far as I am concerned. But I am going to work at it and I am going to work at it hard, to keep freedom, liberty, independence, and sanity in government. The more I work at it then I think my people will give me the greater credit for keeping America safe, keeping liberty and justice for all our people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk tomorrow and other special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted on December 20 and presented on January 2 to Hon. Edward Stettinius, Secretary of State, by a delegation representing the Polish-American Democratic organization at Chicago, Ill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 11, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

102. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's tenth annual report covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 71. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses to Elizabeth T. Rabbitt, widow of Frank O. Rabbitt, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 63. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on Education of the effect of certain war activities on colleges and universities; without amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 12. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 13. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 14. Report on the Disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 621. A bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1334. A bill to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended relating to certain nonmailable matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 1335 (by request). A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 1336. A bill to amend section 7 of the act approved February 28, 1925, so as to change the method of computing the daily rate of compensation in the case of certain postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1337. A bill to protect employees engaged in war production; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 1338. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing a method whereby the services of those interfering with war production may be made available on the home front; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1339. A bill to amend Public Law 89, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, known as the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1340. A bill establishing wage differential for leadingmen and quartermen at all naval establishments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 1341. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1342. A bill to provide an appropriate badge and additional compensation for certain enlisted men in the Medical Department of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1343. A bill to authorize the use of certain funds for the care of dependents of conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. GEELAN:

H. Res. 73. Resolution relative to the Jewish national home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 74. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 621, a bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1344. A bill for the relief of George Webb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1345. A bill for the relief of David M. Matteson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1346. A bill for the relief of Alaska D. Jennette; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1347. A bill for the relief of Lee Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1348. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gordon T. Gorham et al.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 1349. A bill for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1350. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Nora R. Neville; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1351. A bill for the relief of Maxine Estelle Boyle, Max W. Boyle, and E. B. Rosegarten; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1352. A bill for the relief of Herman Feinberg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 1353. A bill for the relief of J. P. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1354. A bill granting a pension to John Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1355. A bill granting a pension to William Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1356. A bill for the relief of Elias Baumgarten; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1357. A bill for the relief of the estate of Otto Frederick Gnospelius, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 1358. A bill for the relief of O. M. Minatree; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1359. A bill granting a pension to Sidonia B. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1360. A bill for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 1361. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

18. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of 21 citizens of Humboldt, Kans., asking support for the Nationalist Government of China and requesting our Government make available by lend-lease a portion of the Government stock of silver bullion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, as we rejoice at the gift of another day, may its hours be made luminous by Thy presence who art

the light of all our seeing. In everything we are called to do may we do and be our best, and so be worthy of our high calling.

Grant us the spirit of kindliness, of thoughtfulness, and of fair play in all our relationships. Deliver us from all malice and contempt, lest we hurt others and sour our own souls. May the tyranny of expediency never bend our conscience to low aims which betray high principles. Hear Thou our prayer, as out of the depths we cry bowing at the world's great altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 10, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1945.*

[Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.]

BENEFITS TO DISCHARGED MEMBERS OF MILITARY FORCES OF ALLIED NATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, presently it is my intention to move that the Senate adjourn until Monday. Several Senators are necessarily absent in important conferences. On behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is among those absent, I send to the desk an order which he asks be adopted at this time. I ask that the order be read and that it be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the communication from the Administrator of the Veterans Administration, enclosing copies of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes, laid before the Senate on December 11, 1944, be taken from the files and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

GRAZING FEES ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN—LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently there was a proposal to increase the grazing fees on the public domain in the Western States. The Committee on Public Lands and Surveys met and sent a resolution to the Secretary of the Interior regarding this proposal. The resolution was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Subsequent to that I had several conversations with different officials of the Department, as did other members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. Recently I received a letter from the Secretary of the Interior regarding the proposal, and it is of so much importance to the people in the Western States that I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 10, 1945.

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Reference is made to the proposal of the Director of the Grazing Service to increase the fees charged for the grazing of livestock on the Federal range in grazing districts under the Taylor Grazing Act. This was the subject of a conversation between Assistant Secretary Chapman and yourself a few days ago.

My attention has also been called to the resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the Senate as printed on page 9558 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated December 16, 1944.

As you know, section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act provides for permits to be issued for the grazing of livestock in grazing districts "upon the payment annually of reasonable fees in each case to be fixed or determined from time to time." It was my opinion that in the early years of the Taylor Grazing Act, during the period when the administration was in the formative stage and the livestock industry was in the throes of a depression, a low grazing fee was justified. Consequently a fee of 5 cents a head a month for cattle and 1 cent for sheep was established. Since that time conditions have changed materially. Those privileged to use the range under the Taylor Act and the grazing code are now receiving considerable benefits from the administration of the range as compared with conditions which prevailed prior to the passage of the act or during the first years of administration. The Government has placed several million dollars' worth of improvements on the land, including watering holes, fences, roads, trails, etc., which greatly facilitate the use of the range. The prices the growers are now receiving for livestock are some 70 percent higher than the average during the period 1935–39. The charges for grazing on the public range in the grazing districts are far lower than those customarily paid for the leasing or rental of comparable State or privately owned range land. They are considerably lower also than the charges made for most other federally owned grazing land. The Department does not believe that it was the intent of the Taylor Act to charge the full commercial rate for use of the grazing districts, but there is reason to believe that the present fees are considerably lower than may be considered reasonable. I have felt for some time that an increase in the grazing fees is justified.

The Grazing Service considered increasing the fees early in 1942, but action was postponed, owing to the many uncertainties that existed in range livestock production as well as in most other industries immediately after the war was declared. It is believed, however, that the uncertainties which were present in the livestock industry early in 1942 have been pretty well eliminated, and the point has been reached where the Department should give further consideration to charging fees in accordance with the provisions of the Taylor Act.

Last November, the Director of Grazing discussed with the National Advisory Board Council, consisting of representatives of the users of the Federal range in each of the 10 Western States where grazing districts are located, a proposal which he told me he expected to present to me for my consideration, to increase the grazing fees beginning in 1945. The proposed new fee for 1945 would average approximately 15 cents a head for cattle and 3 cents for sheep, for the 10 Western States, or about 3 times the present rate, but would vary somewhat by States from about 11 cents in New Mexico to a high of about 18 cents in Colorado for cattle and proportionately for sheep. The proposal also provides for a variation in the fees from year to year in accordance with the change in prices received by the growers of livestock.

The National Advisory Board Council has urged the Director that action on his proposal be postponed until all interested people have had an opportunity further to study it and more fully to express their viewpoints, after which the Council would welcome the opportunity to confer with me and other representatives of the Department on the matter. Consequently, the Director has recommended to me that no action be taken on his proposal until May 1, 1945, so that the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys may have an opportunity to study the subject. Those who use the range would also be able to give it full consideration and present all of the facts in the case. The findings would be taken into consideration by the Department in reaching its final decision.

In view of the wishes of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and the users of the grazing districts, I have approved the Director's recommendation to postpone action on his proposal to increase the grazing fees until May 1, 1945.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

RESOLUTIONS OF CHRISTIAN CITIZENS COMMITTEE, WILMINGTON, DEL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Christian Citizens Committee, of Wilmington, Del., protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide compulsory military service and also against certain war activities of the Government, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS CONFERENCE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH IN OPPOSITION TO LIQUOR TRAFFIC

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received resolutions adopted by the Kansas Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in annual session at Miltonvale, Kans., registering opposition of the members of that church to the liquor traffic. I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on

the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADDRESSED TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS OF 1945

The Kansas Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in anual session at Miltonvale, Kans., August 5, 1944, sets forth the following resolutions as registering the attitude of this assembly toward the liquor traffic and kindred evils as operating in the United States and elsewhere among the armed forces of our Army, Navy, and Air Corps:

"Whereas our Nation is in an all-out war, that demands the very best in manhood and efficiency of the men in service and the greatest possible efforts of all in civilian life if our Nation is to win the war; and

"Whereas the use of alcoholic liquors causes inefficiency, waste, and loss in man-hours both in services and industries; and

"Whereas it is a scientific fact that alcoholic beverages are detrimental to the physical and moral well-being of our people; and

"Whereas the failure of our Army and Navy authorities to restrict the sale and use of alcoholic liquors in our Army and Navy camps and adjacent territory has brought a condition greatly deplored; and

"Whereas the manufacture, sale, and distribution of alcoholic liquors consumes men, munitions, and materials urgently needed for the prosecution of the war effort; and

"Whereas the reaction of the nerve force and endurance qualities through the use of tobacco by our armed forces impairs the accuracy and impedes the progress of the offensive of war; and

"Whereas social disease as a result of the accessible places of vice near our Army camps constitutes a great menace to our fighting forces, in the destruction of brain and brawn: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to declare a state of emergency and pass necessary legislation to forbid the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors except for medicinal and scientific purposes for the duration of the war; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Government regulations of tobacco advertising prohibit: First, the use of pictures or portraits of women in both civilian and military life, and the use of pictures or portraits of men in the armed service; in tobacco displays whether on billboards or in periodical advertising; and second, prohibit the advertising of tobaccos over the radio; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That vice districts in the region of Army camps be entirely eliminated."

E. A. COATES, *Conference President.*
CHARLES WILSON, *Conference Secretary.*
C. FLOYD HESTER,
LORIN MILLER,
MRS. PEARL DAVIDSON,
Committee.

EFFECT ON FOOD PRODUCTION OF INDUCTION OF FARM WORKERS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to what may happen to food production if local draft boards are stampeded into inducting into the Army farm workers who are needed for food production.

We are informed, and have been almost daily for weeks past, that the food needs of liberated countries are proving to be much greater than anticipated. We have undertaken to feed a greater proportion of the population of Europe than was understood when the promises to feed as well as to fight were made.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Association, setting forth a few facts in relation to the dairy industry. In the letter he makes the following statement which I think applies to some extent to other segments of agricultural production:

Milk producers cannot depend on prisoners, imported labor, or unskilled workers. The implication that food production can be left entirely to older men, and to women, is entirely unwarranted in the dairy field. The brunt of the heaviest farm work is borne by the younger men—which alone makes possible the fullest utilization of the energies of women, children, and older men in the lighter tasks.

I urge the Senate to study this letter, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: American dairy farmers are worried over the recent directive for the reclassification and induction of farm youths in the 18–25 age group. They are fearful that in many instances local draft boards will be stampeded into overlooking the provisions in the present law which exempts essential agricultural workers from military service.

If because of this oversight, or because of an abandonment of present standards of deferment, the dairy industry is to be further drained of essential workers, it will irreparably cripple our efforts which last year produced 20,000,000,000 pounds of milk products for the armed forces and our allies and cared for our civilian needs as well. A full-scale drafting of workers in the 18–25 age class from dairy farms would cut 1945 milk production by as much as 5,000,000,000 pounds.

No segment of American agriculture is more hard pressed by manpower shortages than the dairy industry. Milk producers cannot depend on prisoners, imported labor, or unskilled workers. The implication that food production can be left entirely to older men, and to women, is entirely unwarranted in the dairy field. The brunt of the heaviest farm work is borne by younger men—which alone makes possible the fullest utilization of the energies of women, children, and older men in lighter tasks.

We present these facts for your information. Army spokesmen have told us that at no time have their working inventories of dairy products been as high as they had hoped. We submit that our wartime efforts should not be further crippled. We ask your influence in this behalf.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INVESTIGATION OF GASOLINE SHORTAGE IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 23) providing for an investigation of the gasoline shortage in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 240. A bill to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for the admission of Alaska as a State into the Union.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 241. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 242. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Galen E. Walter; and

S. 244. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ernest B. Wells; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Lottie A. Abbott, the legal representative and administratrix of the estate of James D. Felley, deceased;

S. 246. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims arising out of certain blasting operations on the Merrimack River;

S. 247. A bill for the relief of Charles Dancause and Virginia P. Rogers;

S. 248. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth B. Dayton;

S. 249. A bill for the relief of Antoinette De Couto and Manuel De Couto;

S. 250. A bill for allowance of certain claims, not heretofore paid, for indemnity for spoliations by the French prior to July 31, 1801, as reported by the Court of Claims;

S. 251. A bill for the relief of Barbara Healy;

S. 252. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. Donohue and Nellie Gilbride;

S. 253. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Selma Lamkin;

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. O'Connor;

S. 255. A bill to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Union Iron Works; and

S. 256. A bill for the relief of John R. Wall; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 257. A bill granting compensation to Philip R. Roby; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 258. A bill relating to the legality of the entry into the United States of certain persons born in a country contiguous to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 259. A bill for the relief of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 260. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Wilder;

S. 261. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to Barney F. Salner;

S. 262. A bill for the relief of William D. Ellison;

S. 263. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan;

S. 264. A bill for the relief of Frank P. Hoyt;

S. 265. A bill for the relief of Hector H. Perry;

S. 266. A bill for the relief of William H. Rouncevill; and

S. 267. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to reinstate Wallace F. Safford to the position and rank of captain in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 268. A bill to correct the record of Ralph Everett Crawshaw;

S. 269. A bill for the relief of Alfred Dearborn;

S. 270. A bill for the relief of Vincent Andrew Donovan;

S. 271. A bill for the relief of Leo Patrick Frawley;

S. 272. A bill for the relief of Ray Funcannon;

S. 273. A bill for the relief of Louis Gershon;

S. 274. A bill for the relief of Angus Winslow Gray;

S. 275. A bill for the relief of George Anthony Goldsborough;

S. 276. A bill for the relief of Irving Kilburn Bills;

S. 277. A bill for the relief of Frederick Elmer Lewis;

S. 278. A bill for the relief of Dominick Edward Maggio;

S. 279. A bill for the relief of Thomas Joseph Malloy;

S. 280. A bill for the relief of Angelo Anthony Scavo;

S. 281. A bill for the relief of Albert L. Sliney; and

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Walden; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 283. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jennie Eaton Ainsworth;

S. 284. A bill granting a pension to Teresa F. Boyle;

S. 285. A bill granting a pension to Alice L. Tourtellotte; to the Committee on Pensions; and

S. 286. A bill for the relief of James F. Desmond; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 287. A bill for the relief of Murphy & Wischmeyer;

S. 288. A bill for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.; and

S. 289. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution directing the Federal Power Commission to inquire into and report to the Congress on various matters with respect to natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and in his absence, I submit a concurrent resolution which would amend a Senate concurrent resolution adopted during the last session of Congress providing for a joint committee to work out a program to improve the procedure of Congress. Several small amendments have been suggested, and a desire has been expressed to incorporate them in a new resolution. In the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] I submit the resolution and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relation between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective House, and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress; *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the time or manner of, or the parliamentary rules or procedure governing, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than April 1, 1945. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THE SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 155, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 26, 1943 (relating to an investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power), as amended and supplemented by Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 5, 1944, and Senate Resolution 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to September 5, 1944, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DECAY OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Decay of the Atlantic Charter" from the December 28, 1944, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTRUCTIVE MOVES IN FOREIGN POLICY—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Constructive Moves in Foreign Policy," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of January 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Has the morning hour been concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business has been concluded.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Joe Leib, who organized the first club for President Roosevelt away back in 1930. He is a veteran of World War No. 2, and he discusses a question which has been before the Senate, but upon which no action has been taken. This matter is of such great importance that I desire to read his letter:

JANUARY 11, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Why has the Senate War Investigating Committee pigeonholed its promised, but long-awaited report of startling service aircraft accidents? In its scandalous Curtiss-Wright announcement of July 10, 1943, this Senate Committee stated (p. 30, Aircraft Accidents):

"In addition to the foregoing the committee has been engaged in a study of military plane crashes and at a subsequent date will report on this subject. The committee is concerned about the large number of such casualties, particularly in noncombat operational flights in the country."

That statement was made more than 17 months ago. Nothing since has been heard from them about this hush-hush topic. Why the sphinxlike silence now? Why aren't the American people told the real truth about the slaying of their boys on the home front? Why is this sensational scandal being silenced?

It is interesting to note, also, that on February 1, 1944, a House Military Subcommittee issued report No. 1052 in which it emphasized the following (pp. 10 and 11, Flying Training Accidents):

"We are sincerely alarmed to discover a recent rise in the rate of those accidents. We are particularly alarmed to learn that the rate continues to rise. An accumulation of experience, development of aircraft, and instruction methods should produce a reduction in the rate. * * * There is no braver man than the young American who volunteers to fight for his country, individually and in the air. It is regrettable that even one of these should die before he had a chance to face the enemy."

This writer has repeatedly brought these facts to the attention of a number of Senators, who in turn took the matter up with the War Department.

I ask every Senator to listen to this paragraph:

One month later, on October 2, 1944, General Arnold, A. A. F. Chief, finally was forced to admit in a meager report that 17,500 planes crashed and were destroyed in the United States alone. This, he related, was more than in combat on all world battlefields. But General Arnold would not reveal what caused this startling number of crashes and loss of planes. The Senate committee should make its own report covering the entire situation thoroughly. Then we might know the unvarnished truth. Maybe.

It is obvious that selfishness and greed rule in our national capital today. Those who sit in the Capitol Tower of Babel regard life as cheap and abundant. What care they about someone else's son? Let us look at the facts to date:

It must be recalled that the Truman committee delved into the Curtiss-Wright episode. The truth is that I asked them to make the investigation. Many precious months rolled by before that committee finally decided to peek into the serious charges.

As early as February 1942 (S. Res. 234), this writer was instrumental in creating a subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs to investigate the amazing number of service crashes. At that time the Curtiss-Wright situation among other companies were mentioned. It took months of tiresome and discouraging efforts before congressional interest manifested itself. Yet, the Truman committee report intimated that it first received defective motor complaints as late as January 1943. Still it admitted that it took no action until the following April. And while the Senate Military Committee also continued its dilatory fiddling of the scandal this writer appealed to a number of House Members, who inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD numerous petitions and documentary facts demanding an immediate study of the startling number of crashes. During this period, untold thousands of our boys died in plane crashes caused by defective motors and other similar acts of legalized sabotage. What did the administration care?

In the midst of numerous pleas demanding action, the courageous St. Louis Post-Dispatch took up the cudgels and featured a series of articles based on the statements that were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Then several columnists added the power of their pens to the cause. Three months later came the Truman report on Curtiss-Wright.

And then an amazing thing happened. Under Secretary of War Patterson jumped in with a ringing defense of Curtiss-Wright, which the Department of Justice on the very day had indicted for the production of defective motors. That case is still pending, but dying a slow death. All that has happened to Curtiss-Wright to date for the production of defective airplane engines is that it has gotten bigger Government orders. But three Army officers were court-martialed and dismissed from the service. They were found neglectful of duty for refusing to stamp out malpractices in inspection of airplane engines and parts. Another Army Air Force supervisor stationed at the Wright Aeronautical Corporation at Paterson, N. J., was discharged from the service for gross irregularities, and admitted that Curtiss-Wright officials had wined and dined him.

This is the same group that the late Billy Mitchell charged with making faulty "flying coffins." These were the same men who disregarded the welfare of America and sold a highly secretive (down-draft) carburetor patent to Russia against the express wish of the Navy Department. The Government had assisted and financed research in that patent. The Curtiss-Wright Corporation helped arm Hitler for this war and divulged the secret of dive-bombing or stuka blitzkrieg to the Nazis. After securing all existing dive-bombing patents Curtiss-Wright invented the Shrike ground attack plane and sold it to the Reich. Then the Germans elaborated on the Shrike model and came out with the deadly Stukas.

This is the namesake and offspring of the company that was punished for aircraft sabotage during the First World War. It was then known as the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation. Here is what Justice Hughes stated in the billion-dollar scandal-rocking 1922 report:

"In the course of this inquiry information was received that frequent attempts had been made to conceal defects in motors and their different parts which were in course of manufacture at the plant. * * * Evidence having been obtained as to specific instances of this practice * * * resulted in the return of indictment. North Elmwood plant officials pleaded guilty for violating the Sabotage Act."

During the last war Congress appropriated $1,650,000,000 for aircraft, and all that General Pershing got in France was 196 planes, all unfit for war duty.

I wish to repeat that:

During the last war Congress appropriated $1,650,000,000 for aircraft and all that General Pershing got in France was 196 planes all unfit for war duty. In his memoirs Pershing said:

"Some of the more sensational newspapers at home are making extravagant claims about the large number of American planes actively engaged in France when in fact, up to this moment there is not a single plane of American make on the western front."

What's more it is of official record, that not a single combat plane of American design saw action in the First World War. General Pershing was obliged to purchase needy planes from England and France. What had happened to the $1,650,000,000 remains a mystery to this day.

Now, read the (Truman) report of 1943 on Curtiss-Wright, page 18:

"The committee found that the company was producing and causing the Government to accept defective and substandard material. This was accomplished in the following ways:

"1. By the falsification of tests.

"2. By destruction of records.

"3. By improperly recording results of tests.

"4. By forging inspection reports.

"5. By failing to segregate substandard and defective material.

"6. By failing to promptly destroy or mutilate such defective and substandard material.

"7. By orally changing tolerances allowed on parts.

"8. By circumventing outside tolerances.

"9. By allowing production to override the inspection force, thereby destroying morale of both company and Army inspectors.

"10. By skipping inspection operations."

Yet, this corporation still enjoys spectacular and unprecedented success in obtaining war contracts. According to the (Truman) committee this organization with the single exception of General Motors, received more war contracts than any other manufacturer in the Nation.

What are the factors behind the power of Curtiss-Wright?

The answer is truly amazing. Here it is, in part: This company has succeeded in getting its key men in important Government positions. In one case, Theodore P. Wright, played a leading role in this diabolical conspiracy, who before he descended upon wartime Washington was vice president of Curtiss-Wright. This man directed the Aircraft Resources Control Office of the War Department, also headed the Aircraft Production Board. This meant that Mr. Wright was the dictator of the aircraft output in the Nation. He had full charge of all raw materials and priorities.

Incidentally, when Henry J. Kaiser was demanding the construction of flying boats for the purpose of carrying war freight in order to break the (still existing) transportation bottleneck, Mr. Wright, as the power behind the War Production Board's Aircraft Division, slyly disposed of Kaiser's proposals by refusing to grant him the necessary materials.

Why? Because the aircraft industry which Curtiss-Wright holds in the palm of its hand feared the amazing talents of Mr. Kaiser. They didn't want him competing with Curtiss-Wright or other companies, now, or after the war in the production of airships. It was purely a selfish motive that kept Mr. Kaiser out of the aircraft field. Obviously, this domineering attitude has played its part in delaying final victory.

It is no wonder that Curtiss-Wright can make Charley McCarthys out of our Government officials. Is it no wonder that Curtiss-Wright can pull strings to hold in abeyance the Federal indictment now pending against the powerful company? Why is this trial being delayed?

And, furthermore, now that the production of war aircraft has reached its peak, Curtiss-Wright got its man, Theodore P. Wright, appointed as Civil Aeronautics Administrator. Does it take a Sherlock Holmes to find out why he was put in that job?

Certainly not. Curtiss-Wright wants to control the post-war aircraft industry and through the power of the C. A. A. it may be able to do so.

The Senate War Investigating Committee holds in its possession undisputed evidence proving that defective Curtiss-Wright motors caused serious crashes not only in America but also in combat zones, still this administration pampers these destroyers of human life, granting them freedom, power, protection, and fabulous profits.

Finally, here is another amazing feature of sinister metamorphosis in official Washington:

Robert Hinckley, recent Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman resigned some time ago as Assistant Secretary of Commerce to become associated with Thomas Morgan, president of the Sperry Corporation. Soon after the Sperry Co. was flooded with war contracts. Morgan was once chairman of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation.

Look out American taxpayers. Here it comes, and may God be with you.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH LEIB.

Mr. President, I proceeded to make an investigation to verify what was said in this letter. I hold in my hand the report of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program with respect to aircraft, dated July 10, 1943, and on page 30 of the report I read as follows:

AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

In addition to the foregoing the committee has been engaged in a study of military plane crashes and at a subsequent date will report on this subject. The committee is concerned about the large number of such casualties, particularly in noncombat operational flights in this country.

Mr. President, that report was made 17 months ago, and the American people have since had no further report of any kind or character on the subject.

I further verify what was stated in the letter I just read by reading from page 10 of the report made by the House Committee on Military Affairs on February 1, 1944, as follows:

An increase in the number of accidents is to be expected in the greatly expanded training program. However, we are sincerely alarmed to discover a recent rise in the rate of those accidents. We are particularly alarmed to learn that the rate continues to rise.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a newspaper clipping containing an interview given by General Arnold on the 14th day of October 1944. The heading is as follows:

More planes lost in training than combat, Army admits.

The article continues:

More Army airplanes have been lost in training pilots in this country than in combat.

The date of this interview, mind you, Mr. President, is October 14, 1944. I read:

More Army airplanes have been lost in training pilots in this country than in combat. That is a startling disclosure by the War Department this week. It released figures confirming a statement printed in Labor a few weeks ago.

Since Pearl Harbor, it said, 17,500 planes have been lost in continental United States, 11,000 in crashes and wrecks, and that is 3,000 more than have been lost by enemy action.

It was also disclosed that there have been 5,600 fatal flying accidents in training, involving about 11,000 deaths.

Mr. President, I have some newspaper clippings dealing with this subject. I find one headline as follows:

TRUMAN says United States pilots fly inferior planes.

Another is as follows:

Congressman ENGEL charges the Army tried to squelch exposé.

Blames Roosevelt for "shameful" waste in building at Arlington.

That is in connection with the War Department building itself.

Thirteen million dollars spent at Fairchild plant; one plane produced.

Here is another:

Senator TRUMAN bares fake tests at Wright; Army O. K.'d bad engines; fliers crash with bad engine; phony ads covered up Curtiss-Wright.

I have before me an article which tells about the appointment of Theodore P. Wright, vice president of Curtiss-Wright. The article is dated August 24, 1944, and is as follows:

Theodore P. Wright, who is to assume his duties as Civil Aeronautics Administrator about September 1, grew up with the aviation industry in this country. He was a vice president and chief engineer for Curtiss-Wright when asked to come to Washington in 1940 to act as liaison man between the Government and manufacturers expanding program of military planes. Mr. Wright is concluding his duties as Director of the Aircraft Resources Control Office to succeed Charles I. Stanton, whose resignation to become Deputy Administrator was recently announced by President Roosevelt.

Here I shall read some more headlines. Here is one from Nebraska:

Seventeen Army fliers killed in collision of bombers.

Here is one from Kansas:

Liberator bomber crash kills four in Kansas.

Here is one from Alabama:

Nine dead, one injured in Alabama in bomber crash.

Here is one from Texas:

Nineteen Army airmen die in two Texas crashes.

Here is one from Arizona:

Four dead, five safe as bomber crashes.

Here is one from Alabama:

Five killed in collision of two Army bombers.

Here is one from Georgia:

Death list grows to eight in Macon bomber crash.

Here is one from Tennessee:

Nine Army flyers killed in crash near Memphis.

Here is one from California:

Ten of Army bomber crew killed in California crash.

Here is one from New Hampshire:

Ten dead as bomber crashes into mountain.

Here are some more headlines:

Five Army airmen killed, one saved, in plane crash.

Ten die as bomber crashes after flying up canyon.

Here is one from Colorado:

Four Army flyers killed, five hurt, in Pueblo crash.

Here is one from Washington:

Four bodies found in plane missing since March 3.

Here is one from Georgia:

Eleven Army flyers killed in crash near Habana.

Here is one from Florida:

Bomber's crash wrecks two homes; nine flyers hurt.

Here is another from Colorado:

Lt. Robert Cockrell killed in Colorado bomber crash.

Here is one from Massachusetts:

Army probes plane crash which killed 10 flyers.

Here is another one from California:

Twelve killed when bomber and fighter planes collide.

Here is another one from California:

Eight Army flyers killed in California crash.

Here is another one from California:

Eighteen killed, 12 injured, in Liberator crash.

Here is an article which I know will be interesting. It is dated December 8, 1944, about 4 weeks ago. It is in the form of an Associated Press dispatch:

The Army Air Forces in 3 years of war have dumped 1,202,130 tons of bombs on enemy targets, destroyed 22,894 enemy planes, and probably wrecked 5,986 others. A Pearl Harbor anniversary summary issued last night says this was accomplished at a cost of 13,491 American planes and 86,580 casualties to air crews. The report covered operations up to last October 31.

I am interested in this matter because I have flown for many years. I was interested to know why so many planes were crashing, and on October 14, 1943, I wrote to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. On October 19, 1943, I received this letter:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Thank you for your letter of October 14, inquiring concerning the report of my committee on military airplane accidents. The committee has been studying this matter for some time, but due to the difficulty which it has encountered in assembling the necessary information, this inquiry has not been completed. Consequently, there will be no report in the immediate future. As soon as the committee's material is fully assembled it will, of course, make a report. I will be glad to advise you as to the approximate time as soon as it is possible to do so.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that this letter is dated October 19, 1943, and up to the present time no report has been forthcoming. I certainly hope that a report will be made before the distinguished Senator from Missouri assumes the office of Vice President of the United States.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the San Diego Union of January 5, 1945. This newspaper is published in California. If the statements made in this article were not the result of an investigation, I doubt if anyone in America would believe them.

INQUEST JURY HEARS WORKERS—PROBE OF CRASH FATAL TO SIX GETS UNDER WAY

Simple, ghastly error, or heedless, death-dealing negligence? Which caused deaths of six men as a Liberator bomber crashed at Loma Portal in test flight November 22?

Answers to these questions are sought in an inquest which opened yesterday in offices of Coroner Chester D. Gunn, and will continue

today. Seven witnesses testified before a jury of 10 men and 2 women yesterday, and upon their answers may depend the fate of possibly 3 workmen whose duties at Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation plants, where the plane was made, included inspection of nuts and bolts. Three other witnesses will be called today.

SECTION IN ROOM

Near the jury box and constantly referred to throughout the inquest's first session stood a 3-foot piece of the 32-foot left outer wing panel that broke loose and left the Liberator helpless. Strips of thin, hard steel pierced by more than 116 bolt holes tracing the shape of the wing formed a focus of interest.

It was because 96 of the holes had never been filled in splicing the panel to the inner w'ng that tragedy overtook the plane soon after its take-off, Deputy Coroner Lloyd F. Jones said in instructing the jury, and at least one witness concurred.

I note the deep interest of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

A wing in an airplane had 116 places for bolts, and 96 of those places never had bolts put in them, and the wing dropped off. The wing was found and shown to the jury. That plane did not burn.

So, Mr. President, once more I join with other Senators who have been endeavoring to get this report. Once more I believe I am with the overwhelming majority of Senators on this floor who insist that the bombers and other airplanes which are being built for our flyers shall not be flying coffins. I join with the overwhelming majority of Senators and, so far as I know, with every Senator on this floor in insisting that when our young heroes go into the air they shall have planes which have been honestly built, honestly inspected, and are safe. Mr. President, I submit that the overwhelming amount of evidence shows that exactly the contrary has occurred.

OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke on the floor of the Senate on an important fact in the history of America's consideration of entrance into the League of Nations. That fact was that in January 1920, Viscount Grey, then British Ambassador to the United States, wrote a letter to the London Times in which he stated that he accepted in principle the American reservations to ratification of the treaty. That was in spite of the fact that President Wilson told his Democratic associates in the Senate to vote against the resolution of ratification which contained the reservations.

Ambassador Grey stated the following, among other things:

It would be a mistake to suppose that the American people are prepared or wish to withdraw their influence in world affairs.

What a dynamic statement that was. It seems to have echoed down through the years.

Viscount Grey also said:

Americans differ among themselves as to whether they could or ought to have entered the war sooner than they did.

Again history has repeated itself. We have just had a political campaign on that issue. When we thought we had the foreign policy of this country settled, after the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair] had fathered a resolution on the subject in the House of Representatives and the Senate had unanimously adopted a similar resolution, we again debated in the campaign the question of intervention or nonintervention, the question of isolation, whatever that means.

I continue to quote from Lord Grey's letter:

It is neither necessary nor profitable for foreigners to discuss this point now.

Stop and think of that statement, Mr. President. Lord Grey was telling his people not to discuss America's own affairs. His statement was quite pointed, was it not? A voice out of the past might have led us away from recent misunderstandings.

I continue to quote from Lord Grey's letter:

What is common to all Americans and to all foreigners who know the facts is the unselfish, wholehearted spirit in which the American Nation acted when it came into the war.

Yet, Mr. President, do you remember, after the war was won, the years when we received no thanks?

In order to keep the record absolutely straight and to belie the expression of the synthetic speakers in America who for 20 years have denounced America and have denounced the Senate in particular for its deliberations in 1919 and 1920 regarding the entry of the United States into the League of Nations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, Lord Grey's letter, which may be found on page 2335 of volume 59 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, under date of February 2, 1920.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of Feb. 1, 1920]

LORD GREY DEFENDS AMERICAN RESERVATIONS; NO OBJECTIONS TO INCREASING UNITED STATES VOTE IN LEAGUE—"OUR OBJECT IS TO MAINTAIN STATES OF BRITISH DOMAINS," NOT TO OUTVOTE AMERICA, HE WRITES—SAYS SENATE HAS REASON AND RIGHT TO PREVENT COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE COMMITTING COUNTRY TO ACTION OPPOSED BY CONGRESS—PRAISES AMERICAN PEOPLE'S SPIRIT

LONDON, January 31.—Lord Grey of Fallodon, the British Ambassador to Washington, now in England, has written the following letter to the London Times:

"Nothing, it seems to me, is more desirable in international politics than a good understanding between the democracy of the United States on one hand and democratic Great Britain and her self-governing dominions, and I hope we may add Ireland, on the other. Nothing would be more disastrous than misunderstanding and estrangement.

"There are some aspects of the position in the United States with regard to the League of Nations which are not wholly understood in Britain. I am in hope that as a result of my recent stay in Washington I may be able to make the position better understood. I venture to offer the following observations. They represent only my own personal opinion; nothing more. They are given simply as those of a private individual."

AMERICANS REGRET IMPASSE

"In Great Britain and the Allied countries there is naturally impatience and disappointment at the delay of the United States in ratifying the peace treaty and the Covenant of the League of Nations. It is perhaps not generally recognized here that there is also great impatience and disappointment in the United States. Nowhere is the impasse caused by the deadlock between the President and the Senate more keenly regretted than in the United States, where there is a strong, even urgent, desire on the part of public opinion to see that a way out of that impasse be found which will be both honorable to America and helpful to the world.

"It will be well to understand the real difficulties with which the people of the United States have been confronted. In the clear light of right understanding, what seemed to be disagreeable features of the situation will assume a more favorable and intelligible aspect. Let us first get rid of one misunderstanding. No charge of bad faith or of repudiating signatures can be brought against the action of the United States."

POLITICS NOT SOLE DIFFICULTY

"The Senate, by the American Constitution, is an independent body, an independent element in the treaty-making power. Its refusal to ratify the treaty cannot expose either itself or the country to a charge of bad faith or of repudiation; nor is it fair to represent the United States as holding up the treaty solely from motives of party politics, thereby sacrificing the interests of other nations for this petty consideration.

"It is true that there are party politics and personal animosities in the United States. An American who saw much of England between 1880 and 1890 said that the present condition of politics in the United States reminded him of what he had observed in London when Gladstone had first advocated home rule for Ireland. Party politics and the personal animosities arising out of them operate in every democratic country. They are factors varying from time to time in degree, but always more or less active, and they operate upon every public question which is at all controversial. They are, however, not the sole or even the prime cause of the difficulty in the United States about the League of Nations."

REASONS FOR RESERVATIONS

"Nor is it true to say that the United States is moved solely by self-interest to a disregard of higher ideals. In the United States, as in other countries, there are cross-currents and backwaters in national life and motives. It would be well, therefore, for reasons both of truth and expediency, to concentrate on the real underlying causes of the Senate's reservations in ratifying the covenant of the League of Nations.

"There is in the United States a conservative feeling for traditional policy, and one of those traditions, consecrated by the advice of Washington, is to abstain from foreign, and particularly from European, entanglements. Even for nations which have been used to European alliances, the League of Nations is felt to be something of a new departure. This is still more true for the United States, which has hitherto held aloof from all outside alliances. The League of Nations is not merely a plunge into the unknown, but a plunge into something which its historical advice and traditions have hitherto positively disapproved. Hence this desire for some qualification and reservation."

GRAVE CLASH POSSIBLE

"The American Constitution not only makes possible but under certain conditions

renders inevitable a conflict between the Executive and the legislature. It would be possible, if the Covenant of the League of Nations stands, for a President in some future years to commit the United States, through its American representative on the council of the League of Nations, to a policy which the legislature at that time might disapprove.

"That contingency is one which cannot arise in Great Britain, where the Government is daily responsible to the representative authority of the House of Commons, and where, in case of conflict between the House of Commons and the Government, the latter must either immediately give way or public opinion must decide between them and assert itself by an immediate general election. But in the United States it is otherwise. The contingency is within the region of practical politics. They have reason and, if they so desire, the right to provide against it."

LEAGUE NEEDS AMERICA

"What, then, may be fairly expected from the United States in this great crisis of world policy? For crisis indeed it is. If the participation of the United States was enormously helpful in securing victory in the critical months of 1918, its help will be even more essential to secure stability in peace. Without the United States present the League of Nations may become little better than a league of allies for armed self-defense against a revival of Prussian militarism or against the military sequel to bolshevism in Russia. Bolshevism is despotism, and despotisms have a tendency to become militarism, as the great French Revolution proved.

"The great object of the League of Nations is to prevent future war and to discourage from the beginning the growth of aggressive armaments which would lead to war. Without the United States it will have neither the overwhelming physical nor moral force behind it that it should have, or if it has physical force it will not have the same degree of moral force, for it will be predominantly a European and not a world organization, and it will be tainted with all the interracial jealousies of Europe."

DEFENDS AMERICAN PEOPLE

"With the United States in the League of Nations, war may be prevented and armaments discouraged, and it will not be in the power of the fretful nations of the world to disturb the general peace. With America outside the League of Nations the old order of things will be revived, old consequences will recur, there will again be some great catastrophe of war in which it will find itself compelled to intervene for the same reason and at no less or even greater cost than in 1917.

"It would be a mistake to suppose that the American people are prepared or wish to withdraw their influence in world affairs. Americans differ among themselves as to whether they could or ought to have entered the war sooner than they did. It is neither necessary nor profitable for foreigners to discuss this point now. What is common to all Americans and to all foreigners who know the facts is the unselfish, wholehearted spirit in which the American Nation acted when it came into the war."

NOT PLAYING SMALL PART

"The immediate adoption of compulsory military service and, even more, the rationing of food and fuel in these millions and millions of households over such a vast area—not by compulsion but by purely voluntary action in response to an appeal which had no compulsion behind it—is a remarkable and even astonishing example of national spirit and idealism. That spirit is still there. It is as much a part of the nature and possibilities of the American people as any other characteristic.

"It would be a great mistake to suppose that because the citizens of the United States wish to limit their obligations they therefore propose to themselves to play a small part in the League of Nations. If they enter the League as a willing partner with limited obligations, it may well be that American opinion and American action inside the League will be more fruitful than if they entered as a reluctant partner who felt that her hand had been forced. It is in this spirit, in this hope, and in this expectation that I think we should approach and are justified in approaching the consideration of American reservations. Difficulties and dangers which Americans foresee in it will probably never arise or be felt by them when they are once in the League; in the same way, the weakening and injury to the League which some of its best friends apprehend from American reservations would not be felt in practice."

SHOULD ACCEPT CONDITIONS

"If the outcome of the long controversy in the Senate will be to offer cooperation in the League of Nations, it would be the greatest mistake to refuse that cooperation because of the conditions attached to it; and when that cooperation is accepted, let it not be accepted in a spirit of pessimism. The most vital considerations are that the representatives should be appointed to the Council of the League of Nations by all nations that are members of the Council; that the representatives should be men who are inspired by the ideals for which we entered the war, and that the representatives should be instructed and supported in that same spirit of equity and freedom by the governments and the public opinion of the countries who are now partners in peace. If that be the spirit of the Council of the League of Nations, fear that the representatives of the United States in that Council will not take part in realizing the hopes of the League are unfounded.

"There is one particular reservation which must give rise to some difficulty in Great Britain and her self-governing dominions. It is that which has reference to the six British votes in the Assembly of the League of Nations."

VOTES OF BRITISH DOMINIONS

"The self-governing dominions are full members of the League. They will admit, and Great Britain can admit, no qualification whatever of that right. Whatever the self-governing dominions may be in theory and in the letter of the constitution, they have in effect ceased to be colonies in the old sense of the word. They are free communities, independent as regards all their own affairs, and partners in those which concern the empire at large."

"To any provision which makes it clear that none of those British votes can be used in a dispute likely to lead to a rupture in which any part of the British Empire is involved no exception can be taken. That is the only reasonable interpretation of the covenant as it now stands. If any part of the British Empire is involved in a dispute with the United States, the latter will be unable to vote, and all parts of the British Empire, precisely because they are partners, will be parties to that dispute and equally unable to vote. But as regards their right to vote where they are not parties to the dispute, there can be no qualification, and there is a very general admission that the votes of the self-governing dominions would in most cases be found on the same side as that of the United States.

"It must not be supposed that in the United States there is any tendency to grudge the fact that Canada and the other self-governing dominions of the British Empire have votes, but any person with the smallest understanding of public audiences must realize the feeling created by the statement that the United States, with several million more English-speaking citizens than there are in the whole of the British Empire, should have only 1 vote, while the British Empire has 6 votes.

"It may be sufficient to observe that the reservation of America does not in any way challenge the right of the self-governing dominions to exercise their votes, nor does it state that the United States will necessarily reject a decision in which those votes have been cast. It is therefore possible—I think it is even more than probable—that in practice no dispute will ever arise. Our object is to maintain the status of the self-governing dominions, not to secure a greater British than American vote, and we have no objection in principle to an increase of the American vote.

"GREY OF FALLODON."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the significance of Lord Grey's letter is that after the First World War America was ready, willing, and able to make all reasonable compromises in the establishment of a just and enduring peace. The same condition holds doubly true today. Our hearts are open; our arms are outstretched to the other nations of the world. Both Houses of Congress have signified their willingness to enter into world-wide cooperation. They have reflected the will of the people, as indicated in every recent poll of public opinion.

Yes, Mr. President; we are again ready. It is for the nations of Europe to demonstrate that they are ready. The United States recognizes the importance of the Allied Nations getting together. It wishes to cooperate with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve world peace. World peace can best be assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty and their own essential interests, find common grounds on which to work together. That is the point. We Americans must consider the issue from the other fellow's viewpoint before criticizing it, and Europe must consider the issue from our point of view.

I see the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in the Chamber. In voicing this sentiment I voice the only basic idea expressed by Abraham Lincoln, when he said that we should put ourselves in the other fellow's position and should consider his viewpoint, before we start criticizing, and that we should attempt to understand his position.

Mr. President, we must first find the common grounds between ourselves and our allies, and subsequently consider the contested grounds, rather than vice versa. Let us first seek the things which unite us, rather than those which divide us; let us first seek the things which strengthen the bonds between us, rather than the things which weaken those bonds. When we have found an issue upon which there is genuine and honest difference of opinion, we should discuss it with our allies without prejudice, without hysteria, without breast beating. Let us give and take rationally, logically, and calmly. In this period we not only have to develop poise, not poison, within ourselves, but we must have humility, not bravado; restraint, not rashness; perspective, not short-sightedness.

So, Mr. President, I say we in this country are ready again, as Lord Grey said we were before.

Today the burden of proof is on the nations of Europe to certify that they are at least willing to come halfway in formulating the post-war international organization. It is for the nations of Europe, individually and collectively, to compose their differences among their own peoples and with each other. It is for each nation of Europe to perform a single, inspired, noble, and unselfish act of harmonious cooperation, and then to follow it up with other such deeds, and thereby win the hearts of their own people and of the American people to the thought that world cooperation is possible. The alternative to such action on the part of Europe is a disillusionment and cynicism regarding European affairs which may develop into a tidal wave of a new isolationism, isolationism in earnest.

We go through the wine press twice. There may be no further chance. It is that which I fear, Mr. President, and it is against that which I pray. I refer to an utter lack of mere common sense. Many times during the practice of the law for 30 years I settled strikes. I settled differences when I could get the parties around the table, and they had composed themselves for rational thinking. Results were then possible. In international affairs we must get around the table. We must see the other fellow's viewpoint. We must not narrow our perspective to merely the American view. We must recognize the other fellow's views as well. In 1939, while representing this Government in the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Oslo, Norway, I made a statement which I should like to read. It is very brief. I repeat to the nations of the world, and to America, especially, what I said on that occasion. All the democratic nations of the world were represented in that meeting. Only the Fascist governments were not represented. It was 10 days before Hitler went into Poland, and the air was charged with coming events. The meeting was held in the Storthing, or parliament building in Oslo. Addressing the group to which I have referred, which was composed of 300 or 400 men representing democratic nations, I said:

From every land in Europe, America has received its blood stream. Your great culture has enriched our lives. Your music, your literature, your drama, some of your great ideas in economics, philosophy, and religion we have made our own. But, Mr. President, you have something we do not want. I refer to those barriers analyzed by the psychologists as fear, hatred, and distress.

Allow me to say parenthetically that the statement with reference to fear which the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] so clearly outlined in his speech of yesterday was clearly America's voice. I continue quoting:

Yes; we owe you much. We know the world is small. We are neighbors. We want to help. Your problems are intricate. There are many equations that we do not understand. I say we want to help, but we want to help you to help yourselves to the end that your problems may find solution through you. * * *

We want to be helpful, but America does not want—

I was speaking then of the voice of America to the extent of between 70 and 95 percent of the people, as indicated by every poll from that time to Pearl Harbor—

We want to be helpful but America does not want to meddle in Europe. The role of a meddler I do not crave for my country.

That, Mr. President, is the thing we have to be careful of in our dealings in the international picture. We do not want to meddle. We want to help. We want to help those poor nations get on their feet so that they can help themselves, but we must be careful or they will be saying that we are putting our noses into their business. The only reason we are going forward and collaborating and cooperating is to make sure, if it is humanly possible to do so, that once again our sons shall not have to go forth into another world holocaust.

REGULATION OF BEEF PRODUCTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the RECORD a very short statement covering my opinion of the order issued yesterday by the Economic Stabilization Director with reference to prices on live cattle. Later in the day I received a copy of the order which had been released to the public press. In order to be perfectly fair, and keep both sides of the controversy thoroughly informed, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the release of the Office of Economic Stabilization.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Economic Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson today directed the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and Defense Supplies Corporation to make several important changes in the cattle stabilization program. The purpose of the directive is to make it possible for O. P. A. to secure more effective control of live cattle prices and to continue to protect the consumer against any increase in the price of meat. The program, which was recommended to the Office of Economic Stabilization by the Office of Price Administration, will, at the same time, prevent any substantial reduction in live cattle prices, which would adversely affect cattle feeding or production. The program is as follows:

1. O. P. A. and W. F. A. were directed to establish an overriding ceiling on live cattle and calves on the basis of $18 per hundredweight at Chicago until July 2, 1945, when the overriding ceiling will be lowered to $17.50.

2. D. S. C. was directed to increase the subsidy payments on Choice (grade AA) by $1, and Good (grade A) beef by 50 cents per 100 pounds, live weight. On July 2, 1945, the subsidy payments on Choice cattle only will be reduced by 50 cents.

3. O. P. A. and W. F. A. were directed to increase the price of the stabilization range for Choice by $1, and Good cattle by 50 cents per 100 pounds, live weight, over the entire country. However, on July 2, 1945, the maximum and the minimum of the stabilization range for Choice cattle will be reduced by 50 cents per hundred pounds, live weight.

4. O. P. A. and W. F. A. were directed to issue a regulation making it an O. P. A. violation for a slaughterer to pay more, on the average, grade and yield considered, than the maximum prices of the stabilization range for the cattle purchased and slaughtered by him over a month's period. This does not include calves.

5. W. F. A. was directed to delegate authority to the Price Administrator to issue an order establishing the maximum percentage of Good and Choice cattle that any slaughterer may slaughter or deliver over a month's time.

Continuation of subsidy payments under the program beyond June 30, 1945, is, of course, contingent upon congressional appropriation of the necessary funds.

This directive is effective January 29, 1945.

Prior to this directive a slaughterer could pay more than the maximums of the stabilization range for cattle, with the only penalty being that of loss of subsidy. Under today's directive the purchase of cattle at levels exceeding the revised stabilization maximums over a month's time will constitute a violation of O. P. A. regulations and be subject to enforcement action.

Furthermore, before the present directive was issued a slaughterer could pay any amount for an individual animal or drove of animals without violating any regulation, provided he was willing to absorb the possible loss of subsidy. Frequently slaughterers could offset very high prices for certain grades of cattle by buying other grades at prices below the minimums of the stabilization range and not lose subsidy. Today's action will prevent a slaughterer from paying more than $1 above the maximum of the stabilization range for any cattle or calf. This will be $18 per hundred pounds, live weight, in Chicago, and will vary somewhat at other points. This figure will become $17.50 in Chicago on July 2, 1945. This action should definitely relieve the squeeze on those slaughterers who have been forced by market conditions to pay more than the maximums of the stabilization range.

The $18 overriding ceiling thus provided at this time, and which will remain in effect until July 2, 1945, is established to protect feeders who now have livestock on hand. Many of these feeders purchased these feeder-type cattle in anticipation of feeding them up to Choice grade and receiving a price in excess of $17.50. The published market quotations on Choice cattle at Chicago during the last 6 months of 1944 averaged somewhat higher than $17.50. It is expected that these feeders will have an opportunity to sell all of these cattle before July 2, 1945.

The increases in the minimum and maximum levels of the stabilization range for Choice cattle, and the increases in the subsidy payments on Choice cattle during this period should permit slaughterers to pay approximately the price levels which have existed during the past few months.

The increases in subsidy payments on Good and Choice cattle, and the increases in the maximum of the stabilization range for Good and Choice cattle, both prior to and after July 2, 1945, should prevent this more effective control on cattle prices from reducing producers' prices sharply under market levels of the last few months. This action should provide the cattle-price structure with a wider spread for feeders than has existed heretofore.

The action does not establish live cattle ceiling prices by individual grades, O. E. S. emphasized, except that no cattle can be bought or sold at prices higher than the overriding ceiling. The slaughterer will, however, on the average, have to buy his cattle at levels no higher than the maximums of the stabilization range, grade, and yield considered, in order to stay in compliance. He may pay up to the overriding ceiling for any individual bullock or drove. This plan leaves the slaughterer considerable flexibility in his cattle buying. Compliance will be determined upon the same basis as is now used by the slaughterer in his applications to D. S. C. for subsidy.

In brief, this drove compliance method works as follows:

Over a month's time the slaughterer knows the dressed weight of his beef by grades and the total cost of the live cattle slaughtered to provide that beef. The dressed weight of the beef of each grade is divided by a conversion factor to determine the calculated live weight of the cattle slaughtered to provide that beef. These conversion factors have been certified by O. P. A. and W. F. A. for each grade. They are stated in D. S. C.'s subsidy application blanks. The calculated live weight for each grade of cattle is multiplied by the maximum price of the stabilization range for that grade of cattle. The amounts determined for each grade of cattle are added together to obtain the amount that would have been paid for that particular drove if all the cattle had been bought at the maximum permitted under the-stabilization range. If the actual cost of the monthly drove exceeds this calculated maximum, the slaughter will be in violation.

Today's action will permit the Price Administrator to issue an order fixing the maximum percentage of Good and Choice cattle that can be slaughtered or delivered by any slaughterer over a month's time. Prior to today's action any slaughterer could elect to kill any percentage of any grade of cattle. A considerable number of slaughterers throughout the country have confined their slaughtering operations primarily to Good and Choice cattle and have killed few or none of the other grades. Since these two grades of cattle have generally tended to sell at or above the maximums of the stabilization range, slaughterers who killed these grades almost exclusively had an average cattle cost higher than that intended under the stabilization program.

Furthermore, these particular slaughterers had available for their customers a much higher percentage of high-quality beef than the average slaughterer in the industry. Today's action permits the Price Administrator to require all slaughterers to kill at least a minimum percentage of other grades of cattle. The percentage of Good and Choice cattle available varies seasonally and the forthcoming O. P. A. order will take this into account. This order will require all slaughterers to participate in the slaughter and distribution of the commoner types of beef and should result in a more equitable distribution of the better grades. Furthermore, this order will require slaughterers to kill a drove including several grades of cattle, which should result in their average costs of cattle staying within the stabilization range.

(Prices, cattle and calves, Office of Economic Stabilization Directive No. 28. Effective January 29, 1945.)

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in this connection I invite the attention of Senators to one clause in the release to which I have referred. It reads as follows:

Today's action will permit the Price Administrator to issue an order fixing the maximum percentage of Good and Choice cattle that can be slaughtered or delivered by any slaughterer over a month's time.

In the next paragraph this sentence appears:

Today's action permits the Price Administrator to require all slaughterers to kill at least a minimum percentage of other grades of cattle.

I can see nothing but chaos following such an interpretation of the order, Mr. President, because cattle slaughterers are similar to persons engaged in other lines of business. Each slaughterer has his regular line of trade. He requires certain grades of beef to satisfy his customers, who would not want the other grades at all. If a slaughterer is required to kill a certain percentage of all the various grades of cattle, nothing but chaos can result.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1945:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Miles N. Pike, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harris Walthall, of El Paso, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex., to fill an existing vacancy.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Walter C. Quigley, Mariposa, Calif., in place of D. K. Campbell, resigned.

FLORIDA

Herman E. Wattwood, Titusville, Fla., in place of M. L. Calder, deceased.

GEORGIA

Jesse G. Scaife, Fort Gaines, Ga., in place of R. A. Fowler, transferred.

ILLINOIS

M. Elaine Bryant, Browning, Ill., in place of B. I. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1941.

James C. Stanley, Fairfield, Ill., in place of O. P. Bonner, transferred.

Genevieve B. Livesay, Posen, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KENTUCKY

Verdie Whitmer, Bremen, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Stella Creekmore, Rockholds, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MICHIGAN

Lester Kittell, Riverside, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Richard M. Odegard, Watson, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MONTANA

Alice A. Van Campen, Reedpoint, Mont., in place of S. J. Guthrie, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Gertrude E. White, Melrose, N. Mex., in place of G. E. White. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

NEW YORK

Mabel J. Bigelow, Richville, N. Y., in place of J. M. Reed, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

John S. Chapman, Grifton, N. C., in place of R. B. Mewborn, transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Walter J. Lundy, Forgan, Okla., in place of B. D. Miller, resigned.

OREGON

Lloyd W. Lewis, Nyssa, Oreg., in place of S. D. Goshert, retired.

TENNESSEE

Louise C. Treadway, Pleasant Hill, Tenn., in place of K. N. Suttle, resigned.

TEXAS

Cecil R. Chamberlain, Goree, Tex., in place of L. C. Cowser, removed.

Walter L. Taylor, Morton, Tex., in place of M. N. Winder, retired.

Leta B. Eidson, Stanton, Tex., in place of J. M. Hall, resigned.

George L. Barber, Talco, Tex., in place of F. A. Brown, transferred.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, we pray today for every effort which is being made for the diffusion of knowledge, of brotherhood, peace, and good will throughout our country. May there be in us a broader understanding and a conscience that is willing and free to be guided aright. O let the breath of the Gospel of our Master be breathed where men are arrayed against one another, seeking selfish power which exerts itself in divisive ways. May they aim at the true ideal, judging themselves in the sight of a just God; forbid that we should follow the courses which have proven fatal to others. Hold us back from a destructive materialism, from vanity and thoughtlessness, reminding us that these sins produced shame and ruin in every age. Everywhere, dear Lord, allow the world to roll no longer eclipsed; grant that it may be redeemed and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord.

O Good Shepherd, wilt Thou grant Thy blessing especially to all those who are in trouble, to all who are in darkness, to all who are suffering from bereavement, to all who are heartsick, and to all children of sorrow; O bring stars into their nights. Keep from despondency those who are in the midst of life's duties, and may we all seek the right things in the right way, and inspire us with an invincible desire for peace, that man to man may brother be. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DRAFTING OF NURSES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of this House have asked me if I would outline some of the factual background of the present nursing situation, with perhaps some of the pros and cons of a draft of nurses for the Army and Navy at this time. I am most happy to do so, and to this end am asking unanimous consent to spread my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The possible drafting of nurses has been talked of for several years as the only means by which an adequate number could be secured for a very heavy load of casualties, especially over a long period. Many nurses have been hoping for it for some time as the only way for them to obtain release from civilian hospitals and other obligations. Many recruiting committees have hoped for it as the only means to shake certain groups of nurses and certain hospital and civilian groups awake to their responsibilities to the fighting men. To all of these and to many others, the President's call for such a draft, whether there be a universal service act or not, was exceedingly welcome.

In order to recognize adequately the voluntary response of the nursing profession to the need under the conditions existing up to the late fall, it seems to me important as a starting point for our considerations of a possible amendment to the Selective Service Act, or to such a bill as that introduced this week by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, that we take cognizance of the fact that out of the 265,000 nurses of the country, 78,000 have already volunteered, 53,000 of whom are in the service today.

Let us not fall into the temptation of considering only the nurses responsible for the present shortage; rather let us inform ourselves of some of the other factors involved. Not the least of these is the fact that we civilians have not recognized our personal responsibility sufficiently. We are not thinking in terms of total-war needs. We are still thinking life is as it used to be. Many people have more money than they have had in a long time, and they are trying to catch up on a lot of their physical ills, flooding the hospitals in consequence. Some of their needs could wait, and I, for one, feel that no one has a right to a hospital bed today unless his need is acute. Whatever could be delayed should be. To the same end, special nurses should be available only to those whose physical need demands constant watchfulness and care; but special nurses should be made available to all who so need them, regardless of ability to pay.

Hospitalization of the acutely sick, on the other hand, helps in the conservation of our depleted community medical personnel, a very real part of the national picture.

The situation in many civilian hospitals due to lack of nurses is acute, but studies have long revealed that salary schedules are generally too low to attract the private-duty nurses into the hospital field, though many married or older nurses are giving part time and so helping to keep the hospital nursing staffs above the danger point. Volunteer nurses' aides, and paid aides, and paid hospital assistants with volunteer orderlies are proving their value everywhere. Here again we civilians have the responsibility of increasing these groups so that qualified nurses can enlist in the armed services.

I do not minimize the difficult situation in which the civilian hospitals find themselves—but we must find ways to supplement their services and ease their loads. For instance, a certain number of patients could be discharged earlier than they are if the doctors would acquire the habit of referring them to the public health nursing associations, whose nurses, though already heavily loaded, could give them care at home. Care of our civilian population is, of course, a necessary part of our responsibility as citizens. In the field of industry, it might be that such organizations employing less than 500 could make arrangements with local public-health services for part-time work, rather than tying up one or more nurses full time. All these various methods added up together would help carry the load.

One of the deterring factors in nurse recruitment during 1944 has been the action of the War Department in January of 1944 in reducing the 50,000 ceiling on nurses to 40,000, and keeping it on overlong. This action canceled plans for the national registration of nurses and an O. W. I. recruitment campaign that was about to be launched.

The fall gave us the extraordinary phenomena of "the war is over; let us reconvert everything possible to be set for peace." Naturally, nurses shared the general attitude.

With the sudden reverses, of course, one of the first reactions had to be "give us nurses"—10,000 overnight. At once the various agencies involved went to work to get the picture of the need dramatically before the available nurses. I myself wrote a vivid letter of appeal, which was sent out by the National Nursing Council for War Service to at least 25,000 senior cadets and young graduates, as well as to hospital directors and superintendents. To this there has been considerable response. This same National Nursing Council for War Service, Inc., which represents all the national nursing organizations and the nursing services of the Federal Government, together with the Red Cross Recruitment Committee, the Procurement and Assignment Committee, the O. W. I. War Advertising Group, and the Army itself pooled all their efforts and launched a campaign. The fact that they were faced with the holiday season meant that the start would be slow. But the start was made, and I think it is important you should know that the upswing had been felt quite definitely during the week preceding the President's message. You should know also, that the Surgeon General's office did not wait for the President's message to activate its part of the recruitment efforts. Some months ago I consulted with Colonel Yarborough and Major Aynes, who are in charge of the Army part of the program, before speaking on a recruitment program in Times Hall, and I had a long conference with Colonel Blanchfield, Major Aynes, and Miss Blewett of the War Advertising Council during the week preceding the message.

The effect of the message itself has been marked. Reports are coming in from many areas of a flooding of the recruitment offices. This is most heartening as the need for nurses is now, and will continue to be.

There have been complaints from nurses who have applied for Army service that there has been long delay in processing them for actual service, as well as delay in calling them after they have been accepted. Examination of the first complaint discloses that many times a nurse overlooks some item in her application with consequent unavoidable delay to which shortage of personnel in recruitment centers contributes its share. All these difficulties are being looked into and corrected.

Study of the second problem revealed that various corps areas have been slow in recognizing the imperative need and have taken nurses in only once or twice a month. Sometimes 2 months have passed before an accepted nurse has actually been brought in. Both these problems are being taken hold of drastically. However, it is important that everyone, including nurses, should understand that certain very definite and important steps must be taken between the moment of application for service and the moment of complete acceptance for active duty, represented by the taking of oath. Qualifications must be checked, and this cannot be done overnight, nor by unaccustomed personnel. I understand that as envisaged by Selective Service, there would be no change in the groups now being used for classification and accrediting.

You will be interested to know that at a corporation meeting of the National Nursing Council for War Service held in New York City, January 10, the following motions were voted and referred to the American Nurses' Association:

1. Owing to the growing national emergency, the National Nursing Council for War Service approves in principle Federal Selective Service legislation for procurement of nurses to meet the needs of the armed forces.

2. *Resolved*, That to assure adequate nursing to the civilian population, the National Nursing Council for War Service urges the enactment of a National Service Act to supplement any Selective Service legislation for nurses.

Inasmuch as the Congress created the United States Cadet Nurse Corps 19 months ago to assure a steady flow of students through the training schools of the country, it would seem appropriate for me to summarize the results as of this date.

The Cadet Nurse Corps is a corps of student nurses that serves a twofold purpose: it augments civilian nursing service so that larger numbers of graduate nurses can be released for the military, and it creates a pool from which the military can draw when cadet nurses become seniors and graduates.

The Cadet Nurse Corps is credited by the American Hospital Association with having prevented the collapse of civilian nursing service. Indicative, also, of the vital contribution rendered by student nurses are the following facts: 29 percent of the non-Federal general hospitals have schools of nursing which care for 56 percent of all patients in non-Federal hospitals in the United States; 60 percent of all nursing service in these non-Federal hospitals is given by student nurses. It is particularly interesting to note that 1944 records show a 76 percent increase in student admis-

sions to nursing schools over 1940, the year prior to the first Federal aid to nurse education.

The Army says that 50 senior cadets can release 40 graduate nurses. From April 1944 to December 31, 1944, 1,157 senior cadets have served in Army hospitals and 43.9 percent have indicated their intention to remain as graduate nurses, and 354 senior cadets have served in Navy hospitals, 31.2 percent having indicated their intention to remain as graduate nurses. The Veterans Administration records show that from April through November 1944, 273 senior cadets have served, and approximately 9 percent remained as graduates. The United States Public Health Service records show 104 senior cadets serving and approximately 17 percent of the 46 who graduated have remained as graduate nurses.

In all consideration of the Cadet Corps it must be remembered that it is but 18 months old. Notwithstanding its present accelerated program, it takes 24 to 30 months—a full 3 years are still necessary in some States—to produce 1 graduate nurse. It must be remembered that most of the 1943–44 graduates were nearing completion of their nursing education when the Corps was formed. Since they had met the bulk of the necessary financial outlay, a very high percentage did not accept Federal scholarships or take the cadet nurse pledge. Therefore it is obvious that the extreme youth of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps accounts for the fact that only a comparatively small number of cadet nurses have been graduated to date. It is important to note, however, that cadet nurses have greatly decreased the burden on graduate nurses in the hospitals, and released great numbers of them for essential service at home and abroad. The growing contributions by the corps to the military, industrial, and civilian nursing is evident by the following statistics showing the estimated number of graduates from the Cadet Corps over the period 1943 through fiscal 1947:

Fiscal year beginning July 1, ending June 30:	
1943–44	[1] 1,206
1944–45	9,165
1945–46	25,161
1946–47	35,579

[1] Corps members only. Total graduates from schools of nursing, 1944, 28,978.

The United States Cadet Nurse Corps recruitment quota for the 12-month period ending June 30, 1945, is 60,000 new student nurses. Without the Cadet Nurse Corps we should be in serious difficulties in keeping up the supply of nurses for the unpredictable road ahead.

In closing let me give you the nursing figures as of today:

Total nurses in United States of America in 1941	265,000
Total nurses volunteered in 1940–44	78,000
Total nurses in Army and Navy	53,000
Total nurses classified	221,000
Classified in:	
Class I–A, single	29,676
Class I–B, married	13,480
Total	42,162
Class I–C (essential until replaced—to be reclassified almost immediately)	33,348

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the special order of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the Members that inasmuch as there is no legislative program today or tomorrow, they may insert their extensions at this point if they desire.

HARVARD MERRILL HODGINS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in response to a letter from a thoughtful, appreciative, and patriotic citizen of my district, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the awarding of an appropriate medal and citation to Harvard Merrill Hodgins, of Hancock Point, Maine, by the Attorney General or the Department of Justice in recognition of the patriotic service rendered by him in connection with the detection in November 1944 of two German spies who had been landed by submarine on the coast of Maine and who were later apprehended by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The letter from Mr. Hanchett reads as follows:

HOLLAND, MICH., *January 6, 1945.*

Congressman BARTEL JONKMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONKMAN: The thought I wish to bring to your attention concerns the 17-year-old Mr. Hodgins, who, when driving home one evening last week, noticed the two German saboteurs plodding through the deep snow and immediately became suspicious of them.

He continued to follow their tracks along the roadside and later on noticed their trail turned off into the dark woods down toward the rocky seashore of the Atlantic. By this time these two suspicious characters had made such a deep impression on this young schoolboy's mind he decided to continue with his check-up on them.

Without seeking the aid or assistance of two or three others, he courageously, single-handed, followed their tracks in the snow until they met the shore line of the ocean, which brought out the fact that said two saboteurs made their way to shore in a rubber boat from a German submarine.

When this young boy started out on this trail into the woods under the cover of a dark night, he did not know if he would walk into a group of heavily armed desperadoes or not, who, with little trouble, could have overpowered him and put him to death. But in spite of all the terrible possibilities of what could happen to him, he bravely and courageously continued on his journey.

I have not the ability to picture the brave feat of this young man in a dramatic story, but it is this point of exceeding heroism on his part I wish to bring out.

We all know the results of his quick thinking and action, namely, the capture of these two trained saboteurs that were heavily armed and having on their persons $60,000. Yes; they could have possibly caused $60,000,000 worth of destruction, besides the loss of many thousands of lives.

The story ends here, but why am I bringing it to your attention? Well, I feel an outstanding act of bravery of this kind should be acknowledged by some Government agency in a citation of some kind. Brave war soldiers receive their Silver Stars, Purple Hearts, and the like, and some recognition should be given to this boy, whether it be by Congress or some Army officer.

This is merely a thought on my part, so I leave it to you to carry on from here.

Very sincerely yours,

MERRICK W. HANCHETT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein a quotation, a letter, and an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

U. N. R. R. A.: MASS COOK'S TOUR

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the letter of T. Titmouse "To the Worthy and Independent Electors of Yatton" appealing for their support of his candidacy for a seat in Parliament should not be overlooked by those who believe in the Act for Giving Everybody Everything. It is a model campaign letter for the champions of largess at the expense of the taxpayers. Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the letter of T. Titmouse to the electors of Yatton:

To the Worthy and Independent Electors of Yatton.

GENTLEMEN: His Majesty having been pleased to dissolve the late Parliament, under very remarkable and exciting circumstances, and, in the midst of the transports of enthusiasm arising out of the passing of that second Great Charter of our Liberties, the Act for Giving Everybody Everything, with kindly wisdom, to call upon you to exercise immediately the high and glorious privilege of choosing your representative in the new Parliament, I beg leave to announce myself as a candidate for that distinguished honor. Gentlemen, long before I succeeded in establishing my right to reside among you in my present capacity, I felt a deep interest in the welfare of the tenants of the property, and especially of those residing in the parts adjacent, and who are now so happily introduced into the constituency of this ancient and loyal borough. I trust that the circumstance of my ancestors having resided for ages within it will not indispose you to a favorable reception of their descendant and representative.

Gentlemen, my political opinions are those which led to the passing of the great measure I have alluded to and which are bound up in it. Without going into details, which are too multifarious for the limits of such an address as the present, let me assure

you that, though firmly resolved to uphold the agricultural interests of this great country, I am equally anxious to sustain the commercial and manufacturing interests; and whenever they are unhappily in fatal conflict with each other, I shall be found at my post, zealously supporting both, to the utmost of my ability. Though a sincere and firm member and friend of the established church, I am not insensible to the fearful abuses which at present prevail in it, particularly in its revenues, which I am disposed to lessen and equalize, devoting the surplus capital to useful purposes connected with the state, from which she derived them, as history testifies. I am bent upon securing the utmost possible latitude to every species of dissent. In fact, I greatly doubt whether any form of religion ought to be established in a free country.

While I am resolved to uphold the interests of Protestantism, I think I best do so by seeking to remove all restrictions from the Catholics, who, I am persuaded, will sacredly abstain from endeavoring to promote their own interests at the expense of ours. The infallible page of history establishes their humility, meekness, and moderation. Gentlemen, depend upon it, the established religion is most likely to flourish when surrounded by danger and threatened by persecution; it has an inherent vitality which will defy, in the long run, all competition. Gentlemen, I am for peace, retrenchment, and reform, which are in fact the three polar stars of my political conduct. I am an advocate for quarterly Parliaments, convinced that we can not too often be summoned to give an account of our stewardship and that the frequency of elections will occasion a wholesale agitation and stimulus to trade. I am for extending the elective franchise to all, except those who are actually the inmates of a prison or a poorhouse on the day of election; and for affording to electors the inviolable secrecy and protection of the ballot. I am an uncompromising advocate of civil and religious liberty all over the globe; and, in short, of giving the greatest happiness to the greatest number. Gentlemen, before concluding, I wish to state explicitly, as the result of long and deep inquiry and reflection, that I am of opinion that every constituency is entitled, nay, bound, to exact from a candidate for its suffrages the most strict and minute pledges as to his future conduct in Parliament in every matter, great or small, that can come before it; in order to prevent his judgment being influenced and warped by the dangerous sophistries and fallacies which are broached in Parliament and protect his integrity from the base, sinister, and corrupt influences which are invariably brought to bear on public men. I am ready, therefore, to pledge myself to anything that may be required of me by any elector who may honor me with his support. Gentlemen, such are my political principles, and I humbly hope that they will prove to be those of the electors of this ancient and loyal borough, so as to warrant the legislature in having preserved it in existence amidst the wholesale havoc which it has just made in property of this description. Though it is not probable that we shall be harassed by a contest, I shall make a point of waiting upon you all personally and humbly answering all questions that may be put to me; and should I be returned, rely upon it that I will never give you occasion to regret your display of so signal an evidence of your confidence in me. I have the honor to be, gentlemen, your most obedient and humble servant.

T. TITMOUSE.

YATTON, *December 3, 18—*.

Mr. Speaker, under further leave to extend my remarks, I am also inserting a news article in reference to U. N. R. R. A. which appears in the Times-Herald under date of January 10, 1945, as follows:

"NOTHING TO DO," REASON BRITON QUIT U. N. R. R. A.

LONDON, January 10.—The Daily Express today quoted H. Vernon Lindsay, London businessman, as saying that he resigned his United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration job in October because he had nothing to do but watch the taxpayers' money being wasted.

Lindsay, who, according to the article, joined U. N. R. R. A. 4 days after D-day at a salary of $4,500 a year plus almost $8 daily living expenses, a total of about $8,000 a year, was quoted as saying:

"I worked for 10 days in the U. N. R. R. A. London office in Portland Place and found a large surplus of staff doing practically nothing. I was posted [assigned] to Cairo and flown there. I found a staff of from 300 to 400, 60 percent of them Americans and the rest British or drawn from other United Nations.

"MASS COOK'S TOUR

"Many officials and their wives with them, also in jobs and drawing pay and living allowances. The U. N. R. R. A. in Cairo is under dual control of Washington and London and there seemed to be no real head to determine policy or decide on action.

"I met several 1,000-pound ($4,000) per year men who had come out from London only to find the posts had already been filled by Washington, so they had to wait around doing nothing until something was found for them. To me it seemed to be a mass Cook's tour at the taxpayers' expense."

A U. N. R. R. A. official in London, commenting on Lindsay's statement, said Lindsay was careless about his facts. There is no dual control in Cairo, the official said, adding that it was directly responsible to Washington.

Since London is the mobilization center for personnel and transportation is irregular, he said, there are temporary surpluses of staff. He attributed Lindsay's resignation to a disinclination to take a position in which he was subordinate to officials younger than himself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point and include therein a statement from the Okonite Co., of Passaic, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, emphasizing what American business faces today in answering the multitude of Government directives issued from day to day, I present defense memorandum No. 45, dated December 19, 1944, and prepared by Mr. Donald R. Stevens, vice president of the Okonite Co., of Passaic, N. J., in my congressional district.

This company, which manufactures insulated wires, cables, and splicing tapes, reports that 20 additional Government directives, and so forth, were received during the month of November, bringing the total since Pearl Harbor to 908. The memorandum reads as follows:

DEFENSE MEMORANDUM NO. 45, DECEMEER 19, 1944

Twenty additional Government directives, etc., were received for the month of November, bringing the total since Pearl Harbor up to 908.

£89, August 19, W. P. B.: Specific request from Donald Nelson on the subject of eyesight and visual conditions among industrial workers. We should study the manual which accompanies the letter; we should ask an appropriate officer in our organization to check out a substantial questionnaire. We do not comply. This is more bureaucratic boloney. Compare 832, 722, 389, 369, etc. Medical people are continually trying to federalize everything in the line of health.

890, September, Office of War Information: An eight-page document entitled "Cut-back Field Guide," giving very complete and specific detailed instructions on how to advise our labor in case we have any cut-backs. We have already had cut-backs and we don't need any of this advice. Compare 874, 876, 829, etc.

891, November 2, I. N. M., Navy, New York: Instructions that excessive overruns in the line of excess materials will be refused by inspectors. Compare 867. We do not have excess overruns.

892, November 3, Second Service Command: Official advice that Okonite, Passaic, has finally been deleted from the responsibility list of Second Service Command. "Plant security measures * * * should be continued as your responsibility." We comply. This is a case of off again, on again, off again. Compare 881.

893, November 3, Ordnance, New York: Request to send 20 representatives to a forum on American Small Arms, including film. We do not comply. Compare 883 and 869.

894, November 3, Navy, I. N. M., New York: Request for advance information concerning anticipated lay-off of large groups of workers account cut-backs. None to date. Will comply. Compare 890, 880, and 879.

895, November 7, Army Air Forces, New York: Full production should be maintained at all war plants on Thanksgiving Day. Christmas is the only day on which to interrupt schedules. We complied at Paterson and Wilkes-Barre. We did not comply at Passaic account Navy cutback. Compare 903, 896, 876, and 829.

896, November 9, Chief Signal Officer, Washington, D. C.: Telegram to observe full working schedule on Thanksgiving Day. We comply. Compare 903, 895, 876, and 829.

897, November 10, Navy Industrial Incentive Division, Washington, D. C.: Suggestion that we should use motion-picture films to promote morale. We do not comply. Compare 906, 900, 864, 843, 838, and 836.

898, November 14, Philadelphia Signal Corps; Advice to protect facilities and avoid sabotage on VE-day. Comment: This war is not yet won. Compare 876, 874, and 829.

899, November 14, Newark Defense Council: Invitation to attend performance of The Forgotten Factor, an industrial drama for national teamwork. We did not comply. Compare 883, 898, etc.

900, November 16, United States Army District Chief, New York., General Reimel: Request to notify all employees that General Eisenhower will speak from European headquarters on November 19 at 3:30 p. m. account Army's urgent need for more supplies. We posted all plants. Compare 906, 864, 843, 838, and 836.

901, November 17, War Manpower Commission and War Mobilization and Reconversion: Suggestion that it may be necessary to rescind authorization for resuming civilian production in groups 1 and 2 labor market areas, account of critical manpower shortage. Compare 874.

902, November 17, United States Engineer, New York: More about working Thanksgiving Day. Compare 903, 876, 829, and 893.

903, November 17, Navy, Inspector of Naval Material, New York: More about working Thanksgiving Day. Compare, 902, 896, 876, 929, etc.

904, November 21, War contracts termination: Questionnaire referred to treasurer, Mr. Metz. Compare 876, 874, and £90.

905, November 21, Signal Corps Regional Labor Office, New York, and National War Labor Board: Advice that year-end bonuses up to $25 may be paid without obtaining permission of War Labor Board; other instructions on bonus plans. This is very untimely and approaches the political. We pay a large established monthly bonus which was in effect long before the Wage Ceiling Act went into effect. Nevertheless this release to the newspapers brought our employees into conference with us—they asking for an extra $25 which we denied. Compare 267, 223, and 222.

906, November 26, War Department, Chief Signal Officer, Washington: Request to increase production if humanly possible. This is one of the few documents in our whole collection from Washington that is interested in production. Compare 864, 843, 838, and 836.

907, November 27, Philadelphia, Signal Corps: Reports of equipment being received in theaters of operation in damaged condition due to inadequate packaging. Circulated to our three plant shipping departments and Signal Corps inspection forces. We are complying with Signal Corps specifications to the satisfaction of their inspectors. Compare 873.

908, November 30, Department of Commerce, Business Advisory Council: Policies on veteran reemployment. The committee forwarded three comprehensive programs; namely, Swift & Co., International Harvester, and Westinghouse. These programs in my opinion are entirely too formal and too complicated for us. They are, however, a very thorough job and will be retained in the works manager's file for reference if necessary. They cover everything that the veteran is entitled to on the G. I. bill of rights, rehabilitation, insurance, vacation policies, etc. They are an effort to make the veteran welcome home. We are writing an individual letter to each employee on this same subject—welcome home—whenever he comes back to work. We have also sent letters to all employees in the armed services asking them whether they intend to come back to us and telling them that they will be welcome.

THE OKONITE CO.,
D. R. STEVENS, *Vice President.*
PASSAIC, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of a secretary of national health.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, coming to the desks of Members of Congress, if they request it, is the Surplus Reporter. This reporter lists the surplus goods being sold by the United States Treasury Department. It is rather confusing when one reads the many pages of this reporter and notes that the hundreds of thousands of articles listed for sale as surplus when, in fact, many of the factories making this type of goods are crying for help.

I note in this morning's paper that the crucial developments in the western front brought forth an announcement by the Red Cross that additional surgical gauze is being shipped to the Red Cross chapters to fill the urgent requests of the Surgeon General of the Army for 43,000,000 surgical dressings. The Surplus Reporter lists, on page 34 of the January 6 issue, 27,000,000 packages of gauze at Louisville, Ky., which they are trying to sell. There is an additional 1,700,000 individually wrapped packages at Pueblo, Colo. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be some very loose and haphazard planning when one department of the Government is desperately trying to sell surplus property which another department is urging a speed-up to produce.

The Surplus Reporter on one page lists 121,000 new hospital mattresses for sale. There are tens of thousands of items like syringes, needles, sulfa and other drugs listed as surplus. One item is 200,000 tubes of catgut. I know the factories of the country are working 24 hours a day trying to produce the same things that are here selling in the surplus.

I refer only to hospital items because I am familiar with this field. We also find in these reports thousands upon thousands of other new and used items which, undoubtedly, will find their way into the familiar Army and Navy stores tomorrow. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it makes one wonder just how good Government planning can be. Does it not mean that when there is a surplus, whether it is 22,000,000 flashlight batteries or 27,000,000 packages of surgical gauze, that someone made a mistake? Does it not also follow that if there is a surplus of the property that the factories ought not to be making the same thing which is being sold by another department of Government as surplus?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore agreed to for today I may have permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

LT. GEN. GEORGE PATTON

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. George Patton has furnished to the Army brilliant military leadership. He has been the victor in many an engagement against the Germans. In Africa, Sicily, in Normandy, and in the Ardennes Forest the enemy has felt the full force of his knock-out punches. I propose that he be made a four-star general. He is entitled to this recognition and to increased authority.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I think all Members of Congress will agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD two very brilliant editorials, one from the Shreveport Journal, dated December 30, entitled "Patton to the Rescue," the other from the Shreveport Times, dated December 31, 1944, entitled "Patton Should Have Four Stars."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Shreveport Journal of December 30, 1944]

PATTON TO THE RESCUE

It was Gen. George S. Patton's Third Army which first broke Germany's west wall and startled the world by its record-breaking dash across Europe to the Saar Basin. Last week "Old Blood and Guts" Patton was again called to the aid of our First Army—at a time when the Germans had, by a surprise counter-offensive, driven a 40-mile wedge through its lines. Leaving his own front to its own devices, General Patton drove 22 miles in 6 days, rescuing American units besieged in the town of Bastogne, and reached on Thursday a point only 17 miles from the First Army line.

The effect of this Third Army lunge was electric. As a result, Von Rundstedt's German divisions were halted and his entire force is today in grave danger of being trapped in the Belgian bulge. They had driven three prongs into Luxemburg and Belgium, the deepest of these being approximately 40 miles, compelling General Hodges' First American Army to fall back steadily over a long front from the Aachen area to the Luxemburg-France boundary line; the retreat could not be stopped until the Third Army swung into action from the south, with the rough and tough pistol-packin' Patton in command.

It may be a little too early to say that Von Rundstedt's gamble has lost, but there can be no question that his headlong plunge has been checked and that the Nazis have been forced to go back to defensive war instead of an offensive. Nor that it was General Patton's brilliant rescue strategy that did the trick.

[From the Shreveport Times of December 31, 1944]

PATTON SHOULD HAVE FOUR STARS

If there is any man who deserves promotion in the United States Army to the rank of four-star general, it is three-star Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr.

In five critical and tragic moments in this war, Patton has stood forth as strategist, tactician, and leader of men to victory against odds that often seemed overwhelming. He has had a larger number of really tough field campaigns than any of our generals, with the possible exception of five-star MacArthur, and has smashed his way to victory for his men, his country, and himself every time.

In the invasion of north Africa Patton was given the one truly tough task—invasion from sea, with armored forces, of Casablanca, where resistance was sure to be great, where tides were so rough and tricky that

only for a few hours each day could men or equipment be put ashore to overcome powerful and fixed defenses. He did the job, magnificently, commanding both Army and Navy invasion forces. His tactics have been cited by Army men as saving thousands of American lives in that combat.

When Rommel tore up an American Army Corps at Kasserine Pass, Patton was called to stem the German onslaught. He did it, rallied faltering troops, reorganized them, and pointed the way to final victory in Africa.

In Sicily he completed conquest of the island in 39 days when all experts expected at least 90 to 100 days to be consumed. He did it by magnificent strategy and tactics, despite the flop of the British Eighth Army in a critical stage of the campaign. He organized the Army that carried out this invasion, planned the strategy, directed the tactics.

After the invasion of northern Europe, his Third American Army made a drive from Normandy to Paris that still has tacticians gasping at its speed and efficiency. With hardly a breath of time for reorganization he led this same army in an equally spectacular drive to the German border. This drive was stopped not by the enemy, but by inability of those in the rear to keep Patton's forces supplied with gasoline for his vehicles and ammunition for his guns. If he had been given both, no one knows where he might have gone.

And now, in the past 2 weeks, when the Germans ripped through the American First Army and drove to the shores of the Meuse and almost within shelling distance of Sedan, it was Patton and his Third Army again that saved the day with a magnificent drive of 22 miles into the tough side of the seemingly invincible German forces. There's no telling where that Nazi break-through would be today but for Patton and the Third Army.

Retired Gen. Peyton C. March, World War No. 1 chief of staff, bluntly charged a few days ago that the American and Allied high commands in Europe had failed to punch the enemy on the nose when real slugging might have been decisive. Patton always has punched the enemy on the nose—with both fists, regardless of the opposing odds, with no quarter asked and none given. It is worthy of thought that in every campaign from Africa to the German border, except one, the American forces have met at least one tragic and unexpected debacle at the hands of a supposedly routed enemy. The one exception was Patton's campaign in Sicily, which military experts say will be a basis of our military textbooks of the future.

General Patton merited four stars long ago. Just about everyone in the Army knows that he would have had them but for the wild, exaggerated, overplayed and partly false versions given to the utterly unimportant incident when he followed a rather well-established and recognized course of slapping a soldier, in Sicily, in an effort to see if he was really battle-fatigued or just "dogging it."

The United States has many fine generals from one-star to five-star. Perhaps many of them are fully comparable in leadership, strategic ability, and tactical ability, to Patton. However, it would be hard to find any, unless it be MacArthur, who has done more under tougher conditions. He deserves four stars—and more.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the great record of the Fifty-sixth Fighter Group, Eighth Air Force, and to include therein two Associated Press dispatches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered on Monday next I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a news item taken from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

IS IT NECESSARY TO DRAFT MORE FARM LABOR INTO THE MILITARY SERVICE?

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with the war in its present critical stage, I regret that I am impelled to make the following remarks. No one likes to oppose the policies of those high in authority under present conditions, but we Members of Congress have our duty to perform and we should not shirk from our responsibilities, however unpleasant the task.

Mr. Speaker, today for a few minutes I want to address my remarks to the recent directive of the War Mobilization Director, Mr. James Byrnes, and to his policies that are about to be carried out by the Selective Service Director, General Hershey. I want to point out some of the dangers and question the wisdom of taking many more young farm hands off of the farms and ask the question, "Is it absolutely necessary?" I think those who are directing this move are making a serious mistake. I believe men can be found in necessary numbers for the Army without further depleting the farm manpower of the Nation.

Before the Tydings amendment was passed, farm labor had no protection and was pretty well depleted. The Congress, recognizing the necessity of keeping up food production to feed the Army, our people, and for lend-lease, sought to stop inroads on farm labor by passing the Tydings amendment.

This latest move, whether so intended, will, in a large degree, bypass the protection against the drafting of farm labor and unless the Congess, representing the people, calls a halt and does it quickly, farm labor will be depleted to the point where with a crop failure coming upon us through unfavorable seasons, we are likely to be faced with a very dangerous shortage of food in this country. This Nation must produce the tremendous amount of food necessary to sustain the Army, our civilian population, its outgo for lend-lease, and we are committed to the other nations helping to fight this war to furnish the greater amount of the food that is necessary to keep the people from starvation in those countries where the forces of the United Nations drive the enemy out. By this commitment, during the coming year, there will be a demand for more food than we have needed during any year since the war began.

It has been suggested by Director Byrnes and War Food Administrator Jones, and endorsed by the President, that this further inroad on the drafting of young men between the ages of 18 and 26 from the farms can be done without endangering our agricultural production, urging that older men can replace these younger men drawn from the farms.

These statements are in error. The Congressman coming from his district and who represents his district is closer to the people than those just named. He is in the best position to know whether or not these statements are correct. I have talked with at least 30 Congressmen representing agricultural districts, every one of whom insist that the manpower shortage is such on the farms that no more men can be spared, that there are no replacements for such men if they are taken into the service. During the harvest time last fall you could drive through any agricultural district and see old men, women, girls, and children helping in the harvest fields throughout the length and breadth of this country, working unthinkable hours in an attempt to harvest the crops that had been the result of months of toil. You cannot go into any agricultural section in these United States and make a survey without being convinced that the farmers have been bled white for help and that it would be a tragedy to take more of their manpower away from them with the commitments this Government has to produce the necessary amount of food to win this war, continue lend-lease, and to keep starvation away from the countries after we drive the enemy out.

The shelves of the grocers in the big cities, whose citizens think they are not interested so acutely in the farm problem, will find a shortage of food, and the pinch will come in such metropolitan centers as New York, Chicago, and the other big cities, if the Congress is unable to stop this most dangerous move that is about to be launched, further depleting of the farm manpower of this country.

Adding to the danger of this situation is the fact that the farm machinery and farm tools used by the farmers and needed for farm production in many instances have been worn out and new machinery cannot be had. The Government has urged the necessity of large farm production to win the war. It finds now that there will be less farm machinery available to the farmers in 1945 than was available in 1944, according to a statement of the International Harvester Co., which will make his work more difficult, and now the

Government says we must take thousands of the young men, who are working long hours on the farms, away from the farms into the military service, at a time when farm help is so scarce that boys and girls from 10 to 15 years of age and the wives of the farmers, in many instances, are compelled to drive the tractors and power-driven machinery throughout this country to till their farms and produce the food that the Government says it must have.

Of course, the winning of the war is the first concern of all of us. We must have the necessary production of munitions and men for military service and we can have them without taking such a terrible gamble with agriculture in the production of food.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD in a statement not long ago, after an exhaustive investigation, said that his committee found there were 500,000 people on the Federal pay rolls who were not needed. Would it not be wise to get all of the men qualified for military service between 18 and 26 out of this group before further disturbing farm production? And, this is only a small group. For years now, the War Manpower Commission has used its power to drive men into the war plants of this country by the threat of taking those who are physically fit into military service. In nearly every war plant in the Nation there are more men employed than are necessary. The greatest waste of manpower and the greatest hoarding of manpower at the present time is in the various war plants of the Nation where, in many instances, two or three men are employed where one man would do the work more efficiently.

You can talk to the men you know who have worked in the war plants of this country and many of them will tell you that, through cost-plus and the connivance of the contractors, in a great many instances men are idling and wasting their time yet drawing big wages from the Government.

Cannot something be done to relieve the congestion in war plants of men who are not needed, taking into the military service those of the proper age and physical qualifications and turning back into civilian life the doubtless hundreds of thousands who could be spared from these plants without reducing their production in any way? Something should be done along this line to reduce the expense in our war effort and to get this great reservoir of hoarded labor in these plants back into active and useful production.

There is a danger that the local draft boards, under the pressure of the State Directors of Selective Service, will not give the farm workers their full protection under the Tydings amendment, which is the law of the land and the direct expression of the will of the Members of Congress.

If undue pressure is being applied to the point where it is bypassing the will of Congress by any of the heads of Selective Service in the States or here in Washington it should be stopped. We cannot meet this manpower shortage without facing the facts. The place to get this additional manpower is not on the farms but is in the factories of the Nation where the hoarding is going on. And in addition let me point out that there are 3,000,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 26 in Belgium and in France who are already over there, obviating the necessity of shipping them across, who are not in the military service and who, in my judgment, in large numbers should and could be utilized in the service to fight for their country now after we traveled thousands of miles to liberate such countries.

In my candid judgment it is time for the Members of Congress to give the most serious consideration and to voice our sentiments for a further search for manpower before more men are taken from the farms who are actually producing in a substantial manner the food that this Nation, our allies, and the liberated countries and our soldiers must have.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the La Crosse Tribune, of La Crosse, Wis., entitled "Mr. President and Congress, Speak Up."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has been a vast amount of talk in executive circles about man shortage. This has been especially true since recent events on the western front. It is proposed now to take the men classed as II–C's, many of whom are the last hope of the farmers engaged in the production of food for the Army and Navy and the liberated people abroad. It is not necessary to comb the farms further for labor. It will bring disaster to our food-production program to do so.

The real reservoir of labor is in those industries where labor has been hoarded.

Throughout many industrial plants men are so numerous that they actually interfere with production. Two and three men are hired to do the work of one man.

One outstanding businessman who has made an investigation of labor hoarding insists that 25 percent of the employees could be dropped from the pay rolls of many war industries without adversely curtailing production.

To quote the exact language of this large employer of labor:

I am honestly convinced that if a thorough and impartial survey were made of the larger industries throughout the country by men who are competent to judge, you would find that at least 25 percent of the employees could be dropped from their rolls without adversely affecting production, and in fact the weeding out of these employees who are excess baggage would undoubtedly result in greater efficiency, and by reason thereof an increase in production.

Mr. Speaker, the farms have been stripped of help, notwithstanding that the Tydings amendment is still the law and as such should be observed in fact and in spirit as was intended by Congress when it passed the amendment as part of the Selective Service Act. I quote from the amendment as it applies to the men classed as II–C:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

I admit that the temptation of large industries to hoard labor is because the excess-profits-tax law invites large pay rolls. It furnishes a means of avoiding falling within the excess-profits provision which in some cases relieves the labor-hoarding industries from a 95 percent tax. It is unjust and dangerous to strip the farms of labor, as is now proposed, thus curtailing the food supply, instead of drawing upon the excess labor supply not needed in many large cost-plus war industries.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1945.*

[Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of the Seventy-fifth and Seventy-sixth Congresses, serving in the House of Representatives for 4 years from 1937 to 1940, inclusive.

I hold in my hand page 7 of the issue of the San Francisco Chronicle of Monday, October 30, 1944, which contains a political advertisement headed, as follows:

Would you trust your post-war future in these hands?—Investigation of un-American propaganda activities in the United States—(Hearing) Tuesday, July 16, 1940—House of Representatives Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Beaumont, Tex.—Excerpts from sworn testimony of John L. Leech, former member, State committee, Communist Party of California and candidate for Congress on the Communist Party ticket in 1936 from the Seventeenth California Congressional District.

I now quote from the advertisement:

Question. Do you know the present Member of Congress from San Francisco—Mr. FRANCK HAVENNER?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. Does he have any connection with the Communist Party?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you ever meet him in a meeting where no one else was present except Communists?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You stated you had met with Mr. HAVENNER in a fraction meeting of the Communist Party?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. Was that fraction meeting held in San Francisco?

Answer. Now excuse me; I would like to make a correction for the record. I did not mean to say, if I did, that I had met him in a fraction meeting. I had met him in a State executive committee meeting.

Question. Was Mr. HAVENNER a member of the State executive committee of the Communist Party?

Answer. No.

Question. What was he doing at this State executive committee meeting?

Answer. To the best of my recollection this was a discussion—and it is not necessary that a person be a member of the State executive committee or the State committee, to be called in for assistance, or directions of the State executive committee.

Question. Could he have attended this meeting if he had not been a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. No; I have never known of a case, and I don't believe such a connection has ever taken place where a nonmember could meet with a leading body of the party.

Question. Now, in addition to this meeting you have already discussed, you stated you met with him on other occasions?

Answer. Yes; informally, in left-wing affairs. In other words he participated in affairs organized by the Communist Party or left-wing organization under the domination of the Communist Party.

Question. And at this time he was a Member of Congress?

Answer. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, when I read this political advertisement in San Francisco last October, I knew nothing about this meeting of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities which the advertisement alleged was held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940. Naturally, I immediately inquired whether such a meeting had actually been held.

I am informed that representatives of the press who went to the office of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities were furnished with a printed volume entitled, "Investigation of Un-American Propaganda in the United States," which contained a report of a meeting of a subcommittee held in Beaumont, Tex., on the date mentioned. It was marked "Executive session" and showed as present, Hon. Martin Dies, chairman, Robert E. Stripling, secretary of the committee, and James H. Stedman, investigator.

In this printed volume appeared all of the questions and answers which were contained in the political advertisement which I have just read, together with other questions and answers relating to me, as follows:

Question. When did you first meet Mr. HAVENNER, Mr. Leech?

Answer. I have been several times with him, Mr. Stedman. However, some of the times were simply at left-wing gatherings, and I am afraid, to be completely accurate, I could not even place the dates.

Question. But you have met him on a number of occasions?

Answer. Yes, sir; I have met him on a number of occasions.

Question. Did Mr. HAVENNER ever join the Communist Party?

Answer. I have never seen an application card or any documentary proof as to that. It is my understanding, on the basis of his participation in party activity, that he has been and is at the present time a member of the Communist Party. But again I say, I have at no time ever seen documentary proof of this.

Question. You have met him in strictly Communist Party meetings?

Answer. On one occasion that I remember.

Question. Would you please state what that occasion was, Mr. Leech?

Answer. That is a very serious question. I am afraid of my accuracy not on the basic facts—but I am afraid of my accuracy on it.

Question. Could you give us the approximate year when this meeting occurred?

Answer. Well, this meeting occurred some time during the course of 1936. Again I think it was in preparation for the State criminal syndicalism congress.

Question. Did Mr. HAVENNER take an active part in that conference?

Answer. In the discussion—he was not, to the best of my recollection, at the conference but he took an active part in the discussion and preparation and the outlining of this conference.

Question. Do you know what he was doing at that time?

Answer. I think he was connected in some way with the first California writers' project. I do know he worked and associated with Harry Carlyle, who was a member of the Communist Party, and he was the organizer of the first California State writers' project. But all of my party work was in the Los Angeles area and Mr. HAVENNER lived in San Francisco, and I will have to say that my recollection of details is vague here.

Question. But you do know Mr. HAVENNER cooperated with the party?

Answer. I do know that to be a fact; yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of this meeting of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities at Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, I was a Member of the House of Representatives and had been for 3½ years next preceding that date. I had never received any notice of this hearing prior to the time it was held and have never received any notice of the hearing from the Special Committee on Un-American Activities or from any other person up to the present time. The first knowledge I had that such a subcommittee meeting was held was more than 4 years later when I read in this political advertisement printed in several San Francisco daily newspapers during the months of October and November 1944 excerpts from the testimony given by witness Leech which I have just read to the Members of the House. I have never been given an opportunity to appear before that committee to face my accuser or to reply to his testimony.

Mr. Speaker, the name "Communist" has been used by the Dies committee from its very inception as a symbol of subversive and un-American beliefs and practices, and membership in the Communist Party has been construed by the committee as proof that the individual holding such membership was an advocate of the use of force and violence to overthrow the Government of this country. Therefore, when this witness was permitted to testify that I was a member of the Communist Party he was in effect indicting me for subversive and un-American beliefs and practices, and charging that I was an advocate of the use of force and violence to overthrow our Government.

If the chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities believed that this sworn testimony was true it was his duty to report it to the House of Representatives and recommend that I be brought before the bar of the House and expelled. If there was any doubt in his mind as to the truth of this testimony, it certainly was his duty to notify me and call me before his committee to disprove the testimony, if I could.

But, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities did neither of those things. He did not even notify all of the other members of his special committee that this damaging testimony had been given against a Member of Congress. Instead, the record of this secret meeting held down in Beaumont, Tex., was pigeonholed for more than 4 years, when suddenly and mysteriously, it was made available for use against me in a political campaign.

Mr. Speaker, the sworn testimony of witness Leech in this printed report is false in its entirety and constitutes perjury of the most vicious and malicious type. I am not and never have been a member of the Communist Party, nor have I ever had any connections or as-

sociations with that party or its activities in any manner whatever. I do not subscribe and never have subscribed to the platform or the program of the Communist Party. I am now and always have been a devout believer in and supporter of the fundamental principles and institutions upon which the American Government is founded. The idea of the employment of force and violence to overthrow the Government which I love is as hateful to me as it possibly could be to any other true American citizen. Indeed the only time when I could possibly advocate the use of violent force with relation to our Government would be in defense of its fundamental principles and institutions. For nearly 20 years I have been a public official in America, sworn to uphold and protect our Constitution and our form of government, and no man in all those years, except in the instance to which I am now addressing myself, has ever accused me of being false to that high trust.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the record and my own reputation, I desire to deal with the testimony of witness Leech item by item. The witness testified that he knew me and that he had been with me several times at what he described as left-wing gatherings, although he admitted he could not fix the dates.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the witness, Leech, and to the best of my knowledge and belief have never met him. If I ever did meet him I did not know who he was. The statement that he has met me on a number of occasions is absolutely false.

In response to a question whether I had ever joined the Communist Party, the witness, Leech, replied:

> I have never seen an application card or documentary proof as to that. It is my understanding on the basis of his participation in party activity, that he has been and is at the present time a member of the Communist Party. But again I say I have at no time seen any documentary proof of this.

The only part of this statement which is true is that the witness had never seen any documentary proof that I was a member of the Communist Party. His statement that it was his understanding, "on the basis of my participation in party activity," that I had been and was at that time a member of the Communist Party is a deliberate lie. I have never participated in Communist Party activity, and the witness never could have had any understanding, based on such a premise, that I was a member of the Communist Party.

In response to other leading questions, the witness, Leech, testified that he had met me in meetings which were attended only by Communists but refused to state the occasions or the dates. The statement that he ever met me at any such gathering was a deliberate and malicious lie, because I have never attended any such meetings.

The witness, Leech, finally testified that one of these meetings occurred sometime in 1936, in preparation for the State Criminal Syndicalism Congress. This statement was another deliberate lie, because I never had anything to do with the State Criminal Syndicalism Congress nor attended any meetings in preparation for it.

The witness testified that I took an active part in the discussion and preparation and outlining of this congress. This statement was equally as false as any of his preceding statements.

The witness, Leech, testified that he met me in a State executive meeting of the Communist Party and that I could not have attended this meeting if I had not been a member of the Communist Party. This was merely another malicious lie by the witness, as I have never attended any such meeting. The witness fixed the date of this meeting as sometime in 1936 and testified that at that time I was a Member of Congress. This was probably the only unintentional falsehood which he uttered during this testimony, because I was not a Member of Congress in 1936. At that time I was an elected member and president of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

The witness testified that at the time of this meeting I was connected in some way with the first California writers' project, and that I worked with and associated with a man named Harry Carlyle, a member of the Communist Party and organizer of the writers' project. I had no connection with the California writers' project. I do not know Harry Carlyle, and did not work with him or associate with him, and this statement is as false and malicious as any other statements made by witness Leech.

The witness, Leech, testified that he knew that I cooperated with the Communist Party. He could not have known anything of the kind, because I never cooperated with the Communist Party in any way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time of the House, not so much to defend my own reputation against this malicious perjury, because I am proud to say that my reputation needs no defense before many thousands of patriotic Americans in my district in California, but because of the outrageous and un-American treatment to which a Member of this and previous Congresses has been subjected by this so-called Committee on Un-American Activities. I know, as a result of conversations with various members of the Dies committee, that few members if any, other than the chairman, knew any more than I did of the star-chamber meeting of the subcommittee at which this perjured testimony was given. I personally know of no other instance in all of the history of the Congress of the United States when a secret meeting of a committee of the Congress was held for the purpose of receiving defamatory testimony concerning a Member of the Congress without permitting that Member to have any knowledge of the meeting or any opportunity to appear and testify in his own defense. Surely such a proceeding violated all of the ethical precedents of this democratic body and constituted a glaring and flagrant illustration of the very kind of un-American activities which this committee was set up to prevent.

Even if the charges made against me had been true—instead of being false in their entirety—I was entitled to be informed of the accusations and to be given an opportunity to confront my accuser.

But, Mr. Speaker, this smear attack was permitted and I was not notified or given any opportunity to appear in my own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, witnesses like Leech do not appear by mere accident at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the House of Representatives in a place remote from the Capitol of the United States to attack the reputation of a Member of Congress who is at his post of duty at the Capitol. Someone brought this witness, Leech, to that secret meeting in Beaumont, Tex., by prearrangement, and whoever brought him there was undoubtedly thoroughly familiar with the testimony he was prepared to give. And if his testimony concerning me was, as I now solemnly assure the House, perjured in its entirety, then someone was guilty of subornation of perjury.

The circumstances surrounding the ultimate release of this perjured testimony for publication as a paid political advertisement during the recent congressional campaign are as mysterious and surreptitious as the conduct of the subcommittee meeting down in Beaumont, Tex., when this perjury was permitted to be perpetrated. I do not know and have not been able to ascertain the identity of the person or persons to whom this perjured testimony was first released, after it had been kept secret from public scrutiny for more than 4 years. I can only surmise that the person or persons to whom this release was made were the same individuals who paid for the political advertisement in which its first publication occurred.

Did those individuals disclose their identity when they arranged for the publication of this perjured and libelous testimony in a political advertisement? No, Mr. Speaker, they did not. On the contrary the only indication of the origin of this advertisement was a line in parentheses at the bottom of the ad, reading as follows:

> The cost of this advertisement was paid for by a group of citizens who believe in good government and the American way of life.

God help good government and the American way of life if they must depend upon secret character assassination.

The witness Leech did not confine his smearing testimony to me, Mr. Speaker. Immediately after completing the perjured statement about me, which I just read to the House, he proceeded to swear that two of the most prominent men now holding elective offices in California were also members of the Communist Party. I doubt if either of those men knew, any more than I did, that they were being subjected to damaging testimony at the secret meeting down in Beaumont. They can speak for themselves, and undoubtedly will, if they are ever given an opportunity to do so. An interesting indication of the accuracy of Leech's testimony is that he assigned a wrong first name to one of these prominent California officials, although he swore that he knew him.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the members of the new standing Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives are

appointed, I intend to ask for the privilege of appearing before that committee to request that this witness Leech be subpenaed for further questioning concerning his testimony about me.

I think nothing remains to be said, Mr. Speaker. This record speaks for itself.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. At the time that this meeting was held in Beaumont, Tex., I was a member of the Dies committee and I want to say to the gentleman that I never heard about the holding of such a meeting or about any of this testimony with regard to him. The first time I knew anything about it was when the advertisement appeared in San Francisco.

On Friday last I addressed the House on the general subject of a proper investigation of un-American activities, what I believe it could accomplish if properly conducted and what I thought the dangers were if improperly conducted. I cited as one of my greatest fears that on the basis of unsupported, uncorroborated evidence a single member might make possible accusations of an untrue sort against an American citizen, an accusation of a most serious nature, and, as I put it on that occasion, it will deal a body blow to the institution of basic American political institutions. May I say to the gentleman that I think this procedure is indefensible and I would like to point out one thing further, if I may, and I would like to ask the gentleman: He was in Congress, as I recall it, in the Seventy-fifth and Seventy-sixth Congresses. What position did he hold prior to that time?

Mr. HAVENNER. Prior to the Seventy-fifth Congress?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. HAVENNER. I was a member and at that time president of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. For how many years did the gentleman hold that position?

Mr. HAVENNER. I was a member of the board of supervisors for 11 years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. After the gentleman ceased to be a Member of the House, what position did he hold in the interim between his service in the Congress before and his service now?

Mr. HAVENNER. I was appointed a member of the State railroad commission.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And was its chairman?

Mr. HAVENNER. I served as chairman of that commission also.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I submit to the House it is a pretty serious matter when a man with a record of that sort has to get up and make the speech which he has been called upon to make. I merely point out further that in Mr. Leech's testimony he makes not one single definite statement upon which any positive investigation could possibly be made to determine whether or not he was accurate with regard to it.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. May I say that I was also a member of the Dies committee when this incident is supposed to have happened in Beaumont, Tex. Here in the House is the first time I had ever heard about it. I have never known anything about the testimony or about the meeting that was held and I do not think either the House or the gentlemen on the floor should blame the committee for any such performance as we have had described today. It is too bad when any subcommittee or any committee of this House will hold, as has been stated, star-chamber proceedings and then keep those proceedings from the public and from the other members of the committee and from the House and only reveal them at the time of a political campaign. I think the new committee should go into this matter and find out just exactly what did happen and how this testimony was kept from the public for 4 years and then brought up in a political campaign in the shape of an advertisement.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman. I tried to make it plain that I knew most of the Members had no knowledge of this proceeding.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to point out further that in my speech of the 4th of January I suggested certain basic rules of procedure that should be, in my judgment, followed by any committee of this House. The second of those proposed rules of procedure that I proposed was as follows:

> No public statements, press releases, communications, or reports involving the work and responsibilities of the committee shall be issued or released by any member thereof excepting after such statements, releases, communications, or reports have been submitted to the entire committee and approved by a majority thereof—

And I should have added, "or by any employee of the committee." Had that rule been observed this situation never could have taken place.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. May I say that it has been my privilege and, in fact, an honor to have been personally acquainted with the gentleman from California since the day that he first became a Member of this House. On many, many occasions I have enjoyed his company.

May I ask the gentleman if the record of the Dies committee shows who were members of this subcommittee?

Mr. HAVENNER. It only shows those who were present.

Mr. COCHRAN. What members were present?

Mr. HAVENNER. The record shows as present the Hon. Martin Dies, chairman, Robert E. Stripling, secretary of the committee, and James H. Stedman, investigator.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that there was only one Member of the Congress present at that hearing, Mr. Dies. I was criticized the other day when I said that this was a one-man committee. I recall the name of Stedman, who the gentleman mentioned, and if I am not in error, he was in charge of the committee's Los Angeles office; was he not?

Mr. HAVENNER. I do not know.

Mr. COCHRAN. I can find out for the gentleman, because the vouchers to pay salaries came through my committee every month. I heard the gentleman mention the name of Stedman as asking this witness questions, and that confirms my contention that this committee has been more or less a one-man committee in the last few years. But this goes all the way back to 1940.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman for his statement concerning me.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I wish to inform the gentleman from Missouri that Mr. Stedman was the investigator in charge of the Los Angeles office. He is correct. He was one of the best investigators the Dies committee ever had.

May I also say to the gentleman that this committee was a one-man committee, and it worked both ways. At one time I went out to California and I was the only member of the committee who went out there. You could call me a one-man commitee, then. Another time we sent a subcommittee out to California. Mr. Dies was not on that committee; neither was I. You might call that a three- or one-man committee. But all the way through this investigation, for 6½ years while we were investigating the Bund, while we were investigating the Communists, while we were investigating these Fascist crackpots——

Mr. IZAC. And Members of the Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Certain Members have repeatedly opposed the committee and others opposed the committee only at certain times, but there were certain Members of the Congress, and I would include the gentleman from Missouri as having fought our committee at all times.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. In further evidence, in view of what the gentleman from New Jersey has said, I want to show just exactly what a one-man committee this was. It so happened we had no business over the week end here several years ago. We adjourned on Thursday until Monday, so I just thought I would spend the week end in New York. I left here on the 1 o'clock train on Thursday. I had a seat in the parlor car. The gentleman from New Jersey came in that car and sat across from me. He had a large envelope. I said to him, "What are you going to do, work over the week end?" He said, "No; that is the white paper that Dies is releasing Sunday."

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. May I correct the gentleman?

Mr. COCHRAN. Just a moment now.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I said the Dies committee was releasing it; not Dies; the Dies committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I said to the gentleman, "Let me read it. I will not say anything about it until it is released." The gentleman said to me that he had never read it himself. I said, "Do you mean to say that you are letting a document of this size be released without even reading it?" He started to read then. As he read page after page of that proof he handed it to me, and it took 3 hours and 15 minutes to read that critical document which went out under the name of the Dies committee, of which he was a member. He admitted he had never read it himself.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman is wrong as usual. I want to say that the document was not released until the members of the committee had read the document. I was at that time starting to read the proof of the document, and the gentleman was so insistent that he also be given the same privilege to read the document that I turned it over to the gentleman from Missouri.

I want to tell you how the gentleman from Missouri can also be wrong in connection with his own committee. Just the other day I received a letter from the gentleman from Missouri bawling me out for having sent a telegram at Government expense. So I wrote the gentleman from Missouri and I enclosed the telegram, and I told him in my letter that it was clearly marked up on top that the telegram should be charged to me. So the gentleman very kindly, I will say, sent me a letter of apology, and I now accept that apology.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I only rise to say a few words. I think the action in this case speaks louder than any words of any members of the Dies committee or myself.

We of California know the gentleman from San Francisco and have great confidence not only in his ability but in his integrity. We have known him for over 20 years. He has served the people of California well, as well as the people of all the United States. I think it is a most dastardly thing to have such a thing as this done by one Member of Congress against another Member of Congress.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I should like to propound two questions to the gentleman from California, for whom I have great respect and for whom the people of California have great respect, as shown by their repeated election of him to public office. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the laws regarding perjury in Texas are outlawed at the end of 3 years, and that this testimony was released subsequent to the outlawing of the laws regarding perjury?

Mr. HAVENNER. I was not aware of that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That happens to be the case.

May I propound this question through the gentleman from California to the gentleman from New Jersey, who is always so anxious to defend all of the actions of this committee. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey condones the action of this committee or a subcommittee thereof in investigating the gentleman from California and releasing such executive action to the public press.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I will answer that. Of course not. In fact, I was not here when the gentleman from California started his speech, and I really do not know what he started to talk about, but if it is in line with what the gentleman says, of course not. Our committee would not condone it and I would not condone it. The gentleman from California enjoys a very high reputation, and so does the Dies committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. May I say to the gentleman from California that I have known him all during his tenures of office in this House, and I can testify to his earnest patriotism and his willingness to serve this country with all that is in him. I heard the gentleman from California the other day outline certain rules of procedure that should be followed by the new committee. For the new Members, may I state that the Dies committee and its chairman, Mr. Dies himself, had the temerity to pay out of the expenses appropriated for the Dies committee the settlement of a private lawsuit. The chairman had been sued for libel, and he had the temerity to come into this House and say that that case was settled, this private lawsuit was settled by the use of funds appropriated by this Congress for expenses of the Dies committee. I hope the gentleman from California will revise his suggested rules so as to prohibit any such outlandish practices.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I also know the gentleman and have served with him in the House. I know something about the Dies committee and what they have been doing. The gentleman from California is not the only victim in this mess. When the truth is known, it will be found that there are hundreds of Americans who have been labeled as un-American based upon testimony that was not fit to believe. If the proper thing were done, if that committee is going to function, we ought to go back and restore respect for Americans who have been charged without proof with being Communists or believers in other "isms," when there was not a scintilla of evidence to prove it.

On this floor at least for the last 2 or 3 years I have stated that this was a one-man committee of Dies, Dies, and Dies, and that the rest of the committee, who are now defending it, had not even taken the trouble to find out what was going on in the "White House" of Texas.

I have been attacked by certain Members of this House who criticized me by saying I was envious because I was not on that committee. The truth is that I was the originator of the original committee in 1934. My purpose and the policy of the McCormack-Dickstein committee was to give every American an opportunity at least to defend himself before we passed judgment. All the rules that were laid down by my friend from California [Mr. VOORHIS] are not going to do a blessed thing. We have to watch our step and be careful where we are going with this committee and the way we are going, because we are destroying democracy.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I want to add my testimony of absolute faith in the full Americanism of the gentleman, having served with him and being associated with him for a number of years. May I add, also, that this same Dies committee attacked the name of an outstanding citizen of Alabama, for which they were condemned by both the Senators from our State. I think the gentleman from New Jersey signed the document. I am pretty sure he did. If he did not, he has plenty of time, a whole year, to straighten it out.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I suggest that the gentleman from Alabama should look it up to find out if I did sign it before making any kind of statement. I note that the gentleman from New York has changed the name of the McCormack committee to the McCormack-Dickstein committee.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has yielded to me and I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has the floor and he yields to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. And they took Mr. William Mitch, who was a steward in the Methodist Church, an active churchman and Shriner, and a well-known Mason and outstanding citizen, and placarded him before the country as a Communist. So the gentleman has company. The gentleman has good company. Of course, it may not be true with the Members of this body, but I think the people of America have been in accord there, especially in the Democratic ranks, in the expression of their condemnation of the unfair methods practiced.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in order for me to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] a question on his time?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield if I have further time.

Mr. FOLGER. I believe that the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is gone. But I believe the gentleman did state, however, that he had never himself, although he was a member of this committee until he got disgusted and resigned, that he had never heard of this

thing until it was published for political purposes a few months ago.

Mr. HAVENNER. I think that is correct; yes.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman give the names of those who questioned this witness? Was it Mr. Dies himself, or was it this man Stripling or Matthews?

Mr. HAVENNER. I think most of the questions were asked by Mr. Stedman.

Mr. SABATH. Is he still with the committee? Does the gentleman know, and this man Stripling?

Mr. HAVENNER. I do not know.

Mr. SABATH. Do you think he should remain with the committee in view of that performance and his activity in view of the fact that he should have the knowledge that the evidence that he secured was purely a lie and perjury and an untruth about you?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that there are not any members of the Dies committee present because there is not any such committee as yet pending the appointment of members to the committee.

The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended at least 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will there be an opportunity after the expiration of the 10 minutes for others to call attention to some more of this smearing campaign that went on and the sources which it came from and of things they said?

The SPEAKER. There is no legislative program before the House today and all Members who desire to address the House will be recognized to do so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would it be in order then, Mr. Speaker, to ask now for extension of the time that I have?

Mr. RANKIN. Do not interfere with his time; you can have time later.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was not worrying about his time. I am just worrying about you taking the time.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be recognized and the Chair will certainly entertain a unanimous-consent request to extend his time for a longer period.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] and having served with him more intimately than any of these men who have testified up to now, during the time that he was in Congress and joined with me in the power fight, I want to say to him that, in my humble opinion, Mr. Dies did not attach any importance to this testimony. We all know the gentleman from California, and the criticism I would have to offer is that his attention was not called to it.

The very statement of the gentleman from California is one of the greatest arguments I have heard in favor of making this a permanent committee or a standing committee of the House in order that it may be governed by the regular rules of the House.

I have great respect for him, and I regret that this testimony was ever given out. It should have been submitted to him, and he should have been given an opportunity to answer it.

But the mere fact that somebody got hold of the files of this committee and published something that some alleged Communist had said about a Member of Congress is no argument at all in favor of condemning the great work of the Dies committee and condemning Congress for continuing it as a permanent committee of the House. I have heard from every State, and I would say from almost every congressional district, in the United States praising us for perpetuating this committee as a standing committee of the House, not as a witch-hunting committee, as some of its enemies have alleged, not to go out and smear somebody, but to help protect American institutions from those influences that are threatening them from within as well as from without.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TOLAN. I wish to ask the gentleman from California if he had any conversation with Chairman Dies prior or subsequent to this testimony which was given at Beaumont, Tex.

Mr. HAVENNER. I may say to the gentleman from California that during the Congressional campaign of 1940 I was informed by a friend in San Francisco that he had information on what he considered good authority that an attempt might be made to smear my reputation before the Dies committee. I went to see Mr. Dies and told him that I had heard this report on what seemed to be good authority and asked that if any such attempt should be made I be given an oportunity to appear before the committee. Mr. Dies replied that nothing of the sort had been attempted and that if it was he would notify me and give me an opportunity to appear.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Did he give you such an opportunity?

Mr. HAVENNER. I never received it.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Mississippi claims, and I presume he is right, that a great many American people have the utmost confidence in the Dies committee. I may say to him they do because they have heard only from Dies and sometimes from his two managers and investigators whose names have been mentioned. In that way they have obtained a great deal of information favorable to the committee. But the fact was not given to the American people that the gentleman from California was smeared. There are hundreds of other people of standing who have been assailed and attacked and charged with being Communists when they were no more Communists than Mr. Dies or any member of the committee, or the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]; but they too did not have a chance to defend themselves and the people of America did not know how unfair the activities of Mr. Dies were.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I asked the gentleman to yield because I understood the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] asked a question a while ago when I was temporarily off the floor. I will be glad to answer it if he wants me to. Does the gentleman remember what the question was?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for the purpose of repeating the question.

Mr. FOLGER. The question was whether the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] did not say that he never knew a thing in the world about this until it was published last fall.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true; that is what I did say and that is the fact.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I am sorry I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's statement. We have no way, of course, of telling who the members of the new committee will be, but I should like to make this suggestion to the new committee: That they call in this witness and allow the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] to be there at the same time and give the gentleman from California every consideration it possibly can. I do not like that kind of article any more than the gentleman does and I feel that the gentleman from California should be given every consideration and the opportunity of questioning the witness.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman. I stated that it was my intention to appear before the committee and ask for that opportunity.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition to what the gentleman from New Jersey said, if anything like that is done there should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happened to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.

Without entering into a discussion of the investigation but confining it to the gentleman's case and without in any way saying anything that might be construed as critical of the hearing, the gentleman has said that the testimony was false. The gentleman from California

is a Member of the House. It might happen to any one of us. If that testimony was false it means that there was a conspiracy among certain individuals in California to smear the gentleman for no particular purpose. It seems to me to be a matter of interest to each and every Member of the House and I think, speaking as an individual, if anything is done that the committee should go further and if they do find falsehoods look into them. They will find falsehoods, for the gentleman has denied that the statements were true. They should investigate the conspiracy because it concerns every Member of this body.

As far as the gentleman himself is concerned, I have served with him, and I believe I speak the sentiments of every Member of this body. The gentleman may differ with me on this or that question, or differ with some of us who serve with him, but because we differ on public questions does not mean that we are not good Americans; it means simply a difference in our individual conscience and our individual judgment as to the best interests of the country. We may disagree as to judgment, but every man here has a love of America and is actuated by the same high patriotic motives as the gentleman from California who enjoys the confidence of every Member on each side of the aisle, as far as I know, who serves with him. I rise particularly to make this contribution because the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] enjoys our respect and confidence and because we recognize that he is both honorable and trustworthy.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. It is my feeling that the entire membership of the House accepts as their view the utterances made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. I do not believe there is a Member of the House who questions the accuracy of the gentleman's statement and certainly no Member questions his patriotism.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Without in any way attempting to excuse that most reprehensible attack made on the gentleman, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, in view of what he said, if he will either reintroduce or join me in attempting to put through the Rules Committee the resolution offered more than 2½ years ago which was designed to accomplish just what he is advocating, an investigation of the conspiracies which have been formed, not only in this particular case but in dozens of other cases throughout the country, to destroy the confidence of the people in their Representatives?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California desire to proceed further?

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I may say to the gentleman that I have listened very attentively to his speech and to the remarks made here today, and I may say that is the very reason I offered a resolution, which is Resolution No. 58, to repeal the amendment to the rules creating a certain standing committee. I do not believe that the House of Representatives should be made a continuing investigating body investigating individuals or people who may not have the same views as other people. I believe that in a democratic government people should have the right of free speech, free press, and free religion without regard to race, creed, color, or ancestry. For that reason I would like to urge the Members of the House and the Rules Committee to give consideration to that resolution and at least have hearings to determine whether or not we acted deliberately at the time we agreed to that rule.

May I say further in closing that it is my understanding, at one time during the existence of the previous committee, there were 300, possibly more, names submitted to the F. B. I., and out of those names it is my understanding there were only 2 at which any criticism could be leveled. The rest of them were smeared. It is about time we stopped smearing people for their political beliefs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Did not the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] insert some letters in the RECORD here that were found to be forged?

Mr. HOOK. You are talking about a conspiracy that was a real conspiracy. Does the gentleman know that David D. Mann, who was on the pay roll of the Dies committee at that time, was convicted and sentenced to prison for from 2 to 6 years for that? You talk about a conspiracy.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. David Mann was never on the pay roll of the Dies committee.

Mr. HOOK. David Mann received pay from the Dies committee.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman did not let me finish my question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Mississippi——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will suspend also. The gentleman from California has the floor and unless he yields to a Member and a Member interrupts, that Member is out of order in trying to stop him. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I addressed the House in this manner today because I understood that under the rules of the House I could not rise to a question of personal privilege on this matter. I would have made a similar statement if this report had emanated from any committee other than the Dies committee. I rose really on a question of personal privilege, although that was not in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I appreciate that fact, and I may say to the gentleman from California that from my viewpoint he was entitled to rise under a question of personal privilege if this material had been published while he was a Member.

As I said to the gentleman a moment ago, we all deplore this incident so far as he is concerned. But that is no reason for the enemies of the Dies committee destroying it. They do not stand a chance to destroy it. It reminds me of a man who had his wife and children in a boat crossing the lake, when a little snake dropped into the boat; instead of taking his paddle and killing it or throwing it out, he excitedly took up his gun and shot the bottom out of the boat.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] does not stand any more chance of repealing the rule setting up this committee than Gov. Bob Taylor's proverbial gutta-percha dog did to catch the asbestos cat in hades.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial published in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin on Future Defense Roads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a newspaper article, and in the other to include a statement I made in regard to a bill that I introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ARE WE SCRAPPING THE TYDINGS AMENDMENT?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, has directed a letter to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, asking that he re-examine all deferred farm workers.

It is my pleasure to represent in this House, one of the most purely farm States of this Union—North Dakota. As a Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress, I had occasion to request General Hershey on numerous occasions to analyze the effectiveness of the selective-service law upon the food-producing sections of the Nation. At that time, tremendous inroads were being made upon the farm population. You will remember that farmers and their sons were not then regarded as essential to the war effort. In my visits to North Dakota during that period, I discovered alarming situations. The selective service had taken the boys from the farms, leaving the fathers, who were 65 years of age or older, in charge of these extensive farming operations and large dairy herds. Everywhere I went I was faced with sale bills where important dairy herds were being thrown on the market and where farmers were liquidating their farming operations, unable to carry on without their boys.

I appealed to General Hershey to review this situation. I was not alone in this effort, of course. The records show that in due time food came to be regarded as a very essential thing, and accordingly farmers were placed in the category of essential industries. This occurred through the Tydings amendment.

And now, at this time, I feel it my duty to present the case of my State of North Dakota in regard to the drafting of boys from our farms. In doing so, I present, I believe the case of the farm situation of the whole country. It is true, that favor in deferment has been granted to farm boys, just as favor has been granted to scientific minds in industry and the many phases of labor in industry. And I can readily understand that when our Nation stands on the brink of danger, those who have to do with the conduct of war see only war itself. That is humanly natural. I can readily see that in their search for more men, when they refer to their records and see the deferment of farm boys to the amount of 364,000 between the ages of 18 and 25, trained as they are to hard work, it offers a field for them. They would make an excellent source of supply for the armed forces.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me remind you that the growing of food is just as essential as any part of our war effort. In most cases, these boys deferred for farm labor cannot be replaced on these farms. Older men, reared in urban life, do not seek farm work, however patriotic they may be. Huge farms, stretching across the prairies, endless in appearance, seem to reach the horizon. These farms can be cared for only by mechanized methods. True, fewer men are required on these mechanized farms, but we have already reached that minimum of men. Machinery on these farms requires trained minds. Costly machinery used in farming as an industry cannot be run by rail splitters.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman is discussing a timely subject. Recently when I was home I called on a farmer who owns and operates a 400-acre farm. He is a big cattle grower. He is now 75 years of age. He is unable to work. His wife showed me on the wall of his living room photographs of three 200-pound east Tennesseans, every one of whom is in the armed services and everyone of whom has been in combat.

That man told me it would be impossible this year for him to operate his farm and produce food to carry on his cattle operations. I know it to be a fact that all over east Tennessee and all over the State, for that matter, farms have been stripped of their manpower through the operation of the selective-service law and through the fact that there are war industries there that are paying labor all the way from $8 to $15 per day. The people are faced with a fact. The men who are stripping the farms of manpower do not know what they are doing. They are never consistent. They start out to do a thing one day and get everybody all excited, and then the next day they reverse themselves and head in the other direction. It is time for some sanity and common sense to be used in the administration of that law. We cannot fight unless we eat. Any army travels on its belly, and the people in industry and other lines of endeavor in this country must have something to eat.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution.

All phases of farm life in this Nation have made great forward steps in the dairy industry. My State is no exception to the rule. This also requires trained minds and experienced hands. We cannot reduce further these trained men on the farms of our country.

Quoting Mr. John Brandt, president of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, he speaks as follows:

> A full scale drafting of workers in the 18 to 25 age class from dairy farms would cut 1945 milk production by as much as 5,000,000,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, I have scarcely met a boy who has been deferred for farm work who does not in some degree resent it. He feels he, too, should be shouldering a gun, flying a plane, or taking some place in the armed service of his country. There is less glamor in running a tractor, or a milking machine, or doing many other things necessary in the production of foodstuffs than in flying a bomber or parachuting over enemy terrain. He feels that in his part of the fight here he will be deprived of the honor and glory that will be awarded to his city friends, and yet he is engaged in a very noble part of the war effort.

Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, our Nation's part as one of the great Allies of this World War. Let us not forget that food is a very vital weapon in the hands of this administration in its policies and dealings with the liberated countries. As each country is liberated by the Allied forces, it becomes the problem of the United States to feed those people, and great as has been our part and great as our part is today in the actual fighting on the five fronts of this war, of no less importance is our contribution of food to those people whom we liberate. And not to them alone, but also to Russia, to England, and now to Italy and France. Regardless of the marvelous contributions to the war which this country has made, I say that without our part in the production of food alone, this war would already have been lost. Handicapped enormously by lack of men and of machinery, our farmers have made heroic effort and amazing contributions to this phase of the war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is my understanding that the gentleman from North Dakota is making his appeal not as a matter of trying to get the farm boys deferred for themselves, which is something that the farm boys do not want, but because of the lack of the production of food and the lack of food which will undoubtedly stare us in the face very shortly and become acute if the present policies are adhered to.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct. I think in the concluding part of my remarks I cover that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I compliment the gentleman from North Dakota for basing his argument entirely upon the production of food without any regard whatsoever to the matter of trying to get the farm boys out of the draft, which none of us want to do.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I recognize how difficult is the task of those men concerned with the organization of humanity in this great war effort, and I have no disposition to raise my voice against them as they go forth to do their work. But I do feel it my serious duty to present to the Congress this side of the picture, with which I am particularly familiar. We must not, in our effort to bring about an early peace, lose sight of this very vital phase of war work. With few exceptions, these 364,000 farm boys want to go into the armed forces, but it just cannot be done. We in the United States are beginning to feel the pinch for the first time in the life of this generation on the question of food within our own country, and yet not one of us would hesitate to make every sacrifice necessary; but sacrifice is not the problem, production is the problem.

The President told us in his speech on the state of the Nation that the problem of the liberated countries would be great. No problem there will be greater than the one of supplying food. Now, as we wage war on five different fronts, more and more of everything is required, particularly of food products. Shortages begin to appear because all commodities, whether it be food, cigarettes, tanks, or any other phase of war material, are pouring out through five different pipe lines—pipe lines thousands of miles in length that must be kept crammed full from one end to the other, from the place where they start until they discharge their cargo.

As a representative from the great farm State of North Dakota, I have this to say to this Congress, and I say it with deep conviction and an intimate knowledge of the facts: There may be some sections of this country where a surplus of farm labor exists, but in our country—a land of great, limitless prairies—we have long ago scraped the bottom of our manpower barrel. I say we have reached the point of diminishing returns. I am not here addressing the Congress for the purpose of holding in my State these young men to shield them from danger or sacrifice. Doing so would be an insult to them. I have but one ambition, and that is to present to our leaders in my feeble manner the important side of this question, particularly as they look to my State for help. There is every reason there will be a continuation of the war for some time to come. Should this be true, even the drafting of 364,000 farm youth would not be sufficient to end the war. Remember, the longer the war goes on the greater will become the demand for farm products, because it is the policy of this administration primarily so, perhaps, to use money and food in our diplomatic relations with our allies and with the other countries of the globe.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. In that connection this is total war, and the man between the plow handles, the man producing foodstuffs, is just as much a member of our armed forces as if he had a uniform on and a gun in his hand. The man at the lathe, the man in the shop, the man in the mines, and the man in the factory building the implements of war is projecting himself and his muscle and skill to the battle front. What we mean, I think, and what I believe you have in mind and we all have in mind, is to so coordinate all the efforts of our people so that there will not be a lag in any particular. We must have food. We must keep the Army going. I know of another incident in my district. I had a letter the other day from a father and mother who have four boys in the armed services and a fifth boy about to go in. They own a 200-acre farm. Two of their boys have been killed in action, one in July and one in August. They made the appeal that one of the boys in the armed services be permitted to come back home. Well, the exigencies are such that the request was turned down. Those things not only have a heart appeal but they adjust themselves and should adjust themselves to the sound judgment and discretion of the men in authority so that a case like that might not become a tragedy, not only because of the extreme hardship but because of the tragedy of these two old people who are physically unable to operate their farm, who must sit there in the shadows in their great grief, having lost two boys and having two others in the service and with the fifth boy about to go. It does look as if something might be done not only to enable them to operate their farm which is the source of their livelihood, but something might be done which would in some measure assuage their great grief and atone in some way for the great sacrifices they have made on behalf of their country.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman again for the fine contribution, Mr. Speaker.

Since this is our policy, may I suggest that we most carefully review every phase of the situation before, in fever heat, we move out and draft from the farms these essential young men who are today engaged in a life of hard work and drudgery, with no pay for overtime, no 40-hour week, no further reward—nothing but hard work from sunrise to sunset, doing their part nobly and patriotically in every sense of the word. Can we afford to destroy this all-important productive capacity of one of the most essential elements in all warfare?

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ABSURDITIES IN PROPOSALS TO DRAFT LABOR AND NURSES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, every patriotic citizen familiar with the facts concedes the necessity for increased production for war, for more and better care for war's casualties, but thinking citizens, desirous of reestablishing and maintaining the "four freedoms," constitutional government here at home, see no necessity—on the contrary, great danger if we follow blindly the administration's proposal—to draft the IV-F's, nurses, and farm workers.

If we accept, as we do, Churchill's statement that, from a military and economic standpoint, we are the most powerful Nation in the world, and at the same time remember that we attained and now hold that position under and because of our constitutional form of government, even the least unobserving and thoughtful should see the folly of exchanging the best for something less efficient, more restrictive of the opportunity for freedom and prosperity.

The administration's policy of forcing everyone under Federal control, making everyone and everything subject to administrative orders and directives, leads to but one end—a dictatorship.

Nor can it be said that the United States is not doing its part; bearing its share of the burden of this war. It is matter of common knowledge that once again we came to the aid of the British Empire when it was in dire straits; that the materials of war furnished Russia enabled her to make her drive against Germany; saved her from the German invasion.

The food, the clothing, the merchandise furnished by us have gone a long, long way toward preventing civil war in Italy and Greece.

We now have 12,000,000 young Americans in the service; the battle lines in Belgium, France, and Italy are held largely by American troops; the estimate being that from 60 to 80 percent of the men on the fighting front are Americans.

It is time, yes, long past time, that there should be some definite guaranteed agreement as to the objectives of our allies, as to the part which America is expected to take, not only in the war but after the war is over.

If, as was stated in the Senate yesterday by Republican Members of that body, American youth is to be drafted to police Europe and that without the consent or action of Congress, but at the will of the President, in all fairness the American people should know the form of government which is to be imposed upon the conquered countries, or whether the people of those countries are to be permitted to choose their own form of government.

Without in any way criticizing our allies, it may be said it apparently is now true that in certain sections of Europe we must, to use a common expression, clear through Stalin; in other sections clear through Churchill.

There is no reason why here at home we should forsake our constitutional methods and procedure, clear through Sidney Hillman. It is long past time when someone should arise in this country, speak for America, act in the interest of America.

The American people went into this war reluctantly. Some thought that it was necessary for the preservation of our own national existence; the overwhelming majority did not believe that but have supported the war because they thought we were to carry the "four freedoms" to downtrodden people throughout the world.

Those whose sons, brothers, and husbands are dying because of this war have the right to know whether we are fighting to preserve and extend the British Empire; whether we are fighting to make Russia's claims good; whether we are fighting to aid the submerged millions of the world. They have the right to know whether in another generation or two we are to be called to again fight, not Germany, if the plan to hold her people in subjugation succeeds, but whether in Europe another nation will threaten the British Empire, civilization, or democracy, and if it does, whether we will be called to carry the burden of that war. Whether that menace will be met on the centuries-old battlefields of Europe or

whether we will stay out; make ourselves so strong here at home from an economic and military standpoint that any nation will hesitate to attack us; that if it does it will meet defeat before it invades our shores.

The above information should be given us before we accept the administration's plan to draft men and women for civilian service; for industrial work; before we adopt universal conscription.

If the war lords of Europe are fighting to but extend and make secure their national interest, there is every reason why America should not exhaust herself in efforts to aid them. We should conserve and increase our strength, provide for our own impregnable defense.

Experience has now demonstrated that neither Hitler's, Stalin's, nor Churchill's form of government, to say nothing of Italy and France, can lead us further nor for that matter as far, along the road to happiness, prosperity, and security, as have our own methods.

When New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and Canada, all integral parts of the British Empire, which exists today only because we came to its rescue, refused to conscript their men to serve the Empire and her needs beyond the confines of their home lands, there would seem little reason why America should conscript her men, her women, and then put them, while engaged in civilian activities, under the control of the Federal Government—of a dictator.

This war has demonstrated the patriotism of our people, their willingness to fight—to fight not only for their own country, their own institutions, but to sacrifice their lives for others, for other nations—nations which are interested not in establishing the Four Freedoms throughout the world, but in extending their spheres of influence, their own material well-being.

That being true, let this Congress insist that this administration, which demands so much power, which has to this date exercised powers never granted it in favor of special groups in return for political support, from this time on put into effect that principal expressed in the legend carried over the entrance of the Supreme Court here in Washington, "Equal justice under law."

Only last Monday, 4 days ago, one of the Justices of the United States Supreme Court, who concurred in overruling an opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, which upheld an act requiring those soliciting membership in unions to register with the State, frankly stated, in substance, that the United States Supreme Court was extending to the representatives of labor unions the exercise of a right denied to employers. That decision went a long way on the road to establish a double standard in the administration of the law. That decision denied to employers "Equal justice under law."

The administration's proposal to draft the IV–F's into military service, put them into work battalions, or force them to work in industry, without at the same time freeing them from the administration's policy and orders which would compel them to join a union, be and remain a member of a union, pay an initiation fee and such monthly dues and special assessments as the politically-minded bosses of some of the unions might impose, analyzed and plainly stated, partakes of the nature of a conspiracy to compel American citizens to contribute to a campaign fund, become members of an organization which is under political allegiance to the administration.

PRESIDENT DOES NOT KEEP HIS PROMISE

As has all too often happened, the President has not kept faith with the workers or the employers. It was on the 13th of November 1941, that Franklin D. Roosevelt told the American people that:

> The Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass legislation ordering, a so-called closed shop.

At that time there was a strike on, and talking face to face with John L. Lewis, who was speaking for the United Mine Workers, Mr. Roosevelt said:

> The Government will never compel this (remaining) 5 percent to join the union by a Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor.

Nevertheless, in recent months and since Pearl Harbor, the President, through his executive agencies, has time and time again compelled nonunion men to join a union, a procedure which he himself said "would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor."

When the President learns that honesty is the best policy, when he considers his words before making a promise, then keeps that promise, or, if that be impossible, frankly admits the necessity for a change, the American people will have more faith in him, in his administration. They will be more united in their efforts.

This administration, through executive agencies, in peacetime and now in wartime, has acted as an organizing agent, as a recruiting agency for the organizations of would-be political bosses.

The National Labor Relations Board earlier in its existence and the present War Labor Board now deliberately has followed a course and issued orders, the logical result of which has been to enable unions, without legal authority, to levy and collect taxes from workers who desired to do their utmost in aid of an increased war production.

At the moment, when the President is telling the people that hundreds of thousands of additional young men must be sent to the battle front, that there is need for billions of dollars of tax money, to be spent to carry on the Government and the war effort—some eighty-three billion—he is employing the Army to seize, take over, and operate the retail stores of Montgomery Ward & Co.

Instead of devoting undivided effort to the war, where on the western German front our men are suffering, fighting, and dying in snow, in freezing mud, he is keeping one eye on the political front here at home and following a course which will increase the political power and prestige of those who claim that to their efforts he owes his reelection.

The administration's excuse—it is no reason—for the seizure of Ward's retail stores was that certain Ward employees who are members of the C. I. O. were on strike and that unless their demands were granted by Ward the strike would continue and sympathetic strikes would be called by other C. I. O. unions in Detroit and elsewhere, which would adversely affect war production.

It was therefore necessary, said the administration, in order to prevent strikes in war industries, which would slow up production, to seize Ward's retail stores and grant the demands of the C. I. O. union which had members in those stores.

Just read that again.

The same reasoning would require the policeman who came upon a hold-up man and his victim to force the victim to submit because the robber had pals throughout the city and unless the victim did submit the pals would start holding up other good citizens.

Even though other C. I. O. unions in Ford's, in General Motors, in industrial plants throughout the Detroit area had no grievances, if the demands of their affiliate in Ward's were not granted, a hundred or more C. I. O. unions, with hundreds of thousands of employees engaged in essential war work, would go out on strike—take part in picketing Ward's retail stores—so it was threatened.

The proposition needs but to be stated to show its absurdity. The administration's course does establish one thing, and that is its complete domination, in this instance, by the C. I. O. political leadership.

WHY DRAFT MEN TO COLLECT UNION DUES?

Perhaps you remember that one of the first demands made by the union labor leaders when the Army seized and began to operate Ward's retail stores was that the Army compel Ward's employees to pay the dues which for 13 successive months employees of Ward's, exercising their rights under the Constitution, refused to pay into the union treasury.

The President is using the Army as a collecting agency for his political ally, the C. I. O. That is a fact, and no volume of abuse, no multitude of words used in name calling, no lying charges that criticism indicates a lack of patriotism will change the fact.

While men are needed in Europe and in the Pacific, while men are needed in factories, mines, and mills to send an ever-increasing volume of supplies to the armed forces, the President, to aid the C. I. O. in obtaining dominion over employees of Ward's, in a civil retail business, ordered the Army to take possession, follow a course which will ultimately compel them to join a union, pay tribute to that union.

Unions have no legal right to levy and collect taxes, but the policy followed by the administration has given them that power.

FARM LABOR

The administration has determined that it is our policy not only to feed, clothe, furnish fuel and shelter, for the people of the liberated countries, but that we are to supply the needy in other lands with much of their food and clothing, and that we are to rebuild—rehabilitate it is termed—the towns, cities, and countries, which have suffered from

Germany's power and cruelty. That being true, and the administration having also adopted the policy of sending abroad quantities of farm machinery, a policy of drafting farm boys for work in industrial plants just does not make sense.

The administration has also adopted a policy of paying high wages to industrial workers, furnishing many of them housing, granting them special privileges. That policy has brought the farmer into competition with a Government-subsidized industry, which pays a wage from two to eight times as great as that which it is possible for the farmer to pay and make both ends meet.

Not only do we ship abroad farm machinery badly needed here at home, but the farmer is put in direct competition with the high-paid factory workers, a portion of whose wage is met by payments on Government contracts.

If the farm boys are to be drafted and be sent abroad, will farm production meet our needs? Will the clerks who are drafted from the stores, those who are taken from factories because they will not work, be sent to the farms?

Will those drafted and put upon farms have the knowledge requisite to perform the task assigned them? Will they work more than the 35 or the 40 hours a week which has been their practice, without being paid for overtime? What of the union man sent to a farm and who finds that cows must be milked two or three times a day; that they must be milked on Saturday and Sunday, as well as on Friday and Monday? Or does the administration contemplate for farm work a swing shift?

If the individual or the co-op which operates a dairy, a cheese factory, a creamery, any sort of an industry processing farm products, refuses to sign a union contract with a security-of-membership clause, or to pay the wage demanded by the union which happens to be the collective-bargaining agent, will the Government send in an Army officer to operate the dairy, or the cheese factory, as it did to operate the retail business at Ward's? And, if the business did not make enough money to pay the wage fixed by the Government, will they make an appropriation from the Treasury to meet the deficiency?

We should take a look at the possibilities, the probabilities, which may grow out of the rules, regulations, interpretations, which will be put out by an executive agency attempting to produce food by farming. Fair and equal consideration of every citizen will get the Government more and quicker production than any granting of special favors to pressure groups.

TWENTY-FOUR HOURS FOR THE SOLDIERS—PART TIME FOR US

To me, in wartime, limited hours of work, or paying additional compensation for hours worked over a certain number does not make sense. I can see no reason for discrimination between the task imposed upon men drafted into the armed service and upon those who remain at home. It is the young men, many of whom have not yet reached the voting age, many of whom have never had an opportunity to enjoy the good things of this life, who are conscripted and sent to the battle front. They give all of their time, perhaps their lives, to the service of their country, while here at home we bicker, we quarrel, and we fight over how many hours we are to work, over what we are to be paid. Many of us shirk, spend more for luxuries, as well as for necessities, and still we complain and gripe.

From more than one industry we receive information that production has not reached the limit. To me, as to others, have come specific instances of the slow-down, sometimes because of union demands, sometimes because the industrialists for one reason or another held down production.

Recently there came to my office a manufacturer, the owner of a comparatively small plant who had taken subcontracts for the manufacture of a small casting. He had estimated the cost of production, calculated the number of units which could be made per day. He discovered after the contract was taken that a large plant had been and was making but half the number per day which he figured he could produce. He and his production men were frightened but they had the contract so they went ahead, and they learned that they could manufacture not twice but more than three times the number of units per day produced by the larger plant. The difference in production, according to his statement, did not grow out of greater skill, better machinery, but was the result of the efforts of the workers in his plant, most of whom came from farms or small towns and had no union boss.

In the larger plant it was not the fault of the men on the job that production was at a minimum, it was the fault of certain union politicians who believed in the doctrine of scarcity.

Before men who are needed at home, who have been rejected by the armed forces, are drafted, we should make certain that neither Sidney Hillman, nor any of those who think as he does, or have in mind the same purpose, should have any control over, should in any way determine the policy under which they are to serve or work.

If IV–F's are put into factories, work beside union men, discrimination in wages or hours will never be acceptable to them, and it is more than probable that they will no more than reach their jobs than Sidney will make his demand that they come under union jurisdiction.

If you think that idea is absurd, just remember that when the Navy was manufacturing planes at Brewster a union under Tom De Lorenzo gave orders to men who had taken an oath of allegiance to our country.

When the administration adopts a policy of "Equal justice under law"; when it ceases its drive to make citizens subject to the orders of its political allies; to come under the control in their daily lives of administrative agencies; then it will be on the road toward national unity and an all-out effort.

The orders of the O. P. A. have, time and again, in the midst of an abundance, established a scarcity. Because of O. P. A. defiance of nature's laws, of the law of supply and demand, of its assumption that a small group of men are all-wise, we have had a shortage of butter; of meat; an overabundance of eggs; a shortage of poultry; first a shortage of potatoes and then potatoes rotting by the carload on city dumps; rationed cheese, cheese spoiling in warehouses; a shortage of gasoline; of tires; of farm implements—of this, that, and the other. In my judgment, all due to the fact that no group of men, however wise, however industrious, however efficient, can obliterate human greed and selfishness, the desire to profit; suspend the operations of nature's laws.

The O. P. A. has in common parlance bit off more than it can chew.

Now if the administration drafts nurses, drafts labor, it will find itself in a more serious and dangerous situation with more of waste, confusion, and inefficiency in production than has been created by the O. P. A.

I have not the slightest objection to compelling everyone to do his part, either by way of contributions of money, or labor to the war effort, but I do object to making nurses, farm workers, the IV–F's or anyone else subject, through administrative orders, to a policy or a program conceived by, put into effect by Sidney Hillman or any other left-winger or Communist.

When the President asserts his independence of the corrupt city machines; when he frees himself of the influences of those who do not believe in the American system of government, he will find the people more than willing to bring about some of his objectives.

As long ago as January of 1943 bills were introduced by me which would have put those who refused to work in support of the war effort, regardless of their physical condition, or their age, into the military service; to be assigned by that service to whatever position it might be determined they could best perform. But with that bill there was another bill which, if adopted, would have made it impossible for any official of the Government, any union, or member of a union, to demand as a condition precedent, to the exercising of the right to work in industry, the payment of tribute.

What this Government needs at the moment is a return to the principle of equality—of equal justice—an end to special favors; and to the attempt to overturn our system of government and establish some form of communism, socialism, fascism, or dictatorship.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CANCELATION OF FOOD RATION POINTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I am about to make and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SERIOUS CHARGE AGAINST O. P. A. ANSWERED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a statement was made to the press by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. I expect to comment on that statement today. I called the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] over the telephone and told him that I did expect to comment on it and hoped he would be here. His statement of course outlines a state of facts which we regret very much were necessary. The gentleman from Minnesota in his statement says:

O. P. A. SWINDLES AMERICAN CONSUMERS

(By Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota)

Millions of thrifty American housewives have been swindled out of rationed food supplies when Economic Stabilizer Vinson and O. P. A. Director Bowles conspired to issue the new ration order which canceled unused red and blue stamps.

I am satisfied that the War Food Administration, which is in charge of food supplies, was bypassed and not consulted, when the O. P. A. fixed up this Christmas present for the American people, especially when we consider the latest report from the Department of Agriculture which states: "This year (1944) total production of food was the highest in history." We now have the largest cattle, poultry, and grain supplies in our history, and if the Administration will let nature take its course, we will have an abundance of hogs and other food commodities in 1945.

I want the men and women in the armed forces to have an abundance of the best American food. But I hate to see my Government deliberately cheat patriotic Americans who are doing everything possible to help win the war and back their boys on the fighting fronts. We need more honesty on the part of our officials in their dealings with the people.

That was a rather strong statement to say that officials were not honest with the people and to say Mr. Bowles and Judge Vinson conspired to swindle the people.

The gentleman from Minnesota further states:

I am not in the habit of saying, "I told you so," but on May 5, 1944, I made a speech in the House on Politics in Rationing in which I predicted: "I am convinced that should the New Deal elect its fourth term candidate on November 7, the O. P. A. will shortly thereafter, reinstate and make more drastic all rationing policies to further regiment and socialize the economy of our country." My prophecy has now become a reality.

It is reprehensible for those in charge of our Government to continue deceiving the people, and for initiating vital economic policies for political purposes. We want the truth about the war and also in regard to policies governing our lives and domestic economy.

In the first place the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota is incorrect in the second paragraph because there were discussions between the War Food Administration, O. P. A. and the Economic Stabilizer before that order went into effect.

Paragraph 2 also is incorrect in its implication that there are no food shortages.

There will be no over-all shortage of foods, but certain rationed foods will be very short. Here is the expectation:

Sugar: 10 percent under 1944 supplies.

Meat: First quarter in 1945, less by 10 to 15 percent than same quarter in 1944.

Butter: Less than in 1944.

Canned vegetables: Supply on hand December 1, 1944, for civilians, 56 percent less than December 1, 1943. Both had to last until new crop was canned.

In paragraphs 4 and 5 it is implied that politics guided O. P. A.'s actions.

BOWLES CHOSE COURSE THAT LED TO CRITICISM

If ever action taken by the head of a Government agency was not guided by political considerations, it was this action of Chester Bowles in canceling outstanding ration stamps. He knew he would be criticized bitterly by many persons, like the gentleman from Minnesota, if he canceled the stamps. He knew if he did not do so that there would not be fair distribution of scarce foods in 1945; but that probably few persons would know things could be better. But, he deliberately chose the course that led to criticism because it was the only way to distribute fairly short supplies of foods in 1945.

Many of the heads of outstanding women's organizations of the country endorsed O. P. A.'s stand in restoring rationing to meats and processed foods and canceling stamps to make the action effective. No woman's organization to my knowledge has criticized O. P. A.'s action, although individual women have done so.

Here are women's organizations endorsing O. P. A.'s stand:

American Association of University Women.

League of Women Shoppers.

National Consumers' League.

National Council of Jewish Women.

C. I. O. women's auxiliaries.

National Council of Negro Women.

National Federation of Settlements—Consumer Interest Committee.

Parent-teacher associations.

National Women's Trade Union League.

The total membership in the above associations is over 9,500,000 women.

Is it in behalf of these women that the gentleman from Minnesota complains? If so, they have repudiated his position in advance. They are behind Mr. Bowles in the action he has taken.

CONGRESSMAN FROM MINNESOTA AND FULTON LEWIS, JR., BRING SERIOUS CHARGES

Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, has been charged by the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and by Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio news commentator, with swindling American housewives by cancelation of outstanding ration stamps issued prior to last December.

This was a very grave charge, as I have said. So I took the trouble to investigate. I wish to report the result.

Last year, due to a large livestock population, a large pack of canned vegetables and fruits, and expectation of early end of the European war, rationing was removed from most meats and processed foods by order of the Office of Economic Stabilization upon recommendation of the War Food Administration.

This step made rationing of remaining meats and processed foods very difficult for the Office of Price Administration. Most families could get along without using any of most foods retaining point values. If points were placed too high people would get along without them and points would accumulate in consumers' hands. But the same thing would happen if points were placed very low. O. P. A. adopted a fairly liberal policy. Points did accumulate in the hands of the public.

They accumulated not alone for this reason, but because points had to be adjusted to give needed rations to families of adults living in big cities and in no position to raise any of their own food. This meant that rural families, producing at least part of their meat supply and canning their own fruits and vegetables, had stamps they did not need. Many of their surplus stamps never were used. In some cases these were transferred to city friends, giving the latter a surplus.

By these and other ways a large surplus of unspent ration points accumulated during 1944 in the hands of consumers.

A survey made to determine as of November the number of unspent ration stamps in consumers' hands showed approximately 10,000,000,000 red and 26,000,000,000 blue points, and stamps for 281,000,000 pounds of sugar.

These were equal, roughly, to 2½ or 3 months' supply of meats, butter, and other red-point foods; 4 months' supply of canned goods and other processed foods, and 2 months' supply of sugar for home use, including canning.

The supply of unused stamps, moreover, had been accumulating rapidly, after most meats and processed foods were removed from rationing. As of the end of the year, unused stamps probably represented close to 3 months' supply of many foods.

Armed with that many unused points consumers could have bought up at one throw the Nation's supply of rationed foods required to last 2½ to 3 months. Obviously this would have resulted in serious disruption of food distribution.

The survey showed, moreover, that outstanding points were very unevenly distributed. Some families of adults living in cities and producing none of their own food had no surplus stamps. But other families had upward to a 6-month supply. There could be no assurance of equitable distribution of short supplies of rationed foods in 1945 so long as outstanding stamps remained valid.

There was reason to believe that there would be no extensive hardship if the

stamps were canceled. Those who had accumulated them had not required the average use of stamps in 1944. They probably would not need the average use of stamps in 1945. Certainly few of them would require in 1945 a 2½ or 3 months greater supply than other people.

Mr. Bowles freely admits that O. P. A. made a mistake in 1944, allowing these unspent stamps to accumulate, even though the situation, for reasons earlier explained, was difficult to control.

But whatever is one's opinion regarding the mistakes of 1944, these facts were true: The Nation faced short supplies of rationed foods for 1945 and unspent ration stamps totaled billions of points. There was one and only one thing to do if these short supplies were to be distributed fairly in 1945. That was to cancel the outstanding stamps.

Mr. Bowles knew when he ordered cancelation that it would stir up a storm of protest. That he faced the criticism and did what was required in the public interest deserves commendation and not criticism. It was statesmanship of the highest order.

Fortunately, his position is being supported vigorously by the women of America, contrary to the implications of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], and Fulton Lewis, Jr.

If they had wanted to take the easy road they would have permitted these rationing coupons to have remained alive, although the shelves would have been empty pretty soon after the 1st of January of everything available to eat. Yet nobody could have blamed Mr. Bowles or Mr. Vinson. They were issued and they could have said, "We let them go ahead and let them clean out the shelves. We could not help it." It did require in this case courageous action on the part of honest, conscientious public officials to take the stand they did take in order to do what was necessary to properly prosecute the war and to protect the civilian population here at home.

FOOD AS IMPORTANT AS BULLETS

I agree with what has been said here today about the importance of food in the winning of the war. Next to air, food is next in importance. May I say, too, that the farmers have done a magnificent job in this war. They have been handicapped by shortage of manpower, equipment, machinery, and everything else, yet last year they increased their production 25 percent. It is a wonderful and an outstanding record. Food is just as important as bullets because if we do not have food the soldiers cannot use the bullets.

MR. JUSTICE BYRNES

I do not know the over-all picture concerning the great need for men in the armed services but I have confidence in Mr. Justice Byrnes. In my opinion, he is one of the greatest, the finest, and best men that we have ever had in our Government. He has made a great sacrifice in order to take the thankless job he is doing today. Here is a man who served in this House with distinction for many years and in the United States Senate as long as he wanted to remain there. He was then appointed and served as a member of the United States Supreme Court, a position that pays twice as much as is paid a Member of Congress, if you want to look at it from the standpoint of security. The members of the Supreme Court can retire and have $20,000 a year retirement benefit. So far as security and a good job are concerned, he had the very best job in this Nation. Yet he was willing to resign from that position and come down here and take a job in the White House that paid less than one-half as much, with no future security and nothing in the world except a thankless job to perform. However, he has the consolation of knowing he is doing something to help win this war by helping the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we should be very reluctant to criticize the actions of a man like that unless we have very positive proof that will support and corroborate everything we say.

Now, on the question of points, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] said that the women's organizations, as I understood from his statement, were supporting him. A commentator, Mr. Fulton Lewis, mentioned on the radio how bad this was and how the women were up in arms against it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did not make the statement that the women's organizations were supporting me. Fulton Lewis may have done that.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to have the statement from the gentleman, because I believe the gentleman would have been in error if he had made the statement. The women's organizations who have representatives right here in Washington who understand the situation approve it 100 percent, and I refer to organizations such as the American Association of University Women, the League of Women Shoppers, the National Consumers League, and a number of others, including the Parent-Teachers Association. They have all endorsed the action of Mr. Bowles and Mr. Vinson. They say it was the right thing to do and they represent nine and one-half million women in the United States.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Has the gentleman any proof of the statement he has just made?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. I will be glad if the gentleman would include it in the RECORD in connection with his remarks.

PARENTS AND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION APPROVES

Mr. PATMAN. I will read it to the gentleman. I have a letter here. The following is a letter from Mrs. William A. Hastings, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers:

The homemakers of this country, in overwhelming majority, are glad to cooperate in some tangible way with their men in service in meeting the needs of these critical months.

Giving up ration stamps that have accumulated these past few months because so many foods have been point free and could be purchased in any desired quantity is no real sacrifice to anyone who understands the situation. If some of us let our stamps accumulate, it was because we did not really need to use them. Without them, even now that so many foods are back on the ration list, we can still feed our children well and still share with the children of our allies.

Ever since the beginning of the war, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, with more than 3,000,000 members, has believed in food rationing, because it is the fair and just way in which to give everyone his fair share of available foods. We believe in ceiling prices for foods, with price ceilings posted in plain view and with shoppers pledged to pay no more than ceiling prices. This is self-protection, for we know that inflation in food prices would be disastrous to the family budget and so to the national well-being.

We have cooperated with the O. P. A. consistently ever since it came into being. We know what a difficult task it has, and we expect to continue to cooperate.

We would deplore any weakening of O. P. A.'s program as long as it is necessary for us to share our food supplies with our men in service and with the suffering people of the war-torn countries. There is enough food for all of us if we are careful in its distribution and no one uses any more than his fair share.

This is an easy way in which the soldiers on the home front can back up those on the battle fronts.

MRS. WILLIAM A. HASTINGS,
President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

MADISON, WIS., *January 7, 1945.*

Here is another one by Mrs. LaSell Dickenson, of the General Federation of Women's Clubs:

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is strongly back of the principles of rationing and price control. We realize it is not always easy to see the reason behind action, but we have confidence that those in power are doing the very best they can to see that food supplies are sent to our armies, to our allies, and that sufficient is left here at home for all.

We also realize and appreciate the effort that is being made to keep prices down. We will try to do our part in every way to prevent inflation.

MRS. LASELL DICKENSON.

Here is one from Helen C. White, president, American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C., dated January 6, 1945:

The American Association of University Women, which has supported price control since long before Pearl Harbor and has backed rationing throughout the war, recognizes that the necessity for strong price control and strict rationing will be greater than ever in the months ahead.

At this time, when the need for unremitting effort to speed victory is so great, I want to reiterate the full support of the American Association of University Women for these programs. Our members will continue to cooperate in making price control, rent control, and rationing work in their communities and will stand back of O. P. A. in its measures to hold the line on price and to distribute short supplies equitably. We are confident that O. P. A. will continue to carry out its increasingly important and difficult task vigorously, and will take measures which are fundamentally fair even when they may happen to bear hard upon individual cases. We shall support the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act through the remainder of the war and so long as the threat of inflation lasts.

Caroline F. Ware, chairman, national social studies committee, American Association of University Women:

Far from protesting the restoration of meats and canned vegetables to rationing, consumer organizations have been asking for this action since these products were made point free. As soon as the new program was announced, 15 national organizations, representing millions of consumers, telegraphed Chester Bowles, Marvin Jones, and Judge Vinson to commend their action.

Kathleen Clift, president of the Washington League of Women Shoppers:

I believe that the vast majority of all housewives want everybody to share alike when supplies are short. Especially those of us with husbands in the service resent the charge that we want to grab more than our share. It is our job to adjust our buying for our families' needs within the ration points issued to us on the basis of available supplies each month.

Margaret Cross, head of consumer interest committee of the National Federation of Settlements:

City housewives who belong to the mothers' clubs at our settlements aren't worried about old coupons. They only have the money and storage space to buy for their weekly needs, they are absolutely dependent on what they find in the stores, and they know that rationing is their only protection.

Mrs. Gerson P. Levi, national chairman of social welfare and war activities, National Council of Jewish Women:

Any annoyance that our housewives may have shown is temporary and has arisen because women who have been anxious to have rationing restored to canned goods and meats didn't at first fully understand why it was necessary to invalidate old coupons. The O. P. A. broadcast last night made it clear that this was much the fairest thing to do, since people who did not use the old coupons either did not need them or patriotically refrained from drawing on the limited supplies, and since it means more for all of us not to have to save part of the sugar, meat, and canned goods for the people with left-over stamps.

Mrs. William A. Hastings, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers:

Giving up ration stamps that have accumulated these past few months because so many foods have been point free and could be purchased in any desired quantity is no real sacrifice to anyone who understands the situation. If some of us let our stamps accumulate, it was because we did not really need to use them. Without them, even now that so many foods are back on the ration list, we can still feed our children well and still share with the children of our allies.

Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs:

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is strongly back of the principle of rationing and price control. We realize it is not always easy to see the reason behind action—but we have confidence that those in power are doing the very best they can to see that food supplies are sent to our armies, to our allies, and that sufficient is left here at home for all.

Mr. JENKINS. Of course, I have no way to impugn the honesty and the sincerity of these letters, but I dare say that none of them have been written after submission of this proposition to their membership and if they have been, I should like the ladies that put those in to furnish the gentleman with information whether or not they wrote these letters with the full approval of their membership. I doubt it very seriously.

Mr. PATMAN. Whether they did or not, they did the right thing and doubtless expressed the views of their members. I believe in the patriotism of every Member of this House. I shall not question or impugn the motives or the patriotism or sincerity of purpose of any Member of this House. I never have and never will.

But let us just analyze this thing a little bit. There were a lot of foodstuffs made ration free. Some meats you had to have points for; some you did not have to have points for. The same way with canned goods. By reason of that, many people did not use their points because they could buy the meats they wanted without them. It was just as satisfactory and just as desirable without points. Therefore, they just let their points accumulate. On January 1, if it had remained that way, there were enough points outstanding for people to go in and take all the food that was available, not only on the shelves at that time, but that could be produced in 3 long months. Now, what would that have meant?

That would have meant that possibly our 12,000,000 men upon the 55 battle fronts of the world and here at home would not have gotten the finest and best food on earth, because it would not have been available. That is one of the reasons for rationing, No. 1, to let every one of those 12,000,000 men, who, by the way, have to have just twice as much as the average civilian—he averages 5½ pounds of food every day, 4,500 calories, twice as much as we can consume; that is, over 65,000,000 pounds of the finest and best foods on earth every day mus. be set aside for these fighting men. If we let this thing go on, if Mr. Bowles or Mr. Vinson had done so, possibly they could not have gotten the required amount. We would have been depriving our servicemen of the foods that are necessary to fight this war.

No. 2, a few people would have had these points. Other people who had used theirs would not have had a fair chance to obtain the kind of food that would keep up their health standards in this country. Further, every time we furnish food to China or to Russia and they take that food and go out and kill Japs or Germans, there are just that many fewer Japs and Germans to kill American boys. I do not think the people who study this program and who know the sincerity of purpose, without any politics whatsoever but in the interest of the war effort and the domestic front, can criticize the program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. At the time last summer when approximately 85 percent of the rationed foods were put on the free list, the O. P. A. reduced the number of stamps from 60 a month to 30 a month, and still left butter on the rationed list and placed the point value on butter at 20 points, so that if a person wanted to get a pound of butter a month there were only a few points left to spend on other rationed foods.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not doubt that the gentleman can pick out a lot of complaints. I marvel at the fine job they have done. They have 8,000,000 different commodities and prices. The O. P. A. has a good chance to make mistakes and will make lots of them. The gentleman could not have done a better job, probably. I know I could not. You take 8,000,000 different things and you can point out a lot of things to criticize, but this is war. We are in war now. We are trying to fight a war. We should have just as little partisan politics as possible. Criticism, certainly, if it is constructive, but just to criticize and raise sand with somebody for doing his duty sincerely and honestly, I think we ought to be very reluctant to do it unless it serves a very good purpose.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to the large accumulation of ration stamps. I was not criticizing from a partisan angle on that point, but the gentleman knows that when they reduced the ration stamps and still some necessary foods were under rationing, by reducing it down to 30 points a month there were not very many stamps with which to buy butter and other rationed foods.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going to argue the details of it. It is just like gasoline. Suppose we had had some kind of fuel that could have been used in the place of gasoline, a substitute, and we let our gasoline coupons accumulate to January 1 and we had had enough gasoline, we had not been doing without, we had been getting everything that we wanted, our transportation had not been cut, we had been going along all right, just like we were on the food. We were getting just as good food as we wanted, but our points were accumulating. Then suppose on January 1 there had been enough gasoline coupons so that the people who would use the gasoline for purposes not essential could just go in and drain every tank in America and keep them drained for 3 months, and not let anybody else get any gasoline. Does the gentleman think that should be permitted? No. Would it be breaking faith? In wartime things like that are expected, just like your travel. You want to travel, but if Mr. Byrnes says you should not travel, you have your ticket, you have the money, and you have everything, but you are going to stay at home. That is no violation of any contract in wartime, that is just working together shoulder to shoulder and cooperating, trying to win this war.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I understood the gentleman to make the statement a moment ago that if these meat ration points had been allowed to stand civilian consumption would possibly have used up the supply of meat that was available and thereby created a shortage for the armed services.

Mr. PATMAN. I am talking about food generally.

Mr. PLOESER. I know, but did not the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. PATMAN. I said food generally; yes.

Mr. PLOESER. I understood him to say meat.

Mr. PATMAN. For food generally, that is true.

Mr. PLOESER. In the case of meat it could not have happened that way, because the Army sets aside the amount of meat it wants before the civilian population ever gets a chance at it.

Mr. PATMAN. Anyway, I think rationing is a fine thing in wartime. I would not want it in time of peace unless absolutely necessary.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I answer the gentleman from Missouri? Not only is it a matter of obtaining the necessary food for the armed forces, the necessary meat for the armed forces, but it is a matter of distributing equitably that which is left among the people of the country.

Mr. PATMAN. It would have been unfair, absolutely and obviously unfair to let a few people accumulate their points and use them under the circumstances without losing anything and to the detriment of the other people. They were getting everything on earth they needed, getting all the food they wanted. They were just not buying that particular kind that required points. If they could go in on January 1 and buy up everything in the stores of America and have enough points to keep on buying stuff for 2.8 months, approximately 3 months, that would certainly have worked a hardship on a lot of people. I think that is obvious. I do not think one should be branded with swindling the people, with being swindlers and conspiring to defraud the public, when they do something that is obviously a courageous act in wartime, to help promote the war.

Mr. PLOESER. I have never accused Mr. Bowles of swindling nor did I condemn him for that move.

However, I do recall saying that the move was a blunder.

Mr. PATMAN. No; you are mistaken. I am glad you brought that up.

Mr. PLOESER. I read that in the press.

Mr. PATMAN. I know you read it; and the newspaper would not even correct it. Here is a copy of that newspaper of January 4, 1945. It is the Times-Herald here in Washington, D. C. It says:

STAMP VOIDING "ERROR," BOWLES—BLAMES SURVEY FOR CHRISTMAS MISTAKE

NEW YORK, January 3.—A flat admission that we were wrong was made by O. P. A. Administrator Bowles today in reference to the Christmas cancelations of various unused sugar and red-and blue-point ration stamps.

However, he added, the mistake could not be rectified without hardship to a majority of the people.

Speaking at a luncheon of the marketing conference of the American Management Association, Bowles attributed the mistake to a preliminary survey in which, he said, a majority of housewives said they did not need their unused stamps.

"We were wrong. We should have foreseen these possibilities. However, I was not willing to cover that mistake by working a hardship on the great majority who need their stamps to get their fair share of food," Bowles said.

It is not true. Mr. Bowles did not say it. He said the error was made long before January 1 when they did not anticipate what might happen. He said they had to do it; that it was the right thing to do, but they committed the error along back possibly last spring and summer in not anticipating that this thing would occur. I hope that is straight. I will include a copy of that statement and also of Mr. Bowles' speech since I have permission to do so. Here I insert that part of the speech referred to:

We placed back on the list of rationed products 85 percent of all meats sold in the average grocery store. We restored five canned vegetables to rationing. The invalidation of ration stamps was one of the toughest decisions we have ever had to make. When we originally said there would be notification in the case of invalidation of stamps we did not estimate properly the number of unused stamps which would accumulate nor the serious effect the spending of these stamps could have on reduced supplies.

We were wrong. We should have foreseen these possibilities.

However, I was not willing to cover that mistake by working a hardship on the large majority who need their stamps to get their fair share of food.

It shows how information will be printed which is not true. Now, of course, the gentleman honestly believed that. I know the gentleman. He is a good and sincere Member of this body and he is very able. He has been misled by that statement. If he has been misled I know other Members have been misled also. But it is not true. This newspaper was told that it was not true and they refused and failed to correct it. I am inserting Mr. Bowles' own comment about this speech and the misquotation. It is as follows:

This is the speech for which I was misquoted by one of the papers you may have seen. That paper attributed to me a "flat admission that 'we were wrong' in reference to the Christmas cancelation of various unused sugar and red and blue point ration stamps." As you will see on the first page of this attached statement, the phrase "we were wrong" refers to our estimate of the number of unused stamps which would accumulate and the serious effect which the spending of such stamps could have on reduced supplies.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. If it be true that Mr. Bowles admits the error last summer, then it is confirmation probably of the many statements I have heard that this relaxing of rationing was due to the impending election. I would much rather believe that the error was one of accident this winter.

JONES, VINSON, BYRNES, AND BOWLES

Mr. PATMAN. Just a moment. Mr. Bowles is not the only man to be consulted in this. Other people were to be consulted, such as Mr. Vinson, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Byrnes, as well as Mr. Bowles. If you want to inject a political question here I might point out that there are more Republicans in high positions in the O. P. A. than there are Democrats, and you will find the same thing in the W. P. B. and in all these different war agencies.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now that the question of the election has been injected into the debate here, I might say that the O. P. A. and none of the officials in any way participated in the election, and Mr. Bowles never made a speech.

Mr. PATMAN. He made a statement advising them to stay out. No one can accuse the O. P. A. or Mr. Bowles of taking part in the election.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it was right because there are tens of thousands of fine citizens in every community serving on the board in connection with the O. P. A. These men and women belong to both parties and some are independents, and it would have been a wrong and reflection on them and on the fine service that they have rendered. You ought to commend them, because they have a hard job. So reluctantly I am constrained to take that position, because I would like to see them out campaigning. But I think, having in mind his job and the relationship of his agency to the people and to the many people who are in that agency in an unpaid capacity, I believe that he exercised the right judgment in the best interest of the country.

Mr. PATMAN. Not only do we have Mr. Justice Byrnes there, in whom we all have confidence, but there is Fred Vinson. We all have confidence in Fred Vinson, who left a Federal judgeship, resigned, to take a thankless and hard job to do something for his country in wartime. That is No. 2. No. 3 is Marvin Jones. There is no fairer man in this country than Marvin Jones. He is a United States district judge. That not being a statutory court, he did not have to resign. But he wants to do the job of a good War Food Administrator, and he does it without any salary, in order to help win this war. Then there is Mr. Bowles. I do not know of any public official who is serving with greater credit to the administration and for the benefit of the people generally than Mr. Bowles. If he makes a mistake, he comes out frankly and says so. He says, "We will correct it." That is what we have always wanted in administrative agencies. He is doing a good job in a fine way. Out of the millions and millions of transactions, there are a few, which are so small in number that you can count them almost on the fingers of your hands, that some critics will attempt to criticize.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not doubt the sincerity of the statement of my distinguished friend from Texas, nor of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. PATMAN. Now I hope that this is going to be a question.

Mr. PLOESER. No; I want to make this statement in reply to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. PATMAN. All right, go ahead.

Mr. PLOESER. Surely he does not believe that any of us are naive enough to assume that the criticism was placed on thousands of people who worked for the O. P. A. Neither does he believe that any of us are naive enough to assume that the thousands of people who work and labor carrying out the rules of the O. P. A. are the top policy makers nor would he ever expect any of us of the minority to assume that if the great political strategist of the administration sent down word to relax rationing in time for an election that even Mr. Bowles would stand in the way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's gesture of innocence, political or otherwise, is rather refreshing although not very impressive. Let me call to the gentleman's attention one incident as an illustration of what the President and this administration stand for. The invasion of Africa took place 2 days after the election of 1942. That is the best illustration I know of that politics is not entering into questions of strategy in the conduct of the war or questions of policy and administration. Mistakes may be made, but politics does not enter into it. Had that invasion taken place 2 days before election in 1942 the entire situation might have been different.

Mr. PATMAN. And if the administration had been doing something purely for politics it would have probably been against all rationing and price control. I think the gentleman will admit it took some courage to enforce rationing and price control, but it was something that manifestly had to be done to save this country from inflation. If we had not had price control our money would be valueless today, would be practically worthless. It would take a wheelbarrow load to buy a newspaper or a loaf of bread. We can lose this war today on the home front if we permit inflation to engulf us. People will not work for worthless money. If we are so shortsighted as to be against price control, unpopular, annoying, and irritating as it is, we are liable to lose the war right here on the home front.

Mr. McCORMACK. I read in one of the New York papers this morning, I believe it was, where the cost of living in China was 485 times higher today than it was in 1937.

Mr. PATMAN. And our cargo planes that are carrying supplies over the mountains into China find half their cargo space filled with printing-press money. Imagine that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bowles did very properly send out instructions to all his employees that they must not engage in politics. I thought it was one of the finest acts of any administrator. And they refrained from politics. As our majority leader said, it was fitting that they do so, because so many people who have different views from the administration in power were doing a splendid and excellent job on all these thousands of boards throughout the country and there was no place for any kind of partisan politics. This is one agency that no one can claim violated that rule; they did not. There are fine people on both sides of the political fence in the O. P. A. organization. As I said before, over half of the policy-making positions in O. P. A. and W. P. B. are filled with members of the opposite party from me; and they are doing an excellent job, all of them; they have been doing a fine job. I could pick out things to criticize, but they have been doing an excellent job, and they should not be criticized for doing it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Just for the record I should like to ask the gentleman what was the date of this mistake? How long was it prior to November 7?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about this. The gentleman can find out as well as I. Let us go into this thing with an open mind. These officials are not going to steal or swindle. The facts are available if the gentleman wants to investigate them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that if we had had O. P. A. in the last war the country might have been saved from the subsequent depression?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly we would have been. That depression ruined more people than any other period of time in our history. In this war O. P. A. has fixed the price not only of foods, but they have fixed the price of steel. Steel has not gone up 1 penny a ton in 5 years. The price of aluminum has not gone up a penny a ton in 5 years. So with the price of copper, except for the subsidies that we paid. Plate glass, cement, and other things that go into making this war machine: If the prices had been permitted to go up during this war the same way they went up during the same period of time in the last war our national debt on June 30 last would have been $65,000,000,000 more than it was, just on the cost of the war machine alone not counting the amount the American people have saved for themselves. So it is something that is important.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition there would have been the tremendous damage done to the people of the middle class and the poor if we did not have the rationing system in operation that we have, which is the democratic way of assuring, as nearly as possible, equal distribution of the available food when the available food is much less than the demand; is that not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is right. Our health standards would have been broken down. It would have been very unfair for this Congress to sit idly by and see people with money going around hoarding food like they did in the First World War, depriving many people of the United States of the necessary food to go into their diet. The question of health is involved in this. During the present war we have had a limited supply of food in some cases, but it has been distributed so that every person has a chance to get a fair share of it. The health standards of the people, therefore, have been kept up. The other war did not last long enough to permit inflation to ruin us. If it had lasted longer it would have ruined us. People with money went in and bought up commodities like sugar and made the American people pay from 35 cents to 50 cents a pound for that sugar because there was no price control. In this war, under price control, sugar has not gone over 7 cents a pound. That is the best evidence that price control has been successful and has been satisfactory and I think we should be careful about charging those who are enforcing the law and administering it with being swindlers and trying to deceive the American people. Of course, constructive criticism is always welcome if there is anything wrong, but let us be careful in wartime when our sons are serving in the Army all over the world. You know, the sun does not set on the American soldier today. They are serving on 55 battle fronts. There are 6,000,000 of them across the seas. Now is no time to engage in any kind of criticism except the most constructive, helpful type of criticism. It is easy to criticize. It is difficult to construct. I wish I knew who wrote the following:

THE WRECKER

I watched them tear a building down,
A gang of men in a busy town.
With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell
They swung a beam and the side wall fell.

I asked the foreman: "Are these men skilled?
And the kind of men you hire to build?"
He laughed as he answered: "No indeed,
Just common labor is all I need."

"Why I can easily wreck in a day or two
What builders have taken years to do."
Now think for yourself as you go away,
Which of these roles have you played today.

Is that one a builder, who works with care,
Shaping his deeds with rule and square?
Or is he a wrecker, who walks the town,
Content with the labor of tearing down?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I take the gentleman back to his original defense of this rule and say to him that I thank the gentleman cordially for bringing to us this story of the patriotic women or groups of women who back him up. The women I saw did not talk that way. They say that the Government welshed on its promise so far as these rationing points were concerned.

Mr. PATMAN. But the gentleman should talk to women who have sons in this war and who have studied this thing. You talk to the women who have husbands in this war and who have studied this thing.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have heard them talk.

Mr. PATMAN. Talk to the people who know. I hope the gentleman, in whom I have confidence, will investigate for himself.

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course, I do not understand the thing like the gentleman does, I appreciate and I acknowledge that, but I have heard them talk, great groups of them and the point was that the Government had welshed on its promise that these stamps would be good indefinitely. They were not using those stamps, neither would they use them all on January 1 to denude the market. Now they are using what stamps they have to denude the market for fear the Government will go back on its agreement. The situation has brought about exactly what the gentleman condemns as happening on January 1.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman had been the Administrator and he had this situation facing him what would he have done? As to whether or not it should have been anticipated in the past, that is behind us, and our hindsight is always better than our foresight. We had a practical situation facing us of either letting the shelves be emptied and no food available at all except for those people who had saved up their points, or canceling the points and letting everybody have a fair chance at the limited supply of food.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not criticize the Administrator.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman does not criticize him.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think he was mighty shrewd to wait until after the election though.

Mr. PATMAN. I think he was mighty courageous.

Mr. GIFFORD. He knew of this.

Mr. PATMAN. He was courageous.

Mr. GIFFORD. He must have known of it.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think the gentleman should say that everything is politics.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman says there is no politics in this?

Mr. PATMAN. It took courage to do this. The political side would have been the side the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] does not know that the election is over.

Mr. GIFFORD. No; but we have been defending a lot of subversive people here today.

Mr. PATMAN. I am inserting herewith the speech of Mr. Bowles heretofore referred to. It tells the whole story:

I am very glad of an opportunity to speak to the members of the American Management Association here in New York City. I'd like to use this opportunity to tell you about some of the management and policy problems we must solve if we are to win our wartime struggle to hold the price line and assure fair distribution of scarce supplies.

There are five major problems which we must lick if we are to win this fight.

O. P. A. problem No. 1 involves food rationing. A week ago today we announced a series of fundamental changes in our food-rationing system. We invalidated surplus sugar stamps covering over 250,000 tons of sugar. We invalidated nearly 17,000,000,000 blue ration points, covering processed foods; and over 10,000,000,000 red points covering meats, fats, and oils.

We placed back on the list of rationed products 85 percent of all meats sold in the average grocery store. We restored five canned vegetables to rationing. The invalidation of ration stamps was one of the toughest decisions we've ever had to make. When we originally said there would be notification in the case of invalidation of stamps, we did not estimate properly the number of unused stamps which would accumulate nor the serious effect the spending of these stamps could have on reduced supplies.

We were wrong. We should have foreseen these possibilities.

However, I was not willing to cover that mistake by working a hardship on the large majority who need their stamps to get their fair share of food.

Our choice was simply this: First, we could allow the old stamps to remain valid and cut the value of the new stamps. Or, second, we could cancel the old stamps and give everyone his fair share of 1945 supplies. The first plan would have allowed one comparatively small group of families a substantially larger share of 1945 supplies than the majority of families. That would have been unfair.

When we asked women who had extra stamps why they had not spent them, the large majority told us, "Because we didn't need them." Most of them, I am sure, will tell you that it would be unfair to cut the rations of those who have to spend their stamps promptly in order to allow an extra share of scarce food to others who were able to save stamps when food was more plentiful. It was a hard decision. We knew some people would be mad, and with many of them I really sympathize. That is no reason, however, why we should not insist on a fair share of 1945 supplies to each household * * * particularly when the supplies of these foods are lower than they have been at any time during the war.

Very frankly, these changes in our food-rationing program, unwelcome though they be, could not be postponed longer.

It was evident that meat supplies were likely to be substantially below last year's level. We knew that billions of unused sugar stamps and blue ration points, representing inflationary ration currency, were a threat to the proper working of our whole food-rationing program. We knew that the supply of canned foods allotted to civilians was unlikely to be sufficient to meet civilian demand.

The food requirements of the armed forces must be met. The guns in Europe are still roaring today and all of us realize that we are up against a tough struggle both in Europe and in Asia.

In many sections of the country, meat has been scarce. Distribution has been dangerously uneven. Three weeks ago, for example, 35 percent of all stores were out of butter; 45 percent were out of ham; 66 percent were out of bacon.

The Army's meat requirements have increased sharply. For the coming 3 months there will be 15 percent less meat available for civilians than we had a year ago.

We are faced with the problem of distributing very carefully our available supply of canned vegetables for civilian use until the new pack is completed next summer.

Needless to say, the decision to restore more rigid food rationing was not an easy one. We dislike the necessity for additional red tape and inconvenience to our housewives and grocers.

But facts are facts. And in wartime in particular, they must be met honestly and fairly. The food rationing program which we launched last week will serve, over a period of time, to see that every family in the land gets a fair share of meat, canned vegetables, and sugar. If we had failed to meet this issue squarely, we would have failed to carry out the responsibility with which we have been entrusted.

So much for the policy aspects of the rationing situation.

I think you may be interested, however, as management specialists, in the administrative problems of carrying out such a policy decision. Let me list some of them.

There are 8 O. P. A. regional offices, 93 district offices, and about 5,500 local O. P. A. boards—each one of which has to be given instructions for applying and interpreting the regulations.

There are about 8,000 wholesalers and 600,000 retailers of meats, processed vegetables, or sugar. Each one of these has to be notified of the basic decisions and provided with a poster showing the point values to be charged for each type of rationed food.

There are some 550,000 hotels, restaurants, and other institutional users of rationed foods, including schools, hospitals, asylums, and jails. Each one of these has to prepare ration-point inventories by the end of the year.

In addition, there is the problem of issuing new quotas to about 125,000 industrial users of rationed food products.

Moreover, there are about 1,500 newspapers and radio stations to be notified of the essentials of the program so that the buying public and food retailers may suffer as little inconvenience as possible.

Finally, in the case of rationing changes, there is the special problem of maintaining complete secrecy while making preparations to carry out the administrative details. The printing of instructions and regulations, the notification of field offices, the necessary consultation with specialists in different parts of the Washington office and with officers of other agencies involve so many people that the maintenance of secrecy is very difficult indeed. And yet, if we are to avoid advance buying of newly rationed items or more tightly rationed commodities, it is essential that there be no advance notice to the general public. We have never succeeded in doing a 100-percent perfect job.

On several occasions we have had to advance the effective date of ration changes because leaks had already occurred. Naturally, this leads to confusion, since we are then not able to put out the necessary instructions on time. However, during the last 3 years, we have all learned a good deal about the administrative details of rationing. The public is much better informed. The trades involved are very cooperative, and our own specialists have been trained in the hard school of experience. We can look forward, I think, to a much smoother operation of all rationing programs in the future.

O. P. A. problem No. 2, for which we shall have to find some solution, is control over livestock prices. For many months now, live cattle has been almost the only basic commodity, either agricultural or manufacturing, on which there has been no price ceiling.

We have encountered difficulties in administering ceiling prices at wholesale and retail levels because the price of the original product is not under control. But control over livestock prices involves serious technical difficulties. In tightening controls over the top prices in livestock, we would be taking a step which, to many cattle raisers, would seem to be a drastic one. There is considerable resistance to it.

We in the O. P. A. have felt for a long time that such controls are inevitable. If the authority should be delegated to us by the Stabilization Director, we would act promptly. We feel we would be better protecting the public against overcharges at the retail level. But, again, it will be a tough decision, and it would not be an easy program to manage.

Since the quality of beef cannot be accurately graded on the hoof, it has to be graded after slaughtering. There are about 20,000 slaughterers, ranging from very small operations, employing a few men, to the huge, integrated companies making the fullest possible use of all byproducts. These slaughterers must be inspected by a very limited staff of skilled people. The specialized knowledge required for proper inspection and grading of dressed beef takes many years to acquire.

In addition to the slaughterers, there are about 10,000 meat wholesalers and more than 500,000 meat retail outlets. Compliance with ceiling prices at each level of distribution must be achieved if the consumer is to be protected at retail. If there are violations at any level of distribution, it produces squeezes at later levels which make the elimination of black markets extremely difficult, if not impossible.

To secure compliance with retail ceiling prices, more than a million meat price charts to organize and administer the work of price for different price zones have to be prepared and distributed in retail stores and to the price panels of local boards. Members of price panels must be recruited and trained panel assistants who help butchers abide by price regulations and take care of reported violations.

Success in carrying out this tremendous management task depends, to a very large extent, upon the understanding and cooperation of both the trade and the housewife. This, in turn, involves an information program to trade associations, trade papers, general newspapers, and consumer organizations.

It's not an impossible job, but we're going to have our hands full.

O. P. A. problem No. 3, to which we must find a fair and practical answer lies in our pricing policy as it applies to the distributive trades: sales agents, jobbers, wholesalers, and retailers. In justice to the consumer and to other segments of our economy, I believe we have no alternative but to apply the principle of cost absorption to the distributive trades we have so long applied to producers.

The Price Control Act states only that the ceiling prices set by the Office of Price Administration should be "generally fair and equitable." It was up to us to determine what these words mean in actual practice. To carry out the purpose of the act we established pricing standards which required the absorption of certain increases in cost before price increases were allowed. If it had not been for this principle the level of all prices would be far higher than it is today. We might well be headed toward a dangerous inflation.

In spite of the fact that we have insisted that manufacturers absorb increased costs as long as their over-all earnings were satisfactory, business in general has been far more prosperous than in any other period in the history of our country.

These principles of pricing were fully explained to Congress last spring. We spent many days before congressional committees with charts and graphs, explaining our standards for price increases both as a general matter of policy and in specific individual cases. Since Congress extended the act without any changes in these standards, it thereby expressed its approval of them. In a case decided in August, the Emergency Court of Appeals upheld their validity.

Even after reasonable cost absorption, however, price increases to manufacturers and other producers are sometimes necessary according to these standards. When those occasions occur—and I hope they will not be too numerous—it seems only fair and just that we apply the same accepted, tested principle of cost absorption to wholesalers, retailers, and other distributors.

As in the case of other groups, the distributive trades have been very profitable during the war period. Large department stores on the average are making nearly seven times as much and small department stores are making about nine times as much on net sales as they were in 1936–39. The hardware retailers are making nearly three times as much on net sales as they did in 1936–39. The hardware wholesalers are making nearly twice as much. Greatly increased profits are also true of music stores, dry goods wholesalers, etc.

As long as these wartime profits remain high, it is only reasonable for the distributive trades to help share cost increases. It is only proper that the consumer should be protected against increases in the retail price on those occasions where some increase is necessary at the manufacturing level. The pricing standards which we have developed are, I believe, entirely fair. However long it takes to win the war our pricing standards will leave the distributive trades, with rare exceptions, in a more profitable position than they have ever been in peacetime.

Again, I believe there is no question of the rightness of our stand. And again I am confident that the vast majority of store owners, wholesalers, and other merchants will cooperate with us to the hilt. But there will be some, of course, who will attempt to apply pressure and who will complain bitterly even in wartime.

O. P. A. problem No. 4 lies in the clothing situation. Clothing, as you probably know, is the only one of the three principal items in the cost of living which has risen in the last year and a half. The level of average rents throughout the country is exactly where it was 30 months ago. The index of individual food prices, according to the Department of Labor, is actually 4.5 percent lower than in the spring of 1943.

But clothing prices have climbed steadily. The climb has been only a portion of the increases we had during the last war, when clothing prices increased more than 200 percent, but the price has risen steadily. The increase this time has amounted to something like 8 percent in the last 12 months. But this increase has bothered us a great deal and in fact has threatened our whole anti-inflation program.

We have been further disturbed by the deterioration in clothing quality and the disappearance of low-price lines. These difficult problems must be met. And again the solution is bound to be disturbing to some groups.

The War Production Board has already taken steps to eliminate or curtail the use of fabrics for nonessential purposes. W. P. B. is taking further steps to allocate fabrics to basic uses for which there is the greatest need.

The O. P. A. in turn has taken strong measures to eliminate overfinishing and overfancying of materials. We are now taking additional steps on finished clothing.

I am afraid some of the moves which we will make will not be greeted by cheers from some of those in the clothing field. But again, I can only point out that the production of textiles and the manufacture of clothing has been very profitable during the war. Already we are open to grave criticism for allowing prices in this field to rise even to the extent to which they have risen.

If we failed to correct this situation now, we would be failing to carry out a major part of our difficult wartime responsibility. I am sure the steps which we must take during the next 30 days to bring clothing prices and quality under better control will be welcomed by consumers and will be conceded to be fair by all the responsible members of the textile and clothing industry.

It's not going to be easy, however, as I think you can judge from the administrative problems involved. There are 3,500 textile manufacturers; 650 converters of textiles; 5,500 wholesalers and jobbers; 1,900 apparel manufacturers and 200,000 retail clothing stores. The trade channels through which textiles and apparel move are probably more complex and varied than those of any other industry. New firms are constantly entering the field while others disappear.

Continual changes take place in style and in the actual processes of manufacture. There are few satisfactory quality standards to which specific prices can be attached. There is so little uniformity of business practice that it is very difficult to draft satisfactory general rules under which we can operate.

We must have fairly accurate information on which to base decisions. We cannot play by ear without becoming arbitrary. If we are to have information, questionnaires must be carefully prepared which will cause the least inconvenience to business. The results of these questionnaires must be put in usable form.

After general regulations have been drawn, there must be provision for meeting the particular circumstances of individuals or special groups. Thousands of applications have to be processed. New prices have to be set on new goods.

Compliance with regulations must be secured at each level of manufacture and distribution through the cooperation of the trade press, trade associations, and individual businessmen. Compliance meetings have to be organized, and permanent compliance committees set up.

Specialized information in the form of press releases and easily readable trade bulletins have to be prepared. Enforcement investigations have to be undertaken. Legal actions must be instituted and court cases presented.

For this stupendous job we have available two or three hundred price specialists, about 370 enforcement investigators and fewer than a hundred attorneys for the entire country.

It is pretty clear, therefore, that even though the original policy decisions may be tough, the actual administration of these decisions involves a good many headaches before the results begin to show up in the cost-of-living. Such a program can't be carried through without error, without strain, irritation, and difficulty. But I believe that every month we stay at this our efficiency improves. We're a lot better at it now than we were 2 or 3 years ago. And none of us will be content unless we can continue to show improvement.

Finally, on our list of O. P. A. problems, there is the question of reconversion pricing. When the happy day eventually comes when our factories once again hum with the manufacture of such consumer goods as automobiles, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, and radios, we shall be faced with the problem of reviewing ceiling prices in these fields—most of which reflect March 1942 prices.

Our policies in this field have already been stated on other occasions. Let me repeat them here. It is our belief, based on preliminary studies, that with relatively few exceptions the consumer durable items which have been off the market during the war years can again be placed on sale at the same prices which were charged the consumer during the first quarter of 1942.

There have, of course, been some increases in wage rates and some increases in raw material prices. But for all these products there will be an almost unlimited demand, once the war has been finally won. Big volume makes for lowered costs. Selling costs will also be

lower, and overhead charges will be reduced. We believe that these reduced costs will go a long way toward offsetting such increases in wage rates and material prices as there may have been. When cost increases cannot be absorbed by the manufacturers, we shall ask, within reason, that they be absorbed by those who distribute the product to the final consumer.

If we are to meet squarely our aim of a stable peacetime economy, if we are to hold the line vigorously and courageously against inflationary forces, retail prices on these products must be firmly held. This, I believe, can be accomplished with full allowance for generous profits, in most cases, to manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, and retailers.

Our American economy runs on the profit motive. A fair and just profit at all levels of production and trade should be maintained. But we must appreciate, too, that while some costs go up, other costs go down. And if we are really determined to control the forces of inflation we must be willing to forego the chance for inflationary profits, which, pleasant though they might be for the moment, could only lead to disaster.

I have listed just a few of our problems. Most of them are not easy. I can assure you that the handling of them is not a pleasant task. In seeking their solution we are certain to make some mistakes. In any such vast operation as this, some errors and some irritations are inevitable.

As I have said so many times before, we will work constantly to eliminate such mistakes as fast as they occur, and to provide the fairest possible administration of the law which Congress has placed in our charge.

We all know that wartime controls are difficult and unpleasant. But we will accept them, I believe with relative cheerfulness as long as we have reason to believe they will fulfill these objectives.

Can we actually hold inflation in check? Can we maintain a stable economy? Can we avoid the skyrocketing prices which historically have always gone with war? Frankly, I believe we can. But let me quickly add that I am not overconfident. So far our record has been reasonably good. The level of wholesale industrial prices is only 3 percent above the prices of 30 months ago, that is, the spring of 1942, when O. P. A. price control first went into effect. During the last 18 months the average of these prices have been held almost exactly even. That means millions upon millions of dollars already saved in the cost of fighting the war.

The cost of living since the first days of price control has increased only 9 percent. Since our O. P. A. controls have been perfected—that is, since the spring of 1943—the increase has been only 1 percent. As I pointed out, we have been weak on clothing, but that weakness has been largely offset by our record on food and rent. I believe that our new clothing program will put an end to price increases in the clothing field.

But we cannot afford to be overconfident. It would be folly to make promises in a field as difficult as this. We should remind ourselves that once before we met the problem and fumbled it rather dismally. After the defeat of Germany, in 1918, prices for a while fell off. From one end of the country to the other it was said that the danger of further inflation was over. But in March 1919 prices started upward, and a wild scramble for inventories developed. Prices rose higher and higher with wages tagging along behind. The white-collar worker—as usual—faced special difficulties.

In June 1920 the inflationary boom collapsed. In a single year $11,000,000,000 in inventories were wiped out. Substantial business profits turned into losses. Net farm income dropped by 62 percent. Factory pay rolls dropped 44 percent.

If our price structure were again to get out of hand, the consequences would be far, far worse. The amount of inflationary pressure in this country today is unbelievably great. If those forces are not firmly and courageously controlled, neither you nor I nor anyone else can estimate the chaos which could result.

The war in Europe today is a long way from being won. Those who are in a position to know, say that many months of hard fighting lie ahead of us. During those months we who are responsible for the control of prices and those who are responsible for production, both in our factories and on our farms, will be faced with problems that will be staggering.

But when the German war is won, we in the O. P. A. may be faced with problems which may be even greater—for, as I pointed out, it was after the armistice of 1918, that the greatest price increases occurred after World War No. 1. For this reason we must hold the price line firmly not only until VE-day, but for sometime thereafter.

Many of us feel that the greatest inflationary threat will come from 4 to 7 months after the Germans finally give in. It will be then that the first consumer durable products come into the market in quantities far below the effective demand. It will be then that our workers will regain their confidence with jobs in peacetime industries. It will be then that our savings will come out of our banks and War bonds. It will be then that the terrible threat of an inventory boom will be most potent. In this period we shall all be called upon for our greatest efforts—if inflation is to be finally licked.

But there will come a time when supplies again begin to approximate demand. At that time price controls will be eliminated first from one field and then from another. I can assure you we are only too anxious for that day to come.

In the intervening months our task will be great. Without the vigorous support of farm groups, labor groups, our Congress, and the people in general, we in the O. P. A. cannot hope to accomplish our task. Without such support we will be swiftly swept aside and the flood gates of inflation will open.

In the struggle to maintain a stable price level our whole economic future may be at stake. If rents should start up, if food, clothing, and raw material prices should start up, the rise would gain in speed and soon be beyond our powers of control.

We would again face economic disaster and collapse—collapse from which our economy could recover only with great difficulty and after widespread suffering.

When the war is won our hearts are set on a new and vastly more prosperous America, with plenty of jobs at good wages, with good income for our farmers, with reasonable profits for our businessmen.

The world we live in, when the peace finally comes, will be an unsettled world—potentially a revolutionary world. If we in America are to know full security, full prosperity, and full opportunity, we must make our economic system work effectively and efficiently in the interest of all of us.

We must fully employ all our resources and all our manpower to raise our standards of living to provide good jobs, a good education, decent medical care, vastly improved housing, and a generally higher standard of living for every family in the land. If we fail to meet this test, our system will have failed. We will have failed and America will have failed. The price-control program, for which we in the O. P. A. are responsible, is a basic part of this fight for a finer, more prosperous, and more democratic America.

We will need your help, your understanding, and your support if we are to succeed in meeting our responsibilities in the difficult months that lie ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order which the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] secured for January 16 be transferred to January 18.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include therein certain excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said, and always truly, that our forefathers came to this new world seeking God, not gold. This Nation of ours is unique in that respect. So it is only natural that we should have put the eagle on our currency, both of coin and paper, referring to God's message to His first chosen people:

> Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people.

Nor is it strange that the great seal of the United States should give ascendancy to the all-seeing eye, surrounded by a halo.

Nor is it surprising that the pillars of cloud and of fire should appear on our currency, and our coins carry the motto: "In God we trust."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Can the gentleman tell the Members when that emblem first appeared on any paper currency?

Mr. HOBBS. My impression is that it was after the report of that committee, which was composed, I think, of Franklin, Adams, and Jefferson. But I do not know when. I am sure the distinguished gentleman who knows so much more than I about such matters will recall.

Mr. WHITE. Were there any one dollar bills printed at that time, prior to the Civil War?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not know, sir. I confess my ignorance and there is no need of an examination to prove it.

Mr. WHITE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am seeking information and not trying to display anybody's ignorance.

Mr. HOBBS. I recognize the distinguished gentleman is one of the eminent authorities on coinage and matters relating to money while I, an ignorant boy, know nothing about the subject.

Mr. WHITE. I confess to the gentleman that I do not know, and I am seeking information.

Mr. HOBBS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not know. I regret that I can be of no assistance in that regard. My point is that he is blind who cannot see in the history of our Nation, the leading of the pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night and the hand of Almighty God as our infant Nation was brought to birth, then from babyhood through childhood, and the era when, under Him, the great Lincoln preserved the Union, and that same leadership has been manifest ever since. The challenge of the hour is that we fail it not. God will use us to work His will if we will let Him. The hour has struck when America at home should come to her knees in prayer, as a united Nation, in order that we may give thanks to Him, for His leadership, praying its continuance, and dedicating ourselves to follow that leadership in the world today and in the world tomorrow. All the churches are urging this. Many organizations have joined in the plea. The National Committee for Christian Leadership and the Breakfast Club groups and their associates have outlined the beginning of the prayer program.

The purpose of the announcement I am trying to make today is to call the attention of the Congress officially to the program for Washington, which will expand over the Nation, we are confident, that on the day after inauguration, January 21, a day of prayer be observed throughout the Nation in all the churches at their regular 11 o'clock services, a season of special prayer for the Government, and its civil and martial servants at home and abroad. For 400 years the great Roman Catholic Church has observed annually the red Mass, and offered special prayer for good government. There never has been a time when such prayer was needed more.

On the 22d there is to be a luncheon, and the theme of that luncheon is uniting to serve. Then on that night, the 22d, there will be a dedicatory dinner for Government officials and representatives of all the people, with the President of the United States, his Cabinet, the Supreme Court, the Members of Congress of both Houses, and the leaders in our departmental life in the Nation uniting for reconsecration and for dedication to the cause which is led by God.

Then on January 23 there is to be a joint meeting of breakfast groups, a luncheon for youth, and a great mass meeting, free and open to all, in the Departmental Auditorium, on the north side of Constitution Avenue between Twelfth and Fourteenth Streets, where all those who will, may dedicate themselves in line with the thought of this program. Outstanding leaders will preside and speak at these meetings.

We Members of Congress are invited and urged to do our utmost to help assure the success of this great undertaking. Especially are we urged to be present in our respective churches on Sunday morning, January 21, at the dedicatory dinner, the evening of the 22d, and at the mass meeting, the evening of the 23d.

Can we not dedicate ourselves anew, as we so often have in our private devotions, and join in concerted prayer for those who fight for God and for His peace, at home and abroad, and that He may give His world the solutions of the problems that press as never before?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CANCELATION OF RATION STAMPS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement and extracts from statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to have the opportunity of following the distinguished gentleman from Alabama because he touched on a moral issue which I think has an important relationship to the subject discussed by my colleague the gentleman from Texas, and also by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who addressed the House yesterday on the subject of the cancelation of ration stamps during the holidays. I thought after Mr. Bowles admitted he blundered in canceling the ration stamps the matter would be dropped. I note, however, that my colleagues from the majority have taken up the cudgels to justify the cancelation of ration stamps by Mr. Bowles, and therefore I feel constrained to make these remarks. Both the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] have seen fit to call attention to a statement made by me on December 28, in which I charged that thrifty American housewives were being swindled and cheated when Mr. Bowles ordered the cancelation of sugar stamps and red and blue ration stamps. I have not changed my opinion as to the accuracy of the sentiment expressed by me.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] stated that the founders of our country ordered the inscription "in God we trust" to be placed on all silver and gold coins. I want to add that in addition to trusting in God the American people have also had trust and confidence in their Government. They have had trust and confidence in our Government's sacred obligation to keep our money good indefinitely and to honor and pay its bonds and other obligations. That is the kind of trust and confidence everyone must have in our Government, and no unwise or blundering act by any policy-making official must be permitted or tolerated that will shake the people's confidence in their Government. This is especially true at the present time, with our country engaged in a terrible war, and the need for complete unity being greater than ever before.

I regard, and Mr. Bowles agrees with me, that for food and other commodities under the rationing system, ration stamps are a medium of legal tender. Without the necessary stamps, even though you possess all of the money in the world, unless you go into the black market, you cannot buy rationed food. And Mr. Bowles stated last year when about 85 percent of the food was taken off the ration list, and the number of red stamps were reduced from 60 points to 30 points a month, that the stamps would be good indefinitely. When Mr. Bowles announced that the ration stamps would be good indefinitely, the people had confidence in him as the policy-making official of our Government. He spoke for their Government, and they did not believe that any responsible official would engage in double talk. The people had a right to rely on the promise made by Mr. Bowles, and they trustingly believed him when he said their ration stamps would be good indefinitely.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield now.

Mr. PATMAN. May I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact with reference to the matter of money that there are billions of dollars of paper money out now, on the face of which there is a statement "Payable on demand in gold." Well, the war came on and we cannot pay in gold, but nobody is losing confidence in the Government because we have these outstanding certificates which say, "Payable in gold" when we do not pay them in gold.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the Congress passed legislation that eliminated the necessity for paying them off in gold.

Mr. PATMAN. But we still have the promise there just as in this case. We have the promise.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that much of it could be paid in gold, for we did have close to $23,000,000,000 worth of gold which has been reduced to $20,500,000,000, and I am wondering where that $2,000,000,000 worth of gold has gone to. I do not want to go into that question. I would rather not discuss that now, because I am trying to find out what happened to the $2,000,000,000 worth of gold which we did have.

I am sorry to see politics injected into this discussion of the canceling of ration points. I think the gentleman from Texas and also the gentleman from California who spoke yesterday were trying to becloud the issues involved in the cancelation of ration stamps.

The gentleman from Texas diverted his discussion to a justification for the cancelation of ration stamps. In my opinion, the issue is one of integrity of a policy-making official, who speaks for our Government.

The question of food is not the primary issue, although with thousands of thrifty American housewives the matter of food was very essential. When Mr. Bowles canceled the unused ration stamps at Christmas, he forgot that a large majority of American housewives had skimped and saved on food so that there might be more for their loved ones in the battle lines, and also a few ration stamps left over for any emergency in

their family. They thought that when Mr. Bowles said the stamps were good indefinitely, they could rely on his promise.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I should like to add that the correspondence I have had with the women of my district and other sections of the country on the subject would indicate that they suffered no loss of food but resented the breach of faith.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And I believe that is the important question involved in this cancelation, a breach of faith on the part of an official representing the United States Government on a promise that he had made to the American people.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. It was an express promise. When the Government asked the people to yield to rationing, the people did so graciously and gracefully. When the Government did that and said they would reduce their food stocks by a certain rationing program, that they would give the people stamps, the Government impliedly agreed that those stamps not only would be good as to length of time but that there would always be something there at the stores for them to get with the stamps. The people gave up about 50 percent of their supplies in many cases. When they did that the Government implied that there would be more food and sufficient food when they went to get it with their limited stamps.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution to my remarks.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has informed us today that Mr. Bowles assumes full and exclusive responsibility for the cancelation of ration stamps. If that be the case, as I am inclined to believe, I want here and now to retract any statement made by me to the effect that Judge Fred Vinson, whom I regard as a very honorable and trustworthy public official, had anything to do with ordering the cancelation or repudiation of the unused ration stamps. I have served in this House with Judge Vinson and I know him to be a man of the highest character and integrity. I have read his order to Mr. Bowles, which led to the cancelation of ration stamps, and on the strength of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas, that Mr. Bowles assumes full responsibility, I am pleased that Judge Vinson did not direct the methods to be used by the O. P. A. under the scheme announced by Mr. Bowles.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Since a conspiracy necessarily involves two people and the two people charged were Mr. Vinson and Mr. Bowles, and since the gentleman has exonerated Mr. Vinson he necessarily must exonerate Mr. Bowles.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Texas himself in his own remarks said that Mr. Bowles took all blame for it, and I assume that he talks for Mr. Bowles.

Mr. PATMAN. I said I would not pass it over to anybody else, I would just speak for Mr. Bowles.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So Mr. Bowles assumes it. But in a letter to me he said it was unfortunate, it was——

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken; he said it was unfortunate they did not anticipate these things.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; they could not anticipate them; that is true. But I recall that on this floor on May 5 I made a speech. It will be recalled that about May 3, 85 percent of the meat that was under rationing was put on the free list. A few days thereafter I made a speech in which I predicted that there would be many other things taken off rationing, including canned goods; and later in the summer approximately 85 percent of all rationed foods were put on the free list.

That was not done by Mr. Bowles. He said on May 8:

> I do not think we can look forward to any broad slackening of our canned-goods rationing program during the next 12 months.

I am quoting from an article that appeared in Collier's magazine for May 8, written by Mr. Bowles in which he said there would not be much relief in rationing until 1945, or until after the war in Europe is over.

At that time I asked the question, Who ordered Mr. Bowles to put 85 percent of the food on the free list? and to this day I have not found out. I am wondering if it was the same person or the same group who recently ordered Mr. Bowles to cancel the rationing stamps.

I went further in my remarks on May 5. Of course, there was not anything political in my remarks. I did suggest, though, that 85 percent of our food was put on the free list because of the impending Presidential election. It was a matter of timing and purely coincidental that it took place a few months before the election was to take place.

I predicted in that speech:

> Personally, I am convinced that should the New Deal elect its fourth-term candidate on November 7, the O. P. A. will shortly thereafter reinstate and make more drastic all rationing policies to further regiment and socialize the economy of our country.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it is worthy of attention of the entire Nation that the gentleman's prophecy was so accurate.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; it was rather accurate, but the trouble is I did not prophesy enough. I could not foresee that they were going to cancel the rationing stamps that Mr. Bowles said would be good indefinitely. I just could not look that far into the future. At the best, who could predict that an official would break his word with the people? In my opinion, this matter of cancelation of rationing stamps was something that came up just around Christmas time as a sort of extra present to the American people.

Speaking about food shortages, the farmers of this country have produced the largest food crop in the history of our country, so that the supply of grain, meat, poultry, milk, and so forth, is abundant. We are committed, and gladly committed, to take care of our troops and of our allies, as well as to help those people in destitute countries that need our assistance so far as food is concerned. We want to meet those commitments. The commitments, of course, to our soldiers come first, whether we have any food at all.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Does not the gentleman feel that we are rather fortunate in this Nation to have had such a wonderful agricultural program directed in the beginning by that great Secretary of Agriculture, HENRY A. WALLACE?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I cannot comment too favorably on that. I recollect Mr. WALLACE was the one who began the scarcity-of-production program. Last year, 1944, was the first year when the restrictions were taken off of all production and the farmers were permitted to go ahead and produce everything they could for the American people.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Personally, I cannot give credit for any great wisdom so far as the powers that be are concerned, especially the O. P. A., that sets a price on butter at such a low point that myself and millions of other farmers are unable to feed their cows in order to produce the butter that everybody today is crying for.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman brought up the question of butter because a good many people are wondering why they are not able to get butter. I want to tell them the reason, because it is important. You know we produce a lot of butter in Minnesota, but we are not going to produce as much butter this year as we did before. A governmental agency, the O. P. A.—Mr. Bowles, if you please—has fixed the price of cream that goes into butter at 7 cents a pound lower than the cream that goes into fluid milk, not used for butter. As a consequence, the refusal to equalize the price has caused the dairy farmers of this country to sell their fluid milk, and we are going to have a decided decrease in the production of butter, and the people of the country will not get it. The decrease in butter production is definitely due to an O. P. A. policy, and the people should know it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if in the production of food any consideration should be given to the possibility of a crop failure. We have been blessed in this country with ideal growing conditions for the production of food. Is that not true?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true.

Mr. O'HARA. If we keep on with the farm-help draft situation, and the farm manpower situation, and the taking of our farm help, what is going to happen to the production of food?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. Speaking of dairying in particular, there are 28,000,000 dairy cows in the United States. Of course, they do not milk themselves. It is no glamour to milk a cow twice a day, and certainly it is no adventure after the first time. It takes skilled labor to milk those cows. It takes labor to feed them. It takes labor to raise them. Here we have a new directive from the Administration which proposes to take a very substantial share of the essential labor now engaged in the dairy and other farms of the country. May I say to my colleague from Minnesota and other Members of the House that as the result of the new directive putting the essential farm workers into the military service we will find a decided decrease in the production of dairy and other food products. We will also find that thousands of farmers throughout the United States will be forced to decrease their production and, yes, I will say, there will be thousands of them who will sell their herds and quit farming because of inability to get labor.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it would be interesting if the gentleman would ascertain from the gentleman from Michigan whether or not the program which has been put into effect by O. P. A. and the War Food Administration to force reduced rates on livestock comes from that great scarcity program put in by that former Secretary of Agriculture, WALLACE. Is that a hang-over from the old days?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It must be a hang-over from the old days.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Just as the gentleman and I and every other American give credit to the fine, patriotic laboring men of this Nation for the wonderful production that we have had in producing munitions and everything else to wage a successful war, so do we, you and I and every other American, give the farmers, the men who till the soil, credit for the production on the farm. We do not give Sidney Hillman, or Earl Browder, or Harry Bridges or anybody else who tries to speak for labor credit for the fine production records that the laboring men have made, nor do we give any other political seat warmer credit for the fine production the farmers have made. Does the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I think that will answer the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan, whom I respect, but nevertheless he is like a lot of the other gentlemen on that side. They go off on a tantrum and they forget fundamentals. They are idealists instead of realists, and if there was ever a time when we should get down to realism it is today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, I might say I would be happy to speak for myself. I am only too happy to get advice from the other side of the aisle but I do not like them speaking for me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope the gentleman can speak in his own time one of these days. But I have stated repeatedly when we have had discussions with reference to the O. P. A., I think most Americans favor price control and are against inflation and want reasonable and businesslike measures passed here as well as a businesslike administration of the laws according to the intent of the Congress. But as a matter of fact the O. P. A. cannot operate unless there is a scarcity. They must have a scarcity in order to have rationing, and therefore it appears to me that they purposely seek to create scarcities. May I illustrate?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The O. P. A. does not ration. The W. P. B. does the rationing; I mean, they order it. The O. P. A. only administers it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to have that contribution.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. What the gentleman says is correct. The power comes from the W. P. B., but the power by Executive order was delegated to the O. P. A., and the O. P. A. does the job. W. P. B. does not have a thing to do with it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman. Here is the way they tell us it should operate with reference to food supplies. It is said that the War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, is supposed to tell the O. P. A. how much food they are to ration among the people. In this instance when they came to canceling the ration stamps, I am satisfied that the O. P. A. bypassed the W. F. A. in reaching its decision.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to continue, following out the statement I made that O. P. A. must have a scarcity in order to operate, that we have a shortage of pork at the present time, a decided shortage. What is the reason for it? In 1942 we also had a shortage of pork. The farmers of this country raised 105,000,000 pigs in 1942, but there was a shortage of the supplies we needed and the price went up and we had to have strict rationing of pork. So in the fall of 1942 the War Food Administration urged farmers to increase their hog production by 20 percent. The farmers did. They raised their hog production in 1943 from 105,000,000 head to 127,000,000 head, and we had an abundance; in fact, we had so much pork and so many hogs that the market was glutted. They took off the rationing, and the people got all of the pork they needed, and we had enough for our allies and for the armed forces. The O. P. A. could not function with an abundance, so someone conceived the idea that the farmers should cut their production of hogs for 1944 by 20 percent, and the way they forced it down was to pull the support price out from under certain weight hogs, and the farmers did not raise as many hogs in 1944. They reduced their production not by 20 percent but by 34 percent, because the Government failed to keep its promise in supporting the price.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So we have a scarcity this year. It is my hope that we can have a consistent program that will assure an abundance of production of all kinds of foods in 1945, which are so necessary to carry on this war. If they would let the War Food Administrator handle production and rationing and the prices of farm products as a single administrator, we would not have the difficulties we are up against today and there would not have been any cancelation of ration stamps.

In conclusion, may I point out that the question of food in connection with this cancelation of stamps is not the important item with me, it is the word of my Government. A competent policy-making official who is in charge said that these ration stamps would be good indefinitely. Indefinitely, bear in mind. The thrifty American housewives had a right to rely on the word from a policy-making Government official. He represented the Government, and his word should have been as good as a Government bond. We must have complete honesty on the part of administration officials placed in charge of our Government, both before and after election. Breaking of promises made to the people can only lead to loss of confidence, and again I say our Government, which needs full confidence from all of the people, must have it now if we are to win this war and retain our American form of government.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman read the news report from New York which stated that Mr. Bowles at a meeting in that city had said he had made a mistake in issuing the rationing order and canceling these stamps.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That was mentioned here today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That he had misjudged the number of people affected, in other words, taking the position that the error was not in canceling the stamps but in simply misjudging the number of people affected, that if there had been a smaller minority affected it would not have been a mistake.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that is correct, as far as I am able to determine, although it is denied here today that he had any such intent in mind.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And that it is all right to invade the rights of a minority, as long as the minority is small enough.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of the House to read the following news item which appeared in this week's issue of Labor, in which it should be noted that Mr. Bowles frankly confessed that he blundered when he canceled the unused ration stamps during the Christmas festivities in 1944:

O. P. A. CHIEF BOWLES SAYS HE BLUNDERED

Frank confession was made this week by O. P. A. Administrator Chester Bowles that he blundered in canceling unused sugar and red and blue point ration stamps.

The order which dropped like a bombshell during Christmas festivities, was the result of mistaken conclusions drawn from a preliminary survey of housewives, Bowles said.

However, he added that it is too late to rectify the mistake, contending that would work a hardship on a majority of the people.

Bowles made his admission in a speech at New York after the cancelation had been bitterly criticized in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STATEMENT OF POLICY BY UNITED STATES CONGRESS APPROVING ATLANTIC CHARTER

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1943, during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I introduced a resolution to place the Congress of the United States on record as approving the now famous Atlantic Charter. Last Tuesday, January 9, I reintroduced this measure which is now House Concurrent Resolution 16 and reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President accurately stated the principles in the national policy of the United States in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, which principles are applicable on a world-wide basis and are as follows:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned;

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth. They will endeavor with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great and small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

Sixth. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance; and

Eighth. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

This resolution has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I hope the committee will soon hold hearings on the measure and report it favorably so that the representatives of the people will have an opportunity to express themselves in respect to this most significant document.

Throughout the country there is a deep and growing interest concerning the Atlantic Charter. When it was announced to the world, liberty-loving nations all over the globe were infused with new hope. The charter is a statement of ends to be sought, of objectives we are trying to realize, of ideals which we hope to reach. Every conceivable step to make these ideals possible of achievement should immediately be taken.

I feel that congressional endorsement of the Atlantic Charter would be most helpful. An official expression of the Congress on these principles would strengthen our position in world affairs. It would add the moral support of the legislative branch of the Government to the position already taken by the executive department. The Congress should take an increasingly active part in developing a foreign policy to guide the Republic in this period of universal upheaval.

Congressional approval of the Atlantic Charter would show the people that their chosen representatives believe in the principles contained therein; it would, in my opinion, increase the power of our voice in international affairs; it would be an excellent move in helping to shape an enlightened foreign policy and it would be an announcement to all the world that this, the greatest legislature on earth, has wholeheartedly given its sanction to the charter which has generated so much hope among the peoples of this earth.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to say I think the tenor of the gentleman's speech is 100 percent correct. I think he has made a great contribution by putting in this resolution and I for one will be glad to support it.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to compliment my colleague. I think if we are going to have peace we have to have a moral foundation for that peace and we can find it in no other place than in some declaration of principles. I commend the gentleman for reintroducing this measure.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for his kind statement.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Does the gentleman feel that if his resolution is adopted by the Congress it will assure a correct observance of the principles of the Atlantic Charter by our executive authorities?

Mr. MERROW. I believe it will help greatly.

Mr. HALE. Is the gentleman disturbed by what is happening to the Atlantic Charter today?

Mr. MERROW. I am much disturbed; and I hope this subject may be debated in both this House and the other body and that we may have congressional expression concerning the principles set forth in this declaration.

Mr. HALE. Does not the gentleman feel that much more could be done by this Government than is being done to procure observance of the principles of the Charter?

Mr. MERROW. I do.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. In referring to the Atlantic Charter as something in existence, I take it the gentleman has reference to the Presidential message to the Congress presented on August 21, 1941, in which was included the purported document which purported to be signed by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt. Is that the Atlantic Charter to which the gentleman refers or the one the President referred to in the recent press conference?

Mr. MERROW. The Atlantic Charter that is contained in Document 358, to which the gentleman has referred, is the one I have in mind. This was contained in a message sent by the President to the

Congress and was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was signed by the President and signed by Mr. Churchill as the gentleman has stated. That is the Atlantic Charter to which I have reference, and it is the charter which I read here this afternoon.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman has in mind that at the press conference indicated it was stated that there was no document as such signed by the representatives of the different countries, Did the gentleman understand that from the press conference?

Mr. MERROW. That is what I inferred from the press conference. The fact is that the message which was sent up here by the President on August 21, 1941, contains the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. FELLOWS. And shows that it was signed?

Mr. MERROW. And shows that it was signed; yes. The word "Signed" is here in front of the President's name and in front of Mr. Churchill's name.

Mr. HALE. Is it not a fact that in January 1942 following the signature of the Charter in August it was agreed to and formed the basis of a treaty by the several United Nations?

Mr. MERROW. It was not a treaty, but it was incorporated in the declaration that the United Nations signed. As yet no legislative body has placed its approval on the Atlantic Charter. I feel therefore it would be most helpful if the Congress would debate this matter and place its stamp of approval upon the Atlantic Charter. I believe that would be a step in helping develop our foreign policy.

Mr. HORAN. In other words the gentleman would have the House ratify it, in a manner of speaking.

Mr. MERROW. I mean that the House should approve it, that the House by adopting my resolution should say that it is the sense of the House that the President accurately stated the principles in the national policy of the United States in the Atlantic Charter. It cannot be ratified in the sense that the Senate ratifies treaties unless it is presented as a treaty; but if we go on record as approving the principles we certainly will give the Atlantic Charter great moral support.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point House Document 353:

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING A PUBLIC STATEMENT MADE BY BOTH PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES WITH REGARD TO THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES NECESSARY UNDER THE CODE OF THE TWO COUNTRIES

To the Congress of the United States:

Over a week ago I held several important conferences at sea with the British Prime Minister. Because of the factor of safety to British, Canadian, and American ships, and their personnel, no prior announcement of these meetings could properly be made.

At the close, a public statement by the Prime Minister and the President was made, I quote it for the information of the Congress and for the record:

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

"They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high-ranking officers of their military, naval, and air services.

"The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lease-Lend Act, for the armed forces of the United States, and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression, has been further examined.

"Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

"The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

"They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

"Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

"Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

"Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

"Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

"Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

"Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

"(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
"(Signed) WINSTON S. CHURCHILL."

The Congress and the President having heretofore determined, through the Lend-Lease Act, on the national policy of American aid to the democracies which east and west are waging war against dictatorships, the military and naval conversations at these meetings made clear gains in furthering the effectiveness of this aid.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister and I are arranging for conferences with the Soviet Union to aid it in its defense against the attack made by the principal aggressor of the modern world—Germany.

Finally, the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal which is worth while for our type of civilization to seek. It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with nazi-ism; or to agree to a world peace which would give to nazi-ism domination over large numbers of conquered nations. Inevitably such a peace would be a gift to nazi-ism to take breath—armed breath—for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia, to the American Hemisphere itself.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government.

It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the declaration of principles includes, of necessity, the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information. No society of the world organized under the announced principles could survive without these freedoms which are a part of the whole freedom for which we strive.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 21, 1941.*

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the question which was asked of me was answered by another Member I ask unanimous consent at this time to proceed for 5 minutes in order to give my own answer to a question that was directed to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, in 1932 and 1933 the agricultural structure of this Nation had reached its lowest level. Farmers were in bankruptcy, and low farm prices had destroyed the farmers' market. Then came the Democratic administration—the New Deal if you please. The agricultural program was headed by the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, as Secretary of Agriculture. During his administration the foundation was laid and a program was built to the point that today the farmer enjoys the highest prices in the history of this Nation and the production of food and fiber has been the highest in history.

This was followed up ably by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard.

It brought the farmer to the point where he actually enjoys the fruits of his labor. The great soil-conservation program, among other things in the agricultural program, was enacted. The A. A. A. has really done a good job. Then came the war, and, thank God, we had that program. Thank God, the farmers

were, with the help of the Department of Agriculture, in a position where they could grow two blades of grass where one grew before and the greatest production of food and fiber resulted. We are now in a position to meet the demands that are made upon us on account of the war.

I am just wondering when we are going to get a Price Administrator who will not be criticized. The O. P. A. has not always done a perfect job, but it, together with the War Food Administration, by virtue of and in cooperation with labor, agriculture, and government, has furnished to our armed forces the food and fiber which is needed. What position would we have been in if we had to meet that crisis with agriculture in the condition it was in during 1932? Again I say, thank God for the program that was given the American people by the Democratic Party with, yes, the help of some fine Republicans on the Agricultural Committee which I had the honor to serve on for 8 years. They cooperated with us and we with them. With the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture and the assistance of the Department of Agriculture the program was perfected and put in working order.

Much has been said about rationing stamps. I do not believe that I know and I do not believe that any Member of this House will attempt to take the floor here and say that any person in this Nation has gone hungry. That is the test of whether the program is successful or not and as long as they keep the food and fiber going to our armed forces and to the men who are valiantly toiling on our farms, in our factories, mills, and mines, we will go on to victory. That program has not broken down yet, and, thank God with good administration it will not break down. It will be the one vehicle upon which we will ride on to victory along with our armed forces.

Oh, they try consistently to read into the minds of the American people the fact that any man who stands up and fights for the cause of humanity, for the cause of labor, is supposed to be a subversive individual. I thank God for the labor leaders of this Nation and the great job that the labor organizations have done in order to bring the help that is necessary in getting the guns and supplies to the boys across the seas. All real Americans praise the labor leaders and especially the C. I. O. for the outstanding work they have performed. Organized labor is doing its job and doing it well. I say to those who criticize and try to distort the facts that America needs the help of our great labor leaders. Do not criticize in this time of crisis because if you do you are hurting and hindering the war effort. No American should smear for political reasons. Your duty to America is to cooperate in the interest of humanity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks previously made on the Atlantic Charter, I ask unanimous consent to include House Document No. 358, a statement by the Prime Minister of England and the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUFFETT, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HEDRICK (at the request of Mr. BAILEY), for 1 legislative day, January 15, 1945, on account of official business.

To Mr. BAILEY (at the request of Mr. HEDRICK), for 3 legislative days, beginning January 15 and including January 18, 1945, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

103. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of James M. Hiler; to the Committee on Claims.

104. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

105. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the thirtieth annual report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 1394. A bill for the relief of William H. W. Komp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY:

H. R. 1395. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary Alice Borden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1396. A bill for the relief of Anne Loacker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 1397. A bill to provide for awarding an appropriate medal and citation to Harvard Merrill Hodgins, of Hancock Point, Maine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1398. A bill granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Swope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 1399. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Palmisano and the legal guardian of Anthony Palmisano, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Louis T. Klauder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 1401. A bill for the relief of Frank Franklin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1402. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1403. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 1404. A bill for the relief of B. H. Matthies; to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1362. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Acts, he Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 1363. A bill for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1364. A bill to encourage full private employment during the post-war period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1365. A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1366. A bill for the relief of officers of the Army who were members of the first two classes at Civil Affairs Training School, University of Chicago; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1367. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a Military Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1368. A bill to reduce immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1369. A bill providing for the designation of certain Mondays during the present war as Memory Monday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 1370. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1371. A bill providing for an additional Naval Academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1372. A bill providing for an additional Military Academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1373. A bill to provide for the construction of a marine hospital in or near Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 1374. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Jefferson County, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 1375. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1376 (by request). A bill providing compensation for time required in training services; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1377 (by request). A bill providing uniforms for Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1378 (by request). A bill defraying traveling expenses of transferred employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1379. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1380. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 1381. A bill referring the claims of the Turtle Mountain Band or Bands of Chippewa Indians of North Dakota to the Court of Claims for adjudication and settlement; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1382. A bill authorizing payment to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians for certain lands ceded by them to the United States by a treaty of July 23, 1851; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1383. A bill providing that certain real property, together with improvements thereon acquired for military purposes or for national parks or monuments, shall not be exempt from taxation by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1384. A bill to establish an additional United States military academy at Muskogee, in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 1385. A bill concerning seeing-eye dogs on trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1386. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 1387. A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before the courts, departments, and offices of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1388. A bill relating to the posthumous award of the decoration of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1389. A bill providing for the transfer of a certain fish hatchery in Comanche County, Okla., to the city of Lawton, Okla.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1390. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co., a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1391. A bill to establish a Department of National Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1392. A bill for the purpose of renewing and increasing forage and improving watershed conditions on range lands, forests or Indian lands, or other public owned and controlled land of the United States; authorizing the sowing operations by airplane, machinery, or other means, for conducting experiments to improve methods of reseeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of the morning, who spreadest the mantle of light about us while other lands are shrouded in shadow, yet who dost brood with watchful love in both darkness and light, grant us a vivid sense of Thy presence as here we face the tangled tragedy of this sorely wounded world. As dawn has grown into fullness of noontide, so let Thy light banish all shadows of doubt and guilt from our own hearts that we may find and follow Thy purpose throughout this day. We beseech Thee help us to use its precious hours in such manner that Thou canst hallow it with Thy blessing and glorify it with Thy presence.

May we be strong to do the things worth doing and put aside the things which are unworthy, belittling, or base. Keep our expectant eyes on the unending future toward which we strive. Give us the radiant joy which is the constant reward of those who are workers together with Thee for a redeemed earth to which Thy kingdom at last shall come. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

ALBERT W. HAWKES, a Senator from the State of New Jersey; JAMES M. MEAD, a Senator from the State of New York; E. H. MOORE, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma; and W. LEE O'DANIEL, a Senator from the State of Texas, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 11, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR TRUMAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate copy of a letter of resignation from Mr. TRUMAN addressed to the Governor of Missouri, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1945.

Hon. PHIL M. DONNELLY,
Governor, State of Missouri,
Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Due to the fact I am to be sworn in as Vice President of the United States on January 20, I am tendering my resignation as United States Senator from Missouri, effective January 18.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
United States Senator.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETING WITH GENERAL MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL KING

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am glad to announce to the Members of the Senate that they, together with Members of the House of Representatives, will soon be invited by the Secretaries of War and Navy to attend an off-the-record discussion on the present war situation, which will be presented by General Marshall on behalf of the War Department and the Army, and Admiral King on behalf of the Navy Department and the Navy.

For reasons of security, the information which will be given to the Members of Congress at this meeting will be highly confidential. The place of the meeting cannot yet be disclosed. However, it will be held on the morning of Wednesday, January 24, at a place which will be convenient to all of us to attend. I understand that each Member of the Senate is to receive a formal invitation, which will contain complete details.

I have been asked to emphasize that only Members of Congress will be permitted to attend. Members of their staffs, or friends, or individuals acting on behalf of the Members, will not be admitted.

I understand that General Marshall and Admiral King will give us information on the war which cannot be released publicly for security reasons. I strongly recommend that all of us attend who possibly can, because such information directly from General Marshall and Admiral King, who have such a profound knowledge of present and pending military and naval operations, should give us all a much better understanding of the enormously important developments taking place today.

Again I must emphasize that the information presented at this meeting will be confidential, and that only Members of Congress will be permitted to attend. The date, I again state, will be the morning of the 24th of January. The exact time of the meeting will be stated in the invitation which we will all receive, and I hope that all the Members of the Senate who possibly can do so will attend.

Many of us will remember a former occasion when General Marshall and Admiral King gave to Members of the Senate on one day, and on another, I think, to Members of the House, a confidential description of the situation up to that time. I am sure we will all be very much interested in and instructed by this confidential recital on their part of the present military and naval situation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters and report, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Food and Drug Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

VISIT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, stating that, pursuant to law, Thursday, June 7, and Friday, June 8, have been fixed as the dates for the 1945 visit of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirtieth annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the company for the year 1944 (the month of December being estimated) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the calendar year 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CEILING PRICES FOR LIVE CATTLE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on New Year's Day about a dozen Senators in association with about 35 cattle producers and cattle feeders from the section of the country extending from the eastern seacoast to the Rocky Mountains, gathered in the office of Judge Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, to discuss the question of ceiling prices for live cattle. Many of the cattle producers in my section of the country do not approve the action which has been taken by the Director, and I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and to have appropriately referred a resolution and statement of the South Dakota Stock Growers' Association.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Rapid City, S. Dak., January 9, 1945.

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HON. BUSHFIELD: The executive board of the South Dakota Stock Growers' Association, in session at Rapid City, S. Dak., on January 8, 1945, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the W. F. A. has requested that the livestock producer and agriculturalist produce more food for the war effort, liberated countries, and home consumption in the year 1945; and

"Whereas the many Federal directives in the past, as well as the present, causes much discouragement to producers of food: Then be it

"*Resolved*, That the South Dakota Stock Growers Association are unalterably opposed to the enactment by law or directive, any ceiling on live cattle. Instead issue a directive that would be for encouragement to all food producers to produce more food for all this coming year."

The livestock producers as well as the livestock feeders of South Dakota have prepared themselves during this last market season to go all-out for greater meat production for this coming year. Therefore, we feel that they should not be thrown off balance by any new proposals which would hinder them in meeting this goal.

Sincerely yours,
RAY KALKBRENNER, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 72. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ruiz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1);

S. 76. A bill for the relief of John T. Cooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 2);

S. 77. A bill for the relief of Lindon A. Long; with amendments (Rept. No. 3);

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 4);

S. 177. A bill for the relief of Oscar Griggs; with amendments (Rept. No. 5);

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Galen E. Walter; without amendment (Rept. No. 6).

Mr. McCARRAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report back favorably Senate Resolution 16 and Senate Resolution 17, and ask unanimous consent that the committee may later file written reports on the resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 16. Resolution continuing the authority for a study into the legal and constitutional authority for the issuance of Executive orders of the President and of departmental regulations, and increasing the limit of expenditures; without amendment (Rept. No. 7) and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; and

S. Res. 17. Resolution continuing the authority for an investigation of the alcoholic-beverage industry and increasing the limit of expenditures; with an amendment (Rept. No. 8) and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. Res. 18. Resolution continuing the authority for an investigation of the use of public lands, and increasing the limit of expenditures; with an amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate and Commerce:

S. Res. 24. Resolution continuing the authority for an investigation of international communications by wire and radio; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Brazil;

Robert L. Buell, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

Walworth Barbour, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

J. Haden Alldredge, of Alabama, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1951 (reappointment);

Charles D. Mahaffie, of the District of Columbia, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1951 (reappointment); and

Paul A. Porter, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1942, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Reed Sharp, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee. (Mr. Sharp is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 12, 1944); and

Miles N. Pike, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada, to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa, to be a member of the Surplus Property Board for a term of 2 years from October 3, 1944.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 290. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co., a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER) introduced Senate bill 291, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 292. A bill to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. WHEELER):

S. 293. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Acts, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code; and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 294 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 295. A bill to provide for certain payments to States and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 296. A bill to safeguard the activities of the Office of Censorship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zenobia Mershon; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 298. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; and

S. 299. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1000–1029), by making it possible for war veterans to obtain loans and insured mortgages, by reserving lands for sale to war veterans, and to other persons eligible under this act as amended, by providing for insurance of farm-tenant mortgages, by increasing the responsibilities of county committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 300. A bill to amend the judicial code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 301. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James E. McGhee; and

S. 302. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa N. Root; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 303. A bill granting a pension to Marie Watrous Meyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 304. A bill amending the Immigration Act of 1924 with respect to ineligibility to citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 305. A bill providing for the incorporation of the National Council of Negro Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 306. A bill granting a pension to Charles G. Hostutler; and

S. 307. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 308. A bill for the relief of John F. Thomas; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. SHIPSTEAD (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. AIKEN) introduced Senate bill 309, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 310. A bill to provide for the establishment of a bee-culture laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 311. A bill for the relief of Philip Kleinman; and

S. 312. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 313. A bill to reopen the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By MR. ELLENDER:

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir;

S. 315. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 316. A bill for the relief of June I. Gradijan;

S. 317. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 318. A bill for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.;

S. 319. A bill for the relief of Dane D. Morgan;

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Francis X. Servaites; and

S. 321. A bill for the relief of James M. Hiler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Clarence Atkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 323. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 324. A bill to provide for the promotion of officers on the retired list of the Army after specified years of service on active duty; and

S. 325. A bill to authorize the issuance of service medals to members of the American Expeditionary Force who participated in the occupation of Siberia in 1918–20; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 326. A bill to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. J. Res. 14. Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944—G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and ask that an explanatory statement of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Montana for himself and the senior Senator from New York will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 291) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

Mr. President: I have sent to the desk on behalf of myself and Mr. WAGNER, a bill amending the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly referred to as the G. I. bill of rights.

The amendment is designed to liberalize the unemployment insurance provisions in the G. I. bill of rights in the following five ways:

1. The G. I. bill of rights now provides that a serviceman receive $20 a week while unemployed. The amendment provides for increasing this amount by $5 for each dependent up to a total of $15 for three or more dependents.

2. Under the G. I. bill of rights a veteran must have had at least 9½ months' service before he is entitled to the full 52 weeks of full employment benefits provided in the act. The amendment eliminates the requirement and makes all servicemen who have served 90 days or more eligible for the full 52 weeks' benefits.

3. As the act now stands, partial weekly unemployment benefits paid to partially employed veterans are counted as full weekly benefits in figuring the maximum of 52 weeks of benefits. The amendment changes this and credits only the dollar amount actually paid out against the total amounts of benefits to which a serviceman would be entitled if he were totally unemployed.

4. The act now authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in case of successive disqualification to extend the period of disqualification of 4 weeks provided for in the law, up to 8 additional weeks. Under the law veterans may be disqualified for leaving suitable work voluntarily without good cause, for discharge for misconduct, or for failure to apply for or accept suitable work. In view of the fact that many veterans after long and hazardous military service will have a difficult time in readjusting to civilian jobs, it does not seem right to give such discretionary authority to the Administrator. The proposed amendment, therefore, eliminates this authority from the law.

5. The act now provides that the conditions and standards prescribed by the unemployment compensation law of the State in which the unemployed veteran files his claim, shall govern the determination of "suitable work" or the existence of "good cause." In view of the fact that unemployment insurance benefits are paid to veterans as a result of Federal military service, the conditions for the payment of benefits should be uniformly determined on a Federal—and not a State—basis, and should not be subject to 51 differing interpretations. The proposed amendment, therefore, provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall, in accordance with criteria set forth in the amendment, establish the conditions and standards relating to the suitability of work and the existence of good cause.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself, I introduce a bill and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 309) to establish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Government, introduced by Mr. SHIPSTEAD (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. AIKEN) was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Rural Electrification Administration, created by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, is hereby reestablished as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government and all its powers shall be exercised by the Administrator appointed pursuant to such act. None of the functions and activities transferred to the Department of Agriculture or to the Secretary of Agriculture by Reorganization Plan No. II transmitted by the President to Congress on May 9, 1939, shall be exercised by such Department or Secretary after the expiration of 30 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. (a) All records and property of the Rural Electrification Administration, and all records and property of the Department of Agriculture used primarily in the administration of any function of the Rural Elec-

trification Administration transferred by such reorganization plan, and all personnel so transferred (not heretofore retransferred or separated from the service under section 402 of such reorganization plan) and all personnel used primarily in the administration of such functions are transferred to the Rural Electrification Administration for use in the administration of its functions.

(b) So much of the unexpended balances of the appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for the use of the Rural Electrification Administration, or of the Department of Agriculture in the exercise of the functions of the Rural Electrification Administration transferred by such reorganization plan, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with the approval of the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Rural Electrification Administration, for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer: *Provided,* That the use of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds transferred by this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of section 4 (d) (3) and section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

SEC. 3. (a) All orders, rules, and regulations promulgated or issued by or in respect of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Department of Agriculture, or the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the functions vested therein by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, or by such reorganization plan, and in effect on the date of enactment of this act, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if this act had not been enacted, until modified, superseded, or repealed.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any of the officers or offices referred to in subsection (a) of this section in his or its official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his or its official duties, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this act, but the court or agency before which such suit, action, or proceeding is pending, may (on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the date of enactment of this act showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved) allow the same to be maintained by or against the Rural Electrification Administration.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective 30 days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, as an additional part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the report on a companion bill introduced at the last session of Congress, signed by members of the subcommittee which dealt with the matter, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT—INTERIM REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE ON HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTION 197, PROVIDING FOR THE INQUIRY INTO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Your subcommittee which was appointed to consider and report on the proposals made in Senate Resolution 197, to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Administration, has completed the preliminary phases of its inquiry and has elected to make this preliminary report.

The Rural Electrification Administration was originally created by an Executive order by the President, and, later, by enactment of law, was made a Federal agency under an administrator appointed by the President for a term of 10 years and confirmed by the Senate.

The provisions of law made the employees subject to civil service, and political activity by the Administrator and employees was prohibited by law. The Administrator was given full authority and responsibility only to the Congress. It was hoped at the time that the record of freedom from political activity and efficiency of management and operation of this agency would compare favorably with the record of T. V. A., which was also made an independent administrative agency not subjected to interference in its program and management.

So long as this policy of independence prevailed, the record of the R. E. A. was outstanding and fulfilled the highest expectations of the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States. All employees were directly responsible to the Administrator. The Administrator was responsible to the Congress.

Under the Reorganization Act of 1939, the R. E. A. was transferred to the Agriculture Department of the Federal Government. The order of transfer stated that the R. E. A. should be under the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. As a result, the various divisions of personnel were divorced from the R. E. A. organization and spread through the various personnel sections of the Department of Agriculture. The Administrator was deprived of authority to select his personnel. The legal department was transferred and became a part of the legal department of the Department of Agriculture. Centralization of authority and responsibility placed by the Congress in the person of the Administrator became dissipated among the various agencies of the Agriculture Department.

There is evidence that subordinates in the Department of Agriculture cooperated with subordinates in the R. E. A. and persons not employed by the Agricultural Department or the R. E. A. to undermine the authority placed by the Congress in the office and person of the Administrator.

The evidence also indicates that one source of disorganization and trouble was the almost constant effort of some of the employees and engineers of the R. E. A. to force upon the farm cooperatives a higher cost of conductors than was desired by some of the farm cooperatives. There was considerable evidence to indicate that the products of the Copperweld Steel Co. were favored over aluminum by some of the engineers having to do with the approval of contracts. The testimony in regard to this controversy was conflicting, but the committee is of the opinion that there was more than a legitimate and ethical connection between some of the engineers and other personnel employed by the R. E. A. in relation to the selection of conductors and other construction materials.

The testimony before the committee indicates that after the local co-ops had let contracts favoring aluminum as a lower cost conductor, pressure was brought to bear by employees of the R. E. A. to have the contracts canceled and new constracts made permitting the use of a higher cost conductor.

As these practices increased, more and more dissatisfaction, controversy, and intrigue became manifest, as the testimony before the committee will show. This resulted in confusion, a lowering of morale of the personnel as authority and responsibility of the Administrator was usurped by various heads and personnel of the Agriculture Department.

There can be no doubt that the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, appointed by the President and confirmed in that appointment by the United States Senate, is no longer the Administrator of the R. E. A. in fact.

There can be no doubt that there is dissension among those in highest authority in the administration of R. E. A.; that there is divided authority; and therefore credence can be given to the reports which came to the committee of growing discord and distrust and disorganization within the R. E. A.

The Rural Electrification Administration was established by Congress as an agency responsible directly to the Congress. During the early years of the Administration it was administered in accord with the spirit of the act and as an agency responsible to the Congress, or what is generally described as an independent agency. Throughout those years the Rural Electrification Administration gained the respect and the commendation of the Congress, as well as the people of the United States. It is fair to say that the Administration gained general approval and was singularly free from adverse criticism.

One of the most disrupting episodes causing further dissension and disorganization was the incorporation of certain private corporations for the operation of insurance companies and agencies to sell supplies and insurance to the R. E. A. cooperatives, their families, and others. The incorporators seem to have included some superintendents of local cooperatives.

Mr. Stoneman, now president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, testified he was one of them. An intensive campaign was started by the officers of this organization and various employees of the R. E. A. to induce the more than 800 local cooperatives to become members of this organization. In fact, the testimony indicates that before these corporations were formed, this scheme was originated by the Deputy Administrator, Mr. Robert B. Craig, who, under oath, testified that he was willing to accept the responsibility of parentage of this scheme.

There is some testimony in the record to indicate that the importance of such an organization for political purposes was estimated and appraised. But there is no testimony showing that the R. E. A. organization itself ever engaged in political activities.

This N. R. E. C. A. organization at first seemed to have the approval of the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administrator. However, after some time the true purpose of this organization became apparent.

It appears that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in order to start in the insurance business, had to have certain funds of the local cooperatives required by State law in various States where they intended to operate and conduct an insurance business. They proposed to obtain these funds by giving their notes to the cooperatives and so use the surplus funds of the cooperatives to start the insurance business.

When these facts came to the knowledge of the Administrator, Mr. Slattery, he wrote a letter of warning to the cooperatives, telling them to "stop, look, and listen." He also wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, to obtain a legal opinion as to the legality of the scheme permitting the local cooperatives to use their funds for such purpose, as of course their funds were under lien to the Government of the United States for loans.

That opinion of the Solicitor seems to have ended the scheme of this group, so far as selling insurance was concerned.

The action the Administrator, Mr. Slattery, took to obtain legal advice on this scheme to use the funds of the R. E. A. seems to have precipitated an attack upon the Administrator by officials of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, as well as by some officials of the Department of Agriculture. Up until that time, the testimony shows, many letters by various members and officials of the National Rural Electric Cooperative had been exceedingly

laudatory in their expressions of admiration for the ability and integrity of the Administrator of the R. E. A., Mr. Slattery.

It is interesting to note that when the Secretary of Agriculture was informed by the legal opinion of his Solicitor that moneys of the R. E. A. could not be used for such purposes as intended by the organizers of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, he warned employees of the R. E. A. to cease and desist from helping to further the scheme and joined Mr. Slattery in warning employees to have nothing to do with the N. R. E. C. A. There is evidence that thereafter certain Agriculture Department officials joined with the organizers of the N. R. E. C. A. in attempts to have Mr. Slattery removed as Administrator of the R. E. A. Pressure was brought upon the President to have him removed. This seems to have failed.

Mr. Slattery, having been appointed by the President, through the authority of a special act of Congress, for a period of 10 years, and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, the question of his removal without a hearing and without the filing of specific charges presented a legal problem that the President might hesitate to undertake, even had he so desired. Emissaries from the Department of Agriculture and of the N. R. E. C. A. brought pressure to bear upon the White House to get rid of the Administrator without resorting to removal for cause and upon hearing. There is direct evidence that he was offered another position subsequently to go to Europe to study rural electrification, at his present salary, if he would resign as Administrator of the R. E. A. This he refused to do.

We have a right to assume that the rumors and charges of incompetency and mismanagement on the part of Mr. Slattery, as Administrator, that were suddenly discovered, after he opposed the insurance activities of the N. R. E. C. A. to use the mortgage funds of the cooperatives to start their insurance companies, were carried to the President and made the basis for the request for his discharge or removal. Such action has our unqualified disapproval.

The rural-electrification program has been regarded by the general public and the Congress and should continue to be regarded as a program to encourage the distribution of electric power to farmers at reasonable cost and to make possible the building of rural electrification distribution lines.

The authority given to the R. E. A. by Congress, and the only authority, was that of granting loans or credit to various groups or organizations which might be interested in the development and building of rural electrification distribution lines and the building of such electrical production plants as necessary where reasonable rates for electric power could be obtained, and the additional authority, of course, to protect and conserve the loans made by the Government to local cooperatives.

The disintegration and demoralization of personnel in the R. E. A. since its integration into the Department of Agriculture, is an outstanding contrast to the harmony and excellency of morale that appears to have existed prior thereto, and is an indictment of the administration under the Agricultural Department.

The T. V. A. was created as an independent agency and seems to have preserved the record of administration that has won the universal praise of the American people. It has apparently not been subjected to campaigns for exploitation by outside private individuals so far as is known. It has not been accused of political activities. It seems to have been operated as a business institution undertaking a service to the people that could not be furnished by private capital. Such an institution, it was hoped, the R. E. A. would be and continue to be of service to the farmers of the United States.

The testimony of John M. Carmody, who was Administrator of R. E. A. immediately prior to the reorganization of R. E. A., is very impressive and supports in every way the idea of strict independence of the R. E. A. Mr. Carmody made an excellent Administrator, but despite his zealous devotion to the work of R. E. A. and his high esteem for the program of rural electrification, he retired from his position as Administrator of the R. E. A. immediately after the Reorganization Act became effective. There can be no question as to why he retired. He made his reasons known in the testimony before the committee. He feared that the success of the R. E. A. would be impaired and the R. E. A. would be handicapped when it became subordinate to the Department of Agriculture. He anticipated the menace of "layers of authority" over R. E. A. His anticipations and fears were fully justified.

There can be no doubt of the desire and intention of Congress in enacting the legislation making the R. E. A. an independent institution and providing that the term of office of the Administrator should be for 10 years. The Congress desired to protect the administration of the R. E. A. program from all kinds of political influence, and desired to establish the R. E. A. as an agency of Government entirely free and independent of any and every influence other than that of the act itself, and the officials and employees appointed to administer the act.

As one witness before the committee emphasized, there is every reason and every obligation in a democratic form of government to divorce, in every possible way, the administration of any units of Government engaged in the administration of economic affairs or business, from the political affairs of the Government. Any other course of action is a step toward the totalitarian state.

Your subcommittee has elected, therefore, to make this preliminary report, with recommendations relating to the emergency situation within R. E. A. The rural electrification program has had such general and enthusiastic approval, and the evidence before your subcommittee raises questions about many matters of administration within R. E. A., and by grace of the influence of R. E. A. in the rural electrification cooperatives which deserve and even demand further study.

However, the subcommittee has labored faithfully with the limited funds and time permitted, and while we are expecting information which has been requested and will be requested from the departments concerned, the record of testimony presented before the committee now justifies a recommendation that the Rural Electrification Administration be, by law, returned to its status first assigned to it by the Congress, and this committee recommends that that be done at the earliest possible date.

E. D. SMITH.
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.
G. M. GILLETTE.
GEORGE D. AIKEN.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee on Immigration:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 15, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 102, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 12 1943 (creating the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning), as amended by Senate Resolution 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 16, 1943, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

THE NEW SENATE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McKELLAR (S. DOC. NO. 4)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD and as a Senate document a very admirable address by my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who is the President pro tempore of the Senate. The address, entitled "The New Senate," was broadcast last Friday evening over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

THE NEW SENATE

Ladies and gentlemen, there are 48 States in the Union and each State has 2 Senators, 96 in all, and under the Constitution one-third of the entire number come up for election every 2 years. We have 16 new Senators this session. Last session the Democrats had 58 Senators and the Republicans had 37 and the Progressive Republicans 1.

This session the Democrats have 57, the Republicans 38, and the Progressive Republicans 1, a net change in politics of only 1 Senator.

Those Senators who had been in the Senate before the election and were defeated were fine men, and so far as I can judge, their successors are likewise fine.

In one respect, however, it was a change for the better. These 16 new men taken as a whole are probably more liberal and less isolationistic than those whose places they took. If this is true, it is a distinct step forward in securing an effective and lasting peace.

The principal advantage that the Senate has in the coming war-and-peace legislation is the well-known Senate rule which guarantees full and free debate. This right of real debate makes the Senate the outstanding liberal legislative body in the world today, and this right of free and full debate was never more necessary and never more desirable in the history of our country than it is and will be during the present session of Congress just opening. For never in the history of this country will more important, more far-reaching, and more fateful decisions have to be made by the Congress.

Tonight I have only time to speak briefly on the two most important and outstanding questions coming before the new Senate; namely, the early winning of the war and the winning of the peace.

This Congress must and will take every step necessary for furnishing the war materials, supplies, and the men to bring this war to a successful conclusion at the earliest possible moment. We recently had a setback on the western front in Belgium and Germany, but I believe that set-back will be short-lived. I know that our men in the

field on the western front are taking care and will continue to take care of the military situation in Europe. I have not the slightest doubt that Germany will be beaten by our forces. From General Eisenhower down to the last private in the army in Europe our armies will make the most successful fight in the history of the world and unless every sign fails their efforts will be crowned with the greatest success. Our armies will destroy Hitlerism. They will destroy German despotism and every vestige of self-called "German superiority," and this time I hope and believe these things will be destroyed forever. Before Germany ever becomes a great nation again her people must get rid of her petty despots, of her corrupt rulers, and of their determination to take advantage of weak nations all around her. They must get rid of every vestige of her ambition to rule the world.

This time Germany first declared war on us and it must be a war to the finish. The new House and the new Senate will appropriate all necessary money and take steps to bring the war to a successful conclusion. I have never a doubt that we will win the war.

The next most important question for discussion in the new Senate will be the peace. We will have to consider and make the most fateful decisions in all our governmental history. May God give us the wisdom and the strength and the ability to decide these questions and to decide them right.

America has never lost a war in all our history but we have not always won in making the peace. We won the First World War but we did not win the peace. This time we will win the war and we must win the peace.

Twenty-five years ago I was an ardent, earnest, and vigorous advocate of President Wilson's League of Nations. That document contained a wonderful plan for preserving the peace of the world. But we all recall that the League was voted down and America lost that peace. This time I am earnestly and sincerely in favor of a world association of nations to keep the peace of the world patterned after the document prepared at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference or by any other pattern substantially like it which may be effective.

Those peace terms must not convey the territory of one nation to another nation. The people concerned must have a voice in any transfer. The peace treaty must not convey spheres of influence to favored nations. It must not create mandates for the political, territorial, and economic benefits for favored nations. It must not follow the unjust and unfair and tragic Treaty of Versailles and award concession benefits and territories to favored nations at the expense of other nations less favored. On the contrary, those peace terms should adhere closely to the high aims and purposes and ideals of America as expressed in the Atlantic Charter. They must give to the nations that have been overrun in Europe, whether by Germany or ourselves or our allies, the right to choose their own governments. The Atlantic Charter provides in substance that all nations and all people themselves have the right to say who their rulers should be. In the early stages of the war Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill in the so-called Atlantic Charter declared those high aims and purposes and our soldiers have been fighting for them for years and they must be followed to the very best of our ability. Already there seems to be a disposition on the part of certain European allies to disregard those high aims and purposes and principles for which our boys are fighting. Some of them seem to be taking over spheres of influence, getting special trade agreements and are entering into unilateral, bilateral, or multilateral or other selfish pacts. My friends, this is not the way to obtain a lasting peace. On the contrary, this is the certain way to sow the seeds of a third world war, and this we must not do.

But it may be said that the United States is just one of the Allies and what can we do about it at the peace table by ourselves. Of course, we must use every honest, sincere, and effective means within our power to be and to continue on the best terms with all our allies. Such uniformity of purpose and action never was more desirable than it is right now. It is exceedingly unfortunate that these questions and divisions are arising in Europe. It is to the best interest of each and everyone of our allies at the present time carefully to consider their positions in this situation and not make a mistake.

When America entered this war, Germany had been for months making vicious, cruel, and successful attacks on Great Britain. Every day it looked from the papers that the Germans might actually land on British soil. And then America entered the war. Our action saved Great Britain.

We have $250,000,000,000 invested in this war. What for? What was our purpose? It was to secure and to preserve a permanent peace in the world. We have thousands of lives of the best and bravest of America's young soldiers invested in this war. We have hundreds of thousands of maimed and stricken soldiers in the hospitals on crutches invested in this war. We must be true to all of these.

In prosecuting this war we have built the largest Navy in the world—larger perhaps than all the navies of all the other nations put together. We have the greatest air forces in the world—greater probably than all the air forces of the other nations put together. We have between eleven and twelve million men under arms all over the world. We have several great armies in Europe and in Asia and they have been marvelously successful. We have spent billions of dollars in the manufacture of guns, and ammunition, and in the production of food and in every conceivable war supply.

We have by law established lend-lease and under it we are furnishing guns, ammunition, supplies, and food to all our allies and have been ever since we have been in this war. We have done everything that a neighbor, that a self-respecting nation could do to win the war and bring about a permanent peace. We aided Russia to stop the German onset at Stalingrad. We have taken this course with the best of motives. We want no other nation's territory. We want no special advantage in our trade with other nations. We want no spheres of special influence. We want no mandates to impose our will on other and so-called inferior peoples. We want only a lasting peace, an even chance to have our ships ply the seas and our airships ply the air unmolested, to trade and travel and take part in the commerce of the world. We want no advantage over any other nation or any other people, great or small. We want no nation to have an advantage over us.

With this great Army and Navy and Air Corps, with these lofty and noble purposes in making and prosecuting this war we are entitled as a matter of right to have our allies join us in forming a lasting peace which is to the best interest of our allies and of all nations and all peoples.

I was here in the last war. I was here when we tried to make the peace, and I am familiar with it all. We won that war, but we lost the peace afterward. We then stood and fought for noble principles and lofty ideals and then what happened? We were simply invited to the peace table to divide the spoils of war and the spoils of war were divided. This time there must be no peace table simply for the purpose of these nations sitting around the table and dividing the spoils of this war. It must be a peace table, not a spoils table. We must meet in the open. Open covenants openly arrived at. We want none of those spoils, but this time when the peace conference takes place the principal purpose of that conference must be to insure fairness and justice to all nations and peoples of the world to put into form and substance those high ideals and aims for which our soldiers went into this war so that a lasting and enduring peace may come to this war-torn world.

In his message to Congress this week it made me extremely happy that President Roosevelt reaffirmed the Atlantic Charter. That he said its high aims and policies must be carried out to the very greatest extent possible. It is the duty of every good American citizen to follow the lead of our great President in this crusade for national and international justice at the peace table. It is to our greatest and truest advantage that this be done. It is to the greatest and truest advantage of Great Britain and of Russia and China and every Allied nation in the world that this should be done. It is to the best interests of every people on the face of the earth that this should be done, and I believe it will be done.

Every night since this war began I have prayed to Almighty God that He might give our leaders and our soldiers the courage, the ability, and the strength to win this war, because I believe in the high aims and purposes for which we are fighting this war. In like manner I have prayed to God to give our great leaders the strength and ability and the courage to secure a permanent peace of the world and permanent justice among nations so that future generations of men would not have to undergo another terrible sacrifice of blood and lives.

May I say in conclusion that I believe the new Senate and the new House will overwhelmingly back our great leader President Roosevelt in his plans for peace based upon the lofty aims and purposes of the Atlantic Charter. I pray God that there will be no voice raised in behalf of selfishness or greed at the peace table, but with one accord all will go forward to secure a lasting peace for every nation and every people.

PRESIDENT'S EPITOME OF HIS ANNUAL MESSAGE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the President's epitome of his address to the Congress on the state of the Union, broadcast over the radio on January 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MEANING OF JACKSON DAY IN 1945—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Jackson Day address delivered by Senator O'MAHONEY at the Jackson Day banquet, Baltimore, Md., January 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATION'S FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address relating to American foreign policy delivered by him in opening the reviewing stand program of Northwestern University, January 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDUCT AND AIMS OF THE WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BROOKS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator BROOKS from Washington, D. C., on Tuesday, January 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL—CORRESPONDENCE WITH BERNARD M. BARUCH

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding surplus-property disposal addressed by him to Bernard M. Baruch, and

Mr. Baruch's reply, which appear in the Appendix.]

SHALL WE HAVE MORE T. V. A.'s?—ARTICLE BY DAVID LILIENTHAL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Shall We Have More T. V. A.'s?" written by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the T. V. A., and published in the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, January 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAXATION AND COOPERATION AS AFFECTING WESTERN FARMERS—EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY C. C. COGSWELL

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an address entitled "Taxation" by C. C. Cogswell, master of the Kansas State Grange, before the seventy-third annual session of the grange, held at the Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., on December 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATION'S HEALTH

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorial comment and letters dealing with the report submitted by the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND ATTAINMENT OF PEACE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. WHEELER obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Austin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Revercomb
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Buck	La Follette	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Langer	Shipstead
Butler	Lucas	Smith
Byrd	McCarran	Stewart
Capehart	McClellan	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	Mead	Truman
Ellender	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Moore	Wagner
Fulbright	Morse	Wheeler
George	Moses	Wherry
Gerry	Murdock	White
Green	Murray	Wiley
Guffey	Myers	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is absent on the business of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am confident that my colleagues in the Senate share my solemn conviction that, should this tragic war issue end in nothing more than a savage repetition of history, no greater calamity could befall the human race.

In January 1917, President Wilson set forth the principles upon which alone men might be able to build a world of decency, justice, and peace, when he said:

> The question upon which the whole future peace and policy of the world depends is this: Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace or only for a new balance of power? Only a tranquil Europe can be a stable Europe. No peace can last, nor ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from potentate to potentate as if they were property. The world can be at peace only if life is stable, and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is no tranquility of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom, and of right.

I agree with all my heart with these conclusions of President Wilson.

Mr. President, history is repeating itself. The question raised by President Wilson has risen again in these dark hours of the Second World War to plague us: "Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace or only for a new balance of power?" Are people being handed about from potentate to potentate, from dictator to dictator?

Personally I am convinced that whether one has accepted in servile acquiescence the present ominous trend toward power politics and is now urging cooperation with the "inevitable" or whether one still refuses to surrender his self-respect and his struggle to salvage what he can of decency and justice from this mad war, it would be a criminal disservice to America to our allies, to the world, to confuse, or to tolerate confusion, on these issues for one moment longer.

For long months on end, this confusion has been fostered in the minds of the American people by deliberate suppression of the truth about the international situation and through reams of propaganda which has identified the struggle of our allies to consolidate and extend their spheres of influence in a new balance of power in Europe, with the deep-rooted ideals and hopes for a just and lasting peace of the American people. These techniques in dealing with the truth have led to such confusion and cynicism among our people that they have begun to lose faith in their own Government leaders. As matters now stand, it is doubtful that even the most fervent global do-gooders, the most inflated internationalist impresarios, or the most ardent Anglo- and Russo-philes could continue to mask the brutal realities with which we are now confronted behind any distortion of the English language, no matter how ingeniously conceived.

Even the bloodiest bitter-enders, I am quite convinced, are going to find that any attempt to cover up the ever-widening tracks of power policies in Europe by prating about "unity, beautiful unity" will be like trying to shackle three tornadoes to a palm tree.

Mr. President, I would have it understood at the outset that what I am saying, the dangers to which I refer, the charges I am making, and the proposition which I am going to offer are in no wise just an expression of personal idiosyncracy. They are not the fiction of an alleged "isolationist" mind. I am not taking the time of this Senate in so crucial an hour of history to embarrass anyone. I am concerned only to be both frank and fair about the nature of the present crisis now confronting America, our allies, and the world.

SUPPORTERS OF ADMINISTRATION FOREIGN POLICY BECOME ANXIOUS

For the purpose of proving beyond all question of doubt that the fears which are now being realized concerning the disintegration of the alliance that has bound the nations together in this war have long been uppermost in the minds of some of the most outstanding administration supporters, and for the further purpose of proving how deep are the basic conflicts of interest that occasion the present disunity, I desire now to enter into the record documentary evidence of these fears and protests.

Mr. President, as far back as March 16, 1944, Mr. Arthur Krock wrote in the New York Times:

> The growing unrest in Congress and elsewhere over the blank spaces in the diplomatic record of the Nation has arisen, not from any lack of statement of our general war and post-war principles, but from absence of information if or how they are being applied. The feeling has been widely expressed that we are being steadily outdistanced by Great Britain, and especially by Soviet Russia, in specific courses, and that these moves and the march of events may draw the United States into policies repugnant to our expressed principles or divide the great Allies on post-war establishments of peace.

Again in March 1944 the following warning appeared in a statement signed and issued by American Friends of Aid to Russia:

> The apparent determination of the Soviet Government to insist on a unilateral settlement of the Polish problem, without mediation or consent either of Russia's allies or the Polish Government, has come as a shock to American opinion. * * * If therefore Russia values America's friendship as we be-

lieve she does, she must not use her power to impose either an unjust frontier or a puppet government upon the Polish people. Russia must choose. She can impose her will but she cannot impose it without estranging millions of Americans whose opinions will be decisive in the development of our foreign policy. And Russia will estrange others besides Americans, for what will millions of citizens of the small conquered (and satellite) countries have to hope from an Allied victory, if this is how we discharge our obligations to Poland? * * * Therefore, in the interest of all the United Nations we urge the British and American Governments to raise these questions with the Soviet Government, and we ourselves appeal to our Russian allies to take cognizance of the legitimate disquiet of the American people.

On March 22, 1944, more than 20 Republican Members of Congress, every one an ardent supporter of the Roosevelt foreign policy, signed and delivered a note to the State Department, from which I quote:

In Europe and in South America we are distressed to observe our foreign relations suffering serious impairment from a want of definition of American policy.

On April 12, 1944, our new State Department appointee, Mr. Archibald MacLeish, was reported in the London Times as saying that:

Nothing had more disturbed him in the last few months at home, and in the last few days in which he had been here, than the collapse of morale among men of good will and of liberal mind in their hope for peace at the end of this war. He did not know one such man who truly believed that the war was going to end in the kind of peace hoped for. The conviction and determination that such a peace should be made were lacking.

On May 3, 1944, the apprehension to which I have been referring rose to great heights in over 100 speeches commemorating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution delivered in both Houses of Congress.

On May 24 Dorothy Thompson was in despair:

What deterioration has set in since Mr. Churchill's great speech of more than a year ago outlining the creation of a Council of Europe.

She exclaimed:

God help us if we leave the peoples of Europe without quick relief and without a vision of their own future.

On June 12, 1944, Anne O'Hare McCormick wrote:

In no phase of the war have political decisions kept pace with military decisions, but the lack of synchronization was never so apparent as now when the invasion brings all the unanswered questions to the foreground. * * * In all these latest attempts to settle political questions what comes out clearly is that whereas last year it seemed they might be postponed until the end of the war, sweeping political obstacles out of the way of the armies becomes a primary military consideration as the last battle begins.

On July 21, 1944, Mr. Sumner Welles declared:

True statesmanship consists in avoiding the impasse. It is not shown by the adoption of policies which lead into one-way streets. The policy so far pursued by the State Department is destructive, not constructive. If persisted in, it will lead inevitably to the obliteration of the good-neighbor policy and of any lasting regional system of the Americas.

On July 25, 1944, the President's personal representative, William Phillips, wrote concerning India:

The peoples of Asia, and I am supported in this opinion by other diplomatic and military observers—cynically regard this war as one between Fascist and imperialist powers. A generous British gesture to India would change this undesirable political atmosphere. * * * And the colonial peoples conquered by the Japanese might hopefully feel they had something better to look forward to than simply a return to their old masters. Such a gesture, Mr. President, will also be positive proof to all peoples * * * that this war is not a war of power politics, but a war for all we say.

Again, on September 1, 1944, Dorothy Thompson asked concerning our policies toward the tragic peoples of Europe:

Do we yet know what policy we shall seek assistance for? Or are we doing all we can to bring about the discouragement and liquidation of any group that might help us?

As this tide of bitter protest concerning the direction in which our diplomacy and political and psychological warfare were moving continued to rise, Walter Lippmann joined in the chorus. On October 3, 1944, he wrote:

At the secondary level in the political conduct of the war, a kind of second-rateness has caused trouble which can become immensely serious. It is as if Messrs. Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt had exhausted the best of their energies on the greatest issues of the war, and then had dealt with issues next in importance—in Poland, France, and Italy—in their odd moments with the residue of their strength, and through lieutenants whose caliber has been much smaller than those who have done the great planning and directing of the war.

On December 13, 1944, Mr. Sumner Welles summed up the nature of the situation of which I speak in the following words:

There is nothing to be gained by holding out to American public opinion any ground for false optimism as to the immediate future in the foreign relations of this Nation. Recent developments in Europe, in the Far East, and in the Western Hemisphere offer no room for illusions as to the gravity of the problems which we confront.

Again, on December 27 last, Sumner Welles wrote:

As the year 1945 dawns, the American people face a future which seems less certain than at any moment since the war began.

At the very time when our armed forces are making their greatest sacrifice to speed the final victory, the objectives for which they fight seem less assured than they did 3 years ago.

There has become evident a wide and growing rift in the basic political understanding between the three major Allies. Unless that rift is repaired, unless unity of policy and unity of purpose between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union can be restored, not only can no valid international organization be established, but no lasting peace settlements can be concluded.

Mr. President, this wide recognition of the failure of our diplomacy when the honor, integrity, and future security of our Nation are at stake strengthens my own conviction that to continue down the road we are traveling cannot lead to anything but disaster. Let us not only document the opinions of administration supporters; let us also document the historical setting in which the present conflicts of interests in international relations are rooted. In order truly to evaluate the present situation, let us recall to mind the long series of principles and proclamations which all three of the greatest of the United Nations have recorded as the minimum essentials for continued peaceful relations among themselves and the other nations of the world if the reign of decency and justice, of law and order, or of governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, were to survive. Let us begin with the United States.

OPPOSITION TO AGGRESSION IS OUR DECLARED OBJECT

The United States Government has time and again proclaimed its strict adherence to principles of noninterference in the affairs of nations, both inside and outside this hemisphere. The most notable success which has rewarded our efforts to build a world with international relations based on these principles has been known as the good-neighbor policy. Very few Americans are aware of the fact that the South American countries refused to enter into any formal commitment to this policy until we had agreed to repudiate the use of force in the settlement of disputes with our sister republics to the south. On December 24, 1938, at the Eighth International Conference of American States, the following principles were incorporated in the Declaration of Lima as the foundation of the good-neighbor policy:

The Governments of the American republics resolve—

To proclaim, support, and recommend once again the following principles as essential to the achievement of the aforesaid objectives:

1. The intervention of any state in the internal or external affairs of another is inadmissible.

How does that fit in with what is now taking place in Europe and with the actions of both Russia and England?

2. All differences of international character should be settled by peaceful means.

3. The use of force as an instrument of national or international policy is proscribed.

I emphasize—

The use of force as an instrument of national or international policy is proscribed.

4. Relations between states should be governed by the precepts of international law.

5. Respect for and faithful observance of treaties constitute the indispensable rule for the development of peaceful relations between states, and treaties can only be revised by agreement of the contracting parties.

I wish Senators to bear these two declarations in mind when I call attention later to some of the things which are going on.

6. Peaceful collaboration between representatives of the various states and the development of intellectual interchange among their peoples is conducive to an understanding by each of the problems of the other as well as of problems common to all, and makes more readily possible the peaceful adjustment of international controversies.

7. Economic reconstruction contributes to national and international well-being, as well as to peace among nations.

8. International cooperation is a necessary condition to the maintenance of the aforementioned principles.

On October 21, 1944, the President took occasion to reaffirm these principles when he said:

In 1933 we took, as the basis for our foreign relations, the good-neighbor policy—the principles of a neighbor who, resolutely respecting himself, equally respects the rights of others. * * * It is my conviction that this policy can be, and should be, made universal.

Again, even while we have made war an instrument of our national and international policy, this administration has been careful repeatedly to reaffirm the principles and ends toward which our war efforts have been directed. As late as January 4, 1939, the President reaffirmed our traditional foreign policy when he said:

We rightly decline to intervene with force of arms to prevent acts of aggression.

That did not mean that we had no concern for the state of the world in which peace was threatened. The ultimate purposes behind our eventual involvement in this war were summed up by the President in his anxious note to Adolf Hitler of April 14, 1939, in which he asked:

Are you willing to give assurance that your armed forces will not attack or invade the territory or possessions of the following independent nations: Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Great Britain, and Ireland, France, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Russia, Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey, Iraq, the Arabias, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Iran?

Again he was asking Hitler to protect those countries.

And when, on September 1, 1939, Hitler struck Poland, in concert with Mr. Stalin, the President asked for repeal of the arms embargo and a change of the Neutrality Act for the purpose, he said, of assuring aid, short of war, to the victims of aggression.

There followed from that point on, in rapid succession, pronouncements by this Government against every act of aggression, and promises of aid to nations who are its victims. On June 10, 1940, the President declared:

We will extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this Nation.

On June 13 he sent the following word to the French Council of Ministers:

This Government is doing everything in its power to make available to the Allied Governments the material they so urgently require.

On December 5, 1940, this Government forwarded a note to the King of Greece, in which it stated:

It is the settled policy of the United States to extend aid to those governments and peoples who defend themselves against aggressions.

On January 6, 1941, the President said in his speech to Congress:

Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or to keep them.

On March 15, 1941, the President interpreted the passage of the Lend-Lease Act as a historical event. Said the President:

This decision is the end of any attempts at appeasement in our land; the end of urging us to get along with the dictators; the end of compromise with tyranny and of forces of oppression.

It was to be the end of urging us to get along with whom? With the dictators. The word was not used in the singular, but in the plural. It was to be the end of compromise with tyranny and of forces of oppression—not one, but all. The record is filled with similar declarations to every victim of aggression: France, Britain, Denmark, Norway, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Portugal, Poland, Finland, the Baltics, China, and every other nation caught in this maelstrom of madness, whether by Germany, Russia, Italy, or Japan. Behind each one of those declarations lay the same fundamental principle upon which such aid was premised.

BRITAIN COMMITTED TO PRINCIPLE OF UNIVERSAL FREEDOM

Now let us consider the case of Britain. As far as Great Britain is concerned, much the same record of principles and purposes has already been written into the pages of history. On October 3, 1939, Churchill declared:

We are fighting to save the whole world from the pestilence of Nazi tyranny and in defense of all that is most sacred to man. This is no war for domination or imperial aggrandizement or material gain; * * * it is a war * * * to establish, on impregnable rocks, the rights of the individual, and it is a war to establish and revive the stature of man.

On October 4, 1939, Lord Halifax said of France and Britain:

They do seek to reestablish for themselves and for others liberty under the reign of law, the right of peoples to decide their own destinies, to trade freely, and to live without fear. Surely then we are fighting for causes that are vital not only for ourselves, but also for all those everywhere who love liberty.

On October 25, 1939, Lord Lothian said:

There can be no basis for a lasting peace in Europe which does not give to all the nations of Europe—

Not merely to one or two—

their right to autonomous freedom. The status of all nations, great and small, should be equal before the law. The strong and powerful nations have no greater rights than the small and weak.

Lord Halifax said, on November 7, 1939:

We are fighting to maintain the rule of law and the quality of mercy in dealings between man and man and in the great society of civilized states.

Again, on April 19, 1940, Lord Lothian said:

We believe we are fighting not only for our existence but to ensure that the basic institutions and ideals which have been guiding the stars of Western civilization for the last 150 years shall not be wiped off the face of Europe and Asia and Africa by the military victory of the totalitarian dictatorships.

Note the use of the word in the plural.

On November 9, 1940, Mr. Churchill declared:

We have affirmed or defined more precisely all the causes of all the countries with whom or for whom we drew the sword—Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, greatest of all France; latest of all Greece. For all of these we will toil and strive, and our victory will supply the liberation of them all.

On March 25, 1941, Lord Halifax precisely defined the nature of the principles for which Great Britain had entered this war, as follows:

The right to think, speak, and act freely within the law, and to have free access to the thoughts of others;

The right of free association, both national and international, with their fellow men;

The right to live without fear of aggression, injustice, or want;

The right to worship as the conscience dictates.

Viscount Cranborne, Secretary of State for Colonies, made the following statement of policy on May 21, 1942:

I can give the House an absolute assurance * * * that there is no question of any departure by His Majesty's Government from the policy of the Atlantic Charter, which remains the fundamental basis for the policy of His Majesty's Government and of the United States and of the United Nations as a whole, who have adhered to that Charter.

Again on June 2, 1943, in the House of Lords, Viscount Cranborne said:

His Majesty's Government regard themselves as absolutely pledged to carry out the Atlantic Charter—all the articles of the Atlantic Charter.

On August 5, 1943, Viscount Simon, the Lord Chancelor, made a very significant speech to the House of Lords. I shall not read the excerpt I have made from his speech, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, because it is along the same line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpt is as follows:

Mr. Cordell Hull * * * pointed out that the Atlantic Charter does not propose to substitute international authority for sovereign rights and self-government. The conception is that sovereign rights and self-government will be preserved and made, as far as self-government is concerned, more authoritative and complete. The conception is not that we should aim at forcing upon as many people as possible the dictates of some international organ, but rather that we should aim at getting agreement between as many sovereign communities as may be, each of them, we trust, enjoying rights of self-government, so that as the result of consent, not as the result of externally applied force, this international authority is able to speak in the name of all well-disposed people. (Referring to Cordell Hull speech of July 23, 1942.)

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have another excerpt from a statement on colonial policy, made on December 3, 1942, by Viscount Cranborne during a debate in the House of Lords, as well as an excerpt from a statement made on July 21, 1940, by Field Marshal Smuts. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the citizens of the British Empire, whatever our race, religion, or color, have a mission to perform, and it is a mission that is essential to the welfare of the world. It is to insure the survival of the way of life for which the United Nations are fighting, a way of life based on freedom, tolerance, justice, and mutual understanding, in harmony with the principles of the Atlantic Charter. (Excerpt from statement by Viscount Cranborne, on December 3, 1942, in the House of Lords.)

Freedom still remains our sovereign remedy for the ills from which human society is suffering. We envisage a free Europe, free for the individual and for the nation, free in the sense of giving full scope for personal and national self-development and self-perfection, each according to his own individual lines. (Excerpt from statement by Field Marshal Smuts, on July 21, 1940.)

RUSSIA'S EFFORTS FROM 1917 TO 1939 WERE FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, having looked at the statements made by the United States and Great Britain, now let us look at Russia's statements. What of our powerful associate in this war, Russia? Her record from 1917 up to 1939 is clearly that of an ardent advocate of noble principles of international law which she deemed essential, or said she deemed essential, to the formation of a peaceful society of nations.

"Peace" was made the watchword of the October Revolution of 1917 when, on November 8, the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets voted unanimously a "peace decree." In that document the new government "invited all the belligerent peoples and their governments immediately to begin" negotiations to bring about an "equitable democratic peace," defined as "an immediate peace without annexations and without indemnities." Because the Great Powers categorically refused to heed that request, the new government was compelled to enter into separate negotiations for peace with the Central Powers.

On the 16th of January 1920, the Allied Supreme Council finally raised the economic blockade.

From then on, Mr. President, the written record of Russia's statements of foreign policy, up until the partition of Poland in 1939, on its face, at least, is one of tireless efforts to bring about the abolition of practices and policies on the part of the Great Powers which have led to the century-long outbursts of war among the nations of Europe.

From 1921 to 1927 the Russian Government carried on a vigorous "disarmament offensive." On November 30, 1927, at the fourth session of the Preparatory Commission of the Disarmament Conference, Maxim Litvinov read the declaration of Russia's proposals which laid down the principle and "a plan of general and complete disarmament." The plan included "the complete abolition of all armed forces on land, on the sea, and in the air." It proposed the following:

Dismissal of all armed men, destruction of all means of combat, scrapping of all warships and military airplanes, prohibition of military instruction, abolition of military service, the dismantling of fortresses, demolition of factories for the supply of equipment, the suppression of military budgets, war ministries, the prohibition of military propaganda and giving patents for means of destruction.

It provided that disarmament should be carried through simultaneously by all states within a period of 4 years. These suggestions met with the stern disapproval of the Disarmament Commission.

Undaunted by this rebuff, the Russian Government continued its effort by suggesting a program for partial disarmament, which met with the same fate. Again the Russian Government rose to the challenge of its own announced ideal for a warless world by seeking to strengthen the draft on disarmament proposed by the League of Nations by the inclusion of prohibition of all preparation for chemical warfare and of bombing from the air. Those proposals also met with the same fate. Yet, even as late as October 21, 1931, Litvinov declared to the Secretary General of the League that the Russian Goverment "is ready to assume, with the other governments and under equal conditions, the obligation to cease increasing its armaments during the Conference on Disarmament," as it was always "ready for complete disarmament or the maximum reduction of armaments."

Mr. President, not only is Russia's record as an opponent of armaments and military conscription outstanding among the nations of the world, but up to the time of her attack on Poland in 1939 her record of ceaseless advocacy of nonaggression pacts was without a rival.

On July 3, 1933, Russia signed in Moscow with the official representatives of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Rumania, Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan a convention for the definition of aggression, which Russia sponsored and in which is found the clearest and most precise definition of what constitutes aggression that is to be found in the history of international relations. Article II of this remarkable treaty reads as follows:

ART. II. In accordance with the above, the aggressor in an international conflict, with due consideration to the agreements existing between the parties involved in the conflict, will be considered the state which will be the first to commit any of the following acts:

1. Declaration of war against another state;

2. Invasion by armed forces, even without a declaration of war, of the territory of another state;

3. An attack by armed land, naval, or air forces, even without a declaration of war, upon the territory, naval vessels, or aircraft of another state;

4. Naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another state;

5. Aid to armed bands formed on the territory of a state and invading the territory of another state, or refusal, despite demands on the part of the state subjected to attack to take all possible measures on its own territory to deprive the said bands of any aid and protection.

Whatever Russia's motives may have been during this period of her weakness, no one will deny that her declarations of principle were of the highest. Indeed, she went beyond the rest of the world in her lofty profession of idealism. Even after her alliance with Hitler she professed the same high principles while threatening her neighbor nations with military occupation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does the Senator object to my interrupting him during his speech?

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to be interrupted.

Mr. PEPPER. In his recital of various Russian declarations, I was wondering if the Senator was about to make reference to the speech of Mr. Litvinov at a meeting of the League of Nations in 1938, calling upon all nations to stand with Russia in perpetuation of collective security, instead of abandoning it and thereby inviting war.

Mr. WHEELER. That was in 1938. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. At that time England, France, and Russia had treaties with Czechoslovakia.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The treaties were to defend Czechoslovakia's integrity in case of a threat of aggression being made against her. Following, or about that time, Litvinov stated at a meeting of the League of Nations, that when Czechoslovakia asked for Russian aid Russia would stand by her pledge. Beneš made the statement that Litvinov had promised that Russia would stand by her agreement. However, Britain and France at that time did not make good on their agreement to defend Czechoslovakia.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct. I am coming to that point.

Mr. President, On October 6, 1939, Pravda carried the following communique from the Soviet Government interpreting the signing of the pact forced on Latvia:

At the basis of the pacts of mutual assistance are irremovable principles of the treaties of peace and nonaggression. The contracting parties affirm once more their unshaken faith to recognize the sovereign rights of each state as well as their firm desire not to interfere with the inner affairs of another country.

On October 31, 1939, in his speech before the Soviet Supreme Council, Mr. Molotov said:

The pacts with the Baltic states in no way imply the intrusion of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania, as some foreign interests are trying to make believe. * * * These pacts are inspired by the mutual respect for the governmental, social, and economic systems of each of the contracting parties. * * * We stand for and exact an honest fulfillment of agreements signed by us on a basis of reciprocity and declare that foolish talks of sovietization of the Baltics is useful only to our common enemies. (Pravda, November 1, 1939.)

On September 24, 1941, Ivan Maisky, in accepting the Atlantic Charter for the Soviet Government, made the solemn declaration that—

the Soviet Union has applied, and will apply, in its foreign policy the high principle of respect for the sovereign rights of peoples. The Soviet Union was, and is, guided in its foreign policy by the principle of self-determination of nations. * * * Accordingly the Soviet Union defends the rights of every nation to the independence and territorial

integrity of its country, and its right to establish such a social order and to choose such a form of government as it deems opportune and necessary for the better promotion of its economic and cultural prosperity.

On November 6, 1941, Stalin said:

We have not nor can we have such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories or the conquest of other peoples, irrespective of whether European peoples and territories or Asiatic peoples and territories including Iran, are concerned.

We have not nor can we have such war aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on the Slavic and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are awaiting our help. Our aim is to help these peoples in their struggle for liberation from Hitler's tyranny, and then to accord them the possibility of arranging their lives on their own land as they think fit, with absolute freedom. No interference of any kind with the domestic affairs of other nations.

As recently as November 6, 1942, Stalin declared:

The program of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition is: "Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations, and integrity of their territories, liberation of enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes, economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance to them in attaining their material welfare, restoration of democratic liberties."

HISTORY OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

Mr. President, I desire to review briefly the history of the Atlantic Charter. To make the record complete, we ought to recall the history of the Atlantic Charter, a history which, according to the New York Times, gives it a standing in international law as valid as any in existence. The record shows that the first lines of the White House press release of August 14, 1941, as reprinted in the Department of State Bulletin of August 16, 1941, read:

The following statement was signed by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

On August 21, 1941, the President submitted to Congress a document purporting to be the text of the Atlantic Charter, bearing what appeared to be President Roosevelt's signature along with Mr. Churchill's.

On September 24, 1941, Ivan Maisky, Soviet Ambassador to Great Britain, pledged the Soviet Government to its principles.

On January 1, 1942, in Washington, 26 United Nations in a joint declaration of purposes subscribed to—

A common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter.

On January 4, 1942, our Department of State issued the following solemn statement:

In order that liberty-loving peoples, silenced by military force, may have an opportunity to support the principles of the declaration by United Nations, the Government of the United States, as the depository for that declaration, will receive statements of adherence to its principles from appropriate authorities which are not governments.

On January 29, 1942, a treaty of alliance between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and Iran was signed having in view—

The principles of the Atlantic Charter jointly agreed upon and announced to the world by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on the 14th August 1941, and endorsed by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the 24th September 1941.

On May 26, 1942, a treaty of mutual assistance between Great Britain and the Soviet Union was signed—

On a basis of the principles enunciated in the declaration made August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, to which the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has adhered.

On June 11, 1942, an agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the principles applying to mutual aid in the prosecution of the war against aggression was signed containing the following solemn preamble:

And whereas the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as signatories to the Declaration of the United Nations of January 1, 1942, have subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration known as the Atlantic Charter, made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the basic principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.

The same principles were reaffirmed as the basis of the Moscow Conference on November 1, 1943, which includes the following pledge that these Governments are "united in their determination, in accordance with the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942."

On December 1, 1943, the declaration regarding Iran was concluded with the following solemn promise:

They count upon the participation of Iran together with all other peace-loving nations in the establishment of international peace, security, and prosperity after the war in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter to which all four Governments have continued to subscribe.

I ask that the text of the Atlantic Charter, as it was printed and sent out by the Department of State, Office of War Information, be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. * * * Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

The following nations are signatories to the Atlantic Charter: United States of America, Great Britain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bolivia, Brazil, Australia, China, Columbia, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czecho-slovakia, Belgium, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, India, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaraugua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, Yugoslovia, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, the Philippines, France.

Mr. President, such, then, is the record of the principles and purposes of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States, which they have proclaimed to the world during two decades, as the indispensable minimum upon which a just, honorable, and lasting peace can be built. And these are the principles: disarmament, abolition of conscription, nonaggression pacts, clear-cut definitions of aggression, the principle of nonintervention in internal or external affairs of another state, the equal sovereignty of all nations large and small, the inviolability of human freedom and personality, proscription of the use of force between nations as a means of settling disputes, an international organization based on consent, guaranties of equal access to raw materials and markets for victor and vanquished, all of which these three great powers have severally and collectively declared to be essential to the establishment of a lasting peace among the nations of the world.

A FAR CRY FROM THESE PRINCIPLES TO DUMBARTON OAKS

Mr. President, unhappily, this is not the whole record. One by one, these three great powers have repudiated these principles with what has amounted to a rising stream of exceptions, reservations, and reversals of policy until today, after many long months of preparation, dis-

cussion, and deliberation, they have turned up before the world with the Dumbarton Oaks proposal.

Mr. President, keeping in mind the foregoing record of solemn declarations of principle, observe how the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, both in spirit and in letter as they now stand, emasculate the good-neighbor policy, override the principle of sovereign equality of all nations, offer in place of a genuinely international society of nations, a grim military alliance, destroy the very concept of neutrality, approve as a cardinal principle the use of brute force and the threat of coercion, without requiring that the security council shall first resort to peaceful methods in dealing with the threat of aggression, deliberately divorce the structure of the proposed security organization from the nature of the peace which it is expected to enforce, and cleverly disguise the deliberate omission of any mention of the Atlantic Charter by referring to a new United Nations charter that is to be formulated in the future.

Mr. President, as these proposals now stand, they constitute nothing more nor less than a plan to underwrite tyranny. The Treaty of Versailles at least tried to guarantee the integrity of independent states, and in a recent issue of an English publication, The Nineteenth Century and After, it was pointed out very clearly that the Dumbarton Oaks Conference had all the bad features of the League of Nations and none of the good ones—but these proposals are primarily designed to maintain a status quo in which our conquered enemies will constitute the main concern of every policy, agreement, and act on the part of self-appointed policemen. All other considerations, all other interests and rights on the part of the European nations will of necessity be subordinated to this one concern. Mr. Churchill's speech of May 24, 1944, contains full proof of this charge. Mr. Churchill said:

> We intend to set up a world order and organization equipped with all the necessary attributes of power in order to prevent future wars or the planning of them in advance by restless and ambitious nations.

How, in the name of goodness, are they going to stop the planning of future wars unless they intervene in the internal affairs of other nations, and who is going to see what the planning is? Is it going to be Mr. Stalin, Mr. Churchill, and the United States? Of course it is.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator said he was going to revert to the Czechoslovakian settlement. When the representatives of Britain and France met with Hitler at Munich, Russia, the third party to the agreement that guaranteed the integrity of Czechoslovakia, and offered to stand by that agreement when France and England went bankrupt on the agreement, was not invited.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And the deal was made with Hitler.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. So the Senator can see the difficulties about having nations, like individuals, keep their agreements.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall point out a good many instances as I go along.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in understanding the able Senator to intimate, from his criticism of the statements of Mr. Churchill, that the declaration of Dumbarton Oaks that force would be used in the international organization to keep down aggression, is unsatisfactory to the Senator? Does he oppose that?

Mr. WHEELER. I am going to let Mr. Churchill's words speak for themselves. I have read them.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not mean to address myself to the words of Mr. Churchill; I meant to ask the opinion of the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. The question of what is aggression has been before the League of Nations on numerous occasions, and I have the word of one who attended the meetings of the League of Nations as a representative of the United States that the statesmen who congregated at the meetings of the League of Nations, were never able to agree upon what was and what was not aggression. I assume the Senator thinks that some new group can agree on what is aggression and what is not aggression, but the League of Nations was never able to agree on it until after the act had occurred.

Mr. PEPPER. What I thought was important was that the able Senator should make clear to his colleagues and the country—because he knows that a great many people will be listening to his address—whether he opposes the international organization which is to be set up having force which may be employed against an aggressor once an aggression is established.

Mr. WHEELER. Once an aggression is established, of course; but what I am talking about is the aggression. The nations were never able to define aggression among themselves, and they never stopped aggression. They did not stop it when Japan went into Manchukuo; they did not stop it when Italy went into Ethiopia; they did not stop it at any time when some strong nation started aggression against another and weaker nation. It is all right to play upon nice words and say we are going to stop aggression, but when we come to write it out and take it up as a practical proposition, what is aggression and what is not?

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Montana has opened up a subject which is vital to the peace of this country and the world, and he cannot be so modest as to fail to recognize that a great many people are listening to what he is saying.

Mr. WHEELER. I have never been accused of immodesty.

Mr. PEPPER. If the President of the United States in the reasonably near future is to be in counsel with the representatives of other nations, it is extremely important that he know what is the sentiment of the United States Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. The sentiment of the Senator from Montana is perhaps more important than that of any other Senator, and I think the Senator should make it clear to us and clear to the country whether he personally favors the setting up of an international organization with power to stop aggression, if necessary by force.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate the Senator's compliment, and I should perhaps make a big bow to him. Let me say to the Senator that I was for the League of Nations until I went to Europe, as I have explained a great many times. But I am not going to be for any organization, or the setting up of an organization, before I know what the terms of the peace treaty are to be, and what we are to be called upon to enforce. Secondly, I shall never vote to delegate to one man the power to send American boys into war any place, anywhere, and all over the world.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think we fail to draw a distinction which should be drawn. Keeping our defeated enemies disarmed is a comparatively minor matter, if we approach it with efficiency and earnestness, and if we remain alert and keep on the job in performing what is necessary to attain that objective.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is one thing. Perhaps that job might be handed to an international organization to which we would contribute, acting under powers coming under the frequent review of Congress, with definite duties which we could study in advance. Perhaps that part of the job could be assigned to an international organization. But when this war has been finished, what nations will have the power to wage war? It will be the Allied Nations. The idea that there shall be confided to an international organization, and particularly to one man in it, the power to involve this country in war—with Russia, let us say, or with Great Britain, let us say, or with China, let us say—falls little short of insanity.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course. I agree with the Senator. The only three nations, as the Senator pointed out, which would have power to wage war, would be Russia, England, and the United States, and does he think for one moment that Russia would permit an international organization to say to her, if she wanted to become an aggressor, "You are not going to have the right to take aggressive action"?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not think Russia would agree, or that Great Britain would agree, or that the United States would agree.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to be sure I understand and the country understands just what the views of the able Senator from Montana are. Do I understand correctly the Senator to say that he does not favor the establishment of any international organization until after the peace treaty is made, so that its terms may be discovered?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. So that the Senator would not favor setting up any international organization until the peace is made and the treaty is written?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. And the able Senator would not favor the American delegate, or member of the International Security Council, which is contemplated by the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, having authority to vote in favor of the use of the armed forces put at the disposal of the international organization, without, I assume, the matter being referred by the Executive to the Congress. Would the Senator say to the Senate and the House, or only to the Senate?

Mr. WHEELER. I would say to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. To the Congress of the United States; and then the Congress—by what vote?

Mr. WHEELER. By a majority vote.

Mr. PEPPER. By a majority vote, specifically authorizing the use of the forces which are at the disposal of the international organization.

Mr. WHEELER. Which would be a virtual declaration of war, and I am not willing to take away from the Congress the right to declare war.

Mr. PEPPER. One other question. Does the Senator make any distinction whatever between, we will say, for example, a force of a hundred thousand men which might be contributed by all the member States in the international organization, which might be at the disposal of the international organization for quick use against any potential or threatened aggressor—I ask, does the Senator distinguish between the use of that kind of force by the international organization and our delegate giving his consent to the use of that limited force against any aggressor and a total mobilization of all the strength of the member States in the way that is done when war is declared? I ask further would he require the same authority for our delegate in respect to both kinds of force? Does the Senator see what I mean?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Senator has propounded a rather complicated question, and it is rather difficult to answer it; but let me make my position clear, although I think I have done so before. If troops must be maintained—and it may be necessary to maintain troops at certain points in order to preserve order and to keep Germany and Japan from rearming—then I am willing to have created an organization which will have the power to say to Germany or to Japan, "You must keep down your armament. You must not rearm." But, as a matter of fact, the best force with which to keep Germany from rearming is the force which resides in Europe itself, the force represented by England, France, and Russia, rather than that we should go over there and take part in preventing Germany from rearming. As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has very well pointed out, England, France, and Russia are the only three nations of Europe that are going to be able to make war on any great scale after the present war is ended, for everyone knows that all other nations of Europe, including Germany, will not only be completely poverty-stricken but their factories and towns will in large measure be destroyed. No thinking person in the United States can fail to realize that after this war is over Germany will be completely destroyed from an economic standpoint, and, in my judgment, she is so destroyed at this time.

Does the Senator from Florida think that a force 100,000 strong, made up of troops contributed by Great Britain, the United States, France, and China would be able to stop Russia, let us say, if she began aggressive warfare against China with the purpose of taking over Manchukuo?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, of course not; but I hope the Senator will let me clarify the matter. I am sure he wants to state his position clearly, and I think it is important that he should state it clearly. I will try to divide the question into two parts. Let me assume that the international organization should be set up, and let me further assume that it should be agreed that it should have at its disposal an army, we will say, of 100,000 men, contributed by member states in some proper proportion; that it should have a navy consisting of a certain number of warships—I am speaking of forces now which are subject to the disposal of the joint chiefs of staff—and that it should have an air force consisting of a certain number of planes. Now, assuming the existence of the international organization, assuming the existence of a certain limited force allocated by the member states for the use of the international organization, and assuming further the existence of the security council, and an American member of that council, before those forces could be used against any aggressor, would the able Senator from Montana require that the Congress of the United States give specific assent?

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator mean that the forces should be used against a country the council decided was an aggressor?

Mr. PEPPER. Any aggressor.

Mr. WHEELER. Against the nation the council decided was an aggressor?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I would not.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator would not require that the Congress of the United States give specific assent?

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, yes; I would require the consent of the Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator would require the consent of the Congress?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. So the Senator would not allow any forces to be at the disposal of the international organization for use against an aggressor, insofar as we are concerned, without the specific consent of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly. In the first place, if the aggression were a serious one, if a great war were started by England or by Russia or by the United States, the small force referred to by the Senator from Florida would be of no use. It would be of no value at all except in a small war or in the case of a small country.

Some individuals have said, "We are perfectly willing to allow the council to act to stop an aggression if it is a minor aggression." All wars generally have begun on a small scale, with small aggressions. Every large outbreak in Europe has generally started from comparatively small bickerings, and with what we would look upon as a small war.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for clarifying his position on this question. If the able Senator will now allow me——

Mr. WHEELER. I thought my position had been made quite clear.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for clarifying his position. I wish to make an inquiry relative to the Senator's recent statement respecting the weakness of the League of Nations. Does not the Senator think the weakness of the League of Nations in respect to stopping aggression consisted not so much in the inability or the unwillingness of the League to define the aggressor as the incapacity of the League to use any force against the aggressor?

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly do not. Let me say to the Senator that Hugh Gibson, who was appointed to be our representative to the League of Nations, and who took part in many of its proceedings, in a recent book has made answer to the Senator's statement when he says that it was not the lack of force on the part of the League of Nations which prevented it from acting. It seems to me that Hugh Gibson should have more knowledge concerning the League than some of us who never attended any of its meetings.

On the other hand, Mr. Gibson said the real trouble arose because of bickerings between the various nations themselves. He said the large nations could get together respecting what to do with some small nation, but they never could get together respecting what to do with a great nation which had violated any of its agreements.

Mr. PEPPER. Let us examine that point for a moment. The most significant aspect of the United Nations acting as an organization is the fact that it evidences the concert of those nations against an aggressor. Let us say, for example, that Hitler had known, either when he marched into the Rhineland or when he committed his first act of aggression, that there existed a reasonable force which could be hurled in his path by an international organization, and suppose the representatives of the various powers constituting that organization voted to use that force, would it not have indicated to Hitler that they were going to resist him collectively? In other words, if they committed 100,000 men against an aggressor in concert, would that not be the best evidence to

the aggressor that, if need be, they would array a million men or 20,000,000 men against him?

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad the Senator raised the Rhineland question, because, as a matter of fact, all that had to be done to stop Hitler from going into the Rhineland was for England and France to say to Hitler, "You cannot go into the Rhineland," and the two countries had the power to prevent him from doing so. France alone had the power at that time to stop Hitler from going into the Rhineland. England at that time had the power to do so. But England and France did not stop Hitler from going into the Rhineland because they were bickering among themselves and could not agree.

Let us suppose a hundred thousand men were stationed in the Rhineland at the time, and suppose England and France could not agree as to what action to take, does the Senator think the force stationed in the Rhineland would have stopped Hitler from going into the Rhineland? As a matter of fact, of course, England and France permitted him to go into the Rhineland.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is not now following through, because the question as I asked it of the able Senator——

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is assuming that England and France and Russia and every other country in Europe would agree and act in agreement.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. But we know what human nature is, and we know how they would act.

Mr. PEPPER. I am asking the Senator if he would not let the American delegate at least have authority to try to lead the others into such an agreement without endless debate and delay here in the Congress, in the hope that there might be a concert among the powers which would stop incipient wars.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate that the Senator has outlined what he hopes and envisages. That is a fine, utopian idea; but, unfortunately, human nature is the same everywhere. It evidences itself the same among nations as among individuals. As I shall point out, as I proceed, even now, after England and Russia and the United States have agreed upon a definite policy and upon the Atlantic Charter, Russia has violated the Atlantic Charter and is violating agreements made with Poland and agreements and treaties made with Lithuania, with Estonia, and with Latvia. She has violated every treaty she has made with those small European countries.

Can we believe that a nation that has thus violated every treaty she has entered into with countries adjoining her will overnight turn around and change her policy? Can we believe that England will turn around and change her policy overnight? The record which I shall read to the Senate before I conclude will convince anyone that it is simply wishful thinking to believe that we can set up some kind of a utopian organization, that all the countries which are members of it will agree, and that we shall have peace and prosperity, when the facts contradict every single assumption the Senator from Florida has made.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator must recall, as he indicated a moment ago, that this policy on the part of Russia of beginning an individualistic approach to its own security occurred historically after Russia had appealed to the League of Nations and to the people of the world to stand by the principle of collective security, and neither Europe nor we had acquiesced in that effort on Russia's part.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me correct the Senator on that point. Russia was for those things when she was weak and powerless. As I shall point out—and I think it cannot be disputed—her own statements indicate that she did it for the purpose of embarrassing the United States and the other so-called capitalistic nations. One cannot read the record and come to any other conclusion. Russia was weak and helpless at that time, and she wanted to have other nations disarmed, because she was afraid of being attacked.

But Russia agreed to certain treaties in the late thirties and later signed the Atlantic Charter. Furthermore, as I read from the record a moment ago, Russia stated, through Pravda, the official organ, that she would not interfere with the Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Poland. Is she violating her agreements? I will read the record, and before I am through I shall demonstrate whether she has violated her agreements.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to refresh the recollection of the distinguished Senator from Montana. When the Germans moved into the Rhineland, France had the largest and best army in the world.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under those circumstances, to suggest that France, herself immediately menaced by the bayonets of the meager German army of occupation of the Rhineland, and not having the energy and spirit to repel that advance, should call upon the United States to send her soldiers into the breach reaches the height of absurdity.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As a matter of fact, Hitler was encouraged to go into the Rhineland, and also to rearm, by the Disarmament Conference, when England and the United States failed to support France at the time Mr. Norman Davis was representing the United States Government. The Disarmament Conference adjourned without accomplishing anything. It adjourned over the protest of France. That left France alone to take care of Germany. As a matter of fact, at that time England was afraid of Russia. We were supporting Great Britain. Britain wanted Germany rearmed as a protection against the growing power of Russia.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. He is absolutely correct. Everyone who knows anything about the subject must be aware that neither Hitler nor Mussolini gained control of his government by a coup d'etat. They were brought in by their own governments, with the consent and connivance of England and other countries, and even some of the international banking group in England and other European countries.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Not only England and other countries in Europe, but the United States as well.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. A loan of $100,000,000 was floated here for Mussolini.

Mr. WHEELER. Not only was a loan floated for him, but he decorated some of our international bankers.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. When Salvameni, the historian, was over here, he told me that he was amazed to find autographed copies of Mussolini's picture on the mantlepieces of many of our great economic royalists in the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me once more?

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Assuming that we knew and favored the peace terms we would have to enforce against our defeated enemies, then under careful prescription of power, and frequent review by the Congress of our participation in it I should be perfectly willing to have an automatic application of force to conserve our victory over our defeated enemies.

I should like to ask the Senator to yield so that I may ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield if it will not take too long.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It will take me only a moment to ask the question.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield, if the Senator from Florida does not take too long to answer it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Leaving out of the picture the conservation of the victory over our defeated enemies, would the Senator from Florida favor having one man representing the United States on an international council vested with the power to declare war, let us say, against Russia or Great Britain?

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, no one has ever advocated that the one man who might be the American delegate on the security council should have any power to declare war.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would he have the power to vote for it?

Mr. PEPPER. The advocates of that plan have always made the distinction which I tried to indicate a few moments ago in my questions addressed to the able Senator from Montana. They have conceived of and contemplated two kinds of force: First, something in the nature of a police force, constituted as the military and naval experts might think it should be constituted, which might be under the command and at the disposal of the international organization for quick use against an aggressor. That is the kind of force, as I understand, which it is considered our delegates should have the right to vote to employ, without coming back to the Congress. My answer is, "Yes," respecting limited forces.

If the situation were to reach the stage where all the nations which were members of the international organization had to pledge their total manpower, wealth, and strength in an enterprise in the nature of an all-out effort, the magnitude of an undertaking of that kind would be such that it is contemplated that it should be referred to the Congress of the United States before consent should be given.

It is contemplated that there would be those two kinds of forces, with respect to one of which our delegates should have the power to act, and with respect to the other, it should be within the privilege and prerogative of the Congress to pass upon it before the consent of the Nation were given.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Assume that one of the three nations which I have mentioned—namely, the United States, Russia, or Great Britain—should commit a clear act of aggression, under all the definitions of the term, would the Senator permit one man to decide the use of the force which the Senator has been describing that would precipitate a war against the aggressor?

Mr. PEPPER. I answer as I answered the previous question. If the Senator is speaking of the use of limited forces which are in the nature of police forces at the disposal of the international organization, then whoever may be the aggressor, those forces would be and should be subject to instant use against such an aggressor. Of course, we are no respectors of persons when we speak of aggressors.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Surely the Senator must appreciate that an attack by a mingled small force including our armed forces would be a perfect casus belli, a perfect affront to war, a perfect way to become involved in war.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, the able Senator from Colorado makes it clear to his colleagues and the country that he does not favor an international organization having force to use against an aggressor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was very careful to say where I favored it, and I am now very careful to say where I do not favor it. I repeat that I would never allow any international organization to put us into war with any of the allied nations, without the prior consent of Congress.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield, although I should like to proceed with my speech.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Let me invite the attention of the Senator to another point. The debate which has been proceeding is very interesting. I wish to add one point respecting the difficulty which we have encountered in the past.

Human nature is always the same. We may have to meet it again in the future. It is said that Senator Williams, of Mississippi, in debating the League of Nations, took his colleagues to task when they contended that it would not work. He said, "It will work. All you have to do is to change human nature."

Manchuria furnishes an illustration of great powers in controversy. When Japan invaded Manchuria the League of Nations was an aggregation of nations to prohibit aggression. A commission was appointed to investigate the matter, after our Secretary of State had called upon the controlling members of the League of Nations to take action. The League of Nations Council was controlled by Britain and France. A commission was appointed, and it made an investigation. That commission condemned the action of Japan in the most vigorous terms that can be used in diplomatic language, and recommended that action be taken. The representative of the British Government spoke for half an hour against taking action. When he concluded, the Japanese representative arose and said, in effect, that he thanked the representative of Great Britain, and that the British representative had explained the situation far better in 30 minutes than he, the representative of Japan, had been able to do in 3 months.

As a result, no action was taken, although all the nations, members of the League, had agreed to the agreements of the League to act. But the United States, although not a member of the League, advanced the problem and wished to have action taken. Those who had solemnly agreed to prohibit aggression simply laid down. As the Ambassador from China said in an address in New York some time ago:

> The League of Nations was killed by the two great powers that controlled it, and it was killed at the time of the Manchuria incident, when they did not want to take action against Japan. The reason they did not want to take action against Japan was that they found it was not to their own interest to do so.

So, Mr. President, nations, like individuals, hesitate to keep their obligations when it is not to their own interest to do so. That is something with which we must contend. We must not forget that it will continue in the future. We can only anticipate the future by remembering the past, so long as human nature remains what it is. We cannot achieve perfection, but must attempt some realism.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much, and I also thank the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Colorado, but I must proceed with my speech.

Of course, the argument made by the Senator from Colorado points out definitely that when we say we will permit the use of 100,000 men to stop aggression by Russia, we have immediately committed our country to an all-out war. There can be no question about that.

Mr. President, it is only recently that the American people have become conscious of the extent to which the deep cleavages between ourselves and our allies have threatened the whole course of this war and the hope of peace. If we are to be frank and honest about the situation now confronting us, the present trend in power politics would compel us to admit that, in reality, the alleged unity which has existed between ourselves and our allies, Great Britain and Russia, is only an ugly offspring born of the necessities; that actually this new-found harmony was the result of an international shotgun wedding. How else can we explain a continuation of present policies on the part of our allies which appear to a growing body of international opinion as though they were saying to each other, "Carry on; take whatever territory you like; change frontiers to suit your whims and fancies; swap minorities and populations to your heart's content; interfere in the internal affairs of whatever governments you wish; we will talk about principles after we have carved up the world to suit ourselves."

What faith can the other nations of the world have that the Big Three intend to establish a just and decent peace, and what sense is there in talking about an international organization to maintain and enforce treaties, if the Atlantic Charter, which underlies every solemn pledge, promise, and agreement of the most powerful Allied Nations, turns out to be a geopolitical IOU?

In view of the violent contradictions and the basic conflicts with which we are now confronted, there is no point whatever in continuing to pull the wool of propaganda farther down over our eyes. There is just no point in slandering honest and sincere questioning, by indiscriminately pasting the label "Made in Berlin" on every question that arises. It would be an outrage to engage in further recrimination, evasion, or double talk as a substitute for the answers to the serious questions the American people now are asking. Further, it is utter folly to continue to divorce the question of our intentions toward Germany from the question of our intentions toward Europe as a whole, or toward Asia, or toward the whole world.

As I understand the past record of declarations on the part of the Big Three, we are not fighting this war just "to destroy the Nazi tyranny." The continued brandishing of such empty slogans before the eyes of the American people amounts to a deliberate misrepresentation of the real issues on the part of our Government officials. Such phrases as "on to Berlin and Tokyo," "hang Hitler," or "total victory" do not even contain half of the truth. According to our own President, we are not fighting this war just to make it impossible for Germany only to start another war of aggression and conquest that might embroil the world. According to the solemn declarations of purpose on the part of this Government and our allies, we fight to make the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" to secure that no nation—not even Russia or England—will be able or will have cause to threaten another vicious attack on the civilized world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield, but I should like to continue my remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not ask the Senator to yield to me for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy, but because the point to which I wish to refer relates to the war, and because the Senator re-

ferred to certain slogans which are directly related to the progress of the war, and because his statements might be misunderstood. Let me say that I am sure the Senator favors going on to Berlin; he favors going on to Tokyo, and I hope he favors hanging Hitler. I do not want there to be any question about that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Senator is correct about that. I am seeking to point out that our war aims are not merely the hanging of Hitler or going on to Tokyo and Berlin. We have told the people of the world that our aims are the establishment of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. Of course, let me make it plain that I wish to see Japan completely destroyed so that she will never be able to start another war. I denounced Hitler when some members of the British royalty were in Germany—hunting with him. I returned to this country in 1936, after spending some time in Europe, and I denounced Hitler from various platforms. But notwithstanding that, because I wished to keep our country out of war, because I thought the steps our country was taking would lead us directly into war, and because I did not believe we would have a utopia immediately after the war, I was denounced by all the internationalists as one who was favoring Hitler, or something of that kind. Actually, I denounced him when other persons were appeasing him.

Mr. President, there is simply no use in attacking this position as "irresponsible perfectionism." Who was the perfectionist when this matter was originally brought up? On January 6, 1941, President Roosevelt said, in his annual message, to Congress:

> The "fourth freedom" is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any nation anywhere in the world.

If that is not perfectionism, I do not know what it is.

Mr. President, as I understand the past record of purposes set down by ourselves and our allies, we are not fighting this war to impose a peace of vengeance upon a conquered people. It is inconceivable to me that the American people would tolerate for one moment any such brutal and savage proposals as those designed by Secretary Morgenthau for the ultimate treatment of the German people or the German nation. Let me repeat what I have said on so many other occasions, that in holding this position I hold no brief for the Nazi brutality, the Hitlerian bestiality and savagery. What I do hold is that such terms will never in a thousand years bring peace to Europe or to the world. Whatever our desires with reference to Germany may be, what we must ultimately consider is not merely what we would like to do in our madness with reference to the German people but what will bring about lasting peace in Europe and throughout the world. Of course, when passions are running high in this country, the popular thing to do is to let madness and hatreds run away with sound judgment; but we must look beyond all that. We in the United States of America, of all people, we who boast of our intelligence and our tolerance, must consider not what we would like to see done but what will be the best for the future of our own country and of the world. What I believe is that for the United States Government to permit the continued use of the basic proposals contained in the Morgenthau "brain child" as representing America's ultimate war and peace aim would cost thousands upon thousands of American lives, as well as the lives of our allies.

Mr. President, I have read a letter from a soldier boy in France which he had written to his uncle, a Texas businessman. I am sorry I do not have the letter with me. In it the boy said, in effect, "The demand for unconditional surrender and Morgenthau's statement are making these Heinies fight like hell from ditch to ditch." A soldier, recently returned from Italy, who was in my office the other day told me practically the same thing.

Mr. President, I believe that in lieu of any basic agreement among the conquerors as to the ultimate treatment of Germany, a continued use of such proposals will only lead to slaughter and carnage. Out of this will arise a savage underground movement over which both of our allies, Great Britain and Russia, will struggle for favor or control. If we do not want Germany ultimately to win this war by holding the real balance in the struggle for the control of Europe between Britain and Russia, if we do not want ourselves sucked into the political, economic, and social vacuum which will exist in Europe when the fighting finally stops, we ought now to agree upon constructive and curative measures.

If I am chided for this stand as being an irresponsible perfectionist or an embittered isolationist, again I ask, Who first brought this issue up?

On January 3, 1940, President Roosevelt solemnly declared:

> It is, of course, true that the record of past centuries includes destruction of small nations, enslavement of peoples, and building of empires on the foundation of force. But wholly apart from the greater international morality which we seek today, we recognize the practical facts that with modern weapons and modern conditions, modern man can no longer live a civilized life if we are to go back to the practice of wars and conquests of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Is not that what is taking place today?

Mr. President, if I am not being realistic about the ominous outlook for America in the years ahead, should this war end in the complete disintegration of international morality and decency for which it is now headed, again I ask, Who first brought this matter up?

In the same speech from which I have just quoted, the President went on to say:

> It becomes clearer and clearer that the future world will be a shabby and dangerous place to live in—even for Americans to live in—if it is ruled by force in the hands of a few.

A few? Russia, United States, and England.

The President continued:

> We must look ahead and see the possibilities for our children if the rest of the world comes to be dominated by concentrated force alone—even though today we are a very large and powerful nation.

I quote further from the President:

> We must look ahead and see the effect on our own future if all the small nations of the world have their independence snatched from them or become mere appendages to relatively vast and powerful military systems.

Mr. President, if I am a perfectionist I am following the example of our Democratic leader when he made the statements which I have read.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield in order that I may make an observation on the point of perfectionism?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. During World War No. 1 the United States, together with France, Britain, and Japan, fought the Central Powers. Before we were through with the war we, together with France, Britain, and Japan, were fighting and invading Russia, and the slaughter of the Russian people was terrible.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Many good people seem to expect perfectionism in international politics. History has been entirely on the other side of the argument, even until recent date.

Mr. WHEELER. I think I shall make that point clear within the next few minutes.

Mr. President, if any nation ought to understand the futility of following the present course of action and the sheer madness of trying to perpetuate the status quo at the end of this war, that nation is Russia. No other government has so plainly and so fully documented its antagonism toward the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations as instruments of the status quo.

On October 8, 1920, Lenin bitterly declared:

> By attacking Poland we are attacking the Allies. By destroying the Polish Army we are destroying the Versailles peace, upon which rests the whole system of present international relations. * * * Had Poland become sovietized, the Versailles peace would have been terminated and the system built on victory over Germany would have been destroyed likewise.

What are they doing now? They are attempting to sovietize Poland. And for what?

On March 15, 1923, in a note sent to the general secretary of the League of Nations, the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs expressed the Soviet Government's attitude toward the League in the following words:

> It regards it as a coalition of certain states endeavoring to usurp the power over other states and masking their attempt on the rights and independence of other nations in a false appearance of groundless legality and in the form of the mandates issued by the Council or * * * Assembly of the League of Nations. * * * The Soviet Government maintains its conviction that this pseudo-international body really serves as a

policy of certain great powers or their vassals. The Soviet Government finds confirmation for its conviction every time that a state assuming the leading role in the League of Nations makes a decision on international questions, touching the interest of the Soviet Republic.

On March 25, 1925, Mr. Manuiski declared to the Third Congress of Communist Parties:

The true function of Poland is to form a barrier preventing the spread of the Communist idea westward. For that reason the international proletariat must consider as its task the smashing of capitalistic Poland and turning it into a Soviet Republic.

On July 1, 1926, in speaking of the formation of an Anglo-Russian Communist Committee, Mr. Stalin declared:

The task of the new bloc consists in the organization of a vast working-class movement against new imperialistic wars in general, and especially against intervention in our country as planned by the great European powers, particularly England.

Again, in 1926 the Soviet Government issued an official Soviet theoretical statement on the League of Nations from which I quote:

Thus the League is, as a matter of fact, a political combination or a group of nations interested in the preservation and utilization of the post-war international status. Its very name and the universal designation ascribed to it are therefore fictitious.

(At this point the Senate received a message from the House of Representatives announcing the death of Representative O'CONNOR, of Montana, which appears in the RECORD following Mr. WHEELER'S speech. Following the reading of the message, Mr. WHEELER said:)

Mr. President, I am certainly saddened to hear of the death of Representative O'CONNOR, who had been a very dear friend of mine for a great many years. He was a very able lawyer. He had been a member of the Montana Legislature and was speaker of the house of representatives of that State. He held various other important positions, and was a very able Member of Congress. His untimely death will be deeply regretted by all the people of Montana, regardless of their party affiliations.

I continue the quotation from the Soviet statement on the League of Nations:

The League, being a continuation of the Entente, did not change its substance because of the fact that neutral countries had been invited to participate and later on the vanquished states—such as Germany in particular—had been admitted. The latter circumstance witnesses that, together with the preservation of the status created by the Versailles Treaty, another aim of the League is becoming more evident, namely, the establishment of a united front of bourgeois states against the U. S. S. R.

The League can by no means be transformed into a superstate or a federation of states, or even into a loose confederation, because of the irreconcilable contradictions between various capitalistic states, members of the League. The growing antagonism and the concealed struggle among the biggest powers (as, for instance, between Great Britain and France), the constant quarrels and conflicts among the members of the League, the militarist "climate" prevailing in the whole world—all this proves the bankruptcy of the bourgeois pacification.

That conforms to what I said to the Senator a moment ago that the failure of the League of Nations, not only as expressed by the Soviet Government but by our own representatives who attended there, came not because of the fact that it lacked power but because there was bickering from within.

On May 22, 1929, the Fifth Congress of the Union declared in its resolution to the Preparatory Commission for the Conference on Disarmament of the League:

The rejection of the Soviet proposal by the preparatory commission and refusal of the member states to make the least step in the reduction in land and naval armaments constitute a new proof that those states base their policies on the preparation for a new world war.

On December 28, 1933, Mr. Molotov declared:

That the danger of new wars has become particularly imminent this year is quite clear if only from the following fact. This year Germany and Japan have announced their decision to withdraw from the League of Nations.

On January 26, 1934, Joseph Stalin reported to the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party—and I should like to have the Senate listen carefully to this statement:

I do not think a single period in the last decade has been so rich in events as this. A result of the protracted economic crisis was the hitherto unprecedented acuteness of the political situation in capitalist countries, both within the respective countries as well as between them. Quite clearly things are moving toward a new war.

Mr. President, there is no necessity for burdening my colleagues with further evidence of the mutual suspicion and distrust which form the background of the present war. Suffice it to say that these suspicions attach themselves to all parties to such an extent that on March 10, 1939, Mr. Stalin described the world situation in the following words:

To what are we to attribute this one-sided and strange character of the new imperialist war?

He called it an imperialistic war.

It might be attributed to the fear that a revolution might break out if the nonaggressive states were to go to war and the war were to assume world-wide proportions. But the chief reason is that the majority of the nonaggressive countries, particularly England and France, have rejected the policy of collective security, the policy of collective resistance to the aggressors, and have taken up a position of nonintervention, reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work; not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, or, better still, with the Soviet Union; not to hinder Germany, say, from enmeshing herself in European affairs; from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union. * * * Cheap and easy. Take Germany, for instance. They let her have Austria, despite the undertaking to defend her independence; they let her have the Sudeten region; they abandoned Czechoslovakia to her fate, thereby violating all their obligations; and then they began to lie vociferously in the press about "the weakness of the Russian Army," "the demoralization of the Russian air force," and "riots" in the Soviet Union egging the Germans on to march farther east, promising them easy pickings and prompting them: "Just start war on the Bolsheviks, and everything will be all right."

Such is Russia's interpretation of this present war. Does not this record bear out my contention that Russia, of all countries, will understand and appreciate the realism of my position?

I cannot understand why anyone now, even in the midst of this horrible war, should be condemned for repeating the warnings of the deep conflict of interests and suspicions that divide the Big Three. They have been uttered by prime ministers, dictators, and presidents. As I see my duty, it is to remind my fellow Americans in this crucial hour of our history that our own leaders have continually pointed out the tragedy that is in store for us, should their own fears be realized.

On January 4, 1939, President Roosevelt warned this Nation that:

In a modern civilization, religion, democracy, and international good faith complement each other. Where freedom of religion has been attacked the attack has come from the sources opposed to democracy. Where democracy has been overthrown, the spirit of free worship has disappeared. And where religion and democracy have vanished, good faith and reason in international affairs have given way to strident ambition and brute force.

He was speaking not only of Germany but of Russia as well.

On April 20, 1939, the Soviet Government suggested as the basis for a possible Soviet cooperation with Britain and France what amounted to a partition of Poland. These proposals concluded the admission of Soviet troops into both north and south Poland, Poland's repudiation of her alliance with Rumania and a declaration by the British that their guarantee given Poland applied only to Poland's western frontiers.

When these proposals were refused on August 22, 1939, the Soviets concluded a mutual-aid pact with Germany, which, according to the New York Times of June 22, 1941—

contained the obligation not to attack each other and secondly, not to interfere in respective spheres of interest. Finland, the Baltic countries, part of Poland, and part of Rumania were declared Russian spheres.

As can be clearly seen from the following record, the deep conflicts of interest of which I speak have carried up to this present hour, leaving a trail of lawlessness, treaty-breaking, brutality, and suspicion.

On August 22, 1939, William Bullitt reports an interview with Daladier from which I quote:

Daladier said that the action of the Soviet Union in signing a nonaggression pact with Germany, containing many unknown secret clauses, placed France in a most tragic and terrible situation. He could not understand how the French diplomats and negotiators had been so deceived by the Russians.

On September 1, 1939, Germany attacked Poland.

On September 17, 1939, Russia stabbed Poland in the back, notwithstanding her agreement to protect that country. Mr. Molotov boldly admits the role Soviet Russia played in this tragedy, for on October 31, 1939, he said:

One swift blow to Poland first by the German Army and then by the Red Army and nothing was left of this ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty.

And this notwithstanding Russia's nonaggression treaty with Poland.

It is interesting to note that in this same speech Mr. Molotov defended Germany as a state striving for peace, condemned England and France, and asserted it was absurd "to fight for the restoration of the Polish state." Yet some say that if we had belonged to the League of Nations, everything would have been lovely.

On November 30, 1939, Russia attacked Finland, again notwithstanding her nonaggression pact.

On December 14, 1939, the Council of the League of Nations, condemning the Soviet Union as an aggressor, expelled Russia from the League. Then, in rapid succession, came Russia's attacks on Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, condemned vigorously and unequivocally in turn by our State Department.

If we remember that Germany and Russia were engaged jointly in liquidating Poland and extending their spheres of influence when the following statement was made, we shall have a clearer understanding of its significance. Germany did not attack Russia until June 22, 1941. Two months earlier, on April 24, 1941, the former Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, replied to those who were asking whether peace could not be made with the dictators.

The following statement was directed not only against Hitler, but at Stalin as well. I quote:

> I wish it were possible. But one obstinate fact stands in the way. One of the contending groups not only does not wish peace, as we understand peace, but literally does not believe in peace. That group uses the word, it is true—as it was used by the aggressor at the time of the Munich arrangement of 1938. Peace to that group is merely a convenient cloak for a continuing undeclared, undercover war, as France and many other nations to their misery have discovered. Behind the deceptive protection of the word "peace" the rulers of that group accumulate vast striking forces. They infiltrate shock troops disguised as peaceful travelers and businessmen. They set up organizations for spying, sabotage, and propaganda. They endeavor to sow hatred and discord. They use every tool of economic attack, bribery, corruption, and local disturbance to weaken the countries with which they are at peace until a military movement can easily complete the task of subjugation. That kind of a peace is nothing more than a trap—a trap into which many nations fell in earlier phases of this movement for world conquest when its true nature was not understood. Indeed the dictator nations make no secret of their plans. They scornfully state their ideas, arrogantly confident that the law-abiding nations will not take them seriously—until it is too late successfully to resist them.

On June 22, 1941, when Germany marched against Russia, Mr. Churchill said in offering aid to the beleaguered Soviets:

> No one has been a more consistent opponent of communism than I have been in the last 25 years. I will unsay no word that I have spoken against it.

The attitude of the British toward the present situation now confronting the Allies is clearly stated in a speech by Lord Halifax, then acting as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. On January 20, 1940, he said:

> The instinct of our people has always throughout their history driven them to resist attempts by any one nation to make itself master of Europe. They have always seen in any such attempt a threat both to their own existence and to the general cause of liberty in Europe.

To those who would charge that I am raking over old coals I would like to say that as recently as May 13, 1944, President Roosevelt permitted Mr. Forrest Davis to speak for him in the Saturday Evening Post. I quote from the article titled "What Really Happened at Teheran":

> Stripped to the bare essentials, we fought in 1917 and are fighting now to prevent the mastery of Europe by one aggressive power. Should Russia as the sole European power display tendencies toward world conquest, our vital interests would again be called into account.

I repeat that statement:

> Stripped to the bare essentials, we fought in 1917 and are fighting now to prevent the mastery of Europe by one aggressive power. Should Russia as the sole European power display tendencies toward world conquest, our vital interests would again be called into account.

Mr. President, certainly it is not being unrealistic for me to recall to mind historical realities.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the article purport to carry the authority of the President for the quotation?

Mr. WHEELER. I so understand it.

Mr. PEPPER. I merely desired to draw the Senator's attention to that. It is unusual for the President to designate a man to write an article for the Saturday Evening Post, as the official spokesman of the President of the United States, regarding an international conference.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand this article was printed with the President's approval, and not only with his approval, but that the author spent days going over the matter with the President. It has never been repudiated in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. PEPPER. The second question is, Does the Senator see no distinction between the character and the location of the Russian Government and the Russian people, and of Germany, with respect, for example, to the danger to this country they might constitute as a dominant power in Europe?

Mr. WHEELER. I shall take that up; I am coming to it, and I have the answer to the Senator's question. It is not my answer to it, but the answer given by the British themselves—what they think about it.

It is not unrealistic for me to warn of the tragic consequences to our civilization if this war ends up in a struggle for the domination of Europe by one or two great powers. It is not unrealistic for me to protest the continuation on the part of my own Government and my own people of policies which our whole history proves will lead to disaster.

There are those who are irritated that I should continue to fight against the extension of power politics, both actual and threatened, into the so-called peace. They want to get on with the bloody business and be done with this fol-de-rol. To them again I say for us such a course is sheer madness. This would mean that we would have to start immediately playing power politics according to the 1945 pattern. We would be compelled to organize resistance groups and to interfere in the internal affairs of governments and nations with brute force, the world around. We would have to start annexing territories, changing boundaries, deporting or liquidating populations, and defying the will of masses of people among our friends and enemies alike. We would have to go in for bigger and more horrible concentration camps, newer and more terrible G. P. U.'s and Gestapos, suppressing all news and communications, distorting truth, and fouling our sacred honor, until, struggling to hold high the ever-weakening hands of Britain, we finally came to death grips with Soviet Russia. If we really want to commit national suicide, this is the road down which to travel from here on out.

Surely my colleagues have not forgotten the slogan of "All aid, short of war, to our allies." On December 29, 1940, the President set the theme for America's role as the arsenal of democracy when he said:

> In a military sense Great Britain and the British Empire are today the spearhead of resistance to world conquest.

Sir Harold MacKinder, in founding the science of geopolitics during the last war, issued the solemn warning of what would happen to England if any nation finally succeeded in annexing Poland. His thesis is simply this: Whoever would control Europe must control eastern Europe, the key to which is Poland. Whoever controls Poland controls eastern Europe. Whoever controls eastern Europe controls Europe. Whoever controls Europe controls the great Eurasian Island, and the world.

Mr. President, I quote from an article printed in the September 1943 issue of The Nineteenth Century and After. The editor, Mr. F. A. Voigt, said:

> To be master of eastern Europe is, therefore, to be master of all Europe. If England were to abdicate in eastern Europe, she would be abdicating in all Europe. Such a policy would lead to her isolation, it would destroy the British ascendancy in the Near and Middle East. It would, by placing the Balkans and the Straits under the domination of one power, bring the British command of the Mediterranean to an end. It would isolate Turkey and eliminate British influence in Iraq and in Iran, and threaten the security of India and of the Persian Gulf. It would compel England to reconsider her attitude toward Germany.

Mr. President, there are those who are now so heartily sick of the terrible problems and conflicts arising out of this war, into which they so idealistically precipitated America, that they are openly urging that we let Europe fall into the hands of Stalin. Perhaps that would be best from our standpoint. They argue in this vein, "England and France have never been able to prevent the outbreak of war

in Europe. Let Stalin try his hand." To them I would say, in the words of another, they "are now willing to settle for a nickel on a dollar and they are not so sure but what even the nickel is plugged." Certainly if America wants to gain the everlasting enmity of 350,000,000 people in Europe, and not only in Europe but throughout the world, this is the way to do it, because if we agreed to such a suggestion, what people on the face of the globe could have any faith or confidence in anything the American people might ever say or ever do?

There are those, on the other hand, Mr. President, who declare that Mr. Stalin has changed his tune and his intentions. Say they, "Mr. Stalin does not want to take over Europe. He has too much else on his hands and mind." To them I would say, this is the most unrealistic interpretation of the history I have documented that could be imagined. Whether Mr. Stalin has changed his mind or not, the fact remains that the present situation in Europe is disintegrating morally, socially, and economically, and politically to such an extent it is now obvious that the whole tragic European situation has gotten out of hand. Europe is being forced into Mr. Stalin's embrace whether he wants it or not. Compare the scene that now confronts us in Europe with the picture drawn by President Roosevelt on the Axis "new order," when he said on December 29, 1940:

> The proposed new order is the very opposite of a United States of Europe or a United States of Asia. It is not a government based on the consent of the governed. It is not a union of ordinary, self-respecting men and women to protect themselves and their freedom and their dignity from oppression. It is an unholy alliance of power and pelf to dominate the human race.

Again, I say, Mr. President, it is my studied conviction that whether we or our allies have deliberately intended such an outcome to this war or not, for us to continue down the road we are going will make such an outcome inevitable. Certainly no more personal parleys on the part of three men, no more secret agreements, no more secret or open extensions of spheres of influence, no more identification of our desperate military necessities with ulterior political purposes on the part of ourselves or of our allies can possibly correct the present mortal errors we are now committing.

SIX-POINT STATEMENT OF PEACE AIMS

Mr. President, I desire at this time to urge upon my colleagues with all the strength of conviction at my command support of the principles contained in the resolution (S. Res. 8) submitted by me on January 6, 1945, as embodying the bases upon which a peace of decency, justice, and sanity can be salvaged from this terrible war.

The first principle reads as follows:

> The adoption of a universal Bill of Rights to safeguard the inalienable rights of every individual regardless of race, class, or religious belief.

Mr. President, I am certain that in urging the acceptance of this principle I am not speaking in behalf of a "discredited minority." I hold in my hand a map titled "Movements of Non-German Populations in Europe," published by the International Labor Office, Montreal, Canada, in 1943. Herein is contained a general outline of the most terrifying and staggering mass deportation, evacuations, and repatriations that history records. The fate of millions is at stake.

On August 14, 1944, the American Jewish Conference, consisting of delegates from 63 Jewish organizations, in a memorandum submitted to Secretary of State Stettinius, urged the incorporation of an international Bill of Rights in any post-war security system that the four-power parley at Dumbarton Oaks might conceive. The memorandum pointed to "the total disregard of civilized concepts, of individual human rights on the part of some States" and asserted that "herein lie the roots of the international anarchy that contributed to the assault of the Axis Powers on the civilized world."

On October 7, 1943, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Council, and the Synagogue Council of America issued a joint statement titled "Pattern for Peace," the second principle of which declares:

> The rights of the individual must be assured—the dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

Recently the American Jewish Committee issued a statement containing a six-point declaration of human rights that urges promulgation of an international bill of rights to guarantee individual liberties throughout the world. This statement has been signed by 1,326 distinguished Americans of all faiths. Vice President Wallace, Supreme Court Justices Roberts and Murphy, A. F. of L. President William Green, C. I. O. President Philip Murray, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, and Sidney Hillman, as well as numerous Senators and Representatives and 348 church leaders are listed among the signers.

Mr. President, this map to which I have referred indicates that not only Germany but also our associate Russia has been responsible for the tragic plight of vast numbers of so-called liberated peoples. Among the deportations attributed to Russia we find the following: 61,000 Estonians, 60,000 Latvians, 66,000 Lithuanians, and 1,500,000 Poles, Jews, and others from Poland, all of whom have been forcibly removed from their homes and their countries. From the meager reports that trickle through to us from Russian-occupied territories, we know only too well that under the present armistice terms now being forced upon the countries of eastern Europe, one by one, thousands upon thousands more human beings are being subjected to the terrors of a ruthless conqueror. Let us remind ourselves again of what Woodrow Wilson said, "No right exists anywhere to hand peoples about from potentate to potentate as if they were property." Unless there can be reestablished immediately a minimum of humanitarian principles to which the Allies will pledge themselves as a basis for rectifying the evils already committed, this war will prove a hideous mockery so far as liberation of the suffering people of Europe is concerned. There can be no better way to assure the world of the integrity of Russia's intention toward liberated people than for Mr. Stalin to act now in the name of the Russian people in order to hasten the realization of simple and basic humanitarian laws upon which to rebuild the social order of Europe. Certainly, we are convinced that the European peoples take no greater delight in ruthless treatment, inhumanities, or murder, whether perpetrated by ourselves or our allies, than they take in Nazi atrocities. Would it be too much to expect that they were entitled to something more from their liberators? Personally I am convinced there is no possible moral ground upon which Americans can condone their associates and allies for doing what they condemn in others.

The Washington Post of December 13 carried an Associated Press dispatch of December 12 from London, which reads, in part:

> There is a growing belief in diplomatic quarters that Russia's proposals, when presented to the European Advisory Commission, would suggest that several million Germans be sent to the Soviet to help in the reconstruction of that country.

I am informed that at least under Nazi occupation the Polish people carried on a desperate underground opposition to their conquerors, but that under the alleged Russian liberation even a great many of the underground forces have been liquidated or sent to concentration camps.

Surely the fanatical German resistance now adding to the already terrible casualties of our own American boys is not lessened by the realization of the fate being visited upon one of our allies by another alleged ally even before the war is over.

Mr. President, the second principle contained in my resolution reads as follows:

> The assured survival of democratic principles and institutions and the preservation here of our American way of life.

It has become all too clear that we have reached such a point in our relations with our allies that the English language is in danger of losing its meaning. I would suggest that there is no better time than now to deal with this danger. All about us we hear the words "democracy," "democratic," "fundamental law," "constitutional government" bandied about from pillar to post. I quote from an editorial in Pravda commemorating the eighth anniversary of the U. S. S. R.'s Stalin constitution, in which it is declared—New York Times, December 4, 1944:

> Soviet democracy is the most consistent democracy in the world.

Mr. President, when certain Senators sent a cablegram to Stalin congratulating him upon this anniversary a Communist in my home town whom I happen to know said to me, "The trouble

with those Senators is that they do not recognize the difference between a revolution by the proletariat and a revolution such as that which took place in the United States. They make a mockery of the word 'revolution.'" The Russians, the Communists, know what they are after, and they are taking what they want. Certainly I can hardly be accused of being anti-Communist so far as Russia is concerned, because I visited Russia in 1923, and when I returned to this country I advocated recognition of Russia. Some newspapers in this country stated that I ought to be deported because of that fact. I stated at that time that the Russian Government would last just as long as the Army could be kept loyal. The Army could be kept loyal, because the government took millions of boys who were illiterate and gave them shoes, clothes, and food. It made a superclass of them. Then it taught them to read and write and the principles of communism. That is all they know.

Soviet democracy is the most consistent democracy in the world.

The editorial further states:

The victories of the Soviet people are creating foundations for an international policy based on the consent of peoples. * * * The working masses of the whole world regard the Soviet people as a reliable support for the democratic system in their own country.

Anyone who has been to Russia knows differently.

I submit, Mr. President, that we are not fighting for the extension of the policies, practices, and techniques which are peculiar to the Soviet type of totalitarianism. There is a fundamental contradiction between what we know and mean as democracy in the United States and what is meant and known by the term in Russia.

On December 29, 1940, President Roosevelt clearly painted this contradiction when he said:

The history of recent years proves that shootings and chains and concentration camps are not the transient tools but the very altars of modern dictatorships. They may talk of a "new order" in the world but what they have in mind is but a revival of the oldest and the worst tyranny. In that there is no liberty, no religion, and no hope.

The difference is so real and so basic that we ought now, without equivocation, to state that it is not our intention to subject the so-called liberated peoples of Europe to Stalin's type of democratic rule any more than we intend to restore Hitler's tyranny. At least, let us make perfectly clear to the peoples of Europe that it is our intention so far as it lies within our power to provide them the opportunity to define and to determine what they mean by the type of political system and government they desire to support.

The third principle contained in my resolution reads:

The immediate creation of a United Nations political council to provide for the democratic settlement in harmony with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, of territorial questions that have arisen in Europe and that may arise elsewhere.

Mr. President, I do not happen to be one of those who believe that they have a simple and easy answer to the grievous questions now burdening us. This much I do believe, namely, that the questions now arising in Europe are so fraught with dangers to the post-war world that they ought not under any condition to be left to the resources, intentions, and discretion of any one nation for settlement. These problems involve the fate of millions of helpless suffering human beings; they bear directly on the settlement of the whole European question; they threaten the very foundation of western civilization, and they are so complicated and so pressing that they constitute a challenge to the combined resources of cultured, civilized, and christianized humanity.

I feel it is my duty to record the course that has been followed and that threatens to be followed where these problems have been left to one or two powers for settlement.

These are the brutal armistice terms that have been imposed on Finland:

The Finns lose Karelia, the area northwest of Leningrad. This includes the city of Viipuri—the most industrially developed region of Finland. In that area lives more than 10 percent of Finland's pre-1940 population. The agreement also provided for the outright ceding to Russia of the Petsamo area in the far north, with its port and rich nickel mines, and the leasing for 50 years of the Porkkala Peninsula, with its naval base on the Finnish Gulf, for use as a military region. In cash Finland must pay reparations totaling $300,000,000 within 6 years which is relatively heavier than any demand for reparations made on any country after the last war.

Now we are informed that our Treasury Department has refused to "unfreeze" sufficient Finnish funds in this country to enable her to pay a note on her indebtedness arising out of the last war, because for some strange reason such an act would play havoc with Russia's intention to integrate the economy of Finland with that of the Soviet Union.

Mr. C. L. Sulzberger informs us in the New York Times of December 31, 1944, that the three Baltic countries—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—have been abandoned to their fate by this Government.

I cannot believe that what Mr. Sulzberger says constitutes one of the real war aims of the United States. The Russion Institute of the Rand School on October 7, 1944, printed in its publication, Russian Affairs, a revealing document showing the treatment of Lithuanians at the hands of Russia in 1939. This document was supplied by the Lithuanian Red Cross as an "order of the people's commissar for the interior of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic" defining alleged anti-Soviet and socially alien elements, in order to permit the Soviets "to determine the strength of the counter-revolution and to direct apparatus for its digestion and liquidation."

These elements include: (a) All former members of anti-Soviet political parties, Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, Social Democrats, Anarchists, and the like; (b) all former members of national chauvinistic anti-Soviet parties, organizations, and groups: Nationalists, Young Lithuania, Voldemarists, Populists, Christian Democrats, members of nationalist terroristic organization, Iron Wolf, active members of the riflemen's association, the Catholic terrorist organization, White Horse; (c) former gendarmes, policemen, former employees of political and criminal police, and of the prisons; (d) former officers of the Czar, Petliura, and other armies; (e) former officers and members of military courts of the armies of Lithuania and Poland; (f) former political bandits and volunteers of the White and other armies; (g) persons expelled from the Communist Party and Communist Youth for antiparty offenses; (h) all deserters, political emigrants, reemigrants, repatriates, and contrabandists; (i) all citizens of foreign countries, representatives of foreign firms, employees of offices of foreign countries, former employees of legations, firms, concessions, and stock companies of foreign countries; (k) former employees of the departments of ministries from referents; (l) former workers of the Red Cross and Polish refugees; (m) religionists (priests, pastors), sectarians, and active religionists of religious communities; (n) former noblemen, estate owners, merchants, bankers, businessmen (who availed themselves of hired labor), shop owners, owners of hotels and restaurants.

It needs no stretch of the imagination to realize that this vast purge does not constitute American intentions toward the people of the Baltic countries.

Quite obviously, Russia intends to continue these tactics in imposing its own unilateral settlement of the Polish dispute on the heroic Polish peoples. Her recent recognition of the Moscow-spawned Lublin committee bears no other interpretation. Russia has twice refused our good offices in the settlement of the Polish dispute, and to date the record of her treatment of the Polish people, the Polish Army, and the Polish Government, at least, according to our standards, constitutes one of the blackest pages of modern history.

The extent to which the future peace of the world is threatened is further illustrated from the letter sent by the Coordinating Committee of American-Polish Associations in the East to former Secretary Cordell Hull, from which I quote:

Outside of the actual defeat of the common enemy, American arms are already helping to establish a division of the continent between two rival powers, Great Britain and Russia. The division of Europe between England and Russia is obviously a division into two zones of uneven strength. The very endeavor to level up that strength must inevitably become a source of conflict. Under these circumstances, chaos could be prevented only if American troops were to remain in Europe indefinitely. If such a plan for Europe were the result of United States policy, America would be responsible not only for the distortion of the true aims of this war and for the fifth partition of Poland, but also for the first partition of Europe. Our sons and our grandsons would have to pay for such a crime some day with their blood.

To confirm the extent to which Russia has gone in treating with the Polish problem I quote from William L. White's Report on the Russians in the January Reader's Digest:

In addition to the 180,000 Polish war prisoners, an estimated 1,500,000 civilians were removed from Poland in the early part of 1940 as part of the social engineering program. It was the practice to send men to lumber and mining camps in northern Siberia, women and children to brickyards and

cooperative farms in southern Mazakstan. It should be said in defense of the Soviet Government that under similar circumstances it has treated its own people exactly as it did the Poles.

Mr. President, the story of the betrayal of General Mihailovitch by both Russia and Britain, and the fate now being imposed on Yugoslavia is vividly described by Eleanor Packard, United Press correspondent, who has recently been expelled from Russian occupied territory, whom I quote:

In Belgrade alone Tito has arrested 40,000 followers of Mihailovitch and has already executed several hundreds. At the same time he has confiscated 2,000 businesses and industrial enterprises, all the banks, and 30,000 small land holdings belonging to Serbian peasants who supported General Mihailovitch. Actually Yugoslavia is now being liquidated literally and the people are being forced under the totalitarian, communistic rule of partisan bands supported by the Soviet Union.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that some of us want to see what kind of a peace treaty is made before we agree to set up machinery to maintain the status quo? Certainly if any American Government should do so without knowing the facts, the American people would repudiate it at the next election. It is inconceivable to me that we should wish to maintain the status quo if these things are going on, as reported by the labor organization in Canada, the Red Cross, and other organizations.

The story of what is going on in Bulgaria is more of the same. As I understand the situation, Bulgaria had sent delegates to Cairo to negotiate armistice terms with the British and the Americans. Under the terms agreed upon, Russia would not have been able to occupy Bulgaria, for the Bulgarian Army was to be demobilized after evacuating all territory in Greece and Yugoslavia; the boundary settlements were to be reserved until a later date; the Government was to remain neutral and without change. When a copy of those terms was forwarded to Russia, she immediately declared war on Bulgaria, voiding the Cairo terms, and imposed surrender and occupation, with Tudor Pavlov, the Bulgarian Communist leader, installed as the King's first adviser.

Now word comes that the leading spirit behind the coup d'état of September 2, namely, Eikolai Mushanoff, is being tried in Bulgarian courts as a war criminal. Yet Mushanoff was the leading spirit behind Premier Maavieff and his new Bulgarian Government that decreed amnesty for all anti-Nazi political prisoners, ordered the disbanding of all pro-Fascist organizations, denounced the anti-Comintern pact, revoked all anti-Jewish laws, and declared war on Germany before being attacked by the Soviets. Nevertheless, Russia declared war on that government, in order to overthrow it. Russia's determination to impose her will upon Bulgaria is further illustrated by the expulsion of two Anglo-American commissions from Bulgarian soil by Red Army officials, and the clamping down of a news black-out by Russia over the entire eastern European area from Finland to the Balkans.

In Greece open violence between Communist-inspired forces and British interests has already provided Americans with a preview of what they can expect as the struggle for the consolidation, extension, and control of two spheres of influence expands and intensifies. The same struggle goes on in various and sundry forms in every country in Europe. Even the neutrals are now feeling the bitter lash of vindictiveness and the sting of selfish interests. Switzerland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, and Palestine—all are caught in the rising tide of conflict. The dismay which accompanies the extension of this struggle for the control of the fate and destinies of nations is not dispelled by the recent news that Dr. Eduard Beneš, who has been preaching the gospel of pro-Russian solidarity up and down this land, has been informed, at least through the press, that Russia intends to incorporate all Slovakians into the western Soviet Ukraine, and to that end another government probably will be necessary in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. President, while I speak a harvest of violence, civil war, and death is been reaped in every country in Europe. The middle class and the economic foundations of our enemies and allies alike are being destroyed. If any problem cries out for a sane and reasonable solution, it is the problem which arises from the delegation of power to any one country to solve problems which involve the fate of all the other countries in Europe. As matters now stand, the aim—the sole aim—in Europe of the United Nations is to defeat Germany. As a corollary to that aim, Germany could not be defeated unless she was driven out of the occupied territories. In that sense they had to be liberated—liberated from Germany—but to liberate them for the sake of making them free was with Britain a wholly secondary aim, and with Russia, as matters now stand, not an aim at all.

On December 30, 1938, the former Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Grew, said, in a note to the Foreign Minister of Japan:

This government does not admit that there is need or warrant for any one power to take upon itself to prescribe what shall be the terms and conditions of a new order in areas not under its sovereignty and to constitute itself the repository of authority and the agent of destiny in regard thereto.

I see no other way of meeting this problem head-on save by establishing at the earliest possible moment a United Nations Political Council. Certainly Russia should agree to it. If she should not do so, we would know what we were in for. I submit that Stalin has the greatest opportunity of any leader in the world at this moment to show the peoples of the world that he intends to do what was stated in the agreements he made in the name of Russia, what he told Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, and all the other countries he would do, namely, that he would not interfere in any way in the internal affairs of those countries, and that he would permit them to have a democratic government, as they saw fit.

The fourth principle in my resolution calls for "free plebiscites under international supervision (not by Russia or England alone but by the combined forces) in all liberated countries to choose their own form of government and leadership, the time and procedure to be determined by the United Nations Political Council."

The Hague Convention of 1907, articles 42 to 56, distinguishes between military occupation as temporary occupation and annexation, or the final taking over of a foreign territory. The convention states that the occupying authority has not the right to force the population to any acts directed against its fatherland; it must respect the honor, laws, life, religious faiths, and private property of people of the occupied lands. In the case of Poland, after the Soviets had announced that the Polish Government no longer existed, just 11 days were given to the Polish people to study the unfamiliar new election laws and to choose delegates to execute their wish. Pravda reported:

During the period of preparation of the election of delegates to the People's Assembly of the Western Ukraine, thousands of fighting men and officers carried on an immense political work among the population.

On October 22, Pravda stated that in eastern Poland alone there were some 100,000 agitators and other persons preparing for the election, and that number did not include the soldiers, which meant that there was one election worker from Russia for every 27 or 28 persons qualified to vote.

Again, it takes no stretch of the imagination to understand what the word "plebiscite" means under the Soviet's one-party system in which no names can go on the ballots except those proposed by local peasant or workers' committees, which are of course, controlled; a system which provides that, since no other group or party can nominate a candidate, only one name can be presented to the voter. Surely there is a crying need for a United Nations Political Council to provide for genuine plebiscites among the disinherited peoples of Europe.

The fifth principle calls for:

The immediate creation of a United Nations Economic and Social Council "to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security."

Mr. President, I wish to quote from an address delivered by Mr. Harry C. Hawkins, formerly State Department Director of Economic Affairs, on April 25, 1944, who stated as one of the two necessities for the establishment of a genuine and secure peace:

The creation of a better world economic order, the essential purposes of which are to eliminate the economic causes of international friction and to reduce the poverty and distress which gangster elements in any nation can so effectively exploit to build up their own strength.

I believe I do not need to illustrate the necessity for the acceptance and implementation of such a council any further than by calling to mind the fact that at this very moment, in spite of all the various conferences that have been called to discuss basic international problems, the tremendous U. N. R. R. A. organization, which was set up primarily to minister to the basic needs of the civilian victims of this war, has

not yet been able to gain sufficient cooperation from the Allied Governments to permit the extension of its services and supplies into liberated territories. According to press reports, to this moment Russia is withholding payment of her assessment for U. N. R. R. A. administration expenses of $1,500,000 until she has studied the way in which U. N. R. R. A. proposes to use Russian funds. Meanwhile, thousands upon thousands of innocent victims of the ravages of this war are starving.

When food becomes a political weapon it is high time for the Senate of the United States to do everything in its power, at least to make the necessities of life available, on the basis of need alone, to a suffering humanity.

The last principle contained in my resolution warrants the most careful and serious consideration. It reads as follows:

> With a view to assuring the security of all nations, large or small, victor or vanquished, and promoting the earliest possible peace and rehabilitation of Europe and the world, the United States Senate favors the creation of a general federation of European nations at the earliest possible date, within which disarmament and economic unification will be combined with sovereign equality and cultural self-determination.

Mr. President, the most clear-cut picture of what is happening throughout Europe is to be found in a dispatch from Herbert L. Matthews, published in the New York Times of December 14, concerning the situation in Italy. He wrote as follows:

> The whole set-up is unbalanced by differences of ideas between Washington and London. Our conception of war is an unusual one. Britain and Russia and other European nations see war as an instrument of politics, but for the United States it is something narrowly and purely military—to win the war and then go home. The result is that the United States is furnishing almost all the material and the money, but it is not directing their use.

Not only is the United States unable to direct the use to which its money and matériel are being put, not only are our boys bleeding and dying on the battlefields of Europe to further the intentions and designs of our allies, but it becomes increasingly apparent that our Government has not the slightest idea or purpose behind these sacrifices, other than defeating Hitler on the battlefield.

Now is the time to face boldly the question of what our intentions are toward Germany and Europe. As I see the problem, there are only four possible alternatives:

(a) Europe dismembered into twenty-odd separate states.

(b) Europe dominated by Soviet Russia.

(c) Europe partitioned into British and Russian spheres of influence.

(d) Europe united in a free and peaceful federation.

The dismemberment of Europe has led our generation into two world wars and already threatens a third. There is no nation in Europe that either could or would dare to have attacked its neighbor states one by one had they been united by federal ties. Europe in this modern age cannot remain broken up into twenty-odd isolated, economic units, without precipitating another world conflict. Actually, to follow such a policy through would mean that we have fought this war merely to restore totalitarian governments and states all over Europe. What is a totalitarian state, Mr. President, but that state in which its cultural, economic, and political power is under the centralized control of a sovereign government which knows and owes no higher allegiance than to itself? A dismembered Europe could not help but become again a chessboard of international intrigue, a breeding ground for revolutions, and an international booby trap in the form of a third world war.

I am sure it was never the President's intention to rescue the peoples of Europe from Hitler's tyranny at the cost of uncounted American lives in order to turn them over to the control of totalitarian Soviet Russia.

We have only to look across the water to envision the grim prospects for ourselves and for the world if Europe becomes an unhappy hunting ground in which Britain and Russia use 350,000,000 people further to consolidate and extend either ideologies or selfish interests in a bitter struggle to partition and control Europe.

A general federation of European nations, I am convinced, will provide the only sane attempt at a solution to the crucial issues now taxing the resources of the Allies. Such a federation in which disarmament was combined with economic collaboration would constitute no threat either to Britain or to Russia. Already the Soviets are talking and working themselves toward the establishment of an eastern European and Balkan federation while, as Gen. Jan Smuts advised the British some time ago, Mr. Churchill is trying to establish Britain's sphere of influence under the guise of a western European federation. The very idea of a general federation of European states would at least provide a nobler cause for which both Britain and Russia could strive.

There is no reason why the people of Russia and England, like the people of the United States, should not be interested in helping the suffering peoples of Europe to set up a federation of democratic republics patterned after genuinely democratic ideals, which have brought to our people more freedom, liberty, and prosperity than any other form of government has achieved in the history of the world To those in our midst who say this cannot be done, I can only say it has never been tried.

I want to go on record again to the effect that I will do everything within my power to further America's participation in a world organization providing guaranties of security for Russia's interest and Russia's territory on the basis of international law in the event of any new threat of aggression from any countries, in exchange for the acceptance by Russia and Great Britain of the only sure way of preserving the peace of Europe and the world, and that is the setting up in Europe of a confederation of European states, or a United States of Europe, and the acceptance of the principles of the Atlantic Charter as the basis upon which all settlements that have been made or are yet to be made in Europe since September 1, 1939, are to be ultimately established.

Mr. President, allow me to invite attention to the fact that the idea of a federation of Europe is not new with me. It was advocated, if you please, by Briand, of France, and Von Schuschnigg, of Austria. Even Mr. Churchill, in 1930, wrote for the Saturday Evening Post an article in which he said that a United States of Europe could do no harm, but should be helpful to Europe, to the United States of America, and to Germany. I am not sure of the exact words which Mr. Churchill used, but I have stated their substance.

I am unwilling, however, to commit this country to a world organization which will seek to enforce an unjust peace upon the people of Europe; a peace which will throw hundreds of millions of people into slavery and degradation; a peace which is contrary to every precept of common decency; and a peace which is contrary to every principle which has ever been enunciated in this country from its inception. This is not what the American people were told they were fighting for; this is not what the American boys are dying for. If we expect to maintain a democratic republic in this country, to say nothing of fighting for it in foreign countries, we must now let it be known that our leaders insist upon our allies keeping their promises, and that we, in turn, keep faith with them and with the boys who are dying upon foreign soil.

Mr. President, I want to straighten out the matter of "discredited minorities," whose views, we are told, "have been overwhelmingly rejected by their fellow citizens of every party."

I do not know just to whom the Secretary of State had reference when he used the words "discredited minorities," whether he had reference to the people of my State or not. But surely, unless the people have changed their minds considerably since 1940, I am not representing a minority, because I carried every city and county in the State, and received twice as great a majority of votes as did the President himself. Not only was that true in 1940 but it was also true in 1934.

I have made the statement again and again that the demand for "unconditional surrender" has been a mistake. Not only have I said this but so have thousands of other people of high intelligence and of the class you would call "interventionists," if you please, or "internationalists." I believe that the continued use of the brutal, asinine boast of "unconditional surrender" is costing thousands upon thousands of American lives, is contributing to the deterioration of Allied unity, and threatens to lay the foundations for such an impossible situation in Europe, that a third world war cannot possibly be averted. For many long months I have been supported in my conviction that this outcome is certain by statements issued from every quarter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has made the statement that the continuation of the demand for unconditional surrender is, in his opinion, costing thousands upon thousands of lives.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; that is my opinion.

Mr. LUCAS. What does the Senator suggest in lieu thereof?

Mr. WHEELER. I suggest that the Allies should state their peace terms to the German people just as President Woodrow Wilson stated his Fourteen Points.

Mr. LUCAS. The time when he stated his Fourteen Points was after the First World War.

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; it was not after the war.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. The Senator wants us at the present time to state to Germany our peace aims.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Who started the war?

Mr. WHEELER. What difference does it make who started the war?

Mr. LUCAS. It makes a great deal of difference to me. I do not know whether it makes very much difference to the Senator, and I think it does not from the way he has been speaking.

Mr. WHEELER. It is one thing to talk about unconditional surrender of Germany, and another thing to state our peace aims. What I am saying, Mr. President, is that we should state our peace aims to the German people, because failure to do so is costing the lives of American boys. That is not only my opinion but, as I stated a few moments ago, it is the opinion of boys who are fighting on the western front. While we are sitting in this Chamber and are perfectly safe from German bombs and tanks, it is very well to talk about unconditional surrender, or anything else which we may wish to talk about, but it would be quite a different thing if we were over there fighting. A little while ago I referred to a letter which had come to my attention from a boy addressed to his uncle in Texas. In that letter he stated in effect, "The demand for unconditional surrender is causing these Heinies"—he called them—"to fight like hell every minute of the time." He also mentioned Mr. Morgenthau's statement. As I said a moment ago, an Army officer who recently came into my office, and who had been in Italy, told me almost exactly the same thing. I have also talked with high ranking officers who made similar statements. They belong to the armed forces of this country.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that the Morgenthau statement was most unfortunate.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad that the Senator agrees with me on something.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator on many things, but not on the speech which he is making today.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not expect the Senator to agree with my speech.

Mr. LUCAS. No. I may say to the Senator that many statements which are being made, in addition to the Morgenthau statement, are not helping the war effort very much or the soldiers on the western front. So far as the question of unconditional surrender is concerned, I do not know what the situation is in the Senator's State, but I refer him to somewhat more recent news on the question of foreign policy from Illinois, which was once presumed to be the heart of the isolationist section, but no longer is in that category. There was seldom a campaign speech upon foreign policy made by the Senator from Illinois in which he did not advocate the unconditional surrender of Germany and Japan in line with what the President of the United States had stated along with our allies in this war. I asked the people of Illinois to elect me or defeat me upon the foreign policy now being advocated by the administration, at a time when I had as my opponent one who was classed as an isolationist and obstructionist, and who admitted it in his speeches. The issue was on that point.

Mr. WHEELER. Now I understand where Stettinius got his ideas.

Mr. LUCAS. He did not get them from me, nor did he get them from the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I know he did not get them from me, because I have not talked with him.

Mr. LUCAS. I have not talked with Mr. Stettinius, either, upon this question.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator would visit my office and look at the mail and telegrams which come there, he would not say that Mr. Stettinius was at all accurate in suggesting that I was speaking merely for a few in a discredited minority.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the Senator gets letters and mail and talks much about that fact on the floor of the Senate. We all get a lot of mail. The Senator is making an interesting speech from his viewpoint; but I have read his universal bill-of-rights proposal and I was just wondering, after he has made this speech against Russia, whether Russia would be included in his universal bill of rights if it were adopted.

Mr. WHEELER. I should certainly hope so.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not understand how the Senator could present a universal bill of rights and want it to apply to Russia in view of the fact the Senator says that Russia is totally insincere in all the statements she makes about peace and foreign affairs in general.

Mr. WHEELER. Then the Senator misunderstood me, or I misunderstood him. In speaking of a confederation of Europe, I do not know of anybody who has advocated that either England or Russia be a part of it.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know, either.

Mr. WHEELER. No one has advocated that Russia be a part of the United States of Europe and no one has advocated that England become a part of it. England could not very well be a part because of the fact that she has an empire which would bring her constantly in conflict with the United States of Europe. That was not the conception of Briand; it was not the conception of Schuschnigg; it was not the conception of Churchill; and, so far as I know, it has not been the conception of anyone who has advocated a United States of Europe.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about the Senator's proposed universal bill of rights.

Mr. WHEELER. I am talking about the bill of rights, and I should like to see Russia included in the bill of rights, if that is what the Senator refers to.

Mr. LUCAS. In his resolution recently submitted the Senator advocates "the adoption of a universal bill of rights to safeguard the inalienable rights of every individual regardless of race, class, or religious belief."

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume that the Senator was not using that expression in the sense of its applying to the world.

Mr. WHEELER. I used it in the sense of its application to the world, and I should like to see it adopted by every country on the face of the globe, including Russia.

Mr. LUCAS. I wondered if the Senator meant to apply it to the world, how he would enforce a universal bill of rights or how he would enforce any of the proposals he has included in his resolution. There is nothing in any of them which suggests the use of force.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator is familiar with the resolution and has read it, he would know what it proposes is to have the United States Senate go on record as favoring the things it sets forth. I felt, and feel now, that if the United States Senate went on record as favoring these things, it would have a profound effect upon Russia and I hope it would have a profound effect upon England, and the British Empire.

On February 22, 1944, the Times, of London, said—and I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to this:

> Unless shattered and dismembered Europe can find some new vision that looks forward rather than back, some leadership bold enough to survey her needs and problems as a whole, the civilization will surely perish. To blot out Germany from among the nations of Europe would be neither practical nor morally acceptable to the civilized world. Germany cannot be allowed to become a cancer at the heart of the European organism.

The London Times is probably the most influential publication in England and is generally recognized as speaking for the British Foreign Office.

On March 26, 1944, the Archbishop of Canterbury and free church leaders in England offered an eight-point program for peace and a warning against "breaches of basic human rights in dealing with Germany." Said they:

> We must not lend ourselves in a mood of vengefulness to breaches of basic human rights or the punitive measures against the entire German people, which will be repudiated as unjust by later generations or will permanently frustrate hopes of peace and unity in Europe.

On June 1 Pope Pius XII, who, I presume, was speaking for a "discredited minority," declared:

> No just peace can be reached if the victor would by force of arms dictate the terms.

A just policy has to give the defeated nation a dignified place.

On June 26 Mr. Raymond Moley wrote:

The trouble with unconditional surrender as an objective is that few Americans or Britons really believe that surrender can be without conditions, while to Germans the slogan means that there will be no distinctions in punishment among the elements in Germany. To them it means that the Nazi party, the army, and the mass of the people are to suffer equally, which can have no effect beyond tying together 80,000,000 Germans in a desperate unity.

On July 29 the London Economist carried the following warning:

Unconditional surrender is becoming a policy of drift, of wait and see, of reliance on what may turn up. But the drift of events may carry Germany, Europe, and the grand alliance itself to a very different conclusion from the one the Allies desire. It may carry them to a military stalemate or prolonged fighting, and then to divided counsels and Allied disputes. No policy for Germany means no policy for peace.

Of course, in the mind of the Secretary of State, the London Economist speaks for a "discredited minority."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I inquire if, to the Senator's knowledge, the term "unconditional surrender" has ever been defined by the President or anyone else in this country?

Mr. WHEELER. The President has not defined it, to my knowledge.

Mr. WILEY. I am wondering if now the President and Stalin and Churchill should define the conditions and say there could be no other conditions, if that would not be equivalent to unconditional surrender, and drastic, although the terms might be quite lenient.

Mr. WHEELER. I cannot answer that, I will say to the Senator.

In the same month of July the National Opinion Research Center of Denver University polling the 48 States on the subject of whether Americans should help to put Germany back on her industrial feet, even at the cost of continued rationing at home, reports that 64 percent or nearly a two-thirds majority of the American people, believe we should follow this course. The research center comments:

They hold this view because, in the long run, this country would benefit from such a policy, and because the announcement that such help would be forthcoming might speed the German surrender.

I presume the 64 percent, according to the National Opinion Research Center of Denver University, represents a "discredited minority."

I quote from a war correspondent of the New York Sun, Gault MacGowan, who wrote as far back as August 14:

Our terms to Hitler are unconditional surrender, and only that prevents a military demand for an armistice. Despite the drastic bombings of German cities, the destruction of thousands of German homes and buildings and the anxiety of the German people to see the end of the war, the Gestapo won't let them demonstrate for peace or raise a questioning voice against their Fuehrer's unchallengeable wisdom. Such are my impressions of the situation tonight. It is no longer a military problem but a political one.

Not only has this man said that, but I have talked with military leaders in this country who have said identically the same thing.

Life magazine on August 21 carried the same message from John Scott, a Time and Life correspondent:

The future looks blacker day by day but those inside Germany who want peace and not national suicide are hindered rather than helped by the Allies. The Anglo-American attitude is still expressed by our determined adherence to the unconditional surrender formula, with which has been coupled a reluctance to make any concrete promise to any German opposition group. As a result, the complaint is made that any opposition group attempting to overthrow Hitler and make peace with western powers has no basic program on which it can talk convincingly to the German people. The Russians on the other hand, indirectly offer the German people that Germany won't be destroyed and that the German Army won't be destroyed. It has resulted in a pro-Russia orientation among a growing number of Germans who, all other things being equal, would be much more inclined to be pro-Anglo-American and pro-democratic.

On September 26, 1944, even Mr. Walter Lippmann plainly pointed out that we no longer deal with reality when we talk about whether we shall impose a soft or a harsh peace on Germany. Of course, Mr. Walter Lippmann represents the "discredited" view; but he has been one of the strongest advocates of the President's foreign policy, stronger than almost any other man in this country. He said:

Imagine the mildest conceivable terms of peace, and Germany will still be an economic ruin, incapable in her existing industrial structure of employing all her people, incapable of supporting a tolerable standard of life. Imagine no loss of territory, no reparations, no military occupation, no interference with the internal administration, and the full benefits of the Atlantic Charter, suppose that the only demand of the Allies is that Germany disarm and that she should not take any steps to rearm for the next 15 years. Post-war Germany would nevertheless be an economic ruin.

On October 11, 1944, a group of members of Parliament, including 26 labor members, entered a motion in the House of Parliament calling for a government declaration which would—

Encourage the emergence within Germany of a new regime, composed of democratically minded persons in whom the United Nations could have confidence so that a settlement of the problems which caused the present conflict in Europe might be reached on the basis of the principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

As far back as the early part of this year the personal confidant of the President, Anne O'Hare McCormick, wrote:

The American Government is silent on every political issue at the moment when as much depends on psychological as on military "softening." This war differs from the last in many respects, but in none more than in the apparent determination of the high strategists to defeat the enemy in the hardest way.

On January 3, 1945, Dorothy Thompson, another who supported the President, who was one of the strongest interventionists and internationalists in this country, one of our greatest authorities on Germany and a most intelligent and consistent opponent of the brutal slogan "Unconditional surrender," and who made a speech for the President during the last campaign, wrote as follows:

There are two conditions under which Germany, as an entity, can surrender. The first is to make clear that a Germany will be left which is economically capable of life. A Germany that is deindustralized or loses its industrial provinces or is overcrowded by the evacuation of ten to twenty million Germans into a truncated Reich will be more incapable of sustaining life than Puerto Rico. The second condition under which Germany could surrender is: She could become the ward of an already established world organization, operating along clear and established principles. The surrender of a nation must mean the merging of one's identity, but it cannot happen unless some larger identity exists. A Germany conquered by four powers but not surrendered to any one thing is no answer.

Of course, Dorothy Thompson spends much time in Europe. She knows more about Germany than probably almost any Member of the Senate. I now wish to read extracts from an article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 8, 1945:

There have been three major political errors in this war, all arising out of the first one—the discounting of the Atlantic Charter. The second was the interpretation that has accumulated around unconditional surrender; and the third, the failure to produce any reasonable policy for a post-war Europe.

* * * * *

And what our own Government and some of our publicists have been doing in regard to the Atlantic Charter, since the President's press conference, is most discouraging.

Elmer Davis, as head of the Office of War Information, must be regarded as official. The other day on the air he took the line that the Atlantic Charter (like the Ten Commandments referred to by the President) represents only a lofty ideal, "Nobody ever said it could be put into effect day after tomorrow or even at the end of the war," are his words. The New York Herald Tribune took, editorially, exactly the same line. * * *

Mr. Davis' remarks are senseless. The Atlantic Charter is no lofty ideal. It represents what was universally accepted political principle, and to a large extent political practice, before Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy embarked on a counterprogram. * * *

The unconditional surrender formula has gradually become clothed with concepts that mean the extinction of Germany, as a state, a nation, a functioning economy, and, consequentially, as a people. This interpretation has closed every door to forces that might have arisen in Germany to eliminate top Nazis and effect surrender. Those forces existed; they came to a head; in that moment time was of the essence; but receiving no aid in any form, they were lost, and today the leaders are dead.

Dorothy Thompson, again, represents a "discredited minority."

She supported Mr. Roosevelt in the last campaign.

It now appears that Prime Minister Churchill has begun to see the light—that the futility of the present course of events is slowly dawning on him. As recently as November 10, 1944, he said he thought it was high time that "we had another triple conference and that such

a meeting might easily abridge the sufferings of mankind and stop the fearful process of destruction that is ravaging the earth."

Whatever Mr. Stalin's motives may be he has scrupulously avoided in his speeches the term "unconditional surrender" of Germany. The Moscow-sponsored Free Germany Committee has been broadcasting three to six times a day to the Germany people two terms upon which peace might be concluded between the Soviets and the German people, namely, get rid of the Hitlerites and get off Russian soil.

As recently as November 6, 1943, Mr. Stalin declared:

It is not our aim to destroy Germany, for it is impossible to destroy Germany, just as it is impossible to destroy Russia. But the Hitlerite state can and should be destroyed. And our first task, in fact, is to destroy the Hitlerite state and its inspirers.

It is not our aim to destroy all organized military force in Germany, for every literate person will understand that this is not only impossible in regard to Germany, as it is in regard to Russia, but also inadvisable from the point of view of the victor. Comrades, we are waging a great war of liberation.

Mr. President, I am not advocating anything contrary to American traditions when I insist upon the abandonment of this senseless slogan. On December 22, 1848, Mr. Calhoun stood on the floor of the Senate and championed the noble tradition of American statesmanship when he said:

War is made by one party, but it takes two to make peace. If all authority is overthrown in Mexico, where will be the power to enter into negotiation and make peace? Our very success would defeat the possibility of making peace. In that case the war would not end in peace, but in conquest; not in negotiation but in subjugation, and defeat, I repeat, the very object we aim to accomplish—and accomplish that which we disavow to be our intention by destroying the separate existence of Mexico, overthrowing her nationality, and blotting out her name from the list of nations. I must say I am at a loss to see how a free and independent republic can be established in Mexico under the protection and authority of its conquerors. I had always supposed that such a government must be the spontaneous wish of the people; that it must emanate from the hearts of the people and be supported by their devotion to it, without support from abroad.

Mr. President, I desire now to quote from a recent statement made by a Belgian exile, Mr. G. Jensen, who has been through all the horrors and sufferings of this war.

Mr. Jensen was not a candidate for the Senate, subject to popular election by the people, but he went through all the horrors of this war. He said:

Unconditional surrender of Germany means chaos for Europe. All those who knew the German people just before the war know that Germany will never give in. She will fight to the bitter end if no just peace proposals are made. The German people are fighting with the spirit that was Britain's in 1940.

Judging by all the lessons of history, the next last war will be one between the Anglo-Saxon world and Russia, and nothing on earth will prevent an injured Germany from seizing her chance at that moment.

It should by now be clear to everyone that the politicians who started this war and pretend to be leading it have themselves become the slaves of the destructive powers they have let loose, and are no longer in a position to control them. How in such circumstances dare they talk about controlling the future of the world for years to come?

Unless people everywhere wake up and themselves take control of their future, they will be deceived again and again by those who pretend to be leading them and willfully mislead them.

Victory is the most dangerous of poisons. Only a just and righteous peace can save humanity in the next generation from a new and far worse calamity.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not quite clear concerning the statement about the politicians who started this war. Was that a quotation?

Mr. WHEELER. That was a quotation.

Mr. PEPPER. The quotation is from whom?

Mr. WHEELER. From Mr. G. Jensen, a Belgian exile. I suppose he is talking about Mr. Hitler as a politician; I suppose he is talking about Mr. Stalin as a politician; I suppose he is talking about all of us as politicians.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that I am convinced that these principles I have advocated are in complete uniformity with all that is best and most enduring in America's traditions. In spite of all the equivocation and evasion and deception that has been practiced, we have, I say, pledged our solemn word that this war would not end in a new struggle of power politics but in a just and lasting peace. There is no point whatsoever in talking about future international agreements, future world organizations, future world charters, if the very basis upon which the present precarious unity of the United Nations rests is repudiated.

It was President Franklin D. Roosevelt who in 1937—in the very same "quarantine" speech which launched us on the course of action that broke down our neutrality and involved us in two great wars simultaneously, solemnly laid down the principle which underlies this speech of mine:

There can be no stability or peace either within nations or between nations except under laws and moral standards adhered to by all. International anarchy destroys every foundation for peace. It jeopardizes either the immediate or future security of every nation large or small. It is therefore a matter of vital interest and concern to the people of the United States that the sanctity of international treaties and the maintenance of international morality be restored.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, late a Representative from the State of Montana, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

SENATOR FROM WASHINGTON—CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair) laid before the Senate a letter from Mon C. Wallgren, Governor of Washington, together with the credentials of HUGH B. MITCHELL, appointed a Senator from the State of Washington to fill the unexpired term of Mon C. Wallgren, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia, January 10, 1945.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Vice President and President of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed find my appointment of HUGH B. MITCHELL as a United States Senator from the State of Washington, to fill the vacancy created by my becoming the duly elected and qualified Governor of the State of Washington.

May I express my great esteem and affection for yourself and the Members of the Senate.

Respectfully yours,
MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia.

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greetings:

Having vacated my office as a United States Senator from the State of Washington by becoming the duly elected and qualified Governor of the State of Washington:

Therefore, I, Mon C. Wallgren, Governor of the State of Washington, pursuant to the authority vested in me, do appoint HUGH B. MITCHELL as a Senator from the State of Washington in the Senate of the United States until the general election next to be hereafter held in the State of Washington, and until his successor shall have been elected and qualified.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Washington to be affixed at Olympia this 10th day of January A. D. 1945.

MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor of Washington.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] BELLE REEVES,
Secretary of State.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY AND ATTAINMENT OF PEACE

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I prefer not to yield for the time being, but shall be glad to do so after making a brief statement.

Mr. President, when an able Senator, who has a national reputation, upon the floor of the Senate holds out hope of terms more favorable than unconditional surrender to the enemy, attacks our allies, and makes it clear that he does not favor our entering into any effective international organization to keep the peace of the world, I cannot refrain from stating at least that those are not my sentiments, and I believe they are the sentiments of very few, if any other Senators, upon this floor.

Mr. President, I asked for a yea and nay vote of the Senate on the Connally resolution, which was adopted some time ago, and I notice that the able Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] was 1 of 5 Senators who opposed the Connally resolution, while 85 Senators voted in favor of it, and 6 Senators were recorded as not voting at all. The Con-

nally resolution committed the Senate to the following declarations:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The able Senator from Montana refers to a resolution which he offered in the Senate on January 6, this year, which sets out what in his opinion should be the peace aims of this country upon which hostilities should cease, because in the early part of his resolution, on the first page, as I have it before me, the Senator uses this language:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States, in order to affirm our faith in the uncompromised principles of the Atlantic Charter, and in the integrity of its coauthors and 35 or more signatories, and in order that the ideals which sustain and guide our role in the present conflict shall continue to strengthen a victorious hope in the hearts of the suffering peoples of the world, a noble magnanimity of purpose within the United Nations, and an enduring bulwark of unity among the people of these United States; and in order to avert the further loss of the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys as well as those of our allies, the wastage of our natural resources and the further break-down of the moral fiber of our people.

Proposes the following statement of peace aims believing them to represent the aspirations of the American people and the essential features of a just and lasting peace:

Mr. President, nowhere among the six peace aims which are listed is there any reference to unconditional surrender or to punishment of the German Nation or any of the German leaders or war criminals in Germany. Nowhere at all in those six points is there any intimation that the United States will take any part in setting up an effective international organization with any power to keep the peace of the world against the aggressors of the future.

Mr. President, with all kindliness to the able Senator, in my humble opinion, with his ability and with the audience he has in this country, if he persists in urging that we abandon the demand for unconditional surrender, which was made long ago by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, and I understand also by Premier Stalin—about which the Senator was silent at that time, if my memory is not in error—if now, when we have reached a crisis in this war, the able Senator from Montana persists in urging that we abandon the purpose to bring about unconditional surrender, it will cost more American lives than any statement Mr. Morgenthau ever made about taking away from Germany the power to wage war in the future by destroying her industrial capacity located in the Ruhr.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator refers to abandoning the demand for unconditional surrender. Is there not another course which is possible? Could not the term "unconditional surrender" be defined and implemented without abandoning it?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have not heard of any peace terms. If the able Senator wishes to write a set of peace terms which he would propose, and we can compare them with unconditional surrender, well and good. However, it is now proposed that we advocate something less than unconditional surrender. I do not see anything very severe to the enemy in these six points. Let me read them:

1. The adoption of a universal bill of rights to safeguard the inalienable rights of every individual regardless of race, class, or religious belief.

2. The assured survival and extension of democratic principles and institutions and the preservation here of our American way of life.

3. The immediate creation of a United Nations political council to provide for the democratic settlement, in harmony with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, of territorial questions that have arisen in Europe and that may arise elsewhere.

4. Free plebiscites under international supervision in all liberated countries to choose their own form of government and leadership, the time and procedure to be determined by the United Nations political council.

5. The immediate creation of a United Nations economic and social council "to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security."

6. With a view to assuring the security of all nations, large or small, victor or vanquished, and promoting the earliest possible peace and rehabilitation of Europe and the world, the United States Senate favors the creation of a general federation of European nations at the earliest possible date, within which disarmament and economic unification will be combined with sovereign equality and cultural self-determination.

The able Senator from Montana says that those should be the peace aims that the United States Senate should declare to the world.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator tell me with which one of those points he disagrees?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I very distinctly——

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator tell me with which one he disagrees?

Mr. PEPPER. I disagree with No. 6, which limits the international organization to keep the peace of the future to European nations, and very definitely keeps us out of it.

Mr. WHEELER. Is that the only one with which the Senator disagrees?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator tell me with which of the other points he disagrees?

Mr. PEPPER. Point No. 2, which refers to preserving the American way of life in the United States, has very little to do with peace terms. I did not know that that had to be one of the peace terms.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator disagree with it?

Mr. PEPPER. No; I do not; but I do not consider it very relevant to the peace terms.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator disagree with any of the other points?

Mr. PEPPER. On their face the other points are not objectionable; but the able Senator proposes them as an alternative to unconditional surrender.

Mr. WHEELER. No. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what the resolution says.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is trying to put words in my mouth, which I will not permit him to do.

Mr. PEPPER. I read from the resolution of the able Senator. I did not quote his words.

Mr. WHEELER. The resolution is not in lieu of unconditional surrender. I have repeatedly stated, and I now repeat, that I am not suggesting a negotiated peace. I have so stated to the Senator from Florida, and he knows that I have made that statement on the floor of the Senate time and time again.

What I am suggesting is that the President, Mr. Churchill, and the other Allied leaders state their terms to the German people, as suggested by Dorothy Thompson, by the London Times, by the London Economist, by the Nineteenth Century and After, and by members of the British Parliament. They call upon us to state our peace aims. Soldiers who are dying upon the battlefield have said that the fact that we have not stated our peace aims to Germany is costing the lives of American boys. In my judgment, the reason we have not stated them—and I say it advisedly—is that the Big Three have not been able to agree upon them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in my humble opinion, what will cost far more lives is the hope of the Germans that political division and dissension in the United States, to which the able Senator from Montana is now contributing, will make it possible for them to obtain better terms than unconditional surrender. That is where their hope lies, Mr. President; and until that hope is crushed and destroyed they will continue to fight. But if the United Nations, and especially the people of the United States and the United States Senate, will, without a single break in our moral front, hold out no hope to them, and tell them that we made a mistake the last time when we did not go on to Berlin, the will of the German people to resist will be broken.

When the able Senator was making his address he quoted with some disparagement the slogans, "On to Berlin," "On to Tokyo," and "Hang Hitler." He did not make his position any too clear

even when questions were asked of him. He stated that he believed in the destruction of Japan. He did not say anything about the destruction of Germany. I venture to say that if that speech is picked up and translated to the German people by Propaganda Minister Goebbels it will give encouragement to the enemy. I believe that it would be desirable, for the information of the Senate, to learn what the reaction in Germany is to what the able Senator has said on the floor of the Senate today, if the O. W. I. has the ability to determine the German reaction.

Mr. President, I do not disparage or question the motives of the able Senator; but I do very seriously question the wisdom of the effect of what he says when he makes speeches such as he has made here today.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me say first that I do not believe that we can abandon unconditional surrender, except with complete agreement among the Allied Nations as to a substitute policy. I believe that the weakness of the Senator's argument lies in the fact that Russia has never accepted the unconditional surrender demand.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I can speak only for myself; other Senators can speak only for themselves; but unconditional surrender is the purpose of our leader, our Commander in Chief, as a military objective. Some of the opponents of the President have criticized him, alleging that he has interfered in the administration of military, naval, and strategic policies. Under our Constitution, the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. When he, as Commander in Chief, states a military objective of this country the Senate ought to support him, unless he gives us some reason to believe that he has changed his objective, or unless the military and naval leaders do not believe it to be the wise thing. The Senator from Montana did not quote any admirals or generals, or any military, naval, or air authorities in the United States. We should support our own Commander in Chief. We should put up a solid front in the Senate in support of our military objectives.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator made the point that the argument of the Senator from Montana has a divisive effect among our allies.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was making the point that it cannot have that effect, because our allies are not agreed upon unconditional surrender.

Mr. PEPPER. The United States has the largest concentration of forces facing the enemy upon the western front; and in the long run we shall be one of the major powers which will bring about the defeat of Germany. I have heard nothing from any governmental source in Great Britain about changing the objective of unconditional surrender.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. A few moments ago I read a statement to the effect that 26 members of Parliament had made a statement and signed a petition. I quoted the London Times and the London Economist. It is generally conceded that the London Times is the most powerful newspaper in London, and is the spokesman for the Foreign Office.

Mr. PEPPER. What newspapers say is a matter of freedom of speech. I am speaking about what the duly elected representatives of the people, and those who are a part of the Government, have said.

Mr. WHEELER. I have called attention to what 26 members of the British Parliament have said.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. If the members of Parliament have said that, I say that their remarks, as I have said of the remarks of the Senator from Montana, are doing more harm than almost anything else could do in respect to changing the determination of the Germans to fight and shorten the war.

But, Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said in a speech over the radio yesterday, namely, that within the confines of these four walls is where the peace of the Nation and the world in the future will be kept or lost. What the able Senator has said is the best evidence of it that I know of. It was not on the battlefields of Flanders that the last war and its victory of peace were lost, but in this Chamber.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I challenge that statement, and I should like to have a demonstration of it.

Mr. PEPPER. History demonstrates it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I do not care about the Senator's notions of history. I think that is a terrible accusation to make against this country and against the Senate.

Will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In what way was the peace of the world lost on the floor of the Senate? Let us have a demonstration of it.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. It was because, in my humble opinion, the Senate failed to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and to provide for our part in the League of Nations. Senators who have the point of view of the able Senator from Montana, if there are a sufficient number of them, and if we do not change the rules of the Senate so as to curb their power of filibuster, are going to do the same thing again.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. This war was started by the movement of the German armies into Poland, preceded by the movement of the German armies into the Rhineland and several other aggressive acts. Will the Senator demonstrate how, if we had been in the League of Nations, any decisions would have been different than those which were made?

Mr. PEPPER. I will tell the Senator how I think they would have been different. I think the United States at the conclusion of the last war had the moral leadership of the world. In addition to that, the United States, through its duly elected President, had led in the establishment of a League of Nations which offered the collective machinery by which collective security might be preserved in the world, and by which the might and conscience of the good people of the earth might be mobilized against warmongers and wicked aggressors.

The United States then, as now, occupied a position of great power in the world, as well as the position of moral leadership which it then enjoyed. I believe the United States in a world-wide organization would have brought to its councils not only great moral leadership, great physical power, and great natural resources and their strength, but a moral elevation, if you please, and personal disinterestedness which the nations of the Old World do not have. I think we could have brought to bear upon those councils influences without which they disintegrated into a bickering, fighting lot of Old World powers, as they have always been. I think that President Wilson saw, when he advocated the League of Nations, that never again could the United States of America be secure and safe by simply standing on the Monroe Doctrine and by waiting for some nation to become the dominant nation of western Europe and to supplant Britain in the domination of the Atlantic Ocean. He saw that we had to take an affirmative part, as the able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], said when he electrified this body and the country several days ago by pointing out in the Senate that no longer can a negative policy on the part of the United States secure the peace of this Nation in the future, and therefore he advocated that we take our part in keeping the peace of the world. But in President Wilson's day the Senate repudiated that effort.

When the able senior Senator from Michigan spoke to the Senate a day or two ago, he emphasized the desirability of having the United States enter into collective security commitments against the rise of a new German aggression. That is what President Wilson saw when he was at Versailles. The French pleaded with him and with Great Britain, saying, "We know that Germany will attack us again, and the only hope we have is either to keep the Rhineland or to keep the Germans from reoccupying the Rhineland, or to have you join us in a pact of security against future German aggressions."

But it was not thought desirable that the French should occupy the left bank of the Rhine; and it was considered that perhaps it would be dangerous to agree to the other French suggestion. So a tentative agreement was made, as the Senator well knows, by the British and American peoples and Governments to guarantee to the French security against future German aggression. The British Parliament ratified that agreement unanimously. Thereafter it came to the United States Senate, together with the

Treaty of Versailles. After the Senate failed to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, including provision for the League of Nations, it did not even take up the pact to make secure the frontiers of France. We abandoned our allies. We abandoned our objectives. We abandoned our dead. We waited for the next war to come.

That is why I say that if America had taken an affirmative part, at least the probability is that we might have avoided the war which has come to curse this generation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator agree with me that the war might have been prevented had France, which had the best and largest army in the world, repelled the German aggression in the Rhineland?

Mr. PEPPER. It might have.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Upon what theory can the Senator put the blame for this war upon the Senate of the United States or the Senators who preceded us in this Chamber, when France, with the largest army in the world lacked the spirit to protect her own interests? Under what theory can it be said that the Senate of the United States should have taken action to repel those attacks?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the first place the Germans were our enemies, as well as the enemies of the French, because we had previously fought them and had suffered some several hundred thousand casualties in the earlier war to crush Germany and to keep Germany from becoming the master of western Europe and to prevent her from crushing Britain and becoming the dominant naval power in the Atlantic Ocean. I am not at all sure that France has any greater obligation to keep a would-be world conqueror in check than we have. Our interests reach around the world, and, in my opinion, we have a comparable obligation to keep down a would-be world conqueror.

However, we abandoned that obligation and left it to those who happened to be geographically more proximate. But the military truism was established in the last war, and before it, that if Germany comes across the Rhine River, to the west, she endangers the security of the Western Hemisphere and the peace of this Nation. So it is as much our obligation as it is the obligation of France to see to it that a great aggressor such as Germany, which threatens our own security, and which would have challenged the Monroe Doctrine immediately after becoming the master of western Europe and the Atlantic Ocean, does not gain her aspirations of conquest.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest the weakness of the Senator's argument is that he draws no distinction between primary and secondary responsibilities. Certainly a nation directly threatened with aggression and able to repel it has a primary responsibility, and those who do not come at least within the immediate threat have no more than a secondary responsibility, except under international theories which would cast sovereignties into an international jackpot—theories which have never been accepted by this country, and which I say never will be accepted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let us assume that the responsibility of the United States is a secondary obligation. Nevertheless, the obligation of France is not exclusive. Not only that, Mr. President, but, as I said a moment ago, the next thing which was responsible for the German nation's rising to its present position and starting this war was the fact that the Allies were divided. They fell apart. Even Russia could not get them together by her appeal. The United States might have gotten them together, but we abandoned any effort to get them together.

In other words, it has always been my belief that if the United States had taken a strong position, even as late as September 1939, we could have stopped the beginning of this war without the shedding of the blood of one American man, and I shall always believe that those who delayed the repeal of the Neutrality Act in the United States Senate in 1939 also contributed dangerously to the probability of this war.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I disclaim the responsibility the Senator has just mentioned, and I disclaim our ability to have been effective in the ways the Senator has just indicated. We were the leaders in promoting the peace of the world through the Kellogg Pact and through the various other pacts. We were always taking a front position. We took a lead to stop the first act of aggression in Manchuria, but we were deserted; we had no support. The Senator cannot demonstrate that had we been a member of the League of Nations the course of history would have been any different.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will leave the Senator to argue with history. I wish to say only another word in conclusion. I respect the Senator's view, but I have stated the reasons which caused me to state the conclusions I presented a moment ago.

Mr. President, let me say, as I said a short time ago, that with the machinery which now prevails in the Senate of the United States for implementing the decisions of our Chief Executive, there is no nation in the world which can count upon the commitments of this country to be effective in preserving their security against new aggressors in future years.

A few days ago I made the statement on the floor of the Senate that I thought, in view of our duty and our power to concur with the Executive in the making of treaties before they became effective, that we had a coequal responsibility in the determination of our own foreign policy. Some constitutional authority thereafter wrote a letter to the President and took sharp issue with the statement which I made. He said that no authority existed in the Constitution for my making such a statement. The President transmitted the letter to me.

Mr. President, I think it is of interest to every Senator to reexamine the question of what is the status of the Senate in respect to commitments of this country which constitute the framework and foundation of our foreign policy.

In my statement the other day I also said that we had, under the Constitution, the right to advise the Executive about what our foreign policy should be. I stand upon that statement. In my opinion, the matter of committing this country to a foreign policy is a partnership between the Executive and the Senate. We cannot have a foreign policy without commitments, and the Executive cannot make commitments without the approval of the United States Senate. I do not think it is proper to sit here, divided as we appear to be, without clarification of our own sentiments and ideas, and not give the Chief Executive any general charter of authority, or indication of policy which we will back up, but, instead, send him off on a mission around the world to meet with other world leaders and make commitments upon which to base a hope for future peace. I do not know how we can avoid doing so, because constitutional and organizational difficulties are very great. I am sure that the only way we can get around it is for the Senate voluntarily to come together with a new spirit of consecration and dedication in backing up the men who are dying and in trying to save the lives of the men who would otherwise have to fight in a future war.

I would dare to propose that it would not be improper for the minority leader and his colleagues to caucus formally or informally with reference to their sentiments, and how far they would go, and for our majority leader to do the same thing on this side of the aisle. By doing so I believe that something in the way of a patriotic compact could be worked out which would represent at least the views of a sufficient number of the Members of the Senate to be determinative of what we will do and when we will do it. If the United States Senate wants really to guarantee that we shall have an effective foreign policy, certain things could be accomplished in the Senate, and within a week's time the world could be made over by purpose, determination, and patriotism on the part of the Senate of the United States.

I wish we could abandon any regard for those views by which we are bound with respect to traditions, and that ritualism by which we are so often controlled, and sit down here humbly and prayerfully, and try to save the lives of boys who are dying on the battle fronts every day in the snows of France, in the dark oceans of the Asiatic world, and upon the jungle mainland where they grapple with the dastardly Japs.

So, Mr. President, while I have read the statement of the able Senator who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that it would be perhaps better for the Senate not to discuss this subject, nevertheless, since the able Senator from Montana has opened it up and at least indicated the sentiments which he has expressed here today, it might be well for the Senate to consider what its own course should be in trying to serve best the cause of peace.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to make one more observation on the attempt of the Senator to put the blood of this war upon the Senate. I would remind the Senator that after the debates which took place in the Senate with regard to the League of Nations, the matter was fully canvassed on the hustings, and the voters overwhelmingly decided in 1920 against the League of Nations.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; and I could quote to the able Senator from Colorado from a book a statement that the Republican leader, former Senator Watson, of Indiana, who was put in charge of the debate against the League of Nations, said that he told Henry Cabot Lodge when he asked him to take the leadership of the debate against the League of Nations on the floor of the Senate, that 80 percent of the people favored the League of Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I did not intend to bring politics into this discussion.

Mr. PEPPER. Neither did I.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yet, the Senator has referred to such a subject, and so let me state——

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator referred to the elections of 1920.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The record will show that more Members of the Senate on the Democratic side of the aisle voted against the League with reservations than on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator may war with history if he wishes to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not want to war with history; I cooperate with the inevitable. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Today the able Senator from Colorado has been cooperating with the Senator from Montana, and I do not know with whom else he cooperates. Maybe he has in mind the inevitable dead when he says he would not join an effective international organization to keep the peace.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I cooperated with the Senator from Montana in his statements of fact as to the present state of foreign affairs. I have not indicated any conclusion as to his thesis. I defined to the Senator from Florida where I would use force and where I would not use it. I believe that when the Senator attempts to put a gag upon any Senator in this Chamber by urging that one line of argument is divisive and another line patriotic, he is merely scratching an unwholesome itch.

Mr. PEPPER. I say to the able Senator from Colorado that it is not the itches within the Senate but the cancers which are dangerous to the peace of the world.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to answer the statements which have been made, but I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement appearing in The Progressive of January 1, 1945, quoting Mr. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, in which he states, among other things, as follows:

> At the Roosevelt-Churchill conference in Casablanca early in 1943 the President "ardently urged the adoption of an unconditional-surrender policy by the Allies," Sulzberger informs us. "Mr. Churchill was reluctant to support such an out-and-out statement * * *. It was felt that this would tend to negate the moral effect of the Allies' aerial bombings of Germany by stiffening the Germans' morale."

Of course, Mr. President, when I made my statement I expected that at any time I disagreed with my friend, the Senator from Florida, I would be charged by the internationalist crowd, which was so anxious to take us into this war, with doing something to injure the war effort. But, so far as I am concerned, I can "take it," and nobody will stop me from expressing my honest views upon this floor by a statement that by doing so is to help Goebbels. I am not interested in helping Goebbels; I am not interested in helping Churchill. I am interested only in helping the boys who are dying upon the battlefields of Europe. When the Senator from Florida intimates that Goebbels will send out my speech, let me ask him if it was not Goebbels who placed Morgenthau's statement and the unconditional surrender pledges in the hands of every German soldier on the front.

Let me ask, Mr. President, If what I have said is true, when we are pursuing a program which would drag the German people into enslavement, how can they do otherwise than continue to fight as they have been fighting?

Mr. President, I would not charge that what the Senator has said would be read by Goebbels, but if that kind of inflammatory speech is to help the Allies, if it tends to save boys who are dying upon the battlefields, then I certainly miss my guess. Certainly the boys who are writing home do not say that.

During the course of my remarks I called attention to letters which have come from soldier boys saying that the demand for unconditional surrender has caused the Germans to fight like hell. Of course, my colleague from Florida knows more about what is going on in Europe in the front-line trenches than do the boys who are fighting there and dying; he knows more than the officer to whom I referred who has just returned from Italy; he knows more than correspondents over there on the battlefields. He knows more about Germany than do Dorothy Thompson and Walter Lippmann. He knows more than the London Times, which is right there on the spot. He knows more than the London Economist, and the Nineteenth Century and After. Certainly it is fine for him, and many others in this country who are safe from bombing and other perils of war, to rise and wrap the American flag around them and denounce everyone who disagrees, saying that their statements probably emanate from Germany, or something of the kind. In my judgment, statements of that kind are, to say the least, not representative of fair play in the Senate of the United States or anywhere else. I would never intimate that any Member of the Senate under any conditions would interfere with the war effort.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on December 11 and 12 last the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, at a special meeting in Salt Lake City, Utah, adopted a certain resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1

Whereas the fish and game resources on many Indian reservations have progressively declined to an alarming extent; and

Whereas these resources, when properly perpetuated, are of great value to the Indians for subsistence, ceremonial, and recreational purposes; and

Whereas fish and game migrate to and from Indian reservations from State and federally owned lands and waters; and

Whereas the absence of regulations in the interest of conservation of fish and game on Indian reservations is a cause of regret, and, at times, of contention between the Indians and the whites, who both participate in these resources; and

Whereas both Indians and whites would benefit from the rebuilding of fish and game resources on Indian reservations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners favors the enactment of legislation which will authorize and empower the councils or other governing bodies of the various Indian tribes to promulgate codes, and, in the absence of such codes acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, said Secretary of the Interior be authorized to prescribe regulations for the conservation and restoration of fish and wildlife, and for the control of fishing, trapping, and hunting by Indians on tax-free Indian-owned lands within Indian reservations; and be it further

Resolved, That such codes and regulations shall conform as closely as practicable to the fish and wildlife laws of the State in which the reservation is located; and be it further

Resolved, That such codes and regulations shall require that all non-Indians shall conform to the laws of the State in which the reservation is located; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Members of Congress, the Governors of the 11 Western States, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, and such other person or organization as the president and/or secretary may determine.

INDEPENDENT STATUS OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Tennessee Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a committee of the United States Senate, which was appointed to investigate the Rural Electrification Administration, has reported its conclusions that an emergency exists in R. E. A. which imperils the successful continuance of R. E. A.; and

Whereas this committee has recommended to the United States Senate that legislation should be approved immediately to remove R. E. A. from its present subordinate position in the Department of Agriculture and to restore it to its original status as an independent agency of government; and

Whereas the Rural Electrification Cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley have, in addition to the facts and arguments made by the Senate committee to support the recommendation that R. E. A. be restored to its independent status, the ever-present example given in the Tennessee Valley Authority of the advantages which R. E. A. would have as an independent agency; and

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the United States Senate to restore the independent status of R. E. A. and that bill is now before the Senate Committee on Agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the representatives of Tennessee Rural Electric Cooperative Association and representatives of other rural electric cooperatives which purchase power from Tennessee Valley Authority assembled in meeting in Nashville, Tenn., September 12 and 13, 1944, urge that the Senate Committee on Agriculture shall hear evidence immediately on the bill, and that every opportunity shall be given to any opponent of the bill to present evidence, but that no delay shall be permitted in rushing the issues involved to an immediate decision; and

That, unless evidence is presented to overwhelm the evidence already in the records of the Senate, and is presented immediately, the Congress of the United States shall move to meet the emergency condition in R. E. A. and shall approve of the legislation to restore the independent status of R. E. A.; and

That the Senate committee investigating the R. E. A. is urged to resume its inquiry immediately and to inquire whether certain officials and employees of R. E. A. who have been charged in the testimony already taken with very questionable conduct, have any answer and that they shall be given an opportunity to answer; and

That the Secretary of Agriculture and Administration authorities in R. E. A. shall be comepelled to show immediately what they have done to restore the guilt or innocence of such officials and employees and that they shall be held to an accounting for their failure to act or be commended for action they may have taken and of which we are not yet aware; and

That the committee shall hear further testimony from any R. E. A. cooperative representative who has proposals to improve the administration of R. E. A.; and

That copies of this resolution shall be sent to Members of the United States Senate, members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and to Members of the House of Representatives from the Tennessee Valley area; and

That representatives of the Tennessee Valley in Congress shall be advised of the convictions of the representatives of rural electric cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley area that R. E. A. is in peril of divided administrative authority and division of responsibilities of administrators within R. E. A. and that the representatives in the Congress must assume their responsibility in this matter and be expected hereafter to be held to an accounting for the success or failure to get immediate consideration for this legislation to restore the independent status of R. E. A.

PETROLEUM AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the President of the United States, in an official communication a few days ago, requested that the Senate return to the President the so-called oil agreement, or treaty, with Great Britain. In pursuance of that request as in executive session I submit an order which I send to the desk and ask to have agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read.

The legislative clerk read the order as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to return to the President of the United States, in compliance with his request of the 10th instant, the agreement on petroleum between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in Washington August 8, 1944, printed as Executive F, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

TRIAL IN CAIRO OF ASSASSINS OF LORD MOYNE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I read in the New York Times a dispatch from Cairo reporting on the trial which is now under way there of two young Palestinians who have confessed to the assassination of Lord Moyne, the late British Resident Minister in the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that the story entitled "Moyne Trial Plea Censored by Court," by C. L. Sulzberger, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The New York Times correspondent states that the defendants have explained for 2 hours their reasons and motives which led them to their unfortunate act of despair. The courtroom was packed with correspondents. The defendants spoke fluent English and the correspondents took plenty of notes—but, says the Times correspondent, they were prohibited by the censorship from reporting one single word of the defense of the two young men being tried for their lives.

Now, Mr. President, political assassinations are one of the world's most ancient and persistent ills, and the precedents are very numerous, but it is the custom of civilized peoples to give fair and open trials so that justice may prevail. I submit, Mr. President, a procedure which prevents the defendants from stating their case is grossly unfair and inimical to justice. I rise to express my hope that the British authorities in Egypt, who have probably forced this procedure upon the Egyptian judges trying this case, will rectify their grossly erroneous decision.

Mr. President, we are in the midst of a bloody and costly war for human decency and justice. The Hebrew people—the compatriots of the two defendants—have suffered millions of dead wantonly murdered by our barbarous enemies. The two young Palestinians must get a fair and just trial, lest, God forbid, they, too, be added to the staggering toll of Hebrew martyrs in this war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOYNE TRIAL PLEA CENSORED BY COURT—"STERN GANG" KILLER EXPLAINS CRIME'S POLITICAL SETTING, BUT IT IS KEPT SECRET

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

CAIRO, EGYPT, January 11.—A secret organization dispatched two young Palestinian Jews to Cairo last autumn with specific instructions to assassinate Lord Moyne, British Resident Minister, it was frankly admitted in military court here today by Eliahu Bet-Tsouri, one of the youthful pair now on trial for their lives.

The accused man, who yesterday said openly that he and his friend, Eliahu Hakim, had together shot Lord Moyne and Corporal Fuller, his English chauffeur, on November 6, did not specifically identify this organization as the notorious "Stern gang," as it is generally known, but it was obvious that it was one and the same.

One is permitted to state that Bet-Tsouri delivered himself of what it is permitted to describe only as a "political tirade." This "political tirade" lasted 2 hours and was coolly and calmly spoken by Bet-Tsouri in fluent, if frequently slightly incorrect, English, so that all the foreign correspondents seeking to report the case could fully understand.

CONDUCTS HIS OWN DEFENSE

The presiding justice of the five-man tribunal, which is composed of Egyptian jurists and army officers, interrupted Bet-Tsouri frequently and requested him to adhere to the facts surrounding the actual details of the crime.

Bet-Tsouri, who appeared to handle his defense almost solely on his own without consultation with or interruption by his counsel, explained that he desired to give the reasons for this assassination and why he had been ordered to undertake it. He managed to maintain the sequence of his tale and to continue its even flow, referring only rarely to his shabby sheaf of notes and leaning forward, arms akimbo, as he surveyed the courtroom and tribunal across a row of spiked iron pickets isolating the prisoners' dock.

The packed courtroom buzzed with excitement and red tarbooshes bobbed back and forth in whispered comment. The presiding justice, warning the prisoner against making propaganda statements, ordered the newspapermen to cease taking notes.

Bet-Tsouri's tale was long and dramatic, but the dramatis personnae, in the sense of individuals or countries, cannot be mentioned, partly because of censorship and partly because of the tribunal's ruling against any propaganda.

It is permitted to state that Bet-Tsouri contends that "the ideas I am going to mention are very different from Zionist ideas."

This point is important in the view of Jewish elements in Palestine. Lord Moyne's assassination is heartily deplored by a huge majority of Palestine Jewry.

Bet-Tsouri showed no emotion as he recounted details of the murder itself—which it is permitted to report—and in fact he described himself at one point as "absolutely cold-blooded."

Bet-Tsouri again pointed out his belief that he and Hakim should be tried by an international court, but this request already had been rejected at yesterday's opening session on the ground that the crime was committed on Egyptian soil by persons possessing weapons illegally, who later attacked an Egyptian policeman.

"We believe this case is tied to questions of absolute justice, which is not confined to the boundaries of any one state," he said. "It is impossible to try it according to the laws of any one country."

The prisoner said the chauffeur was killed by accident, as contrasted with his admission that Lord Moyne's murder was deliberate and premeditated. He said Hakim had taken precautions to avoid hurting anyone else. He outlined three alternative plans for the execution of the crime and said it was finally decided to shoot the Minister before his residence to limit other loss of life. It was especially desired not to kill the chauffeur, he said, because he was wearing the uniform of the British Army and fighting a war that is not connected with our war.

He contended that by selecting the plan to shoot Lord Moyne at his residence he had increased the danger to Hakim and himself, since Lord Moyne lived on an island in the Nile connected with the mainland by narrow bridges.

Speaking in a legalistic, almost detached way, Bet-Tsouri told how Hakim had approached Lord Moyne's car while he himself covered the driver and shot him when Fuller refused to lie down on the ground. He said he had shot him to prevent him from grabbing his revolver and had shot him three times because his mind was more or less blank and his finger had been trained by target practice always to fire three times.

"We had previously agreed that my friend would shoot the lord because he was using a pistol known in America as a six-shooter and used by American cowboys," he added. "It is simpler, with less danger of stoppages. Nobody in the world is sorrier than I that I had to shoot the driver.

"The facts proved that our precautions to avoid hitting anybody else were insufficient. Men of our organization are accustomed to shooting anybody interfering with their actions, but we had special instructions not to hurt anybody but the lord."

From this point on the judge's ruling, plus extensive censorship, prevents reporting Bet-Tsouri's statement.

REPRINT OF DUMBARTON OAKS AGREEMENT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is much demand revealed by correspondence of Senators for copies of the Dumbarton Oaks document. The supply has now been exhausted, and I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the document, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJUSTMENTS OF WAGES IN GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Grand Forks Civic and Commerce Association on the 8th day of January, dealing with the matter of adverse rulings by the National War Labor Board on applications for permission to increase or adjust wages to meet changing labor conditions in Grand Forks, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is apparent to the Grand Forks Civic and Commerce Association that real hardships are being imposed on many of the old established businesses of this community through adverse rulings by the National War Labor Board on their applications for permission to increase or adjust wages to meet changing labor conditions in Grand Forks; and

Whereas the Grand Forks Civic and Commerce Association believes it is essential to the future prosperity of this community that an effort be made to correct this condition, the following statement is made:

In the wage base period of October 1942, and prior to that time, there was a surplus of skilled and semiskilled labor in Grand Forks and this enabled employers to establish and maintain competent organizations stabilized on the then prevailing wage scales.

There then was no important war industry in Grand Forks attracting labor from the normal peacetime pursuits, nor had there then been any marked increase in new businesses to compete for the labor supply in this community.

Demands for labor in other sections and the influx of new businesses into the community after that base period resulted in a vast turn-over in employment. Only the new businesses and the businesses permitted to establish higher wage rates were able to employ and hold adequate staffs, and these were drawn largely from long-established businesses unable to meet the wage competition, as they were compelled to conform to wages on the October 1942 base period.

This turn-over has forced employment in the older establishments of many more employees than would have been necessary had they been permitted to increase the wages of trained employees to meet the competition of other employers, both in and outside the community, with a resultant actual loss in man-hours and lessened efficiency in operation of their businesses.

It is apparent that unless many of the businesses of this community are permitted to adjust their wage scales and thus hold their remaining employees, both trained and newly employed, the post-war period will find them inadequately manned and unable to meet the anticipated competition that will accompany the return to peacetime conditions.

There is no real solution in the authority to raise wages to 50 cents an hour without formal application to the War Labor Board. While this may satisfy the inexperienced employees and those not in important positions, it serves only to work a discrimination against the skilled employees of long tenure and for whose services the competition is keenest. This tends to destroy established differentials of pay within the business organization: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Grand Forks Civic and Commerce Association, That it urges the National War Labor Board to give full cognizance to this condition and so rule on applications of employers for wage increases and adjustments in Grand Forks that the older-established businesses will be enabled to retain their present employees, a condition essential to their proper service to this important agricultural region and one necessary for their preparation for the post-war period: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the National War Labor Board in Washington and to its regional office in Chicago, and that copies also be sent to Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation in Washington.

CHARGES FOR GRAZING ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, for some time there has been a movement on the part of the Interior Department to increase the charges for grazing made against users of the open public domain in the public-land States. Letters have passed between the senior Senator from Nevada and the Secretary of the Interior on that subject. One of the letters from the Secretary was, either inadvertently or otherwise, addressed to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD my letter to the Secretary dated January 5 last.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 5, 1945.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Referring to your letter of December 28, 1944, I can agree with you that the advisory board system, as provided for in the Taylor Grazing Act, affords a highly desirable instrument and method of procedure for the consideration of matters affecting the users of grazing districts. The National Advisory Board Council, I have no doubt, too, serves a very useful purpose as an adjunct of the advisory board set up. I can also agree with your comment with respect to the National Advisory Board Council that "Any advice that they may offer on the matter of grazing fees, will, I am sure, be helpful to me in determining what action to take on any recommendation that the Director of Grazing may make on the subject."

But I cannot agree that the Advisory Board Council alone can speak for all of the State and district advisory boards, and the many livestock users of the grazing districts, upon so important a matter as the drastic increase in grazing fees proposed by the Director of Grazing. Especially the council cannot speak for all these interests when the proposal is suddenly pulled out of a hat, without previous notice, as it was at Salt Lake City, and it is presented by your Department officials as virtually an accomplished fact, to be made effective without an opportunity for the council or users to give it the careful study that its importance demands.

Nor can I agree wtih you that a small committee of the council, closeted with you in Washington, and no doubt surrounded by an array of department attorneys and officials, is qualified to represent the grazing district users in a decision of such far-reaching consequences. That is not a democratic procedure. It cannot possibly take the place of a full and frank discussion, in the open, with the opportunity for all interested parties to be heard, and the subject to be carefully considered on its merits with all of its incidence and implications. For this reason I shall insist that the whole matter be discussed in public hearings before my subcommittee on Public Lands and Surveys, at central and accessible points in the West, before a final decision is reached or changes in the grazing fees made effective.

This has been my posiiton since the matter first came to my attention, as you know. I now find that it is also the view of the president of the National Advisory Board Council; and I have reason to believe that it represents the views of other members of the council as well.

The views of the president of the National Advisory Board Council, and inferentially those of other members as well, have been conveyed to me in a letter of December 29, 1944. In that letter Mr. Gordon Griswold has so clearly stated the viewpoints and issues involved that I am attaching hereto a copy of it for your enlightenment. In Mr. Griswold's entire statement I most heartily concur.

It is true, as you point out in your letter in such detail, that certain compilations and conclusions, which the Grazing Service choose to call a range appraisal study, were presented and discussed at hearings before my subcommittee in 1941. The study comprises, essentially, wholly inadequate data, and a long and tortuous series of eliminations and substitutions. After listening to those discussions, I could not escape the definite conclusion that the so-called range appraisal study, to which you refer, could not, even by courtesy, be designated as a study in any proper meaning of that term. That conclusion was evidently shared by Director Rut-

ledge, who repeatedly stated flatly, both during the discussions and afterward, that he had not approved the study or its conclusions or inferences.

That study, in my judgment, and that of every competent person who has attempted to analyze it, with whom I have discussed it, is far from being either adequate or sound. It certainly falls far short of being a proper basis for the conclusions drawn, and the uses to which your Department is attempting to apply them.

I do not gather, from anything that has come to my attention since those hearings, including your letters, that the so-called study has been carried forward since 1941. In fact, the investigator for my subcommittee, when in the Grazing Service Salt Lake City office, in October last, specifically and in detail asked to see any and all files pertaining to grazing fees. He was assured by the Acting Director of Grazing, Mr. Leech, that virtually nothing has been done on the subject since 1941, other than some very recent correspondence with the Nevada Central Committee looking forward to future studies. What was alleged to be the only existing file on the subject was examined by the investigator, and it apparently verified Mr. Leech's statement.

I call your attention and consideration to the following statements taken from the press release issued by the National Advisory Board Council on November 25, 1944, at the conclusion of its meetings with Director Forsling:

"The National Advisory Board Council, in session at the Newhouse Hotel, charge the Grazing Service with breaking its pledge given to livestock operators if the proposed increase in grazing fees, as outlined by the Director of Grazing, is put into effect before the end of the war.

"In 1942 the National Advisory Board Council was given assurances by the Grazing Service that there would be no change in the grazing fee for the duration of the war.

"At yesterday's session the director presented to the National Advisory Board the proposed schedule of fees to be put into effect for the grazing season of 1945. This would constitute an increase of approximately 300 percent over the grazing fees and without consideration of the pledge previously given to the range livestock operators.

"The Taylor Grazing Act provides that the stockmen shall pay a reasonable fee.

"The Secretary of the Interior is named as the Administrator with authority to fix such fee. The Secretary assured the stockmen that he 'had no intention of making the act a revenue producer at all.' That the users of the range would be asked to pay for range administration but nothing more. That the estimated cost at that time of such administration was $150,000 per annum.

"These were direct representations made to obtain support for the passage of the act. That support was obtained. * * * This organization opposes such increase for the following reasons:

"In open meeting it has been stated to the livestock industry that no action would be taken to raise the fees during the present emergency. * * *

"1. Any fee finally fixed must be based on a direct relation to the reasonable cost of administering public lands for grazing purposes and nothing more. Until the facts as to the cost of administration, together with the necessity therefor and their relation to grazing are determined, no one can fix a reasonable fee as provided by the act.

"2. The original estimate of the cost of administration was fixed at $150,000; the present fee produces in excess of $900,000. Certainly until facts showing the error of their estimate are presented there is no reason for raising additional moneys.

"3. To raise grazing fees will constitute a direct repudiation of repeated promises made by representatives of the office of the Secretary of the Interior and of the Grazing Service that fees would not be raised during the present emergency. Many livestock operators holding grazing permits are now serving in the armed forces of the United States. We should at least keep faith with them."

May I remind you, Mr. Secretary, that on April 20, 1934, when the Taylor grazing bill was under consideration, you made this statement of policy to the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Gentlemen of the committee, all that the Department of the Interior wants to do is to maintain and upbuild the ranges for the benefit of the local interests."

"We have no intention of making this a revenue producer at all. We would like for the range to pay for its own administration and nothing more."

On the same day your spokesman, Mr. Poole, reiterated this policy to the Senate committee in these words:

"We have stated repeatedly it was not the intention of the Department to make this a revenue-producing measure."

Again, on February 21, 1934, Mr. Poole informed the House Committee on the Public Lands that:

"It is not the intention of the Department of the Interior to create new bureaus to administer this bill. We feel confident that the present personnel of the General Land Office and the Geological Survey are adequately equipped both in experience and in knowledge to administer. Secondly, I would like to make a statement with reference to the cost of administration. We have made a study of what thought this measure would involve in the way of expense to the users of the range. I have discussed it personally with the Secretary and it is his opinion that at the present time, in view of the economic conditions, we cannot put a charge on range use which would be burdensome to the livestock industry. We do not, however, think it will cost greatly in excess of $150,000 a year to administer the bill."

At the time you made the statements quoted above, Congressman Taylor, the author of the bill, made this statement of policy:

"It is a great national conservation policy and nothing else. There is no intention or thought of putting any hardship upon any of the people of the West."

I am reliably informed that Director Forsling has freely acknowledged that Director Rutledge pledged to the livestock men that there would be no change in the grazing fees for the duration. He questions only as to whether he is bound by the pledges of his predecessor. I submit, that if there is to be no more continuity of policy than that, how is the livestock industry to attain the stability so specifically set up as an objective in the preamble to the Taylor Grazing Act?

In the course of my recent 'nterview with Assistant Secretary Chapman, he repeatedly stated that this increase in the grazing fees has been forced upon the Grazing Service by pressure exerted by the House subcommittee on appropriations, when the Budget was before that subcommittee on February 29, 1944. The testimony in question appears on pages 115 to 142 of the subcommittee hearings. A reading of that testimony can lead to no other reasonable conclusion than that the criticism or pressure was deliberately invited by the representatives of the Grazing Service who testified. I am supported in this conclusion by statements made to Congressman ROCKWELL, of Colorado, by the members of the House subcommittee, when this matter was recently discussed with them. These members have stated definitely that they had no such thought or intention.

At the hearings referred to, Mr. Leech passed around a chart or table, not reproduced in the record, purporting to show that the grazing furnished by the grazing districts was worth nearly $6,000,000 to the licensees and permittees, whereas the fees collected were less than $1,000,000. The alleged value of nearly $6,000,000 was derived from the so-called range appraisal study, through a long and involved process of deductions and inferences. It is a purely hypothetical figure, and its validity is much more than highly questionable.

As you know, the central committee of the Nevada State grazing boards has made a careful and detailed analysis of the so-called range appraisal study and its conclusions. This analysis was completed on November 15, 1944, and was before the National Advisory Board Council when it met with Director Forsling in Salt Lake City. I am informed that it is now being printed by the State of Nevada, and is to be widely distributed throughout the range States. The analysis had an important part in the deliberations of the Council at the Salt Lake City meeting, and it influenced the position that the Council has taken. It is worthy of your careful consideration.

In the interest of fair play with the thousands of livestock users of the 48 grazing districts in the 10 Western States, as well as in the interest of the reputation of your Department for fair dealing, this whole subject of proper grazing fees should be fully and impartially discussed, in the open, with ample opportunity for all interested parties to be heard. I am determined that this shall be done before my subcommittee on Public Lands and Surveys at accessible points in the West. It is much too important and far-reaching a matter to be decided behind the closed doors of your office in the manner that your letters indicate that it is your intention to do it.

I would appreciate hearing from you at the earliest possible moment.

Respectfully,

PAT MCCARRAN.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCMAHON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE O'CONNOR, OF MONTANA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 79) of the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 15, 1945.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, a Representative from the State of Montana.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 34) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, late a Representative from the State of Montana.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, January 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 15, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edwin C. Wilson, of Florida, now Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs, Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

To be assistant surgeons effective date of oath of office:

George F. Kamen	Clarke W. Mangun, Jr.
William C. Redmon	Dean W. Geheber
Wardell H. Mills	Isaac M. Zigler
Richard H. Linn	Arthur M. Pettler
Frank A. Buell	Jacob Wagner
Andrew P. Sackett	John C. Sheehan
Edwin D. Merrill	Harold S. Barrett
Herbert F. Hager	Edmund R. Clarke, Jr.
Vernon R. Dennis, Jr.	Ira Avrin
Vernon G. Guenther	Merle Bundy
James R. Hurley	George W. Gibbins
Robert L. Morrison	Ralph V. Kinzie

Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr.

To be passed assistant surgeons effective date of oath of office:

Will H. Aufranc
William P. Sellers III
Gene B. Haber

Senior surgeons to be temporary medical directors effective January 1, 1945:

William Hendon Gordon
Leroy E. Burney

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. William L. McKittrick to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 3d day of June 1944.

Col. Lawson H. M. Sanderson to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of June 1944.

Col. Christian F. Schilt to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of June 1944.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the perfection of our humanity, who assures the deep satisfaction of the soul, verify Thy promise unto us: "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee." We praise Thee that the dominating truth which glows through the pages of Thy holy word and harks back through the long expectant years of the past, unfolded by the words of the prophets, is Thy mercy in the remission of sins. Dear Lord, we humbly confess that our experiences confirm the sting of transgression and pray that Thy law may be written in our hearts. Thou hast a way out of every wrong, a release from every sorrow, and a strength for every frailty. Each day keep before us an uncompromising ideal; search us and know our hearts; try us and know our thoughts and see if there be any wicked way in us, and lead us in the way everlasting.

O Good Shepherd, bend low. There cometh a mist and a weeping rain and life is never the same again. At an early hour the watch of death came when the world was asleep and took from us a strong, capable, patriotic Member, and as the heavens opened his soul became immortal. Yea, though we walk through the valley of the shadow of death may Thy rod and Thy staff be our comfort and our support and in Thy holy name, blessed Saviour, may we dwell in the House of our Lord forever. We pray that blessings of peace and rest may abide with this strickened fireside both now and forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 11, 1945, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Members who have special orders for today, may, if they desire, extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Chair will not recognize anyone except the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES F. O'CONNOR

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of regret that I announce to the House the death of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Montana, Mr. JAMES F. O'CONNOR. It was only this morning I was notified of his passing, and the shock of his death has been a great personal blow to me. To his devoted wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy. They, too, will miss him because of his fine traits as a husband and father.

Words are useless to express one's real emotion at a time like this, I know, but I will miss his kindliness, his sound advice, and his never-failing willingness to help at all times.

I wish at this time to state that I feel a deep personal loss in the passing of JIM O'CONNOR, because he has been guide, mentor, and friend to me. He has spent most of his life in our State. He has achieved there a reputation which will rank him with our greatest statesmen. We are going to miss him deeply, because of his wisdom, because of his courage, and because of his forthright honesty. He was a man to whom we of Montana looked up to. I know that as one of our colleagues he had the respect of the entire House of Representatives. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in paying this last tribute of respect to his colleague from Montana, Mr. O'CONNOR. During a period of several years it has been my pleasure and my privilege to have served in this House with the distinguished gentleman who passed away last night. His death leaves a vacancy here which will be hard to fill. He was a fine, outstanding example of what a public servant ought to be and what a public servant can be in the discharge of his duties as a Representative in the Congress of the United States. He was a tireless worker in the cause of the people of his district who sent him to Congress. He was a man of great patriotism, he was a man of great ability, he was a man who made his voice heard here and who accomplished many, many constructive things not only for his State but for the people of this country. I join with our colleagues in expressing sorrow that he has passed from our midst.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of JIM O'CONNOR the Nation has sustained a serious loss and the people of Montana has lost one of the great statesmen of the Central West. The big, friendly Irishman whom we knew as JIM O'CONNOR was one of the best loved Members of the House by Representatives on both sides of the aisle.

I think, perhaps, JIM O'CONNOR was the first Member of the Democratic group of the House it was my pleasure to meet, because he had a habit of making himself known at once to Members coming in newly from the Middle West. From that time until his death he and I have served together always on at least one committee, and sometimes on two or three committees. I know he was a great American, a courageous and independent thinker, sometimes voting with his party and sometimes voting against his party, but always voting in the interests of America as they appeared to him in the

solemnity of his own serious contemplation.

He was the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, on which it has been my pleasure to serve with him throughout the period in which I have been a Member of the House. He was a great chairman, he was an honest and a fair chairman. At no time in the 6 years during which I served on that committee did politics ever enter into any decision made by JIM O'CONNOR. He had one objective only, and that was to do well by the American Indian and to do well by all the people of the Indian country.

I am sure that now that that great heart of his, which loved so much of life and failed so soon and so regrettably in its life-sustaining function, has stopped, the Indians of America as well as the white people throughout this great Republic of ours, and especially those of us who served with Jim here in the House, know that he has gone to his happy hunting ground. Our sympathies flow out to his family in their hour of grief.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our beloved friend leaves a void in the House which will be hard to fill. His sudden passing is a blow to every Member of the House. Our late friend and I were very closely associated during the years which he was a Member of the House. A sincere conscientious legislator always devoted to his duty, he served the people of his district and his State with great distinction. The big heritage that JIM O'CONNOR left, which will never die or be forgotten, is the great love that he had for his fellow men. You and I remember him in his contacts with us. We remember him in his debates on the floor. No matter how heated the debate might be, no matter how controversial the bill was that was before the House, no matter how intense the feeling might have been on the part of the Members who favored or opposed the bill or question pending in the House, JIM O'CONNOR always took his position and expressed himself in a manner which always evidenced his tolerance of the views of those who differed with him. In addition to his devoted service as a Member of this body the one big heritage which I have referred to and which constitutes the light of his candle that will never die, is the love that he held for his fellow men, that fine, noble spirit that he always evidenced, showing a mind which endeared itself to all who came in contact with him and setting an example of tolerance, of understanding and of love of neighbor which everyone might follow with benefit to themselves.

The passing of our beloved friend is a blow to those of us who have served with him, a great loss to the House of Representatives, a distinct loss to his constituency, and to the people of his entire State and a personal loss to myself. I extend to those loved ones whom he leaves behind the deepest sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as James R. Mann said with reference to Champ Clark, the ones who knew JIM O'CONNOR best loved him most. He had those qualities of mind and heart which entitle him to the highest characterization to be found in our language: he was a Christian gentleman.

He was a patriotic American who had the courage of his convictions and always did his duty as he saw it, regardless of the cost to himself. He was my friend, and like the rest of you, I shall never cease to miss him.

Someone said:

I wrote my name upon the sand
And trusted it would stand for aye.
But soon, alas, the refluent sea had washed
My feeble lines away.

I carved my name upon the wood
And after years returned again.
I missed the shadow of the tree
That stretched of old upon the plain.

The solid marble next my name
I gave as a perpetual trust.
An earthquake rent it to its base,
And now it lies o'er laid with dust.

All these had failed; I was perplexed.
I turned and asked myself what then?
If I would have my name endure,
I'll write it on the hearts of men.

JIM O'CONNOR indelibly wrote his name upon the hearts of his fellow Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to hear of the death of our colleague, JAMES F. O'CONNOR. His passing is a distinct loss to the West. He served with distinction in this House for close to 10 years. The people of his State honored him on many occasions. He served as a distinguished judge of his district and also as a speaker of the House in the State of Montana.

Since I have been here I have learned to know him and to love him. He was a hard worker and rendered great service as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. He was a great representative not only of the State of Montana but of the entire West. He worked untiringly on behalf of the livestock and agricultural interests of the West. He was a shining example of a young man who went West without means and worked his way up. He owned a big cattle ranch. He was a successful lawyer. He was a great American. At all times he was most helpful to me on the problems of the State of Wyoming, which State I have the high honor to represent in this Congress. I know that we shall miss him sorely in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to find words to express one's innermost thoughts and feelings on occasions like this. Death comes always as a shock, certainly it did to me this morning.

It has been my privilege to work very closely with JIM O'CONNOR, as we knew him. Our section of the country and its representatives work very closely on matters affecting that entire territory. It was always a pleasure to contact Mr. O'CONNOR and ask for his support, advice, and aid in the problems of the Missouri River Basin. He never refused help for our section. His sudden passing again reminds each and every one of us that we travel through this life just once. The opportunity to serve is here now; it may be too late tomorrow. I well remember visiting with Mr. O'CONNOR last Friday. It seems most unbelievable that death has called him home.

Death reminds us that we should not drive the stakes of our earthly tents so firmly in the soil here that we might expect them to remain forever; for, after all, life is but a fleeting moment. We are privileged to serve and we should serve while we have an opportunity. This is one thing that JIM O'CONNOR did, he was consistently working for the citizens of this Nation, for the citizens of the Middle West, and especially for the people of Montana. He never missed an opportunity to work and vote for legislation affecting our people. The folks in that section, especially the western section of the United States, and Montana particularly, are going to miss a very able Representative and the Nation is losing a great American. I extend my sympathy to the family. All of us will miss him very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible for me to express in words the very high personal regard I had for JIM O'CONNOR and the keen sense of loss I feel at his passing. I think perhaps Jim suspected that his span of life was drawing to a close, because just a few short weeks ago he told me he would like more than anything else in the world to continue as a Member of Congress until such time as a permanent and enduring peace could be written by the United States and other nations so that bloodshed and the trials and tribulations of warfare would never occur again. He has given to the armed forces his only son who is now engaged in fighting for this country overseas.

JIM O'CONNOR has contributed much to this Nation and to Congress. It was my pleasure and high privilege to serve with him on numerous committees of the House. On each committee he always contributed as much if not more than any individual member.

It is regrettable that Jim's destiny did not permit him to realize his ambition to remain a Member of this body until such time as he could participate in helping to fashion a final and lasting peace.

We shall miss Jim very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was preparing to come to the House floor this morning for the purpose of engaging in the regular work of the day when I was notified that our good friend, JAMES F. O'CONNOR, of Montana, had passed to the Great Beyond, to the "happy hunting ground." It casts a great shadow over all

of us and it makes us feel very humble in the sight of our Maker, when we realize, as the days go by, that the human body becomes more frail. It is our duty and our responsibility to our families and to our friends to live in closer touch with Him.

JAMES O'CONNOR, the gentleman from Montana, in my judgment was a real friend to man. He has always been a great friend of mine. Returning here a few weeks ago I received one of the finest tributes and one of the best welcomes back to Washington from JIM O'CONNOR that I received from any of my friends on either side of the aisle. He was an honest, honorable, and conscientious individual. He did everything he could for the best interests of the people he represented.

I admired JIM O'CONNOR always. While he was a party man, deep down in his heart he was first a real, true American. I have lost a real friend in the passing of JIM O'CONNOR, because I always considered him such.

To his family I extend the deepest sympathy. The citizens of Montana, whom he represented, have lost a faithful and honorable servant. His place in the legislative halls of our Nation will be vacant and we will miss him. JIM O'CONNOR was a real, true American and a gentleman.

May God have mercy upon his soul.

Our departed colleague to whom we pay tribute and our real friendship for him through our years of service together is like the friendship we find in verse:

There is no friend like an old friend
Who has shared our morning days;
No greeting like his welcome,
No homage like his praise.

Fame is the scentless sunflower
With gaudy crown of gold,
But friendship is the breathing rose
With sweets in every fold.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my friend and our colleague, JAMES F. O'CONNOR, chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, will be felt particularly by me. I recall that we came here together in the Seventy-fifth Congress. We served together 8 years in this body on three different committees. I outranked him on two committees and he outranked me on one committee, the Indian Affairs Committee. Since we came at the same time we were seated side by side on all of those committees. I remember many, many committee meetings where perplexing problems confronted us. I cannot help but recall numerous instances that I received great assistance from him.

While he had a keen legal mind he was not over legalistic. He thought more of justice than of legal technicalities and I, not being a lawyer, found it necessary to inquire of him and lean upon him very often. I never found him lacking in friendly advice.

May I say of my colleague from Montana that he was my friend and mentor, my adviser and helpful friend. He never failed me. While he was a friend to all, he was not a respecter of official persons as such. He fought the cause of the Indian and of the common man, whether it conformed with the ideas of officialdom or no.

I remember distinctly that the gentleman from Mississippi received earnest assistance from the gentleman from Montana, Mr. O'CONNOR, who has now passed from us, in legislation seeing to it, at the beginning of our defense program, that the private soldiers in our armed forces were adequately paid.

The gentleman from Montana, Mr. O'CONNOR, was always interested in doing justice to the red man. It was the Indian in his hogan and in his tepee on the various Indian reservations that was uppermost in the mind of this big-hearted legislator, and not particularly the dictates or the wishes of an official in any department. He wanted to see that the laws governing and affecting the red men were carried out in the interest of and for the benefit of our American citizens of Indian descent.

And so it was all through JIM O'CONNOR'S philosophy and his legislative career he thought first of the interests of the common man, whether white, red, or black.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss him in our councils, and I personally will miss him greatly.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with a sad and heavy heart because of the loss of my good friend and colleague, JAMES F. O'CONNOR, the able Representative from the Second District of Montana. I mourn and share the sorrow that his family and friends everywhere feel today. Montana and the entire Nation have lost an outstanding statesman and one who will be hard to replace. To me, his death is a keen and personal loss, one that words are simply inadequate to express.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we are all sad at heart because of the sudden, unexpected, and untimely passing of Representative JAMES F. O'CONNOR, of Montana.

Friday night, just a few hours ago, along with other Members, I attended the banquet of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense. Mr. O'CONNOR was present. I had a fine visit with him and no one suspicioned that the end was so near. He was apparently in good spirits and as affable, friendly, and likeable as usual.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. O'CONNOR'S section of the country has lost a great Representative and an enthusiastic advocate of that land "out where the West begins." JIM O'CONNOR was honest, capable, and fearless. He had definite notions about government, and never hesitated to express his views in this forum. He will be greatly missed, and we all sympathize with his family, his district, and his State.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of distinct loss that I have learned of the death of JIM O'CONNOR. It has been my privilege to serve with him on at least three committees. He was one of the ranking members of the Committee on the Public Lands. I had occasion to work with him on several subcommitees. I also appeared before his own committee on problems of vital interest to our section. I always found him earnest, conscientious, and helpful. He was a very constant attendant at committee meetings. He always tried to get to the bottom of things, and in a vigorous way he advocated those things that he felt to be right. My colleagues who have preceded me today have pointed out his chief characteristic, and that was his love of his fellow man. No finer, kinder, or friendlier man ever lived than JIM O'CONNOR. But his chief character was not just that alone. Embodied in his heart and soul was a deep consciousness, a good fighting spirit for those things that were right, and he did a lot of hard work, because he always devoted himself to the duties of his committee and of the House. His passing is a distinct loss to his great State that he represented so ably, and a great loss to this Nation, and a great personal loss to those of us who knew him and loved him. I join in expressing my deep sympathy to his family and the many others who loved him.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly shocked and deeply grieved to learn of the passing of my good friend JIM O'CONNOR, of Montana. It has been my privilege to serve with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], on three standing committees of the House. I found him to be a hard-working man who followed his personal convictions and independence of spirit. Montana has lost a great advocate and the Nation a great servant. I join with my colleagues in extending my sympathies to the members of his family.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, word of JIM O'CONNOR'S death was just given me as I entered the floor of the House this morning. Jim and I came here together in the Seventy-fifth Congress. We served together on the Committee on Indian Affairs that first term, and we also served together on the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. During the years since then when our committee paths have separated somewhat, I have found that JIM O'CONNOR never forgot the friendship and the mutuality of interest that was revealed through our work on those committees.

During the late Presidential campaign I was asked by the Republican National Committee to make some speeches in a couple of neighboring States, including Montana. I declined to go to Montana. JIM O'CONNOR'S district borders part of mine. Through our association here I knew that Jim was a Representative of

the people of that part of the country; as we say out there sometimes, "He was our kind of people."

He had been born in Iowa, as I was. He had gone to Montana in the days of the homesteader as I went to South Dakota when a boy. The history of our part of the West is intertwined. It was a part of the last great Sioux Reservation opened to settlement in 1876, after troops with Custer had found gold on French Creek in the Black Hills in 1874. My home town is named Custer. I recall going with JIM O'CONNOR in our first term here to appear before a committee in behalf of his bill to establish a national monument on the banks of the Little Big Horn in Montana, where General Custer fell in June 1876.

So Jim saw Montana when it was young. And he became a part of the country. He saw that story of America in the life about him, the plowing of the first furrow in virgin ground, the digging of the first well, the building of a sod house, the stringing of the first fence, the building of a school, the building of churches and homes and towns—those things which have marked the transition of a pioneer community into modern civilization.

And he knew the ups and downs of a new country—the good years, the bad years, the wet years, the dry years, the years of crops, and the years of grasshoppers. He know the tragedy of the Indian who had been moved from his home; he knew the struggles of the white man as he sought to establish a sound economy for himself and his family. You who have seen Jim battle on this floor for whatever he believed to be for the welfare of his people understand what I am trying to say.

I could not have gone into Montana in the heat of a political campaign and have avoided some reference to the congressional representation or to congressional problems, at least. And I could not go there and say anything against the kind of representation JIM O'CONNOR was trying to give the people of Montana, so I declined to go.

I mention that merely because it suggests something of the way I felt about JIM O'CONNOR; personal friendship, yes, but also a feeling that he truly tried to represent the kind of people that live in Montana and—that live in western South Dakota.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the Seventy-ninth Congress that one of our Members has answered the final roll call. In the hushed silence of this Chamber and in the real sincerity of the Members of the House as they have paid tribute to JAMES F. O'CONNOR, there is, I feel, an expression of the greatest tribute any of us could merit.

To everyone our late colleague from Montana was Jim. It follows like the night the day that he would have to come from a State like Montana, out where the West begins and where neighbors may be widely separated by distance but are very close together as to sentiment and thinking.

As I look back over the years I have served with Jim, and while he was a fighter and an advocate, yet I never heard him utter an unkind word, either on the floor or off the floor, about any one of his colleagues. While he was a member of the Democratic Party, I have seen him refuse to follow party lines, to do what he thought was right. He was both fearless and honest.

The last time I saw him was on the occasion of a group meeting where there were no party lines, and Jim was there fighting for his farmers and ranchers, not only of his district but of the State of Montana and the Nation as well. He always acted upon the principle of humanity and simple justice to the people not only of his district but of the Nation as well. The fight that he made for our American Indians exemplifies that Jim was a champion of those who had no particular pressure group to cause him to act.

I appreciate that to the new Member of Congress it may come as a surprise to find that the tributes to JIM O'CONNOR have come almost equally from each side of the aisle, but I assure them that they will shortly see from experience that party lines mean nothing in the recognition of ability and sincerity to the membership of this House and the recognition of the true worth of the men and women who serve in Congress.

I feel very strongly that his district and the State of Montana, and the Middle West and West, have lost a great advocate. I know I feel that I have lost a good and a true friend. The Nation has lost a courageous and a real American.

I have no doubt that the fact that his only son is in this war has added to the strain which hastened his death, as only those of us who have children in or who have lost children in this war can fully appreciate.

To his family we extend our heartfelt sympathy in the loss of a husband and father.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked this morning when I learned of the death of JIM O'CONNOR. I wish to join with my colleagues in paying respect to his memory. I became attached to Jim when I first came to Congress 4 years ago. I always enjoyed visiting with him. I considered him one of the most able Members of the House. Certainly, Montana has lost a capable and courageous Representative in this body, and this Nation has lost a public servant of extraordinary ability. We can ill afford to lose a man of the type of JIM O'CONNOR at this time. He was desperately needed in this critical hour. I was associated with Mr. O'CONNOR on the Committee on the Public Lands. He was always a champion of the West. My first contact with him was on a small committee of western Members formed to protect the interests of Western States. At that time we were particularly concerned over maintaining our decreed water rights in the different States which were threatened by pending legislation. I soon recognized in JIM O'CONNOR a man thoroughly conversant with the many phases of irrigation law. He was an authority on agriculture and was ever alert to promote and defend the mining and livestock industries of the West. We in Colorado appreciated a man of the type of JIM O'CONNOR in the Congress of the United States. It has been said that no one has lived in vain who leaves friends to mourn him. I never heard of JIM O'CONNOR having an enemy. He made friends easily and knew how to keep them.

As Hamlet said of his father:

> He was a man, take him for all in all;
> We shall not look upon his like again.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, although I had some knowledge of the physical condition of our friend the late JAMES FRANCIS O'CONNOR, the news of his death, which came to me this morning at about 11 o'clock, was a distinct shock. He had seemed to me to have recovered his health and to have regained his vigor. He seemed to be feeling quite well. His passing is a real loss to me, because he was my neighbor, his office and mine being close together on the third floor of the Capitol during the past 2 years. During that period I had come to know JIM O'CONNOR quite well. Practically every day he greeted me with a cheery word and often we talked of his district in Montana and his ranch out there. He had great pride in the fine cattle he raised on his ranch, and he had a great love of home and country. It has been said if you would have friends be one. Judged by that saying, JIM O'CONNOR'S friends are legion. He was a good neighbor and a good friend. He served his district, his State, and his Nation with fidelity and with great ability. We all will miss him, and we all feel the deepest sympathy for his family and the people of his district.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, it seemed unbelievable this morning when MIKE MANSFIELD called me to announce the passing of the chairman of our Indian Affairs Committee, JIM O'CONNOR.

Last week a group of us from the House went with him to Judge Vinson's office to protest the placing of ceilings upon live cattle. Jim not only arranged this meeting, but seemed in unusually good health, and took the most active part in it.

We men of the West have lost another warm friend, a courteous gentleman and an able debater and legislator. It has been my privilege to serve with JIM O'CONNOR on three different committees, and I have always been impressed by the fairness he always displayed and his friendly attitude toward all things. I doubt if he had an enemy in the world.

In the passing of JIM O'CONNOR, Montana has lost an able Representative, and we from the Rocky Mountain States will miss the warm smile, the fighting

spirit, and the courtesy of this gentleman from the great open spaces of the West.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the passing so very suddenly of our colleague, Judge JAMES O'CONNOR, again proves the uncertainty of life. Only last Friday it was my privilege and pleasure to have luncheon with him. As usual, he not only showed his great interest in the people he so conscientiously and ably represented, especially the Indians of all our Nation, as has been stated by our other colleagues, but also anxious interest in the whole Government, whose proper functions he continually expounded with much luminosity. He explained to me the special work he was doing with his committee in an endeavor to effect saving of millions of dollars to the taxpayers, and he urged me to read his committee report. At the same time he requested the continuation of his committee's special work in connection with improvements in Indian administration, which work has been, and will continue to be, so beneficial to the Indians and the Government.

I have known this honorable deceased ever since the day he entered the House. He was a man of real ability and thoroughness, courageous, honest, and sincere; and, as has been stated, he was a good Christian gentleman, always sedulously and actually practicing the teachings of Christianity in their broadest application. I do not know any man who has been more devoted to duty than he. With his passing, not only the House, his district, and his State, but the Nation loses a very valuable citizen and legislator.

I conclude by expressing to his district, to his family, and the people of his great State my sincere regret at his passing; and I hope that his selfless and praiseworthy activities here may be an inspiration and guidance for all of us in the work that awaits us.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved this morning when our good colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] came to my office and informed me of the death of our lovable and esteemed colleague JAMES O'CONNOR. Out in my district is a small town by the name of California Junction, in Harrison County, a town of possibly two or three hundred people. It was in that small town that JIM O'CONNOR was born. He received his education in the public and normal schools in the State of Iowa.

Jim always liked to talk about his boyhood days in Iowa. He was proud of the fact that he was born in a small country town, a little hamlet, one of the crossroads of America. As has been said, "America lives at the crossroads." Yes, JIM O'CONNOR was well grounded in pioneer spirit of the West; he was a genuine American. JIM O'CONNOR then went farther west and finally became the Representative of the great State of Montana, whose interests he has cared for so well here in Congress for many years.

It was always a pleasure to talk to Jim. On last Friday was held the annual Women's National Defense Convention here in Washington. JIM O'CONNOR was there and I had the privilege of making Jim acquainted with my wife and the Representatives of the State of Iowa who were there at that convention. In his very jovial and delightful manner, Jim had some very nice things to say about the people of Iowa, and we liked it.

JIM O'CONNOR was a great American; the country has sustained a great loss in his passing. Our hearts go out to his family and to his son who is fighting for America in far-away lands. JIM O'CONNOR to me, and, I think, to most of those who knew him, was "like a rainbow to the storms of life, like the evening beams that smile the clouds away." Jim will be missed in this House; I am going to miss him; America will miss him, and, most of all, his dear loved ones will miss him. For them we grieve.

God rest his soul.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not for him who has gone before that we should feel sadness but, rather, for those who are left behind. JIM O'CONNOR has run a good race, he has kept the faith, he has finished his course, and a good course it was. That mane of snow-white hair that used to appear in the House Chamber here and that finger that used to reach out and point to us when he wanted to emphasize a point will not be here any more; but his spirit will be here and it will be in the hearts of the people he represented; it will be in the hearts and minds of all who knew him; it will go marching down through the years of American history like the influence of every true son of this great Nation, making the country better and truer than it could possibly have been if he had not passed this way.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to add my word of sorrow at the passing of JIM O'CONNOR. I had known him ever since he became a Member of this House. I worked with him on two official committees, but more often on unofficial committees that are closer to the Nation's heart pulse than are the official committees. It was on one such occasion just last Saturday that I talked to him over the telephone. This morning we missed him. He was not there.

Mr. Speaker, may I say on behalf of JIM O'CONNOR that he was not partisan after the election. He was a citizen of the United States first, last, and always, and I could but wish that there was more of that sentiment on both sides of the aisle.

I have known Mr. O'CONNOR to stand for that which was right regardless of whether it was in keeping and in accord with all of his colleagues. He never subordinated his conscience to party expediency. He was JIM O'CONNOR all the time. He has made the State of Montana and this Nation a better place in which to live on account of his having been here, and I am sure the work he has done will live in our memories forever, and especially in the memory of those of us who worked with him.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate to express my personal feeling in the loss of JIM O'CONNOR. He was a friendly man, one of the best friends that I have had since coming to Congress. He was one of the first men here to express an interest in me and to give me the benefit of his rich experience and counsel.

It will be gratifying to his family and to his friends to note the great tributes that are being paid to his memory and which will long linger in our hearts. It is true that anything said here today will be of no benefit to JIM O'CONNOR but certainly his great influence for good and his ability to cause men to respect and love him will be of special value to the membership of this House. It will make us realize the importance of being friendly, not only to one another, but to all people.

Not only the State of Montana but the whole area in the West has lost a warrior and a valiant fighter for the things that the West needs and, especially and above all, a somewhat forgotten people, the American Indian, has lost a real champion and a good friend.

It was only Saturday that we met as a Rocky Mountain group to discuss things that were vital to his section and to the section that we represent.

May I express my deepest sympathy to his family and especially to his son, now serving his country, and on whom he counted so much when the war was over. May it be said to his memory and to the people he represented that when he went down, he went down fighting for their interests.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Montana, JAMES F. O'CONNOR, left this House to enter that House not made with hands, the losses sustained were many. JIM O'CONNOR was not only my friend, but he was a friend of a great many. He was one of the distinguished alumni of the law college of the University of Nebraska. He graduated from that institution in 1904. He had a distinguished career as a lawyer. He was a great judge and a great legislator. Our Republic, more particularly that section of the country known as the great West, has lost a devoted public servant.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was grieved when I walked into the Chamber this noon to learn of the passing of JIM O'CONNOR. During my term in office in this House it has been a privilege to have served on three separate committees with JIM O'CONNOR. I know of no man who was so fair regarding all legislation as was JIM O'CONNOR. The

Western States have lost a man who knew their many problems; one that we could look forward to for the purpose of consulting from time to time as to his viewpoint and the proper leadership we should follow in achieving the legislation the Western States wanted. The State of Montana has lost a great legislator. We Members of the House, as well as his family, will miss him.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, JIM O'CONNOR is dead; great big, old, loving JIM O'CONNOR, with a big heart and big hands. I just would not have expected him to be dead. He was so very much alive. That is one of the first things that I learned when I came to this body was how the Members die off here; how our brothers in the legislative halls take such sudden departures. It is probably not amiss on this occasion to have it said to America how men work and fight to the death and die right here in the harness. So many seem to think that a Congressman comes up here and sits around and takes it easy. That is so far from the truth. If the people could just study the lives of those they send here and see how they go out right in the midst of the noonday of action, how their hearts and minds would be changed about the life of a Congressman; work, work from early morn until sometimes quite frequently late at night. Big, old, loving Jim. You could put your hand on him in the dark, you always knew how he was, how he would vote, and how American he was. Man, how American that man was. He just had to have his say. He wanted to have his word, his two bits' worth. Even if he thought it was not worth more than two bits, he wanted to have it out. He reflected so much of the very spirit of the thing that makes America—JIM O'CONNOR. You could not find a man on this floor who was more average American than JIM O'CONNOR. You could not find a man on this floor more willing to tell you exactly how he felt, and when he advocated a thing he advocated it to the end. As to his belief and his sentiments he was always ready and eager to express his views at any time, and he did not wait for somebody else to make up his mind for him. A great big, old loving thing. He could put his arm further around you and reach further into your heart than any man you ever saw in your life. He is dead today. He is just as dead as though he had not been so much alive. He is just as dead as if he had not been one of those men who met you on the corner with a big smile and a happy thought, questioning you as to how we should answer things for America. He asked for America questions that have not been answered yet, and it is up to us to help find the answers.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, last night we lost a friend. It has been my privilege to know and to work closely with JIM O'CONNOR, of Montana. Jim was one of those men whom we refer to as one of Nature's noblemen.

He was a true product of the western part of this great Nation of ours, born in Iowa, a graduate of the Nebraska Law School, and then for 40 years a leader in the development of the great State of Montana.

But not alone has Montana lost a leader, for Jim wanted and worked diligently for a world in which friends could live in mutual security and peace. The State of Washington will also miss JIM O'CONNOR.

Yet, there is always this saving thought. Each useful life leaves a record of achievement, and though the body passes the soul and purpose that once moved it, lives on. Jim is gone, still we can all look back upon his deeds and works and feel the lift of happy memories.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 79):

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, a Representative from the State of Montana.

Resolved, That a committee of five Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

Pursuant to the provision of House Resolution 79, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to attend the funeral: Messrs. MANSFIELD of Montana, WHITE, MURDOCK, KNUTSON, and CASE of South Dakota.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 16, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

106. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting a report of holders of its 500 shares of stock and the earnings and expenses for the calendar year 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

107. A letter from the Administrator of War Food Administration, transmitting a report of operations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 626. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 1405. A bill to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon persons discharged from the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps on account of disability as are conferred upon members of the Army of the United States who served during the present war; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1406. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for payment of benefits with respect to the month in which an annuitant or pensioner dies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1407. A bill to authorize the acquisition of forest lands adjacent to and over which highways, roads, or trails are constructed or to be constructed wholly or partially with Federal funds in order to preserve or restore their natural beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1408. A bill authorizing acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise of certain forest lands within the Mount Hood National Forest in Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1409. A bill making appropriations for the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 1410. A bill to establish a Commission on Taxation in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1411. A bill to extend the benefits of the Social Security Act to include individuals who are physically disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1412. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to locate, establish, construct, equip, and operate a hospital for the insane of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 1413—A bill to authorize the construction of a National Guard armory at Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1414. A bill relating to the payment of certain benefits under the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1415. A bill to provide for the education of all types of physically handicapped children, to authorize an appropriation of money therefor, and to regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 1416. A bill to provide for the payment of annuities to blind persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1417. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1418. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1419. A bill to provide pension benefits for certain Spanish-American War veterans equivalent to those granted to Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1420. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 1421. A bill to provide for the total mobilization of the Nation's manpower in the present war with the aid of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 1422. A bill to provide for the construction of Veterans Administration facilities in accordance with veteran population needs; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1423. A bill to provide that the Veterans Administration shall not, in the absence of fraud or clear and unmistakable error, reduce any permanent disability rating; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1424. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1425. A bill to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 1426. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 so as to grant insurance to certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces prior to securing such insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 1427. A bill relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1428. A bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 1429. A bill to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1430. A bill to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage record information to State unemployment compensation agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1431 (by request). A bill to create a Public Vehicle Control Board in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1432. A bill providing for the establishment of a junior division of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 1433. A bill to make it unlawful for any person to be employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, who has engaged in activity subversive of the Government of the United States or is or has been a member of or associated with any organization, any part of the aims or purposes of which is or has been subversive of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1434. A bill to provide for flood-control work on the Wabash River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 1435. A bill to restore certain disabled veterans of the Regular Establishment who were disabled in line of duty to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1436. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1437. A bill to amend the act approved March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations for Government employees, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1438. A bill providing compensation for forfeited leave; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1439. A bill to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1440. A bill to limit the purposes for which loans may be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank of Washington to foreign governments and persons in foreign countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1441. A bill to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1442. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to aid the States in providing certain medical, surgical, and hospital care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1443. A bill to limit the purposes for which loans may be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank of Washington to foreign governments and persons in foreign countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 1444. A bill to provide for the deportation of Japanese aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1445. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government employees who have attained the age of 55 years and rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 1446. A bill to restore standard time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1447. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 1448. A bill to authorize long-distance telephone calls and telegrams by military personnel at Government expense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 1449. A bill to provide for paying certain educational costs of States and political subdivisions, in the case of children of families temporarily residing therein due to activities related to the war effort; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1450. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1451. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $50 to $60 per month; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the Government of the United States in regard to tide and submerged lands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the terms of office of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution providing for the administration and protection of insular possessions of the United States by the Navy Department; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in Springerville, Ariz., of a memorial to Gustav Becker; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. Res. 75. Resolution to continue the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 76. Resolution relative to the Jewish national home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. Res. 77. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Old-Age Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 78. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 626, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1452. A bill granting a pension to Martha J. Poole, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Edith M. Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1454. A bill for the relief of the Contracting & Sales Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Palmer G. Snedecor; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1456. A bill for the relief of George E. Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Josephine Benham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of James E. Taylor; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Williams, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of D. C. Todd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 1461. A bill granting an increase of pension to Clara Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1462. A bill granting an increase of pension to Matilda Tarno; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1463. A bill granting an increase of pension to Susan McClelland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Leonard Hutchings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1465. A bill for the relief of the State of California; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 1466. A bill for the relief of William H. Bibb; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Walter R. McKinney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMES of Washington:

H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Warrant Officer Wayne C. Proper; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Cox Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1470. A bill granting a pension to Edward Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1471. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Sevaljevick, now known as Nicholas Hornacky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1472. A bill for the relief of B. B. Stringer; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1473. A bill granting a pension to Ernest Somers; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Isobell Shanks; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1475. A bill granting a pension to John Hannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1476. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edwin E. Harper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. W. McMurray, R. T. Latham, G. B. Cooper, L. W. Pearson, and Billups Oil Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1478. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Russell C. Allen and Molly Ann Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Axel A. Stromberg; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of the S. G. Leoffler Operating Co. of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of R. W. Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Sam Wadford; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of the Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Henry B. Tucker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Sam D. Moak; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Clifton L. Holmes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Austin Bruce Bowan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri:

H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of Harold B. Alden and Walter E. Strohm; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1490. A bill awarding a Distinguished Service Cross to Tony Siminoff, veteran of the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H. R. 1491: A bill for the relief of Albert P. Dunbar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Florence J. Sypert, administratrix, of the estate of Leona Conner Childers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1493. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the eminent-domain case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States, No. 34450; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1494. A bill to authorize the presentation of an appropriate medal to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

19. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Supreme Lodge of the Order of Ahepa, Washington, D. C., endorsing the enactment of universal military service legislation and requesting the mediation and active participation of the Government of the United States of America in the negotiations now under way in Athens and in London to end the present conflict in Greece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

20. Also, petition of the American Legion, Kings County, Department of New York, by Thomas F. Kilcourse, county adjutant, requesting consideration that action be taken for the continuance of the Dies committee, which has performed for the past number of years valuable assistance in uncovering subversive elements as well as activities of subversive groups in our Government as well as in our country in general; to the Committee on Rules.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, help us to believe in the hand that never fails and see through our severest losses our greater gains. Forgive the defects of our spirits; speak to us of a tender heart full of pity and grace; speak to us of integrity and of the higher wisdom. Our calling is full of difficulty and we pray for Thy magnifying presence that shall enable Thy servants to resist temptation or compromise. Inspire in us a self-energy, an inner freedom, a basic liberty by which we triumph over rude circumstances.

Thou who art the Lord of the harvest, the winds and the waters are in Thine hands; do Thou enable us to measure ourselves by Thy standards. Thou art evermore gloriously able and willing to succor those who are weak and sinful. Deep in our breasts where the tides of emotion ebb and flow, where the might of the good is struggling to live, O give us power to build a fortress of defense and undergird our best understanding. We pray that these days we may gage by our wisdom, our sense of duty, and our unwavering loyalty all that has made our country memorable, and Thine shall be the praise. In the name of Him who is the light of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 34):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR, late a Representative from the State of Montana.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution, the President of the Senate appointed Mr. WHEELER and Mr. MURRAY members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent after the completion of business today that I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour to report to the House of Representatives on my mission to China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House tomorrow for 20 minutes after the completion of other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes succeeding me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in four instances in the RECORD and include therein an extension on four subjects and certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House tomorrow for 30 minutes after the completion of other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter written by an attorney named Matt. S. Walton to the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein three excerpts from the press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 15 minutes after the address of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include an article from the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of the business of the day and other special orders, my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] may address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today after the completion of other special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is present and prepared to take the oath of office. If the gentleman from West Virginia will present himself at the bar of the House, he may take the oath.

Mr. NEELY took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an article by John Griffin, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of January 14; and in the other to include an address by Rev. Joseph Z. Demers in Lawrence, Mass., on January 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

DRAFTING FARM LABOR

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there is alarm throughout the country over the threat of farm boys being drafted into the Army. I am not pleading for farm boys to be left on the farms, but I am interested in the food supply of the Nation. I have here a letter from a farmer in my district in which he makes the following statement:

> I operate a large dairy farm, 135 head of pure-bred Guernsey cattle and a 500-acre farm, producing between 70,000 to 1,000,000 pounds of milk a year. Necessarily we have to use some young able-bodied men to carry on.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Right now we have a 19-year-old single boy in our employ. A single boy, 23, that is a conscientious objector; a married man, 23, with two children, whose eyes are so bad that doctors told me that he could not pass a physical examination; a cripple about 26, single, that was placed in IV–F and later in II–C; and a married man, 28, that appears sound. All the rest of our employees are over draft age, one of them over 60, one stone deaf, and the other with only one hand.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I have tried repeatedly to hire a man that was here and drafted and is now discharged from the Army. About 3 days a week he helps us out but we never know whether he will be here or not, we have to pay him 60 cents an hour and you, as a farmer, know that this cannot be done and make both ends meet.
>
> The best years of my life have been spent in building our herd up and bull calves from it have gone into practically every State of the Union to help raise the production of the dairy industry throughout the United States. It seems a shame to see such a herd dispersed but if it is going to be necessary to take all of the single young men off farms, I honestly can't see any other answer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the Secretary of State and a statement made by the Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL JOINT SESSION SUGGESTED

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks a concurrent resolution I am today introducing in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a concurrent resolution. It seems to me that at a time like this when our country is in danger and the people of the Nation are going to their churches and asking divine guidance from Almighty God for the President of the United States and the Congress in the deliberation of our duties that we ourselves should congregate for that purpose and ask for ourselves divine guidance that we be guided aright in thought, act, and deed. I introduce this resolution in order that we may accomplish a greater good, meeting together as Christian gentlemen, and in the hope that the legislation we consider under Christian influence will be for the best interest of America and the world in this critical period in our national life. We ourselves need such divine guidance. We need to pray ourselves as well as have our people pray for us.

The concurrent resolution referred to follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of asking God's divine guidance in the deliberations and actions of Congress, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 12 o'clock meridian on such day during February 1945 as may be selected by a joint committee consisting of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives.

Invitations to attend the joint session shall be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the diplomatic corps (through the Secretary of State), the General of the Armies, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Lieutenant General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and such other persons as the joint committee shall deem proper.

The joint committee is authorized to make arrangements for the joint session herein authorized, and to invite a Catholic priest, a Jewish rabbi, and a Protestant minister to

conduct a nonsectarian service with the aid of the Chaplain of the Senate and the Chaplain of the House of Representatives. The priest, rabbi, and minister shall each be allotted 45 minutes for his participation in such service.

PILGRIMAGES FOR GOLD STAR MOTHERS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, just after the First World War the Congress took the same action that is now contemplated in a bill I am introducing at this time. I hope the Congress will pass this bill as soon as possible. It is a bill to provide for pilgrimages after the present war of Gold Star mothers and fathers to the graves of their sons and daughters who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States and who are buried in foreign lands.

Be it enacted, etc., That there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for, after the termination of hostilities in the present war, and to pay the necessary expenses of, pilgrimages of mothers and fathers (or if they be dead, the next of kin) of servicemen and servicewomen who died and were buried in foreign lands during the present war, to their sons' and daughters' graves.

REDUCTION OF ABSENTEEISM, CONSERVATION OF MANPOWER, AND SPEEDING WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, we have just had the privilege this morning of hearing Major General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service, explain the acute shortage of manpower both in and out of our armed forces. The general dealt very frankly with the subject, pointing out the grave necessity of digging further into the barrel of manpower supply. Special attention was called to instructions lately issued by War Mobilization Director Byrnes, which have been passed on to the local selective-service boards.

In view of this increased demand for men in our armed forces it seems most appropriate that we should take further stock to see wherein there may still be waste both of manpower and materials.

It is my purpose presently to reintroduce a House resolution which was on the calendar of the Seventy-eighth Congress, bearing No. 2082, providing in its caption for, "To reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war."

It is my privilege now to welcome to the city and acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Mrs. D. Leigh Colvin, national president; Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith, honorary national president; Miss Lily Grace Matheson, national corresponding secretary; Mrs. Margaret C. Munns, national treasurer; and Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, national director, department of legislation; representatives of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. These women are attending a conference of national temperance workers, studying the controversial subject of intemperance, especially with reference to the war program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by the Honorable William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow immediately after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with H. R. 671, which has to do with the St. Lawrence seaway project and to include in my remarks certain letters, correspondence, and excerpts from statements and resolutions contained therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of insurance for old-age recipients.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MANUFACTURE OF WHISKY AND GIN

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a gentleman who preceded me calls attention to this matter of the liquor industry in this country. I want to call attention to an order issued by the War Production Board, approved by the War Food Administration, granting a holiday of 30 days to make whisky, which is all wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the order issued by the War Production Board and approved by the War Food Administration granting a holiday of 30 days to the whisky distillers for the manufacture of fifty to sixty million gallons of alcohol to make whisky and gin is about the most unreasonable, inexcusable, unjustified order that has come from any agency of the Government for a long time.

The War Production Board and other war agencies, including the War Department, tell us the need for certain war materials for our armed forces is critical. Military authorities and Selective Service are asking for legislation to put more men in the Army and more men in essential war industries, and yet our Government has seen fit to approve an order to carry on one of the most unessential industries in the category.

The War Food Administration, I am informed, has released 5,500,000 bushels of corn to make the liquor. Now if there is anyone, including the War Food Administration itself, who can justify that sort of thing, I would like to know it. According to Treasury Department figures there are about 300,000,000 gallons of bonded whisky in this country at the present time—enough to last, even under present increased consumption, for a period of 3 or 4 years.

Everyone knows of the critical shortage of tires needed by the armed forces as well as civilians. The Army needs an extra supply of them right now, and yet alcohol that ought to go for making tires is used for making liquor. Fifty million gallons of alcohol would help make a good many much needed tires.

Millions of people in Europe are clamoring for our grain for food, and yet our Government takes 5,500,000 bushels of corn as well as other products to make liquor alcohol. Farmers and producers have been requested by our Government to increase the production of food. They have been asked to raise more corn, more wheat, more foods of all kinds. They have delivered beyond all expectations a tremendous crop in 1944. It was understood that every bit of this crop was to go for essential war uses. Five million five hundred thousand bushels of corn would feed a lot of people.

Right now the military and the Selective Service are demanding a greater supply of men for the armed forces to replace the thousands being lost in battle. The manufacture of essential materials for the fighting men was never more critical, and yet the War Production Board approves the manufacture of beverage alcohol when there is a supply of more than 300,000,000 gallons of whisky in the warehouses of this country. The manpower consumed in the making of this alcohol would help to some extent remedy the labor situation.

Mr. Speaker, this thing is inexcusable. Why in the world should we divert the labor of hundreds of thousands of workers as well as the use of equipment in our industrial plants to make alcohol for whisky when it is so much needed for the manufacture of strategic materials? If there is a shortage, why not utilize at least a part of the manpower now being used in the wholesale and retail sale of liquor? You talk about nonessential industries—is there anyone on the floor of the House that believes 1,700 liquor places in Washington are necessary for the war effort? Why not take a little of that manpower and use it for more important purposes? Incidentally, we are informed there must be a curtailment of the use of light and heat. It is said the school period is to be cut 1 hour in some of our larger cities to save light and heat. Nothing is being said about cutting the hours of cocktail bars and liquor places that are run far into the night.

Mr. Speaker, here is an example where in my judgment the Government itself is interfering with the war effort. The order for making liquor is inexcusable. It does not make sense. It ought to be rescinded now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Senator Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a brief article taken from the newspapers of this morning on the opening of the new Leyte road.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

LET US TAKE THIS STEP

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record in favor of the United States taking the step toward post-war peace that has been suggested by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; namely, the creation of an interim council of the nations associated in the war effort.

The nations of the world, Mr. Speaker, will learn to work together by working together. As I said on the floor of the House Monday, July 5, 1943:

> Our task is not easy. We must not make it more difficult than it is. We must not allow ourselves to focus attention upon points of disagreement; we must apply ourselves to the things we have in common. People work together only when they have a common purpose and when they work on matters in which they find a common interest. Nations will learn to live together in the same way.
>
> In our own national development, we took one step at a time. Committees of correspondence acquainted the Colonies with each other before they formed the Continental Congress. Independence was maintained under the Articles of Confederation for several years before the Constitution came to form a more perfect union.

In the great responsibility that rests upon this generation and this Congress, Mr. Speaker, that of launching international cooperation instead of strife, we must not try to find ways to fail. We must try to succeed. The simple, natural way is to start now with an interim council devoting itself as best it can to the questions that arise from day to day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two very fine editorials, one on the the uniform air laws and the other on unconditional surrender.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Gilbert H. Montague, of New York, on international trade agreements and cartels.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT POLICY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the dean of the House, made some statements on the floor with reference to the service officers on duty in Washington filling the cocktail bars. Without in any way condoning the offense that he referred to, but simply in order that there may not be any misunderstanding, I desire to call attention of the House to some of the War Department policies.

All officers under 28, except in the rarest instances, are not permitted to serve either on temporary or permanent duty in Washington.

To the utmost possible extent all qualified troop-age officers are assigned to troop duty and not for duty in Washington.

The number of military personnel, as well as civilian personnel, on duty in the War Department is constantly reviewed by a War Department division set up for that purpose, and each War Department agency is required to maintain its strength within set quotas.

War Department policy requires all officers for whom there are no appropriate assignments within the Army and for whom none are likely to occur, to be declared surplus and separated from active duty. Thousands have been so separated and hundreds are so separated each month.

All of these matters have had the personal attention of both the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, and the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson.

There are many officers passing through Washington all of the time—officers on furlough, back from combat areas for new assignment. These are, so to speak, on their own.

Following the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], an Associated Press reporter made an investigation for his own satisfaction. Following is the story he wrote reporting his investigation:

SABATH CLAIM CHALLENGED

WASHINGTON, January 11.—Somebody's wrong.

There's a story around this town that colonels and majors and captains and lieutenants spend all their time messing around cocktail bars.

Representative ADOLPH SABATH (Democrat, Illinois) is one of the sponsors of the story. He took a fast gander around one place and reckoned that there were 30,000 officers who didn't seem to be doing anything.

So, in this manpower shortage, this would be a good time to put them to good use, he told the House Rules Committee.

So, we went out to find out.

And, somebody's wrong, like we said.

It grieves us deeply to disagree with Judge SABATH who is one of our favorite people. The judge is hereby empowered to call us pronto and object.

This search was not a hit-and-miss affair. It was conducted in all good faith, and it didn't produce for a minute any 30,000 officers fighting the war in cocktail bars.

To make it authentic, we took along with us a full-fledged Navy lieutenant who kept saying, "Stop counting me twice in every place."

There was the Mayflower Hotel, pride of Capital town. The cocktail bar was crowded. There were two captains, four WAVES, two WAC's (including a captain), and an enlisted man.

There was the Shoreham, quite a place. Perhaps 300 people, mostly old folks. A handful of Navy officers, one or two Army men.

There was the Statler, a very fancy joint indeed. The room was peopled all right. Again it was old guys and old dolls. Four WAVES came in. It was like fresh air.

Now that's the way it was. This might have been a bad night. But, just offhand, it comes out like this:

Perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the population in the night clubs consisted of Army or Navy or Marine Corps officers.

FARM LABOR DRAFT

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I have been told that food is essential to the war effort. I also understand that farming has been declared an essential industry. This morning I had occasion to attend a caucus, at which there was present Major General Hershey, where there was discussed the relation to and the effect on agriculture of the new draft directive. I understood the general to say that 31 percent of our population was engaged in agriculture. I understood the general to say further that 43 percent of the men in the armed forces came from the farm group.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, if that is true, very obviously agriculture has been rankly discriminated against or it must not be deemed by the Selective Service to be an essential industry. I think these figures will be of interest to the Members of the House, and I pass them to you for what they are worth, as, if the above-quoted figures are correct, then the agricultural group has contributed nearly 40 percent more men than its quota, based on population, and this does not include those from the farm group who have gone into other war industry.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD URGE THE ADOPTION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1945, will come the fourth inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President of the United States. Shortly thereafter he will attend a conference of the heads of the three greatest powers of the United Nations, Great Britain, Russia and the United States. He will go fortified with the knowledge that the people of the United States, Republicans and Democrats alike, believe in the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter. They regret that the Atlantic Charter is not a written document adopted and signed by Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin. I hope that, upon his return from the coming conference, President Roosevelt will be able to tell our people that he has secured the adoption of the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter by all the conferees and that they are finally embodied in a written document, signed and sealed, which can be displayed to the American people.

One group of loyal American citizens is particularly anxious as to the outcome of this conference. They are Americans who have come from Poland or are of Polish descent. They are seeing the destiny of their fatherland determined while it remains the main battlefield of the Eastern European war front and while most of its people are still subjugated by Germany and unable to speak for themselves. They are particularly concerned that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be affirmed.

Many Americans have ties, freshly broken, with other lands. They are fighting and making extraordinary sacrifices for our country, the United States. Yet, they are intensely interested in the future of the land from which they or their parents came to this country. It may be Great Britain, France, Norway, Italy, Russia, Holland, Belgium, or Greece. I am sure that they desire and fully expect each of these countries to emerge from this terrible war as free and independent nations; free and independent in the form of government which their people may choose; free and independent within their boundaries, fixed after the war by agreements to which they are willing parties. Only the people of Poland, of all the peoples of the United Nations, are in doubt as to their future. No questions are expected to be raised concerning the independence and territorial integrity of any United Nation which is not on the mainland of Europe. The principles of the Atlantic Charter, whether or not reduced to writing, will apply to them. These principles should also apply not only to France, Norway, Italy, Belgium, and Greece, but also to Poland.

We are fighting to destroy forever the power and the will of the Axis Nations to resume the roles of aggressor nations after this war. The people of the United States will assume such obligations upon our part as are necessary to accomplish this purpose. But that is not all. We are fighting for a new world made up of peoples and of nations free and independent as to their own internal destinies, friendly and cooperative in their relations with each other, just and considerate in their dealings with minority groups within their lands.

The peoples of the United Nations now or formerly occupied by the enemy have fought valiantly. They deserve to have their futures determined by the principles of the Atlantic Charter. Since President Roosevelt sent his famous message to Congress on August 21, 1941, stating therein the principles orally agreed upon by Mr. Churchill and himself in their famous conferences at sea, the people of the United States have believed that these principles would govern all postwar settlements and treaties. We are anxious that they be reaffirmed at the coming conference. If forms of government are to be decided, if boundaries of nations are to be determined as a result of this war, we believe that these decisions should properly be made at a time when the representatives of a nation act by command of a free people. Then the people of each nation will be willing to abide by the signed agreement and the peace of the world will be more secure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DRAFTING MEN FOR JOBS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about drafting men for jobs we should keep in mind two situations. Here is one which came in a letter from a farmer 70 years old who had just been released from a hospital:

When I got home, Gussie—

That is his daughter, 35 years old—

was milking 6 fresh cows, taking care of 30 head of cattle, and doing the other farm chores. She had "learned" 5 cows to drink out of a pail without knocking their brains out.

Keep that in mind in connection with a report that came from Michigan this morning that there were 266,000 industrial workers, so called, drawing unemployment compensation in Michigan.

Of the accuracy of that figure I have no knowledge. To me it seems exaggerated. But from the Lieutenant Governor of Michigan came a wire stating that there were 13,456 workers drawing unemployment compensation in Michigan.

It does seem that, when a woman has so much farm work, a few of those who are drawing unemployment benefits should be able to find work.

If there are even 13,456 who cannot find jobs, there would appear to be no need to draft men for jobs.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on account of illness I have not heretofore taken the oath of office, and should like to do so at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will present himself at the bar of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMPOSITION OF HOUSE COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 80), as follows:

Resolved, That during the Seventy-ninth Congress the Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 43 members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 28 members;

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors shall be composed of 26 members;

The Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of 28 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 26 members;

The Committee on Military Affairs shall be composed of 27 members;

The Committee on Naval Affairs shall be composed of 27 members; and

The Committee on Insular Affairs shall be composed of 23 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 81), as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Accounts: Berkeley L. Bunker, Nevada; Tom Pickett, Texas.

Agriculture: John W. Flannagan, Jr. (chairman), Virginia; Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina; Orville Zimmerman, Missouri; Stephen Pace, Georgia; W. R. Poage, Texas; George M. Grant, Alabama; Pat Cannon, Florida; Victor Wickersham, Oklahoma; Jerry Voorhis, California; Walter K. Granger, Utah; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Eugene Worley, Texas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Earle C. Clements, Kentucky; Harold H. Earthman, Tennessee; Jesús T. Piñero, Puerto Rico.

Appropriations: Albert Gore, Tennessee; Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Maryland; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; Herman P. Kopplemann, Connecticut.

Banking and Currency: Brent Spence (chairman), Kentucky; Paul Brown, Georgia; Wright Patman, Texas; William B. Barry, New York; A. S. Mike Monroney, Oklahoma; John H. Folger, North Carolina; H. Streett Baldwin, Maryland; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; Daniel K. Hoch, Pennsylvania; George E. Outland, California; William R. Thom, Ohio; Peter A. Quinn, New York; Chase Going Woodhouse, Connecticut; John J. Riley, South Carolina; Albert Rains, Alabama; Merlin Hull, Wisconsin.

Census: A. Leonard Allen (chairman), Louisiana; John E. Rankin, Mississippi; Ed Gossett, Texas; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Andrew L. Somers, New York; Charles R. Savage, Washington; Walter B. Huber, Ohio; James J. Delaney, New York; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; William J. Gallagher, Minnesota; ——— ———; ——— ———.

Civil Service: Robert Ramspeck (chairman), Georgia; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Carter Manasco, Alabama; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Frank E. Hook, Michigan; Leo F. Rayfiel, New York; George P. Miller, California; J. M. Combs, Texas; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Walter B. Huber, Ohio.

Claims: Dan R. McGehee (chairman), Mississippi; Samuel Dickstein, New York; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; William G. Stigler, Oklahoma; Frank E. Hook, Michigan; J. M. Combs, Texas; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; E. H. Hedrick, West Virginia; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; Clyde Doyle, California; ——— ———.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures: Compton I. White (chairman), Idaho; Andrew L. Somers, New York; John J. Cochran, Missouri; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; John Lesinski, Michigan; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; William L. Dawson, Illinois; Clair Engle, California; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; George F. Rogers, New York; George H. Fallon, Maryland; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; James P. Geelan, Connecticut.

Disposition of Executive Papers: Alfred J. Elliott (chairman), California.

District of Columbia: Jennings Randolph (chairman), West Virginia; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Oren Harris, Arkansas; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; John W. Murphy, Pennsylvania; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; William W. Link, Illinois; Ned R. Healy, California; J. M. Combs, Texas.

Education: Graham A. Barden (chairman), North Carolina; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; John Lesinski, Michigan; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Fritz G. Lanham, Texas; Mary T. Norton, New Jersey; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; Berkeley L. Bunker, Nevada.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: Herbert C. Bonner (chairman), North Carolina; John E. Rankin, Mississippi; Carter Manasco, Alabama; John S. Gibson, Georgia; John Lesinski, Michigan; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; J. M. Combs, Texas; Ellis E. Patterson, California.

Elections No. 1: James Domengeaux (chairman), Louisiana; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; James J. Delaney, New York.

Elections No. 2: Ed Gossett (chairman), Texas; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Leo F. Rayfiel, New York; Joe W. Ervin, North Carolina.

Elections No. 3: O. C. Fisher (chairman), Texas; Hugh Peterson, Georgia; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; ——— ———.

Enrolled Bills: George F. Rogers (chairman), New York; Mary T. Norton, New Jersey; John J. Cochran, Missouri; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania.

Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Carter Manasco (chairman), Alabama; John J. Cochran, Missouri; William M. Whittington, Mississippi; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Joseph J. Mansfield, Texas; William L. Dawson, Illinois; Donald L. O'Toole, New York; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Ed Gossett, Texas; Joe W. Ervin, North Carolina; Alexander J. Resa, Illinois.

Flood Control: William M. Whittington (chairman), Mississippi; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Carter Manasco, Alabama; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; William G. Stigler, Oklahoma; Mike Mansfield, Montana; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri.

Foreign Affairs: Sol Bloom (chairman), New York; Luther A. Johnson, Texas; John Kee, West Virginia; James P. Richards, South Carolina; Joseph L. Pfeifer, New York; Pete Jarman, Alabama; W. O. Burgin, North Carolina; Wirt Courtney, Tennessee; Thomas S. Gordon, Illinois; John S. Wood, Georgia; Emily Taft Douglas, Illinois; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; Helen Gahagan Douglas, California; Joseph F. Ryter, Connecticut; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania.

Immigration and Naturalization: Samuel Dickstein, (chairman), New York; John Lesinski, Michigan; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Ed Gossett, Texas; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Ralph H. Daughton, Virginia; George P. Miller, California; E. H. Hedrick, West Virginia; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; ——— ———.

Indian Affairs: Henry M. Jackson (chairman), Washington; Samuel Dickstein, New York; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Compton I. White, Idaho; Antonio M. Ferdandez, New Mexico; William G. Stigler, Oklahoma; Mike Mansfield, Montana; Ellis E. Patterson, California; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York; William J. Gallagher, Minnesota; Berkeley L. Bunker, Nevada; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska.

Insular Affairs: C. Jasper Bell (chairman), Missouri; Dan R. McGehee, Mississippi; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Ed Gossett, Texas; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; John S. Gibson, Georgia; William L. Dawson, Illinois; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Donald L. O'Toole, New York; Ralph H. Daughton, Virginia; George P. Miller, California; Herbert J. McGlinchey, Pennsylvania, Jesús T. Piñero, Puerto Rico.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Clarence F. Lea (chairman), California; Robert Crosser, Ohio; Alfred L. Bulwinkle, North Carolina; Virgil Chapman, Kentucky; Lyle H. Boren, Oklahoma; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Oren Harris, Arkansas; George E. Sadowski, Michigan; Richard F. Harless, Arizona; John W. Murphy, Pennsylvania; Edward A. Kelly, Illinois; Luther Patrick, Alabama; John B. Sullivan, Missouri; Dwight L. Rogers, Florida; Benjamin J. Rabin, New York; Vito Marcantonio, New York.

Invalid Pensions: John Lesinski (chairman), Michigan; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; William L. Dawson, Illinois; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Charles R. Savage, Washington; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York; Clyde Doyle, California; E. H. Hedrick, West Virginia; ——— ———.

Irrigation and Reclamation: John R. Murdock (chairman), Arizona; Compton I. White, Idaho; J. W. Robinson, Utah; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; Andrew L. Somers, New York; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; William L. Dawson, Illinois; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Mike Mansfield, Montana; Tom Pickett, Texas; Charles R. Savage, Washington.

Judiciary: Hatton W. Sumners (chairman), Texas; Emanuel Celler, New York; Zebulon Weaver, North Carolina; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Sam Hobbs, Alabama; John H. Tolan, California; William T. Byrne, New York; Dave E. Satterfield, Jr., Virginia; Estes Kefauver, Tennessee; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Fadjo Cravens, Arkansas; Sam M. Russell, Texas; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Martin Gorski, Illinois; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio.

Labor: Mary T. Norton (chairman), New Jersey; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; John Lesinski, Michigan; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; O. C. Fisher, Texas; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Frank E. Hook, Michigan; Ellis E. Patterson, California; James P. Geelan, Connecticut; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York; Jesús T. Piñero, Puerto Rico.

Library: Donald L. O'Toole (chairman), New York; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Schuyler Otis Bland, Virginia.

Memorials: Antonio M. Fernandez (chairman), New Mexico; Mary T. Norton, New Jersey.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: James Domengeaux, Louisiana; Ellis E. Patterson, California; Edward L. Bartlett, Alaska.

Military Affairs: Robert Sikes, Florida; Chet Holifield, California; James A. Roe, New York; Melvin Price, Illinois; Edward L. Bartlett, Alaska; Jesús T. Piñero, Puerto Rico.

Mines and Mining: Andrew L. Somers (chairman), New York; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; Compton I. White, Idaho; Clair Engle, California; E. H. Hedrick, West Virginia; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; William J. Gallagher, Minnesota; Thomas E. Morgan,

Pennsylvania; Berkeley L. Bunker, Nevada; Edward L. Bartlett, Alaska.

Naval Affairs: John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; Franck R. Havenner, California; Hugh De Lacy, Washington; Andrew J. Biemiller, Wisconsin; Edward L. Bartlett, Alaska; Jesús T. Piñero, Puerto Rico.

Patents: Frank W. Boykin (chairman), Alabama; Fritz G. Lanham, Texas; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; Frank E. Hook, Michigan; Herbert J. McGlinchey, Pennsylvania; Leo F. Rayfiel, New York; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Clyde Doyle, California; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia.

Pensions: Charles A. Buckley (chairman), New York; John S. Gibson, Georgia; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Carter Manasco, Alabama; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; Tom Pickett, Texas; George F. Rogers, New York; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; George P. Miller, California; William W. Link, Illinois; William J. Gallagher, Minnesota.

Post Office and Post Roads: Thomas G. Burch (chairman), Virginia; George D. O'Brien, Michigan; Samuel A. Weiss, Pennsylvania; Charles E. McKenzie, Louisiana; Tom Murray, Tennessee; James H. Torrens, New York; Matthew M. Neely, West Virginia; Philip A. Traynor, Delaware; Edward J. Gardner, Ohio; Frank T. Starkey, Minnesota; Ned R. Healy, California; John E. Lyle, Texas; Dudley G. Roe, Maryland; Frank L. Chelf, Kentucky.

Printing: Pete Jarman (chairman), Alabama; Alfred L. Bulwinkle, North Carolina.

Public Buildings and Grounds: Fritz G. Lanham (chairman), Texas; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Carter Manasco, Alabama; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Herbert J. McGlinchey, Pennsylvania; Walter B. Huber, Ohio; Charles R. Savage, Washington; Joe W. Ervin, North Carolina.

Public Lands: J. Hardin Peterson (chairman), Florida; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Compton I. White, Idaho; Hugh Peterson, Georgia; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Clair Engle, California; Mike Mansfield, Montana; Charles R. Savage, Washington; Berkeley L. Bunker, Nevada; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska.

Revision of the Laws: Eugene J. Keogh (chairman), New York; Ed Gossett, Texas; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; Joe W. Erwin, North Carolina; J. M. Combs, Texas; ——— ———; ——— ———.

Rivers and Harbors: Joseph J. Mansfield (chairman), Texas; Hugh Peterson, Georgia; C. Jasper Bell, Missouri; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; John E. Rankin, Mississippi; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Clyde Doyle, California; James P. Geelan, Connecticut; Herbert J. McGlinchey, Pennsylvania; William W. Link, Illinois; James J. Delaney, New York; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska.

Roads: J. W. Robinson (chairman), Utah; William M. Whittington, Mississippi; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; Hugh Peterson, Georgia; Alfred J. Elliott, California; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Clair Engle, California; William G. Stigler, Oklahoma; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; William W. Link, Illinois; George H. Fallon, Maryland; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska.

Territories: Hugh Peterson (chairman), Georgia; J. W. Robinson, Utah; Ed Gossett, Texas; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; John S. Gibson, Georgia; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; Mike Mansfield, Montana; James J. Delaney, New York; George P. Miller, California; James P. Geelan, Connecticut; Alexander J. Resa, Illinois; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; Jesús T. Piñero, Puerto Rico.

War Claims: Clair Engle (chairman), California; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Samuel Dickstein, New York; Donald L. O'Toole, New York; Ralph H. Daughton, Virginia; Frank E. Hook, Michigan; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Ellis E. Patterson, California; Alexander J. Resa, Illinois; ——— ———; ——— ———.

World War Veterans' Legislation: John E. Rankin (chairman), Mississippi; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; John S. Gibson, Georgia; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; Clair Engle, California; William G. Stigler, Oklahoma; Joe W. Ervin, North Carolina; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; Tom Pickett, Texas; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Leo F. Rayfiel, New York; Walter B. Huber, Ohio.

Un-American Activities: Edward J. Hart (chairman), New Jersey; John E. Rankin, Mississippi; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; J. W. Robinson, Utah; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I note in scanning the list of Members elected to various committees that I have been placed on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Many Members of the House approached me and urged me to accept the chairmanship of that committee. I said that I would not give up the position I now hold as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for any other committee position in the House.

Tonight at 10:30 over the Columbia Broadcasting System I am going to discuss this Committee on Un-American Activities.

I realize that the eyes of the Nation will constantly be upon every member of that committee.

I realize that the eyes of the young men who are fighting and dying on foreign soil for this great Republic of ours, for this great constitutional government, for American institutions, and for the American way of life, are on us now, and will be at all times upon every member of this committee.

I serve notice on the un-American elements in this country now that this "grand jury" will be in session to investigate un-American activities at all times.

REPORT BY GENERAL MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL KING TO THE CONGRESS ON THE WAR SITUATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I announced to the House that there would be a meeting soon at which General Marshall and Admiral King, and perhaps some others, would appear to address the Members of Congress, both of the Senate and House of Representatives, in executive session, so to speak, or under conditions of confidence, with reference to the war. At that time I announced I would give the date later. The date is January 24, the time at 9 o'clock a. m. I am not announcing the place of the meeting, but Members will be advised of that by the invitation that they will receive. I have received my invitation, and I assume that the Members have received theirs. Again, may I state that the place of the meeting appears on the invitation. May I call attention to the language that appears in the lower left-hand corner of the invitation:

> The confidential nature of this meeting makes it necessary to limit attendance solely to Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

The meeting is on January 24 at 9 o'clock a. m., at the place designated on the invitation.

O. W. I. SPECIAL FILM ON PROPAGANDA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make another announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that the Office of War Information will sponsor a special showing of films produced by the Motion Picture Bureau of its overseas branch for Members of the House of Representatives and Senate at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, January 17, that is, tomorrow morning, in the Coolidge Auditorium in the Library of Congress.

Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, will give a brief introductory talk. To illustrate the type of propaganda it has to counteract, the Office of War Information will open with a German propaganda film. This will be followed by O. W. I. informational and propaganda films designed to give a true picture of America to foreign audiences. The entire show will last a little more than 1 hour.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand it, you chose the Library of Congress, instead of the Hall of the House, because of the fact they had a screen there where these pictures could be shown?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is correct.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in

order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what he has on the program for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to. The Committee on Naval Affairs, as I was informed by its able chairman, has already reported or will today report H. R. 621. That is a bill providing for the transfer of the V–12 program of the Navy into the naval R. O. T. C. and raises the limit, as I understand it, from 7,200 to 24,000 during the war, and thereafter in peacetime to 14,000. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs informs me that he intends to ask unanimous consent tomorrow for the consideration and passage of that bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand if the unanimous-consent request is taken up in the House there will be an hour's debate under the procedure in the usual way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that is the information I have. The impression I received was that it was a straight unanimous-consent request. On the other hand, if it is as the gentleman from Massachusetts understands, then it is perfectly agreeable to me. Then there is another bill that is coming out of that committee, a bill authorizing shore construction in the sum of approximately $1,500,000,000. I think it is slightly in excess of $1,500,000,000. On that bill a rule has been reported. That bill will come up tomorrow under the rule providing for 1 hour's debate. Now, so far as the other bills are concerned my information based on the talk I had with the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is to the effect that a straight unanimous-consent request would be made for their consideration. However, if I misunderstood him, it is immaterial because it will be agreeable to me.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there was a little controversy about the numbers to be used in peacetime, so I understand, and that the chairman suggested that opportunity would be given for amendments or discussion if needed.

Mr. McCORMACK. It may be that the situation arose subsequent to my talk with him, but as far as I am concerned it is perfectly agreeable to me if the understanding is for the immediate consideration with 1 hour's general debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I believe that was the understanding that was reached. Probably the gentleman has not been informed of it as yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is perfectly agreeable to me.

I may further advise the gentleman from Massachusetts and the membership that the Rules Committee reported out this morning several resolutions in a sense extending these existing special committees. The committees are as follows: The Woodrum committee, the Colmer committee, the Maloney-Monroney committee, the Ramspeck committee, the Smith committee, and the Robertson committee. Those resolutions have been reported out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What has happened to the Boren committee?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just advising the gentleman and the Members as to the information I have as to what the Rules Committee has done this morning. I am unable to answer that question. Such rule has not been reported out yet. I assume therefore it is still in the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A great many newspaper publishers throughout the country believe that the existence of the so-called Boren committee has been very helpful to them in securing newsprint.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am quite aware of the fact that the American newspaper publishers are very much interested in it and they have been very delicately effective in transmitting their interest in it to the members, I assume; at least I am aware of the fact.

But those are the resolutions that have been reported out and I can see no reason why we might not call as many of them up as we can on Thursday and dispose of them as quickly as possible. I doubt if there will be any controversy over the adoption of any of them.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF NAVY TO CONSTRUCT CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following privileged report for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 626, Rept. No. 18) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 60), authorizing the continuation of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 408 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 408 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CONTINUATION OF COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 55) to establish a select committee on post-war military policy (Rept. No. 20) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 465 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 465 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 64), creating a select committee on small business of the House of Representatives, defining its powers and duties (Rept. No. 21) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise because of the war, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and utilized, and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering such development and utilization; (2) whether adequate consideration is being given to the needs of small business engaged in nonwar activities, or engaged in the transition from nonwar activities to war activities; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound program for the solution of the post-war problems of small business.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged

resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (Rept. No. 22), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses, and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the time or manner of, or the parliamentary rules or procedure governing, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than April 1, 1945. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be.

AUTHORIZATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE TO CONDUCT CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 66), to authorize the Committee on the Civil Service to investigate various activities in the departments and agencies of the Government (Rept. No. 23), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (a) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in the departments and agencies of the Government, including Government-owned corporations; (b) to study and investigate the effect of such policies and practices upon the conduct of the war, with the view of determining whether such policies and practices are efficient and economical; (c) to determine the number of employees in each department or agency (including Government-owned corporations), whether such number of employees is necessary, and whether their skills are used to the best advantage; (d) all other matters relating to the recruiting and the efficient and economical use of the civilian employees; and (e) to make such inquiry as said Committee on the Civil Service may consider important or pertinent to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 1 hour.

CHINA AND HER PROBLEMS, MILITARY AND POLITICAL

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday my late colleague, the Honorable James F. O'Connor, of Montana, asked that I be granted this time that I might have the opportunity of presenting to the House a report on my mission to China. Jim is not here today in person, but I still see him in the front seat, and this report is for him as well as for the rest of the membership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I reluctantly relinquished my position on the Foreign Affairs Committee to take over the committee assignments formerly held by my late colleague. I did so, not because I am losing my interest in foreign affairs but because I felt it would be the best thing to do in behalf of the interests of my State. I intend to continue to be just as much interested in foreign affairs and winning the war now as I was while I served on that committee.

There are a few things I would like to say before I get into the body of my report. First, I am neither a military expert nor a China expert. Second, this report is going to be candid and truthful. I should like to say also that the Chinese people, as I found them and as I have always known them, are a people who are quite similar in many respects to those of us who live in this country. Of all the countries I traversed on this mission, the Chinese were the only ones who were smiling. They are people who have courage and determination. You may rest assured they will do all they can to help us bring this war to a successful conclusion, and they in turn can rest assured that we will help them and do all we can to see that they achieve the place which is rightly theirs in the scheme of world affairs.

I would also like to say a good word for some of the U. S. O. shows which have traveled to China, India, and the Burma theaters of war. This may seem out of place here, but you would be surprised at the way the morale of the boys and girls—because there are girls there, too—is lifted by some of these theatrical troupes. I should like to make special mention at this time of two troupes and one individual.

While I was there the so-called Jinx Falkenberg-Pat O'Brien troupe put on its show all over that theater. It was the first star troupe to make the complete coverage of the C.-B.-I. You have all heard of Jinx Falkenberg and Pat O'Brien, but there are others in that group who are also entitled to a great deal of consideration and certainly have earned the gratitude of the folks out in that theater. They are Betty Yeaton, a dancer; Ruth Carrell and Jimmy Dodd, a song-and-guitar team; and Harry Brown, pianist.

There is one other group I would like to mention. This group has no stars in the usual sense, but in the G. I. sense they are all stars. That is the little known U. S. O. 99 Troupe, which is made up of a group which has traversed North Africa, Italy, the Persian Gulf Command, the Middle East, and all of the C.-B.-I. It went overseas on September 1, 1943, and returned to this country on December 1, 1944. On occasions in China they even held lanterns for one another, because there were no lights, so that their

acts could be put on before small audiences of three, four, or five G. I.'s. Their names are as follows, and we should remember them well: Gene Emerald, M. C. and comic; Jack Cavanagh, who put on a cowboy act; Joseph Tershay, a magician; Basil Fomeen, accordionist.

There was still another member of that group, Count Cutelli, who had to leave it because of a serious illness.

The third individual in this category whom I would like to mention is Joe E. Brown, who did a grand job and who earned the affection and respect of all the folks in the C.-B.-I. area.

Mr. Speaker, I am presenting herewith for the consideration of the House a candid report of my findings as a result of my mission to China in November and December 1944. I have tried to look at China's problems realistically and sympathetically because I wanted to get the clearest possible picture. This is necessary if we are to understand our gallant ally, for not to do so would hamstring the possibility of a sound peace in Asia and the Pacific. Furthermore, because of the difficulties China has faced, and is facing, she needs the sympathy, forbearance, and active assistance of all the United Nations.

On arriving in India, I called on Maj. Gen. Frank Merrill at the headquarters of the India-Burma theater in New Delhi and had a long discussion with him concerning the situation in China. He said that the Chinese soldier was very good, if he was given enough to eat, the proper training, adequate matériel, and competent leadership. In his opinion, much of the difficulties of the Chinese armies could be laid to the incompetency of the field commands. When asked about the Chinese Communists, he stated that, in his opinion, they were not allied to Moscow but were primarily a Chinese agrarian group interested in land and tax reforms.

He was well pleased with the fact that the British and Indians were now, after 2½ years of relative inactivity, going into the Burmese jungles after the Japanese and were doing a very good job. I noticed, also, on the daily statistics tonnage data, that something like 35,000 tons of supplies was anticipated being shipped over the hump for the month of November. Coming back from China in December, I checked this particular figure and found that actually 34,929 tons had been shipped, which was a remarkable achievement in itself.

In General Merrill's opinion, a seaport will have to be acquired on the China coast to be of real help to China and that, while the Ledo-Burma Road with its pipe line will be of considerable assistance, it will not be enough to figure decisively in the China theater.

General Merrill invited me to make the trip over the Ledo-Burma Road from Ledo, in Assam, to Myitkyina, in Burma, which I accepted with alacrity, because I felt that it would give me a good insight in the procedure and policy adopted by the United States in that particular part of the world and, at the same time, give me an opportunity to talk to the G. I.'s along the way.

On Monday, November 20, I left for Ledo by plane and stopped at Halminar Hat, and from there went on to my destination where I met with General Pick, the engineer in charge of the building of the Ledo-Burma Road; Colonel Davis, his executive officer; Brig. Gen. Vernon Evans, chief of staff for the India-Burma theater, stationed in that vicinity. General Pick stated that the Ledo-Burma Road would be capable of transporting a minimum of 60,000 tons a month when completed, although. I must say that when I saw the general 3 weeks later he had modified that particular estimate.

I visited the Twentieth General Hospital at Ledo, which has had as many as 2,600 cases at one time and is manned by a staff of 156 American nurses, 80 doctors, and several hundred Medical Corps men. They have done a remarkably good job in this general hospital, as they have in all the hospitals along the road under the most difficult conditions and the most trying circumstances. The wards, generally speaking, have dirt floors, and the sides are made of bamboo and hessian cloth, while the roofs are thatched affairs. The buildings last from 9 months to a year and a half, and then new ones have to be built in their place.

In this particular hospital they have done a lot of work in connection with a type of disease known as scrub or mite typhus, for which our typhus shots are of no avail. The cure that the general hospital found most successful in combating this disease was the use of air conditioning. By keeping the wards at a steady temperature, they have reduced the fatalities from 27 percent to less than 1 percent.

In visiting the 8 hospitals along the road, I found that the work being done in all of them was outstanding. There was one hospital which had no women nurses and one hospital at Tagap in the process of being activated which would have a complete colored staff of doctors and nurses. From the experiences of over 400 American nurses along the road, I found that a great many of them had been out there 1½ to 2 years and more, and the remarkable thing to me was how they had been able to sustain their morale and do the fine work they had been doing under the difficulties which were, and are, their daily lot.

I also found at Ledo that 100 silver rupees were being paid to natives for each bailed out American flyer brought in. Many of our flyers are forced down in the jungles and have to live there for days and weeks, and many of them have never been found. The natives have been responsible for rescuing a great many and bringing them back to American headquarters.

On November 21 I left Ledo by jeep for my trip over the road, but before starting out I visited the plane-loading warehouses and saw how the Quartermaster Corps had developed a system of loading matériel in a very efficient manner and also a system of dropping stuff into the jungle with remarkably little loss. This particular area has had to use this type of transportation because there was no other way of getting the stuff to our men, and they have dropped such things as galvanized barrels of water, motors, and field guns, rations, medical supplies, ammunition, and so forth. Approximately 600 tons are shipped out daily by air from the Ledo fields, and a plane can be loaded on an average of 17 minutes.

After leaving Ledo I stopped and visited the Fourteenth Evacuation Hospital, the Three Hundred and Thirty-fifth Hospital at Tagap, and the Seventy-third Evacuation Hospital at Shingbwiyang at the end of the Naga country and the beginning of the Hukawng Valley. The road so far, from Ledo to Shingbwiyang, 102 miles, was a rough one, but all things considered a good road, wide, rocked, and proven in the last monsoon.

On November 22 I left Shingbwiyang and on the road visited the medical battalion station outside of Tingkawk, went through a lot of dense jungle, crossed a number of rivers on pontoon bridges, and observed the extremely good work being done by the engineer battalions, both white and colored, all along the road. I also visited the aviation liaison field at Shadazup and from there went on to Warazup, where there are fighter and transport fields. The route from Warazup was through Kamaing to Mogaung and this was the roughest ride I have ever undertaken. We averaged around 10 miles an hour for about 50 miles. I left Mogaung on November 23 and took the jeep train from there to Myitkyina. However, before I left Mogaung, I had a chance to visit Gen. Liao Yao-hsiang of the Chinese Sixth Army and his American liaison officer, Colonel Philipp. Gen. Liao Yao-hsiang, with his Sixth, and Lt. Gen. Sun Li-jen, of the First, were both doing a grand job to the south of the road and the reason that these two armies had the respect and confidence of the American military was because they were well fed, well trained, well equipped, and well led. It might be well to point out here that one of the chief complaints which I found along the road and in China was the lack of a definite rotation policy. The boys feel that they are the forgotten men at the end of the line. They resent the secondary status of their area in matters such as priorities and they are fearful of the let-down which will result at home when Germany is defeated. They do not want to be forgotten and they wish their folks could really be made to understand the viciousness of the enemy they face in the Far East and the amount of time it is going to take to defeat Japan. These boys are realists and they know what they are up against because they have learned the hard way. Our men fight bravely and well but not with any crusading spirit. They are interested in getting a dirty job done and coming home. That is their war aim—to come home to "Shangri-la" or the "Old Country," as they refer to the United States, and to get out of the places they are in just as quickly as they can after the job is finished.

It is not our policy to fight in Burma except where necessary, to protect the road. General Sultan claimed that there were 250,000 Japanese in Burma against 6 or 7 divisions of Chinese, British, and American troops under his command. The Japanese divisions that he was facing were greatly decimated as to personnel and matériel. The British, I found

out later, had at least 13 additional divisions under their own command, in west Burma.

The busiest airfields in the world are at Myitkyina, Chabua, and Kunming. The Myitkyina field is a marvel of efficiency. Indian pioneer troops do the unloading. The British pay them and we feed them. The British also clothe the troops of the First and Sixth Chinese Armies but we furnish them with arms. When food is dropped, American liaison personnel attached to the Chinese armies are there to see that the food is evenly distributed to all concerned. This is very important because otherwise some of the soldiers would have to do without and the result would be impaired efficiency as is the case so often in China itself.

At the Myitkyina Airfield, there have been as high as 284 transports loaded and unloaded in a day, in addition to fighter and liaison planes coming on and off the field. In one 13-hour stretch there were 556 landings and take-offs, and during October 1944, 195 transports landed per day.

On November 24, I visited Maj. Gen. Howard Davidson, commander of the Tenth Air Force, at his headquarters and sat in on his daily conference. Later that afternoon I took off in a Billy Mitchell bomber with Col. Rosy Grubb and Lieutenant Colonel Pinkney for Kunming. After leaving Myitkyina we went south to Bhamo and circled the town while American P–51 Thunderbolts came in low and dropped their bomb loads and made some good hits. Then we went over the Hump at 14,000 feet to Kunming, where I stayed with Gen. Claire Chennault. He expressed great confidence in the Chinese. He stated that the tactical situation looked bad due to the loss of our advanced airfields, but that the over-all picture was good as he had engaged 350,000 Japanese with his Fourteenth Air Force and he hoped to draw in 150,000 more. He notified me that he was still maintaining a number of American-operated airfields behind the Japanese lines and that while it was a difficult proposition he was continuing to supply them all. In his opinion Japan is moving a great deal of her heavy industry on to the Chinese mainland and he further stated that a China landing is necessary if the war is to be brought to a successful conclusion in that country. He rates the Communists highly as fighters, and declares there is no connection between them and Russia, a conclusion which was borne out in my conversations during the rest of my stay in China. He is, however, sympathetic to Chiang Kai-shek in his dealings with the Communists and thinks he is the one man who symbolizes an aggressive China. He has nowhere near enough planes and neither does Chiang Kai-shek have enough supplies even though they have been promised them time and time again.

There was a three-ball alert in Kunming while I was there but the Japanese dropped their bombs at Chenking, 25 miles away. The next day I visited Maj. Gen. G. X. Cheves, the S. O. S. officer of the Chinese theater, and he informed me that all the stuff coming into China is shipped to Calcutta and from there to Assam, where it is loaded in planes for flights over the Hump, and that in excess of 90 percent of the food and all building supplies are furnished by the Chinese. He informed me that the generalissimo had just put him in charge of all internal transportation in China; that he was going to run trucks—not transportation—from Ledo to Kunming over the Burma Road on January 22, 1945; and that the road would be opened for transporting supplies into China from Burma and India by April 1, 1945, at the latest. It is my understanding that General Cheves will be appointed Chief of S. O. S. for the Chinese armies soon and if such is the case, the problem of feeding and supplying the Chinese armies will be well handled.

I have been able to arrive at some conclusions on the basis of my few contacts to date. Under the present system, being conscripted into the Chinese Army is like receiving a death sentence because the soldier receives little training, food, and equipment. They are starved and poorly equipped because of graft up above. The commanders hang on to much of the stuff they receive and then flood the black markets and enrich themselves. The administration of food supply on an equitable basis is necessary or the Chinese Army will not be able to fight as it should.

During my stay in China I noticed many conscripts but I did not think they were being handled very well. Many rich men's sons have bought themselves out of being conscripted into the Army for as little as $50,000 CN. I have been informed that $500,000 CN will make one a regimental commander. Surely no sound type of soldiery can be created on this basis.

On November 26, I left Kunming for Chungking. When I started on this mission I thought that the Chinese problem was supply, but now I feel that the most important factor is cooperation among the Chinese themselves and that this has been the case for some time. Conditions in China are really bad. Some people, for example, working for the Chinese Maritime Commission can work only one-half day because they cannot get enough to eat and many soldiers die of malnutrition.

I met Maj. Gen. Albert Wedemeyer, commander in chief of American forces in China, and was very favorably impressed by him. It is a tough situation for anyone to be put into "cold," but I feel that if any man can salvage anything out of this, that Wedemeyer will be the one. He recognizes the gravity of the situation. He is not fooling himself. He is not underestimating the abilities of the Japanese, nor is he overestimating the fighting qualities of the Chinese. He wanted to get Gen. Chen Cheng as his field commander against the Japanese, but the generalissimo appointed Chen Cheng his Minister of War instead and gave Wedemeyer Gen. Hoh Ying-chin as his field commander. While this did not look so good at the time, it very likely was a shrewd move, because Hoh Ying-chin is the Kweichow war lord, and consequently will fight harder to save his province. Hoh Ying-chin is now Chief of Staff of the Chinese Army and commander of the forces in Kweichow and Kwangsi.

In Chungking Maj. Gen. Pat Hurley informed me that the United States objectives were, first, to keep China from collapsing, and, second, to unify, replenish, and regroup Chinese military forces for the purpose of carrying on the struggle and thereby saving American lives. There was some talk at that time that General Hurley would be appointed Ambassador, and later, when that news became definite, there was a feeling of relief on the part of all hands. No better choice could be made for this very important position. General Hurley tried, and is trying, to get the different elements in the country together so that a unified China will result and a greater degree of cooperation brought about.

The Communists are a force to be reckoned with in China. They have approximately 90,000,000 people in the territories under their control and they seem to have evolved a system of government which is quite democratic, and they also are strong enough to have their authority recognized in the areas they rule. They make their own laws, collect their own taxes, and issue their own paper money. The Central Government has somewhere around 300,000 troops in the Communist area and the result is that the Communist and Central Government troops that could be used in fighting the Japanese are being used to blockade one another, and consequently the rift in China remains quite wide. The biggest single problem in the country today is this disunity within China itself. Our military and diplomatic representatives are doing all that they can do to close this breach and to bring about greater cooperation among the Chinese. This is the crux of the whole Chinese picture, and much will depend on this gulf between these two elements being closed.

The Communists are well disciplined. They teach their young boys and girls how to use hand grenades. They have developed small cannons out of bored elms, which they set off by a fuze or a matchlock. For armament they use captured Japanese guns, and when they do not have guns they use spears and clubs. Japanese steel helmets, telephones, and wires are other things which they have captured and used.

The Communists have gone into villages which they captured, told the people they were spreading democracy, asked how many were in favor of reducing land taxes, interest rates, and so forth, and then allowed them to vote. Young girls go in and propagandize the women, getting them to make rugs, blankets, and so forth, which the Communist Army buys, and thus they are given a better economic standing. Then they form ladies' societies of various kinds and in this way help to lift themselves out of the rut they have always been in. The Communists at this time look upon the United States as their great ally because they know that we are really fighting their enemy, the Japanese, and every time a B–29 flies over their territory, they know it is an assurance that we are their friends.

The Communist Party is the chief opposition group in China. They are not Communists in the sense that Russians are as their interests seem to focus on

primarily agrarian reforms. Whereas they used to execute landlords and expropriate their estates to divide up among the peasants, today they try to cooperate with landlords or anyone else who will help them in their fight against Japan. They are more reformers than revolutionaries and they have attacked the problems most deep-seated in agricultural China—namely, high rents, taxes, and interest rates—and they have developed cooperatives and a system of local democracy. They are organized effectively in the region under their control to carry on the war and to maintain their own standing. There is a theoretical agreement between them and Chiang Kai-shek wherein their armies—the Fourth and Eighth Route—are under Chungking, but such is not the case and the result is that they maintain their separate status militarily, economically, and politically. The Soviets send in no aid to them. Consequently they are dependent on their own resources and what they capture from the Japanese. The generalissimo looks askance at the Communists because he feels that they are too strong, that they will extend their influence wherever and whenever possible and, if allowed to continue unchecked, they might supersede the Kuomintang. While there have been incidents between the Kuomintang and the Communists there has probably been no civil war. We do not know all that has gone on between them because of the rigid censorship which exists, but we do know that negotiations have been carried on looking to a settlement of their differences; that Chou En-lai has made many trips to Chungking to discuss matters with the Central Government, and that at the present time a small amount of medical supplies—3 percent of a 20-ton American shipment—has been sent to Yenan.

American influence has been to try to get the divergent elements in China together. This is important and necessary to prevent a possible civil war; to bring about as great a degree of unification as possible to carry on the war; and to help the Chinese to help themselves in settling their own internal problems. There is a bare possibility that the present crisis which confronts China may be a means of bringing these two groups together.

On November 28, I visited several businessmen and friends in downtown Chungking and tried to get their views on the present situation. It appeared to me that the Chinese businessmen had adopted a "wait and see" attitude. All depended on what would happen at Kweiwang. If it stood, well and good; if it fell, the great retreat from Chungking would begin. As of this date, China's house has a leaky roof, and a shaky foundation. Whether or not that house can be put in order is a question mark.

I had a conference with Dr. Sun Fo, son of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who told me that there used to be a connection between Yenan and Russia, but since the dissolution of the Comintern it has disappeared, although it might rise again as there is an idealistic bond between the two. Dr. Sun Fo said that the generalissimo is now becoming more realistic; that previously he did not like to hear bad things, saying it was enemy propaganda and his subordinates, therefore, told him only the good things and consequently conditions went from bad to worse. Finally, the generalissimo set out to find what was wrong and sent his two sons out to investigate the conscription policy. When they came back with their story of ill-treatment, graft, and corruption he made a personal trip to the conscription center in Chungking, saw what they had told him was true, and jailed and court-martialed the administrator in charge. Sun Fo told me that about 100,000 of the two hundred and fifty to three hundred thousand troops under General Hu Tsung-nan in the Northwest area have been shifted to the Kweichow-Kwangsi front and that the old "sit back and let the United States do the job" attitude is changing. Sun Fo said the generalissimo was the one man, in China, capable of bringing all elements together because of his ability and prestige.

On the basis of information which I have been able to gather, it appears to me that both the Communists and the Kuomintang are more interested in preserving their respective parties at the present time, and have been for the past 2 years, than they are in carrying on the war against Japan. Each party is more interested in its own status because both feel that America will guarantee victory.

The Kuomintang is disliked more every day and this is due to fear of the army and the attitude of tax collectors; and is proved by the revolts of the peasantry, the party criticism by provincial leaders, and student revolts against conscription. It speaks democratically but acts dictatorially. The Kuomintang is afraid of the will of the people, has lost much of its popular support, and will not allow any of its power to be used in the way of agrarian reforms. However, the Kuomintang is still the party in China. It has its leader in the generalissimo, who has the franchise in the war against Japan. It has a powerful army. The middle class leans toward it and it still has the support of America. On the other hand, the Communists have their elements of strength and weakness. Among their weak points is their spirit of sanctimoniousness. They look upon themselves as pious crusaders and do-gooders. Their knowledge of the outside world is primitive; there are social distinctions among them, and they are totalitarian and dictatorial in their own way. Their points of strength are they have a good military force, estimated at around 600,000 and there is more democracy in their territory than in the rest of China.

I saw the generalissimo on Thursday, November 30, and told him that the United States had sent over three of its very best men in Generals Hurley and Wedemeyer and Donald Nelson. He answered that if they had been there a year ago the situation would be different now. I said that we must forget the past and look to the present and the future; that the United States had a great admiration for China and wanted to see her a strong power so that she could make herself a bulwark for peace in the Orient.

When I saw the generalissimo again he expressed his belief that China would hold at Kweiyang. When the generalissimo asked Donald Nelson, who was with us, what differences he noted between his first trip and this one, Nelson told him that he found less talk of postwar development and a greater concentration on the present needs of China.

On Saturday, December 2, I went to Chengtu and saw the fields at which the B–29's were refueled and serviced, going to and coming from Japan. The morale at Chengtu is not too good, and the reason is the faulty rotation program. Among the bomber crews, morale is fairly good; among the fighters, it is fair; but in the supply units, it is poor. Furthermore, the rotation policy seems to work better for the officers than the enlisted men and it creates a bad situation.

In this area, $40,000 CN are paid to the Chinese bringing in grounded American flyers. This goes to pay for porters, and so forth. The guerillas pick many of the grounded Americans up inside the Japanese lines and carry them out, and sometimes the process takes a matter of weeks. Then they notify a magistrate or some other official who in turn notifies American headquarters, which in turn sends out a plane to pick them up.

I had a conference with T. V. Soong, Chinese Foreign Minister, on Friday, December 8. He informed me that he and the generalissimo were in full accord and also that the condition of the Chinese soldiers, who were ill fed and ill cared for, is being attended to. T. V. Soong is probably the best known of China's leaders abroad. He does not have a large following in China but he has great personal prestige there and among Americans. He is modern in his outlook, understands China's needs, and now that he is Acting President of the Executive Yuan, he can, I believe, be depended upon to do his utmost to see that the necessary reforms are administered. Politically Dr. Soong informed me that the Government was making at long last overtures toward the Communists. He was quite hopeful some solution could be worked out. He said China would have to unify internally to win the war and to have a strong position at the peace table. Economically, he admitted the situation in China was bad but one of his policies is going to keep inflation from spreading. He said that the generalissimo had too much to look after personally, that there were too many "yes men" around him, that bad news worried him, but that now the generalissimo was going to take a more active interest in military affairs and that he, T. V. Soong, would help him in administrative affairs.

On Sunday, December 10, the Chinese situation took a turn for the better with the recapture of Tushan, although it must be admitted that this "victory" was due not to actual fighting, but to the withdrawal of the Japanese some time before. This was brought about because the Japs had evidently overextended themselves and had pushed ahead too rapidly. Furthermore, it has been

confirmed that the Japanese are pulling up the rails of the railroads in western Kwangsi and transporting them to complete the link betwen Nanning and Dong Dang in French Indochina and which when completed will create an all-rail transportation link betwen Indochina in the south and Manchukuo and Korea in the north.

I had a conference that same day with one of the generalissimo's closest advisers, and he informed me that the recent cabinet shake-up was demanded by groups in China long before it took place. The generalissimo refused to accede to these demands until he was ready to make the move, and then he wanted to make it appear that it was his own doing. This, of course, was a matter of face, and is a factor of great importance in comprehending the Chinese situation. This adviser realized the great need for food, training, and leadership in the Chinese Army, and he has made it a point to stress these lacks to Chiang Kai-shek from time to time. He made a report on the bad conditions in the army in Hunan and Kwangsi, sent a memorandum to the generalissimo, who visited these areas and confirmed what he had found. He stated that his report and the generalissimo's visit was in part responsible for the removal of several cabinet members. He said, further, that the Generalissimo could not consent to General Wedemeyer's placing Chen Chang in command before Kweiwang, because Chen as War Minister was in a better position to push needed army reforms. I was further informed by this adviser that the generalissimo lacks confidence in the Communists, war lords, and intellectuals, and makes his decisions with these groups in mind. Later in the day I spent an hour with Mme. Sun Yat-sen, who said that the only solution to China's problem is a coalition government. She is not unfriendly toward the Communists but thinks that the generalissimo will not have anything to do with them. She further stated that China, to be a great power, must form such a government, and she thought that such a move would in reality strengthen the Kuomintang rather than weaken it. She made the statement that all factions of Chinese are "very much pleased with America's disinterested attitude" and that they realize that we have no ulterior motive in their country. Before leaving Mme. Sun Yat-sen, she told me that many people were very much worried and wanted to get out of Chungking, because they felt that the situation could not be saved.

On Monday, December 11, I saw Gen. Chen Cheng, Minister of War, and referred to him a Reuter's dispatch quoting certain Americans to the effect that we would lose all our air fields in China unless a miracle occurred. He termed the statements politics and said it was only helping the enemy. He was very confident of China's ability to hold and he stated that he could be of much more use as War Minister than in the field in the way of executing reforms, as he puts it, "at the rear where it has to be done for those at the front who need it." In other words, he has the authority now which he lacked as a commander in the field. We discussed the reforms needed in the Chinese Army, the Burma Road, and the present situation. He impressed me as a man who will do his job and do it well, or know the reason why. Chen Cheng, according to all American military men, is China's best soldier. His appointment as War Minister was the best possible move that the generalissimo could make to bolster China's armies and lagging war morale. His loyalty to Chiang Kai-shek is unquestioned and he is personally incorruptible. Among the many leading generals in China he stands out because of his devotion to his country, his word which is his bond, and his courage.

Later in the afternoon, I talked to Ambassador Hurley and he told me that the generalissimo had offered the Communists the following proposals:

First. Recognition as a legal party.

Second. Equipment of their armies on the basis of equality.

Third. Participation in the government.

The Communists would not accept these proposals because they feared their participation in the government would be very limited and their armies would be wiped out. They, therefore, turned down the generalissimo's three-point program.

That evening I saw the generalissimo for the third time and spent an hour and a half with him, and at his request gave him a frank recital of my findings. I pointed out the full extent of our lend-lease support to him and emphasized that in an effort to assist China we have done everything humanly possible and some things which were thought impossible. To evaluate fully our assistance we should keep in mind the following points:

First. We have performed superhuman feats in getting material over the Hump to aid in China's defense.

Second. We are doing a tremendous job in building the Ledo-Burma Road and its auxiliary pipe line.

Third. We have carried on operations in the Pacific which were all aimed at weakening China's—and our—enemy, Japan, and which must be included in any reckoning of assistance to our Asiatic ally.

Fourth. We have given China much in the way of financial aid through loans, credits, and so forth.

Fifth. We have tried to assist in a reorganization of the Chinese Army through developing training schools in this country and China; through detailing liaison personnel to the different armies; through better feeding methods; and through the activation of the Chinese-American composite wing of the Fourteenth Air Force.

We have done all within our means to assist China because we want to see her use everything she has to bring the war in the Far East to a successful conclusion. We want to see China a great power because we feel that as such she will be a decided factor in maintaining the peace in the Orient. We want to get out of China as soon as victory is won.

Last but most important, every move we have made and will make in China is dictated by one primary consideration and that is to save as many American lives as possible. Everything else—everything—is predicated on this.

I told the generalissimo that he had had, and would continue to have, our full support, but that he should take the necessary steps to bring about the needed internal reforms in his civil, military, and economic administration, and I also mentioned several times our lack of any designs on China. I further stated that my opinion of the Chinese situation had changed from one wherein supplies to China was most important to one which stressed the need of cooperation among the Chinese people themselves. He replied by saying America did not understand a country in revolution and he compared China today with its dissident elements and the Kuomintang to the dissident elements and the revolutionary soldiers of George Washington's time. He stated that he would continue to try for a settlement with the Communists in a political way. I pointed out different possibilities to him and he answered that he had considered them all. Americans, he continued, expect his government to make all the concessions. Why don't we try to get the Yenan group to make some? This sounds like a good suggestion.

Chiang Kai-shek is a dictator in name only. It is true that he is President of the Republic and Commander-in-Chief of the army, but his power is limited because he has to recognize all factions within the Kuomintang—and some outside—with the result that he serves as a balance wheel and has to resort to compromise to keep a semblance of unity. No one would acknowledge this more quickly than Chiang himself. Though constantly subject to pressures he has shown great skill in maintaining the stability of his government over the years he has been its head. He has been a remarkable leader, and today he is the one man in China with sufficient prestige to carry her through the war. He has had to be a politician primarily, a military leader secondarily. To maintain himself in power he has had to manipulate these groups as the occasions demanded. The results have been a hodge-podge of policies which the western mind finds hard to comprehend. The disastrous results of this maneuvering have been manifested in many ways:

First. He has used something like 16 divisions to blockade the Communists and has thus lost the use of large numbers of troops to fight Japan.

Second. He has allowed Chinese military strength to deteriorate in other ways through his inability to mobilize China's resources; to conscript the college students and the rich men's sons; to see that his troops received food and medical supplies.

Third. He has not checked hoarding; he has not stopped inflation; and has allowed merchants and landlords to profiteer tremendously.

Fourth. He has failed to improve the condition of the peasantry in regard to high rents and high rates of interest.

On the other hand, he is the one leader in China. It has been under him that China has attained political freedom and the status of a great power. He is the one man who can make Chinese independence and unity a reality. His faults can be understood when the complexity

of the Chinese puzzle are studied in detail, and they are no more uncommon than the faults of the other leaders of the United Nations.

The seriousness of the situation in China has brought home to him the need for some reforms and he has applied himself to bringing order out of chaos. He has withdrawn some of his Communist blockading divisions from the northwest to the Kweichow-Kwangsi front; he has continued to carry on negotiations with Chou En-lai, the No. 3 Communist, with the hope, as he expressed it to me, "that a political settlement can be made"; he has given his full support to the Chinese W. P. B. set up by Donald Nelson and administered by Wong Wen-hao; he has called for 100,000 volunteers from among the college students though he has not conscripted them; and he is seeing to it, under American help and supervision, that the Chinese soldier is now being fed and that the Chinese conscripts are now being treated better.

He has reorganized his cabinet and given the more democratic elements a chance to be represented and he has pledged his full support to the American team of Wedemeyer and Hurley. His intentions are good and he has shed some of his administrative burdens on T. V. Soong, now acting president of the Executive Yuan, so that he can devote more of his time to strictly military affairs.

All these moves are in the right direction, but the question is, Has he gone far enough or does he intend to, and, is there still time? China used to be able to trade space for time, but now she has very little space and not much time. As I tried to impress on Chiang, the responsibility is now his as we have done everything we possibly could do to assist him. If he holds we will get the stuff through to him; if he fails, all our efforts in Burma, over the hump, and the magnificent work of the Tenth and Fourteenth Air Forces and the Twentieth Bomber Command will have been for naught.

We are committed to Chiang Kai-shek and we will help him to the best of our ability. The decision, though, rests not on our shoulders, but on the generalissimo's. He, and he alone, can untangle the present situation, because, on the basis of what he has done and in spite of some of the things he has done, he is China.

The American Government through General Wedemeyer, Ambassador Hurley, and Donald Nelson has been doing all in its power to bring the different groups in China together. This policy has been pursued not because we want to dictate in China's internal affairs but because we want the Chinese to cooperate with one another so that the full forces of their resources and manpower can be brought to bear against Japan. They realize that Chiang Kai-shek's position is a difficult one and that he fears giving in to the Communists because of the effect it might have on him and his party. They think, though, that if the Chinese themselves can get together it would be to the best interests of China. If they do not get together the seeds of dissension will only continue to grow and the eventual harvest will be of such a nature as to make the Taiping Rebellion of the last century a minor revolution in comparison. It might even mean the intervention of a great power in the Chinese internal situation.

I should like to state, once again at this point, that the policy of the United States in China is one in which no ulterior motives are involved. In that country—and in that country only, so far as I know—our foreign policy is clear, clean, and definite. We are in China to help China and ourselves against a common enemy; we intend to get out of China just as soon as victory is won; and we, alone among the great nations, want China to be a world power, because we feel she will become the bastion of peace in Asia. The Chinese know all this and because of it they trust us implicitly.

I left Chungking on December 13, and I must say that my conclusions are in close accord with the thoughts of the majority of the American civil, diplomatic, and military officials there. They want the Chinese to get together so that we can win the war in Asia, and they want to get the boys out of China just as soon as victory is won. The main concern of all of them is the saving of American lives. They do not care whether a Chinese is an agrarian or not, just so he fights Japan and takes that much of the burden off our soldiers.

The weaknesses of the generalissimo's government are apparent, as I have tried to point out in this report—its durability a question which only Chiang Kai-shek himself can answer. It is my belief that he will do all that he can, according to his views, to bring about the necessary reforms and to achieve a degree of unity. It is his purpose, he informed me, to try to get democracy to the people as soon as possible, and he intends to call a constitutional convention some time during 1945.

He has had, and will continue to have, a difficult problem on his hands. I feel we should give him every possible support, because he alone can bring China together. There is no other person in that country who has the prestige or his ability, and I say this in spite of the weaknesses in his government which I have called to your attention. In retrospect, he has been a great leader for China. No other country has ever fought so long with so little against such great odds. Furthermore, China is doubly important now because of the fact that Japanese heavy industry has been moving to the Chinese mainland since the Doolittle bombing of Tokyo, and this adds up to the war ending in China, where it began in 1931—a grim picture to look forward to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made a very interesting report and a very informative one. I was particularly interested in the comments on his visits to Gen. Louis A. Pick, who was the division engineer in the Missouri River Basin, in which the gentleman as well as a number of others of us are intensely interested, and also his visit with Gen. Al Wedemeyer, and his report of that conference. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Is the opinion unanimous to the effect that the Communists of China have no connection with the Communists of Moscow?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. So far as I have been able to find out that opinion, at the present time, is held unanimously. Soviet Russia does send in a few supplies to China, but they do not go to the Communists in the northwest but to the Central Government in Chungking.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe you said there was an idealistic bond existing, however?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Our Government here in Washington has sent a number of representatives from time to time to China to insist that Chiang Kai-shek get together with the Communists. Do you know of any such emissaries being sent to the Communists of China to tell them to get together with Chiang?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will forgive me, I should like to make a correction in his statement, because, so far as I known, no emissaries have ever been sent from Washington to insist on a settlement.

Mr. CURTIS. Then they have been sent to urge them, have they not?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Well, they might have urged them, but I do not know.

Mr. CURTIS. Have we sent any emissaries to the Communists urging that they get together and make some concessions to Chiang?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I do not know. I do not believe, though, that we should interfere too much in the internal affairs of China. Consequently all of our dealings should be, and are, through Chungking and the generalissimo.

Mr. CURTIS. So far as you know we have not sent anybody to urge the Communists that they do that?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. So far as I know we have not sent anybody.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman very much for one of the finest presentations that I have ever had the pleasure of listening to in the House since I have been a Member. I want to ask him two questions, both having to do with the question of democracy. The gentleman said in the course of his remarks there was more democracy in the sections of China controlled by the Communists than there is elsewhere. I wish you would explain a little what you mean by that, as to whether the gentleman speaks of a political democracy or whether the gentleman means the economic situation is more democratic, or just what? And then I wish the gentleman would follow that by telling us what he believes are the chances of the generalissimo succeeding in his effort to form a constitution with at least elements of democracy in it for China and whether he can in-

form us what those elements will be and how far it is likely to go.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman will pardon me if I miss some portions of those questions. I will try to answer them as best I can.

There is more democracy in the northwest area than in the area under the control of the Kuomintang. I mean by that that on certain specific occasions the people in that area have the right to express their wishes through a voting procedure, as I have tried to point out before. They have had the opportunity to declare themselves in favor of lowering of land rents, usurious rates of interest, and things of that sort. In Kuomintang China those reforms have not been pushed because in that area of China are found the landlords and the merchants who are in the ascendancy, and they are the ones who are in control. They are the ones who are making the money on the basis of these land rents, interest rates, and the like. Consequently, they do not want to change. It may be that Chiang Kai-shek would like to bring about a change economically in the case of the factors I have mentioned, but as he has to juggle so many different factions within his party at this time he finds it difficult. I think in time Chiang Kai-shek will succeed in spreading the principles of Dr. Sun Yat-sen so that all elements in China will have a greater degree of freedom. I believe furthermore that his statement made on New Year's Day to the effect that he was going to call what we could term a constitutional convention this year is a very good indication that he is determined to add to the reforms he has made in the last 3 or 4 months. He is a very intelligent and capable individual.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In his very able address I notice the gentleman mentioned some of the American military leaders and their relationship to General Chiang. I did not happen to hear the gentleman say anything about the difference of opinion between General Chiang and General Stilwell. Did the gentleman happen to hear any reaction to that?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. For the gentleman's benefit, may I say that I did not leave this country until after General Stilwell was recalled and the matter was dropped. I tried to see the situation as impartially as I could, based on the facts that existed while I was there.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the statement he has just made. I know it is going to be very helpful to me in time to come. Does the gentleman know Dr. Hu Shih, former Chinese Ambassador to the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Not personally, although I know of him.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wonder if the gentleman knows whether Dr. Hu Shih has a position in the Government at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. As far as I know, Dr. Hu Shih does not have a position with the Government but is carrying on research work and can be found almost any time over in the Congressional Library.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know he has made a great contribution toward our better understanding of China.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. He is a real diplomat.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Some months ago we were informed—or perhaps the gentleman was present—by some of our Army leaders as to the armies of China. This important leader made the categorical statement that the Chinese armies had been and were then nonexistent. Do they have real armies over there?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I believe the gentleman quoted made a serious misstatement.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Perhaps the gentleman heard the statement made that I have quoted here.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. No; I did not, but I do want to emphasize the fact that the American military men in the China-Burma-India theater have great respect for the fighting qualities of the Chinese if they are fed; if they are equipped and trained in the same way our own men are, and if they are capably led.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given an additional minute to develop that thought.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. My question is, Do the Chinese now have what one would call a real army or armies, a fighting force?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. If the gentleman will pardon me for going into some detail I will try to answer his question, for I should like to bring all the facts I have to his attention.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to have the information.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. In Burma we have what are known as the First and Sixth Chinese Armies, made up of five divisions which are under the command of Lt. Gen. Dan I. Sultan. They were trained by the Americans at a base at Ramghar in India, and they have been remarkably good in the field because they have had the things given to them which we give to our own soldiers. In China, on the other hand, where they have not had these opportunities they have not been able to perform as effectively. At Kunming we have a training school to which we bring Chinese officers. When they have completed their training they are sent into the field and the resulting effectiveness of the troops under their command is both notable and noticeable. I should like to add that this school, known as Little Fort Benning, is under the command of Brig. Gen. Frank Dorn, who has done a grand job in activating the Y Force in Yunnan and on the Salween.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. My purpose is not to be critical, but those conditions are important and what those conditions are is what I want to find out.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I appreciate the gentleman's interest. The conditions have been very much improved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 75), providing for the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate the Conservation of Wildlife (Rept. No. 24), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 237 of the Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, House Resolution 11 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, House Resolution 65 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 49 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 20 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 237 of the Seventy-third Congress, and shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than January 3, 1947, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations, for necessary legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement entitled "Imperialism Is Indicted as a Cause of War."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order previously agreed to, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PATENTS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, at page A141 of the Appendix of the RECORD there appear remarks by myself which cover somewhat more than what I will say to the House today on the same subject. I had hoped to get time on yesterday to make this speech, but, of course, due to the sad passing of our colleague the gentleman from Montana, Mr. O'CONNOR, we did not transact

any other business. So I have asked for this time today because I feel that the matter contained in that speech in the Appendix of the RECORD is of such moment that I am justified in presenting it here when some Members may care to listen to what I have to say.

On December 18, 1943, I addressed the House on a bill which was then numbered H. R. 3874, the title to which was "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes."

That bill has been reintroduced and is now numbered H. R. 97.

This bill aims to provide that a patent holder may no longer enforce his patent if he is found in regular judicial proceedings to have illegally used his patent in restraint of trade and commerce. Very briefly, there are four main provisions in the bill.

First, it would authorize the United States to intervene in any Federal court proceeding involving infringement or the validity of patents. This is to assure representation in the courts of the public interest so often disregarded in patent litigation and, after all, the most important single interest involved therein. In the second place, it would require registration of patent agreements, a proposal which has been advanced by both industry and Government agencies for a good many years. In the third place it would render unenforceable patents which are illegally used to restrain trade or commerce or to establish monopoly. This, of course, is the heart of the bill. In the fourth place, it would permit determination of the validity and scope of patents in antitrust proceedings.

In providing for the cancelation of a patent which has been employed as a part of an illegal conspiracy or monopoly, the bill will give assurance to the public that patents will be used for purposes within the constitutional grant, namely, for the promotion of science and the useful arts.

The Supreme Court in a recent decision has referred to the patent as a property right, but I wish to point out that after all it is a property right which has been granted by Government action and would not exist at all without this action.

The necessity for action upon my bill is made immediately apparent by the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Hartford-Empire Co. against United States, which was handed down a week ago on yesterday. This was a case where this company had gotten complete control of 600 patents and used them in a conspiracy to restrain trade. The entire glass-container industry is controlled through a gigantic patent pool. Only 2 results of this patent pool are to make consumers pay more for food products put up in glass jars and to prevent new companies from going into the glass-container industry.

There is no doubt whatsoever about the facts in the Hartford-Empire Co. case. The majority opinion of the Supreme Court, given by Justice Roberts, states:

> The district court found that invention of glass-making machinery had been discouraged, that competition in the manufacture and sale or licensing of such machinery had been suppressed, and that the system of restricted licensing had been employed to suppress competition in the manufacture of unpatented glassware and to maintain prices of the manufactured product. The findings are full and adequate and are supported by evidence, much of it contemporary writings of corporate defendants of their officers and agents.

The majority opinion continues as follows:

> It is clear that, by cooperative arrangements and binding agreements, the appellant corporations, over a period of years, regulated and suppressed competition in the use of glass-making machinery and employed their joint patent position to allocate fields of manufacture and to maintain prices of unpatented glassware.

The first point I want to make, therefore, is that there is no question of doubt in the opinion of the majority of the Court that this company had violated the law; that it was guilty of action in restraint of trade of the most flagrant sort. The High Court upheld completely the findings of the district court in that regard.

The conspirators had a definite program to misuse patents—that is, to misuse public grants from the Federal Government. They stated that they had acquired these patents with the intention—and I quote from a memorandum of policy from the files of this company itself which was published by the Temporary National Economic Committee:

> To block the development of machines which might be constructed by others * * * and to secure patents on possible improvements of competing machines so as to "fence in" these and prevent their reaching an improved state.

As Justice Black stated in his dissent:

> These patents were the major weapons in the campaign to subjugate the industry.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court found that Hartford-Empire had grossly violated the antitrust laws, and yet the majority of four judges—since three judges disqualified themselves and did not sit—felt that it did not have the power under the existing antitrust statutes to keep Hartford-Empire from enforcing in the future the 600 or more patents which it had acquired for the very purpose of using them in restraint of trade, in which way it had so misused those 600 patents.

This decision was handed down by four Justices of the Supreme Court: Justices Roberts, Stone, Frankfurter, and Reed. Three Justices did not sit: Justices Douglas, Jackson, and Murphy. Two Justices dissented: Justices Black and Rutledge. It was, therefore, a 4-to-2 decision.

As Justice Rutledge pointed out in his dissent, "The effect of the majority decision is to say that men who have acquired property by violating the Sherman Act have as much right to their property as other men who have not."

The Supreme Court referred to the fact that the Congress had failed to pass supporting legislation providing imposition of a penalty as to patents used in violation of the antitrust laws and at least in part based its decision upon the absence of positive legislation by the Congress providing for penalties in cases of this kind. My bill aims to correct that situation.

Mr. Speaker, I am no lawyer, and I do not presume to pass upon the propriety or rightness of the majority opinion of the Supreme Court, but I do know that it is a completely anomalous and indefensible position for the great Federal Government of the United States to remain powerless when the very grants which it gives are used as weapons in an illegal conspiracy against the public interest. The use made of these patents is illegal under our present laws. It takes no amendment of the antitrust laws to make this use in restraint of trade illegal.

The only question, therefore, is whether admittedly illegal conduct in the use of a patent does not result in the loss of the patent. The majority four of the Supreme Court did not think that they had the power to grant this public relief. If that is so, then the Congress should make it clear that the courts do have that power.

Mr. Speaker, this goes to the very heart of the American economic system. It is upon the control of patents and patent pools that international cartels have been built up. It is because of the power that patents give that it was possible for our country to be confronted with serious shortages of synthetic rubber, magnesium and many other commodities which we needed badly for this war. We know that patents and the control of patents have been used to restrain technology at home and to keep out those new companies and new enterprises which, at the conclusion of this war, should lead the way toward an era of prosperity and industrial employment in this Nation.

If one of the major policies of this Government for 50 years has been to prevent restraint of trade in an effort to maintain a free enterprise system, then surely monopoly grants by the Federal Government, which can only be given to promote science and the useful arts, should be withdrawn if these grants are used against the fundamental policy of this country.

I will not take time to catalog further instances where the control of patents, for example, by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and I. G. Farben were responsible for blocking the development of synthetic rubber in the United States, and for giving to Germany the benefit through that one giant corporation of theirs of a great many patents controlled in this country by our own corporations. Those who oppose increasing Government control and increasing Government operations in the field of business should think twice of the consequences of what is the present state of the law, namely, that according to the majority of the Supreme Court even when the patents controlling these processes are improperly used for the very purpose of maintaining prices and of keeping out new enterprise, the Federal Government which gave the patents is powerless to enforce a remedy.

The Court said that the patents were illegally acquired and illegally used. The Court said that this was a violation of the antitrust laws. But it then decided that in the future this monopoly of patents should be able to get a "reasonable royalty" under its licenses.

In plain terms to a layman, this means that the monopoly is to be able to charge admission before allowing anyone to go into the glass-container industry. Its right to charge that admission is based upon admittedly illegal combinations of patents. In other words, the defendants are to be permitted to make what is called a reasonable profit out of their admittedly illegal acts. When a bank robber is caught in the act of robbing a bank, we do not customarily say to him that he will be permitted to get a reasonable amount out of the bank and no more. Neither do we tell him that as long as he does not rob any more banks the fact that he did rob a couple will be of no consequence to us.

The defendants in this case were smart enough to foresee what would happen. Justice Black in his dissent recites a memorandum in which an officer of one of the defendant companies set forth the benefits to be obtained even though the monopoly was found to be illegal. I read from that memorandum:

> Of course, the court might order that we transfer the entire Federal licensing business to some other party and turn over to that party the Federal patents. This, of course, would simply restore to a certain extent the existing situation and establish a competitor * * * I * * * do not see much danger of having any of these deals upset. * * * If they are upset, I still believe that by that time, we will be in a better position even with such dissolution than we would be otherwise.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that under all the circumstances of this decision what has in effect been done is to give an invitation to people to violate the antitrust laws of the country by saying, "If you do violate them, all we shall ask of you is that you shall reform your ways in the future and charge no more than a reasonable fee for the patents which you have in the past abused." I do not believe that that is sound policy.

After this decision, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for affirmative action which will strengthen the patent system and will take the value out of illegal conduct in the misuse of patents rests with the Congress. The Sherman Act has been regarded as the fundamental statement of legislative policy in the field of economic doctrine. I still regard it as such. Erosions of the effectiveness of the antitrust laws should be prevented. I offer H. R. 97 for this purpose.

This bill, in my judgment, is needed if the Congress is to do the job of preventing increasing monopolistic control of American industry. In all probability our No. 1 danger as far as our domestic problems are concerned in the post-war period will be the increasing march of monopoly until at last our much vaunted and highly prized economic liberty is threatened in the whole United States. Such an eventuality we simply must prevent. The Supreme Court decision to which I have adverted is utterly inadequate to do so. It leaves the door wide open for a continuance of these practices.

For that reason, I most earnestly urge consideration of H. R. 97 by the appropriate committee of the House, which of course is the Judiciary Committee, to which the bill was referred. I hope earnestly for early consideration thereof.

I close, Mr. Speaker, with a paragraph from the dissenting opinion of Justice Rutledge where he said, and I quote:

> When the patent holder so far overreaches his privilege as to intrude upon the rights of others and the public protected by the antitrust legislation and does this in such a way that he cannot further exercise that privilege without also trespassing upon the rights thus protected, either his right or the other person's and the public right must give way. It is wholly incongruous in such circumstances to say that the privilege of the trespasser shall be preserved and the rights of all others which he has trespassed against shall continue to give way to the consequences of his wrongdoing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FARM LABOR AND ARMY MANPOWER

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, to fill the increased need for physically fit young men for the armed forces, both the Army and Navy have an eye on approximately 365,000 able-bodied young farmers in this country, who are between the ages of 18 and 25, and who have so far been deferred. The Director of the Selective Service has now instructed the local draft boards to go through all of these cases with a fine-tooth comb for the purpose of determining just how many of them could be released for military duty.

At this point, let me make myself clear. I do not want to give the impression that, so far as the men themselves are concerned, one man has a higher obligation to defend his country than another, or that the life of one man is more valuable than that of another. That is not the case. The whole matter is simply a question of what is best for the country as a whole. So far as it is humanly possible, each man should be assigned to the task where he is best fitted and where he can render the greatest service to the country. For some tasks men can be trained in a matter of months, or even weeks; others take years. Men cannot be trained to operate and manage a modern agricultural or livestock set-up in less than 5 or 6 years. Therefore, vast numbers of these deferred farmers are simply irreplaceable. No qualified operator of a substantial agricultural set-up should be inducted into the armed forces until definite proof is submitted that a competent person is available to take his place. Food is just as necessary to winning the war as is ammunition or ships, or planes. This Nation has obligated itself not only to maintain its own population on a reasonably high standard of living, but it has more or less obligated itself to furnish foodstuffs to large sections of the world.

Already the large reserves of certain agricultural commodities which we had on hand when this war broke out are exhausted, or practically so, while the demand is increasing from day to day. As more nations are liberated the greater is the demand for American foodstuffs. Considerable areas of agricultural land are now lying idle and more may be expected to follow. Also because of the shortages of competent farm help, farmers are switching to the producing of crops that can be handled largely with the aid of machinery. This will result in serious shortages in certain essential items. Favorable climatic conditions have kept production, as a whole, up to normal, but these favorable conditions cannot be counted upon to continue. Two or three bad crop years, which it is only natural for us to expect, would place our reserves of foodstuffs at a dangerously low level.

Now then, our obligations both at home and abroad are enormous. All of our allies are calling for foodstuffs and in addition we have committed ourselves to furnish food to all of the liberated countries, at least until they can get back to normal production again. While, I feel that we should be absolutely sure that these shipments are needed, and that they get into the hands of those that do need them, still there is no doubt but what a certain amount of imported food is necessary to prevent starvation and general chaos. A hungry, unemployed, and neglected people are in no mood to cooperate in the organizing of a free world, which we all hope will result from this war. Already, we are told that large numbers of Italians and some French insist that they were better off under German regimentation than they are under Allied freedom. Consequently, to further reduce our agricultural or livestock production may result in serious consequences.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. It is pretty well established that there are several million soldiers in this country, men in uniform, who would like to go into foreign service, is it not?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes; that has been brought to my attention a number of times.

Mr. GROSS. It is generally admitted there is overstaffing everywhere and that in industrial plants, in many plants, one-third of the employees could be taken out and production could be stepped up notwithstanding?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I do not know just what the percentage is, but I am convinced that most of our war plants could operate just as efficiently with less men.

Mr. GROSS. Men are not only complaining about it, but they are boasting about doing nothing and getting excessive wages. Is it not true also that to have a good farm hand he has got to grow up with the job?

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is certainly correct.

Mr. GROSS. He has to understand livestock and the operation of modern farm equipment or he just cannot be used to any advantage. Those are well-established facts, are they not?

Mr. STOCKMAN. A farm hand has to learn the business from the ground up.

Mr. GROSS. He has to know when an animal is not coming up to the trough

and eating and drinking. He has to know about how to start his tractor. A lot of these old fellows who they say could do this work could do it if there is a young fellow along to show them how to keep the machine running for them. I want to commend the gentleman for making a very factual statement, as I understand it, and I want to say I do understand it.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that the gentleman who is now addressing us is a practical farmer with many years of experience. May I ask the gentleman what length of time he has been engaged in farming and what type of farming it has been?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I spent 20 years growing wheat in eastern Oregon on dry land and under semiarid conditions.

Mr. ANGELL. You have practically spent your entire adult life in connection with this work?

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is right; I have spent my entire adult life so far in this work.

Mr. ANGELL. The observations which the gentleman has made, to a considerable extent, are based on his actual practical experience in the operation of large farming undertakings?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I think they are practical, and certainly they are firsthand.

I thank both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Oregon for their valuable contributions.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Gladly.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I should like also to commend the statement being made by the gentleman, because I think it is especially timely now that the manpower need is being emphasized by the executive department of the Government. I wish also to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that not only are men being discharged from the Army who are physically unfit for service but, to my personal knowledge, quite a number of men are being discharged who are physically fit. I know that in one area in my district quite a number of men who are apparently physically fit have been discharged with no other statement on the discharge than that they are being released at the convenience of the Government. Meanwhile, that local board is inducting its usual quota, and at one time they were discharging more than they were taking in. I think this also should be called to the attention of this House and the draft authorities.

Mr. STOCKMAN. So do I.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I gladly do so.

Mr. O'HARA. It happens that we had General Hershey before a group of us this morning discussing this condition, which has existed since his recent order of January 3, under which many of us felt that draft boards had been notified to draft all of the deferred II–C farm help, the residue of our farm help. It developed at that hearing that there were other sources of men who were eligible besides the farmers. But, coming back particularly to the farm situation, I would ask the gentleman if he knows, in his own district, where he is familiar with the situation, whether, if they keep on taking the farm help that is left, the II–C's, we are not coming to a condition where many of those farms will go out of production.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is just exactly what will happen.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman will yield further, in handling this problem, does not the gentleman feel that both the executive and legislative branches of the Government in considering the over-all war picture should, along with the demands of the armed services, consider the needs of production?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes. Getting help for our production forces is just about as important as supplementing our fighting forces. Until those two phases of the over-all problem can be coordinated we cannot solve this.

I thank both the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Oregon for their contributions.

This brings me to the point that I consider of extreme importance. I would like to suggest to the leaders of our armed forces that they do some selecting and drafting of manpower within their own organizations. This has been called to the attention of the Army and Navy officials many times, but, as yet, I have heard of little or nothing being done about it. It is commonly believed that the armed forces, and especially the Army, are the greatest wasters of manpower in the country. While it is not possible to get actual figures, a little preliminary investigating convinces me that from the something like 12,000,000 men which we now have in the armed forces, at least 1,000,000 physically fit and thoroughly able-bodied members are now assigned to duties that could very well be performed by older men, women, or men who are now classified as IV–F.

One has only to travel across the country by train to see the large number of physically fit young men who are assigned as M. P.'s, S. P.'s, or guards, when older men or men less physically fit could perform the duties just as well. Large numbers of physically qualified men are assigned to branches of the service like paymaster's office, the Quartermaster Corps, ordnance, kitchen police, the band, and almost any number of other such organizations, when physically handicapped men or women could take over. Likewise, large numbers are stationed in places such as Panama, Trinidad, Alaska, Newfoundland, north Africa, and other such areas where the likelihood of any kind of combat is very remote. Why keep able-bodied young men on such duties and in such locations when others less physically fit could do the job?

I am advised that both the Russians and the Germans are now using disabled veterans who have lost an arm or a leg, or an eye, for such duties as exacting as engineers, and that satisfactory results are being obtained. Men like this are happier doing something that keeps them in uniform than they would be back in civilian life. I understand that in the past it has been our practice to ask men who have been wounded in action or who have contracted certain diseases whether or not they wished to remain in the service or to accept medical discharges. Many of these men were anxious to return home and jumped at the chance to be discharged, frequently when they should have remained in the service for further treatment. Others, more nearly disabled, elected to remain in the service and quite a number have since returned to combat. A good many of those who returned to civilian life would now like to get back in uniform but will not be accepted. It seems that these fellows just simply do not fit in as civilians. They become restless and impatient, and quite often get mixed up in mischief. They know that most of their buddies are still in uniform so they, for some reason or another, do not feel right where they are. The Germans and the Russians have correctly appraised the mentality of the disabled serviceman and have found him something to do where he can still feel that he is a part of the fighting forces. While I do not advocate that we go as far as those countries have gone, nevertheless, I am bringing this out to show that important results can be obtained from physically handicapped men when they are properly assigned.

It would seem to me that any of these men who have been out as much as 3 months and want to get back in should be given another and rather liberal physical examination, and if at all acceptable should be taken back in the service. Such men are usually young, without a trade or profession, and since they already have a military background they should be of more value to the armed forces than as civilian employees.

But there is still another source of untapped manpower that should be taken advantage of immediately. I refer specifically to the tens of thousands of young Frenchmen and Belgians who are idling their time away while our boys are fighting and dying for their liberty. A few months ago I had occasion to make a trip to Europe—a trip on which I was accompanied by some of you gentlemen present at this time. I will never forget the impression that I received upon seeing all these young men who seemed to be doing little or nothing. The thought occurred to me at the time, why cannot large numbers of these men be put in uniform and be permitted to fight for the freedom of their country?

There are a number of reasons why these young fellows should be required to enter the armed forces. In the first place, it is their country that we are seeking to free, and if anyone should have to fight to drive out an invader, it is the native population. These people have already shown that they intend to take a hand in shaping the affairs of western Europe, so there seems no logical reason why they should not be obliged to bear a share of the burden in bringing this war to a successful conclusion. On top of these obligations, I want to

tell you that it is not a good thing to have thousands of young fellows lounging around in idleness. Such conditions are ideal breeding grounds for communism, anarchy, and general crime and lawlessness.

We are told that there are at least 3,000,000 young men fully capable of bearing arms in these 2 countries. If only 1,000,000 of them could be used, think what it would mean to our overtaxed farms and industries. And on top of that, it would restore to those people a measure of self-respect which they have never regained since they were overrun by the Nazis in 1940. I was informed that large numbers would volunteer for military service if they were only given the chance. So far, it appears as though our military leaders have felt that we did not need any more help.

The enemy certainly has not overlooked any opportunity to acquire additional troops, regardless of the source. The Germans have taken every man they could get from their satellite nations, such as Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Slovakia. But they have not stopped at this. They have even encouraged considerable numbers of prisoners of war to enlist in the fighting forces. Oddly enough, some of these mercenary or non-German soldiers are reported under certain conditions, especially in defensive fighting, to compare favorably with dyed-in-the-wool Nazis. The Japanese are likewise reported to be using considerable numbers of Koreans, Mongolians, Manchurians, and north Chinese. Then, in the face of what the enemy is doing, are not we overlooking important opportunities in neglecting or refusing to enlist and equip troops from nations that we now regard as our allies?

Seemingly, it would appear as though we were deliberately trying to kill off our young men and deplete our resources. I understand that American generals prefer to command American troops because they are more dependable and are a known quantity. However, it should not be any harder for an American Army leader to work in French or Belgian troops, who profess to want to fight, than it would be for the German officers to work with Rumanians or Latvians, who, maybe, are not very enthusiastic about fighting.

I also realize that there are disadvantages in shifting men of our own forces around from one branch of the service to another and that it frequently takes considerable additional training before they are qualified to perform their new duties satisfactorily. It might be appropriate here to suggest to the Army that they give more time to investigating the possibilities of the men, and some of their handicaps, at the induction centers before making assignments. It has been called to my attention that, at least in some instances, the men are lined up and without being interviewed or investigated at all are allotted a quota to this branch of the Army and a quota to that. What do you think would happen to a large business concern if it operated in that manner? Cases have also been brought to my attention where men have been assigned to the Infantry who had bad feet or arches. In a few days or weeks they were given medical discharges as being unfit for military service. Had these men been assigned to the Transportation Corps or a medical unit or bakers' school this would not have happened.

It is time that we take inventory of our resources and eliminate this extravagance of our military leaders. Otherwise, we are heading toward impoverishment of both our industrial life and our young manhood.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. According to an article appearing in Nation's Business, there are 3,000,000 men over there who are refused arms because of power politics.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes; that is about the figures that I have.

Mr. GROSS. Now, it is proposed that we send the materials to put them to work in manufacturing munitions of war for our men to fight with. According to the article in Nation's Business that is the idea that some of the military men have. That is a far cry from Churchill's statement to us of some time ago saying, "Give us the munitions of war and we will do the fighting."

Mr. STOCKMAN. The gentleman is quite correct.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD of yesterday following the other eulogies on the death of our colleague from Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement of the O. P. A. Labor Policy Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 7 minutes.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, America and the world have every confidence in the ability and the leadership of our armed forces.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for our foreign policy. The wait-and-see attitude of the past several months has served to discourage the peoples of the liberated countries and to convince our allies that we ourselves are uncertain as to our aims and objectives beyond mere survival. Britain and Russia, remembering our about-face after the last war, cannot wait to determine if the dead hand of isolationism will reappear to paralyze our foreign policy. For their own security, they are resorting to the practical measures of power politics. Our enemies are delighted by this turn of events; our friends are dismayed. Politically we have lost much ground, and for that we must share a large part of the blame.

It would be a strange and bitter mockery if the victories our men are winning at such sacrifice on the battle fronts were to be lost by our political inaptitude on the diplomatic front.

As of the moment our foreign policy is one of extreme caution—when constructive leadership is required. We are allowing others to set the course of readjustment into dangerous channels which will perpetuate tension. The moral leadership of the United States is presently adrift.

In the wake of our liberating armies we have left not hope but despair. Two-thirds of Italy have been released from fascism. The people should be overjoyed, but they are not, for the simple reason that they are cold and hungry. If this situation is allowed to continue, these disillusioned people cannot be blamed if they long for the return of a tyranny which at least gave them food and clothing. And in winning the war we shall have lost it.

I, for one, cannot understand how we so complacently tolerate such a dangerous situation. Is it that the Allied Military Government in the occupied area cannot or will not take steps to alleviate this misery? Obviously we have the material resources. The fault then must lie in the administration of the area as determined by our national policy. It is on this point that I ask the Congress to investigate the whole set-up that governs occupied territories with a view to providing relief for the impoverished residents.

We have heard much of U. N. R. R. A. I would like to know what it is doing to help the people of Italy.

There are those who say that we have no shipping available to carry relief supplies to this unfortunate country. Out of the many millions of tons of merchant shipping we alone have constructed during this war, we could allocate a few thousand tons for this humanitarian purpose. I submit that it is necessary for another reason, to win the respect and confidence of these people that we may have their help in establishing international security.

From my district there are thousands of Americans of Italian extraction serving in our armed forces, many of them fighting in the land of their forebears. They write letters asking their relatives here to send scraps of clothing and food that they—the G. I.'s—may give to help feed and clothe the unfortunate victims of war. There is a quantitative limit restricting this source of supply from here. And there is a bottleneck preventing distribution of it over there. There is no provision for delivering these desperately needed items, once they are unloaded at

Naples and other ports. The undernourished and ill-clothed people are asked to travel from all sections of the occupied area to pick up these goods in person which means that many never receive this meager aid at all.

They are not asking that our Government give them supplies. Their thrifty and hard-working relatives here will provide relief if we will cut red tape to insure transport and delivery.

Already numerous societies here are raising funds to provide such relief. As inflation has already started its disastrous spiral in Italy and because consumer goods are scarce over there, the money raised will be used to purchase goods here for delivery to Italy, where enterprising Italian housewives may make clothes for their families. In addition, it is planned to send space-saving, dehydrated goods to the needy.

This voluntary and humanitarian help is doomed to failure unless our Government takes positive action in this emergency. A few ships must be allocated to transport these supplies. Allied Military Government must cooperate with the Provisional Italian Government to work out arrangements for effective distribution of this life-saving aid. Anything less may well jeopardize our military victories.

These people cannot subsist on words. They need food and clothing without delay. It is manifestly our duty to give aid to the helpless until such time as the people of this war-ravaged country can provide for themselves again. If we fail in this, our victory is but half won.

Therefore, I urge the Congress to give to this aspect of total war its immediate and effective attention.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, for 3 days, on account of important official business.

THE LATE FRANCIS MALONEY

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, with sadness and a heavy heart I rise to announce to the House the death of United States Senator FRANCIS T. MALONEY, of my State. He was a Member of this House. He came here with me in 1933. There was no more faithful Member to both his colleagues and the people of this Nation and his district than FRANK MALONEY, active, serious, honest, endeavoring to do his full duty.

Quickly the people of Connecticut recognized his talents, his tireless energy, and his worth. They elevated him by their votes to the United States Senate. In that body he distinguished himself. In the midst of his greatest work, his effort to bring the Congress of the United States closer to the people with the hope of making for a more effective Government, his life was cut off at the age of 50, still a young man.

He served his country faithfully. He served in the last war with distinction and credit to himself. In his passing our country mourns the loss of a great statesman whose place will be difficult to fill. He was an outstanding American. Personally, I always had his friendship. He cooperated to the best of his ability that others might benefit through his knowledge and his judgment.

I, too, have lost a friend. Words alone cannot express to his family my sympathy. The accomplishments which he had achieved stand as a monument to his fame. The glory of his record leaves a memory which will never die. His family has that consolation. May God rest his soul.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. WOODHOUSE].

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult adequately to express the loss that has come to some of us very personally and to all of us as American citizens in the untimely passing of Senator MALONEY. His integrity, his devotion to principle, has made him an outstanding figure in the civic life of this Nation. An untiring worker, no task was ever too heavy for him if it promised to be of value to his country. He was a student, a clear thinker, who believed we could have genuine democracy if we would only work for it. He expressed his belief in practical ways.

As I know from personal experience, the women of Connecticut have lost a very real friend in his going. He was never afraid to take a stand when it was necessary to uphold his principles. Not only those of us who were fortunate enough to have him as a friend but the country and the world that we would hope to build have suffered an irretrievable loss in the very untimely death of FRANCIS MALONEY.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, time passes and with the passage of time changes take place. Time passes in the life of each and every one of us, and the passage of time in our life on earth is represented by the period between birth and death.

To those of us who have known our late friend, and to those of us who numbered him as our friend, one of our great pleasures and one of our great possessions was the knowledge that we knew him and that we possessed his friendship.

You and I during our life leave our imprint in this world. So has our late friend left his imprint. Serving the people of his district as he has faithfully in this body, serving the people of his State as he has faithfully in the other body, and in both positions serving the people of the Nation, our late friend, FRANCIS T. MALONEY, has left his strong, outstanding imprint on life. A man of great courage, intellectually honest, fearless in fighting for any cause which he espoused, he was also a man of very intense feelings. He put into everything that he was interested in the best that was within him, drawing upon his reserve, as we know, in order to carry out the duties of his responsible office under the trying conditions of this very important era. Always believing that public office is a public trust, he leaves an example for all others in public life in the future to follow. It might well be said that FRANCIS T. MALONEY, or FRANK MALONEY, as his friends called him, died in the line of duty. We who knew him intimately were aware of the fact that his health was not good. We were aware of the fact that for some months he was not the FRANK MALONEY physically that we would have liked him to be. Yet we met him in our contacts, as we meet each other, always performing his duties with that same sincerity and intensity with which he performed his duties when he enjoyed normal health.

As we look back now we realize that the performance of those duties by him, in the intense manner that he always performed them, constituted an aggravating circumstance which precipitated and hastened his death. I do not hesitate to say that this circumstance brought about his death sooner than such event would have normally taken place if he had not followed his intense feelings by carrying on his duties in the strong and courageous way that he did. Therefore I say that FRANCIS T. MALONEY, or FRANK MALONEY, as we knew him, died in the line of legislative duty. He is just as much a casualty of this war as if he had died in the line of duty in actual combat against our enemies. I know those whom he leaves behind will derive great consolation in the knowledge that he lived up to the trust that was reposed in him and the confidence placed in him by the people of his State; that he went ahead performing his duties with the knowledge that in all probability it might hasten his death; and that he felt it was his duty to do so. From another viewpoint it might be a lesson to other Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate who might not be feeling well to realize they owe something to themselves, and to realize that by trying to carry on the intense duties of their office, and we all have intense duties to perform, if their condition of health is not good, it might not be a wise thing to impose too great a strain upon themselves.

We can learn something out of the experiences of our late friend if only we pause to do so: that we should not draw upon all of our physical reserves or to believe that we can effectively perform our duties when we are not feeling well without dissipating those physical reserves which mean so much in time of serious illness. On the other hand, the relatives of our late friend, as I said, probably, and I hope they will, derive great consolation in the knowledge that their loved one died in the line of duty, in the line of legislative duty to his country. To the members of his family left behind I join with the dean of the Connecticut delegation in the House on the Democratic side and all of the delegation from Connecticut in expressing to his loved ones my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow. As far as I personally am concerned, in the passing of FRANK MALONEY, I have lost a close friend whose friendship I greatly valued.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Members from Connecticut and the other New England States in my deep regret over the death of a great statesman and a patriotic American.

It was my privilege to have known FRANK MALONEY since the first day he entered Congress. Through the years he has been a warm personal friend whom I held in high esteem and for whom I had great affection. Because of this friendship, I know the high motives which have guided him throughout all these years of his splendid service in the interest of his State and his country. He was a man of courage, of fine ability, and ever ready to fight for his convictions.

In this hour when so many momentous changes are taking place in the world, when we are traveling through many difficult phases of our national life, we can ill afford to lose a man like FRANK MALONEY.

We need his cool judgment, his calm manner and his clear thinking to help guide the good ship of state. His untimely death is tragic.

FRANK MALONEY was a student of political economy. He came here for one purpose, and that purpose was to serve his day and generation, and to make this a better land. His death was undoubtedly hastened by his close application to the many duties of his office and his anxiety to meet fully the many obligations he owed to the great State he so efficiently represented.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow to FRANK MALONEY's good wife and the members of his family. They will be comforted in this hour by the knowledge of the fine service he rendered to mankind, and the fact that many other lives have been made a little brighter because of his own stay on this earth.

A good life never dies; its influence is reflected in the generations that follow. We are all saddened by the death of our beloved and very able colleague.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Senator MALONEY I feel a sense of great personal loss. I know many Members of the House and Senate feel likewise. Senator MALONEY was an inspiration to many of us who were younger in service in the Congress than he. He was always glad to lend a helping hand to the younger Members of both Houses as we tried to understand, appreciate, and evaluate our work in Congress.

I know Senator MALONEY as a deeply religious man, as a husband with a deep and abiding love for his family. He traveled late in the night to his home in Connecticut and early in the morning to Washington so that he could have a few extra hours with his family.

I know the work load he carried in the Senate on his many important committees and in his office. I know how he served the humblest as well as the most prominent citizens of his State and of the Nation as well.

It was this determination to try to serve everyone who had the slightest call upon the important senatorial office, I believe, that led to his early death.

Senator MALONEY was a student of government, a man of courage, a man of ability, and a tireless worker; busy Sundays and late into the night trying to acquire the complete understanding of all sides of questions necessary for the perfection of the good legislation that was his ideal.

The Senate, the House, the people of Connecticut, and the people of the United States have lost a great friend and a true American who worked his heart out in the interest of helping to improve this Government.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEELAN].

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult, if not impossible, to adequately express in words my deep feeling of sorrow at the passing of my dear friend, Senator FRANCIS J. MALONEY, of Connecticut.

The Nation has lost one of its ablest statesmen, which in these critical times it can ill afford. Senator MALONEY, formerly the mayor of his native city, Meriden, Conn., and former Representative in this branch of Congress, was serving his second term in the Senate. In a recently published article in the Saturday Evening Post, he was referred to as "the Senators' Senator," because of his keen judgment, his analytical mind, and his true sense of patriotism. He, as the article states, was the wheel horse and stabilizer to whom the various groups in the Senate came to for advice, counsel, and aid in seeking a solution of their respective problems.

Although a genuine liberal he has differed on occasions from those who could also be called progressives when in his conscience he felt he could not go along.

To the people of the State of Connecticut, the city of Meriden, but more particularly to Mrs. Maloney and his children, I offer my most sincere sympathy. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TALBOT].

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, a great, true and noble Christian gentleman has passed on to his heavenly reward. It was with great and profound sorrow that I learned earlier in the day of the passing of my good friend and our distinguished Senator from Connecticut, FRANCIS MALONEY. With all his heart, with all his soul and all his strength he met and solved each day the problems that come before us here in the Congress.

We can ill afford in these dire times to lose a man like FRANCIS MALONEY. Connecticut and the United States have lost a great leader and a great statesman. He was a man who loved above everything else his family, and I know that each week he took that long train journey back to his city of Meriden to be with them for a few minutes. He worked hard and courageously on every problem.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy. I am certain that everyone who knew FRANCIS MALONEY will feel as I do that he was a man worthy of the tasks placed before him and I know that had he lived he would have performed with dignity and efficiency the great undertaking he was about to assume in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RYTER].

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the first time in this honorable body to express my feelings of deep regret at the untimely passing of the senior Senator from Connecticut, the late Honorable FRANCIS T. MALONEY.

In this hour of profound sorrow many thoughts rush from my heart to my mind to seek expression. But in this truly sad hour words are such frail means that they seemingly challenge and mock the heart and lose their capacity for real expression. We in Connecticut shall miss him greatly, and the greater shall be our loss the sooner our realization that he is no longer with us. The Nation shall miss him, and in this we find our only consolation, that Connecticut had given to the Nation one of its most capable, untiring, and illustrious sons to serve her and us in the past decade.

I join with my colleagues in extending to his devoted wife and family our deepest sympathy and that of the entire membership of this House.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I come down upon this floor to say anything about anything, but I would not be true to myself if I just did not utter one word about the subject that has been talked about here this afternoon.

When FRANK MALONEY came to the Congress he was placed on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce where I served with him, where he was diligent, where he was intelligent, where he was what I would want a colleague upon a committee to be; sane, sound, and, let me repeat, intelligent and industrious. I loved him deeply. He was the type and character of man who elicited from his fellows deep affection. I had it for him and I know he had it for me. His going at this time, as has been remarked better than I can by others who have preceded me, is a terrible loss to the whole United States of America. In the days that lie ahead of us, his counsel, his advice and his vote in the Senate of the United States would have meant much to the future of the world, and especially the peace of this world. His was a sweet spirit. His was a fine, big soul. I will not see many like him again.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 84), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, a Senator of the United States from the State of Connecticut.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit

a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 84, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to attend the funeral: Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mrs. WOODHOUSE, Mr. RYTER, Mr. GEELAN, Mr. TALBOT, Mrs. LUCE, and Mr. MONRONEY.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 17, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

108. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration covering operations of this Administration for the fiscal year of 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

109. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

110. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1944, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

111. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of loans to Indian chartered corporations for the purposes of promoting the economic development of such tribes and their members, under authority of section 10 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

112. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Food and Drug Administration for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

113. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

114. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 212 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. R. 1427. A bill relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange; without amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 82. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 626, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 60. Resolution authorizing the continuation of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 55. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 64. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and defining its powers and duties; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 18. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 66. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Civil Service to investigate various activities in the departments and agencies of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 75. Resolution to continue the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1495. A bill providing for the establishment of a minimum rating for disabled war veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1496. A bill to repeal the income limitation as to payment of death pension to widows and children of deceased service-connected disabled World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1497. A bill to amend subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 1498. A bill to correct the naval record of former members of the crews of the revenue cutters *Algonquin* and *Onondaga*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1499. A bill to validate certain applications for national service life insurance where deductions of premiums from service pay were authorized but the applicant died prior to the effective date of such insurance and prior to February 11, 1942; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1500. A bill to provide for pilgrimages, after the present war, of Gold Star mothers and fathers to the graves of their sons and daughters who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States and who are buried in foreign lands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1501. A bill to provide that automatic national service life insurance as to deceased veterans of World War No. 2 shall be payable, in turn, to their widows, children, and parents, if any, without any requirement, as at present, as to their dependency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1502. A bill to provide for lump payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave and current accrued annual leave to certain officers and employees, and authorizing the appropriation of funds for that purpose; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 1503. A bill to establish a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1504. A bill providing for the transfer of title to Federal equipment or supplies used in training defense workers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 1505. A bill to establish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1506. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1507. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1508. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 by providing insurance benefits, regardless of dependency, for the parents and other relatives of those persons in active service who died in line of duty after October 8, 1940, and before April 20, 1942, without having in force at the time of such death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1509. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1510. A bill to amend the Classification Act of March 4, 1923, as amended, to create a Mechanical Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1511. A bill to extend the status of veterans of the World War to persons enrolled or enlisted and serving on United States Shipping Board vessels during the World War in war zones; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1512. A bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law No. 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1513. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1514. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers'

retirement benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1515. A bill relating to the foreign tax credit in the case of an individual owning a majority of the voting stock of a foreign corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1516. A bill relating to overtime compensation prior to December 1, 1942, of certain per annum employees of the field services of the Department of War, the Panama Canal, the Department of the Navy, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1517. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain retired World War veterans to the rank of chief warrant officer on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1518. A bill to regulate the character of discharges from the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1519. A bill relating to marine insurance in the case of certain employees of the Army Transport Service who suffered death, injury, or other casualty prior to April 23, 1943, as a result of marine risks; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1520. A bill providing for longevity pay to employees of the United States Government and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 1521. A bill to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1522. A bill to safeguard the activities of the Office of Censorship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1523. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the War Department from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1524. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees within the Office of Scientific Research and Development from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1525. A bill relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1526. A bill regulating the commitment of insane persons to veterans' and other United States institutions and making applicable to Federal reservations certain State laws pertaining to administration of estates of decedents, guardianship of minors and insane persons, commitment of insane persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1527. A bill to exempt the members of the Advisory Board appointed under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1528. A bill to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting of Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1529. A bill to provide for the setting aside of convictions of Federal offenders who have been placed on probation and have fully complied with the conditions of their probation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1530. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1531. A bill to provide for the control of confidential business data submitted to the War Production Board; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1532. A bill to reestablish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1533 (by request). A bill to encourage employment of veterans with pensionable or compensable service-connected disabilities through Federal reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund of amounts of workmen's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 1534. A bill to amend the Fact Finders' Act; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. RICH:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses of Congress during February 1945 to ask God's divine guidance in the deliberations and actions of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to treaty ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 83. Resolution to investigate the effect upon the country of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 85. Resolution to appoint a committee to protect the integrity of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 86. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the decree of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in re James B. Dunn; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 87. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by the special committee authorized by House resolution 86; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 88. Resolution for the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies which exceed their authority; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Res. 89. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate All Labor Conditions and Labor and Employer Practices Which Affect the War Production Program, with a particular view to determining the extent of the hoarding of manpower by war industries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 90. Resolution to provide additional compensation for the clerk to the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 91. Resolution to amend clause 40, rule XI, of the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 1535. A bill for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1536. A bill for the relief of the Fidelity & Casualty Co. and the Baugh Chemical Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1537. A bill for the relief of David Stiefel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 1538. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Cramer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1539. A bill for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1541. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Calogeras; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1542. A bill for the relief of Gorgios Nicolaou Perivolaris (also known as George N. Perivolaris); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1543. A bill for the relief of Michael Ioannis Vagianos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1544. A bill for the relief of Georgios M. Tsarouchas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1545. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Tusow; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 1546. A bill for the relief of C. Y. Webb; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1547. A bill for the relief of W. H. Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1548. A bill for the relief of August W. Dietz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1549. A bill for the relief of William Thompson Sansom; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1550. A bill for the relief of E. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1551. A bill for the relief of Capt. Edward J. L. Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1552. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1553. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Kearney; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1554. A bill for the relief of C. J. Boyle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1555. A bill for the relief of Albert S. Horton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1556. A bill for the relief of Aileen Phyllis Flock and Ellen Frances Flock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1557. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to summon William D. Gill before an Army retiring board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri:

H. R. 1558. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alma Mallette and Ancel Adkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1559. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Moody and Gulf Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1560. A bill for the relief of J. B. Grigsby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 1561. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Cinigilio; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1562. A bill for the relief of the Borough of Park Ridge, Park Ridge, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1563. A bill for the relief of Lamar Oxley, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1564. A bill for the relief of William W. Maddox; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1565. A bill for the relief of Inglis Construction Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1566. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:
H. R. 1567. A bill for the relief of Katherine Smith; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 1568. A bill for the relief of John C. Tuttle; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. TIBBOTT:
H. R. 1569. A bill for the relief of Mihjalo Bakic or Mile Vujaklija; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
By Mr. WHITE:
H. R. 1570. A bill for the relief of Edward Pittwood; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord God, as we walk the pathway where so many others have lived and labored, may we go along as brothers until the last door is closed. If we fail of being what we ought to be or of doing what we ought to do, forgive us. In our conscience, in our reason, and in the mysterious instincts of our personality, O Father of Light, give us strength to unlock the spiritual power which has made us and fulfill in us the great design of our holy Creator, and thus be a help to others throughout the day.

Grant that we may not be merely industrious, but may we love industry; not merely learned, but may we love understanding; not merely just, but may we hunger and thirst after justice. Though all else decline, the noontide of Thy love and peace remain. We rejoice that—

"Could we with ink the ocean fill,
And were the whole skies of parchment made,
And every single stick a quill,
And every man a scribe by trade,
To write the love of God alone
Would drain the ocean dry;
Nor could the whole contain the scroll,
Though stretched from sky to sky."

In the name of Him who loved the world that it might be saved. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. EARTHMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 16, 1945.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public, No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1945: Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, Hon. RALPH H. DAUGHTON, Hon. GORDON CANFIELD.

As chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex-officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Yours very sincerely,
S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 16, 1945.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1945: Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH.

As chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex-officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Yours very sincerely,
S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 70), as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and examinations authorized by House Resolution 50 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed the unobligated balance on January 3, 1945, under House Resolution 116 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and examination or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member, appeared before the Committee on Accounts in support of their request for funds. The resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes available for the Appropriations Committee the unexpended balances which was provided in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Initially the Committee on Appropriations was granted the sum of $100,000 to conduct studies and examinations of the organization and operation of the Executive Departments and agencies for the purpose of obtaining information to be used in connection with the various appropriation bills. At the hearing it developed that the Appropriations Committee had spent approximately half of the funds originally provided, and the Committee on Accounts voted in favor of making the unexpended balance available.

The following is a tabulation submitted to the Committee on Accounts by the Appropriations Committee showing the status of the funds originally provided under House Resolution 116 of the Seventy-eighth Congress:

Funds available under H. Res. 116		$100,000.00
Obligations incurred since the beginning of this program on Mar. 8, 1943:		
Personal services:		
Regular members of the staff (on loan from the Federal Bureau of Investigation)		18,522.97
Reimbursement to the following agencies and departments for personnel on loan to the committee:		
Treasury		3,116.35
Civil Service Commission		5,509.96
Interstate Commerce Commission		258.31
Agriculture		4,958.90
Federal Works Agency		374.89
Veterans Administration		2,364.74
Commerce		1,622.83
Federal Security Agency		2,164.19
Labor		1,178.10
Office of Censorship		1,870.21
Justice		1,994.63
Office of War Information		346.01
Total personal services		44,282.09
Other expense items:		
Travel	$5,705.48	
Communications	10.68	
Supplies and materials	222.39	
Total other expenses		5,938.55
Total obligations to and including Jan. 3, 1945		50,220.64
Unobligated balance as of Jan. 3, 1945		49,779.36

In the foregoing schedule all obligations that have been incurred during the period March 8, 1943, through January 3, 1945, have been taken into consideration. It should be noted that some of these obligations have not as yet been liquidated and, therefore, the balance available as reflected on the records of the disbursing clerk in the House of Representatives will not agree with the balance in the above schedule.

The following tabulation reconciles the total obligations to and including January 3, 1945, with the actual expenditures as recorded in the office of the disbursing clerk:

Total obligations through Jan. 3, 1945	$50,220.64
Actual expenditures as recorded in the records of the disbursing clerk	46,954.08
Unpaid obligations as of Jan. 3, 1945, consisting of the following	3,266.56
Personal services:	
Regular staff	199.87
Reimbursement to executive agencies for personnel on loan to the committee	3,034.04
Other expenses, supplies	32.65
Total	3,266.56

The unpaid obligations for reimbursement to executive agencies for personnel on loan represents 10 men now working on the staff on loan from the various bureaus in the Department of Agriculture. The investigations that are presently under way are being handled partially by this staff, and in order to carry out the various directives that have been approved by the appropriate subcommittees, it will be necessary to obtain additional men from other executive agencies in the immediate future.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 92) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 592 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 63 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Education, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $2,400 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums made available during the Seventy-eighth Congress for conducting the study and investigation authorized by said House Resolution 592 of the Seventy-eighth Congress including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and investigation or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] appeared before the Committee on Accounts in support of his request for additional funds. The Committee on Education, under the terms of the original resolution, was to have submitted a report to the House before the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress. It developed that the work could not be completed in that Congress and the committee was extended to January 31, 1945. There is on hand now a balance of $444.92 which the committee did not spend.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] submitted an estimate to the committee and said he felt confident the work could be completed with $2,800. Some of this amount has already been obligated in the hope that additional funds would be provided.

The Committee on Accounts unanimously voted in favor of providing an additional $2,400 to the Committee on Education, and in addition to make available the unexpended balance of $444.92.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain what this is?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the House passed two resolutions a day or two ago, one of them continuing the activities of the Committee on Appropriations in making investigations of fiscal affairs. That, of course, requires money. Any time they pass a resolution of that kind the request for money follows.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that.

Mr. COCHRAN. There was about $50,000 left over from the last Congress and the previous resolution provides for that unexpended balance to be carried over for the use of this committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The pending resolution is with reference to the Committee on Education. The Committee on Education was authorized to make an investigation and to report during the last Congress in reference to higher educational institutions. It was unable to complete its report and the Committee on Rules brought in a resolution extending their time to January 31. The committee expires on the 31st. They needed some more money. They made a showing before the Committee on Accounts and we granted them $2,800, $400 of which was left over from the last Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that satisfactory to the committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; it is.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN SALARY FOR TELEPHONE OPERATORS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 1427, relating to compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the necessity for this legislation? I understand it personally, but I think the Members of the House would like to know about it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1427) relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange, reported favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill pass.

H. R. 1427 provides for an adjustment of salary for the chief, assistant chief, and other telephone operators who handle the Capitol switchboard under the Clerk of the House and Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Your committee, after a hearing, came to the conclusion this was an emergency and that there should be no delay in placing the subject before the House.

The scale recommended is:

Chief operator, $3,000 per annum.

Assistant chief operator, $2,400 per annum, and $200 per annum additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Others, $1,800 per annum plus—

Two hundred and forty dollars per annum additional in the case of those having more than 25 years of service;

One hundred and eighty dollars per annum additional in the case of those having more than 20 and not more than 25 years of service;

One hundred and fifty dollars per annum additional in the case of those having more than 15 and not more than 20 years of service;

One hundred and twenty dollars per annum additional in the case of those having more than 10 and not more than 15 years of service; and

Sixty dollars per annum additional in the case of those having more than 5 and not more than 10 years of service.

There is hardly a person involved who could not go, either with a Government agency, the telephone company, or a private concern in a similar position and earn $50 or more a month than she is now receiving, if she secured benefits that accrue to telephone operators employed other than at the Capitol.

The hearing disclosed telephone company operators are on a 5-day week, time and one-half for the sixth day, double time for the seventh day, as well as double time for holidays and overtime pay.

Our operators are on a 6-day week, required to work every fourth Sunday, no extra pay; also to work holidays with no extra pay, and receive no overtime pay. The Capitol switchboard prior to the war was one of the largest in Washington. The calls in 1939 averaged 38,000 a day; in 1944, 44,000 a day, based on a count last July, with no increase in personnel.

There are no facilities for additional lines, but there is a steady demand from Members for a second telephone, which cannot be filled until an additional board and equipment is available.

The Clerk of the House was required to ask that all outside calls be dialed by the Members and their secretaries, as the operators could not carry the load and at the same time render speedy and efficient service. Members have cooperated and it has been most helpful.

The compilation of the length of service of the Capitol telephone operators is as follows:

SENATE	*Years*
Chief operator	46
1 operator	30
1 operator (broken service)	32
2 operators	23
1 operator (broken service)	21
1 operator	15
2 operators	12
1 operator (broken service)	9
1 operator	5
3 operators	3
1 operator	2

HOUSE	Years
Assistant chief operator	33
2 operators	27
2 operators	22
1 operator (broken service)	25
2 operators	20
1 operator	19
1 operator (broken service)	18
1 operator	13
1 operator	12
1 operator	9
1 operator	6
1 operator	5
1 operator	4
3 operators	3
3 operators	2
2 operators	1

At the present time the basic salary of the operators is $1,620.

The chief operator, who has served for 46 years, has been ill, and her duties for quite a period have been taken over by the assistant chief operator. This assistant chief operator has seen 33 years of continuous service and her basic salary today is but $1,800.

While some of the operators are credited to the House and some to the Senate, they operate as a whole under the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

Your committee unanimously recommends favorable action on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the basic salary is $1,620. The Congress provided for taking care of the telephone operators uptown by granting them overtime and time and a half and double time, but we did not so provide for our own operators.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. To whom does the gentleman refer when he says we provided for the operators uptown?

Mr. COCHRAN. I refer to the Congress and to the telephone operators in every one of the Government agencies.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This simply raises their salary to a parity with the operators who are employed in the Government agencies elsewhere whom we took care of in the uptown offices?

Mr. COCHRAN. We do not grant the Capitol telephone-exchange operators overtime or double time. And while this bill does not, we raise their salaries. We make their basic salaries start at $1,800 and provide that by reason of length of service they shall get an increase when they are here a certain length of time, say 5, 10, 15, 20, or 25 years. Listen to this. Your acting chief operator, who is also carrying on her own assignment as assistant chief operator, the chief operator being sick, gets a basic salary now of $1,800 a year. She has been serving Congress for 33 years. Who will say that is fair?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to say to the gentleman I am in full accord with the report of his committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, there is certainly no group in the Capitol which works harder or gives more valuable service, not only to Members of Congress, who carry on the Nation's business, but to the people of the entire Nation who make telephone calls to the Capitol often involving matters of personal welfare and happiness or important business and financial matters. They are able, cheerful, and tireless workers.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say this is justice long delayed.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I beg to disagree with my colleague. I do not think it is justice. I do not think we are paying these girls enough money.

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, they are satisfied with the provisions of this bill. A representative of theirs came before the committee, made the suggestions, and your committee accepted them.

Mr. CANFIELD. However, I doubt that they are satisfied.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Are these people all compelled to join a union before they can serve?

Mr. COCHRAN. Let us keep that out; of course they are not.

Mr. RICH. I think that is an important question; I just wondered whether they were compelled to join the union before they could serve the Government.

Mr. COCHRAN. If there were a union and they had joined it I do not think they would need this bill for the union would have protected their interests.

Mr. RICH. Is it not the duty of Congressmen to protect their interests if they are not being properly protected without having a union necessary to look after them?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is what Congress is doing now—we are doing something we should have done long ago. Everyone seems to agree this bill should pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after February 1, 1945, the basic rates of compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange (whether under the jurisdiction of the Clerk of the House of Representatives or under the jurisdiction of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate) shall be as follows:

(a) Chief operator, $3,000 per annum.

(b) Assistant chief operator, $2,400 per annum, and $200 per annum additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

(c) Others, $1,800 per annum plus—

(1) $240 per annum additional in the case of those having more than 25 years of service;

(2) $180 per annum additional in the case of those having more than 20 and not more than 25 years of service;

(3) $150 per annum additional in the case of those having more than 15 and not more than 20 years of service;

(4) $120 per annum additional in the case of those having more than 10 and not more than 15 years of service; and

(5) $60 per annum additional in the case of those having more than 5 and not more than 10 years of service.

In computing such years of service, the term "service" means service as a telephone operator on the United States Capitol telephone exchange (whether under the jurisdiction of the Clerk of the House of Representatives or under the jurisdiction of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate) and shall not be limited to continuous service.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ACTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES WHICH EXCEED THEIR AUTHORITY

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 88) for a continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority (Rept. No. 27), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 102, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 102 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address he is delivering today before the State legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I informed this House that according to statements made by General Hershey approximately 31 percent of the population of this Nation are engaged in agricultural pursuits; yet 43 percent of the men in the armed forces come from so-called agricultural groups. I think it might be well at this time also to point out to this House that whatever discrimination, if there be discrimination, exists is probably due to the fact that some members of the local draft boards are not fully informed on the provisions of the so-called Tydings amendment which set aside the agricultural group for special treatment as regards the draft. General Hershey said in his statement yesterday that the Appeals Board has no jurisdiction in those cases; it is done by an act of Congress, and until that act is changed the local boards will have full authority in the drafting of farm personnel.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] may address the House for 20 minutes after the legislative calendar of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Gold and Silver as Money in the Post-war World."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GOSSETT asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two matters and to include in one an editorial that appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Item, and in the second to include a letter written by the chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ARMY NURSES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include as part of my remarks an article from the Boston Herald by Catherine Coyne, one of their correspondents who has been serving overseas with our forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today to address the House for 1 hour. I ask unanimous consent that that special order be transferred to next Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a newspaper article and in the other a table from the United States Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

W. L. B. ORDERS CHURCHMEN TO JOIN UNION OR QUIT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I quote as follows from an article appearing in a newspaper:

W. L. B. ORDERS CHURCHMEN TO JOIN UNION OR QUIT

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The War Labor Board found itself in conflict with a religious sect today when it ordered members of Christ's Church of the Golden Rule, San Jose, Calif., to join the teamsters' union (A. F. of L.) if they want to work at the commercial dairy operated by the church.

The Board said the church bought the commercial dairy in September 1943 and retained the incumbent manager who renewed a closed-shop contract with the union.

The dispute arose shortly thereafter when two church members were discharged by the dairy manager for their refusal to become members of the union in accordance with the closed-shop provision.

The church maintained that its rules prohibited members from joining any other organization.

Our laws must be changed. We must remember that anyone getting a job for any war work must join a union before he is permitted to work for the United States Government. I am for proper unionization where people want it, but I am against enforced joining by free American labor. Why, bless your soul, the C. I. O.-P. A. C. will soon enforce Members of Congress to join the union and do their bidding or they will not be permitted to serve in Congress. Oh, America, where is our freedom fleeting? I say, free America, wake up or be shackled.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper article and excerpts from leaders relating to the draft of farm labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DRAFT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to inquire what has become of the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act? This inquiry is prompted by two articles appearing in this morning's Washington Post which clearly show the inexcusable confusion of policies which exist in Washington at this time.

One of these reads as follows:

War Food Administrator Marvin Jones yesterday called again on the Nation's farmers for an all-out food production year and announced acreage goals 3 percent above 1944.

Here is the other:

In a stormy 3-hour session of 150 farm-bloc Congressmen with Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, regarding a new selective-service directive to local boards concerning the draft deferment of farmers and farm labor under 26, General Hershey said about half of the 364,000 farm workers under 26 would probably be inducted by July 1.

This means the induction of all who can pass the physical examination because Selective Service estimates that half of the 364,000 will be disqualified physically.

There you have it. It took every man now on the farms plus all available women and children to make our 1944 production. Yet, the War Food Administrator insists that farmers increase production above the record-breaking year of 1944, and the Selective Service Director says that he is going to take every physically qualified man between 18 and 26 off the farms.

That means absolute disregard of the Tydings amendment. If these men were necessary for food production in 1944 they are even more necessary if we are to meet the larger goals for 1945. I have no interest in keeping any boy on the farm but we all have an interest and responsibility in seeing that the Nation produces the food supplies which the War Food Administrator says are necessary.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the other special orders previously granted I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter bearing on the very serious manpower shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in Collier's Weekly on guinea pigs in the steel industry. Inasmuch as this article is longer than the rules of the House permit, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by one of the officials back home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address which I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial recently appearing in the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the National Tribune, a veterans' paper here in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

MANPOWER SHORTAGE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has introduced a bill, No. 1421, that I believe should have the serious looking over and consideration of the Members. I think it will go a long way toward obviating the need of a National Service Act, and at the same time go further than anything that has been suggested to find out where the surplus manpower is and to relieve the manpower shortage of the Nation. I wish the Members would look into this piece of legislation. I think it is worthy of a few minutes of your time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when General Hershey talks about taking all of the farm boys, he is getting rather close to home. I heard him say yesterday that if General MacArthur wanted 20,000 men he was not going to be the one to stand in the way. Well, that is all right, as far as it goes, but there is no use sending 20,000 men down there without anything to eat, for they cannot live on the country. By all means give MacArthur everything for which he asks, but with the men, send the necessary food and munitions.

Yesterday, after the House adjourned, I had a wire from our lieutenant governor in reply to one I had sent him, and he said that for the last available weekly figures the State of Michigan was paying thirteen thousand four hundred-and-some-odd men unemployment insurance. They have no jobs, so the State is paying them; thirteen thousand four hundred-odd men on the State pay roll because they cannot find work. Now what about the manpower shortage? Why draft men for industry when Michigan is paying upward of 13,000 who cannot find jobs?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week, outside of those periods when a bill may be under consideration under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION OF PRISON SENTENCES OF WILLIAM BIOFF AND GEORGE E. BROWNE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

[Mr. McCORMACK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO PROCEED WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 82 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

This resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain works, and for other purposes. The rule is an open one and provides for 1

hour for general debate, after which amendments may be offered under the 5-minute rule.

The bill authorizes an appropriation in the amount of $1,500,549,500 for ship repair, construction of facilities, material, and equipment, as follows:

Ship repair and laying-up facilities, $230,222,000; fleet training facilities, amphibious and operational, $12,000,000; aviation facilities, $59,416,500; storage facilities, $19,950,000; Marine Corps housing and training, $14,190,000; ordnance facilities, $65,500,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $40,022,000; hospital facilities, $28,519,000; shore radio facilities, $3,230,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $225,000; miscellaneous structures and facilities, $41,265,000; advance base construction, material and equipment.

Originally, as I understood the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to testify before the Committee on Rules, the field officers recommended about $1,000,000,000 more than the amount carried in this bill, and I wish to compliment the Navy personnel in charge here in Washington who, with the aid, I presume, of the Committee on Naval Affairs, eliminated about $1,000,000,000 from the original recommendations that were made.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. After making the statement before the Committee on Rules yesterday I checked up on the matter and find that it is in the neighborhood of $540,000,000 instead of $1,000,000,000.

Mr. SABATH. I am pleased to hear that it is $540,000,000, but as I recollect, the gentleman stated it was close to $1,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, of course, this is a tremendous amount despite the fact that it has been reduced by $540,000,000, but I feel that it is absolutely necessary and that the Navy should have every dollar that it needs, because it has done a splendid job in the defense of our country. We should be proud of its accomplishments.

I feel strongly that if there had not been a delay of nearly 2 years in preparation of our defenses, or if we had started to prepare our defenses when originally recommended and urged by the President, the need for quick and hurried construction would not have been so great now and the expenditures would not have been so tremendous. Millions upon millions could have been saved. Unfortunately, at that time, due to the expenditure of about $200,000,000 by the Nazis in this country, as was testified to by General Donovan, for propaganda and fifth-column activities, many Americans were misled into believing that it was impossible for us to be drawn into the conflict. They could not believe that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito had already agreed on the conquest of the world, and all who urged that it was necessary to prepare for defense were assailed, attacked, and viciously criticized.

At the time General Donovan made his report and some of us called attention to the tremendous expenditure on the part of Hitler for Nazi propaganda, we were told that the money was being sent here to be hidden for Hitler and his gang. I am pleased that there were some of us that said, "No, that money has been sent here to be used for propaganda purposes to undermine the American people, to create discord and disunion." As has been testified before our courts under oath, he had plans laid through fifth columnists as early as 1933 to divide our Nation and bring about a revolution to obtain control of our Nation.

But that is water over the dam. I hope that from now on we will not pay a great deal of attention to propaganda emanating from the hirelings of Goebbels and others of his ilk. Unfortunately, many well-intentioned Americans have been led astray and I hope that they are commencing to realize that fact. It is high time that we begin to have perfect harmony and unity and I trust that unnecessary talks and attacks will be eliminated which might create and be responsible for any disunity. Of course, the gentleman from Mississippi calls attention to certain organizations which Congress has created, intimating that they are creating discord and disunity. Well, I will say this: All these organizations or bureaus which we have created I do not think have done as much harm as have those who accuse them. We are investigating their activities right along and we shall continue to do so. I regret that we do not pay more attention to the activities of some men and organizations who are actually endeavoring to create sectional prejudice and discord. Only today I received a letter from one of the organizations which is still functioning, which is un-American, yes, seditious. The communication was from the so-called "We, the Mothers, Mobilize for America, Inc.", and was signed by one Lyrl Clark Van Hyning. I quote from one of the paragraphs of the letter:

Bring our boys home; get out of the European theater of war, before we are further instrumental in imposing on Europe a worse totalitarian regime than that which we are fighting.

Mr. Speaker, I think that statement is not only seditious but treasonable. Yet there are some people who will say it is a patriotic organization. It savors of the type and kind of organization to which the 26 men belonged who were recently indicted on sedition charges.

Some gentlemen are under the impression that we are at war with Great Britain or with Russia, instead of being at war with Germany and Japan. They seem to disregard that fact. I hope that they will realize it in the interest of justice and fairness and in the interest of their own country, which I know they love and believe they want to remain as a country which has the respect of all peoples the world over. It is my fervent hope that it will forever remain a free nation under its Constitution and principles of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago at a hearing on a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] before the Committee on Rules calling for a continuation of the investigation by the Committee on the Civil Service to further investigate the employment of unnecessary employees in the various departments, I stated that I believe we have many thousands of Federal employees in Washington and throughout the United States who should be separated from the pay rolls.

Unfortunately, some newspapers did not carry my full statement with respect to those young commissioned officers who are seen in Washington and cities throughout the United States patronizing cocktail lounges, cabarets, and places of entertainment. My allusions were to those young commissioned officers who have not had overseas service, but who have been stationed in the United States in office or service positions, the duties of which could be performed by women and disabled overseas veterans. Neither did my statement apply to those officers stationed in the camps or naval training stations throughout the United States who are giving training to our young men who may be on furlough over a week end, and it most certainly did not apply to those officers who are arduously exerting their best efforts in improving our planes, guns, and implements of war. To the contrary, I feel that they are entitled to enjoy an opportunity to join with their friends in a cabaret or cocktail lounge, but unfortunately they cannot be accommodated because of the number of young commissioned officers in "soft" assignments who have been retained in the United States from 1 to 3 years. I would be the last man to be guilty of unfairly criticizing deserving officers.

Notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, I still maintain there are in this city, and other cities, too many young commissioned personnel who have been in service for 2 and 3 years who have not been sent across, and I cannot understand why unless it be that favoritism is shown them or influence used to keep them here in easy jobs. Mr. Speaker, I have received hundreds of letters. I am not going to read them now but I shall insert a few in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to substantiate my statements. These letters come from every section of the country, from far away California, far away Texas, and other sections. If only one-half of what these people say is true something should be done about it and I believe something will be done. I believe that the remarks I made previously, which received a great deal of publicity, has done a great deal of good. Mr. Speaker, if only a few thousand are sent overseas I shall have saved the Government some money and shall have done some good and at the same time have brought about a situation whereby some of these favored gentlemen who have plenty of time on their hands will not be around as much as they were and civilians and others will have a chance at the tables in some of these restaurants, although I am not especially interested in this aspect of it.

Mr. Speaker, I shall take no more of the time of the House with the exception of making this one statement: I have called to the attention of the War Department and the Navy Department that we have at this time some 4,000 retired officers. I admit that many of them may be too old for effective service. Nevertheless this group represents men who

have been schooled at our expense, they are graduates of West Point and Annapolis.

Mr. Speaker, just today I received a reply from Under Secretary of War Patterson to a communication which I addressed to him wherein I urged that in view of the shortage of manpower and the need to increase our forces abroad that the thousands of young officers to whom I have called attention should be sent abroad. I suggested that their assignments in the United States could be filled with women or discharged or disabled vterans. For the information of the House and the country, I insert his letter at this point, as follows:

JANUARY 15, 1945.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SABATH: I have your letter of January 8, 1945, in which you state that you have been informed that field recruitment of civilian personnel is being carried on at considerable expense with negligible results; that various offices in Washington are overstaffed, with consequent idleness (you enclose a clipping to this effect); that personnel are being protected in their positions; that Mr. RAMSPECK will probably continue his investigations of surplus personnel; and that you hope I will notify the heads of War Department divisions to release unnecessary employees.

The headquarters of the Army Service Forces, the largest users of War Department civilian employees in Washington, are conducting a field recruiting campaign to replace losses in Washington. Average monthly losses in this headquarters during the past 6 months have been 833 and average monthly accessions 593. Were it not for the recruiting campaign, the strength of the headquarters, which is about 80 percent civilian, would diminish below operating necessity.

In a large organization, such as the wartime War Department, it is possible that there are instances of idleness such as that claimed in the clipping, and that there may also be cases of protection of employees. It is unfortunate that the writers of such complaints do not specify the activity which employs such personnel, so that the matter might be investigated.

I can assure you that the War Department will welcome Mr. RAMSPECK's investigation of surplus personnel and will do everything in its power to assist him. While our record, perhaps, should be better, it is appropriate to remark that as of November 30, 1944, the War Department had achieved, since the peak in June 1943, a decrease of about 395,000 persons, of which 227,000 were military and 168,000 civilian. This decrease was in personnel operating zone of interior establishments, such as personnel processing installations; station complements; armament, equipment and supply procurement and maintenance agencies; hospitalization; and training centers and schools. The saving would have been greater were it not for the fact that as certain activities, such as station complements and training centers, go down, others, such as hospitalization and prisoner of war guards, go up.

The War Department has a manpower board and each major command has personnel controls units down through the echelons, working constantly on the better utilization of manpower within the Army. It is our policy to release soldiers for overseas as far as possible, and, if necessary, to replace these soldiers with civilians. We feel that this policy is sound, although it operates to hold down the saving in civilians. Should you so desire, I will have an officer who is thoroughly familiar with the War Department personnel policies and operations thereunder personally discuss these matters with you.

In compliance with your hope that I will notify the heads of War Department divisions to release unnecessary employees, I have sent, this date, a memorandum on the subject to the Deputy Chief of Staff. A copy of this memorandum is attached.

If I can further assist you in this important matter, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

In this connection, I insert 1 of at least 25 letters which I have received from retired officers which convincingly sets forth the facts and their desire to be recalled to service. Other than to say that this retired officer is from Wisconsin, I shall not give his name. His letter follows:

JANUARY 15, 1945.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: Reference your charge about the Army, I write to give you some positive information of misuse and lack of use of officers and hope it may interest you. There are over 4,500 retired officers of the Army of whom only 12 percent have been called to active duty though they draw 75 percent retired pay. Now it is probable that a fair percentage of these actually are too old and feeble to serve actively. That group might total 500 to 700 still leaving 3,800 or more available for swivel chair jobs which are now held by young, combat-able officers from lieutenant to colonel.

Let me give you a specific example of where over $1,000,000 a year could be saved by using these retired officers in Selective Service offices in the various States. If the officers—11 of them—on duty at Wisconsin State headquarters were replaced by retired officers, the saving here alone would total $50,000 a year. For example, after training for 24 years a lieutenant colonel of Chemical Warfare Reserve, sending him to Maryland twice every 3 years for 2 weeks active duty training, they assign him to Selective Service headquarters at Madison, Wis., instead of utilizing him for the specialty he was trained for.

I am a retired captain of nearly 18 years service in the Regular Army—Infantry. They pay this officer, the lieutenant colonel, nearly $7,000 a year. Yet right here I sit, available and asking for duty, only 53 years old, and physically able to do anything, drawing $3,000 a year retired pay, available for active duty for only $1,332 more a year than it costs the Government now to have me doing nothing for it. Over $5,668 would be saved in this one case.

Selective Service duty is but one of 30 or 40 jobs such retired officers could fill. For example, we have a major at Truax Airfield here, who is in charge of the sales commissary. He has a first lieutenant, assistant. I could replace any one of them. They have captains and majors as public relations officers. I am a trained professional newspaperman, fully capable of such work, yet I am not used. I could name you 30 different assignments these retired officers could be put to at service commands headquarters, colleges, plants, etc., where physical condition means little or nothing.

Although the General Staff will offer numerous explanations for their failure to use these retired officers, these are nothing but fake alibis. There is no substantial justification for not using these capable, long-trained, professional soldiers in any emergency, and, to listen to Mr. Byrnes, such emergency seems to exist, though the War Department doesn't seem to realize it. Instead of being the last to realize this, it ought to be the first.

It takes many years to acquaint an officer with the ramificatione of Army regulations and their application in various exigencies. An officer of the Reserve, with little active duty, knows little about these. But here you have a mass of professionals who at least could hold down most of the administrative jobs now held by physically capable younger officers of combat-duty age. It's nothing short of a crime that they are not used.

Very truly yours.

The following is an excerpt from a letter received from a gentleman who is a resident of Washington who urges that some of the young Navy commissioned personnel in Washington be given sea duty:

It is my opinion that you are correct in this statement but you only know just a little concerning them, let me give you some information. First, when these men find that they are going to be drafted, they dig heaven and hell in order to get a commission so that they can stay in the department and will not have to serve overseas. Two years of college will make an ensign, while 4 years will make a lieutenant, and you may have had this college training in botany or just ordinary bug chasing, and still become a great Navy officer, and after this commission has been bestowed upon them they are generally placed in a job with nothing to do but act and treat people like they were little gods, meting out justice. Some of them sit at their desks and consider the employees as nothing, and these same men cock their hats sideways on their heads and are foreverlasting strutting up and down the halls, while at other times they are in locked rooms playing poker.

You are not the only one to feel resentment toward these draft dodgers, the entire Navy civilian personnel have the same attitude and no respect for them at all. You must bear in mind these same civilians have their sons and their husbands in the service and at the front, and many of them have been killed, and naturally it hurts to see these cowards don an officer's uniform and stay within the sacred precincts of the Navy Department, not even doing the work of a messenger, but walking up and down the hallways all during the day, or lording it over the personnel with a contemptuous attitude to all but their own ilk.

I also insert excerpts from a letter received from a soldier in California, who complains as to the services of some officers and enlisted personnel, as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1945.

DEAR SIR: I read your article in the Los Angeles Times about there being 30,000 officers too many and could be replaced by girls and messenger boys, I admire your courage by putting such an article in the papers, because all what you have said is true and more so. The officers, especially in the A. T. C., are only wasting taxpayer's money. Most of the officers are stationed close to the town they used to live in. Everytime Cincinnati tries to ship them out, they get an extension by writing back that they have so much to do and cannot be replaced, which isn't true. In my estimation I don't think they earn 5 cents an hour for the amount of work they do, they are having one grand time on the taxpayers' expense, if you do not believe it, just come around to the Palm Springs Army Air Base, Calif., and see for yourself.

I cannot see why they need so many officers, why not make them do something or give them a discharge, at least they will be less expense for the taxpayers.

The enlisted men also are only wasting their time in the Army, by doing unnecessary work, which has nothing to do with winning the war, such as planting grass and trees in the desert. Some of the men have been trying to get shipped overseas, but, of

course, the officers have Cincinnati fooled and say that the men are needed here. So why draft IV–F's when there are too many men doing nothing in the Army without the IV–F's coming into the Army just like us, and only wasting taxpayers' money. I could go on and on like this but I know it will not do any good.

I, for one, have been in the Army for over 3½ years, and didn't do anything to help win the war. I have been overseas, but I still say that I have wasted taxpayers' money. I cannot print my name because I would only spend the rest of my life in the guardhouse, there is no such thing as freedom of speech in the Army.

I believe if there were more men like you, with enough courage to say what you think and see, it would help to break up this happy family affair and the war would end much sooner.

JUST A SOLDIER WHO CANNOT PRINT
HIS NAME FOR HIS OWN PROTECTION.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the War and Navy Departments to give these experienced and able retired officers the opportunity of serving their country in view of the shortage of manpower in the armed services. They are patriotic and the obtaining of their services will save the Government millions of dollars and due to their experience they will serve the interests of the Nation with greater efficiency than the newly commissioned inexperienced young officers.

I hope, in conclusion, that I have expressed my views to the satisfaction of some of the officers who may have felt that I unfairly classified them as idlers.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the full 30 minutes. I am sure we all appreciate the interesting address made by the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee. He is to be commended for his effort to see that all personnel in the Government, whether it be in the Army, the Navy, or elsewhere, which is not absolutely required be placed where it will render necessary service and relieve the manpower shortage which is causing so much distress and apprehension throughout the length and breadth of the Nation at the moment.

I am not going to discuss the pending legislative bill at all. I speak only as a member of the Rules Committee. The function of the Rules Committee is to make it possible for needed legislation to come before the House, to give legislation its day in court. Therefore, the only question before the House at the moment is, Shall the rule permitting this naval bill be considered by the House at once?

If this rule is agreed to, there will be, first, 1 hour's general debate on the bill, then it will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. To the new Members may I say that any of you under the 5-minute rule, will be permitted to offer any germane amendment you see fit to offer to any provision of the bill. In addition to that, if any of you have any observations that you desire to make about the bill, all you have to do is to rise when a section has been read and say, "Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word:" then you will be recognized for 5 minutes and you may express your views, even though you do not really want to amend the bill.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The bill before us is a very general one and we cannot understand it without having the hearings and indulging in a great many hours of work in order to determine just what it is for. First, no one wants to interfere with the war work. All we are interested in is determining whether this is absolutely necessary for the welfare of the country at this time. If it is not, that is another thing, but the responsibility lies with the Committee on Naval Affairs because it is that committee that has gone over this and knows all about it. The individual Members of the Congress cannot be expected in the time allotted to us for consideration of the bill to determine whether it is necessary or not; so we have to put great reliance on the Naval Affairs Committee, if this bill is to be enacted, that the bill is what it is intended and for the best interests of our country.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it what the gentleman says is a truism recognized by all of us. I assume he favors the rule?

Mr. RICH. I am not going to offer any objection to the rule, although I am thinking of the responsibility of the Congress for passing this bill involving a billion and a half dollars of expenditure in the length of time allotted for its consideration on the floor of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know just what the gentleman's remarks contemplate.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman let me explain that?

Mr. MICHENER. I will if it does not take too long. What is it the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. RICH. The gentleman makes the statement that we have the privilege and the right, if things contained herein are not right, to amend this bill. I say to the gentleman and I say to the members of the committee and to the Members of the Congress that the Members of the House do not have the opportunity to do that because we have not the time. I do not know exactly what all the items are for; therefore, we have to put our full faith in the Naval Affairs Committee and assume that the members of that committee are doing the right thing because they are the ones who have attended the hearings and they are responsible for the amount contained in the bill. We do not know anything about the various points contained in the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has reiterated a truism with which we are all familiar. It is impossible for every one of the 435 Members to speak on every bill. The spade work, the hearings, and the investigations cannot be done on the floor. If such procedure were attempted the House just could not function; therefore, we have the committee system. This bill was introduced and was referred to the Naval Committee. The House had notice when the bill was introduced. The committee held hearings. Any Member of the Congress had a right to go before the committee. He had a right and he had a duty to study the bill. Then, when the bill comes to the floor, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it is in charge of the legislative committee reporting the bill, which committee is familiar with the hearings and is familiar with the purposes and the terms of the bill. The Committee on Rules does not have the advantage of that study. The Committee on Rules does not hold general hearings on the merits of the bill. It has only such superficial information as is given to it by the legislative committee proposing the bill.

Therefore, as a member of the Rules Committee, I shall not attempt to discuss the details of the bill. I am sure that this very responsible, this very capable, this very worth-while, this very courageous committee—and I do not always agree with it—will present its facts to the House telling us why we should pass this bill. After we have heard that explanation, if we do not agree with it, it is not only our privilege, but it is our duty to vote against the bill. So I am not going to take another minute's time.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further call for time on this side.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 626, with Mr. MONRONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Ship repair and laying-up facilities, $230,222,000; fleet training facilities, amphibious and operational, $12,000,000; aviation facilities, $74,500,000; storage facilities, $19,950,000; Marine Corps housing and training, $14,190,000; ordnance facilities, $65,500,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $40,022,000; hospital facilities, $28,519,000; shore radio facilities, $3,230,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $225,000; miscellaneous structures and facilities, $41,265,000; advance base construction, material, and equipment, $936,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate

cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed $1,515,623,000.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy from time to time, but not less frequently than every 60 days, shall transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisitions of land, by lease or otherwise, effected under the authority of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the Naval Affairs Committee has presented to the House a bill to authorize the construction of continental public works and the procurement of equipment and materials and their installation at outlying and advance bases, the total amount involved being $1,500,549,500.

The program is divided into two main categories which are the procurement for and construction of advance and outlying bases, $986,000,000; and continental construction, $529,623,000.

In support of this program there have appeared before the committee Vice Admiral Horne, representing the Chief of Naval Operations; Lieutenant General Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, and all of the bureau chiefs of the Navy Department.

The testimony of these officers indicates that each and every one is fully aware of the vital necessity of reducing expenditures for prosecuting the war to an absolute and irreducible minimum consistent with the successful conduct of our war operations and the adequate training and care of our fighting personnel.

The Navy Department has set up a very meticulous and careful screening procedure to guarantee that no construction project will be undertaken within the continental limits of the United States unless it is in fact essential for war purposes. This screening process is followed when a project is originally proposed for authorization. When the project has been included in the authorized list and the time comes for funds to be released for its construction, it is again subjected to a more intensive screening procedure.

The bill now before the House represents a reduction of approximately $540,000,000 in the total amount of projects which were considered necessary by the field forces of the Navy Department and is the considered judgment of the responsible bureaus and offices of the Navy Department as the minimum that should be provided during the next fiscal year.

Admiral Horne and the Bureau chiefs have, however, emphasized very strongly the fact that this is a war program and that the uncertainty of war makes it essential that the Department be given a certain degree of freedom in its handling of the program. The program covers the period up to June 30, 1946, and it is obvious that the rapidly changing war conditions, as exemplified by the recent German offensive on the European front, cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty for a period as far in advance as that.

While the Department is reasonably sure of the approximate amount of developments which they will be called upon to undertake, there may be some changes in detail to meet changing needs. A typical example is the recently expanded rocket-production program which a year ago had not been anticipated but which now, as a result of actual battle experience, has become the most important construction program on the Navy's list. We trust that the Navy will be able to develop other new and powerful weapons which will justify the expenditure of funds in order to save the lives and limbs of our fighting men.

In conformity with agreements reached with the Navy Department, the Naval Affairs Committee retains a continuous control of projects in the United States. All land and property acquisitions, by purchase or lease, are cleared in advance with the Naval Affairs Committee. All projects for permanent construction which were not justified in detail by the Bureau chiefs are also discussed with the Naval Affairs Committee, and all projects which were not in the original program are listed with the Naval Affairs Committee by the Department.

The detailed program presented to the Naval Affairs Committee was supported by the various bureau chiefs with an individual justification for each project and these justifications are on file with the committee. It was made clear that the Department and the bureau chiefs are thoroughly aware of the fact that the limited manpower and material situation are such that no project can be undertaken without resulting in an interference with some other important war work and therefore it behooves them to eliminate any project which is not essential.

With respect to the authorization for procurement and construction of advance and outlying bases, the works to be provided by this item are essential to support the active operations of the fleets, naval aviation and the marines in the active theaters of war. Therefore, while the individual projects undertaken with these funds by the fleet commanders must be in accord with general strategic plans developed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the specific plans developed by the Chief of Naval Operations, considerable freedom must be given to fleet commanders to shift their construction forces in the field with the changing dispositions of their own and the enemy forces. Without knowing what the enemy movements will be during the next year, it is impossible to state the locations and the extent of the developments which will be undertaken with these funds, just as it is impossible to state where and to what extent ammunition will be expended by the fleets during the coming year.

The procedures followed in this bill are exactly the same as those which have been followed since the outbreak of war and our past experience justifies the confidence which we have reposed in the Navy Department in the handling of these funds. The results obtained to date speak for themselves.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Of these expenditures which are being made are there any contained in the bill not pertaining directly to the war effort, which could be deferred until some future time for the benefit of the Navy, or which projects might be delayed now in order to save manpower so that we could use that manpower directly in the winning of this war?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has asked that question. I want to take this opportunity to welcome him back to the House of Representatives because for a great many years he was one of the outstanding Members of the House. I know my sentiments are shared by everybody who had the pleasure of serving with him.

Now, I asked that identical question of Admiral Horne. I said, "Admiral, this committee wants to know if in your opinion and that of Admiral King it is absolutely necessary for every one of these expenditures to be made to aid in the prosecution of the war?" The admiral said, "I consider it absolutely essential to aid in the prosecution of the war that every one of these items be authorized in this bill." That is the very reason why we have left out the $15,083,500 for the naval airfield at Annapolis, because it had no direct bearing or relationship to the successful prosecution of the war since it related to a course of instruction at the academy over a period of years, coupled with the fact that the course is now so accelerated that they could not have an aviation training program even if they had the airfield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the members of his committee for having their minds centered on spending that money on nothing but that which is essential and necessary for the prosecution of the war. As evidence of that it is gratifying to me to see that the committee screened out this $15,000,000. I hope that every committee of the House of Representatives dealing with matters of this kind, in view of our great national debt and heavy expenditures and taxes, will follow the course pursued here by the gentleman and his fine Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. May I say that I will not hesitate to yield at any time to any members of the committee for any question, and if any member wants infor-

mation we will try to furnish it. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Under "Personnel and training and housing facilities" you have an item of $40,022,000. Is it possible under the item of personnel and housing facilities to build structures that will be necessary for the prosecution of the war but which can be used after the war profitably for naval training in the western part of the United States?

Mr. VINSON. I doubt very seriously whether much of the construction that has already taken place outside of the permanent Naval Establishment will be utilized in a program that may be maintained in a post-war period. Most of the construction is of a temporary character. Under the project of personnel housing and training there is contemplated housing for transient naval personnel, a total of 2,271 units, at a total cost of $6,865,200.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Where is that report?

Mr. VINSON. It may so happen that in the prosecution of this war, changing as rapidly as it does, that not a single one of these items I have just read will be built. As I visualize it, today there are items they think may be necessary, but we particularly write in the bill a flexibility that enables them in the prosecution of the war to omit any of these items and substitute in lieu thereof any other item of greater importance in the prosecution of the war they think should go into a construction program in lieu of this.

In the last bill there was included something like a billion dollars along this line. Of that amount $165,000,000 was used for things other than those enumerated. What we are trying to do is to keep as close tab on these expenditures as possible.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Can the gentleman state the location of the structures in the Eleventh Naval District?

Mr. VINSON. No. It may change tomorrow; and for that very reason I would not advise any Member—while this is public, anybody can come to the committee room and get it—I would not advise any Member of Congress sending a telegram to his district that there is going to be a forty or fifty million dollar project in his district, because by the time the telegram reaches there the war might have changed the entire picture and nothing would be built there at all. For that very reason we do not make it a part of the report, but we use it as our basis and our justification. If things run along as they are today this will be adhered to very strictly.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In the work that is being prosecuted outside the United States—I do not feel at liberty to ask what it was spent for, I would not want to do that for publicity purposes—I should like to ask whether in cases where money has been spent on foreign soil the interests of the United States have been looked after relative to what use we can make of those facilities over a term of years or permanently so that we will have some satisfaction—let us put it that way—some satisfaction from the money that is spent in these foreign countries by our Navy in order that we may get some benefit from this money at some future time. I do not want to mention anything in particular because I do not want to give anything away.

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania has raised the question of expenditures outside the country. I should like, first, to complete the matter of expenditures within the continental United States, and then I will take up the question of expenditures outside the United States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee with respect to section 4 of this bill proposed as a committee amendment this question: Is it the purpose by section 4 to prevent the disposition of any property other than that authorized under the terms of this act?

Mr. VINSON. It is the purpose of the section the gentleman just referred to to prohibit the sale of auxiliary ships, barges, and so forth, that might have been disposed of by the terms of the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman permit me to proceed further in that connection?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am entirely in sympathy with the purpose to prohibit the disposal of auxiliary ships essential to the operation of combat vessels, but, as far as I am concerned, I do not think any qualification of existing law is necessary. Certainly the proposed amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Just a minute on that. No auxiliary ship may be disposed of, within the terms of the Surplus Property Act, unless the Navy Department recommends it as being surplus. I call the gentleman's attention to the language of section 4 of that title "Title to All Ships." The phrase, "Auxiliary ships or vessels," is not mentioned. "Boats, barges, and floating drydocks of the Navy Department shall remain in the United States" and shall not be disposed of under the Surplus Property Act.

With all deference to the gentleman, it strikes me that language is entirely too broad and that it would prevent the Navy Department from disposing of the craft that have been acquired by the Navy and that are not being used at all, and this applies to a boat of any kind or any converted yacht. I wonder if that is not going too far; because we have passed the Surplus Property Disposal Act and if we commence in every authorization bill to limit disposition of that property as to any department, whether it be the War Department or the Navy Department, we will wind up without any disposal of surplus war property.

Mr. VINSON. Let me clear that up. Under the Surplus Property Act definitions the term "property" means any interest owned by the United States or any Government agency in real or personal property of any kind wherever located, but does not include public domain or land withdrawn or reserved from the public domain; second, naval vessels of the following categories: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines. Therefore, under the Surplus Property Disposal Act the word "property" does not include battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, or submarines.

The definition of "property" as fixed in the Surplus Property Act does include auxiliaries of every type in the Navy; therefore, the surplus property organization, if it is coupled up with another law, lease-lend, for instance, prohibits certain things. It is stated, "After consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, or both," in which case they could sell the great auxiliary fleet or transfer it or let the title go.

The position of the Committee on Naval Affairs is simply that the auxiliary, which is the train or supporting fleet to the battleships, must be maintained by the Government, as well as the battleships and other combatant ships. We have no objection to their being leased and lent if the war emergency requires it, but we do not want the taxpayers' money to be invested to the extent of millions of dollars in an auxiliary fleet and have it sold without the Congress having a voice in the matter and Congress controlling the situation. If it becomes necessary to lay it up we do not want the Chief of Naval Operations to reach the conclusion that it should be sold.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am asking these questions, not in any spirit of controversy, but in order to clear up the matter because the House devoted much consideration to this matter in passing the Surplus Property Act in August and September 1944; but, with all deference, those auxiliary vessels could not be disposed of under the Surplus Property Act unless the Secretary of the Navy recommended it, and, having familiarity with that act, may I say that I have no objection to clarifying it to include auxiliary vessels. I do want to call attention to the fact that the language here applies to all ships, to boats, to barges, and so forth.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. It does apply to floating drydocks as well. How are we repairing the damaged ships in the Pacific? By floating drydocks.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Are they the same thing as auxiliary vessels?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. They are classified as an auxiliary vessel. The Surplus Property Act retains in the Congress the right of disposal of the battleships and other vessels in the combatant class, but we do not retain by use of the definition "property" the auxiliary vessels.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. In connection with the definition of an auxiliary, it may be true that a floating drydock does not come within the technical terminology of an auxiliary to the Navy, but it does come within that general classification of auxiliaries so far as the Surplus Property Disposal Act is concerned.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have no objection to clarifying it in that regard.

Mr. VINSON. That is all we do. The Committee on Naval Affairs is of one mind, and that is, we do not propose to sit by and see this great navy that we have built up, which will maintain peace in future years, scrapped or disposed of unless the Congress has a voice in the matter.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I read section 4 it says:

> Notwithstanding any provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, title to all ships, boats, barges, and floating drydocks of the Navy Department shall remain in the United States.

And so forth. In short, section 4 repeals any provision in the Surplus Property Act dealing with the class of craft named in section 4.

Mr. VINSON. I would say that was correct. We did it deliberately. We did it because the word "property" is defined in the Surplus Property Act to include this type of ship, and we want to exclude from that the interpretation under the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the word "boats" would include craft of all kind, including the many yachts that were sold at a nominal value to the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. If you adopt this bill, they will not be able to do it until the Congress has authorized it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It would be a mistake if you did. The Surplus Property Act would be crippled.

Mr. VINSON. This is a matter of great importance, and I truly trust with this clarification in it there will not be any hesitancy on the part of this committee approving what we have done because, as I have stated, we have to retain this Navy instead of giving it away or scrapping it. The bill provides $99,000,000 for places to put up this Navy instead of destroying it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on that section of the bill, for I know at the present time there are things in the Army that they are disposing of that they do not know whether they are going to need until this war is over.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. RICH. And I congratulate the Navy on taking that step because the Army, I know, is selling things that I am afraid they are going to need before the war is over with.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly. In regard to the bases outside of continental United States, for which some $900,000,000 is provided here, as the campaign progresses further towards Tokyo, it is necessary to establish new bases. They cannot tell today where they are going to establish them. We did not even go into it, because they do not know themselves. We know where we have established bases. We have established a permanent base, as near as permanent can be, on the Island of Guam. We are establishing facilities at Saipan. We have established facilities at Kwajalein. We have established facilities at Guadalcanal and other places. The type of expenditures there is based upon the military campaign.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the Navy heads knew where we were going to establish those bases, it would certainly be improper to disclose it.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly. When we came down to the various items, we tried to be realistic and we tried to be practical. We just said, "Admiral, we see that you have an item here of over $900,000,000 for bases in the Pacific." "Yes," he said, "we may need more than that, and we not need that much, but we figured in our own minds now that the way we have the campaign mapped out it will probably cost that amount to establish bases and so we ask for it." We cannot estimate it and neither can they but we have to trust these men and we are trusting them. They are rendering a great service to the country, and are bringing victory to our cause.

Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the question has been raised by some Members as to the thoroughness with which the Naval Committee undertook to survey the recommendations of the Navy Department. I suggest that you put yourselves in our position sitting on the committee as we were, the Navy Department coming before us and saying, "This is the minimum requirement that we know we need in order to carry on the war." What would you do? Would you raise a controversy over a small particular item? Would you undertake to go through the program with the finest of fine-tooth combs, or would you look at it from the broad standpoint? I am sure that you all agree with the attitude of the committee; we tried to inquire as thoroughly as we could into the particular items, but principally we relied upon the recommendations of the officials who have the responsibilities of doing this tremendous job. Especially did we rely upon their recommendations in view of the assurance given to the committee by Admiral Horne, Vice Chief of Operations, whose job it is to see that the tools are made and are in place and that the bases are established at the time they are needed. Upon his assurance of the various steps taken by the Navy Department itself in screening these various projects as they were received by the Department from the officers in the field, we felt that the Navy had been unusually thorough in its consideration of the necessity of the items.

These various steps total nine. They are included in the report, but in case none of you have had an opportunity to study the report, I will briefly call them to your attention. First, the item is recommended by the commanding officer in the field. He knows his local situation. He knows his responsibilities. He sees that a certain thing has to be done. He recommends to the Department that it be done. In addition to that, the Department itself initiates projects of its own accord to be developed and constructed in the field. That is the first step.

The second step is the submission of all these projects to the Bureau of Yards and Docks, which has the job of building them.

The third step is the review of the public-works program by the Bureau of Yards and Docks and the submission by that Bureau to the Chief of Naval Operations. Then the Chief of Naval Operations surveys all the recommendations, and his decisions are based upon the military necessity for each individual item. His recommendations are submitted to the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary then refers the entire program to the Judge Advocate General for the preparation of appropriate legislation. After it is prepared, it is submitted to the Budget Bureau.

Heretofore the Budget Bureau has been rather critical of the Navy's requests for funds. I feel that we would not perform our duty to the House if we did not advise the House that in this instance the Budget Bureau did not reduce any of the items recommended by the Navy Department.

Then it goes from the Budget Bureau back to the Judge Advocate General and is submitted by the Judge Advocate General to the Speaker of the House and to the President of the Senate, and referred to the committees where again it is considered. Bear in mind that after this authorization is adopted the Navy people have to come back again to the Congress and go to the Committee on Appropriations for the money and again they will have to substantiate their requests.

I cannot conceive how any system could be more thorough or more complete than this system has been when we consider the responsibilities of the job.

There is a paragraph in the bill, as the Members will note, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to acquire land wherever it is necessary. It should have been brought to your attention that the law requires, or if the law does not require it, it is the practice of the Navy Department, that before the Navy acquires any bit of land in any place within the continental limits of the United States or our insular or Territorial possessions, the Navy comes to the Committee on Naval Affairs, whether it be for a lease of land or for the acquisition of title to

land, and justifies its particular needs. The committee then must put its stamp of approval upon that land acquisition or the land is not acquired. Already in the past 3 years I think the committee has surveyed some 2,000 or 3,000 pieces of property. If that number is not correct, I hope the chairman will correct me.

A question in regard to advance base construction perhaps arises in your minds which might well be answered, What is done with our land bases as our military machine rolls along farther and farther into the Pacific and these bases which were so essential a year or 2 years ago become practically useless? What becomes of our naval equipment and of the land installations? Are they turned over to the local governments? Are they dismantled and moved forward? What is the picture?

We were assured by Admiral Horne, and I think it is no military confidence, that wherever possible every item of naval equipment, whether it is afloat or ashore, that can be used miles in advance is used. Every bit that is salvageable is salvaged. As to the remainder, the title still remains in the United States. We have not disposed of any of our naval equipment in any of the advance bases to any of the local authorities.

A question has been raised with regard to section 4 which I am very happy has been brought to the attention of the House because of my own personal interest in it. Public Act No. 1 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the first bill the Seventy-eighth Congress passed in 1943, provided that no ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock could be disposed of except in accordance with the terms of the Lend-Lease Act of March 11, 1941. That was attached to the public works bill, as I recall it, similarly as this section 4 is attached to this bill.

In 1943 the Congress determined that not a ship sailing under the flag of the United States Navy should be disposed of in any way except as we had previously authorized its lease to foreign countries under the Lend-Lease Act. That has been established as a matter of policy by the Congress. Subsequent to that law came the Surplus Property Act, which by its definitions made possible the disposition of all types of naval craft except the combatant type. That would include floating drydocks, barges, oil tankers, and landing craft. These enormous ships that take the tanks right up to the shore could be disposed of. As the chairman has so very well said, it is the opinion of the committee that it is for the Congress to determine at some future date how and when any of the ships will be disposed of and how and what ships will be retained.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the House has before it today a naval construction bill which authorizes a further expenditure of $1,500,549,500. The purpose of this bill is to expand the already huge public-works program in order that the needs of the Navy in its many activities can be fully met. Nearly one billion of the sum authorized in this bill will be spent on advanced base construction and for material and equipment. The needs of the fleet as it advances into the far western Pacific are becoming greater and greater as time goes on, and we should lose no time in seeing to it that all of the facilities needed to support the fleet are given approval in the quickest possible time. Not only are the fighting lines being extended but the size of the Navy is being expanded at a tremendous rate. The combat strength of the Navy—meaning its fighting ships—on January 1, 1941, was approximately 1,250,000 tons. On January 1, 1945, the fighting strength was 3,893,000 tons, having tripled the tonnage during the last 4 years. Four years ago we had 321 fighting ships. As of January 1 this year we have 1,167 fighting ships. This also shows a threefold increase in the same 4-year period. In addition to the combat ships, we have the various types of patrol and auxiliary ships, landing craft, and district craft. Four years ago the combined tonnage of all these classifications, including combat ships, was 1,984,000 tons. January 1 this year it reached the staggering total of 11,707,000 tons. This shows an increase of nearly sixfold in the over-all tonnage of our Navy in the period of 4 short years. These were ships actually on hand on January 1, 1945, and takes into full account the ship losses in action and the transfer of certain vessels, especially escort carriers, destroyer escorts, and landing craft to Allied nations, none of which are included in these totals. We have gone a long way in ship construction during this 4-year period of time. The speed with which we build ships is amazing. For instance, in the year just closed—1944—we built 1,313,497 tons of fighting ships. This was more than the total tonnage of the combat fleet as it existed 4 years ago. We are all filled with pride as we read the papers day by day showing the magnificent work the Navy is doing in the many parts of the world. We are fast reaching the most crucial hour when the American Navy will give a full account of itself in combat action with the main Japanese Fleet. The Japs, we know, cannot delay this action. It will be the supreme test as to whether or not the American or the Japanese Navy will control the waters of the far-off Pacific. As this time approaches, we have complete confidence that the American Navy will uphold the great traditions of the past and will wipe the Japanese Fleet off the seas. We all know that today the mightiest naval armada the world has ever seen stands guard over our operations in the Philippines. You know, too, that that fleet is manned by sailors as competent and courageous as any who ever went to sea. But ships and men are not the entire Navy by any means. What I have to say deals with the third component of our fleet—the naval bases in the combat zones and the vital public-works establishment thousands of miles from the action which makes it possible for the fleet to fight.

You will remember when the grim realization struck us that we would have to have a two-ocean fleet. You will also remember the way our shipyards went to work. I am sure you will recall how the Nation's press heralded the growth in the size of the fleet and the increase in the numbers of men who man it. But shore installations are not as glamorous, so you did not hear much about them. The story of their development is, I know, of great interest to the Members of the House and the American people as a whole.

Since the beginning of the emergency in July 1940, the Navy's shore facilities have increased 11 times over. We started with a shore establishment valued at about $600,000,000. By December 1 of last year, we had added enough fleet facilities, air stations, hospitals, ordnance plants, shipbuilding and repair facilities, and all the other components of the Navy ashore to bring its value to more than $6,790,000,000. It had been probably the most varied and widespread construction program ever undertaken in history. It has been carried on by the Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks, under the magnificent leadership of the Chief of the Bureau, Admiral Ben Moreell, and at a pace equal to the ever-increasing demands of the fleet.

Just to give you an idea of some of the specific projects that program has included: A bililon and a half dollars—$1,521,735,000—has gone into the building of naval aviation facilities alone. Established air stations have been expanded, and more than 30 major new stations and 25 important auxiliary stations have been built from the ground up, including the world's largest at Corpus Christi, Tex.

Our navy yards have become virtual manufacturing cities whose product is the fighting ships of the fleet. The Norfolk, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and west coast navy yards have been expanded to a size where they are hardly recognizable, and at New York alone more than $100,000,000 has been spent for battleship graving docks, shops, and utilities.

Well over a half billion dollars—$539,934,000—has gone into the building of ordnance facilities which are producing the shells the fleet is pouring in ever-increasing quantities at the enemy. Nearly as much more—$499,350,309—has been spent for training camps to train the men who are firing those shells and manning the ships. Another $163,000,000 has been spent for hospitals and dispensaries in order that those who are the casualties of this war may have adequate facilities and the best possible care that medical science can provide.

I could go on with statistics on the Navy's construction program, but they are not as important now as the significance of this program. The bill before us today provides for the expansion of these facilities which will be constructed under direction of the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy. They are as important to the operation of the fleet as the ships themselves. It is an integral part of the fleet. Without adequate shore facilities, the finest ships and men in the world would be able to function only for a limited time. Every naval ship or aircraft, regardless of the type, is dependent

upon shore-based facilities for its maintenance. The larger the ship the longer she can remain at sea, but sooner or later the time comes when her own crew and fleet repair ships cannot give her the general overhaul she needs. The same is as true of the men aboard the ships. All the recreational facilities in the world cannot take the place of a port and dry land.

Before the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor, you will remember that the Navy's advanced bases were constructed by civilian contractors under contract to the Bureau of Yards and Docks. A number of these contractors had joined together and pooled their resources to build advanced bases both in the Pacific and the Atlantic. They did as good a job as could be expected from civilians and it was entirely adequate until the Japs struck. But these men did not have either the equipment, the discipline, or the knowledge of how to fight. They were defenseless at Cavite, at Guam, and at Wake Island. The Japs captured them. And let me tell you—the Japs never made a worse mistake. Their fate gave birth to the organization of men known as the Navy's fighting Seabees, who not only could build but who can fight if necessary as they have done shoulder to shoulder with the marines. In this war tributes can be paid to men in practically every branch of our fighting forces—on land, in the air, on the water, and under the sea. But today as we consider this naval construction program, I want to pay tribute to the construction men of the Navy—the Seabees and officers of the Civil Engineer Corps, whose job it is to cooperate with the fighting forces of the Navy and the Army, too, and to build for them the facilities they need. Their skill and courage in this respect have earned them honor for all time to come. Without their amazing speed of construction and their contempt for enemy bombs, snipers, and bullets, our forces would not be in the Philippines today, and without the vast shore establishments which were authorized by Congress and which the Navy has built in this country, the size of the fleet would have outstripped its support—the roots would have been too small for the tree. If today, I speak of the Seabees in a laudatory way, it is only because of the wholesome and sincere respect I have for the men of this organization and the splendid work they have done in the present conflict.

Like all of you, I had heard in a general way what the Seabees have done. I had heard that they performed miracles of construction and they could handle guns as well as they could bulldozers. But I did not know specifically what they have done until I inquired into it much further. The more I learned the higher my admiration grew for these construction men, these men who have been building the way to victory.

In the first place, the Seabees have brought an amazing amount of construction experience into the war. They are not kids. In some of the battalions the average age runs as high as 35 years, and a large percent are well over 40 years of age. What do you think that means? Well, for one thing it means that many of them were beyond draft age and when they enlisted they did it because they knew that they had something to contribute to the war effort. They were willing to give up war wages during boomtime construction to go out and fight at enlisted men's pay. What is more, a far higher percentage of these Seabees were married and had children than any other branch of the service—in other words, the Seabees for the most part started out by making a sacrifice. And when men will do that, you may feel certain that they mean business.

For the most part the Seabees were highly skilled men who were determined to do a job, and the Navy had to have officers who knew their business, too, in order to hold the respect of these men. The logical thing was done. The same men—engineers and contractors—who had bossed these men in civilian life were brought into the Navy's Civil Engineer Corps. The combination has produced everything the Navy hoped it would.

The first Seabee detachment to leave the States sailed in January of 1942. It was such a critical time and the need for a fueling base on the way to Australia was so great that the men had no time for training and only enough ammunition to fight for about 6 minutes. They landed on the island of Bora Bora in the Societies and went to work. Yes; they built the base and in time to receive fuel from a group of tankers. That is all we in the United States ever heard. Well, here is just one incident about that job we did not hear. No masks were available for the men who welded the pipe line. So they improvised helmets out of gas masks and cut pieces of glass out of windows to serve as eye protectors. But the sparks frosted this glass until finally they had no more. Do you think that stopped them? Not the Seabees. They used their hands to protect their eyes and peeked through the slits of their fingers while they welded. And all the time it was raining. If you do not know it, operating a welding torch in the rain is about like sticking your finger in a light socket. But the pipe line was ready in time.

It was not long after that the Japs came on down to Guadalcanal and commenced building an airfield. They had already begun when a battalion of Seabees landed at Espiritu Santo and also began to build an airfield. It was one of the war's most critical races. Whoever won that race would be able to send land-based bombers at the other. If the Japs won, it also would have made their way to Australia much easier. But you know who won, and, what is more, the Seabees finally came in and finished the Japs' work at Henderson Field. That was the time when the situation in the South Pacific was a touch-and-go affair. That was the time when the fighting marines, and later the One Hundred and Eighty-second Infantry, United States Army, as well as the fleet, was battling it out with the Japs in the Solomon area. That was the time when for months on end our Solomon offensive hung by a slender thread. That was the time when we had but one carrier left in the Pacific; and, gentlemen, that was only a little over 2 years ago. We have come a long way since then, but the work of the Seabees usually makes but one line in a newspaper, and usually you will find it down toward the end of the story. It will read like this: "Work was immediately begun on construction of an airfield."

Let me give you just one instance of what that involved. When the invasion of Segi Island in the South Pacific was contemplated the Civil Engineer Corps had to send its engineers into shore secretly long before the invasion in order to survey the site and stake out where the field was to be built. And at this island they had to play hide and seek with Jap patrols in order to do it. Finally, the time came for the invasion, and within an hour, bulldozers were smashing into the jungle, clearing for the strip. Of course, it was raining, and the mud was so deep the machinery bogged down. The Seabees had to build a camp in which to live, and roads to bring in supplies, and fuel dumps to supply the planes when the field was finished. They worked days and they worked under lights at night despite enemy bombers. Every day it rained torrents. But 10 days and 22 hours later, a fighter plane came in on a hard packed coral strip. Just compare that with the experience some of you have had in obtaining airports for your home communities.

And these Seabees can do more than build. Consider for a moment what they did at Los Negros Island in the Admiralties. The Army's dismounted Cavalry units had made the assault and the stage was set for the arrival of the Seabees. Their job was to restore the airfield. The only trouble was that the Japs launched a powerful counterattack the night before the Seabees arrived. The attack had driven our forces back to within 200 feet of the beach, so the Seabees found that they were landing almost in the middle of a battlefield. Fortunately they can fight as well as they can build.

The second piece of equipment to come ashore was a ditching machine operated by Clifford Dorian, of Okanogan, Wash. It did not stop at the beach, but kept right on going to the front lines. Another Seabee protected him with a tommy gun. These two went back and forth digging trenches for the men while Jap snipers did their worst to stop them. And at the same time, the Seabee bulldozers pushed out in front of the front lines, clearing fire lanes for the Army's guns.

When the Japs were finally beaten back, the Seabees began their own job. And they did that, too, at a speed that played an important part in our quick conquest of the Admiralties. They had to rebuild completely the sand pile that the Japs called an airfield, and 2 days before it was scheduled to be completed, an Army bomber came in for a successful landing. The Fortieth Battalion earned the Presidential unit citation for this job—and on recommendation of the Army.

You would think that the Seabees had done enough to contribute their share to the Admiralties campaign. But that was just a bare start. At nearby Manus

other skilled construction experts really went to work. They took that muddy, bomb-blasted island, and in less than 6 months they had built a staging base that stretched for 9 miles. It had been completed with all the facilities of a first-class base. Huge warehouses, machine shops, power stations, scores of miles of roads, wharves, and docks, a hospital, mess halls, barracks for the men, administration buildings, utilities, communications, and all the other necessities for the Navy and the other combat forces. And if you do not think that base was important, you need only realize that there America cocked its fist for the blow at the Philippines.

Yes, and the Seabees' construction magic went to work along with the assault on the Philippines, too. Next door to Leyte is the island of Samar. There, in less than 2 months and despite more than 100 enemy air raids that cost the lives of a number of Seabees, this is what they accomplished: They moved a quarter of a million yards of stubborn, muddy clay for an air base. They built a thousand feet of barge landings. They built a wharf for deadly P-T boats in less than a week. They cleared storage space for cargoes unloaded from heavily laden ships tied up at Seabee piers. They virtually completed a ship repair base and then finished the shops, the barracks, and the warehouses that went with it. They drained the swamp in the area, set up electric lights, telephones, and a running-water system. And in their spare time they completed adequate roads and bridges to serve the base. Such work as this is what we mean when we say the Seabees are "backing up the line."

It would seem that with fighting and constructing bases under the enemy's nose that the Seabees had their hands full. But, no, they have got a few other jobs, too. There are the Seabee special battalions who have been given training in the loading and unloading of ships. They have gone out into the combat areas and taken over the vital stevedoring work. At one port in the South Pacific a battalion arrived at a congested port where 66 fully loaded ships rode at anchor for lack of cargo handlers—sitting ducks for enemy bombers. In a month the special battalion had unloaded 28 of them, and by the end of the next month the port was cleared and ships were being unloaded as fast as they came in. Even under the most primitive harbor conditions and under actual combat conditions these trained Seabees have discharged cargo as fast as it is handled at well-equipped ports in the United States.

Another job is that done by the Seabee maintaining units, which get plenty of dull, back-breaking hard work to do. But the 270 men who comprise each of these units enable an entire construction battalion, four times as large, to go forward and build a new base. The maintenance units do not get the glamor assignments, but they provide the critical links in our chain of bases.

Then, there are the Seabees who serve in special detachments — demolition workers, operators of spare-parts depots, repairmen for automotive equipment, camouflage experts, and specialists in petroleum installations. But of all these specialties, none is more important or more dramatic than that done by the Seabee pontoon specialists. Theirs is the job of transporting supplies over the last hazard-fraught "mile" on the long journey from the factories to the front lines. And to do this, they operate the pontoons which engineers of the Bureau of Yards and Docks developed and which have become almost as much the hallmark of the Seabees as their bulldozers. These rectangular steel pontoons are one of the great innovations of the war, but they require the ultimate in courage to operate them. Not only are the Seabees who man them completely without protection from enemy fire, but because they form the slender bridge for supplies from ship to shore, the full fury of enemy attack is concentrated on them. The story is told that some paratroopers watched the Seabees operate their pontoons and then turned to one another and said: "And here we thought we were the worst damn fools in this war."

The Seabees first used their pontoons assembled together as barges, but during the invasion of Sicily they pulled a surprise that went a long way to establish the success of that invasion. They put their pontoons together in long strings to form a bridge from the supply ships to shore. Tanks, guns, trucks, and supplies poured ashore faster and in greater quantity than ever before. The Seabees had won a permanent job for themselves.

Again at Salerno, and again at Anzio the Seabees unloaded supplies over the causeways, and when the job was done, many of these veterans went to England to begin preparations for the invasion of the Continent. For months, the Seabees assembled their pontoons into huge Rhino ferries, into long strings of pontoons which would be sunk on the far shore to provide a steel roadway to the beach at all stages of the tide. They helped to build units of the Mulberries, the famous artificial harbors which were towed to France. On D-day, it was the Seabees of the Navy who manned these harbors, who stood unprotected on the Rhino barges and the pontoon causeways. They not only withstood enemy bombs and shells, they literally withstood the sea. There were instances where Seabees operated the barges for as much as 80 hours exposed to the surf and without hot food. Day and night they kept bringing supplies ashore—not just during the time the headlines blazed with the story of Normandy, but for 3 months afterward they continued to help unload supplies over the open beaches, until the channel ports could be opened. Yes, and they helped do that, too. Their demolition experts and their skilled water-front construction men played an important part in restoring those ports.

In the Pacific, too, the pontoons and their Seabee riders have been in the forefront of a half-dozen invasions. First, at Kwajalein, again at Saipan and Guam their pontoon causeways fed supplies to the combat troops. At Peleliu the Seabees' supply line merged into the fighting front, and many were the Seabee carbines that grew hot in the defense of that line. Logistic support is a pretty cumbersome and dull phrase but I can assure you nothing was dull about piloting a pontoon barge loaded with gasoline and ammunition into a shower of mortar fire. But the Seabees did it, and they suffered casualties.

In the invasion of Leyte, their pontoons repeated the performance during the height of attack by the Japs' land-based bombers. The Seabees ran their loaded barges onto the beach, grabbed their guns, and took their places in the defense line where they stayed until the Jap counterattack had been thrown back. A few hours later, the Seabees strung their pontoons into a temporary pier and floated it in to shore. All the Jap sniper fire in the area concentrated on them. What happened? In less than 50 minutes, the pier was in place and supplies were coming ashore to the front-line combat troops.

That's the story of the Seabees in just the broadest outline. You could take any island and any outfit, learn what it has done, and you would leave in humble admiration for these fighting builders in the Navy. More than a billion and a half dollars—$1,581,342,000—have gone into their construction of the advanced bases the Navy must have. But that is only a small measure of the contribution they have made.

More than 234,000 strong, and with more than 75 percent—75.1 percent—overseas, the Navy's Seabees have only begun the toughest part of their job. The Japs have the advantage of land-based aviation from their homeland and the China coast. The new bases we construct will have to be built under such a threat of enemy air attack as we have never experienced before. That means the ultimate in high-speed construction will be necessary. I can give you this assurance: The Seabees will live up to their motto, "Can Do."

They "can do" what is required of them—they have proved it times without number, and so can the organization which has built the Navy's shore establishment in this country, the Bureau of Yards and Docks. What this branch of the Navy requires in the way of support from the Congress must be forthcoming.

This war is far from over. Make no mistake about that. The fact is, we are still over 1,300 miles away from Tokyo. Much of our fighting lies ahead. The road to Tokyo will be costly in lives and money. We have the men and the ships and the best material money can buy. Let us at home give our fighting men everything they need in order that the period of this war may be shortened and victory brought to our cause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be

included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Ship repair and laying-up facilities, $230,222,000; fleet training facilities, amphibious and operational, $12,000,000; aviation facilities, $74,500,000; storage facilities, $19,950,000; Marine Corps housing and training, $14,190,000; ordnance facilities, $65,500,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $40,022,000; hospital facilities, $28,519,000; shore radio facilities, $3,230,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $225,000; miscellaneous structures and facilities, $41,265,000; advance base construction, material and equipment, $936,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed $1,515,623,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "$74,500,000" and insert "$59,416,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 16, strike out "$1,515,623,000" and insert "$1,500,549,500."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment simply to ask a question, and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Georgia. In looking over section 4 in which you amend the Surplus Property Act, you provide that "title to all ships, boats, barges, and floating drydocks of the Navy Department shall remain in the United States."

That question was thoroughly threshed out on the floor of the House. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] who has just left the floor for a second, was the one who made the prevailing argument. When the surplus property bill was in conference this subject was up, and we found out that the Navy has thousands of small boats, many of them now of absolutely no value to them. For instance, there were hundreds and hundreds of patriotic citizens who turned their yachts over to the Navy for $1 apiece. Some donated them to the Navy. They have turned many of them back to the former owners. Take out in my section, we had hundreds of Coast Guard boats in the Mississippi. The Coast Guard is in the Navy. Hundreds of motorboats, pleasure craft, were turned over to the Navy to assist in the prosecution of the war. They have been patrolling the inland waterways, including the Great Lakes, since this war started, and if this section 4 prevails you are going to keep the Navy from turning any of those boats back to their former owners after they have served their purpose.

May I say that the conferees on the surplus property bill protected the combat vessels, protected the carriers, the cruisers, the destroyers, and the battleships, but we eliminated the provision that would have tied the Navy's hands and required them to hold all these small ships, and I maintain that under the wording of this amendment you are going to require the Navy, if it has small boats, to keep them regardless of whether they need them or not.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I tried to state in general debate what the committee had in mind in offering this amendment, and I regret that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri was not here at that time. As you will recall in the first bill dealing with this subject in connection with the Lend-Lease Act, it was stated that none of this kind of property belonging to the Navy could be disposed of unless it had the approval of the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy. In February 1943 we come along and put a provision in a bill that hereafter any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock of the Navy may be leased in accordance with the act approved March 11, 1941, but not otherwise disposed of for that period beyond the termination of the present war but title thereto should remain in the United States.

Then Congress came along and passed the Surplus Property Act, and it defined what the word "property" meant. The word "property" means "any interest owned by the United States or any Government agency in real or personal property." All these boats are personal property. It permitted the Surplus Property Corporation to dispose of those except a boat known as a battleship, cruiser, carrier, destroyer, or submarine. It permits escort carriers to be sold. It permits all the auxiliary fleets to be sold. It permits floating dry docks to be sold.

What we are seeking to do is to retain those in the custody of the Government and then have Congress say what shall be done with them.

In regard to this great fleet of small boats, no doubt in a short time we shall have a bill here giving the Navy Department blanket authority to dispose of boats of certain tonnage and in that way get rid of the types of boats we do not need. The gentleman need not be exercised that we want to be burdened with the care of something that has no military value. There are thousands of ships that will be disposed of, but we must clear up what the word "property" means, and we are clearing it up by saying that this type of ship shall not be disposed of. Therefore, it takes it out of the definition of "property" in the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why does not the gentleman write this section along those lines and not make it so broad.

Mr. VINSON. For the simple reason that we have not reached a decision yet as to the tonnage of the ships that shall go back. All these fishing smacks, all these little harbor craft, all these little boats we have taken over will probably be classified on a tonnage basis, so that the Navy Department shall have the right to dispose of ships of so many tons without coming to Congress. We will give the Department blanket authority. But it is highly important to restrict the word "property" as used in the Surplus Property Act, or else the Surplus Property Administrator can dispose of an escort carrier.

Mr. COCHRAN. You can do it right here if you draw the proper amendment.

Mr. VINSON. We have done it this way and we are asking the House to adopt it the way we have done it.

Mr. COCHRAN. And that would make the Navy wait to get rid of all the little boats?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; at the right time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am as much in favor of a big Navy and an adequate Navy as any Member of the House. However, the committee amendment, section 4 of this bill, has no place in this bill. It is not germane to the bill. This bill was submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs by the Secretary of the Navy. No mention was made of an amendment to the Lend-Lease Act or the Surplus Property Act in the communication from the Secretary of the Navy.

I have read the report. There is a statement in the report from the Chief of Naval Operations in detail with respect to the construction authorized by this bill. Nothing is said with respect to amending the Surplus Property Act or the Lend-Lease Act.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter. As to this section 4, we have no hearings. I am not criticizing this committee, but I respectfully submit that section 4 is not entitled to consideration in this bill. It has nothing whatever to do with construction. It is not germane to the subject matter of this bill, and it sets a precedent here that is intended to destroy surplus-property legislation.

With respect to the Surplus Property Act, Members will recall that the House considered that for substantially 2 months—in August and September 1944. Probably no subject received more consideration than the matter of the disposal of property of the Army and the Navy. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the great bulk of the surplus property for disposal after this war will be property acquired by the Army and the Navy.

As a member of the committee that reported the surplus property bill, and as a member of the committee of conference on it, I insisted from the beginning that no legislation of any kind should be enacted that would in anywise hamper the War or the Navy Departments in the prosecution of the war.

What property may be disposed of under the Surplus Property Act? Section 11 of that act provides that no property can be disposed of unless the head of the Department declares the property to be surplus. No property can be disposed of under the Surplus Property Act unless the Secretary of War says it is surplus or unless the Secretary of the Navy says it is surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the War and Navy Departments. However, in order to make assurance doubly sure, and in order to provide that no combat vessels of any kind should be disposed of under the Surplus Property Act, after full consideration, after careful consideration, both in the committee. on the floor of

the House, and in the committee of conference, the language to which the gentleman from Missouri has referred in the matter of the definition of property was embraced in the act so as to make it absolutely certain that no combat vessel of any kind could be disposed of without affirmative action by Congress.

But now when we are asked to insert provisions in this bill to follow the Navy Department, to provide for the prosecution of the war, I respectfully submit it is a precedent which ought not to be adopted and that we are undertaking thereby to amend the Surplus Property Act via the back door because the testimony before the committee which reported the Surplus Property Act was and is largely to the effect that there were many vessels, many small vessels, including yachts and other types, carried by the Navy Department which were surplus, and many of them obsolete, and they could not be disposed of under existing law. The purpose in passing the Surplus Property Act was to prevent delay in the disposal of the property which the Secretary of the Navy, the head of the Navy Department, said was surplus. I might remind the Members of the House that because of the lack of adequate legislation, it was brought out on the floor of this House that there are docks or water-front facilities in the New York area costing millions and millions of dollars, acquired during the First World War, and not used then or since, which have never been disposed of. If the language of this amendment obtains, and in response to a question I asked the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and he agreed, not a single yacht for which the Government paid probably $10,000 or less could be disposed of unless Congress passed an act to that effect. Now then we have a hundred statutes enacted prior to the Surplus Property Act, providing for the disposal of property by the War Department and the Navy Department, the Department of Agriculture and the other agencies of the Government, but in a constructive way, in order to provide for the disposal of property that is surplus, the Congress passed for the first time in September last the Surplus Property Act of 1944, which provides for the disposal of surplus war property. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not germane and should not be considered in connection with this legislation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then I will make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And I will join you, or I will make the point if you do not make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi has raised the point that this amendment if adopted would establish an undesirable precedent in that it would destroy existing legislation. I should like to point out to him and to the committee that this amendment if adopted rather than destroy existing legislation reenacts previous legislation and once again declares it to be the policy of the Congress that the size of the Navy, whether in reference to fighting ships or a ship that is essential to fighting ships, shall be decided by the Congress rather than by the Secretary of the Navy or any other group.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I have no disposition to be controversial.

Mr. COLE of New York. If I may continue further for just a moment I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I gladly wait.

Mr. COLE of New York. The law to which the gentleman refers and in the enactment of which he was so instrumental and active, the Surplus Property Act, in itself set up a precedent by changing existing law. One year prior to the enactment of the Surplus Property Act, Congress had declared that no ship of any kind owned by the Navy should be disposed of except in accordance with the Lend-Lease Act. The Surplus Property Act came along and changed that. This amendment simply seeks to restore the provision of law which existed before the Surplus Property Act was enacted. As to the disposal of small boats about which there seems to be such great concern because there might be an undue delay in the disposal by the Navy if the time comes when the Navy is so cluttered up with small boats for which it has no need, it would be a simple matter for the Secretary of the Navy to come to the committee and lay before it and the Congress its program for the disposal of those boats and the legislation will be provided for the Secretary of the Navy forthwith, I am sure. But, as yet, there has been no indication from the Department of the Navy that there are so many small boats and barges and yachts that it is bothered with the handling of them. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi at this time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the Secretary of the Navy as well as the Secretary of War, who submitted the two chief reports on the surplus property bill, recommended the enactment of that legislation which, as you say, set a precedent to take the place of 100 statutes, contradictory statutes, which have been passed during the history of our country for the disposal of surplus and our surplus war property?

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, the gentleman is better advised than I as to the part that Navy officials played in the enactment of the Surplus Property Act. But I would call to your attention and to the attention of the House that for every fighting ship you must have a certain number of small ships, auxiliary ships, which the gentleman seeks to have disposed of under the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all if the auxiliary ships are a component part of combat vessels.

Mr. COLE of New York. The Surplus Property Act protected the Navy only halfway in this responsibility of maintaining a fleet in that it prevented disposal of combatant ships. Now, until the Congress at some future time determines what total tonnage those combatant vessels shall aggregate to round out a peacetime navy, we are not in a position to know the tonnage of the auxiliary vessels which should be maintained by the Navy in order to support that combatant fleet. So I submit that if the gentleman is really sincere in his statement—and I have no question to doubt that he is for a strong, peacetime Navy—then he should be anxious for this amendment to be adopted so we can be sure that a strong peacetime fleet in combat ships will be supported by a sufficient number of auxiliary vessels.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not utterly inconceivable that any Secretary of the Navy would declare any property surplus that was essential to the fleet or any part of it?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is true, of course, if he knows the national policy of fleet requirements as fixed by law.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The weakness of the position of the gentleman from Mississippi is that they have not yet fixed the strength of the Navy in peacetime. How then can the Secretary of the Navy know whether he will require 350 or 250 auxiliary ships?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. VINSON. So, we are proposing that he retain all of them. When the strength of the peacetime combat fleet is fixed then the number of auxiliaries can be fixed in proportion to the number of combat ships.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the point exactly. That is the principal reason these vessels should be retained except as to the small craft which the Secretary says cannot possibly be used by any peacetime fleet. Then let him submit his proposal to the Congress and it will be enacted without any delay.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to limitation, there is no limitation whatsoever. The Secretary of the Navy is the sole judge; and it is not necessary to fix the strength of the fleet. It is difficult to say whether any Congress or any man now can say what property of the Navy is surplus, so long as hostilities continue with either or both Germany and Japan.

Mr. COLE of New York. The point made by the gentleman from Georgia was that it is not up to the Secretary to determine the strength of our peacetime fleet, our combat fleet.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But it is necessary for the Secretary to declare a ship surplus before it can be treated as surplus in any category. The point is that if we have sufficient confidence in the Secretary to appropriate a billion and a half dollars for the building of these structures, with all the flexibility of decision this bill carries for the Secretary, certainly we can rely upon his recommendation in the disposition of a little yacht or boat costing probably $10,000.

Mr. COLE of New York. Certainly the gentleman does not assume that the Secretary of the Navy is in position now to dispose of any of our ships until he knows

the amount and tonnage of our combatant peacetime fleet. Until that is determined, not by the Secretary of the Navy, not by the President, but by the gentleman from Mississippi and the other Members of Congress—they are the ones who will decide the strength of the peacetime fleet—until that is decided no Secretary of the Navy is in position to dispose of any boat.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], about fishing boats. As he perhaps knows I represent one of the largest fishing sections of the country, a section from which a great many fishing boats were taken by both the Navy and the Coast Guard. I was very deeply concerned about the question he raised relative to the inability of the Government to return these fishing boats. I thought the question was answered very satisfactorily in the committee, that there is no provision in this bill that in any way interferes with the authority of the Navy Department to return those boats under present law. That is what the Judge Advocate General of the Navy told me over the telephone and I wanted to assure the gentleman from St. Louis that I am very much interested in this particular question.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will tell the gentleman that they have already returned boats on the Mississippi River during the month of November while I was home.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They returned them in my district, too. There is nothing in this bill that will stop the Navy Department from returning them.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why not?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Because there is nothing in the bill that relates to that authority.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that when the bill reads to the effect that the title must remain in the United States to all ships, boats, barges, and so forth, that that does not mean that the Navy will have to keep them?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I can only say to the gentleman from Missouri that I was very much disturbed by the question he raised. Representing perhaps one of the largest fishing sections of the country, from which perhaps more boats were taken by the Coast Guard and the Navy than any other district, I wanted to be doubly sure, so I called the Judge Advocate General personally and discussed this provision with him, the matter of returning these fishing and pleasure boats, and he assured me that there is nothing in this provision of the bill that will interfere with that in any way.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Judge Advocate General, of course, is the man who is going to decide the question; not the gentleman from Missouri or I.

Mr. COCHRAN. When the proper time comes I am going to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that there is a committee amendment pending on page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the committee amendment to section 1 is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy from time to time, but not less frequently than every 60 days, shall transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisitions of land, by lease or otherwise, effected under the authority of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, and of the act approved March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31, as amended, title to all ships, boats, barges, and floating drydocks of the Navy Department shall remain in the United States; and possession thereof shall remain in the Navy Department and none of the foregoing shall be disposed of in any manner: *Provided*, That lease thereof may be made in accordance with such act of March 11, 1941, as amended, for periods not beyond the termination of the present war."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 4 on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that section 4 is not germane to the bill. Does he wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. May I say that the original bill is an authorization bill to establish or develop naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or public works as may be considered necessary, and so forth.

Section 4, an amendment, has absolutely nothing to do with that. Section 4 amends the Surplus Property Act, which does not enter into the original bill at all. In adding section 4 it is sought to have the Navy retain title to every type of ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock that is now in possession of the Navy Department, and I submit that is not germane to the original bill and is, therefore, subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the objectives of this bill is to provide facilities for inactive ships. There would be no justification to dispose of these ships, then provide facilities for inactive ships. As a matter of fact, $99,000,000 is provided for facilities for inactive ships.

What we are seeking to do is to utilize the facilities by not disposing of ships; otherwise it would be probably a waste of public money if we go ahead and dispose of the ships, then turn around and provide facilities for inactive ships. We have got rid of the inactive ships; therefore we propose to provide the berthing facilities for that purpose by the amendment in order to keep what we have. That is the justification, from my viewpoint, for the germaneness of it. The whole purpose of this is to keep the ships and at the same time provide facilities for keeping them.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I only wish to point out, in furtherance of the argument submitted by the gentleman from Georgia, that this bill authorizes the construction of certain fleet-training facilities for the training of sailors. For what purpose? For a ship that is not in being or might be disposed of? It seems to me there is a proper relationship between the construction of a shore establishment necessary for the operation of a ship and the disposal or the conduct of the ship itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] desire to be heard?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add, in support of the point of order and to supplement what the gentleman from Missouri has said, first: I remind the Chair that this is an amendment. It is a committee amendment, true, but it has no higher privilege and is entitled to no greater weight than if it were an amendment proposed on the floor by the committee or by any member of the Committee of the Whole. Inasmuch as this amendment definitely is not germane to the bill under consideration which provides for construction and for the construction enumerated in the bill, and inasmuch as this amendment is not a limitation for the repairs and for shore facilities and for the housing authorized in this bill, but is an amendment to the general law covering all ships, all boats, all barges, and floating drydocks of the Navy Department, applying to property that is covered by two acts heretofore passed by the Congress, the very latest of which was the Surplus Property Act passed in 1944, and the other the Lend-Lease Act that has been in effect since March 11, 1941, I submit that the amendment is not germane to the bill under consideration, to the bill as submitted by the Navy Department, and to the bill as reported by the committee. It must be germane if reported by the committee as a committee amendment. Therefore, I assert the point of order should be sustained. The bill provides for construction—the amendment prevents disposal of other types and classes of property. The amendment is not germane to the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the point of order. I have not heard all of the debate; but it seems to me that this is a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That being the title of the bill, the com-

mittee would have jurisdiction over anything coming within the title. There is not a single thing in section 4 over which the Committee on Naval Affairs does not have jurisdiction per se. The Surplus Property Act provided that none of this property could be disposed of unless it was declared surplus by the Navy. Even if that were not true, the title of this bill is so broad that it does not attempt to amend any specific law. There is no provision in section 4 that attempts to amend anything. It is original legislation. In effect, it repeals certain existing law. That seems to me to be perfectly clear.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. If we are going to accept the argument that the gentleman from Michigan makes, it means that because of the words "other purposes" in the title any language that you can construe in the form of an amendment is germane to this bill. For instance, if you want to raise your salary to $15,000, if the gentleman's argument is sound, then it is germane to this bill, because that is "other purposes." I never heard of such an argument.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment is subject to a point of order, and that section 4, notwithstanding what the gentleman from Michigan says, does amend existing law, the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the question of germaneness to me is not important when a bill is drafted by the committee if the matter included in the committee draft has to do with the subject matter over which the committee has jurisdiction.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. In other words, the Committee on Naval Affairs has no jurisdiction to bring in an omnibus bill dealing with a half dozen different phases of that which it has jurisdiction over.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, there is no question about that. The committee has such jurisdiction.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am rather interested in this point of order. The gentleman does not mean to say that because of the words "for other purposes" that a committee having jurisdiction of a bill can report back any amendment that the committee wants to; does he?

Mr. MICHENER. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not argue, because it is considered by the committee that no member can make a point of order; that it occupies a different status than if this amendment was offered on the floor by an individual Member?

Mr. MICHENER. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, this amendment has no higher status than if an individual Member offered it.

Mr. MICHENER. No; not if offered on the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman recognizes, I am sure, that on the question of germaneness you do not look to the title of the bill, you look to the body of the bill; is that not correct?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that the title, of course, has nothing to do with its germaneness. It is the body of the bill; what is contained in the body of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. No. I think there are decisions holding that where you refer to "other purposes" and where there is a close case, that the language is vital and important. But the point I am making is this: That when a bill is introduced and goes to a committee having jurisdiction, the introducer of the bill cannot limit the action of the committee which has jurisdiction to only those things in the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. They could add anything that the majority wanted to, but that does not mean that it would be germane to the bill and that a point of order would not lie. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not think the question of germaneness to the bill is important at all if——

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan who is such a good parliamentarian does not mean to say that; does he?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes, I mean it; if the committee has jurisdiction over the new matter included.

I mean to say that if the gentleman introduced a bill and it went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, let us say, that committee might think the gentleman's bill was a good bill, but at the same time it might want to add something additional over which it had jurisdiction.

Mr. McCORMACK. But which was not germane to my bill.

Mr. MICHENER. My view is that when a Member introduces a bill and it goes before a committee it becomes a committee bill when the committee reports it out, and that an individual by introducing a bill and referring it to a committee cannot prevent the committee from adding to the bill anything over which the committee has jurisdiction, I may be wrong, but that is my view of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says is correct, but when the committee reports out a committee amendment, then that amendment occupies no higher standing in the House than if it were offered by a Member from the floor.

Mr. MICHENER. No; I did not say so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Further, if the committee had adopted this section 4 and then directed the chairman to introduce a bill including section 4 and then reported it out, I can see that a point of order would probably not lie against it, because then the bill would have been introduced and reported as a complete bill. We do not have that situation now, however; we have the original bill introduced and then section 4 added as a committee amendment. Of course, the gentleman knows that an amendment may be related to the subject matter of a bill reported out but at the same time not be germane to it.

Mr. IZAC rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentlemen from California rise?

Mr. IZAC. I should like to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the title of the bill, which states "for other purposes," the Committee on Naval Affairs has jurisdiction over all matters coming under the cognizance of the Navy Department. It is the legislative committee of the House which deals with those matters. I cannot see any difference between this and any other omnibus bill that might be brought in, but I can cite instances in the bill itself which lies before us now that show that this amendment is strictly germane to three provisions in the bill; one mentioned by my chairman the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], one by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], and the third, fleet training facilities, amphibious and operational.

"Amphibious" means by boat. We need a certain number of boats. Are we going to dispose of these boats or are we going to provide these facilities? If we have the right to authorize an appropriation for more boats in this bill, then we certainly can determine on their disposal. That is exactly what we attempt to do in section 4. We deny to anyone outside of the Congress of the United States the right to dispose of any of the boats. The purpose of the Committee on Naval Affairs is to retain the power and authority in the House of Representatives that should be there, to determine not only the size of the fleet, but the way we are going to dispose of the boats that may be declared surplus in the future.

That brings me to this point. The Navy Department does not know what boats may be declared surplus or what auxiliaries may be declared surplus. We have already passed a bill—it went through the House of Representatives—that we would permit the sale or the gift of some of these boats to Latin-American countries, up to a tonnage of 1,000. Perhaps we will want to do something like that when the Navy Department finally determines how many of these boats will be declared surplus. At the present time, however, we do not want to have any of these boats declared surplus until a plan and a schedule have been worked out by which we will know that they will not be disposed of in a way that would cripple the future Navy of the United States. That is why we insert section 4 in this bill as a preventive measure.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MONRONEY). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] makes the point of order against the committee amendment, which provides that title to all ships, boats, barges, and floating drydocks of the Navy Department shall remain in the United States, on the ground that it is not germane to the bill. This amendment, although a committee

amendment, occupies the same position with respect to the rule of germaneness as an amendment offered from the floor.

The Chair has carefully read the bill. It is the opinion of the Chair that the substance of this bill relates solely to the construction of public works. It would be rather futile to argue that this amendment comes within the rule of germaneness because if the argument of those opposing the point of order were sustained any amendment proposing a change in any other activity of the Navy Department could also be considered as germane. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONRONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 626) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 82, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING THE LIMITATION ON TOTAL PERSONNEL OF NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, the bill (H. R. 621) to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes, and that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that there may be general debate confined to the bill, not exceeding 1 hour, the bill then to be considered under the 5-minute rule.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I assume that if the gentleman's request is granted the time will be equally divided?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; of course. Mr. Speaker, I so modify my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole; that there may be not exceeding 1 hour's general debate to be confined to the bill, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from New York, the bill then to be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Is there objection?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the bill is taken up providing for 1 hour's debate I presume the gentleman from Georgia will yield for certain questions?

Mr. VINSON. I will yield with pleasure to any Member at any time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I simply ask that question in accordance with parliamentary procedure. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1276), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out of section (a) thereof the phrase: "by the act approved June 4, 1920, sections 33 and 34 (41 Stat. L. 776–779)," and by changing the last proviso of such subsection to read as follows: "*And provided further,* That until the expiration of 1 year after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress, the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall not at any one time exceed 24,000 and thereafter the total personnel of such corps shall not at any one time exceed 14,000." So that such subsection so amended will read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) A Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps is hereby authorized to be established and operated under such regulations as the President may prescribe, which regulations shall, so far as may be practicable, conform to the provisions of the National Defense Act approved June 3, 1916, sections 40 to 53, inclusive (39 Stat. L. 191–194), as amended: *Provided,* That the powers conferred therein upon the Secretary of War with regard to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are hereby conferred upon the Secretary of the Navy with regard to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps: *Provided further,* That all expenditures in connection with the establishment and operation of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall be specifically appropriated therefor: *Provided further,* That members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall be eligible for appointment as Naval Reserve officers under the same conditions as provided by law for the appointment of Naval Reserve officers from other citizens of the United States, and when so appointed shall have the same status and be entitled to the same benefits in all respects as provided by law for other members of the Naval Reserve: *Provided further,* That the word 'naval' wherever used in this section shall be construed to include Marine Corps: *And provided further,* That until the expiration of 1 year after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress, the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall not at any one time exceed 24,000 and thereafter the total personnel of such corps shall not at any one time exceed 14,000."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, as I stated to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, I will be glad to yield at any time in an endeavor to answer any questions which may be propounded about this bill. But permit me first to make a general statement.

The Naval Affairs Committee has presented to the House a bill to increase the maximum authorized personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps to 24,000 during the period ending 1 year after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress, and to 14,000 after such period.

The existing statutory limitation contained in the act of March 4, 1925—43 Statutes 1276, as amended by the act of September 11, 1940, United States Code, title 34, supplement III, section 821—limits to 7,200 the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

When the Congress determined upon a maximum of 7,200 students in this corps it believed this number to be adequate considering the current needs of the Navy in 1940. Since that time we have become engaged in a war, the magnitude of which has required an expansion of the officer personnel of the Navy beyond anything contemplated when the limit was established at 7,200.

It was necessary to supplement this source of officer personnel by inaugurating the emergency V–12 program, which provided officer personnel in a much shorter period than was possible under the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps program. The V–12 program, while necessary to meet the emergency, is not suitable in scope to provide the minimum training considered essential for a reserve officer and certainly far below the required minimum for training an officer who may be considered for appointment to the Regular Navy.

The V–12 program has served its purpose and it is now considered necessary to take steps to provide for better trained officers through an expansion of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps. This can be most expeditiously, efficiently, and economically done through the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps. This organization has proved its worth through the years in providing properly trained officers for the Naval Reserve.

There is a further consideration and that is the providing for increased officer strength for the Regular Naval Establishment. It is obvious now that the Naval Academy cannot furnish all of the officers required to man the Regular Navy which we must of necessity maintain in peacetime and certainly during the postwar years. The Navy Department is making a thorough study of the postwar officer personnel problems and will be prepared in the near future to recommend to the Congress steps necessary to provide the necessary personnel. The Navy Department has concluded that one of the mediums through which regular

officers should be obtained is through the commissioning of a certain number of the graduates of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the Regular Navy. The law now provides that such officers may be commissioned in the Regular Navy.

The Navy Department is requesting this legislation at this time because it is only fair that civilian colleges who have done such outstanding work in the V–12 program be permitted to resume normal activities and handle the increasing number of civilians discharged from the service as well as making necessary adjustments in their teaching staffs.

It should be noted that although the number of personnel in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps will reach a strength of 24,000 in the next year, thereafter it will decrease. The reason for this is obvious in view of the fact that all of the members of the emergency V–12 program now undergoing instruction will be transferred to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

In my opinion and in the opinion of the members of the committee, this legislation should be enacted promptly in order that the Navy Department may proceed with its plans without delaying the war effort.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that we are all interested in furnishing properly trained officers for our Navy. I wish, however, to go back to the question involved in this bill as to the present status and future status of the 52,000 young men who have been taken into the V–12 program from the enlisted personnel of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And a portion of them from the various schools of the country. They were selected as a result of competitive examinations, and many of these young men entered the service before they had reached draft age—18. A rather distinct agreement or contract was made with these young men and their parents as to the type of training these boys would receive. So, in their interests, I would like to ask the gentleman one or two questions, because I am sure he can give the answers.

Mr. VINSON. And I assure the gentleman I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will all the young men now participating in the V–12 program be incorporated into the R. O. T. C. by a broad general order?

Mr. VINSON. They will if they do not finish their course before July, when this program goes into effect, and if they are in training for general duties such as dock officers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Before July 1?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. The gentleman may rest assured that there will be no big pool of these 52,000 men now in the Navy V–12 program dispersed out into the fleet without having had full opportunity to carry out the original V–12 program. The V–12 students in training for doctors, dentists, chaplains, engineers, and supply, totaling about 16,000, will continue as V–12 students until they complete their training. This group, with the 12,000 completing the course before July 1, takes care of the difference between the 52,000 and the 24,000 provided for in this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman will yield, what he says is true, generally, but there are exceptions. In the case of medical students and engineering students they will continue under the V–12 program.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman's answer mean that if a young man does not graduate from V–12 by July 1, 1945, he will then be automatically transferred into the R. O. T. C. training corps or will be dropped from the service?

Mr. VINSON. He will be transferred into the R. O. T. C. and there he will get a different training. Up to date he has been a specialist. In the R. O. T. C. he will get a broad training for better line work.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There are 52,000 young men now taking V–12 training; therefore, in order to reduce down to 24,000 that will go into the R. O. T. C. by July 1, it will mean 28,000 of these V–12 trainees will either be graduated or eliminated. The query I have in mind is whether there will be any change in the requirements for young men or standards that they must meet in order to continue in the V–12 program.

Mr. VINSON. When they transfer to the R. O. T. C.; no.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Or to continue in the program now?

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is there any likelihood that the requirements will be so tightened up you will wash out, as you say, five, ten, or twenty thousand of these young men?

Mr. VINSON. No; the gentleman does not have to worry about that. We developed that one thought, because we were unwilling to have any injustice done to the 52,000 boys in the V–12 today, a great many of them coming in at 17 years of age and a great many coming from the fleet. When the transition takes place there will be no prejudice to their former standing by transfer to the R. O. T. C.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Or no change in the requirements or qualifications?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all; but there will be changes after all those 52,000 have been taken care of from the V–12 program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There will be different standards for those who enter in the future?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I ask this question because I am not unmindful of the fact that many young boys under the draft age went into the Army student training program but suddenly found themselves transferred to the Infantry.

Mr. VINSON. We are not going to let that happen in this program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the Congress and the Naval Affairs Committee of the House want to see to it that it is distinctly understood the Government of the United States shall keep the contract it has made with these boys and their parents.

Mr. VINSON. We have the assurance of Admiral Jacobs along that line, that there will be nothing happening here such as happened with the Army.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee has given that matter careful consideration.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Can the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs say whether the two acts which are amended by this bill have any provision which would exclude smaller colleges from participating in this program because the number of enrolled students did not reach a certain figure?

Mr. VINSON. There is no provision in the law requiring a university to have a certain number of students before it may be eligible to have a naval R. O. T. C. Here is how the universities will be selected: A board of distinguished educators has been named by the Secretary of the Navy to investigate and recommend colleges for the Navy's Reserve Officers Training Corps. Twenty-seven universities today have the naval R. O. T. C. In all probability those 27 will be retained. Therefore, there will be 23 more universities permitted to have naval R. O. T. C. training.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee includes colleges and universities?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. When I say "universities" I mean universities and colleges. This board will consider all the colleges and universities to determine which 50 shall have a Navy R. O. T. C. There is nothing in the requirement or in the standards to say that a university or school must have an enrollment of a certain number.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. What will be the age limit placed on young men now in the Naval Reserve who desire to make the Navy a career?

Mr. VINSON. Well, the age limit is fixed by other laws. You have to be at least 18 years old. When he becomes a student in the naval R. O. T. C. he gets there a 3- or 4-year course, then he goes into the Naval Reserve or he can go directly into the Regular Navy. The age limit there is from 18 years on up for certain ranks.

Mr. WELCH. All young men now in the Naval Reserve must be over the age of 18?

Mr. VINSON. No. They can come in when 17 years of age.

Mr. WELCH. What will be the maximum age?

Mr. HARRIS. Twenty-three, I think.

Mr. VINSON. I do not know that. I am sorry.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say that in talking with the officials of V–12 only today, they advised me that 23 was the maximum age.

As I understand from the very able statement of the chairman of this program, this will become effective July 1 of this year.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. That is when the transfer begins to take effect.

Mr. HARRIS. At which time a limitation of 24,000 students could go into the program as trainees. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee what will happen to the other 28,000?

Mr. VINSON. That is what I just stated to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. When this transfer from 52,000 will ultimately come down to 24,000 no injustice or hardship is going to be done to the original 52,000. The 28,000 will either complete the course or be in a specialist group that will continue the program as V–12 students.

Mr. HARRIS. Including the 2,000 trainees estimated in the class to start in the near future.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I am wondering if the very small colleges are represented on this board that has been set up to make the selection of the training institutions.

Mr. VINSON. I do not know what the gentleman classifies as "very small." I do not recall the names of the members constituting the board. I consider they are great educators, qualified to canvass the whole situation. I am hoping that in view of the fact we have 27 colleges today and 23 more to be named, that there will be one institution, at least, in every State of the Union. We have so suggested.

Mr. NORRELL. It would be reasonable to presume then that since, I believe, there is only one college in Arkansas that is doing V–12 training now, that such an institution might be continued in this program.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman just stated there were 27 institutions now carrying on training which will be retained. Are those the 27 institutions which are referred to on page 2 of the report in which it states, "those institutions to receive new Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units have been selected and quotas set"?

Mr. VINSON. None have been selected yet.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The report on page 2, just above subsections (a) and (b), states that the institutions have been selected and quotas set.

Mr. VINSON. Twenty-seven institutions are operating today under the V–12 program. We are now establishing a new board, establishing a naval R. O. T. C., using 50 universities and colleges, and that board has not yet made its selection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The report says that the institutions have been selected.

Mr. VINSON. That is an error in the report, because we wanted to know very accurately and we were very anxious about it. Where is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. SCRIVNER. On page 2 of the report, just above subsections (a) and (b).

Mr. VINSON. I see.

> Those institutions to receive new Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units have been selected and quotas set in relation both to wartime conditions and peacetime conditions, and fall into two classes:
>
> (a) Institutions with enrollments sufficiently large so that a peacetime Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps can be supported; and
>
> (b) Smaller colleges which have no commitments to the Army for Reserve Officers' Training Corps units and which have been enthusiastic and successful in administering the V–12 program.

They may have been selected but they have not been agreed upon, and we have not been advised. Admiral Jacobs informed the committee that the Board had just been appointed and that they were waiting to determine what colleges should be used; otherwise we would have an interim report.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I am assuming that the distinguished committee that has reported this bill has arranged with the Navy Department for the elimination of any possibility that Annapolis graduates would be preferred to those graduates of the R. O. T. C. and the other civilian officers that would come in.

Mr. VINSON. I am glad my distinguished colleague from Alabama raised that question. I raised that very question. I said, "When these boys graduate from the R. O. T. C. program in, say, 1947 and 1948, and then a Naval Academy boy graduates in the same year, how will they stand; who will have precedence, because that is very important in military establishments?" Admiral Jacobs stated that he had not worked that out but the idea was running through his mind of pooling these two sources of officers and then from there determine which would have precedence, whether it was an R. O. T. C. boy or a Naval Academy boy, because their careers must start from that day on. Of course, all of them will go into the Navy for a probationary period of 7 years. I am positive we are not going to stand by and permit any discrimination to be shown against a man because he happens to come from Georgia Tech or Alabama or Harvard or Yale and not from the Naval Academy. We must treat them all alike, because they are going to be officers in the United States Navy.

I consider this to be one of the great pieces of legislation that is being enacted for the officer material, because it gives a poor boy an opportunity to become an officer in the United States Navy even though he does not happen to have the endorsement of a Congressman or Senator to send him to the Naval Academy.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the distinguished gentleman and congratulate the committee on the bill it has presented, which I believe will have the effect of democratizing the officer personnel of the Navy if it is properly applied.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. HOBBS. I hope the Committee on Naval Affairs will leave no question about it in the discussions and in the administration of the act.

Mr. VINSON. I am going to do my level best to see that the graduate of the Naval R. O. T. C. is put upon the same footing as the Naval Academy graduate.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. After this R. O. T. C. program is set up and gets to working, who will determine who are to be selected and how they will be selected?

Mr. VINSON. It will follow the same rule as applies today. When the young man goes to college he can make application to become a member of the Naval R. O. T. C. We already have them in 27 colleges today. We are merely expanding and raising the limit on the number to be enrolled. In all probability there will be a great many changes in the post-war period, perhaps to such an extent that when a man goes into the Naval R. O. T. C. he will become a midshipman with the same rights he would have if he were in the Naval Academy.

Mr. CRAVENS. How is he to be selected? Who will determine whether he is to go there?

Mr. VINSON. He determines that himself. He is a student in a college, and he makes application to go to the Naval R. O. T. C. established in that college.

Mr. CRAVENS. If he wants to go, they will have to take him up to the limit of that particular college?

Mr. VINSON. Up to the capacity of that school.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. Are the institutions that are to be selected for the R. O. T. C. only those that are comprehended within paragraphs (a) and (b) on page 2 of the report?

Mr. VINSON. No; I would say the institutions that are going to be selected are the ones that the Board of Educators will designate.

Mr. LEWIS. They are selected by the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. They are selected by a board the Secretary of the Navy has designated and the Secretary will have to approve of their selections. I forget the names of the educators but they are very distinguished men. They are canvassing the whole situation to see what universities and colleges should be used. The committee expressed its hope that there will be at least one institution in every State in the Union, giving every boy in every section an opportunity to get into the R. O. T. C.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I am assuming from what the gentleman says that he contemplates that we are going to have a much larger Navy than we have ever had in peacetime.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, we have to have a large Navy, because we are a world power, we are going to continue to be a world power, and we have to participate in world affairs. It is estimated there will be at least 40,000 officers in the peacetime Navy.

Mr. GRANGER. Is it contemplated that these R. O. T. C. schools will have the same standards as Annapolis?

Mr. VINSON. The standards will have to be prescribed. They may not have the same standards. These schools will not be clothed with the same atmosphere and naval surroundings as the Naval Academy, but the college work will be fixed by the Department so that a man who graduates as an R. O. T. C. student will be in a good position to compete with a Naval Academy graduate.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I have applications from young men seeking appointments to Annapolis. Of course, I cannot take care of all of them. I have in mind a couple of young men who stand very high in scholastic attainment and who are now in the V–12 program. Am I to assume that if this bill is passed, they will have as good a chance, if their academic standing is high and if they are physically qualified, to become officers in the Navy as if they were nominated to and went through the Naval Academy?

Mr. VINSON. He will become an officer under this bill, under the V–12 program, when he graduates from the V–12 course. If he does not graduate there and is merged into the R. O. T. C. then he becomes an officer in the Naval Reserve when he graduates from that and he will also have an opportunity of being selected to become an officer in the permanent Navy.

Mr. VURSELL. I assume their status will not be changed by any part of the law between now and that time?

Mr. VINSON. Not a bit.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the member of the committee.

Mr. SASSCER. As these men graduate from the R. O. T. C. do they become officers on active duty in the United States Navy or do they become Reserve officers just like the Army officers who now become Reserve officers and are called as the service needs them?

Mr. VINSON. It can be either way. He can go directly into the Regular Navy as an R. O. T. C. officer, or else he can go in the Reserve, all depending on whether or not the Navy needs him at that time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. As I understand it, the purpose of this legislation will reduce the number of boys who will be engaged in this training; is that right?

Mr. VINSON. It has that purpose in one way and increases it in another. It reduces the V–12 program by gradually getting a new set-up and then raising the old set-up from 7,200 to 24,000 during the war.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. May I ask this further question? For example, we have a State college in my district that has a V–12 training course. Here is a boy who is in his third course at this time. Would he be disturbed?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all. He will be given an opportunity to finish his V–12 program or else, if he does not finish it, he will be merged into the R. O. T. C. without prejudice.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And he will be able to finish the work he has already started?

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, I think the bill has been fully explained so that we can thoroughly understand what we are doing. This is an outstanding opportunity for the American youth that goes to college to get into the United States Navy by going through the R. O. T. C. It is a forward step in opening the doors which heretofore have been closed to such a great number of worth-while students, and it will have a tendency to bring in more democratic and broader aspects of the life of the country than is possible through the group which has been coming entirely from the Naval Academy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman state how many of the Reserve officers who are now serving in the Navy will be kept?

Mr. VINSON. No; I cannot answer that question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. You have no figures on that?

Mr. VINSON. We cannot say that exactly. We do not have that information because we do not know how many we are going to ask for.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I had heard so, and I was under the impression they were working on that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes for the time being.

Mr. Speaker, if the chairman of the committee created the impression here this afternoon that this bill is submitted to the House with substantial unanimity of opinion from the Committee on Naval Affairs then he has unintentionally created a decidedly false impression. It has very rarely happened that the Committee on Naval Affairs has been divided on any issue of major importance, but in this instance the committee was decidedly divided as to certain phases of this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? So far as I am able to say, it was only divided in reference to the question of whether it should relate to peacetime or wartime.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the phase of the matter on which the committee was divided.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the phase which made the division so fundamental, and I feel I should bring it to your attention this afternoon for your consideration. In the questions that have been raised and presented to the chairman, the inquiries that were made by various members show the confusion surrounding this bill, and it is not surprising that there is confusion.

Substantially the bill can be divided into three phases. Three issues are involved. One is whether the Navy should be permitted to undertake a transition from a V–12 specialized officers' training program into a R. O. T. C. general training program for the duration of the war to the extent of 24,000 officers or persons at any one time. With that proposal the committee has no disagreement whatsoever. The Navy finds that it has filled its specialized officer requirements and now it feels it to be the better part of wisdom to give these young men a broader over-all naval training. With that, there is no disagreement. The disagreement comes with respect to the number of 14,000 which shall be the authorized Reserve naval officer training in peacetime. Now, that can be divided into two phases: First, the training of Reserve officers, as that training was known before this war, for the purpose of developing a reservoir of competent Reserve officer material in case our country is again threatened with war.

Those men who take the R. O. T. C. training program in peacetime, as you know, get a smattering of sailing and a little bit of nautical lore. They were scarcely better trained from an over-all naval standpoint than the ordinary graduate of college. The proof of it is that the only allowance an R. O. T. C. student got from the Navy for taking this extra-curricular naval training was a uniform allowance and one ration a day while he attended school. So the value the Navy received in terms of the qualified and trained officers upon graduation is measured by the cost of the uniform and one ration a day during the training period. An officer trained under the R. O. T. C. program was not intended to be a general naval officer. That brings up the third phase of this bill.

It is contemplated by the Navy to use the Reserve officers' training program as a source from which Regular officers of the Navy may be acquired in the future. I am sure there can be little disagreement with the statement that the ordinary R. O. T. C.-trained student is not qualified to be a Regular officer of the Navy.

There must be established a new kind of program for the training of Regular officers, and it should not be a part of Reserve officer training program. The two purposes are entirely distinct; a Reserve officer is something quite different from a Regular officer. Another reason why we should not proceed to acquire Regular officers through an R. O. T. C. program is that the training given them will not be commensurate in any way

with the training given to the Regular officers who are trained by the Government at Annapolis.

The Navy tells us that their present plans for officer requirements in the future call for some 3,000 new officers every year. This is for Regular officers; it has nothing to do with the reservoir of Reserve officers which this bill contemplates. The present Naval Academy, expanded as it has recently been until the roof itself is bulging, can produce a maximum of 750 or 800 Regular officers in contrast with the 3,000 that are going to be needed every year. This means that the Government must seek Regular officer material to the extent of 2,250 from outside sources. It is my view that if these 2,250 officer candidates are to be trained in our civilian institutions and are to be qualified to fill their jobs with equal ability to the graduates of Annapolis they must have exactly the same kind of nautical training the Annapolis graduate has.

There are three alternatives for acquiring the 3,000 officers: One is the building of three more naval academies at some other places in the country. The expansion of the present Naval Academy to meet all future requirements is impossible, it is out of the question. The second alternative is to establish in civilian institutions courses of instruction for young men who when they enter a college will want to make the Navy a career for their lifetime, which is not true of the R. O. T. C. individual. These men should be given the same kind of naval training as that given the Annapolis graduate. Then when they go into the service they will be on common footing with the Annapolis graduate. The third alternative, and it is one which I am inclined to feel is the only logical course to follow, is that we take into Annapolis only college graduates. Let the young man determine before he enters college whether he wants to be a sailor or not; send him to the civilian school under naval auspices and paid by the Government, the same as the man at Annapolis is being paid; train them the same; then upon graduation send them to Annapolis for a 1-year concentrated course in nothing but Navy. In this way we can put out 3,000 officers a year and at the same time destroy the feeling of college consciousness, if I may use that term, which has inevitably been built up, the feeling of comradeship between graduates of the Naval Academy.

If you are an academy graduate and wear the academy ring you are all right. If you come up through the ranks, or if you come to the ranks from some other school, you are something distinct and apart from the Navy. You are not a real Navy man unless you graduate from Annapolis. That feeling is the natural consequence of deriving the bulk of officers from one academy. If we can train the men in our college institutions throughout the country, give them their academic training there, language, mathematics, their sciences, and all that type of instruction which is common to any college education, then bring them into Annapolis for a year of concentrated study, in my opinion, we can then meet our Navy needs. The point is that this whole problem of programing the needs for the peacetime Navy of the future has not been thought through either by the Navy Department or by the Committee on Naval Affairs and certainly not by us here this afternoon. This bill will not solve it in any way.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am thinking of that vast army of American boys who might not be able to acquire a college education but would be splendid material for the Navy.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is one of the issues that the Congress must determine in deciding what boys shall go to the college in the first instance. It should not be limited to those financially able to go to college. There must be some system devised for selecting the young men to go to the college in the first instance. That is a part of the over-all picture which has not been given full consideration.

Prior to 1937 the Reserve officers training authorization for our Navy was 1,200. The Navy that we had then was of a size which the Navy authorities felt needed a Reserve training program of 1,200 officer candidates. In 1939 that ceiling, that we are talking about today, was raised from 1,200 to 2,400. In 1940 the same ceiling was raised to 7,200. So over a period of the past 7 years we have raised the ceiling of our Reserve officer training program from 1,200 to 7,200 as it exists today.

I submit that if for a fleet of the size we had 7 years ago the number 1,200 was the proper relationship between that size fleet and the reserve requirements, then certainly the number of 14,000, which is enumerated in this bill, is far too large. Either 1,200 was too small for the peacetime Navy we had 7 or 8 years ago, or this 14,000 is much too high.

This whole training program of reserve officers, whether it be for the Navy or for the Army, the program of training regular officers either for the Army or the Navy is part of a job that the Congress will have to do after the bigger job of winning the war is ended. It is a mistake to join the two. If the Navy says it wants 24,000 to carry on its wartime responsibilities, well and good, but as to their future needs, I am of the opinion that should be deferred until after the war is over, or at least, until after a committee which this House created last year and which I anticipate will be recreated this year, the Committee on Post-war Military Policy, has had an opportunity to study the military needs of which Reserve training and officer training are very important parts. If we pass this bill today we are taking away from the Committee on Post-War Military Policy one of the very vital functions of its deliberations.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this bill creates a permanent policy for the Navy or is this simply a temporary bill for the emergency and 1 year thereafter?

Mr. COLE of New York. I call to the gentleman's attention the last 2 lines on page 3, which state that thereafter the total personnel of such corps shall not at any one time exceed 14,000.

Mr. RIZLEY. It is the gentleman's understanding of the bill that if we pass it today it may become a permanent policy of the Navy to get this increased personnel which the gentleman talks about of 2,250 over the amount that graduates from Annapolis. This will become the permanent policy of fixing that personnel of the Navy from here on out?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes; and it will be left up to the Navy Department without any restrictions, limitations, or qualifications to speak of to determine who shall enter this R. O. T. C. course or how long the course will be, whether these men will have the opportunity to stay in the Navy or the comparative rank these men will have along with Annapolis graduates. The door is thrown wide open. Understand, if this 14,000 limitation is adopted, the Navy Department is given blanket authority to lay out a program for the training of regular officers for the future of our Navy as well as the development of a reservoir of Reserve officers.

This issue was presented by me in committee and the question was posed to Admiral Jacobs as to whether the elimination of the 14,000 ceiling would interfere with wartime responsibilities. The answer was that it would not interfere at all. It was supported by testimony that the Navy Department is now studying these very problems of how we are going to get Regular officers for the Navy and how we are going to get Reserve officers for the Navy. We have tied up in this bill two very distinct problems, which I think is a decided mistake.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. What is the future plan for the present Reserve officers in active service?

Mr. COLE of New York. The Navy Department has sent out questionnaires to all reservists now on active duty, and I think the House might be interested to learn that this grand fighting fleet that has done such a remarkable job and is still doing it is manned and staffed 90 percent by Reserve officers who 3, 4, and 5 years ago were selling insurance or practicing law or pulling teeth or some other line of civilian vocation. Ninety percent of all the officers were reservists, civilians 5 or 6 years ago, a record that everyone can be proud of.

But to answer the gentleman's question, the Navy has sent out inquiries to all of those men to determine which ones want to stay in the Navy. The policy as regards what will happen to them, what their standing will be with the Annapolis graduates, has not been determined. The whole problem is still in an unsettled condition, and this is no time to try to settle it.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will that not provide a reservoir of trained officers to take care

of the immediate needs of the Navy and for several years to come?

Mr. COLE of New York. I have no doubt that a great percentage of the reserve officers now on duty will prefer to go back to active life and, of course, will serve as a reservoir for reserve needs for the near future, at least.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In respect of the character of the services that the present reserve officers are rendering to the fleet, I might call to the gentleman's attention the proclamation issued by Admiral Nimitz for the splendid work they have been doing out in the fighting area.

But is it not true, in answer to an inquiry that I made of Admiral Jacobs, that this bill as we have it before us today will not in any way establish a definite peacetime policy of the Navy, and are we committed by the adoption of this bill to a definite peacetime policy? His answer was that it did not commit the Navy or the Government to any definite peacetime policy; that all those things are now being worked out. It is purely a transitional proposition.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, this bill does not commit the Navy to any definite peacetime policy. It is quite natural that that would be the answer, because the Navy does not have any definite peacetime policy. That is my thought exactly. Let us wait until the Navy has thought this thing through; until the board which is now working has deliberated and submitted recommendations, and then bring its proposal to the Congress and consider it on its merits, and not try to cover the whole thing, these vast problems, by simply raising the numerical limit of those who might be in the reserve officer training program at one time.

I propose, when the bill is being read, to offer an amendment striking out the 14,000 and reducing it back to 7,200, which is the existing law. The effect of that would be to permit the Navy to go ahead with its transition from the V–12 specialists to the 24,000 R. O. T. C. trainees to meet the war needs and then leave the eventual R. O. T. C. requirements and the eventual system for training reserve officers to some future time when more of us will have a great deal more knowledge about it than we have this afternoon.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. CRAVENS. Is there anything in this bill that will insure uniformity of selection of young men that are qualified for the program throughout the country, or will they all be taken from one locality, or is there anything like we have now that will insure the selection of naval officers on the basis of population?

Mr. COLE of New York. Nothing in this bill gives that assurance. There is no more assurance that those situations will be prevented than the record has been in peacetimes.

Mr. CRAVENS. If this bill is passed, then we have committed ourselves to leave 24,000 during the war and 14,000 selected after the war without any limitation and with no way to assure that they will be selected on any uniform system throughout the country at all.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is right. There is another thought that makes it dangerous for us to do this. It has been discussed and used as an argument in supporting this bill that the Navy wants to get Regular officers out of this 24,000 or 14,000.

What is going to happen to a young man who goes into the R. O. T. C. in June or July of this year, anticipating that the program he is about to enter is going to qualify him for a Regular commission in the Navy? The time may well come when the Navy will say to him that it is sorry but it did not mean quite what it said when this bill was enacted. In other words, by the enactment of the bill we are making possible the raising of false hopes in the young men who enter the program.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have heard from a number of young able Reserve officers who are friends of mine that it may be that the present Reserve officers in the Navy will make a proposal after this war is over that the naval officers be taken from college graduates, who would be sent to the Naval Academy for further training for 6 months or a year, and that the Naval Officers' Corps in the Regular Navy be built up from college graduates who have had that additional year at the Naval Academy, the collegiate course that is now being given being abandoned.

Mr. COLE of New York. Apparently the gentleman's attention was distracted somewhat earlier in the discussion, because I discussed that very thing. It is my thought that the only alternative as far as developing Regular officer material for the Navy is concerned is to get them from the universities and then give them 1 year of specialized training in the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot find myself in accord with the point of view of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] in regard to the bill presently before the House. This bill was very thoroughly discussed in committee in order to determine just what kind of a program we should proceed with in the training of young naval officers.

Four and one-half years ago we started with the V–7 program. A year ago last July we started with the so-called V–12 program. Through that period of 4½ years, we have trained many thousands of these young officers for the naval service who, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] has said, and as Admiral Nimitz has testified publicly, have done very splendid work out in the fleet. But they were trained to meet an emergency situation. Of course, they are operating as specialists in a particular field on board the ships or at our shore stations. They are filling a very vital need in the war machine and doing a very effective piece of work.

The Navy Department, through the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Admiral Jacobs, appeared before the committee and gave as his reason for the transition not from the V–7 to the V–12 program but from the V–12 program to the R. O. T. C. the thought—and we agreed with him—that there ought to be an orderly transition from the V–12 to the R. O. T. C. program. This does not mean that all the R. O. T. C. boys are going to be taken in as permanent members of the commissioned forces in the Navy, any more than they have heretofore. However, there is a limitation of 7,200 at the present time. It is the intention of this bill to increase that limitation to 24,000 during the emergency and 14,000 thereafter.

It seems to me that we ought to go along with the Navy Department in this respect in order that they may properly lay out a program to train these young men not only for the emergency which is with us but also in the peacetime period to follow. There is not in this bill a commitment that the Navy Department is making insofar as establishing a definite peacetime policy is concerned. I definitely asked Admiral Jacobs that very question, whether or not there is anything in this bill that definitely commits us to a peacetime program for the R. O. T. C. His answer was that there is nothing in the bill to that effect. He further says that he does not intend to establish any definite peacetime program for the Navy because the Navy Department now has under consideration by a body of experts in the various branches of the Navy Department a complete study of the over-all needs of the peacetime Navy after the emergency is over.

It was only 5 years ago that we had a Navy composed of about 150,000 officers and men. During the war emergency period the Navy grew until today we have over 3,000,000 officers and men composing the personnel of the Navy. As I said here earlier this afternoon in connection with the consideration of the public works program, the Navy has tripled the tonnage in combat ships within the period of the last 4 years and the over-all tonnage of the fleet, including combat and auxiliary ships, has gone up six-fold during that same period of time.

It seems to me with the tremendous program of officer training that the Navy has been undergoing in the last 4½ years they must make some transition to a program that will reflect the future needs of the Navy. The Naval Academy obviously will not be able to take care of the peacetime Navy requirements and I frankly say that I do not think it is the intention of the Navy to train all of its future officers at the Naval Academy. If such were the case we would have to quadruple the present output from the Naval Academy. Large additions to the academy facilities would be required and that will take a tremendous sum of money. This bill provides only for the kind of a program they believe ought to be put into effect in a transition

period during the emergency, with no commitment made as to peacetime policy.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. Did the gentleman hear the testimony of Admiral Jacobs in response to a question I put to him in the hearings? Did the gentleman hear him say that, regardless of this bill, it was the intention of the Department to go on with an extension program at the Naval Academy which doubled the output there, giving them about 1,500 of the necessary 3,000 officers and that they would get the other 1,500 from this program?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. SASSCER. In other words, I asked him the question, Did this conflict with the proposed enlargement of the Naval Academy? and my recollection is that he said it did not. Is that the recollection of the gentleman?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right. The Navy at this time is not able to determine what the officer needs of the Navy in peacetime will be, and will not be able to tell until Congress determines what the size of the fleet will be.

That is a matter we will have to determine later on. But he did say that even with the so-called Reserve officers' training program through the R. O. T. C., it is very probable that in the peacetime period we will have to double the output of the Naval Academy. Those, however, are problems of the future. This is an emergency situation. This is a bill that provides only for a change from the V–12 to the R. O. T. C. program with no commitment whatever as to the peacetime policy.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. With reference to the raising of the number to 14,000, is that an emergency situation?

Mr. BATES of Massachusets. No; it is not. The present figure is 7,200, which was based on the size and the need of the Navy prior to the war. Now 14,000 obviously is reflected in the peacetime requirements after the war when we know the Navy will be much larger than it was 4 years ago.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1276), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out of section (a) thereof the phrase "by the act approved June 4, 1920, sections 33 and 34 (41 Stat. L. 776–779)" and by changing the last proviso of such subsection to read as follows: "*And provided further*, That until the expiration of 1 year after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress, the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall not at any one time exceed 24,000, and thereafter the total personnel of such corps shall not at any one time exceed 14,000." So that such subsection so amended will read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) A Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps is hereby authorized to be established and operated under such regulations as the President may prescribe, which regulations shall, so far as may be practicable, conform to the provisions of the National Defense Act approved June 3, 1916, sections 40 to 53, inclusive (39 Stat. L. 191–194), as amended: *Provided*, That the powers conferred therein upon the Secretary of War with regard to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are hereby conferred upon the Secretary of the Navy with regard to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps: *Provided further*, That all expenditures in connection with the establishment and operation of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall be specifically appropriated therefor: *Provided further*, That members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall be eligible for appointment as Naval Reserve officers under the same conditions as provided by law for the appointment of Naval Reserve officers from other citizens of the United States, and when so appointed shall have the same status and be entitled to the same benefits in all respects as provided by law for other members of the Naval Reserve: *Provided further*, That the word 'naval' wherever used in this section shall be construed to include Marine Corps: *And provided further*, That until the expiration of 1 year after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress, the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall not at any one time exceed 24,000, and thereafter the total personnel of such corps shall not at any one time exceed 14,000."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHENER: On page 1, line 3, after the word "that", strike out the remainder of the paragraph down to and including line 8, and insert the following: "Subsection (a) of section 22, of the act approved March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1276), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, we accept the amendment. The object of it is to clarify the language in the interest of better draftsmanship. I am grateful to the gentleman from Michigan for having offered the amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Georgia would accept the amendment. The amendment is offered to correct an oversight, because I feel sure the committee would not bring ir a bill drafted as the forepart of this bill is drafted. This amendment in no way affects the merits of the bill. It simply makes the language understandable as it will appear in the statute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 3, line 13, strike out the figures "14,000" and insert "7,200."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is in accordance with the discussion I previously had with regard to the bill. The Navy Department has no objection to the change and states that it will not interfere with its wartime responsibilities at all. It will, however, have the effect of preserving existing law so far as the Reserve officer training program is concerned and permit the Congress time within which to study the recommendation of the naval board now considering the proper method of acquiring Regular officer personnel for the Navy to supplement the Regulars to be trained at Annapolis. In other words, it defers until after the war the determination of how large our Reserve officer training program should be and what our Regular officer acquisition program should be. It is in deference to the House Committee on Post-war Military Policy, which is studying Reserve officer requirements for both the Army and the Navy as well as other broad military problems. It seems to me it is the better part of wisdom for the Congress to wait until after the Navy has had a chance to study its needs and make its recommendations and until after the special House committee has had an opportunity to survey the entire field of officer training of both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Naval Affairs Committee, of course, is glad to have the advice of the Committee on Post-war Military Policy; we expect them to make studies, but at the same time they have no legislative authority in this body. The Committee on Naval Affairs is the one that is going to have to come before the House and give the membership the benefit of its advice regarding what shall be the policy of the Navy after this war is over.

The reason the number in the bill is set at 14,000 does have some bearing on the whole problem because today we have 55,000 in the V–12 program. Naval officer strength is nearly at a peak, so we do not need 55,000 new men, coming in at the age of 17 every few months, to continue this program. We do, however, need some younger officers continually coming in not only to the wartime Navy but into the peacetime Navy. By reducing the 24,000 in the R. O. T. C. program during the war and giving us a little latitude, say with 14,000 after the war, we are given a chance to blend this new program in with the V–12 program. It is true Admiral Jacobs said he did not so much care, that he would rather have half a loaf than to get nothing at all. That is the Navy Department program they are building up to and trying to build on. No good purpose would be served therefore by the adoption of the gentleman's amendment. On the other hand it would really interfere with the present planning that is going on in the Navy Department. In other words, nobody knows when the war is going to end. We are going to have a big hump in officer personnel. I mean by that that practically everybody is going to be an admiral or at least a lieutenant. We are going to need men coming in way down at the bottom. We will take these older Reserve officers, by that I mean those who have served 4 or 5 years, and give them post-graduate courses at the Naval Academy where our schools are; but those people then will be senior lieutenants and lieutenant commanders and the like. We need these young ensigns to feed into the Navy annually and put it onto the regular peacetime basis it has been on during these past years.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I understand that all of the officers now who are not academy graduates are Reserve officers and that their number far exceeds the present statutory limits. Is that true?

Mr. IZAC. There are over 100,000 Reserve officers, or 90 percent of our total officer strength actively serving in the Navy.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. What I do not see is why there is any necessity for the 24,000 legislation at this time since the number of Reserve officers now commissioned is far in excess of the 24,000.

Mr. IZAC. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that the enlisted strength of the Navy is going to be increased, and this being so, we shall need even more officers as the war goes on.

The plan now is that we scale down from the 55,000 in the V-12 program today to about 24,000 under the R. O. T. C. program, which will just about take care of the probable needs of the wartime Navy. That program is supposed to be decreased steadily as we approach the end of the war.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Do we not have far more than 24,000 Reserve officers at the present time?

Mr. IZAC. Oh, yes. Do not misunderstand me. The Naval R. O. T. C. program has nothing to do with those in the service today. They would not be given this course. These are the young men who would be coming in, starting as Reserve officers and they would become under the proposed plan about 50 percent of the future strength of the officer personnel of the Regular Navy.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am not a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs but this legislation reads as if this were the only authorization for Reserve officers.

Mr. IZAC. Oh, no.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is what I do not understand.

Mr. IZAC. There are two categories of Reserve officers. First, there are those of the Naval R. O. T. C. limited before the war to 7,200. Second, there are those that we have in at the present time who have come in in various ways from civil life. They cannot be in the Regular Navy unless we pass additional legislation, except, of course, naval aviators for whom that legislation has already been enacted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the question raised by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] was raised in the committee and the committee failed to agree with his viewpoint.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield and advise the House by what margin?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, with pleasure; because I never have anything to hide. By a vote of 7 to 6 the committee rejected the proposal offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. Eleven members at that time constituted a quorum, so, a quorum being present, by a majority vote they failed to follow his views.

Mr. Speaker, the committee did that based upon the statement of Admiral Jacobs who said that he had no objection to striking out entirely the 14,000 if the committee saw fit to do so but, he said, by putting the 14,000 in the Navy was enabled to have a well-planned program. That is the justification.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman also advise the Members that Admiral Jacobs also said that if this was stricken out the Navy would go ahead with its plans in any event?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. And come back to the Congress with a counterproposal?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. This is a case of tweedledee and tweedledum. It does not make any difference except that this does enable the Navy to have some objective toward which to work in peacetimes. If you go back to the 7,200, then there is no need for the 50 universities and the 23 that you are going to put in will probably fade away. That is a factor that should be taken into consideration in a planning program. I am hoping that the universities of the country may be utilized to make officers in the Navy and give every poor boy in America a chance to follow a naval career if he wants to. When we have 14,000 we have an assurance that is going to be a standard at which to shoot instead of the 7,200.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy made the following statement:

> The maximum of 7,200 students was fixed by Congress to reflect the officer-candidate needs of the Navy as constituted prior to the present war—a small Navy in contrast to the present one or to that which will operate in the period immediately following the war. Long-term planning for an expanded Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps program is essential to serve the peacetime officer replacement needs of a greatly expanded post-war Navy. * * * It is considered essential that a proposal which would permit this expansion be introduced into the present Congress at the earliest practicable date. Therefore, the Navy Department strongly recommends the enactment of the proposed legislation embodied in the enclosed bill.

Mr. VINSON. Yes. The gentleman is quite correct in his quotation. I trust the House will vote down the pending amendment because this bill is a constructive post-war planning which does not commit the Congress to any definite proposal; however, you cannot plan unless you have an objective.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a member of the Post-war Committee myself and may I say that committee has no legislative authority. We have got to do this through the Committee on Naval Affairs, therefore this is the right and proper time to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman from Ohio asked a question a while ago which I do not think anybody answered, certainly not to my satisfaction. As I understand it, this bill deals with trainees, not officers.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. They may never become officers.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, they may never become officers.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Where are these trainees to come from?

Mr. VINSON. They will come from the student bodies of universities.

Mr. FOLGER. Suppose a boy in the Navy wants to take advantage of this?

Mr. VINSON. He has an equal opportunity because we are taking them in today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE.]

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my remarks and include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], is recognized for 20 minutes.

ARMY AND NAVY NURSES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the press and on Capitol Hill about the drafting of nurses who are badly needed both for the Army and the Navy. It has also been said that by drafting some of these nurses our home front will be crippled and our hospitals will be greatly affected if and when we follow through with this program. I can understand that nurses in the armed forces are essential and necessary at all costs, even at the cost of the home front, but it is my best judgment, after giving the matter some careful

study, that we do not have to draft any nurse in the armed services and that we can get all the nurses necessary to supply the demands of the Army and the Navy if and when we will consider the problem intelligently and will do away with a number of restrictive regulations adopted by both Army and Navy during peacetime.

I have today introduced two bills. One bill was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and the other to the Committee on Military Affairs. One is H. R. 1571 and the other is H. R. 1572. May I call your attention to them and ask you to examine them in the light of the problem we are facing?

Under the strict regulations of the Army and the Navy a graduate nurse of any academy, school, or college cannot join the Nurse Corps of the Army or the Navy unless she is registered with the State. There are thousands upon thousands of young women who have graduated from colleges and schools as nurses, more than qualified, but who have not registered or been examined or taken the examination in their own State.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentleman realize that the registration of nurses in the various States is for the protection of the people; that it does establish the qualifications that a young woman must have for the practice of the profession which she has studied?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I fully agree with the gentlewoman, definitely; but we are in a war and we need nurses.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; but we need nurses for our men who are tops. We cannot take chances on them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am for the gentlewoman 100 percent, but may I call this to her attention? In my State I think there are available at least between 10,000 and 15,000 young women who have graduated from schools or colleges as nurses, but who have never registered or taken the so-called State examination.

Mrs. BOLTON. Then would it not be well if they did?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It would be well, but they have not.

Mrs. BOLTON. But they can at any time. The State boards give examinations all the time. They can take these examinations.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate that. The reason that some of them were not able to take it was because of home conditions, because they had not complied with certain rules and regulations so strictly provided for in certain States, that when they were apprentices in hospitals they had not taken care of more than 10 or 12 beds, and the requirements call for at least 20 beds before they would let them qualify for registry under the law. Some requirements are very technical and do not measure the actual ability of the nurses. The Army and Navy regulations are based solely on the fact that she must be a registered nurse of the State. Some States may not have as strict requirement as the State of New York has and their nurses have made a very good showing. Therefore, we have thousands upon thousands of young women who, I am reliably informed by responsible groups, would be more than glad to join the Nurse Corps of either the Army or the Navy in order to help win this war and give our boys every possible protection. I agree with my colleague from Ohio. I tend to agree with her on many things.

Mrs. BOLTON. Have you, sir? That is very nice to know.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentlewoman's point is well taken, but we are short of nurses. How are we going to get them? We cannot create them overnight. Here is an opportunity, by repealing that restriction in the Navy and Army rules, to get from 20,000 or 30,000 to 100,000 young women and send them to school, if necessary, to brush up on their training, irrespective of the fact that they have not been registered in the States as required by the States as well as the Federal Government. It would seem to me it would be a great help. At the same time, we would not be crippling our hospitals. I am informed that there are hospitals today with 10 to 20 and 50 beds vacant because there are no nurses to take care of the home front, yet there are thousands upon thousands of sick people on the home front who need every possible nursing attention.

I think we should be practical in this time of our need for nurses and relax that strict rule that a nurse, although graduated from the finest school, cannot join the Nurse Corps of the Army or the Navy unless she is registered in her own State. If you remove that restriction you will have all the nurses you want.

If necessary, let us spend a little money and send them to a school to brush up on their training. I am sure they will then do something for the war effort, and we will not be crippled by our lack of nurses.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am sure of this, that the Army and the Navy are looking for various ways to do the thing that needs to be done, and that they will welcome any suggestions from any Member of this body. I feel it would be very well to have the suggestions the gentleman has made studied thoroughly. The restrictions that are put on by the Army and the Navy are naturally for the protection of the men, which the gentleman knows and has stated.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I grant that; but if I needed help, I would rather have help from a graduate nurse who has not registered with her State than have no nurse at all. These physically fit, able, and intelligent young American women are ready to do the job, but they are not allowed to enter that service or be recognized as nurses because of certain complicated regulations in some States. I say those regulations are proper during peacetime, but it seems to me that any intelligent American who has some sort of schooling can fill the place in an emergency, and we have an emergency, there is no question about that. I suggest that we may then be in a position to take registered nurses from certain hospitals, if necessary, and replace them with some of these young women to take care of the home front.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think that is an excellent suggestion.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think we ought to get some action without trying to disturb the homes of this country by making it appear as if we were going to draft all the women for the Nurse Corps.

Let me call attention to another point. We have colored regiments, and I think they have done a great job.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What relationship has the gentleman's bill to the cadet nurse service which is now in effect, where they take girls who are not college graduates, give them a little nursing training, and put them into uniform and finally put them in the service?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. My judgment is that the ones I am talking about would be more fitted and more capable of performing nursing than those they are taking from the volunteer ranks and putting into some school and giving some temporary training.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman admits that they must have some opportunity to get scientific training in order to be satisfactory nurses?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Of course I do. The people I am speaking about have all had their necessary training. They just did not register in their respective States, which in turn, despite their training, disqualifies them for appointment in the Army or Navy Nurse Corps. I am just calling attention to the fact that we must cut the red tape of such regulations. It is not a law; it is a regulation by the Army and the Navy. Under this regulation, which I will incorporate in the RECORD, no young lady of any age, no matter what school she may graduate from as a nurse, is eligible to join the Nurses' Corps in either of the branches unless she is registered in a certain State under its provisions. I say that by repealing that we can get trained nurses capable to serve.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is the gentleman familiar with the Cadet Nurse Training Service?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I know something about it. I do not know too much about it. As I understand, they are taking some young women and sending them to this particular college for the purpose of training them as nurses. Am I correct?

Mr. McDONOUGH. A lot of them, yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. There is still in the appropriation made by this body money which is available to nurses who have inadequate training for the purpose of giving them what is called a refresher or specialized course so that many of these nurses of which you speak, sir, can go at Government expense to reinforce their nurse's training as needed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is very encouraging.

Mrs. BOLTON. This feature of the bill setting up the Cadet Nurse Corps has been of great service to the country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think there ought to be some more information on it. These graduated nurses ought to be given every opportunity to brush up a bit, if necessary, so as to make them eligible for the armed services.

Mrs. BOLTON. As I have said, there has been up to this time a fund which has been used for exactly that purpose and it has done splendid work.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentlewoman. While thinking about this pressing need for qualified nurses, I happened to come across a little item in the press referring to the subject. It was a letter written to Mr. Winchell. It reads as follows:

DEAR MR. WINCHELL: As I listen each Sunday evening I am more convinced you are honestly and conscientiously trying to help win the war and make possible the winning of the peace. You mentioned the desperate need for nurses for the armed forces. Can you, as an honest reporter, continue to make the plea for nurses without adding "the Army wants white nurses"? Of the 9,000 registered Negro nurses, the Army has taken 247, while the Navy has taken not a one. Yet we are told that 10,000 nurses are needed at once and may be drafted.

Apparently these nurses are registered and perfectly able and willing to do their part. Should we permit prejudice and intolerance to stay in the way of our fighting men's getting all the care to which they are entitled? Why not permit these young women to do their share for their country?

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think the figures the gentleman has are a little low. I believe there are 308 Negro nurses in the Army Nurse Corps. There was established some years ago a ratio of colored nurses in the Army, based somewhat on population, I believe. It may interest the gentleman to know that I have been working for some years to lift the ban on Negro nurses in the Army, and I am constantly working at it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is the gentlewoman still working at it?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, indeed, sir. The gentleman would perhaps be interested to know that I had the pleasure and the privilege of spending a day with 61 colored nurses who were sent over as a unit to England as they were just finishing their orientation course. They were an exceedingly fine group of women, and the reports I have had of their work since then have been splendid. I am very much in accord with the gentleman's view that we could use more of them.

At the same time I hope the gentleman appreciates that the actual number of these women who would qualify for the Army out of that 9,000 is probably in the same ratio as in the case of white nurses. Seventy-eight thousand nurses have volunteered for service and only 53,000 have been accepted. So it is well to remember that there is a ratio there to be considered, of age, and other factors.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentlewoman has made a very fair observation and I appreciate it. But my point is that we are engaged in an all-out war and that we need every possible help, manpower as well as womanpower. We have that material if we just turn around and cut some of the red tape which has accumulated during peacetime. My dear colleagues, regulations do not mean a thing when they deprive a soldier of needed help. I do not care whether the nurse who helps our soldiers is a graduate from a school in Alabama, New York, or Ohio, if she is right there to help him when he most needs her help. If we will revise these restrictive regulations I am sure that we can get a sufficient number of nurses to cope with the problem we are facing.

Mrs. BOLTON. Would it perhaps be contributive to the gentleman if I advised him I do know these regulations are being studied at this moment?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am very grateful to the gentlewoman and thank her for her contribution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence may be granted the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOVEN], for 7 days, on account of the illness of his father.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PEACE AND A JUST WORLD ORDER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the past month has been a harrowing experience for our people. They have seen our beloved country suffer serious set-backs, both on the military and the political fronts. Thanks be to God that the break-through in the west was only a temporary defeat, and that our heroic fighting men are driving the Nazis back to their initial starting point. On the political front, however, we have not yet regained the ground we lost during the past month. Recent utterances of responsible statesmen, both here and abroad, particularly with respect to the future of Poland, have left our people bewildered, disheartened, and confused. They are bewildered, disheartened, and confused because to them it has appeared that the ideals for which their boys are fighting are in serious danger of being compromised. They are disturbed by the signs that the Allied leaders find it expedient to yield to necessity, that they find it to their best interests to sacrifice ideals to so-called practical necessity. And that is why they are still weighed down by what Senator VANDENBERG called in his recent epochal address "a grave melancholy."

The President launched, it is true, a counter attack in his recent State of the Union address, to regain the ground we have lost on what might be called the spiritual front, when he give us the comforting assurance that—

We and our allies have a duty, which we cannot ignore, to use our influence to the end that no temporary or provisional authorities in the liberated countries block the eventual exercise of the people's right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as freemen, they are to live.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that our people need more assurance than that. They need more definite assurance that we shall not return to what the American bishops called in their annual statement last November "the tragedy of power politics which, in the past, divided nations and sowed the seeds of war." The people need more at this present moment than the assurance that we shall stand by the principles of the Atlantic Charter. They need the assurance that we shall stand by those principles not because it is expedient for us to do so, or because it is in our self-interest to do so. They need the assurance that we shall stand by those principles for the soundest and deepest of motives, because it is the right, the moral thing to do.

I view with real concern, Mr. Speaker, the assertion made recently that our country cannot be expected to act on any final motive other than self-interest. I feel sure that the parents of the 40,000 casualties in the battle of the Belgian bulge expect our country to act from higher motives than that. It is true that all the nations are wedded to their own interests, but I might recall here the remark of Winston Churchill that it is "not always given to the wisest of men or nations to know at every moment where their true interests lie, but even the humblest and simplest can see from day to day where their duty lies." And I should like to recall that the Great Powers thought they were consulting their best interests in the thirties when they connived at the open defiance of international law; history has mocked their worldly wisdom, and it seems to me that too much of our present diplomacy smacks of the same sort of wisdom; a wisdom that is willing to compromise with duty and ends by avoiding it. If we cannot mobilize in this country sufficient altruism, which is basically different from the motive of self-interest, we shall never lead the world toward a finer future. Let us put it on the record that the most enlightened selfishness will not get us very far in the titanic task that lies before us. It will crack under the strain and under the pressure of the heavy sacrifices that will be demanded of us. Our people know this. They know that only a spirit of unselfishness, a religious spirit, a strong sense of human brotherhood, an impelling desire to achieve the common good, which, after all, includes our own national good, will suffice to strengthen our arms for the task. This unselfishness has a far greater range of vision, they know, than even the most enlightened self-interest. This spirit of unselfishness or altruism will not betray us, but will lead us along straight paths. That enlightened self-interest which has been set before us recently as the final motive of our national action is a very deceptive policy, they know. It is not honest with ourselves, nor with others. It travels on crooked paths which lead only to disappointment and defeat. We may not always realize it at the time, but in retrospect we shall come to know that the road of enlightened self-interest brings us only to the dead end of defeat.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that more and more people are becoming convinced that the peace which we are about to set up can only be secure under the moral law that comes from God, a law from which no nation, no more than any man, can claim exemption. The people are expecting that we shall set about the framing of the peace and of the machinery to maintain it with this conviction deep in our hearts. Mr. Speaker, we are entering upon the most solemn period in our national history. Within the next few months we shall be called upon to take a leading part in setting up the foundation, at least, of the new world order. And unless I misinterpret the temper of our people, I am sure that they demand that this new order be founded upon the solid rock of international morality. They have not forgotten what our President said in his message to Congress January 6, 1941, when he enumerated the "four freedoms," "to that new order—Hitler's—we oppose the greater conception—the moral order."

What is that moral order which the President says must supplant the so-called new order of the Nazis? Over 15 months ago, Mr. Speaker, the official spokesmen of the three great religious bodies of this country outlined the minimum requirements of that order. In a statement unprecedented in the history of the country, 146 Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant leaders set forth 7 minimum requirements of a just peace and a just world order. That 7-point declaration was hailed in the Senate as "confirming the deepest and best aims of our country in this war." The majority leader of this House, in introducing this statement in the RECORD, declared that "it is the fullest and farthest reaching brief statement on world peace that has yet been issued," and he declared further that "it merits close and favorable consideration by all the citizens of the country."

Mr. Speaker, it is my information that the citizens of this country—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—have indeed been giving this momentous statement the closest consideration ever since its issuance. Through sermons and study groups, in church and synagogue, in public mass meetings throughout the land, it has reached, I am told, a large proportion of the 60,000,000 members of these 3 great religious bodies. I may say that I was deeply impressed by the statement of the Catholic signers in their separate preamble, that these articles are "principles of the moral law and their prime applications to the world problems of our day" and express "the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men."

May I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to article 5 of the tri-faith statement which declares that international institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized. Both church and synagogue are teaching the moral necessity of such an organization. This country, Mr. Speaker, will be called upon in the near future to declare itself with regard to American participation in a world organization to preserve peace with justice. Let us not deceive ourselves. The setting up and successful operation of that organization will not be an easy task. It will take the most complete all-out effort of which this Nation is capable. What shall sustain us in that demanding effort? Will self-interest be sufficient? Will political expediency? Never. It will call for sacrifices which national selfishness could never endure. It will call for concessions which self-interest would never make. It will call for contributions which mere expediency would never justify. Those are the motives which wrecked the old League of Nations. So-called vital interests which the individual nations used as a touchstone of their cooperation and of which they alone remained supreme judge, were not enough to ensure its success. Judging only by their so-called vital interest, none of the great powers acknowledged any responsibility to the world community or conceded that the common good of humanity was superior to its own national good. Only one motive will ever bring success to the new organization for peace. Only one motive will ever arouse in our people and in the other peoples that unflagging, permanent flow of effort that will be necessary; only one dynamic will ever empower us to carry through, and that motive, that dynamic, is the conviction that such an organization is a moral imperative, demanded now by the interdependence of the family of nations.

It is strongly significant, Mr. Speaker, that according to their official declaration, the Catholic, Protestant and Jewish bodies of this country agree, as the Catholic hierarchy declared in their recent statement, that "an international institution, based on the recognition of an objective moral obligation, and not on the binding force of covenant alone, is needed for the preservation of a just peace and the promotion of international cooperation for the common good of the international community."

It is the great contribution of these religious bodies that they are continuing to preach the moral necessity of an international organization at this time. They are convinced that no other motive than this moral imperative will ever be able to provide the compelling power sufficient to sustain statesmen and people in the arduous effort to organize the world for peace.

I submit that if we Members of Congress give assurance that we share this deep conviction, we would go far toward dissipating that "grave melancholy" which still shadows the lives of so many of our citizens, who still fear that their spokesmen are guided by nothing more exalted than self interest and expediency. What better assurance could we give to the bereaved parents of the 40,000 casualties in the battle of the Belgian bulge than that their boys have not fought to serve the ends of national self interest, but for the reign of justice and righteousness in a world of peace.

Therefore I propose that we reaffirm at this time our adherence to the moral principles set forth in the following resolution which my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE], join me in introducing.

The resolution referred to by me follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)—

Whereas inspired by the reverent recognition and acknowledgment of Almighty God as the Creator of mankind and as the Supreme and All Wise Legislator in our Declaration of Independence and official documents of every kind, and officially or unofficially in everyday conduct of our Government, and necessarily therefore acknowledging the existence of a higher law than man-made law, with a superior sanction than that imposed by nations on themselves and having for its basis ultimately the very author of nature; and

Whereas forced by sad experience to acknowledge that the ignoring of such higher law by the violation of solemnly sworn treaties between nations and by the violation of natural and inalienable rights of men and nations has resulted in almost irremediable evils and general chaos threatening the very existence of humankind, and recognizing that the vast majority of men of good will all over the world who realize this imminent danger are seeking sound and solid principles which may guide the establishment of a just world order, and mindful of the fact that it is the common people upon whom the burdens and the horrors of war fall most heavily and assuredly; and

Whereas we, the Members of this Congress, representing as we believe the desires and the aspirations of our people for a lasting peace after the successful conclusion of the present conflict, do propose as the basis for the directives which are to guide our representatives in the making of the peace, the following principles of a just world order; and

Whereas, we believe that the fundamental principles of right and duty between nation and nation contained in this code, if loyally and honestly followed by governments, will put an end to such tragedies and catastrophies as we witness today: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the desire and the will of the Congress of the United States that the following principles shall be adhered to as the basis for the establishment of peace and a just world order;

Furthermore, the implementation of these principles shall be the objective of this Nation.

THE MORAL LAW MUST GOVERN WORLD ORDER

1. The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL MUST BE ASSURED

2. The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

THE RIGHTS OF OPPRESSED, WEAK, OR COLONIAL PEOPLES MUST BE PROTECTED

3. The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES MUST BE SECURED

4. National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal op-

portunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE WITH JUSTICE MUST BE ORGANIZED

5. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION MUST BE DEVELOPED

6. International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

A JUST SOCIAL ORDER WITHIN EACH STATE MUST BE ACHIEVED

7. Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WEISS. I wish to congratulate the gentleman for his very fine statement and to state to the House that he has been materially responsible for gathering the information and getting three Members of the House of all faiths and of both political parties to join in introducing the concurrent resolution today.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I further ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, the crucial importance of impending decisions impels me to join with my colleagues the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] in urging the affirmation at this time of the fundamental moral propositions contained in our resolution. In face of the historic opportunities and the historic responsibilities which confront us, I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that something new must be added to our statecraft—a more lively sense of the demands which are made upon us by that basic morality which governs Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and pagans alike.

In support of my colleagues, I want to emphasize that the seven proposals of our resolution are invested with much higher authority than that which our sponsorship confers upon them. These proposals represent the distillation of scores of official church and synagogue pronouncements on world order issued during the past 5 years. The principles of our resolution set forth the agreements which were found by comparative studies of all those various statements. Those agreements were formulated after months of negotiation, and subscribed to by leading personalities in the three religious groups.

The authority of these statements is further enhanced by the standing of the signatories, among them the official heads of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Synagogue Council of America, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference. I understand, furthermore, that the British Council of Christians and Jews, headed by the Archbishops of York and Canterbury, the Archbishop of Westminster, the Chief Rabbi of Great Britain, and the Moderator of the Scottish Churches have also declared their adherence to the same principles. We are thus presented, Mr. Speaker, with a unanimity of agreement among the religious leaders in the English-speaking democracies that is unprecedented in the history of the past 400 years.

This unanimity is all the more impressive in view of the wide divergencies among the same religious groups on so many matters of doctrine and ecclesiastical policy. I think it may be considered a measure of the importance they ascribe to the problem of organizing the peace that, despite all their continuing differences, they have chosen to carry out this common enterprise.

A Protestant can easily recognize in these propositions the reformulation of principles that have already repeatedly been expounded in Protestant pronouncements. These seven principles clearly reflect, for example, the political propositions of the well-known "six pillars of peace" promulgated by the Federal Council's Commission on a Just and Durable Peace.

I can testify, Mr. Speaker, that the Protestant signers of this statement form as impressive a list of leaders of American protestantism as can be found. They include not only the then president of the Federal Council of Churches, Rt. Rev. Henry St. George Tucker, but two former presidents, Bishop Francis J. McConnell and Dean Luther A. Weigle, as well as the new president, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. In addition, the heads of 21 Protestant denominations, not to mention leaders of the more important interdenominational organizations, adhered to the statement. To be sure, the leaders signed as individuals, but their official responsibilities gave weight to their signatures.

Bishop Tucker, then president of the Federal Council of Churches, commended the three-faith declaration to the Protestant churches in the following words:

The pattern for peace represents such an impressive consensus of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish thought with regard to the postwar world that I earnestly hope it will be widely studied and discussed throughout the constituency of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. I warmly commend it to the churches as a highly significant interpretation of the goals for which Christian people should strive as they think of their responsibility for world order.

Bishop Oxnam, secretary of the Council of Methodist Bishops and now president of the Federal Council of Churches, praised the Pattern for Peace, as follows:

It is significant that Protestant, Jew, and Roman Catholic, all inspired by the basic considerations of religion, have united in the formulation of a statement of principles upon which enduring peace inevitably rests. This great document, issued jointly last October, has become known as the Pattern for Peace. It behooves religious forces everywhere to center fundamental attention upon this Pattern for Peace, study the related document entitled "The Pillars of Peace," issued by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, and move forward with the full strength of religion in a free democracy until decision shall be made upon the basis of these documents.

Dr. Samuel McCrae Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council, said in his report to the biennial session of the Federal Council, meeting in Pittsburgh in December:

The Pattern for Peace is an impressive demonstration of the fact that there are common causes in support of which all the religious bodies of our Nation can stand together.

Recently these same principles have been commended to the churches for study and discussion by the international convention of the Disciples of Christ and by the biennial convention of the United Lutheran Church of America.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that these are fundamental general principles rather than concrete solutions of individual problems, but it would be a mistake to consider that they are, therefore, so far removed from the realities of the present world situation as to be impracticable and utopian. While they may seem remote from the world of practical politics and common experience, they are, and must be considered, the indispensable guides upon which our political intelligence must rely. The task of applying these principles, of course, to the concrete problems of the current situation is a continuing one. An example of such an effort by Protestant leaders was the resolution on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals adopted at Pittsburgh last December at the biennial session of the Federal Council of Churches, which represents 25 Protestant and Orthodox denominations, with a membership, roughly, of 25,000,000.

I quote from this resolution the considered judgment on those proposals in the light of moral principles:

We believe that the proposed organization, with such beneficial modifications as ought to result from further consideration by the prospective members, can be developed into one that will commend itself to the Christian conscience. As such, we believe it should receive the support of our people, with full recognition of its present limitations and with determination to overcome them. Admittedly, that will be a long, hard task. We emphasize that success will depend not merely upon political measures but upon more general acceptance throughout the

world of common moral judgments about national conduct. The ethical and moral standards recognized as applying to individuals must become generally accepted as applicable also to national and international conduct. This is one of the indispensable conditions of world order. Without it international law can never become a reliable instrument of order.

It is at this point that Christians have a peculiar responsibility. We recognize it as our duty to seek to translate into action the beliefs which we profess. It is, at the same time, our profound conviction that no system of international security can succeed which fails to reckon with such principles of our faith as the imperative of the moral law, the worth of every human being, the precedence of human over material values, and the moral duty of cooperative action in a world community. No system for the organization of world society, however perfect in political theory and structure, can long succeed without the undergirding of these principles. And a system which may be imperfect at its inception may develop into something curative and creative if Christians are vigilant and persistent in concerted action to bring the moral and spiritual resources of their faith to bear continuously upon the problem of world order.

May I note, Mr. Speaker, that Christians are indeed becoming more and more vigilant and persistent "in concerted action to bring the moral and spiritual resources of their faith to bear continuously upon the problem of world order." I, for one, would not wish to brave their righteous indignation if these basic principles which the Protestant leaders said in their separate preamble "must find expression in our national policies," were either minimized or contravened.

There is, at the present time, Mr. Speaker, a widespread popular demand for the clarification of our war and our peace aims. I can think of no better way to satisfy that legitimate expression of the public will than the immediate affirmation of these principles as the basis of our national policy. They are, as a fact, as even a cursory glance would show, far more complete and far more profound than the Atlantic Charter itself.

There is a deeper reason for our making this affirmation at the present juncture. The Axis has not attacked only the United Nations. It has attacked the basic principles of human conduct which, for centuries, have united the nations. It has not only violated the law of nations, it has proclaimed a new law, a new order, governed by rules of its own making.

As we victoriously repel this attempt to subvert civilization's traditional morality, it is timely, I suggest, to reaffirm the postulates of that "moral order" which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] said our President opposed to the "new order" proposed by Hitler.

It is timely too, as we prepare to take counsel upon the shape of the peace that will crown our victory, to make public avowal of our determination to base our decisions upon these premises. If America is to vindicate her oft-repeated claim to the moral leadership of the world, we can do no less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PATTERN FOR PEACE

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, making and maintaining peace following the present war is a problem which men in all fields of human endeavor must help to solve. Practical and realistic planning cannot be based on any one-sided consideration of the problem. Peace cannot be lasting unless built upon a firm foundation supported by all religious faiths, endorsed by all political elements and adopted by all nations. With this objective in view, I, of the Jewish faith—together with my colleagues, Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, of the Catholic faith, and Congressman CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, Republican, of Indiana, of the Protestant faith—have this day introduced a concurrent resolution which embodies the principles that emanated from the pronouncements issued by the great church bodies of the Western Hemisphere in their famous "Declaration on World Peace" as written on October 7, 1943, by 146 American Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders. Among these leaders we have the Rt. Rev. St. George Tucker, Bishop William Y. Bell, Rev. Ferdinand Q. Blanchard, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, and Rev. Daniel Poling, of the Protestant faith; Most Rev. Edward Mooney, Most Rev. Samuel Alphonsus Stritch, Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, and Most Rev. Basil Takach, of the Catholic faith; and Dr. Israel Goldstein, Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, and Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, of the Jewish faith.

This great document has become known as Pattern for Peace because the "fruit of righteousness is justice and peace." Peace without justice, history has demonstrated, does not endure.

It is encouraging that religious spokesmen of America—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—who have the greatest stake in the triumph of righteousness, have joined in a statement on peace.

I quote the Pattern for Peace:

1. The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

2. The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

3. The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

4. National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

5. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration, and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

6. International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

7. Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

Obviously, this declaration does not aim to be a blueprint for a new world. Rather it is a statement of the principles that the signers believe should be applied toward the end of achieving world peace. As a statement of principles, the declaration should be heartening for any of the oppressed people abroad or at home who may have read it. The document gives utterance to prophetic demands that have a cutting edge. To quote John Ruskin, the authors recognize that "the prosperity of their neighbors is in the end their own also; and that the poverty of their neighbors becomes also in the end their own." A special merit, then, of this declaration is that it assumes that the achievement of world peace is not only a spiritual problem but also a political and racial and an economic problem. It should be noted also that the declaration gives evidence of a new intercredal cooperation. One can scarcely imagine a joint statement like this being issued even a quarter of a century ago. In short, the declaration is an edifying document.

Peace predicated on such foundations would mean the cessation of the racial or color injustices by which one-third of the world's population, which happens to be white, denies rights and opportunities to the other two-thirds of the population which happen to be black or brown or yellow. It would mean an end to the exploitation of primitive groups by enlightened peoples. It would mean that nations economically disadvantaged are helped to self-improvement and economic reconstruction, even as we bring such aid to the disadvantaged in our own midst. It would mean the spiritual regeneration of the human family to that concept of just and righteous interrelation in which the aggressors within each nation would desist from squeezing and oppressing their neighbors and fellow citizens for their own personal aggrandizement. All the most perfected, practical machinery in the world for maintaining peace will not avail until within men and nations there is created the spirit of the will to peace.

Despite the war on the Axis powers, and despite our verbal contempt for their ideologies, it is difficult to make an essential distinction between the attitude of the average gentile in America toward the Jew or of the average white toward the Negro—or the Japanese—

and the racist attitude expressed in the philosophies of national socialism and Japanese shintoism. Other examples could easily be cited to show that the strife that divides the nations also divides us here at home. As Dr. H. P. Van Dusen, of the World Council of Churches, says:

> The significant divisions in the making of the peace will not be between victors and vanquished, or even between nations allied in victory. The real division will be within nations, within each nation.

A just and lasting peace will come only in the way in which war comes, that is, when it is inevitable. It will come only when there is a strong enough prophetic sentiment to demand it and get it. This hope and possibility, one may say, belongs in the realm of religion rather than practical statesmanship. Perhaps what the world suffers from most is a condition in which the prophetic principles do not animate statesmanship. Statesmanship must be animated and governed by the great principle first enunciated in the Old Testament and then spread the world over through its quotation in the New Testament, "Thou shall not hate thy brother in thy heart—but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." So long as race riots occur in Detroit and in other cities, so long as the poll tax can continue in the South—preventing even soldiers on the front from voting—so long as anti-Semitism continues to increase in America, there is little likelihood of our securing an enduring basis for cooperation with the Orient or even with the countries of Latin America. The brotherhood of man must grow at home before it can be in wider commonalty spread. Our real task lies not between the nations but within each nation. Yes, within the heart and mind and will of every man.

The recent statement by the President to Congress on foreign policy was encouraging. Its generalities met with widespread approval both at home and abroad. Certainly no one could disagree with the President in arguing that we must stand together with the United Nations in war and peace; that the period of readjusment following liberation will be as hard for the freed peoples as it was for us after the Revolutionary War; that differences among the victors are certain to arise; that we must not let these differences divide us, but that international cooperation on which enduring peace must be based is not a one-way street.

And the Nation rejoices in the President's reaffirmation that he stands four-square on the principles of the Atlantic Charter; that it is our purpose to respect the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they are to live and that we intend to use our influence to the end that "no temporary or provisional authorities in the liberated countries block the eventual exercise of the people's right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as free men, they are to live."

There is evident a wide and growing rift in the basic political understanding between the three major allies. Unless that rift is repaired, unless unity of policy and unity of purpose between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union can be restored, not only can no valid international organization be established but no lasting peace settlements can be concluded. An immediate meeting of Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin, and, yes, de Gaulle, must be reached so that the present threat to Allied unity will be overruled and so that neither foreign imposition nor mob rule, but popular democracy, will become the means by which the United Nations will jointly restore governments to the liberated regions.

A meeting of all the United Nations immediately thereafter is needed so that the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks may become the basis for a final agreement, and an international organization may be promptly installed, and initial authority to handle all political questions may be delegated to the Security Council of that organization. These will never be successfully solved if Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin attempt to deal with them exclusively in their rare and sporadic meetings.

There is still time to turn the present tide if the Government of the United States will only assert the bold, vigorous, and democratic leadership which it has long since been called upon to assume.

After World War No. 1 the United States lost its moral leadership in the world because it would not commit its military forces to the preservation of the international order its President helped establish. It would be an even greater mistake for the United States after this war to commit its military forces to the preservation of an international order in which it had abdicated its moral leadership. With the heavy price America has paid in bloodshed and human life in this war, we cannot abdicate our responsibility to mankind. We must exert all our power and moral leadership; we must invoke divine guidance in preserving world peace. Our failure to act following World War No. 1 hastened and brought about World War No. 2. We must not fail again. The American people will not tolerate it.

Free peoples everywhere have a right to realize the American dream of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To realize this objective, the nations of the world must restore human dignity among mankind. There can be no dignity of man without faith in God. And unless all men are imbued with that faith, their hopes of realizing the cherished dream of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will crumble in hopeless disaster.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CARE OF DISCHARGED VETERANS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to advise the House that I am requesting the Secretary of War and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to investigate the discharge and hospitalization of a G. I. from my district. He is Michael Slavik, 23 years of age, of 296 Gregory Avenue, Passaic, N. J.

On Tuesday, December 26, the press of the Nation featured a story in which Mike was an unfortunate principal. It described how he obtained an automatic revolver from a soldier, hailed a cab, and was driven to Newark, where he relieved the driver of $55. Then, the story continued, he went to Times Square in New York, where he boarded a car driven by a Manhattan lawyer, forced him to drive back to New Jersey, and took from him $8 in bills and a $333 check. He made the lawyer get out of the car after telling him he would find it at a designated spot in New York the following day. He also handed the New Yorker $2 for cab fare. "I'll bet you think I'm a heel," were the last words the lawyer remembered Mike saying as he drove on.

When Mike was apprehended in Passaic by that city's police on the following day he admitted the hold-up, confessing also that he had kidnaped and robbed a taxi driver earlier that Christmas morning.

Mike's story hit the daily and weekly press, because he wore numerous decorations, including the Purple Heart and the Silver Star. He was described as a G. I. who had killed a dozen or more Japs in the jungles of Goodenough Island, Finschhaven, and Sanananda in the Pacific. He was also supposed to have a shell fragment in his right leg and a bayonet scar on his arm. Time magazine reported that after cracking up in the Pacific he could not take it any more, and the "Army kept him in rest hospitals for a while, then suddenly last August gave him an honorable medical discharge, assumed that he was fit to return to civilian life."

After his arrest by the Passaic police, Mike waived extradition and was surrendered to the New York authorities. He was committed to Bellevue Hospital for observation by a New York magistrate, and his time there is supposed to be up this week-end. When he was arraigned in New York Mike is said to have run his big hands through his mop of brown hair saying dejectedly, "Maybe I need a psychiatrist."

When I was home last week end I instituted some inquiries about this G. I. and I found that shortly before this crime he had approached a Passaic citizen asking the latter if he knew where there was a veterans' hospital. The latter had directed him to a local servicemen's organization.

Returning to Washington I followed up my inquiries and was surprised to find that while Mike was entitled to wear the Asiatic-Pacific ribbon, he was not entitled to wear the Purple Heart or the Silver Star. Then I was amazed to learn that his Army record showed numerous infractions, a history of mental trouble dating back to his early days in Pennsylvania when his father, a coal miner, used to beat him, and there was also a notation in his papers indicating that he could not be released from the military "without danger."

This soldier was discharged from the Rhoades General Hospital at Utica, N. Y., on August 3, 1944. I was informed today that the Army was endeavoring, through its personnel at Fort Jay, N. Y., to regain control of this discharged veteran. I do not know how this can be done unless

the fact that he has been wearing decorations contrary to Federal laws gives this right. I do know this, however, that in fairness to Mike Slavik and to every other G. I. who may be a mental case and to our society as a whole, this case should be investigated promptly. If the appropriate agencies of Government are not properly screening these men before discharge and caring for them after discharge it is time for corrective action. Mike Slavik's case is a challenge to our Government and, strangely enough, it may well be the story he helped to write on this last Christmas Day will have a better ending.

Time magazine in its issue of January 8, 1945, describes Mike Slavik's homecoming as follows:

NEW JERSEY

HOMECOMING

Big, muscular Michael Slavik, 23, decided to have another drink. To a man who has killed a dozen or so Japs in the jungles of Goodenough Island, Finschhaven and Sanandana, there is not much going on in Passaic, N. J. To Mike, L's Tavern in Passaic looked like a more exciting place to welcome Christmas in than his neatly furnished cubicle at the Gregory Street rooming house. But even at a bar, an ex-sergeant of paratroopers, who has won a Silver Star, a Purple Heart, a shell fragment in his right leg, and a bayonet scar on his arm, gets bored—especially after a humdrum day on the job at a New Jersey rubber plant. Mike ordered still another drink.

By 4 a. m. on Christmas morning, Mike did not remember exactly how many drinks he had or what it was he was trying to forget. He found himself with an automatic revolver which he later said a soldier had given him. He went out on the street, hailed a cab, rode to Newark. Flashing his gun, he relieved the cab driver of $55.

Then he caught a bus to Manhattan and spent the day in Times Square, weaving all afternoon from bar to bar. That evening, in the middle of theater-time traffic, the gun proved useful again. He stepped on the running board of a passing car and scrambled into the seat beside the startled driver, Manhattan Lawyer Robert P. Lord. "Keep quiet," Mike said, "I'm going with you." He gave Lawyer Lord directions for driving to Newark, left him $2 for cab fare, but took $8 in bills, a $333 check, and Lord's car. "I bet you think I'm a heel," Mike said. "Now beat it. You'll find your car tomorrow at Eighth Avenue and Forty-second Street." When Mike showed up again in L's Tavern with his gun, someone called the police.

"A bunch of nerves"

More and more in the last few years, liquor had been helping Mike to get away from depressing things. Time was when he could get away from things by running. At 14, to escape a future in the coal mines, he ran away from the 4-room shack in Daiseytown, Pa., where he and 10 other Slavik children lived on their father's scant coal-mining wages. At 16, Mike lied about his age and escaped into the Army. In the Army, Mike won a hero's medals, but injuries and battle strain were too much for him. He was hurt at Lae, but when he was sent to an Australian hospital, he ran away and was A. W. O. L. for 3 months. Sent back into the Pacific fighting, he was wounded and suddenly cracked up. He now admits: "I just couldn't take it any more." The Army kept him in rest hospitals for a while, then suddenly last August gave him an honorable medical discharge, assumed that he was fit to return to civilian life.

Last week Mike was in the Passaic jail. The hardened cops, a few with sons of their own in the service who must some day begin to adjust themselves to civilian life, treated Mike gently. The charges were serious: Armed robbery and carrying a concealed weapon. But no one seemed anxious to press the more serious charge of kidnaping.

Mike's sister, Margaret, mourned: "He used to be so nice. Now he's just a bunch of nerves and never sits still." Mike, dejectedly running his big hands through his mop of brown hair, said: "Maybe I need a psychiatrist."

Carl Ek, writing for the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News on January 2, editorializes about Mike Slavik, as follows:

BACKGROUND

(By Carl Ek)

People will read the story of 23-year-old Michael Slavik, back from fighting the Japanese, a hero with the Silver Star, Purple Heart, and scars on his body and mind, and they will shake their heads and say: "It's the war that did it to him. He couldn't settle down to a quiet life." And they will worry about its effects on young fellows they know more intimately than they know Mike Slavik, the kidnaper and robber. Maybe, if they knew more about him, about his life before he went to New Guinea to serve under General Douglas MacArthur, they would be less inclined to put the blame for what happened to him on the war. It may have helped, true enough, but there were other things in Mike Slavik's life.

He told some of his story to the Passaic detectives whose not very pleasant duty it was to arrest him. Maybe because he sensed the genuine sympathy which Detective Captain Michael Wynne felt for him, he unburdened himself to the captain, who served, himself, in France in the last war and has a boy of his own in uniform this time. Not a nice story, and it is remotely possible not an entirely true story. But the captain believes it is, and he has been a detective long enough to be reasonably cynical about the tales poured into his ears.

Mike Slavik was born in Czechoslovakia. His father came alone to this country, as many another immigrant has done, to earn enough money to bring his family over, too. He was a coal miner, a trade which has never made the men who follow it sweet and reasonable. He brought Mike Slavik to the United States first, then the rest of the family. They lived, nine in all eventually, in a four-room company shack in a small mining town.

Mike Slavik had a scar on his leg where he was hit by shrapnel. He had another scar on his arm where a Japanese bayonet caught him in hand-to-hand combat. Yet, he told Captain Wynne, neither the incidents in which he had received those scars nor his other experiences in service—nor anything else in his life—stood out as vividly in his memory as something which had happened when he was 4 years old. His father, he told Captain Wynne, had hit him across the ear with a poker. Beside this terrifying memory, everything else which had ever happened to him dimmed, became trivial. A psychologist could explain this, but anyone can understand it.

So, even before he was of age, he tried to enlist in this Army. It offered him escape.

He was smart enough, he related, to fib about his age. But when he was asked where he was born, he told the truth, and because he was an alien, he was not accepted. He went to another recruiting station, he said, and told them he was born in California. It worked, he said, and he became a soldier. This was several years before the war.

Mike Slavik was proud of his record as a soldier. At one point in his story, a thought struck him. What a mess he had made of things, he observed. He had served his country in a manner of which he could be proud. And then he had flung it all away.

Yes, he said, his record had been spotless. It had been so good he had come back from his pre-war tour of duty in the Pacific and had been assigned as a guard at the White House. This was just before the war. Remember, this is Mike Slavik's story. Whether or not he had been, in fact, stationed at the White House has not been verified.

Then, when you come to his record in this war, you find the Silver Star. The Army does not hand out Silver Stars liberally. Many and many a genuine hero never gets to wear one. Mike Slavik's Army record says it was awarded him.

"You know what I ought to do?" he said. "I ought to put a rope around my neck."

At that, the police think, Mike Slavik did have a little bit of good luck. He got caught before he could do something worse. There is still the chance left for Mike Slavik to get straightened out.

I don't suppose anyone has missed the moral of Mike Slavik's story. It is different when a fellow has something to come home to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow following other special orders already granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WHY THE SHORTAGE OF BEEF?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that only three Members are present, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend at this point in the RECORD the speech I had prepared for this occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, O. P. A. has been repeatedly but vainly urged to protect the historic margins which would induce cattle feeders to provide more beef. But O. P. A. restrictions encourage thin cattle to go to market before they are fattened. And now O. P. A. has concocted a new program which feeders lament will further reduce the beef supply.

Said the Drover's Journal editorial November 20, 1944:

While competent beef makers continue to drop out of business because of ill-advised restrictive measures, consumers endure a meat shortage and resultant rationing, and packers are forced to kill 10 beef animals now, to get the same quantity of meat 6 formerly provided. And despite these shortages, many good calves which might well eventually end up in the feed lot under different conditions, continue to find their way to the slaughter house.

On November 16, the same well-informed trade paper said:

Cattle of top quality are scarce and will continue so under O. P. A. There is no incentive to long feeding and thus cattle of 1944 lack the tonnage of the beef in 1942 and 1943. The greatly augmented calf slaughter, another result of Government mismanagement, gives warning of reduced beef supplies. The calves are little wanted except by the slaughterer, and he is turning

into veal what wouldn't be accepted as veal in normal times—that is, heavier weights. This is only one of a number of unnatural and uneconomic manifestations of unwise control measures.

As every woman knows, a thick, hot juicy steak is a morale builder for most any man. Neither our fighting men nor our men and women civilians should be forced to do without beef because of a cent or two per pound they would gladly pay in order to get the beef. A steak a day. Why not if they want it? According to O. P. A. officials there is now a plentitude of cattle feed, there is a plentitude of thin cattle. There are many cattle feeders who, given adequate price encouragement, could, experts say, increase present total beef supply by as much as 40 percent. But, says O. P. A., our duty under the law—the law O. P. A. insisted Congress pass—is to hold down prices. How soon O. P. A. officials have forgotten how they promised at the hearings they would be scrupulously careful to obey the provision of law which protects historic price margins.

Housewives, though they shop avidly for beef, do not protest because, of course, they cannot be expected to know the reason for the gross beef shortage. There is no loud outcry from farmers because many of the relatively few farmers who practice cattle feeding in normal times would just as soon skip it under uncertain wartime conditions.

Put yourself in the farmers' shoes: You are the cattle feeder living on your midwestern farm. Your income is derived chiefly from corn supplemented by soybeans, wheat, oats, clover, and so forth. Still, you realize that it is considered good, efficient farming to feed some cattle during the winter when farm work slacks. The cattle would eat some of your corn and hay. They would also range among your cornstalks and eat stuff you would otherwise plow under. By feeding some cattle and some hogs together with the cattle you can improve the fertility of your soil and perhaps make a bit of profit. But at best cattle feeding is a highly speculative operation in which even expert cattle feeders sometimes "lose their shirts."

Every fall you do some worrying and figuring, trying to guess what the cattle prices are apt to be by spring.

In order to emerge from the operation without a loss the price margin in normal times must be such that there is a 3-cent spread between the price you paid and the price for which you sell the cattle. You cannot finance the operation yourself because the cost of a herd of cattle runs up into thousands of dollars. You have to borrow the money from the bank. The banker cannot lend you the money unless he, too, feels that prices are going to be such that you will not come out of the operation "in the red."

Having decided to feed the coming winter, you journey to Kansas City in the fall and buy a lot of thin cattle shipped in from western ranges on which pasture has dried up. Then your troubles begin. You ship the animals home—some may arrive dead. All through the long, icy, cold winter you labor from 4 in the morning until long after dark, cutting ice in the tanks, caring for sick steers, mending fences, driving, feeding, and watering the cattle—all the arduous tasks necessary if you are to avoid being ruined in the gamble. At best the job is no picnic. Now that labor is scarce and dear, cattle feeding is literally an Augean undertaking. These days you could not come out of it at all with the historic 3-cent margin; it had better be 5 cents.

This year, with commercial fertilizer scarce, you would like to feed some cattle, but you know from your account books there is no money in it—thanks to O. P. A.—except maybe for big-time experts. Even if you could persuade your banker to lend you the money, you would not be able to repay him. You want to be patriotic and back the Yanks. But O. P. A. will not let you, though it does seem a crying shame. Some day when the truth seeps out it may be considered a national scandal—like that business of killing all the little pigs. As for you, of course, you can sell your corn, plow under your cornstalks, and go without beef and eat pork.

The following letter from a Midwestern cattle feeder who is a professional farm expert shows that experts feel about the same way:

DEAR MISS SUMNER: The bungling bureaucrats are on the loose again. I suppose that every business and industry thinks that they are the hardest hit but I doubt if any business has had the hurdles to surmount, nor the obstructions to meet that the Corn Belt beef-cattle feeder has had. Much intelligent evidence has been given by experienced farmers and feeders to point out that production of meats could not be maintained with live price ceilings on hogs, cattle, and sheep and the corn freeze of last summer. Even the Department of Agriculture records show that sheep are at their lowest level since 1937, hogs are down 30 percent and in both cases the actual number is less than indicated. Cattle feeders have quit by the thousands. By summer there definitely will not be enough meat for the Army.

Yet in the face of these facts which are obvious to all but the O. P. A. and apparently Judge Vinson, more regulations and edicts and ceilings are forthcoming as the O. P. A. had their minds made up on beef ceilings and intended to put it on at $17.50 before they went to the Corn Belt to hold the hearings as a matter of form. I hope that you were able to attend the meeting on last Monday and if you did you no doubt came to the same conclusion that a handful of eastern butchers are more important to the cattle industry than thousands of farmers and feeders. The butcher belongs to the labor union and voted right. The feeder didn't.

Now, to add insult to inquiry the proposal is to draft into the armed forces all farm help in the 18-to-25 age group. Anyone knows that it is the only intelligent group of farm help, that is left. This group came up through 4-H Club work, is the group that has some education and are doing the feeding of hogs, cattle, and sheep, are milking the cows, are young enough to understand and operate the machinery, have the physical stamina to stand the 14- to 16-hour days that are necessary to operate a livestock farm at all, will do as they agree to do and are young enough to understand why it is necessary, are not susceptible to the propaganda of the d——— labor unions that will undoubtedly try to descend on the farms with an older, less intelligent group of farm help and most important of all are the men who are giving the armed forces some meat and milk to fight on. Without this group of farm help we absolutely cannot produce meat in this country.

At present we are feeding 1,400 cattle, 800 hogs, and 400 sheep. All of our help is 2-C or the age group which they propose to take. Every feeder in this county is in the same predicament. Plans are being made for the year of 1945 or by all means should be. The only choice the livestock man has is to seed the farm in grass and quit. He will be called a slacker by Washington yet if he is forced to such a decision, its entire responsibility lies with Washington. Our only hope is that Congress will block the effort being made to bring this about. I know that you will do all that you can and I hope other Congressmen will, too.

Very truly yours.

Prior to January 10 there were no ceilings on live cattle, but O. P. A. achieved the same results by penalizing through reduced subsidies packers who pay above set prices. The War Food Administration, it is said, has tried to persuade O. P. A. to adopt the cattle-feeder view. The Agricultural Department, according to the press, has admitted the obvious fact that there is going to be a reduced supply of beef in the future. Cattle feeders scoff bitterly at O. P. A.'s theory that the new $18 ceiling will curb the black market, pointing to the fact that choice cattle prices have been ranging below $18. They regard O. P. A.'s new scheme as a blessing for the black markets, enabling black marketeers to buy from the decreased supply at still lower prices.

As usual, the real trouble seems to be the way O. P. A. is influenced by mighty pressure groups, the leaders of which want to be able to say to their membership, "Look how our pressure on O. P. A. has kept down the cost of living for you." The American food larder may become as bare as Mother Hubbard's cupboard and still they will say, "But we kept down the ceiling price on bones." Yes; the cattle which processors are buying today are little more than bones—bones, hoofs, horns, and heads.

Sixty percent of the beef supply goes to the armed forces. It is not going to hurt us taxpayers to pay the few cents a pound necessary to provide our fighting men a steak a day if they want it. Of course, beef is not essential to living, since many people live without it, due to preference, doctors' orders, religious belief, or because of the shortage. But how can it be American for our Government to deprive a great many of our citizens of beef they would gladly buy for no reason except to keep the price less than 5 cents a pound cheaper to favor the few who are not going to be able to buy it anyway because of the shortage this policy is creating?

New dealers consider themselves maligned and vilified whenever they are accused of being Communists, but if this New Deal policy is not communistic, what is it?

In every nation of Europe today despairing people are being urged to turn to communism. They may not know that even after a quarter of a century Russian communism was still feeding the mass of people stuff you would not feed

a dog. They hear that now there are food shortages in the United States, too. They cannot know, since even most Americans themselves are unaware that the shortages are to a large extent caused by unnecessary communistic practices. Why not throw off the unnecessary communistic practices and give our producers enough freedom to produce efficiently? Now is our supreme chance to show the world that the American form of government is the most productive form of government, whether in war or peace. Let us adopt as our advertising slogan, "Use the American principles of government—and eat." But we should practice what we preach.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana for 15 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

115. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $80,000,000, supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $1,834,114,000, and contract authorization in the amount of $136,800,000, for the Navy Department and naval service (H. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

116. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, amounting to $184,000, together with a draft of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for said Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 29); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

117. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $23,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 30); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

118. A letter from the Adjutant General, Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting the Journal of the Proceedings of the Seventy-seventh National Encampment, held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19–24, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

119. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill providing for the abolition of the office of coroner and for the organization of the office of medical examiner for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

120. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting his report on the inspection of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines for the period ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 70. Resolution providing an allocation from the contingent fund of the House to the Committee on Appropriations for expenses of studies and examinations under House Resolution 50; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 92. Resolution authorizing the expense of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 592 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 63 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 88. Resolution for the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 1571. A bill to amend the act regarding the qualifications for the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1572. A bill to amend the act regarding the qualifications for the Navy Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 1573. A bill to provide for preliminary examination and survey of the Cross-Rock Channel between Wallace Channel and Sheep Island Slue, via Casey Island, Pamlico Sound, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1574. A bill to provide for preliminary examination and survey of Harkers Point Basin at Harkers Island, Carteret County, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 1575. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1576. A bill to further amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 1577. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1578 (by request). A bill to amend the Classification Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1579 (by request). A bill to prohibit the reduction of permanent disability ratings except in case of fraud or clear and unmistakable error; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1580 (by request). A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to provide payment of benefits based upon permanent total disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1581 (by request). A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a) to provide orthopedic and prosthetic appliances to veterans of any war discharged under conditions other than dishonorable; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1582. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1583. A bill to regulate in the United States Court of Claims and in the United States district courts suits for payment for the infringement of patents infringed by or for the Government and for the use of inventions used by or for the Government, and for the better protection of the rights of inventors and owners of patents, and to stimulate the making of inventions useful to the Government, and insure payment for the use thereof when used by or for the Government and its contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 1584. A bill to authorize the naturalization and the admission into the United States under a quota of Eastern Hemisphere Indians and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1585. A bill to transfer jurisdiction over Fort Hamilton, N. Y., from the Secretary of War to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the purpose of establishing a Veterans Administration facility; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1586. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States, under a quota for Koreans, of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1587. A bill to provide for the classification of cotton for producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1588. A bill to promote the defense of the United States by prohibiting the conducting of certain foreign-language schools; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 1589. A bill to exclude service performed by certain real-estate salesmen from the definition of "employment" under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1590. A bill to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1591. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1592. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1593. A bill to extend for 1 year the time for filing applications for the payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution to provide for termination of the act of January 20, 1942, providing for daylight-saving time;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution providing a basis for peace and a just world order; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution providing a basis for peace and a just world order; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution providing a basis for a declaration on world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to declare October 28, 1945, Statue of Liberty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-in's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. Res. 93. Resolution to provide for the continuation of the investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 98 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 94. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1594. A bill for the relief of William Albert Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1595. A bill for the relief of the borough of Beach Haven, Ocean County, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1596. A bill for the relief of David B. Reidy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 1597. A bill for the relief of the United Seamen's Service, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1598. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 1599. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Norfolk-Portsmouth Bridge, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1600. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Kenneth T. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1601. A bill for the relief of Dorothy M. Moon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DREWRY:

H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Robert Lee Slade; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1603. A bill for the relief of C. W. Robbins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEELAN:

H. R. 1604. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Armstrong; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 1605. A bill for the relief of the National Liberty Insurance Co. of America; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 1606. A bill for the relief of Ethel Farkas, Julius Farkas, and the legal guardian of Terez Farkas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 1607. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Earnshow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1608. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Seager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1609. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jennie V. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1610. A bill granting an increase of pension to Carrie H. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1611. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Surmont; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1612. A bill for the relief of James M. Robedee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 1613: A bill for the relief of Christopher Dance; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1614. A bill for the relief of Jennie Olsen Andersen, widow, and Arthur Andrew Andersen, infant son, of Carl Edward Andersen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1615. A bill for the relief of the legal guardians of John Buchan and Lawrence Gillingham, minors; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1616. A bill to grant an honorable discharge from the military service of the United States to William Rosenberg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1617. A bill for the relief of Hugh M. Gregory; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

21. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: 20 petitions of 506 signatures from residents of Long Island in opposition to House bill 2082 (78th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

22. Also, 2 petitions of 42 signatures from residents of Long Island in opposition to House bill 2082 (78th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

23. Also, petition protesting against the partition of Poland and urging the United States Government to reaffirm its pledges expressed in the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit who hast appointed our portion of labor, we pause in the midst of this day's duties to acknowledge that we are not our own; it is Thy lordship over life which we would keep vividly before our eyes lest we be confounded by the world's confusion and become mired in the devices and desires of selfish motives. Help us to work while it is called day, knowing that the night cometh when our work is done.

O Thou who art the Compassionate Father found of those who seek Thee in loneliness and whose sustaining grace is sufficient for the sorrowing souls of Thy children, remember in tender mercy the inner family circle and dear ones of him who so recently stood in this Chamber with the consecrated powers of his strong manhood, so able and faithful, and who, serving the nation he loved, has now fallen on sleep in the full strength of his days. Vouchsafe to him, O Lord, light and rest, peace and refreshment, joy and consolation in the paradise of God. Unite us with Thyself and with those who have traveled by our side in the holy communion of the life eternal. May we have the assurance of their continued fellowship in Thee and the realization that there is no separation in the realm of love and service. Bring us all to the homeland of Thy eternal love. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

HAROLD H. BURTON, a Senator from the State of Ohio; ALBERT B. CHANDLER, a Senator from the State of Kentucky; and JAMES M. TUNNELL, a Senator from the State of Delaware, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 15, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SENATORS FROM CALIFORNIA AND WASHINGTON—ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, the Senator-elect from California, Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY, and the Senator-designate from Washington, Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, whose credentials have heretofore been read and placed on file, are present in the Chamber and desire to be sworn in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-elect and the Senator-designate will present themselves at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to them.

Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. MITCHELL, escorted by Mr. TRUMAN, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as it is contemplated that the Senate will adjourn until Monday, it is deemed that there would be no impropriety in going through the morning routine proceedings for the introduction of bills and such other routine business as it may be desired to transact at this time.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SPECIAL ATTORNEYS, ETC., DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1, to December 31, 1944, under the appropriation "Compensation of Special Attorneys, etc., Department of Justice" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 212 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

INSPECTION OF COAL MINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the inspection of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines for the period ended December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

REPORT OF CREDIT OPERATIONS UNDER OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of credit operations under authority of the acts of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), as of June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration covering operations of the Administration for the fiscal year of 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for the fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Corporation for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, submitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the period from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (3), Justice (3), Post Office, Navy (9), Agriculture, and Commerce; War Manpower Commission, National Housing Agency, and Federal Security Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Lodge of the Order of Ahepa, Washington, D. C., requesting the mediation and active participation of the Government in the negotiations now under way in Athens and in London designed to achieve the cessation of the present war in Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Lodge of the Order of Ahepa, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of national service legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Haviland, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to establish permanent peacetime conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DRAFTING OF FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am receiving in increasing numbers telegrams and letters protesting against what seems to be the Government's policy of drafting all farmers and farm workers between the ages of 18 and 26 who are physically fit, without regard to whether under the so-called Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act these men are required to be deferred, because they are essential to food production in the war effort.

The Tydings amendment was enacted by the Congress for the purpose of insuring that sufficient able-bodied men were kept on the farms to do the work necessary to bring about maximum food production. Where some individual is known by his local draft board to be using this as a subterfuge to escape military service, the board should find someone to replace him, and induct him.

But this latest directive from General Hershey, Selective Service Director, has been taken by the local draft boards, according to my information, as a directive to draft all farmers and farm workers in this age group, without respect to the effect such action will have on necessary farming operations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a letter I have written to General Hershey and two letters and a telegram received by me on this subject.

There being no objection, the letters and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1945.

Maj. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director, Selective Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: I am receiving a number of telegrams like the following from a farmer and stockman at Clements, Kans.:

"The farm front is getting serious. The draft boards are drafting farmers right and left. Essential young farmers are selling out. Farmers should be frozen on the farm, as land will be idle and livestock sacrificed.

"ERNEST LALOVETTE."

It seems to me what has happened, as a result of your recent telegram to State selective-service directors, is that the local boards understand that they are to draft all farmers between 18 and 26 who are physically fit.

I am aware that a careful reading of your telegram does not so instruct—but it is probably open to that interpretation. The fact that you say "who do not clearly come within the provisions of the Tydings amendment" is more than offset by the following quotation, directing the local boards to consider the President's finding that "the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men."

That statement that the "deferment of all men * * * is not as essential" apparently is being interpreted to mean that the boards must induct all men so deferred. I think the boards are entitled to a more clear-cut statement of what you want them to do.

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *January 13, 1945.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our local draft boards are taking all our boys off the farms and putting them in the armed services. We were so glad to read your article in today's paper where you came to the rescue of the young farmers. My son is about to be forced into the service, although we farm 500 acres of diversified crops, have over 100 head of cattle, all of which we have raised. Included in the herd are 18 milk cows. The rest are mainly cows and heifers. We also have other livestock.

The War Manpower Board in our county recommended my son as essential to agriculture, since our farm is rated as a 47-unit farm and the average for the county is 40 units for a father and son. He has complied with the Tydings amendment, and for the past almost 2 years since he has been out of high school has worked from daylight until dark trying to do all he could for his country. Is the Tydings amendment still in effect? If so, do you think it will remain in effect for the duration of the war? Do you think that our local draft board can legally induct into service a boy whose war board says he is essential to agriculture under the Tydings amendment?

With the giving up of my son I will have to let a lot of the land lay idle and let down a lot on my cattle production, for it will be impossible to get any help this summer.

We hope Congress will act and act quickly, for, like you said in your article, the young men are the backbone of the farm, for the older men and the women and children can't do the heavier work. The administration urged us to raise the cattle, and now they won't leave us any help to take care of them. It seems since Byrnes put it out to draft the farm boys the draft boards are taking them all.

Some people say our Congressmen in Washington won't stick their necks out to help us for fear Washington will say they are hindering the war effort. I don't believe the people realize what a serious shortage of meat, milk, and milk products there will be unless you in Washington act and act quickly. My son Douglas is the only help I have.

Thanking you for a speedy reply, I am,

COLUMBUS, KANS., *January 17, 1945.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

The order is here calling all farm workers, regardless of how necessary they are to produce foodstuff, not only for the armed forces but for civilians as well. I will state my own case, and there are thousands just like me. I operate a turkey farm, and now, on account of labor shortage, I have only one man working; could use several more. This boy is 19 years old, and I have trained him in this specialized work for 2 years. Last summer I produced 2,500 turkeys, and this boy did all of the work. We now have 850 breeders on hand. Their eggs will produce

this season at least 20,000 turkeys. On account of other business that is essential, there is no one in my family that can do this work. If this boy is taken into the Army, I will be forced to discontinue this turkey farm until after the war. You can see that the country will lose at least 300,000 pounds of turkey. Congress certainly is not going to sit idly by and let a few men, that do not seem to have the brains that they should have, ruin the country. Men can't fight on empty stomachs, and neither can civilians work on empty stomachs. Please advise me if the Tydings amendment was made as a law or was done to fool the people. If it is a law, can they take this boy?

AVERILL TURKEY FARM.

GREENSBURG, KANS., *January 13, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR: In this second week of January 1945, 32 young men from Reno County, 48 men from Barton County, 15 men from Pratt County, and 19 men from Kiowa County were drafted into the armed forces. Here are 114 unreplaceable men for the farms All indications are that more men will be drafted before the spring work starts. This harvest, we will be very much in need of these men It usually takes 3 men for every farm at harvest time. Let us say it takes 2 men to a crew, we'll put most of the grain on the ground, but that is what we did last year. We may as well face it here; in 2 weeks we are 114 farmhands short. This is not counting the men that will be drafted the next 3 months, nor is it counting the men taken from other counties or States.

In that work-or-fight bill, I ask of you, for the welfare of our country, if you would put in that bill a phrase that would at least defer IV-F's on the farms. We could defer them as they were deferred before.

These young men are future farmers and will work more hours and do heavier work than any factory worker. If this war is going to last some time, let us not forget that we must have food. We hope that you will do your very best.

Very truly yours,

CECIL A. UNRUH.

PRICES OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented a letter, together with a resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the fourth district of the Minnesota Creameries Association, held at Le Sueur, Minn., which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, MINN.,
December 6, 1944.

Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Attached you will find a resolution adopted and passed at the annual meeting of the fourth district of the Minnesota Creameries Association, held at Le Sueur, Minn.

We, the undersigned members of the creamery board of the Springfield Farmers' Co-Operative Creamery, wish to ask you to use your influence on the agencies that have it within their power to make the correction according to the resolution adopted.

Yours very truly,

SPRINGFIELD FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE CREAMERY CO.,
WALTER F. HENSCH,
Operator and Manager.
JOHN GATZLAPP, *President.*
PAUL AMDT, *Vice President.*
ALBERT W. SCHULTZ,
Secretary and Treasurer.
JOS. TURLES,
JACOB SCHMITZ,
ED. H. KRUEGER,
Directors.

Whereas it has come to the attention and knowledge of the members of this district that butter production in this area, which is normally a high producing area, has dropped alarmingly during recent months; and

Whereas this situation is brought about directly as a result of the O. P. A., the W. F. A., and other policies which make it possible for the powdered-milk people to outbid the creameries for the milk produced; and

Whereas considerable volume of cream and plastic cream now being sold and shipped from our State, at a higher price than the cream churned into butter, creates an unfair situation to the producer and farmer: Now therefore

We petition the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and such other agencies as have it within their power to correct this situation to collaborate in a program of regulations, prices, and rules as will make it possible for the creameries to bid satisfactorily and be able to pay to the producer a price comparable to that permitted to be paid for other dairy products; that a ceiling price may be established on cream and cream products, and to be rationed the same as butter; also that the feed subsidy paid for butterfat will be equalized to that paid on whole milk.

PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred resolutions adopted by the western district conference of the General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America, at North Newton, Kans., in opposition to peacetime military conscription.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND TO SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

We want to express to you our deep Christian concern over the present agitation for peacetime military conscription in our country and military training in our public schools.

Our forefathers knew what it was to live in countries cursed by military conscription. That is why they came to America seeking to be free from compulsory military service and the restrictions of religious and personal freedom by the power of the State.

You will, therefore, understand why we are so concerned lest the scourge of State totalitarianism and militarism which now threatens to curse the entire world may engulf our own land and its institutions. We cease not in our prayers, earnestly petitioning that our country may be spared from being caught in this fateful drift. With equal earnestness we pray that you may be used of God to help stem this dangerous tide and to help find a more God-pleasing answer to the problem of human conflict than that of militarism and war.

HERBERT E. MILLER,
President.
DAVID C. WEDEL,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 63. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 9).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 184. A bill to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage-record information to State unemployment compensation agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 10); and

S. 294. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 11); and

S. Res. 33. Resolution continuing the authority for the creation of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back favorably without amendment Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 dealing with coverage benefits and pay-roll taxes under the old-age section of the social-security law. I ask that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) providing for a study of certain phases of old-age and survivors' insurance under the Social Security Act, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

Hattie W. Caraway, of Arkansas, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from March 15, 1943, vice John J. Keegan, deceased.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Ross E. Brown, of Holland, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

Harris Walthall, of El Paso, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex., to fill an existing vacancy; and

Sundry officers for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee on Finance:

Nigel D. Campbell, of Chicago, Ill., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Finance:

Harry D. White, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of John L. Sullivan whose resignation was effective November 30, 1944.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 327. A bill to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 328. A bill for the relief of James A. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 329. A bill for the relief of Alfred P. Paquin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 330. A bill to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 331. A bill to authorize the naturalization and the admission into the United States under a quota of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 332. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the property known as Temple Heights to be used for the duration of the war as a recreation center for Government employees, or for offices, and thereafter as a site for a memorial building in commemoration of the sacrifices of the defenders of the Union during the Civil War; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. WILSON):

S. 333. A bill to restore to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 334. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED:

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 336. A bill to amend section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the pooling and division of certain revenues of carriers subject to such act; and

S. 337. A bill to amend section 1 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to permit joint action by common carriers subject to part I, II, III, or IV, respectively, in connection with procedures related to the establishment of rates and taking of other action; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and Mr. MCFARLAND):

S. 338. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCFARLAND:

S. 339. A bill granting to the State of Arizona certain lands and interests in lands in such State heretofore released by railroad companies; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. MCCARRAN (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

S. 340. A bill to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 341. A bill to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

S. 342. A bill to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for nonpayment of fines;

S. 343. A bill to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended (11 U. S. C. 63), so as to remove the legal incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy;

S. 344. A bill to prescribe and furnish to United States commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal;

S. 345. A bill concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States commissioners; and

S. 346. A bill to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 347. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern district, of West Virginia," approved June 22, 1936, as amended, by eliminating the provision that the judge of the District Court of the Northern and Southern Districts of West Virginia shall succeed to the office of the district judge of the northern district of West Virginia upon a vacancy in the latter office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 348. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Highway Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 349. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach and others, for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. CAPPER):

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution on international economic collaboration; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HILL (for Mr. PEPPER and Mr. ANDREWS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 35), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, or any representative thereof, with a view of determining whether (a) the activities of said agencies, through their representatives, are crippling, hampering, or rendering ineffective the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, heretofore enacted by Congress; and (b) whether or not the activities of said agencies, through their representatives, are unfairly resulting in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida.

The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the result of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purpose of th's resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, and make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES IN RELATION TO THE NATIONAL WELFARE

Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 36), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 13, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare), is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] be assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] as a Member of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the resignation of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], which takes effect tonight, and by direction of the steering committee, I move that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] be assigned to the Committee on Military Affairs to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, pursuant to law, and as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I appoint the following members of the committee to the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy for 1945:

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to file reports from the committee during the adjournment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMERICA'S PART IN WORLD AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America's Part in World Affairs," delivered by Senator FULBRIGHT in the New York Times Forum at New York City on January 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S OBLIGATION TO CONTRIBUTE TO WORLD PEACE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "There Is No Ivory Tower for Us," written by him and published in the New York Times of January 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROSPERITY IN THE POST-WAR ERA—ADDRESS BY JOHN BRANDT

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "Post-war Prosperity—Or No?", delivered by John Brandt, president of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, at the organization's twenty-eighth annual meeting, in Chicago, Ill., December 6, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF BOOK ENTITLED "THE PHILADELPHIA LAWYER"

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Allen Nevins, reviewing the book entitled "The Philadelphia Lawyer," written by former Senator George Wharton Pepper, of Pennsylvania, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR PEACE—EDITORIAL BY JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the column This Morning by John Temple Graves, published in the Birmingham Age-Herald of January 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 626. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1427. An act relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 626. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1427. An act relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the calendar of executive nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, as in executive session, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar.

SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Surplus Property Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adolf A. Berle, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Brazil.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Buell, of New York, to be consul general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walworth Barbour, of Massachusetts, to be consul.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Haden Alldredge, of Alabama, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for term expiring December 1, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles D. Mahaffie, of the District of Columbia, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for term expiring December 1, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul A. Porter, of Kentucky, to be a Member for the unexpired term of 7 years, from July 1, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Miles N. Pike, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Reed Sharp, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

DEATH OF SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is with deep grief that I rise to announce the death of my late colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MALONEY.

It is not my purpose at this time to endeavor to enumerate the many great qualities or to call attention to the statesmanship of FRANCIS MALONEY. Later I shall speak at length upon the life and services of our late colleague. All Senators knew him. Many of them had worked with him for the 10 years in which he served the people of the State of Connecticut and of the United States with high honor and great distinction. The Senate, the Nation, and his State, will greatly miss his statesmanship.

At this time I submit resolutions, and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 37) were read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Resolved, That a committee of 13 Senators be appointed by the President of the

Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will withhold the question of agreeing to the resolutions until several Senators who very much wish to be heard have made the statements which are on their minds.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement with reference to the death of our late distinguished colleague, Senator FRANCIS MALONEY.

Mr. President, I was very fond of the late Senator from Connecticut. I think he was one of the ablest and hardest working men in this body. I served with him on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds ever since we both came to the Senate, which we entered at the same time, being sworn in on the same day. The Senate has suffered a real loss in the death of Senator MALONEY.

I should like to have permission to have printed as a part of my remarks an editorial which was published in the Washington Post yesterday morning in tribute to Senator MALONEY, which is an able statement of what he meant to this great legislative body.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCIS MALONEY

In a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post, Eliot Janeway described FRANCIS MALONEY as a man who, through his demonstrated fairness, his freedom from narrow partisanship and political sectarianism, and his great talent for mediation, had won the respect of all groups on both sides of the Senate. He was, in fact, a "Senator's Senator," and Janeway predicted that his influence among his colleagues would steadily increase with the years.

Alas, fate has decreed that FRANCIS MALONEY'S life be cut short in midstream. Dead at the age of 51, he leaves behind him a fine record as a public servant, first in his native city of Meriden, Conn., later in the House, and during the past 10 years in the Senate. One of the chief proponents of an efficient Congress, he was, at the time of his death, chairman of a joint study committee on modernization.

His death, in fact, was proof of the need of such modernization. A conscientious statesman, MALONEY took his committee assignments very seriously, and the burden of presiding over one senatorial committee, serving on four others as well as two special committees, serving on one joint committee and several commissions, undoubtedly helped to wear him down. His death is a very real loss to his State and to the Nation. We mourn it. There are too few men like him in our public life.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall not at this time indulge in any extensive remarks about our late colleague, Senator MALONEY, and his untimely end. If when the Senate adjourned for the holidays, only a few weeks ago, I had been asked to name any Senator who might in the meantime depart this life, I certainly would not have named FRANCIS MALONEY. When he left us for the Christmas holidays he seemed to be in the full vigor of health and strength, and would have been one among the last I would have thought of in connection with death so soon. Yet, as we all know, the strongest may be stricken in the most unexpected hour, which of course should be an admonition to all of us who are yet here to keep our lamps trimmed and burning.

Mr. President, I served with Senator MALONEY during his entire service in the Senate, and even before he became a Member of the Senate I knew him as a Member of the House of Representatives from Connecticut. A public servant more sincerely devoted to the public interest I have never known. In his conception of his duty he did not follow any pattern laid down by others unless the pattern fitted him and his own idea of public duty.

Senator MALONEY was an independent thinker, and as a member of the committee on which I served with him during most of the time he was in the Senate he exhibited a constructive mind, and on all occasions, in the most controversial situations, offered helpful suggestions, and frequently was instrumental in resolving controversies, and thus enlivened our interest in his mental processes and our appreciation of his ability.

He was a man of the highest character. In his personal life I presume he occupied a level as high as that of any man in the United States Senate, or in much wider circles that might be mentioned.

At the time of his death he was interested in a project or proposal which for years has been on the minds of many American people, a proposal regarding the procedures of the Congress of the United States, and designed to make more efficient the legislative branch of our Government. He was the chairman of the joint committee created to study that subject. What might have come out of it, or what may come out of it, no one can now predict, but it is a subject worthy of careful study and investigation. All of us who have been here for years know that improvements can be made.

Mr. President, I regard with peculiar sorrow and grief the untimely death of Senator MALONEY. In the prime of life, at a time when, by reason of his experience and character and his devotion to duty and his industry, he seemed destined to render a greater service to his country and to his State than it had ever been possible for him to render before, it is peculiarly unfortunate that the hand of death has touched him and taken him from us. We shall always cherish his memory and remember his high example.

We express our profound sympathy to his family and his friends and his neighbors, many of whom it was my privilege to know. At some later date I hope that the opportunity will be afforded to me and to others in more detail to express our sentiments regarding Senator MALONEY. For the time being we can only feebly and humbly express our grief and sorrow, and extend to his family and friends our affection and regard.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, news of the death of Senator MALONEY came with shocking suddenness, and brought grief and infinite regret to all who were associated with him in the Senate. In this body Senator MALONEY was known as a man of diligence, great ability, courage, and high-mindedness. He had our great respect and he had our deep affection. The people of his State, the Senate, and the country have suffered a grievous loss in his untimely taking.

My tender sympathy goes out to his widow and to his children, and I think we all join in the sentiment that his life and his character may be always a blessed memory to them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the death of Senator FRANCIS MALONEY is a real calamity in these critical hours of the Republic, when the high and courageous statesmanship which he typified is so desperately needed. I never knew a more useful public servant. I never knew a finer Christian spirit or a character of finer integrity. I never knew a Member of this body who more intimately endeared himself to his colleagues. His State will miss him, his country will miss him, the Senate will miss him. He leaves a great void in the hearts and hopes of men.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I cannot resist saying a word on this occasion because of the situation under which the news of the death of Senator MALONEY reached the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] and myself. Yesterday morning we were in Casablanca, north Africa, and we received there the bulletin which we read on the way back—and we arrived here this morning—telling of the death of Senator MALONEY. The manner in which the sad news reached us deeply impressed upon me the thought that in Senator MALONEY there was a man who fully appreciated the ever-increasing responsibility and opportunity of the United States Senate, and who sought, not only by his own example and personal endeavors but by his effort, to improve the machinery of the Senate, to enable us to live up to the responsibilities of our time.

I wish to join in the expressions of other Senators of our deep appreciation of Senator MALONEY. He was an outstanding example of a God-fearing, conscientious, hard-working, capable, and public-spirited Senator. He placed the interest of God and country above all others. The Nation will greatly miss his service. His colleagues will deeply miss his friendly, modest, helpful comradeship. He did lasting honor to the Senate. I deem it a great privilege to have been associated with him in some of his work here.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate 6 years ago I served for 2 years with Senator MALONEY on the Appropriations Committee and frequently worked with him. During all that period I was associated with him mostly on the Banking and Currency Committee and on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I know of no Senator who was more useful. I know of no one who had a firmer belief in the principles of the United States Government. He had to a certain extent a pessimism and a sense of futility. He disapproved of many of the things which were going on. He disapproved of the direction toward which he felt the country was inevitably moving. Sometimes he contented himself with a violent

protest against some particular measure. Sometimes he simply felt that it was beyond his power to stop the enactment of certain legislation. When he did see something which he thought he could accomplish he entered upon the endeavor with all his spirit and with all his force and ability, and he usually accomplished the purpose he sought to achieve. He judged well the limitations of individual Senators, and, having determined their limitations, he went ahead and succeeded in the objectives he thought he could attain. Thus he left his mark on legislation and on the record of the United States Senate.

I suppose there was no Senator who worked harder for his constituents, both by way of correspondence and personal contact. I know there was no Senator who worked harder on the legislation which came before committees of which he was a member. In his death I feel a deep personal loss, and I know that the Nation has suffered a loss which cannot be replaced.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on this sad occasion I should like to add my brief and humble but sincere tribute to the memory of FRANCIS MALONEY. During the years I have served in this Chamber I have never known a more conscientious, a more high-minded, or a more indefatigable servant of the common good. In committee, as a member or as chairman of a committee, he showed that great quality of leadership which is represented in much constructive legislation. Although a man of deep and firm convictions, he always maintained the most cordial personal relations with his colleagues, and he had that fine spirit of tolerance which recognized the right of others to disagree with his opinions, no matter how firmly they were held.

The Senate, his State, and the country can ill afford the great loss which they have suffered in the untimely death of this true statesman. I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his loving and adoring family.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I was greatly shocked on Monday last to learn in Chicago the news of the illness of my dear friend the Senator from Connecticut. I dispatched a telegram to him forthwith expressing the hope that he would shortly and speedily recover from what I had been told was a heart attack.

During the last 5 years I have been for most of the time seated here by his side. I learned to know him pretty well, and to admire him greatly. We had an understanding that when we were able to vote together, we were glad of it. When we voted on opposite sides, as we sometimes did, we gave each other what we called a soft note. We gave a soft objection, and not a vigorous or harsh one. In the last fight we had here we were side by side.

During the last war FRANCIS MALONEY was a first-class seaman. I learned of the great pride he had in a son who is serving in the Navy in this war. His son is a first-class seaman, just as his father had been. I learned of his great pride in the accomplishments of his children, and of his hope, if the occasion should permit, of visiting Kentucky, in the center of the country, and enjoying life with us, a promise which he was never able to fulfill because of his untimely death.

We are all so busy doing things we consider important that we do not have time to tell those we love, while they live, that we love them. Unfortunately, too, often we wait until they are dead, and then try to think of some words, futile and pitiful as they may be, to express our affection and admiration for them.

When Alan Seeger, during the First World War, penned those valiant lines "I Have a Rendezvous With Death," fear found no resting place in his heart. Charles Frohman, as he stood upon the deck of the sinking *Lusitania*, was a mountain of courage as he whispered, "Now, I shall learn the rest of that beautiful adventure." Each must have been filled with anticipation of a great reunion. There is an immortality in the love which sees death fearlessly and, with forethought, lays plans for the happiness of the survivor.

For his devoted wife and children, who will be deprived of his presence and his love and devotion, and who will suffer because of plans not fulfilled, which he will not be able to accomplish for them, I wish to read a poem which I read on one other occasion, written by my very dear friend, Albert Kennedy Roswell, of Pittsburgh, Pa., which expresses, better than I could express, the feelings of a survivor for one who has gone ahead:

Should you go first and I remain
To walk the road alone,
I'll live in memory's garden, dear,
With happy days we've known.
In Spring I'll wait for roses red,
When fades the lilac blue,
In early Fall when brown leaves call
I'll catch a glimpse of you.

Should you go first and I remain
For battles to be fought,
Each thing you've touched along the way
Will be a hallowed spot.
I'll hear your voice, I'll see your smile,
Though blindly I may grope,
The memory of your helping hand
Will buoy me on with hope.

Should you go first and I remain
To finish with the scroll,
No length'ning shadows shall creep in
To make this life seem droll.
We've known so much of happiness,
We've had our cup of joy,
And memory is one gift of God
That death cannot destroy.

Should you go first and I remain
One thing I'd have you do:
Walk slowly down the path of death,
For soon I'll follow you.
I'll want to know each step you take
That I may walk the same,
For some day down that lonely road
You'll hear me call your name.

To the memory of my beloved friend, FRANCIS MALONEY, first-class seaman, first-class Senator, and first-class man, Mr. President, I pay this humble tribute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolving clause, the Vice President appointed Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BILBO, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MEAD, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. HAWKES, and Mr. REVERCOMB as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY OUT OF RESPECT TO THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of my late colleague from Connecticut, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

Robert L. Buell to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Walworth Barbour to be a consul of the United States of America.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

TO BE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONERS FOR TERMS EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 1951

J. Haden Alldredge
Charles D. Mahaffie

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Paul A. Porter to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1942.

SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

Guy M. Gillette to be a member of the Surplus Property Board.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Miles N. Pike to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Reed Sharp to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

To be assistant surgeons, effective date of oath of office

George P. Hand, Jr.
James L. Hart

To be passed assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated

John F. Flynn, Jr., January 17, 1945.
William D. Hazlehurst, January 29, 1945.
Robert T. Potter, December 15, 1944.
Edward W. Kunckel, January 19, 1945.
Selwyn H. Drummond, July 1, 1944.
John W. O'Donnell, July 10, 1944.

To be surgeons, effective dates indicated

Bert R. Boone, November 16, 1944.
Michael J. Pescor, November 1, 1944.
Don S. Cameron, November 16, 1944.
Ralph R. Braund, September 1, 1944.

To be senior surgeon, effective July 6, 1944

Fletcher C. Stewart

To be temporary passed assistant surgeon, effective December 1, 1944

Arthur Kornberg

To be temporary senior surgeons, effective December 1, 1944

Ralph R. Braund
Leslie McC. Smith
Francis J. Weber

To be temporary surgeons, effective December 1, 1944

Esta R. Allen
William B. Hoover
John D. Porterfield
Jack C. Haldeman

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Grady Richardson, Donalsonville.
Jesse G. Scaife, Fort Gaines.

ILLINOIS

M. Elaine Bryant, Browning.
James L. Westfall, Crossville.
James C. Stanley, Fairfield.
Genevieve B. Livesay, Posen.
Kenneth A. Elmore, Quincy.

KANSAS

Reuben J. Wilhelm, Bazine.
Harold V. Luginbill, Greensburg.
Joseph Lillard Johnson, Osawatomie.
Wade H. McDowell, Paola.
Gordon Alvis, Seneca.
Charles S. Smith, Westmoreland.

TENNESSEE

Louise C. Treadway, Pleasant Hill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, hitherto we have been the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence, and we rejoice that in each succeeding day we may find our strength and hope in Thee.

We pray that during this new year Thou wilt endue with special tokens of divine wisdom our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of this Congress who have been entrusted with the vocation of administering the affairs of government. May our beloved country continue to be the land of faith and of freedom.

Show us how we may find promising and practical ways of meeting the needs of mankind of whatever race or creed. Help us to solve the problems of human relationships on the high and hallowed levels of a sacred respect for human personality and human rights.

Grant that we may be inspired to establish a new world order of social justice and international friendship through understanding and good will. When we are discouraged, disappointed, and disillusioned, we pray that we may accept the challenge of a stronger and greater faith in the Lord our God.

We offer our prayer through the merits and mediation of the Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in Collier's Weekly. The Public Printer estimates the cost to be $130 in excess of that allowed under the rules of the House, and I ask that I may include this article notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. PLUMLEY asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the New York Sun, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the City Council of the City of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a very thoughtful article appearing in the January 1 issue of the Pathfinder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, January 25, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article appearing in the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter and two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HALLECK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain extracts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include two letters addressed to me and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANT READING CLERK

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 95) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of $3,600 per annum, payable monthly, for the services of an assistant reading clerk, who shall be designated by the Clerk of the House, subject to the approval of the

Speaker: *Provided, however,* That the authorization and appropriation herein contained shall terminate whenever a vacancy occurs in a position of reading clerk.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 66 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (a) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in the departments and agencies of the Government, including Government-owned corporations; (b) to study and investigate the effect of such policies and practices upon the conduct of the war, with the view of determining whether such policies and practices are efficient and economical; (c) to determine the number of employees in each department or agency (including Government-owned corporations), whether such number of employees is necessary, and whether their skills are used to the best advantage; (d) all other matters relating to the recruiting and the efficient and economical use of the civilian employees; and (e) to make such inquiry as said Committee on the Civil Service may consider important or pertinent to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned; to hold such hearings; to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers, by subpena or otherwise; and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the seven resolutions the Committee on Rules reported out, having to do with the further investigation of various subjects in the departments. I believe this resolution, giving that power to the Committee on the Civil Service, under the leadership of its extremely able and patriotic chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], deserves unanimous approval. This committee made investigations in the last session of the Congress which brought about the separation of approximately 120,000 people from the pay rolls of the War Department. I believe no committee has done more constructive work than the Ramspeck committee. Consequently, the Committee on Rules unanimously agreed that the investigative work of that committee should continue in the hope that they will bring about still further economies in the departments through the separation of unnecessary employees. I have called attention heretofore to the fact that many of these persons are unnecessarily employed and should be eliminated from the pay rolls.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just for a question?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman will pardon me. We have seven of these resolutions. We are going to adjourn over tomorrow and Saturday. I want to get these resolutions passed today if I possibly can. I am not going to take up much time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SABATH. That would have to be propounded to the Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. That is what I was going to do; ask the Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. If it is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the House agreed to adjourn over Friday?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Of course, that was not a parliamentary inquiry. If the gentleman had listened, if he had not been busy with his colleagues, he would have perhaps heard the consent request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BULWINKLE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot. I am trying to be kind to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SABATH. I myself was under the impression that the powers of this committee should be extended to include not only civilians but both officer and enlisted personnel of the Army and the Navy, but the gentleman from Georgia, being such a gentlemanly person, did not wish to be charged in any way with trying to penetrate the functions of the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs. In view of that, we have not extended that power to the gentleman's committee, although I know he would have rendered great service if we had done so.

In that connection, lest I forget, I have hundreds of complaining letters that I cannot attend to, in which it is charged that employees are in each other's way. I shall turn these communications over to the chairman, and the members of his committee, in the hope that they will investigate the various charges of unnecessary employment in various departments, Government plants, and agencies.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I am not going to detain the House because, as I have said, we have a great deal of business and I want to expedite it.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to cooperate in the passing of these committee rules today. I do not think there is any question concerning the necessity for them, and therefore I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any opposition to the rule?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No; there is not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why do we not vote on it?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is what I am endeavoring to do.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois said, this is the first of six resolutions to be considered. Personally, I am opposed to all of them at the present time. My reason is that there is operating in the Senate now select or special committees which are doing the same type of work that is being done by the House committees.

For a long time the Congress was subject to a great deal of criticism. Then there came some suggestions relative to the ills of the Congress, and it was pointed out that we were operating with antiquated machinery; that it is worn out, we were entitled to new equipment; that the Congress needed streamlining; that the offices of the Congressmen and of the committees were all understaffed. The suggestion was advanced for the joint committee to make investigations and determine improvements that could be made in our organization; to consider increases in salaries and retirement for Members under the Retirement Act. There is no criticism anywhere about that. Editorial comments, writers of news articles, radio commentators, and columnists all agreed that it was necessary. Remember, we were going to streamline the Congress, whatever that means; I assume it means to take off the excess weight. While we are in a favorable position along comes the Committee on Rules, before this special committee has had an opportunity to function and make a report to the Congress, and provides for these special committees, extending the life of each, with the exception of the committee to make the investigation concerning the organization of Congress, for the duration of the Congress.

I feel it would be well if we waited a little while and found out what this joint committee is going to recommend. There was a feeling that we went too far in the last Congress, and we certainly did, in setting up special and select committees and giving jurisdiction to the various committees of the House to make investigations. Why, there were six committees of the House investigating the subject of surplus property. The Senate committee would be investigating one day and would have admirals and generals before them, and the next day those admirals and generals would be before a committee of the House testifying on the same subject. Those men are

fighting this war, and they have important work to do. It seems we should be able to come to some kind of an agreement with the Senate. Let the Senate make some investigations if it wants to, and if the House of Representatives finds it is necessary, let the House make some investigations. Both branches should not be doing the same job. I admit, just as the gentleman from Illinois said, if there is one committee which we had in the last Congress which brought in some results, it is the committee that is set up by this resolution. The Senate has a committee investigating personnel. Senator BYRD has issued many reports with reference to personnel in the Government service. I want to say every time we pass one of these resolutions, and I am saying this for the benefit of the new Members, and, I think, for the benefit of some of the old Members, every time you pass one of these resolutions it is not the end of it. The next thing that comes is a request for money. I think this House is entitled, when each and every one of these resolutions is called up, to have the chairman take the floor and tell the Members of the House what he proposes to do and also tell the Members of the House how much money he expects to get and what he is going to do with it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is important. Let the Members of the House know what the committee is going to do; let the chairman speak for the committee and also let the House know how much money he would like to have and how he is going to spend it. We are entitled to know that. I will find that out of course when they come before the Accounts Committee asking for money, but I think this body before it votes on this should have that information so the membership may know what they are doing. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will yield to the chairman of each one of the committees as he calls up the resolutions in order that the chairman may make a statement along that line. I do not believe this is asking too much.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman, as I understand it, is complaining about the creation of these committees and the money they spend. I remind the gentleman that he is on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; that is right. No speech, please.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a permanent standing committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They could do a great deal of this work if the chairman would advocate it or take the muzzle off and let them go into it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Do not make a speech. I do not happen to be the chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the gentleman controls the committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. You flatter me. We criticize the executive branch of the Government for duplication of effort, for waste of funds. I think we are subject to the same criticism when we duplicate the work of our committees and the Senate. I should like to have the chairman of each committee make a statement as to how much money he expects to get and what he is going to do.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to yielding to the various chairmen of the committees affected by these resolutions that are to be called up. In the present instance if the gentleman from Missouri desires any information in addition to that he already has as to the spendid work this committee has done I know the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] will be very glad to enlighten him. I have all the confidence in the world in the gentleman from Missouri; I know he is sincere and well-meaning.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not want that; I want the House to get this information.

Mr. SABATH. All right; so do I; and the House will have an opportunity to vote on it. The Members know the reputation of the gentleman from Georgia and have the utmost confidence in him. They know he has saved millions of dollars with the work of his committee. Unfortunately the Senate has committees working along similar lines, but they have never functioned as intelligently, as economically, and as efficiently as the House committees with one exception—the Committee on Un-American Activities, which expended over $600,000 and which went beyond its scope of investigation and exceeded the authority originally intended by the House, failing actually to investigate the Nazi, Fascist, un-American, and subversive activities which were dangerous to our country.

In view of the conditions I think the gentleman should not object to resolutions that result in saving money for the Government. The gentleman knows it is not the best policy to be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman from Missouri calls upon the gentleman from Illinois to yield to chairmen of these various committees. As I understand it, this committee is now being created and there is no chairman at the present time, is there?

Mr. SABATH. The former chairman is here, and he will and should be unanimously reelected chairman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I know; but there is no chairman at this time.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is a continuation of the committee.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish any time?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I should like about 2 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as the gentleman from Georgia may desire.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the committee filed a report on December 16, 1944—House Report No. 2084—which showed certain savings which we claim have been made. There are two items in our claim that can be proven beyond the shadow of a doubt. One is an item of $127,000,000 that was taken out of the Army appropriation bill by the Committee on Appropriations; in their report they said they took it out because of the work of the Committee on the Civil Service. The other is an item of $270,000 which we saved by preventing the Civil Service Commission from hiring 300 new employees, and at the same time by adopting the suggestion made by the staff of the Committee on the Civil Service they doubled the production in the Retirement Unit of the Civil Service Commission.

The committee had $84,000. They have turned back $13,515.25 of that money. My own opinion is that we ought to have at least $50,000 for the year 1945. That answers the question of the gentleman from Missouri. We shall, of course, have to justify that in detail before his committee; but I think we can save a great deal of money for the taxpayers. We have already saved millions of dollars. I think the mere fact that the committee is in existence acts more or less like a traffic policeman does on the speed of automobiles coming down the street, because before this committee was given this power the number of civilian employees was increasing at the average rate of 100,000 per month. We stopped that; this Congress stopped it by creating this authority to investigate, and we have actually had a net reduction since that time of something like 275,000 employees.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Are the clerks of the committees still with the gentleman?

Mr. RAMSPECK. They are not on the pay roll. There are a number of them around here.

Mr. COCHRAN. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that he has introduced a new resolution which in effect sets up a new committee. This resolution is not an extension of the old committee; therefore, under the wording of the pending resolution the salaries of the employees would start from the day when this resolution passes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct, and that is what we intend to do with them. We do not expect to pay them for the time since the new Congress convened.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein articles from the Milwaukee Journal and the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 64 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise because of the war, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and utilized, and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering such development and utilization; (2) whether adequate consideration is being given to the needs of small business engaged in nonwar activities, or engaged in the transition from nonwar activities to war activities; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound program for the solution of the post-war problems of small business.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistance, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I will yield later to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the usual 30 minutes knowing that he will more thoroughly and intelligently explain the need for this resolution, because I recall that shortly after I had made an appeal, urging that aid be extended to small businessmen, he called a meeting of the Republican members for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution extends the life of, and gives new powers to, a committee of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been chairman. This committee has recommended legislation on behalf of the small businessmen of the country. I do not think there is a Member of the House who is not in favor of giving every aid and assistance to the small businessman. Although we have a tremendous number of extremely able men in this House I do not know of anyone who is more capable of carrying on this work than is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] who has given over 4 years of his valuable time to bringing about aid, relief, and giving assistance to small businessmen.

In view of the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that the chairmen of these various committees may have the right and opportunity to explain the reasons for the adoption of these resolutions, I am going to yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. However, before I do that, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may speak out of order for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we all read in yesterday's papers with a great deal of satisfaction and pleasure the great accomplishments of the Russian Army that has practically driven every Nazi from unfortunate Poland, and I want to take these few minutes to congratulate Russia and to congratulate Poland. I hope to God that those people in the very near future will have the kind of government the majority of them desire. I know, if they are given their choice, they will choose a democratic form of government which will guarantee freedom, liberty, and prosperity to the deserving and suffering people of Poland. It is my further hope that by constructive application of work they will rehabilitate a more powerful Poland within a short period of time, and that harmony and unity will be theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words of the chairman of the Committee on Rules concerning the Small Business Committee of the House. The greatest tribute, I presume, that can be paid our committee is the fact that every group of small businessmen in America has recommended its continuance. We believe that we have some accomplishments that we can point to with pride. Take, for instance, the Murray-Patman bill which was passed a few years ago—it became a law, to be exact, on June 11, 1942—setting up the Smaller War Plants Corporation. That organization has been of tremendous help to the small business concerns in this country. I use the term "Murray-Patman," but that means the Senate committee and the House committee. It was not just my bill. It belonged to the Committee on Small Business. It carried my name because I happened to be chairman of the committee, but the committee is entitled to the credit.

We also had a bill to help the automobile dealers. You have not heard a single complaint from the automobile dealers but only words of praise. We made it possible for them to continue in business. We protected the consumers as well as protecting the Government; a law that was certainly helpful and instrumental in keeping the automobile dealers in business. That one law alone, I think, has justified the existence of our committee.

Furthermore, we were the author of the bill to shorten these reports that had to be made by small business concerns. That law that we were instrumental in passing and which brought about that condition has been very helpful to the small business concerns because of their lack of help and their inability to make all these voluminous reports that were required of them.

In addition to that we have made several reports to the Congress asking that changes be made in Executive and administrative orders and in almost every case, for I do not know of a single exception, changes were made in accordance with the suggestions that we set forth. Take, for instance in O. P. A. and W. P. B., there are a lot of big people in these key positions. Naturally they are there. If you were the head of this Government or the head of O. P. A. or W. P. B., you would have them, too, because you cannot get any other kind. The small businessman does not have someone that he can send to Washington to represent him on these boards, bureaus, and commissions, but the big businessman can get somebody he can send, and they are filled with big businessmen. That is something that is unavoidable. You cannot prevent it, but you can watch them and make sure that they do not do something that will aid business that will be detrimental and harmful to small business. That has been the function of our committee, and we have done the best job we could.

Not long ago in the allocation of durable goods the big business concerns, the department stores, and the large chains, were getting more than their share of goods and the little fellow could not get anything. The committee went to work, and we soon had a fair allocation. We did not have any complaint from the small dealers after that for we made it possible for them to get their fair share.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. May I say to the gentleman addressing the House that he has done a splendid job as a member of that committee, and may I say further that if he did nothing else but create or help in the creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, that alone justifies the continuance of the life of that committee.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman. The statement has been made here by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that we should not have a select committee if there is a similar committee in the Senate. If you carry that argument to its logical conclusion you would make the same statement about standing committees. You would say, "They have a standing committee over in the Senate, why have one over here in the House?" The same argument that the gentleman made against select committees would apply to standing committees, and certainly it would

be illogical instead of logical. The truth is that the Small Business Committees in the Senate and the House have not duplicated their efforts in any sense of the word, except times when they had joint hearings. We got together and had joint hearings. That is what we should do in cases like that. There has been no charge of duplication whatsoever. No one has contended that we have spent any enormous amount of money, because we have not. We have not spent enough money. We have not had the adequate amount which we should have and which we expect to have if this resolution becomes law, we must have in order to do the best job.

Our committee has had a meeting in anticipation of the passage of the resolution, being advised that the Committee on Rules had unanimously reported it out, and we have agreed that the present-day small business conditions should be brought to the attention of our committee, including the following: The financing of small business, the taxes, war and civilian business, foreign and domestic trade, manpower, and other studies which we propose in the event this resolution is adopted.

If this committee is continued as it has been for the last 3 years we need a certain staff. We shall need in addition to the staff we have had a tax expert, because one of the greatest problems confronting small business today is the question of taxes, and we must handle it in a way that will encourage venture capital and encourage the people to invest their money in small business. In order to do that we must change our tax law. In order to have a comprehensive program in the form of a bill for this House to pass, we must have the very best expert advice, and in doing that we expect to employ a tax expert. We expect to have our investigators as we have had in the past and more of them, and our clerical help, stenographers, and attorneys, but we do not need attorneys all the time. We have not used an attorney all the time. We have been economical. No one can say we have not been economical. If the gentleman from Missouri would like to ask me any question, I should be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. COCHRAN. My opposition is based on the activities of the Murray Small Business Committee in the Senate. I do not want a duplication of effort. I am pleased to hear the gentleman say that his committee is not duplicating the work of the Senate committee. I think the gentleman should confer with Senator MURRAY, because he is very active at the present time. I also called the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the resolution that is being considered now is a new resolution. It does not extend the old committee. Therefore, what is going to happen to the committee employees who have been working since January 3?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope to have them paid. I do not agree with the answer the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] made. These people have been working. None of them are working for the Government downtown. That is another thing we are not doing. We are not borrowing people from O. P. A. and then fighting O. P. A. We are not borrowing people from the War Production Board and then fighting with W. P. B. on certain policies. We have been employing our own people and paying our own people. They remain on the job. I expect if this resolution is not sufficient to offer another one that will enable them to be paid since January 3.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has stated that he wants a large number of additional employees.

Mr. PATMAN. Not a large number, a satisfactory number.

Mr. COCHRAN. Can the gentleman give me an idea of what he will ask for?

Mr. PATMAN. Our committee had a meeting and we have added it up. It will run between $7,000 and $8,000 a month. You can add up the necessary amounts that you must pay to these different people and the different people you must have, and I believe you will find it will be economical.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is a little less than $100,000 a year.

Mr. PATMAN. It is a little less than $100,000 a year. We have not been using a lawyer all the time because most of the members of this committee are lawyers. We have been doing the legal work ourselves and saving that money. We have paid out only a very small amount for legal fees during the 3 years we have been on this committee.

About this Murray committee, Senator MURRAY and I work together perfectly well, as evidenced by the different bills we have gotten through under the joint authorship of the two committees. If this House were to turn down a select committee on small business, that would indicate the Senate is favorable and friendly and sympathetic to small business but the House is not. I do not think we want to get into that attitude, because both the Republican and Democratic conventions expressed themselves as being in favor of small business and doing everything possible to relieve small business. You cannot do it unless you have the necessary staffs to make the necessary investigations.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Does the Small Business Committee intend to follow up the possible allocation of the surplus properties to small business concerns?

Mr. PATMAN. To make sure they get their fair share; yes. We will assist on that all the time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I am happy the gentleman asked that question, because I can see the need for a continuance of a committee which will continue to protect small business. I have followed the work of the gentleman's committee. It has done good work. In the transition period ahead we are going to need a most active small-business committee to safeguard the interests of the small businessmen.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I happened to be on the committee that considered the surplus property bill that is now law. I do not know of any one subject on which we spent more time than looking after the interests of small business in the sale and distribution of surplus property. That committee is a standing committee; of course, it still exists and it is going to go to work on amendments to the Surplus Property Act. Why should the gentleman's committee take up that subject when the Committee on Expenditures is doing it?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman's argument would be more logical if the only problem small business had was just surplus property. It happens that that is just one problem, and in the whole overall picture it is not the major one.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman's committee just recently investigated oil. We have set up for years a special committee in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that has done nothing but investigate oil.

Mr. PATMAN. There is no duplication of effort there. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has nothing to do with price. The O. P. A. has something to do with price. The O. P. A. law comes from an entirely different committee, the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Our activities in connection with oil have been related to the price of oil in order to encourage production for the war.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. It is a fact that the gentleman's committee, in addition to giving the small businessmen an opportunity to obtain some of the services, has been working to safeguard small business against the chain stores and the mail-order houses. The committee has been studying that question in an effort to save to the best of your ability the little independent grocers and butchers and other small businessmen who might be put out of business in the next few years. You are still continuing to do that. Is not that right?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct. As evidence of that I refer him again to the question of allocations and W. P. B. Recently the allocations were changed to where the small man would get his fair share of the goods.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Have your deliberations indicated that a large percentage of war work is done by a comparatively small number of corporations? Would you say that same proportion would carry over into peacetime activity?

Mr. PATMAN. It would not, if we have our way about it, I will say to the gentleman from New York. That is one of the objects of our committee, to keep pointing that out. When this war came on quickly and so suddenly it was necessary to employ the biggest concerns in

America. I do not denounce our Government officials for employing the biggest concerns. Rather, I commend them for doing so because those big concerns were the only ones which had the administrative set-ups and the so-called know-how, in order to start work immediately in producing the huge quantities of goods and supplies necessary for the winning of the war. But as we go along and gain experience we can let the smaller concerns have more and more of certain parts of this work. That is exactly what we have been doing. I think you will find that the ratio is greater today for small business than at any other time since Pearl Harbor; and much of it we think has been due to the activities of our Small Business Committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say as a small businessman who has been engaged in business enterprises in the State of California, I heartily commend the work of your committee. I have letters in my files which I have received in the last 2 or 3 days asking me to serve on this particular Small Business Committee. I would like also to say at this time that with the completion of the war and the entering into business of thousands of veterans in the small-business field there is going to be a great field there for the gentleman's committee to operate for their protection. I think the House should unanimously extend it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we recognize what the gentleman says and we are considering that, I will say to the gentleman from California. I would like to make one other point. I want to say that we have a fine committee, excluding the chairman, and we have members on the Democratic side and the Republican side who have been working conscientiously and sincerely in trying to do something for small business. We feel that our achievements and accomplishments have been the result of the sincere efforts of the members on both sides. We have not been partisan in the committee. We have not filed a single report which was not a unanimous report. Every single report was a unanimous report of the five Democrats and four Republicans on the committee. We have been sponsoring advisory groups to make sure that the small-business people are properly represented on these different boards, and we have been successful in that effort.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Texas in asking for the continuation of this committee. In fact, the germ of the idea of the Small Business Committee came from the Republican side of the House during the summer of 1941. At that time small business was suffering more from the dislocation caused by the defense effort than any other type of business. Our minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] appointed a committee of which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] was chairman. And during that time, Mr. Speaker, that committee, which was unofficial, was the only forum in the United States before which the small businessmen could express their opinions. Out of that unofficial committee sprang the present Small Business Committee of the House. I think the record will show this committee has rendered a wonderful service, not only to the small businessmen of America but also to the House of Representatives. At the outset we held a number of conferences with the officials of the W. P. B. and with the representatives of the armed services. I say to you frankly that in my opinion many of these men formerly believed that there was no part that small business could play in the defense effort and in the war effort. Let us look at the picture today. By reason of hearings and by reason of testimony which we could present to the W. P. B. and to the heads of our armed services, we were able to convince them that there was a real part that our small businessmen could play in the war effort. The result is that today in every little town and hamlet in America you will find these small plants doing real work, carrying on an important role in our defense activities.

Let me say that since the institution of this committee in each of the services today we have a division which is called the Small Business Division; in other words, we have in the Army, we have in the Navy, we have in the Maritime Commission one division handling the matter of small business as its only duty. That was not there until this committee was set up by the House of Representatives, and I think we can take great credit for the fact that now the armed services and the Maritime Commission are bending their every endeavor to bring into the war effort the services of these small plants throughout the country.

One of the organizations set up under a law sponsored by this committee was the Smaller War Plants Corporation. I like the phrase used by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that his committee was more or less of a watch dog. Let me cite one example of what our committee did with respect to the Smaller War Plants Corporation. At the outset we had to admit that the Smaller War Plants Corporation was not working very well, was not doing its job; so our committee sent a subcommittee into the field to take testimony in the various cities as to just how much the Smaller War Plants Corporation was doing for small business in those cities. We found that the Smaller War Plants Corporation was not doing anything; we found there was bickering going on, no cooperation between the agencies in the field and the office in Washington. We came back to Washington and held a hearing on that one question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. We called the Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation before us. At that hearing it developed that the Corporation under his chairmanship had accomplished nothing. As a result of what came out at that hearing—there is no question about it—that Chairman was relieved of his duties and a new one put in control and some good was accomplished by the Corporation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to congratulate the gentleman and his committee on the splendid job they have done for small business in this country. Out in South Dakota, with the exception of the Homestake Mining Co., which operates the largest and most productive gold mine in the world, all our businesses are small. Largely because of the impetus given by the gentleman's committee we have a considerable number of small businesses in my State contributing directly to the war effort. I wish to ask the gentleman this question: Due to the war and the need for hurry-up production there has been great dislocation in the normal manufacturing processes of this country; the Government is part owner in tremendous physical plants practically all operated by big business. Is the gentleman's committee planning to do a watchdog job after the war as we reconvert to peacetime processes to see that these gigantic new physical plants do not robble up all the manufacturing formerly done by small business?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I believe the work of this committee on the question of reconversion will be one of its major tasks.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope this House will leave open to the small businessmen of America the only forum they have where they may be heard, and that only forum is the Small Business Committee of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON], also a member of the committee.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Small Business has done a really constructive piece of work in behalf of the small businessmen without any publicity or fanfare. The committee has worked with unity of purpose and along nonpartisan lines. In its 2½ years of existence it has held some 80 public hearings, heard over 1,500 witnesses, and taken up the troubles of the automobile dealers, tire dealers, investigated the scrap-metal shortage, retail druggists' problems, the problems of the insurance industry, the sugar shortage, the problems of the refrigerator locker industry, and the distribution of war contracts to small business, the problems of the meat packers, of the oil men, the problems of small business arising out of O. P. A. rulings, the lumber industry, the disposal of Government surplus

property, and the operation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Our committee has introduced many bills designed to aid small business, several of which were adopted by the Congress. The problems of some 600 firms doing small business were referred to our committee by other Members of the House.

In these days of partisan politics, Mr. Speaker, the cooperative working relationship which has existed between the various members of this committee when engaged in the work specifically assigned to the committee has been of a nonpartisan and inspiring nature. Small business is not the exclusive charge of either the Republican or Democratic Party. It is the charge of the entire Congress, whichever party may be in power. The work of the committee has served as an inspiration to me personally, and I am hopeful that the Congress will see fit to continue the existence of the committee in view of its splendid work.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL] I was originally chairman of what we knew as a Republican committee set up to try to do something about problems that we saw resulting from the impact of the defense effort on small business. Subsequently, as he further pointed out, the operation of that committee was terminated and this official committee took over.

Until along in the last Congress it was my privilege to serve as one of the minority members of that committee under the able leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN]. I resigned from the committee during the last Congress. May I say that in all my congressional experience my work on the Small Business Committee was as pleasant and likely as effective as of any committee upon which I have been privileged to serve.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] pointed out, the operations of the committee were not partisan. In our hearings there was a complete lack of partisanship as such. When we came on the floor with legislative proposals that we were seeking to have adopted, those of you who were here then will remember that on both sides of the aisle we stood shoulder to shoulder to bring about the adoption of those things which seemed to us to be in the interest of small business and the country.

Of course, when it is sought to extend the life of a committee like this it is frequently asked, and fairly asked, what has the committee accomplished; what can the committee accomplish in the future if it is continued? I think it can be said about the Small Business Committee that it accomplished more than its fair share of the specific things that one can point to—the Smaller War Plants Corporation, legislation to protect the automobile dealers when the great freeze struck them, and the other things that have been referred to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and others. But I believe beyond that and apart from those things to which one can specifically point, it can be said of this committee that it aroused in the consciousness of the people of the country, of the procurement agencies, and of the business leaders of the country a realization of the needs and necessities of small business, and yes, beyond that, a realization of the very evident fact to those of us who worked on the committee that for our most effective war effort we needed the full productivity, cooperation, and participation of the small business structure of the country.

One thing that was not specifically referred to was the work of the Small Business Committee on the matter of surplus property disposal. The Small Business Committee, when I was yet a member of it, recommended a surplus property disposal bill that I say today represented the best approach to that problem that has appeared on the scene. In my opinion it was much better than what we finally got after the bill passed the House, went over to the Senate, and then to the conference. Some of you may recall that we wrote certain amendments in the bill when it was before the House which materially improved the bill, but those amendments were taken out completely or liquidated by changes in language. Be that as it may, that is just another illustration of what the committee did.

As we look at the road ahead, the war is far from over. There yet will be before us the necessity of protecting the interests of small business in the war effort and of bringing about the complete utilization of the capacity of small business in the war effort. And then in that time also, when the war shall have ended, we will have very definitely before us the continuing obligation to see to it that the needs and necessities of small business are protected.

There is another word I would like to say here in connection with this resolution, and this applies somewhat to all of these resolutions seeking to continue special committees.

In the operation of these committees it becomes necessary on occasion to find fault with certain administrative procedures. When those occasions arise, the committee can only do its job if it approaches the accomplishment of the task before it fearlessly and without regard to where the chips are going to fall. I think by and large the Small Business Committee has operated that way.

We, as Members of the Congress, are very often subjected to criticism for things that are administrative responsibilities and not legislative responsibilities. There is not much that we can do about that directly. But is there any method available to the House of Representatives or to the Congress as a whole to correct maladministration, to correct injustices, to correct administration mistakes once they are pointed out? The answer is "yes." It exists in this device of special investigating committees, of which we have had a number.

As has been pointed out, we can bring to public attention maladministration and mistakes. We can offer a forum in which those feeling themselves aggrieved may present their cases to the Congress and to the country. Their voices can be heard. We can turn the spotlight of publicity upon faulty and unjust administration, and it is not too much to say that sometimes it seems that that is about the only way that we can correct maladministration.

The gentleman from Missouri has talked about streamlining, and indicated, if I understood correctly, that maybe we should not have some of these committees. May I say to you that except as we have these committees and they continue to do the job charged upon them by the Congress of the United States, the Congress will stand before the bar of public opinion in this country as having shirked its duty. I, for one, do not intend to stand in that position.

Administrative agencies have a tremendously important job to perform. It is a great burden which they carry. No one will deny that. But I am one of those who believes that it is the job of the Congress of the United States and more specifically the committees of the Congress of the United States to ride herd on the administrative agencies of the Government to the end that the basic and fundamental laws that we put on the books are administered as the Congress intended that they be administered; that they be administered fairly and equitably to protect the interests of all when such interests can be fairly protected.

I participated in numerous hearings of the Small Business Committee. We sat for long hours listening to the testimony of persons who felt themselves aggrieved by certain rules, orders, and administrative actions. We had with us the representatives of the agencies involved in order that those ideas and views would be transmitted to the agency immediately.

I was impressed with one thing in those hearings, and that was that many people would present themselves after the hearings were closed and say, "I never understood that the Congress of the United States had such a solicitude for me and my problems and my difficulties." I think that out of the efforts of these special committees—and the same might be said for all of our committees—can come an improved standing of the Congress of the United States before the people of the country. I just happen to believe that that is a highly desirable result.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, everybody is, of course, for small business, or ought to be. We Congressmen are especially for it. But let us be careful and not promise too much. It would require the repeal of a great many laws that have been in recent years placed upon the statute books to do real justice to small business.

We should not forget that the problem of small business—maintaining its very existence—was not created by the war. It was created long before that. The N. I. R. A., though invalidated by the Court, never really died. Insidiously that program has been insinuated into our

economy to the extent of jeopardizing the future of the smaller plants.

It was the passage of a lot of bad laws by the Congress long before there was any war that threatened the existence of small business and, for that matter, all private industry. First, in behalf of the general good, the Congress strikes down industry, and then in behalf of the general good, we pick up a part of the industry we wrecked and put it on its feet again—or believe we do.

Let us be careful, I repeat, not to promise small business too much.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 64, which provides for the continuance of the special Small Business Committee of the House to continue to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business existing, arising, or that may arise, because of the war during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

This committee was created several years ago because of the general belief among the Members of the House and the people of the country generally that such a committee could be very helpful to small business. I think the work of this committee should continue during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and I therefore am very glad to support it with my voice and vote.

The so-called small business concerns of the Nation number approximately three million, and they provide jobs for millions of workers. It is the real backbone of private enterprise in this country. They have, are, and will provide a great majority of the jobs in private enterprise.

In the beginning and for some year or two thereafter, contracts involving billions of dollars were given to the large business concerns of the country. They had the large plant facilities and personnel to handle large orders for munitions for war. This was a discrimination against the small business concerns of the country. They did not possess these large facilities' personnel and materials for munitions and other war supplies production. This discrimination, together with the many directives and Executive orders, and the failure to secure financial help and critical materials, according to the statistics that we have seen from time to time, put more than 500,000 small business concerns out of business.

We feel that this special small business investigation committee has rendered real service to our small business concerns, and this committee cooperating with the small business associations and corporations have furnished to the Congress information and suggestions that have resulted in a great deal of legislation helpful to small business, and through the influence of the small business association and this special committee, many of the hardships imposed upon small business by the various agencies of the Government have been removed. They have enabled small business to secure a larger share of these contracts; also financial aid and protection from unnecessary and oppressive directives and regulations by various agencies of the Federal Government.

This committee has, in my opinion, justified its existence and the money that has been expended in making these investigations and studies, and it therefore, in my opinion, should continue throughout the Seventy-ninth Congress.

We have been told that in order to maintain our high level of prosperity and income, there must be provided 60,000,000 jobs after the war. We must depend upon nearly 3,000,000 so-called small business concerns of the Nation to provide a large majority of these jobs, and, furthermore, the destruction of small business and the concentration of capital and power in few great business concerns carry a real threat to our free institutions.

In a representative democracy private enterprise has been and must continue to be the foundation rock. Nothing can contribute more to the freedom and liberty of the American people than to have a prosperous private enterprise with management and workers distributed in millions of small business concerns rather than concentrated in a few very large enterprises. These millions of small free private enterprises are a real protection to the American people against large monopolies. The small business concerns must receive proper protection, encouragement, and help.

SAVE MANPOWER AND MONEY

On today I voted for House Resolution 66, to continue during the life of the Seventy-ninth Congress the Special Committee on the Civil Service. This committee has been making studies and investigations of the policies and practices relating to civil employment in the departments and agencies of the Government, including Government-owned corporations to determine the effect of such policies or practices upon the conduct of the war and whether such policies and practices are efficient and economical and the number of employees necessary in each department or agency of the Government.

When the present administration assumed office on March 4, 1933, there were approximately 530,000 Federal employees. We have seen this grow by leaps and bounds from that day to the present, although Mr. Roosevelt was elected on a platform to cut down the number of Federal officeholders and reduce the cost of government 25 percent. We now have approximately 3,250,000. This is an increase of more than 500 percent in number and an increase in salaries of more than 800 percent.

A distinguished committee, made up largely of Democrats of the Senate, has thoroughly investigated and reported to the Senate that there are hundreds of thousands of unnecessary Federal officeholders, costing the taxpayers billions of dollars. There is a great hue and cry today to strip the farms of the necessary manpower when there are hundreds of thousands of surplus and unnecessary officeholders, young men in good health and within the draft age. They are needed in the Army and Navy and in necessary war production in civilian life. It is a matter of common knowledge that there are so many unnecessary officeholders in many of the units, bureaus, and departments of the Government that they are in each other's way. I have voted to extend the life of this committee in the hope that they will dig into the policies and the general set-up of these various departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Government and find out wherein these policies are wasteful, and unnecessary hundreds of millions are being spent, and expose to the Congress and the country the waste of manpower and the consequent burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation.

Food is one of the great necessary elements to win the war. We must have ships, guns, planes, tanks, shells, and other munitions of war. Every unnecessary able-bodied young man who has one of these Government jobs should be separated from the Federal pay roll and required to take his place in those activities necessary to win the war and not strip the farms of those who are necessary to produce the food for our armed forces and our civilian population. We must win this war at the earliest moment possible and each able-bodied man should be willing to do his part. This committee can do this and I am voting for its continuance in the hope that it will do a real job.

I am supporting vigorously House Resolution 88 which provides for a special committee to investigate the acts of executive agencies which exceed their authority. This, too, is a very, very important committee, and has a very, very important job to do during the Seventy-ninth Congress. Too many of the bureaucrats are disposed to ignore the Constitution, the laws passed by Congress, and invade the sacred rights of the American people. They should be made to know that they are the servants of the American people and not their masters. They should issue no directive or regulation that is not bottomed on the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the laws passed by Congress. It is for this committee to find wherein the executive agents of the Government are disregarding the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the acts of Congress. If any new laws are necessary to carry out properly our needs in this emergency they should come to Congress and have the laws amended. They must not be permitted to ignore the Congress and the courts and undertake to legislate by executive orders, directives, rules, and regulations, and interpret their own orders, rules, and regulations in violation of the laws of the land. We are making a tremendous sacrifice in blood and treasure in the name of liberty for ourselves and other peoples. When our boys come home they must not find that we have been fighting for liberty and freedom across the seas and that the bureaucrats have taken liberty and freedom from us here at home.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 37):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Resolved, That a committee of 13 Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the above resolution, the President of the Senate appointed Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BILBO, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MEAD, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. HAWKES, and Mr. REVERCOMB members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 60 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 408 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 408 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to renew the activities of the Special House Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning. This is a committee composed of 18 Members of the House set up in January of last year. It functioned during the last year of the Congress. It has for its purpose the cushioning of the economic blow which would ordinarily follow a war of some long duration, such as the one in which we are now engaged. The committee, in the judgment of those who have expressed themselves, has done a very good job. In that period of time which the committee has been functioning we filed 5 reports. We sponsored 3 major pieces of legislation, which are now on the statute books. We were pioneering in a new field. Some people thought we should have a half-million dollars because of the importance of this committee. Others thought we should have $100,000. We finally agreed to ask for a hundred thousand dollars. That $100,000 was given to us and we used approximately $29,000 and, of course, turned the balance back into the Treasury. While we have not been niggardly in the expenditure of the funds, we have tried to watch and to keep the cost down to the lowest possible level consistent with the effective operation of the committee. I do not know what funds we are going to need for the next year. My present thought is we will ask for $100,000 again. We will use such portion of it as we see fit, or as becomes necessary, and if we need any more we will ask for it. If we do not need the full amount, we will turn the balance back. We think this committee should continue. Personally, as chairman of the committee, I should like to forego the responsibility of the arduous task ahead, but I believe that it is just as much the duty of this Congress to prepare for the economy at the end of this war as it is the duty of the Congress to prepare for the war we are now fighting. I do not want to make a long speech about this committee. Its work speaks for itself. It has received the commendation of the Congress and the country. If there are any questions, I will be glad to yield to any Member.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. What cooperation is there between the gentleman's committee and Senator GEORGE'S committee?

Mr. COLMER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I would like to answer it in my own way. My first thought when I talked about the establishment of such a committee about a year and a half or 2 years ago was that it should be a joint committee; that there should be one committee between the House and the Senate. With that thought in mind before I introduced that resolution I went over and talked with Senator GEORGE, the chairman of the Senate Post-war Committee, and he did not think it was practical. When our committee was appointed by the Speaker, I submitted that proposition from the very beginning to our 18 members of the committee and suggested that it was highly desirable if we could not function as one committee we should at least cooperate. The cooperation between our commitees has been of the highest order.

Mr. Speaker, the other members of the committee appointed by you are as follows:

Democrats: Jere Cooper, Tennessee; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Orville Zimmerman, Missouri; Jerry Voorhis, California; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Walter A. Lynch, New York; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Eugene Worley, Texas.

Republicans: Hamilton Fish, New York; Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Richard J. Welch, California; Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; Charles S. Dewey, Illinois.

The retirement of Messrs. Fish, of New York, and Dewey, of Illinois, has resulted in two vacancies, which will be filled at an early date I am sure. And while I shall follow the policy announced at the beginning of this statement of not engaging in a detailed report or extravagant praise for the committee, I do want to say that these gentlemen, all of whom are outstanding Members of Congress, have rendered valiant service. They have spent many long hours in listening to witnesses and in forming conclusions which will affect the future of our country. This committee has not sought publicity, but I am pleased to say that the publicity it has received has been the most favorable. And these Members who are so intensely interested in seeing that the post-war economy of the country may avoid the pitfalls which have befallen so many other nations as a result of the last war are entitled to the thanks of the Congress and the country for their labors. Whatever success the committee has met with has been largely the result of the labor of these splendid gentlemen and of the committee's staff, which is headed by that outstanding American citizen, Mr. Marion B. Folsom.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a part of a letter from a young man who 3 years ago this month went over to Australia in the first convoy. This is the letter he writes:

My name will go in soon and my orders should come out around the 10th of January and I can get the hell out of here—(East Indies). Would be just my luck if rotation was cut out on January 1 and only T. D. (home 30 days and go back there) authorized. There are rumors of this nature and Time magazine has mentioned it. Oh well, I have gotten to where I don't give a damn any more, if I can just get home. I hear that fellows that have gone back on the rotation plan are being shipped back here again—3 years is not enough. If that is the case, this certainly is a rotten country we're fighting for when there are 5,000,000 at camps over there.

Let me suggest he is a little in error in that figure because according to General Hershey day before yesterday there were only 4,700,000 and some in this country:

Their alibi is they want "seasoned" troops—how do they get to be seasoned if they don't come over here in the first place as green horns? You can't buck a machine like this for 2 minutes. They want this Pacific war on ice before they let any fair sized group go home. Poof! What's 36 stinking months over here to those wheels? They don't give a damn, just so it isn't out of their lives. I don't blame the fellows for crabbing only I know better than to try to buck it! Even though I have withstood this life for 3 years with just one case of jaundice, it takes something out of you and I don't think I could get through another 3 years of the same.

Listen to this, I quote it:

I'd "blow my top" I know.

There you have it! No one doubts that boy's patriotism. He enlisted, he went over to Australia with the first, he

served 3 years; and now he wonders whether he is going to get a chance to come home and if he comes home he wonders whether he is going to be sent back again while so many stay here.

And I wonder what the boy's thoughts are going to be when he gets news as he will that three servicemen who might well have been his buddies were put off a plane and delayed in their trip home because it was thought necessary to bring in a dog from Europe. Now, I know what will happen, I will be accused of sniping at the administration and of making remarks that are of no consequence. Well, snipers have their use and we cannot all be big guns and fire big shells; so some of us have to go along and do some of the lesser tasks.

I am not the only one who has been talking and writing about dogs. The other day I noticed in the press, twice I noticed a comment made by the First Lady, that "Mr. Fala" had gone away to be married; and I wondered then of what interest that was to the public, just when the love life of a dog, even a White House dog, became of sufficient interest to the public to require comment from the Lady of the Executive Mansion. I wondered whether that marriage of Fala to which she referred so touchingly was a legitimate permanent marriage or whether it was just a sort of an experimental excursion; and I wondered last night when I heard over the radio and again when I saw in this morning's paper this item about this dog coming from abroad on transportation which otherwise would have carried three servicemen from the front lines to their homes, whether this English bulldog was going to settle down here in America and raise good true-blue American dogs or whether he was going to be just another angle of a triangle, with Fala and his lady love, so touchingly mentioned by the First Lady of the Executive Mansion, on the other two angles.

Now, after all, if we are to look to the White House for guidance, let them get a little common sense in some of their doings and their comments, and let them quit, as I said more than 2 years ago, and was so bitterly criticized for it—let them quit playing at war. While men—men, not dogs—are fighting and dying, can we not confine our thoughts, our words, and our acts to the war effort.

I will not read you the closing paragraph of this letter from the mother, enclosing the letter from the boy, in which she said, in substance, that she was about ready to come to Washington and see that some of the folks in power here quit playing around at this little game where millions of young Americans are taken across the country, across the seas, to fight and to die. The Commander in Chief might well issue an order that returning servicemen, not dogs, be given priority.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONTINUANCE OF INVESTIGATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 55 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 465 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 465 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with the procedure which has been followed today, not that I regard it necessary, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Post-war Military Policy set up by the House last May pursuant to a resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] had for its purpose the consideration of policy to meet post-war military needs. The committee was in session during the summer and fall and held hearings on the proposal to establish a single department of national defense in the post-war, a subject that has been of great interest to the service forces as well as to the public. The volume of these hearings is available and the committee filed a report with the House on that subject which undoubtedly will be of great interest when we come to the point of legislating on the post-war Military Establishment and that, I imagine, will be when we know what our post-war military commitments are going to be.

The committee has also held hearings on the question of research and development, the necessity for it, the manner, means, and method in the post-war period. There are additional hearings to be held on this subject and it is anticipated that perhaps very early in this session, if the committee is continued, hearings will be held on the question of universal military service in the post-war period.

This committee has no authority to report legislation. It is merely a policy-forming committee. It is a forum to which the people as well as the service departments may come and give their views upon interesting subjects respecting the Military Establishment. It is made up of the ranking members of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and some of the Members of the House at large.

We were given orginally $25,000 and we returned to the Treasury $19,468, having spent $5,531.64. We have no lawyers, no economists, we take no trips. We have a few stenographers who are answering the voluminous mail that comes from every congressional district in the United States about these matters in which the citizens are interested. If this committee is continued we will ask the Committee on Accounts to give us again the same sum that it gave us originally, namely, $25,000, which I am sure will be more than enough to see us through the life of the committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that there is no committee that has been set up which has spent less money than the gentleman's committee. But the gentleman's statement again shows that a special committee or a select committee takes over jurisdiction that belongs to another committee of the House. The gentleman spoke of hearings that were held on the question of a department of national defense. That is a matter which belongs to the Committee on Expenditures. Not once but on two occasions the Committee on Expenditures has held lengthy hearings on that subject. We have had the officers of the Army and Navy before us. It has also taken up the question of setting up of a department of aviation and finally held hearings on a department of national defense, including a Secretary for War, a Secretary for the Navy, and a Secretary for Aviation.

I just mention that to show the gentleman that the select committees of the House take up questions where jurisdiction under the rules lies with a standing committee of the House. If the standing committees of the House will do their job, it is my contention that a lot of the special committees are not needed.

I want to compliment the gentleman on the small amount of money that he has used, but I will say that in the case of the three resolutions that were passed in advance of this one the chairmen wanted $100,000 each. The life of the committees are 2 years, so that this involves an expenditure of $600,000 for the three committees, if they get it, and $50,000 for the gentleman's committee for 2 years makes a total of $650,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that $25,000 will run us for 2 years.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman, in reference to the work of this select committee, that the question of a consolidated department of national defense has assumed very great importance because of the peculiar and unusual situations that have developed in the present war. Any study or any consideration that may have been given to that matter in the past would not be of very much use because of the fact that we have learned since Pearl Harbor the lesson of unified command. There has to be integration of the armed forces and voidance of duplication in the armed effort.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, that matter should be ironed out and I commend the hearings of our committee to the Members of the House on that subject. In addition to that, this

particular committee has as members the ranking members of both the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, men who are interested and who are familiar with the subjects that are being considered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say that if a bill creating a department of national defense is introduced, it should not go to the Committee on Military Affairs, it should not go to the Committee on Naval Affairs but should go to the Committee on Expenditures.

Furthermore, may I ask the gentleman this: Is there any committee in the Senate duplicating the work of his committee?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is no committee in the Senate on this subject.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on this committee under the able leadership of the gentleman from Virginia. We have had many hearings. We have filed reports which I think have been most beneficial to the Members of this House. Much good work has been done, and I believe that there is much more necessary work to be done. I hope this resolution goes through without a single vote against it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. DINGELL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ACTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES WHICH EXCEED THEIR AUTHORITY

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 88 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed Their Authority is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 102, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 102 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side of the House for any discussion on this resolution, for the same resolution was passed last year by the Congress.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is no one going to speak to the resolution at all?

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. The chairman of the committee is not here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COCHRAN. He was here a minute ago. If nobody is going to speak on the resolution, I will.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, why the chairman of the committee, a member of the Committee on Rules, knowing that his resolution is coming up, is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is present.

Mr. COCHRAN. All right. He did not answer a moment ago. This committee was set up by the House for the purpose of determining whether or not any agency in the executive branch of the Government had gone beyond the act in the administration of the law. As you all know, the Congress, in passing important legislation, generally adds a section at the end giving authority to the Administrator to adopt rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of the act. The claim has been made that in adopting those rules and regulations some of the agencies have gone too far beyond the law. This committee has been in existence since February 1943. It made several reports to the House, and whenever it did make a report to the House a resolution was brought in providing for the printing of a large additional number of those reports which were then sent throughout the country.

I noticed in the last report this committee made, and I so stated before the Committee on Rules, that the committee went beyond its jurisdiction. It evidently did not have any more agencies to investigate, so it made a report recommending to the Congress how to streamline the Congress. Among the recommendations was one that this committee be made a permanent committee, with a similar committee of the Senate created as a joint committee. Evidently the committee did not believe its own recommendations because it comes in now to continue its previous activity as formerly set up.

I also called the attention of the Committee on Rules, when I had the report in my hand, to the fact that it was noted that this committee had a general counsel and several associate counsel. Looking over the membership of the committee, it appeared to me as if all but one member of the committee are lawyers themselves, and then they had to have several lawyers to advise the committee.

I think extreme care should be used in the appointment of help by special committees. I do not want to make the charge that some of the committees are set up for the purpose of creating jobs, but they certainly do create jobs, no doubt about that. I cannot see the wisdom of a committee of this House needing several lawyers to advise them. I think one should be sufficient, especially when the chairman of the committee is a distinguished jurist himself having served on the bench.

I should like the chairman of the committee, either in my time or his own time, to tell the House what the committee proposes to do next and about how much money he will ask for to carry out the purposes of the resolution.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this committee was set up, as you know, in the last Congress for the purpose of investigating complaints of alleged excesses or abuses of authority by executive agencies. The specific purpose of the committee was to be able, when complaint was made that any department or agency of the Government had gone beyond the authority vested in it by law, to investigate and report the abuse to the House. We have done that in a series of some eight reports.

I have no doubt the gentleman from Missouri, who has attacked the work of this committee, would be far more able to carry on the work of this committee than I am or the members of the committee, but it so happens that the committee is composed of a number of members selected by the Speaker, including myself, and therefore with such limited knowledge and such limited abilities as we possess we have to do this work in the light of the intelligence that God has given us. I regret that it is not greater. I regret that our work has not met with the approval of the gentleman from Missouri, but I cannot do anything about that.

As far as I am concerned, this House may continue this committee or may discontinue it. I do not care what you do about it. It has been a matter of a lot of extra work for me and for the other members of that committee.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. May I say to my distinguished chairman that his statement is absolutely true. He was most reluctant to introduce this resolution. It was only after the committee unanimously voted that he should do it that the resolution was introduced. May I say further that within 1 month after the creation of the committee we had over 4,000 complaints from every section of this Nation regarding abuses of authority on the part of many agencies of the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Missouri has complained that this committee has exceeded its authority. As I say, we had to work in the light of what we conceived to be our duty without the guiding hand of the gentleman from Missouri, but I should like the House to know just what we thought our duties were and how we went about carrying them out.

We investigated the complaints that came to us and after this investigation, which ran on for nearly 2 years, we came to certain definite conclusions as to how some of those defects might be remedied. We filed two final reports, which the

gentleman from Missouri has criticized, and one of those reports recommended to the Congress that in order to cure this matter of having continual complaints about abuses of authority by executive agencies the Congress should enact for the benefit of the public and for the benefit of these agencies themselves an act on administrative procedure, an administrative-law act, so that all agencies would act along the same lines of procedure.

We pass an act setting up an agency and we do not tell that agency, or define or spell out, its authority, or its method of procedure. The result is that each new agency of the Government which is set up is left in a situation where it must make its own regulations and it must formulate its own methods of procedure. These agencies in their methods of procedure vary one from the other. For the benefit of the agencies and for the benefit of the public which has to deal with them we felt very emphatically that there should be some administrative law by which a person who was haled before one of these agencies would know, just as he would know when he went into a court of law, what the procedure was and what the methods and the rules of the organization were; and that they should be uniform so that when he went into one agency today and into another one tomorrow he would find the same method of procedure and the same method of pleading. That was one conclusion. The other conclusion which we very definitely came to was that much of the difficulty which arose in executive agencies by abuses or excessive use of the authority granted to them was in the drafting of legislation; that the Congress was ill adapted to draft legislation. Legislation very often, as you all know, is drafted by the agencies which expect to construe and carry out the proposed legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, conceiving it to be our duty, although we may be wrong about it, nevertheless we did file a report recommending certain changes in the method of operation of the Congress itself, and additional staffing for legislation, and for a rather permanent committee that would keep guard over the procedures of executive agencies and report to the Congress from time to time when it did come in contact with abuses of authority by executive agencies.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. To what extent does this committee and the McCarran committee in the Senate conflict?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. COCHRAN. That committee is doing the same type of work.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot answer that question because I have nothing to do with the McCarran committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I hope your committee is not doing the same work as the McCarran committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would not know anything about the Senator McCarran set-up. He operates in the Senate and we operate in the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then it matters not to the gentleman whether there is a duplication of work or not?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would not say that it does not matter to me but if there is a duplication of work it is not the only duplication of work to be found around here and I would very much like to assist in preventing such duplication.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is what I want to stop. Will the gentleman tell the House how much money he expects to ask for the operation of his committee?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think the Committee on Accounts gave us for the last 2 years $50,000, and then we got $1,500 more. I am unable to predict what the expenses of this committee will be in the next Congress because I do not know what complaints are going to come in or what work the committee will have to do. I can assure the gentleman from Missouri that as usual this committee is going to be very economical in its operations and expenditures.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Is it not a fact that when the committee went before the Committee on Accounts they wanted to give us almost voluntarily $100,000 to start this work and that you refused and you said you wanted the minimum amount?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That was suggested as I recall.

Mr. COCHRAN. Wanted to give the Committee $100,000?

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. The committee wanted to give us $100,000 to start this work.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to assure the gentleman from New York that that was not the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. It most certainly was not.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. I agree that it was not the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that people came before this committee in Washington from all over the United States?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, sir; they came from Maine to California.

Mr. JENNINGS. And when we would hear the party who complained, we would call the representatives of the agencies before the committee and in many instances after hearing both sides the whole matter was amicably adjusted and the complaints were discontinued?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That happened in very many instances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Illinois desire to yield some of his time?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no request for time on this side. I supported this resolution before and I am supporting it now. I think we are all very conscious of the growth of administrative agencies in the Government and of the very profound duty and responsibility which rests upon the Congress to keep the administration within bounds. I am therefore supporting the resolution.

I have no request for time and so far as I am concerned the gentleman from New York might move the previous question.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 254, nays 55, not voting 117, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—254

Abernethy	Clevenger	Gwinn, N. Y.
Allen, Ill.	Cole, Kans.	Gwynne, Iowa
Allen, La.	Cole, Mo.	Hagen
Andersen, H. Carl	Cole, N. Y.	Hale
Anderson, N. Mex.	Colmer	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Andrews, N. Y.	Cooper	Hall, Leonard W.
Angell	Courtney	Halleck
Arends	Cox	Hancock
Arnold	Cravens	Hare
Auchincloss	Crawford	Harless, Ariz.
Bailey	Curley	Harness, Ind.
Barden	Curtis	Harris
Barrett, Wyo.	D'Alesandro	Hartley
Barry	Daughton, Va.	Havenner
Bates, Ky.	Davis	Hays
Bates, Mass.	Delaney, James J.	Hébert
Beall	Delaney, John J.	Hedrick
Beckworth	Dirksen	Hendricks
Bennet, N. Y.	Dolliver	Henry
Bennett, Mo.	Dondero	Herter
Bishop	Doughton, N. C.	Heselton
Blackney	Drewry	Hess
Bland	Durham	Hinshaw
Bloom	Dworshak	Hobbs
Bolton	Earthman	Hoch
Bonner	Elliott	Hoffman
Boren	Ellsworth	Holifield
Bradley, Mich.	Engel, Mich.	Holmes, Wash.
Brehm	Ervin	Hope
Brooks	Fallon	Horan
Brown, Ga.	Fellows	Howell
Brown, Ohio	Fernandez	Izac
Bryson	Fisher	Jenkins
Bunker	Flannagan	Jennings
Butler	Fuller	Jensen
Byrnes, Wis.	Gathings	Johnson, Calif.
Camp	Gearhart	Johnson, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Geelan	Johnson, Ind.
Carlson	Gibson	Johnson, Luther A.
Carnahan	Gifford	Johnson, Okla.
Case, N. J.	Gillespie	Jones
Chelf	Gillie	Jonkman
Chenoweth	Goodwin	Kean
Chiperfield	Gossett	Kearney
Church	Granger	Keefe
Clark	Grant, Ind.	Kelley, Pa.
Clason	Gregory	Kerr
Clements	Griffiths	

Kilburn	Philbin	Sparkman
Kilday	Phillips	Springer
King	Pickett	Stefan
Landis	Pittenger	Stevenson
Larcade	Plumley	Stewart
Lea	Price, Fla.	Stigler
LeCompte	Priest	Stockman
LeFevre	Rains	Sullivan
Lemke	Ramey	Sumner, Ill.
Lewis	Ramspeck	Sumners Tex.
Luce	Rankin	Sundstrom
Lyle	Reece, Tenn.	Talbot
McCormack	Reed, Ill.	Talle
McCowen	Rees, Kans.	Tarver
McDonough	Richards	Thomas, Tex.
McGregor	Riley	Thomason
McKenzie	Rivers	Tolan
McMillen, Ill.	Rizley	Traynor
Mahon	Robertson, N. Dak.	Trimble
Maloney	Robertson, Va.	Vinson
Manasco	Robsion, Ky.	Voorhis, Calif
Mansfield, Tex.	Rockwell	Vursell
Martin, Iowa	Roe, Md.	Walter
Martin, Mass.	Rogers, Fla.	Wasielewski
Mason	Rogers Mass.	Weaver
May	Rogers, N. Y.	West
Michener	Sasscer	Whitten
Monroney	Schwabe, Mo.	Whittington
Mundt	Schwabe, Okla.	Wickersham
Murray, Tenn.	Scrivner	Wigglesworth
Murray, Wis.	Sharp	Wilson
Norrell	Simpson, Ill.	Winstead
O'Hara	Slaughter	Woodruff, Mich.
O'Neal	Smith, Maine	Woodrum Va.
Pace	Smith, Ohio	Worley
Patman	Smith, Va.	Zimmerman
Peterson, Fla.	Smith, Wis.	
Peterson, Ga.		

NAYS—55

Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Patterson
Biemiller	Green	Powell
Bradley, Pa.	Healy	Price, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Hook	Quinn, N. Y.
Cannon, Mo.	Huber	Rabaut
Celler	Hull	Rabin
Cochran	Kee	Resa
Crosser	Kirwan	Roe, N. Y.
Dawson	Kopplemann	Rowan
De Lacy	Lesinski	Ryter
Dicksicin	Ludlow	Sadowski
Dingell	Lynch	Savage
Douglas, Calif.	Madden	Sheppard
Douglas, Ill.	Marcantonio	Spence
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Starkey
Flood	Neely	Welch
Folger	Norton	Woodhouse
Forand	O'Brien, Ill.	
Gordon	Patrick	

NOT VOTING—117

Adams	Gorski	O'Konski
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	O'Toole
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ala.	Outland
Andrews Ala.	Gross	Pfeifer
Baldwin, Md.	Hand	Ploeser
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hart	Poage
Bell	Heffernan	Powers
Bender	Heidinger	Randolph
Boykin	Hill	Rayfiel
Brumbaugh	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Buck	Holmes, Mass.	Rich
Buckley	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Buffett	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rodgers, Pa.
Burch	Judd	Rooney
Burgin	Kefauver	Russell
Byrne, N. Y.	Kelly, Ill.	Sabath
Campbell	Keogh	Satterfield
Canfield	Kinzer	Shafer
Case, S. Dak.	Knutson	Sheridan
Coffee	Kunkel	Short
Combs	LaFollette	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Lane	Snyder
Corbett	Lanham	Somers, N. Y.
Cunningham	Link	Taber
Domengeaux	McConnell	Taylor
Eaton	McGehee	Thom
Eberharter	McGlinchey	Thomas, N. J.
Ellis	McMillan, S. C.	Tibbott
Elsaesser	Mansfield, Mont.	Torrens
Elston	Merrow	Towe
Engle, Calif.	Miller, Nebr.	Vorys, Ohio
Feighan	Mills	Wadsworth
Fenton	Morgan	Weichel
Gallagher	Morrison	Weiss
Gamble	Mott	White
Gardner	Murdock	Winter
Gavin	Murphy	Wolcott
Gerlach	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillette		Wolverton, N. J.
		Wood

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Outland with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Short.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Graham.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Rogers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Rayfiel with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Bender.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up for immediate consideration House Resolution 75, to continue the investigation by the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 237 of the Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, House Resolution 11 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, House Resolution 65 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 49 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 20 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 237 of the Seventy-third Congress, and shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than January 3, 1947, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations, for necessary legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which continues the House Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife which has been in existence for some 10 years. It involves the expenditure of a very small sum each year. It is a committee which meets with universal approval. A great many Members of the House and many people throughout the country have urged the continuance of this committee. It has been the practice of the Congress to continue this committee each Congress.

I have no further request for time. Does the gentleman from Illinois have any request for time?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No request for time on this side.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 18 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of 6 Members of the Senate (not more than 3 of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives (not more than 3 of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses, and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the time or manner of, or the parliamentary rules or procedure governing, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than April 1, 1945. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SABATH. Of that hour, Mr. Speaker, I shall later on yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

At the present time I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, inasmuch as you have heard the resolution read I believe it unnecessary for me to explain its provisions. We passed a similar resolution in the last session of the Congress because it was believed, due to the general publicity given to the matter, that such a committee should be created for the purpose of investigating and trying to improve upon the relationship between the two Houses of Congress and the relationship between the Congress and executive departments of the Government, in order to bring about greater efficiency and economy in Government and the elimination of unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh resolution the House has considered today. We have heretofore passed six. This has been truly a banner legislative day. In my 38 years of service in the House of Representatives I do not recollect that we have passed so many resolutions in such a short period of time. That is due to the fact that these committees now being renewed and re-created have actually rendered a valuable service to the House and to the country.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that I shall remain here long enough to see one of these committees that are created come before the House and say, "We have performed our duty, we are through, we will not ask for an extension." What applies to the committees of the House also applies to all departments of government and all the bureaus we have created. It is remarkable how anxious these people are at all times to take on work, greater responsibility, and render an additional service to the country.

These committees that have been created will continue as they have in the past to serve the Congress and the country. The resolution now before us will tend to bring about an improvement as I have stated in the relationship between the Congress and the executive branch of the Government and it will also see how the prevailing governmental practices which have existed in our country for over 150 years may be improved. I presume the urgent desire for the passage of this resolution was based originally on the suggestion that the committee, if created, would favor enlargement of the personnel of the committees and make it possible to provide for the various committees such additional help as may be necessary. I truly believe there is justification for such a demand.

I fully appreciate that many of the legislative committees, though they have been deprived of appropriation power and function, should be given capable and experienced men to make investigations on many of the important subjects that are brought before them from time to time. I hope when this committee is through making its thorough investigation, as it has promised, it will find that not only do these committees need additional efficient help but the individual members as well. In view of what has taken place during the last session of the Congress, and particularly in the last few weeks, I trust this resolution will receive favorable consideration.

I may say that upon the recommendation of the watchdog of the Treasury, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], we have received an additional allowance for clerk hire. Nevertheless, there are some clerks with the committees and with Members whose salaries have not been increased. That is especially true with some of the stenographers who refuse to work for the meager pay of $150 a month and live in this very expensive city of Washington.

In the last few days I was pleased to read an article in the newspapers concerning an important conference that had been held, a so-called planning group composed of businessmen, lawyers, doctors, labor leaders, in fact, of all outstanding men who take a real interest in the affairs of the country. They made several recommendations which I believe will be of interest to the committee which is being created. The one thing that appealed to me, especially, was the headline in the report, the statement to the effect that these manufacturers and others who have criticized Congress heretofore came to the conclusion that the Members of the Congress are underpaid. I agree with their statement, especially in view of the conditions existing now in the city of Washington. A $10,000 salary is insufficient for any Member to live on decently. A Member, instead of thinking and devoting his time to his duties, worries how he can take care of his family and provide for them out of this salary or rather out of the balance of the salary which is left to him, because Uncle Sam says, "Well, yes, you get that much but I need a little of it," and he deducts a certain amount. That is proper because the Government needs the money.

I do not object to paying my part, and I feel every loyal American citizen feels the same. That committee recommended that the pay of Members of the Congress be increased to $25,000. That should be of interest to any Member who feels he is deserving of it or entitled to it. There may be some who are not concerned or that feel they are not entitled to that consideration or that amount of pay. I do not think that the Congress at the present time will agree to such an amount, because in the last session an effort was made to increase the salary by $5,000. There were many Members in favor of it, but there were some who were exceptionally economical in their ways of life who thought that they might be criticized if they voted for this increase, which is only one-third of the increase recommended by this body that met here in Washington.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I shall be glad to yield when I have completed my statement, but not now.

Mr. CELLER. We have a bill to that effect. I hope the gentleman will give us a rule out of the Committee on Rules to increase the salary to $12,500.

Mr. SABATH. This committee recomended $25,000. I do not say that the Committee on the Judiciary is always extremely economical, but I do not know whether there is a chance for its passage now.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman give us a rule for $15,000?

Mr. SABATH. Wait a second, please. Any increase that we would vote for at this time under the law would not help to pay your high rent and high expenses while you are here. I believe it would only apply to those who will be reelected to the next Congress.

Realizing and believing that a mistake has been made in not voting for the $5,000 increase, I have prepared a bill which I think will to some little extent aid the Members. I have not introduced it yet, but I am going to introduce it now. That bill provides that the Members of the Congress should be entitled to certain deductions in figuring their income tax for the extra expenses and additional cost of living in Washington. It may save perhaps six or seven hundred dollars; it may save $800. Even that little help will be received with a great deal of satisfaction by many Members who unfortunately find it hard to get along on their present salary. My proposed bill will amend the revenue act. I introduced it because the present law permits the deductions of trade and business expenses to corporations and individuals.

I realize a certain amount is provided for transportation, but even with that, in view of present-day needs, I think a little relief should not be denied and I

hope that this bill, after I have introduced it, will receive favorable consideration from the committee to which it will be referred. I hope the gentleman from Missouri will approve of it, because I know he realizes that something should be done for the Members of the House. I will endeavor to use my influence with the chairman and members of the Committee on Rules to see that a rule will be forthcoming as soon as the Committee on Ways and Means will have acted favorably on the bill.

May I make this explanation to some of the new Members, and this may even apply to some of the older Members, who may be wondering how it is that we have been able to pass so many resolutions today. It is because the Committee on Rules has original jurisdiction of all resolutions creating committees or authorizing committees to investigate or giving committees the power which they ordinarily do not possess, namely, the power of subpena.

That is not true with bills. Bills must go through legislative committees. When a legislative committee approves of a bill and reports it, it must authorize its chairman, if it desires speedy action under the present chairman of the Committee on Rules, to seek to obtain a rule providing for special and immediate consideration of the bill. But please remember that that is not absolutely necessary. There are many other ways whereby a bill can be passed. If a Member obtains a favorable report on his bill from the committee to which it was referred, he can have it placed on the Unanimous Consent Calendar or it can be put on the Union Calendar, and, under the rules of the House, Calendar Wednesday is set aside for the purpose of permitting committees to call such bills up for consideration.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman also tell the Members that every Calendar Wednesday during the Seventy-eighth Congress, without exception, was dispensed with, and not once on a Calendar Wednesday was the calendar called?

Mr. SABATH. It requires unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday, and as we have a very pleasant and capable majority leader, he invariably obtains that consent without a great deal of effort on his part other than casting his usual engaging smile. Formerly we did not grant consent to dispense with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday because the Committee on Rules as then constituted was not as liberal as the present one. It is my belief that it is the duty of the Committee on Rules to help to expedite business, especially during these trying days. We of the Committee on Rules feel that it is our duty to do all in our power to expedite business so that there is no unnecessary delay.

Reverting to the consideration of the resolution now before us, which I have only partially explained because I know the Republican Member in charge of the resolution on that side, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who possesses great ability and is so eminently fair, will in his usual way go over the entire resolution and explain it to the House so that each and every Member who is on the floor now will understand its far-reaching importance.

Not wishing to delay you any longer from hearing him, I now yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances on two subjects and include extracts from newspapers and letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my fearless and able chairman is always generous. At the risk of repetition but in the interest of clarity, may I say this resolution has nothing to do with changing the rules of the House or with fixing the salaries or compensation of its membership, other than to provide an agency to make a study as to the advisability of such changes? All this resolution does is to continue a committee which was created shortly before the last Congress adjourned, the purpose of which was to make a general survey of the whole congressional set-up and then report its findings back to the Congress with its recommendations. The resolution provides that that committee must make a preliminary report not later than April 1 of this year. I discussed the resolution fully in this forum, just a few weeks ago, when the original resolution was before the House. I can add nothing to that explanation other than to say that there was one provision in the original resolution which limited the committee in making recommendations concerning certain changes in the organization of the House. By agreement of those interested in the subject, the language in this resolution has now been amplified so that the hobbles are taken off the committee and the committee can recommend just what it thinks should be done to improve the efficiency of the Congress. Thus, when that report is made, many of the things to which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has so ably referred will be issues before the House. In brief the only question before the House is: Shall the investigating committee be continued to complete its work? I do not believe there is any opposition to this course.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an improvement over the resolution which we passed just before the last Congress adjourned. I propose to support it. I complained about the proviso in section 2. According to the way it read in the original resolution, it nullified everything that the resolution instructed the committee to do. As written now it simply provides that the committee must eliminate from its report any reference to the procedure on the floor of the House. The original resolution went far beyond that. I am disappointed in the resolution, however, from one standpoint and that is that a committee of this importance representing this House as a whole is not given the power to report legislation, and that that legislation be given a privileged status. As the situation now stands, any recommendations which this committee makes with reference to committees or consolidations, transfer of jurisdiction from one committee to another, goes to the Committee on Rules, which would have the veto power, because if it did not report the resolution then the matter is dead. If this committee should see fit to recommend an extension of the Legislative Reference Service, to create a research division, to create a division of investigation for the entire House of Representatives and all the committees, or increasing personnel of the committees, then that legislation would be referred to the Committee on Accounts, of which I have the honor to be chairman. But when the Committee on Accounts reports a bill it would have no privileged status. It would be necessary to go to the Rules Committee for a special rule, and if that committee refused to vote out a rule, again the Committee on Rules would have the veto power. I say to you that this committee should have the power to report legislation and that it should have a privileged status. Thus, each and every Member of this House would constitute the body which would have the power to approve or reject instead of a few members of one committee of this House of Representatives. I am sorry that the committee did not provide for this in the resolution. Such power was extended to economy committees; why not to this very important committee?

Mr. Speaker, this committee is on the spot, so to speak. The country will watch it. It will expect results, and it is my opinion if the committee does a good job it will receive strong support from every section of the country. We have an opportunity to do something for ourselves. Naturally there will be objections to recommendations that the committee might make that will directly affect many of the Members, but it is impossible to do a job of this kind without offending many.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee

on Rules adverted to the salaries of Members of the House. Let me say that a bill is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary to increase our salaries and that of the Senators to $12,500. I hope the Judiciary Committee in its wisdom will vote that bill out—either that bill or one to increase the salary 50 percent, namely to $15,000.

I want to disabuse the minds of the Members that we have no right to increase our salary during the term for which we are elected; we have a right to do that; there is no constitutional prohibition against increasing our own salaries during the term for which we are elected. This precedent was followed the last time the salaries of Senators and Members of Congress were increased namely, on March 4, 1924. At that time we increased our salaries from $7,500 to $10,000, the increase to take effect immediately. I hope the committee will report it out because we can then get the matter before the Appropriations Committee and have it included in a deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question but what Members of Congress should receive an increase in salary. In addition to that I believe we should be permitted to deduct for tax purposes as a proper item of expense the amount it costs us to procure living quarters in Washington up to a maximum, say, of $3,000. I do not mean to include food in this expense, but the actual expense we incur in procuring living quarters. A businessman is allowed to deduct every cent he spends in the conduct of his business. There is no reason why a Member of Congress should not be allowed to treat as a deductible item the amount he actually pays for living quarters while here in Washington.

Mr. CELLER. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have enough to say to take 20 minutes, but I will try to pack the main points into 4.

In the first place I expect I have worked as hard on this proposition as any Member of the House. I am deeply interested in it, deeply concerned about it. My reason, briefly, is this: In every nation where democratic constitutional government has gone down and dictatorship replaced it, the first step in the process has been the weakening of the prestige and power and position of the legislative arm of the government. I am for this resolution because I want to strengthen the hand of the Congress; and that is all I care about. I want to say in supporting this resolution with a whole heart that I do so as one who has not only not taken seriously the question of increasing congressional salaries during this very critical wartime but as one who is definitely opposed to any such action at a time when we are attempting to stabilize the economy in the midst of that war and when ceilings are in effect on the earnings of millions of Americans. Whatever argument may be made on the ground that in comparison to the importance of the job Congressmen's salaries are low, whatever the arguments from the viewpoint of justice and equity, nevertheless at this time, in the midst of war, it would in my judgment be a great mistake for us even to consider such a thing. I do not believe that it is by any means a primary concern of this committee that is here proposed. Indeed, there are two things that so far exceed any such consideration in importance that I hope I can speak about them very briefly to make the record clear. The first of those is that the Congress of the United States should have access to independent sources of information and research analysis so that the Congress in judging matters that come before it will not be completely dependent upon either the testimony of executive agencies, however capable they may be, or the testimony of groups of individuals with particular interest in legislation for the vast bulk of information upon matters concerning which we legislate. I want Congress to have an independent source of such information.

The second reason this committee is important is this: The Congress of the United States together with the Constitution of this Nation is the only proper source of executive power that exists. If the Congress grants power to executive agencies, as it must do under present circumstances and under conditions of modern government must continue to do, if the Congress grants any power it becomes the corollary duty of the Congress to see that that power is properly and justly exercised, that it is not abused, that it is exercised to carry out the intent of Congress. In that respect my view of the matter is—and I have introduced a bill to that effect—that when the Congress delegates power it should be part of the duty of the standing committee which reports the legislation to follow up the legislation and investigate as a continuing matter the administration of that legislation to make certain that the powers granted are not abused and that the intent of Congress is carried out. That is the way I think it ought to be done. A few moments ago I voted for the Smith committee only because of my belief that it is part of the duy of Congress to review the exercise of powers that it grants.

I do not think that a special committee ought to be the answer. It is a stopgap until the fundamental solution can be had. I think the answer should be to give that function to the regular standing committees of the House. I hope out of this study will come such a provision.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this resolution because I want to strengthen the hand of the Congress of the United States; I am for it because I know the citadel of individual liberty, the citadel of constitutional government in the whole world, resides in this Congress more than anywhere else in the world today; I am for it because in the midst of this war we have to grant Executive power, of course we have, of the most sweeping nature, and because I want to lay the groundwork, even while we do this for the future, in order that this Congress may perform its functions efficiently, effectively, and in accord with the needs of the people of this Nation and so that it will become not merely an agency that says yes or no to Executive proposals, but an agency capable of, and actually performing, the function of bringing forth its own constructive program for the needs of the people of this Nation. Thus, it will take its place and keep its place as an altogether coequal branch of our Government. That is why I am for this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for a very clear and concise explanation of what I think all the authors of this resolution had in mind. He stated the case. He has been one of the moving spirits for many years in the modernization of the institution called Congress to protect our rightful place in the constitutional scheme of things and I heartily second what he said on the floor just now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in the time remaining on this side, may I say that due to a recurring attack of sinus, which has affected my hearing, I did not understand what the gentleman had to say about the Committee on Rules. Surely he could not have found any fault with the failure of the committee to act to permit bills to reach the floor of the House, because if he had been a Member at the time I entered the House, when "Uncle Joe" Cannon was both Speaker of the House and chairman of the Committee on Rules, he would appreciate the beneficial changes and improvement in the rules which afford opportunities, rights, and privileges now enjoyed by the Members, which were at that time denied them. Further, as chairman of the committee, I have at all times opposed any action that would infringe upon or allow another committee to assume jurisdiction that the rules of the House granted to the respective legislative committees. So, I feel if the gentleman finds fault, it is unwarranted.

As to the cost of the investigations provided under the resolutions which we have passed, it will be his duty to hold them down, and with his experience and ability, he should be able to do so.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to say I have expedited the passage of these resolutions today, because it will be necessary for me to be absent for about 2 weeks. During that time I hope all of the committees that were created today will go to work and perform their duties to the best interests of the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the pending resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, January 30, at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on the subject Peace, if We Want It.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked and secured unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a certain article. I now find that the article exceeds the allowable limit. I hereby state that it is two and one-eighth pages long, and that it will cost the sum of $110.50. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a news article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE ROAD TO ROME

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the House Military Affairs Committee, I recently visited the European and Mediterranean theaters of war. I am happy to have this opportunity to express something of the admiration I feel for the mighty and heroic efforts which our armed services abroad have launched over vast and difficult areas in great extremes of climate.

To be sure, on such a long trip, taken in such a short time—5 weeks—we could not do more than sample these Herculean endeavors. Nevertheless, as a relay of officers carried us with dispatch, efficiency, and great courtesy through the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Italy, the sampling we made was comprehensive. We saw the prodigious tasks performed by the Quartermaster, Signal, Engineer, and Transportation Corps—tasks which have kept our striking forces supplied with all the multidinous accoutrements and provender of modern war. We have witnessed the miracles performed by the Ordnance and Medical Departments as they maintained, salvaged, and repaired the anatomies of machines, and the machinery of men. We saw the work of adjutant generals, provost marshals, finance departments, the special services, A. M. G. and the Bureau of Psychological Warfare, which seek to establish economic, legal, and political order in the very midst of war's chaos. We noted with admiration the services performed by the M. P.'s, who monitor the martial law, keep men at peace with one another, and the traffic rolling; and we witnessed with reverence the services of our chaplains, who monitor the Divine law and keep men at peace with God and on the road to heaven.

As a woman, I naturally took special pride in the great work of the women of the Red Cross, the heroic Army nurses, and the WAC's. In view of a most serious shortage of nurses and the demand overseas for WAC's, I hope to speak in the future at much greater length about these magnificent women.

In a military effort so complex, diverse, and extensive, which was undertaken in so short a time, by a Nation which when war broke was so ill prepared, it was not to be expected that our committee would find nothing to criticize. We discovered battle lacks and shortages. "Discovered," perhaps, is not the correct word. Even before our departure, most of these shortages and lacks had been much publicized on the home front. Our shortages are ammunition, heavy tanks—tanks that can outmatch the Germans' Panthers and Tigers; artillery—including guns that can outmatch the Germans' 88; heavy trucks and tires. Our lacks are robot bombs, mines, and jet-propelled and rocket planes. But none of these shortages or lacks was serious enough—or so it seemed to me—to imperil victory. And yet it is a vast pity that these things have not been produced in quantity by our factories, or gotten sooner to the battlefronts. There can be no doubt that the failure to do so has postponed V-day.

In particular, the members of our committee were besieged by both officers and G. I.'s to explain the ammunition and artillery shortages. I regret to say that there was a disposition among the G. I.'s to blame the Congress somewhat for them. We are used in this House, in recent years, to being the seat of the pants of our Government. And up to a certain point, it does people good to kick us, and it does us good to be kicked. Nevertheless, the present ammunition and artillery shortages cannot be blamed on the Congress.

It is interesting to reread one paragraph from the Annual Report for the Fiscal Year 1944 of the Army Service Forces, which General Somervell sent on November 15, 1944, to every member of our committee. I quote:

> A good illustration of the changing needs of war, and the problems they create, is provided by the heavy artillery and heavy ammunition programs. The original production plans for heavy artillery and ammunition were revised downward in November 1942 and again in February 1943. Field commanders and staff planners believed that mobile warfare tactics would reduce the requirements for heavy artillery battalions. * * *
>
> Early in the calendar year 1944 it became evident that heavy artillery was destined to play a far larger role than had been anticipated. Effective use of the 155-millimeter gun in the north African campaign and in the Pacific against the Japanese increased the demands for this weapon. * * * Experience on the Italian front during the winter of 1943–44 showed that expenditures of heavy artillery ammunition had been underestimated.

Indeed, a careful study of General Somervell's admirably candid report shows that the responsibility for the ammunition and artillery shortages up to the present time lies largely with field commanders and staff planners whose early optimism concerning the decisive nature of mobile tactics—meaning, no doubt, strategic bombing—caused the War Department steadily to revise battlefield needs downward until early 1944.

One shortage for which the home front can, however, be blamed is the battlefront shortage of whole blood—blood from O, or universal type donors. This intolerable and shameful shortage, like the shortage of nurses, results in the wholly unnecessary loss of our sons' lives. And surely the whole blood shortage requires no legislation. It requires only that the ordinary citizen bare his or her right arm to a mild prick. Perhaps courage will come in this moment, remembering that somewhere there is a man who needs blood unto death, because he bared his breast to some weapon far more lethal than a small needle.

But these shortages, as I say, are already well publicized and remedial measures are even now being taken for them.

However, as one member of our committee I became intensely aware for the first time, while overseas, of one serious shortcoming in War Department policy. This shortcoming I shall examine fully at the end of this address.

Apart from it I can sum up my own over-all impression by saying that I believe that we all returned with enhanced confidence in our military leadership at home and abroad, and a more profound pride in the caliber of our overseas forces. We also returned more determined than ever that nothing we do in this House should result in the slackening of the fury with which our sea, land, and air forces are everywhere engaging the enemy.

And I think I may add that none of us yearns to proffer suggestions on future military tactics or strategy. We have

seen what prodigies General Marshall and the Allied High Command have accomplished on seven oceans and on five continents, without them. We are content to leave discussions of strategy to the Allied High Command and to the armchair Napoleons and the chaise longue Joans of Arc.

Admittedly, it is impossible fairly to distribute grateful praise over war theaters so widespread, in which so many men, individually, and in units, have each played a significant part in weaving the fabric of victory. Nevertheless, today I would like to single out one group of men for your very special consideration. That group is the American Fifth Army in Italy.

On January 6, in his annual message to the Congress, President Roosevelt said:

> The tremendous operations in western Europe have overshadowed in the public mind the less spectacular, but vitally important Italian front. Its place in the strategic conduct of the war in Europe has been obscured, and—by some people, unfortunately—underrated.

Never has the President made a truer observation, nor one more timely.

For the Fifth Army man in Italy today also feels that the part his campaign has played, and is playing, has been overshadowed, obscured, and underrated. It is a wicked thing—a most subtly demoralizing thing—for great fighting men to feel that they are on a forgotten front. Because I know that the Members of this House, many of whose sons and relatives are today on that front, have not forgotten its vital importance, I ask your permission now to review briefly the history of the Fifth Army, and to reestimate its place in the scheme of Allied victory.

That history properly begins with the landing of the Fifth Army at Salerno in September 1943. But its roots go much further back. A few months after the successful landings in north Africa in November 1942, Gen. Mark Wayne Clark, who had been General Eisenhower's right hand in the quiescent U. K. theater, undertook the building of an army there for the attack on the mainland of Italy. For 7 months that army was vigorously trained in the rear of the battle that flowed across north Africa to Tunis. By the time it was activated, some of its units had already fought to drive Rommel back across the Mediterranean onto the European Continent. Other units were first seasoned to combat when, on July 9, 1943, in a high stinging wind off the Mediterranean, Allied forces landed at Gela in Sicily.

The battle for Sicily was brilliantly effective and gratifyingly brief. By August 17 Palermo had fallen and Sicily was ours. A jubilant American public took stock of the European military situation, which perhaps for the first time it really began to understand. For the conquest—or liberation if you prefer—of Sicily had, at long last, partially lifted the curtain on Allied grand strategy against Hitler's Europa Festung. The first step was to knock Italy out of the war. Suddenly it became clear to even the most captious amateur that this might be a whale of a good idea. First, to knock Italy out would mean the capture, or neutralization, of the Italian Fleet. This accomplishment alone would free the Mediterranean from the scourge of Hitler's submarines and planes, shorten our sea lines to the Near East, Russia, India, and China by thousands of miles, and add several millions of tons to our shipping. Second, under the sights of our heavy bombers would come strategical industrial targets in south Germany, and in Axis-held lands to the east. Third, Allied forces would outflank the Germans in the Balkans, and hold a springboard to the vital Danube Basin, where, through the shaky Nazi backdoor, we could join up with our Russian allies—if the Russians were disposed to accept our aid in that politically disputed part of the world. And, fourth, Allied forces would then hold a firm bridgehead for landings in southern France.

What was not so clear at the time, although it was always the most important consideration, the investment of Italy would protect Allied flanks in France, once we crossed the channel. This, it is now abundantly plain, our Supreme Allied Command had always intended to do.

The military fruits that promised to ripen once we successfully stormed the Italian mainland were augmented by the sweet political fruits which the Sicilian campaign suddenly bore. On July 25 Mussolini, the Jackal of Europe, was forced to resign by the King. By September 8, the newly appointed Premier, Marshal Badoglio, had feverishly negotiated that unconditional surrender of his misguided country which gratified the Allies no less than it did all the wise and loyal sons of Mazzini and Garibaldi. But though that surrender meant the end of organized Italian resistance, it did not, alas, mean the end of organized resistance in Italy. For knocking Italy out of the war also meant knocking the Germans out of Italy. And that was the stern job assigned to Mark Clark's Fifth Army.

So, as historians figure things, the great saga of this great American Army began on September 9 at 3:30 in the morning when it landed at Salerno on the west coast of Italy, on a lovely beach, fringed with the ancient ruins of Greek temples, called Paestum.

If I have gone further back in time than this historic date, it is because, as I have said, it was the Sicilian campaign which first revealed to the public the great significance of the task assigned to General Clark. And, also, because hundreds, no, thousands, of the men who took part in the Fifth Army's baptism of fire at Salerno had already fought hard and long in the curtain-raising operations in Africa and Sicily. They had already had, you might say, a bellyful of war.

The Salerno landing was, in military jargon, a calculated risk. That is to say, it was a great gamble thought to be necessary at the time. Salerno was the only landing spot within the range of our Sicilian-based fighter planes. The invasion, like that of Sicily, was a three-dimensional logistical and tactical problem of vast magnitude, involving the movements of thousands of air, sea, and land craft, bearing all the incredible paraphernalia of modern war and their attendant personnel: tanks, trucks, jeeps, peeps, bulldozers, wreckers, cranes, repair units, field guns of great variety, flame throwers, pipe lines, the famous Bailey bridges, communications and signal equipment, ammunition, ambulances, hospitals complete in every detail, and so on. It was a magnificent display of teamwork between Army, Navy, and Air Forces. Nevertheless, the most difficult military operation of all is a landing on a hostile, defended shore. And unlike the Sicilian landing, Salerno did not catch the enemy by surprise. The Germans met the Fifth at Salerno in force. In the hellish melee of that beachhead it was, as Winston Churchill said, "Touch and go from day 3 to 7."

All the world's eyes were focused on the course of this great battle, the loss of which would imperil the whole of Allied grand strategy. But in the terrible days that followed a fact became suddenly clear which made Salerno for the experts, at any rate, the most significant European battle of World War No. 2. That fact was that the Infantry was still "the queen of battles." For there, at Salerno, the Infantryman, the rifleman, the "dogface," as he is wont to call himself, came into his own. Once again, as always throughout the history of war since rifles were invented, the Infantry became the key to victory.

On the blackest day of the fighting, during a vicious German counterattack against the bridgehead, when it seemed they could not stay, cool, long, lanky Mark Wayne Clark's terse order to his troops came: "We are here to stay." And so they were. They cut and tore and shot their way through barbed wire and over mine fields, past pillboxes and into a red curtain of rifle and artillery fire and air bombardment. On the ninth day the Germans began to retreat. While they pivoted on the Sorrento hills, preparing a new line of defense, the Fifth advanced, battering the mountain gateways to the flat lands around Naples.

Even as we watch so breathlessly today General MacArthur's advance on Manila, so almost a year and a half ago we followed General Clark's advance on Naples. Every step his army took toward the lava-scarred cone of plumed Vesuvius drew hundreds of thousands of words of praise and concern from the press and radio. Then, was there any place so important as Naples, any army so valiant as Clark's Fifth? The weary "dogfaces" who finally marched into the demolished port of Naples on October 1 were adored by thrilled and grateful freemen and freewomen all over the world.

But all that was bloody past, was bloody prologue for Clark's Fifth. With the taking of Naples, there began in grim earnest the Calvary of the Fifth, the Via Dolorosa: the road to Rome.

In Sicily, Allied forces had comprised 13 divisions, the best that we then had in the world. They faced an enemy whose backbone was formed by no more than 4 Nazi divisions, whose supply lines were paralyzed, and whose air cover had been removed.

Once on the Italian boot, Clark's Fifth, and the British Eighth together were not so great in strength as the enemy. And the enemy had on his side two tremendous, and all but decisive allies—the Italian climate and terrain. Although we had unquestionable air superiority, beginning with the autumn rainy season our planes were often grounded day after day, and in the terrible winters month after month.

The boot of Italy is quilled with mountain peaks, like a porcupine. Towering on all sides was an insane jumble of sleet-lashed, snow-blanketed ranges, peppered with strongly entrenched, easily defended enemy artillery posts. Ahead of Clark, the road to Rome threaded through narrow winding valleys that soon became quagmires of mud. In this mud, up these snowy mountains, tanks and trucks moved with incredible difficulty. Often they could not move at all. Even that prodigious little contraption, the jeep, was sometimes balked and gave way to the little Italian mule. And sometimes the mule gave way to man, for on slippery mountain sides where even mules could not climb Mark's men clambered with heavy pack boards. The men of the Fifth ate and lived and slept in that mountain snow and valley mud. Do you wonder why the infantrymen call themselves, with such sardonic emphasis, the "dogfaces"? It is because they often live like dogs, and many of them died like dogs, in these bitter circumstances.

But by October 15, before the full force of the evil winter was unleashed, the Fifth had crossed the tortuous and swollen Volturno. This madding stream doubles and redoubles upon itself so often that one G. I. could truthfully say to me later: "All I ever seemed to be doing for one whole month was wading across the Volturno." But with the crossing, the world again applauded the Fifth. It had completed the second most difficult of military operations; it had successfully assaulted a strongly defended river line.

But now, as the Germans installed themselves on the winter line, the Fifth began to slog along, 3 miles a week. It was a muddy, bloody grind. In those days no doubt some of their officers often reflected that in all history Rome had never been taken from the south. But then they took heart, also remembering that the great Hannibal himself had been hurled back from Paestum and Salerno—which Mark Clark had not been.

And yet, by December 1, the Fifth Army had cracked the powerful German winter line. By January 15, it was secure along the general line of the Rapido and Garigliano Rivers, which traversed the Liri Valley. Now, how many mountains had the "dogfaces" climbed up and down, digging out Krauts, as it were, by hand? No matter, there was always one more mountain on the other side.

"Dogfaces" are not noted for their ability to quote poetry much above the level of "The Infantry, the Infantry with mud behind their ears," which no other branch of service can lick "in a hundred million years." But if they could, their favorite poem in Italy might well be the poem of the pilgrim who walked to Rome over the Alps, the Pyrenees, the Caucasus, and the Apennines—

Where sun doth never shine.
When he some heaps of hills hath overwent,
Begins to think on rest, his journey spent,
Till mounting some tall mountains, he do find
More heights before him than he left behind!

But today the Fifth fought in a valley. Is a valley of the Apennines any better to fight in than the Apennines themselves? Not this valley where they fought. For although it was called the Liri Valley on the map, it soon became known to the world as the "Valley of the Purple Heart," so great were the casualties taken there. And there, at the valley's end, lay the mountain bastion of Monte Cassino, the linch-pin in the Gustav Line.

On January 16 the epic battle for Cassino began. And on January 22 a new element of the Fifth received its terrible baptism of fire at Anzio.

Anzio was 60 miles northwest of Cassino on the seacoast, and 30 miles from Rome. The Anzio landing was a leapfrog, left-hook, or end-run operation. It was meant to threaten the rear of the German army, to be a dagger pointed at the German right flank, which would divert his forces from Monte Cassino, and thus allow a junction of our Anzio and Cassino forces.

The initial landing was a success. At nightfall on D-Day we had 36,000 men to oppose Kesselring's 20,000, and a beachhead 20 miles long and 8 miles deep. But the German is an enemy to be hated, not underestimated. D-day plus 11, despite all the best efforts of Clark's men, 98,000 German troops faced our 92,000 at Anzio.

For over a month, the Germans threw in everything they had at the embattled beachhead. Tiger tanks, with accompanying infantry, made mass attacks again and again and again. Artillery and huge railroad guns, "the Anzio expresses," lobbed shells into beachhead areas, which could be called "rear areas" only by military courtesy. Meanwhile, the Hunnish defenders of Cassino remained undiverted and unbudged.

As days—no, months—wore by, many Americans on the homefront began to complain of a failure of American generalship, or found fault with our weapons, the training of our troops, or blamed those in the highest places in Washington for not delivering more men and matériel to this only live European theater of war. Some shouted that everything should be taken from the United Kingdom and north Africa to break this humiliating stalemate, so costly in American lives. Others indicted the whole Italian campaign as foolhardy from its inception, forgetting the clarity with which they had seen, at the time of Palermo and Salerno, the rich military and political fruits to be gained by knocking Italy out of the war. Nevertheless, throughout all the complaints, our sympathy and admiration and praise of Clark's Infantry—"the queen of battles"—and for the men who protected and served the "queen," the Air Force, Artillery, Engineers, Signal, Ordnance, and Supply, remained endlessly and richly eloquent. If some thought Clark's men martyrs to faulty strategy, or a breakdown in supply systems, all thought them heroes whom we would never, no never, cease to extol, while radio time, newspaper space, and breath remained to us.

The truth about Anzio and Cassino was simple. Secretary of War Stimson stated half of it 2½ months after the Anzio landing when he said, "The simple fact is that the Germans stopped us." The other half of the truth was still the best held secret of the war: Cross Channel was only a few months off, and the lesson learned at Palermo and Salerno and Anzio itself was—do it with enough. And enough for Cross Channel meant, alas, something less than was needed to crack Cassino and break out of Anzio.

And yet in the end there was enough. At 1 minute before 3 on the night of May 11 you might have heard a whispered gripe in a pup tent, so quiet was the Valley of the Purple Heart. One minute later you could not have heard a top sergeant shout, as Allied artillery opened up a great bombardment from Cassino to the sea, and the whole night burst into flame. And all along the line Mark Clark's "dogfaces" jumped off.

On May 18 Cassino fell. "Fell" is a strange expression to use of that sepulchral town, crowned by the jagged ruins of the Benedictine Abbey. For abbey and town alike had long before tumbled down the mountainside into ghastly piles of rubble.

Today the only ordered things, the only recognizable objects in Cassino are the rows and rows of white crosses that mark on the outskirts the graves of the men who fell there.

Though, quite naturally as an American, I have talked mostly of Clark's Fifth, here I pause to pay tribute to the British. From the beginning, many British units had fought with the Fifth. Only the conjoined effort of the British Eighth Army on its right, from the time of Salerno, made the Fifth's advance possible. And let us remember here, too, that under the banners of the Fifth and Eighth, the blood of many peoples and nations has been spilled. Today, not only Americans, including Americans of Negro and Japanese ancestry, but British, Canadians, Scots, New Zealanders, South Africans, French, Goums, Sikhs, Punjabi, Pathans, Moroccans, Algerians, Senegalese, Poles, and Brazilians, and Italians, too, have contributed to our victories in Italy. With the taking of Monte Cassino, the Gustav line crumbled to the sea.

During the early morning of May 25, near Borgo Grappa beachhead, elements from Anzio made that contact with elements coming up from Cassino which had been the long delayed purpose of the Anzio landing. By June 2, the German line that had formed a cordon around the beachhead caved in, even as had the winter line, the Gustav line, the Hitler line. Headed by Maj. Gen. Lucian Truscott, the beachhead forces broke out of their bitter trap, raced through the Pontine marshes, and hopped off for Cisterna and Velletri. Al-

though the German retreat had become a flight, many could not flee fast enough and Fifth Army prison cages soon filled with a steady and gratifying flow of dejected supermen.

On June 4, Mark Clark's Fifth, the first American Army to be activated on foreign soil, the first to best the Wehrmacht in Europe, the first to liberate an Axis capital, the first in world's history to take Rome from the south, and the first to test and implement the grand strategy of the war in the west, marched into the Eternal City. Every step on the road to Rome had been bought in hardship and blood. The Fifth had had 9 months of the bitterest campaign ever fought in history.

June 4—please mark that date well. For it fixes the high point of American interest in the Italian campaign. For on June 6, Allied forces crossed the channel.

It is the most natural thing in the world that the battles fought with many armies on the Normandy beachheads and across France should have eclipsed the subsequent battles of Clark's Fifth. While those great battles raged, with gargantuan teams of tanks, planes, heavy artillery, and airborne troops supporting infantry, the Battle of Italy had begun to repeat a rather monotonous pattern. To be sure, the Fifth did not linger in the Eternal City. By late October the impetus of the Rome advance had carried the Fifth north to Leghorn and the Arno River. By September 2 the occupation of Pisa was completed, leaving the Tower of Pisa leaning not an inch more or less. And then—Clark's Fifth came up against the Gothic line. It was the most terrible of all the German lines. I wish you could have seen, as our committee has seen, that cruel mountainous terrain, sewn with the enemy's concrete emplacements, pill boxes, countless miles of barbed-wire entanglements, yawning tank traps, and vicious mine fields. You would wonder how the men of the Fifth, wearied as they were of a long year of war in Italy, could break through such a wicked barrier. Guts and stamina were the answer. Before the Gothic line was breached, the battle of the blizzard-blown Futa Pass was as bloody as the battle of the muddy Liri Valley.

Today the Fifth Army line runs from south of La Spezia, at the knee of the Italian boot, to a few miles south of Bologna, an important Nazi ammunition center. And on that line, in one more winter, the Fifth finds itself in a towering tangle of sleety mountains where tanks can move only with great difficulty. Once more it fights without the all-out aid of the air forces, grounded by blizzard and fog. Once more the "dogface" freezes in his fox-hole, or shudders in his pup-tent, pitched in waist-high snow. Once more his mission is to dig "krauts" out of the side of perilous and slippery crags—by hand! Yet once more the Fifth Army is fighting forward, forward toward the Valley of the Po and the Lombardy plains, containing and engaging, with the British Eighth, some 25 front-line German divisions.

At the end of August, Winston Churchill said, addressing units of Clark's Fifth Army:

I greet you here this morning with feelings of pride that the honor should have fallen to me to inspect * * * one of the great armies of the United Nations. * * *

The Thirty-fourth United States Division was first, or among the very first, of all the United States troops to leave the New World and carry by their sacrifices and their valor the precious blessing of freedom and justice to the lands enslaved by Hitler's tyranny. * * *

We have here in Italy one of the finest armies in the world. The combination of the Fifth Army and of the British Eighth Army binds together two veteran armies in a bond of brotherhood and comradeship in arms, and in the sense of marching and fighting shoulder to shoulder for a righteous cause. You have done deeds which will long be remembered. The earliest landings in Italy, the long fighting at Anzio beachhead, the battle of the Cassino front, and the capture of Rome and Leghorn—all of these are episodes which have played a fruitful and an invaluable part in the entire scheme and design of the Allied armies. No operation could have been more fruitful in this theater than the work which you have done by drawing away perhaps two dozen or more divisions down into Italy where they have been torn to pieces. You have aided notably and most effectively the great battle now proceeding to its victorious climax on the fields of France. But though you have done great deeds in the past, and may well be proud of what has been achieved, I come here to tell you today that greater ventures and greater achievements now lie ahead of you, and that you will be playing constantly an absolutely vital part in the long, hard struggle for whose speedy end we all strike and for whose speedy end we all pray.

Consider for a moment what would happen if the Germans could hold the Italian line against little resistance, or indeed had not had to hold it at all. Would Eisenhower welcome on his front the appearance at this hour of 25 first-line German divisions? Indeed, the picture on the European front might be very black indeed, if the Germans had not been forced for a year and a half to engage the Fifth Army, and if that army, by its long campaign, had not robbed Hitler of large elements of men and material he once drew from southern Italy.

This war has often been called a war of logistics. Consider, too, that the Italian campaign was the prime laboratory for all Eisenhower's subsequent logistical operations in Europe. The transportation and supply systems which rolled Allied might across northern France last summer were carefully patterned after the set-up of the Fifth as it advanced up the boot. Valuable lessons were learned in the feeding and clothing of our troops. And as General Somervell said in his report, the revising up of ammunition, artillery, and infantry conversion programs came as the result of Anzio and Salerno. Army engineers did great pioneering in the rehabilitation of demolished ports at Naples, Leghorn, Civitavecchia, and Piombino—pioneering jobs that paid off brilliantly at Cherbourg, Antwerp, and Le Havre. Weapons of all types had a good testing in Italy. Indeed, what weapons failed to appear in the battle of Italy, failed to appear, alas, in our own arsenals in France—rocket bombs, jet planes, and so on. I believe that it is quite possible to say that but for the many military lessons learned on the Italian front and in its rear areas, the cross channel operation might have failed altogether.

Yes; the Fifth Army has much of which to be proud. And it is especially proud of its leadership; of Mark Clark, its originator, who is not only a great commander of troops, but a man who knows the true secret of generalship is to leave nothing to hazard.

And it is very proud of its present commander, Lt. Gen. Lucian K. Truscott, who has recently replaced Clark as Fifth Army chief, when Clark became field commander of all Allied armies in the Italian theater. Truscott, the fiery Texan, is a man quite after the heart of the Fifth Army. A veteran of the Dieppe raids, he fought in Sicily, on the Volturno, at Cassino, and Anzio. He has recently returned to his Italian command from commanding the Sixth Corps in the French landings, and at the Battle of Belfort Gap.

Socrates' ancient recipe for a general fits Lucian K. Truscott admirably. Said Socrates:

A general must be skillful in preparing the materials of war, and in supplying his soldiers; he must be a man of mechanical ingenuity, careful, persevering, sagacious, kind, and yet severe, open yet crafty, careful of his own, yet ready to steal from others, profuse yet rapacious, cautious yet enterprising.

Yet, I believe that it is the rapacity of Lieutenant General Truscott which most endears him to Fifth Army men, for he has such a rapacious appetite for dead Germans, and he devotes so much of his efforts to satisfying that appetite, that he has neither appetite nor efforts left for courting personal publicity. He does not seek the bubble reputation in the cannon's mouth. He seeks only to batter his way to Berchtesgaden, a villa I trust will be handed to him on a silver platter for his south German headquarters.

And yet I have said many times before today that the Fifth Army is the bitterest as well as the proudest army in Europe. Why, with faith in its own achievements and prowess, and faith in its commanders, is it bitter? For two reasons. For both there is a remedy, and I shall present them both for your consideration.

First. The men of the Fifth Army—above all the combat elements—are bitter because there really are very many at home who, as the President said, either have forgotten or underestimated the task they have performed, and that still remains before them. There has been little public appreciation of the incredible hardships which the "dogfaces" have endured since Rome fell 7 months ago. And many are the front line G. I.'s who confided in me that they have received letters from home saying how glad their families are that they were on "an inactive front in sunny Italy." This type of letter, combined with the scant press coverage the Italian theater has had since D-day, has a very disheartening effect on a man who, for example, has recently seen his platoon go into action 45 strong against an enemy emplacement

on the side of an ice-bound mountain, and brought it out with 5 men alive.

An even more dastardly type of letter is one received by many a G. I. in Italy saying in effect: "What are we doing in Italy? The Italian campaign might as well have stopped after Rome. It began to be a waste of men and matériel from then on. The big show is on the western front or the Pacific anyway. That's where all the real fighting is going on."

To make a soldier doubt the cause for which he fights and doubt the value of his own campaign is the whole object of enemy propaganda. Such letters from loved ones at home are body blows to fighting morale; Goebbels himself could do no better for they make the individual soldier feel that he is in a sucker's game.

Second. The second reason that the individual combat soldier in Italy is bitter is admittedly a very difficult one to deal with. He feels that under our present policy of keeping divisions constantly in the line, the law of battle averages today is working inexorably to make him a casualty. Our World War No. 1 policy was to draw weary or chewed-up and shot-out divisions out of the line for substantial periods of rest, and to replace them with entirely fresh divisions. This got a whole division out of battle when it had reached the limit of its endurance, which was always the limit of its efficiency. But our World War No. 2 policy is to hold divisions almost continuously in the line, making individual replacements for the killed and wounded and for those who are otherwise relieved.

Thus it will be seen that there is no over-all or fixed policy which will get the individual soldier out of battle when he shall have reached the limit of his human endurance, which is also the limit of his individual efficiency.

Today, under this policy, the individual combat soldier too often feels that if his division fights on a front which will be bitterly contested for many months his only future is to be replaced—which generally means killed or wounded.

Nowhere is this feeling more justified than in the infantry of the Fifth Army. Many units of the Fifth Army have been under fire for long periods since the Casablanca landings—a period of 2½ years. For example, the Thirty-fourth Division of that army has had over 400 actual combat days. Total American casualties in the Italian campaign to date have been 98,366. Yesterday I inquired of the War Department what percentage of these had been sustained by the infantry but the War Department declined to divulge this information. In Italy I was informed that it was over 90 percent. I believe that some such percentage will hold for all armies overseas.

Toward this bitterness of the individual combat soldier—his personal feeling that in this war he cannot win, we must draw the attention of the War Department. In its failure so far to deal with it, at a policy level, lies the one grave criticism to which I referred when I began.

I make this criticism most respectfully, fully aware of the terrible shortage of qualified combat replacements, that our reservoir of combatant soldiers is not inexhaustible, and fully aware, too, that Secretary of War Stimson and General Marshall are no doubt doing everything in their power now to devise means of relieving individual soldiers too long wearied by battle.

Nevertheless the individual combat soldier's feeling that he cannot win stems from present War Department policy. For while that policy provides for rotation, furloughs, and leaves, based on length of service in uniform, it does not provide for fixed tours of duty which any individual soldier may be required to endure under battle fire.

I believe with many people that the time has come for the War Department to adopt a policy which will give the combat soldier a fixed tour of duty under battle fire: In short, the time has come to apply to ground troops the same policy now in effect in the Air Forces, of a limited number of battle missions which any pilot in a given theater shall be required to endure, after which, irrespective of leave, furlough, or rotation, he is relieved of combat duty for a substantial period of time before he again returns to it.

I have talked to individual men in Italy who have actually been many, many months under fire. And invariably these men have pointed out to me that the men of the Air Forces are given a number of battle missions. I remember defending this excellent policy by saying, "A bomber or fighter pilot is just no good after a certain number of missions. And if he flew on, he would imperil a very expensive piece of machinery." This was the bitter and true rejoinder one G. I. gave me: "So I am not in such good shape either, after I have been fired at steady day after day after day. But an MI rifle is cheap for the taxpayer, so I suppose I can drop with it."

Yes; it seems to me that in addition to the rotation and furlough plans, there must soon be added a fixed tour of duty under fire for the individual soldier. After which he should be given a substantial relief period of service in a noncombat area before returning to battle duty. The period of time would naturally depend on the local exigencies of battle, and would be fixed by commanders in the field. But this policy would give the combat soldier a goal to shoot at, and what is more, a goal to fight forward to. Any other policy in a war as long and bitter and deadly as this one might in the end tend to demoralize troops. It will also weaken the will to victory on the home front, as many mothers and fathers and sweethearts and wives, counting not so much the time their men will have been away from home but the interminable number of days their men are required to spend under fire, also begin to feel, however unjustifiably, that they do not stand much chance of coming home alive. I hope that this lesson will also be one we shall learn from the Fifth Army.

To sum up, there is no more heroic army, nor any army whose significance in the scheme of victory has been and will continue to be greater than that of the Fifth Army. And today, despite all they have endured and are yet to endure—as General Truscott says—"Their tails are up." Their morale is good. Let us help to keep it so.

Our God and soldiers we alike adore,
Even at the brink of danger: not before.
After deliverance, both alike requited,
Our God's forgotten and our soldiers slighted.

As it is not so with our God, let it not be so with the men of our Fifth Army. We have won great battles—they have managed it. We will win a great peace—they have purchased it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentlewoman spoke of the Thirty-fourth Division, which is made up of boys from Iowa and Minnesota. I wonder if the gentlewoman will agree, if it is the truth or fact, that that division, the Thirty-fourth Division, has been at the front lines longer and has possibly suffered more casualties than any other division?

Mrs. LUCE. I do not know the actual casualty figures of the Thirty-fourth Division, but, as I pointed out, it has had 400 combat days. I believe that to be the longest combat record of any American division in Europe up to this time, and if that is true, necessarily, in that kind of terrain, the Thirty-fourth's casualties must be substantially greater than those of any other division.

Mr. JENSEN. They have been in contact with the enemy——

Mrs. LUCE. Almost continuously since the days of Salerno.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to add, after listening to the fine speech the gentlewoman has just made, that it is easy for us who come from Iowa and Minnesota to understand why every newspaper we get from home has accounts of boys being killed and missing from those States. It is very appalling. Of course, we read too about the deaths of boys from all over the Nation. But I think the boys in the Thirty-fourth Division from Iowa and Minnesota have suffered a little more and possibly have done more than their share. We are proud of them and, of course, happy that they will come back home under the rotation scheme.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am sure I express the feelings of the membership of the House present in thanking the gentlelady for the vividness with which she has presented Mark Clark's Fifth in the Italian campaign. The tiny glimpse I have had makes me realize how very splendidly she has given us the picture, bringing it closer to us, which is what this House wants and needs.

Mrs. LUCE. I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Ohio. She will be pleased to know that her trip, however brief, to that theater was a remarkable inspiration and comfort, particularly to the heroic women about whom she is so concerned, the Army nurses.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman on her very timely and vivid picture of the war on the Italian and European fronts. The statement she has made to us in this House more than justifies the reason for that group having made the trip. There are many Members of Congress who openly oppose other Members of Congress going on these trips and seeing where the money of the American taxpayers is being spent, how it is being spent, and how these boys are dying. I certainly want to congratulate the gentlewoman for a very able and a very timely statement on this matter.

Mrs. LUCE. I am very grateful to the gentleman from South Carolina, and since he has raised the matter may I say that our committee was met abroad at first with a mild skepticism by many G.I.'s. Many wondered what possible use we could be over there. But judging by subsequent editorials in the various Stars and Stripes in the war theaters, before we left they did feel that it had done much good to have us understand and see these things with our own eyes. I know that all of my colleagues who were there will give you most useful and inspiring résumés of many things we saw there which I have not even touched upon. It would take us many hours to tell you all that we saw and experienced and concluded in these short 5 weeks. For example, I hope later to be able to talk about the political aspects of that Italian theater.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 5, 1945.*
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
SIR: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs.
With great respect, your obedient servant,
JOHN T. ROONEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

REAFFIRMATION OF ATLANTIC CHARTER NEEDED

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a native son from the Midwest, governed by common considerations of prudence and horse sense, not as a reactionary. A reactionary would worship the devil because of his antiquity. Nor as a theorist. A theorist is afraid of eternity because it will be a bore to him. He fears he could not fuss about practical perfection.

I have, I assure you, heard of both and I am well aware of what they might be able to do in the future, and I am further well aware of the fact that our country cannot go into the future, as we did after the First World War, choosing to ignore the rest of the world.

The truth, of course, is that we are already headed into the future and the post-war world. It is being shaped as we fight.

I think I should say in the beginning that I resent the implication, which is often the direct charge, that every elected Representative of the people who now raises his voice to question the course of world politics is provoking disunity.

The London Times, probably the most influential of British newspapers, recently called for more backing for President Roosevelt in the formulation of a foreign policy, the character of which they are perhaps reasonably sure will be to their liking. They want America, and I quote, "to take a bolder and more active lead in world affairs."

The London Economist, which is owned by a company whose chairman is Brendan Bracken, Mr. Churchill's Minister of Information, recently denounced the United States as hypocritical, preachy, and vague; and the Yorkshire Post, owned by the family of Mrs. Anthony Eden, endorsed what the Economist had to say, and demanded that the United States accept political responsibilities in Europe.

While this sort of thing is going on in the British press, American Congressmen are warned that we must do nothing, say nothing, be nothing.

So much for that. I trust that in view of the manner in which the British press is speaking of our country, the remarks of an American Congressman may not be entirely out of order.

The people of the United States of America are totally frank and completely unselfish. They put themselves out of the way to save others always. They must be sure they are right. Then nothing stands in their way.

At the present time the United States is furnishing most of the money and arms and ammunition for the western front, as well as most of the men. Should not the nation that sacrifices most see that statesmanship, not power politics, has the right of way?

In my home city of Toledo there are two wards—the fourth and the fourteenth—which are meaningless numbers to you who are hearing this speech. They are 2 of our 21 wards, 2 wards in a city of close to 300,000, just like 2 wards in any other city. In Toledo they are known as the Polish wards, and about 40,000 people live in them. The name "Polish wards" is a misnomer, for most of the people who live there are fourth-, fifth-, sixth-generation Americans whose ancestors came from Poland. In these 2 wards in my home city there are more service flags in the windows than there are in any other wards of similar size in Toledo. We have from my county some 35,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines. And while I haven't the figures at hand I do not doubt but that these 2 wards furnished a larger proportion of them than any other areas of similar population. By the same token they have furnished the greatest number of gold stars.

These people, my friends at home, have never been to Poland, most of them. They have no thought of going there. But their resentment is as mine, based on the sound concept of justice and common decency and a respect for freedom.

To them, as they do to many another American, the recent words of the Vatican newspaper have a very definite meaning.

That newspaper, the Osservatore Romano, has declared:

In order to end the war, Russia and England are asking Poland to renounce the territories between Vilna and Lemberg, west of the Curzon line. The Allies took up arms in defense of Polish integrity and today they seek a division of Poland in order to conclude the conflict. Churchill did not hide reality. He has one iron rule, "To let be what is. Necessity knows no law and events are greater than men." If such is today's reality, what will tomorrow's reality be? What will happen to today's promises of Poland's inviolability by those who are unable or unwilling to guarantee Poland's old frontiers? The Polish case compromises the war's end and peace itself.

I think I have stated the case and the danger. I now return briefly to the injunction from the executive branch of our Government that we Americans must say nothing to rock the boat, that we must remain silent.

I for one refuse to do so. Unity, yes; but on our terms or a reasonable compromise. Criticism? Yes. Our own history shows the value of it.

Washington, Lincoln, McKinley, Wilson were all criticized severely and helpfully. Sometimes not helpfully enough, sometimes not severely enough. Those who hammered at the evils of reconstruction in post-Civil War days were reviled for criticizing the era of reconstruction. They were told not to rock the boat, not to disturb unity. There was criticism, too, of Wilson's stubbornness and the Senate's abdication of power in 1919. That was criticism we did not heed, and the World War of the current hour resulted.

If we are to avoid a third world war, we must criticize our own leaders, our allies whenever we think they are wrong. We must criticize with all the vigor at our command because it is our country and our future, and no one can shape it in the last analysis but ourselves. We cannot be timid. We must not be silent. We must in all matters, regardless of preachments about the unity we all desire, speak our pieces and express our wishes

Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, soon are to meet, we are now told, at a point as yet unnamed. It has been a long time since the Atlantic Charter was formulated. It is time it be reaffirmed.

I sincerely hope that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill will clarify this situation. They speak the same language. They know that the reaction of the common man in Great Britain, particularly in Canada and Australia, is pretty much like that of the common man in America.

They know that the mass of people in all those countries object strenuously to the contemplated fourth partition of Poland.

With reference to Mr. Churchill, it is largely a matter of his own conscience. He has not recently been elected in the sense that our people elect their leaders.

Mr. Roosevelt faces a different situation. Apparently the Polish matter was one of the principal subjects at Teheran. Mr. Roosevelt had not been reelected, and while his part in the Teheran conference is not quite clear, it is certain that by his silence he gave consent. The

people would have defeated Mr. Roosevelt at the polls if they had known about this plan for Poland. As it stands, the Americans of Polish descent helped reelect him.

Mr. Roosevelt is in the doubly awkward position of a President who has consented to an unpardonable thing, and a successful candidate who has won reelection by suppressing facts which he knew to be all-important and damaging to him personally.

The President owes the American people a clear-cut statement. He owes them further a recommitment of our Government to the terms which he well knows the people approve, the terms of the Atlantic Charter insofar as they apply to the rights of small peoples, and those who by invasion have been disinherited and dispossessed.

I have abiding faith that Mr. Roosevelt will do just that, and that the small, dispossessed nations of the world will have cause to look back with thanksgiving to the reaffirmation of their rights which the approaching Big Three conference must accomplish or fail.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WORK-OR-FIGHT BILL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to address the House upon the very important work-or-fight bill now before the House Military Affairs Committee. This bill is no less than restricted national-service legislation, restricted to men from 18 to 45 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced there is a better alternative, and there are much more democratic methods of solving the problem than this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, we have the strange situation of the War and Navy Departments, the Selective Service System, and the War Manpower Commission calling for national-service legislation, when, as a matter of fact, these agencies, together with many other departments and agencies of the Government, are among the most flagrant wasters of manpower in this country. Civilian employment in the Federal Government could be cut by several hundred thousand without any injury whatever to the war effort. In addition to saving the Government millions of dollars, the reduction in employees would provide the armed forces, the farms, and war industries of this Nation with much of the manpower now being sought through the undemocratic manner of making the IV–F's scapegoats of the administration's failure to provide an intelligent and farsighted manpower program in 1942. This waste of manpower is not confined to the civilian pay rolls of the Government.

Just a few days ago the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman SABATH, charged there are thousands of commissioned officers performing menial and routine duties whose jobs could be performed by others not fit for actual combat service. He could also include thousands of other men in the armed forces who are qualified to perform more important services than are presently assigned to them. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but there are many of these men who could perform more work than they are doing now. Now do not misunderstand me. We have thousands of commissioned officers who are performing routine duty and need to be kept in their particular positions. Everybody understands that. But there are a lot of others who could be doing more important jobs in direct prosecution of the war.

I am informed the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is prepared to ask for an investigation of the War and Navy Departments to determine the cause for the excessive number of employees on their pay rolls and the cause for overstaffing and lack of efficient personnel practices.

The solution is not national service legislation for men from 18 to 45 years of age and the placing of IV-F's in labor battalions without the benefits and privileges of their more physically perfect brothers in the armed forces or by threatening them with fines and jail sentences. Administration leaders must be at a loss for ideas if this is the best solution they have to offer. Nothing could be more undemocratic, totalitarian, or more contrary to the very ideals for which we are fighting than this legislative product which has been conceived at this late hour in an attempt to rectify manpower mistakes already made. If the principle of this legislation is sound, then why not enact an all-inclusive national service act and be done with it?

A great portion of my congressional district in Kansas is rich farming country whose products will be sorely needed by ourselves and our allies this year. Yet, notwithstanding the intent of the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, the Government tells us that farmers and farm workers shall be drafted into the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, let it be understood that I am not asking that all farmers and farm workers be deferred. As a matter of fact, the farmers have furnished and are now providing a big share of the boys on the battlefronts in all parts of the world. Look at the casualty lists that are coming in, and you will find plenty of evidence on this point. While I am on that subject, there is no group in this country that has worked harder and for longer hours and more faithfully than the farmers and their families. Men, women and children of all ages have not hesitated for one minute in their effort to produce the biggest food crop in years. They have done it despite shortages of help, of farm equipment, and repairs. They have done it while their sons and brothers are on the fighting lines.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my district and the people of this country have a right to ask this question: "Will these men who will be drafted from the farms be forced to leave their crops and farms while many servicemen and officers, fully trained, or who could be trained, continue their routine in the various military and naval establishments, including the Pentagon and the Navy Buildings?" I mean those engaged in various routine noncombatant duties either unnecessary, or capable of being performed by men less physically fit, who are now engaged in less essential activities. There are thousands who have been rejected with capabilities equal to many holding these jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country have a right to ask the War and Navy Departments to adopt a reasonable, logical policy of replacing those officers and enlisted men wherever possible, who are engaged in noncombatant or limited activities, by men from the IV–F category not in war work but physically and mentally capable of performing such duties. In my opinion, it would then be unnecessary to draft workers from the farms or war plants before next summer. The real answer to this question is the bill I introduced on January 9—H. R. 1280.

The bill in substance provides that all male citizens classified in the category of IV–F under examinations given for the purpose of inducting men into the armed forces, and not engaged in essential war activity, be reexamined with a view of giving such men who are physically and mentally capable, the opportunity to perform noncombatant duties now performed by members of the armed forces. Under the bill I have submitted, such men in the IV–F category who could be utilized as herein outlined are inducted in the armed forces before essential farmers and war plant workers are put in the armed forces.

During the past several days I have been accorded the privilege of attending the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee and have carefully listened to the testimony regarding Congressman MAY's bill.

Mr. Patterson, Assistant Secretary of War, for whom I have the most profound respect, made some interesting observations. Mr. Patterson insisted the armed forces could not use any of the IV–F's in noncombatant jobs. I feel sure he was misjudging the knowledge of the members of the committee on this subject. Any time Secretary Patterson wants to utilize 500,000 able-bodied IV–F's in the Army, who are not now doing war work, I am sure he has enough personnel experts and consultants on the War Department staff who, using modern personnel methods, can do the job. As a matter of fact, if he needs some material, he can get it from the civilian pay rolls of the Government right here in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Patterson made the statement that, if under the provisions of the May bill, it was found the Army had to take more than a few thousand IV–F's in labor battalions—this act is a flop. Under such reasoning this bill is already a flop.

From the days of the Continental Army to the present this is the first time, to my knowledge, that the precious birthright of every American fighting for his country in the Army of the United States has been lowered to the point that it was considered comparable to a prison sentence without rights, benefits, and honor, or that such treatment would be afforded a citizen of the Nation for the failure of the Creator to provide him with a perfect physique.

Mr. Speaker, it is prètty drastic to say that those who desire to be a member of the Army of the United States must submit to induction under these circumstances without rights, without privileges, without honor. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the induction of IV–F's who fail to secure war jobs and who are physically and mentally capable of performing thousands and thousands of noncombatant jobs now being performed by officers and enlisted men needed on the lines. In fact, that is what I have proposed. I am not merely opposing for the sake of opposition—I have an alternative, which I believe is more acceptable to labor and to industry and to the American people than the bill that has been offered. I also believe the measure I have submitted will do far more toward bringing this war to a successful conclusion than the proposal under the May bill.

Let us analyze the situation from the facts and figures that have been presented. Evidence at the hearings developed the following: During the next 6 months the armed forces will require an additional 900,000 men for military duty and 700,000 for war industries. Now, let us examine what is proposed. The 900,000 men for the services under the plan are to be taken from the farms and the war plants. So instead of requiring 700,000 men for the war plants, industry will require about 1,500,000, and this 1,500,000 will theoretically be called from the IV–F's under threat of induction into special labor battalions or penalties without any rights. The shifting of labor from one district to the other will be under the direct control of the Government. It would seem to make this plan work, the Government will need to control the plants.

The procedure is not only undemocratic, but it is awkward and inefficient. Industry will be required to train and bring to top production in the space of 6 months at least 1,500,000 men who, for the most part, are white-collar workers totally unfit for factory work.

Mr. Speaker, this late hour is not the time to precipitate arguments, discussions, and dissension which can be avoided by the simple expedient of drafting IV–F's not now engaged in war work into noncombatant and other jobs in the armed forces which do not require the same physical standards that are required for men in more hazardous positions.

There are many jobs in the armed forces now being performed by military and naval personnel that can be performed by a million or more able-bodied IV–F's. Mr. Speaker, I would not be so positive in my assertions were it not for the obvious fact that the departments of Government have shown little disposition to utilize more fully the manpower they now have at their disposal.

Mr. Speaker, the acid test whether a department or agency is required in this crucial period has not been applied. The Government should set the pace and put its own house in order with respect to utilization of manpower before making demand for national-service legislation. Mr. Speaker, if national-service legislation is necessary, then why not apply it to everyone? This legislation will not do the job. This is not a work-or-fight bill. The IV–F men are told they have no chance to fight or even to take any place in the armed forces. This particular group is told under this bill that "we will not give you a chance in the armed forces, but we will see to it that you will go where the Government sends you or you will join a labor battalion or be subject to fine or other penalties." Mr. Speaker, if the situation is so critical that national-service legislation is necessary, then we ought to go all the way and make it apply to everybody. We ought to make sure at the same time that a lot of activities in the Government and outside the Government that do not contribute to the war effort are withheld until the crisis is over.

Mr. Speaker, if national-service legislation is the way to handle a problem, we ought to have had it a long time ago. Mr. Speaker, only a few months ago newspapers and radio commentators and men in high places in the Government gave the American people to understand we should not only have a big supply of manpower in our armed forces, but stressed especially the tremendous surplus of war materials of all kinds we had on hand in this country as well as abroad. We were told the amount was so great that within a short time a tremendous amount of it would likely be dumped on the market. Legislation was submitted to deal with questions of reconversion and other post-war problems. The American public got the idea the war was almost over and we should hasten to put our house in order to deal with surplus property and for release of men from our armed forces right away.

Mr. Speaker, I really feel that those in charge of the prosecution of the war ought to give the people of this country just as much information as possible, favorable or not, with regard to the realities of this war. The situation is a grim one. It is critical and the people have a right to know it. They ought to know the news, good or bad. It should be told as is. Of course, we have had reverses—why not tell the people? Tell them of the dire need of equipment and materials. This war can be won by the united efforts of the American people. Those in charge of the prosecution of the war ought to bring industry, business, and agriculture together and tell them the grim truth. Tell the American people of the effort required for the production of goods, and I believe we will get it. Cut out a lot of unnecessary activities in the Government and outside the Government until this war is over.

National-service legislation may have been the thing if we had done it in the first place, but this is not even national-service legislation. It is legislation with respect to a certain group only. I should remind you, too, that this legislation if put into effect will cause dislocations of manpower difficult to solve. You will have more migratory labor than you had before. Under the present law a man of draft age who quits a war job can be inducted into the armed forces immediately. These IV–F men are not slackers or draft dodgers—they are not evading military service. They have complied with the law, registered for the draft and reported, and have been rejected through no fault of their own. Many of these men may be used for active service after joining the armed forces.

I do not believe there are very many in this IV–F category who want to shirk their duties. You will find them just as patriotic and as willing as anybody else. They will do their part if you will just tell them about the grave need of their service, but first of all they are entitled to join the armed forces just as far as their services may be utilized.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a statement by Secretary Ickes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the Pearl Harbor disaster, the Western Defense Command issued an order excluding from the west coast persons of Japanese ancestry whose presence was then deemed inimical in planning the defense of our Nation against the Axis Powers.

On March 18, 1942, the President, in Executive Order No. 9102, established the War Relocation Authority and defined its functions and duties. The program outlined for the removal of both alien and American-born Japanese from the west coast embraced the setting up of numerous relocation centers in the States in the Rocky Mountain area. About 110,000 people of Japanese descent were evacuated to these camps, and administrative functions were assumed by the War Relocation Authority. The extremely large appropriations provided for this activity included funds for a work corps, with a wage scale of $12 per month for apprentice workers, $16 for general labor, and $19 for professional people and supervisors. Many thousands of these evacuees also were extended temporary leaves to enable them to accept private employment in contiguous areas. Because of the background and training of many of these evacuees, their labor in agricultural pursuits was highly important in the production of crops in the years of 1942, 1943, and 1944.

Efforts were made by the War Relocation Authority to scrutinize carefully the views of these evacuees and to determine whether there was any trace of disloyalty to the United States. There were reports of disturbances and uprisings in the first year of the W. R. A. program, but all of the Japanese of questionable loyalty or those who openly declared their allegiance to Japan were segregated and placed in the camp at Tulelake, Calif.

About 2,500 Japanese-Americans have been inducted into or have volunteered for service in the armed forces of the United States. Glowing reports have

been received from Italy, where one of these Japanese units has won acclaim for valorous and outstanding service. The casualties in this particular unit were unusually heavy, and many awards of the Purple Heart and other decorations have been given to these soldiers. The War Relocation Authority, although subjected to considerable pressure and agitation, and some criticism, has carried out the evacuation program in a manner deemed satisfactory to most of the communities near which the relocation centers are situated. Some criticism resulted from the policy of extending what many considered too many liberties to some of the evacuees, since it was frequently overlooked that a large percentage of these evacuees were American citizens and, therefore, entitled to the same constitutional rights and safeguards as are other Americans.

Because of the hostility existing in some of the communities on the west coast from which these Japanese had been evacuated, the War Relocation Authority has made extensive efforts to relocate these persons in other sections of the country. It is reported that about 35,000, or one-third of the original number of evacuees, have been relocated outside the west coast area. This includes nearly 70 percent of American citizen evacuees beyond the age of 17 who have been eligible for relocation.

Maj. Gen. H. C. Pratt, of the Western Defense Command, on December 17, 1944, issued Public Proclamation No. 21, revoking the exclusion order which had been issued shortly after Pearl Harbor and which was responsible for the creation of the War Relocation Authority. General Pratt declared that the military situation on that date made possible modification and relaxation of restrictions and the termination of the system of mass exclusion of persons of Japanese ancestry. Section 8 of the general's proclamation stated that the purpose of that public proclamation is to restore to all persons of Japanese ancestry who were excluded under orders of the commanding general, Western Defense Command, and who have not been designated individually for exclusion or other control, their full rights to enter and remain in the military areas of the Western Defense Command.

General Pratt assured the people of the States situated within the Western Defense Command that the records of all persons of Japanese ancestry have been carefully examined, and that only those persons who have been cleared by military authority are permitted to return. They should be accorded the same treatment and allowed to enjoy the same privileges accorded to other law-abiding American citizens or residents, declared the proclamation; which does not operate to affect any offense heretofore committed, nor any conviction or penalty incurred because of violations of the provisions of public proclamations, civilian exclusion orders, civilian restrictive orders, or individual exclusion orders already issued.

On the day following General Pratt's revocation order, Secretary Ickes issued a statement on behalf of the War Relocation Authority, which I ask permission to insert at this point:

The Western Defense Command's action in revoking the blanket exclusion orders for persons of Japanese ancestry on the Pacific coast means, in its simplest terms, that the War Relocation Authority will immediately expand its relocation program to cover the entire country, including the west coast. It most definitely does not mean that there will be a hasty mass movement of all evacuees back into the coastal area. The War Relocation Authority will continue and intensify its efforts to relocate in parts of the United States other than the west coast those loyal and law-abiding persons of Japanese ancestry who are willing to participate in this program. It will also aid those who prefer to exercise their legal and moral right to return to the west coast.

The persons who are eligible for relocation or return to the west coast have been found by the Army authorities to be loyal citizens or law-abiding aliens. They are entitled to their full constitutional and legal rights, and perhaps to something more than ordinary consideration because they have really suffered as a direct result of the war. In a real sense, these people, too, were drafted by their country. They were uprooted from their homes and substantially deprived of an opportunity to lead a normal life. They are casualties of war.

It is the responsibility of every American worthy of citizenship in this great Nation to do everything that he can to make easier the return to normal life of these people who have been cleared by the Army authorities. By our conduct toward them we will be judged by all of the people of the world.

I call upon State and local officials throughout the country, and especially on the west coast, and on public and private agencies to assist in the enormous task of returning these people to ordinary community life. I believe that the response will be enthusiastic and wholehearted. And I particularly hope that we may see veterans' organizations like the American Legion and church and welfare groups in the forefront of those who will consider it their responsibility to aid these people, and by so doing to show their devotion to the American principles of charity, justice, and democracy.

All the evidence available at the relocation centers indicates that the majority of the evacuee residents have not yet finally decided whether to return to their former homes or relocate elsewhere, and that most of those who eventually elect to go back will need considerable time in making necessary arrangements before they can actually leave the centers. The War Relocation Authority is now formulating detailed plans for keeping the westwar l relocation movement on a gradual, orderly, and systematic basis.

People of Japanese ancestry, both at the relocation centers and elsewhere, who have been found eligible by the Western Defense Command for residence in the west coast area, are, of course, free to go back at any time. However, only those whose specific plans for resettlement in the evacuated area are approved by W. R. A. will be eligible for travel assistance which the Authority now extends to those relocating in other parts of the country. This includes the payment of rail or bus fare to the point of relocation and transportation of personal properties, such as household furnishings. Since most of the evacuees at the relocation centers have had little opportunity to accumulate savings over the past 2½ years, they will doubtless need such assistance. Only a few evacuees, therefore, are expected to leave the centers, either for the west coast or any other destination, without first having their plans checked and approved by W. R. A.

In view of the fact that the evacuees were removed from their homes in 1942 by governmental order, the War Relocation Authority will make assistance available to those evacuees, both at the centers and previously relocated, who now have urgent reasons and sound plans for returning to the west coast area. Simultaneously, however, the Authority will continue and intensify its efforts to relocate evacuees in other sections of the country. One of the major W. R. A. aims from the beginning has been to encourage the widest possible dispersal of evacuees throughout the Nation, and this will continue as a prime objective during the final phase of the program.

Of the 110,000 people of Japanese descent originally evacuated, more than 35,000 have now relocated under W. R. A. procedures outside the west coast area. This includes nearly 70 percent of the American citizen evacuees beyond the age of 17 who have been eligible for relocation, and also takes in nearly 2,500 Japanese-Americans who have been inducted into the Army of the United States from relocation centers. The great majority of the 35,000 relocated evacuees have become satisfactorily adjusted in their new locations and will probably want to stay where they are. Many of them, in fact, will doubtless now make arrangements for having their parents and other family members still at the centers come out and rejoin them at their new homes.

Since the mass exclusion orders have been revoked and the great majority of evacuees are free to establish residence anywhere in the United States, the War Relocation Authority will now work toward an early liquidation of the relocation centers which were established originally for the temporary maintenance of a dislocated people. No center will be closed in less than 6 months, but it is anticipated that all will be closed within a year. Funds have been provided to the Federal Security Agency for public assistance through State and local welfare agencies for those evacuees who are incapable of self-support.

As the War Relocation Authority enters the final phase of its program, its immediate aims, as always, will be to restore the loyal and law-abiding evacuees of Japanese descent to a normal American environment, to relieve local manpower shortages, and to cut down Government expenditures for the maintenance of a displaced segment of the population. Its long-range objective will be to bring about a better economic adjustment and a more satisfactory Nation-wide distribution of a minority group which was doubtless too heavily concentrated before the war in one particular section of the country.

I desire to point out that the War Relocation Authority, according to Secretary Ickes, will now work toward an early liquidation of the relocation centers; and that it is anticipated all camps will be closed within a year. However, there are fewer obstacles now facing this liquidation than 1 year hence.

I also call your attention to the final paragraph of the Secretary's announcement, which states that as the War Relocation Authority enters the final phase of its program—

its immediate aims, as always, will be to restore the loyal and law-abiding evacuees of Japanese descent to a normal American environment, to relieve local manpower shortages, and to cut down Government expenditures for the maintenance of a displaced segment of the population.

Most important is the reference by Secretary Ickes to the long-range objective, which will be to bring about a better economic adjustment and a more satisfactory Nation-wide distribution of a minority group, which was doubtless too

heavily concentrated before the war in one particular section of the country.

There is no authority in law nor Presidential executive orders for any program designed to relocate American citizens, because of the assumption by any Federal authorities that they are too heavily concentrated in any particular area. If this policy can be applied to American-born Japanese, then it might also be applied to other racial groups of American citizens, which are notoriously concentrated in some of our large cities. Surely this is no time for the consideration of policies which may have such far-reaching effects in jeopardizing constitutional rights and safeguards of citizens.

For the current fiscal year, the War Relocation Authority has an appropriation of $39,000,000. On December 31, 1944, the War Relocation Authority reported a total of 2,422 employees, of whom 287 were departmental and 2,135 were in the field. Nine relocation camps are now being operated, including the segregation camp at Tulelake, Calif. It has been reported that all of the evacuees remaining in the 8 camps may leave immediately and return to their former homes, or be relocated elsewhere, because their records have been carefully examined and they are considered to be law-abiding citizens. There have been reports, also, that some of these evacuees have been so enraptured by the liberal treatment which they have received, as well as by the satisfying life in these camps, they are reluctant to leave these centers.

Director Dillon S. Myer has pointed out that the W. R. A. program enters its final phase at a time when there is a good demand for workers in war plants, in civilian goods production, in service occupations, and on the farms. Both from the standpoint of the national welfare and the evacuees' long-range economic security, it is highly important, says Mr. Myer, that the people now residing in the relocation centers make the transition to private life at a time when employment opportunities are still plentiful.

The Nation today is facing an acute manpower shortage, and there is little, if any, reason to justify the operation of W. R. A. camps for another year. The evacuees not only are entitled to the rights of American citizens, but they should also be compelled to assume the duties and the obligations of citizens. There will be less difficulty from the early closing of these camps than would result if their closing were deferred for periods of 6 months to a year. Then, it is entirely possible that this country may be facing economic conditions as a result of the cessation of hostilities in Europe which will cause some confusion and conflict between these evacuees and other citizens, particularly returning veterans. Likewise, the early liquidation of the War Relocation Authority program will release at least 2,000 trained Federal officials and employees whose services could be utilized to help alleviate the manpower shortage which now exists.

Therefore, I have today introduced a bill which would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to complete, not later than June 30, 1945, the relocation or return to their former homes of all persons eligible for such relocation and who are now in centers operated by this agency. This bill also directs the Secretary, not later than such date, to close all such relocation centers, except any such center which is operated and maintained exclusively as a segregation center for persons of Japanese ancestry whose loyalty to the United States is in doubt, or whose loyalty to Japan has been established.

I am hopeful that my bill may receive early and favorable action, because it makes possible not only economy in the expenditure of Federal funds, but will help relieve the manpower shortage and, thus, make a worth-while contribution to the war program. Likewise, there are facilities, farm equipment, and other machinery temporarily in use at all of these relocation camps, which could be used to greater advantage by other Federal departments or by private citizens. If this equipment is held for another year, it will merely swell the stocks of surplus property of the Government which will be sacrificed without being put to any worth-while war use.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PROPOSED TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT TO LIMIT TAXES ON THE RICH

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain statements and excerpts and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, I addressed the House several times in reference to the nefarious efforts of the so-called Committee for Constitutional Government to slip through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would restrict the amount of taxes to be levied and collected by the Federal Government on incomes, gifts, and estates to 25 percent.

I referred to this group as "the most sinister lobby ever organized." I called their efforts "a sneak devastating attack on the Constitution," and I characterized their proposed amendment as the "millionaires' amendment to make the rich richer and the poor poorer." I repeat these statements today.

On November 27, 1944, I made a brief speech to the House which listed the State legislatures which have already adopted resolutions favoring this amendment. I also listed those States in which the representatives of this vicious group are active today in the hope of securing the adoption of additional resolutions by other State legislatures to the end that Congress will be forced to take action on this proposition.

Fortunately, the press gave considerable publicity to this last speech of mine, and voters and State legislators who apparently had never heard of this diabolical program before have been writing me in increasing numbers to learn more about this sneak attack. Strange as it may seem, State legislators who were members of the very bodies which passed some of these approving resolutions are now writing to me and telling me that they were either unaware of the adoption of these resolutions in their own States or were under the impression, given them by others, that the resolutions had failed of adoption. That shows how carefully these quiet but extremely effective lobbyists work in order to keep their hands covered until the right moment for unveiling their final attack upon the Congress itself.

The searchlight must be kept upon this group. These Fascist-minded lobbyists who seek to throw the main tax burden upon the low-income group must be ferreted out and their efforts exposed in every State capitol in which they set up their lobbying shop. I have named the leaders of this group many times before, but I will name them once again, just to keep the record clear. They are Frank Gannett, pious publisher from New York State, who seeks to reduce his millionaire's taxes to a minimum of 25 percent; Samuel B. Pettingill, able orator and former Member of this body, who uses the cloak of the Constitution as a shield for his real schemes; Edward A. Rumely, convicted German agent in World War No. 1, whom many think is the real brain behind the activities of this group who seek to lead us into the ways of fascism; and, lastly, the aging S. S. McClure, once reputable author and publisher, who, after studying fascism 2 years in Italy, let himself become the tool and "front" man for the spiderlike activities of Rumely and his group of unknown associates.

Fortunately, I think the tide is turning. At least, I think the voters and their State representatives are becoming fully aware of just what the program offered to them by this group really means. This awareness is also being exhibited by certain State Governors from whom I have also received considerable correspondence during the past few weeks since my November 27 speech.

During the past few weeks, I have heard favorably from legislators in the following States: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, Kentucky, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, New Jersey, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming. Seven of the above 15 States thus represented have already passed resolutions favoring the adoption of the proposed twenty-second amendment. These legislators tell me that they will seek the repeal of the resolutions already passed. The others tell me they will fight vigorously the attempt of this lobby to put across one of these resolutions in their own States. A sample of what they write me is as follows:

State senator from Arkansas:

I find that I was in error when I told you recently that I didn't think the Arkansas resolution concerning the proposed twenty-second amendment had passed. I now learn that it did pass both houses—under a guise, of course. I am interested in supporting a move to repeal this resolution in the fifty-fifth general assembly which opens in Arkansas on January 8.

Assemblyman from New Jersey:

Please be advised that as a member of the New Jersey Legislature (one of the States

that has passed such a resolution), I voted against this vicious and unholy attempt to sabotage the economic structure of our Government. Your speech comes at a very timely moment. It is with great credit to yourself. May I suggest that the President of the United States be enrolled in your crusade before it is too late. I am certain that he is in sympathy with your views as is every other sane-thinking citizen.

State representative from Ohio:

I read with great interest your speech of November 27, 1944, relative to the attempt to bring about an amendment to the Constitution by subterfuge. I shall be on the lookout for any resolution coming before the house in 1945.

State representative from Georgia:

I shall be on the look-out for the tax dodgers when that resolution comes before the Georgia Legislature. I can assure you that I will take a shot at it when its head bobs up. Our legislature meets January 8, 1945, and continues for 70 days. I am glad you are on the watch-out for the dangerous things that show up and that you have the courage of your convictions.

State representative from Illinois:

I was elected a member of the Illinois State Legislature at the November election. Inasmuch as I propose to attack and, if possible, have the legislature reconsider its action as regards this resolution, will you please forward me copies of the speeches you have made against the actions of this committee?

State representative from Louisiana:

This group you speak of, while pretending to uphold the Constitution, is in effect preparing to entrench itself against a day when only a few of them will own all the wealth, particularly the tax-free wealth, and then have this law or amendment to the Constitution.

Assemblyman from North Carolina:

My interest in the subject results from my being a member of the next General Assembly of North Carolina, which convenes January 3, and I have heard that our general assembly will be asked to approve this proposed amendment. Outside of the committee for constitutional government, I have found very little sentiment for the proposed twenty-second amendment. I do not find it included as one of the measures advocated by the committee for economic development.

State representative from Wyoming:

Thanks for the copy of your speech, Sneak Devastating Attack Being Made on the Constitution of the United States. As a member of the Wyoming Legislature I can use this material to considerable advantage in attempting to rescind the resolution passed in 1939.

As further evidence that the tide is turning and more persons are becoming aware of this group and its insidious activities, I append in conclusion two newspaper articles and one editorial which shows that the press of the Nation is also taking up the cudgels and demanding that this movement be stopped. I also append herewith a resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the Louisiana Teachers Association at its annual meeting in Baton Rouge, La., on December 7 and 8, 1944. This splendid resolution by this group of alert teachers was furnished me by my sympathetic colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], to whom it was sent by that association. The resolution speaks for itself. It reads as follows:

Whereas a proposal is now being submitted and pressed upon State legislators, which, if adopted, bids fair to turn the tide away from democracy at the very time our men are laying down their lives to safeguard democracy; and

Whereas great concentrations of wealth have ever been the enemy of liberty and the powerful friend of the oppressor; and

Whereas such wealth financed Hitler and Mussolini during their struggles for power and supported the war party in Japan; and

Whereas we now have a nefarious scheme to take advantage of the preoccupation of our people with the war and of the fact that our men are overseas to force Congress to call a convention to propose an amendment which would become effective when ratified by 36 State legislatures; and

Whereas these forces have consistently fought the forces of education and hindered the march of progress; and

Whereas this proposal would repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, overwhelmingly adopted by the people in 1913; and

Whereas this proposed legislation is a perfect opportunity by which multimillionaires may and will escape paying their just share of the war debt, of educating children, and of maintaining our democratic standard and way of life; and

Whereas if Congress is prohibited from applying higher taxes on larger incomes, it will be necessary to increase taxes on smaller incomes and to maintain them over longer periods, thus lowering the standard of living of the teacher and others of low incomes; and

Whereas this same menace to the birthright of the American people was defeated and exposed in Congress, but is now being promulgated by fraud and chicanery and has collected a huge fund which has been and is being investigated by Congress; and

Whereas these same vested interests are now attempting to secure State laws to favor their proposal: Be it

Resolved, That this house of delegates of the Louisiana Teachers Association, in official meeting convened, do denounce and express our vigorous opposition to any amendment to the United States Constitution which provides for a limitation on Federal income, inheritance, and gift taxes.

That copies of this resolution be sent to each member of the Louisiana Legislature.

That additional copies of this resolution be sent also to the Louisiana delegation in Congress.

[From Townsend National Weekly of December 23, 1944]

PATMAN FLAYS BARRAGE AGAINST AMENDMENT 16

WASHINGTON.—The Committee for Constitutional Government, sparked by the ex-convict Edward A. Rumely, threatens to launch a new campaign in 1945 to repeal the income-tax amendment to the Constitution. It is now accumulating a huge war chest to finance widespread lobbying activities in State legislatures, nearly all of which will meet after the 1st of the year.

The committee, characterized by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, as "the outstanding Fascist group in America," has already persuaded 16 State legislatures to adopt resolutions calling for a constitutional convention to repeal the income-tax amendment.

In its place, the committee would substitute a new amendment restricting the taxing powers of Congress to 25 percent on all incomes. The effect would be to cut revenue so drastically that all taxes except the income tax would be impossible. The Townsend plan, which advocates a gross income tax, would be killed. Virtually the entire cost of the war would, of course, be borne by low-income groups.

After Townsend National Weekly had exposed the phony committee and had revealed that Rumely is an ex-convict who served time for failing to report the receipt of German funds to finance an American newspaper during the First World War, 2 of the 16 States that have played ball with the committee reversed their stand.

In Pennsylvania, Gov. Edward Martin vetoed the resolution adopted by the State legislature. In Kentucky, the house rescinded its approval after it had learned the facts.

Thus, there are now only 14 States which demand adoption of the Rumely amendment. They are: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Seven States, approached by the Rumely gang, have turned him down flat. They are: Colorado, Louisiana, Montana, New York, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia. In addition, a poll taken among Minnesota legislators indicates that they are overwhelmingly opposed to the scheme, and will vote it down if it is presented to them next year.

Resolutions have not yet been offered in 23 States. But they probably will be early in 1945, because the Rumely machine has begun to move again, and funds are coming in to support the fight. It is estimated that the Committee for Constitutional Government will probably spend about $350,000 next year. It has spent in excess of $300,000 annually for the past few years.

Purpose of the outfit is to persuade a total of 32 States to approve its resolution so Congress would be forced to call a constitutional convention. Since 14 States are already in line, this means that 18 more must approve.

Representative PATMAN, warning that the committee will be more active than ever in 1945, has written to governors asking them to be on the watch for lobbying activities. Among other arguments against the scheme, Representative PATMAN has pointed out that, if adopted, the Rumely amendment would wreck all prospects for old-age pensions, because there would simply be no money other than that needed for bare Government expenses.

Meanwhile, Rumely is still under indictment by a Federal grand jury for contempt. He refused to tell the House Campaign Expenditures Committee the names of persons who have contributed more than $100 to his committee, as required by the Corrupt Practices Act.

[From People, the Other Side of the News of December 7, 1944]

PRESS SILENT ON SCHEME TO SHIFT TAX BURDEN ON LOW-INCOME GROUPS

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Last week in Congress, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, lifted the lid on the activities of a strong-arm pressure group which is trying to ease off taxes on the rich onto the backs of the poor. Here's what Representative PATMAN said:

"An effort is being made by a group known as the committee for constitutional government, alias the committee to uphold the Constitution, to slip through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restrict the amount of taxes that Congress may cause to be levied and collected by the Federal Government on incomes, gifts, and estates to 25 percent.

"If adopted, it will pave the way to throw the enormous war debt on the shoulders of the poor, causing the poor to become poorer and to make the rich richer.

"At the same time, the war wounded and the dependents of those who gave their lives in battle can receive nothing from the Federal Government if this amendment is adopted."

Representative PATMAN hit at the plan with plenty of ginger. Said the Congressman heatedly:

"It is the way to convert a successful and efficient democracy like our own into a Fascist state. The committee for constitutional government, which is sponsoring this proposal which is referred to as the twenty-second amendment, is the outstanding Fascist group in America. (EDITOR'S NOTE.—Frank Gannett, Republican newspaper publisher and the man who tried to suppress the book Under Cover, is the founder and said to be the guiding genius of the group.)

"Those who are behind this group," continued Representative PATMAN, "are trying to hide their identity and conceal their motives but the true facts have recently come to light. Anyone interested in the exposé of their group may receive copies of speeches I made in the House of Representatives in May and June of this year—upon written request to me. * * * Single copies will be sent free upon request."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Address your letters to Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.)

In order to bring its amendment to the attention of Congress, at least 32 States must adopt resolutions in favor of its passage. Already, 16 States have done so. These States include Alabama, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Wisconsin. The Governor of Pennsylvania vetoed the resolution in his State. No resolution has yet been brought up in the Maryland Legislature, but it is expected that some attempt will be made when the legislature meets in 1945.

Noting how quietly the thing was being pushed, Representative PATMAN declared:

"This campaign which is obviously against the public interest has been conducted so quietly and smoothly, backed by huge lobbying funds, that 14 State legislatures had actually adopted the proposed amendment before I even knew it was being considered.

"If there was publicity in the newspapers about it, I did not see it. Other people who also try to keep up with current events told me they were astounded to learn that such a devastating proposal got by so quietly through the 14 legislatures without the question being brought to public attention."

[From Billings (Mont.) Yellowstone of November 2, 1944]

A DANGEROUS THREAT

One of the most subtle and sinister efforts to put over a colossal and dangerous threat to our whole tax system is the campaign of Frank Gannett and Sam Pettengill, American Fascists, to amend the sixteenth amendment (income tax) by replacing a 25 percent ceiling on income, estate, and gifts taxes. This campaign is purposely kept out of the big daily press' news columns for fear of awakening the people to the real peril. They are confining their campaign to propaganda sent out through a big slush fund provided by millionaires who would be saved billions of dollars in income taxes. This Gannett propaganda machine boasts that it has sent out 82,000,000 pieces of literature; 760,000 books; more than 10,000 radio transcriptions; 350,000 telegrams, full-page ads in 536 newspapers, and thousands of weekly releases to newspapers.

This organization was cited before a House committee and ordered to furnish a list of its contributors, which it has refused to do and the secretary, an ex-convict, has been cited for contempt. It claims it is educational and not political, although it is carrying on a vicious campaign against the President and is supporting Dewey. It masquerades under the sweet-sounding name of Committee for the Preservation of Constitutional Government. But beneath the beautiful flower lurks a deadly serpent.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas exposed on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 11, 1944, this threat of American Fascists to destroy our Government. His masterful address is found in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 11, 1944, pages 4328–4330.

Here is how this amendment would work: While now a millionaire pays about $800,000 taxes on a million-dollar annual income, he would pay but $250,000 and have $750,000 left. John Doe, who now pays about $175 on a $2,000 income, could, and no doubt would, have his taxes increased to $500. If the rich are so relieved, the poorer classes would have to make up the deficiency or the Government be short of funds upon the return of our veterans, to whom could only be said, "Yes; we want to help you, but we have no way of paying you."

This undercover movement has already passed in 11 States, strange as it may seem. It came before the New York Legislature and passed the senate, but was defeated in the house through the diligent efforts of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, who appealed to Governor Dewey but received from him no support. If it comes before the Montana Legislature and it is as rotten and reactionary as the 1943 session, it will undoubtedly pass.

Who is backing this vicious amendment? Frank Gannett, millionaire owner of 22 newspapers, who tried to suppress the book, Under Cover; Sam B. Pettengill, ex-Congressman and renegade Democrat, who became finance chairman of the Republican National Committee; E. A. Rumely, previously convicted and now held for contempt; Vivian Kellems, who refused to pay income taxes and advised others to do likewise, and who was revealed to be corresponding with a Nazi agent in South America; and other American Fascists and millionaires, who would be financially benefited.

All liberal papers are urged to give this dire threat the widest publicity.

[From Labor of December 2, 1944]

GANNETT GROUP CALLED FASCIST—TAX PROPOSAL DENOUNCED

The Committee for Constitutional Government, headed by Frank Gannett, wealthy reactionary publisher of a string of newspapers, "is the outstanding Fascist group in America," Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat, Texas) told the House on Tuesday in a blistering speech.

He warned his colleagues that the committee is trying to put over a constitutional amendment restricting to 25 percent the amount of taxes Congress may levy on income, gifts, and estates.

The proposal, PATMAN said, is designed to enable the rich to escape their fair share of taxes and transfer the burden to ordinary Americans.

The committee has worked so quietly that it has been able to convert the legislatures of 16 States to the proposal, PATMAN said.

Should the drive succeed, PATMAN declared, it would destroy small business, deprive returning soldiers of relief, wreck the social-security program and halt Federal contributions for road building and other improvements.

"The brains" behind the $300,000-a-year lobby, Patman declared, is Edward A. Rumely, convicted during the last war as German agent and pardoned by President Coolidge.

Rumely was indicted for contempt of the House 6 weeks ago for refusing to tell a campaign-investigating committee how his organization is financed and to disclose the names of its "angels." He will be tried in January.

PATMAN said the committee had uncovered some of the big contributors, among them Joseph N. Pew, Pennsylvania oil mogul; the du Ponts and others of large means.

DR. EDWARD A. RUMELY

(By Albert E. Kahn)

(The third in a series of profiles on dangerous Americans)

Dr. Edward A. Rumely calls himself a "public relations expert." The title is far too modest. Something like "unofficial propaganda minister of American reaction" would be more appropriate. What Henry Ford did for the auto industry, Rumely has done for the promotion of antidemocratic propaganda in the United States. Rumely has put antidemocratic propaganda on a mass-production basis.

At present Rumely is the executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government with headquarters at 205 East Forty-second Street in New York City. The committee specializes in combating progressive legislation, attacking organized labor, and propagandizing against the Roosevelt administration. Last fall, Rumely's committee spent vast sums to prevent the reelection of President Roosevelt. When the special congressional committee investigating campaign expenditures asked Rumely to produce the list of financial contributors to his organization, Rumely refused. "Our activity is not political," declared Rumely. The congressional investigatory body thought otherwise, and subpenaed the files of the Committee for Constitutional Government. Rumely defied the subpena. A District of Columbia grand jury indicted Rumely for contempt. He still would not produce his files. He even displayed a certain bravado. Rumely was experienced in matters of this sort.

During the First World War Rumely had served as a leading propaganda agent of the Government of Imperial Germany. When the American authorities finally caught up with Rumely, he served a prison sentence at the Atlanta Penitentiary.

A Hoosier by birth, Edward Aloysius Rumely is something of a Hun by education. He was born in La Porte, Ind., but educated in Germany at the Universities of Heidelberg and Freiberg. When Rumely returned to the United States in the early 1900's, his ambition was to spread Germanic ideas in the United States. He founded the Interlaken School for Boys in Wisconsin. "Dr. Rumely," observed the bulletin of the Interlaken school, "is carrying out in American form the soundest ideas of German education." The bulletin added: "It is almost solely by the power of its new type of education that Germany has forged to the front in the last 25 years."

When Germany's "new type of education" culminated in World War No. 1, Rumely went to work for the Kaiser. According to testimony of United States intelligence officers before a Senate committee in 1918, Rumely was present at the first important meeting in the United States of key German strategists and their agents. Among the others at the meeting which took place on November 5, 1914, were Dr. Heinrich A. Albert, the commercial attaché at the German Embassy in Washington, who was the brains behind the German espionage-sabotage ring in the United States; Count Johann Heinrich von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador who was also playing a key role in the espionage-sabotage ring; Dr. Bernhard Dernburg, the former German Secretary of State; and George Sylvester Viereck, who received $100,000 from the Central Powers for his propaganda services during World War No. 1, and who went to jail for his propaganda services for the Nazis during World War No. 2.

United States intelligence officers testified at the Senate hearing in 1918, that during the war Rumely performed important tasks for the Germans. He invested $200,000 for the Germans in advertisements in 619 foreign-language newspapers in the United States, urging that America refrain from sending

munitions to the Allies. In the spring of 1915, with money secretly provided by the German Government, Rumely bought the New York Evening Mail. He operated the paper until 1918, at a total cost to Germany of $1,451,000.

On July 18, 1918, Rumely was arrested by the United States authorities. After prolonged court action, he was sentenced on December 18, 1920, to serve a year and a day in prison for his work as a secret agent of Imperial Germany. The sentence was affirmed on appeal. Rumely, however, had powerful friends in the United States who intervened in his behalf with the President. Among the friends of Rumely was Henry Ford. "Edward A. Rumely was for years the secret paid agent of the German Government," George Harvey, the American Ambassador to England during 1921–23, wrote in his magazine War Weekly. "Rumely's close, if not closest friend during the past 6 years has been Henry Ford." President Harding commuted Rumely's sentence to 30 days, which Rumely served in the Atlanta Penitentiary.

For some time afterward Rumely discreetly withdrew from public affairs. But by the early 1930's he was back in circulation. He organized an "investment concern" in Chicago and was soon engaged in various lobbying activities in Washington, D. C. He had lost none of his affection for Germany. One of Rumely's employees recorded in a letter that Rumely frequently expressed the belief that Germany was destined some day to rule the world.

Well-known travelers from Germany were frequent visitors at Rumely's Chicago home. In 1933, after Hitler came to power, a young woman educator, planning a trip to Germany, asked Rumely if he could give her an introduction to any interesting personages in the Third Reich. Rumely dashed off a note on his personal stationery. The note was addressed to Putzi Hanfstaengel, chief of the Nazi press and one of Hitler's most intimate aides.

In the winter of 1936, Frank Gannett, the reactionary publisher of a string of American newspapers, called together a small group of wealthy men in New York City. He proposed that they establish an organization which would spread propaganda on a mass scale attacking the New Deal and everything it stood for. He had the ideal man to head such an organization. The man's name, said Frank Gannett, was Dr. Edward A. Rumely.

The name of the organization set up by Gannett and his friends, with Rumely as executive secretary and Gannett as chairman, was called the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government (the name was changed in April 1941 to the Committee for Constitutional Government). Lavishly financed by the Gannett group, Rumely launched a propaganda campaign of unprecedented proportions against the Roosevelt Administration, progressive legislation, trade unions, and the foreign-born.

During the first 6 months of his committee's existence, Rumely supervised the distribution of 10,000,000 pieces of propaganda. This material was sent to editors, clergymen, business executives, and educators in every part of the country. In one case when progressive legislation was pending in Washington, Rumely sent a special telegram to 32,000 influential citizens living in States represented by key Congressmen. The telegram urged the defeat of the legislation in question. The cost of the telegram was $1.27 per message.

Sometimes, by mistake, Rumely sent his antidemocratic propaganda material to the wrong people. In one case, Rumely's propaganda, accompanied by a solicitation for funds, reached Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes. "I don't know how my name happened to get on your sucker list," wrote Secretary Ickes to Rumely's committee, "but I advise you to spend your money where there is a greater prospect of pay dirt and a greater respect for dirt."

During 1937–44, the expenditures of Rumely's committee totaled approximately $10,000,000. Here is a summary of the antidemocratic material distributed by Rumely's committee:

Eighty-two million pieces of literature—booklets, pamphlets, reprints of editorials and articles, especially addressed letters and 760,000 books;

More than 10,000 transcriptions, carrying 15-minute radio talks on national issues, besides frequent national hook-ups for representatives of the committee;

Three hundred and fifty thousand telegrams;

Many thousands of releases to daily and weekly newspapers; full-page advertisements in 536 different newspapers with a combined circulation of nearly 20,000,000.

Today, as the United States enters its fourth year of war against the Axis, antidemocratic propaganda continues to stream from Rumely's headquarters at 205 East 42d Street, New York City. It is time that Federal authorities put an end to the propaganda activities of this former German agent.

[From People, the Other Side of the News, of January 11, 1945]

WATCH FOR THE GANNETT GANG IN LEGISLATURE

BALTIMORE, MD.—When the Maryland Legislature meets it is likely that an attempt will be made by henchmen of Frank Gannett, rich newspaper publisher, to put through a resolution enabling the wealthy taxpayers to escape their just share of taxes.

Mr. Gannett—the man who tried to have the book Under Cover suppressed—heads the Committee for Constitutional Government, which is "the outstanding reactionary group in the United States," in the words of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

In a speech made recently in Congress, PATMAN warned his colleagues that Gannett's committee is trying to put over a constitutional amendment restricting to 25 percent the amount of taxes Congress may levy on income, gifts, and estates. The proposal, PATMAN contended, is designed to enable the wealthy to avoid their fair share of taxes and shift the burden to people of small means.

The committee has worked so quietly that it has been able to convert the legislatures of 16 States to the proposal, PATMAN declared. Should the drive succeed it would destroy small business, deprive returning soldiers of relief, wreck the social-security program, and halt Federal contributions for road building and other improvements.

The brains behind the $300,000-a-year lobby, said PATMAN, is Edward A. Rumely, convicted during the last war in connection with alleged German financing of a newspaper and pardoned by President Coolidge.

Rumely was indicted for contempt of court some weeks ago for refusing to tell a campaign investigating committee how his organization is financed and to disclose the names of its "angels." He will be tried in January.

So when the Maryland Legislature gets down to work, some of Gannett's $300,000 will be used to get local legislatures to push through the rich man's resolution. Keep your eyes on this move.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Noble of the Blue Network.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I secured permission to speak under a special order on Tuesday, January 30, for 40 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that that time be extended to 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m., Monday, January 22, 1945, for the purpose of hearing the national commanders of the various veterans' organizations present their programs for the Seventy-ninth Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

121. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1946, amounting to $78,115,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 32); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

122. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1945 in the amount of $6,784,000 (H. Doc. No. 33); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

123. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Education.

124. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report of the Federal Communications Commission concerning the recently conducted investigation and hearings regarding the application of radio to railroad operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

125. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation for the month of October 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 1618. A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ percent; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 1619. A bill to provide for the prompt closing of relocation centers maintained by the War Relocation Authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1620. A bill to provide for the retention of naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 1621. A bill to authorize payment of increased pension on account of dependents for any period not more than 1 year prior to receipt of evidence showing the existence of such dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1622. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1623. A bill to amend section 511 (1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1624. A bill to permit approximately 3,000 natives of India who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, to become naturalized; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1625 (by request). A bill providing for the abolition of the office of coroner and for the organization of the office of medical examiner for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 1626. A bill amending paragraph 16, schedule A, of the Securities Act of 1933, and section 15 (c) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 1627. A bill to permit certain living expenses while away from home incurred by Members of the Congress to be deducted for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. Res. 96. Resolution authorizing continuance of study by the Committee on the Public Lands of certain public-land problems and the use of public lands in rehabilitation of veterans, as authorized under House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. Res. 97. Resolution providing expenses for continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution 75; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. Res. 98. Resolution to amend rule 111 of the House, with respect to the duties of the Clerk of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, requesting the appointment of a southern representative to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 1628. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Michael C. Donatell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1630. A bill for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1631. A bill for the relief of William Tolar Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1632. A bill for the relief of James Owens; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Raymond Crosby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 1634. A bill for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of the estate of R. A. Ellison, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 1636. A bill for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1637. A bill to authorize the issuance of an unrestricted patent on certain lands to Henry S. Giddens; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1638. A bill granting a pension to Olivia Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hortense Arnow, J. M. Rogers, and Mrs. Willie L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Patrick Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1641. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund of California; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Edith Popwell; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

24. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition signed by 22 members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Port Hope (Mich.) Presbyterian Church approving legislation for the elimination of the sale of intoxicants in Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1945

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, when it was called to order by HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, Vice President of the United States, whose entrance into the Senate Chamber was greeted with applause.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to whom a thousand years are as but one day, our brief stay is but as a watch in the night, yet, while last its ebbing hours, make us bold and swift and brave to do Thy will. From this exalted chair of governance, bless him who goes and pour the riches of Thy grace upon him who comes. As the new President of this body takes reverently into his hand today the historic gavel into which has seemed to enter every decision since the Nation's founding, may the mantle of the great public servants whose hands have grasped it fall in double portion upon him. Give him fairness of appraisal, poise amid confusion, the kindly heart, nobility of goodness, and the simple faith in man that is more than coronets.

To the Chief Executive of the Republic as for a new term of his high office he turns to problems more tragic and thorny than any man in history ever knew, may there be given the wisdom from above; make clear and clean his eyes; steady his hand, as on the heaving bridge of our Ship of State he with us is tossed by mountainous seas. "In spite of rocks and tempest's roar, in spite of false lights on the shore," bring our national bark to the desired haven of peace with victory and justice. Grant that before another Presidential oath is taken a grateful people may sing in glad yet humble jubilation:

"Our fearful trip is done,
The ship has weathered every rack,
The prize we sought is won."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JAMES O. EASTLAND, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H.

Con. Res. 18) establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM MISSOURI—ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator-designate from Missouri, the Honorable FRANK P. BRIGGS, whose credentials I now offer for filing, is present in the Chamber and ready to take the oath of office as Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF MISSOURI,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on this 15th day of January A. D. 1945, I, Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby appoint FRANK P. BRIGGS United States Senator from the State of Missouri, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term beginning January 18, 1945, and ending January 3, 1947, or until his successor shall be duly elected and qualified according to law, to fill the vacancy in the office of United States Senator created by the resignation of HARRY S. TRUMAN. This appointment is made pursuant to the authority vested in me as chief executive of the State of Missouri by the provisions of section 11540, Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1939.

In testimony whereof I hereunto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Missouri. Done at the city of Jefferson this 15th day of January A. D. 1945.

PHIL M. DONNELLY.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WILSON BELL,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. BRIGGS, escorted by Mr. DONNELL, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

INAUGURATION CEREMONIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings of the inauguration of the President and Vice President of the United States on Saturday last be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The 20th day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, twentieth amendment, for the beginning of the Presidential and Vice Presidential terms, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of New York, and HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, were this day inaugurated President of the United States and Vice President of the United States, respectively, on the south portico of the White House.

The ceremonies were in charge of the Joint Committee on Arrangements of the two Houses of Congress, consisting of Harry Flood Byrd, chairman; Kenneth McKellar; Arthur Vandenberg; Sam Rayburn; Robert L. Doughton; Joseph W. Martin, Jr.; and Edwin A. Halsey, Secretary.

Assembled on the south portico were the Committee on Arrangements, and their secretary, members of the families of the President and Vice President, the President's Cabinet, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the United States Army and Navy, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commandant of the Coast Guard, and other high military and naval officers and distinguished guests.

On the lawn surrounding the portico, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Diplomatic Corps, and a large number of citizens were gathered.

At 11:55 o'clock a. m. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President-elect, accompanied by his son, Col. James Roosevelt, United States Marine Corps Reserve, and Harry S. Truman, Vice President-elect, appeared on the portico, the United States Marine Band playing Hail to the Chief.

INVOCATION

The Right Reverend Angus Dun, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou alone holdest rightful rule over the kingdoms of the world, and without Thy favor we are but dust that builds on dust. As we, the people of these United States, intrust the powers of government to those whom we have chosen, enable us to dedicate them, and to rededicate ourselves, to the tasks to which Thou has called us. Keep us ever mindful of the sacrifices we ask of those who give their lives on our behalf; keep us mindful of the heritage of good or of ill which we shall leave to our children and to our children's children. Hold these Thy servants, and us, steadfastly faithful to the maintenance of responsible liberty for all, and equal justice under law. For the sake of this people and of all peoples, lift those who bear authority among us above the claims of class, the prejudices of race, the seeking of party advantage, and make them in truth the resolute servants of the common good. And in these days of perplexity and pain, forbid that we shall be content with any peace save that of a world at unity with itself where all nations in mutual trust may bring their glory unto Thy kingdom. Hear us, O Father, and grant our prayer for the honor of Thy holy name.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The Vice President of the United States administered to the Vice President-elect the oath of office prescribed by law, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter: So help you God?

The VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT. I do.

The Chief Justice of the United States, Harlan F. Stone, administered to the President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, as follows:

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, you do solemnly swear that you will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and that you will to the best of your ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States?

The PRESIDENT-ELECT. I, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. So help you God.

The PRESIDENT-ELECT. So help me God.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

Thereupon the President of the United States delivered the following inaugural address:

Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Vice President, my friends, you will understand and, I believe, agree with my wish that the form of this inauguration be simple and its words brief.

We Americans of today, together with our allies, are passing through a period of supreme test. It is a test of our courage—of our resolve—of our wisdom—of our essential democracy.

If we meet that test—successfully and honorably—we shall perform a service of historic importance which men and women and children will honor throughout all time.

As I stand here today, having taken the solemn oath of office in the presence of my fellow countrymen—in the presence of our God—I know that it is America's purpose that we shall not fail.

In the days and in the years that are to come we shall work for a just and honorable peace, a durable peace, as today we work and fight for total victory in war.

We can and we will achieve such a peace.

We shall strive for perfection. We shall not achieve it immediately—but we still shall strive. We may make mistakes—but they must never be mistakes which result from faintness of heart or abandonment of moral principle.

I remember that my old schoolmaster, Dr. Peabody, said, in days that seemed to us then to be secure and untroubled: "Things in life will not always run smoothly. Sometimes we will be rising toward the heights—then all will seem to reverse itself and start downward. The great fact to remember is that the trend of civilization itself is forever upward; that a line drawn through the middle of the peaks and the valleys of the centuries always has an upward trend."

Our Constitution of 1787 was not a perfect instrument; it is not perfect yet. But it provided a firm base upon which all manner of men, of all races and colors and creeds, could build our solid structure of democracy.

And so today, in this year of war, 1945, we have learned lessons—at a fearful cost—and we shall profit by them.

We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away. We have learned that we must live as men, not as ostriches, nor as dogs in the manger.

We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.

We have learned the simple truth, as Emerson said, that "The only way to have a friend is to be one."

We can gain no lasting peace if we approach it with suspicion and mistrust or with fear. We can gain it only if we proceed with the understanding, the confidence, and the courage which flow from conviction.

The Almighty God has blessed our land in many ways. He has given our people stout hearts and strong arms with which to strike mighty blows for freedom and truth. He has given to our country a faith which has become the hope of all peoples in an anguished world.

So we pray to Him now for the vision to see our way clearly—to see the way that leads to a better life for ourselves and for all our fellow men—to the achievement of His will, to peace on earth.

BENEDICTION

The Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Ryan director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, pronounced the following benediction:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Almighty and all-merciful God, we beseech Thee to bless the United States of America, inspire our magistrates and legislators with wisdom and prudence; infuse the minds and hearts of our people with sentiments of loyalty, cooperation, and brotherhood. Crown, we beseech Thee, our fighting forces with a decisive and righteous victory, and bring to all the nations of the world a just and lasting peace.

In particular, we beg Thee to bless, enlighten, and strengthen the man who has this day been reinaugurated in his great office. The tasks which he faces are supremely difficult; the responsibilities which he assumes are weightier and more complex than those that burdened any of his predecessors. Continue, we beseech Thee, to bless and prosper his efforts and endeavors for social and international justice.

Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The ceremonies were concluded by the rendition of the Star-Spangled Banner by the United States Marine Corps Band.

REPORT ON THE WAR BY GENERAL MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL KING

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate the announcement I made a few days ago that on Wednesday the 24th of this month at 9 o'clock in the morning General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and Admiral King, Chief of Operations of the United States Navy, will give to Members of Congress a confidential report on the present status of the war and related subjects.

We have all received a formal invitation from General Marshall and Admiral King, and the place where the report is to be made is set out in the invitation. I merely wish to emphasize that the report is to be made Wednesday morning at 9 o'clock, and it will be concluded in time for Senators to report at the Senate for the day's business.

I am sure we shall all profit by the information we get from General Marshall and Admiral King, which I know will be information we cannot otherwise obtain. I hope all Senators who possibly can will attend.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I was sorry that I was unable to be present last Thursday when the sad news of the death of Senator MALONEY was announced to the Senate.

I first knew Senator MALONEY when he was a Member of the House several years ago. When he came to the Senate he became a member of the Appropriations Committee, of which I was the acting chairman, and quickly proved himself to be one of the most efficient, fair, active, and vigorous members of that committee.

Senator MALONEY was in the early years of a brilliant and useful career. He was born in 1894 and was just 50 years of age. He served in the Navy in the First World War and made an enviable record. He was Mayor of Meriden, his home city, from 1930 to 1933. He was elected in 1932 to the House of Representatives of the Seventy-third Congress and served in that body until 1935, when he took the seat in the Senate to which he had been elected in 1934. He was reelected in 1940.

Senator MALONEY had a most engaging personality. Always smiling, good-looking, and in every way attractive, he made friends with all. He was a good fighter for every principle he supported and he made an able and forceful Senator.

He was not satisfied with all of the rules of procedure of the Senate and he had submitted a resolution to reorganize the Senate so as to make it more efficient. He was a liberal. He was a strong Democrat and a strong party man, but never offensive to those who disagreed with him. I think he was one of the most capable men who ever served in the Senate.

Personally I was devoted to him, and I think he liked me. We got along splendidly on the Appropriations Committee and in the Senate. I believe I never heard him say anything unkind about others.

The Senate of the United States will miss him. He was a great ornament to the body. He was a profound student of government. He was wise and his counsel was ever welcome and helpful. He loved our country and he loved our Government, and he just naturally loved people.

I am greatly distressed at his passing away. I saw him only a short time ago and he was the picture of health. I thought I had never seen a stronger, healthier, more able-bodied man.

I join with other Senators in expressing my heartfelt sorrow and my deepest sympathy to his stricken family.

EXCHANGE OF NOTES BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JONES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed on January 20 by the President to Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, and the reply of Mr. Jones to the President.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1945.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

DEAR JESSE: This is a very difficult letter to write—first, because of our long friendship and splendid relations during all these years, and also because of your splendid services to the Government, and the excellent way in which you have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years.

Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited, and I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the administration.

It is for this reason only that I am asking you to relinquish this present post for Henry, and I want to tell you that it is in no way a lack of appreciation for all that you have done, and I hope you will continue to be a part of the Government.

During the next few days I hope you will think about a new post—there are several ambassadorships which are vacant—or about to be vacated. I make this suggestion among many other posts and I hope you will have a chance, if you think well of it, to speak to Ed Stettinius.

Finally, let me tell you that you have my full confidence and that I'm very proud of all you have done during these past years.

With my warm regards, always sincerely.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 20, 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have your letter of today, asking that I relinquish my post as Secretary of Commerce, which carries with it the vast financial and war production agencies within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, so that you can give it to Henry Wallace as a reward for his support of you in the campaign.

You state that Henry thinks he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce and that you consider him fully suited for the post. With all due respect, Mr. President, while I must accede to your decision, I cannot agree with either of you.

You refer very kindly to our long friendship and our splendid relations during all the years, and state that you appreciate my splendid services to the Government and the excellent way I have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years. You are

also good enough to say that I have your full confidence, and that you are very proud of all I have done during these past years, and that you hope I will continue to be a part of the Government, probably in a diplomatic post. It is difficult to reconcile these encomiums with your avowed purpose to replace me. While I want to be of any further service that I can, I would not want a diplomatic assignment.

I feel and have felt a great sense of responsibility to the Congress and to you for the proper administration of the laws with respect to the R. F. C. that have been passed in the expectation that they would be administered by me or someone experienced in business and finance.

I have had satisfaction in my Government service because I have had the confidence of the Congress, as well as your own. I have had that confidence because I have been faithful to the responsibilities that have been intrusted to me. For you to turn over all these assets and responsibilities to a man inexperienced in business and finance will, I believe, be hard for the business and financial world to understand.

I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to serve my country through the depression and in time of war. My 13 years of Government service are ample evidence of my desire to be of any assistance to the Government. I can best be helpful in the line of my life's work—business and finance—but I seek no job.

With best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

JESSE H. JONES.

APPOINTMENT OF HENRY A. WALLACE AS SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have issued with respect to the appointment of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The appointment of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, with control of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and 10 subsidiary Government corporations, could not have been based on either the business experience, training, or aptitude of the appointee for this work.

If Jesse Jones did a good job, and the President said he did, by no manner of logical reasoning could the exercise of the same vast powers by Mr. Wallace result in anything like a similar administration. I can say this and still acknowledge, as I am glad to do, the high character and sincerity of Mr. Wallace.

Eliminating at this time a discussion of the important duties of the Secretary of Commerce, I can think of no person less suited by temperament and business ability to undertake the management of the vast Reconstruction Finance Corporation than Mr. Wallace. I say this with personal knowledge of his past public record in such matters, and notably his management of the Board of Economic Warfare, which the joint economy committee of which I am chairman investigated, and from which he was wisely and properly removed by the President.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with its 10 subsidiaries, is the most colossal banking institution the world has ever known, either public or private. By reason of blanket authorizations for loans, and the right to issue bonds, fully guaranteed by the Government, it is virtually immune from the control of Congress. I have frequently pointed out that it is in actuality, as it now operates, a fourth branch of the Government. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and its kindred corporations, has made either loans or commitments in excess of $40,000,000,000. Loans are revolving in the sense that when paid off they can be used to make commitments or loans for other purposes.

The correspondence between the President and Mr. Jones indicates that Mr. Wallace was permitted to select a position and be the judge of his own qualifications in return for his political services in the recent campaign. An appointment made under these conditions makes it imperative that the Senate of the United States protect the interests of the American people in the exercise of its power to reject Presidential nominations.

Mr. Wallace is the leader of the most radical groups in America. He is the close friend and coworker of Sidney Hillman and the extreme elements of the C. I. O. The maintenance of free enterprise means the preservation of our American way of life. It may well be that the action of the United States Senate on this appointment will have a decisive effect on the future of the free enterprise system.

RESIGNATION OF JESSE JONES AS SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two telegrams which explain themselves.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *January 22, 1945.*

Senator K. D. MCKELLAR:

Strongly protest shelving of Jones and hope you will work against confirmation of Wallace as Secretary of Commerce as consider him dangerous influence and totally unfit for this highly important post.

H. B. POTTS.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *January 22, 1945.*

Hon. K. D. MCKELLAR:

Shocked to hear of Jones forced resignation. Think Wallace absolutely unqualified for Secretary of Commerce post. Sincerely hope you will use your influence against such appointment.

NEWTON C. PERKINS.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third annual financial statement and report of operations under the provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774, approved July 19, 1940) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION—SAFETY OF LIFE AND PROPERTY

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report as to whether any new wire or radio communication legislation is necessary in order better to insure the safety of life and property (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

OCTOBER 1944 REPORT OF R. F. C.

A letter from the chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of October 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE R. F. C.

A letter from the chairman of the Board and secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to September 30, 1944, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

JOINT MEMORIAL OF LEGISLATURE OF ARIZONA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Senate Joint Memorial 2

Joint memorial requesting the Senate of the United States to ratify the treaty with Mexico relating to the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers

To the Senate of the United States:

Your memorialist represents that it is the belief of this body that the pending treaty between the United States and Mexico, respecting the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers, signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, as clarified by the protocol signed November 14, 1944, will, as it pertains to the waters of the Colorado River, prove very beneficial to the United States and to the State of Arizona.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

1. That your honorable body ratify the proposed treaty at the earliest possible date.

CONCENTRATION OF POWER IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution recently adopted by the Town Hall Committee of Wichita, sent to me by Mr. E. C. Moriarty, of Wichita, president.

This resolution addresses itself to a situation that is disturbing to many of us, that is, the increasing powers which are being seized by Federal agencies under extremely broad interpretations being given the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. Without undertaking to say that this resolution points toward the right solution, I desire to express my approval of its purpose. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed at this point as part of my remarks, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the tendency of the Federal administration in recent years toward construction of what constitutes interstate commerce has gone far beyond the wishes and beliefs of the public; and

Whereas the Town Hall Committee of Wichita believing that the abuse has reached the point where some action should be taken to correct the tendency; and

Whereas the effect of the recent construction of interstate commerce has been to eliminate and curtail free enterprise and bring practically every business within the control of Federal bureaus.

Now, therefore, we, the Town Hall Committee of Wichita, recommend to Congress that it give full and immediate consideration to an amendment to the Constitution that will limit and define "commerce among the several States" as set forth in the Constitution so as to better meet the needs of the people in protecting their liberties and property and in this connection we cite, as outstanding examples, the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in

the case of the *Southeastern Underwriters Association* and *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111), the latter case holding in substance that a farmer cannot feed his own wheat to his own livestock, because to do so would depress interstate commerce.

MANPOWER SHORTAGE—BEER AND LIQUOR TRAFFIC

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Miss Ethel R. Copenhaver, Meade, Kans., urging that, in view of the manpower shortage, the liquor distilleries and breweries be closed and men given employment in industries where they are needed to produce materials for war purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEADE, KANS., *January 15, 1945.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am taking this liberty of writing you about some of the very great and grave problems that confront us today in the United States of America.

First, this manpower shortage that we hear and read so much about. In all sincerity I ask, Why can't the needed manpower be drawn from nonessential industries, such as breweries, and put where it is needed, either in factories or the battle fronts?—as well as the huge saving of sugar, grains, and fuel which we do know can be of no benefit to the human body. For the harm it does our fighting men I am greatly opposed to our shipping the enormous amounts of beer and liquor that we do to our fighting men. I have two wonderful boys, one being now in France. I am sure opposed to this poison we are allowing to be set before them. How much more sensible to leave some young men (that really know farming) on the farms, and take them out of the distilleries.

* * * * *

Yours for a Christian United States of America,

ETHEL R. COPENHAVER.

INDEPENDENCE OF POLAND

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter and resolution which I have received from the Polish-American citizens of Clinton, Mass., asking that due recognition be given to the independence of the Republic of Poland, as it existed before September 1939, and that the present Polish Government-in-exile be recognized.

I suggest that this letter and resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW DEPARTMENT,
TOWN SOLICITOR'S OFFICE,
Clinton, Mass., January 15, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The representatives of the various Polish-American societies and professions have instructed me to send you the enclosed resolution for your kind consideration.

We have followed your leadership from the beginning and shall appreciate any response you care to make in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY E. MACORA, *Attorney.*

Whereas the United States of America has always safeguarded and protected the sovereignty of all small nations in maintaining the boundaries established prior to September 1939; and

Whereas the United States was the first nation to recognize and acknowledge meritoriously the present Polish Government-in-exile established in London; and

Whereas your honor, as our senior Senator, you were one of the first to evaluate the principles of the now historic meeting promulgating the famous precepts of the Atlantic Charter, which held the old established boundaries of small nations as inviolate and sacred, without any changes whatsoever until all hostilities cease: Be it

Resolved, That there be noted on your official records the sentiment and sympathetic feeling of Polish-American citizens in this area, that due recognition be given to the independence of the Republic of Poland as it existed before September 1939, and that you perpetuate your valiant leadership in continuing to recognize the present Polish Government-in-exile.

Rev. JOHN OSZAJCA,
Pastor, St. Mary's Parish of Clinton.
Rev. A. S. NASIATKA,
Curate, St. Mary's Parish of Clinton.
STANLEY E. MACORA,
Attorney and Town Solicitor of Clinton.
WALTER F. JAROS,
President, Thaddeus Kosciusko Association.
EDWARD NICEWICZ,
President, Polish National Alliance.
JOSEPH F. SIOK,
President, Polish-American Citizens Club.
GABRIEL SANDROWSKI,
Secretary, Polish Roman Catholic Union.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred letters and resolutions sent me by the United Polish Organization and Polish Mothers' Association of World War No. 2 of Salem, Mass.; by the pastor and parishioners of St. Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr Church, of Chicopee, Mass.; by the Federation of Polish-American Societies of Greater Boston; and by the American Women of Polish Descent of Bondsville, Mass., urging a just treatment for Poland.

There being no objection, the letters and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. STANISLAUS
BISHOP AND MARTYR CHURCH,
Chicopee, Mass., January 16, 1945.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find a copy of a resolution which was drawn up and ratified by the members of this parish on January 7. This resolution was sent to the President. We are firmly convinced that the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" were not just a passing fancy but the real ideals for which we are at present entangled in the world-wide conflict. To us they are the very essence of our American way of life. Outside of those, we have no other ambitions. It seems to us that Poland and other small and weak nations are really the test and proving grounds for the application of those principles. It would be most unfortunate for the American posterity if the present shedding of American blood would have been in vain. Russia's or any other big nation's unilateral land grabs are incompatible with these principles.

The people of this parish have been in close contact with you, Mr. WALSH, during your many years in public service. They have come to know you for your sincerity and sound principles. To them you are much more than a public servant—a man ever faithful to the trust they have placed in you. They consider you to be a true American, and they love you more than you will ever realize. They are grateful to you for your interest in their good-being here and in the country of their forefathers. They are of the opinion that American principles of justice and freedom must prevail in the end if these are dispensed by such public leaders as yourself.

I have tried to convey the opinions of this parish on matters which they consider of grave importance. To these may I add, for them and myself, "God bless you, Mr. WALSH, and grant you every possible good wish."

Respectfully yours,

EUGENE PIASECKI, O. M. C.,
Pastor.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: Saint Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr Roman Catholic Church with all its members, societies, and many fraternal organizations is in accord with the contents of the resolution sent to you by the Polish American Congress on December 22, 1944. All have faith that you will adhere to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Only through a just treatment of Poland and the small nations can real peace endure.

Therefore, we ardently request that action be taken for the following reasons and facts:

Whereas 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent stand determined in defense of the cultural rights of Poland to her pre-war boundaries and territory, and

Whereas for over 3 years our country, jointly with its Allies, has been engaged in a titanic struggle, the outcome of which will determine whether the American way of life and man's inherent right to self-determination will survive, and

Whereas our American boys answered the call for our country—they went to war in defense of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Over 2,500 boys, members of this parish, are already in the Army and Navy for the same cause, and

Whereas hundreds of thousands of the American boys are shedding their blood in the sacred cause of human rights of men and nations. Are their sacrifices to be in vain and the principles and rights for which they are fighting be repudiated and trampled upon? Many have already made the supreme sacrifice—43 boys of this parish are among the dead heroes—and because they are not able to speak for themselves, it is our sacred duty to speak for them,

Therefore, we, duly accredited Polish American citizens, members of the Saint Stanislaus Bishop Martyr Polish Roman Catholic Church, assembled here today, Sunday, January 7, 1945, unanimously

Resolve and dedicate ourselves to extend to our Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, our continued and wholehearted support in his every undertaking in leading our Nation in its war effort. We pray Almighty God that in the trying days ahead, the blessings of divine providence be with him constantly, so that he might continue to guide our Nation to victory over the enemies of mankind: Be it

Resolved, that we call upon our President to join us and our fighting boys and Polish brethren in this important protest. We earnestly implore that our Commander in Chief will use his influence and power to prevent the greatest crime of modern times, the unjust and unhuman imposition of a foreign culture upon a great nation that has contributed so much to the culture and learning of the western and Christian's civilization—our culture: Be it

Resolved, That you as President, by all means, will not permit the contemplated partition of Poland and enslavement of other nations: Be it

Resolved, furthermore, That justice and peace may prevail forever.

EUGENE PIASECKI, O. M. C.,
Pastor, Saint Stanislaus Bishop Martyr Roman Catholic Church, Chicopee, Mass., January 7, 1945.

FEDERATION OF POLISH-AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF GREATER BOSTON,
Chelsea, Mass., January 15, 1945.

To the Massachussetts Members of Congress:

At a mass meeting, A tribute to Poland, held at Fanueil Hall on January 14, 1945, at Boston, Mass., the enclosed resolutions were adopted.

Very truly yours,

ROMAN F. PUCKO,
Chairman of the Resolution Committee,

Whereas Poland, the first nation in Europe to reject appeasement, was the first to fight Nazi tyranny in the cause of freedom and civilization; and

Whereas Poland continues to fight valiantly on land, sea, and in the air for her cause and that of the United Nations; and

Whereas Poland is a country whose people have always throughout its history guarded the achievements of western civilization, and the democratic traditions of individual liberty and the freedom of conscience; and

Whereas Poland, in this tragic hour, despite her efforts in the cause of the United Nations, is being threatened with partition and the possible loss of her independence through the disregard of justice, international law, and the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Resolved, that we, citizens of the United States, gathered at Fanueil Hall, the cradle of liberty, on the 14th day of January 1945, at Boston, Mass., firmly condemn a policy of settlement, and power politics in the course of the prosecution of the war.

Resolved, that while it is in the best interests of the Allies to maintain unity and to fight together in loyalty for their cause and for the hopes that have rallied 36 nationalities in the 6 continents to the banner of the United Nations, we declare, it is equally important that the peace settlement reached after the war is won shall be based on the democratic principles of justice, law, and the respect of the rights of all nations.

Resolved, that a copy of these resolutions shall be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State, and to each of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Respectfully submitted by the committee on resolutions.

ROMAN F. POCKO,
Chairman.
LILLIAN J. NEMENOSKI,
FRANK NOWAK,
GLADYS PIEKARAKI,
ELAINE H. PROABOSAGCZ,
JOHN SOKOBOUSKI.

BONDSVILLE, MASS., *January 20, 1945.*

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned American soldiers' mothers, sisters, and sweethearts respectfully ask if their sons fight for democracy and all nations' freedom has now decidedly become a fight for Russia's and England's world supremacy, and if their beloved Poland in particular shall be reduced to the question of dying Caesar: "Et tu Brutus contra me"? America also is now against their much beloved Poland.

Sincerely yours,

American Women of Polish Descent: K. Pietras, M. Pietryka, A. Mihonski, K. Gula, W. Bigda, A. Rumanczyk, K. Duda, W. Bubon, B. Dernoga, K. Wegrnyn, S. Stolarz, K. Sowaa, K. Kapinos, W. Chmura, B. Godek, G. Marcinkiewicz, M. Wachta, J. Karcz, A. Stolarz, M. Kapinos, H. Bigda, M. Moniec, F. Kulig, M. Lebida, M. Zabka, A. Stankiewicz, K. Czehowska, A. Kos, B. Starnyk, A. Nekodem, A. Lepa, R. Soltys, M. Mihonski, A. Pietruszka, K. Kraweic, A. Bigda, M. Jarosz, A. Bak, A. Skourinski, M. Gill, B. Duda, M. Lesniak, J. Piechota, A. Wodas, W. Zbylot, A. Antonowicz, J. Kos, A. Dudek, A. Wolonik, M. Krol, A. Stefanowicz, K. Dudek, M. Wolas, M. Sczygiel, A. Ksen, W. Kawalec, H. Krol, K. Bigda, B. Wlosczyna, A. Kopacz, C. Saletnik, J. Pietryka, J. Czech, J. Piechota, L. Lavinge, M. Legieza, R. Sowa, S. Wachta, H. Wachta, A. Karcz, M. Miga, S. Kapinos, K. Mazar, A. Jasak, M. Jasak, I. Qula, I. Moniec, E. Moniec, G. Moniec, J. Sowa, L. Kulig, J. Kulig, J. Lanczak, S. Lebida, M. Geslak, P. Geslak, H. Pisarczyk, G. Pisarczyk, Am. Zabka, Z. Balow, A. Puza, K. Kuzza, J. Swiat, G. Kos, B. Mastalarz, A. Nikodem, A. Mihonski, A. Skrzyniasz, W. Bukowska, M. Kulig, A. Kozlik, L. Kozlik, L. Gill, H. Kusza, A. Pietras, H. Izyk, K. Maraj.

UNITED POLISH ORGANIZATION OF MASSACHUSETTS,
January 10, 1945.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The United Polish Organizations of Salem, Mass., at a meeting held on Wednesday, December 27, 1944, at Salem, Mass., whereat the following resolution was unanimously adopted and whereat it was unanimously voted to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Hon. DAVID I. WALSH and Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Senators from Massachusetts, and Hon. GEORGE J. BATES, Congressman from the Sixth Essex District of Massachusetts:

"*Resolved,* That the United Polish Organizations of Salem, Mass., protest the partition of Poland as proposed by Premier Stalin of Russia and approved by Prime Minister Churchill of England, whereby that part of Poland east of the Curzon Line, so-called, is to be given or awarded to Russia."

And the organizations further protest the statement of the Prime Minister of England that the President of the United States has directly or indirectly agreed to the proposed partition of Poland, and the organizations further record that such a partition would be a breach and a violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter which warrant confidence that the integrity of Poland and the basic rights of her people will be preserved.

Respectfully yours,

St. Joseph's Society, Branch 604, Roman Catholic Union, W. Dolmat; Sons of Poland Society, Branch 555, Polish National Alliance, J. Kozlowski, president; St. John's Society, Branch 1041, Polish National Alliance, J. Mioskiewicz, president; Polish Falcons Nest No. 188, T. Melec, president; Polish-American Citizens Club, Thomas J. Zak, president; St. Anthony's Society, John Maciejewicz, president; Polish-American Veterans and Auxiliary, J. Szostak, commandant; Women's Polish-American Citizens Club; Wanda Kolczak, president; Polish Workman's Aid Fund, W. Oleck, president; St. Anne's Society, Emelia Bachorowski, president; St. Elizabeth's Society, C. Zmyewski, president; Mrs. Julia Kobuszewski, secretary; United Polish Organization, 18 Boardman Street, Salem, Mass.

SALEM, MASS., *January 20, 1945.*

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Massachusetts Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Please uphold the principles of the Atlantic Charter for the sake of Poland and all other small nations. Sixteen hundred and forty-three of our sons believe that is what they are fighting for. Your statements are appreciated, especially at Fanueil Hall.

POLISH MOTHERS ASSOCIATION,
WORLD WAR NO. 2.

ENDORSEMENT OF DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSAL BY SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, there has recently been issued by the Synagogue Council of America, representing orthodox, reform, and conservative Jewish religious groups an endorsement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a constructive step forward in international relations, but criticizing their lack of any spiritual motive to inspire the will to peace. A copy of the endorsement has been sent me by Rabbi Ahron Opher.

The statement, which was prepared by a committee headed by Rabbi Isaac Landman, editor of the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, declared:

The Dumbarton Oaks document provides the machinery for the possible prevention of future wars, not for the establishing of universal peace; proposals for the suppression of international violence after these occur, not for their prevention; a mechanism calculated to rectify and adjudicate international strife, not an instrument to eliminate the bases of strife and violence and war.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by these Jewish groups, and the letter endorsing it, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., January 19, 1945.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: You were good enough to make reference to the Synagogue Council statement on Dumbarton Oaks in your remarks last night in the Town Hall meeting of the air.

May I therefore take the liberty of sending you a copy of the full text of the statement of the Synagogue Council of America, in the hope that you may want to make reference to it in the Senate?

With cordial greetings,

Yours in the service of God and country,

RABBI AHRON OPHER.

The Synagogue Council of America greets with profound gratitude the labors of the leaders and the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, China, and our own country as set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for an international organization to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security. Although these proposals are admittedly tentative, and constitute only a preliminary and incomplete statement of a hope yet to be fulfilled, the Synagogue Council acclaims the temper in

which they are drawn. The statesmen of the four Allied Nations testified to the faith that resides in the human spirit and bespeak our own conviction that men and nations can and will cooperate to free the world of the curse of war.

The Synagogue Council of America is in full accord with the recommendation in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals to establish a security council, an international court of justice, and to develop such measures as shall advance the possibilities of universal peace.

The security council would be empowered to employ force to maintain or restore international peace. Use of force to suppress the persecutor and to vanquish the oppressor is a recognized principle of Judaism. Jewish Rabbinic tradition distinguishes clearly between wars of offense and wars of defense. Wars of offense are those waged by aggressor peoples and are in defiance of the laws of God and man: Judaism condemns such wars. Wars of defense, however, are those waged against aggressors who would conquer, enslave, and destroy other peoples: Judaism makes such war obligatory, and in every country where Jews have lived they have taken part in wars of defense against the aggressor. Now that the hope to make aggressor nations powerless is inherent in the charter of the United Nations, Judaism accepts as a divine obligation the call to take up arms whenever and under what conditions a defensive battle must be waged against those who attempt to destroy the peace of the world.

We commend with deep fervor the proposed international court of justice to which power and means will be granted to enforce its decisions. Judaism, often referred to erroneously as exclusively a religion of law, was the first to entwine law with justice—"Justice, justice shalt thou pursue, that thou mayest live" (Deutronomy xvi: 20)—and crowned both with the attribute of Mercy—"For I desire mercy, and not sacrifice" (Hosea vi: 6)—to soften and assuage the hardness and relentlessness of the strict interpretation of law. The reign of law alone, in its austerity and rigor, may prove as inefficient to thwart international aggression and crime as it has been within the individual nations. Only in the application of law tempered with justice and long-suffering in mercy, by no means, however, clearing the guilty (Exodus xxxiv: 6–7), may be achieved the contemplated and longed-for cooperation of the nations in the adjustment and settlement of international disputes without conflict and recourse to war.

To achieve the purposes envisaged by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the conduct of men and nations must accept the sanctions of the ethical law, proclaimed by Judaism as the sine qua non for the redemption and salvation of humanity. The bow and the sword and the battle will be banished from the earth, warns the Prophet (Hosea ii: 20–22), only when mankind will become betrothed to God in righteousness and justice, in loving kindness and compassion on faithfulness. These divine attributes, in which man shares, transmute the problem of war and peace into the realm of the ethical principles taught by our prophets, without which an enduring peace is impossible. Nor is a just and enduring peace probable unless it shall be universal. Therefore, the Synagogue Council of America hails the purpose of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals to implement the friendly relations among nations with appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace. In due time, these measures should aim to fulfill the vision of the Prophets to bring near the day when swords will be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks, when the implements of war will be forged into implements of plenty and of good for all, when nations shall no more learn the arts of war and the fear of fear shall be banished from among men (Isaiah ii: 4; Micah iv: 3–4).

The Synagogue Council feels, however, that the Dumbarton Oaks document, as did the Covenant of the League of Nations, lacks the prophetic passion to stir and capture the universal spiritual and ethical values inherent in the souls of men. The making of an enduring peace is a challenge to these values. "But the work of righteousness shall be peace," says Isaiah (xxxii: 17), "and the effect of righteousness, quietness, and confidence forever."

The Dumbarton Oaks document provides the machinery for the possible prevention of future wars, not for the establishing of universal peace; proposals for the suppression of international violence after these occur, not for their prevention; a mechanism calculated to rectify and adjudicate international strife, not an instrument to eliminate the bases of strife and violence and war. Unless justice and righteousness are enthroned as the capstone of the aim of any organization that proposes to achieve it, the world can have no hope for an enduring peace. There can be no hope for an enduring peace unless there is a reconversion of the human spirit to the inspired insight of Isaiah that man must work righteousness to earn peace, since only the effect of righteousness can assure to mankind perpetual quietness and confidence.

Peace predicated on such foundations would mean the cessation of the racial or color injustices by which one-third of the world's population, which happens to be white, denies rights and opportunities to the other two-thirds of the population which happens to be black or brown or yellow. It would mean an end to the exploitation of primitive groups by enlightened peoples. It would mean that nations economically disadvantaged are helped to self-improvement and economic reconstruction, even as we bring such aid to the disadvantaged in our own midst. It would mean the spiritual regeneration of the human family to that concept of just and righteous interrelation in which the aggressors within each nation would desist from squeezing and oppressing their neighbors and fellow citizens for their own personal aggrandizement. All the most perfected, practical machinery in the world for maintaining peace will not avail until within men and nations there is created the spirit of the will to peace.

This hope and possibility, one may say, belongs in the realm of religion rather than practical statesmanship. Perhaps what the world suffers from most is a condition in which the prophetic principles do not animate statesmanship. Statesmanship, the Synagogue Council of America holds, must be animated and governed by the great principle first enunciated in the Old Testament (Leviticus 19: 17–18) and then spread the world over through its quotation in the New Testament, "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Nonetheless, the Synagogue Council of America welcomes the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference as marking a most significant step forward in human striving to answer the question long ago propounded by the prophet (Malachi 2: 10): "Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us all?"

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
RABBI HERBERT S. GOLDSTEIN, *President*,
RABBI AHRON OPHER,
Assistant to the President.
RABBI ISAAC LANDMAN, *Chairman*,
RABBI LOUIS FINKELSTEIN,
RABBI DAVID DE SOLA POOL,
Committee on Peace Studies.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat, reported it on January 20, 1945, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 12) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 311. A bill for the relief of Philip Kleinman; without amendment (Rept. No. 13);

S. 312. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; without amendment (Rept. No. 14);

S. 315. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 15);

S. 317. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 16); and

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; without amendment (Rept. No. 17).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 219. A bill to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 18); and

H. R. 621. A bill to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19).

AUTHORIZATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at half past 3 this afternoon there is to be a meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary on a very important matter. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may file its report during the recess of the Senate, assuming that the Senate takes a recess at the conclusion of the day's work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 350. A bill granting a pension to Lottie Flint; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 351. A bill to promote on the retired list all line officers of the Army who have or may be specially commended for performance of duty in actual combat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 352. A bill authorizing the State of Minnesota Department of Highways to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hastings, Minn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Carl Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 354. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Hondros; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. REED:

S. 355. A bill to restore standard time; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 356. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide a limitation on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by, or against, common carriers by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 357. A bill for the relief of the Forward Columbus Fund, of Columbus, Nebr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Lisitano; and

S. 359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen McCormack; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of certain governmental agencies and corporations, and for other purposes. This refers to the corporations created by the R. F. C. or under its authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Vermont will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 360. A bill providing for an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of certain governmental agencies and corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 361. A bill for the relief of C. Owen Welch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 362. A bill amending the Fact Finders' Act of 1924 relative to costs of investigations of certain reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 363. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 364. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act;

S. 365. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; and

S. 366. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 367. A bill to provide for the compilation and publication of a list showing the names and addresses of taxpayers relieved from liability for the payment of taxes under the provisions of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 and the amounts of taxes from which such taxpayers are relieved from liability for payment; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 368. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, to prohibit the use of any pipe line constructed under such act for the transportation or distribution of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 369. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to overtime pay, and for other purposes; and

S. 370. A bill relating to the hours of employment, compensation, and conditions of employment of employees engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for such commerce or employed in the performance of any Government contract; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 371. A bill making unlawful the use of force or violence, or threats thereof, to prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 372. A bill granting a pension to Mary Alice Pridgen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'DANIEL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 373. A bill to incorporate The Navy Mothers' Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 374. A bill to amend the Act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An Act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. GEORGE introduced Senate bill 375, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to regulate the use of certain listening devices, and call attention to the fact that a new listening device has been invented which is revolutionary, and under which, without the use of wires, individuals can listen in on a private conversation held as far as 3½ miles away.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 376. A bill to regulate the use of certain listening devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 377. A bill to reclassify and adjust salaries of supervisors in the first- and second-class post offices; and

S. 378. A bill amending sections 7 (a) and 12 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 379. A bill to authorize the presentation of an appropriate medal to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. O'MAHONEY) introduced Senate bill 380, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 381. A bill to provide for recognition of active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol as veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 382. A bill granting to certain dismissed governmental employees the right to hearings before the Civil Service Committees of Congress; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 383. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 384. A bill to provide for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BUSHFIELD, and Mr. LANGER):

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to aid in maintaining agricultural production essential to the prosecution of the war, to clarify the application of existing law relating to the utilization of agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to freedom to work; and

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President of the United States and Members of Congress to 6 years and imposing limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and wish to make a statement regarding it.

The bill does not create any new agency, but simply recognizes the existence of an existing agency, to wit, the Federal Loan Agency, created by Reorganization Plan No. I under the Reorganization Act of 1939. It reestablishes that agency, which now is a skeleton agency, since the transfer by the President under the Second War Powers Act under date of February 24, 1942, of most of the agencies and the functions of those agencies theretofore operating under the Federal Loan Agency. The purpose of this bill is to return and restore to the Federal Loan Agency all those agencies and activities which were transferred by Executive order of the President under date of February 24, 1942, to the Department of Commerce.

The bill does not affect the status of the National Housing Agency or of housing agencies which were transferred to the National Housing Agency at the time of the Executive order, nor does the bill deal with the Export-Import Bank, which seems to have been transferred by subsequent Executive act to the F. E. A., and is not now under the Department of Commerce.

Since this bill creates no new agency and does not enlarge the power or responsibility of any of the existing agencies, but merely takes out of the Department of Commerce or from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce all the loaning agencies heretofore transferred to that Department, I think the bill should go to the Committee on Commerce, and I request that it be so referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

THE DRAFTING OF FARM WORKERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, commencing more than 2 years ago, I have repeatedly since called the attention of the Senate to the desperate situation caused by the drafting of farm workers into the service. The Tydings amendment was finally adopted and the situation, to some extent, bettered. So far as I know, nothing was done about the 375,000 able-bodied men who were deferred to take jobs in the Government. The best I could do was to get a list of such individuals sent to the Speaker of the House and the Vice President. In my opinion, thousands of these men occupy places which could be filled by those who are unfit, or who are too old for combat service, and the able-bodied released.

Since the Selective Service has directed local draft boards to send more farm workers, I have been deluged with letters from every section of my State and the Northwest making clear that the taking of additional farm help, in many instances, means that the farmers must quit farming. I ask unanimous consent to have the letters printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and that the signatures not be printed, because that might prove embarrassing.

There being no objection, the letters, without the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATHGATE, N. DAK., *January 10, 1945.*

Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing with reference to drafting the few men we have left to do the farm work. I am a farmer and do not have any sons to be drafted nor to do my farm work. Therefore I am writing from a production basis.

I farm about 800 acres and hire two men in the summer. If these men are all taken to the Army who is going to do the work? Inexperienced men from the cities and different parts of the country are not capable of running this modern machinery.

As a farmer I want to be patriotic and do my bit for the war effort, but if these farm boys are taken my farm, like many of my neighbors, will have to stand idle and just grow up to weeds.

BLAISDELL, N. DAK., *January 12, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: From what we hear over the radio it seems likely that all able-bodied young farmers will be in the Army soon if the military get everything the way they want it.

In my case it means that I shall have to quit farming because I am too old to do much work myself.

I mention this because I know there are thousands of farmers similarly situated.

Older men are going to take charge they say. Where are all those older men we hear so much about? All the older men I know of are overloaded with work now and cannot take on any new jobs.

BUXTON, N. DAK., *January 14, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This is the first time in my life I have written to any of our Senators in Washington, but things are pressing us farmers up here in North Dakota, and I am sure it is not new to you.

As I understand, they are to draft our farm boys who are left, and as we have only a little over 200 boys left in II–C class I for one do not feel it quite right.

We have a hard time taking care of our 1944 crop on account of help.

Had we had enough help from the start of harvest we could have saved a lot more of the grain, but as it happened the heavy rains came and lot of the grain is still out in the field. Many of the boys got disgusted and left for their homes down South. If we had had enough help from the start much of this grain could have been saved before the rains.

I hope you will pardon me for writing a rather long letter as I know you are a busy man, but as you are a man from our own State I urge you to do your best for us farmers up here to help keep our boys, who are left, on the farm.

FESSENDEN, N. DAK., *January 15, 1945.*

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: Enclosed find two copies of our newspapers.

Why so much confusion in regard to II–C men deferred in agriculture, which are the men we farmers so badly need here in North Dakota. Something should be done to freeze II–C deferments to those that want to be our future farmers, and for the duration. Instead of being batted around within the draft, and out of the draft, and don't know where they are at, to do planning ahead for a successful job on the farm.

Some official and others that put pressure to induct II–C farm workers believe we farmers can use anybody to run our tractors and machinery, which we know cannot be done. Some believe we have too many farm boys deferred, when we know it was the farm boys that were the first to be drafted in North Dakota after those dry years, and besides the farm boys should have same rights as those Federal men and factory workers in defense that are 18 to 26 in deferments, and if it came to the worst, we could get along with a lot less Federal men that are now on the pay rolls.

The farm boys that reach the age of 18 here of late have not had much chance for deferment, which should be considered, and give them an even chance with those drafted in 1942.

TO EXAMINE ALL II–C MEN

MINOT, N. DAK.—Brig. Gen. Heber L. Edwards, North Dakota director of Selective Service, said here that within the next 60 days, every North Dakota man deferred in class II–C (farm work) and under 26 years of age, will be sent to Fort Snelling, Minn., for preinduction physical examinations under the new regulations.

This does not mean, however, General Edwards added, that every II–C man passing the examination will be inducted.

He came here with other officials from State headquarters in Bismarck for a conference on the new regulations with draft boards from nine counties in the Minot area.

EXPLAINS NORTH DAKOTA POLICY ON FARM DEFERMENTS

Despite what the headlines may say, the bulk of young men from 18 through 26 deferred for agricultural purposes are not going to be drafted for the Army.

This was the reassuring statement made before the county officers by Lt. Comdr. Frank L. Benson, of the North Dakota selective-service headquarters staff. These young men will be given preinduction physical examinations, but that does not mean they will be called.

The fact that North Dakota has the highest agricultural production per man in the United States, except in Montana, is an indication that this State has no wasted manpower in agriculture, Benson said, pointing out that the selective-service board was interested seeing that agricultural production was maintained.

He said that the nonagricultural group of eligibles in the State had been exhausted, and that a small percentage of agriculturally deferred men would be taken from some counties, but that the service would try to take those who would hurt farm production the least.

Lieutenant Commander Benson urged all to cooperate with local boards in trying to find out which would be best spared from agricultural work. He said that farming was defense work, in the eyes of Selective Service, and that the man on the farm had as good a chance at deferment as one who went west to work in a bomber plant.

ROGERS, N. DAK., *January 13, 1945.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing in regard to the drafting of farm labor. I think the Government is making a grave mistake in taking the boys from the lower-age brackets from the farms.

To cite my own case. We have 430 acres. last year we raised 170 hogs, sold $1,200 worth of cattle, and around 2,000 bushels of wheat. This year we are keeping 15 brood sows and 60 head of cattle, 20 of which are cows and heifers which will increase our herd this year. Included in this are 6 milk cows.

Except for a month and a half in harvest and threshing when we had the help of one man, our only boy, 23 years of age, has done practically all the work, as I am 70 years of age, and physically unable because of a bad heart condition, to do anything except the lightest work. My wife has been crippled with arthritis for 3 years and is unable to do her housework.

I had my farm loan renewed in 1933 to the amount of $8,000, and owing to the condition of crops and prices, interest and taxes, increased it to $12,000. During the last 3 years we have paid off $6,000 of this loan (a Federal loan) besides paying some feed and seed loans.) We have also subscribed to our quota of bonds and all other war drives in our community.

If this boy is taken, our farm would lie idle, as there would be no one I could get to take his place. I am personally acquainted with five other farmers (all older men like myself) in our township, who are faced with the same situation as I, and who have one boy in the 18–25 age group, with no other help.

Please give this matter your consideration, for if these younger farm boys are taken, the output of food would be drastically reduced.

Thank you.

ASHLEY, N. DAK., *January 13, 1945.*

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am sending you this newspaper clipping so you can see what is going on at home.

When I read it I wondered if this is our pay-off from our Government for the work that we farmers did. For our boys on the fronts and for our Government that they want all our young boys from the farms and put them in the Army. So other young boys can play football, basketball, and boxing matches. I heard a boxing match this evening on the radio again.

Someone told me that a high officer made this statement in Ashley lately. We have to draft the farm boys now to get them. We can't draft them in March.

Are we farmers still recognized in Washington as on essential jobs or not? It don't look like it here at home. It looks very bad for us right now.

I hope you can do something for us farmers real soon.

[From the Ashley (N. Dak.) Tribune of January 11, 1945[

WILL CALL FARMERS FOR PREPHYSICAL

Reorganization of the McIntosh County Local Selective Service Board took place Monday, due to the resignation of Ed. Herr, of

Wishek. Otto Brandt, of Wishek, was named in his place. The board now includes Jacob Rempfer, chairman; Fred Breitmeyer, vice chairman, and Otto Brandt, secretary.

Lt. Comdr. Frank L. Bensen, Bismarck, occupational adviser of State headquarters of Selective Service, met with the local board here Monday to acquaint them with some of the new regulations.

According to Lieutenant Commander Bensen, the new regulations provide that all farm boys under the age of 26 will be called for a preinduction physical examination. This will take place soon—within a period of about 6 weeks. He stated, however, that farmers should not become too alarmed and assured us that this does not mean that all farmers will be taken out of their agricultural classification, but that the purpose is to find out how many are qualified for military service and to get a check on the available manpower.

Regardless of what happens, it is nevertheless true that the armed services are in need of more men due to our expanding war fronts in the Pacific and in Europe. This need must be met. For that reason we needn't try to fool ourselves—many more men will have to be drafted, since there are not going to be enough boys turning 18 to meet the heavy demand.

BINFORD, N. DAK., *January 8, 1945.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WILLIAM LANGER: Your kind and considerate communications of January 2 and 3 at hand, for which we sincerely thank you.

We would like to have more information regarding the Tydings amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act. Is not this amendment in effect (just as much now) to protect the farmer if he is within the bounds of this amendment?

The local board fully agreed that we were in strict accord with the terms of the Tydings amendment. Can either of these boys be legally deprived of their deferred status when they are in strict accord with the amendment?

Grain farming differs from dairy farming in that it can be layed down for a year, and the next spring the farmer can go out and plant a crop. In 3 or 4 months he will have raised a crop. But a dairy farmer who has disposed of his cows cannot build up his herd in any less time than 3 years, and for that reason we believe that the dairy farmer should be spared in preference to the grain farmer.

Any information that you can give us on this matter will be very much appreciated, and thanking you for an early reply, I am,

---

SAWYER, N. DAK., *January 13, 1945.*
Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being a farmer for 40 years, I am very much interested in the new draft regulation.

It's been almost impossible to farm the last year with what farmers we did have left and if they take any more there will be many farms standing vacant.

There is a farm within a mile of me that has been vacated by the owner for lack of competent farm help. It's a well improved farm with $4,000 improvements and a section of land. The owner tried to farm it after his last boy on the farm was drafted last May. He had one of the best dairy herds around here, but as he was 65 years old and in poor health, he couldn't do the work and had a sale last November and went to California. Since then and probably through the duration this farm will lay idle.

On this farm was 20 acres of crested wheat grass that was never cut which would have made 200 pounds of seed per acre if it had been harvested.

It's my opinion if they take more farm boys and try to replace them with IV–F or other hired help, who are not interested in the place, and who are not willing to work 12 to 16 hours every day like the farm boys do themselves, there will be many more farms standing idle.

We had a good crop in this part of the country last year and most of it was harvested. In my estimation, 10 to 20 percent had gone back into the ground for lack of help and combines.

There were hundreds of tons of wild hay that wasn't cut in this part of the country, although many of the farmers put up hay as late as the last of November.

To me the farm situation looks very serious and the present administration will find it out when it's too late.

I am Wayne Morey's father and Wayne failed to pass the physical examination and is in class IV–F. For the last 2 years he has been working in the Kaiser shipyards in Vancouver, Wash. I also have a married son who farms for himself. Then I have one 20-year-old son at home who is running this farm with my advice and help. Last year we milked 16 cows and had 350 acres of crop in. If my son is taken into the Army I'll have to quit farming, as my health is very poor and I am not able to do the work myself.

My reason for writing this letter was to let you know the exact condition in this part of the State, and I know you will be interested in knowing these facts.

ZAP, N. DAK., *January 6, 1945.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am herewith writing this letter concerning my son, the only boy that I have that can help me on the farm. They are trying to induct him the 15th of January. I am unable to see at times, as I have only one good eye and have an infection on that eye. I am farming 250 acres and milk 24 cows. The total number of cattle that we have to feed during the winter is 46 head.

The oldest boy that I have at home is only 14 years old and is still going to school. If they take Oscar into the Army then I don't know what I am going to do with the farm. I have one boy in the Army already for more than 2 years.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *January 6, 1945.*
WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Once again the administration wants to take our young farmers into the Army, because of a so-called manpower shortage, and still they want us to produce more foodstuffs. As a citizen of North Dakota and in draft age myself, I for one expect you, as well as our other representatives, to oppose this move to the best of your ability.

While I am over 26 years my parents are both over 70, so if I, like hundreds of others, were taken the farming would be discontinued.

I write this letter to you so as you can find out the opinion of one farmer anyway. Although I know of many similar cases right in my own township.

If this ever comes on the floor of the Senate, as a bill, I for one will look to you to oppose the drafting of any more farm workers, regardless of age.

SYKESTON, N. DAK., *January 15, 1945.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: Am writing to you in regard to the draft.

Am hearing over the radio that they will draft the IV–F's for war work. They are doing it already; and not only that, they are taking the last boy away from the farm where the old man is not able to do the work. I know of a few where this happened, and others have not been called on yet so far. Wish you would look into this matter and if this draft of farm boys keeps up there will be hundreds of acres not put in and you can look for a food shortage of everything.

And all the boo-hoo about the labor shortage in the war plants is not labor—it's the 10 percent, as I talked with some that work there. They say it is not work as on the farms; they work from 6½ to 8 hours, but on the farm it's 12 to 18 hours a day and no time and one-half for overtime.

I think the best the War Labor Board can do is to investigate the war plants and let the workers work 12 hours a day and not 6½ to 8, and they have one-third more men to do the work. That's what we have to do on the farm—and have to get it done in time, too.

LEMMON, S. DAK., *January 12, 1945.*
Mr. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I'm afraid we are headed for trouble again and this is the reason why:

The draft board has sent questionnaires out to everyone eligible in the county and we hear they do not plan on deferring a single farm boy, and if they take our son, Vernon, who you so kindly got discharged a year ago last November, we will have to quit farming, sell all of the cattle—although we could milk 26 head in spring if we could get the help to do so—and move to town. As I wrote you, mister's health is none too good and I am diabetic, so where would we be.

If the draft board takes him again please advise what can be done and how to do it, and I'll be so grateful to you and what you did in the past will never be forgotten.

Expect to hear from the draft board somewhere near the middle of the week, so am sending this air mail and sending an air mail stamped envelope for reply. Again I thank you for a reply.

RYDER, N. DAK., *December 28, 1944.*
Senator W. LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am writing to you about trying to get my boy deferred.

He has been married 4 years and has two children. The 2 first years he was married he worked on the farm, and in the fall he got a job in a creamery, and then he was frozen there for some time, but he came to help me in his spare time, like in the evenings and on Sunday. Then he was put in II–C and deferred for farm work last summer, so he moved back to the farm and has been helping me ever since.

I have rented everything to him, because I have not been able to do my own work by myself for the last 2 years; have been under the doctor's care all the time.

I have a doctor's statement at the draft board in Minot, but they don't pay no attention to it, and he is due to be called most any time, as he has been put back in I–A.

Help is so hard to get, and we only have the one boy, and it is hard to do without him when farm work is so important to help win this war we all are trying to fight.

Mr. LANGER, you have helped us before, when times were hard and we could not work it out by ourselves, and I am asking you for your help again, as I need it as bad now as I did before.

Write at once and let me know what to do.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *January 19, 1945.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am writing you about the draft taking all of our farm boys. You know the conditions here in the Northwest as well as anybody else, and that when it breaks up in the spring we have got only a

short time to get our crops in if we expect to get a crop at all. And in order to do that we have got to have help we can depend on to go ahead and do their stuff, and there is just no substitute for the boy that has been born and raised on the farm. He knows his machinery and he knows the lay of the land. He knows where he can go with a tractor and where he cannot.

My experience with inexperienced help is, they spend most of their time in a mud hole somewhere, burning up a lot of our much-needed gas and getting nowhere. Now, we have a boy 23 years old that, after keeping company with a girl for 4 years, was married last summer and is living on our farm, which consists of about 1,600 acres, rented land and all. My wife and I moved to town last fall and she is operating a rooming house, and I spend a good share of my time helping the boy on the farm.

We aim to keep around 100 head of cattle, of which 30 are milk cows, and along with the hogs, sheep, and poultry gives us plenty to do. We have on the average 600 acres of small grain. The boy got his notice to go to Fort Snelling for his examination, so he went last Tuesday and passed; so the local board says now if he gets a card stating he is in I–A he had better get ready to go, as they have no authority to defer him.

That means he will have to sell off his stock and farming equipment and I will have to reduce mine, as I have been handicapped with a stiff leg for the last 20 years and am crowding the 60 mark. Am still able to do a lot of work, but there are certain things I cannot do. I don't like to quit farming now, as I know we have all got to do all we can to win the war, and if our boys have got to go over there and fight, give them all the eats and help we can; but we can only do so much. We only have two boys, and the youngest enlisted in the Navy 2 years ago.

A bad year with a large acreage there is still a little surplus left, but a bad year with a small acreage it takes it all for seed and feed.

In closing, I hope the officials can see before it is too late and leave us some good help on the farms.

FARGO, N. DAK., *January 9, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Farm boys as ready and willing to serve in armed forces as any group. Many were deferred because of absolute need of maximum production. Now if armed forces need men more than maximum production, Congress must decide. The farm-labor situation is acute and production will be cut if large numbers of farm youths are called. Their need cannot be replaced by transient labor, older men, or young boys.

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: American dairy farmers are worried over the recent directive for the reclassification and induction of farm youths in the 18–25 age group. They are fearful that in many instances local draft boards will be stampeded into overlooking the provisions in the present law which exempts essential agricultural workers from military service.

If because of this oversight, or because of an abandonment of present standards of deferment, the dairy industry is to be further drained of essential workers, it will irreparably cripple our efforts which last year produced 20,000,000,000 pounds of milk products for the armed forces and our allies and cared for our civilian needs as well. A full-scale drafting of workers in the 18–25 age class from dairy farms would cut 1945 milk production by as much as 5,000,000,000 pounds.

No segment of American agriculture is more hard pressed by manpower shortages than the dairy industry. Milk producers cannot depend on prisoners, imported labor, or unskilled workers. The implication that food production can be left entirely to older men, and to women, is entirely unwarranted in the dairy field. The brunt of the heaviest farm work is borne by younger men—which alone makes possible the fullest utilization of the energeries of women, children, and older men in lighter tasks.

We present these facts for your information. Army spokesmen have told us that at no time have their working inventories of dairy products been as high as they had hoped. We submit that our wartime efforts should not be further crippled. We ask your influence in this behalf.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *January 8, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are very much alarmed at recent reclassification and induction into military service of farm boys in 18 to 26 age group. There may be areas where surplus of farm labor still exists; however, North Dakota has long ago scraped the bottom of its agricultural manpower barrel for military service if maximum food production is as vitally imperative as is indicated by food goals established for 1945 by the War Food Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture.

We believe maximum output from our farms to be of equal importance in winning the war with maximum output from our mines, factories, and shipyards; particularly is this true if there are to be several more years of war. Additionally, this war is being fought to destroy the totalitarian ideology of fascism. The destruction of fascism is the major prerequisite to building for our people and the people of the world a decent peace under which the will of people may be expressed and their needs may be served through governments and economic systems of their own choice. For these reasons the winning of the war and the peace must be an inseparable process. With few exceptions the induction of North Dakota farm boys between the ages of 18 and 26 means an inevitable reduction our food production from the maximum which effective prosecution of this war and the establishment of a lasting peace will require.

WALHALLA, N. DAK., *January 5, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

If present production to be maintained everything possible must be done to have farm laborers deferred.

BUXTON, N. DAK., *January 15, 1945.*

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Have been reading in the papers and hearing across the radio that all the farm boys and others are going to be drafted in the near future. If that is the case what are we older fellows going to do with so much crop to put in and other work to be done on the farm? It just can't be done. If they want food for our fighting men I can't see that they can take farmers especially when there is only one in the family and one that has never been off the farm, either for any school or anything else, as that has been his only ambition. If there is anything you could do in this matter in the near future or as soon as possible as the II–C's are coming up now, it would be surely appreciated, and we look to you as our Senator to be of some help to us here in this matter. Thanking you for what you can do.

ECKELSON, N. DAK., *January 12, 1945.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to the farm-labor situation. We would like to tell you that if they take our boys away we would have to leave our farm, as Mr. ——— has a bad heart ailment and can do no heavy work. Now we farm a lot of land and have a large herd of cattle and quite a few hogs, and milk quite a few cows. I wish you would try and do something about it. Last year help was so scarce. There is no man that will come and take charge of chores, and so forth, or even help with them, beside all the other farm work involved to produce a crop, like our own boys would. Please consider this and oblige. I have only three boys in for 3 years now.

HATTON, N. DAK., *January 16, 1945.*

Mr. WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR SIR: I have confidence in you Mr. LANGER—and have always admired your work, therefore, I am bringing my problem to you, hoping you can do something about it.

I am farming 2 quarters of land (320 acres) which I bought in 1943. My son and I have been farming it since; I could not get along without him, because I am not in such a good condition as I used to be. I'm 54 and my son is 23. Last fall my son went to the draft board to find out if it was all right to rent some land on his own so he rented 240 acres more, and has bought tractor and machinery, and we plan to do all this together, but if they're going to draft him, I will never be able to farm my own land, saying nothing about his, which has already been contracted.

There are several cases just like this one around here. Last fall when we threshed we couldn't get any help, and we had to use bull rakes and push it to the machine, I pitched alone because we were so short-handed. If he went and if they take the other deferred boys, there is no one who can replace them, because there is no one to hire, and wages are outrageous.

Please do what you can. There won't be enough food at all—if this happens.

Thank you.

P. S.—Please do not publish this, or let my name be known to anyone but yourself.

BISBEE, N. DAK., *January 16, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

I am alarmed at the draft of farm boys that we hear so much about on the radio and read about in the newspapers. I was just listening to the radio and heard General Hershey say that they were going to take all farm boys regardless of deferments. I want to say right now, that it just means the end to family-type farming. I further want to state that we are just going to fold up and quite farming. We will be unable to carry on. I know several farmers that are going to do the same thing. So if General Hershey wants to see the farmer out of business, all he has to do is go ahead and draft these boys and he will see a farm panic.

ALFRED, N. DAK., *January 4, 1945.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am going to write to you, and would like to know what you can do about farmers being called into the Army.

I have been on the farm all my life. Now I've been reclassified in I–A and also am called to get my preinduction physical examination.

Here is my standing: I am farming 3½ quarters of land of which 225 acres is cropland. I have 12 head of dairy cows, 12 head of young dairy cattle, 38 head of sheep (ewes), 7 horses, and a complete set of farm machinery. I bought my farm a year and a half ago. If drafted in the Army, I would have to give up my farm, lose the payments I've made. There is also no market for horses or machinery in the middle of the winter.

I am married, have no children, but my wife expects a baby sometime in February. There are still single men of draft age. I cannot see why I should be forced off the farm, when I'm doing essential work in agriculture. Please try and do something about the matter. I am going to have my physical examination on or after January 9, 1945.

JANUARY 8, 1945.

SENATOR LANGER: I see in the paper that they are going to draft farmers. If they do that, they will not need much food for 1945. My boy is in draft age, and if they draft him there will not be much food produced on that farm. My boy is all alone on the farm. He owns eight cows, eight young stock, besides two horses, chickens, and pigs. He is the only boy I got. He is married and got one child. I know you have been a good friend to the working class and I know you will see that the farmers will keep on producing the food.

Mr. LANGER, I am too old to work like the younger ones do. I am over 68 years old and not very strong. I live in town. I hope you will do all you can to keep the boy farming.

GRANDIN, N. DAK., *January 12, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a clipping from the Hillsboro Banner, Traill County, N. Dak. I am a farmer and have an only son in the draft age. I also have several neighbors in the same fix as I am. I like to do my part, but where are we going to get help to replace these boys that are worth five inexperienced hands? Can you help us figure the answer? Thanks for any information or help we may get.

TRAILL GETS LARGE CALL FOR II–C EXAMS—MANY 18–26 FARM DEFERRED YOUNG MEN GO TO SNELLING JANUARY 26

Concrete evidence that steps are being taken to process youth of the county, deferred in the past for farm work, and prepare an increasing number for possible induction, was offered Monday morning when the Traill County selective-service board received instructions to send an additional number of registrants to Fort Snelling, Minn., for preinduction physical examinations.

The call is scheduled for January 27 and was for a very large number, the board disclosed. Those to be sent in addition to the regular January call for preinduction are now classed II–C in the draft and are between the ages of 18 and 26. The regular monthly contingent of preinduction physicals left Wednesday. There were 16 in the call

The II–C draft class is the only remaining one in this county in which there is an appreciable number of men under 26. Last week the State selective-service office said Traill County has 226 young men in the class. The problem of determining which of the 226 are to go to Fort Snelling for their examinations is one with which the county board will wrestle this week. The men can be selected by order number or by other means. Whether they can be deferred after receiving their physicals is open to question.

The need for younger fighting men has been evident for sometime, and the present critical situation on the western front has accelerated the demand. Draft calls have been stepped up, and if the II–C group does not yield the necessary number, older men will have to be requisitioned.

Leaving January 16 for induction are these men:

Edgar Haugstad and Albert Smith, of Cummings; Harry T. Anderson, Robert Koering, and Robert Hutchison, of Hillsboro; Ralph Chandler, of Caledonia; LeRoy Guttormson, of Portland; Wendell Thorstad, of Clifford; and Robert Hanson, of Hatton.

Marcus A. Evans, of Mayville, has volunteered and will leave soon for specialized training in the Navy.

PEKIN, N. DAK., *January 4, 1945.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I enjoyed your speech last night over the radio, and I trust you will urge Congress and the Selective Service heads to leave the necessary farm workers on the farms, and especially where many families have only one boy, or one boy left, as most of us farmers are getting on the old side of life and simply cannot run our farms and produce to full capacity without efficient help. It seems reasonable where a farmer is over 55 years old and has a full line of equipment and farming over 200 acres of land, raising cattle, etc., he should be able to keep his own son on the farm, especially when that son does a big share of the work.

Many hundreds of farmers have quit farming on account of inefficient help, and if more farm boys are taken there will be more farms left idle and our country will run into a food shortage. Please do what you can.

DICKINSON, N. DAK.

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: We were at a meeting in South Dickinson when your speech came over the radio, and we are all for your plans for North Dakota, especially in keeping our young men here—the few that are left. According to the population of North Dakota, we think we have more men in the service than any other State in the Union. The classified ad sections in the newspapers out here are getting crowded with ads of farms for sale, and most everyone wants to sell on account of not having help enough to farm any more. This fall we worked in the harvest fields from 14 to 16 hours a day, then went home at night to do chores—and at that there still are crops to thresh in some parts of the country.

Roosevelt wants us to produce more foodstuffs in 1945. How will we be able to do it if we have to give the rest of our manpower to the armed forces? North Dakota is left out in the cold as far as war plants are concerned, so we have to produce all the foodstuffs we can, but if they take much more of our help we will not be able to do that.

FARGO, N. DAK., *January 15, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

I am writing you concerning the latest draft order. I have 2 sons of draft age. One is married and has 1 child, farming 440 acres in the Red River Valley, milking 10 cows, has 50 head of ewes to lamb, a large flock of laying hens, and will have some sows this spring. He lost his 1944 crop by water, and to buy feed and live has been compelled to work out, too, this winter, but lives on the farm, doing his chores and then full-time work. No hired man or war prisoner would do anything like that.

The other son is farming 400 acres of land, living at home; has had a fine purebred herd of milking Shorthorns for 7 years, and has just spent $1,000 for new blood in his herd. He has done all the field work for the past 6 years as I am not able to do so. I am not able to keep up the work he has been doing, and my chores if he is taken and no help can be secured to do the work now—dependable help.

A neighbor who farms 320 acres lost his crop with water and in order to live and heed the cry for help he arranged his work at home and got a job in a war plant for the winter. He has been called for his medical.

Two other neighbor boys are farming 400 acres; raise a large number of cattle and hogs; the third boy is in service. Their widowed mother keeps house for them. They are within the age limit. These are a few instances of farm boys who are in this latest draft, and what will happen if it is followed up? No hired man or war prisoner would put in 16 or 18 hours a day in the field and watch a sick cow that night, or a farrowing sow, or get up two or three times a night to look after a brooder fire, or work until midnight to finish a job of haying, and be on the job next morning ready for work, or run a corn picker all night because the mud had thawed out during the day.

There are hundreds of other farm boys in similar positions. The dairy industry has suffered from lack of help. The grain and livestock end will be hard hit as well. The few boys left on the farms must stay there or there will be a decrease in farm production during 1945. This spring will be doubly hard for all on account of the condition of the fields from excess moisture.

You are a Senator of North Dakota and know the conditions here, and we are asking you to exert every effort to keep the essential farm boys on the farm.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have prepared a joint resolution, which I shall now introduce, which is as follows:

Whereas previous directives of the Selective Service apparently have misled boards into inducting farm workers that are desperately needed upon the farms and have either ignored or twisted beyond all understanding the Tydings amendment for draft deferment of farm workers; and

Whereas the Nation's farm population has declined by approximately 5,000,000 even before the ambiguous directives the local boards have received which were sent out by the Selective Service: Be it

Resolved, etc.—1. That the Selective Service is hereby directed to clarify its directives on the drafting of farm workers;

2. That there be a reclassification for the availability into the armed service of the 3,300,783 Federal employees;

3. That farming be declared to be a critical war industry;

4. That pending the investigation as to why the Tydings amendment of the Selective Service has not been carried out, that the deferment of all farm workers between the ages of 18 and 35, inclusive, be deferred.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the joint resolution I introduced this morning dealing with the matter of directing General Hershey to clarify the directive he issued on the Tydings amendment. My reason is that after offering the resolution I found that a joint resolution had been introduced by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] in behalf of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. I withdraw my resolution and join with these Senators in the introduction of their joint resolution so that there will be one less measure to consider.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution re-

ferred to by the Senator from North Dakota is withdrawn.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress was referred to the Committee on Rules.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. For the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and myself I submit a resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make an inquiry into the present production and supply and distribution of dairy products. I should like briefly to explain my reason for offering the resolution.

I am offering this simple resolution directing the Committee on Agriculture to make an inqury into the production, transportation, and distribution of dairy products because of an event which has occurred and which may conceivably affect every farmer in the United States who uses mechanical equipment on his farm. I refer to the secondary boycott called by Local 680 of the teamsters union against the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm, of Plainsboro, N. J.

The controversy between the teamsters union and the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm began some months ago, when the union undertook to organize the employees of Walker-Gordon.

In response to a telegram from Mr. Fred Brenckman, of the National Grange, as to whether the union was undertaking to organize farm labor, Mr. Thomas E. Flynn, acting president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, replied under date of August 7, 1944, to the effect that the union had no intention of organizing farmers or farm workers, that they had accepted 65 of the 260 employees of the Walker-Gordon Co. as members of their union, and put forth the claims that these employees were industrial dairy employees as they were operators of mechanical milking machines.

It would appear that inasmuch as the teamsters' union was unsuccessful in organizing the employees of the Walker-Gordon Farm, it resorted to a secondary boycott of the products of the farm, and since January 9, 1945, members of the teamsters' union have been forbidden to handle the milk produced on the Walker-Gordon Farm. According to news reports, this amount to 23,000 quarts a day. I understand it is all certified milk, and a large percentage of it is sold to hospitals and on doctors' prescription in New York City and vicinity.

I further understand that at present the milk is being skimmed and the cream held at the farm, because no member of the teamsters' union is permitted to deliver it anywhere.

I hold no brief for the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm. I know very little about them. Possibly their employees should be organized. I realize that corporation farms are very attractive to union organizers and will probably become more so. What concerns me is the claim of the teamsters' union that dairymen who operate mechanical milking machines are industrial employees. If a precedent to this effect is set as a result of the Walker-Gordon boycott, and such precedent upheld, it would mean that several hundred thousand dairy farms in the United States could be forced to become members of and pay dues to the teamsters' union in order to get their milk delivered to the market.

In my small State of Vermont alone, this would mean that at the rate of $2 per month per member, the farmers might be required to pay over $500,000 a year in dues to the teamsters' union in order to market their milk. Throughout the country the total would amount to millions of dollars.

What concerns me further is a report which came to me yesterday that the teamsters' union had demanded of the Walker-Gordon Dairy Farm that not only should the operators of the milking machines be required to join the union, but all employees of the farm, regardless of their duties, should be required to become union members.

On getting this report, I telegraphed Mr. Henry Jeffers, president of the Walker-Gordon Farm, asking if it were true. I received a telegram stating that the report was true; that the only employees to be exempted from union membership would be nonworking supervisors.

It is my opinion that if Mr. Jeffers requires his employees to become union members when only 25 percent of them have signified their willingness to do so, he would very definitely be violating the labor laws of the country.

Furthermore, it is reasonable to believe that if operators of milking machines on farms are adjudged to be industrial employees, then operators of other machines, such as combines, mechanical cotton pickers, and orchard sprayers, would also be classed as industrial employees.

It is conceivable that this might lead to a situation whereby almost any and every farmer could be forced to pay dues to the teamsters union in order to get his products to market.

The situation is so serious that it merits the immediate attention of the Congress, and for that reason I am offering this resolution in the hope that a thorough investigation may be made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the facts ascertained before it is too late.

It is bad enough to have 23,000 quarts of high-grade milk withheld from the New York market. It would be infinitely worse to have a general conflict between labor and agriculture, although I cannot conceive of labor in general supporting the reported contentions of the teamsters union. It is a matter in which every labor organization, every farmer, and every consumer should be immediately concerned.

There is little time to lose in getting at the facts of this unfortunate situation which exists in New Jersey. We may have only a matter of hours in which to act.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) submitted by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. HAWKES) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a study and inquiry into the present production and supply of dairy products and the transportation and distribution thereof, and into the laws, regulations, and orders of the War Food Administration, with a view to ascertaining among other things whether the present laws are adequate to permit the War Food Administration to take any and all action that may be necessary to prevent waste and spoilage in the production, transportation, and distribution of such dairy products. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with recommendations as it deems advisable.

HOWARD B. SMITH

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the limit of expenditures contained in Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to December 9, 1943 (authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act), as modified by Senate Resolution 238, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944, there is hereby authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate to Howard B. Smith, the sum of $2,805 as compensation for stenographic services rendered to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in reporting and transcribing hearings held before such committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV RESPECTING INVESTIGATIONS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and it is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"4. Each of the several standing committees of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall have the authority to make investigations and conduct studies of any and all matters within the jurisdiction of the committee or which are germane to any matters which have been referred to the committee or which the committee may determine will be of assistance in the performance of its functions and duties; and, in the exercise of such authority, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable; and to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall

not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

"5. No resolution calling for the establishment of a special or select committee of the Senate shall be considered by the Senate unless there is no standing committee of the Senate whose jurisdiction extends to the subject matter of the investigation or study proposed to be made by such special or select committee."

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 9 RELATING TO EXPENSES OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 9, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 6, 1945, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the total expenses of each standing committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, in connection with the performance of its duties and functions under paragraph 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, shall be limited as follows: For the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, $50,000; for the Committee on Appropriations, $150,000; for the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, $; for the Committee on Banking and Currency, $50,000; for the Committee on Civil Service, $; for the Committee on Claims, $; for the Committee on Commerce, $50,000; for the Committee on the District of Columbia, $; for the Committee on Education and Labor, $; for the Committee on Enrolled Bills, $; for the Committee on Finance, $50,000; for the Committee on Foreign Relations, $50,000; for the Committee on Immigration, $; for the Committee on Indian Affairs, $; for the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, $; for the Committee on Interstate Commerce, $50,000; for the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, $; for the Committee on the Judiciary, $50,000; for the Committee on the Library, $; for the Committee on Manufactures, $; for the Committee on Military Affairs, $50,000; for the Committee on Mines and Mining, $; for the Committee on Naval Affairs, $50,000; for the Committee on Patents, $; for the Committee on Pensions, $; for the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, $; for the Committee on Printing, $; for the Committee on Privileges and Elections, $; for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, $; for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, $; for the Committee on Rules, $; for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, $: *Provided*, That the limitation herein set forth may be increased, at the request of any standing committee, by such sum or sums as may be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate."

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING FERTILIZERS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 42), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the supply, production, distribution, and sale of fertilizers for agricultural purposes. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CONSERVATION OF WILD-ANIMAL LIFE

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 43), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 246, agreed to April 17, 1930, authorizing a special committee to investigate the conservation of wild-animal life, hereby is continued from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $13,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purpose.

CONSIDERATION OF AGRICULTURE AS A CRITICAL WAR INDUSTRY

Mr. BUSHFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, sent out a directive on Wednesday, January 3, 1945, to the State directors and the local draft boards throughout the Nation; and

Whereas said directive is interpreted by most of the draft boards and State directors as a directive to take the farm workers who are physically qualified without regard to the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas the War Food Administrator has said, in reference to his statement quoted in the directive, that it was his intention to refer only to such farm labor as is not deferred by the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas under this directive all farm workers aged 18 through 25 in class II–C, except those previously disqualified, are ordered "to report for preinduction physical examination"; and

Whereas evidence has been placed before the Congress that same local draft boards have interpreted this directive as a Presidential order for both examination and immediate induction, and not subject to appeal thus in effect nullifying the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas farm boys are patriotic and if called for induction will not willingly apply for deferment, even though the need for their services may be greater on the farms than elsewhere; and

Whereas the farm owners and employers of farm labor have no way of knowing whether the workers called for preexamination will be physically qualified or disqualified; and

Whereas they know that if they are physically qualified, they will be immediately inducted into the armed forces, and as a result, therefore, auction sales are being held throughout the Nation disposing of livestock, poultry, and farm machinery and thousands of farms are either being abandoned or farm operations curtailed because there is no available farm help for replacement; and

Whereas this threat to the Nation's food supply has aroused the country to the danger of a shortage of food not only for our armed forces but for the civilian workers; and

Whereas there is already a severe shortage of butter, milk, cheese, and other dairy products and also of meat and meat products, in spite of unusually favorable weather conditions, resulting in the greatest crops in our history; and

Whereas there are 3,300,783 in Government employment, and since there are great inconsistencies and contradictions in the governmental statistics in regard to deferments, and since Senator BYRD states that there are at least several hundred thousand unnecessary Federal employees; and

Whereas it is acknowledged that there are millions of hoarded workers in the cost-plus and other industrial plants; and

Whereas there are over 4,500,000 of the armed forces still in continental United States; and

Whereas the necessary replacements in our present armed forces are less than 800,000 per annum: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to comply with the intent and spirit, as well as with the letter, of the Tydings amendment, and he is directed to consider agriculture as a critical war industry, and that farm help be deferred in accordance with the provisions of the Tydings amendment wherever it is shown that it is essential for agricultural production; be it further.

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to immediately issue a clarifying directive to all State directors and local draft boards in accordance with this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That the Director of War Mobilization direct the War Manpower Commission to immediately investigate the availability of manpower among the 3,300,783 Federal employees, and especially to make a thorough investigation in regard to labor hoarding in industry, and particularly so in the cost-plus war industries, in order that all essential labor in every critical industry may be treated alike; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be directed and authorized immediately to determine the effect of the State director advice No. 288, released January 3, 1945, upon agricultural production and upon the war effort, and to return its findings to the Senate within 5 days.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. McMAHON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

GUARANTY OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AT STANDARD WAGES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "No Democratic Government Can Guarantee Full-Time Employment at Standard Wages" delivered by him to the National Industrial Conference Board, New York City, on January 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S WAR AND PEACE AIMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on America's war and peace aims delivered by

him before America's Town Meeting of the Air in New York on January 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TIME TO TAKE STOCK—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Time To Take Stock" delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, of Topeka, Kans., before the annual meeting of the junior chamber of commerce in Cleveland, Ohio, January 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. ALBERT L. COX

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on compulsory military training delivered by Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox at the Central High School in Washington on January 18, 1945, under the auspices of the Parent-Teachers' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

SIX FULL DAYS' WORK EVERY WEEK—PLAN OF KIWANIS CLUB OF WEST POINT, VA.

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a plan to regulate full-time work in essential industry by every available person, proposed by the Kiwanis Club of West Point, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR BRICKER, OF OHIO—EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBUS SUNDAY DISPATCH

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Outstanding Governor Retires," from the Columbus Dispatch of Sunday, January 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSTMASTER, MOUNT VERNON, MO.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I report favorably the nomination of Ruth C. Fossett, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Mo., in place of Robert Stemmons, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session, I now ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of this postmaster nomination, in which the President of the Senate is interested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ruth C. Fossett to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Mo.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nomination be confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the confirmation of a postmaster nomination?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, as in executive session.

Mr. WHITE. Has the nomination been reported from the committee, and is it on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the nomination?

Mr. McKELLAR. The nomination was just read at the desk. I ask that it again be read for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk again read the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL POLICY AND PROGRAM FOR CONTINUING FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself, a bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government.

This bill offers a fundamental method of attacking America's No. 1 post-war problem: that of assuring post-war jobs for the people of our country.

I ask that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD, and that a series of questions and answers which I have prepared in explanation of the bill be printed following the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. O'MAHONEY), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Full Employment Act of 1945."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that—

(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce and in the development of the natural resources of the United States;

(b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remnuerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right;

(c) In order to carry out the policies set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation; (2) foster and protect the American home and the American family as the foundation of the American way of life; (3) raise the standard of living of the American people; (4) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (5) contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise; (8) strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations, it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States;

(d) In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure;

(e) To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment; and

(f) Such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

THE NATIONAL PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT BUDGET

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session the National Production and Employment Budget (hereinafter referred to as the "National Budget"), which shall set forth in summary and detail for the ensuing fiscal year, or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate—

(1) the estimated size of the labor force, including the self-employed in industry and agriculture;

(2) the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, required to produce such volume of the gross national product, at the expected level of prices, as will be necessary to provide employment opportunities for such labor force (such dollar volume being hereinafter referred to as the "full employment volume of production"); and

(3) the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government (not taking into account any increased or decreased investment or expenditure which might be expected to result from the programs set forth in such Budget).

The estimates and information herein called for shall take account of such foreign investments and expenditure for exports and imports as affect the volume of the gross national product.

(b) The extent, if any, by which the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is less than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, shall for the purposes of this title be regarded as a prospective deficiency in the National Budget. When there is a prospective deficiency in the National Budget for any fiscal year or other period, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for encouraging such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure, particularly investment and expenditure which will promote increased employment opportunities by private enterprise, as will prevent such deficiency to the greatest possible extent. The President shall also include in such Budget such recommendations for legislation relating to such program as he may deem necessary or desirable. Such program may include, but need not be limited to, current and projected Federal policies and activities with reference to banking and currency, monopoly and competition, wages and

working conditions, foreign trade and investment, agriculture, taxation, social security, the development of natural resources, and such other matters as may directly or indirectly affect the level of non-Federal investment and expenditure.

(c) To the extent, if any, that such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure as may be expected to result from actions taken under the program set forth in accordance with subsection (b) of this section are deemed insufficient to provide a full employment volume of production, the President shall transmit a general program for such Federal investment and expenditure as will be sufficient to bring the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local government, and the Federal Government, up to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production. Such program shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate additional non-Federal investment and expenditure. Any of such programs calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private concerns under contracts awarded in accordance with applicable laws, except where the performance of such work by some other method is necessary by reason of special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law.

(d) If the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is more than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both.

(e) The programs referred to in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall include such measures as may be necessary to assure that monopolistic practices with respect to prices, production, or distribution, or other monopolistic practices, will not interfere with the achievement of the purposes of this act.

(f) The National Budget shall include a report on the distribution of the national income during the preceding fiscal year, or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate, together with an evaluation of the effect upon the distribution of the national income of the programs set forth in such Budget.

(g) The President may from time to time transmit to Congress such supplemental or revised estimates, information, programs, or legislative recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable in connection with the National Budget.

PREPARATION OF NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 4. (a) The National Budget shall be prepared in the Executive Office of the President under the general direction and supervision of the President, and in consultation with the members of his Cabinet and other heads of departments and establishments.

(b) The President shall transmit to the several departments and establishments such preliminary estimates and other information as will enable them to prepare such plans and programs as may be needed during the ensuing or subsequent fiscal years to help achieve a full employment volume of production.

(c) The President may establish such advisory boards or committees composed of representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, and others, as he may deem advisable for the purpose of advising and consulting on methods of achieving the objectives of this act.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL BUDGET

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the National Budget, to be composed of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, and Finance, and seven additional Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Labor, and Ways and Means, and seven additional Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation of the joint committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a study of the National Budget transmitted to Congress by the President in accordance with section 3 of this act; and

(2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1 of each year, its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget, together with a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year a general policy with respect to such National Budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena, or to testify when summoned, under authority of this section.

(e) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments.

(f) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

RATE OF EXPENDITURES

SEC. 6. (a) The President shall review quarterly all Federal investment and expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which the current and anticipated level of non-Federal investment and expenditure warrants any change in the volume of such Federal investment and expenditure.

(b) Subject to such principles and standards as may be set forth in applicable appropriation acts and other statutes, the rate of Federal investment and expenditure may be varied to whatever extent and in whatever manner the President may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring continuing full employment, with due consideration being given to current and anticipated variations in savings and in investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

AID TO COMMITTEES

SEC. 7. The heads of departments and establishments shall, at the request of any committee of either House of Congress, furnish such committee with such aid and information with regard to the National Budget as it may request.

INTERPRETATION

SEC. 8. Nothing contained herein shall be construed as calling for or authorizing—

(a) The operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government;

(b) The use of compulsory measures of any type whatsoever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower;

(c) Any change in the existing procedures on appropriations; or

(d) The carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the National Budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

1. Does the bill aim at an economic situation where there will be 60,000,000 jobs?

The bill purposely does not offer any preconceived figure for the total number of jobs needed to provide full employment. The number of jobs needed for full employment depends on such changing factors as total population, the number of young people in the labor force, the size of our post-war armed forces, the extent to which old people retire from the labor market, the number of women who resume their full-time housekeeping duties, the number of hours worked, technological progress, and other considerations. In view of probable changes in these items, the exact number of jobs that would constitute full employment in any one year can best be estimated currently.

2. Does the bill guarantee everyone the kind of job he wants?

This is not a bill to guarantee jobs to any individual. It aims at making real the time-honored right of every American able to work and seeking work to find a job, by giving him the assurance that there are jobs to be had.

3. Does the bill provide for a planned economy?

The bill aims at creating a dynamic approach to the problem of providing expanded production and consumption, thus creating sufficient job opportunities. The approach attempted is not dissimilar to the one taken in the Homestead Act which helped expand our system of free enterprise during the last century.

The kind of Government responsibility envisioned in this bill is excellently described by a quotation from the January 8, 1945, issue of the magazine Time:

"If Government responsibility means stabilization of high business volume by control of the over-all volume of spending and other general measures which do not dictate how men shall earn their livings, it would be a capitalistic blessing."

4. What effect would enactment of the bill have upon the war effort?

By assuring the country that unemployment would not be the aftermath of victory,

the enactment of the bill would mean still greater effort by industry, labor, and agriculture. In particular, it would help avoid the excessive shifts to nonwar work which have taken place after every military victory. Above all, the enactment of the bill unquestionably would contribute to the morale of our fighting men.

5. What would the passage of this bill mean for business and agriculture?

The bill aims at the highest levels of sustained production possible under the free-enterprise system, with the least amount of Government coercion or domination. This is the economic climate most beneficial to business and agriculture.

The bill also aims at eliminating the wild economic fluctuations that have hitherto been so disastrous for the small businessman and the small farmer.

6. Does the bill call for increased expenditures by the Federal Government?

The bill is neither an appropriation measure, nor a revenue measure. It provides a framework within which the administrative and legislative branches of Government working with private enterprise may effectively promote such governmental policies and actions as will bring about maximum activity on the part of private enterprise. This is the only effective way of keeping Federal expenditures to a minimum.

At the present time, nearly half of the total job opportunities are being provided by Government spending for war purposes. As we approach post-war conditions, this proportion will naturally shrink. Consequently, we are entering a period in which Federal expenditures will be declining as expenditures by business and consumers rise, so that the total is maintained at the level necessary to provide full employment.

7. Does the bill provide for "deficit financing?"

The bill provides a positive way for bringing about the greatest possible activity on the part of business. This, in turn, would make it possible to reduce Government expenditures to a minimum. Therefore, except in most dire emergencies, the Government would not have to step into the breach with a spending program.

Furthermore, Government spending does not necessarily mean "deficit financing." It is entirely possible for a Government-expenditure program to be financed through money raised by taxes, rather than through borrowing.

8. What about the national debt?

The enactment of the bill into law, and its sound administration, would have the result of stimulating activity by private enterprise to the maximum. The resultant increase in the production of goods and services would, over a period of time, permit the collection of a comparatively high volume of taxes for debt-retirement purposes, which would be impossible if the national income were to remain at low pre-war levels. The annual service upon the debt, morever, would represent a relatively small proportion of the national income.

9. How would this bill guard against the danger of inflation or of a speculative boom?

The best guaranty against inflation is a larger volume of production of goods and services. It is precisely the aim of this bill to stimulate the highest possible volume of production by private enterprise. Therefore, this bill provides the best protection imaginable against inflationary tendencies which may occur during the transition from a war economy to a peacetime economy.

In addiition the President is required to set forth in the National Budget "a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both" if there is a prospect of too much spending in comparison with the volume of goods available.

10. Does the bill provide for a new W. P. A.?

It is the very purpose of the bill to assure a continuing high level of activity upon the part of private enterprise and thus to prevent emergency situations in which it might become necessary to resort to a new W. P. A.

On the other hand, should it become necessary to provide additional employment opportunities through Federal public works, the bill provides for the performance of construction work by private concerns under contracts awarded in accordance with applicable laws.

11. What is the difference between the National Budget created by this bill and the regular Federal Budget?

The regular Federal Budget deals with the expenditures of the Federal establishments, together with the extent to which these expenditures are to be financed through taxes or borrowing. It does not reveal the relationship between Federal expenditures and those of business, consumers, and State and local governments.

The National Budget, however, deals with the Nation as a whole, not merely the Federal Government. In addition to Federal expenditures, it includes expenditures of business, consumers, and State and local governments. If all expenditures are less than that required to assure full employment, the difference is regarded as a deficit in the National Budget. Such deficit means unemployment and insufficient production. This may be overcome by increasing the aggregate expenditures by business, consumers, and Government until they equal the amount required to assure full employment.

12. In what way does a deficit in the Federal Budget differ from a deficit in the National Budget?

The Federal Budget shows a deficit when expenditures exceed receipts other than from borrowing. In the National Budget, the total of consumer, business, and Government expenditures is always equal to the total of receipts, for the income of business, consumers, and Government comes only from these three sources of expenditures. This balance between the Nation's expenditures and the Nation's receipts may take place at any level—either at $200,000,000,000 or at $100,000,000,000. But when the national total of all expenditures or all receipts is less than that required to assure full employment, the difference is regarded as a deficit in the National Budget. This deficit, which shows up as unemployment and underproduction, may be overcome by increasing aggregate expenditures of business, consumers, and Government to equal the amount required to assure full employment.

13. If it is estimated that there are 60,000,000 persons looking for jobs and willing to work, and if it is estimated that private enterprise may provide only 40,000,000 jobs, would the bill call on the Federal Government to provide the deficit of 20,000,000 jobs?

Under the bill the estimates as to the number of persons looking for jobs and the number of jobs available in private business would be made by the President on the basis of available public and private information. Once the estimates are made and a deficiency is found to exist, it is the responsibility of the President to recommend, and of the Congress to adopt, any measures which they believe necessary and desirable for the purpose of aiding and encouraging private enterprise to provide additional job opportunities. Only if the President and the Congress agree that an adequate number of additional job opportunities cannot be created by these various means, is it the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide direct programs for employment.

14. Is the National Budget limited to a single fiscal year?

The question of drawing up a National Budget for 1 fiscal year or longer is left to the judgment of the President. Certain programs of economic development that Congress may want to provide for will present a long-range character that may be planned in 1 year and executed in the course of 2 or 3 years.

Furthermore, individual industries or other groups in the economy may also find it more practical to base their investment plans on projects covering more than 1 year. Therefore, the bill allows the President to present a National Budget for a period longer than 1 fiscal year.

15. Are existing economic statistics adequate for the effective administration of this bill?

A tremendous amount of new information has become available both to private enterprise and to Government as a result of the war effort. The President has asked the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of the Budget and cooperating Government agencies to bring together war and nonwar statistics that will be needed for reconversion to post-war production.

The problem of making advance estimates, however, will not materially affect the administration of the bill, since provision is made for a quarterly review of the National Budget and for whatever changes in the rate of Federal expenditure which may be necessary to meet changing conditions.

16. Why isn't the responsibility of developing the National Budget given to one of the regular Government departments?

The National Budget transcends in scope the activities and responsibility of any one department. While it would be based on the estimates and programs submitted by the various agencies, its development properly belongs in the Executive Office of the President.

17. Is Congress obligated to accept the National Budget transmitted by the President?

No. Like the regular Federal Budget, the National Budget is in the nature of a Presidential recommendation to Congress. Under the provisions of the bill, the Congress would be free to reject in part or in total the President's recommendation and to substitute its own program for full employment.

18. Would the enactment of this bill make other legislation on domestic economic problems unnecessary?

No. The purpose of the bill is to bring into proper focus the wide range of legislative proposals which affect employment and which are likely to be sponsored by the administration or various economic groups—proposals in the field of taxation, social security, export trade, and so forth. Its enactment would give rise to a vastly increased amount of legislative activity.

19. Why is a Joint Committee on the Budget set up?

At present, there is no arm of the Congress that has the responsibility of considering all the elements in the Federal Budget, or the relationships between the Federal Budget and the national economy. With a National Budget in operation, comprehensive congressional consideration of budgetary problems would be still more important than under present circumstances. The Joint Committee on the Budget, therefore, is created to study the National Budget in its entirety.

20. What is the purpose of the joint resolution on the Budget?

At present, individual fiscal measures are handled separately and without any formal consideration of budgetary policy in general. Under the bill, therefore, a joint resolution on the Budget is to be drawn up by the Joint Committee on the Budget and reported to both Houses, where it would then be debated. The resulting resolution would then serve as a general policy framework to guide the operations of the several committees of each

House dealing with fiscal matters. This resolution is to be reported to both Houses by March 1, of each year, so that there would be sufficient time to debate the resolution and enact fiscal policy measures by the beginning of the next fiscal year.

21. What changes does the bill call for in the activities of the various individual congressional committees?

There would be no change in the activities of the individual congressional committess, except that the joint resolution on the Budget would provide a general policy framework within which they would operate.

22. Does the bill provide for lump-sum appropriations to the President?

No. The bill provides for no appropriations at all.

23. How does the philosophy of the bill differ from the "Compensatory economy" philosophy developed during the 1930's?

First of all, it places major emphasis upon non-Federal expenditures and that Federal expenditures are only to be used as a last resort.

Second, it provides for preventing unemployment, rather than for "taking up the slack" after men are walking the street looking for work.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to make an explanation of the bill. I understand the Senate is still in the morning hour, but it seems that speeches are being made, and if speeches are to be made at this time I want the right to make a statement now in support of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough to enable me to make an observation?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for years I have sought to secure the enforcement of the rule which provides that during the morning hour no Senator shall speak longer than 5 minutes. That rule is constantly being violated, and I hope the President of the Senate, without his attention having to be called to it, will enforce that rule. The rule was made for a good purpose, in order that Senators who desire to transact business in the morning hour will not have to wait to listen to long speeches. If any Senator desires to make a speech, he should obtain unanimous consent, but he should not transgress the rule.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I express my complete concurrence in what the majority leader has just stated. I think the rule should be respected. I believe that if the rule is respected, by and large, in the length of time its enforcement will amply justify its existence.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in full sympathy with that rule, and have always followed it. But if I am to be precluded from making a statement in explanation of a very important piece of legislation, I shall ask to have the privilege——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator has already obtained unanimous consent to make his explanation. I made the statement which I did simply for the benefit of other Senators, and for future conduct of business.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the history of the world, the struggle for existence has manifested itself in economic systems that have been constantly changing. At one time western civilization was based upon the feudal manor. Then came the city and the development of handicraft industry. Then came the industrial revolution, and with it the economic system of free enterprise and the political system which we call democracy.

In America private enterprise and political democracy have developed and flourished side by side. They have contributed more to human welfare and human happiness than any previous system. The American people, therefore, want to preserve this system. They want it further strengthened and perfected so as to usher in a still greater future for our country. They know that no economic system can survive by remaining static. Times and conditions change, and our lives must change with them.

Our free-enterprise system has been subject to many improvements. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, we have enacted minimum-wage laws, we have reduced working hours, we have created unemployment compensation benefits, we have provided old-age benefits, we have guaranteed the right of collective bargaining for labor, we have corrected abuses in the security market and provided protection to investors. We have made it possible for millions of farmers to cooperate among themselves and with their Government in matters of land use, soil conservation, production, and prices. When these laws were first proposed they were attacked and it was charged that they would undermine our system. But after these laws were put in operation they were recognized as necessary to the strengthening of business enterprise, and today no one would dare to propose their repeal.

While we have been improving and strengthening our economic system of free enterprise throughout the years, we have as yet been unable to control the violent economic fluctuations which have resulted in periodic mass unemployment.

During the nineteenth century we had the western frontier, which acted as a safety valve in times of depression. Furthermore, it permitted constant expansion. We aided this expansion through the enactment of the Homestead Act, the Railroad Land Grant Act, and the mineral and mining laws, which threw open the public domain to exploitation and development. As early as 1816 we began to enact tariff laws deliberately designed to protect and foster business rather than for revenue. Through the pension system following the Civil War, we increased the capacity of our population to consume the newly developed riches and thereby, in turn, provided additional incentive for further expansion.

Expansion is the essence of our capitalist system. But today, when there is no longer any frontier in the geographical sense, we must think of strengthening our free competitive economy by expanding it from within. Today our new frontier is in our back yard in every State and city of the country. Today we must again attempt to foster economic expansion through wise laws, just as we did when we enacted the Homestead Act and the other measures which helped develop the West.

If, after the war, we fail to expand, America will once again be visited with another great depression. And another serious depression would mean millions of disillusioned and jobless men would have little interest in the maintenance of a system which offers so little in the way of good living conditions. It would give birth to strong political pressures against such a system.

There are some in this country who have lost faith in capitalism. It is up to us in the Congress to stop this trend. I have a stubborn and abiding faith in the principle of private competitive enterprise and in the necessity of making our system work. I have confidence that we can succeed in finding a way to eliminate its principal weakness—periodic mass unemployment.

The full employment bill which we are proposing here today is a bill to help make free enterprise work. For unless we make it work, unless we can make it operate so as to avoid the wild fluctuations that have characterized our economy in past years, capitalism will be threatened in America and throughout the world. Already, before the war, three of the largest nations in the world had abandoned it, and many other nations were preparing to emulate their action.

There are some today who dread lest America be converted to socialism, communism, fascism, or some other ism such as those that have taken root in other countries. I say to them—let us make our system of private competitive enterprise work so well here in America that other countries will seek to imitate us. Other nations follow our lead in technology—in mass production methods of making steel and of fabricating automobiles and airplanes. Why should we not progress to the point where they will imitate us in the field of economics also?

Why can we not take the lead in remedying the weaknesses that have developed in our capitalist system? Why can we not set an example here for all the peoples of the world by affording the fullest possible opportunity and encouragement for private initiative and ending chronic unemployment? Why can we not demonstrate to the world that it is possible to have the highest standard of living without abandoning our cherished political freedoms?

My colleagues, who have joined me in sponsoring this bill, the distinguished senior Senators from New York, Utah, and Wyoming, have to their credit some of the most valuable and constructive social and economic legislation on the statute books of the Nation. They have served their country well as chairmen of important committees of the United States Senate, and their broad understanding of economic and social problems is well recognized.

As chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, the senior Senator from Wyoming has made a historic study of the operations of the American economy. In the final report of the Temporary National Economic

Committee in March 1941 he made the following prophetic statement:

> The termination of the war effort, putting to an end, as it may very suddenly, the industrial activity now gaining tremendous momentum, will bring with it problems more critical and more fraught with danger than those which followed the collapse of 1929. Unless the democratic society of America shall have prepared in advance for this hour there will be no alternative except Government action, which will necessarily be as inconclusive as the action which has heretofore been taken. The unsolved problems of post-war depression will be heaped upon the unsolved problems of pre-war depression and it is difficult to say how, in these circumstances, democracy can survive unless democracy prepares for peace now.

The distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming concluded his statement by stressing the need of finding "a formula for stimulated production under the impetus of peace rather than war."

My colleagues and I believe that the full-employment bill provides a method of achieving the desired volume of peacetime production within the framework of our democratic political institutions and of our economy of free enterprise.

In the past we have made many attempts to grapple with the problem of unemployment. But we have lacked the essential weapons to deal with this problem effectively. We have never had a consistent and openly arrived at national policy on employment. We have never had a businesslike method of appraising the operations of our economy and our Government. We have never had a real understanding of the economic responsibilities of the President, as Chief of the executive branch, and of the Congress of the United States.

The proposed full-employment bill supplies us the three elements we have lacked in the past.

First. It establishes a national policy on the maintenance of employment opportunities.

Second. It creates a budgetary system to appraise the operations of both the national economy and the Government.

Third. It defines the economic responsibilities of the President and the Congress.

These three elements, when added together, provide the opportunity for full and wholehearted cooperation between industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments and the Federal Government—the cooperation which is essential to our hopes and plans for a stronger and better America.

I shall discuss each of these points briefly.

NATIONAL POLICY ON FULL EMPLOYMENT

The bill declares that it is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time home and family responsibilities. The bill recognizes that these Americans are entitled to opportunities for "useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment."

The right to a job does not mean guaranteeing John Jones a given job carrying a set salary and a definite social standing. It is not the aim of the bill to provide specific jobs for specific individuals. However, I believe nobody will deny that our economic system of free enterprise must offer opportunities for jobs for all who are able and want to work. Our American system owes no man a living but it does owe every man an opportunity to make a living. That is the proper interpretation of the "right to work."

Full employment is not a static condition. It depends upon changing national trends, population growth, changes in school age or retirement age, the number of persons serving in the armed forces, the number of hours worked, and similar factors which change the size of the labor force.

Furthermore, full employment does not mean that there should be at any given time no unemployment at all. Our economic system requires flexibility, which means that at all times a minimum amount of unemployment is unavoidable. Technological advances, the desire to shift to other work, seasonal changes in production, or other circumstances cause what is known among economists as short-run frictional unemployment. As conditions change, the volume of this relatively small amount of frictional unemployment will also change.

The responsibility of the Government with regard to full employment is clearly stated in the bill. I quote from the declaration of policy, as set forth in the bill:

> In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure.
>
> To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment.

This policy is in accord with the philosophy recently expressed by an outstanding political leader. I quote:

> Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise * * *
>
> If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours.

This statement was made in San Francisco on September 21, 1944, by the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

In the same speech, Governor Dewey emphasized the responsibility of government, in the following words:

> Yet, if there is one thing we are all agreed upon, it is that in the coming peacetime years we in this country must have jobs and opportunity for all. That is everybody's business. Therefore it is the business of government.

In this connection I should also like to quote from an editorial from a leading American business magazine, pointing out the Government's responsibility on employment so clearly that it has been imprinted upon my mind ever since. The editorial reads:

> Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that he does not know how to guarantee, without Government intervention, the markets with which alone his free competitive capitalism can function. Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that, if left to its own devices, business would sooner or later run headlong into another 1930.

This editorial appeared in the June 1938 issue of Fortune magazine, and I obtained unanimous consent to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during 1938.

A BUDGETARY SYSTEM

The bill sets up a national production and employment budget to help appraise the extent to which the total demand for goods and services is sufficient to assure the productive employment of those who are willing and able to work.

This national production and employment budget differs from the ordinary budget of the Federal Government in that it includes not only investment and expenditures by the Federal Government, but also investment and expenditures by all groups in the country: Consumers, business, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. The sum total of all these expenditures adds up to what the economists call the gross national product or the gross national income. This total expenditure for goods and services is the generally accepted measurement of our Nation's total economic activity.

When the aggregate volume of expenditures by consumers, business, State and local governments, and Federal Government is equivalent to the volume needed to guarantee full employment, this national production and employment budget is regarded as balanced. If there is a deficiency of total expenditures, the result will be unemployment.

The purpose of this new budgetary system is to provide a businesslike way of appraising:

(a) The number of jobs needed over a given period to provide full employment;

(b) The total of consumer-business-Government expenditures required to provide that number of jobs;

(c) The prospective volume of investment and other expenditures by consumers, business, and Government, including expenditures in our foreign trade;

(d) The fiscal or other programs required to encourage additional private employment, if necessary; and

(e) Whatever program of Federal investment and expenditure may be required as a last resort to make up the difference between the total required expenditures and the total that is likely to prevail without additional Federal investment and expenditures.

This procedure is not only businesslike and logical, but it is also conducive to drawing upon all segments of our economy for their maximum effort.

A FRAMEWORK OF RESPONSIBILITY

The responsibility of the President under the bill is to report to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, on the extent to which the economy is providing jobs for all. This report might be regarded as an essential part of the state of the Union message. If he finds that there is unemployment or that there is the danger of unemployment, he must transmit his program for assuring full employment through stimulating private enterprise and through necessary Government programs, together with recommendations for such additional legislation as he deems desirable.

Congressional responsibilities are also defined.

At the present moment, unfortunately, there is no single body within either House of the Congress which has the responsibility of considering in a comprehensive manner either:

First. The general contents—with respect to taxes, appropriations, and borrowings—of the regular Federal Budget; or

Second. The relationship between the regular Federal Budget and the national economy.

For example, both Houses of Congress have just received the President's proposed Budget for the coming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee will study the Budget's proposals for individual agencies. The Finance Committee will study the revenue aspects of the Budget message. But no committee will study the Budget message as a whole, or its relation to our national economy.

The full-employment bill sets up a joint committee to make a detailed study of the national production and employment budget transmitted to Congress by the President. This committee, called the Joint Committee on the Budget, is to be composed of 15 Members of each House, chosen in such a manner as to reflect the relative political strength of the major political parties.

By March 1, at the very latest, this committee would be expected to report to both Houses of Congress a joint resolution setting forth a general policy with respect to the National Budget for the next fiscal year.

Consideration of the joint resolution would mean an annual debate, in both Houses, on national economic policy. The resolution could then be amended in any manner that the majority of Congress might determine to be appropriate. As finally agreed to, it would serve as a general policy framework within which the individual committees of Congress could work on individual appropriation acts, revenue acts, and related measures.

These provisions go a long way toward restoring Congress to its rightful place as the policy-determining branch of the Government. And this is done in a way which provides for active interplay between the Congress and the Executive, a way which makes the two branches of the Government really coordinate. The bill avoids both the danger of delegating excessive power to the Executive, and the danger of involving Congress in administrative determinations.

I should like to point out that the bill aims at eliminating business uncertainty over the Government's fiscal policies. Business cannot plan effectively for full employment without knowing the Government's plans. This requires advance knowledge and open discussion of the Government's plans, and reasonable consistency and stability in the administration of the Government's program.

For example, revenue measures are often enacted only a few weeks before they are to become effective. This, I submit, does not give the businessman sufficient time to consider the Government's tax policy in relation to his own plans for future investment. Under this bill it would be easier for Congress to develop its fiscal policies in a unified manner, and to enact both revenue and appropriation measures before the beginning of each fiscal year.

TYPES OF NATIONAL BUDGET

The full employment bill recognizes that we live in a world of changing conditions and changing requirements in national economic policy. For that reason, it provides no fixed proportions of the National Budget to be supplied by consumers, business, or Government. In certain circumstances, Congress may find it desirable or necessary to provide:

First. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in consumers' expenditures; or

Second. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in the capital outlays of business; or

Third. A National Budget that emphasizes increases in Government expenditures.

Naturally there could be all degrees of difference between these three general types, as well as combinations of any types.

In other words, the Government's program could aim at balancing the national economy through measures to increase consumers' expenditures, through measures to increase capital outlays of business, through increased Government expenditures, or through a combination of those methods.

There are some who think that the major emphasis in our post-war economy must be upon Government expenditures. There are others who say that this means deficit financing, and that deficit financing would lead to a planned economy or to national bankruptcy. They, in turn, propose that the Government do everything in its power to give a green light to business and heighten the confidence of private investors so that the major emphasis in the post-war period would be upon increased capital outlays of private enterprise.

It is my own personal opinion—and I have stated this before on the floor of the Senate—that the royal road to prosperity is high wages, low prices, and a tax system that is unequivocally based upon the ability to pay and the encouragement to produce. It is my belief that in this way, with only moderate Government expenditures for desirable Government services, we could achieve a more equitable distribution of the national income. It is my conviction that this improved distribution of the national income would give us an unprecedented expansion in consumers' expenditures and a vigorous, though not excessive, expansion in the capital outlays of business.

But my personal opinion on how the national economy might best be balanced is not relevant to the question of how it would be balanced under this bill. The specific National Budget that would result in any given period would be determined, not by the operations of any one individual or any one group, but on the basis of that active interplay between all groups and all our political leaders which is the very essence of the democratic process in our democratic America.

NEED FOR ACTION

A few weeks ago, Dr. Gallup's interviewers went around the country asking people whether they thought that there would be enough jobs after the war. Sixty-eight percent thought that there would not be enough jobs. The younger people of the country were even more pessimistic than their elders; 73 percent of those between 20 and 30 years of age thought that the outlook was black.

What Senator would stand up and say that the people of this country are mistaken in their beliefs? Who is there who, on the basis of what has thus far been done in the field of post-war planning, would be willing to predict that there will be jobs for all after this war?

We all know that during the war we have transformed our economy into an economic skyscraper of breath-taking magnitude.

We all know that when war-production contracts are withdrawn, the danger will be that the entire edifice will topple over.

We all know that while the end of the war may bring with it 6 to 18 months of an inflationary boom, the long-term threat is a deflationary collapse.

Unless an economic substitute is found for war contracts, we face mass unemployment in this country of a magnitude which could easily surpass anything that was dreamed of during the last depression. Thus far, we have not found that substitute.

This country cannot afford again to go into a depression such as we experienced in the 1930's. It would be extremely dangerous to do so. Mass unemployment would mean discontent, disunity, and an irreparable loss to our Nation in terms of both physical wealth and moral well-being.

Still more appalling, an unemployment crisis in America would spread like wildfire throughout the world. It would give us dumping, higher tariffs, export subsidies, blocked currencies, and every other new and old type of economic warfare. And this, I submit, would inevitably wreck our plans for an effective international security organization, turn back the clock of progress, and plunge us into another holocaust of blood, suffering, and chaos.

We here in Congress have it in our power to take effective action now to reassure the people of America that mass unemployment shall not happen again.

We have it in our power to make full employment the cardinal principle in our domestic economic policy.

We have it in our power to make full employment in America the keystone of our economic relations with the other countries of the world.

BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

In principle, both of our major political parties are agreed that this must be provided.

In Chicago, on October 28, 1944, President Roosevelt stated that "every American, able to work and willing to work, has the right to a useful and remunerative job." To make this right effective he promised America 60,000,000 post-war jobs.

In Seattle, on September 18, 1944, Governor Dewey, the Republican nominee for President, made the following statement:

> We must have full employment. * * * Those who come home from the war and those who have produced for war—all our people—have earned a future with jobs for all.

The full-employment bill, I submit, provides the instrument whereby the political parties can make good on their common aspirations for post-war full employment.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE DEBATE

Of course, some Members of Congress may disagree with the sponsors of this bill. That is how it should be in a democracy. Sound legislation can be developed only by clarifying the differences between conflicting schools of thought. The sponsors of this bill, therefore, welcome criticism. We welcome debate on alternative methods of assuring post-war full employment.

But let it be constructive debate. Let it not be like the writings of some editorialists and columnists who, in their pontifical infallibility, have thrown up their hands in horror at the full-employment bill—and have then offered no constructive proposals of their own.

The United States Senate has been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. On this issue of full employment, at a time when democratic institutions are under attack in one country after another, the opportunity exists for the Members of the Senate during the Seventy-ninth Congress to demonstrate that we really are the greatest deliberative body in the world, and that we have the capacity to bring forth constructive legislation fully commensurate with the needs of our country.

I have faith in the Members of this body. I know that they will take advantage of this opportunity. I know that if any Senators arise to take issue with the principles set forth in the full-employment bill, they will realize that, as Members of this great deliberative body, and as influential leaders of public opinion, they are under obligation to offer alternative proposals of their own. If such proposals indicate the need for changes which are practical and realistic, they will undoubtedly win the support of this body.

Every two decades, for the past 100 years, we have been plagued by a boom and a major depression; and every decade has brought forth new explanations as to the causes of the business cycle and new remedies. But there is one fact upon which all are agreed, namely, that fear of a depression tends to lead us inevitably into a depression. When business, agriculture and labor fear unemployment, they make plans to adjust themselves to unemployment. When their daily actions are based upon such plans, then we are doomed to have unemployment.

Whatever program we adopt, therefore, let us act without delay.

Let us have courage and be decisive in our efforts. Let us not be swayed by fear of our inability to determine our own destiny.

Let us not wait until millions of men are walking the streets looking for work before we do something about post-war employment.

Let us act now, through the regular legislative processes as set forth in our Constitution, to provide our businessmen, our farmers, and workers, and, above all, our 11,000,000 soldiers and sailors, with confidence in the future of American enterprise and American democracy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the bill which the Senator introduces substantially the same as that which was printed in the New York Times 2 or 3 weeks ago?

Mr. MURRAY. No; it has been greatly improved as the result of constant study and contact with the experts of the Treasury Department and experts of the Federal Reserve Board and of various other Federal agencies.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator intend that the bill shall be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I shall ask that it go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I might say that if the bill is as I have understood it to be described its philosophy is so completely at variance with my whole idea of the American system that I made a brief address analyzing the bill on Thursday night, which was inserted by me in the RECORD today, and I hope that those who read the speech made by the Senator from Montana today will do me the favor of reading the speech which I made on the bill. I think we have here a fundamental difference. I agree fully with the Senator from Montana on the importance of the subject, but I believe very strongly that the remedy which he has suggested is absolutely dangerous and incorrect.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator from Montana if he has suggested that the bill which he has just introduced be referred also to the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning?

Mr. MURRAY. It is my intention, and I am now in the process of preparing a copy of the bill, with an explanation of it, and will ask consent to have it sent to the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that that committee has no power to report the bill. It could be referred to that committee for the information of the committee, of course, but not for the purpose of having a report submitted.

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to say that I am very happy the Senator has done that. As I understood him, he asked that the bill be referred to the legislative Committee on Banking and Currency. In view of the fact, however, that this measure deals with a fundamental policy of greatest importance, and in view of the further fact that the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is the head has been set up by the Senate to study post-war economic policy and planning, it is of the utmost importance, I think, that that committee should participate in the study. The cooperative action of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee with the legislative committee on matters of such far-reaching importance could not fail to be beneficial to all concerned. The Senator from Montana has, on numerous occasions, consulted me—and I feel grateful to him for so doing—with respect to the underlying plan of this bill. I feel that the study which can be given to it by these two committees cannot fail to be helpful.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER IN GOVERNMENT PLANTS—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from time to time the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and later the war program has made reports to the Senate, and particularly on occasions when it was apparent that some major problem was holding up the war effort. It will be recalled that the committee reported to this body on the necessity for complete conversion to the war program. We reported on the matter of the recruitment and training of personnel for the war effort. We reported to the Senate on the question of eliminating bottlenecks and material shortages. Now I wish to discuss with my colleagues of the Senate the apparent need today of the proper utilization of manpower in Government plants, the navy yards, and arsenals.

Our committee is making an investigation, as quickly and as widely as our personnel will permit, and today I wish to discuss particularly what the committee saw at a nearby navy yard.

It is my duty, Mr. President, to reveal to the Senate what I believe to be an alarming condition. A subcommittee of the war investigating committee last week visited the Norfolk Navy Yard. I might say we visited several other navy yards as well, and reports on them will be forthcoming shortly. What we learned in Norfolk is, I believe, disturbing and, I think, most significant.

The armed forces have long painted a gloomy picture of their civilian labor needs. Program after program on the "must" list is described as short of labor.

One such "must" is the ship-repair program. Norfolk Navy Yard, which both builds and repairs ships, employs over 38,000 people. It is said to be short more than 4,000 workers for essential programs. But in this yard the subcommittee found excess manpower, wasted labor, hoarded labor, and enforced loafing. We did not investigate the entire yard, but we checked several large shops employing thousands of people. We also went through several ships. Here is what we found: Each of the members of our subcommittee personally saw idleness and loafing on a big scale. Men stood and sat around in groups smoking and talking right on the decks of vital fighting ships. Their bosses were not to be seen. The men themselves think there are too many of them on the job. They say they are unable to do an honest day's work. They brought these complaints to us and brought them before our committee after they were sworn.

So many men are assigned to some jobs that they cannot even all squeeze into the place. Most of them stand around outside while a few work.

Men waste valuable time and materials making personal trinkets for their superiors. One man deferred as an essential worker spends most of his time on such work. Valuable hand-carved furniture is made in wartime for the use of the shop masters. Many weeks of labor were wasted on one table alone, which our committee saw. While we were in the yard, work was being done on an ornate checkerboard and on a special table for opening oysters.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I think it would be wise to permit the Members of the Senate to see the checkerboard and the table to which the Senator has referred, which I believe are available. The checkerboard was just one of many we traced down which were made by this one man, who is under 30, with no children, and who apparently devoted all his time for a while to making cigarette boxes from lucite, as well as hand-carved legs of tables for the masters' conference room. I wonder if the Senator would care to have that checkerboard brought into the Senate, to show the volume of work done on it, it being inlaid. Incidentally, it is made from Government material.

Mr. MEAD. I understand the checkerboard is available, and it will be called to the attention of the Senate a little later in the progress of this statement.

Mr. KILGORE. If the Senator will yield again, one other matter which impressed me was the fact that before going to Norfolk I had read in the newspapers of the coal shortage. My State being a coal-producing State, I made a tour of the employment offices in the State, in each of which I found a recruiter from the Norfolk Navy Yard taking experienced miners away from the mines and giving them priorities to go to the Norfolk Navy Yard. Of course, there were many other recruiters there. There were recruiters from Bethlehem Steel, Sparrows Point. They seemed to divide up, Bethlehem Steel, one also from Bethlehem-Fairfield, Hercules Powder, and Goodyear Rubber, recruiting workers from the mines, at a time when the mines in my State are only 75-percent manned, and the newspapers claim there is a fuel shortage. That was a matter which impressed me in connection with the question, why 4,000 additional men are needed for that yard. I think it is well that the Senate should know why that yard needs 4,000 additional men, taken largely from the coal mines of Virginia and West Virginia.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am pleased with the interjection, and I wish to say to Senators that the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, as they already know, is a diligent and hard-working member of our committee. He himself made a survey of the situation at the Norfolk Navy Yard, and I am sure we can agree with him that the recruitment of labor in the district of which he speaks for this particular operation is not in keeping with the over-all and appropriate plan of manpower mobilization.

Mr. KILGORE. I may interject that these recruiters, when they secure a man's consent to go to Norfolk Navy Yard, have automatically forced his release from the mine in which he is working by an enforced release.

Mr. MEAD. That is because they have a higher priority rating.

Mr. KILGORE. It is because they have a higher priority on manpower.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the oyster table I spoke of was intended for use for one oyster feast that was to be attended by the shop masters.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator how many shop masters there are.

Mr. MEAD. It is my understanding that there is one master mechanic to every shop, and there is a small number of shops.

Mr. KILGORE. Not over 25?

Mr. MEAD. Not over 25.

Mr. KILGORE. So it was not a general morale idea for the whole yard but simply for 25 or 26 men?

Mr. MEAD. Only for the masters.

Erection of an elaborate Christmas tree and a model village with elaborate lighting took many days' work. All this work was directed to be done by supervisors.

Men are told to stretch out jobs and to appear to be working.

When investigators go through the men are warned in advance to look busy. They must put work into machines even if they merely ruin metals. A few minutes before the investigators actually appear, another warning is given by a "Paul Revere" who tears through the shop just ahead of the investigators.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Were the supervisors civilians or naval officers?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts asked that question. The supervisors are for the most part civil-service workers. There are, however, officers of the Navy in charge of these shops, but the immediate supervision, I would say, is by civil-service employees.

Mr. WALSH. So that in order to dismiss or discharge any supervisor who was found not to be performing his duty efficiently, charges would have to be preferred against him and evidence presented?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me so that I may make answer to that question?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. The apparent situation, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts is that naval officers come and naval officers go, but the master mechanics and the supervisors remain forever, and I think the Senator from New York will remember that we could not find a single job order actually signed by a naval officer. All of them were signed by the master mechanics. I do not know whether they can sign an order for building a battleship, but they can certainly sign orders for anything smaller than that apparently, and they stay on the job while the officers are being constantly transferred back and forth.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the navy yards operate somewhat differently from the Army arsenals; that in the navy yards the master mechanics or the foremen are, as in private industry, responsible for the job and for the work; that the Navy officers are simply inspectors and have nothing to do with respect to the men, but see that the work is done, that the material complies with specifications, and that the job is satisfactorily completed. I have had complaints made to me by the master mechanics or by the foremen at the arsenal at Springfield, Mass., that the Army officers interfere with the master mechanics, by saying, "You are not doing this right" or "You ought to do it differently." Protests have been lodged with some Members of the House and with me against that system prevailing in Army arsenals. The statement is made that a foreman and a superintendent ought to be allowed to do the job, and that a transient Army officer or Navy officer who comes and goes every 2 or 3 years, should not tell the foremen and the superintendent how to perform their work.

As I understand the situation at Norfolk, the whole operation is under foremen or master mechanics who are under civil service, and the naval officers are supervisors only to the extent of seeing that the job is done; they do not interfere with the men, or say that a certain man is doing his job satisfactorily or is not doing it satisfactorily, or does not attend to his employment, and should be dismissed. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. MEAD. I think as a whole that statement is correct; and, further than that, the selection of men for promotion is originated in the civilian supervisory set-up.

Mr. WALSH. Which is also under civil service.

Mr. MEAD. Which is also under civil service. There is an over-all supervision by naval officers, but as pointed out by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], it is not so direct and so constant as is the supervision of the civil-service employees.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. On that point I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that this is the weakness: The commissioned officers are actually responsible and accountable fiscally and otherwise for everything that goes on, but the actual control is vested in individuals who have no financial responsiblity to the Government. In other words, the responsibility and accountability do not go with the actual bosses, but go with the commissioned personnel, who are rather isolated, and if anything goes wrong the naval officers will be blamed. The master goes scot free because of regulations which prescribe that only a commissioned officer can be responsible to the Government for money and material expended on the job.

Mr. MEAD. There is an apparent need for a revision or refinement of this supervisory system so that the Navy Department, through its regular selected and appointed officers, may have a larger share in the actual operation of the plant.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. May I inquire if the committee fixed the blame for this system, which I understood the Senator to say was——

Mr. MEAD. This dual supervisory system?

Mr. WALSH. No; of word being passed around that an inspector is coming, and for the men to get on the job? I think the Senator characterized someone as a "Paul Revere" who went around through the factory.

Mr. MEAD. That is the sworn testimony of a number of employees who appeared before our committee, and we heard about it in other instances. The instance referred to is simply one.

Mr. WALSH. On whom did the committee fix the blame for it?

Mr. MEAD. On the supervisors.

Mr. WALSH. Did the committee find the names of the men or officers so that the Navy Department or some authority could present charges against them? Or did the committee find involved naval officers who ought to be removed for being negligent in the performance of their duty?

Mr. MEAD. We have not presented a finished report. This is simply a statement made to the Senate concerning what we found on this particular visit. Our committee is continuing the investigation, and we may proceed to the point where we may find disciplinary action should be taken. We have not arrived at that point as yet.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the committee will make recommendations, and I hope the committee will name naval officers or civilians who are responsible, and that such naval officers will be court-martialed, and that civilians who are found negligent will be dismissed from the service. The committee can render splendid service by helping the Navy Department to detect this underground system of wasting time and wasting property and not properly performing work. Of course, the system should be traced up as high as it can be traced, in order to find out where the blame is higher up.

Mr. MEAD. I have already said that we have had the cooperation of labor, and we expect the cooperation of management and of the Navy Department, and we have reason to believe we will have such cooperation, because in its own report made on this particular navy yard its recommendations, in some measure at least, square with ours. The Department indicates in its report that there is wasted labor and hoarded labor there, and that there should be better utilization of labor.

Mr. WALSH. That is a report made a year ago when the Navy Department called in some civilian outsiders to make an investigation?

Mr. MEAD. No; there is a later report, made by an industrial set-up which has been created in the Navy for this very purpose. I think Admiral Fisher is in charge.

Mr. WALSH. They are not naval officers, but are supposed to be efficient leaders of industry?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. They are industrial engineers.

Mr. WALSH. While I am on my feet, I should like to make another suggestion. The subject of employees at our navy yards is very important, and the situation is very serious, as the Senator probably ascertained. Is it not a fact that at the navy yard at Norfolk, where there were 40,000 employees, 20,000 of them were assigned by the Labor Board or the Civil Service Commission as new employees during the past year?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. And 26,000 employees were dropped from the service, leaving a net loss of 6,000.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the turn-over very extensive, not only at that navy yard, but at all other navy yards?

Mr. MEAD. That is my understanding.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator's committee expect to link up that fact with the need for some manpower legislation?

Mr. MEAD. Yes. I believe that a good deal of the trouble resulted from relaxation due to predictions that the war would soon be over, and also because of War Production Board orders which launched a great many new civilian programs. The turn-over which occurred, not only in navy yards but at other plants throughout the country, resulted from those orders. There was an attempt on the part of the individual worker to find peacetime occupation which would be more permanent. However, that trend has been stopped. Only this morning I was informed that since the work-or-fight order was issued, more than 2,000 persons have applied for work at the gate of the Norfolk Navy Yard.

Mr. WALSH. Were any of the supervisers or superintendents informed of these things?

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH. What defense did they make?

Mr. MEAD. A very inadequate defense. We went as high as the master.

Mr. WALSH. He is a civilian, is he not?

Mr. MEAD. He is a civilian.

Mr. WALSH. Did it appear to the Senator that there was an implied league for loafing or inefficiency, which extended from the masters down, or from labor up to the masters?

Mr. MEAD. No. For the most part, the higher we went among the supervisory personnel, the more they tried to cover up the situation, and to indicate that it was not true, that we actually did not see it. But the further down we went along the line, the more willing the workers were to agree that it was there.

Mr. WALSH. Was the investigating all done by members of the Senator's committee, or was some of it done by members of the committee staff or other personnel?

Mr. MEAD. We had an expert from the War Manpower Commission make a survey, and then our committee went down there with several agents. While we were there, we divided into subcommittees and went in all directions, so that we would not be going in a single direction, with opportunity for everyone to know of our coming before we got there.

Mr. WALSH. Before I take my seat, let me say, that as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I welcome the the activities of the Senator's committee along the lines which he has described. I wish to cooperate in every way and to do everything possible to see that inefficiency or violation of the regulations of the Navy is stopped. If any new regulations should be put into force, I wish to assure the Senator of my hearty cooperation. I believe that it is a wise thing on the part of the Congress to have such an investigation, conducted by an independent committee, and not by the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, or the Committee on Commerce, so that there can be no suspicion or suggestion that members of the committee might be influenced or prejudiced with respect to one particular department.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the Senator's offer of cooperation. I know that it will be forthcoming willingly, and that it will be very constructive. I assure my distinguished colleague that our work will be brought to his attention, so that it may be helpful to his committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In connection with the question of management, did we not

also learn from the testimony that the Bureau of Ships had control of one line of work, and the Bureau of Yards and Docks had control over another line of work, and that the line of demarcation between them was not clear?

Mr. MEAD. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. When we follow the chain of authority through to the management, we find areas in which the authority of one bureau or the other is not clear.

I greatly appreciate the interest of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in this matter. I believe that this investigation is very vital in connection with the manpower question.

Mr. WALSH. Complaints of a somewhat similar nature have reached me from other navy yards, and also from arsenals. I am disturbed over the fact that there seems to be a lack of that spirit which we expect in time of war from the personnel employed in these great and important agencies of the Government. I do not believe that the situation which has been described is general. I should dislike to think that American workingmen would knowingly participate in any program or effort to loaf on the job. However, if such a condition exists, we should find it out and correct it.

Mr. MEAD. Let me say for the record that, so far as employees in the Norfolk Navy Yard were concerned, when they were assured that they were afforded protection, they very willingly came before our committee and pleaded with us for a more orderly system whereby they could do a real day's work. We have the cooperation of labor, and I am sure we shall have the cooperation of the high naval officials.

Mr. President, as I have previously stated, men were told to stretch out jobs, and appear to be working. Our committee did not receive the customary treatment provided by the "Paul Reveres" on this trip, because we appeared on short notice.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The statement which the Senator has just made is very important. If men were told to stretch out their jobs, who was responsible for such instructions? Let us get our hands on him. If such a situation exists, those responsible for it are indirectly committing sabotage. If anyone is saying "Let us make this job last," we ought to ascertain his name. I hope the committee will do so.

Mr. MEAD. We have the names. They are in the record, in the sworn testimony of witnesses who were told to stretch out the job. This condition exists at a navy yard which has been asking for 4,400 additional workers. The Navy's record was made available to our committee, and this information is taken from the record. There was a report by the Navy's own industrial Survey Board, which operates from the Office of the Secretary of the Navy. From this report the Navy has found that there was poor utilization in the yard. The report concluded that the yard's work could be done with substantially fewer employees, at a time when it was asking for 4,400 additional men. This report was filed with the Department last December. Despite this report, already this month the yard has recruited 2,000 new workers who flocked to its gates in voluntary response to the present recruiting drive.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it contemplated that the Senator from New York and his committee will investigate other navy yards?

Mr. MEAD. We have visited two, and we now have an investigation in progress on another one. We are not neglecting any of them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The reason I ask that question is that as Governor of South Carolina various complaints came to me along the same line as those which the Senator has reported. It was stated that thousands of employees reported daily for work, and did nothing all day long. The employees themselves came to see me, and wanted to know what could be done. They wanted to help their Government in time of war, instead of being on the job without rendering service to their Nation.

Mr. MEAD. That is the very story which we received at Norfolk. The men want to work.

Mr. President, we have no reason to believe that the persons in charge of the Norfolk Navy Yard are any less able than those in charge of other navy yards or war plants. In fact, we are informed that the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, in comparison with that of some other navy yards, is considered excellent. That yard has built and repaired many great ships.

Mr. WALSH. Their record in the production line is excellent.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. They have built and repaired many great ships, but they are wasting labor.

As I previously stated, to a large degree the supervision is that of the civil service, with the complicated naval organization on top of that. In that connection, the contribution made by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was a good one, because, as it was explained to us, there are several bureaus in Washington, each of which has a part in the operations of the navy yards in the field.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator mentioned the question of civil service. Is it not a fact that we found that one of the things which ought to be cleared up is that the rating and the amount of pay are determined by the number of employees under a given manager? Even according to the report from the Navy Department itself, that condition causes "feather bedding" and the keeping of men on the pay roll, because if they are dismissed, the number under the supervision of a given manager or supervisor will be smaller, and therefore he will receive less pay.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did we not find that to be a fact there?

Mr. MEAD. That was testified to, and it was apparent; because where there are a certain number of men there will be a certain number of supervisors. The supervisors begin with the snapperman. He is the lowest in rank in the supervisor group. Above him is the leaderman. Above him is the quarterman, and above him is the superquarterman. Above him is the master man. When the number of employees decrease, both the number and the rate of pay of the personnel diminish.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. That is true of all the navy yards; is it not?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, the situation arises more as a result of the general system than because of any particular mismanagement at the Norfolk Navy Yard; is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. I wish to make that plain. The condition arises because of the system which is generally followed.

Mr. President, the committee has received information which leads it to believe that manpower is being inefficiently utilized in a great many war plants. That is natural, but it must be stopped. It is natural because prior to the war these plants were efficiently operated. The plants were sufficiently large, and they had the correct number of employees, and the employees were well trained. Then the emergency caused a rapid increase of personnel and machinery, and the recruitment of personnel became more and more difficult as we began to absorb the labor load in its entirety. As a result, many plants are overmanned. It is claimed that they are overmanned simply because they are not able to obtain the trained workers they used to get and because they have training programs and because they have to meet selective-service demands. Therefore, this is the time, all over the country, when a labor utilization program must be instituted.

In that connection, let me say that the War Manpower Commission is not allowed in certain plants. It is feared that it will provoke strikes or that it will create a chaotic condition. But in my opinion, the War Manpower Commission should have the power to go into any plant which has a war contract or into any Government plant and conduct a war-utilization survey.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in connection with the statement of the Senator concerning the increase of personnel, let me say that the Norfolk Navy Yard had 5,000 employees some years ago, but today it has 40,000 employees.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator that the system calls for great numbers of workers.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, let me repeat that, probably before the Senator entered the Chamber, I said that the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, by comparison, is considered excellent.

Mr. BYRD. But there is no doubt that the system does utilize a great deal of manpower.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the question of the ability of the War Manpower Commission to go into various shipbuilding plants and to study their programs, has it not been true until very recently that the War Manpower Commission has not been allowed to make a survey?

Mr. MEAD. That is my information.

Mr. FERGUSON. Now that situation has been changed?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the War Manpower Commission must obtain the consent of the particular management concerned.

Mr. MEAD. That is our information.

Mr. President, at one other navy yard at which we made a preliminary visit, we were informed that only 30 percent of the potential work of much of the common labor is actually realized under present conditions, and that in many instances the production of skilled workers is not very much better. When we asked about that we were told that it is due to the fact that we are now reaching——

Mr. WALSH. The bottom of the barrel.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct; that is a very good statement of the situation now existing, namely, we are reaching the bottom of the labor barrel. We were informed that we not only need recruitment programs and training programs, but, above all, we need a scientific, expert survey of the situation by the War Manpower Commission. It must be given added authority in order to do a good job.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am sorry I entered the Chamber after the Senator began his remarks, and that I failed to hear a considerable part of his statement; but I assume he has been talking about the situation existing in the various navy yards.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Has the Senator been discussing the general situation in regard to the supply of manpower, its potentialities, and its reserves?

Mr. MEAD. No; I was discussing the situation at the Norfolk navy yard; and I have said that, by comparison, based on Navy figures, that yard's record is considered excellent.

We are making a survey of other navy yards, let me say to my distinguished colleague, but we are not as yet ready to discuss them.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. We intend to continue our investigation in other plants until this situation is corrected.

In this work we have utilized, and will continue to utilize, the services of an expert made available to us by the War Manpower Commission. This expert has been invaluable to our committee.

As I have said before, we have enjoyed the cooperation of labor. We expect the same cooperation from management.

We have arrived at a stage in our war-production picture where manpower utilization must be the prime objective. As the war has progressed we have encountered many obstacles. In every period of our production effort we have had to concentrate primarily on one of these obstacles, although continuing to work strenuously on the others. Our first problems concerned the acquisition of raw materials, the construction of plants, the conversion of peacetime industry into a wartime economy, and the building of new machines and tools. But now our first problem is the utilization of labor.

Throughout the last 4 years we have continuously striven to find manpower for the armed forces without disrupting the production of munitions and other essential articles. During this time much thought and effort have been devoted to the problems of manpower utilization. But today we have come to the point where the most urgent and largest task which remains to be done is properly to mobilize the human forces, the manpower resources of this Nation for the waging of all-out war. The key to this problem lies in the efficient utilization of the abilities of each individual.

Mr. President, we have gone far and have accomplished much in the prosecution of this war. We have the best trained Army this country has ever known. We have accomplished a miracle of production. We produce 100,000 planes and 20,000,000 tons of shipping a year. In order to exceed these goals and to go on to even greater records we must improve the efficiency of our labor force.

The armed forces have asked for a National Service Act. This, we understand, is a direct result of increased manpower needs developed in the last few months. The Army says it needs more soldiers. To equip them, and to keep pace with the furious tempo of the war, more production is required, and for it more workers.

Less than 2 months ago, the picture, though grim, was more promising. General Somervell, Mr. Hay, and Mr. Krug testified before our committee last December that they expected to pull through without asking for any new laws. At that time about 40 percent of war programs were behind schedule. Manpower shortages were responsible for 22 percent of the trouble, according to Mr. Krug.

Much has been accomplished since then. Labor recruitment for all "must" programs proceeded satisfactorily until the holiday season, when, as must have been expected, it slumped badly. Throughout January, voluntary labor recruitment has been excellent.

Mr. President, one of the officers at the Norfolk Navy Yard told us that they now have very little difficulty in recruiting at the gate. More than 2,000 persons have applied for work there in recent weeks. That is the first time that has happened in a long period of time.

The American people have shown their willingness to respond voluntarily whenever the facts have been made clear to them, and we expect to help make them clear. Our committee has frequently pointed out the need to give the people the facts. Too often the people have been scolded for acting on optimistic news put out by military or other Government authorities. If the military situation requires a greater effort on the part of those at home, they will respond; but they should be told the facts.

Just a few months ago the Prime Minister of Great Britain and General Eisenhower were telling us that the war would soon be over or that we could expect that it would soon be over. We all shared in the resultant feeling of buoyancy. Naturally, some persons relaxed their efforts under those circumstances.

Now some persons are confused. The news columns of the press print rosy reports, but the very same newspapers recently have carried statements that they are not being allowed to print the real facts. Give the people the facts, tell them clearly what to do, and they will do it.

Recent newspaper reports state that 243 nurses were enlisted in New York City alone within a few days after the call for more nurses went out, and that over 4,000 of the 20,000 who are required volunteered in the first week.

Employment officials state that today they are being flooded with applicants. In part, this is due to the pressure which is being brought to bear on IV–F's, and in part it is due to a realization on the part of the people that we are in a real fight, perhaps just getting into the real battle.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I am really very much surprised to hear the statement which the Senator has just made. I do not doubt that the Senator has been informed employment offices are being flooded with requests for employment. I cannot take up a newspaper without reading in it requests by various industries in my State for more employees. I know that in one small manufacturing town, having a few industries, every night an advertisement appears in the newspaper, covering from an eighth to a quarter of a page, appealing for employees in every one of the small industries in that town. All the Boston newspapers contain similar requests. I am surprised to hear the statement that employment offices are crowded with applicants for employment.

Mr. MEAD. That is the report which we have received from some of the employment offices which we contacted, as well as from the War Manpower Commission. A statement was made to us by the officer in charge of production at the Norfolk Navy Yard to the effect that 2,000 applicants had been recruited for work in the past 2 weeks since the call went out.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that at the Norfolk Navy Yard during the month of January there was a complete reversal of the former experience there with respect to obtaining employees.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. The naval officer said that for some unexpected reason there had been an increase in the number of applicants for employment as compared with the past year.

Mr. MEAD. We are beginning to understand that that situation is now fairly general in the various war plants.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I may state that in Boston and other New England areas during the evening hours from 6 o'clock to midnight every radio program is interrupted four or five times by a radio announcer calling for help in behalf of various industries.

Mr. MEAD. I have in my possession a number of letters which I think will be illuminating on that subject.

It may be that we need some form of legislation to keep war workers on their jobs. It seems most unlikely that this would take the form of an all-over regimentation of 100,000,000 Americans. This task may prove so complicated and so cumbersome that it could only add to our troubles.

The inefficiencies which mark the administration of the few existing regulations would multiply and thrive in a completely regimented system. No existing agency could do the job. Certainly the armed forces have failed to demonstrate sufficient capacity to deal with such nonmilitary matters. Full national service at this stage of the war, with the present inefficiencies in utilization, would result only in chaos, because if the employers already have more workers than are needed, and they are given additional workers there will be an additional utilization job on their hands.

There may be a need for specific types of legislation to accomplish specific results. Such measures might include provisions to keep IV–F's in war work, to eliminate turn-over by freezing at least some workers in their jobs, and to prevent people from loafing or taking jobs in nonessential industry at times when, and in places where, there are jobs open in war industries. Such legislation with real teeth may well be needed.

But before we can intelligently vote for or against any such legislation, we must have more facts. We must know the real military situation. We must be told the full production situation. We must know what has been done to make war production more effective. We must know exactly how such legislation would be enforced.

From the information which our committee has been able to gather so far, one thing is clearly apparent. If we need further manpower controls, we certainly need additional production controls.

The manpower which is forced to work in our plants must be used efficiently. Labor and industry must take more effective steps to do this. Government must insist on this result, and Government must help to achieve it.

A manpower draft of any kind means hardship, and impairment of the civilian economy upon which the prosecution of the war and the future of our Nation depend. These sacrifices which would be involved—and they may not be small sacrifices—must be made if they are needed. No matter how great they are, they are nothing when compared to the sacrifices of the men who are shedding their blood for us. Any sacrifice here at home is worth while if there is even a chance of its helping to shorten the war. But the result would be worse than useless if, instead of doing good, such inroads into the home economy should result in a net loss.

There are still some instances of labor and management being reluctant to give us practices which interfere with efficient production. Production delays, resulting from hard and fast boundaries between crafts, are still a major cause of delay. Carpenters have to wait for electricians. Electricians have to wait for toolmakers, and so on, with the result that each craft spends a substantial amount of its time waiting to get to work. In the meantime, the Nation must wait for war production. Management also, in a great many instances, has shown a reluctance to reengineer jobs, to increase efficiency, and to make changes which would increase production.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What does the Senator mean by a re-engineering job?

Mr. MEAD. A re-engineering job would mean that in the light of new demands and new practices the work could be arranged so as to be done more efficiently.

Mr. President, a plant manager will not rack his brains to put in an efficient system if he can merely call for and obtain additional workers whenever he wants them.

The workers, some of whom have a tendency to loaf on the job as it is, will be much more likely to do so if they are working under compulsion.

In other words, the existing condition will not be eliminated. It will become worse. We want to diminish the demand for labor by proper utilization. That, in my judgment, will be done only with the approval and support of labor itself.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a fact that because of voluntary retirement and dismissals, a very considerable turn-over takes place, which results in a deficiency?

Mr. MEAD. What the Senator has said is true to some extent with respect to dismissals, and is also true to some extent with respect to retirement, but I should not say that the turn-over due to those causes is large.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator know what the rate of turn-over has been?

Mr. MEAD. It has been large as applied to the IV–F's.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. It is said that the situation has been stabilized to a considerable extent. When the Nation was given to understand that we were well on our way to victory and we felt that it would not be long before workers could return to civilian occupations, there was a great turn-over of employment. The turnover took place because men felt that they could provide better for their future by securing a position in a permanent industry.

Mr. BREWSTER. So the Senator feels that the more critical phase of the war which has recently taken place has helped to improve the situation?

Mr. MEAD. It has.

Mr. BREWSTER. When the situation with respect to the war improves—as we certainly hope it will—will there not be a tendency for the difficulty to recur unless we provide for some form of stabilizing employment?

Mr. MEAD. I trust that it will not recur.

Mr. BREWSTER. If a man is not required to remain in a war job, why should he remain in it and sacrifice his future after the return of peace?

Mr. MEAD. Some control can be exercised by the W. P. B. in authorizing civilian activities to increase, as was done a year ago.

Mr. BREWSTER. Those controls proved utterly inadequate through 4 pessimistic months last summer, as the Senator well recalls.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is there not a very great likelihood that that situation will recur when the war situation improves, as we hope it will within the next few months?

Mr. MEAD. There is such a possibility; and we should guard against it as a result of the experiences of the past. I think the idea is a very excellent one to be put into the RECORD.

Mr. President, we have learned through sad experience that placing more men in a plant will not necessarily mean more production.

Surveys conducted by the War Manpower Commission show that idle labor can be eliminated in war plants. This is accomplished by vigorous action. When successful it usually results in a corresponding increase in production. This has been done in many cases.

In one shipyard alone which this committee has investigated, total employment was reduced about 10,000 in the last year, while the yard's productivity remained equal to what it had been with the swollen labor force. This was a result of a desire on the part of the management and the Maritime Commission to improve performance. Without incentives to do the job efficiently, management must be expected to try to accomplish its ends by using excess labor.

The war contract set-up has not helped this situation. The cost-plus contract not only provided no incentive to keep pay rolls down but actually paid dividends for hoarding labor, because if the contract were terminated before completion, the amount of fee paid depended on the proportion of the job which was finished. Any work completed as a result of hiring excess labor benefited the contractor. The cost was all the Government's.

When we adopted the system of fixed-price contracts, we accomplished little to correct this situation. In the first place, the prices were based on cost experience acquired under the cost-plus-fixed-fee

system. As a result, the price allows the accumulation of excess labor. Secondly, there is no incentive to cut costs by reducing the amount of labor, because profits realized in that way would be absorbed by renegotiation or taxes.

The last year has seen substantially increased efficiency in war plants. The Manpower Commission surveyed one shipbuilding company, which in August of 1944 said it needed 17,000 additional workers. When the job was finished in October, the needs had been reduced to 1,000. At the same time production jumped from five and seven-tenths to seven ships a month.

But the Manpower Commission has not really been permitted to do a job. It lacks the power to go into many plants. In the shipbuilding industry it is permitted to make its surveys only if the plant management agrees. Too often management says that a survey would disrupt production.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, is that true about the navy yards and arsenals?

Mr. MEAD. No; I cannot say it is. I think as a rule the navy yards cooperate very well.

Mr. WALSH. Why has not the War Manpower Commission made some recommendation with regard to these matters?

Mr. MEAD. I believe, in justice to them, I should say that they have mentioned this to our committee. Until November they were all pretty sure that they were up to schedule, but in December the scheduling was so impoverished and the supply of workers so reduced by demands which were not foreseen that immediately a conference was held; all the agencies got together and agreed among themselves that, with certain controls and certain cooperation, they could meet the emergency without legislation. So, in December, the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, General Somervell and his associates, and several other agencies, came before our committee and told us that they were able then to take care of the situation. But additional demands have been made since the beginning of the year, and they now need, I believe, some added controls unless the workers are forthcoming.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator stated a few moments ago—and his statement was true—that the optimistic reports or statements made by high officials about the termination of the war in Europe led to a movement of employees from one industry to another so as to obtain permanent positions in life. It seems to me the time has come for somebody in high position to say that the ending of the war in Europe does not mean the disbandment of the Navy and the Army. The information most of us are able to get is that the war against Japan may last from 2 to 4 years, and that the end of the European war will simply mean the transfer of the Army and Navy and the entire war effort into the Pacific Ocean area. If that is known it ought to end the belief which is prevalent that as soon as the European fight is over the war itself is practically over.

Mr. MEAD. That is a valuable contribution, and I appreciate it.

This committee has heard the story before. We risked disrupting production about a year ago when we made our own survey of one of the largest airplane plants. That plant's labor shortage of over 10,000 workers proved wholly fictitious once the people on the job really got to work. And in most instances the workers prefer to do a good job.

The War Manpower Commission must be empowered to do plant surveys wherever they are needed. It must be staffed to accomplish this job. It must be permitted full access to records and to books. It must be able to question witnesses under oath. It must have power to force action on its findings. It must have this power now. Management and labor must cooperate to get this done. There are too many inefficient plants where workers anxious to work are not given enough to keep them busy.

Malutilization of labor is not all that is wrong. In our last report to the Senate this committee pointed out some of the slack practices in our procurement system which result in waste of manpower. We called attention to poor overall planning, to overbuying, to duplication of procurement, to wasted transportation, to inefficient storaging, to poor inventory control, and to other wasteful practices. It is up to the armed forces and the other procurement agencies to eliminate these conditions.

I will say for the armed forces that they are doing a remarkable job, taking it by percentages, but now when we are scraping the barrel it is up to them to refine their work so that none of these inefficiencies will remain if it is possible to eliminate them.

An excellent example of what can be done is the solution of the serious bottleneck problem in foundries. This problem was solved in the case of the heavy tire industry some 6 or 8 months ago, although there is now an apparent need for additional personnel there. The foundries have raised some of the most troublesome of our production problems. Thousands of men were said to be required to cure the situation. Meanwhile vital war programs were held up for lack of castings. The dilemma was solved by rescheduling the work in the foundries in order to put first things first. That was done by the Army. As a result, the foundry situation is now largely corrected. Throwing labor into the plants is not the answer to all the problems. Management and government must do their share, too.

Labor efficiency also was increased in the foundries as a result of a survey by the War Manpower Commission which resulted in the productivity of individual foundries being increased by as much as 53 percent. The results of this survey are just beginning to become apparent. It is interesting to note that one plant which did not cooperate made one of the worst records. Complete cooperation with the War Manpower Commission in such surveys is essential today. Where such cooperation prevails there is always increased efficiency.

We must also find ways to use perfectly good labor which is available. The committee is informed that at least 20,000 workers who had previously worked in war plants are now idle in Detroit. We are advised that thousands of Negroes, including skilled workers, are unable to obtain war work in many parts of the country.

There is still unemployment in many communities despite the urgent need for workers elsewhere.

The procurement agencies are now hastening to award new contracts in the areas which have most workers available, and that will be very helpful; but the present situation is not helped by the fact that in the last few months contracts have been allowed to expire in places where workers were available while more work was piled into the critical labor areas. Both shipbuilding and munitions contracts were placed in critical west coast areas, while in other sections plants with labor available were passed by.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. How are we going to remedy that situation? The argument the Senator is making is one which leads to what he and I are, I believe, both opposed, namely, the drafting of labor. Yet the facts which the Senator presents almost raise in the mind the necessity of it. Is there any other method of handling the problem where there is a shortage of labor in one place and a superabundance of it in another?

Mr. MEAD. We have been assured that withdrawing contracts where labor is available, and increasing contracts in areas where labor is not available, will be eliminated so far as possible. That has not been eliminated, but excellent control is already in the hands of the proper procurement agencies. They can, in a survey of the field, place contracts where there is available labor, and they can discontinue withdrawing contracts where there is labor available. They have excellent controls if they cooperate, one agency with another, and do a good, over-all job with the power they have.

Mr. WALSH. Who could give us information today, or in the next day or two, as to the areas in which there is a surplus of labor, and in what areas there is a shortage? Is there some authority that could give us the information?

Mr. MEAD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH. Who is it?

Mr. MEAD. I imagine the information could be secured from the War Manpower Commission, and from certain branches of the War Production Board.

Mr. WALSH. What, if anything, is being done to level out that uneven surface?

Mr. MEAD. We are told contracts are now being placed where there is labor available, and are being withdrawn where there is a shortage of labor.

Mr. WALSH. That would help.

Mr. MEAD. For instance, some time ago there were cut-backs in the airplane industry. Some time ago there was a severe cut-back in aluminum production, and a number of plants were closed. In some cases aluminum plants, which were the main sources of employment in the

communities, were closed, and no conversion of the aluminum plants was ordered, with the result that there was quite a surplus of labor available.

Mr. WALSH. I assume the Senator feels as I do at present, antagonistic to our reaching the point where we would have to draft labor, and I feel very strongly we should have accurate figures as to the extent to which there is a surplus of labor in the market, exactly what the needs are, and how important all those factors are to the war effort.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield so that I may say something on the point raised by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I think a prize illustration of the point in question was the Corsair contract of the Navy, which was divided among three plants—namely, Chance Vought who were the designers of the Corsair, and of course did the engineering work; Goodyear, in Akron, and Brewster, of Long Island and southern Pennsylvania. When it became necessary to cut back the Corsair contract, as it was cut back, Goodyear was in a critical labor area, where the tire plants were crying for more workers. It was also in a Government-owned plant. So that Goodyear would not be hurt financially by the cut-back. Brewster was a privately owned concern in a noncritical area. Unfortunately, Brewster was shut down, and Goodyear permitted to go ahead at the same time when labor could not be found for the tire plants.

Another point which I think may be of interest is the conflict which possibly, I fear, civil-service rules may contribute to the troubles in the Norfolk Navy Yard. The Navy, I think with the proper idea, went into its navy yards, like that at Norfolk, and subcontracted from the congested area into smaller plants great quantities of work, but unfortunately the personnel of the navy yard was not cut commensurately at the time. They still held it, and I greatly fear it was due to the fact that civil-service ratings for supervisors are based upon number of employees on the job. In other words, a man's rating all too frequently was based on the number of men who worked under him, and naturally a supervisor did not want to have the personnel cut down, because that would mean he would have to take a cut in pay.

Mr. WALSH. The making of the regulations is a result of the recommendations of the workmen themselves.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. These recommendations are largely the result of pressure of the labor organizations in groups in these yards upon the Army and Navy to enforce the standards they have set up.

Mr. KILGORE. These yards are not organized, so far as unions are concerned.

Mr. WALSH. They have their own unions, their own organizations.

Mr. KILGORE. No; it is not a labor-organization matter at all. Approximately 60 percent of the men in the yard, we were informed, belonged to the union, and 40 percent did not belong to it.

Mr. WALSH. That is, at Norfolk?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; so it is not a labor-union situation.

Mr. WALSH. Delegations come to me from labor unions in Norfolk.

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, yes; they are recognized, but it is not what we would call a closed shop, by any means. About 40 percent of the employees are nonunion employees, but the trouble with the situation I think is the fact that the yards have not gotten over their normal peacetime methods of operation; in the lower levels they are still operating as they operated in time of peace.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to conclude in a moment or two. The Senator from Massachusetts has made a very helpful contribution to the discussion.

The armed forces also must clean their houses—not only their arsenals and navy yards, but also their actual uniformed ranks. There has been too much evidence of excess manpower in uniform. There are too many men now assigned to nonproductive jobs, whom the armed services either will not or cannot shift to useful work. These men complain that they have not enough to do. They should either be utilized in uniform or released to industry.

This country will back up its fighting men. It will give them the munitions they need. But our people just cannot act blindly. American people want the facts, and they want to know what is being done about the facts. This country will stand for compulsory labor if it is shown it is necessary to win the war.

Labor, industry, and agriculture will make any sacrifice to meet our military needs. In fact, their spokesmen have only very recently appeared before congressional committees and assured us of their fullest cooperation. Let us give them the facts, and put them to work. They will not shirk their responsibility. Our committee will continue its study of manpower utilization, and a committee report will be considered later and presented to the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to say, before I take my seat, that very recently there has been a change in management at the Norfolk Navy Yard. A new admiral has been appointed as commandant of the yard, and a new captain has been appointed in charge of the industrial productivity of the yard.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the important office that of the industrial manager of the yard?

Mr. MEAD. I think that would be an important office.

Mr. WALSH. The commanding officer comes and goes, but I think the intustrial manager of the yard holds the important office. He is more likely to remain permanently. Nearly all labor problems finally go to him rather than to the commanding officer. Of course, the commanding officer has other duties.

Mr. MEAD. There are two major officers, one more or less in charge of the physical plant, and the naval personnel, who comes and goes. The other is in charge of the productivity, the industrial and engineering side of the plant.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. MEAD. I believe there is a need for change in the system. It is a complicated system, and supervision and responsibility should be lodged more generally in the naval personnel.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator knows the reason for the condition. First of all, practically every officer in the Navy must be seagoing in time of peace. But it is not fair to keep a man 30 or 40 years of his life at sea, so after a certain period of time at sea, an officer is given a billet on shore commensurate with his training and ability, and many of the billets are in navy yards. I agree the problem is a serious one.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think the testimony before our committee was to the effect that the average tour of duty of a naval officer is about 2 years, whereas none of the masters at Norfolk, so far as the Navy has any record, has ever been dismissed. They have retired on account of age. In order that one may be dismissed, the officials have to come to Washington and hold hearings. So it can be imagined that officers on duty at the yard for 2 years are not likely to tackle that kind of a proposition. The masters are a power unto themselves.

Mr. WALSH. And they resent official regulation, official direction. That is my observation. Just as the Senator has said, the presence of the conflict is apparent to anyone who studies the matter.

Mr. BALL. Let me make a remark in the Senator's time. In connection with the demand for a national service act, if now there are men who are being forced to loaf on the job, or stretch out work, because of inefficient management, and we pass a national service act and put more men to doing the same job, I think we will increase the problem, rather than solve it. I am concerned about that. It strikes me that in this picture, not only in the navy yards, but in too many private plants, management has been under no spur whatever to clean its own house and provide supervision which will get results. I understand that when the captain of a company or commander of a regiment falls down on the job in the field he is yanked off right then and there and replaced. That certainly has not been done with the executives who fail to deliver production at Norfolk, or in any other plant I have seen.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator, I will say that there is one Navy establishment in this country—and I hope the committee will visit it—which is manned and controlled and operated entirely by officers and enlisted personnel. That is the one at San Diego. It is apparently very successful. The committee will learn some lessons by visiting that yard. I have visited it and have contrasted the system employed there with the other system. Of course, it is unbelievable that we can change over from the present system of civilian control because it has been so long established.

Mr. KILGORE. Is that not purely a repair yard?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. No new construction is done there?

Mr. WALSH. No.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to point out that we on this side of the Chamber cannot hear the Senator from Massachusetts. We would be glad to hear everything that is being said.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I regret that we have not spoken louder during the debate.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the present situation is a serious one. It needs to be solved now. We need the ships badly. Therefore, I would recommend to the Navy that it immediately institute an all-out manpower utilization survey by experts, which I understand can be furnished to the Navy by the War Manpower Commission; that the Navy put its house in order; and then, as a long-range program, let us get at the system which my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts, points out is in need of improvement and refinement. If the two programs are accomplished, I am sure that a good deal of this difficulty will be behind us.

I wish to conclude by saying that the naval officers have cooperated with us in this survey in every yard, and I wish also to add that labor has very generally and enthusiastically embraced the opportunity for a thoroughgoing utilization of the manpower needs in our navy yards.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, addressing myself to the subject which has been discussed by my colleague on the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], I wish to be a little more specific as to what we found at Norfolk in an examination of the navy yard there. I think the time has come when we must speak out. We must make these investigations and we must give the results to the people as soon as possible, so that a remedy may be found for the condition which exists. What was presented by the Senator from New York is not a report of what we have found, and I am sure the able Senator from New York was not intending to make a report from the committee.

Mr. President, I feel called upon today to say something in reply to certain remarks made by the Under Secretary of the Navy, and I want to be specific with reference to them. I shall be frank to the Senate and to my fellow citizens of America.

On the 17th day of January this year, when we went through the Norfolk Navy Yard and took the testimony of 27 witnesses, comprising 375 pages, I personally was shocked that such a condition could exist in our country at this time and, as the Under Secretary of the Navy says, I did remark that I found conditions in the navy yard at Norfolk amounting almost to the point of treason. The definition of treason, my fellow Senators, is merely the giving of aid and comfort to the enemy. The able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] today in indicating his thought with respect to what had happened in that navy yard based on the report of the able Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] used the word "sabotage."

Mr. President, I shall make a statement as to what we found at the navy yard, so that all may judge what the conditions are.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I did not comment on any facts, but I did say that if men were whispering to other men, "Go slow; let up; do not produce it," it was a form of sabotage, which is the same thing that the Senator said.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, among other things, I had anticipated complete cooperation upon the part of the Navy in the solution of this problam. I feel certain that the great majority of officers in the Navy if not every one of them, when the conditions which prevail have been brought to their attention and they realize the situation, will cooperate to the fullest, as I know that Congress is going to cooperate.

What I shall discuss deals merely with the utilization of labor. It has nothing to do with any recommendation by the President as to what we should do with respect to any bill to provide labor for these plants. I think our first job is immediately—it is long past due—to look into the utilization of every man and every woman in America toward the winning of the war. My only reason for saying what I say today is that I want to cooperate with the various agencies in order that we may get every ounce of effort out of our citizens in the winning of the war.

Mr. President, I wish to read most of a letter written by the Under Secretary of the Navy in order that we may know the attitude of one who is high in power and authority over the very conditions the committee has investigated. The Under Secretary said in his letter:

> This is a serious charge against a loyal and able unit of the Naval Establishment which I cannot let pass unanswered.

Mr. President, no one is more loyal to the fighting Navy of the United States and to every man who is rendering service out on the high seas and on shore than I am. It is by reason of my devotion to the Navy that I have made my statement, because I believe it to be substantiated by the evidence, and I think the time has come not only in the shipyard in question but everywhere, when we should demand that every individual in the United States, no matter what his position may be, whether it be high or low, do his utmost toward the winning of the war; that everyone should exert every ounce of his efforts to the winning of the war, and when he does not do that, but is in a position where he is loafing and giving aid and comfort to the enemy, then a proper description of his action is almost that of treason or sabotage, for it interferes with the prosecution of this war, which we must win.

He further states that the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, including its labor utilization record, is good. Mr. President, today I had the privilege of seeing a report to the Under Secretary of the Navy showing that the utilization of labor was not good. I am unable to bring that report to the floor of the Senate. Let me read some excerpts from it. The report was made in December 1944.

I shall not overestimate what we found. A fair, mild description of what we found will speak volumes to the Senate and to the American people as to the results of failure fully to utilize the labor in this yard. Reading from the report, under the heading "Utilization," we find the following:

> It is estimated that the same amount of work could be accomplished with substantially fewer employees.

Mr. President, how does that line up with the letter which was released by the Under Secretary to the press on Saturday evening? He says that during 1944 the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, including its labor utilization record, was good. Later I shall read further from the report which I have described, but at this point I wish to read the following:

> Idle time: Idle time, as used here, includes plain loafing, which is the employee's own fault.

Mr. President, are we going to blame the employee himself, and not supervision, up to the highest ranking supervisor, for so-called loafing, and are we to say that it is the employee's own fault?

I read further from the report:

> Stand-by time: When men are idle due to no fault of their own, waiting for other trades, for material, or for furnishing of instructions.

Mr. President, whose fault is that? The testimony in this record shows that a man receiving $1.26 an hour spent 4 days, with a helper, waiting for four screws; that he complained, and was told by the leaderman to go back and stay there until the screws arrived. When the four screws arrived, he required 1 minute to put them in.

Mr. President, that is a sworn statement. I believe it, and I believe that every other member of the committee believes it.

Another man testified that in January of this year he and two other men waited 4 days in a place where the work which they were supposed to do had already been done. He stated the days he waited there—Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

In this organization in many instances it is not exactly clear as to just who is in authority. Today we heard with great interest a description of the authority, from the top down. The Bureau of Yards and Docks has certain authority. The Bureau of Ships has certain authority. As we go down the line of authority, we find a commandant in the yard. He is an admiral. Under him we find a captain, who is the manager of the yard. As between those two, the division of authority is very clear; but when we go from the Navy official side into the so-called civil-service side, it is not clear.

Coming up the ladder from the bottom, in the line of so-called supervision, we have first the snapper. Next we have

the keyman. Those two men have no particular authority, except that given to them by the leaderman, who comes next. Next in the scale we have the leaderman, and then the quarterman. Next we have the chief quarterman, then the foreman, and then the master.

It was testified that there are many good men in the yard who would be able to do the job of supervision. Most of the men who testified before the committee had more than 4 years of experience. They were good, loyal American citizens, and wanted to do a job, but because of circumstances and conditions they felt that they were unable to do it.

The evidence clearly shows that men who had been there for only a short time were up-graded, above men who had been there for years.

There is no complaint from the top because of not having work to do. The chief occupation of those at the top seems to be defending themselves. I appreciate that one of the first instincts of man is to defend himself when he is accused. One witness, who had been in the yard for 4 years and 3 months, had never seen the master, and had seen his chief quarterman only half a dozen times during that period. The testimony shows that men were not laid off because of lack of work, but that men were recruited during this entire period. At the present time they are taking on all the labor they can get. The figures show that at present, as of the 1st day of January, there are 37,578 men working in that navy yard. January 20 is the last day for which I have a report. Up to January 20, 2,012 men have been hired. In the meantime 839 men have been lost. The quota is said to be 40,000; and the yard is said to be in need of men up to that number.

Mr. President, there are 16 masters in this yard. Men who have been there for a long time say that they have never known a master to be discharged from a shipyard for inefficiency. Some of the witnesses told of the conduct of the masters. Some of the things they do seem small, but they have a great effect upon the spirit of the men. Witnesses told of one master going through the plant and breaking up 15 or 20 stools on which the men were sitting. In a few days it was necessary for the Government to replace the stools. In his letter, the Under Secretary tells us that such things represent an expense of only a few hundred dollars; but, Mr. President, they mean more than that. They affect the morale and spirit of the men.

Witness after witness testified that 50-percent production was all that was being obtained in connection with building new ships. Only one man testified that it would run as high as 75 or 80 percent. He was in the pattern-making department. The peculiar thing was that when the master testified before the committee, the only department which he said did not have enough work to do was the pattern department. The other testimony all showed that that was the only department which had enough work to keep the men busy. The witness from the pattern department stated that he felt that up to 80-percent production was being obtained in that department.

I have spoken of the men who were working on the *Champlain*. That is a carrier, and it is needed at sea as soon as it can be put in the water. One man testified that on a certain Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday he and two other men were sent to do certain work when the leaderman knew that there was no work for them to do, and that it had already been done. Those three men were sent to a certain place and stayed there during that period.

Another witness testified that on the very day they had told the leaderman they needed a welder for a short job, the leaderman insisted on sending the welder there and having her remain all day; that the welder actually worked in the morning from 9:05 until 9:25, and then waited until 2:25, and then worked until 2:30—just 5 minutes. The witness estimated that the Government would have to pay that welder for the actual work done, on an hourly basis. He said that if the welder was paid on an hourly basis, the payment would amount to $23.46.

Another witness who testified about timing the workers, said that in connection with work on Sundays, he had timed a person who was going to the rest room. He testified that the first time that person went to the rest room he stayed 45 minutes; that he had gone there four times that particular day; and that he had spent a little more than 3 hours in the shop. That was on the Sunday previous to our going there.

Another witness testified that he saw loafing in the storeroom 25 or 30 men who claimed they did not have anything to do. The witness testified that the leaderman came along and told them to go down into the ship and hide, that the storeroom was not the proper place for them to be loafing.

There is considerable testimony in the record that only approximately 50 percent of the time is spent on essential work. A witness testified about jobs being overmanned. He said that if 10 men can do a job, they will send 20 to do it, and that actually one is in the way of another. Representatives of the metal trades testified that so many persons were put into a room that they could not work, that they had lack of supervision, that there was featherbedding, and that they had to wait for the crafts to finish the job. One man described working in a room 12 feet by 12 feet, with a smokestack going up through the center of it. He testified that 10 men were sent to that room and that there was not sufficient space for all 10 men to work there, so some had to go outside and come back later to relieve others who had been working.

The wages paid joiners—in other words, expert carpenters—are $1.26 an hour. A lay-out man is paid $1.32 an hour. Not all the men were union members. Some of them were nonunion men. It is not a closed shop, according to evidence we received from both sides. Some of the men testified before the committee that they had belonged to a union previously, but that they were not then members.

The working hours there are 9 hours a day. The men are paid for 9½ hours. They work three Sundays each month. Later I shall read what the Navy's report of last December shows in that connection.

The testimony shows beyond the possibility of contradiction that 15 minutes before the whistle blows the men leave their jobs, and when they come back it is 15 or 20 minutes before they return to the jobs. The testimony was that some of the men were not doing anything at all that day.

On one of the new ships at almost any time of the day, the testimony shows, one could see on the flight deck and on the hangar deck from 100 to 150 men who were not working. About 10 minutes before the whistle blows, a witness testifies, one could see a thousand men upon those decks, waiting, before quitting time, to get off.

The testimony shows that if you go down into a hold you probably will find only 1 out of 10 men or, as the witness stated, only 1 out of 8 men working. I personally observed conditions on one of the top decks of this carrier. Not more than 1 man in 10 was working. I am sure other members of the committee observed the same condition. However, at this same time, we are advised that, according to the War Manpower Commission—and let me say that the Commission cooperated with us in the survey, and representatives of the Commission went there with us—4,400 more men are now needed.

One workman described a good workman as follows: One who is in good attendance, one who has a good bond-drive record and who makes good donations to the collections. The witness said he would be a fine man. Mr. President, no one wishes to hinder the selling of bonds and the making of the various collections; but it appears to me that the actual workman has a further duty, besides merely the buying of bonds. The bond is sold to help pay him and others for their work, and to enable the Government to employ sufficient men to do the needed work, each of them to do a day's work in return for the wages paid by means of the bonds which he and his fellow citizens are buying.

With respect to the "slow-down," a witness testified he was told to make the job last. The work is stretched out. A witness said that when the work load is not up to what it could be and jobs are scarce, he was told to say, "I can stretch it." At that time that condition was general in the ship. The witness said, "You can stretch it out double." One man said he had not been ordered to stretch it, but that it is the natural thing to do when they see what is going on around them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KILGORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. To me, that is the worst of all the conditions complained about.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very serious.

Mr. WALSH. If in that yard or in any other yard there is a conspiracy among Government workers to stretch out the work and to slow down produc-

tion, it is a very serious offense, in my opinion, and I am sure the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the Senator's committee will investigate that matter to the core, and will find out who are the leaders, and will have them prosecuted, and also will find out who are the superiors in that navy yard, or in the Navy, who should know about the situation but have done nothing to correct it.

To me that condition is inconceivable. I can understand loafing; I can understand an inferior type of labor which the navy yards are obliged to hire; I can understand that civil-service regulations may tie the hands of the management so that it is not always to be able to get the best and most efficient labor; but if there is a spirit of "take it easy and do not produce too much," that is intolerable, and to me it is unbelievable.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have the able senior Senator from Massachusetts state his views in that connection. I feel wholeheartedly, as he does, that we must go to the bottom of these matters, we must bring them to light, and that prosecution should be had in all cases in which it is warranted.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not the Senator's opinion, from the testimony in the hearings, that statements about the existence of such a spirit did not emanate from the individual workers themselves, but that the workers received such an impression as a result of being told, "This is all we see in sight"? So they gained the impression that they had better make that much last. Was not that the situation?

Mr. FERGUSON. Exactly.

Mr. KILGORE. That was testified to by witness after witness, and they "kicked" because they did not have enough work; because, as the Senator has said, the witnesses stated, "When we work all day and are busy the work goes fast and the day is short."

I believe the Senator will remember two or three witnesses who made that statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and they said that 8 hours was a long time when they had nothing to do.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What the Senator means is that a certain portion of the work was being assigned to a certain group of men, and that when it had been performed and there were no more orders from Washington, or from the Navy Department, the men had to be dropped from employment, or the work had to be stretched out.

Mr. KILGORE. The leadman would say, "This is all the job we have in sight." Whereupon the men would proceed to stretch out the job.

Mr. WALSH. From time to time various persons from the navy yard have visited me and asked that contracts be procured and sent to this yard or that yard. When they had finished the job on which they were engaged, and it was perhaps necessary for some men to be dropped from employment, the union's representatives came and asked for more work.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that one of the causes for the unnatural slowdown in work has been described by some of the witnesses as the subcontracting of work to other yards. As they said, the workmen protested against the situation and often went to the higher-ups. A job was brought in at a time when 300 men were idle or off the pay roll. It would have taken 4 or 5 months to complete it. The employees tried to get their superior officers to keep the work in that particular yard, but it was sent to another yard. As a natural consequence, the men slowed down in the performance of their work.

Mr. President, I believe that another thing which causes men to slow down is the so-called private work in the yard. I wish to describe that rather in detail because of the effect it has upon the morale of the men. One of the most difficult things the men have to do is to make a survey of the yard. We appreciate Cook's Tours. We know what is coming, but in the past 2 or 3 years we have been able to look around and observe and not be taken on a Cook's Tour through the plant, as was described by the able Senator from New York. So on one trip we split up into subcommittees and went into various buildings without any previous notice having been given.

The reason I say that private work affects the morale of the men is that, as I was going through the plant, I fell behind and spoke to a workman, and out of the side of his mouth, in a whisper so that the officials could not hear him, he said, "Look for an oyster-shucking table over in the corner." Another one said, "Look for some picture frames over in the corner." Another one remarked to me, "Look for a checkerboard, or three of them, down in the lower room." I shall have something to say about those various matters. The situation which I have described is contagious. It affects every one of the employees. Each knows what is going on, and it breaks down the spirit and the desire to produce.

The record shows that much work was done on private orders. A witness stated that when there was technical work to be done, if a private work job came in they dropped the work which they were doing in order to do the private work, which came first.

Sitting in the shop among the private items to be worked upon was a small safe belonging to a lieutenant. It was a metal case only a foot by a foot in size. It was equipped with a lock. But it had been brought in, and the men had considered it as a private job. They had installed small drawers in the safe. They had even lined it with green felt. I obtained the time card on that particular safe. On the 13th day of January 1945 there was expended $16.20 worth of labor, and on January 15, $10.83 worth of labor, or a total of $27.03 which represented the cost of the job. It had not yet been finished, and workmen in that yard considered it a private piece of work for the lieutenant. It affected the morale of not only the particular workman who told me to look at it, but of all the other workmen, because information concerning it went out over the yard.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What was the private work to which the Senator refers? Was it work done for an officer, or for a private individual, for which no payment was made?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was done for either an officer, a master, or a civil-service employee, and the men felt that it had no direct relationship to the war.

Mr. WALSH. Was it a naval job?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Did the safe come from a naval vessel?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Was it going back to the naval vessel?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it was going into the office of the lieutenant.

Mr. WALSH. Was it going to the office of the lieutenant, or to his home?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was going into his office.

Mr. WALSH. So it was being moved from a ship for use in the lieutenant's new job in some office capacity. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should not put it in that way.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand a little more about the situation, perhaps, than does the Senator from Michigan. The cabinet was a little steel cabinet about 12 by 12 inches in size.

Mr. WALSH. Was it a private job being done for a naval officer, and was it for his own individual use?

Mr. KILGORE. The theory was that it was to be used in his office. The officer is said to have stated, "I got this off the salvage pile and brought it in to have it fixed up for my own office, because everyone else has one like it." It was not a safe. It was a small steel cabinet which would correspond to a dispatch case.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator says that it was being repaired.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Was there any evidence that it was a private job, and that the employees of the yard were repairing the cabinet for private use?

Mr. KILGORE. The empty box, without the felt-lined compartments, could have been used.

Mr. WALSH. I agree with that statement. If a naval officer asks to have a box, a safe, or some other article changed or modified for use by the Navy, that may be extravagant. On the other hand, if he asks one or more employees to repair something for him personally in their own time, that is an entirely different matter.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator, but I also believe that there is too much divergence of the employee's time

when he has to do what was done in this case.

Mr. WALSH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak a few minutes on the work in the lucite room.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before proceeding, will the Senator say how much the work to which he has referred amounted to altogether? Was it a considerable amount, or was it limited to the particular case which he cited?

Mr. FERGUSON. The work was considerable. I shall try to describe some other things as I proceed, showing that the amount of work was considerable.

I wish to describe the work in the lucite room, and state what we found in going through the room. It was only a small office, not more than 15 feet square. It may possibly have been 20 feet square. It was a workshop. Outside we found about 398 sheets of scarce lucite, and the testimony disclosed that all of it had been ordered out of the warehouse, and to be stored outside the door of the lucite room. It had been there from August, and one of the witnesses said it was worth $18.75 a sheet and there were about 398 sheets. He said that it was placed there and had remained there. They could not tell us whether it was surplus or what it was, but it could not be declared to be surplus so long as it was outside of that small office on this floor. It merely shows how this material was handled.

This witness described the taking of lumber, large timbers, to a dump and being burned there. It was claimed they were good timbers.

Another witness, by affidavit, showed that 100,000 gallons of Diesel oil were pumped into a sludge oil tank to dispose of it. Another witness described how workmen tore down their benches and built them up again because they wanted to keep busy at work, although benches were in good condition and needed no repairs.

One of the chief complaints, which came from another witness was concerning the destruction of insulation. It was stated that insulation work would be done three times. It would be put on, and then the electricians would come along and say they had not done their work and the insulation would be removed. Then the steam fitters or pipe fitters would come along and say "we have not done our work." So, as the testimony shows, much insulation was destroyed because the pipes which had been put under this insulation had not been tested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. After hearing the witnesses testify—and I presume publicly so that the persons responsible for the wastage which the Senator describes had an opportunity of rebuttal and an opportunity to deny—that valuable timber was destroyed by fire and that all these other wastages had occurred, did they have an opportunity to refute that testimony?

Mr. FERGUSON. They were asked about it. This was in executive session and the witnesses were sworn in executive session.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Were the persons responsible who were informed of these facts have an opportunity to reply?

Mr. FERGUSON. They were asked about these various facts, and there was a defense for most of the conditions, and a lack of knowledge as to others.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to explain to the Senator from Massachusetts the regulations so that he will understand. Up to some months ago this lucite, which is in sheets of 40 by 50 and a quarter-inch thick, clear plastic, was used for plotting boards on battleships, carriers, and cruisers, and of course, was necessary in navy yards. It was discovered that it would bend when it was leaned on, so a new and much better glass was devised, and glass was substituted, and the lucite was placed in a warehouse. So that it might be declared surplus, they had it brought to the lucite room where it could go into surplus. It got out of the hands of the property man, who could have declared it surplus and use it for airplane construction, for which it is very valuable, and it went to the lucite room and was stored there. There was lack of proper supervision; somebody should have seen to it that proper steps were taken to declare it surplus.

Mr. WALSH. I want to say this to both Senators: My interest as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee is to get at the facts and take action. I want to know if as a result of the committee's investigation we should take action to remove the Secretary of the Navy or the commanding officer of the navy yard in question. Who is the man we can put our hands on to make an example of. This disclosure should be beneficial in every navy yard, and should make them cautious for the time being; but should not drastic action be taken in the case of someone to whom we can tie this burning of valuable lumber and the wasteful practices referred to here? They may not be of very great importance in themselves individually, but several of them show that there has been laxity on the part of someone. Who is the person against whom we can take action rather than merely discuss these matters in these debates and hear this presentation? Even the discussion will be of benefit, because it will be read in all the navy yards and there will be a change for the time being; but I think the committee could say, "This man or that man ought to be fired," and let us go to the Navy Department and demand that it be done.

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee that the point I was trying to make regarding lucite I did not fully develop. There are some terrific weaknesses in the regulations that do not go to the human element at all, but are due to peacetime weaknesses which have not been corrected to take care of this vast construction.

For instance the granting of over-all job orders, signed by the master mechanic, which run for a period of 30 days or so, on which all kinds of jobs can be done, some necessary and many unnecessary, without any real appropriation, so that they could be charged up to construction. Such a condition indicates that amendments are needed, which the Senator's committee could go into.

Mr. WALSH. My committee does not make regulations.

Mr. KILGORE. In my opinion, it is not a function of the Secretary.

Mr. WALSH. We could be helpful.

Mr. KILGORE. The committee of which the Senator from Massachusetts is chairman should make a recommendation that the regulations be changed.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the Senator from Michigan is making merely a preliminary report?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. The committee comes here with mere suggestions rather than a report. Who are the men loafing on the job? Who are those who are derelict? Is it a naval officer who is incompetent or is it the master mechanic or is it some other master? Is there not some one in this navy yard or other navy yards of whom we can make an example, so as to give some assurance that it will not happen again?

Mr. KILGORE. One factor is that the naval officer on the job who should know what is going on is not kept there long but is sent to sea.

Mr. WALSH. No matter how long he is there, he ought to know enough to have subordinate officers in whom he has confidence to know what is going on and to submit reports.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator that we took the superintendent of every shop in all the yards with us, so that everything we found we were very sure was discovered when they were present, so they would understand.

Mr. WALSH. Did they make any reply to these things? Where is the Navy's explanation?

Mr. FERGUSON. They have no explanation.

Mr. WALSH. Have they not made any?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy sent me a memorandum about some of these things. One was about a safe that had been taken off a submarine and was going into an office to be used for the safekeeping of bonds and radio parts. That is their explanation about that. I do not know whether it was correct or not, but I suppose the committee would ask the Navy as to each one of these items.

Mr. FERGUSON. We did; we had the Navy officers before us this morning. The difficulty is that the managers change.

Mr. WALSH. Do they say these things are true and that they are responsible, or do they say that the system is wrong and they cannot control the carelessness on

the part of employees. What is their answer?

Mr. FERGUSON. Their answer is that the naval officer who had been there had been sent to sea.

Mr. WALSH. Was he the commanding officer?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they have a commanding officer and the manager.

Mr. WALSH. So that the answer is that the commanding officer who knew about it was sent to sea, and did not take any action.

Mr. FERGUSON. They do not admit he knew about it, and they say they did not let him go to sea because of his work or because of this adverse report.

Mr. WALSH. Did not some master mechanic know about these things? Certainly there is some individual higher up than these poor workmen whom we can discipline for this condition and not, as the result of these disclosures, resort to a drastic law to draft labor. Can we not correct it by punishing, if it be possible, those in executive positions?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we can; I am sure we can. I shall do everything I can to get to the bottom of the matter.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the Senator will try to see if we cannot set an example once for all. As I have said, the evidence is helpful in that it will be read in every navy yard and every arsenal, and it will have a beneficial effect, but the most valuable thing of all would be to have some executive held responsible and punished—a naval officer, if it is a naval matter, a civilian, if it is a civilian. But we would have trouble removing any civilian without evidence, because there are civil-service regulations for their protection. Charges must be preferred and proven.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the orders, and the method of indicating the amount of labor to be used on a particular order that has helped and hurt labor and caused excessive costs.

There is a pink-slip order. The orders are not numbered consecutively, so that one uses it or does not use it as he pleases, but if one uses one of those pink slips, he puts on it the amount of labor he anticipates being necessary.

One witness describes it in this way, that if it would take $25 worth of labor to do a job, $125 might be indicated upon the slip, and then they make sure that that much labor is charged on that slip against that particular job.

I wish to take one particular order number, that is, order No. X–8140. This comes out of the foundry, and as I was going through this shop, a witness told me that there was an oyster-shucking table over in the corner. I was curious to know how an oyster-shucking table was going to help win the war, so I went over and looked at it, and this is what I discovered. It had an order number, No. X–8140. Here is the diagram, Exhibit 1, showing what this oyster table was. It is made out of fir. It is cabinet work. They were careful to see that all the screws were countersunk and the edges smoothed. It is 16 feet long. It has a backboard 12 inches high. It has a depth of 45 inches. It has 4 holes in it, through which oyster shells can be dropped. The holes are 5 inches by 5 inches. The table has four highly polished oak blocks, 4 by 2 inches, hollowed out so that an oyster may be placed in the block and be shucked much easier. One man described working a whole half day on the blocks.

There was an explanation for that. The statement had been made that commandants come and go, but the masters stay on forever. The explanation was that the masters were going to have an oyster party in their closed room in the cafeteria, and they had that one board made. The officials say in a letter to me that the actual cost of the board was $14.60, $11.97 in labor, and $2.63 in material.

Mr. President, I should like to have every Member of the Senate look at that board, which is here as an exhibit. I think it would be good for the Under Secretary to see the board.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Who issued the order?

Mr FERGUSON. Mr. Williams, the master in the joiners' department.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator permit the order to be placed in the RECORD?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I shall ask to place it in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

[Order omitted from RECORD under rules of Joint Committee on Printing.]

Mr. WALSH. What was the oyster board to be used for, and where was it to be used?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was to be used in the cafeteria for a party given by the masters on Friday night; we were there on Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. WALSH. So that this master issued an order to have made, at Government expense, with Government labor, a board or table which was to be used in shucking oysters at a masters' party. Is that the story?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. What action has been taken against that man?

Mr. FERGUSON. So far as I know, no action has been taken by the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Do they know the man's name?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Under Secretary of the Navy defends the making of this board as a morale builder.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, his claim is that the masters have clubs, like all officers and enlisted personnel, and that this was an adjunct of their club, which was on the Navy premises and used by the masters, instead of by enlisted men or by officers?

Mr. FERGUSON. Here is the express language:

> It is true that a woodworker in the Norfolk Navy Yard built an oyster shucking board. The total cost in labor and material was exactly $14.60, or $11.97 in labor and $2.63 in material. This oyster shucking board was built to protect one of the yard's cafeteria table tops during an oyster roast which was being given for morale purposes in the yard.

Mr. WALSH. What does the Under Secretary mean by "morale purposes"? Does he mean that the existence of these clubs helped to create a good morale?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not been able to discover just what is meant by "morale" when speaking in connection with either management or labor. I think it is one of those words which is general in its nature, and if one wants an excuse for doing anything one can say that it is for morale purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator that the only club I found in the yard was the masters' club. Other personnel apparently do not have access to it. Only the masters have access to it. Not even the admiral has a key to it, nor does the custodian.

Mr. WALSH. It would seem from some of the allegations, that "brass hats" ought to be taken off the admirals and placed on the masters in the navy yards.

Mr. KILGORE. I said so at the outset.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to be more difficult to get rid of them than it is to get rid of "brass hats."

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. If the Senator from Michigan will permit me to interrupt him further, I may say that the reason responsibility cannot be fixed for this thing is that it is being done under one of those general job orders which runs for months, and such a thing as this is simply sandwiched in under verbal request. I do not know what job order this particular thing happened to be charged up to, but responsibility cannot be fixed because the name of the man who issued the order cannot be found.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the order show the name?

Mr. KILGORE. No. Only the general job order shows the name of the one who issued it. The Senator from Michigan will remember that some seven or eight hundred dollars' worth of work was done under that general job order.

Mr. FERGUSON. This particular order has the name on it.

Mr. WALSH. If the individual whose name appeared on the order were asked about it he might say that this work was not contained in the general job order, but that someone down the line did not know that, and ordered the work to be done. The Senator speaks of a general order; that the work would be said to come under a general order, and the individual who performed it therefore would not be subject to blame?

Mr. KILGORE. In tracing the matter down, I will say to the Senator, the work came on the general job order, and one master signed that order.

Mr. FERGUSON. The sketch or print they were going to use was signed.

By an examination of the records with respect to this job number X–8140 one cannot distinguish what labor devoted to the particular work. Therefore they can cover it up by putting it under the number of a general job order.

One thing, as I have said, which greatly concerns these workmen, and I think that it broke their spirit in a way, was the furniture which was made for the master's room. I should like to describe

it, because I think it is worth a description. It was made 8 months ago when we were straining every nerve to have ships constructed. The table in that room is 25 feet long and 4 feet wide. It is of solid mahogany. It has four massive legs under it. The foot under each leg is made of a piece of 12 by 4 solid walnut.

The carving of a claw on each one of these legs was made by one man, and it took him a day to make the particular carving. We were informed by that man himself that he spends 30 percent of his time on nonproductive so-called private work, not on work essential to winning the war. That table was built on the fourth floor of the shop. It was crated. It took 12 or 15 men several hours to take it down the elevator because the top of the table was 25 feet long and 4 feet wide, and they did not want to scar it.

They were not satisfied with making that table alone for the clubroom of the 16 masters. They made a large chair known as the master's chair to be placed at the head of that table. The same man carved the eagle of the United States and other designs upon that chair. They were not satisfied with that, but had to have a mirror with a carved eagle over the top of it in the rear of the table.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. Was an order issued for the making of this furniture for the masters' clubroom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will answer that just about as the testimony was given. We had great difficulty in finding out on whose order it was done. I state frankly that I believe the man committed perjury before our committee when he refused to tell us who the higher-up was who ordered this work done. We have asked them to try and find the order, but they expressed doubt that they ever would, because the orders have no serial numbers on them, and they disappear in a short time.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator visit this club?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I made a visit to it. The door was locked, but we got in finally.

Mr. WALSH. This furniture was all on display there?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Do the master mechanics contribute anything toward the support and maintenance of this club?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand not.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the Navy itself has contributed money toward it and permitted it to be furnished. I am trying to find out whether the master mechanics themselves did all this, or whether they had any approval from the Navy Department. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. FERGUSON. We failed in ascertaining the real authority for the construction of this furniture, because the witness testified at first that he knew but did not want to tell, and then finally he made up his mind he could not remember.

Mr. WALSH. Is the committee going to send all this testimony to the Navy Department?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That is well. Is the committee also going to ask the Navy Department for an investigation and report?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Has the Department made any report on the furniture to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it has not as yet reported.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Navy support and maintain this masters' club? Does it furnish the food and the refreshments and other things served there?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The masters pay 25 cents a meal—it has been increased to 30 cents—in the cafeteria, which is one of the rooms in the masters' club.

Mr. WALSH. So it is a club where the masters meet socially, and have their lunch in the middle of the day?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And they pay for their own lunch?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. And manage it all themselves?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. But they took advantage, apparently, from what the Senator has said, of their positions as masters, to have some furniture made at the Government's expense. It is important to know, it seems to me, whether the Navy officials higher up approved of that.

Mr. FERGUSON. As to that, we could not get an answer from the witness.

Mr. President, in relation to this club I wish to describe some things in the dining room. A sideboard was there. It looked as fine as any piece of Grand Rapids furniture. I pulled out a drawer immediately, knowing that Grand Rapids furniture makers usually place their label inside on a little plate. I could not find such a label. Then I was informed that that sideboard had been made at the navy yard. Two smaller sideboards were also made there. They were made of fine mahogany, and were of first-class workmanship.

In that room was something which came out of the so-called metal shop.

Mr. WALSH. Is the property now owned by the Navy or by this club?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is owned by the club of the masters, as I am informed.

Mr. WALSH. It is on Navy property?

Mr. FERGUSON. In the Navy Building.

Mr. WALSH. And so far as the Senator knows, the furniture in it is owned by the members of the masters' club?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The furniture has carved upon it "M M A", meaning "Master Mechanics' Association" and "N N Y", Norfolk Navy Yard, is graved by handcarving on all this furniture in the yard. This club has two large rooms, cut off from the central cafeteria, and is entered by a different entrance. We were informed that it was for the exclusive use of the masters' association of the yard. The yard superintendent who was with us had difficulty in obtaining a key. Finally he had to locate a master in order to get into the club rooms.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Have the naval officers a club there?

Mr. KILGORE. There is a naval officers' club, but it has no connection with this club.

Mr. WALSH. I am trying to compare this station with other stations of which I have some knowledge. At other stations the naval officers have a club where they lunch.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And the masters have a club where they lunch. The enlisted personnel have places where they lunch, and the same is true of the civilian employees.

Mr. KILGORE. The civilian employees have only cafeterias.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me that the masters are seeking to imitate the officers by having as luxurious a club as the naval officers have and by having the Navy supply them with furniture.

Mr. FERGUSON. This club is very much smaller than the officers' club.

Mr. President, in the dining room next to the club room was a steam table, made of stainless steel. It measured about 12 by 3½ feet, and was equipped with electrical connections so that the food could be kept warm. The men in the yard complained about the use of stainless steel for that purpose, when it was so urgently needed for war purposes. The workmanship on the table was of a high class, and many hours must have been required to build it. The room in which the steam table is used is not more than 25 or 30 feet from the kitchen. As these workmen testified, the furniture in this room was put there solely for the use of the masters. We have the testimony of men who are familiar with the construction of furniture. They say that it would cost as much as $5,000 to make this furniture. The Under Secretary describes it in his letter as having a value of about $200.

One other item which I wish to mention is the making of checkerboards. I can conceive that the making of checkerboards for the masters, who have idle time, may affect their so-called morale, and that a master may be enabled to go home at night and say to his family "My patriotism has been raised today because I have been able to play checkers at work." Some of the workmen described these boards as costing as much as $50 in labor.

Mr. President, I think it is well that we know exactly what is done when these checkerboards are made. We were told that the checkerboards were in the lucite room. We asked to see them. The man to whom we talked denied that he had any checkerboards.

There were three of them there. I suggested to him that he come to the hotel room that evening and be prepared to take an oath about the checkerboards. By the time he reached the committee room, about 9 o'clock, he had a very vivid memory, so vivid that he could describe the checkerboards, and just how they were made. We had seen one of them in the master's room, and I suggested that it would be well for us to take one of them with us as an exhibit, so that the Under Secretary could see it and judge for himself.

I have before me today in the Senate Chamber a checkerboard made at Government expense. It is not an ordinary painted board. It is not made of cardboard; it is made of solid walnut. The white squares are inlaid with maple. On the border are the chess emblems—the knight, the rook, and so forth. Around the checkerboard there is inlaid a fine line of white maple, less than an eight of an inch in width.

This board was being made by a man who claims that he is essential to the war effort and who is evading service in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps. It was stated that he was making three such boards. The Under Secretary says that these boards are for the morale of the masters.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Were these boards to be used in the masters' club?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the testimony.

Mr. WALSH. How many of them were there in all?

Mr. FERGUSON. There are 16 masters. There are now two checkerboards in the masters' club.

Mr. WALSH. How many boards were there in all?

Mr. FERGUSON. Three were being made at that particular time.

Mr. WALSH. Was the Senator able to obtain the orders for the making of those boards?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; we have not been able to obtain the orders for these particular boards.

Mr. WALSH. Apparently, from what the Senator is saying, the furniture for this club was made largely on Government working time, and with Government materials.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was made on Government working time and with Government materials.

Mr. WALSH. I infer from what the Senator says that he discovered, at least in some parts of the yard, a rather unfriendly, if not bitter, feeling on the part of the workmen toward the masters. Was that feeling extensive?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was very extensive.

Mr. WALSH. That is an unfortunate situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very bad.

Mr. WALSH. There is, I infer, a hidden rebellion in the breasts of some of the employees against their masters.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is great resentment at what is going on. Just such things as this are causing the resentment.

Mr. President, this board has not been painted or varnished. The wood had just been sanded on the particular day when we received it as an exhibit. We have testimony that as much as 3 days are required to make one of these boards. There are many other items. I shall only mention them, because they are knickknacks. Nevertheless, they create resentment on the part of the men.

Another exhibit which I have before me is made of lignum vitae, a very important war material. It is a napkin ring. It will be noted that it is bored out in the center. One man told us, on oath, that it requires an hour to bore out the center. The men feel that these things are being made for private use and not for the use of the Navy in winning the war. That is why the question is important to them, although the articles themselves may be small. One witness testified that in the past week or two, 250 such napkin rings were made. A special machine had to be made to bore out the center.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Were the napkin rings also for the club?

Mr. FERGUSON. We found no evidence of them in the club.

Mr. WALSH. The reason I ask the question is that I have been on naval vessels and have found in the officers' mess napkin rings furnished by the Government. I do not know whether they are of this particular type. The purpose of them is to save laundry. By the use of napkin rings napkins may be used for more than one meal. Did the Senator inquire whether these napkin rings were being made for naval vessels?

Mr. FERGUSON. The letter of the Under Secretary states that they are for naval vessels; but the men tell us that because of the way they are made, they are being made for private use. That is the opinion of the men, and it is such things that are breaking down their spirit.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator find any of them in the club?

Mr. FERGUSON. None in the club.

Mr. WALSH. So far, then, we have the testimony of the men that they thought they were for private use, and the statement of the Under Secretary that they are for official use on naval vessels.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If they are being made for private use, and are taken outside the yard, that is larceny of Government property.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, I wish to mention some of the other things which the men claim have been made in the yard. One of them is a dog house. Others are a serving table, knives, bracelets, rings, ashtrays, candlesticks, handbag handles, cigarette boxes made of solid mahogany, cigar boxes, candle holders, picture frames, and a screen for a fireplace.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I understand the Senator has said the men told him those articles were for personal use and were taken outside the yard.

Mr. FERGUSON. They testified they made them on Government time, they made them for a superior officer, and that is all they know about it. They do not pretend to know what he did with it.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, a superior officer might have some right, as in the case of the man with the safe, to have repairs done for his quarters; but, if they were made for an officer's personal use, it should not take 1 hour to discharge from the yard the master at whose orders such work was done. Of course, if it was done for naval use, the situation is different; but, as the Senator has said, the men at least suspect that it was for private use. The Senator has said that there is widespread a rather bitter feeling on the part of the employees against the masters.

Mr. FERGUSON that is correct. Mr. President, I am very glad the able senior Senator from Massachusetts takes such a great interest in this matter because it is a very serious one.

With regard to one item let me say I think even the strongest imagination would have difficulty in understanding how it would help us win the war. That is the item of handles for a lady's handbag. Other evidence was that a handle was made for a smoothing iron.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to say that my interest is to localize and fix the blame where it belongs, and to have some action taken against any wrongdoers. My interest is to make sure that the records of Admiral King, Admiral Nimitz, Admiral Horne, Admiral Jacobs, and the Secretary of the Navy—all of whom are innocent, and all of whom are gallantly fighting this war—are not tainted by the existence of such conditions in any part of any navy yard, without any action being taken. I do not want the Navy Department as a whole to be held responsible for a local situation which it is alleged is unsavory.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to read now a portion of a report made last December by the Navy itself. Then I shall read the Under Secretary's letter, and I shall make a few remarks about it.

As I have said, the report states that it is estimated that the same amount of work could be accomplished with substantially fewer employees.

I read from the report:

IDLE TIME

Idle time, as used herein, includes plain loafing, which is the employee's own fault; "stand-by time," when men are idle due to no fault of their own, waiting for other trades, for material, or for the furnishing of instructions.

STAND-BY

On the other hand, much stand-by time and loafing was observed on board ships.

Idle time at St. Helena——

That is one of the branch yards there—

was excessive; December 37,578; 36 percent, 1,173; January 20 received 2,012—1,173, 839 separate; 40,000.

Part of it attributable to the fact that leadermen and other critical supervision bypass the ship superintendent and deal directly with the officer in charge at St. Helena.

They cease work at least 5 minutes before the whistle blows, instead of remaining at the job.

The tempo of work decreased perceptibly during the survey.

SUPERVISORS

Grades both 4–A and 4–B. Their pay is cut if the number of workers under them is reduced.

This wastes manpower.

Means should be found to make it to the advantage of all concerned to do the work as quickly as possible with as few men as possible.

Here is another criticism about putting the amount of wages on the order. Nothing has been done about it, but this report was filed about the first of December:

Making direct labor charges to jobs encourages overmanning because only one type—1–BM—of labor card is ordinarily furnished for each employee each day; the result of this, although not contemplated by the actual instructions, is that too many workers having short jobs hang around, sometimes doing nothing the rest of the day, even though the job assigned many times may have required only 1 or 2 hours' work.

In not a few instances, it appeared that team or gangs of workers are assigned to a ship upon arrival and they in turn stay with the ship until its departure, whether their services are needed or not.

That statement is contained in the report made last December to the Under Secretary.

Now let me say a few words about the turn-over of officers. I read from the report:

Officers' turn-over in key positions is high, and changes during the current 6 months are so numerous as to be detrimental to efficiency.

We find that the new captain now in charge has come from the Bureau of Ships, and he has been at sea for approximately 8 years. He goes as a new man to a yard where from 37,000 to 40,000 persons are employed. The commandant is a new admiral, just placed in charge of the navy yard. But please understand that the higher officers are not transferred because of good management but because transfers are routine. If there is mismanagement, it will not be cured by saying that men are removed, not because of it but in spite of it.

The report refers to Sunday work and to the so-called private items. The men work on Saturdays and on Sundays. They receive pay for overtime when doing such jobs. The report says:

Quite a number of employees were observed on Sunday manning jobs that appeared to be by no means urgent.

I assume that checkerboards or oyster-shucking boards, bracelets, and so forth, are meant.

The report further states:

Sunday work should be confined to urgent jobs.

It cannot be said that these conditions exist because of poor labor relations, because the report states specifically that "labor relations are generally satisfactory."

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to the letter which I have mentioned, because I think the release of this letter will have more to do with having these masters feel that they can do such things and not be checked on by those higher up than anything else which has occurred, not only in respect to the utilization of Government yards but in respect to the utilization of labor all over the country, because they will know that those in high office in the United States condone this sort of thing and even stand back of it. Let me say that I have not taken back one word I used when I said that such actions go almost to the point of treason, because I sincerely believe that actions which result in help and aid to the enemy, instead of helping and aiding the armed forces of the United States in this war, do border on treason; and, as the able senior Senator from Massachusetts has said, if the charges are true the acts border on sabotage.

I said that not more than 1 in 10 of the men were working. I do not take back one word of that statement, because it is absolutely true, and other Senators can vouch for the same thing. We saw that condition.

Mr. President, I will now read the letter. The Under Secretary of the Navy said in the letter:

This is a serious charge against a loyal and able unit of the Naval Establishment which I cannot let pass unanswered. The record of the Norfolk yard, including its labor utilization record, is good. During 1944 the Norfolk Navy Yard, in addition to building new ships (including 1 large aircraft carrier), repaired 2,458 ships so that they could return to active duty with the Navy. Of these 2,458 ships, 830 had to be drydocked in the course of the repair work, and the Norfolk Navy Yard has the outstanding record of having drydocked and repaired during 1944 more vessels than any other navy yard anywhere in the world. I do not believe that a navy yard with this outstanding record deserves to be accused by you of a condition amounting almost to the point of treason. Nor do I believe that this yard could achieve this record if, as you said, "not more than 1 in 10 (workers) was working."

Mr. President, if the men of that yard had performed the amount of work which the Under Secretary describes—the testimony clearly shows that they worked only 15 percent of the time—I say to the Under Secretary that they could have performed double that amount of work if they had had proper supervision, proper organization, and a proper spirit influencing them from the top.

The Under Secretary continues:

You offer in partial support of these accusations the following specific facts:

"A fancy checkerboard made of mahogany and bird's-eye maple was made for one of the Navy's civilian masters of shipbuilding at Norfolk. It was built by Navy workers on Government time. An oyster table was another luxury built for another master shipbuilder for an oyster party he was giving friends."

At the outset I want to make clear that all of the articles which I shall discuss were made for use within the Navy.

I do not know what he means by "the Navy," but I had never understood that civilian employees under civil service were in the United States Navy. It is true that some of them use their status to avoid service in the Navy.

I continue reading from the communication:

They were not for private use or use outside the Navy. Moreover, they were made by workers in intervals between their more urgent assignments.

But, Mr. President, the testimony is clear that the so-called private work comes first and not afterwards.

The Under Secretary continues, as follows:

It is true that a woodworker in the Norfolk Navy Yard built an oyster-shucking board. The total cost in labor and material was exactly $14.60, or $11.97 in labor and $2.63 in material. This oyster-shucking board was built to protect one of the yard's cafeteria table tops during an oyster roast which was being given for morale purposes in the yard.

Mr. President, that may have been building up morale, but from what I heard from men who worked there, it was doing just the opposite; it was breaking down morale.

It is also true that a few checkerboards were made in the woodworking shop of the yard for one of the recreational facilities at the yard. While an investigation which I have initiated indicates that the boards were more elaborate than necessary, each board required the intermittent time of one man for a total of 2 days. The cost of the materials was negligible.

Although you did not mention them in your interview, I understand that you also found that the Norfolk yard's woodworking shop had made napkin rings and had manufactured woodwork for one of the conference rooms at the yard.

Napkin rings made from waste materials and costing much less than 50 cents each were made in the woodworking shop of the yard for the use of officers serving on the new aircraft carrier *Shangri La*, which was built at the yard. I might add that this is standard practice at this yard. Napkin rings save napkins and laundry aboard ship.

As to the furniture in the master mechanics conference room all the chairs but one were removed as surplus from a ship converted at the yard. One chair and the conference table were built at the yard and were paid for by private funds of the Yard's Cooperative Association.

I submit, Senator FERGUSON, that these minor items in total probably would not add to $200 and are not sufficient basis for an accusation of conditions amounting "almost to the point of treason" against a navy yard having the record in ship repair and construction of the yard at Norfolk.

Mr. President, it is not the amount involved which is important, but the time which is spent.

I continue reading from the Under Secretary's letter:

It is impossible for me to discuss all conditions which may have impressed you at Norfolk.

Then he states that he does not have a summary or enumeration of the allegations made against the Norfolk Navy Yard. He then continues as follows:

The Navy endeavors continuously to improve operating efficiency at all its navy yards. Specifically at Norfolk two manpower utilization surveys have been conducted within the past year. The first of these was conducted by the so-called Andrews Board, which included civil service and industrial experts. The second survey, completed about a month ago, was made by the Industrial Survey Divi-

sion of the Secretary's office, an agency especially established to scrutinize manpower utilization in navy yards.

The officers of the United States Navy who are operating the Norfolk Navy Yard are as patriotic and hardworking as anyone in the Government, and are doing the best job they can with the largely inexperienced supervisory force and personnel with which they have to work.

Their operations are constantly inspected and supervised and steady improvement is being made as is definitely evidenced by the heavy decrease in man-hours required to build ships as compared to man-hours necessary for the same type of job a year or 2 years ago. There is no just basis for unreasonable condemnation of their performance.

Mr. President, as I have already said, I think the conditions which I have pointed out require the attention and consideration of each one of us, as well as of the Government. Why do I say "the Government"? Because I know from experience, and from the record, that many officials who are letting contracts state that they do not price them very carefully because they rely on the income tax for adjustment. They say that in that manner the Government recovers from 85 to 90 percent of the total profit. With regard to the remaining 10 percent they say, "We obtain that by renegotiation." But, Mr. President, in doing so they break down morale in industry all along the line. They state that a careful check will show that the work is done at the very lowest cost, because otherwise, when the next order is received, the men down the line would be able to obtain more money. Labor is not carefully checked, and, therefore, hoarding results.

We need the cooperation of industry in order to assure that the pricing is done properly, that we do not waste any manpower, and that the men do not sit and wait for work. The report shows that in some instances men have gone onto a ship in process of construction and have remained there for some time, even when they were not needed.

We need the patriotic cooperation of each and every laborer and workman, as well as those who supervise them. We should expose to the public gaze all these conditions by casting the limelight on them. I hope that our committee can go into the highways and byways in private industry and check them. I have reason to believe that the Norfolk Navy Yard is not the worst navy yard, or the worst arsenal in its waste of labor and manpower, and therefore I was glad today to hear the chairman of the committee state that there is a desire to check each and every one of them. I wish to say to the Navy and the Army that we hope we shall have their cooperation, and I know we shall have it, with few exceptions. I know what they must think about the "Cook tours" being conducted so that we may not obtain evidence. One man said that when the surveys were made the men were informed of them even 2 weeks in advance, so that they could get busy and show that they were working.

Mr. President, we are going to ask for the cooperation of each and every person, both in private and public life, so that every ounce of our effort, without waste of manpower or womanpower, may be exerted in production for the armed forces, and so that it may be possible to supply properly the civilians at home who are making their contribution to the war effort.

It will require some praying on the part of those in charge of these important matters that they may have spiritual guidance, and on our part that we may be able to do what is before us, and finish it at the very earliest moment.

PROPOSED INCREASES OF PAY FOR CAPITOL TELEPHONE OPERATORS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there has come over from the House of Representatives, House bill 1427, a measure relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange. With the bill there comes a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Accounts of the House, addressed to the President pro tempore of the Senate, now presiding, requesting immediate action on the bill, because it is to go into effect the 1st day of February.

Ordinarily the bill would go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The chairmanship of that committee is vacant at this time. In order that the bill may be expedited and passed so that it may become effective on the 1st of February, if at all, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the late Senator Maloney of Connecticut was the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I do not know whether any action has been taken toward filling that position.

Mr. McCARRAN. No action has been taken to fill that chairmanship, and I am making this request in order that the bill may be acted on promptly, and the Committee on Appropriations seems to be the proper committee to consider the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Under the ordinary rules, I suppose the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would succeed to the chairmanship of the committee, if he desired. He is not present today. I am not a member of the committee, but I think some Senator who is a member of the committee should take some notice of the situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I do not know why a chairman should not be appointed. I would guess that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] would be the new chairman.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Florida is very ill in the hospital at Bethesda.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know why the ranking majority member should not call the committee together. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is the ranking majority member.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to that committee considering the bill. My suggestion was made only in a desire to obtain action on the bill. It was acted on in the House by the Committee on Accounts, and would probably go to the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate, but apparently, under the letter I have, to which I have referred, it was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It must be dealt with by way of appropriations anyway.

Mr. TAFT. What does the bill provide?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is a House bill relating to the compensation of telephone operators in the United States Capitol. It increases the salaries of the operators. It passed the House several days ago almost unanimously.

Mr. TAFT. I see no reason why a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should not be called. I do not suppose I could call a meeting. I should think the ranking majority member could do so.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am advised that the Senator from Maryland will return to the Senate Thursday. I merely counsel against action until that committee at least has an opportunity to be consulted. If the Senator from Nevada would agree to put the matter off until Thursday, I think perhaps we might be able to make just as much progress.

Mr. McCARRAN. My reason for presenting the matter is that the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is now in the chair, presiding over the Senate, and I am making the request after consideration given to the matter by the present Presiding Officer. We think the bill should go to the Committee on Appropriations for immediate action.

Mr. CHANDLER. I feel bound to object at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ENLIGHTENED NATIONALISM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I realize the hour is late, and I shall hurry through the remarks I have prepared for this occasion.

From all appearances, Mr. President, the Nation-wide debate over our foreign policy has taken on the earmarks of the debate during the last political campaign. It is full of dead cats, out-dated issues, foggy notions, and unnecessary vituperation which we can ill-afford in so momentous a discussion. This debate, Nation-wide, is mostly in the newspapers.

As my humble contribution to clearing the air for a more sound and sensible debate, I should like to present some thoughts now.

These thoughts are arranged so as to first, define the relevant terms; second, state the basic issue; third, reiterate my personal position on this issue; and fourth, propose a brief constructive program in line with my position.

DEFINITIONS OF FOREIGN POLICY TERMS

Now, first, if we are ever to come to a meeting of minds, we must reach an agreement on the meaning of the terms we use.

Therefore, I am going to submit definitions on five terms important to our discussion. Do not imagine that I believe that my definitions, or those of any other single person, will be universally

accepted without qualification. But, at least, they will provide a basis on which we may systematically proceed and be more adequate to our task.

The five terms most relevant to the foreign policy discussion in the past, present, and future are these: Noninterventionism, interventionism, isolationism, internationalism, and nationalism.

These words epitomize the opposing viewpoints among our people before and after Pearl Harbor.

Each of these words to a greater or a lesser degree has become a "fight word." Their very mention makes people see red. They have been used ambiguously and irresponsibly in smear campaigns. They have become filled with derogatory connotations.

Let us, however, examine them in the cold light of unemotional analysis.

Noninterventionism was the belief in and desire for America's nonparticipation in the European war either as a declared or nondeclared belligerent. Parenthetically, I may add that this belief was held by 70 to 90 percent of our people prior to Pearl Harbor, as indicated by every public-opinion poll.

Interventionism was the belief in and desire for America's participation in the Second World War as a declared belligerent.

Isolationism was the belief in and desire for America's abstaining from entangling herself in foreign alliances, abstaining from meddling in other nations affairs, and the belief in and desire for America's playing a free hand in foreign affairs.

Internationalism is the belief in and desire for America's entrance into a supergovernment which, for the purpose of international peace, pools the sovereignty of national states and exerts dominion over those states in a manner supposedly irrespective of particular national interests.

Nationalism—and when I say "nationalism" I mean the new enlightened nationalism of today—is the belief in and desire for America's advancement and protection of its own interests and sovereignty; the desire for our cooperation in world affairs in a manner consistent with such self-interest and sovereignty and for America's participation in establishing a peace which will make for enduring peace, if humanly possible.

It will be noted that the past tense was used for three of these definitions. That is because "noninterventionism" and "interventionism" went out the window when the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. We have been and are in this war for keeps. There has been no question of withdrawal before final and decisive victory is achieved. "Isolationism," too, has become a thing largely of the past. It will remain so, if certain developments which may produce a new isolationism are nipped in the bud. Whether we like it or not, the war, a shrunken world, and modern inventions have forced us into an alliance with our allies.

We have now placed in what I believe to be their proper perspective those three terms which may be well considered obsolete and inappropriate to our present discussion. But before leaving these terms, let us take one more measure to antidote the poisons which have developed around these three terms and the two remaining terms, "internationalism" and "nationalism." Let us set the record straight by stating what all five terms do not and did not mean.

First. "Noninterventionism" did not signify a belief in or desire for nonintercourse with the belligerents. On the contrary, noninterventionists, by and large, favored uninterrupted trade between private American concerns and the belligerents and in addition, favored international arbitration.

Second. "Interventionism" did not signify a willingness to enter war for the sake of war. Interventionists regarded war as a slaughter and our entrance into it a painful necessity rather than an unmixed blessing.

Third. Isolationism did not signify "ostrich-ism." The isolationists did not close their eyes to what was going on around them. Indeed, it was because of the very things they saw that they were isolationists. Nor were they isolationists because they abnormally hated one or the other belligerent, notably Britain or Germany. They were isolationists because of what they felt toward America and not because of what they felt toward foreign nations. They loved America so much; they gloried in our independence so highly, that they would not allow our beloved Nation to become the dupe or pawn of an alien power.

Fourth. Internationalism does not signify a lack of love for America. Rather, the internationalist holds America dear, but he believes his Nation can achieve the greatest good for itself and others only by surrendering its sovereignty into a collective pool of the sovereignties of all states.

Fifth. Nationalism, I repeat, the new enlightened nationalism of today, does not signify antiforeignism. The nationalist who exults in his nation and its people and desires to protect and advance their interests does not irresponsibly disparage or damage the interests of other nations and peoples. Nor does nationalism signify noncooperation. On the contrary the enlightened nationalist desires realistic and practical collaboration with other nations, but not at the price of the loss of national sovereignty.

These, then, are the relevant terms in what I believe to be their true light.

THE BASIC ISSUE OF OUR TIME

What, then, is the true basic issue of our time?

It is the issue of the two clashing concepts which we have just found by the process of elimination to be the only relevant terms to our discussion today: Internationalism and nationalism. It is around these two concepts that the opposing lines in our country have formed.

I, for one, take my stand on the side of nationalism, the new enlightened nationalism, free from the selfish excesses of the past. It does not mean living unto ourselves alone. It does mean using the instrumentalities available for this day.

I take this stand on the side of enlightened nationalism because I believe:

First. The force of enlightened nationalism is the dominant and irresistible force of our time, both at home and abroad, whether we foster it or not.

Second. It provides the only sound and realistic approach in our time through which we may meet the challenge for world cooperation and peace.

Third. It provides the only sound and realistic approach through which we, at home, may maintain and multiply the blessings of our American way and our American standard of living, and make our contribution to world stability.

In taking this stand, I am continuing along the same pro-American line determined by my conscience in pre-Pearl Harbor days.

At that time, the force of enlightened nationalism pointed unerringly to the absolute necessity for nonintervention in the war. In moving with this force, I took no action which I have ever since had cause to regret.

The overwhelming majority of our people were even then behind this force. I heard their insistent plea that we keep out of this war. I saw the pitiful state of our national defenses, the danger of "playing with fire" by undeclared belligerency; the complete lack of reward for us in war. What is more, I saw that Europe was then unready for and would be unresponsive to any sacrifice in blood we might make in the name of world cooperation. I remembered the past. I pray the future will be different in this respect.

As I declared then, all my sympathies were with the Allies. The danger of a German victory was obvious to me. Yet, even more obvious were the dangers of plunging an unwilling and unprepared nation into war and the danger of sullying our name in the eyes of the world by shamelessly breaking international law through devious means. Pearl Harbor did not decide who was right—the interventionist or the noninterventionist.

Now that our country is in this war, the force of enlightened nationalism still points the way for our people. And, again, it is my interpretation of this force and this way which guides my own thinking. Through this interpretation I have the fervent conviction that everything humanly possible must be done to make this the last world war in which American boys or any other boys engage. I have the earnest desire that we make every effort to lay the foundations for a just and lasting peace.

Mr. President, in connection with the possibilities of peace immediately at hand, I should like to digress for a moment to clarify one point. In the recent debate on this floor on January 15, I asked the distinguished Senator from Montana if the President or anyone else in America had ever defined the terms "unconditional surrender." The Senator replied that he could not answer my question.

Language at times is a faulty tool, but it is the best tool we have to express our ideas. My only intent in asking this question was to ascertain whether we might further particularize our language and thereby clarify any misunderstand-

ing in our enemies' minds over the terms we use.

My concept of the use of the words "unconditional surrender" is this: When one nation states this as the basis for its enemies' capitulation, the victorious nation signifies thereby that it alone will have the right to designate the immediate and the ultimate terms of peace.

In our own history, Gen. U. S. Grant was known as Unconditional Surrender Grant. When Gen. Robert E. Lee asked for terms, General Grant stated "unconditional surrender," and Lee accepted. Then Grant did the magnanimous thing. His immediate peace terms fitted the situation and were an opening wedge to a reconciliation between the North and the South. Grant permitted the southern soldiers to retain their horses for spring plowing and also their sidearms.

I personally have never interpreted what the ultimate peace terms to our enemies would be following their unconditional surrender, whether they would or should be drastic or lenient. I believe that the decision as to the immediate basis for our enemies' capitulation in any one battle or for the entire war is a matter for the supreme commander of the Allied Armies in the field to determine. When the time approaches and there is the prospect of a cessation of hostilities, our military men will handle that problem.

Therefore, in summary, the leaders of the Allied States have determined unconditional surrender as the immediate basis for Germany's and Japan's laying down their arms. I would suggest, therefore, we get on with the business at hand of defining the ultimate meaning of that term, for it is over the ultimate meaning of unconditional surrender that we and our enemies are largely in the dark.

Belief in enlightened nationalism prescribes "don'ts" as well as "do's." Thus, I do not want our country to strip herself of her sovereignty and lay it in a collective "kitty" before the present rapacious greed and untender mercy of foreign nations. I do not want our country to meddle arbitrarily in the internal affairs of other powers. I do not want our country to pay through the nose as a Santa Claus or a Lady Bountiful only to be inevitably abused when we cease our donations. I do not want our country to trade a bird in the bush—a complete dependence on a hoped-for collective security—for our bird in the hand—primary reliance on our own national defenses.

I do want our country to retain her sovereignty while willingly collaborating with like-minded nations. I do want our country to be a good Samaritan, helping other nations to help themselves. I do want our country to proceed in her own plans for adequate national security. I do want our country to be eternally vigilant for the preservation of her liberty.

American nationalists are ready, willing, and able to consider these issues with those who differ with them. But I do not think that our nationalists want to enter into an acrimonious debate with the internationalists. We know that such a debate would cripple our Nation. Such a debate would make our Nation a verbal battlefield with slander, abuse, and defamation firing back and forth. No; let us argue the respective merits of our cases calmly and rationally. Let us neither beat our breasts, beat the air, nor beat each others' heads. Let us not impugn each others' honesty or integrity on the floor of the Senate or off the Senate floor. Let us not forget that all of us as good Americans are agreed on the goals of peace and justice, if not on the means to achieve those goals.

But let not the internationalists misinterpret our desire for restraint in this debate as a confession of weakness of our case.

Rather, I, personally, have every confidence in the strength of the case for and of our peoples' desire for enlightened nationalism.

Every war we or any other nation has ever fought has resulted in a post-war resurgence of nationalism. It will be so with our own Nation after this war. It is so now with a reborn Britain, an invigorated Russia, China, and France. But modern war and a contracted world due to man's inventive genius have changed the picture. Our perspective is enlarged.

However, do you think for one moment that the 12,000,000 service men and women who are making so great a sacrifice for our flag will return and lower that flag before a foreign banner of some supergovernment and superstate?

Do you think, Mr. President, that they will not take a fiercer pride than ever before in our own Nation, after seeing the squalor, the poverty, the hatreds everywhere else in the world?

Do you think that the loved ones of our fallen servicemen will allow all that for which their beloved died, to be destructively changed one whit?

Do you think that our citizenry who have helped to build what are the world's greatest land, air, and sea forces, will permit our Nation to fall asleep at the switch again and allow a political or military Pearl Harbor to occur? No; continuous vigilance for a long time to come will be the price of liberty.

No; we have every confidence that enlightened nationalism is in the saddle and will be in the saddle to stay. And we glory in that fact, because we are certain it will prove America's salvation and aid all nations to build a better world.

It is for our internationalists to recognize the fact of enlightened nationalism's ascendance. It will be to their shame if they vilify it. It will be to their peril if they ignore it.

Similarly, the attitudes and actions of the internationalists will determine the lengths and directions to which our enlightened nationalism is to go.

If the internationalists persist in their slander of the so-called nonintervention-ists or isolationsts of the past;

If they persist in trying to foist a guilt or inferiority complex upon our people;

If they persist in their either rubber-stamping some arbitrary unilateral actions undertaken by our allies or remaining at loggerheads over some such actions because they have never come to a "cards up" understanding with our allies;

If they persist in their insistence on secrecy in foreign dealings;

If they persist in their plans for our continuing as a "sugar daddy" to the world;

Then, America may become nationalist to an undue extreme, even to embracing a sterner isolationism than ever before. At the very minimum, America may become so cynical and distrustful that it will only half-heartedly collaborate for peace.

That I, for one, do not want. Against that possibility, I urge that all reasonable measures be taken. I have faith that if we—yes; and our allies too—uplift ourselves from the level of bickering and name calling, and get on with the job that destiny, whether we like it or not, has thrust upon our shoulders, we shall discover in ourselves the stature to succeed in that job.

A PROGRAM OF ENLIGHTENED NATIONALISM

Now, what would be the specific attitudes and the specific bases on which enlightented nationalism—and that is the subject of my talk—might have us proceed to success?

Let me suggest four points. They are:

First. Realism and understanding.

Second. Sovereignty and constitutionality.

Third. Leadership and salesmanship.

Fourth. Enlightened self-interest.

First, realism and understanding: This means that we must face the facts of life in the world today, understand those facts sympathetically, and then proceed on the basis of those facts in a practical manner.

What are those facts?

First. We have been "beating around the bush" with our allies. We have not "talked turkey" with the Russian bear and the British lion. We have not shown our respective "card hands." We are still in the dark as to our differences. As a result we have been shocked by sharp clashes of inter-Allied policy which came as surprises to us. Therefore, the time has come to get down to cases, bare our differences, and go ahead in threshing them out in a mutually satisfactory give-and-take.

Second. We have been having pipe dreams of the world. I could elaborate on the many pipe dreams you and I have heard. We have been picturing the millenium as just around the corner. We have been expecting our allies to sprout wings as angels, or we have been imagining them with horns, as devils. These pipe dreams only leave us in blind alleys. Therefore, the time has come to wake up, break our addiction to wishful thinking, and see things straight.

Third. We have been chained to the past. We have fancied a return to a static pre-war world. We have so slavishly thought of some of the world's errors of the past that we have almost come to the foregone conclusion that those errors would be repeated. Yet, we have forgotten the basic error of the past—the failure to recognize that all things change. Therefore, the time has come

to gear our thinking to the dynamic world of today; to learn from the errors of the past, but otherwise "let the dead past bury its dead."

Fourth. We have been obsessed with the possible forms of post-war organization. We have channeled all our energies into arguing over the rival details of the blueprints. In so doing, we have shirked the job at hand. As a result, our international relations have hit one avoidable snag after another. Therefore, the time has come to start doing the job of cooperating, in the knowledge that we will achieve the ultimate organization mechanism through practice rather than through theory. Cooperation is a two-way street—a thing of mutual intent and will and purpose—for all nations, not simply for America.

Fifth. We have not recognized the true state of misery of the world. We have not seen that the economic life of the European continent has been smashed to pieces by the war. We have not noted that the social structure of Europe has been twisted out of shape. We have not seen that Europe is bled white, is discouraged, disillusioned, cynical, pessimistic. We have not seen its preoccupation with age-old problems of boundaries, minorities, and seaports. We have not sensed the problems imposed upon it by all the variants of class hatreds and struggle. We have not felt its haunting fear of the specter of more state socialism, communism, and fascism. As a result of our blindness here, we can be of little help to Europe, unless we awaken.

In order that I may better illustrate the vast differences today between the Old and New Worlds. I ask unanimous consent at this time that a recent article on this subject by R. H. Markham, be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WILEY. So, to conclude this part, let us recognize our blindness heretofore, let us resolve to open our eyes to these facts, to redouble our own efforts and our sympathy with Europe for these problems.

Sixth. We have not appreciated the tremendous emphasis which Europe fearfully places on its post-war trade. We have not borne in mind Europe's heavy reliance on foreign commerce as its life blood. As a result, we are often given to irresponsible statements and thinking.

To illustrate, it will be remembered that President Roosevelt, in speaking about plans for 60,000,000 post-war jobs in this country, said that to accomplish this the United States would have to triple its pre-war exports. That statement was greeted with the deepest concern across the Atlantic. As one Englishman Labor member put it during a debate in Commons, "If the Americans are going to export three times as much as they did before the war they are going to export unemployment to Great Britain."

Of course, I am not championing British trade, export or import, at the expense of legitimate American interests. But, I am making the point that such loose and casual statements are taken by the British and other Europeans as one more instance of American misunderstanding and almost nonconcern, in spite of our high talk, with vital European problems. Let me say parenthetically, "American green pastures" are not distant. They are here in America. Here is the greatest market on earth. Let us remember that and better our distribution system.

Seventh. We have unrealistically failed to impress on Europe our willingness to see our mutual problems through. We have not driven home the point that it is our intention to stand by our obligations and that we have never failed in the past to so stand by them. Because of our failure to reassure Europe in this manner, we have provided it an out for its own forsaking of its obligations. Therefore, the time has come to make as clear as day our stick-to-it-iveness and our desire that Europe evidence this trait which it has so sadly lacked in the past.

Mr. President, the very dynamic speech made by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on the floor of the Senate a few days ago probably did more to bring to the attention of our allies the real intent of America than anything else that has happened. Whether it will result in a nucleus for post-war organization no one can tell, because, as I previously stated, cooperation is a two-way street.

Eighth. We have unrealistically misrepresented our program of aid to Europe. We have given Europe the idea that we are either a meddler spreading homemade solutions or a fairy godfather lavishing blank but signed checks. As a result, we have set the stage for Europe ultimately to throw us out by the ear and call us Uncle Shylock to boot. Therefore, the time has come for us to demonstrate that we intend to help Europe to help itself, that we want to see its problems largely solved through itself.

These, then, are my points on the need for realism and understanding.

Second, leadership and salesmanship: Who is there to deny that America must assume its place of leadership in the world? Who is there to gainsay that we must display a caliber of leadership that will inspire the respect and admiration of the world and the world's will to pursue an honorable and straight path for itself?

In our leadership we must not lead by the nose, push, drag, or trick the world into cooperation and peace. Rather, we must do a genuine and honest salesmanship job. We must sell Europe the following articles on the basis of their own intrinsic merits:

(a) The utter futility of war as an instrument of national policy.

(b) The imperative need for a world peace authority with adequate power.

(c) The necessity from every standpoint—economic, political and spiritual—of observing the sanctity of the pledged word.

(d) The necessity of each nation living up to its natural obligations.

(e) The equality of all states before international law.

(f) The indivisibility of world security. Let me amplify this last point.

Any durable system of world security can be achieved only if the major powers of the post-war world first achieve their own reasonable security. And, since reasonable security is by definition a security which is not achieved at the expense of a similar security of others, it follows that the security of all nations is interdependent. Our own Nation, of course, of all nations, is least dependent on the security of others as a guaranty of its own security. But even we, in this shrunken world and in these days of abundant and destructive inventive genius, must promote the security of others in addition to securing inviolate a sphere of our own security.

Lastly, we must sell one further article—the American way. Yes; while our Russian ally is undoubtedly even now propagandizing for her form of government, we must do likewise for ours. This does not mean a high-pressure, printed-handout type of propaganda for us. Rather, we must continue to set "a standard to which the wise and the honest may repair." We have every moral right to hold up our Nation as a model.

A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

Yes; let us be salesmen of the light, even as we are exponents of enlightened nationalism.

Third, sovereignty and constitutionality: Let us ask of no nation and let no nation ask of us for a surrender of national sovereignty to a superstate. Let us cease our chatter of possibly depriving Congress of its right to declare war. But let us understand that in this stand we are not hamstringing our efforts for peace.

Let me make this clear. It is my opinion that if America enters into a treaty with foreign nations and if by the terms of such treaty a mechanism is provided for policing any of the world's areas by American forces, fulfillment of such policing action would not require a further act of Congress.

We are a constitutional Republic. Under the Constitution, the power to declare war rests in the Congress of the United States. The President, however, throughout our history has possessed the power to preserve peace in the sense that whenever the peace of this country was at stake, and there was danger of an insurrection, or when the integrity of the Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere was threatened, the President has had the inherent power to utilize the armed forces of the United States to preserve the peace without a declaration of war by Congress.

As a matter of fact, there might not be a clear line of demarcation between actual war and the result of the Presidential use of the power to preserve the peace. If the President and the Senate should enter into a general treaty with other nations, which treaty contains the joint obligation of the contracting nations to preserve peace, including a provision for the utilization of our armed forces to effectuate that purpose, I am satisfied that our Supreme Court would hold that such provision would be valid.

This would not be in derogation of congressional power to declare war, but in fulfillment of the inherent power of government to maintain and preserve peace.

Fourth and finally, our enlightened self-interest: Let us openly proclaim that we are going into the difficult post-war business for the same reason we hope and believe every other like-minded nation is entering it—for enlightened self-interest. We are going in not for territories, not for power, but for a peace, a security and a husbanding of our strength with which we may confidently and uninterruptedly work out our blessed American way of life. We are going to take out life insurance on ourself by helping to underwrite the life insurance of the world. Let us openly proclaim that we do not intend to cut our own economic throat any more than we expect to cut the economic throat of any other nation.

This is the program which I humbly suggest for our new day, a new day purchased for us by the blood and sweat and tears of our service men and women and their loved ones.

Let us advance confidently to this new day with the knowledge that it is always darkest before the dawn. Let us advance with sure step and clear mind. Let us shake the cobwebs from our thinking. Let us cease making a mystery of the obvious, a complex puzzle of the simple, and a paper theory of the practical.

This is the challenge to us in the ferment of our time. This is the answer to that challenge through the new enlightened nationalism, the nationalism of light which fulfills the word of old:

Arise, shine [America]; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.

EXHIBIT A

GOOD AMERICA!—THE WIDE HORIZON

(By R. H. Markham)

Two years ago I left my home and desk to accept a post in a United States war agency. During much of that period I was away from America in a war zone. A few days ago I returned. Reentering America seemed to me a dream. America seemed as the Promised Land.

I know that is an extravagant statement. It is gushing. Such an impression is based on emotion. But I am not ashamed of it. It is wonderful to be in America again.

Now I hasten to point out that I did not undergo especial hardships, nor make appreciable sacrifices, nor face great dangers when abroad. I was just a civilian and almost all the time was well behind the front. I was adequately fed and usually slept in a bed. But I was in a very sad world among thwarted people. I had good companions, both American and British, and was surrounded by friendly people, but I was terribly lonely. Not only for my family and home and street and comrades, but for hope and, perhaps, for truth; for more equality among classes, for good will among groups and nations.

At times I sojourned near the Pyramids and ate food produced by exploited fellahin who are almost as restricted and warped and dulled as the slaves of the Pharaohs. I looked down upon Mount Zion and saw local turmoil, hatred, and injustice almost as rampant as when Abraham led his flocks past it. I was much in Italy, where I dwelt among people more despondent, discouraged, and crushed than those for whom the Caesars prepared gory spectacles. It was a dark and sinister world and most of the few lights that appeared here and there through the gloom were false will-of-the-wisps.

I think that is why America seemed a miracle to me. America is hope. And much more. It is a demonstration that people can live well together. I know it has many defects. I know its future is uncertain. But this first week back home I shall not concentrate on those defects, nor dwell on that uncertainty. I shall rejoice in America's good things and draw inspiration from America's marvelous demonstration of brotherhood.

This week, America seems to me the place of brotherhood. It is a family in which we may all feel that we "belong."

Perhaps that is what we humans most want in our serious moments, namely, to "belong." In most parts of the world now, and indeed much of the time, people are as waifs. This week I don't feel as a waif.

I could almost imagine that the Statue of Liberty waved at me as I flew over New York. As our marvelous silver ship landed at Washington in the darkness of an early morning, I allowed myself the feeling that the lights were all glowing for me.

I was only a civilian among fighting colonels and majors and captains and among heroic fliers—at best I was a superfluity, at worst a nuisance—but still I was treated kindly by everybody at the airport. The Red Cross girls gave me coffee and even smiles. The information man speedily arranged for my further transportation.

The telephone brought me into immediate touch with two rather distant cities, bringing to my ears two sleepy voices which I had long wished to hear. The efficiency of American telephones is something unique in the world. It is a part of the American miracle. I felt like calling up everybody in the country and saying, "Wake up, folks, and say hello; a neighbor has come home."

Then I went to a teeming railroad station with people streaming in all directions and there seemed to be a host of helpers there to serve us "little guys." There were also special booths to make ticket buying easy.

There were many pleasant voices and everywhere beautiful women. Indeed, all the women of America seemed to me beautiful. I suppose they couldn't be, but they seemed so to me. I never saw anything like it any place else in the world. Of course, I know the mothers and grandmothers of America's women came from Italy, or the Balkans, or France, or Germany, or Scandinavia, or Great Britain, or some other foreign country. But America changed them all into Cinderellas—that is, those who needed changing. I think nowhere on earth have women been so inspiring as they could be in America. Here fairy tales come true.

In time—a very short time—I got onto an almost interminably long train. I was swept onto it by a surging stream of my fellow Americans. Most of us found comfortable seats. There were soldiers, sailors, WAVES, and WAC's, babies and their mammas, mothers and fathers who had gone to see soldier sons, teachers, storekeepers, war workers. They were all well dressed, serious, quiet. Some were sad, others troubled about the war, a few were happy over meetings or prospective meetings. All were self-assured and self-confident, free from hidden fear. One saw they were accustomed to travel in utter freedom. They expressed opinions without restraint. They cast no furtive glances for lurking detectives. They were friendly to one another. Many were reading, some the funnies, others about the world.

I felt like going to each one in my car and saying: Mr. Zulalian, Miss Olsen, Grandpa Jones, Corporal Ivanovich, how are you, my neighbors? Mrs. Murphy, Tony Zimboni, Grandma Feldman, Lieutenant Terbessy, hello. Shake hands. I just got back to our country. Mr. Werhuski, Sam White, Miss Zukaukas, Sergeant Miltiades, good morning. Isn't this a marvelous place? People really do live well, and are beautiful and help one another as neighbors, don't they?

When I got onto the streets of New York, a lady asked me to buy a Watchtower. She was a Witness of Jehovah. Many of her fellow sectarians are against this war and against our Government. Some even refuse to salute the American flag. But no one molested her. The United States courts even protect her. That seemed to me a supreme manifestation of freedom.

America seemed to me a marvelous place.

That feeling of mine was not vain pride or empty patriotism. It aroused no impulse to boast. Rather a high and holy sentiment of gratitude. I felt like thanking God that it had been demonstrated that men can gather from all corners of the earth and found a good society with much freedom, much equality, and much good will.

I wanted to tell the exploited, fear-ridden, hate-torn, hungry people of a score of countries, "Brothers and sisters, don't give up. We shall yet create a world society in which men may live as neighbors."

DEFERMENT OF FARM WORKERS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, only the urgency of the question upon which I am about to speak, and which I hope to discuss as concisely as possible, justifies me in taking the time of the Senate at this hour in the afternoon. The mail of every Member of the Senate and every Member of the House from the farm States, the telegraph wires, and the telephone wires, bring us stories of the consternation that has spread over the farm area and among the farming population because of an order issued on January 3 by General Hershey, Director of Selective Service.

In describing the urgency of this matter, let me suggest that if commodities and goods are to be placed in their proper order, there is nothing so essential as food.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Are we to understand that General Hershey's order in any way interfered with or attempted to interfere with the validity of the Tydings amendment?

Mr. REED. I shall discuss that question in due course, if I may be permitted to proceed.

The Army cannot fight without food. The civilian cannot work without food. Nothing can be done without food. That is the first thing which is necessary. We have not too much food as it is. The demands for food for our own people, for our Army, for the Navy, for lend-lease, and for liberated countries exceeds anything in our previous history.

Mr. President, on this floor in November 1942 the Senate adopted the amendment known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act. I think the Committee on Military Affairs was handling the selective-service bill. It refused to accept the amendment, and the amendment was written into the bill on the floor of the Senate.

I read now from Public Law 772, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 638, second session, House bill 7528. This is the so-called Tydings amendment, and it is

to be found in paragraph (k) of section 4 of the Selective Service Act:

Every registrant found by a selective service local board * * * to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

I have omitted some language which is not necessary to an understanding of the Tydings amendment and what it meant. It is still the law of the land.

On January 3, General Hershey sent a telegram to all State directors of the Selective Service System. He quoted first from a letter received by him from Mr. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization. I now read what Mr. Byrnes wrote General Hershey:

You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age, the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation.

Further on General Hershey quoted further from the letter from Mr. Byrnes, as follows—I now read what Mr. Byrnes wrote:

The War Food Administration, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18- through 25-year age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

With that statement I agree. In other words, Marvin Jones, the head of the War Food Administration, upon whose organization devolves the duty of seeing that the necessary food is produced, said:

As long as you comply with the Tydings amendment, that will be all there will be to it, and we can get along.

But General Hershey did not stop there. Mr. Byrnes wrote him further:

I have reported these facts to the President.

Now I charge my fellow Senators to follow this language carefully. I repeat what Mr. Byrnes wrote:

I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, let me inquire who said that.

Mr. REED. The President.

Mr. Byrnes further wrote as follows:

The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture, like our other war industries, can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

Mr. President, if the hour were not so late I should like to discuss that very point. As a matter of fact, the population on the farms in the United States has decreased by 4,749,000 since 1941. There are now slightly more than 25,000,000 persons on the farms. They are mainly divided into the young people and the older people beyond the ages of 50 or 60, whose working capacity is limited.

Mr. President, I telephoned the Bureau of Agricultural Economics this morning and asked them how far back we would have to go to find a point in our history when the farm population was as low as 25,000,000 persons, which it is now. I was told that prior to 1910, no separation was made of the population to show the farm population, and that therefore all they could tell me was that it would be necessary to go a way back of 1910, 35 years ago, to find a time when the farm population was anything like as low as it is now—with the difference that today the demand for food is greater than ever before in our history, and of course the need for production must correspond with the demand.

Now General Hershey has directed the State directors to forward the text of Mr. Byrnes' letter to all local boards. Of course that is proper. Finally General Hershey concluded with the following, which is in his own language:

In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–C, local boards will consider the President's finding that—

And I quote again—

further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

After receiving an order of that kind from the head of the Selective Service System, through the State director, in a letter which concludes by quoting that language of the President, I think there is scarcely a local draft board in the country which would not assume that it had been ordered by the President of the United States, as well as by the Selective Service System Director, to take all these men.

Mr. President, you particularly are interested in this matter. The present occupant of the chair is the distinguished former Senator from Missouri, the Vice President of the United States. Someone might think that possibly I have overstated the effect on the draft boards and the State boards. I have dealt rather actively with this matter. Last Thursday morning the Kansas City Times carried a story based on an interview with me, describing this situation. I immediately received a letter from the government appeal agent of Bates County, Mo. He gave me some startling information, namely, that in Missouri the procedure was to take everyone, regardless. I immediately sent him a telegram asking him please to send me a copy of the order to which he referred. I received it in the mail this morning.

Let me read it, Mr. President. I am sure no one will be more concerned than will the present occupant of the chair; and if the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished Vice President and former Senator from Missouri, does not proceed in his own State in this matter, then I shall be somewhat surprised and very much disappointed.

Here is the directive which the Missouri State board issued to the Missouri local draft boards:

A careful study of this section of the law, and a careful study of the directive in which the finding of the President is quoted, indicates to us that the agricultural occupation of a registrant 18 through 25 is not as essential to the war effort as the need for young men in the Army and Navy.

That is the language of the board, and none of it is in quotation marks.

I read further:

You will note the word "essential" is used by the Tydings amendment. Therefore, it would seem to us that the proper interpretation of this new directive is that practically all registrants 18 through 25 in II–C should be inducted into the armed forces if they pass the physical examination.

Mr. President, that directive comes from your own State. It was issued by the State headquarters of the Selective Service System, at Jefferson City, Mo., on January 4, 1945, and it is signed by Claude C. Earp, colonel, Army of the United States, State director. I shall be very happy to send the Chair a copy of the directive, if he so desires. I send to the Chair a press release which contains the language I just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thanks the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wished to obtain the Senator's own interpretation of whether the President's statement is not again an attempt to override the legislative intent of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. REED. Oh, I very clearly think it is, and that is what it does.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say that, after all, we are still a land of law, and it is still the function of the Congress, not the Executive, to enact the laws. If that be true, is it not the opinion of the distinguished Senator that in each case the respective boards are not bound in any way whatever, either legally or otherwise, by the statement of the President?

Mr. REED. That is certainly my opinion. Yesterday, being unable to obtain the exact information regarding what was going on in my own State of Kansas, I telegraphed Governor Schoeppel and told him of the difficulties and of my lack of a clear understanding, and that I thought he should have his personal representative check up, through the office of the State director, and ascertain the situation regarding the operations of every local draft board in the State.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has already answered the question propounded by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I really rose to offer an answer to the question, because I joined with the junior Senator from Kansas in he resolution which provides for a clarification. If the directive of Director Hershey will not cause any confusion or will not in any way encourage local draft boards to take different positions with respect to the Se-

lective Service Act, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may feel willing to report the resolution to the calendar. I believe that to be the entire question. I am sure the junior Senator from Kansas agrees with me that it is not a question of how badly we need our farm boys. I have received many letters showing how badly they are needed. I am impressed with the necessity of bringing to the attention of the Senate the fact that the directive to which reference has been made was issued by General Hershey and has been interpreted by draft boards in various States of the Union to mean that if a man is engaged in an agricultural occupation he is not as essential to it as he would be to the military service, and therefore the draft boards should automatically induct him into service. Do I state the situation correctly?

Mr. REED. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I wish to be as brief as possible. The hour is growing late, and I hope to be able to finish my remarks within the next 7 or 8 minutes.

I have received many letters and telegrams. One came to my desk only this afternoon. It is dated January 20, and reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: They are drafting farm boys here right down the line and past. And don't let any governmental buck passer or lawyer tell you any different. If you fellows are going to save many of them, you will have to work fast.

Mr. President, I have taken out of the mass of correspondence which has reached me approximately 15 or 18 short excerpts. I shall read 2 or 3 of them, and then ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remainder of them without reading them.

Here is an excerpt which reads as follows:

The farmers are terribly disturbed. Our Nation is * * * drafting our farm labor, saying it can be replaced with older men. * * * There will be hundreds of acres of land lay idle.

Another one reads:

There are 3 young men in my community who have farmed all of their lives. Each of them are the only help the aging fathers and each are farming about 600 acres, with as many as 125 head of livestock on each farm. * * * Each of these boys have been, or will be, called for service immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the excerpts to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We * * * protest action taken by State director in drafting agricultural labor who qualify under Tydings bill; under present procedure local boards are unnecessary.

Have a boy 21 who, with an older brother, has been operating 1,000 acres of land, 700 in cultivation. Received a notice from local draft board Tuesday calling him to Leavenworth January 27 for preinduction examinations. * * * Through this section of country almost half of corn is in fields, no help, weather conditions unfavorable for picker. We are feeding 150 head of cattle. * * * If this boy is taken it will just close our operations. His father is 66 past and older brother is not well following a major operation. There is absolutely no help through this section. * * * Farmers are getting panicky, will be forced to sell stock, machinery, and close up.

The farmers are terribly disturbed. Our Nation is * * * drafting our farm labor, saying it can be replaced with older men. * * * There will be hundreds of acres of land lying idle.

Draft boards are drafting farmers right and left; essential young farmers are selling out. Farmers should be frozen on the farm as land will be idle and livestock sacrificed.

There are 3 young men in my community who have farmed all of their lives. Each of them are the only help of aging fathers and each are farming about 600 acres with as many as 125 head of livestock on each farm. * * * Each of these boys have been, or will be called for service immediately.

The order is here calling all farm workers regardless of how necessary they are to produce foodstuff not only for the armed forces but for civilians as well. * * * Congress certainly is not going to sit idly by and let a few men that do not seem to have the brains that they should have ruin the country. Men can't fight on empty stomachs and neither can civilians work on empty stomachs.

At a meeting of farmers and businessmen held in the Farm Bureau offices * * * we, the undersigned, were appointed as a committee to advise you of the critical situation facing this community, and probably all other farming communities, due to the new draft regulations * * *. The records in the Farm Bureau office here show that we have over 200,000 acres of land in cultivation in this county with a total of only 454 farm workers. This includes farm owners, farm operators, all hired farm help. We are facing an absolute break-down in agriculture. * * * One large farm operator of this county advises that he does not have one man left to farm with and it looks like he will have to fold up on his operations.

I have 3 sons in service—two are in France at last report * * * These two boys were in the first draft. Our third boy enlisted in the Navy 4 years ago and has seen active duty. * * * I have a son 19 who they have been deferring because my farm operations depend largely upon him. Since this new decree it looks like he would have to go. If he does, I will be compelled to quit for lack of qualified help. * * * We milk 20 cows, raise cattle and hogs, also poultry in addition to grain.

I felt I just had to write you * * *. I was born and raised on a farm. My brother, sister, and I still own that farm. We have a man on the farm who is past 60. He has two sons, one of them was drafted a year ago and if the other one is taken, the man simply cannot carry on as he can't do heavy work. * * * If this remaining son is taken this 360-acre farm will be idle * * *. This is only one instance of what will happen if those men who probably never even saw a farm are allowed to have their way about it.

I have been disturbed a bit for some time about the orders coming from Washington. * * * It will take a lot of farm products to feed our boys. * * * My daughter has a son who will be 22 years old on February 1, 1945, who has been running the 160-acre farm, milking 7 cows, feeding about 50 hogs, has 25 sheep and some young stock, and 3 head of horses. He is the only support his mother has * * *. This boy was called yesterday to go to Leavenworth to take physical examination. If he is taken all this daughter can do is sell her stock and implements, close up her home and leave the farm.

Here is my case. * * * Just to give you a rough idea of how much attention our draft boards give * * * the Tydings Act. My oldest son-in-law enlisted and was killed. * * * Then drafted my youngest son-in-law. * * * That left me one son to carry on operation of 360-acre farm and I am crippled too badly to do any kind of heavy work. * * * At the time this boy entered the United States armed forces he was actually producing over 30 farm units besides farming 160 acres and feeding and producing the feed for over 40 head of cattle, milk cows, and beef. He had to take * * * a loss at sale for it was such a bad day and so many farmers are uncertain of their standings in the draft they are afraid to buy.

My boy got his call to go to Leavenworth. * * * If he has to go so will his dairy cows and all as there is no one to take his place.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to dwell briefly on the subject of the decline in the size of the population producing food. In 1940 the number of people producing food was 30,269,000. In 1941 it was 29,988,000. In 1942 it was 29,048,000. In 1943 it was 26,659,000. In 1944 it was 25,521,000, the lowest farm population we have had in at least 50 years, at a time when the demand for food is greater than it ever has been in our history.

Breaking the figures down, in the year 1943 alone the farms lost 2,389,000 people, and last year, 1944, the farms again lost 1,138,000 people. The total loss since 1940 has been 4,748,000 people.

Adverting for a moment to the point which the Senator from Nebraska raises, General Hershey is primarily responsible. Of course, he is subject to the orders of the President. The President, I think, has gone further in disregard of the Tydings amendment as applied to the farm-deferment question that he is justified in doing.

A few days ago on the House side there was a conference participated in by about 150 Members of the House of Representatives. General Hershey came to the meeting, and at that time this matter was discussed. One of the Representatives from Idaho read a telegram he had received from the State dairy organization of Idaho which described the situation very much as I have done. General Hershey said, "If anybody in Idaho or anywhere else is telling the draft boards to disregard the Tydings amendment, he is not speaking for the Director of Selective Service."

Yet here is the Missouri board, in the State from which comes the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Vice President, issuing an order which to all intents and purposes repeals the Tydings amendment, and orders that all deferments be disregarded.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Nebraska indicated, there are two important phases involved in this case. One of them, of course, is the production of food. The other is of equal importance, if anything could be as important as the production of food. It is whether a law

passed by Congress, written into the statutes of this country and still remaining on the statute books—and the intent is expressed in plain language—can be repealed by the President or General Hershey, or the President and General Hershey; whether they can disregard the law; whether we have come so far along the road that the executive branch of the Government can repeal or completely disregard a law written by this body which has not been changed in a single syllable since it was put on the statute books.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It may add some emphasis to the Senator's statement when it is recalled that the Tydings amendment is pursuant to the constitutional power of Congress to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy.

Mr. REED. The distinguished and able Senator from Colorado of course is correct. Let me add this further comment: Two years ago last November I collaborated to some extent with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in writing the Tydings amendment into the Selective Service Act. The Committee on Military Affairs of this body was, I may say, rather "uncordial" toward the amendment. Finally, if I remember correctly, repeating a conversation of more than 2 years ago, the Senator from Maryland told me he went to the selective service headquarters and told the officials what he wanted, and asked them to draft the language of an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would accomplish what he desired, and the Selective Service itself prepared the language of the so-called Tydings amendment. So here is an amendment to the Selective Service Act which, according to my memory, which I am quite sure is correct, was prepared by the Selective Service. It is still in effect, and should govern everyone connected with the Selective Service, all the way from the director down to the local boards. The Senator from Nebraska has very correctly said that draft boards are interpreting it differently the country over.

Mr. President, this morning I introduced a joint resolution following the language of a similar joint resolution which was to be introduced in the other House today, in which the Director of the Selective Service is directed to plant his feet on the law, to stay by the law, and to instruct every one of his associates and subordinates, and the draft boards, that they are to comply with the law as it is. That measure was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because it so definitely affects the production of food. The first impact of this disregard of the Tydings amendment is upon the production of food, and the joint resolution contains instructions that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is to report back its findings to the Senate in 5 days.

Mr. President, this is a subject of such import that only the seriousness and the urgency of the situation justify my taking this time at the close of a long and weary afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, supplementing the remarks I made a few minutes ago on the floor of the Senate when I stated I joined with the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas in introducing the joint resolution which he has now explained, I should like to say a word or two more relative to my position.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Of course, there is a manpower situation confronting this Nation which is most serious. Certainly, after the remarks which have been made by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] relative to the clearing up of the situation within the military forces themselves, certainly within the provisions of the joint resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Kansas, which calls for an investigation into all Government offices and into all the industries of the country, we of the Farm Belt should also welcome an investigation of the farm boys who might have been deferred unwisely, or did come within the provisions of the act. In other words, I wish to go on record as stating to the Members of the Senate that we should do our full share in providing the military forces with the boys who do not come under the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I concur fully in what the Senator from Nebraska has said, and in everything I have uttered upon this subject I tried to make that clear. Let me remind the Senator from Nebraska that the joint resolution in itself, in terms, plainly indicates a lack of intention to interfere in the taking of boys from the farms whenever they are found at any place where they do not come under the provisions of the Tydings amendment, which means they must be essentially employed on the farm. The joint resolution by its own terms makes that declaration.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for making a part of my speech. He just took the words out of my mouth, and I wish to endorse what he said in my time, because possibly he explains the matter better than I could explain it.

I also wish to compliment General Henninger, of Nebraska, who has had charge of the Selective Service of that State, and our different boards, for the splendid cooperation they have given to General Hershey.

I shall take just two exhibits to show to the Members of the Senate the reason why I join in supporting the joint resolution. A letter I received from a town located near my home city, in one of the very fertile districts of Nebraska, where the farmers produce corn and meat, so essential to the military forces, as well as to the civilian population, carries this paragraph:

> I am enclosing a report that was given to our local board at a hearing January 9, 1945, in our own case. The board did not consider production whatever. They say they have orders for heavy calls which they absolutely must fill, and all they have to fill them with is farm boys.

Mr. President, they could make no other interpretation than that, in view of the directive which has been issued by General Hershey, which restates what was contained in the letter of the Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Justice Byrnes, which was used by the President as the basis of his directive which he gave to General Hershey, which calls upon the draft boards to determine that agriculture is not as essential as the military needs, and therefore that farm boys should be drafted to fill the quotas. That is what causes confusion and will continue to cause confusion among the draft boards not only in my State, but among draft boards in all States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Nebraska to read a statement from General Hershey saying that service in the military was more important than service on the farm?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I did not say more important. If the Senator had been present——

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator read the statement again?

Mr. WHERRY. The statement was made by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. He read into the RECORD from a telegram.

Mr. CHANDLER. If that is what he said I do not think it would admit of much doubt, because we must have enough men in the military service to win the war, and if we do not win the war there will be no use of talking about service on the farm.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree once again with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. The Senator was not present when I made a statement at the beginning of my remarks that we were perfectly willing to go along with all industry, and have the military authorities take our farm boys if in the opinion of the military authorities they needed them, but that they should take them on the basis of the Tydings amendment. I think the Senator from Kentucky is of the same opinion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator read the extract from the letter to which he just referred?

Mr. WHERRY. I read from the telegram as follows:

> In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–B, local boards will consider the President's finding that "Further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men."

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator subscribe to that?

Mr. WHERRY. I subscribe to this, that if we need to take the same percentage of farm boys to help win the war that we take from any other industry and the military authorities say they need them to win the war, I have no quarrel. But I say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that the directive causes confusion among draft boards throughout the country who have taken the position that the President has issued a directive that agriculture is not an essential industry, and therefore farm boys

should be taken like any other boys when they arrive at military age, without the Tydings amendment being given the least consideration.

We have done a good job in Nebraska. In most of the States they have done a good job. But here is a directive which has caused confusion. We do not want confusion to exist. We want the Tydings amendment to be followed. It provides how farm boys shall be taken. We want the boards to subscribe to the letter of the law. We do not want any directive from the President or the Director of War Mobilization, or anyone else which will throw confusion into the minds of the draft boards so that they in any way will act contrary to the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am sure the Senator will concede that neither the President nor General Hershey nor anyone else who has any authority to issue a directive wants to issue a confusing one.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. Many directives result in confusion; but I think we will all agree that the winning of the war is of the first and greatest importance, and if we have to take farm boys in order to win the war, then we will have to take farm boys.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and when the time comes, let me suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that I will go along with him to take them; but until that time comes I want to have them taken as the law of the land prescribes they should be taken, and that is according to the Tydings amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, if we can win the war without taking a maximum number of farm boys and at the same time let them continue to raise food for the country and for other countries we are undertaking to feed, that is what we want to do.

Mr. WHERRY. I subscribe to that statement.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not say that the directive did not confuse some people, because I have seen many confusing directives, but I am sure the Senate will agree with me that there was no intention deliberately to confuse.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that I am not charging any intention to confuse with respect to the directive at all. I am explaining my position in joining with the junior Senator from Kansas and other Senators in the resolution asking that this order be clarified, and I think the junior Senator from Kentucky would be glad to go along with us. It is not a question of whether we are willing to furnish the boys. Certainly we are willing to furnish whatever the military authorities ask us to furnish, but we want the military authorities to take them in the way the law of the land prescribes, and that is to take them according to the Tydings amendment.

Mr. President, it is not only a question of confusion. The question of need arises. A local draft board should not have imposed upon it the determination respecting agricultural need after the Congress of the United States has enacted the Tydings amendment. Agriculture has already been determined to be an essential industry. If a man is engaged in agriculture and continues to be engaged in agriculture, the Tydings amendment provides that he shall be deferred to class II–C until a replacement can be made. That is the law. The directive alters the law. The directive circumvents the action of Congress. The directive runs right over the Tydings amendment. That is what I am objecting to. We are not objecting to furnishing whatever men may be needed when the time comes to furnish them; but we say they should be taken in the way the law prescribes they shall be taken.

Here is a letter from Mr. Coryell, from my section of the country. He is a farmer, a large operator. He says:

> You would be surprised to see this country now. Our little towns that used to have 600 or 700 population are down to 75 or 100, just a few old men who can't crawl out of town. * * * All the farmers who have any enterprise are either drafted or gone somewhere else. I don't know where they are going to get men for these farms and I can't imagine how we are going to farm next year without men or tools.
>
> I have 30,000 bushels of corn that is in the fields, not husked, and I cannot find a man to husk them.

That letter is from Mr. L. L. Coryell. I did not ask his permission to introduce it into the RECORD, but I read from it because Mr. Coryell is one of our very fine citizens, and a man who is just as patriotic as anyone else in the United States with respect to furnishing men for the armed services.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the time has come when the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives should be the determining factor in determining what is an essential industry. No one in any Governernment department, either an administrator or executive, should override the will of Congress and issue a directive which runs around the fundamental law of the land and is contrary to the Tydings amendment. The Tydings amendment is the law of the land and remains so until it is changed by the Congress. It should not be changed by means of a directive issued by anyone who says what is an essential industry, contrary to the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. President, I had not intended to make any extended remarks upon this subject, but the junior Senator from Kentucky suggested a few questions which brought about further discussion. The resolution was submitted in the best of faith. In submitting it there was no purpose of criticizing the military with respect to the men they need or the estimates they present. I have supported every military appropriation that has come before the Senate and every measure having to do with the war. I shall continue to support such measures. But I wish to say that when it comes to farm production, that production is just as essential as anything else. The Tydings amendment is the law of the land and if any changes are to be made in the draft law, the Congress of the United States should make the determination and the change, and it should not be done by some executive of a bureau in Washington.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there is a considerable lack of understanding of and familiarity with the directive issued by General Hershey on January 3. In order to advise everyone who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what that directive was, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the telegram sent by General Hershey on January 3 to all the State directors be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

State director advice (No. 288), issued January 3, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of registrants in agriculture, ages 18–25.

CONFIRMATION OF TELEGRAM TO ALL STATE DIRECTORS WITHIN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES DATED JANUARY 3, 1945

The following letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has been received by the Director of Selective Service:

"The Secretaries of War and Navy have advised me jointly that the calls from the Army and Navy to be met in the coming year will exhaust and eligibles in the 18- through 25-year age group at an early date. The Army and Navy believe it essential to the effective prosecution of the war to induct more men in this age group.

"You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation. You have advised me that if this group is not available, you must call into the service occupationally deferred men in the next age group, 26 years and older, most of whom are fathers.

"The Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Krug, advises me that the loss of these men would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet critical war demands. Moreover, these older men would not meet the expressed needs of the Army and Navy.

"The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18- through 25-year age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

"The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act does not give the agricultural worker absolute exemption from selective service. It was not so intended. In asking Congress to adopt this amendment Senator TYDINGS said: 'All my amendment seeks to do is to provide that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food, and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated, and there is no replacement, he shall be deferred upon those facts until a replacement can be found.'

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need in the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture like our other war industries can, with few exceptions, be carried out by those in the older-age groups.

"The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the

full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and boards of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all registrants ages 18 through 25 deferred in class II–C excluding those identified by the letters "F" or "L." In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–C, local boards will consider the President's finding that "further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II–C excluding those identified with the letters "F" or "L" in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction physical examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class II–C registrants at the same time as they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction physical examination.

HERSHEY.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of January 1943;

Rear Admiral Willard A. Kitts 3d, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of January 1943;

Capt. James D. Boyle, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be a pay director with the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of April 1943;

Col. William L. McKittrick to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 3d day of June 1944;

Col. Lawson H. M. Sanderson to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 5th day of June 1944;

Col. Christian F. Schilt to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 7th day of June 1944; and

Col. Charles R. Sanderson, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps on the retired list with the rank of brigadier general, for temporary service, from the 23d day of December 1944.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edwin C. Wilson, of Florida, now Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs, Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Turkey.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hattie W. Caraway to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry D. White to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nigel D. Campbell to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ross E. Brown to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harris Walthall to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the routine nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 25, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22, 1945:

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Henry A. Wallace, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edwin Jackson Kyle, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala.

Joseph F. McGurk, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

H. Struve Hensel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

THE JUDICIARY

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To Be Chief Justice

Hon. Bolitha J. Laws, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Edward C. Eicher, deceased.

To Be Associate Justice

Hon. Nathan Ross Margold, of the District of Columbia, to be Associate Justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Bolitha J. Laws.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John F. X. McGohey, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice James B. H. McNally, resigned.

PATENT OFFICE

Harold H. Jacobs, of Massachusetts, to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frank H. Duffy, Jr., of Rutland, Vt., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt. (Reappointment.)

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. Raymond H. Fleming, of Louisiana, for appointment as State Director of Selective Service for Louisiana under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Raymond M. Stone to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 16th day of December 1944.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Charles Pearce Bellican, Infantry (temporary colonel) with rank from June 13, 1943.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Second Lt. John Baker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 29, 1942.

TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. James Stevenson Rodwell, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general), with rank from October 24, 1940.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from December 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Thomas Lyle Martin, Infantry (temporary colonel).

To be colonel with rank from January 1, 1945

Lt. Col. George Sidney Andrew, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Roland Paget Shugg, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Rafael Larrosa Garcia, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Ellicott Hewes Freeland, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Spencer Albert Townsend, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Richard Clarke Birmingham, Infantry.

Lt. Col. James Cornelius Ruddell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Joseph Hamilton Grant, Infantry (temporary colonel).

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Frank G. Fahrion, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of February 1943.

Commodore Thomas P. Jeter, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Battleship Squadron 2, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944.

Capt. Marshall R. Greer, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of August 1943.

Capt. Peter K. Fischler, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of May 1943.

Vice Admiral Frederick J. Horne, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Jack C. Scott, from the 14th day of October 1941.

William H. Whitaker, from the 16th day of October 1941.

John B. Berteling, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Elmer P. Thompson, Jr., from the 12th day of March 1942.

Robert R. Read, from the 14th day of March 1942.

Albert L. Clark, from the 15th day of May 1942.

Stanley V. Titterud, from the 13th day of July 1942.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

Warren H. Keck, a citizen of Illinois.

George W. Bubb, a citizen of Michigan.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943:

George W. Carrington, Jr., a citizen of New York.

William F. Lane, a citizen of Alabama.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944:

Andrew S. Farago, a citizen of Montana.

Albert E. Leonard, a citizen of Ohio.

Francis J. Stutler, a citizen of California.

Roland A. Marbaugh, a citizen of Ohio.

Donald F. Dickey, a citizen of Oklahoma, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of May 1944.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of August 1944:

Charles B. Spradley, a citizen of Texas.

James E. Garner, a citizen of Louisiana.

Ernest B. Ford, a citizen of Vermont.

Richard M. Bickford, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Ira Goldberg, a citizen of New York.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

IDAHO

William Clay Peebles, Nampa, Idaho, in place of J. J. Walling, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Roy M. Hart, Fairmount, Ill., in place of K. E. Rowand, transferred.

George T. Hobkirk, Williamsville, Ill., in place of R. L. Cooper, transferred.

LOUISIANA

William M. Payne, Natchitoches, La., in place of W. E. Brock, resigned.

MAINE

Loretta M. Dwyer, Great Works, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clara A. Lewis, Litchfield, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Everett E. Clarke, Long Island, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Maud R. Tyus, New Harbor, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Walter W. Anderson, New Sweden, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clarence T. Caril, Waterboro, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary W. Dingley, West Farmington, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MARYLAND

May B. Bolt, Eckhart Mines, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruth V. Hoshall, Parkton, Md., in place of R. B. Hoshall, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Royce Glen Hayward, Casnovia, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marcella A. Doyle, Menominee, Mich., in place of M. F. Bilek, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Joseph C. Berg, LeRoy, Minn., in place of J. A. Schneider, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Ola B. Jones, Crowder, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

San Ben Hudnall, Porterville, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

James H. Powell, Elsberry, Mo., in place of R. M. Burchett, transferred.

Imogene Johnson, Galt, Mo., in place of D. S. Vencill, transferred.

Ethel I. McRaven, Glencoe, Mo., in place of Herbert Samel, resigned.

Oren G. Gamel, Half Way, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW MEXICO

Dolores Romero, Roy, N. Mex., in place of M. Y. Ray, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clyde B. Shaw, Carthage, N. C., in place of P. H. McDonald, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Helen B. Hoven, Hoven, S. Dak., in place of L. I. Wright, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Manie R. Rodeffer, Keswick, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WASHINGTON

Doris M. Stock, Allyn, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 22, 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Harry D. White to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Hattie W. Caraway to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from March 15, 1943.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Nigel D. Campbell to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Ross E. Brown to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.

Harris Walthall to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be assistant surgeons

George F. Kamen
William C. Redmon
Wardell H. Mills
Richard H. Linn
Frank A. Buell
Andrew P. Sackett
Edwin D. Merrill
Herbert F. Hager
Vernon R. Dennis, Jr.
Vernon G. Guenther
James R. Hurley
Robert L. Morrison
Clarke W. Mangun, Jr.
Dean W. Geheber
Isaac M. Zigler
Arthur M. Pettler
Jacob Wagner
John S. Sheehan
Harold B. Barrett
Edmund R. Clarke, Jr.
Ira Avrin
Merle Bundy
George W. Gibbins
Ralph V. Kinzie
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr.

To be passed assistant surgeons

Will H. Aufranc
Gene B. Haber
William P. Sellers III

To be temporary medical directors

William Hendon Gordon
Leroy E. Burney

POSTMASTER

MISSOURI

Ruth C. Fossett, Mount Vernon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Fr. Arthur J. Hagan, St. Margaret's Church, Dorchester, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

Almighty and Eternal God, we lift our hearts and minds to Thee in prayer. Grant that every thought, word, and action of ours will be for Thy honor and glory and the welfare of mankind. We pray Thee, O God of wisdom and justice, through whom authority is rightfully administered, laws enacted, and judgments decreed, to guide and direct with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of the United States that under his leadership our Nation will succeed to an early and convincing victory, and thereafter the establishment of effective means, in cooperation with other

nations, to assure everlasting peace to all mankind.

Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the Speaker, the leaders, and Members of the Congress to a solution of all questions coming before the Congress that will be for the best interests of our beloved country.

Grant unto all who serve in our armed forces faith, wisdom, and courage that they may succeed in their heroic efforts to bring early victory to our cause and peace to all nations.

Have mercy, O Lord, on all who have made the supreme sacrifice in fighting the ungodly forces of ruthless world conquest and grant unto them eternal rest with Thee.

Recognizing Thee, as we do, as our Creator and Heavenly Father, we pray that all people will become united with Thee, and that through unity with Thee, the differences of the past which have brought about misunderstanding, hatred, conflict, war, will disappear, and through love of Thee a strong religious life will exist throughout the world that will merit peace and happiness to all mankind.

O God, the author and lover of peace, to know whom is to live, to serve whom is to reign, shield Thy suppliant people from all assaults, so that we who trust in Thy protection may fear no foe. Through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of War.
6. Post Office Department.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. National Housing Agency.
9. War Manpower Commission.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 16, 1945.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: Will you kindly accept, as of today, my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Accounts?

I have very much enjoyed my work on the Accounts Committee, and it is only because of my assignment to the Appropriations Committee that I wish to resign from the Accounts Committee.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

DEAN M. GILLESPIE.

JESSE H. JONES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the forced resignation of Jesse Jones as Secretary of Commerce and the appointment of Henry Wallace as a political reward is most unfortunate. The change is particularly unfortunate, coming as it does at a time when complete unity and the best business leadership are needed for an all-out war effort.

Jesse Jones is a man of wide experience and great ability. Certainly if ever we needed his services, it is right now and in the readjustment days following the war. To remove him for political reasons will destroy the confidence of many people and will cause great fears as to what will be our economic life in the post-war days.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. SIKES appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions adopted by the New York State Horticultural Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SELECTIVE SERVICE FOR NURSES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include as part of my remarks a bill I am introducing today with suggestions for selective service for nurses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if selective service becomes necessary within a few days, if the necessary number of nurses do not enlist in the armed forces to care for our disabled servicemen, I am placing in the hopper a so-called selective-service bill for nurses which would serve as a protection for the nurses who are taken in. For instance, it would write into the law that when they are inducted they should be made officers with a rank not less than second lieutenant in the Army, or ensign in the Navy, the minute they enter the service. That is only justice. Surgeon General Kirk has stated they planned to take them in just as they do the doctors, that is, with an officer's rank. But I would like to know that protection is written into the law. I do not blame the nurses for not having enlisted, because they have not realized the need. They have not been told the staggering casualty lists until recently. Our casualty list has increased 270 percent in the past year, and there is a grave shortage of nurses, not only in the armed services but also in the Veterans' Administration.

Briefly, my bill follows rather closely the general outlines of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended, adjusting the provisions thereof to meet the situation contemplated.

The Veterans' Administration should have its own nurse corps, but the suggestions in this bill will be a measure to ensure nurses to care for the veterans in veterans' hospitals. There is today a severe shortage of nurses there.

Specifically, the more important features of the bill are as follows:

First. Liability for service—after registration—is imposed upon every female person between the ages of 20 and 45 who is a graduate of a hospital training course of not less than 2 years. Generally, this follows the standards for acceptance into the Army and Navy Nurse Corps, but no female person with such qualifications will be inducted unless acceptable to the land and naval forces under such additional standards as they may create.

Second. The number of nurses to be inducted will be determined by the President in the light of the national interest involved.

Third. Service of persons inducted will be for the duration of the present war and 6 months thereafter.

Fourth. Each person inducted must be commissioned at a grade, or relative rank, not lower than that of second lieutenant in the Army of the United States or ensign in the United States Naval Reserve.

Fifth. Each person inducted may, subject to agreements between the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Veterans' Administrator, be assigned to duty with the Veterans' Administration.

Sixth. Each person inducted will receive the same rights, privileges, benefits, and so forth, accorded all other members of the land and naval forces both during and upon and after termination of service.

Seventh. All bases for deferment, exemption, and relief from service contained in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, are contained in this act, including those provisions regarding ministers of religion and conscientious objectors.

Eighth. The provisions of the proposed bill will be administered through the Selective Service System under rules and regulations prescribed by the President or, by delegation, the Director of Selective Service.

Ninth. The penalties for any violation of the duties and obligations accruing under this act will be the same as those

imposed by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Tenth. The provisions of the act, except the benefits during and after service and the penalties for offenses committed during the operation of the act, will continue only for the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to provide for the registration, selection, and induction of certain female persons for service in and with the armed forces of the United States

SECTION 1. Declaration of policy and intent of Congress:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Congress hereby declares that it is imperative in order to provide adequate medical and nursing care for the armed forces in the successful prosecution of the war to increase the personnel of the armed forces of the United States by the selection and induction of qualified graduate female nurses.

(b) The Congress further declares that in a free system the obligations and privileges of service in and with the armed forces should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selection for service but that the necessity for the complete utilization of specialized schooling and training makes it imperative that the obligations for service be and are from time to time settled upon one or more occupational groups.

SEC. 2. Registration in general: For the reasons of policy hereinabove enumerated and except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every female citizen of the United States and of any other female person residing in the United States who on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration is between the ages of 20 and 45 and who is a graduate of a hospital training school having a course of instruction of not less than 2 years to present herself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places and in such manner and in such age group or groups as shall be determined by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

SEC. 3. Service in general: (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every female citizen of the United States and every other female person residing in the United States who is between the ages of 20 and 45 at the time fixed for her registration and who is a graduate of a hospital training school having a course of instruction of not less than 2 years shall be liable for service in the land or naval forces of the United States: *Provided,* That any citizen or subject of a neutral country shall be relieved from liability for service under this act if prior to her induction into the land or naval forces she has made application to be relieved from such liability in a manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States: *Provided further,* That no citizen or subject of any country who has been or who may hereafter be proclaimed by the President to be an alien enemy of the United States shall be inducted for service under this act unless she is acceptable to the land or naval forces. The President is authorized from time to time during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months thereafter to select and induct into the land and naval forces of the United States for service in the manner provided in this act such number of graduate nurses as in his judgment is required in the national interest: *Provided,* That within the limits established by the President in the light of information at his disposal regarding the availability of graduate nurses for the subdivision in which she resides, any graduate nurse, regardless of race or color, between the ages of 20 and 45 shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States for the service prescribed in subsection (b) of this section but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for service so long as she is deferred after classification: *Provided further,* That no graduate nurse shall be inducted for service under this act unless and until she is acceptable to the land or naval forces for such service and her physical and mental fitness and professional qualification for such service have been satisfactorily determined: *Provided further,* That no female persons shall be inducted for such service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations, for such female persons, as may be determined by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, to be essential to public and personal health: *Provided further,* That no female person, without her consent, shall be inducted for service under this act after she has attained the forty-fifth anniversary of the day of her birth.

(b) Each female person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter unless sooner discharged.

(c) Each person accepted by and inducted into the armed forces of the United States under the provisions of this act shall, if inducted into the Army of the United States, be commissioned in the Army of the United States at a grade not lower than that of second lieutenant, and if inducted into the United States Navy shall be commissioned in the United States Naval Reserve (or appointed to a relative rank in the Navy Nurse Corps) at a grade not lower than that of ensign.

(d) The provisions of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress (title I, ch. I, sec. 102), permitting the transfer or detail of any commissioned, appointed, or enlisted personnel from the armed forces to the Veterans Administration subject to agreements between the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy and Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall be applicable to all persons inducted under this act.

(e) During the period of service of female persons inducted for service under this act and thereafter upon termination of such service, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability, and death compensation, and all other rights, privileges, and benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members and former members of the land or naval forces of like grades and length of service of that component of the land or naval forces to which they are assigned.

(f) Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States for service under this act who, prior to their induction, were receiving compensation from such person, firm, or corporation.

SEC. 4. Administration: The selection of female persons for induction and service under the provisions of section 3 shall be made in an impartial manner and under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe from the female persons who are liable for such service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified but not deferred or exempted: Provided, That in the selection and induction of persons under this act and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further,* That in the classification of registrants under this act within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of any person within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations.

SEC. 5. Deferment, exemption, and release from service: (a) Any female person described in section 2 while a member of the land or naval forces or any reserve component thereof; and diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice counsuls, and consular agents of foreign countries, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, who are not citizens of the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 2 and shall be relieved from liability for service under section 3.

(b) (1) The Vice President of the United States, the Governors, and all other State officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, of the several States and Territories, members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States and Territories, judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States.

(2) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States, of any person holding an office (other than an office described in paragraph (1) of this subsection) under the United States or any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, whose continued service in such office is found in accordance with section 7 (b) to be necessary to the maintenance of the public health, safety, or interest.

(c) Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion and students who are preparing for the ministry in theological or divinity schools recognized as such for more than 1 year prior to the date of enactment of this act, shall be exempt from service (but not from registration) under this act.

(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those female persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 7 (b) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States (A) of any or all categories of those female persons in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (B) of any or all categories of those female persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the land and naval

forces of the United States of any or all categories of those female persons who have husbands or children, or husbands and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution. Rules and regulations issued pursuant to this subsection shall include provisions requiring that there be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those female persons who have been classified by such local board.

(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States, of those female persons whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the female persons so deferred.

(e) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to service in the land or naval forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Any such person claiming such exemption from all service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, in lieu of induction into the land or naval forces, be assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction. Any such person claiming such exemption from all service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board provided for in section 7 (b). Upon the filing of such appeal with the appeal board, the appeal board shall forthwith refer the matter to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing by the Department or the proper agency thereof. After appropriate inquiry by such agency, a hearing shall be held by the Department of Justice with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that she shall in lieu of induction be assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction. If after such hearing the Department finds that her objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall give consideration to but shall not be bound to follow the recommendation of the Department of Justice, together with the record on appeal from the local board in making its decision. Each person whose claim for exemption from all service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

(f) No exemption from registration or exemption or deferment from service under this act shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

SEC. 6. Bounties; substitutes; purchases of release: No bounty shall be paid to induce any female person to enlist in or be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That the clothing or enlistment allowances authorized by law shall not be regarded as bounties within the meaning of this section. No female person liable for service in such forces shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such service; no substitute as such shall be received, enlisted, enrolled, or inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States; and no person liable for service in such forces under section 3 shall be permitted to escape such service or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of her period of such service by the payment of money or any other valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for her release from such service or liability therefor.

SEC. 7. Rules and regulations: (a) The President is authorized—

(1) To prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act and shall provide for the classification of registrants and of persons who volunteer for induction under this act on the basis of availability for training and service;

(2) To administer the provisions of this act through the Selective Service System;

(3) To utilize the services of any or all departments and any and all officers or agents of the United States and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia and subdivisions thereof in the execution of this act; and

(4) To prescribe eligibility, rules, and regulations governing the parole for service in the land or naval forces, or for any other special service established pursuant to this act, of any person convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of this act.

(b) The local boards of the Selective Service System, under the rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards of the Selective Service System, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, service under this act of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local boards shall be final except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, service under this act, and the determination of the President shall be final.

(c) No person who is an officer, member, agent, or employee of the Selective Service System, or of any such local or appeal board or other agency, shall be excepted from registration, or deferred from training and service, as provided for in this act, by reason of his status as such officer, member, agent, or employee.

(d) Any officer on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or of any reserve component thereof or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards of the Selective Service System) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States: *Provided*, That any person so appointed, assigned, or detailed to a position the compensation in respect of which is at a rate in excess of $5,000 per annum shall be appointed, assigned, or detailed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(e) The President is authorized to delegate to the Director of Selective Service only, any authority vested in him under this act. The Director of Selective Service may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the President and any other authority vested in him under this act, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

(f) In the administration of this act voluntary services may be accepted. Correspondence necessary in the execution of this act may be carried in official penalty envelopes.

(g) The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is hereby designated, empowered, and directed to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director of Selective Service in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. Penalties: Any person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this act, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said act, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate as to the fitness or unfitness or liability or nonliability of himself or any other person for service under the provisions of this act, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades registration or service in the land or naval forces or any of the requirements of this act, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to evade registration or service in the land or naval forces or any of the requirements of this act, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this act, or rules or regulations made pursuant to this act, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere in any way by force or violence with the administration of this act or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or conspire to do so, shall, upon conviction in the district court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court martial, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by any military or naval court martial in any case arising under this act unless such person has been actually inducted for the service prescribed under this act or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this act. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this act.

SEC. 9. Notice of act, partial invalidity, and voluntary enlistment: (a) Every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this act upon publication by the President of a proclamation or other public notice fixing a time for any registration under section 2.

(b) If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

(c) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment in the land or naval forces of the

United States, including the reserve components thereof.

SEC. 10. Definitions: When used in this act:

(a) The term "between the ages of 20 and 45" shall refer to female persons who have attained the twentieth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the forty-fifth anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

(b) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The terms "land or naval forces" and "land and naval forces" shall be deemed to include aviation units of such forces.

(d) The term "district court of the United States" shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and the possessions of the United States.

SEC. 11. Suspension of conflicting laws; duration of act; authority for appropriation: (a) Except as provided in this act, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this act shall be in force.

(b) All the provisions of this act, except the provisions of section 3 (e), shall become inoperative and cease to apply on and after 6 months after the termination of the present war, except as to offenses committed prior to such date, unless this act is continued in effect by the Congress.

(c) Funds now and hereafter appropriated for the administration of the Selective Service System shall be available for the administration of all the provisions of this act.

SEC. 12. Effective date: This act shall take effect immediately.

SHORTAGE OF FARM LABOR

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I exhibit to the House notice of an auction sale held in my congressional district last Thursday. On that day one of the best farms in Oakland County, Mich., ceased to operate. The owners of that farm are known to me personally. Their names are signed to this auction bill. They are Messrs. C. G. and A. D. Fuller. They are loyal, patriotic, dependable Americans who believe in our system of government and our way of life under it. Why did they cease to operate that farm, one of the largest in the production of meat in that great county? They tell the public and the world in the auction bill the reason, "Due to the help situation and my son having gone to the Army we no longer can operate this farm." The farmers of the Nation are asked to produce more food with less help, less machinery, less fertilizer, and in many instances for an inadequate price. Common sense is becoming rare in this country. Now the Nation is faced with another "directive" from the President to General Hershey, in charge of the draft, which blots out the Tydings amendment, designed to protect bona fide farm labor. So grave might be the results of such a decision that nearly half the membership of this House, including myself, met to protect the taking of farm labor for military service. Let us look before we leap that we do nothing to injure the war effort of the Nation.

DRAFTING OF NURSES, FARM BOYS, AND IV-F'S

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Military Affairs Committee of this House is now considering a problem in which practically every man, woman, and child in the country is vitally interested.

Drafting nurses means drafting women, which has never been done in this land noted for its chivalry. This should not be done hastily, if at all. It is not that urgent.

Food is the first and most vital war munition. Farmers produce the food and they must have adequate help to do it. For the past 8 successive years our country has been blessed with most unusually fine productive weather. This is a record never before approached. Usually we had 1 bad year out of 3. One bad year with a 60 percent or 70 percent production would be a calamity now. It would seriously cripple our war efforts.

The drafting of farm boys should not be done hastily.

The Selective Service has developed into a very large and far-reaching organization. No doubt some changes can be made that would shake down a part of the large group of IV-F's but we must not underestimate the patriotism of any of this group and neither should we become tyrannical and neither should we permit undeserving evaders to escape. This is a tough problem, the solution of which calls for statesmanship of the highest order. The Military Affairs Committee should not be hurried.

The three problems to which I have just referred can and should be disposed of before Congress takes up the consideration of the very important matter of the adoption of the General National Service Act. That problem involves matters other than military problems.

The House Military Affairs Committee is a strong and able committee. Its members have given intelligent study to the many problems of the great war. The interests of Congress and the country would best be served if this committee would refuse to be crowded into hasty action. It should take time to permit the people of the country to be heard. We, as Members of Congress, are entitled to the well-considered judgment of these capable men. The people can understand all these problems for they are all problems in which the personal equations are the rights and duties of our people. Due deliberation removes obstructions in the way of justice.

I shall want to vote for the best interests of our country mindful that we are in a terrific war. I respect the opinions of the generals and admirals in all matters strictly within their duties and professions. But in matters which are as personal to the people as their very lives, I want to give consideration to the views of the people whose lives are to be at stake. Let us not be stampeded when a few days will clear our vision.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the directive issued by the Director of Selective Service, General Hershey, a few days ago appears from its reading to nullify the Tydings amendment and denies the draft boards proper discretion in exempting farm labor.

The draft boards, from all indications, after receiving this directive have become confused and uncertain as to their discretion and duty in the drafting of such labor. I urge that the Director of Selective Service without delay issue a clarifying statement that will sufficiently advise the draft boards in the various districts as to their duties in calling to military service this class of labor.

I come from an agricultural district in central Illinois where the principal farm products are corn and soybeans and where many cattle are fed for the market brought in from the Southwest and Western States. I hold before you a snapshot picture of a drove of 125 cattle that were purchased in Texas and brought on a farm as calves when weighing about 400 pounds and after being fed corn and soybean supplement for a little more than a year, were shipped to the Chicago market weighing approximately 1,200 pounds. That year the tenant, his son and 1 hired man with a family farmed 320 acres and fed out these cattle. Last year the hired man left the farm, also the tenant's son, for a portion of the year to work in a Government industry in the city of Decatur some 16 miles distant from the farm, attracted by the higher wages paid for unskilled labor. The following season, 1943–44, fewer and only short-feed cattle were purchased.

We then were compelled to give up the feeding of cattle as it was impossible to secure the labor not only for feeding cattle, but for the adequate farming of this land. Last spring this tenant found himself without help for ploughing, preparing the seed bed and planting his crops. During the the previous months from time to time he employed various so-called farm hands who remained with him only a few weeks, until they were attracted and took more lucrative work in the war-production plant as mentioned or in the munitions plants in the adjoining county. The season for planting the crops does not await the opportunity that the farmer may or may not have for obtaining necessary labor, and this tenant found it necessary to employ an inexperienced high-school boy and with the help of his neighbors working during the day and part of the night, prepared the ground and planted the crops.

Otherwise the land would have remained idle during the last crop year.

I do not mean to interfere with drafting for combat service or for critical war production, but great caution should be exercised in any further depletion of farm labor necessary for the growing of food for the civilian population and certainly the quantity essential for the service men and women in the combat areas over the world.

I urge that an immediate survey be made to ascertain any hoarding of labor—that a thorough search be made in departmental work in Washington and elsewhere, including the War and Navy Departments, where able-bodied draft-age men will be found many of whom prefer combat service and could easily be replaced with men classed in IV–F. Furthermore I urge that immediate attention be given to the proper arming of seasoned soldiers in France, India and other Allied countries or their possessions, who no doubt are anxious to serve.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances, in the first to include a letter from the Secretary of War, and one from General Marshall; and in the second instance to include a letter from Dr. Griffith of the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on individual freedom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Shreveport Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

OIL PRODUCTION IN KEARN COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from a Bakersfield (Calif.) newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the oil industry and the oil workers of Kern County, in my congressional district in California, for the wonderful work they are doing in this emergency in increasing production in oil. The total amount produced in 1944 was 95,000,000 barrels in this one county, which, according to this report is more than 20,000,000 barrels of oil over that produced in 1942.

The newspaper article referred to follows:

OIL WORK HITS ALL-TIME HIGH—KERN PRODUCTION REACHES 95,000,000 BARRELS FOR 1944

Oil production in Kern County has been the highest in history during the past year, topping 1943's record output, with approximately 95,000,000 barrels of oil produced in 1944, it was estimated today by Paul Howard, deputy county assessor in charge of assessment of the mineral wealth of the county.

The county during 1944 has produced almost one-third of the oil of the State, with 32.5 percent of the State's production during a 10-day test period in December, Mr. Howard estimated. This compares with Kern's production of 28 percent of the State's total before the war according to figures in the assessor's office.

The estimated production of 95,000,000 barrels of oil in 1944 compares with 84,931,770 barrels produced in 1943, at that time a record high for the county.

During 1942, 72,101,741 barrels were produced; during 1941, 65,616,045; and during 1940, 60,657,075, Mr. Howard stated. He added that exact figures on the record production in 1944 will be available in the near future.

NOT CONTINUE

"This production is the highest in the history of Kern County, but probably will not continue, since new discoveries of oil are not equal to the rate at which oil is now being taken from the ground," the deputy assessor added.

"The present rate of production is expected to continue for at least another year, but will then drop off," Mr. Howard stated.

The deputy assessor asserted that 1,100 new oil wells have been opened up in the county during the past year, in comparison with 864 new wells in 1943.

"We now have half of the producing wells in the State; but since the average well in Kern is small, our production is one-third of the State's total," Mr. Howard said.

NINE THOUSAND WELLS

"We also have over a third of the oil reserves of the State," he added. Total number of oil wells in Kern County is now 9,000.

Mr. Howard attributes the increase in oil production in the county chiefly to the opening up of new wells at Elk Hills.

Many old wells are also being made to produce more than ever before in history, the deputy assessor states. Kern River field, opened in 1899, is expected to top last year's record production of 3,000,000 barrels of oil. Between 1899 and 1943 Kern River field has produced 281,479,617 barrels of oil, according to Mr. Howard.

Mr. Howard's estimate of 95,000,000 barrels of oil produce in 1944 is based on 10-day test periods conducted throughout the year. According to a test last March, 87,038,630 barrels of oil would be the estimated year's total; a September test showed 95,346,395; and a December test, 105,647,060, Mr. Howard concluded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Governor of Arizona and a memorial from the legislature of that State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the farm-labor situation and include an editorial from the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include letters and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Cleveland News, which gives a realistic picture of a great city's helplessness under present conditions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter and accompanying data which I sent out to a hundred Americans asking them to define "un-American activity."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

GAS SHORTAGE IN WASHINGTON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, we hear much these days about shortages of manpower and of gasoline.

Last Friday morning on the way to the office, I stopped at the Capitol, and, to my amazement, I saw five big black sedans parked in front of the House wing of the Capitol—each bearing the identifying legend of the Federal Works Agency. Each had a chauffeur sitting in it. Five cars and five men all from the same executive agency.

I could not help reflecting what a wonderful opportunity to save manpower and gasoline by following any one of the following recommendations:

First. Inducing the officials of the Federal Works Agency to share-a-ride with others in their own department, since it scarcely seems possible that five full carloads of officials were visting the Capitol at the same time.

Second. Employing officials in that agency who know enough about their department so fewer men can speak authoritatively to congressional committees

without whole battalions of advisors, prompters, stage setters, manuscript-carriers, and compensated clappers being required.

Third. Failing in either of the foregoing recommendations, I recommend the Federal Works Agency purchase a Greyhound bus to bring its legions to the Capitol, thus saving the wear and tear and the expense of five big black sedans and releasing four good men and true to do more productive work in the war effort than driving the king's ministers and the minister's men around the streets of Washington.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next following the other special orders that have been entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by the president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce concerning the post-war problems of Southern California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement from an overseas soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to hear the complaints from this floor about the recent order placing all farm help between the ages of 18 and 26 in class I–A under the draft law. I said "interesting." I mean alarming. If there is any such order, and if that order is adhered to by the local draft boards, the coming year's food supply will not be adequate for the downright necessities of our people. We can talk about some things down here and "view with alarm." Anyone familiar with the facts knows that those protests are not idle talk. We cannot live and our armies cannot fight, and our allies cannot carry on without adequate food and fiber produced in the United States. Of course, we need more men in the service if we are to believe the military authorities who should know. It will get us nowhere, however, if we remove the cornerstone upon which all our military structure is built. The farm and food are on the bottom, and it is just silly to take any other view of the matter.

Many Members here have read letters and telegrams from specific farmers telling about their cases. My district has more than the average of such cases because it is a great agricultural and dairy district. I am not going to burden the House by reading these messages. We from the farm areas know what the situation is. We do not need to be convinced and we want to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, the Tydings amendment reads as follows:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided,* That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

This is the formula written by the Congress into law to guide the local draft boards. To disregard that formula is to violate the law, and it is inconceivable that draft boards will assume any such responsibility.

The Military Affairs Committee is today in executive session preparing a bill to report to the Congress, and let us hope that that legislation will be so clear, so definite, and so unmistakable that not even over-zealous directors or public officials can place a wrong construction upon it.

The Congress knows what it meant when it passed the Tydings amendment, and the President signed that bill. Therefore he also knows what is intended. By the same token, Director Hershey, Mobilizer Byrnes, the State director and the local boards know what the law is. In these circumstances there should be no hesitancy on the part of draft boards in seeing that adequate farm help is kept on the farm to do the farm job. I shall certainly do everything I can to bring about this end.

I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise these remarks and include excerpts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by O. P. A. Administrator Chester Bowles concerning the problem of servicemen's families.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article which I have entitled "Democracy Working in Puerto Rico."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Wednesday next for 20 minutes after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered on the one hundred and thirty-first anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

JESSE JONES AGAINST HENRY WALLACE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to insert President Roosevelt's letter to Jesse Jones, of the Department of Commerce, and Secretary Jones' reply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express the hope that the President will change his mind and retain Jesse Jones as Secretary of Commerce.

When I say that I believe I express the wish of 90 percent of the Members of this Congress, especially the Members who know of the great work that Jesse Jones has done in that important position.

The Lower House ought to have something to say about these things, as well as the Senate, for the simple reason that every appropriation has to originate in the House of Representatives. If this change is made, under these circumstances, I can see a continuing battle over the appropriations for the Department of Commerce and the R. F. C. from now on.

I sincerely hope, and I express the hope from the bottom of my heart, that the President will withdraw his demand for Mr. Jones' resignation and retain him as Secretary of Commerce.

I am inserting President Roosevelt's letter to Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, and Mr. Jones' reply:

THE PRESIDENT'S AND JONES' LETTERS

(By the Associated Press)

WASHINGTON, January 21.—President Roosevelt's letter asking Jesse Jones to resign as Secretary of Commerce, and Mr. Jones' reply, read as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

"DEAR JESSE: This is a very difficult letter to write—first, because of our long friendship and splendid relations during all these years and also because of your splendid services to the Government and the excellent way in which you have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years.

"Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

"He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited. And I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration."

RELINQUISH THIS FOR HENRY

"It is for this reason only that I am asking you to relinquish this present post for Henry, and I want to tell you that it is in no way a lack of appreciation for all that you have done, and that I hope you will continue to be a part of the Government.

"During the next few days I hope you will think about a new post—there are several Ambassadorships which are vacant, or about to be vacated. I make this suggestion, among many other posts, and I hope you will have a chance, if you think well of it, to speak to Ed Stettinius.

"Finally, let me tell you that you have my full confidence and that I am very proud of all that you have done during these past years.

"With my warm regards,

"Always sincerely,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

MR. JONES' REPLY

Mr. Jones' reply read:

JANUARY 20, 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have your letter of today, asking that I relinquish my post as Secretary of Commerce, which carries with it the vast financial and war production agencies within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, so that you can give it to Henry Wallace as a reward for his support of you in the campaign.

You state that Henry thinks he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, and that you consider him fully suited for the post. With all due respect, Mr. President, while I must accede to your decision, I cannot agree with either of you.

You refer very kindly to our long friendship and our splendid relations during all the years, and state that you appreciate my splendid services to the Government and the excellent way I have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years. You are also good enough to say that I have your full confidence, and that you are very proud of all I have done during these past years, and that you hope I will continue to be a part of the Government probably in a diplomatic post. It is difficult to reconcile these encomiums with your avowed purpose to replace me. While I want to be of any further service that I can, I would not want a diplomatic assignment.

POINTS TO BUSINESS EXPERIENCE

I feel and have felt a great sense of responsibility to the Congress and to you for the proper administration of the laws with respect to the R. F. C. that have been passed in the expectation that they would be administered by me or someone experienced in business and finance.

I have had satisfaction in my Government service because I have had the confidence of the Congress, as well as your own. I have had that confidence because I have been faithful to the responsibilities that have been entrusted to me. For you to turn over all these assets and responsibilities to a man inexperienced in business and finance will, I believe, be hard for the business and financial worlds to understand.

I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to serve my country through the depression and in time of war. My 13 years of Government service are ample evidence of my desire to be of any assistance I can to the Government. I can best be helpful in the line of my life's work—business and finance—but I seek no job.

With best wishes,

Faithfully yours,

JESSE H. JONES.

JESSE JONES

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter of the President and a letter of Jesse Jones in reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has just asked and received permission to include those letters.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the part of the request having to do with the letters.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman may read them in my remarks tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee to address the House for 1 minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, "And Joab said to Amasa, art thou in health, my brother? And Joab took Amasa by the beard with the right hand to kiss him.

"But Amasa took no heed to the sword that was in Joab's hand: so he smote him therewith in the fifth rib, and shed out his bowels to the ground, and struck him not again; and he died."

Of course, Jesse Jones is not dead. He is a great American. For the past 13 years he has rendered an outstanding service to his country as the head and directing genius of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the greatest lending program ever undertaken by any government in the history of the world. Henry Wallace has been chosen by the President to succeed him as Secretary of Commerce, and there is to be placed in his untrained and erratic hands the power to liquidate the Government's $32,000,000,000 war plants.

The President's Joabian salutation does not soften or give a sound reason for discarding Jesse Jones. And Jesse Jones did not take it lying down.

The President emphasized that he was not supplanting Jones with Wallace because of any failure of the Texan to faithfully and efficiently perform his duties; he emphasized that he was rewarding Wallace for his "utmost devotion to our cause" in the Presidential campaign. The great powers, the tremendous responsibilities of these two offices that so vitally affect the welfare and destiny of the Nation are being used to pay a political debt of Mr. Roosevelt to Mr. Wallace.

The President said in his letter to Jones:

Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. * * * I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration.

The President began his letter to "Dear Jesse" by saying:

This is a very difficult letter to write * * * because of our long friendship and splendid relations * * * and because of your splendid service to the Government, and the excellent way in which you have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years.

He then expressed the hope that Mr. Jones would consider a new job—stated that many ambassadorships were vacant, and hoped he might speak to Ed Stettinius, Secretary of State.

Mr. Jones replied that it was difficult for him to "reconcile these encomiums with your avowed purpose to replace me." He said he would not want a diplomatic assignment.

My 13 years of Government service are ample evidence of my desire to be of any assistance I can be to the Government—

He declared—

I can best be helpful in the line of my life's work—business and finance—but I seek no job.

Mr. Jones explained that he has satisfaction from his long service "because I have had the confidence of the Congress, as well as your own."

I have had the confidence, because I have been faithful to the responsibilities that have been entrusted to me—

He added—

For you to turn over all these assets and responsibilities to a man inexperienced in business and finance will, I believe, be hard for the business and financial world to understand.

Mr. Jones also said he could not agree with either the President or Mr. Wallace that the latter could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, or was fully suited for the post.

Mr. Speaker, it is my deliberate and considered judgment that any office which Henry Wallace is competent to fill should be abolished.

MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 64, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of

the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House: Mr. PATMAN, chairman; Mr. ROBINSON of Utah; Mr. KEOGH; Mr. JACKSON; Mr. KEFAUVER; Mr. LEONARD W. HALL; Mr. PLOESER; Mr. STEVENSON; Mr. HOWELL.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 18, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress the following Members of the House: Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. COX, Mr. LANE, Mr. MICHENER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PLUMLEY.

JESSE JONES

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, those who are acquainted with the vernacular used in handling horses, and others, know that when you give the command "Gee," the animal goes to the right; when you give the command "Haw," they go to the left.

My comment on the replacement of Jesse Jones is, "Haw, haw, haw."

Gen. Phil Sheridan shouted to his men in the Shenadoah Valley, "Turn, boys, turn. We're going back." The removal of Jesse Jones says to the country, "Left turn boys, left turn. We are not going back to the fundamentals of our Republic, we are making a further wheel to the left and instead of heading down the Shenandoah Valley, we are heading down the valley of unpleasant dreams."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by the gentleman from West Virginia, Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, at Chicago recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the reason for which he rises to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a mimeographed sheet consisting of four or five pages there are certain statements.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman first identify the paper?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, That is a little difficult to do. This is a publication purporting to be put out by the People's Democratic Committee in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, though I am certain that no responsible member of a regular Democratic organization in that district had anything to do with it.

The SPEAKER. And it was circulated there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It was circulated in the nighttime, under cover of darkness, when the forces of evil usually do their dirty work, not in the daytime. They threw it around in doorways of the stores, on the porches of the residences and on the streets, on the highways and byways, in the gutters where it properly belonged, in the nighttime of the Friday before election day. The part that gives me, I believe, the right to claim personal privilege is this:

Well, HOFFMAN worked with the isolationists for several years before the war started.

I am not finding any fault about that, for I did my utmost to keep us out of the war which so many old men seemed to want, which the young men are fighting; but this I do complain about:

He was working with Hitler and his agents in this country to defeat the President's policy of preparing America in the time of dangerous world conditions.

That statement that I was working with Hitler is utterly without foundation and is but an illustration of the bigotry, the intolerance, of those who would gag everyone who refuses to subordinate the interest of America to that of a super-United States of the World, who refuses to accept without question or qualification everything offered by the New Deal, by those who would remake America.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes that the gentleman states a matter upon which he deserves recognition on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, one reason for calling this matter up at this time is that on January 11 last the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] made complaint, and rightfully, too, about a certain part of the testimony which had been taken by some one connected with the Dies committee, and which was given publicity in his district in the State of California shortly before election. On that same day the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], speaking before the House, called attention to the misuse of that testimony and suggested that an investigation was in order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman quote everything I said on that occasion?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I do not care to quote everything the gentleman said, because it would take too long but I will quote the pertinent part. A part of what the gentleman from Massachusetts said was a well-deserved tribute paid to the gentleman from California in which I think every Member of the House will wholeheartedly join, because I listened to the gentleman and there was no excuse whatever for the misuse of that testimony. In my judgment, neither Mr. Dies nor any member of that committee had anything to do with releasing it.

In the first place, when that testimony was given before someone connected with the Dies committee, the gentleman from California should have been called, he should have been confronted with the witness and he should have been given an opportunity to spread on the record the truth about the matter, as should all of us when we are accused by these various groups, these organizations, and individuals.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will quote what the gentleman from Massachusetts said.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was not asking the gentleman to yield other than to state that my statement was to expose the conspiracy. I think that is what I said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will read it. The gentlemen from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] had deplored and condemned the use which had been made of that testimony, and then the gentleman from Massachusetts arose and he said this:

In addition to what the gentleman from New Jersey—

That was Mr. THOMAS—

said, if anything like that is done there should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happened to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentelman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] that the Dies committee did not give out that testimony in the Havenner case, but this stooge of a certain influence in California that has been fighting the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] ever since he has been in public life went down there and gratuitously gave the testimony and evidently took a copy of his own testimony back and saved it until the time he could use it. That testimony of the Dies committee is locked up and under seal and was not given out by the Dies committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say to the gentleman from Mississippi that it was nothing I said.

Mr. RANKIN. No, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to have that corrected; that I did not in any way, directly or indirectly, include any member of the Dies committee within the purview of my statement.

Mr. RANKIN. I was not referring to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I was merely trying to clarify the record.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman did, because I was satisfied

that was so without knowing. On the other hand I think this is a proper place for the gentleman's contribution in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now to go back to the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, he said:

The gentleman from California is the one who happened to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.

If the Members will recall, or if you will refer to the May 18, 1942, issue of the New Republic, you will find that more than 100 Members of Congress, including Members of both bodies, were vilified and lied about in that publication.

When you are talking about an investigation it would seem that the Members of this body, outraged as they were by the situation disclosed by the gentleman from California, should have the courage and the determination to investigate these organizations, these publications, those individuals, who for more than 2 years have been attempting deliberately to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen Representatives.

If a conspiracy or a concerted movement to destroy the faith of the people in their Representatives, if charges that the people's Representatives are betraying them and aiding Hitler, if the charge that there are saboteurs in Congress, if those things are not subversive activities, then I do not understand the meaning of the word "subversive."

As long ago as the Seventy-seventh Congress, to be exact on December 3, 1942, when this campaign to render the Congress ineffective, to belittle it, to destroy its usefulness had been running ever since May of 1942, a resolution was offered by me to investigate those who were carrying on that campaign. I wanted the House to appoint a committee which would ascertain who it was that was putting out this false propaganda, who was paying for it, and what the purpose was. The Rules Committee turned down that resolution which was introduced again on January 6, 1943, after the election; and on January 16 of this year 1945 it was again introduced. The Rules Committee now has it.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts so aptly said, while the other day, on the 11th, it was the gentleman from California who was complaining because some testimony which had been taken, and which he had not had an opportunity to show was untrue, saw the light of day and was given publicity just prior to an election; tomorrow it may be other Members of the House. For more than 2 years more than 100 Members of this body have had equally untrue charges hurled at them, have been referred to as aiding in one way or another our enemy Hitler.

I hold in my hand a partial list—approximately 100 in number—of those who were named in the New Republic as being disloyal, unpatriotic, and not fit to serve the people. I have that list here naming those Members of Congress but, as I understand the rules, it is not permissible to read their names into the RECORD, and in any event I do not choose to do so, and the only possible benefit would be to remind those Members so named that it was time for them to act, but that advantage would be overcome by repeating in the RECORD false charges made by the New Republic.

But I want to say to the Members of this body that if you think that any one of you is going to get by without being unjustly and falsely accused by some of these organizations then you are just misapprehending their purpose, their power, that you also do not realize the methods they will use, the lengths to which they will go.

From the New Republic I will read this one about Mr. Churchill, as an example of how it assumed to dictate and criticize. It is headed "Is Churchill's star setting?" Then down further appears this:

His eloquence and his personality were invaluable in helping to arouse the people of the United States to action. He will always be remembered with warmth and devotion as the man who both felt and acted in the one right way when any other course would have led to disaster.

Now get this:

But there is a growing distrust of what he represents and protects in the web of the British social structure. The conservatives in party politics, the monopolists in business and finance, the military caste, and the colonial administrators of empire cannot escape the record they have written.

The whole article is derogatory as you read it of what Mr. Churchill had been doing and of what he would do if he were continued in Parliament, and that was back in 1942. The New Republic was assailing the leader of our ally, but if a Senator or Congressman attempted to do the same the New Republic jumped on him as disloyal.

Then referring to the primaries in the State of South Dakota, they refer to a gentleman who was defeated and then refer to one who was renominated, and said:

And even here the edge was taken off the triumph by renomination of—

Another gentleman; I shall not name him—

who swims with Hamilton Fish.

In these issues, this special issue and the other regular issues, Members of Congress are described as being disloyal and unpatriotic. If you think those false charges were forgotten during the campaign then you are not familiar with the record.

If some of our smug Republicans and some of the cock-sure Democrats who think they are not going to be hit—if you think these fellows are not going after you, all you need to do is wait until the fateful day rolls around and you will find that they are, and you may find yourself on the outside looking in.

Here is a campaign document put out in the Fourth Congressional District. There were many organizations putting out material of that kind during the campaign. On the outside under Foxhole Comment it shows soldiers in a fox hole commenting upon the record of certain Congressmen. Then it says:

Why are certain Michigan Congressmen afraid of the soldier vote?

And inside I find this. I wish that some of the Republicans in Michigan, or from any other State who think they have not been described most inaccurately by this organization, would listen. In this particular case it is the Michigan Citizens Committee for Roosevelt which makes the charge. I note they contributed upward of a thousand dollars to the campaign fund of the gentleman who was a candidate on the Democratic ticket in the Fourth Congressional District.

Now, I read:

Our G. I.'s cannot speak for themselves.

Yes, if the gentleman from South Dakota who thinks he is going to slip by would get that copy of the New Republic which I quoted from he will find where they gave him a rap. None of the Congressmen who are not rubber stamps for the P. A. C. are going to get away, you know, without being smeared.

But Michigan's fighting men and women have a long bill of grievances against that group of congressional "no" boys, Michener (he is our assistant minority leader), Shafer, Hoffman, Blackney, Wolcott, Crawford, Engel, Woodruff, Bradley, Bennett, Dondero, and Jonkman, which has consistently voted—what? Voted to impede preparedness and thwarted the war effort.

There never was a more vicious lie uttered. Yet this Congress refuses to call the boys who wrote that and put it out, thousands upon thousands of copies of this sort of false propaganda—because similar leaflets were circulated in other congressional districts of Michigan and throughout the Nation—this Congress refuses to call them and put them upon the witness stand under oath and then say, "Well, now, when you said that what did you mean?" It is not a hard task. It is not a difficult task.

The other day when the gentleman from California made his plea here I noticed that Members on the Democratic side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] and others, including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] who was on his feet, but did not secure recognition, were all ready to deplore and did deplore in caustic language that most unjustifiable, that low, vicious assault upon the reputation of the gentleman from California. But I have never heard any one of them—no, not one of them, rise to his feet and deplore anything that was said by the P. A. C., the C. I. O., or the Communist organizations falsely charging loyal citizens with being unpatriotic or with aiding Hitler. I would like some of their sympathy; I would like some of that support for Republicans and Democrats who have ventured to speak for America and I would like it to come from some of those gentlemen who were so worked up, so indignant, and whose hearts were bleeding on the 11th, because of the unfair attack upon the gentleman from California. Are false charges as to one's loyalty reprehensible when stolen from the Dies committee files and given publicity but commendatory when put out by the P. A. C., the political ally of the New Deal?

Never from those who complain so long and so bitterly of the mistakes of the Dies committee have I heard one word of criticism about the false statements of the P. A. C. which have falsely and unfairly reflected upon Members of Congress.

Call those men who put out the false charges before a congressional committee and make them admit the untruthfulness of their statements. Let these organizations tell us where they get the money. Let them tell us what their purpose is and then ask them to give proof, if proof they have, of the statements they make, and when they fail and when they cannot give us proof, let us then say to them, "Well, Mr. Murphy," or whatever his name may be, "you did not tell the truth, did you?" And we should insist upon a yes-or-no answer. Then when that gentleman is compelled, as he will be compelled, to say that he did not tell the truth, put this question: "Well, then you lied about it, did you not?" When he admits that he did, as he must, then ask: "You are a liar, are you not?" and make him answer. Then we should print the facts in the RECORD so that we can send it out to the people who have read the false statements which have been put out throughout our congressional districts.

The circular from which I am now reading purports to be put out by the Michigan Citizens' Committee for Roosevelt, 927 David Stott Building, Detroit, Mich. Across the caption of three pages runs this statement: "Our G. I.'s can't speak for themselves." Then you will find the following, among other paragraphs:

But Michigan's fighting men and women have a long bill of grievances against that group of congressional "no" boys—Michener, Shafer, Hoffman, Blackney, Wolcott, Crawford, Engel, Woodruff, Bradley, Bennett, Dondero, and Jonkman—which has consistently voted to impede preparedness and thwart the war effort.

On October 17, 1941, Michigan's "no" boys—Michener, Shafer, Hoffman, Blackney, Bradley, Woodruff, Wolcott, Dondero, Crawford, Engel, and Jonkman—once more betrayed our fighting men by voting against repeal of section 6 of the Neutrality Act to permit arming of American merchant ships.

But the blackest spot on the dark records of these blockheads is their vote to bar America's fighting men and women from the ballot box. On February 3, 1944, Hoffman, Michener, Shafer, Blackney, Wolcott, Crawford, Engel, Woodruff, Bradley, Bennett, Dondero, and Jonkman voted to scuttle the bill which would have provided a Federal ballot for members of the armed forces. Instead, they passed a "States' Rights" soldier vote bill which has been denounced as "a fraud on the soldiers, sailors, and marines; a fraud upon the American people."

These Congressmen denied millions of our fighting men and women the right to take part in a decision involving their own futures. By taking this stand they implied that many of our sons and daughters in service are unfit to vote. They, in effect, gagged the very people who are risking their lives to preserve free speech.

Here's why the Michigan "no" boys are afraid of the soldier vote. Here's their infamous record—the soldiers know this record. They know what it means. Their families should know it, too.

These men have said "no" too many times when they should have said "yes." They consider no one but themselves and their own petty prejudices. It's high time we citizens of Michigan turned the tables on them. Let's vote for men with intelligent, objective viewpoints.

Among those named are at least three who served abroad in World War No. 1—WOODRUFF, WOLCOTT, and ENGEL, the latter serving overseas 23 months—and yet that organization had the effrontery to say that those gentlemen, those veterans of World War No. 1, betrayed our fighting men.

And we on the Republican side of the aisle lack either the courage or the inclination to call in those men who slandered the World War veterans and force the truth from them—the truth which would disclose that today they are assailing members of a coordinate branch of the Government, and if I use their words, I would add, giving aid and comfort to Hitler. But those words I will not use, that charge I will not make.

Just what is it that we fear that induces us to permit these false charges to be made, to be repeated, without calling the authors to account? It is no answer to say that the charges are not believed. Where, in the years to come, will the people find candidates of ability, candidates who are decent, who are loyal, and are patriotic, with skins thick enough, feelings so blunted, that they will seek office, knowing that, regardless of what they do here in Congress, they will be assailed by the P. A. C., the C. I. O.'s politically ambitious leaders, or their successors?

If we do not owe it to ourselves to expose those who are in this conspiracy to destroy the Congress, we at least owe it to those who come after. We owe it to those who have gone before, who have preserved constitutional government and handed it down to us.

Why do we let them go on? I ask you? Why do we let them go on? There are enough Republicans on this side who would, I know, be joined up by men on the right side who do not like that kind of campaigning to put through a resolution for an investigation which will end that reprehensible practice.

Why do we not do it? Will this new committee, this resurrected Dies committee or whatever you want to call it, will its members have the courage to go along while investigating subversive activities, and learn whether or not these gentleman are speaking truly about Members of Congress?

All of the Michigan Congressmen except one who were charged with being disloyal and unpatriotic were reelected. The only Republican from Michigan who was not charged more than once with being disloyal was the gentleman from northern Michigan, Mr. Bennett. He was defeated. What a sad commentary that is. All of those who were falsely accused by the P. A. C., the Roosevelt-for-President organization, were reelected. The only one who was defeated was the one who was named but once by them.

Here is another one; here is the $64 question:

As you know, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, November 8 is election day. Now, are you going to vote for a man who has repeatedly betrayed you, and what is more important, betrayed our fighting men?

That was circulated in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan. In how many districts throughout the country were similar statements made?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the same dirty lies were circulated by the same organizations throughout the United States. I have gone up against it twice in my district; the same kind of sheets, with the same circulars, accusing me of being un-American and unpatriotic and everything else; but as in Michigan, so in Illinois, with one exception every person accused by that organization was reelected. So perhaps the people of the Nation are learning to analyze these dirty statements and not take them at face value.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is quite true. The election returns in Michigan demonstrated that they did not believe it, but a lie often enough repeated impresses some people as being the truth. Every time a lie is repeated it gets somebody. I have had good folks, intelligent people, people who were Republicans, who have been my supporters for years, had them come to me and say: "Now, you explain this"; or "you explain that."

It would take a lifetime to explain to the satisfaction of some folks every single vote cast here in the Congress. It is well known that a lie once started on its course, is never overtaken and dissipated by the truth.

Let me read a little further:

Now, are you going to vote for a man who has repeatedly betrayed you? And what is more important, betrayed our fighting men? HOFFMAN is one of the Congressmen as shown by their votes in Congress who think our sons in service are good enough to fight for us, are not men enough to vote and decide their own futures.

That thing went all over the country, in many, many districts, and, of course, as the Congress knows, it is made out of the whole cloth; there was no truth in it; yet some people believed it.

Here is another one:

The truth about HOFFMAN. Is he pro-Nazi? He appeared before a Federal grand jury twice in connection with the mailing out over his frank of thousands of pieces of seditious literature.

He frequently attacked our allies. He slowed down and hurt our war effort whenever possible. He was the idol of Dudley Pelley, Elizabeth Dilling, and other Fascist leaders operating within our shores. HOFFMAN'S speeches were circulated as part of the activities of George Sylvester Viereck convicted Nazy spy master. But why go on with this endless account of HOFFMAN'S un-American leanings? Does this sound like the kind of background a Congressman from this district should have?

People familiar with me in my district knew those charges were false, and my majority this time was 5,000 greater than ever before.

I notice the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has come in. I was talking about this attack disclosed the 11th of this month by the gentleman from California, and I called attention to the

fact that the gentleman from New York spoke in behalf of the gentleman from California, in defense of his record which none here questioned. Then the gentleman from New York said something about an investigation.

I was asking whether or not we who were vilified and slandered by the P. A. C., by the C. I. O., and other organizations of that type were going to have the gentleman's help in an investigation to point out the falsehoods in their charges. I said that we would like a little of the gentleman's sympathy when so many of the Members of this House were charged falsely with being unpatriotic and disloyal.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am perfectly willing, speaking for myself, to say that wherever subversive activities exist they should be ferreted out by this new committee; but I would want that activity not to be confined solely to those who might be deemed, to use a word in common parlance, "pink," but that the Fascist and the Nazy sympathizers and the anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and the anti-Catholic, and every other anti group might be investigated. That is my creed in that regard.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman also go further and say that all those who are anti-American should be investigated and that, when charges are made, for example, that all of the Republican Congressmen from Michigan, except one, are pro-Nazi, the group which makes that kind of a charge should be investigated?

Mr. CELLER. I want every Member of this House to be properly protected in his rights. If a charge is made against the gentleman or any other Member of the House, he should be apprized of that charge and given an opportunity, which opportunity has been denied in certain cases, to meet that charge personally and publicly, because if we do not do that we will have one or two or more groups of Congressmen attacking the other groups of Congressmen and wielding their personal axes and giving vent to their personal peeves and to their personal grievances. Then we will have a House divided against itself. I want to protect the gentleman from Michigan. He should have the right to express his views as his conscience dictates. We all should have that right. But if we continue to follow the practice of the old Dies committee soon we will have that right filched from us. The gentleman will be sorely grieved and I shall be sorely grieved.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman believe that, when there are published throughout the country pamphlets and leaflets alleging that Members of Congress are pro-Nazi, that sort of activity is a subversive activity and this House should call before it those making the charge? If the charge be true, then the Member should be expelled and if the charge is not true, then those making the charge should be dealt with accordingly?

Mr. CELLER. I agree with the gentleman on that score.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hope we may have the gentleman's support either in action to be taken by this newly created committee or by some special committee which will go along and investigate these charges because the people should not be permitted to read that a Congressman is pro-Nazi or that Congressmen are disloyal unless they are.

I do not care where they come from, when those charges are made, if it is an organized public effort, then those who make the charges should be required either to substantiate them or to withdraw them and be subjected to punishment which should follow false charges of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on indefinitely. The charges of that nature in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan were put out by the Fourth Congressional District P. A. C., by the Independent Voters Committee of the Fourth Congressional District, by Voice for Victory, by the Independent Voters of the Fourth Michigan District, a slight change in the name from the other one, by Foley for Congress Committee, the Independent Voters Committee, Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, a little change. There are a half dozen, yes, almost a dozen organizations.

They did not file returns as required by the Federal statute, so there is no way of telling who was back of them. You are left hanging in the air, yet those statements are published by groups using an assumed name, all of them practically of the same purport, almost the same language. Where did they come from? They came from the P. A. C. There is where they came from, and from their offices they were given currency. You know that because of the similarity of the language and the thought.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the members of a labor organization when it is engaged in legitimate activities taking part in a political campaign. That is their right. No one should deny them that right. But as I get it, the purpose of a labor organization is to promote the interest and well-being of the workers, to obtain better working conditions and higher wages.

For those purposes, this Congress has given unions of workers special privileges. The National Relations Labor Act guarantees to them certain rights which other organizations do not possess. So far as I know, all Members of Congress are in favor of collective bargaining, all Members are in favor of unions, as are most employers, but when a union steps over the line, when an organization ceases to be strictly a labor organization, when it ceases to be interested primarily in those who are members and their status as workers or the wages they receive, that is something else again. It thereupon becomes a political organization and when it does that, Congress should strip it of its right to collect dues and to force people into its ranks in order to hold a job.

Do you see the distinction I am trying to make? The P. A. C., as a political committee, can go as far as it likes under the corrupt practices statute so far as political activities are concerned, but the P. A. C. as a labor organization does not have the right to claim the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act, the aid given it by the administration, and then engage in political activities and collect from every worker that it can intimidate or coerce into putting up a dollar to advance the interest of its candidates.

So I want to yield back the balance of my time with this plea that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] if he meant it—and I assume he did—join with us on the Republican side and others who have been vilified by the vicious and vile slander and libel of the P. A. C. and others and hold an investigation to determine whether those charges are true or false.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Recalling the magazine which the gentleman read from a while ago, in 1942 I was charged with the sole responsibility, practically, of the attack on Pearl Harbor. They put it in a little paper and sent out about 200,000 copies in my district during the primaries in August 1942. I was present when my opponent was speaking on a certain occasion to a large group, and he took up this magazine, Independent Action, or whatever the name was——

Mr. HOFFMAN. New Republic.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. New Republic. He said, "Now, this is not a local paper like the Courier-Journal or the Louisville Times, engaged in politics and partisan matters. This is an independent publication interested solely in the protection of our country." When I finally interrupted him and asked him if it was not put out by a Communist-front organization, of course he refused to answer that question. But there it was, circulated all over the district, and one copy put into every home in the district; a publication accusing me directly and solely, almost, of responsibility for the attack on Pearl Harbor, although I had voted and urged that that attack be investigated, and that we had been denied that investigation, and so on.

So now in 1944, with another fellow running, he takes up that same stuff and goes about with it all over the district. In the first campaign perhaps I did not win by more than 5 to 1, and in the second campaign I think it was 10 to 1 or a little bit over.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, but did the gentleman like it, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman's people like it?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No. When it first came out most of the people in my section of the State had not read that magazine; they did not know about it; they did not know but what it was backed by some truthful, responsible organization. I had a good deal of comfort this year when the Secretary of War, after the election, perhaps, and the Sec-

retary of the Navy made their reports absolving me and every other Member of the House and the Senate of bringing on the attack on Pearl Harbor, but put the responsibility right where it belonged, on this administration, and those in charge of Pearl Harbor.

Yes; I am in favor of bringing these fellows in and finding out who is putting up the money; who is the father of these malicious, willful falsehoods that are put out all the time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Needless for me to say that I meant what I said when I responded to the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I accepted the gentleman's statement.

Mr. CELLER. But in reference to some of the activities of the Dies committee, I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will also agree with me that some of the activities of that committee were not open and aboveboard and were reprehensible, while some other activities might have been praiseworthy. I believe it should be the function of the new committee to do a constructive job, and if all of the Members of the House will get behind that committee, a constructive job can be done. If they keep in mind what democracy is, they will do that constructive job.

I have before me a leaf from the trans-Atlantic edition of a London paper called the Daily Mail. It speaks of how Churchill was baffled when he was asked to define "democracy," a question that offered no difficulty to Mr. Dies. A reader of that paper defines it this way, and it is well for us Americans to keep it in mind, particularly the Members of the House:

> Democracy: Being able to preserve one's status as an individual potato instead of being forced to lose one's identity by being mashed.

The chairman of the former committee wanted to mash everybody so that they would conform to his views of democracy. He conducted his commission in that brash manner.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, just a moment right there.

Mr. CELLER. And that is what I deplore, and I think the gentleman from Michigan deplores that, and I judge that he does deplore that from the observations he has just made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman is trying to put me on record as a critic of the Dies committee, he is just going to fail. Beyond question, the Dies committee made mistakes. I think we all do. Does not the gentleman admit that, even he and I, once in a while make a mistake?

Mr. CELLER. We must profit by those past mistakes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right, we should, but the Dies committee never, never made anywhere near as many mistakes as the administration. When the Dies committee was investigating the Communists and the administration took them under its wing, I think the mistake in that case was on the part of the administration.

If Mr. Dies himself made mistakes, perhaps some of them were due to the lack of supervision on the part of members of the committee and Members of the House who did not aid him with their advice. I think, if you want my opinion, that Mr. Dies did a wonderful, courageous job, a job that neither the gentleman from New York nor I would even want to undertake and go through with and take the abuse that came to Mr. Dies from Members of the House itself from the floor of the House. The gentleman would not like to take that. I do not believe the gentleman now, as intellectual as he is, is so presumptuous as to think that he would want that job. Would he?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will yield I will answer. No, of course I do not want that job.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is too much hard work involved, and too many kicks.

Mr. CELLER. I am not afraid of hard work. I think I work as hard as does the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No doubt. But there are too many kicks.

Mr. CELLER. I do not want to put myself in a position where the abuse would be justified.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Dies had to take a lot of abuse that was not justified.

Mr. CELLER. Is the following fair and reasonable and just: Some 11 Members, I believe, of this House and 2 Senators, I believe Senator PEPPER of Florida and Senator THOMAS of Utah, are the subject of files of the Dies committee. Apparently these Members, including myself, were the subject of investigation by Mr. Dies and Mr. Stripling and the paid employees of that committee. Does not the gentleman think it would be proper and judicious before anybody connected with the Dies committee made such an investigation for him to apprise that Member or the Members of the House or the members of the coordinate body that the Dies committee was investigating the activities of that Member or the Senator. Does not the gentleman think that that is fair?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Most certainly they should, but the fact that I or anyone else as a Member of this body or the other body is no reason why we should not be investigated. I think we should be if there is the slightest reason for it.

Mr. CELLER. That is not what I said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know what the gentleman is getting at. The gentleman says that if they charge me with something in the Dies committee or any other committee, and start to investigate me, I should be called to confront the witness. That is what I said in opening my statement. Of course we should be called.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman in turn battle for that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly. Every man should be confronted with the witnesses who appear against him. I would not follow the policy that was followed all too often by the National Labor Relations Board of hearing charges and denying the employer any opportunity to be heard. That was the practice as disclosed by the Smith committee. That was the method of the N. L. R. B., and time and time again they followed it until it became an established practice.

Mr. CELLER. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; of course they do not, and I have tried to right them both. I tried to do what I could for public hearings and for jury trials on the National Labor Relations Board and when O. P. A. legislation was before the House.

Here in America, when a man is accused by anyone, he should be given opportunity at the time to confront the witnesses and to cross-examine them. That is all I am asking. That is all I am asking the gentleman's help in securing, is to help, with those on the majority side, to bring in those birds who sent out false statements during the campaign, statements which we allege to be false. Let them lay their cards on the table face up, then call those who were vilified in here and say, "All right, here it is. What is your answer?" That is all I am asking.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I wish to say emphatically, positively, and without fear of any successful contradiction that the Dies committee never, never investigated any Member of this House or of the other body, never in all of its 7 years' history, and that anyone who says they did or intimates they did, does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman a member of that committee?

Mr. MASON. I was for practically 6 years.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GALLAGHER. May I ask the gentleman if the abuse of the P. A. C. and these other organizations against certain Congressmen was any worse than the abuse heaped upon the administration?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That depends altogether upon how much of it was true. One thing is sure, that if the administration was abused and lied about, it had some 250 Members of Congress to answer those charges. The charges, as far as I know, were never made in secret. They were never paid for, as far as I know, by anyone who concealed his contribution to the fund which gave them circulation. Moreover, a true charge made against a public official is not abuse. It is justifiable criticism. I do not consider it abuse to quote the President's promise to workers, made when he said, "The Government will never compel this—remaining—5 percent to join the union by a Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor," and then to call attention to the fact that the administration, through the National Labor Relations Board in the past, and more recently through the orders of the War

Labor Board, has effectively forced men to join a union in order to work in a defense plant.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. You did not want to go as far as that, did you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, it might be that I, like the gentleman from Massachusetts, upon looking it over a few days later, might find something that I did not think was exactly 102 percent right, but we will let it stand for the moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. What does that remark lead to?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, do you want me to tell you, or do you not?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Only to request back and forth permission to delete from the RECORD certain remarks made on the floor now and then.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, the gentleman has that in mind. What remarks do you refer to? Do you refer to my remarks the other day that I asked about?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, you can do or say whatever you want right now.

Mr. McCORMACK. When you get into a nasty atmosphere about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, there is nothing nasty about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you want to get nasty, go ahead. You asked me to take it out.

Mr. McCORMACK. I asked you for your benefit. I asked it for your benefit. The gentleman's skin is very, very thin.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. And no one in the House has reason to think it is thin.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to ask you a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My skin is like that of a rhinoceros. It would have to be to take the abuse of the P. A. C. and certain columnists.

Mr. McCORMACK. How do you know what it was?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know about your mind. I can tell what you are going to advertise on the Blue Network.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, you come to the Blue Network. The gentleman is very astute. He is so suspicious, he is so suspicious even of himself, that he does not wear pockets in his clothes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Perhaps I do not have pockets because I do not want anyone to put their hands into them, do you not see? I would not trust myself in the company of the New Deal with anything in my pockets. I notice you have your hands in your own pockets.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do not worry about me, brother. I have confidence in myself. What I rose to ask is this—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman aware of the old saying that the easiest way for a person with a good reputation to acquire a bad one is to be a candidate for a public office?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I do not know that you really acquire it, but they surely attempt to hang it on you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, without regard to party, we have got to be practical, and as practical men we realize in the campaigns of all of us, both primary and election campaigns, that many charges are made against us that are not correct. I think we have all undergone that experience. If I might suggest to the gentleman from Michigan, it seems to me the charge he is complaining about, if it should be investigated by a committee at all, should be more properly referred to the Special Committee on Primary and Election Campaigns, of which the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I gave his investigators a complete file before election.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I rose, as the gentleman can perceive, to make a constructive observation and not as the friendly, suspicious mind of the gentleman from Michigan anticipated an observation that was to be destructive.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman sits down, do we want to ask unanimous consent to strike out everything we said up to the gentleman's last question?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman wants me to take out my remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am not worrying. I am talking about taking out all the byplay up to the gentleman's question.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman wants me to take out my remarks where I referred to the fact that he is suspicious of himself and about not having pockets in his own clothes, I would be very glad to take that out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And also the observation I made that the reason that I had no pockets was that I was afraid somebody around here might get their hands into them, some of the new dealers.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the gentleman's own observation. That was the gentleman's own observation, again showing, as evidence in support of what I said, that the gentleman has an unusually suspicious mind even toward himself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, insofar as the people have lost practically all of the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution and have got down to just going around in their shoes——

Mr. McCORMACK. The majority of the people still vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right, he has given them more—some of them—of other people's property, a Huey Long share-the-wealth program, than anyone else could promise.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The thing I complain about is this: Here is a little handbill being put out by a committee. One of the committeemen was an editor. He saw this bill and he said it was a dirty thing and it would get votes for me; it would cost my opponent support. Yet his name was on the letterhead of that organization. The committee put it out. They had a little ad there and a cartoon of Mr. Hitler on one side and they had me on the other and we are saluting each other, only I am doing it with my left hand. They put that out everywhere, seeking to create the impression I was working with Hitler. Do you think an organization that puts out this kind of a circular should not be investigated? I think the gentleman from Massachusetts who rendered such a distinguished service on one of these un-American investigation committees would agree that the people who put that out ought to be called up to the witness stand and given an opportunity to say, "Yes; I said it, but I lied."

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time not having expired, I wish to speak on the question of drafting manpower.

DRAFTING MANPOWER

Mr. Speaker, the President's demand that he be given authority to assign all men who have reached the age of 18 and are not yet 46 to civilian jobs anywhere in the United States should not be granted for the following, among other reasons:

First. Employee and employer, our farmers, have shown that they can in less time produce more of better quality than any other people or nation.

It having been demonstrated that a free people will voluntarily outproduce any half or wholly regimented or totalitarian group, it is foolish during the critical phase of a great war to experiment.

Second. The present demands rest upon the false assumption that there is a shortage of manpower in industry; that the President and his advisers know and can do more about production than employees and employers.

If there is a scarcity of production of any particular item, it is primarily due to a lack of foresight, of accurate knowledge on the part of the Army, the Navy, and the administration of what would be needed—when and where.

To a large degree the uncertainties of war excuse that lack of knowledge, of foresight. But, in addition, every inquiring individual familiar with facts has known for more than a year that in some industries the available manpower and machinery were not being used and are not now being used to full capacity.

Full use of available manpower and machinery would give us miraculously increased production.

From the January 15, 1945, issue of The Detroiter, the weekly publication of the Detroit Board of Commerce, read this clear, concise statement printed in black-face type on page 5:

> You don't have to be told that the unions, themselves, invited the President to propose an all-over national service act—not directly but their own ordered limitation of production. Practically any superintendent or factory manager will tell you that war workers are not producing to capacity. Workers can't. Their union small fry won't let them. "Make the job last!" is too often the shop steward's command. "Slow down!" is the rule.
>
> There is no manpower shortage in most war industries. There is an instructed man-effort shortage. "Make the job last!" means "Make the war last!" That's mass murder.

The publication might well have added employers to those limiting production. Some employers have been none too anxious to produce the most at the least possible cost.

It is not only possible, but probable that, in some instances, the fact that

profits are based upon the over-all cost, rather than upon efficiency, upon quality, quantity, production has limited the output.

Third. If there is a shortage of manpower in some few localities, that is due to the administration's policy of encouraging the payment of high wages, offering special advantages, to those who work in other areas.

On page 1 of the January 15, 1945, issue of the The Detroiter, there is a statement which shows how workers from all over the country have been attracted to the Detroit area. That statement is as follows:

Immigrant residents of Detroit-Willow Run area

1940 residence	Total	Total male	Total female	Nonwhite male	Nonwhite female
Total immigrants	254,485	120,285	134,200	20,735	22,275
From elsewhere in State	51,590	22,385	29,205	330	495
From other States	198,330	95,810	102,520	20,240	21,615
New England	3,190	1,595	1,595	55	55
Middle Atlantic	29,205	13,695	15,510	935	1,045
East-North Central	46,970	22,220	24,750	2,475	3,190
West North Central	17,875	7,590	10,285	660	1,045
South Atlantic	23,540	12,210	11,330	5,170	5,005
East South Central	57,420	27,720	29,700	6,710	8,085
West South Central	13,750	6,765	6,985	2,365	2,640
Mountain	1,265	770	495	55	0
Pacific	5,115	3,245	1,870	1,815	550
From foreign countries	4,565	2,090	2,475	165	165

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census. Estimates based on a 2 percent sample count.

JOHN R. STEWART.

MICHIGAN DRAWS WORKERS FROM ALL STATES

Nearly 10 percent of the people residing in Detroit area now have come here since 1940. Every State in the Union has contributed emigrants to this area; in addition, 4,565 persons came here from foreign countries.

According to a 2 percent sample of Detroit's population taken by United States Bureau of the Census, there were 254,485 persons living in Detroit-Willow Run area—Macomb, Oakland, Washtenaw, and Wayne Counties—in June 1944 who lived elsewhere in 1940. Of this number 51,590 came from out-State sections.

Over one-half of remaining 198,330 immigrants came from 8 States. The 4 East-South Central States—Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi—lead with 57,420 while Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin contributed 46,970. Emigrants from other sections of United States are shown in accompanying table.

Most of Detroit's new arrivals have come from urban areas. Only 42,515 reported residence on farms in 1940. This trend was especially pronounced among persons coming here from other East-North Central States.

Among resident newcomers, women outnumber men, 134,200 to 120,285. This relationship held for most of contributing areas, exceptions being South Atlantic States, Mountain States, and Pacific region. It should be noted that this does not necessarily mean that females outnumbered males in the incoming families as originally constituted. Many of the male immigrants subsequently joined the armed services.

Nearly 40 percent of immigrants living in Detroit in June 1944 were between ages of 20 and 35. Among nonmigrants in this area, this age group comprised but 21.3 percent.

Of the 254,485 newcomers, 43,010 or 16.9 percent, were colored, 24,970 of the nonwhites coming from area south of Ohio River and east of Mississippi. Negro women immigrants now living in Detroit area outnumber the men, 22,275 to 20,735. This brings our total colored population in this area to 259,490, or 9.8 percent.

Everyone who reads the news knows that ever since the sit-down strikes began in Michigan in '37, due in part to communistic influences, in part to the justifiable demands of workers, there have been repeated strikes, slow-downs and work stoppages, which limited production.

Before we entered the war and in '39, certain C. I. O. unions were openly, according to the official statement of the Navy, deliberately holding up production for materials needed by the Navy. That is a matter of record.

Since we entered the war there has been almost daily strike after strike in Michigan, which curtailed war production.

When there is a slow-down, a work stoppage, a strike, or a lock-out, manpower is wasted. On the issue as to whether there is, or is not, a shortage of manpower in the Detroit area, it is not a matter of argument. Last week, in answer to an inquiry, I received from Michigan, the following telegrams:

Commission reports 13,456 drawing unemployment compensation.

Commissioner of Labor George Dean has asked that we advise you that during the most recently completed calendar week 13,456 workers were eligible for unemployment compensation.

When 13,456 workers are drawing unemployment compensation because they cannot get jobs, it cannot be argued that there is a shortage of available workers in Michigan.

Nor is the payment of higher wages, as advocated by a union spokesman before the House Military Affairs Committee, the answer to any apparent shortage of available workers.

Selective Service has already stripped the farms—the food factory of the Nation—of needed efficient manpower.

The administration, by sanctioning the union demand for the payment of comparatively higher wages, has induced farm workers to forsake their jobs and seek industrial employment.

The recent ruling of Selective Service, which, in effect, disregards the Tydings amendment, classifies farm production as a nonessential industry, will complete the job and, if carried far enough and continued long enough, will make it impossible for the remaining farmers to feed our allies, the armed forces, our civilian population, and the hungry of conquered lands.

Whatever may be the administration's intention, taking from the farm worker any claim to deferment, offering him a comparatively higher wage in industry, will in the end bring a shortage of necessary food.

MANPOWER SHORTAGE?—WE DO NOT SEE IT

The Army, according to the President, has men not only to do the planning and fighting of a war, but to sell candy, socks, toys, and a thousand other items.

And do not forget that this administration inspired migration of workers from Democratic States where their votes were not needed to go to States and districts where they cast a deciding vote in more than one city where that city's vote was the controlling factor which gave the State's electoral votes to the fourth-term candidate. Was that just a coincidence?

Some folks are so suspicious that they think the President and his advisers, intent upon their determination to steer the ship of state indefinitely, think it would not too greatly interfere with their purpose if he could have the legal power to shift, say, a few hundred thousand Democratic voting workers from the South to a close industrial district in the North. Nor is it merely a figment of the imagination to envision a few hundred thousand members of a racial group shifted from a district or a State which is overwhelmingly Democratic or New Deal, to a close Republican Congressional District or State in the North or where election contests are close, where a few thousand votes are decisive. Michigan elected a Republican Governor by a majority of 200,000, but the industrial vote of the cities, controlled largely by the President's allies in the Communist Party and the P. A. C. and the C. I. O., while voting for Kelly for Governor, gave the State's 19 electoral votes to President Roosevelt.

Think of the power to perpetuate itself in office wielded by an administration with authority to shift, not a few, but hundreds of thousands, of its supporters from one election district to another.

Some folks are so suspicious of this administration's motives that they are now asking whether the administration is rewarding the organized industrial vote for its election support by deferments granted outstanding union politicians and industrial workers, while calling upon local boards to strip the farms of their few remaining efficient workers, who in the North voted Republican.

At the time the President ordered and the Army took over the civilian business of Montgomery Ward & Co. in the Detroit area, as well as in other cities, because, it was said, if that course was not followed, workers engaged in production in plants producing war materials in the Detroit area, would walk out on sympathetic strikes, was there a manpower shortage?

If there is, as the President says, need for manpower, one remedy which would aid in solving that need, would be an administrative policy which discouraged not only sympathetic and jurisdictional strikes, but put an end to strikes, slowdowns, and work stoppages, lock-outs, which were due to other than avoidable causes.

When the President states that there is a lack of productive manpower, in, for example, the Detroit area, he is either unaware of or ignores the fact.

If the administration wants to use in war industries to the best possible advantage all the available manpower, it can contribute materially to that end by abruptly and completely discontinuing its political maneuvers to grant special favors to those organizations which claim the credit for the President's election to a fourth term.

If the administration will unlock the factory gates and let American citizens, many of whom have flesh and blood relatives fighting abroad, enter those gates unrestricted, unfettered by union regulations, rulings or favoritism, it will find there is ample manpower available.

Once upon a time in the long ago, a fleet manned by Americans sailed into Tokyo—on another occasion defied the Barbary pirates. In 1812 we told Great Britain, then the mistress of the seas, that she could not impress American seamen. On a former occasion, the world was advised that, while we had millions for defense, we had not one cent for tribute.

In this, our time of need, when our generals and the men who are fighting 3,000 and 10,000 miles from home, are asking for supplies from the homeland, let the administration, all its agencies and departments, throw open the doors of our industrial plants, demand that employers and employees make their objective the greatest possible production of the highest quality in the shortest time.

What this Nation needs today is not the granting of greater power, of arbitrary power, over civilian life to the Commander in Chief, but a restoration of the opportunity for free citizens, who love their country, to render all-out aid to those who are doing the fighting.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD the speech I intended to make when I got up to address the House this morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what was the request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asked unanimous consent to put in the RECORD the speech he rose to make.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Dr. Peter Marshall in the Washington Cathedral yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House during the remainder of this week. May I add that I do not think we will be in session longer than today, and in no event, all of tomorrow. We are considering a bill which we hope to get out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

RE-REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 95) to transfer Government activities in connection with domestic rabbits to the Department of Agriculture, and that it be re-referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

This bill deals with rabbits and does not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NINETY-DAY CONTINUANCE OF TIME FOR STUDY OF POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 99.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the investigation and study of political, economic, and social conditions in Puerto Rico conducted by the Committee on Insular Affairs under authority of House Resolution 159 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, be continued for a period of 90 days from this date, for the purpose of allowing said committee to complete and file a report on the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has conferred with me on this resolution. I suggested that he confer also with the leadership on the other side. I wonder if the gentleman from Missouri has done so? I ask this question for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that when the gentleman from Missouri asked for recognition, the Chair asked the gentleman to consult with the leadership on both sides.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Missouri did clear on this side. The gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the ranking minority member, is here and advises that this resolution should pass.

As I understand, this committee has completed its work to the point of making its report. As I understand, it made one trip to Puerto Rico. The report has not been made; it should be made. No additional money will be asked for, no additional investigation will be made. As I am informed, it is a question of giving this committee time in which to file a report on what it has done.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection. There are minority committee members present. I am sure they will object if this resolution should not pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Wednesday, January 24, following the special orders already entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Tuesday, following the special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I shall make this afternoon and to include an excerpt from a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

BIDDLE, CORCORAN, AND SETTLEMENT OF STERLING CASE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution calling for a full and complete investigation of the conduct of the Attorney General of the United States, Francis Biddle, in connection with certain charges made by one Norman M. Littell, formerly Assistant Attorney General. The resolution also provides for the investigation into the activities of the Department of Justice also as a result of the same charges, and the activities of one Tommy Corcoran.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks the statement of Mr. Littell pertaining to the settlement of the Sterling Products case as contained in the memorandum filed in another body on January 8, 1945. To all intents and purposes, the report is public property and the Congress is on notice as to the charges made. Involving as it does an important Government officer and a highly respected governmental department, there is a responsibility on the Congress to ascertain the facts in the interest of maintaining good government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in any quarrel that might exist between Mr. Biddle and Mr. Littell, if one exists. I am greatly concerned, however, in finding out just what the facts are. This is

not a partisan matter and is not being approached on that basis. This resolution, therefore, should have the unanimous support of every Member and the men and the department involved should insist upon a full and complete hearing in order that justice be done.

It is my purpose to discuss the settlement of the Sterling Products Co. case on September 5, 1941. I shall deal first with a brief history of this company and its relationship to the I. G. Farbenindustrie, a huge German drug combine, and how shortly before we entered the war, Sterling and Farben were advancing the Nazi cause in this country and in South America, contrary to an agreement between the Sterling Co. and the Alien Property Custodian in 1919.

The original Sterling Products Corporation was organized in 1899 in the United States and was not considered a very important organibation in its field until 1919 when it purchased the Bayer Co., Inc., formerly owned by the German Bayer Co., from the Alien Property Custodian. Seizure of the property belonging to the German company was made during the First World War.

A condition was imposed upon Sterling at the time of purchase and it signed a pledge that under no circumstances would the property purchased be otherwise owned by people not 100-percent American. Notwithstanding such pledge, one of the first acts of the company was to employ one Earl I. McClintock, who had previously been employed by the Alien Property Custodian, having charge of the German properties in question. Mr. McClintock became secretary and counsel for the American Bayer Co. and later a director of the Sterling Products Corporation, of which one William E. Weiss was the president. Hardly had the sale been consummated when Sterling began negotiations with the former owners in Germany. As early as 1919, representatives of Sterling and the I. G. Farbenindustrie were in conference at Baden-Baden and even reached an agreement prior to the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. The record is clear that from this point on, in violation of the pledge made by Sterling, that the I. G. Farben companies and Sterling inaugurated a scheme in violation of law to control the international drug market and contrary to law and agreement with our Government. This grew to be one of the most powerful international cartels in existence. A reading of the correspondence between the president of the Sterling Co. and the head of the German Bayer Co. bears out this fact.

In the agreement between these companies it appears that Sterling was to cooperate in the handling of South American business with the German concerns. As a matter of fact, there was a common understanding that Sterling, the American company, and Farben, the German company, were to be partners in the venture.

At this time, the Sterling Products Corporation then owned 100 percent of the American Bayer Co. which was purchased from the Alien Property Custodian, but the name was changed to Bayer Co. of New York. It was obvious that the Germans were intent upon getting back into the American drug market and especially into the lucrative Bayer Aspirin business. The American company protested against this move by the German concern, but there was a compensating arrangement made to give the German company 75 percent of the profits of the Latin-American business. In November 1920, the United States was still technically at war with Germany, but that did not prevent the consummation of a final agreement which was the first of two cartel agreements which later became involved in the antitrust suit against Sterling.

Mr. Littell, in his statement, points out that by 1923, all of the parties involved became much bolder, and the Germans were insisting upon getting into the American drug market again with the result that the Winthrop Chemical Co. was organized, owned 50–50 by Sterling and I. G. Farbenindustrie. Winthrop was to handle the so-called ethical drugs—those prescribed by doctors—and also all products previously involved in the Alien Property Custodian's sale, which was contrary to the pledge made to him. About this time, another agreement had been worked out granting Winthrop Chemical Co. exclusive marketing rights of I. G. Farben's products in certain other fields, such as perfumery, cosmetics, and toilet articles. Thus, Winthrop Chemical Co. became the agent of the German concerns for the United States, its possessions, and Canada. Two years later, Sterling organized the Alba Pharmaceutical Co. which was owned 50–50 by Sterling and Farbenindustrie. Thus the first agreement of October 1920 and the second of April 1923 completed the cartel agreement, contrary to law, which enabled the I. G. Farbenindustrie organization to again resume its grasp on the American drug business, and contrary to the Sterling Products Co.'s pledge to the Alien Property Custodian, and only a short time thereafter.

To further illustrate the maze of corporate organizations and to further this unlawful scheme, other American corporations were organized, but with the German interests controlling the situation. There was organized the American I. G. Chemical Corporation, controlled by Farben and which changed its name in 1939 to General Aniline Film Corporation, holding 50 percent of the Winthrop Chemical Corporation and 50 percent of the Alba Pharmaceutical Corporation. Sterling had two members on the board of directors, and I. G. Farben had one, but dominance and control was in I. G. Farbenindustrie.

It perhaps was but natural, and under the corporate set-up, for Sterling to be dominated by the Farbenindustrie and Farben, in turn, to be dominated by the Nazi government. On a division of the profits of Bayer Co. of New York, 75 percent went to the German Bayer and 25 percent to the American Bayer on South American, Central American, and Mexican trade, while profits were divided 50–50 on the Cuban, Canadian, United Kingdom, Australian, New Zealand, and South African business; payments under the agreement were to be made within 90 days of receipt of the invoice on shipments from Germany, but they were actually made sooner in order to cooperate with the financial needs of I. G. Farbenindustrie. In 1938, the Nazi government pressed Farben for money and when that happened, Farben drew on Sterling Products or its subsidiaries.

On the surface, it appeared that both Sterling and Winthrop Chemical Co. controlled their own affairs. However, management in fundamental policies was dictated from Germany. There were many conferences in this country, and in Germany between the officers of these interlocking concerns. Thus, when the Alien Property Custodian again took over the German property in this country in the present war, Sterling and Winthrop were not seized for they were smart enough to see that Farben had but one member on the board compared to two representing the American interests, and they continued to do business as usual and as surprising as it may seem, they are still doing business and this may be another story. But there was no interruption in the business of these concerns when this war broke out, as the subservient Sterling Products Co. promptly served the Nazi purposes by holding the German market in South America. It has been shipped packages so nearly identical with I. G. Farbenindustrie's own shipments that the Bayer Aspirin products are identical—and the buyers never knew the difference.

It has been established beyond question by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice that funds were actually diverted by Sterling Products to spread German propaganda. Payments were made to Farben's agents in South America and supplies were sent to German agents in South America and they, in turn, would use the proceeds to further the work of German agents there. In 1941, a new branch of the Bayer Co. of New York, the American Co., was organized in Venezuela, and a German citizen was made the head of that company. Later, it appears that many agents in South American countries were exposed as Gestapo agents. In the United States, the activities of this group were becoming so involved and the effort to cover up so intent, that fake offices were established in New York and in New Jersey. These secret hideouts were places to which funds could be transferred in an effort to cover up the real intent behind this entire scheme. The time came ultimately when these companies became so bold as to bring pressure to bear upon newspapers who dared to be critical of the German Government. Threats were made and instructions given by the officers of German companies to refuse advertising contracts unless there was a cessation of the criticism of the Nazis. The Germans were desperate and were willing to take great risks.

These are just a few of the facts with reference to the operations of the Sterling Products Co., its subsidiaries, and German-controlled associates, and show that these companies were involved in a gigantic cartel agreement, contrary to an expressed pledge to the United States Government and a menace to the efforts of the United States Government in

the early days prior to our entry into the war. Their activities fostered disunity in our national life and interfered with our national defense program. These facts must have been known by the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, in view of the activities of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Likewise, that must have been known to Mr. Tommy Corcoran, who later appears as attorney for Sterling, and it was he who effected a settlement of the case instituted against Sterling Products Co. by the Government, charging unlawful conspiracy.

CORCORAN'S INFLUENCE IN SETTLEMENT OF STERLING PRODUCTS CASE

It seems a peculiar coincidence, but in 1934 the brother of Tommy Corcoran, one David Corcoran, was employed by the Sterling Products Corporation and he later became an executive in two corporations, subsidiaries of Sterling—one, the Sterling International Products Co., and the other the Sidney Ross Co. Following this he became vice president of the parent company, Sterling Products, in charge of Mexican and South American business. Prior to the time when he was so employed David Corcoran was an automobile salesman with no knowledge whatever of the drug business or of South America.

In the fall of 1939 the Antitrust Division started an investigation in New York of the alleged drug conspiracy, including the penetration of Farbenindustrie into the drug business in this country through the cartel agreements, which I have already mentioned. This investigation, under the direction of Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, continued through 1940 and 1941.

On May 9, 1941, Attorney General Jackson froze the I. G. Farbenindustrie funds in the National City Bank of New York and on June 19, 1941, all German assets in this country were tied up by Executive order of the President. About this time, or in the spring of 1941, Attorney General Jackson was appointed to the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Biddle, as Solicitor General, became the Acting Attorney General. By the summer of 1941 the Antitrust Division investigation had proceeded so far as to leave no doubt in the minds of the investigators and the attorneys in charge of this work that there was an unlawful and illegal combination existing between Sterling and Farbenindustries. Those in charge of the work were reported to be anxious to complete their case and bring it on for trial. At this same time it was well known throughout the Department that Tommy Corcoran was in the case and that he was spending a great deal of time in the office of the Attorney General. Mr. Biddle was then only the Acting Attorney General and was in no position to make an important decision relating to a settlement of the case.

It seems strange, however, that at this time one John Cahill, a former United States attorney and classmate of Tommy Corcoran, resigned his position with the Government and became attorney for Sterling. Just a short period of time elapsed when the switch was made. Following that, one Sam S. Isseks, a friend and classmate of Tommy Corcoran's, was placed in charge of the Sterling Products investigation by Mr. Biddle in New York. By this time, the investigation had reached a point where the staff members of the Antitrust Division were of the opinion that not only indictments under the antitrust laws were justified, but also indictments for criminal conspiracy.

So flagrant were the violations of law by Sterling and its subsidiaries that it was a matter which called for the presentation of facts to a Federal grand jury. But what actually happened? On September 4, 1941, Mr. Biddle's appointment as Attorney General was confirmed, and, mind you, on the very next day, September 5, the Sterling Products case was settled, and all papers required for a dismissal prepared and ready for execution. Some speed for a law suit. Here is what happened: A petition was filed setting forth violations of the antitrust laws, a consent decree enjoining further violations entered by stipulation with the Sterling Products Corporation, and, of course, the Government and information invoking the penalty provision of the antitrust laws; and fourth, the defense plea of nolo contendere pursuant to which the defendant companies were each fined $5,000 as were certain individuals. This came after months of investigational work by the Department of Justice, which had in that time compiled some 30,000 vital exhibits revealing the means by which the I. G. Farbenindustrie and its subsidiaries were serving the purpose of the German Government in North and South America. On the very day that the consent decree was entered dismissing the action, there appeared a newspaper release in which the Sterling Products Co. was given the old familiar "whitewash." It is reported that the hand of Mr. Tommy Corcoran assisted in the draft of that press release. So after the expenditures of much money and many hours of work by loyal employees this highly important case was settled quickly within 24 hours after Mr. Biddle became Attorney General. This fact alone is sufficient to warrant an investigation of the charges that have been made.

Now Mr. Biddle had made some public statement to the effect that the proceedings taken by the Government in the Sterling case were strictly in accordance with departmental practices. He has stated that it was the intention of the Department of Justice to prosecute Sterling to the limit. It is true that the filing of an information was in fact a criminal action, but he failed to explain that the settlement was exactly as the defendant wanted it, and by disposing of the case as he did, it precluded a presentation of the whole case to a grand jury which would have considered all of the evidence which had been compiled by the Antitrust Division. There can hardly be any doubt that the charges as leveled against Sterling by the Government could have been proven, but in spite of all of the evidence, Mr. Biddle, by the approval of this consent decree stopped the investigation and confined the presentation of evidence to the very narrow limits of an information. This was a case calling for the imposition of prison sentences upon these corporate officials, for it was apparent they were concerned not with the protection of American interests, but with advancing the interests of our common enemy. It is no excuse for the Attorney General to say now that the entry of this decree was consistent with previous practice on the part of the Department of Justice involving other cases of a like nature. By far the greater number of cases that have been brought have been based upon violations of the criminal code and sentences were imposed accordingly. This should have been the practice in the Sterling case—but it wasn't and why? A House committee can find the answer.

In a case such as Sterling, there were many laws pursuant to which true bills might have been returned, such as those involving conspiracy against the United States, Trading with the Enemy Act espionage for interference with foreign relations, and the Enemy Alien Registration Act. It is conceivable that a grand jury might have indicted Tommy Corcoran for failure to register under the law requiring registration of agents of foreign principals, which affects any attorney for or any other person who receives compensation from, or is under the direction of a foreign business, a foreign political organization, or a domestic organization, subsidized directly or indirectly in whole or in part. It can be proven, and the record seems very clear that Sterling and its subsidiaries acted as the agents of German policy in this country and Mr. Corcoran might have fitted into the definitions of terms as set forth in the rules and regulations prescribed by the Attorney General defining foreign agents.

Mr. Speaker, it is common gossip in Government circles that the long arm of Tommy Corcoran reaches into many agencies; that he has placed many men in important positions and they in turn are amenable to his influence. If this is true the people of the United States are entitled to know all of the facts and the Members of Congress have a responsibility in this connection.

Mr. Speaker, the issue involved in this matter is not one of personalities, but rather a deep, fundamental question of integrity in the transaction of Government business which vitally affects not only the war effort and the consequences which flow therefrom, but the well-being and effectiveness of our system of government. My appeal this afternoon is to impress upon the House that serious charges have been made against a public officer and his department and the public will be satisfied only when this Congress takes action. I urge each of you to join with me in pressing for the adoption of my resolution which I have introduced today.

EXCERPT OF MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED TO SENATE COMMITTEE JANUARY 8, 1945, BY MR. NORMAN M. LITTELL, FORMER ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

MR. BIDDLE, MR. CORCORAN, AND SETTLEMENT OF THE STERLING PRODUCTS CASE

Beyond all shadow of doubt this case is one of the most significant, not only in the history of the Department of Justice, but in the history of the country, and its settle-

ment without submission of all the evidence to a grand jury marks the lowest point in the history of the Department of Justice since the Harding administration. I state as a fact, and will hereinafter show that the settlement was not only influenced by Tommy Corcoran, it was completely dominated by Tommy Corcoran through his influence over Mr. Biddle.

It is quite impossible to review adequately here the enormous volume of evidence represented in some thirty thousand documents embraced in one of the most intensive and thorough investigations which the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has ever made. It is essential to an understanding of this complex matter and of Mr. Biddle's testimony that a number of the material facts be set forth in brief as follows:

History and Activities of Sterling Products Corporation; connections with I. G. Farbenindustrie of Germany: The Sterling Products Corporation started in about 1899, first came into prominence in the drug business after purchasing Bayer Co. Inc., formerly owned by the German Bayer Co., from the Alien Property Custodian in 1919 after the last war. A condition was imposed upon the buyers, and Sterling signed a pledge that under no circumstances would the property purchased be otherwise owned in whole or in part by interests not 100 percent American.

One of the first acts of Sterling Products was to employ Earl T. McClintock, who had served in the office of the Alien Property Custodian, having charge of the German properties in question. Mr. McClintock become secretary and counsel[1] for the American Bayer Co. and later a director of the Sterling Products Corporation of which Mr. William E. Wise was the president.

Hardly had the sale been consummated when negotiations with the former owners in Germany were resumed. While representatives of all nations sat at a peace table at Versailles representatives of Sterling and I. G. Farbenindustrie (as it was later called)[2] were sitting at a conference table at Baden-Baden, reaching an agreement in 1919 even before the Treaty of Versailles was agreed upon.

As William E. Weiss, president of Sterling Products, wrote to Rudolph Mann, who had formerly been head of the German Bayer Co. before the Alien Property Custodian seized its American company, upon returning from conference in Germany in the fall of 1919:

"Wish to say that any proceedings taken or continued by us in Central and South America since the negotiations between us in September and October were taken with the view only of protecting your interests as well as ours. * * * We believe that you will agree with us that any action taken was for the best interests of all concerned. As I cabled you, I am working in complete harmony with you, and you can rest assured that we will do nothing that will be in any way contrary to the understanding at which we arrived at Baden-Baden."

The agreement called for a division of profits, but the German representatives wanted a guaranty of profits. In persuading Mr. Mann to abandon this, Mr. Weiss wrote on December 15, 1919, that such a guaranty "would be unwise from your standpoint. * * * We do not believe that you question that we will deal honestly with you, our partners in the matter."

German agents in Latin America were to be used. As Mann wrote to Weiss (April 30, 1920):

"In conformity with our conversations we take always for granted that the business would be carried out in association with our established agencies which, in a number of centers, would be subject to our mutual agreement."

The Sterling Products Corporation then owned 100 percent of the American Bayer Co., purchased from the Alien Property Custodian, the name being changed to Bayer Co. of New York. The Germans wanted to get back into the American drug market, especially the lucrative Bayer aspirin business, but Weiss confronted his pledge to the Alien Property Custodian. While Sterling dared not permit participation in the American aspirin market, a compensating arrangement was made to give the Germany company 75 percent of the profits on the Latin-American business. Rudolph Mann was correct in writing to Weiss on May 14, 1920:

"I quite understand, of course, that in its final form the agreement will have to leave room to read between the lines."

With the United States still technically at war with Germany, Weiss wrote to Mann, November 23, 1920, upon reaching a final agreement—the first of the two cartel agreements to become involved in the antitrust suit hereafter discussed:

"The desire of each to interpret this arrangement in the spirit in which it is entered into, to wit: as forming a copartnership in a joint enterprise."

By 1923 all parties were bolder. In the face of the German insistence in getting back into the American market, the Winthrop Chemical Co. was formed, owned 50–50 by Sterling and I. G. Farbenindustrie. This company was to handle the so-called ethical drugs (prescribed by doctors), but also all products previously involved in the Alien Property Custodian's sale. By April 1923 another agreement had been worked out granting Winthrop Chemical Co. exclusive marketing rights of I. G. Farben's product in certain fields. Winthrop Chemical Co. thus became the agent of I. G. Farbenindustrie for United States, its possessions, and Canada. (Later in 1935 Sterling organized the Alba Pharmaceutical Co., also owned 50–50 by Sterling and I. G. Farbenindustrie.)

Thus in part by these two agreements of October 1920 and April 1923, of which this Government know nothing, I. G. Farbenindustrie had resumed its grip on the American drug business before the ink was dry on Sterling Product's pledge to the Alien Property Custodian.

The German interests were later held by the American I. G. Chemical Corporation, controlled by I. G. Farbenindustrie, which changed its name in 1939 to General Aniline and Film Corporation, holding 50 percent of the Winthrop Chemical Corporation and 50 percent of the Alba Pharmaceutical Corporation. Sterling had two members on the board of directors and I. G. Farben had one, but dominance and control was in I. G. Farbenindustrie, as shown below.

Subservience of Sterling Products to I. G. Farbenindustrie and Nazi Government: Books could be written (and should be) on this subject, but I can only mention here several concrete facts indicating the character of Sterling's operations:

Payments to I. G. Farbenindustrie: On a division of profits of the Bayer Co. of New York, 75 percent went to the German Bayer and 25 percent to the American Bayer on South American, Central American, and Mexican trade while profits were divided 50–50 on the Cuban, Canadian, United Kingdom, Australian, New Zealand, and South African business. Payments were to be made within 90 days of receipt of the invoice on shipments from Germany, but they were actually made much sooner than that to cooperate with the financial needs of I. G. Farbenindustrie. Actually for many of the years under this contract remittances were received even before the goods were shipped, and possibly even before they were manufacturd. When the Nazi Government pressed I. G. Farbenindustrie for money in 1938, it drew on Sterling Products Co., or its subsidiaries, which cooperated fully for a time although this practice was later objected to in 1939 when credit balances developed for overpayments to I. G. Farbenindustrie.

Manufacturing; German production capacity increased: The practices between Sterling and I. G. Farbenindustrie not only provided prompt or advance payments in excess of contract requirements as the German company wished, but were subservient to the wishes of the Nazi Government that all products be manufactured in Germany in order to develop the maximum productive capacity, even irrespective of cost. For example, shipments of aspirin could be made from Sterling's Albany plant to Canada at $0.743 per pound while the German cost was $1.014. Under the contract the American company should have delivered the goods, but the German Government demanded that the German company should do so, the object being to build up productive capacity in anticipation of German self-sufficiency in time of war. German employment was also aided. The American company complied. There was no thought of building up American productive capacity and employment, or of Sterling's rights under its contract.

Control: This and innumerable other instances of collaboration showed that even though Sterling had presumably control of its own affairs, and outwardly control of Winthrop Chemical because of having two members on the board as opposed to one representing I. G. Farbenindustrie, actually management in fundamental policies was dictated from Germany through constant conferences, in Germany or in this country, between Sterling officials and the German representatives, also by long-distance telephone conversations and correspondence. With I. G. Farbenindustrie having only one member on the board and with the American Sterling Co. having two, was good strategy for I. G. Farben because when the Alien Property Custodian took over I. G. Farben's interests in the present war they only had one seat on the board. This arrangement helped to block licensing of American firms to manufacture atabrine, a substitute for quinine, badly needed by our troops at the front and by civilian populations in all malaria-ridden countries. The Alien Property Custodian has not yet seized the German patents, but this is another story.

During the rise of Hitler, which I. G. Farbenindustrie aided and abetted, its officials were defenders of national socialism and circularized its employees abroad, using Sterling Products Corporation in the same way.

Shipments from Germany to South America; substitution by Sterling Products Corporation: Drugs were manufactured in Germany and shipped to South America although, as noted above, the contract provided that they should be shipped from whichever country had the lowest production costs. There were excellent reasons why the American company should have shipped to South America pursuant to the contract, not only on the basis of lower cost, but on the basis of certain favorable exchange factors.

After much correspondence and many conferences in which the Americans argued for shipments from this country, the shipments continued to South America from Germany right up to the time of the British blockade after the outbreak of war, September 1939. Agents of I. G. Farbenindustrie in South America were deprived of their drug supplies by the British blockade, but

[1] Mr. McClintock left the Alien Property Custodian office at a salary of $3,000 per year to accept this position at $13,000 per year.

[2] The principal German drug companies of which the German Bayer Co. was one, formed a cartel in 1916 which combined into one corporation as one German I. G. Dyes Corporation. All of the German companies combined in 1926 into the I. G. Farbenindustrie composed of I. G. Dyes Corporation and additional German groups and companies, thereby constituting I. G. Farbenindustrie the greatest chemical trust in the world.

the Germans called upon the Sterling Products Corporation to supply the South American market.

This was precisely what had happened in the last war except that the German-owned Bayer Co. had supplied the market until it was taken over by the Alien Property Custodian. There was no such interruption when this war broke out, as the subservient Sterling Products Corporation, American-owned, promptly served the Nazi purposes of holding the German market in South America until after this war is concluded by shipping packages so nearly identical with I. G. Farbenindustrie's own shipments that the Bayer aspirin products were to all intents and purposes identical. Buyers never knew the difference.

German propaganda and agents subsidized by Sterling Products Corporation: In many cases the funds of this business were diverted from the German agents to spread German propaganda. Payments were made to I. G. Farben's agents in South America and supplies were sent to German agents in South America. The German Bayer Co. in Rio de Janeiro was accused of diverting funds to the German embassy: and Renata Kohler, head of the German Bayer Co., was accused in Brazil of being a Nazi agent. A new branch of the Bayer Co. of New York (the American company) was organized in Venezuela in March of 1941 and a German citizen was made the head of that branch. Many of the agents in South American countries were exposed as Gestapo agents, as abundant records in the State Department and the Department of Justice will show.

Here in the United States there were "blind offices," for example—one in New York, one in Newark, N. J. One of them had only one man and a set of books for the purpose of receiving money from the Sterling Products Co. These secret hide-outs or false post-office addresses were names to which funds could be transferred. The funds could thereafter be used in subversive activities in this country. Large sums were used in this way, before the President's order of June 14, 1941, "froze" all German properties intact in the United States.

How far-reaching were cartel agreements, patent control, and stock ownership of German companies in carrying out the purposes of the Nazi Government is now fairly well known, for every avenue of trade penetration was used for political propaganda, collection of strategic information about foreign countries, and efforts to suppress the development of strategic industries in areas which might be hostile to Germany. As an example, in 1934, I. G. Farbenindustrie and Sterling Products agreed to use their advertising as a political weapon and decided "that the notoriously anti-German newspapers should not receive any advertisements for Cafiaspirina or other products showing the Bayer Cross, but only advertisements for Fixal and Milk of Magnesia, to the extent that it was necessary to cause these anti-German newspapers to refrain from attacks."

In 1938, when I. G. Farbenindustrie complained that an anti-Nazi paper was getting more advertising than a rival pro-Nazi paper, Sterling Products defended the former on the ground that it was the best newspaper advertising medium. I. G. Farbenindustrie demanded that future newspaper advertising contracts contain "legal clause whereby the contract is immediately canceled if overnight the political attitude of the paper toward Germany should be changed," and this letter was sent to a Sterling Products executive of German origin, "personally, so that he would know the party in Germany was watching him and could watch his step."

These actions were carried out under the direction of Mr. William Weiss, president; Mr. Earl I. McClintock, Mr. A. H. Diebold, and other personnel, some of whom owed their positions to I. G. Farbenindustrie which had sent them to this country.

In May 1941 the British Ministry of Economic Warfare denounced these activities of Sterling Products Corporation in South America, and of Weiss & McClintock.

The foregoing is a bare summary of typical facts in this company's operations, but is quite adequate to show that there was involved in proceedings against the Sterling Products Corporation, its subsidiaries and affiliates, not only the breaking up of the illegal cartel agreements with I. G. Farbenindustrie, but very real questions of moral turpitude—indeed of conduct bordering on treason to the United States.

Against this background of facts, what was the participation of Tommy Corcoran in effecting settlement of the Sterling Products case, and what is the history of the matter in the Department of Justice?

Settlement of the Sterling Products case; influence of Tommy Corcoran: What is the history of Tommy Corcoran's part in the settlement of this case on September 5, 1941, the next day after Mr. Biddle was confirmed as Attorney General? First, note two statements of Mr. Biddle defining the limits of Corcoran's influence. He praised Tommy Corcoran's helpfulness in this matter; he said: "I think Mr. Corcoran's chief contribution to the settlement was this: Mr. Cahill and the other lawyers representing the company were urging very strongly for a civil suit (instead of a criminal action.) Mr. Corcoran was able to persuade Sterling Products Co. to agree to plead" which meant that the company admitted its violation of the antitrust laws, as charged in an "information," rather than a proceeding before a grand jury, and upon entry of a consent decree prohibiting further violation, it agreed to the imposition of fine.

Mr. Biddle also states that "because we wanted to get that company doing American business in South America," Tommy Corcoran had worked out a plan whereby Biddle was to write "to the Secretary of Commerce and say if the new industry is founded to get the American trade," would the Secretary of Commerce police the industry to see that it was free of German activities, "and maybe put a member of the board in there."

The famous "midnight ride" took place when Tommy Corcoran and Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold drove 90 miles to where the Attorney General was at Big Meadows on the Skyline, to get him to sign such a letter to the Secretary of Commerce. The Attorney General refused to sign the letter to the Secretary of Commerce, apparently not because he thought there was anything wrong about that way of handling the case but "because he didn't think he (i. e., the Secretary of Commerce) would do it."

This was the extent of Tommy Corcoran's influence in the Sterling Products case according to Mr. Biddle. What are the facts?

The principal events leading up to the settlement of this case are summarized below:

1. David Corcoran and Sterling Products: About 1934 a certain Mr. X, whom I need not name, introduced David Corcoran, the brother of Tommy Corcoran, to Earl I. McClintock, vice president, Sterling Products, Inc. (now Sterling Products Drug Co.) and president of Sterling Products International, Inc. The introduction was made on the grounds and for the reason that Tommy Corcoran, Dave's brother, was then most influential in Washington, D. C. David Corcoran was then an automobile salesman with no knowledge whatever of the drug business or of South America, but McClintock and Mr. Weiss, president of Sterling Products, took David Corcoran in as an executive in the Sterling Products International Co. and Sidney Ross Co., two subsidiaries of the Sterling Products Corporation. Subsequently, David Corcoran became vice president of Sterling Products in charge of Mexican and South American business.

2. Department of Justice investigation of drug conspiracy; German domination: In the fall of 1939 the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice started an investigation in New York into the drug conspiracy including the penetration of I. G. Farbenindustrie of Germany into the drug business here through cartel agreements. Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, then serving under Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, placed F. Whalen in charge of the New York office of the Antitrust Division conducting this investigation which continued thrcugh 1940 and 1941. Many very able men in the Antitrust Division were assigned to the investigation.

3. British Ministry of Economic Warfare denounces Sterling Products' pro-Nazi activities: By the spring of 1941 the activities of Sterling Products Co. in aiding Nazi penetration into South America and subsidizing Nazi agents, had become so well known, as briefly outlined above, that on May 1, 1941, the British Ministry of Economic Warfare issued a statement accusing the Sterling Products Co. and William Weiss, its president, and Earl McClintock, vice president, of rendering assistance to the Nazis in South America.

4. German assets frozen in United States of America: On May 9, 1941, Attorney General Jackson tied up I. G. Farbenindustrie funds in the National City Bank of New York, and on June 14, 1941, by Executive order of the President, all German assets in this country were frozen.

5. Attorney General Jackson appointed to Supreme Court: In the spring of 1941, Chief Justice Hughes of the Supreme Court resigned and on June 2 Attorney General Jackson was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States. Francis Biddle, Solicitor General, as the next ranking officer of the Department of Justice, became Acting Attorney General.

6. Department of Justice investigation; proof of Sterling Products collaboration with Nazi Government; Tommy Corcoran's influence: By the summer of 1941, the investigation of Sterling Products Corporation in New York had proceeded to a point where the collaboration of the company with I. G. Farben Industrie was overwhelmingly established to a degree which went beyond contractual obligation even under illegal cartel agreements. The investigation was still not complete. With Mr. Biddle becoming Acting Attorney General, apprehension increased in the investigational staff of the Antitrust Division over the probable effects of Tommy Corcoran's influence in terminating the investigation and defeating indictment of the companies and individuals involved. Members of the staff in New York had already redoubled their efforts when they learned that Tommy Corcoran represented Sterling Products; they worked overtime at night in a determined drive to advance the investigation as rapidly as possible to a stage so complete that the sheer force of the facts revealed would defeat Tommy Corcoran's efforts. Tommy Corcoran was engaged in a race with time to (1) stop the investigation before it reached such a conclusive stage and (2) get the cases filed on a civil basis with consent decrees merely restraining further violation of the antitrust laws, and above all things, (3) prevent the presentation of the evidence to a grand jury.

After Mr. Biddle became Attorney General upon Mr. Jackson's promotion to the Supreme Court on June 2, 1941, apprehension within the staff became so great that Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General, found it necessary on July 15, 1941, to advise the New York staff of the Antitrust Division working on the Sterling Products investigation that they would not be inter-

fered with as he had the "go ahead signal" from the White House on this investigation. This did not, however, dispel the rising tension of these conflicting forces within the Antitrust Division during the summer of 1941 while Mr. Biddle served as Acting Attorney General. It was common knowledge that Tommy Corcoran was in and out of the Department of Justice and it was also known that he was working hard to secure Mr. Biddle's appointment as Attorney General. (As subsequently developed, Biddle was then to urge Tommy's appointment as Solicitor General, which he later did—but without success.)

Obviously as only Acting Secretary General, Mr. Biddle could not make so momentous a decision as the one posed for him by these conflicting forces in the Department of Justice, and so the race went on between Tommy Corcoran and the staff.

7. John Cahill, former United States attorney and classmate of Tommy Corcoran, representing Sterling Products: One of Tommy Corcoran's innumerable placements throughout the Government was John Cahill, intimate friend and former classmate of Corcoran at the Harvard Law School, both having been employed in the firm of Cotton & Franklin—Corcoran from 1927 to 1932, and Cahill from 1927 to 1931. Mr. Cahill was appointed United States attorney in New York on February 10, 1939, at the instigation of Tommy Corcoran, and served in that capacity all during the period of the Sterling Products Co. investigation up to February 1941. He then resigned the office on February 10. The investigation, while not complete, was rapidly maturing. Mr. Cahill represented Sterling Products Co. in negotiating with the Department of Justice during this crucial period in the summer of 1941.

8. Sam S. Isseks, friend and classmate of Tommp Corcoran, placed in charge of Sterling Products Investigation: Sam S. Isseks (Harvard, from 1922 to 1926), had been employed in the Department of Justice and was working on the New York staff of the Antitrust Division, but not on the Sterling Products case. On July 30, 1941, after a conference in Washington, D. C., Sam Isseks returned to New York and advised Mr. F. Whalen, previously in charge of the New York antitrust office, that he, Isseks, would take over the New York office as its head, although I believe he was not officially confirmed as chief of the New York office until October 1941 (Mr. Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General, later advised Mr. Whalen that this change was not due to dissatisfaction with Mr. Whalen's handling of the Antitrust Division business in New York).

9. July 30 to August 24, 1941: This was a period of mounting tension in the Antitrust Division. Violations of the antitrust laws had long been overwhelmingly clear on the part of Sterling Products Co. but far more sinister facts were presented by the record. In its subservience to I. G. Farbenindustrie, Sterling Products had in fact become an agent of Nazi Germany, carrying out policies aimed at the United States. In the opinion of some members of the staff, not only indictments under the antitrust laws were justified but also indictments for criminal conspiracy under section 88 of title 18, providing maximum fines of $10,000 and 2 years' imprisonment.

If ever a case in the history of the Department of Justice justified presentation of all of the facts to a grand jury, this was it. But there was a deep anxiety in a zealous staff of the Antitrust Division as to whether the whole matter would be suppressed from public view by merely filing a civil proceedings with a consent decree, and by the filing of an information, thereby avoiding a grand jury and limiting the whole matter of punishment to the counts set forth in the information—to which the defendant would plead nolo contendere (equivalent to a plea of guilty), and accept a fine.

Pressures to confine the matter to a civil proceedings under the antitrust laws, and, at the very worse, to the filing of an information, were perfectly obvious. It was common knowledge throughout the Department and particularly in the Antitrust Division that Tommy Corcoran was in and out of the Department frequently throughout this period (see sec. 3, below).

10. Francis Biddle nominated as Attorney General on August 24, 1941: On August 24, after 2 months of delay, Mr. Biddle's name was sent to the Senate for confirmation as Attorney General of the United States. Events moved rapidly after that for it was then clear that he would then have authority to act.

11. Mr. Biddle's appointment as Attorney General confirmed September 4, 1941; Sterling Products case settled September 5, 1941: Mr. Biddle's appointment as Attorney General was confirmed by the Senate on September 4, and on the next day there was filed in court all of the completed papers necessary to settle the Sterling Products case, namely: (1) A petition setting forth violations of the antitrust laws; (2) a consent decree enjoining further violations, entered by stipulation with the Sterling Products Corporation; (3) an information invoking the penalty provision of the antitrust laws; and (4) the defendant's plea of nolo contendere, pursuant to which the defendant companies were each fined $5,000 and certain of the defendants (individuals) were likewise fined.

Investigational work had already been stopped by order of Mr. Biddle after some thirty thousand vital documents had been assembled revealing as conclusively as any case in the history of the Department of Justice the means employed by I. G. Farbenindustrie in this as in the last war to serve the purposes of the German Government in the Western Hemisphere. The whole incident was polished off with a press release on September 5, which had also been well prepared in advance. This was commonly referred to in the press at the time as the "white wash" of the Sterling Products case. It was a notorious fact that Tommy Corcoran even assisted in drafting this press release on September 5. It is reported that Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General, refused to sign the release.

Mr. Biddle says that "the only conference had with Mr. Corcoran was before Judge Arnold in October of 1941," but the pressure leading up to the conclusion of the case on September 5, 1941, was so great that resignations were threatened within the staff of the Department because of the interference of Tommy Corcoran. Obviously, Mr. Biddle's statements quoted above are untrue; it was a physical impossibility for all this to have happened with Mr. Biddle knowing so little about it as he professes. As one commentator put it, Tommy Corcoran "hung his hat" in the Attorney General's office during this period.

4. Other testimony of Mr. Biddle considered in the light of the facts: Mr. Biddle said he insisted on criminal proceedings:

"Counsel for the company, and particularly Mr. Cahill, were very anxious that we would bring civil proceedings and get a decree, rather than a criminal proceeding. When the matter was finally put up to me by counsel, and with Judge Arnold, Judge Arnold advocated criminal proceedings, and I insisted on criminal proceedings. * * *

"The defendants were urging that no criminal action be brought, and they wanted to get low fines. I insisted that the criminal action be brought and heavy fines imposed."

Mr. Biddle also said:

"We told those fellows we were going to ask for the maximum fine, and we did * * *. I insisted that the criminal action be brought and heavy fines imposed * * *—we gave his client (Tommy's) the works on that."

The statement is made to sound very virtuous, but Mr. Biddle did not explain what he meant by a "criminal action." The filing of an information was in fact a criminal action, but he does not explain that he did exactly what the defendant wished, and avoided the presentation to a grand jury of a vast body of evidence on which the jury would undoubtedly have found not only many more violations of the antitrust laws than were set forth in the information, but also acts affecting our national security and welfare.

The information by no means includes all of the acts or refers to all of the evidence in the Department of Justice.

With plenty of facts available and the investigation in the Department at white heat, thereby putting Mr. Biddle on notice that this was an extraordinary case of vastly more significance than a mere antitrust suit, reflecting actual Nazi penetration into the Western Hemisphere, Mr. Biddle stopped the investigation in its tracks and confined the presentation of evidence to the narrow limits of an information.

Mr. Biddle also said in considering why no sentences were imposed and only fines were assessed:

"The history of the Antitrust Act has been that prison sentences are never imposed by the courts. Violation of the Antitrust Act is considered an economic violation and not a matter of moral turpitude, and that is the whole history of the act."

If ever there was a case of moral turpitude, this was it. Furthermore, Mr. Biddle's statement is untrue. There are plenty of precedents for requesting prison sentences and Congress did provide for such punishment.

Of all the cases filed under the antitrust laws from 1890 to 1943, by far the greatest proportion were by indictment before grand juries, as follows:

Civil suits	345
Criminal cases:	
By information	41
By grand jury	403
Total	789

While I do not have the figures after 1935, from 1890 to 1935, in 184 criminal cases brought, 2,587 defendants had been convicted, $2,321,384 in fines had been imposed, and 786 months of prison sentences had been imposed.

Even while Mr. Biddle was in the Department of Justice as Solicitor General, the next ranking officer under the Attorney General, or as Attorney General, many cases were brought in which the facts were submitted to grand juries and indictments were returned.

Many American-owned companies without taint of German influence and rising nowhere near the German control or direction which was attained by the Nazi government in the Sterling Products Corporation were indicted by grand jury, as Mr. Biddle most certainly knew. Are these American-owned companies to be prejudiced by their failure to employ Tommy Corcoran?

Mr. Biddle says:

"As a result of that, all of the corporations were fined the maximum fine under the law, $5,000 apiece. Two of the defendants, Diebold and Weiss, were also fined. Weiss, who was, we thought, the main German agent in there, was fined the maximum fine. Diebold was fined a thousand dollars, as his connection had been less apparent."

There was only one count in the Sterling Products case on which fines were assessed and there could have been any number of counts based on the different violations alleged. I believe there were 10 or 11 agreements supposed to be in violation of the antitrust laws and this many counts at least could have been alleged, even in an information. It was quite impossible with the great heat behind the subject, public knowledge of the case, and the intensity of feeling in the

Department of Justice for the Attorney General to do less than file an information, but he did file the most limited information possible.

If the case had gone before a grand jury, as in other cases, the jury could have reviewed documents of the history of this company right down to Pearl Harbor, and might have discovered additional crimes such as conspiracy or fraud against the Government to obtain patents. There could have been numerous true bills returned for different crimes rather than one count in an information.

In the case of this extraordinary character there were many laws pursuant to which true bills might have been returned, such as those involving conspiracy against the United States, Trading with the Enemy Act, espionage, and interference with foreign relations, and the Enemy Alien Registration Act. A grand jury might even have indicted Tommy Corcoran for failure to register under the law requiring registration of agents of foreign principals (52–631, June 8, 1938, amended August 7, 1939) which affects any "attorney for or any other person who receives compensation from, or is under the direction of * * *" a foreign business, a foreign political organization, or a domestic organization subsidized directly or indirectly in whole or in part by any of the above.

As pointed out in the review of activities of the Sterling Products Co., it acted in some cases as agent of German policy, even utilizing their advertising in South America (as reported by the Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate in Monograph No. 1, 78th Cong., 2d sess., entitled "Economic and Political Aspects of International Cartels," p. 55), as a political weapon upon the insistence of I. G. Farbenindustrie, of Germany. Tommy Corcoran, along with the executives of Sterling Products, might well have fitted into these definitions of terms as set forth in the rules and regulations prescribed by the Attorney General defining foreign agents. A grand jury might well have reached these conclusions.

In respect to cleaning out the German elements in the Sterling Products Corporation, Mr. Biddle said:

"Now, the reason the company finally conceded to our terms was because they wanted to go ahead and do business and to clean out the German elements. They were very keen to do it. We cleaned them out, and after a long report from the Treasury, some 400 pages, the Sterling Products were absolutely cleaned out of any German influence."

What changes were actually made? In the busy days between August 24, when Mr. Biddle was nominated as Attorney Attorney, and September 5, when the case was settled, certain changes in the Sterling Products organization were carried out, on August 29, as follows:

Mr. William E. Weiss was shifted from chairman of the board to chairman of the executive committee of the board.

Mr. A. H. Diebold was shifted from president to chairman of the finance committee.

Neither man got completely out.

Mr. Edward H. Rogers, who had been chief counsel, became chairman of the board, and James Hill, Jr., former treasurer (previously just a bookkeeper) became president.

Does anyone suppose for a moment that the seat of authority and direction of the company changed at all with these shifts? Did Mr. Hill, by reason of a change of title suddenly develop the faculty to give Mr. Weiss and Mr. McClintock orders?

As for the Treasury report to which Mr. Biddle refers, it was not even completed until 1942. Not one page of it had been written when Mr. Biddle settled the Sterling Products case. The investigation of the Treasury Department had only started on August 15, 1941.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman knows that in the last Congress I had a resolution before the Congress. That resolution was not adopted.

It is my judgment now as it was then that it is not going to do any good to leave matters of this kind just festering in the public mind; indeed, I believe that it is no more than a matter of justice to the Attorney General himself and everyone involved that a competent committee of the Congress should have an opportunity to go into all these things without prejudice or preconception, find out what the truth is, and present it in dignified fashion to the country.

I had frankly planned to study the matter further, but since the gentleman from Wisconsin has made the move he has today and since I believe it is even more to the interest of the majority party than it is to the interest of the minority party that the full truth about these things should be developed I wanted to tell him that I am preparing a resolution myself which I shall have ready for introduction before the day is over. My resolution will not be like the gentleman's but will call for investigation by the Judiciary Committee of these three things:

First. Whether or not persons outside of the Government but formerly in its employ have influenced or attempted to influence unduly or improperly official decisions of any Justice Department officials.

Second. Whether or not the effective enforcement of the anti-trust laws has been interfered with or obstructed by anyone in or out of the Government.

Third. The truth or falsity of the charges made by Mr. Littell.

Let me say that in my judgment the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has done one of the best jobs of any of the bureaus of the Government and I should regret it should they feel they could not depend on getting support from us. I want to point out that my resolution makes no presuppositions. I simply believe the truth about all these things should be brought out so there can be an end to these charges and countercharges.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from California for his observations and I agree with them. I believe there are many many men in the departments downtown, especially in the Department of Justice, who are doing a splendid job. I agree further with the gentleman from California that this matter of impeding investigations into cartel agreements is a very serious matter.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Does the gentleman have any proof at all that a decree was written within the 24 hours between September 4 and September 5?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not.

Mr. SHERIDAN. On what does the gentleman base his conclusion, then, that the decree was written overnight?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. My answer is that Mr. Biddle was not appointed until the 4th of September, and I would assume that so far as settlement of the case is concerned that it was not being considered before that. These documents must have been prepared before Mr. Biddle was confirmed as Attorney General.

Mr. SHERIDAN. It is only an assumption on the part of the gentleman that they were prepared overnight. The gentleman has no evidence whatsover to substantiate his charge?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is a matter for the House investigating committee to find out.

Mr. SHERIDAN. I am asking the gentleman if he has any evidence of his own to disclose to the House for its information?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Not at all.

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is all.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is enough.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of the participation of the House in the ratification of treaties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article written by the Indianapolis Chapter of the Rainbow Division of the veterans organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. CORBETT (at the request of Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. TALBOT, for 1 week, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 23, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

126. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a copy of the ninth annual report of the Social Security Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

127. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting a copy of the tenth annual report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

128. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the third annual financial statement and report of operations under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

129. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, transmitting an advanced copy of the annual report for the fiscal year 1944, together with statistical bulletin No. 44; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 197. A bill to establish the grade of General in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 618. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.; without amendment (Rept. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 619. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. IZAC: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 623. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 624. A bill to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1076. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; without amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. R. 1643. A bill to provide for the promotion of officers on the retired list of the Army after specified years of service on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 1644. A bill to grant members of the Regular Establishment additional increase for service during World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. R. 1645. A bill to preserve the reemployment preferences of members of the armed forces who after discharge therefrom become employed in essential activities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1646. A bill to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 1647. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the Captain William Edmiston Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution a certain building and tract or parcel of land situated in Montgomery County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1648. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1649 (by request). A bill to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 1650. A bill to give the same priority rights to disabled veterans as are given war workers to housing facilities; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 1651. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1652. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 1653. A bill for the relief of the soldiers who served on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1654. A bill to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 1655. A bill to permit contributions to volunteer fire companies for exclusively public purposes to be deducted in computing net income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1656. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the provisions of a contract for the purchase of a power plant for use in connection with the San Carlos irrigation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1657. A bill to provide for the presentation of national flags to certain parents of deceased veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1658. A bill to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 so as to provide that medical statements be furnished, without request therefor, to persons discharged from the armed forces for disability; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 1659. A bill authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1660. A bill to amend the Classification Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1661. A bill to authorize the establishment of a permanent veterans' medical and hospital service in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1662. A bill to promote on the retired list all line officers of the Army who have or may be specially commended for performance of duty in actual combat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1663. A bill to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H., subject to regulations of the Secretary of the Navy for the control, protection, and defense of the naval station, harbor, and entrance channel, and other lawful regulations and requirements; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 1664. A bill to provide for the giving of flags to widows and children of deceased Members; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1665. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 in order to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1666. A bill to provide for the registration, selection, and induction of certain female persons for service in and with the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution to provide for termination of the act of January 20, 1942, providing for daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 100. Resolution urging on behalf of the United States House of Representatives a diplomatic break with Franco (Fascist) Spain, and extension of lend-lease to the guerilla armies of the Spanish Republic underground; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 101. Resolution providing for an investigation by the Committee on Military Affairs with respect to emergency fire fighting equipment purchased by the Office of Civilian Defense; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 102. Resolution to investigate the activities of Francis Biddle, Thomas Corcoran, and the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 103. Resolution to authorize the Judiciary Committee to investigate certain matters affecting the Justice Department; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of the estates of John C. and Ann K. Keegan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1669. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Stowell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1670. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Garwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zelma Inez Cheek; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of the legal representatives of Owen Thorne, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of the Superior Coach Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKENZIE:

H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ollie Patton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 1675. A bill granting a pension to Nancy Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1676. A bill for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Hires Turner Glass Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 1678. A bill for the relief of Batista Illinoco; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

25. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of John C. Burt, of New York, N. Y., concerning the civil rights of inventors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

26. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of School District No. 10, Tacoma, Wash., Bartlett Rummel, president, E. M. Wetherell, secretary, pointing out to Congress that war time necessitates children of school age walking to school in darkness during winter months and that such darkness presents traffic hazards. Alleging that it is not practical to change hours of school opening and closing because of transportation conditions and further disruption of the routine of families of war workers and, therefore, memorializing Congress to the end that standard time be restored during the winter months in the regoins of the northerly latitudes; to the Committee on Rules.

27. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. George Smeaton, president, and sundry other members of Women's Guild of St. Paul's Evangelical Church of Sigourney, Iowa, opposing post-war military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

28. By Mr. RILEY: House resolution submitted by James E. Hunter, Jr., clerk, house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., memorializing the National Congress to pass the bill of Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, United States Senator from Montana, to establish a National Institute of Dental Research, introduced by F. B. Hines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

29. Also, house resolution submitted by James E. Hunter, Jr., clerk, house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., memorializing the National Congress to provide assistance and funds for county service officers to assist veterans of all wars, introduced by Steve Anderson, J. Ralph Gasque, Wilbur S. White, and A. J. Wheeler; to the Committee on Appropriations.

30. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, endorsing the provisions of assistance and funds for county service officers to assist veterans of all wars; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

31. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, endorsing the bill of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, to establish a National Institute of Dental Research; to the Committee on Appropriations.

32. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Town Hall Committee of Wichita, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their recommendation for full and immediate consideration to an amendment to the Constitution that will limit and define the term "commerce among the several States" as set forth in the Constitution so as to meet better the needs of the people in protecting their liberties and property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the giver of all that makes life blessed, we praise Thee that Thy providence has been with our country throughout the years. We earnestly pray for the continuance of Thy unfailing care and for the spiritual enrichment of the soul of America. Grant that the gifts we have as a free people may more and more flower into goodness and fidelity. Provide us with that dignity which compels us to stand for the right and shun the wrong; to stand when the heat of conflict swelters and the storm beats down, when the task of survival is a grinding yoke of sacrifice, and when loyalty calls forth as never before. We pray for a crusade of peace and unity throughout our land, from border to border.

Almighty God, let the blessing of heaven abide with our President as he continues his arduous duties, unparalleled in the history of our Republic. Thou who are infinitely gracious, preserve his health; give him great wisdom and broad vision; guide his thoughts and aspirations in his counsels at home and abroad for the honor and welfare of our people and for the union of the peace-loving nations of this torn world. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. JACKSON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CLASSIFICATION OF REGISTRANTS, AGES 18–25

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may have the attention of the Representatives from the farming areas.

On yesterday the House Committee on Agriculture went into State directors' advice No. 288, issued January 3, 1945, subject, Reclassification of Registrants, Ages 18 to 25, with General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, and Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator. Directive No. 288, issued January 3, 1945, was construed, as most Members from farming sections know from the mail they have been receiving, as an annulment of what is known as the Tydings amendment. After considerable discussion, I appointed a subcommittee, composed of myself, as chairman, and Congressmen COOLEY, ZIMMERMAN, PACE, HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and PHILLIPS, to confer with General Hershey in order to work out, if possible, the language of a new directive, advising in plain English that directive No. 288 was not intended to annul, change, or modify the Tydings amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 1 additional minute. The directive is very short and many Members will be interested in it.

The SPEAKER. Inasmuch as there is no legislative program for today, the Chair will entertain the request. The Chair wants it understood that this is not a precedent, however.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The meeting of the subcommittee with General Hershey resulted in a new directive being sent out by General Hershey last night, which reads as follows:

Questions of interpretation of State directors' advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State directors' advice No. 288, have been brought to modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State directors' advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5K of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant, whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

Congressmen LEMKE, H. CARL ANDRESEN, and LARCADE, representing the group that has given considerable thought to the matter, sat in on the meeting, and approved the directive that I have just read. This directive, I be-

lieve, is a happy solution of the farm-labor problem that has been giving Representatives from the farming sections so much trouble since the issuance of directive No. 288.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

POLAND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the principles for which we fight are to be given any practical significance at all, if the ideals set forth in the Atlantic Charter are to have any meaning, if the announcements and pronouncements in behalf of a lasting peace are to have any effect, we must move at once to do everything in our power to save the liberty-loving people of Poland and the other small nations of the earth from conquest, political domination, and unwelcome ideological infiltration.

I need not remind Members of this body of the gallant, supremely courageous fight of the people of Poland in behalf of their liberties. They were the first victims of Nazi tyranny. From the beginning of this war they have fought with unexcelled fury and spirit of sacrifice. They waged this desperate battle, which destroyed much of their beautiful country, because they believe in democracy and are willing to fight, bleed, and die to preserve and sustain it. They are now entitled to our assistance in reestablishing their free institutions.

The manner in which the Polish question is settled presents the first and truest test of the sincerity of the United Nations and will affect for good or evil the entire peace. Are we to desert these gallant Polish people who are now having superimposed upon them by force and conspiracy a form of government and a set of institutions that they do not want? The outcome of this struggle between freedom and coercion will determine whether we have been fighting in vain. I earnestly hope that the President and the State Department of this Nation will soon proclaim to the world that we here in America intend to assist the Polish people in their hour of urgent need and will take affirmative action to reconstitute their free government. For us to do less at this time will be to pervert our objectives in the war and to make a travesty and a mockery out of the sacrifices of our sons.

Let us have a clear, unequivocal statement that this Government will support and contend with all means in its command for the rights of our gallant Polish allies and other small nations and that we will never permit them, if we can prevent it, to be the victims of aggression and aggrandizement.

TRANSCONTINENTAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, if the some 16,000 miles of transcontinental or superhighways that my bill calls for in the United States—the bill I have been calling your attention to each year since 1937, and I am reintroducing today—I say, if these highways had been completed December 31, 1940, they would have more than paid for themselves by December 31, 1945.

In other words, you will recall my program calls for highways 100 feet wide and not more than 4 percent grade, 3 running east and west and 6 running north and south in the United States—thus making 18 intersectional air bases of no less than 4 miles square each. Yes, if we had had these highways to use during these war years, we would have saved more than $10,000,000,000 in transportation.

I know most of the Members of Congress are favorable to some highway construction similar to my program and I trust that Congress will take action on this bill in the near future, so that the Army engineers can get the blueprints ready to put a million or two men to work on them immediately after the shooting stops in Europe.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Ridgely Bank, in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Fred Bennett of New York, president of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I delivered before the National Association of State Chambers of Commerce this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two different matters, and to include in one a very able address delivered by Dr. Nahum Goldman at the Hotel Bradford in Boston recently, and in the other an editorial that appeared in one of the Boston newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the three special orders heretofore entered for today the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] may address the House for 20 minutes, as he was chairman of the proceedings held in the caucus room with reference to the drafting of IV-C's from the farms.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief note and an article by former Gov. Ben W. Hooper, of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a merchant in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some resolutions adopted by the Town Hall of Wichita, Kans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

JESSE JONES

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the firing of Jesse Jones and the appointment

of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce should not have caused the surprise it did. Like the "clear everything with Sidney," it was but the cropping to the surface of a concrete plan which has been effervescing and all but dominating the country and the American people since the inception of the New Deal. Henry Wallace can have anything he wants in this administration. Henry Wallace and Rexford Tugwell, according to the record, were two of the principal originators of this concrete plan which leaked out in the first year of the New Deal. True, it was not recognized in the hearings of the first Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; the minority report even said it was suppressed. But here it is in substance.

First. Thwart and prevent recovery from the economic depression.

Second. Prolong the country's destitution until they had demonstrated to the American people that the Government must operate industry and commerce.

Third. Commercial banks cannot make long-time capital loans, so destroy by propaganda the other institutions that had been making capital loans.

Fourth. Then push Uncle Sam into position where he must make these capital loans.

Fifth. When Uncle Sam becomes our financier he must also follow his money with control and management.

Sixth. We believe we have Mr. Roosevelt in the middle of a swift stream and that the current is so strong that he cannot turn back or escape from it. We believe that we can keep Mr. Roosevelt there until we are ready to supplant him with a Stalin. We believe Mr. Roosevelt is only the Kerenski of this revolution. We can make Mr. Roosevelt believe that he is making decisions for himself.

Seventh. If Americans remonstrate against our imaginary war against depression, all we need to do is to point the finger of scorn and derision at the traitorous opposition.

Eighth. The American people underestimate the power of propaganda which has been developed into a science since the last World War. The power of public investigation in our hands will make the cold chills run up and down the spines of newspapers, magazines, financiers, and other business leaders and politicians—honest men as well as crooks.

Ninth. We will depend upon the psychology of empty stomachs and keep them empty. The masses would soon agree that anything should be done rather than nothing. Any escape from present miseries would be welcomed even though it should turn out to be another misery.

Tenth. Leaders of labor and industry can be kept quiet by the hope of getting their own share of the Government doles in the form of loans and contracts for material and labor, provided they were subservient.

Eleventh. Schools and colleges can be kept in line by the hope of Federal aid until the many new dealers in the schools and colleges have control of them.

Twelfth. Our propaganda can inflame the masses against the old social order and the honest men as well as the crooks that represent that order.

Thirteenth. When the Government can no longer dole out relief, the oft-repeated exhortation to industry and commerce to make jobs out of confidence and to produce and pay wages out of psychology together with other propaganda will have won the people to the idea for Government itself to operate commerce and industry.

Fourteenth. No Government operation of agriculture for a long time. Farmers can be won by doles and subsidies to support Government ownership of commerce and industry.

I will not say that this firing and hiring puts the success of the concrete plan or the political fortunes of Henry Wallace ahead of the war effort. But I will say that in my opinion Jesse Jones, as Secretary of Commerce, would make a greater contribution to the war effort and the reconstruction period than will Henry Wallace.

The ultra new dealers failed miserably in their ideologies for 8 years and until the war. But the war is playing into their hand. In the next 4 of 16 years Congress and the people will do well to examine every play as to whether its objective is to win the war and the peace or to regiment the American people into the "concrete plan" of Henry Wallace and his crowd.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Barre Times, of Barre, Vt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and received permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce alarmed many people, but should have surprised no one. I know of nothing that would indict the personal life or character of Mr. Wallace.

I do feel that his economic theories are bad. His economic theories are part and parcel of the system of state socialism, known as the New Deal, which is owned by the P. A. C. The program that they are imposing upon America is one of stateism and planned economy. It will destroy our system of private enterprise, which has blessed our Nation and the whole world. It will lead ultimately to total regimentation and slavery. It is of the Old World. State socialism is a step backward. It is a movement away from liberty and opportunity.

If the other body confirms the appointment of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce and permits him to become head of the R. F. C. and all its subsidiaries, it amounts to welcoming totalitarianism in the United States. It is a request for the end of liberty and opportunity.

REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT AND THE NEW DEAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is amusing to listen to the remarks made by the gentleman who preceded me about state socialism and the New Deal. Let me call to the attention of the gentleman that the leader of his own party, the Republican candidate for President in the last election, only a few months ago accepted every major piece of legislation passed during the last 12 years. The Governor of New York said he would not repeal the law establishing the National Labor Relations Board. He said he stood for and would not repeal the Social Security Act and its extensions. The Republican candidate for President came out absolutely in favor of every major piece of legislation passed in the past 12 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a statement which I do not believe he intended to make, inasmuch as he has already qualified it somewhat. The Governor of New York did not give his approval of every bit of the New Deal and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. McCORMACK. He accepted every major piece of legislation passed in the last 12 years, and that constitutes the Democratic program of the past 12 years. The gentleman who just spoke undertakes to talk about state socialism. Why, the leader of your own party endorsed the Democratic program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to quote therein the new directive sent out by the Director of Selective Service last night relative to the farm labor situation, and also to include therein certain letters and statements relative to the farm-labor problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short letters from Columbia City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROMISE OR PLEDGES BY POLITICAL CANDIDATES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would not want to say anything that might excite the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], but I do want to read something to him and to the House, section 249 of title 2 of the United States Code:

> It is unlawful for any candidate to directly or indirectly promise or pledge the appointment, or the use of his influence or support for the appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment, for the purpose of procuring support in his candidacy. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 310, 43 Stat. 1073.)

The gentleman might get the opinion of Attorney General Biddle as to whether there was any promise prior to Wallace's appointment that he would be appointed in return for extraordinary political services rendered during the campaign.

When Mr. Wallace was kicked out at the Chicago Convention did someone promise him a consolation prize? Was it the place of Jesse Jones? Or was Wallace just given the promise that clearing through Sidney he might have anything he wanted? As the President said on Saturday, "Henry will not starve."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland transportation system is reaching a critical stage. Under the stress of a difficult winter and the break-down of existing streetcar and bus equipment, the city is experiencing a new series of obstacles in the form of Federal obstruction.

Cleveland is one of the Nation's greatest war manufacturing cities in the Nation. Absenteeism and loss of man-hours in this city through late arrival at work affect the course of the war directly.

Under these circumstances it should be the goal of those in authority to do everything possible to keep the workers of Cleveland on the job every day in the week. It is the easiest thing in the world to say "No" to every request for assistance. The Cleveland representative of the Office of Defense Transportation has chosen this easy way out. That choice does not solve Cleveland's problems. It does not meet the Nation's requirements for service in wartime.

I am informed that 27 gasoline-driven busses now being used on Wade Park Avenue could be freed for use elsewhere if the O. D. T. would approve the purchase of available trackless trolleys. The electric power and the wire needed are on hand. This permission has been denied.

All of us know that these problems are general throughout the country. But they must be solved by the establishment of a formula which weighs both the needs of the community and the importance of that community to the war effort. Cleveland transportation difficulties should have high priority on such a formula.

I am urging Mr. Guy Richardson, head of the City Transportation Section of the O. D. T. in Washington to send an investigator immediately to the Cleveland area to reappraise our needs and offer constructive suggestions to the community. A flat "No" will do nothing toward speeding the day of victory.

CAUSE OF REPUBLICAN DEFEAT

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, replying to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] that Governor Dewey accepted practically every law enacted by the New Deal in the past 12 years, I would just like to make the observation that Governor Dewey was not elected, either.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein copies of telegrams and a newspaper article in regard to the farm draft.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some excerpts from a statement made by the Honorable Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion before the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusets, that the gentleman may make an announcement concerning a meeting to be held at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire again to announce to the Members of the House that there will be a meeting held tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock. It will start promptly at 9 o'clock. Suggestion has been made that the Members get there a little earlier so the meeting can proceed promptly at 9 o'clock.

I am sure it will be a meeting we will all be pleased to attend as General Marshall and Admiral King will be there. I am unable to say who else will be there but these two outstanding leaders of our armed forces will be there to speak to us, as I have said, in an off-the-record discussion.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish to inform the Republican membership that the caucus and conference which was called for this afternoon really should have been called for tomorrow afternoon. The date carried in the notice was a mistake.

The conference will take place at the end of the legislative business tomorrow, Wednesday, the 24th.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of the Tydings amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD PRODUCTION AND WHAT IS AHEAD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress several years ago I have from time to time discussed the food situation here in the House. There were those few who claimed I was unduly alarmed; but, having been a farm operator all my life, and knowing what the farmer really is up against in various sections of the country, and also understanding the sale and distribution of foods, I am more concerned today about our food situation than I have been at any time in the past.

A few years ago in Philadelphia I sat in conference with the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, who threw his hands above his head and said:

> There are 100,000,000 pounds of butter in cold storage; you fellows will just have to produce less.

We have heard the same story over and over again about wheat, beef, pork, lard, poultry, and eggs. There were some of us who always contended that these surpluses were not so burdensome as some would have us believe; and I am sure that from time to time they have been used to beat down prices of farm

products. However, these surpluses never reflected strongly in retail prices.

The present situation is not helped a single bit by the Secretary of Agriculture, who is continually publishing figures to show that farmers are receiving more money than they have ever before received for their products.

The farmer is not so much concerned about food supplies if he is making money and if he gets what is needed in the way of supplies and equipment. Our Secretary of Agriculture overlooks the fact that we are in a rising market and have been for some time, and, while the farmer is handling more money than he has in the past, supplies of food and stocks of food are going down; and we might as well meet the issue from that standpoint.

Then, too, when the Secretary of Agriculture speaks of farm income he includes upward of a billion dollars paid to farmers in subsidies, for which they never asked and which in many cases they do not want. Surely it is unfair to call this money "farm income." That has, however, been one of the many rackets of the administration for a long time. The farmer has never been fooled into accepting it from that standpoint.

Now the facts are that Chester Bowles announces that there has been a decline of 15 percent in beef; butter is extremely scarce; the egg supply is off sharply; cold-storage stocks have been reduced tremendously, because people are using eggs as a meat substitute, and because the Government requested less egg production. Edible stocks of turkeys have been consumed, and there is only a trickle of poultry of any kind coming to market. Poultry dealers are closing out entirely. Many meat lines, including lamb, veal, and some cuts of pork are getting tighter daily. There is a veritable scramble on the market when a few sides of bacon appear. Canned goods are apparently quite plentiful, but the amount of canned goods for 1945 will be reduced considerably, because of a reduction of acreage and lack of help at planting time, which is just around the corner.

We have had several years of good seasonable weather; but a dry season in the canning sections of the country would prove disastrous. Weather is an unpredictable element which might darken the picture. For 5 years we have enjoyed exceptionally fine growing weather, but in view of the law of averages experts sit around with their fingers crossed hoping that the weather will at least be on our side.

It is all right for Government officials to say that, despite less production, there will still be enough to eat; that our diet, although somewhat thinner, will be ample and nutritious. But we must bear in mind that when the consuming public goes off a staple food to what is always considered a secondary food by producers and distributors, the secondary food item will be quickly consumed and disappear from the market.

Now comes War Food Administrator Marvin Jones calling again on the Nation's farmers for an all-out food production year and announcing acreage goals 3 percent above 1944. The goals call for a seeding of 363,635,000 acres and also a slight increase in meat production. Mr. Jones expressed confidence—barring adverse weather—that 1945 will be another year of "splendid farm achievement."

I am glad to say that Mr. Jones recognized, and warned, however, that farmers face many wartime difficulties, including shortages of labor, machinery, and supplies.

Under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement we have taken on commitments to supply food in unlimited quantities to liberated countries. We have fallen down thus far in that, but no doubt food will begin to move to these liberated countries in greater quantities soon. One thing is quite certain, namely, that, finally, we will be feeding a good part of the world. We are committed to this by this administration, and there is no doubt in my mind that when they become a little better organized we will be feeding them whether or not we have sufficient food here at home.

There are a good many reasons why this alarming scarcity looms. First, we are in a global war and our demands are simply unprecedented. The farmers of the country are willing to do their share and they have exerted all possible effort during 1943 and 1944 in producing food; and apparently the administration believes there is no limit to their endurance, no limit as to how long their equipment will hold up, and that farmers can continue to produce whether or not they have the needed farm help.

I have personal knowledge of a dairy farm having 135 head of purebred cows that produce about a million pounds of milk a year. In this community there appears to be a shortage of milk. Each day this operator is asked to take on more milk customers. Today he is so short of milk that his own household now uses oleomargarine in order to supply his trade. This dairy farm has been in successful operation and this trade has been built up during more than 50 years. There are now employed on this farm a 19-year-old single boy; a single man of 23, who is a conscientious objector; a married man 23 with two children, whose eyes are bad; a cripple about 26, single, who was placed in IV–F and later in II–C; and a married man 28 that appears sound. The rest of the employees are over draft age, two of them over 60, one stone deaf, and the other with only one hand. In other words, this operator has done his best to employ, for what he was told was necessary work, just as many men as he could that were not subject to the draft. This farm needs 8 or 10 good, active men 365 days a year. This is a herd that has supplied breeding stock during the years to every State in the Union.

The owner of this farm has written to me saying that if the farm help is to be drafted further, he would like to be informed immediately, so that he may dispose of his herd. This is only one of thousands of cases where operators will be forced to close out.

It is too bad that the administration sees fit to go to these farms and take away the little remaining help. While one branch of the Government sets production goals and calls upon the farmers to lend their all-out efforts to the war program, another branch of our Government sees fit to take away farm hands thereby endangering the proposed farm-production program.

Farm equipment is rapidly wearing out in all section of the country; repairs and replacements are just about impossible; and, whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture will agree, food production will go down from here on; and that is the thing that vitally concerns me, because men get hungry three times a day and hungry men are always desperate; children cry when they have no food, and decent men will not stand for it.

It gives the farmer no relief to have the War Production Board allocate a lot of tractors when manufacturers are denied materials with which to make them; and, if they are made, usually the greater percentage of them are shipped to foreign countries whose people do not know how to use them. The farmer gets little attention or consideration from the administration.

A ceiling on cattle on the hoof may sound all right, but it will not work finally. A small cattle-feeder in the East feeding 20 steers, for instance, without doubt will ship them to market without finishing them, which means that those 20 steers will go to market with probably 2 tons less meat than otherwise, and, obviously, all these things have their reflection in our food supply, and this is the thing about which I am concerned.

Then, too, we read and hear a great deal about much waste in the handling and storage of food. I know that it is practically impossible to prevent waste in wartime, but there is no rhyme nor reason for the wholesale and reckless purchase of foods simply to be stored in warehouses for 1 month or longer periods, and then throw it out because it has spoiled because of overbuying and bad warehouse methods.

Wastage from bad warehousing and from storing it too long is a real tragedy during wartime.

The Department of Agriculture is doing everything possible to encourage our farmers to greater production, but the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and the other Federal agencies are doing nothing to extend production that I can see.

The constant bickering over policy between the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. is demoralizing.

This desperate food situation is being thoroughly recognized by far-sighted men everywhere. It will be hard at first to make the average housewife believe, after everything she has heard about great food stock piles or Government hoarding to feed the world, and large reserves purchased by the Army and the Navy, that there is likely to be a food shortage. The truth is we could lose this war on the food front if we do not have good crop weather this year.

The recent changes in point rationing was, I believe, an indication that someone in Government finally admitted the likelihood of a food shortage. I do not believe it is just a scare program.

It can be said of cigarettes that they are scarce because the public is smoking more now than ever before. And the

same thing also goes for food. We are consuming more today because our entire population is working and we have more money with which to buy food than ever before. The fighting soldier on the battle front needs a great deal more food than he ever before consumed.

Recently the Governor of Pennsylvania issued a statement dealing with the food situation, and urged farmers to stand by. But it is entirely impossible for a farmer who has, say, three service flags hanging in his window, representing three men or women who were regularly employed on that farm, to meet his obligations as a producer if he is, say, 60 years old and has no one to help him.

There is no use in urging all-out food production unless the administration wants to give the support that is due the producers, namely, by leaving them their necessary help, and providing necessary equipment.

On the well-organized and well-managed farm there are 365 days' work in a year, and this work cannot be done and will not be done by imported labor from Jamaica and Puerto Rico, farm labor from Canada, or men and women taken from our cities. It can be done and will only be done by men of experience, men who have grown up on the farm, men who are familiar with the work, men who understand the care and feeding of livestock and the operating of farm machinery. The feeding of livestock is a job that must be understood. First of all a man must like his work and be enough of a livestock man to be able to walk among his cattle and know whether they are doing as well as they should and whether or not they are all right. The older farm hand today can drive a team and he can feed livestock, but with modern equipment, he cannot go ahead. This is a younger man's job.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Army needs many more men, for, apparently, we have a long, hard road ahead; but more and more people are asking each day why we do not supply arms to the 3,000,000 Frenchmen and Belgians who want arms with which to fight. More people each day are wondering why, if we need more men for the armed forces, we do not send abroad the 2,000,000 men in uniform who have been in the Army several years and, still being in this country, they wish to be sent across.

Then, too, we hear many complaints, and I have personal knowledge of the unnecessary hoarding of manpower in various plants throughout the country. We get those complaints and that information from workers themselves. Some boast that they are getting very high wages and not doing any work. Others complain about loafers in their plants. Just recently a man in whom I have complete confidence told me that in the defense plant in which he is employed they could produce much more if one-third of the workers were taken out of the plant, and I have heard it said that such action has been taken in some shipyards of the country.

Apparently the fertilizer supplies are going to be shorter than last year. Farm labor is being further reduced. New farm equipment is going to be harder to obtain than last year and repairs are practically out of the question. A combination of these factors is going to be reflected in our food supply. I earnestly hope that the administration, those men in executive positions who issue the directives from day to day, will wake up to the farmers' plight, so that production of necessary food supplies will be maintained at proper levels.

There is only one real surplus of food in the country today, and that is wheat, but the prospects are that this one surplus will be exhausted before 1946.

At the end of the war we are going to need greater food supplies than ever before, because food will then have to be distributed to many sections where there will be dire need.

The farmers of this country have always been patriotic and done their bit, and they are just as much so today as ever, and if the administration will simply leave them alone or give them encouragement, make it possible for them to produce, there is no question in my mind but that the food question will be satisfactorily solved. But action must be taken, immediately; now is the time, because, after all, farmers raise only one crop a year. We have only one harvest each year, and when that harvest is short there is no such thing as going out and bringing in another load.

Long-drawn-out legislative steps cannot solve the problem ahead. Now is the time and here is the place to do it. Farm boys will continue to leave for the war plant or to enlist. We need to realize and admit that the man on the farm is performing an essential and patriotic job, just as the man in the factory, war plant, the armed forces, or the merchant marine.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on labor's interest in forestry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SILENCE IS GOLDEN, SOMETIMES PLAIN YELLOW

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly confused as to the line of thought that I might indulge myself in this afternoon, lest if I criticize much it will be labeled as "Made in Germany." To restate a hint made by one of the majority the other day, "the Republicans should go lie down in the corner." I will not "go lie down in the corner." This language conforms to the dog literature of which we read so much recently. I will not keep silent. As I have said once before, "Silence is golden, but sometimes just plain yellow." I do not want to be listed among such.

The minority party has a real duty to perform. The responsibility is very heavy upon us. I want to assure you good old-fashioned Democrats who still believe in the vital principles of our Government and who are not led astray by those advocating foreign ideologies that you may lead and we will follow. You will have our help to keep the United States ship of state held to its moorings. I have been with you many years. There are many of you in the majority whom I may count as real friends. They feel worse than even I do, I am sure, about present trends masquerading under the name of liberalism. I feel sure there is a determination that they will try to clean house in their own party. I want to help them. How painful it must be to many Democrats when they contemplate the last election. Why and how did they win it? One speaker of the minority said today that Governor Dewey endorsed too many of the New Deal policies and that was one reason for his defeat. It was one of the reasons, of course. Will the day ever come again when principles of government and live vital issues will determine an election? I can remember the days when such questions as free silver and the tariff determined election results. It was not so much the personality of the candidate as it was the course the Nation should follow.

Now, we seemingly concern ourselves wholly with the personality of a candidate and after his election he may well feel, and does feel, that in whatever he does, he has the support of the people. To be elected the candidate must promise much in largesse to many classes of our citizens. The venerable Senator GLASS, of Virginia, has called them bought elections. Because he said it, may I not say it also? They were bought by promises of various sorts. This time, worst of all, you won that election with the help of many questionable groups. Earl Browder was with you, was he not? Can you feel proud of such support? The P. A. C. is said to be an educational organization. It seemingly is not so much an organization of education, as it is of vilification. Are they to continue this program of vilification under the title of education? When I read the letter to the honorable Jesse Jones in which the President unblushingly declared that as a political reward he was giving the Cabinet post of Secretary of Commerce to Henry Wallace, I wanted to ejaculate, "What will Earl Browder receive for his support?" However, it

seems that he had already been rewarded. I do not like to think of the companionships you made during this last election. If that is the way you want it, I am sorry for you, not for myself. Perhaps I should not be harsh about it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think perhaps the answer to the question: What is Earl Browder going to get, is that Earl Browder has already been the recipient of a very fine pardon which should justify some support.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I spoke about that here on the floor once before. The reason given for it was that it would bring about harmony.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Part of Browder's reward perhaps is that his wife will be permitted to remain in this country?

Mr. GIFFORD. Perhaps so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That matter is up, you know.

Mr. GIFFORD. She may be the only steadying influence he has. Some of us find it that way, you know.

I really am truly sorry for such a combination of men and principles as those which swept the Democratic Party into office. Many of you are ashamed of them, of course. You will try to clean your house of them, I feel certain. When the Congress convened recently, what happened on the very first day? When the question was brought up to continue or set up a committee to look into subversive activities, what did we hear from this side of the aisle? We heard such lengthy condemnations of the Dies committee that it simply meant to me, as it must have meant to you, that the new standing committee should be set up simply to investigate the Dies committee. With the highest regard for all the members appointed on the standing committee, I did hear one Congressman say that we should not expect too much. At least four Members who were placed on the committee did vote that the committee be not established. It does not seem as if they could have great sympathy or enthusiasm for the job.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts think that the appointment of Henry Wallace to the position to which he has been appointed is going to help the morale of the country or the war effort?

Mr. GIFFORD. May I say to my colleague that it is probably a great shock to the entire country. Henry Wallace's character is probably beyond reproach; but we know his viewpoints and he has preached his doctrines on all possible occasions. The country is well advised as to his abilities and policies. With Henry Wallace controlling billions and billions of dollars, I now say to the other countries of the world, as well as to our own "gimme" organizations, get ready to ride on the gravy train. What a delightful prospect. He will soon be able to give away many quarts of milk.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Does not the gentleman believe the pattern is shaping up? After the President's budget message, which specifically indicated that we are in for an era of planned economy, and then the appointment of the greatest exponent of planned economy in the country to replace Jesse Jones; is not that a pretty clear picture that is being painted for us at this time?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; we have been following this pattern for 12 long years; laws of supply and demand suspended. The natural laws of economics have had no place in this administration. But we cannot forever keep it up; we cannot tax, spend, and lend forever. We know that. But what of it. We owe the debt only to ourselves. A hateful philosophy to me. I have spoken of this many times, as I desire to remind my people of this foolish economy. It has been argued that we ought to have a hush-hush atmosphere around here, but that, of course, is the advice of the leaders of the majority. I ought to argue like our friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. I have here a statement he made recently. Although very sincere, he was mild in his statements. He declared that the President should inform the public. I want to add to that, Mr. Speaker, that when they do not tell us, how can they expect much but suspicion on our part?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Does not the gentleman believe it is about time the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments begins functioning?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have answered that question so many times here. I was ranking Republican member on the Committee on Expenditures for years. You must remember how I exploded here day after day against the action of the majority party on the Committee on Expenditures, always and continuously refusing to let anyone come before the committee for investigation. The administration leaders saw to it that the Committee on Expenditures should not function. I did my best. I have no apologies. I received a great deal of abuse because I constantly insisted that we send for the executives of many agencies to come before our committee and explain their expenditures. Some of the newer Members perhaps may not know the great difficulty that we encountered and the part some of us did play in those days to try to see that the committee did work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some of us who are on that committee with the gentleman know very well how earnest and continuous have been his efforts; but we know also, we think, the reason why the administration would not let us pull the lid off some of those things. I think the gentleman has a distinct idea on that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, yes; but we must not expect too much. Expect little help from the Expenditures Committee during this administration. He who expects nothing will seldom be disappointed. I have managed to find plenty of work on other committees and in other activities.

I desire to say to you Democrats on this side of the House that when I came here some 22 years ago you were constantly deploring. Indeed, how you did deplore. Now, forgive us, if we should deplore a little, will you not? You did it for so long a time. I do not believe that in the last 12 years we have deplored anything like as much as you deplored previous to 1933. I should like to call the names of those who deplored the longest and best. We should now reserve that right, and deplore about many things. I have deplored often about the national debt. Do not boast to me too much about the recent $21,000,000,000 subscription of bonds, when the quota asked for was only $14,000,000,000. We know that more than half was an expansion of bank credit. We ought to know by this time the great danger of bank credit, issuing "debt" to create money. When I give my note I create money. When the Government issues a bond it creates money. There is a vast reservoir of this debt-created money that is of the greatest potential danger to our Nation. But what does the financial situation mean to this administration? Well, again, the comforting assurance that we will assess ourselves and pay ourselves a pension.

The various social security plans will be put into effect and no one need worry. Somehow, I wonder who eventually will pay for all these things, and the huge debt besides.

Perhaps, I should join the Democratic Party, where worrying about such things is regarded as foolish and unnecessary.

What a rosy future, with a debt of $300,000,000,000. I am compelled to face my audiences and tell them that I dared, as a Congressman, to tax them that $45,000,000,000 a year, which we are now taking from them. We in the minority are trying to figure out how, in the future, we can get along with a budget of $20,000,000,000. That is perhaps only a hope. Think not only of this huge debt but of the guaranties made by the Government. We guarantee bank deposits; we guarantee mortgages; have have built great housing facilities; the R. F. C. loans you money if the banks charge too much interest. We could mention the huge amounts already paid or promised. The Government seemingly cannot exist in the future without more and more subsidies. Again, whither are we traveling? Who started us on that road? When I came here 22 years ago I heard constant and violent speeches made on the Democratic side of the House against subsidies in any form. The word "subsidies" was hateful to you, yet today we have seemingly nothing but subsidies.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. In talking about guaranties, I wonder if the gentleman read

today's paper where Senator MURRAY, of Montana, has introduced a bill to guarantee 60,000,000 jobs in the Nation?

Mr. GIFFORD. I read it. I expected to take a little time to talk about our foreign policy. I have talked with many; I have read much; I have a great deal of material here about it. I wish to quote from Dr. Edwin Ryan, an authority on the Argentine and South America and one who has given a good deal of thought to our foreign policy.

I quote:

PRINCIPLES OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

1. Intercourse between the American countries and Europe must be kept unimpeded.

2. The "open door" in China must be maintained.

3. American territory shall not be transferred by one American state to a European state nor by one European state to another.

The first principle involves the concept of the Atlantic community, i. e., that the American countries constitute with the countries of western Europe a group within which there must be at all times unimpeded interchange of ideas and goods. Any country that threatens to obstruct that interchange must be opposed. The Nazis, by seeking to master Europe and by their machinations in the Western Hemisphere constituted themselves a threat to the free untrammelled use of the Atlantic Ocean, and it is therefore our duty to oppose them. We must remember that the Atlantic Ocean is not a barrier, but a highway.

The second principle is similar to the first. It involves the same considerations, applying them to the Pacific region.

The third principle involves the conviction that the American countries must work together harmoniously to preserve their freedom, and that their freedom would be endangered if a non-American country secured a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. The existing European possessions may continue in their present state, but they are not to be transferred by one non-American country to another.

The above principles of foreign policy ought to be enunciated as the will of all, or substantially all, the American states. They should also be supported by adequate physical force—Army, Navy, etc.—since the United States, and the other American countries must be prepared to wage war, if necessary, in their defense.

When we hear so much about unilateral, bilateral, and lack of multilateral action, we wonder what may be the matter with our own Government that it seems so hesitant. I rejoice on behalf of the Republican Party in the marvelous speech made by the Senator from Michigan recently in which he came valiantly to the rescue of this hesitant administration. The Republicans are, indeed, coming to the rescue of the Democratic Party. They did so at Mackinac.

The Republicans have made great contributions during the hush-hush days of those who sit in the seats of the mighty. You cannot now say to us that we are recalcitrant isolationists. We are leading the way. We seem quite ready for a world peace organization, and most of us will probably vote our share of the forces needed to curb an aggressor nation. Let us not forget that Woodrow Wilson wrote that letter to Members of the Senate of the United States asking them to vote against the League of Nations because of a few reservations which had been added. Yet, you try to place the blame on the Republican Party. How you have enjoyed upbraiding my former Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts. He may have been deserving of some criticism, but the Democratic Party itself killed that proposition. History records that Wilson had in his possession the letter from Lord Salisbury, in which Wilson had been notified that the other nations would accept the proposed reservations.

We say to you that we are ready to join a strong organization of nations to keep peace in the world, and to keep it by force, if necessary. We should not delay. Our democracy acts slowly and sometimes too late. I believe in swift action against an aggressor nation. Modern methods of warfare allow little time for proper defense.

We have heard much about the Polish question. I have here a telegram similar to so many others, begging that we protect the partition of that country. Well, what have we? We have Stalin favoring the Lublin government, and Churchill and the United States favoring the government in exile. How and when are they to determine that issue? I hesitate to criticize too much at this time these so-called unilateral determinations, but they should be subject to review by that larger organization that later on will determine the ways of peace. Let them not be regarded as a fait accompli. However, if Russia and Britain should insist that these so-called unilateral and bilaterals were approved by the United States under the rule "silence gives consent" then we should at least reassert our Monroe Doctrine, and the open-door policy of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Why hesitate to assert this? Mr. Churchill states that the United States has been fully informed and that no protests have been made; that our silence implies consent. At this next meeting of the Big Three our President holds the cards. We are depended upon both for men and munitions. Should not the United States be persuasive? Small wonder the little boy said, "Tell us about the war and what we are fighting for." Fine phrases will not be sufficient answer. When your heart is afire, some sparks will flow from your lips. I should have used that as the text of these remarks. I had two nephews about 18 years of age. Two weeks ago one was killed in Germany and the other had already been taken prisoner. They called on me not long ago and we had a long talk. They seemed but children to me. They had received but little training as soldiers. They were courageous and even cheerful. What could I have told them? Your hearts are afire over such sacrifices. We look at the map and find that three-fifths of the soldiers in Germany are our own boys, in spite of the promises made that if we would furnish the munitions and supplies they would furnish the men. I am not complaining too much, having in mind the awful destruction in Great Britain and the million men they have already sacrificed. They may well say they have done their full share and already endured more than their share of suffering. But this European war becomes too strictly our war, when our war is plainly in the Pacific. The Japanese were the ones who attacked us, and that is why, admittedly, we went to war at that particular moment. I am asked: "Why have we so many boys in Germany?" I must be able to answer, and to do so I must know our war aims as determined by this hesitant administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope I have not given the gentleman the idea I am an isolationist, because I am far from it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think I understand the gentleman's statement that while this is deplorable, it is necessary. But did the gentleman read David Lawrence's explanation this week? He said—and I do not agree with him—that we were fighting over there for the preservation of the United States of America.

Mr. GIFFORD. I did not happen to read it. Of course, we are to a degree, certainly, but I think the degree is much greater for those other nations than ours.

Unconditional surrender. I want to speak of that. Everybody should concede that unconditional surrender has brought about a lengthening of the war. The enemy are attempting to make us believe that they will fight desperately to the last man before they will surrender unconditionally. Do we not dare to intimate, at least, the terms that will be imposed after such surrender? Small wonder they will not surrender unconditionally. They know the awful cruelties they have inflicted on other people, and they well know that they should get their just reward and that severe punishment is their due. Might I say that simple terms be suggested, such as: Military occupation indefinitely; a just punishment for so-called war criminals, to be determined by civil or military courts; ample reparations to restore fully their ravages in other countries.

Could not some suggestions be made as to the exactions to be required after even an unconditional surrender?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, once before American lives decided the issue over there and put Germany down where they might have been held if the nations across had done their part. Now we are doing it again. How much longer does the gentleman think American lives should be sacrificed?

Mr. GIFFORD. A boy from the front lines recently said: "We lick them; then we feed them; then we finance them; then we lick them again."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is that to go on, does the gentleman believe, indefinitely?

Mr. GIFFORD. "Our blood in torrents pours in vain—always in vain! For war breeds war again." That is an old adage. The vanquished will generally rise again and take their vengeance.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Does not the gentleman feel that the Members of Congress and the American people should be told what commitments are being made in the name of the American Government? We are a part of this world whether we want to be or not. We have our

money and our blood invested wholesale in this war. We are part of the world. The earth is relatively small today, in view of the planes and all the other instruments of warfare now in use. Does not the gentleman believe it is high time that the President inform the Congress and take some of the leaders on both sides of the aisle into his confidence, men and women that we trust in this House and in the other body, and tell them so that we may feel that we know what is being done?

We understand that Churchill is looking after British interests, and properly so. We understand that Stalin is looking after Russian interests, and properly so. By the same token, since we are making the contribution we are, we should be concerned with what the pitching is, and it is high time that we know.

Mr. GIFFORD. As one lady said to another, "Can you keep a secret?" She said, "Yes; I can keep it in circulation." Our leaders probably fear that if they tell us what they deem secrets, we will keep them in circulation. It is said that diplomats use language to conceal their thoughts, rather than to reveal them.

I was disturbed when I read that Stettinius was not to go to this new conference. I might ask you, "Who is going?" You would probably need but one guess. However, I am glad to hear now that Stettinius will attend and bear his share of responsibility.

I asked for time today to warn the Democratic Party against some of their recent supporters in the election, and to tell them that "we will not go and lie down in the corner." We have a serious job on our hands. I shall want to join those loyal Democrats in their attempt to clean house. I hesitated to go to the backyard inaugural, lest they photograph me with Earl Browder. I could only presume that his support entitled him to at least a reasonably comfortable seat. I represent good old Plymouth and adjacent territory. They are a people who still believe in the old verities of our form of government. It is my duty to voice those beliefs as best I can. Some people still think they were "wise"; some, "otherwise."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FAITH BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND ITS PEOPLE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word today about the pending controversy involving the appointment of the Honorable Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce and as Federal Loan Administrator. I am impelled to speak today not because it has political significance for me or because I am trying to read potential political significance into this action as far as the destinies of our own party are concerned, but because I believe that it involves long-range economic planning for one thing and that it involves secondly that very elusive and attenuated thing that you call the fabric of faith between the Government and its people.

Perhaps I ought to reverse the sequence in which I wanted to address myself to this matter by resurrecting an incident that was so emotionally ventilated on this floor way back when I first came here in 1933. That incident to me indicates what faith means between a government and its chosen servants in administrative places on the one side and the people on the other.

In June of 1932, Mr. Jesse Jones authorized and disbursed a loan to the Central Republic Bank and Trust Co., of Chicago, in the sum of $90,000,000.

How it was ventilated in this Chamber. What outcries there were in protest and with what vehemence Members addressed themselves to it and talked about the gravy train and special privilege, and all that sort of thing. Sometimes my heart bled for Charles Gates Dawes, of Chicago. Certainly he needs no encomiums from me. This Government saw fit to give him the Distinguished Service Medal for extraordinary service in the First World War. He served as the first Director of the Budget when the Accounting Act of 1921 became law. Then he served with distinction as Vice President of the United States. He suffered all the contumely, along with Jesse Jones, that people could heap upon him. And not the least of the castigations were those that were uttered in the well of this Chamber. Charles Gates Dawes, so well-known as "Hell 'n' Maria" has paid off. While he was being castigated he quietly went about the business of reconstructing the affairs of this huge bank in Chicago. He was not thinking of himself; he was thinking of the hundreds of little correspondent banks scattered all through the Middle West whose very existence was dependent upon the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago. He was concerned about humble people whose savings reposed in many small banks. I can report to you today that "Hell 'n' Maria" has paid off. The records of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will show that $98,593,000 has been collected from the assets and by way of assessment upon the people who had an interest. In addition to the $98,593,000, the R. F. C. holds about $10,000,000 of the assets still to be disposed of. So I am happy today to pay this tribute to Jesse Jones who had faith in Charles Gates Dawes, the great patriot, who will be 80 years of age in August 1945; who by sheer will power and determination, and the grace of God, was permitted to live on and to give stewardship to the affairs of that bank until that loan had been paid in its entirety; $3,500,000 more was paid to preserve the assets, and another $10,000,000 was paid in interest. That shows what faith will do. That is what the faith of Jesse Jones did when he made that loan under all kinds of censure, to that bank in Chicago and saved in large part the banking fabric of these little banks in the Middle West. That element of faith is involved in what is transpiring and what did transpire when Mr. Wallace was designated as Secretary of Commerce and as Federal Loan Administrator.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman. He said it was based on faith. It was based on honesty, was it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. And honesty, of course, is a large component in the whole fabric of faith.

Now, I bring this matter to your attention today because you are going to hear about it in the years that lie ahead. I like Henry Wallace. I like the alertness of his mind, although I do not often agree with him. Yet I will take my text from him today for what I have to say. I have lived for a long time in the Mayflower Hotel and a good many of those celebrated party dinners have been held there. There was such a dinner on the anniversary in 1942 of Washington's birth. Mr. Wallace was the principal speaker. At that time he said this:

> It places upon the Republican minority the responsibility of really behaving as a loyal opposition and abstaining from tactics that are purely political.

I would say to my good friend, Mr. Wallace, that that will be my text today. I shall refrain from anything that may be regarded as an endeavor to secure political advantage and discuss his appointment wholly from the viewpoint of public good.

I agree that the President had a perfect right to appoint him. I agree as a matter of fact that the President is indebted to Mr. Wallace, and surely if anybody is deserving of the President's largesse it would be Mr. Wallace, for the work that he has done. When I was privileged to go abroad in the land on my own behalf and on behalf of our own candidate in 1944, I would run across his trail, as I did in Omaha, Seattle, San Francisco, and elsewhere. He is an indefatigable worker and so is entitled to consideration. But there is a larger element involved, and that element is whether or not his appointment was made in the larger public interest. That, of course, involves not merely our own opinions as Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, but the welfare of the people of the United States of America.

Does he possess the qualifications to administer the office? Are his views and his experience and his background such that he can do this job? I am afraid that too often we fail to refresh ourselves upon the responsibilities and duties of some of these departments in seeking an appropriate answer. What would be his responsibility, for instance, as Secretary of Commerce? A good deal of it is routine, of course; but do not forget that one of the constituent agencies of the Department of Commerce is the Civil Aeronautics Administration. What broad powers we lavished on it over civil aviation in this country as well as in foreign fields, and right now we are engaged in something of a controversy, partly solved, I would say, dealing with

the whole structure of world airways. Only recently there convened at Chicago a world conference on aviation problems which developed some divergence of views as between us and certain other nations. So we ought to know something about Mr. Wallace's views in the field of world aviation. He said in an article in the American magazine in March of 1943 that in his judgment there should be a great world system of airways, and it ought to be operated by the air arm of the United Nations Peace Corps. Mr. Wallace is going to have something to say. Many of these problems in world aviation will be under his partial direction. They will be controversial. His views are important to the Nation, to aviation, to our well-being.

As Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce would be under his direction. It involves this whole question of domestic and foreign trade. Some of his views he expressed in that article in the American magazine. Many of his opinions and views he has expressed on other occasions. May I say parenthetically there has never been any reticence about Mr. Wallace proclaiming his views on any occasion to any group in the land—but there, I wonder what the impact of his ideas and policies will be, for instance, upon foreign commerce, upon our trade relationships with other countries in the post-war period. Many of his views are well known. Is it good or bad for our economy? He stated that he favored a United Nations investment corporation; and I assume this country and its people will be called upon to pledge the major amount of credit for a corporation like that operated all over the face of the earth to develop tin in Bolivia, a hydroelectric plant in Peru, a Y. V. A. in China—a Yangtse Valley Authority—all desirable; but to what extent will our credit and our cash and our faith be committed on programs of that kind?

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, he will have something to say about it. His views will command respect in Government circles and hence those views are extremely important to the people whose credit and cash will be utilized to carry such ideas into effect.

And then, as Federal Loan Administrator—do you realize that by now we have $700,000,000 invested in 47 synthetic-rubber plants and their auxiliary facilities? There has been some controversy on this floor from time to time as to whether or not that enterprise should be continued in the interest of cheap rubber for our people in the days that lie ahead, or whether we may yet go back under a cartel system and get our rubber from far fields. How does Mr. Wallace feel about that and how would he feel as the Federal Loan Administrator? I can only use his own words. This is what he wrote in the New York Times on the 12th of July 1942:

> Personally, I hope that after the war is over a few small synthetic alcohol rubber plants are kept running so that improvements may be made, so that there may be an outlet for overflow corn and wheat from the ever-normal granary and so that we may have the technical knowledge for rapid expansion should the need ever again arise. These plants could be kept in operation by Government subsidy. I trust, however—

This is Mr. Wallace speaking—

> that the vast bulk of our rubber would come from a really cheap source or from Latin America and the Far East.

That whole development has been under the direction of Mr. Jesse Jones in large measure, as the Federal Loan Administrator, and his views were important even as Mr. Wallace's views are and will be important when it comes time to dispose of this industry one way or another and to determine whether it shall be dismantled and abandoned or whether it shall be retained.

Perhaps we do not know as much as we should about the whole set-up of the Federal Loan Agency in order the better to determine whether Mr. Wallace has the requisite experience and background for this job. Involved there is the R. F. C., the Rubber Reserve Company, the Metals Reserve Company, the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, the War Damage Corporation, the United States Commercial Company, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Petroleum Reserve Corporation, and the Rubber Development Corporation. How much of the public credit has been committed and disbursed already by the Federal Loan Agency?

Here is the last figure as of December 1944. They have committed the people of this country by means of authorizations to the extent of $32,300,000,000. Already there has been disbursed eighteen thousand million dollars of the people's cash and the people's money. You see, it is not only the interest we may have as we make speeches apropos of this subject but it is the interest of every taxpayer of the United States, because it is his money and it is his credit.

There are 47 rubber plants with an investment of $700,000,000. The Metals Reserve Company has stock piles of critical and strategic materials and has made commitments of over $5,000,000,000.

Let us now consider the Defense Plant Corporation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, $10,000,000,000 has been committed by the Defense Plants Corporation. There are 920 plants that the Defense Plants Corporation own outright and all the facilities that are in them. There are some 2,098 that they have either built or expanded in every State of the Union, including 574 aircraft facilities, 161 chemical plants, 97 aluminum plants, 38 aviation-gas plants, and 183 pig-iron and steel plants.

That is a part of the structure that it is now proposed to commit to Mr. Wallace. So it becomes a matter of extraordinary interest, not only to us as the people's representatives but to the people themselves as well.

I could go on and enumerate in detail the commitments and authorizations by the Defense Supplies Corporation and others. I just want to refer to a few, however, because it is informative and conveys some idea of the magnitude of the loan operations of this Government and how efficiently those operations have been conducted by Jesse Jones.

Do you remember the battle on subsidies that raged on this floor year after year? Frankly, I was a part of that controversy and added my humble bit as it went along. Do you remember how we sought to prevent the commitments of this Government to that kind of a subsidy program which would become so integrated and imbedded in our whole economic system that it could never be dislodged? Look at the subsidies that have been paid, by direction, of course, of the Defense Supplies Corporation—$359,000,000 on meat, $117,000,000 on butter, $86,100,000 on flour.

The subsidies on crude oil from strip wells only began in August of 1944, but already we have disbursed $11,300,000 for that purpose. You will remember also that we undertook to pay subsidies where transportation costs were high on petroleum from the Midwest and the Southwest fields. The total amount paid by way of transportation subsidies now aggregate $297,000,000 on oil that is far distant from the eastern seaboard, $4,000,000 on petroleum from Texas and Louisiana, $39,400,000 for transportation subsidies on coal, and $84,000,000 on the transportation of sugar to this country.

All those have been disbursed by one of the auxiliaries or subsidiaries of the whole Federal Loan Agency. So you see that subsidy money is involved here.

We are interested, are we not, in the view of Mr. Wallace on this subject, even as we are interested in his views on rubber, the future of the rubber industry of the country, and his relationship to the business structure of the Nation. The authorizations of this one agency alone are in an amount which is 10 times greater than the whole revenue of the Government in 1932. Even in a day and time when the word "billion" comes so easily to the tongue, the Federal Loan Agency is a vast undertaking, calling for financial vision and capacity because it represents public credit. Does Mr. Wallace qualify?

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not quarrel with the President's authority to do this, I do not quarrel with his feeling of gratitude toward a servant whose work has been well done, but would there not be loud and vehement protest if Tom Girdler had suddenly been made Secretary of Labor? Would not the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. cry out in agony? Would there not be a great hue and cry if one of our former colleagues, the very gentle and gracious lady from Montana, Jeannette Rankin, whom you remember so well, and whose views on peace were so well known, had suddenly been made Secretary of War, if somebody had got the notion and so appointed her? What a protest there would be. As Shakespeare said, "There is an eternal fitness of things." There is a fitness of things here as you think about the enormous amount of money and authority involved.

Certainly these should not have been dismissed from mind when the time came to appoint a Secretary of Commerce who would also discharge the responsibilities of Federal Loan Administrator.

Why would Jeannette Rankin as Secretary of War meet with protest from all over the country? Why should the appointment of Tom Girdler as Secretary of Labor meet with protest from all over the country? Why would the appointment of Dan Tobin meet with protest and hostility if he were made Secretary of the Navy?

After all it is not only fitness of things, but experience, background, and viewpoint on broad economic policy. It involves the simple problem of capacity by training and fitness to do the job. And in that problem, there is and there should be an abiding interest on the part of the people.

Here then is a very distinguished, amiable, affable gentleman, the spinnings of whose mind I often enjoy but what about the cooperation between the Department of Commerce and the people of the country, particularly the business element, to whom we shall look in the days ahead to find a solution for this problem of 60,000,000 jobs? They say that first private enterprise must do the job, and thereafter, in proportion as it falls short or fails, then government, through all its various agencies, must move into the picture. But first, consonant with the whole policy and purpose of this country, it is a job for private enterprise. Should there then not be someone in whom private enterprise has faith and, conversely, one who has unalloyed and undiminished faith in the private enterprise system as the great hope and the great incentive of a great America in the post-war period? It is the tegument and the fabric of faith that is involved here, and without heaping any castigations upon Mr. Wallace—because I shall not do so—I think the people now must determine whether or not there is the requisite qualification to administer $32,000,000,000 of commitments and $18,000,000,000 of disbursements, because it is their money and their credit. They must indicate whether this question of world aviation and the disposal of our rubber program one way or another shall be committed to the hands of Mr. Wallace rather than to someone who has had more experience in this field, and whose views are deemed to be more nearly in line with American tradition.

Perhaps a few additional observations on the operations of the Federal Loan Agency may be appropriate in determining the capacity and experience of anyone who may be called upon to administer this activity.

The Rubber Reserve Corporation sponsors or has operating for its account 47 plants with a capacity of 1,000,000 tons of synthetic rubber annually. In addition to this, the plants operating for its account have produced 25,000,000 gallons of ethyl benzine and 4,000,000 gallons of cumene. The Corporation also bought 1,100,000 tons of scrap rubber, of which 920,000 tons have been sold. We, therefore, as a people have a tremendous fiscal as well as economic interest in this program and it is only fair to consider the new appointee's views with respect thereto.

The Metals Reserve Corporation has committed more than $5,000,000,000 for the purchase of critical metals and materials from 51 different foreign countries and 38 States. It has paid subsidies aggregating $162,800,000 on the purchase of copper, lead, and zinc from sources which have high production costs. What would be our future policy with respect to the purchase of such materials? Would producers in other countries be given preference on the ground that they can produce at cheaper prices. These are matters which are entitled to consideration as one considers the viewpoint and the qualifications of the prospective Secretary.

Consider the 2,098 plants of all types which have been built by or expanded by or for the account of the Defense Plant Corporation, involving commitments of more than $10,000,000,000, including commitments aggregating more than $42,000,000 for the production of copper in Chile, nickel in Cuba, vanadium in Peru, peat in Canada, fluorspar in Newfoundland, balsa wood in Ecuador. What of our policy with respect to this enormous investment? Certainly the people are entitled to know the basic views and the qualifications of the new appointee in administering this great industrial empire.

The Defense Supplies Corporation has made authorizations and commitments in excess of $10,000,000 for the purchase of all manner of supplies, the payment of subsidies, the speedy establishment of post exchanges for the War Department, the sale of aviation equipment to South American countries in order to oust Axis air lines and finally for the operation of pipe lines.

The people are entitled to ask about the new Secretary's views with respect to all of these operations and activities.

When all is said and done, it gets back to the essential fact that whether in war or in peace the credit of the people is being continually pledged in the form of bonds and debentures and other contingent obligations and in the form of the expenditure of revenues derived from the people for the various purposes which have heretofore been enumerated.

It is thus a matter of profound public interest not only now but in the years ahead as policies are shaped and inaugurated which might be regarded as a distinct departure from what the people conceive to be sound business policies for government.

As for Jesse Jones, he needs no words of praise from me. I first learned to know Mr. Jones when I served as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency in this House years ago. His foresight, his courage, his capacious mind which could retain detail, his amazing vision which could cast itself over the whole landscape and embrace the great coordinated program that you see articulated here to the extent of $32,000,000,000, was one of the amazing things. Time and time again I have seen him take the questions from members of that committee, and with rare patience and amazing foresight would answer them and say, "I am your servant." He had undiminished faith in the Congress. He would say, "I am just a hired man. It is for you on the hilltop to define the policy and I will carry out to the best of my ability the things that you and your colleagues inscribe upon the statute books of the Nation." He had a rare faith in balanced, articulated government, most of all in the integrity and the capacity of the legislative branch of the Government. That is one of the reasons our relationships with Mr. Jones in all the years have been so fine and so felicitous. He was a great public servant.

Few men in public life ever begot such wide public confidence. Few men were gifted with the vision and energy to integrate and operate such a vast loan program on such a sound basis. I think back then to the faith that business reposed in him and he reposed in business. I think back to that date in June of 1932 when distress was upon the land, when wild deflation was at work, when Jesse Jones evinced his faith in the honesty and capacity of still another man in business, when he took a banker who was under vilification, made a loan of $90,000,000 despite the abuse and criticism which both of them received and lived to see the day when his faith and judgment were fully vindicated; remained in government service to see the day when that loan was repaid in full with interest, remained to see the day when Charles Gates Dawes could with clear conscience say that he had not only requited every dollar of obligation but had the satisfaction of knowing that without praise or glory, he had served the little folks whose money was deposited in the small banks of the Middle West.

Yes, Hell 'n' Maria has paid off. It is a testimony to him and a testimony to Jesse Jones. Of such things is the strength of this Nation truly made. You do not find public servants like that in the highways and byways of the country every day. Well done, Jesse Jones. I think I speak for nearly every Member of the Congress when I say we consider you as a loyal, trusted, and devoted public servant who gave his all to the people and to the welfare of this country. The people then have a right to expect that if you are to be displaced, you will be displaced by one who has the qualifications, the background, and the viewpoint to discharge that responsibility and who begets the faith and confidence of the country even as you did.

Does Mr. Wallace have it?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday General Hershey agreed with a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture to send out the following telegram in connection with agricultural deferments:

Questions of interpretation of State directors' advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State directors' advice No. 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State directors' advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5K of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

That is the telegram General Hershey sent out last night correcting the misinterpretation of an ambiguous directive sent out prior thereto, under which the farm owners as well as all the farmers' sons together with farm workers were being inducted into the armed forces, provided they were physically qualified.

The chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], invited 3 members of the committee of 11, which committee reresents the over 200 Members of Congress that met on January 16 in the Old House caucus room in protest of stripping agriculture of its remaining help.

After General Hershey had agreed with the subcommittee to send the above telegram, I questioned him about those farmers and farm workers that had already been reclassified and put into I–A. His answer was that unless they had already been inducted into the armed forces—in which case the local draft boards had no further jurisdiction—the thing for them to do is to immediately apply to the local draft board to have their cases reopened in view of the above telegram, which he agreed to send, and that then they could present the facts to the local draft board showing whether or not they came within the provisions of the Tydings amendment, and that from the decision of the local draft board there is an appeal to the board of appeals consisting of five members, and if there is one dissenting vote they have a right to have a Presidential appeal to the National Selective Service here in Washington. The Government appeal agent can order an appeal up to the time of receipt of the orders to report for induction and the State director can order an appeal up to the date of actual induction.

Let us make no mistake. General Hershey was emphatic that the farmer's son or the farm helper or the farmer himself had the right of appeal. This, although under the former directive many local boards took it for granted and held that he did not have such right and refused to allow him an appeal.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Was there not a further misconception, as indicated by the letters received by various Members of Congress, that the draft boards' ruling was to the effect that it was a Presidential order and that there was no appeal?

Mr. LEMKE. That was the information indicated in thousands of letters and from draft boards themselves and also from boards of appeal. I shall read one of the letters from a Government appeal agent who says that that was the position taken by the local draft boards. These held that they were ordered to take all of the farmers, their sons, and farm help within the 18-to-25 age group.

I shall also read some letters that will show you that they took the last person on some farms, together with the owner, and inducted them into the armed forces.

Now, in view of the above, the committee of 11 met and approved and accepted the telegram as sufficient if lived up to. This they did on behalf of the over 200 Members that met in the caucus room and protested the further taking of essential farm labor.

The committee of 11 also directed me to make a full explanation of all the steps and proceedings had in connection with this problem. Before I proceed I wish to suggest to the Members of Congress who have been flooded with telegrams and letters in regard to the taking of heads of families and of farm help regardless of necessity for food production that they mail a copy of General Hershey's telegram, together with an explanation that if any of them have already been reclassified and put in I–A in violation of the provisions of the Tydings amendment, they make immediate application for reopening of their case and for reclassification and deferment in accordance with the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

I also wish on behalf of the committee of 11 and the over 200 Members of Congress they represent to thank the Committee on Agriculture and its chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], in calling General Hershey and Mr. Jones before them and in getting this all-important question clarified so that the Army and the civilian workers will be assured a sufficient supply of food.

I wish also to say for the committee of 11—and I know that I speak for the over 200 Members that met in the caucus room—that we are glad to have been of help in bringing this matter to a close before the Nation's food supply was hampered, even virtually destroyed.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr BENNETT of Missouri. This is going to help in many cases where reclassification has been made but where induction has not occurred. But there are hundreds of cases, and I can cite some in my own district to the gentleman, where men have already been inducted into the service in direct violation of the Tydings amendment. Now, nothing can be done in those cases and the damage has already been done; has it not?

Mr. LEMKE. I agree with the gentleman. The damage has been done. The only possible way they can get back to the farms where they belong is by an application by someone who needs them back home more than they are needed in the Army field and to have their commanding officer O. K. it, and then they will be discharged. But that is all that can be done to remedy the damage.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. HULL. Suppose an application for discharge is made and the commanding officer refuses to give his approval? What redress has a man who is illegally inducted?

Mr LEMKE. None whatever.

Now, the trouble with this whole thing and the cause of the misunderstanding was the directive which was sent out by General Hershey, which I shall read. I would like the Members to follow me closely in this, because I am satisfied if you and I had been on the local draft board we, too, would have taken it to mean but one thing, that was, they were ordered to take every young man from the farm between the ages of 18 and 25 who was physically qualified.

The directive reads as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
OF SELECTIVE SERVICE,
Wednesday, January 3, 1945.

National Headquarters of Selective Service sent a telegram to all State directors today containing the text of the letter from James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, requesting Selective Service "to take such action in connection with its administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

After quoting the letter in full, the telegram stated:

"Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and boards of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all registrants ages 18 through 25 deferred in class II–C excluding those identified by the letters F or L. In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–C, local boards will consider the President's finding that 'the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.' Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II–C excluding those identified with the letters F or L in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction physical examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class II–C registrants at the same time as they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction physical examination."

That is the directive which caused the confusion. I submit it appears equivalent to an order to ignore the Tydings amendment. At least, it was so understood. What happened under that? Let me give you a few examples. Here is a telegram from my own State. It is from Bismarck, N. Dak., and reads as follows:

WILLIAM LEMKE,
Congress of the United States:

I was at Killdeer board 1 today and was informed I have to leave for Army service

January 23. I am a farmer with all my machinery and stock, which is hard to dispose of in a few days. I would like to know why I couldn't stay on the farm. I feel I can do more good here.

ALBIN BENJAMIN SANDAN,
Golden Valley, N. Dak.

I want to say right here that this farmer was told that he had no right of appeal by the local draft board. He farms 320 acres. He is the sole occupant and owner of the farm and does all the work personally. He had 37 head of cattle, 15 hogs, 150 chickens. He has a wife and baby. Yet, he was ordered to enter the service and dispose of all of that on 10 days' notice. I should like to know whether it was not highly important for 250 Members of Congress to meet on that kind of information and see that there was a modification of some kind correcting the general understanding of a directive that was so misleading.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to congratulate the gentleman first of all on the initiative and leadership he has demonstrated in calling together this large group of Congressmen who are interested in this vital problem. There is no question but what the directive of General Hershey has been misinterpreted to a large extent out in the field either through the translation of his recommendations to the local boards by the State directors or through failure of the local boards properly to understand the purport of his directive. Just this noon I received a telegram from the State president of the Farm Bureau Federation of South Dakota, calling attention to the fact that they were calling in a lot of necessary farm help and inducting them in the Army at great hazard to the agricultural productivity of the great agricultural State of South Dakota. I want to ask the gentleman whether he believes the new directive sent out by General Hershey today largely as a result of the activities of the gentleman from North Dakota and his group, whether that is sufficient to correct the condition now prevailing throughout the country in the agricultural areas?

Mr. LEMKE. It is sufficient and as far as we can go unless Congress wants to pass additional legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. This directive, as I understand it, goes only to the State directors, not to the local draft boards.

Mr. LEMKE. But General Hershey requests, in fact orders, the State directors to immediately notify all the local boards.

Mr. MUNDT. It would seem then that continued vigilance is indicated on the part of Members of Congress to see to it that their State directors transmit properly and fully to the local boards the intention of General Hershey as expressed to them.

Mr. LEMKE. I would not say it was for Members of Congress to inform the local boards as it was for General Hershey himself to correct the misinterpretation. But it is up to every Member of Congress to get it into the press and thus notify the farmers of his district of their rights under that directive as corrected by General Hershey. The gentleman knows as well as I that the farmers are not informed of these things. They are too busy taking care of their livestock and working on their farms in place of chasing all over to find out what their legal rights are. It is up to us to see that they get that information; and that is one reason why I am addressing the House.

Mr. MUNDT. That is especially true inasmuch as General Hershey did not direct this new communication to the local draft boards but transmitted it to the State directors.

Mr. LEMKE. But in the telegram itself is the provision—and we insisted upon that, especially the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]—that the telegram contain the provision that the State directors immediately notify their local draft boards.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very glad that was done.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to absolve General Hershey from having any part in that directive No. 288. He was merely acting as the agent to send it out. It contained instructions from Mr. Byrnes supplemented by direct quotations from the President who said that it was more essential to have men in the armed forces than engaged in the production of food. As the gentleman knows—he sat in on the conference—the committee did a pretty good job; and so did General Hershey in trying to correct this error which has crept in which we believe caused local boards to set aside the Tydings amendment; and I compliment the gentleman for the part of the work he did in getting this corrected.

Mr. LEMKE. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota and say I am perfectly aware that General Hershey is a soldier. When he gets his orders from higher up he obeys them and he made that very clear to us on the occasion when he appeared before the 200 and again yesterday.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Regardless of what has happened, the fact is that the present status of this matter is what it is because of the action, the unofficial action, of Members of Congress; is not that true?

And, second, if these boys are taken from the farm in violation of the Tydings amendment in the future in view of the directive which has just gone out, the responsibility and the burden and the fault will be on the local boards.

Mr. LEMKE. That is correct; and I may say further that if it is not corrected and kept corrected then we shall have been deceived, because we had a resolution ready for introduction in the House yesterday which we withheld only because we were assured the matter could be adjusted without a formal action of Congress.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall the many hours that our committee spent in preparing that resolution, and I am pleased to see in the RECORD of yesterday that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] inserted the resolution verbatim as our committee had prepared it. I am glad to see it in the RECORD.

Mr. LEMKE. I may say that I intend to include it as a part of my remarks in order that all people dealing with this question may keep faith with one another. The time has come when all branches of the Government must cooperate a little closer during the remainder of this war.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I appreciate the fine explanation that the chairman of this unofficial committee is making. I appreciate the opportunity we 10 other members serving with him had in helping to draft the resolution that has been referred to. Representing the agricultural State of Illinois, I should like to say that Mr. Earl Smith, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, one of the outstanding and leading men in knowledge of farm work, farm production, and in organization and leadership, was very much exercised and contacted me several days ago asking that I exert my effort and stating that agriculture would be seriously crippled in Illinois if there was not a reversal sent out quickly on this Tydings amendment. I am glad that we have been able to accomplish that, and I think if we keep watchful of the matter we will be doing agriculture a great service.

Mr. LEMKE. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that he is absolutely correct and also that we have run off a number of mimeographed copies of this directive. They are in the hands of members of our committee and may be had and sent out to the public.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I congratulate the gentleman, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] raised a question regarding the local draft boards. I am sure this directive has gone on to the draft boards, but they have so many other directives that it behooves the Selective Service headquarters here to clear away all the other directives that they have, so that the local draft boards will know clearly what they are to do. When a draft board receives an order for so many men, of course they ignore many times the directives they have. When an order is issued for additional men, it is essential that the draft board be informed as to what these other conditions are. I trust the gentleman will make that clear in his statement, as I am sure he will.

Mr. LEMKE. I shall do that if I have time.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the unofficial group which met were in the position of trying to insist upon the following of the law, which was the law of the land in the first place, and in the second place it was the opinion of the unofficial committee that someone had better give consideration to the matter of the all-important question of the necessary balance of manpower in the service and out of the service, so that we might not only have an Army and Navy but the means of producing food for the Army and Navy. Is that correct?

Mr. LEMKE. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman and his committee are entitled to the thanks of every Member of Congress who has agriculture in his district. I for one hope that the gentleman will not let the matter rest where it is now but will continue his effort and see that the efforts of the committee are continued. Unless we watch these people all the time they are going to grab every man off the farm. I had a wire from Michigan on either last Thursday or Friday in which it was stated that Brigadier General Pearson, who is head of the Selective Service in Michigan, had ordered the local draft boards to put every farm boy in. Of course, that was regardless of any instructions that have been issued and it was in violation of the Tydings amendment. There was absolutely no authority for it.

Mr. LEMKE. I may say to the gentleman that we expect to continue our vigilance over this matter and I may say further that the gentleman is correct in his statement that the farms would have been absolutely denuded if this new directive had not gone out. Not only are the heads of families inducted, but the last son in families who have already three or four in the service is being taken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not only that, but the farmers would be taken from the class of producers and put in the class of consumers who are eating up the food supply instead of adding to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In connection with the service that was rendered by the unofficial committee which the gentleman presided over, did he secure any information as to how long it would take for this directive, issued by Selective Service to the State directors, to filter back to the local draft boards?

Mr. LEMKE. I will answer the gentleman by saying that we were very much concerned over that, and we were assured by General Hershey that he would send a telegram to the State directors last night directing them immediately—the word "immediately" is in the General's telegram—to report the clarifying directive to the local boards.

Mr. KEEFE. The difficulty, I may say to the gentleman, as I have observed it in the past in the operation of local draft boards who attempt to comply with directives, is this: That a telegram directed to a director of Selective Service is one thing, but for that directive to be in formal form and to get into the hands of the local draft board is quite another thing. I have observed that many local draft boards are not inclined to be guided by the receipt of a telegraphic communication but expect to receive a formal directive indicating just what the procedure is to be. My contact with many local draft boards is to the effect that they want a formal directive in their hands and in their files before they will take action.

I suggest to the gentleman, as a part of the vigilance which I know he and his committee will exercise, that he will follow that thing through to be certain that the local draft boards are officially advised and officially directed to comply with the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. LEMKE. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I intend to take that up after I get through here with General Hershey's office and find out what is being done.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The regular customary, and established form and method has been used by Director Hershey in this case to get the word in the quickest way to the local draft boards; is that not true?

Mr. LEMKE. As far as I know; yes. I am satisfied that he is absolutely sincere and will do all he can, although we are going to keep on and find out how fast this clarifying directive has been handled by Selective Service.

Mr. MICHENER. May I suggest this, as the technique of one Member in following up. I have already sent a telegram to the director of the State selective service asking if he had this directive, and if he had imparted the information to all local boards in Michigan.

Mr. LEMKE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In connection with what the gentleman from Michigan said, I followed a little different policy, but I doubt whether it has much effect. I just wired the newspapers in my district, after listening to General Hershey over here in the Old House caucus room, that neither the President nor General Hershey nor Brigadier General Pearson had any authority to authorize the local draft boards to disregard the Tydings amendment. I suppose, coming from a Congressman, they will not pay any attention to it, but I think it is about time that General Hershey sent them something like that.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I made a 1-minute speech here on the floor in which I quoted the Tydings amendment and said that was the law, and that Mobilizer Byrnes, General Hershey, or the Director of the Selective Service had no legal right to violate it. Now they admit it.

Mr. LEMKE. I might say to the gentleman that there is no question but what there is need for prompt action on the part of every Member of the Congress to enlighten the people of his community as to what the facts are. That can be done through the newspapers as well as by General Hershey's own clarifying directive. Then, if the State director ignores the clarifying directive, the publicity will give the people an opportunity to know who is responsible for the violation of the Tydings amendment.

I wish now to read an excerpt from another letter. This comes from Eckelson, N. Dak.:

> I am writing you in regard to the seriousness of taking all the farm help. If I have to give up my boy I will have to quit the farm. I am operating a large farm and have a large herd of cattle and milk a number of cows and have quite a few hogs. I am not able to do any heavy work myself due to a bad heart ailment and am forbidden by my doctor to do any heavy work.
>
> P. S.—I only have three boys in the service and they have been in now 3 years. They are now trying to take the last one.

I admit there is neither sense nor justice in such a proceeding, but there is also danger. There was a crisis confronting this Nation, because an army cannot win battles without something to eat and neither can the civilian workers supply the Army with the necessary equipment to fight the battles of the world unless they have enough to eat to do it on. Congress had to act.

I will just read one more letter and then I will quit reading letters and go to other issues. Here is a letter from an attorney in Woodstock, Va.:

> JANUARY 20, 1945.
>
> Representative LEMKE,
> *Congressman from North Dakota,*
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I was appointed and have been acting as Government appeal agent to local board No. 1 of Shenandoah County since the inauguration of the Selective Service System in 1940.
>
> Shenandoah County is predominantly an agricultural county and Virginia Circular No. 999, issued on January 3, 1945, has affected more registrants in this county than any one order that I know of. I have been approached daily by farmers in distress.
>
> The local board here has given very little consideration, if any, to the Tydings amendment and the State headquarters in Richmond has practically, if not wholly, ignored it, insofar as men under 26 years of age are concerned.
>
> I noted through the press on January 17 that you, together with some of your colleagues in Congress, had planned to call upon General Hershey for a clarification of his recent directive in regard to the wholsale drafting of farmers. Our board is proceeding in accordance with Virginia Circular No. 999, and has up to this time called up all II–C registrants for preinduction physical examination, and I am advised that they expect to fill

their current calls from this class of registrants. Unless some clarification is given to the boards at once in this connection it will be too late as they are devoting practically all of their attention to this class at the present time.

It occurs to me that General Hershey should clarify his directive and give to the local boards direction that they must consider the Tydings amendment where applicable. From my association with our local board and from my information received from State headquarters, they have the opinion that the recent directive supersedes the act itself, which, of course, is not true.

I would appreciate any suggestions which you might offer in this connection and just what progress, if any, has been made in regard to General Hershey's position in the matter.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM H. LOGAN.

I also have a telegram which reads as follows:

PORTALES, N. MEX., *January 22, 1945.*

Congressman LEMKE of North Dakota,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Regarding the resolution which you are reported to be preparing to introduce tomorrow concerning the draft of farm labor I wish to emphatically commend you for the position you are taking. I have a large two-man diversified farm on the south plains in Roosevelt County, N. Mex. We have 1,035 acres of land, divided as follows: 365 acres dry farm land; 75 acres irrigated land in the Portales Valley; 590 acres pasture lands; livestock, including 65 dairy cows, 40 head young dairy cattle; 60 head of hogs, including 5 brood sows; and 150 hens. If permitted to continue operating this farm at its present volume of production we can count very conservatively on marketing the following farm products during the year 1945: 350,000 pounds of grade A milk; 30,000 pounds of pork, including pigs we will buy and finish; 35,000 pounds of beef from dairy calves raised and cull cows replaced by heifers raised on the farm; 50 cases of eggs; 90,000 pounds of peanuts from 60 acres; and 5,000 bushels of sweetpotatoes from 15 acres.

As stated previously, this is a two-man affair and all of the work of dairying and farming is done by myself, a single man, and my assistant, a man of 21 years, also single. He is very skillful with all types of farm machinery, is practically a specialist with cattle, and can be trusted to single handedly take care of any phase of the farming activity; but unfortunately is within the draft age at which those people—who would rob the farms and cripple the war by forcing our soldiers to fight a war of attrition brought about by their own Government—are shooting.

I feel that these facts are self-explanatory and that with no further elaboration on my part you can see that the drafting of this young man would cut production on this farm at lease 50 percent. There is no other labor available in this community except German prison labor, which is not adapted to our needs. I feel that multiplying this instance by many thousands will give you a fair picture of what the drafting of 180,000 agricultural workers would do to the food situation at this time.

Very truly yours.

J. Y. NETHERY.

We have hundreds of auction sales going on throughout the Nation, where milk cows are selling for very little because there is no help and no one wants to buy a milk cow unless there is somebody to milk her, so the cows are going to the butchers and into cheap meat. This will simply further deplete the dairy products.

Now let me make some observations. First, there is something wrong. This is not an appeal for deferment of farmers' sons, this is an appeal for farmers to feed the Nation. The farmers' sons have already given their full quota of fighting men and also of men in essential and critical war industries. This is simply an appeal to our intelligence so that we will win this war and not wreck the Nation while doing it.

A farm is different from a home in the city. In the city there are many families where only one person is occupied, while others are not engaged in anything. However, every farm is a factory producing food. I should like to impress this upon the Members, that every farm is a factory producing food. There never was any idle or surplus labor on the farm to begin with. Everyone was essential. I will give you some illustrations.

In my own State I know that children 10 and 11 years of age were shocking grain and driving combines—child labor—and old men and women from 60 to 70 years of age were helping to gather the crop. We had already removed farm help to the extent that taking further help from the farm simply means a famine if we should continue it in the future.

May I state further that no one knows better than we do that this war is not over. We know that it requires men to win the war. We know it requires war implements to win it. But we also know that there is a surplus of hoarded labor in many of the cost-plus war industries. That is no longer a matter for dispute and General Hershey does not deny it. All he says, and he is correct, is that he was ordered to raise so many men. There was nowhere else to go unless he included the agricultural II–C class.

It was brought to his attention about the surplus hoarded labor and he frankly answered that is a matter for Congress to take care of. He was told about the fact that there are 3,000,000 Frenchmen that are willing to fight and that perhaps some of those could be used. He said again that question was not for him to answer. He was frank. He also admitted that there were still 4,500,000 men in the armed forces in the continental United States. He admitted that there were a great number of people over 30 years of age who were perhaps qualified for the armed services, but again he said that was not his problem. He had been ordered to raise young men between 18 and 25.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, we realize full well the situation that confronts the Nation. We intend to do our full part in actively cooperating for the best interests of the Nation. I wish at this point to introduce as part of my remarks the resolution which we had prepared prior to General Hershey's consent to change or modify or clarify his directives.

I want to say this resolution was prepared previously and I would have introduced it yesterday but for the fact that we were requested not to do it because the general might clarify his previous directive. Further, the reason we prepared this resolution was because we were unable to get in touch with the general for 3 or 4 days after our meeting on January 16. That was no fault of his. He was out of the city but the matter was so urgent that something had to be done. For that reason I would like to introduce this resolution at this time so that it will be part of the record.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas over 200 Members of Congress who are vitally interested in the Nation's food supply met on January 16, and as a result of said meeting a commitee of 11 was selected, to wit, LEMKE, North Dakota; HORAN, Washington; ANDERSEN, Minnesota; RAINS, Alabama; VURSELL, Illinois; ROGERS, Florida; REED, New York; LARCADE, Louisiana; PHILLIPS, California; O'HARA, Minnesota; WHITE, Idaho, to study the crisis confronting agriculture and to prevent the further taking from the farms of essential farm workers; and

Whereas General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, sent out a directive on Wednesday, January 3, 1945, to the State directors and the local draft boards throughout the Nation; and

Whereas said directive is interpreted by most of the draft boards and State directors as a directive to take the farm workers who are physically qualified without regard to the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas the War Food Administrator has said in reference to his statement quoted in the directive that it was his intention to refer only to such farm labor as is not deferred by the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas under this directive all farm workers aged 18 through 25 in class II–C, except those previously disqualified, are ordered "to report for preinduction physical examination"; and

Whereas evidence has been placed before the Congress that some local draft boards have interpreted this directive as a Presidential order for both examination and immediate induction and not subject to appeal, thus in effect nullifying the Tydings amendment; and

Whereas farm boys are patriotic and if called for induction will not willingly apply for deferment, even though the need for their services may be greater on the farms than elsewhere; and

Whereas the farm owners and employers of farm labor have no way of knowing whether the workers called for preexamination will be physically qualified or disqualified; and

Whereas they know that if they are physically qualified they will be immediately inducted into the armed forces, and as a result, therefore, auction sales are being held throughout the Nation disposing of livestock, poultry, and farm machinery and thousands of farms are either being abandoned or farm operations curtailed because there is no available farm help for replacement; and

Whereas this threat to the Nation's food supply has aroused the country to the danger of a shortage of food not only for our armed forces but for the civilian workers; and

Whereas there is already a severe shortage of butter, milk, cheese, and other dairy products, and also of meat and meat products, in spite of unusually favorable weather conditions, resulting in the greatest crops in our history; and

Whereas there are 3,300,783 in Government employment, and since there are great inconsistencies and contradictions in the gov-

ernmental statistics in regard to deferments, and since Senator BYRD states that there are at least several hundred thousand unnecessary Federal employees; and

Whereas it is acknowledged that there are millions of hoarded workers in the cost-plus and other industrial plants; and

Whereas there are over 4,500,000 of the armed forces still in continental United States; and

Whereas the necessary replacements in our present armed forces are less than 800,000 per annum: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to comply with the intent and spirit, as well as with the letter, of the Tydings amendment, and he is directed to consider agriculture as a critical war industry, and that farm help be deferred in accordance with the provisions of the Tydings amendment wherever it is shown that it is essential for agricultural production; and be it further

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service be and he is hereby authorized and directed to immediately issue a clarifying directive to all State directors and local draft boards in accordance with this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Director of War Mobilization direct the War Manpower Commission to immediately investigate the availability of manpower among the 3,300,783 Federal employees, and especially to make a thorough investigation in regard to labor hoarding in industry, and particularly so in the cost-plus war industries, in order that all essential labor in every critical industry may be treated alike; and be it further

Resolved, That the House Committee on Agriculture be directed and authorized immediately to determine the effect of the State director advice No. 288, released January 3, 1945, upon agricultural production and upon the war effort, and to return its findings to the Congress within 5 days.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. In view of the fact that General Hershey has sent out a new directive would the resolution be very effective now?

Mr. LEMKE. It would simply be a warning to those who are in charge of inductions that Congress is not going to permit the Nation's food supply to be wrecked because some draft boards are not giving proper consideration to the Tydings amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; I agree with the gentleman. Is the gentleman satisfied with the way the clarifying directive has gone out now that it will reach the ears of all the draft boards?

Mr. LEMKE. I am satisfied it will, but we will have to be on the alert.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines, General ROMULO, be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on January 25, and also on January 26, immediately after the reading of the Journal and before any other special orders, if any.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, which is McKinley's birthday, my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject McKinley and His Accomplishments, and that that address come immediately after the 1-minute speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post on the manpower situation and the labor draft.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, January 24, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders heretofore entered I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House tomorrow for 15 minutes after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances by including first a poem by Edna St. Vincent Millay, and secondly a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DOYLE, for 3 days, on account of illness of Lieutenant Doyle.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 24, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

130. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting a copy of the revised personnel requirements of the War Production Board for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

131. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1429. A bill to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation; in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 35. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1473) granting a pension to Ernest Somers, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1679. A bill making an appropriation for the relief of areas in the State of New Jersey damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 1680. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1681. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Loosahatchie River, Tenn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1682. A bill to regulate the practice of shorthand reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1683. A bill authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversay on June 1, 1946, of the statehood of the State of Tennessee, admitted to the Union on June 1, 1796; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 1684. A bill to provide for the return of unabsorbed premiums for war damage insurance, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1685. A bill to provide for the issuing of headstones to the next of kin of persons in the armed services who may be killed or lost in action or otherwise unaccounted for; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1686. A bill to prohibit exclusion from cemeteries of grave markers supplied by the United States Government for deceased veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1687. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1688. A bill authorizing the appointment of X-ray technicians as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 1689. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1690. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 1691. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act (title 50, sec. 1611); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 1692. A bill to exempt from the tax on amounts paid for long-distance telephone messages amounts paid by members of the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1693. A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1694. A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1695. A bill to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 1696. A bill to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1697. A bill to provide for assignment to nonhazardous posts of duty of certain members of the armed forces who have lost two or more members of their immediate family; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 1698. A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 1699. A bill to establish an Optometry Corps in the Medical Department of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 1700. A bill to provide for the location, survey, and building of a system of transcontinental or superhighways, three east and west and six north and south highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1701. A bill to amend section 5, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1702. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to extend the time for awarding decorations to persons for service in the armed forces in any war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1703. A bill to require that the Federal contribution to States for old-age assistance shall be the full amount in cases where the State matches to the extent of its ability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1704. A bill to provide for the appointment of female dentists in the Dental Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 1705. A bill providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 1706. A bill to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Murray W. Moran; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1708. A bill for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., and the Memphis Park Commission; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1709. A bill for the relief of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1710. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1711. A bill for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1712. A bill for the relief of A. T. Steele and J. C. Corbitt; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1713. A bill for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1714. A bill for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1715. A bill for the relief of W. T. Martin Luckett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 1716. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1717. A bill for the relief of George Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1718. A bill for the relief of James A. Kelley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 1719. A bill to confirm the claim of Charles Gaudet; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 1720. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nora C. Fetterhoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Eli L. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 1722. A bill for the relief of the Vermont Stone Products Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1723. A bill granting a pension to Clara L. Garvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1724. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Nora Ellsworth, guardian of Kenneth Edward Ellsworth, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Surface Shaughnessy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1726. A bill granting an increase of pension to Rosalie C. Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1727. A bill granting a pension to Margaret McAllister Barron; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1728. A bill for the relief of Claude Edwards; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1729. A bill for the relief of Winston Holder; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1730. A bill for the relief of John T. Cooper; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1731. A bill for the relief of Louis and Estelle Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 1732. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie A. Shedd, Mrs. Maude C. Denney, Mrs. Mabel Glenn Gray, and Mrs. Ruth C. Shedd for injuries sustained when an Army truck was in collision with the car in which they were riding; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

33. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Vance Bull and others of Jasper County, Mo., opposing (1) legislation for the drafting of 17-year-old boys for military service until more effective use is made of available man and woman power and (2) House bills 1806 and 3947 or any like measure committing the Nation at this time to a program of post-war military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

34. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Texas School Executives and Teacher Trainers, resolving that it is the earnest and considered conviction of that organization that our 18-year-old sons should not be sent into combat without adequate preparation and training to be construed to mean the equivalent of 12 months; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great Jehovah, we pray Thee to incline our hearts to do Thy will. Keep us in the paths of rectitude and duty, crowning us with well-poised minds and with pure motives. As men and women called to serve a great people, forgive the poverty and unwisdom of our lives. Make us strong and courageous to bear and defend the truth.

O God, the long, long generations of the future are our constituents; we pray that the Congress may be an inspiration to every permanent movement for the good of our children and our children's children. May they be buoyant in spirit and in love of country, led by the light of religion and a holy faith. We turn to Thee for guidance, that we, with the entire body of our citizens, may continue

to labor toward that destiny which was sealed by our immortal founding fathers.

"O holy Lord, uplifted high
With outstretched arms, in mortal woe
Embracing in Thy wondrous love
The sinful world that lies below,
Give us an ever-living faith
To gaze beyond the things we see;
And, in the mystery of Thy death,
Draw us and all men after Thee."

In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article on the world rubber situation by Mr. John L. Collyer, of the Goodrich Rubber Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a poem by James Patrick McGovern.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today and on tomorrow, Thursday, I may address the House for 30 minutes following the special orders heretofore entered for those dates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Thursday, I may address the House for 20 minutes following the special orders heretofore entered for that date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

A CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATION OF POLICY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that in order to exert our full force internationally, and to the end that we may realize the fruition of our hopes nationally, for which we fight, we must have a congressional declaration of American international policy to procure its eventual acceptance. We are asleep if we of the House of Representatives do not define it soon.

I do not mean we should try here and now to deliver an ultimatum, as such. I insist we should have a platform on which to stand, from which to step as occasion requires, and from which to trade for position only if required. There will have to be some compromises, but not of principle. We need not expect, nor insist upon complete accord, nor total rejection or total acceptance of our proposition. We should propose at the outset and finally dictate the terms which suit us, else for what have we fought? That will take all the nerve we have. It is that which demands all we can give, now and then.

We should have and make a clearly defined statement of general objectives to which Congress subscribes as such to submit at the early conferences of the Big Three, to back up the President.

There should be permitted no repetition of the Wilson-League of Nations debacle. The President should know in advance to what extent we will or will not support him as our representative. President Roosevelt should go armed, for "Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just."

We should furnish the ammunition and the power to enable him to enforce his, which are in the ultimate our, suggestions.

We should insist, through him, upon the establishment of our place in the sun at the price we have paid for the leadership we propose to have and to take, and to hold, and we should say so; make it so, or quit now. That we do not contemplate to do, nor until victory as spelled by unconditional surrender is accomplished.

We have taken our place. Destiny found it for us. It is now for us to keep it. To lose it would be a catastrophe for civilization.

As our Chief Executive the President is our spokesman. We are the people. Without us and our support, history teaches that he is as helpless as a newborn babe. He will be doing business with adults in diplomacy.

It is for Congress in toto to define a broad policy subject to such modification and compromises as do not compromise us, superinduced by situations now beyond our control, which may arise, as will establish the perpetual peace we seek to establish. We representatives must have a program of our own.

The people have given too much to lose all at a conference table again. We cannot afford to wait for anybody, parliamentary or otherwise. It is time we, the representatives of the people, did something before the next Big Three conference. The President has a right to insist to know what we, the people, will do. It is our business to tell him what they are willing to do to support him. It is not wholly up to any other branch of Congress as representatives of the States to define what the people at home will represent and insist shall be done. We could be too deferential parliamentarily for the good of the country. It has happened before. As repsentatives of the people in the House of Representatives we should not let it happen again. The burden of responsibility to the people and for the peace is on our shoulders. It is time for us to act.

HOUSING FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time merely to announce that at 3 o'clock on next Friday, January 26, a meeting will be held to hear proposals from Senators, Congressmen, and those properly interested in providing housing for Congressmen and their secretarial help. This meeting will be held in the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee room in the Old House Office Building, and, as I said, it will be at 3 o'clock on Friday afternoon. Not only will proposed amendments to the Sabath bill be considered, or to the Bilbo bill, but a number of architects, builders, and draftsmen will be at the meeting with proposals and eager to be heard. A number of lawmakers and their secretarial help are still without homes.

There is considerable discussion with reference to an amendment to whichever bill is adopted, assuming one will be, and I think one will be agreed to, providing facilities to take care of the pages. Our pages are practically orphans up here from the time they arrive to the time they get back home.

There are a number of things that will be considered at this meeting to be held at 3 o'clock on next Friday afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on tomorrow for 30 minutes at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today, and I ask unanimous consent that the time granted me under this special order may be transferred to Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include in one a resolution on Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may have permission to address the House for 10 minutes on the housing situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and after the special order just granted the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. There are a number of Members who have special orders for today who have not yet arrived on account of the address we listened to this morning, and without objection the Chair will declare a recess for 10 minutes. The House will stand in recess until 12:20.

There was no objection; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 12:20 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12:20 o'clock p. m.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I understood that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] was to speak today. I also understand that the Republicans are to have a conference this afternoon just after adjournment. I do not wish to take the time of the House now, so I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very fine description of the concert given by the First Combat Infantry Band here in Washington recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some editorial comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to Hallett Johnson, recently appointed Ambassador to Costa Rica.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that it is doubtful that the House will be in session Friday. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that in the event the House does not meet on Friday I be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter regarding the services of ex-Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

EFFECTIVE USE AND DISTRIBUTION OF MANPOWER—STOP HOARDING OF MANPOWER

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, we listened this morning to high officials in the military service, and I think we are all in accord on the fact that everything possible should be done to make the winning of the war a certainty and at the earliest date. I believe there is opportunity for us to improve the production in the factories and war plants all over this country, and I believe one of the greatest responsibilities resting upon the Congress now is to give the proper direction that will bring about such an increase, throwing all of the resources and force of this Nation possible back of the war effort for the purpose of bringing victory at the earliest possible moment. To that end legislation is probably necessary.

I rise to speak for a few minutes today to support in principle the Barrett bill (H. R. 1421) introduced by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. It may need some refinement, it may need some change, it may need to be integrated at a certain point later by amendment if it ever gets to that stage, bringing in the cooperation and the force of the Manpower Commission, but I think it points in the right direction. That is my purpose in taking a little of the time of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the Congress of the United States, after waiting for over 2 years for the executive department and the War Manpower Commission to devise and enunciate sound policies for the effective use and distribution of the manpower of this country—I repeat, the time has come when the Members of Congress who think independently and who are willing to free themselves from political pressure from any person or group should take the matter into their own hands and find at least a quick and temporary solution, and I believe the temporary solution I shall speak of might very well prove to be a sound and permanent solution of the manpower problem.

I believe the essential elements necessary to such a solution are found in the bill H. R. 1421, recently introduced in the House by the gentleman from Wyoming, Congressman BARRETT. I commend the study of this bill to the Members of the

House. It is a brief and very plain approach to the problem. It is so simple that at first glance you may not comprehend the effectiveness that could well be the result of the enactment of such legislation. It is a direct frontal attack. It is a bill which expresses its faith in the patriotism of the American people; it is not a compulsory bill; it is an American type of legislation that gives the IV–F men and all people who are not engaged in essential work for the prosecution of the war an opportunity to volunteer their services wherever the Government sees fit under their own signatures. It is a bill which decentralizes the solution of this matter and asks the people to help solve it rather than a bill giving compulsory and greater power to the Government here in Washington. Certainly the people of this country who make up the greater part of this Government should be directly called upon to volunteer a solution to this manpower problem before we fall into the footsteps of totalitarian governments and attempt to enforce and coerce our people further by directives and the threat of heavy fines and jail sentences.

This bill, if enacted into law, for the first time will determine whether or not we have a general shortage of manpower. When enacted and put in operation there is little question but that its findings will show that we do not have as serious a shortage of manpower as we are led to believe, but, to the contrary, we will find that our manpower is simply not properly distributed to the points where shortages are complained of at the present time. Certainly it would be well to determine this fact before passing a national service law which is in direct opposition to every principle of our form of government. The question for the Congress to decide is whether or not we want to make a sound and definite approach in an attempt to find a real and lasting solution to this vexing problem.

Mr. Speaker, briefly this is the approach made by the Barrett bill. It calls upon the local selective service boards of the Nation to begin at once to call in and reclassify all men from 18 to 45 years of age with the exception of the I–A group, who are those now classified as ready for military service. Those called in will be classified:

First. To find out if they are employed in essential war activities including agriculture.

Second. If in war-supporting activity.

Third. If they are regularly engaged in occupations necessary for the civilian economy of the State or Nation.

Fourth. To reclassify IV–F's to find out if they are in class I or II.

Fifth. All other people between 18 and 45 who are not in these four classifications who would be willing to sign up voluntarily to go into either of the first two classes.

Mr. Speaker, in other words, everyone who is called in who is not now employed in essential war activity would be given the opportunity to voluntarily sign his name stating that he is willing to go into any employment requested by the Government. The draft boards and the war effort at once will receive the benefit of that tremendous power known as public sentiment. It is my judgment that 98 percent of the IV–F men of the Nation will welcome an opportunity to get out from under the unjust cloud of suspicion due to no fault of their own and will gladly sign up, volunteering their services.

There are over 4,000,000 of these men alone. In the other groups answering the call who are not employed in essential war industry it is estimated that there are one and one-half million of them. Here you have a manpower of five and one-half million men who have not had a call or an opportunity by their Government through their local draft boards to enroll in the war effort.

Would it not be wise to give them this opportunity rather than to pass a bill that will threaten them with heavy fines and jail sentences?

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman from Illinois is making a very fine statement on this important problem. Does not the gentleman feel, and I believe he indicates that he does, that an appeal to the patriotism of the American people and to their loyalty will go much further toward getting this problem solved than an attempt to browbeat them and drive them into the necessary work?

Mr. VURSELL. I think that approach at least should be made before the harsher approach is made.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman know of any efficient investigation that has been made of the waste of manpower in many of the war plants? I get reports from my district that indicate that thousands of people are not working at their jobs and that people are employed who are not needed.

Mr. VURSELL. I think it is quite obvious there is great wastage of manpower. I will touch on that a little later. I believe it will be corrected with this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in the military forces it is estimated they will need 900,000 men by July 1. Many of the IV–F's and other volunteers, under the provision of this bill, can take employment in the military camps of the Nation in a civilian capacity, releasing great numbers of military men who are now performing limited duty for more effective military work in the services for which they have been trained.

Further military replacements can be had from the 1,000,000 young men becoming 18 years of age each year.

The Government estimates that we will need 700,000 more men in civilian war activity employment within the next 6 months. There is little doubt but that more than enough of the IV–F's and others will volunteer to furnish this manpower the Government seeks. Why not give these 5,500,000 men referred to at least the decency of a call to the service of their country in a civilian capacity before threatening them with fines and jail sentences?

Now I come to a most important provision of the Barrett bill which provides and instructs every draft board in the industrial areas of this country to make an immediate survey of the industrial and war plants of the Nation, including those operated by the Army and Navy, to ascertain if there is hoarding of manpower and a wastage of labor. These selective-service boards are given the power of subpena to call in the managers of such plants and any of their employees and take testimony under oath in making such investigation. However, it is anticipated that many patriotic employees of these plants will voluntarily give evidence of such scandalous hoarding and wastage of manpower that will rock the Nation. If, when the investigation is completed, a surplus of manpower is found, the plant management must decide who shall be released from the pay rolls and give their names to the selective-service board.

The draft boards in the Nation covering these industrial areas, the members of which have no axes to grind, can make such an investigation in a short period of time, and when this investigation is made the results are to be returned at once to the Director of Selective Service, to the Congress of the United States, and the press of the Nation.

In this connection it will throw a very heavy load on the draft boards in the larger cities, and that is why I said possibly some amendments could work out the problem; and therein lies an opportunity to coordinate the agencies of the manpower organizations of the country.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Undoubtedly the proposed National Service Act would create the most drastic control over the people of America in the 160 years of our history. Has the gentleman heard any explanation why this proposal was not put forward to the people during the late political campaign so they could have passed upon it in the American way?

Mr. VURSELL. In answer to the gentleman from Nebraska, I may say that it was not advanced by the President, as his remarks indicate, before the campaign. But I believe we should consider this matter without regard to any consideration except the common welfare of the soldiers who are fighting and in support of the splendid military men of this country and as a relief to the taxpayers in keeping down the additional cost of the war effort.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. I am sure the gentleman has read or seen accounts of the report of Senator MEAD on shortage of manpower in some of the shipbuilding plants. Has the gentleman seen that report?

Mr. VURSELL. I have seen that report and I expect to quote from it a little later.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I receive a great many letters from management

and persons working in the yards on this identical question about the wastage of manpower in various defense plants, and especially those which are operated under the so-called cost-plus system.

In this connection General Hershey, when he was before a group of the Members the other day, said he had all the power that was necessary to induct anybody and everybody of military age in the Army, men between the ages of 18 and 45.

Mr. VURSELL. Answering the gentleman's question I may say that I believe General Hershey did make that admission, but circumscribed it with the thought that it would be rather dangerous for him to start out on such a program at the present time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He said he had the power to draft them, though.

Mr. VURSELL. This bill seeks to decentralize that power over this Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, here again the power of public opinion, that power upon which democracy was founded and must be sustained, will work wonders toward solving this manpower shortage. Is there anything wrong with this provision of the bill? Can any patriotic citizen object to it? No well-meaning citizen wants hoarding of manpower going on throughout this Nation in these critical times. The War Manpower Commission and those in the executive department of Government, with charges on every hand that there has been a waste of labor throughout the country by cost-plus contractors and others, have not made such an investigation and have failed in this most necessary approach in solving the manpower problem which is facing the Nation.

It is the duty of the Members of Congress when we have these selective-service boards ready to do the job all over the country—I repeat, it is the duty of the Congress to implement these boards with extra help at the expense of the Government, if necessary, as is provided in the Barrett bill, so that we may find out whether or not countless thousands of men are retained by cost-plus contractors and others in the war plants of the Nation at high wages who are not given work to do and who are not permitted to render the service to their Government they thought they would be able to render when they were employed in such war industries. Thousands of men all over the Nation have reported to the press, to their friends at home, and to the Members of Congress that these conditions are going on in many of the plants of the country. Thousands of men have resigned from jobs which were paying them over $250 per month because they were too patriotic to wait days, weeks, and months for work that was not provided, yet at the same time drawing their checks regularly on pay day. Such hoarding of manpower is adding tremendously to the cost of our war production and is an added burden on the taxpayers of this Nation which should have been stopped in the very beginning.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I like what the gentleman is saying about an approach to the manpower problems. Does he not feel, however, in these critical areas where there is a shortage of manpower that if a man is permitted, even forced, to do a full day's work, perhaps lengthening the day of labor by 1, 2, or 4 hours, will produce the desired results instead of a forced draft of labor?

Mr. VURSELL. I think the great majority of labor wants to do a day's work if properly supervised and if given the work to do. Naturally the way things have been going the morale of labor has been lowered in many instances and, of course, many have taken advantage of such a situation and doubtless are loafing on the job.

It is endangering the economy of the country. Our citizens who are asked to buy bonds until it hurts to support the war effort want this thing stopped. This bill provides an opportunity for the first substantial effort along this line to be made. It is the very crux of the manpower problem. The manpower problem cannot be solved until the wasteful hoarding of labor in the war plants of the Nation and in the Army and Navy and in the Federal Government is cleaned up. These Selective Service boards properly implemented by the provision of this bill can, and will, get the job done in a forthright manner and with the least possible delay.

Let me give you an example which was published on the front pages of every newspaper in the Nation yesterday. The result of an investigation of the Bipartisan Committee of the Senate empowered to make such an investigation of the wastefulness of manpower. This happened in the Norfolk Navy Yard, close to Washington. One of the members of that Senate investigating committee gave out the following report. He said:

> On a surprise visit to Norfolk Navy Yard we found idleness and loafing on a big scale with so many men assigned to some jobs they cannot even all squeeze into the place. Part of the help was employed in making inlaid chess boards, doll houses, dog houses, and napkin rings, others were employed in making a 25-foot mahogany dining-room table being turned out in the midst of war to be used for just one oyster feast to be attended by a few of the shop masters, another table 16 feet long, 40 inches wide, with a 12-inch back upon which oysters would be placed for opening. The chess boards were inlaid with birdseye maple and even inlaid chess symbols.

Members of the committee joined in the statement that the widespread loafing they had observed was the fault of top managers rather than the workers whose morale was being lowered by the waste and extravagance they saw.

The men themselves, the members of the committee said, think there are too many of them on the job. They said they were unable to do an honest day's work. Members of the committee said that they had reason to believe that the record of the Norfolk Navy Yard, in comparison with other naval yards, is excellent. They have built and repaired many great ships, but they are wasting labor.

The committee reported:

> Men are told to stretch out jobs and to appear to be working.
>
> When investigators go through the men are warned in advance to look busy. They must put work into machines even if they merely ruin metals. A few minutes before the investigators actually appear another warning is given by a Paul Revere, who tears through the shop just ahead of the investigators. Our committee did not receive this treatment, probably because we appeared on short notice. It was worked on others.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman referred to or does he intend to refer to the letter of the Secretary of the Navy in which he attempted to justify that practice?

Mr. VURSELL. I am referring to the report that has been given out by the committee, which ridicules, in my judgment, the letter from the Navy officials who sought to intervene and cushion the shock to the American people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course, the whole sum and substance of the letter attempting to justify that practice of hoarding of labor, loafing, and misapplication of labor is based upon the theory or upon the argument that inasmuch as the navy yards produce a certain amount they should not be criticized notwithstanding the fact they might have produced a third or a half more. Until the Army and Navy get around to demanding full production instead of just part-time production, we will never cure that evil.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman is quite right, and the purpose of this bill is to get at that very real objective. It was testified to that so many men were hired and crowded into places that they could not work. The strange thing about it is that the men themselves informed the committee and patriotically made the effort to help get that situation cleaned up in the Norfolk Navy Yard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman will recall that more than a year ago a similar nonproduction record was disclosed

by the House Subcommittee on Naval Affairs, which held hearings here, with reference to the Brewster plant, so it is nothing new. The practice has been going on for 2 or 3 years that we know of.

Mr. VURSELL. I think that is in the main correct.

A national service act, empowered with the threat of heavy fines and jail penalties, will further congest these overloaded war plants, where labor is being hoarded, and add to the confusion, for lack of work and lack of space to work in will not increase production, but will put a premium on idleness and add to the cost of the unthinkable height of the national debt, will hinder civilian business and civilian services, and will further deplete the farm manpower of the country with a reduction in the production of food to feed our armed forces, our civilians, to supply our commitments to lend-lease and the liberated countries of the world. Instead of equipping the Manpower Commission and the Selective Service with whip and spur to ride herd on the American people with greater centralized power, driving them like sheep into the defense-plant corrals, the Barrett bill will reverse the situation and do what should have been done months ago, stop labor hoarding in these plants by opening the gates of these hoarded reserves and allowing the unemployed labor, at the expense of the Government, to be transferred to where it is needed and will release a great quantity of manpower of the proper age for entry into the military services who, because of past practices, are now deferred. It will reach into the over 3,000,000 people now on the Federal pay rolls, and will assort thousands of them into the armed forces and back into the civilian economy of the country to the great relief of the taxpayers and to their entire satisfaction.

Out near San Francisco is one of the great shipbuilding plants. The local management was calling for 40,000 extra employees. Mr. Kaiser, on this complaint of manpower shortage, sent some of his top men in to make an investigation and to adopt a better policy for production.

The result was that instead of employing 40,000 more men, over 20,000 were released from the pay rolls of the plant and production with this lesser force was increased 150 percent.

There is little question but that many war plants in the Nation can be operated with greater production than at present without calling any more skilled mechanics into that phase of the war effort. There is little question but that countless thousands are being held in war plants at Government expense where there is already a surplus of labor which should be released to those plants which have a shortage of labor.

This is the first definite and real approach pointing to the solution of this No. 1 problem that has been offered to my knowledge by any piece of legislation within the past 2 years.

Here is a bill that, in my judgment, the labor leaders of the Nation should rally to its support. When this bill is passed you will be amazed at the number of contractors in the war plants of the Nation who will begin to cut down their forces and get rid of unnecessary employees before they are exposed to the bar of public opinion and to the Government of this country. At least they will quickly begin to put their houses in order in the industrial plants of the Nation. This bill will furnish the manpower needed in the Nation through its voluntary provisions and through its power of investigation in the war plants and may reduce the cost of Government billions of dollars.

It is not too late to give this relief to the Nation and to speed up the war effort by the adoption of this measure. I believe this bill is the real answer to the problem. If this bill is enacted into law, the people will rise up and acclaim the Congress.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I wish to commend the gentleman on the splendid summation he has made of this great problem. I think it is perhaps the most important question before the American people today. I heartily agree with everything the gentleman has said. I am quite certain that if the people of this Nation were properly aroused and told the exact facts as to the conditions confronting our fighting men and the necessity for backing them up to the limit, there is no question that American labor, American industry, and American agriculture would do everything necessary to get the job done on a voluntary basis.

Mr. VURSELL. I agree with the gentleman from Wyoming.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the subject of manpower.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman introduced the amended bill that is being reported on?

Mr. MAY. No; I have not. That bill will not be ready for introduction until the committee passes on it at 2 o'clock or shortly thereafter. It will then be immediately introduced and a number assigned to it, and it will be available in the morning.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject The Future of Fifty Million Tons of United States Ships, and to include therein certain statements. I may say that the cost of printing this in the RECORD will be $138.50, and I ask that this matter may be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Honorable Grover M. Moscowitz, United States district judge, eastern district of New York, at the annual banquet of the New York Association of the Commercial Law League of America on December 11, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. If, at the time my name is called, I am not present, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE AMERICAN COAL MINER

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to present to the House the war-production record of the American coal miner. It is a record in production that every American should be proud of, because it reflects patriotism, love of country, and a burning desire to contribute to the war effort. I am confident that the impartial historian of tomorrow in recording labor's great contribution to the war effort will proclaim that no segment of our great labor population made a more outstanding war-production record than the men who supplied our Nation and to some extent, to say the least, our allies, with coal. The record is fully set out in the United Mine Workers Journal of January 1, 1945, which I intend to read to the House before concluding. Let me first, however, call your attention to some of the highlights in the article.

First. The 1944 American coal-production record is the greatest coal-production record in the history of the world. We produced 620,000,000 tons of bituminous coal and 64,500,000 tons of anthracite coal, making a combined tonnage of 684,500,000 tons.

Second. The 684,500,000 tons of bituminous and anthracite coal produced in 1944 by the American coal miners exceeds the combined coal production of the rest of the world.

Third. The 1944 coal production exceeds the 1943 coal production by 31,000,000 tons.

Fourth. The previous high in coal production was in 1918 when we produced 678,500,000 tons. A comparison of the 1944 production with the 1918 production brings out some startling—well nigh unbelievable—facts.

In 1918 it took 760,000 coal miners to produce 678,500,000 tons of coal. In 1944 it only took 479,000 miners to produce 684,500,000 tons. In other words, in 1944, 479,000 coal miners produced 6,000,000 tons of coal more than 760,000 miners produced in 1918. Just stop for a moment you who seem to be skeptical of the accomplishments of the American coal miner, and contemplate the record: reducing the number of miners by 281,000 and increasing the tonnage by 6,000,000 tons—37 percent fewer miners producing 6,000,000 more tons of coal. The record is all the more remarkable when you consider that in 1918 the average age of the miners was 32 years and in 1944 the average age had gone up to 45 years. Why this great increase in the average age? Let me tell you: Thousands upon thousands of young men employed in the mines before the war are now in the armed forces. To take their places, thousands of old coal miners—many of them now 70 to 80 years of age and who had retired because of old age or infirmities—prompted by the patriotic urge to carry on in the place of their fighting sons and grandsons, and anxious to contribute their part to the war effort, donned their work clothes and went back into the mines, knowing when they did so that they were assuming a great risk to life and limb, because the mining of coal is a hazardous undertaking to the young and strong and doubly so to the aged and infirm. As proof let me record that the fatal and nonfatal accidents in coal mines rose from 61,089 in 1940 to 78,064 in 1943. The figures for 1944 have not been released. The 1940 to 1943 record of accidents is as follows:

In 1940 there were 1,308 fatal and 59,731 nonfatal accidents, making a total of 61,089.

In 1941 there were 1,266 fatal and 63,465 nonfatal accidents, making a total of 64,731.

In 1942 there were 1,482 fatal and 72,000 nonfatal accidents, making a total of 73,482.

In 1943 there were 1,394 fatal and 76,670 nonfatal accidents, making a total of 78,064.

Fifth. The 684,500,000 tons in 1944 are 20,000,000 more tons than the Government authorities estimated the coal production at the beginning of the year 1944. In other words, the miners exceeded the Government estimate by 20,000,000 tons. And remember this record was made in spite of a decrease in coal mine manpower during the year, due to disabilities, retirements, and enlistments in the military service of 30,000 men.

Sixth. Storage stocks of coal are 15,000,000 higher than they were when we entered the war. Bituminous coal stocks as of December 1, 1944, totaled 65,000,000 tons.

Now, having given you the high lights in the war production of coal as revealed by the article referred to, let me read the article to you, because I believe it will open the eyes of many Members:

MUCH-MALIGNED AMERICAN COAL MINERS BREAK ALL PRODUCTION RECORDS IN 1944

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Official figures released by the Department of the Interior, on coal production, may be at variance with the totals of 1944 coal production used in this summary, but the fact is that it is many months following the close of the calendar year before correct totals are available. These belated totals invariably add from two to five million additional tons to the totals reported by the Department at the year end.)

American coal miners, and the coal industry as a whole, despite the shenanigans of certain managements, can look their fellow Americans in the eye in the midst of all the claims and counterclaims of manpower shortages, production delays, misdirected efforts, and countless other accusations which have flared of late in official circles as regards alleged shortages of munitions, supplies, and take a bow.

Four hundred seventy-nine thousand bituminous and anthracite miners, responding to the Nation's demand for increased coal production on the home front, and to supply the ever-increasing but undisclosed demands of our allies, literally tore the cover off the ball to establish an all-time production record of 684,500,000 tons in 1944—20,000,000 tons more coal than Government authorities were willing to admit at the start of the year as being obtainable with the decreased manpower available. Such an achievement is something for the boys over there and the war effort at home which the industry has every right to feel proud of and boast about. The industry faced many difficulties and hazards to life and property in the repair and maintenance of old and defective equipment to achieve the result.

There were not quite as many directives and press releases relating to coal issued by the combined Government agencies and operators' associations as there were millions of tons of coal produced, but, looking over the shelf-laden stacks of words, sermons, statistical summaries, and public appeals in this office, and without an official count, we judge that it was a close race.

Despite all the directives and, in certain instances, failure of management to function through the medium of joint mine production committees, machinery shortages, lack of repair parts, dwindled manpower, decreased transportation facilities for miners, confused distribution, delayed action and stalling tactics by Government agencies—purposely planned to avoid validating negotiated wage agreements—lawsuits by some operators to circumvent the law of the land providing portal to portal payments, American coal miners patriotically set about to do the job plainly necessary to keep the wheels of American industry and transportation delivering in ever-increasing quantities the implements of war needed to speed victory.

Although the story has been told over and over again, too few people in the United States seem to recognize that without coal—and plenty of it—the war-production effort could not be maintained, to say nothing of being increased month after month.

American coal miners produced in 1944 a total of 684,500,000 tons of anthracite and bituminous coal—more than the combined production of the rest of the world. Bituminous production totaled 620,000,000 tons—an increase of 31,000,000 tons over 1943. Anthracite production totaled 64,500,000 tons—an increase of 4,000,000 tons over 1943. The over-all increase of 35,000,000 tons approximates 5.1 percent.

The 1944 production records were achieved despite a decrease in manpower during the year, due to permanent and partial disabilities, retirements, enlistments in the military services and other causes, of approximately 30,000 men, and an increase in the average age of miners employed of 13 years, from 32 to 45 years. Demonstrating their loyalty to the Nation's war effort, 15,000 miners over the social-security retirement age of 65—many between the ages of 70 and 80—remained on the job, while others returned to the mines from retirement to take up any available task which could be assigned to them to meet needed coal requirements.

The efficiency of the production efforts of American coal miners in 1944 stands out all the more remarkable when compared with the previous record high established in 1918 during World War No. 1.

In 1918, 613,000 bituminous coal miners produced 579,500,000 tons of coal, while 147,000 anthracite coal miners produced 99,000,000 tons—a total production of 678,500,000 tons by 760,000 miners.

In 1944, 72,000 anthracite miners and 407,000 bituminous miners—a total of 479,000—produced, on a basis of 281,000 fewer men employed, 6,000,000 tons more coal than were produced in 1918, a reduction in manpower of approximately 37 percent—all of which tells the story of why Americans enjoy the cheapest coal produced in the world.

In 1944, as in 1943, coal miners sacrificed their vacation periods, worked holidays in bad air and under dangerous conditions, in some cases where companies flatly refused to install safety devices and improved ventilation, and in others where companies could not obtain the machinery and devices to comply with the safety recommendations of Federal and State mine inspectors.

Coal-mine fatalities for 1944 are not available except for the number killed, which total 934 for the first 9 month, of which 810 deaths were in bituminous and 124 in anthracite. Both fatal and nonfatal accidents have been increasing since 1940, with 61,089 recorded for 1940 and 78,064 for 1943.

All the while the miners were slugging and digging the record 1944 coal production, hardly a week passed that coal associations did not indulge in their favorite pastime of giving out news releases attacking miners for absenteeism. These figures usually included the sick, disabled on compensation, worn-out old men who cannot take it every day, men forced to lay off and take their children to nearby communities for medical care for lack of mine-community doctors, and those absent for many other reasons who should not, in all fairness to American coal miners, be included in honest absenteeism accounting.

Topping all the publicity show and resorting to full-time competition of using the coal industry to get all possible individual news space for personal play, the Solid Fuels Administration seldom let a day pass without grinding out some release containing refigured calculations of an estimated, growing coal shortage. All this was indulged in face of the fact that during many months of 1944 thousands of miners were forced to work short time because, in the scheme of preferential buying, the coals they mined were snubbed by purchasers and the operators for whom they worked were forced to curtail running time for lack of orders.

Some of the publicity about "the growing coal shortage," unless understood fully by the trade, would lead one to believe that the coal miners were very negligent and should be blamed for mining inferior coals. In other words, all miners had to do to mine the kind and size of coal that the preferential buyers wanted was simply to follow the course of one in a garden—pick the big tomatoes and pass up the little ones—or exercise the same selectivity in loading coal that the grower does when grading oranges

or any other fruit. In fact, we believe the result of these releases which came with such frequency induced many consumers to think that they would be foolish to take whatever was offered them at the time; let it go to the other fellow and they would get the cream of the crop later on.

STORAGE STOCKS HAVE GROWN SINCE WAR BEGAN

Bituminous coal stocks as of December 1 totaled 65,000,000 tons. Storage stocks of coal are 15,000,000 tons higher now than they were when we entered the war. (We believe that, at a minimum, stocks are 7,000,000 tons higher than reported. We don't trust voluntary war estimates of stocks on hand by consumers.)

The ability of the American coal industry to supply every need and build up reserve stocks—while every other country in the world has exhibited such a miserable failure in meeting its coal requirements—is but another demonstration of the efficiency of American coal miners.

Early, cold December weather, which brought rains that flooded mines and snowdrifts that stopped all transportation, closed mines in Pennsylvania, southern West Virginia, and elsewhere for 4 to 5 days, resulting in a production loss of 4,000,000 tons. Many consumers who had postponed adequate storage became anxious buyers, willing to discard their preferential specifications and accept the kind of coals which they refused to buy when many mines were operating on curtailed running time. Such consumers have now rushed and increased spot buying, but there is, however, no over-all coal shortage now, nor will there be one in the immediate months to come.

Lake shipments of coal in 1944 established a new record, in keeping with production, totaling 54,000,000 tons—an increase of 8,300,000 tons over 1943.

Both anthracite and bituminous shipments to New England registered increases, while nearly 3,000,000 tons of coal were shipped from the Midwest territory to the Washington-Oregon region, which constitutes one of the most uneconomic and unlooked-for developments in coal distribution connected with the war effort.

Little publicity is given to shipments of coal to our allies. Just who gets the coal, in whose vessels it is shipped, what the terms are, who pays for it—if anybody—whether on lend-lease or otherwise; constitutes one of those bureaucratic war-suppressed confidences which the coal industry, and especially the coal miner, is not supposed to know about.

Another partial news black-out, although referred to occasionally, is the constant decrease in transportation facilities available for coal miners to get to and from their work. Then we have mine explosions which not only take the lives of men but decrease coal production sometimes as high as 5,000 tons a day for months, or maybe a whole year, which are played down; also floods, snowstorms, and influenza epidemics.

All of these important factors in employment and production receive but scant publicity, while the results are played up in the monthly charts of absenteeism and weekly production figures.

Although American coal production in 1944 totals more than all the rest of the world combined, the job of fueling our allies and liberated countries and increased shipping, together with meeting the expanded domestic and manufacturing needs of the United States, as a result of diverting oil and gas, constitutes a load that will eventually break the camel's back, even though our "burrocratic" statesmen in their good-will travels and conferences do not take such a factual result into consideration when they offer our last shirt as convincing proof of America's all-out war effort.

During the course of the past 3 years international officials of the U. M. W. A. have met and talked with representatives of the coal industry and Government officials representing various nations allied with our war effort. In every case these representatives have persisted in their inquiry:

"How do you get American coal miners to do the job they are doing?"

In each instance the representatives of our allied nations have confessed their inability to overcome a lag in coal production in their own countries. They have been free to assert that, regardless of all the compulsory efforts taken—conscription, draft threats, arbitrated and enforced wage rates—increased production has not resulted. These men read the statistics of American coal production. Many have visited American coal mines. They witness mechanized development, strip-pit operations and hand-loading mines and they marvel even at the high rate of production in hand-loading mines. Yet, somehow or other, in the planned economy of their nations, with compulsory arbitration, and all the other bulwarks to force workers to produce in a regimented economy, they have become so baffled in their viewpoints that they simply cannot understand how, through the simple operation of a collective-bargaining wage agreement, free from the policing and direction of production by Government agencies, such continuity of operation and production results can possibly be attained.

All of which is another way of saying that wherever free collective bargaining has prevailed in American industry on a Nation-wide basis, such as in the coal industry, the most fruitful productive efforts have followed.

The leadership of the U. M. W. A. had a difficult time in 1943 and on into 1944 in championing the maintenance of free collective bargaining in the American coal industry, the sacrificing of which would have resulted in a far different coal-production story for 1944. It was a hard road for the U. M. W. A. to maintain the present collective-bargaining status in the face of the Government's determination to deny miners just wage demands and shove them about from agency to agency when the preservation of free collective bargaining in the industry meant the salvation of the American war-production effort.

The Government took over nearly all coal mines on several occasions; took over others from time to time. Yet the belief of mine workers in their union, their solidarity in acceptance of the fundamental principle of free collective bargaining, finally resulted in the negotiation of a national wage agreement on a collective-bargaining basis for the coal industry as a whole. This enabled the coal industry to continue with such freedoms as are basically essential to maintain high productive efficiency.

It is generally admitted that American coal miners have been the most maligned of all American workingmen by politicians, the press, and radio. The following appraisal by the S. F. A. of the problems faced and results obtained, culled from a year-end press release, confirms the outstanding 1944 performance of American coal miners:

"The biggest factor in the fuel problem is the lack of manpower and equipment for increasing production as rapidly as requirements have arisen. The coal mines have lost one out of every five men employed in peacetime. And, the average age of the coal miner is now forty-five, 13 years older than before the war.

"To help counteract these conditions, mine working hours have been increased 37 percent. Thousands of inexperienced, physically inferior, or aged men have been recruited for mine work. Many of these are men who had been retired because of age, including a large number now 70 to 80 or more years old. The advanced age of the average coal miner is an important factor, in view of the arduous, dangerous work involved in mining. But despite their handicaps, the preponderance of the coal miners are digging more coal per man each day than at any time in history, and the remainder are also giving a good account of themselves.

"Wherever manpower and materials permitted, mine capacity has been expanded, particularly in the higher-grade coals for which the need is most acute."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by Archbishop Cushing, of Boston. I am advised by the Printing Office that this will cost $156.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NATIONAL SERVICE LEGISLATION

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, recent military successes in the Pacific, of American and British arms in Europe, and the breath-taking advance of the Red Army, have given rise to a fresh wave of hope that the European phase of the war may be substantially shorter than previously thought. But long or short, we know the war will not be lightly won.

To save American lives, to insure our fighting fronts the war materials they need at the time they need them and in the quantities they need, President Roosevelt in his annual state of the Union message asked for the enactment of national service legislation. He emphasized that such legislation is even more necessary as the approaching climax of the war demands that America strain every human and natural resource to win.

Surely no one can quarrel with the principle that everyone be required to do his full share in the hard work that lies ahead.

Surely no one could live with his conscience if it should later be established that Hitler or the Mikado got a breathing space, a time in which to butcher more tens of thousands, because our own or the armies of any of our allies lacked essential supplies they could have had with a little more effort on our part.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that no group in the country has realized this sobering truth more thoroughly than labor, more keenly than the millions of men and women in our war plants, whose sons and husbands and brothers make up the bulk of our fighting forces, whose skill and long hours have produced the greatest quantity of deadly armaments this world has ever known, whose patriotism is perhaps best of all expressed in the overwhelming determination with which labor, despite a thousand provocations, has adhered to its no-strike pledge.

In the district which I have the honor to represent, Mr. Speaker, and where I have just put in 2 years as a machinist in a shipyard, there has not been a strike or any serious stoppage of work since 1940. The makers of the far-sweeping B–29, the men and women of Boeing's, the builders of our bristling new destroyers launched and commissioned at Todd-Pacific in Seattle, the Bremerton Navy Yard workers, the workers in countless subcontract shops, small boat yards, foundries, and those upon whose skill and back-breaking hours depends the speedy repair of battle-damaged ships—these unsung Americans in the main have stuck to their jobs. They are maligned as slackers and loafers. They are badly housed in hastily thrown up new or crowded old dwellings. They face acute transportation problems. They are attacked as greedy for high wages and as spendthrifts, although after tax deductions and bond payments, their weekly pay checks are scarcely adequate to meet the high prices they pay for food and shelter, and although many, like some Members of Congress, are compelled, at double expense, to maintain their families back in their home towns and themselves in the war center where they work.

Above all, war workers worry that when the war is won and their plant closes down or reconverts, they will be cast aside, stranded without funds, without a job or even the means of becoming retrained for work that might be found. They know, of course, that Congress has guaranteed post-war farm prices for a definite period, post-war profits for business for a definite period, and they applaud the benefits which Congress has enacted for returning veterans.

They also know that they are the only main link in the whole, vital, working and fighting mechanism we have built to win this war who face the future without some assurance from their country that a prolonged reconversion period will not plunge them into hopeless depression and despair.

These and other factors, such as substandard wages in some areas, overconfidence spread at times that the war is just about over, the shocking fact of labor hoarding in some plants, are part of the series of problems which we lump together as our manpower problem.

One important reason for some labor shortage can be laid directly to Government agencies themselves, which generally speaking have not sufficiently insisted on the maximum possible decentralization of war production. The result is painfully manifest just outside my own district, where a shipyard is having its contracts canceled, a labor force is being dispersed, most of it composed of local, part-time subsistence farmers who will gladly work at any reasonable distance from their homes but will not travel hours a day into Seattle shipyards or airplane plants.

Or again, in my district and just outside it are large trailer camps where war workers and their families exist in one cramped room. I have worked with men trying to do a full day's work after sleeping every night for as long as 2 weeks in the back seat of their cars, waiting for a place to live, trying to decide whether they could stick it out or would have to go back home.

No national service legislation, however badly needed for some purposes, will touch these underlying causes of manpower shortages. And, of course, it is not to be expected that a national service act should be the vehicle for guaranteeing post-war jobs to war workers and returning veterans, for solving housing and transportation problems in war congested areas, or for planning cut-backs and switch-overs in war production to make the most of local labor pools.

But that's just the reason why a national service act, by itself, will not accomplish as much as the able and distinguished members of the Military Affairs Committee may hope it will.

Perhaps it is particularly unfortunate that the committee's bill, despite its many good features, reportedly contains a provision which if enacted by Congress would signal the return of the open shop, the sweat shop, the inhuman speed-up and stretch-out systems formerly common in large-scale American industry.

Passage of a law containing a provision of that kind will multiply our manpower problems. It will aid and comfort the few irresponsibles both in capital and in labor who are even now straining every effort to move the great body of labor from its steadfast observance of its no-strike pledge. It will cause millions of Americans to feel that, in the midst of a great war for freedom, a total war requiring the whole effort of everyone, their country is nevertheless willing to turn aside from its great purpose in order to war against free American labor organizations, built under national law and through collective bargaining for the purpose of bettering the individual worker and guaranteeing that our fighting men will have American living standards to which to return.

The proposed bill reportedly does not include, moreover, a provision carrying out the wise request of the President that a guarantee be given against the use of national service to lower wage standards or destroy plant seniority. And, as I say, despite the good features of the committee bill, whether Congress passes it or not, we shall still find it necessary to take other and farther-reaching steps to get at the roots of our labor shortage.

With the diffidence that properly becomes a new Member in this great body, I therefore venture the suggestion that the first step toward the solution of this difficult series of problems is, as proposed by responsible spokesmen of labor and industry, the calling of a manpower conference to be attended by appropriate Government representatives, by labor, by industry, and by agriculture for the purpose of tightening up the workings of existing legislation and directives, of securing greater voluntary cooperation on local and national levels, and for joint agreement on such legislation as may be further required to ensure the maximum war service from everyone available and able to work.

I respectfully suggest, further, that the gentlemen of the Military Affairs Committee, who have served their country so honorably in the enactment of much legislation lying at the very cornerstone of the whole war effort, for the time being keep the proposed bill under advisement in committee and either themselves initiate, or ask Justice Byrnes, or the President himself, to call a Government-labor-industry-agriculture conference on the manpower shortage for the purpose of determining just how much improvement can be made under existing laws, how far voluntary agreements can be extended and enforced, and what legislation is required of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Since labor, industry, and agriculture are all aware of existing inadequacies, out of such a conference can only come a better understanding of what each must do to fight this hard war through, and concrete legislative proposals to strengthen the War Manpower Commission in procurement and allocation of needed labor.

While I feel that the main step at this time is agreement among the principles involved in the use and direction of manpower, and not legislative action, in the form proposed at this time, I would like to take this opportunity to say also that the President's messages to this session have asked for action on many other recommendations and policies as well.

Not only has he presented a brilliant outline of the course and strategy of the war and a solid, clearly understandable American foreign policy based on unitedly winning the war and unitedly building a free and peaceful world, the President has also asked for legislative action that will guarantee business opportunity, jobs at living wages, farm income, education, security, and decent homes for everyone.

Those great civilized, those great human objectives, we should all be proud to have a part in bringing to America and to the world.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include short articles in each case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself also to the manpower problem. No man in this House, I think, will disagree with the statement that the only question which confronts us is how best to do the job. The testimony of the military leaders of this Nation as to what the military requirements are going to be are, so far as I am concerned, to be taken at absolute face value. They know as nearly as men can know; we cannot know about this phase of the problem. Great lessons have been learned by the citizens of this Nation in the past few weeks, and the last 2 or 3 months. One of those lessons is that we only now stand upon the threshold of the most difficult part of this terrible world war. As I see it, our national psychology has got to be, and I am encouraged to believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is, that we only now are beginning what might be termed a great new war effort in the United States. It is as if the war were starting all over again.

We cannot question, we do not question, we will not question the requirements of our military leaders for supplies or for men or for anything else they tell us they need. Nor will there be any question on my part of the disposition of military personnel or military equipment by the military leaders. I may feel deeply on such matters, but I must trust their judgment. Whatever measure I am convinced is necessary to accomplish the purpose of serving the full supply of our military needs, whatever measure I believe can best accomplish that purpose, for that measure I shall vote, and I shall vote for it whoever is against it and whatever the pressure against it, provided only that I am convinced myself that this is the best way to do that job.

As to what the requirements are, that is a matter for military determination, but when it comes to the question of how best to obtain the actual production, then it seems to me that as Members of Congress it is our duty to exercise to the best of our ability our judgment as to how in practical fact the maximum output can be obtained. The gentleman from Washington has spoken of some of the very great human problems involved. And since men and women must do the job those human problems must be taken full account of and recognized as fundamental considerations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, one of the finest Members of this House.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman should keep in mind the fact that we might not have the option of selecting the best plan; in other words, there might not be an alternative open for which we would have an opportunity to vote.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true. If when the final vote comes I only think that the thing will help some, and will do more good in supplying our fighting forces than it will harm, I will vote for it, but I believe the gentleman should agree that at this point there still is a possibility of an option. That is one of the reasons I have asked for this time today.

May I say that in my judgment there will exist a fundamental, basic, and serious injustice in any measure that compels one American citizen to work not for his Government directly but for the private profit of another citizen. I think that goes to the very root of American principles in this Nation. I want to say two things about that.

In the first place, I have an amendment prepared that would provide that if a compulsory draft of labor is enacted, and as it goes into effect, then in whatever industrial plants drafted men work those plants shall at that point be declared Government facilities for as long a time as any man's labor there is enforced by the law. Such plants would be operated as Government facilities with the same personnel, both supervisory and labor, as before, but everyone would be in Government, not private, employment. I could make a long argument for this but will not take the time now.

The second thing I want to say is that even if I believe there are elements of injustice in a certain measure, nonetheless if I am convinced it is the only thing we can do to meet the situation for the men at the front I am ready even to disregard that injustice, because I know the greatest injustice of all is the fact that older generations all down through the years have failed to keep the peace, have seen the world plunged into war, and then have asked younger generations to go fight that war. This war was none of America's making, of course. It was brought on by unbounded ambition of all-powerful military dictatorships in Germany and Japan. Nonetheless the basic injustice of war of which I have spoken remains. Anything I can do that I believe will practically help to mitigate that injustice I will do. But I want to find the best measure, the one that will have widest, most spontaneous support, the one that will really deliver the goods.

And speaking again of the injustices of war, may I say I hope with all my soul that this war will issue in a peace that can last, and that not power politics or national ambition or any weakness on the part of this one Nation, which holds the greatest moral idealism of any nation in the world, will fail to bring that result.

Now what about this legislation we are called upon to consider? Is it the best way? Is it the answer? I am open to conviction. I mean that very sincerely. But I want to say to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs who may be here and to anyone else that up to date I feel that there are at least as weighty arguments against the particular approach which the Committee on Military Affairs presents to us as there are for it. Arguments for the measure have been appealing, but they have lacked the factual backing, which a measure of the very far-reaching consequence of this bill should have had.

On the other hand it can be pointed out that once the people knew what was expected of them they have hardly failed in any substantial instance to meet those goals.

Other speakers today have pointed out that there are substantial lay-offs taking place in certain places. There is one shipyard in southern California currently laying off 5,000 men. I know that is no answer. I know the fact that the aircraft industry in southern California now has some 50,000 less people employed than it had at the peak in January 1944, is no answer. Those people no doubt have gone elsewhere, perhaps to other jobs of a critical nature. But these things are not the workers' fault, certainly. Largely they are the result of official decisions. The proposed bill will not correct that. But I only make these points to illustrate the fact that this is truly a tremendously complex situation with special problems here and special problems there and that one great over-all sweeping bill is not enough.

I think this is a fundamental consideration. I think the root of all this trouble came last summer in a period of time when throughout the length and breadth of this Nation in the press and over the radio and in some of the highest circles of Government itself there was spread abroad the impression that the war, in Europe, at any rate, was on the way to a successful and speedy conclusion. I am glad I never participated in that overoptimism. But what about the little fellow who had moved from one part of the country to another part of the country to work in war industry? What about him when he found that Congress said in effect to him, "No, we do not think any provision should be made for your problems after this is over"? You remember that is approximately what we did say in the so-called reconversion bill. What about him when he heard people whose judgment he ought to have been able to trust say that the war was about to conclude? What did he do? He went back home. What is he going to do now? Well, he is doing it. I have clippings here from various papers with regard to what they call a stampede for war jobs. Yes, there is a response; and I do not know if it is enough but I want the record to show, so far as the average American is concerned, the average worker and farmer and other people in this country are

responding the best they know how; that they have responded and they will continue to respond. I think that if this thing had been started out by having high officials say in the first place, "Yes, we made a mistake. We made a mistake in judgment but we know the American people are going to understand that no one is infallible, least of all when they are up against a tremendous global war such as this; and we are asking you to stand by now to reverse the process, to begin all over with fighting the war on the home front. We are asking you to do that, not because you made a mistake; not because you have been at fault; not because your production record has not been the most miraculous one in all history but we are asking you to do it anyway for your country." Had that been the approach we should have had an even better situation today.

For my part I think the most clean-cut way to do this job of solving the manpower problem would be this: to reduce as much as necessary or even to cut off a lot of nonessential activities in the Nation. I thought Justice Byrnes was right when he said there is not going to be any more horse racing in the country. I thought he was right when he said there were not going to be any more big conventions. I think the response of the Nation to these things was mighty good. And I think you could go further than that. Entirely aside from the moral aspects of the situation I must say I do not see why we need to spend as much manpower as we do in the production of certain kind of beverages. We could spare it, I think. I do not think we need to make as much liquor as we are making. I doubt it is helping the war. I think we might get along without so much beverages for awhile. I think we might get along without a lot of luxury services in hotels. I think we could spare some labor from exclusive night clubs where it takes as many entertainers and cooks and waiters as there are customers to run them. I could go on. Yes; we could cut down to a food, clothing, and shelter basis, if needed; but we have got to do it in such manner that our people understand that this thing is fair all around for everybody, as nearly as we can make it so. We have got to have them feel we are not leaving anyone out; that we really have equality of sacrifice as nearly as possible. And once they understand that and once they feel to the greatest possible extent that they themselves are being relied upon to do this job the response will be that much better. Those of us who stand closer to the people have to be the ones to take into account that human response that comes from the heart of human beings which makes all the difference between 100 percent effective production and 80 percent effective production or 50 percent. I think it is true, as the gentleman from Illinois said, I think there has been an inadequate utilization of labor. Indeed, a man very close to this problem and who ought to know told me only last summer in California when I asked him, "Do you really believe that some of these big plants need the extra manpower they say they do?" He said, "Well, I cannot say this out loud but I will tell you this, in my judgment, if we did not have any cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts we would not have any shortage of manpower today." And meanwhile the people who worked in those plants were complaining to me not that they had too much work to do but that they had too little and did not feel they were able to produce as much as they wanted to.

Now, do I have a concrete suggestion to make? Yes; I do have.

I have a bill here, a bill that I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert at the conclusion of my remarks, if I may be permitted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am going to tell you very briefly what this bill would do. This bill would give statutory power with mandatory provision for enforcement to the precise program that is now in effect for the control of manpower. Briefly, it would give to the War Manpower Commission the authority to say as to any certain area of the country or if necessary as to the country as a whole that no one shall be hired except through referral from the War Manpower Commission, that is through the United States Employment Service offices. Second, it would say that ceilings could be made mandatory on the number of people who could be employed in any establishment or industry. Under it the Director could say that no more than so many people should be engaged in such and such a nonessential establishment or industry. Third, it would provide that people released from employment in that respect were to be referred to some essential war job, though not necessarily one particular war job. That I think would accomplish the purpose, especially since it would leave freedom both on the part of the employer and on the part of the worker as to precisely where he is going to be employed or precisely whom he is going to hire so long as the job was essential to the war. I wonder if we could not accomplish the job that way? I wonder whether it might not be wiser to take the machinery we already have and improve it, take the committees that are already at work throughout the country, give them the tools to work with and say to the labor-management committee that has I understand been unanimous in every single decision it has made, a committee made up of representatives of industry, labor, agriculture and all the other elements of American life, say to that committee: "Go ahead; we want you to carry out this job, a tougher job than you have ever had before." I wonder what more we need than that? I do not know; but I do know this, I think the effect upon the country of this kind of proposal would avoid certain dangers in the other type of legislation.

As I said in the beginning of my speech I am going to do in the end what I think is the best thing I can do to help. Our first duty is to that generation that is fighting this war, and I want to see that we really do the best we can by them, Mr. Speaker, and not some over-simplified second best that violates long-standing principles.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. In view of the splendid results that have been obtained by the management-labor committees working actively throughout the country in voluntary cooperation and enforcement of voluntary plans adopted by the War Manpower Commission, does the gentleman feel that the situation now is such that that plan which has been accepted pretty generally on a voluntary basis should receive legislative sanction through the type of legislation the gentleman proposes?

And I should like to have the gentleman discuss what he conceives to be the necessity for mandatory legislation in view of the record that has been made.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I do not want compulsion any more than he does and that is one main reason I make my proposal. For unlike the May bill my proposal contains a minimum of compulsion, and what it does contain is merely an implementing of the very system that has been voluntarily developed by the management-labor committees. It is their system I am proposing. I believe the system that is presently in effect, together with the earnest efforts of labor and management and all other factors, have made a remarkable record; but I believe that a good many people who have been connected with that work would say they thought it was desirable that they should operate not alone by Executive order but under statutory authority from the Congress. I believe I am correct in saying that there have been a few instances where it was important that they be able to have real power to enforce employment ceilings. Furthermore we are told that today and in the months ahead the need will be greater and the demands more urgent. And unfortunately there are still situations where people can make more profit in nonessential industry than in war production. I believe there may be in the crisis that we face reasons for us to implement the existing system with statutory standing by an act of Congress with the power to enforce if necessary, and only where necessary, the very system that has been in effect.

I submit the following bill for the consideration of the House. I ask the Members to read it and give me their reactions. I ask them to observe its safeguards, its carefully worked out provisions, as well as the effective measures for shifting, in as fair and just a way as such a thing can be done, workers from nonessential into critically needed jobs.

A bill to provide for the regulation of civilian employment to aid in the prosecution of the war

Be it enacted, etc., (a) The Congress hereby declares as among the purposes of this act (1) to permit the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, and of the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers, (2) to reduce wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration, (3) to channel available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort, (4) to make available

for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort, and (5) to promote the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

(b) The Congress further declares that the effective mobilization and allocation of our available manpower necessitates cooperative action by all Federal departments and agencies responsible for production, procurement, and manpower in determining the relative urgency to the war effort of various products and services and in establishing and maintaining a proper balance between the war production in any given area and the manpower available to that area.

(c) The Congress further declares that there is no intention by this act to modify existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay, or collective bargaining or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any labor controversies or questions.

(d) The Congress hereby directs that to the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and Government agencies.

SEC. 2. The hiring, rehiring, and solicitation for the purpose of hiring or rehiring, of individuals by employers, and the acceptance of employment by workers, shall be conducted in accordance with the following subsections of this section:

(a) An individual who at any time during the preceding 60-day period (or such longer or different periods as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall prescribe) was engaged in an essential or locally needed activity may be hired only if, (1) such individual is hired for work in an essential or locally needed activity or for work to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission, and (2) such individual presents a statement of availability from his last employment in an essential or locally needed activity or is referred by the War Manpower Commission or is hired with its consent as provided herein.

(b) An individual shall receive a statement of availability from employment in an essential or locally needed activity if, (1) he has been discharged or his employment has been otherwise terminated by his employer, or (2) he has been laid off for an indefinite period or for a period of 7 or more days, or (3) continuance of his employment would involve undue personal hardship, or (4) such employment is at a wage or salary or under working conditions below standards established by State or Federal law or regulation, or (5) such employment is at a wage or salary established or approved by the National War Labor Board (or other agency authorized to adjust wages or approve adjustments thereof) as warranting adjustment or consideration for adjustment, and the employer has failed to adjust the wage in accordance with such level or to apply to the appropriate agency for such adjustment or approval thereof, or (6) such employment is with an employer who the War Manpower Commission finds, after notice and opportunity to appeal, has not complied with this act or with any regulation or order thereunder, and who is continuing his noncompliance after such finding. Statements of availability shall be issued promptly to individuals entitled thereto on such forms and in accordance with such procedures as the chairman may by regulation prescribe.

(c) If an individual is employed at less than full time or at a job which does not utilize his highest recognized skill for which there is a need in the war effort, the War Manpower Commission shall upon proper application refer him to other available employment in which it finds that the individual will be more fully utilized in the war effort.

(d) To the extent necessary to provide manpower in the numbers and kinds needed for war production and essential civilian services in situations of manpower shortages, the Chairman may by regulation (1) provide that any or all categories of individuals in any or all areas, activities, or occupations may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission or in accordance with arrangements approved by the War Manpower Commission, (2) establish fair and reasonable employment ceilings limiting the number of workers or of specified types of workers which may be employed in any establishment or place of employment during specified periods, and (3) require the release by an employer of any or all categories of individuals in his employ whose services are urgently needed elsewhere in production or service of more importance to the war effort.

(e) The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the referral of individuals pursuant to this act and governing the making of arrangements with public or private agencies, organizations, or persons for the hiring of individuals pursuant to subsection (d) (1) of this section: *Provided*, That such regulations shall include the following referral standards:

(1) To the greatest degree consistent with war needs, workers who may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission shall be given freedom of choice as to the jobs they wish to accept, and employers shall be given freedom of choice as to the workers they wish to employ.

(2) Good cause for refusing a referral to a job without prejudice to further job offers shall include (i) any case in which the worker, if he accepted the job, would be entitled to a statement of availability or be eligible for a referral on grounds of underutilization of skill or less than full-time work; (ii) any case in which wages or working conditions in the offered employment are not reasonably comparable to those prevailing for similar employment in similar establishments in the community; and (iii) any case in which his acceptance of the job offered would, over an objection presented in good faith by the worker, require him to join or resign from, or refrain from joining a labor organization.

(3) The decision to refer an individual shall be based on qualifications essential for performance of or suitability for the job, and shall be without discrimination as to race, color, creed, sex, national origin, or except as required by law, citizenship.

(f) (1) No employer shall release a worker on grounds that this act or any regulation or order thereunder so requires until after the War Manpower Commission has advised the employer that the worker shall be released. The War Manpower Commission shall so advise the employer only after the worker has been interviewed by the War Manpower Commission or afforded reasonable opportunity therefor, and a determination has been made either (a) that suitable work is available to the worker, the worker does not have good cause for refusing referral to such work, and an employer to which the worker has been referred by the United States Employment Service has agreed to hire the worker, or (b) that the worker has been afforded a reasonable opportunity for an interview and has failed to report for the same, or (c) that the worker has refused without good cause to apply for or to accept suitable work to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission.

(2) In the case of any individual whose employer has been required to release him from a position (other than a temporary position) in his employ under the provisions of this act or any regulation or order thereunder and who thereafter (a) has accepted employment or employments to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission and has continued therein as directed by the War Manpower Commission, (b) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (c) makes application for reemployment within 10 days after notice by the War Manpower Commission that he is no longer required in war work, such person shall be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay under conditions and with rights and privileges similar but subordinate to those prescribed by section 8 (c), (d), and (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

(g) The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the establishment of employment ceilings pursuant to subsection (d) (2) of this section. Such ceilings shall be based upon a consideration of (1) the extent to which the employer is utilizing his available work force, (2) the relative importance to the war effort of the product or service in which the employer is engaged, and (3) the extent and nature of manpower shortages impeding the successful prosecution of the war.

(h) No employer shall advertise or otherwise solicit for the purpose of hiring any individual if the hiring of such individual would be subject to restrictions under this act except in a manner consistent with such restrictions and with such regulations as the Chairman may prescribe in order to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. The Chairman shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal, to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him by the War Manpower Commission under this act or any regulation or order thereunder, is unfair or unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with such act, regulation, or order. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in the regulation, the determination made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable such regulation shall provide for tribunals so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representative of management and labor interests in the locality. Such regulation shall contain reasonable provisions for the representation of any individual or other person by the labor or trade organization of which he is a member or any other representative freely chosen by him.

SEC. 5. No provision of this act shall be applicable to (1) the employment of an individual in agriculture; (2) any Territory or possession of the United States, except Alaska and Hawaii; (3) employment by a foreign, State, county, or municipal government or their political subdivisions or their agencies or instrumentalities, or to the hiring of any of their employees unless such foreign, State, county, or municipal government or political subdivision or agency or instrumentality has indicated its ability and willingness to conform with this act; (4) employment in the legislative or judicial branches of the Federal Government; or (5) persons while in active service in the armed forces of the United States.

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created a War Manpower Commission which shall be under the direction of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission (herein referred to as the "Chairman"). The Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $15,000 per annum. All the provisions of this act and of any regulation, rule, order, or other requirement prescribed thereunder shall be administered by the Chairman. The Chairman may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, and shall fix the

compensation of such employees in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Chairman in any case in any court.

(b) The "War Manpower Commission" shall be composed of one representative of each of the following departments and agencies, to be designated by the respective departments and agencies, subject to the approval of the Chairman: The Department of War, the Department of the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the War Production Board, the United States Civil Service Commission, the National Housing Agency, the Selective Service System, and such other executive departments and agencies as the President shall determine. The Chairman shall consult with the members of the War Manpower Commission in carrying out his responsibilities under this act.

(c) The Chairman shall appoint a National Management-Labor Policy Committee to be selected from the fields of labor, agriculture, and industrial management, and shall consult with the members thereof in carrying out his responsibilities. The Chairman shall also provide for the appointment of regional and State or area management-labor committees whose members shall be similarly selected and who shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the course of the administration of this act. Members of any such committee may be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923 as amended. These committees shall be utilized by the Chairman in connection with hearings and appeals provided under section 3 of this act.

SEC. 7. The chairman, in carrying out the provisions of this act, is authorized:

(a) To issue, amend, rescind such rules, regulations, orders, or other requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act. Any rules, regulation, order, or other requirement under this act may contain such classifications and differentiations with respect to individuals, employers, occupations, establishments, activities and localities, and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as, in the judgment of the Chairman, are necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act;

(b) To delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority vested in him under this act, to such officials, employees, or other persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose;

(c) To accept voluntary services in connection with the administration of this act, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such property, equipment, and supplies as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

(d) To utilize the services of any and all departments, agencies, officers, and agents of the United States, and to accept the services of State and local agencies and their officers and employees in carrying out any provision of this act and notwithstanding any other provision of law, to reimburse such State and local agencies and their officers and employees for services rendered for such purposes.

SEC. 8. (a) The provisions of section 2 (a), 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable under this act, except that the words "subsection (a)," wherever they occur in those provisions, shall be replaced for the purposes of this act by the phrase "this act."

(b) The President shall prescribe the extent to which any wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in any employment commenced or continued in violation of this act, or any regulation or order of the Chairman thereunder, shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other Government agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any individual to accept any benefit or other payment under any State or Federal unemployment compensation or unemployment insurance law, with respect to any period of total or partial unemployment during which or a part of which he fails or refuses to return to, continue in, or accept employment to which he has been referred or otherwise directed by the War Manpower Commission.

(d) Precedence shall be given by the courts to the trial of cases arising under this act.

SEC. 9. As used in this act—

(a) Agriculture means those farm activities carried on by farm owners or tenants on farms in connection with the cultivation of the soil, the harvesting of crops, or the raising, feeding, or management of livestock, bees, and poultry, and shall not include any packing, canning, processing, transportation or marketing of articles produced on farms unless performed or carried on as an incident to ordinary farming operations as distinguished from manufacturing or commercial operations.

(b) "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(c) "Essential activity" means any activity, so designated by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, after finding that it is—

(1) An essential war activity, including the production, repair, transportation, or maintenance of equipment, supplies, facilities, or materials required in the prosecution of the war by the United States;

(2) An activity required for the maintenance or development of essential war activities; or

(3) An activity essential to the maintenance or development of the public safety, health, welfare, or interest.

(d) "Locally needed activity" means any activity other than an essential activity, so designated by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, after finding that it contributes to the prosecution of the war in a critical labor shortage area, and meets standards prescribed by the Chairman to insure the full utilization of manpower.

(e) Employment, work, hire, rehire, employ, employer, or words of similar import shall include any contract, arrangement, undertaking, or relationship whereby or under which an individual undertakes to perform a service or services for another, irrespective of the resulting legal relationship between the parties.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act and all rules, regulations, orders, and other requirements thereunder shall remain in force during the continuance of the war or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.

SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. PIÑERO] is recognized for 2 minutes.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, I feel greatly satisfied and relieved on the approval of House Resolution 99 introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] in agreement with the gentleman from California [Mr. WELSH], chairman and minority ranking member, respectively, of the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Lately disturbing newspaper stories have gone down to Puerto Rico which have received wide and great publicity on the radio and in the local press. This news divulged the contents of an alleged report which, it was said, was about to be filed by the committee of this House in charge of the investigation, in a sort of surprise move.

The approval of the resolution above referred to, extending the time to 90 days in which to prepare and give consideration to the true and official report, should dispel any doubts or disappointments planted in the minds of the people of Puerto Rico by this false alarm. Possibly the sources that inspired the news correspondents and on which they based their information were not very reliable.

May I say that in the minds and judgment of the great majority of the people of Puerto Rico, whom I humbly represent here in Congress, only justice, human justice, can come forth in any document or official report of the committee of which I am also a member. May I add that I am certain that all the members of the committee, in arriving at conclusions which bear on the lives of 2,000,000 inhabitants who live on that island, will totally disregard personal likes or dislikes and petty notions in order to qualify as judges.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include editorials and resolutions on three separate subjects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE MANPOWER QUESTION

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, in considering the manpower question, it might be interesting to note that in the city of Detroit and the areas surrounding Detroit, there were some 60,000 unemployed women and many thousands of unemployed men. When the news went out that the Mead committee that is doing such a wonderful job investigating manpower was about to enter the Detroit area for an investigation, I have it from reliable information that the Army officials rushed with orders to go into plants in Detroit and to flood that area with contracts in order to try to take up the excess labor and at the same time create a condition where it might look as though there was a no surplusage of manpower. That is the kind of stuff we have facing us. We do not need any mandatory manpower legislation such as the May bill or any labor draft of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include as part of my remarks a letter signed by Law-

rence P. Fairburn, president, 975, U. A. W.-C. I. O., addressed to a Mr. Kenneth Cole, of Washington, as follows:

U. A. W.-C. I. O. LOCAL 975,
Lima, Ohio, January 17, 1945.

Mr. KENNETH COLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: I am writing this so that you might be aware of the latest developments at the Ohio Steel Foundry Co., one of the plants listed by the Army as being 50 percent behind schedule due to shortage of manpower.

As I did not arrive in Lima until nearly noon Monday, I went directly to my home and got some rest, being pretty tired from a 17 hour ride in a day coach; however, when I reported for work Tuesday morning, I was approached by the union committeeman in the cleaning room with the following: It seems that women employed as welders in this department have not been working 48 hours per week, and inasmuch as Lima has been classed as a critical area, they filed a grievance asking that they be given 48 hours per week work.

The committeeman approached the general foreman with this grievance and was told the company had more welders than they needed and if any of these women wanted their release the company would release them on request.

I also want to point out to you that the welders on the first and second shifts have about 3 hours' work per day on the average; the company also has 19 welders on the third shift in the cleaning room, but no chippers, so it would naturally follow the 19 welders have no welding to do.

In investigating a grievance in the north plant unit, this same committeeman ran into the following circumstances: Five chippers were working on one conveyor and their earnings were considerably lower than the earnings of the other chippers in the department where two or three men were on a conveyor. The committeeman went to the head timekeeper's office in regard to this matter and was informed that it wasn't a question of adequate prices on jobs, it was due to "We have so damn many chippers, we have to double them up in order to have space for them to work. We have so many men now that it is a problem to know where to place them."

While in the office discussing this matter, a chipper with seniority dating back to 1937, came in to get a letter to his draft board on the renewal of his deferment. His request was denied by the department superintendent.

Captain Pearson who is connected with Ordnance, called today to inform me that the Ohio Steel Foundry Co. had applied for and would receive another large allotment of furloughed soldiers, which to me proves that they plan to trade civilian manpower for soldiers in every instance possible.

I also would like you to have the following figures which are the company's own:

The company estimates that it requires 94 man-hours per ton of steel.

Their schedule for the month is 3,700 tons; the following figures are my own:

3,700 tons x 94 man-hours=347,800 man-hours of work.

An employee working 8 hours per day, 26 days per month, will total 208 hours per month: 347,800÷208=1,672 employees.

The company is now employing approximately 3,100 people and are requesting 800 additional employees; I will have to say that this certainly does not make sense to me, or the local union.

Hoping that you will steer this information into the proper channels, allow me to remain,

Sincerely and fraternally yours,
LAWRENCE P. FAIRBURN,
President, 975, U. A. W.-C. I. O.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, January 25, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

132. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations of the War Department (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

133. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1946 in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

134. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Federal Trade Commission (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

135. A letter from the Chairman of the National Archives, transmitting the annual report of The National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Library.

136. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of Labor, transmitting reports of committees and resolutions adopted by the Eleventh National Conference on Labor Legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1752. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1733. A bill to amend section 204, article 11, of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1734. A bill to provide for cancelation of citizenship in the case of certain naturalized citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1735. A bill to amend section 302 (3), title 111, of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1736. A bill to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1737. A bill to amend section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved August 29, 1935, relative to death benefits, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1738. A bill to provide that veterans be appointed in the selection of personnel for national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1739. A bill to provide that retired Regular Army officers called to active duty shall be entitled to retirement pay in accordance with the highest temporary grade attained by them; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1740. A bill to promote further the friendly relations of the peoples of the pan-American republics by providing for pan-American student-teacher scholarships; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1741. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to find relationship of beneficiary to the insured without requiring submission of birth certificate; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1742. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture organic act of 1944 to facilitate the use of certain funds therein provided for the Rural Electrification Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1743. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 1744. A bill to authorize the naturalization of native-born Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States and Filipinos who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War No. 1; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1745. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1746. A bill to permit all people from India residing in the United States to be naturalized; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1747. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1748. A bill to establish a National University of Government, provide a board of supervisors therefor, and make an appropriation for its establishment and maintenance; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 1749. A bill to amend Public Law 518, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1750. A bill to authorize the adoption of a project for the improvement of Hollywood Harbor (Port Everglades), Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1751. A bill to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Merchant Marine Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American republics, other than the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1752. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect

to the form of oath or affirmation to be taken by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that members of the clergy of the religious faiths believing in Almighty God should be appointed as members of the delegation representing the United States of America at any peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1753. A bill for the relief of Desire J. Bouillion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1754. A bill for the relief of Edwin Doyle Parrish; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKENZIE:

H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reita Tabor Hammack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 1756. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Demetrio Caquias; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of S. I. Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 1758. A bill for the relief of Harry Tansey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 1759. A bill for the relief of Mildred Neiffer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

35. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Richard P. Newby, Oskaloosa, Iowa, and sundry other citizens of Iowa and other States in opposition to compulsory peacetime conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

36. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 132 residents of Port Huron, Mich., urging an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial radio programs by educational institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who revealest Thyself in the true, the honest, the pure, and the lovely, make even our wayward minds Thy audience chamber and our fickle hearts Thy dwelling place. In this quiet moment of prayer which stands as a hallowed altar in the midst of the demanding day, we pause to ask Thy guidance as we tread unknown and tangled ways. We seek that sense of the invisible and the eternal that alone can bring peace and restoration to jaded bodies and spirits with their spent strength.

In this great day of Thy visitation and of our opportunity, grant us such a vision of our needy world with all its yawning divisions and its poisoning suspicions, and yet with its dawning sense of human brotherhood, that the decisions that are here made may never have to be reversed by those who come after us. So at last may we be counted by grateful generations who shall inherit a kindlier earth among the architects of the final parliament of peace and plenty in which every kindred and tongue shall find its rightful place. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 22, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE MOYNE TRIAL—LETTER FROM THE EGYPTIAN MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Egyptian Minister to the United States in reply to the statement I made a few days ago in the Senate in connection with the trial in Cairo of the two young Palestinians.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROYAL LEGATION OF EGYPT,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1945.

The Honorable Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have the honor to inform you that I have just read your speech inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, together with the story of the New York Times printed at your request and entitled "Moyne Trial."

While in no way desirous of discussing the nature of your speech based on this story, I respectfully wish to emphasize that the judiciary in Egypt, on whose benches I had the great honor to serve at one time, is and has always been independent and that no influence whatsoever can affect its decisions. Moreover, it is hardly conceivable that the British, whom, I have no doubt, are as jealous as your people and mine regarding the integrity of the courts and the prestige due to the judiciary, would attempt to bring pressure that could influence the judges.

Bearing in mind these principles practiced by civilized countries, I have no doubt the defendants had a fair and impartial trial. Permit me to add that if the presiding judge confined the debates to the facts or if, as it is claimed, the censor did not permit the reporting of certain utterances not pertaining to these facts, this procedure cannot affect, in any way, the course of justice and could have only been dictated in the interest of the defendants.

I can only hope that this letter will be accorded space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to remove any doubt in the integrity of the Egyptian Judiciary.

Accept, sir, the assurances of my high consideration.

Sincerely yours,

HASSAN,
Egyptian Minister.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth annual report of that Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

POST-WAR COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—MEMORIAL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred a memorial signed by 80 citizens of Mound Valley and Edna, Kans., in opposition to the May bill.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned voters of Kansas, being of the opinion that the May bill pertaining to compulsory military training after the war for all youths reaching the age of 17 years, constitutes a national policy of the American Nation, and not an emergency measure, and is so radical a departure from all our historic precedents that we can afford to proceed with caution and certainly without haste, therefore we most heartily request that you use your influence to the utmost to persuade Congress to postpone until the war is over any action on the May bill.

LEGISLATIVE FARM PROGRAM ADOPTED BY KANSAS FARM BUREAU

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received the legislative farm program adopted by the Kansas Farm Bureau at their recent annual meeting in Topeka, Kans., and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the program was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American citizen of today has a definite responsibility to future generations, as well as a sacred obligation to those who have died on the battlefield, to use every available means to prevent future wars.

Many other momentous problems face the post-war world, including the preservation of democracy, the maintenance of full production, and the stabilization of prices at such levels as to treat all segments of our economy equitably.

Farmers are to be commended for their success in meeting production demands, thus enabling this war to go forward with ample food and fiber to a victorious conclusion.

Our boys and girls are fighting this war to win a lasting peace and to maintain our democratic way of life, making it possible for our citizens to choose their own governmental policies. With this in mind, we offer you this working program for the ensuing year

so that you may exercise your democratic rights in your choice of the same.

W. L. OLSON,
Chairman, Morris County.
MRS. HARVEY BROSS,
Dickinson County.
MRS. RALPH L. COLEMAN,
Douglas County.
DON CHARLES,
Republic County.
G. E. WILSON,
Hamilton County.

NATIONAL FARM PROGRAMS

We reiterate our emphatic approval and continued support of the broad principles of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provides that the farm programs be administered by farmers. This has proved both practical and successful. Congress stipulated this when the appropriations were made for the 1944 program. We commend Congress for this action and recommend that farmer administration be further promoted to assure the practical application of the program.

Soil-conservation practices: We believe that soil-conservation practices should be extended to as many farms as possible, not only to retain soil and soil fertility, but also to aid in flood control.

Commodity loans and ever normal granary: We commend the ever-normal granary and the commodity loan programs which have functioned effectively and done much toward stabilizing farm prices. We further believe that any system of crop loans should be coordinated with a production control program.

Crop insurance: We recognize the urgent need of a sound crop-insurance program and believe providing crop insurance to farmers is a proper and legitimate activity of the Federal Government. Premium rates should vary as to the difference of risks in different areas, so that each farmer would bear his just share, eventually making the crop insurance program self-supporting.

PARITY

The parity concept of prices, one of the basic goals of agriculture, calls for prices for agricultural products bearing the same relationship to prices paid by farmers as existed during the base period of 1910 to 1914. We believe the established parity formula should be used as the basis of agricultural legislation until a special study has been made to determine if improvement can be made in order to meet changing conditions.

LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

We thoroughly realize that Kansas is inherently a livestock State and owes much of its progress to those actively engaged in that industry. We firmly believe that every effort should be made to improve the production and marketing of livestock, poultry, and their products.

PRICE GUARANTIES AFTER THE WAR

We commend the Congress of the United States for having passed laws directing the Government to support the prices of certain agricultural products at 90 percent of parity for 2 years, beginning with the first of January after the cessation of hostilities.

COMMITTEE OF KANSAS FARM ORGANIZATIONS

We again recommend participation in the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations, so that organized agriculture may have a more effective voice in framing and enacting legislation in the interests of the industry.

FARM CREDIT

A cooperative system of farm credit is essential to the wellbeing of agriculture. The American farmer needs a system of dependable credit which will be at his service in times of adversity as well as in times of prosperity. We endorse the Farm Credit Administration, but we believe that the cooperative features of the system should be strengthened by giving more responsibility and authority in the local Cooperative Credit Association.

COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISES

Cooperative marketing, purchasing, and service associations have made such marked growth in the past decade that their success has brought about a bitter fight against them from those whose past exploitations of the farmers through monopolistic control of goods and services have become notorious. Every Farm Bureau member has a stake in the success of cooperatives as a means of offsetting this influence and bringing about a more equitable distribution of income. We, therefore, renew our faith in the cooperative principle and pledge our more active support to legitimate cooperative enterprise of every description.

KANSAS COOPERATIVE COUNCIL

We will endeavor to render more aid by our participation in the Kansas Cooperative Council and to assist in the preservation and further expansion of cooperatives.

KANSAS COUNCIL FOR CHILDREN

We recommend continued collaboration with the Kansas Council for Children in their task of providing better health, schools and social conditions for our children.

RURAL SCHOOLS

Farm people have no greater responsibility than their obligation to protect and promote the rural schools of Kansas. We believe economic parity depends on educational parity. We urge a careful study of the recommendations of the Kansas Legislative Council concerning the improvement of our rural schools.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROADS

We urge special emphasis be given to farm-to-market roads in the allocation of Federal and State funds available in the post-war road construction program.

MILITARY TRAINING

We believe in a military-training program that will not interrupt the normal program of education of our youth yet provide a means whereby we would have sufficiently trained personnel for the armed forces.

POLAND—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF POLISH UNION FOR NEBRASKA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have a communication from the State and district president of the Polish Union of the United States, Omaha, Nebr., which is self-explanatory, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY NO. 7 OF THE POLISH
UNION OF AMERICA,
Omaha, Nebr., January 13, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: District No. 7, of the Polish Union of the United States, for the State of Nebraska, for its membership of Americans of Polish descent respectfully submits this letter for your careful attention.

We believe in the self-determination of all nations, large and small, and in their territorial integrity; that they should not be transferred from one country to another as if they were chattels; that just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed.

These principles and others enunciated in the Atlantic Charter should not now be abandoned for the sake of appeasing any nation playing power politics.

Poland, the first to oppose by force the aggressors seeking world dominion, should not now be sacrificed to one of them that precipitated this great holocaust.

Justice, fair play, honor, and a regard for the opinion of mankind demand fair treatment of Poland as our ally.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANCIS C. KAWA,
State and District President,
Polish Union of United States.
JACOB MRUZ, *Secretary.*

DEFERMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter received from J. J. R. Claassen, of Beatrice, Nebr., supplementing my remarks on the floor of the Senate relative to the drafting of farm boys. The letter is self-explanatory. I should also like to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Herman Seeba, of Cook, Nebr., having to do with the same subject.

There being no objection, the letters are ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TYPICAL FARM SALE HEADING

PUBLIC SALE

As my help has all gone to the Army, I am forced to sell my personal property, at the farm 2 miles west of Belvidere; 5 miles north of Hebron, on Monday, January 22. Sale starts at 10:30 central war time.

BEATRICE, NEBR., *January 20, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: If the drafting of farm boys is continued, and increased as authorities in Washington now say must be done, production of foodstuff will be reduced more than they realize. Our local paper lists farm sales for nearly every day of the month and the reason is: Help unavailable.

We have 145 farm units (as of January 1, 1945). Have been doing the work the best we can with our 3 boys. Last week one of our boys received a I–A classification and after an appeal the draft board gave him a II–C for 30 days which gives us no chance for planning our spring work. Will we be forced to dispose of our 15 milk cows and 140 brood sows to farrow this spring, or what would you advise us to do?

Respectfully yours,

J. J. R. CLAASSEN.

COOK, NEBR., *January 21, 1945.*

SENATOR WHERRY.

DEAR SENATOR: Am writing you in regard to our Johnson County draft board. They have the idea that all our boys 18–26 years that are fit must be inducted in the Army regardless of how essential they are. They have at the present time 30 of our boys, mostly from the farm, in class I–A, and in a short time they will have them in the Army.

Several of us have tried to convince them that (according to the Tydings amendment) some of these boys at least should carry on with the farm work. I left the farm in 1936 on account of a bone infection in my thigh and up to this time I still suffer from the ailment. I have an only son who has taken over the farming since graduating in 1940 and he has done a good job of it.

I have read in the papers how you feel about this kind of a situation and am hoping that perhaps you might be able to do something for us. If there is anything you can do in this case please act at once. It will be highly appreciated.

Yours truly,

HERMAN SEEBA.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram sent to me by

Glenn J. Talbott, president of the North Dakota Farmers' Union and member of the State Selective Board of Appeals, Group No. 1, which deals with the subject of the drafting of farm boys and the relationship of the Tydings amendment to the general drafting program.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *January 22, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

Reurtel. Tydings' amendment is ambiguous in that it leaves determination of essentiality of farm and/or registrant to judgment of local board. Therefore this judgment becomes vital in interpretation of Tydings' amendment. It is my belief that many if not most local boards upon receipt of Hershey's recent directives have reclassified for military service substantial numbers of farmers and key farm workers who are so essential that their induction into the armed services will result in decreased production of some and abandonment of other farms. Shortage of year around manpower on our farms has already resulted in substantial reduction in number of milk cows with resultant loss of dairy products vitally needed in war effort. Summarizing—very few men can be taken from North Dakota farms without adverse effect upon our production goals.

GLENN J. TALBOTT,
President, North Dakota Farmers Union, and Member, State Selective Service Board of Appeals, Group No. 1.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 22d instant,

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, reported it on January 24, 1945, with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 20) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir; without amendment (Rept. No. 21).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 213. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 25);

S. 216. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 26);

S. 217. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 27);

S. 218. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California; with an amendment (Rept. No. 29);

S. 221. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; without amendment (Rept. No. 28); and

H. R. 626. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 23).

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE—RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 22) thereon.

In connection with the reporting of the bill I will say that I have conferred with the majority leader and the minority leader and have asked if they have any objection to my moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill on the next legislative day. I do not know whether that will be tomorrow or Monday. I now give notice that I shall move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the bill—and I think that is agreeable to both the majority leader and the minority leader—on the next legislative day, whenever that may be.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator makes no request now, but simply gives notice that at the next session of the Senate he will move the consideration of the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS (REPT. NO. 24)

Mr. ELLENDER. From the Committee to Investigate the Administration and Operation of the Civil Service Laws, I submit a report. I ask that a copy of the report be referred to the Committee on Civil Service of the Senate, and that at the conclusion of my remarks the conclusions and recommendation of the committee be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will be received and printed, and without objection, a copy thereof will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service; and the conclusions and recommendation of the committee will be printed in the RECORD.

The conclusions and recommendation are as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

A survey of the present situation with regard to civil service administration reveals that much remains to be done to correct existing evils. Some of the corrective measures provided by Executive orders have been modified or nullified by succeeding Executive orders designed to meet war needs; others have been suspended for the duration of the emergency; while others were never effectively put in operation.

The only corrective measures instituted in the past 6 years that have remained in full effect during the war years have been those prescribed through legislation. These include the requirement that incumbents of positions covered into the civil service pass a noncompetitive examination before being admitted into the classified service; the provision for within-grade promotions, and the establishment of efficiency rating appeal boards.

During these years, civil-service rules and regulations have been relaxed to permit recruitment of employees by agencies, admission to service by noncompetitive examinations, waiving of time limits on reinstatements, transfers during probation, transfers to classified positions by persons admitted to the service without competitive examination, and reinstatement of probationers through noncompetitive examinations. Competitive promotion examinations which were never uniformly established have been suspended for the duration. The Commission is authorized to refuse examinations to civil service employees, unless the employing agency agrees that better service can be provided in the position for which examination is being held. This operates to close to employees already in the service opportunities that are open to new recruits. While the appointments made to the service under war service regulations are limited to the end of the war or 6 months thereafter, many of the war service appointees have advanced to much higher positions than have permanent employees of equal qualification and greater experience.

Personal patronage is still prevalent throughout the civil service. During the war years appointments to high positions, unmerited promotions, transfers to higher grades, and excellent efficiency ratings have been increasingly awarded to personal followers. The Civil Service Commission has often been just a means for examining and certifying the friends referred by the agency head to the Commission for examination. Many highly qualified people who have taken examinations have been passed over to find later that their papers had not been graded by the Commission.

The personnel directors and the large personnel divisions within departments have not exerted the beneficial influence originally expected of them. Many of the responsibilities assigned to these divisions are in actuality carried out by the personnel clerks in individual bureaus. The personnel division acts as a form of clearing house through which personnel actions pass for review. Personnel policies remain in the hands of the agency head. The personnel director and his staff carry out these policies. The unprecedented expansion of personnel departments in agencies, without taking on responsibilities and duties in keeping with this expansion, might be questioned.

Although the efficiency-rating appeal boards have constituted a vast improvement in personnel practice, much remains to be done before the system becomes truly effective. The boards are still frequently dominated by the agency head. The employee who appeals his rating often has slight chance of winning and, even when he does, he and the witnesses who testify for him are likely to be subjected to further discrimination within the agency.

The civil-service regulations for reduction in force have placed so much weight upon efficiency ratings, as compared with seniority in service, that it is possible for the employee of 5 years' service to displace the employee of 20 years' service. Complaints from employees in the past year have indicated that agency heads are already adjusting efficiency ratings to provide for future reductions. Employees, who have been rated excellent for many years, during the past year were reduced to good and thus made eligible for separation under these regulations.

RECOMMENDATION

This special committee recognizes the need for the relaxation of peacetime regulations

and the suspension of activities not essential to the promotion of the war effort. However, since the peak of civilian employment in Government has been reached, it would appear desirable that immediate consideration be given to the drafting of legislation designed to return the civil service to a peacetime basis and to merit-system principles. The corrective measures initiated by Executive orders should be considered with a view to perpetuating the desirable features of these orders through permanent legislation. Consideration should be given to the development of other legislation designed to strengthen and protect the merit system. In line with these objectives, consideration should be given to:

I. The effectiveness with which corrective legislation is being administered.

a. Personnel administration.

b. Efficiency rating systems and efficiency rating appeal boards.

c. Grievance appeal systems.

II. Regulations issued by Civil Service Commmission under Executive Orders 9063 and 9067 relative to—

a. Appoints.

b. Examinations.

c. Reduction in force.

III. Effectiveness with which war transfer authority has been administered by Civil Service Commission.

IV. Need for legislation to insure—

a. More effective examinations.

b. Establishment or promotion, transfer, and reinstatement registers from which appointments would be made prior to appointment of new employees.

c. Strengthening of protective devices for employees.

d. Appeals regarding separations.

e. Protection of seniority rights of employees.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE WAR-MOBILIZATION PROBLEMS AND WAR-CONTRACTS MATTERS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs I report a resolution approved by the committee, for reference to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution reported by the Senator from West Virginia will be received, and, under the rule, referred as suggested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The resolution (S. Res. 46) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 107 and Senate Resolution 216, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to study the problems of war mobilization; and that the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 198 and Senate Resolution 288, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to investigate war contracts, termination of war contracts, and related problems, be and are hereby continued to July 1, 1945.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 386. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Tensas River National Park, Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 387. A bill for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 388. A bill granting a pension to Earl E. Bayles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 389. A bill to amend section 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1928 by revising the basis and rate of retired pay of members of the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 390 (by request). A bill to provide for the retirement of certain veterans who served in both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 391. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time," approved January 20, 1942, so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to discontinue daylight saving time under such act in any time zone in which it finds that the continuance thereof is no longer necessary; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 392. A bill for the relief of Nebraska Wesleyan University; and

S. 393. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Union Cooperative Association of Dawson, Nebr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 394. A bill for the relief of Guy Albert Wheaton; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. HATCH):

S. 395 (by request). A bill to modify the application of the excess-land and repayment provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 396. A bill providing for the transfer of a certain fish hatchery in Comanche County, Okla., to the city of Lawton, Okla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 397. A bill to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 398. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 399. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 400. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Andersen; and

S. 401. A bill for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese Beetle Quarantine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 402. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920;

S. 403. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of making possible the crediting under such act of certain periods of State service;

S. 404. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 405. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 406. A bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates;

S. 408. A bill for the relief of certain persons;

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Marino Bello; and

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton; to the Committee on Claims.

S 412 A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 413. A bill for the relief of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 414. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

S. 415. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the armed forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; and

S. 416. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire certain lands in the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL LENDING AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AVIATION EXHIBITION FACILITIES AT SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 47), which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

Whereas the Smithsonian Institution has one of the world's most valuable aviation collections; and

Whereas lack of space has seriously handicapped the effective display of such collection, and has prevented the addition thereto

of exhibits reflecting recent progress in aviation; and

Whereas, as a world leader in the field of aviation, the United States should take steps to preserve for future generations a complete historical record of its contributions to the development of aviation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of exhibition facilities at the Smithsonian Institution with a view to ascertaining what additional facilities are necessary to provide for the proper display of aviation exhibits now in the possession of such Institution, and to provide adequate space for the housing and display of such additional exhibits as may be acquired for the purpose of bringing up to date and maintaining a complete aviation collection. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations as to the construction immediately after the war of such additional facilities as may be found to be necessary.

INSPECTION OF NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS BY NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. WALSH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 48), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to visit, for the purposes of inspection, during the present Congress, any part of the Naval Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof, not to exceed $4,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. The members of such committee or subcommittee shall be paid the actual expenses of transportation incurred by them for travel performed under the provisions of this resolution and a per diem allowance as provided by law while performing travel authorized by this resolution.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 49), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 14, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,880 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 50), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 251, agreed to June 4, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. HILL (for Mr. ANDREWS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 51), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 170, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 29, 1941, as supplemented by Senate Resolution 326, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGE FOR CERTAIN SENATE RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That any person who shall have served as an employee of the Senate restaurant for 55 years or more shall be entitled, upon making application to the Secretary of the Senate, to be retired and to receive retirement pay at a rate equal to the rate of the basic compensation he was receiving at the time of his last active service as such employee: *Provided*, That this resolution shall not apply to any person while he is receiving an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. Such retirement pay shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall determine eligibility for retirement pay under this resolution on the basis of records or secondary evidence. For such purposes, actual service in the Senate restaurant shall be deemed to be service as an employee of such restaurant whether or not the person performing such service was carried on the Senate rolls as such an employee during the time such service was performed, and any person performing such service for the major part of the time during which the Senate was in session in any calendar year shall be deemed to have performed a year's service as an employee of the Senate restaurant during such calendar year.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GREEN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 53), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 28, agreed to January 10, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,220 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. HILL (for Mr. PEPPER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 12, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Patents to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I ask that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] be excused from further service on the Committee on Enrolled Bills, and that he be assigned to the chairmanship of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

I also request that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] be assigned to service on the following committees:

District of Columbia, Interstate Commerce, Printing, and Territories and Insular Affairs.

I also ask that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] be assigned to service on the following committees: Interstate Commerce, Mines and Mining, Public Buildings and Grounds, and Territories and Insular Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY AT PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS' DINNER

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator CONNALLY at the Presidential Electors' dinner in honor of the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and HARRY S. TRUMAN, held in Washington, D. C., January 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thomas of Utah" published in the Birmingham Age-Herald of January 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY TO BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the annual dinner of the Fall River Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, Fall River, Mass., January 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR WORLD AIMS—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our World Aims," published in the Birmingham Age-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY TRAINING FOR NATIONAL SAFETY—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Military Training for National Safety," by Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post, from the issue of January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT TODAY—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Roosevelt Today," published in a recent issue of the Birmingham Age-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS—THE FIRST STEP TOWARD WORLD SECURITY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for more than 5 minutes at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont will proceed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gurney	Overton
Bailey	Hawkes	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McMahon	Tobey
Connally	Maybank	Tunnell
Cordon	Mead	Tydings
Donnell	Millikin	Vandenberg
Downey	Mitchell	Walsh
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Morse	White
Ferguson	Murdock	Wiley
Fulbright	Murray	Willis
George	Myers	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the contemplated meeting of the Big Three Powers, which the President indicates will be held "anon," and the location of which Prime Minister Churchill refers to as "up yonder," impels me to make a brief statement relating to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. My purpose is partly to stimulate such an expression of consecrated effort by our people toward prompt establishment of the Security Organization as will give vital spirit to the basic treaty to which we may agree.

Partly, also, I am interested that we inspire in the negotiators confidence that the Government of the United States can be relied upon to promote the General International Organization for Security, advocated in the Connally resolution, and in the Moscow Declaration, and finally given form in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

The all-party action by 16 new Senators yesterday strengthened the arm of the President immediately. I am sure the 16 Senators will accept from an older Senator who has been in the Senate 14 years a word of commendation for the initiative which the new Senators have displayed. I think the exercise of their functions at such an early date in such a manner as to indicate the power of unity is a great service to our country at this critical hour. If it was an unusual act I hope that hereafter it may become a habit. From my point of view I see nothing but good and great achievement in it, and I want to encourage its repetition.

Mr. President, to give it point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator permit me to place the letter in the RECORD a little later?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes, Mr. President. That is a very gracious move on the Senator's part. I am glad to have the great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate place the document, which is a letter to the President, in the RECORD. I regard this as an event which in due time will speak with remarkable accent on the development of patriotism and unity in the United States at the time when it was most necessary, and by that I mean while the meeting of three great powers is going on.

Yes, Mr. President; I am glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I did not want to interrupt him or to consume any of his time, and if it will not interrupt the Senator, and if it will not consume too much of his time, I should like to ask that the letter be read at the desk.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am glad to have that done, Mr. President.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have read into the RECORD the letter addressed to the President by 16 so-called new Senators with regard to the formation of a United Nations organization along the general lines drafted at Dumbarton Oaks. I feel sure that the action of these Senators will be of very great help and will give impetus to what many of us have been undertaking to accomplish in the past. The 16 Senators were not Members of the Senate when the so-called Connally resolution was adopted, but the older Senators were, and I regard it as particularly appropriate and particularly helpful that the new Senators have addressed to the President this great letter setting forth their views, and I ask that the letter may be read at the desk at this piont. I thank the Senator from Vermont for so generously yielding to me for this purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for having this letter placed in the RECORD. I consider it to be an integral part of the attempt I am making toward the same encouragement of the negotiators who will be anon "up yonder."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the letter be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned new Members of the Senate of the United States, conscious of the profound significance of the conferences soon to be held with our principal allies wish to convey to you for your consideration, some of our thoughts concerning the foreign policy of this Government.

We realize that it is important for you to be advised of the views of the new Senators who heretofore have not had the opportunity to make their position clear.

I. We favor the formation at the earliest possible moment of a United Nations organization, to establish and preserve the peace of the world, along the general lines tentatively drafted at Dumbarton Oaks;

II. We believe this Government should use all reasonable means to assure our allies and the other nations of the world that we intend to share in the direction of and the responsibility for the settlement of this war and the maintenance of peace;

III. We suggest that treaties among the major allies be concluded as soon as possible, to demilitarize Germany and Japan and to keep them demilitarized;

IV. We believe that this Government should, as soon as possible, arrange to participate affirmatively in all decisions affecting the establishment of law and order in the liberated or enemy countries.

Trusting that these suggestions may be of assistance to you and wishing you success in the forthcoming conferences, we are,

Yours respectfully,

Frank P. Briggs, Missouri; Homer E. Capehart, Indiana; Forrest C. Donnell, Missouri; J. W. Fulbright, Arkansas; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa; Clyde R. Hoey, North Carolina; Olin D. Johnston, South Carolina; Warren G. Magnuson, Washington; Brien McMahon, Connecticut; Hugh D. Mitchell, Washington; Wayne L. Morse, Oregon; John Moses, North Dakota; Francis J. Myers, Pennsylvania; Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts; H. Alexander Smith, New Jersey; Glen H. Taylor, Idaho.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in order to give specific point to the support which we wish to give to the negotiators, let us consider briefly the progress evidenced in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as compared with the League of Nations Covenant. The League combined two duties—that of policing the enemy and that of policing the members of the League. Provision for this twofold responsibility proved to be a defect—I shall not say a fatal defect, because no one knows what it was, alone and of itself, that caused the League to fail to reach its objective.

The security organization for member states under the League was frustrated by the fallacies and frailties inherent in the discipline of Germany. The pacification of Germany should have been the

single duty of an organization composed of Germany's military conquerors. An effort was made by France to obtain a separate German treaty for this purpose, but it was rejected in the League Covenant.

By contrast, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals envisage a special policing of enemy states, providing, in chapter 12, subsection 2:

No provision of the treaty should preclude action taken or authorized in relation to enemy states as a result of the present war by the governments having responsibility for such action.

Every word of that sentence is of high value and great importance, and none of it can be omitted in interpreting it. Here and now let us put to rest turbulent thinking in relation to the various bilateral agreements—the Anglo-Soviet mutual assistance agreement of May 26, 1942; the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty of December 12, 1943; the Franco-Soviet treaty of alliance and mutual assistance of December 10, 1944; and any similar agreements which might be made, such as the agreement which was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] only a short time ago. Such agreements are for security. They run against Germany and her Axis specifically. They fit the pattern of the general international organization for security and peace.

Let us see if that is true so far as the existing treaties are concerned.

The Anglo-Soviet pact precisely implemented the Atlantic charter, and is in harmony with the preamble of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and with its articles, as shown by the following extract from the treaty:

The high contracting parties declare their desire to unite with other like-minded states in adopting proposals for common action to preserve peace and resist aggression in the post-war period.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals subsequently adopted indicate awareness of that treaty and the intention to foster other arrangements for security against the enemy. Current opinion that through this treaty the United Nations were then fighting for a common cause was well expressed in the New York Times of June 12, 1942, in an editorial containing the following sentence:

But neither its bilateral character nor the suggestion that it may foreshadow the system of regional groupings, vaguely envisaged in London and Washington as the larger units of a new peace structure, affects in any degree the close cooperation of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States in the war effort.

This treaty was openly arrived at, and its text was published in our own Department of State bulletin on September 26, 1942. I quote further from the New York Times editorial for interpretation, in order that we may see that the public had this information currently:

Our Government was not only in consultation with the British at every stage of the negotiations with Moscow; there is reason to believe that the final draft of the accord was influenced by our views.

Let us now turn to the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty signed December 12, 1943. That is also limited in its terms to the function of policing the enemy, policing Germany and states associated with her in acts of aggression. It expressly incorporates some of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. I quote from article IV of that treaty:

The high-contracting parties, considering the interests of security of each of them, agree to maintain close and friendly cooperation in the period after the reestablishment of peace and to act in conformity with the principles of mutual respect for their independence and sovereignty, as well as for nonintervention in the internal affairs of the other state. They agree to develop their economic relations on the widest possible scale and to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war.

A protocol to that treaty opened the door—and I quote from it the significant words—

* * * to some third country which borders on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or on the Czechoslovak Republic and which formed the object of German aggression in the present war.

Such a country as Poland, desiring to join that treaty, would be accorded that opportunity on the mutual consent of the parties thereto. This is in line with the Dumbarton Oaks policy to depend upon states surrounding or in proximity to Germany, as governments "having responsibility for such action." Those are precise words, describing, as I think, those members of the family of nations who are competent to maintain security and peace under the law, and who are now already sacrificing and striving to their utmost to attain that objective.

Of course, this treaty was colored with great feeling of distrust and sorrow. It was colored by the atrocities of Lidice, which emphasized the necessity of providing special treatment for Germany in the general international organization. To forestall German aggression is one of the measures which are necessary for collective security.

Now let us turn to the Franco-Soviet alliance. I quote from a preamble which has been referred to time after time since then by officials of the various governments interested:

Convinced that when victory is achieved the reestablishment of peace on a firm basis and its maintenance during a long period in the future will be served by the existence of close collaboration between them and all the United Nations—

"Them," of course, refers to the parties—France and Russia—

having decided to collaborate in the creation of an international system of security for the effective maintenance of general peace and for the assurance of the harmonious development of relations between nations.

Of course, this is only an extract from the preamble.

This and other definite references to the policy declared at Moscow, Teheran, and Dumbarton Oaks, such as in the words "in complete accordance with the aims which the United Nations have adopted," show that the Franco-Soviet alliance is an act of performance within the spirit and letter of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The special and distinctive obligation created in this treaty is policing Germany and its Axis. It leaves to the United Nations' organization the general obligation of policing the United Nations, free from the special difficulties inherent in disciplining an enemy.

Of course, Mr. President, let me observe that the world contemplates pacification of the enemy and contemplates such a policing of the civilization of both Germany and Japan that they will ultimately qualify to be freed from this sort of policing and discipline, and will seek to become members of the general organization and, by its express terms, will be entitled to be members of it, and ultimately will be members of it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Are not the compacts to which the Senator has been referring in substance the same as those between France and countries bordering on France, known as the cordon sanitaire treaties?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know to what the Senator refers. I have noticed that from time to time throughout history there have been alliances for security purposes. If that is what the Senator refers to, I would answer in the affirmative, and I would say that the character of protection afforded by such treaties with countries surrounding a definite state is similar to the character of protection set up by the balance of power between the states of Europe in ancient times. The difference is, however, that the so-called cordon sanitaire is not around the circumference of the country which wishes to be protected. It is around the enemy.

These treaties are in reverse of the ancient balance-of-power treaties. These treaties operate against the enemy, and are designed to be limited in time. For example, I think every one of them contains a 20-year limitation, and some of them contain a fact-and-event limitation, namely, such an event as the establishment of the general international organization referred to. I cannot say, from memory, which ones they are, but they all are aimed at policing the enemy during the period of pacification, and in that respect I believe they are different from any other treaty which has ever been entered into heretofore for security purposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is my memory, and I make the statement only upon that basis, that France set up the cordon sanitaire treaties after the last war. The end point in my mind was, of course, that under stress those treaties fell down.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. They had no usefulness.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am wondering how we can distinguish the treaties to which the Senator has been referring, in their prospect of ultimate usefulness, as against the history of the cordon sanitaire treaties which failed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, I do not quite recognize the cordon sanitaire treaties to which the Senator has referred. But assuming that there have been such treaties, they failed to prevent war. However, at that time there was in existence no international organization with

power to police its own members. All it could do was to advise and recommend.

I shall endeavor to point out the difference between the progress made by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the progress made by the League of Nations Covenant, namely, that whatever treaties there may have been, there was an infirmity in the League of Nations Covenant which the Dumbarton Oaks proposals overcome; that is to say, there was combined in the League of Nations Covenant the policing of the enemy with the policing of the members of the League, but with the weakness of having no power of organization to move any agency of policing. That simply rendered the League futile in the case of Manchuria and in the case of Ethiopia, and the League and all the treaties which then existed for security broke down.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a brief observation?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am heartily in favor of joint action under an international system whereby the successful allies shall conserve the peace by policing our defeated enemies. I am heartily in favor of that. I simply wish to make the point now that the cordon sanitaire treaties became an incitement to war, rather than a deterrent to war.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I think they would, if they were set up in a world which had made no effort at all to substitute pacific methods of settlement of international disputes for determination of them by the test of battle.

Although some progress in that direction was made by the League of Nations, and although we are going to make use of it in the effort we now will make—we will start off from where they left it, and we will build on to it and will better it—I have more faith in the pacific elements—that is, the peace forces other than the military, that are provided by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals—than I have in any other part of them. I have more faith in their pacific elements than I have in their military strength. But I think we are not at the stage of civilization where we can depend upon pacific means alone, with no provision for military sanctions. I think we must have them ready, and I think that we as a country must keep ourselves vigorous and well armed at all times.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask whether the Senator intends to make a rather complete analysis of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement with reference to these points.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; with reference to the points about which the Senator has asked me, I intend to offset one against the other, namely, the frailties of the League of Nations Covenant as compared to the power and strength of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was very much interested in the Senator's compliment to the letter signed by the new Senators. I am rather a new Senator, so I have a general simpatico with them. I greatly respect their nerve and their ardor as Lochinvars wooing a general world organization, but I think it would be well to take a look at the girl before we start to write her compromising letters.

Mr. AUSTIN. That might very well be. I myself should like to be careful. Let me say that I once tried a breach of promise suit; and I found on the door of my colleague's office, when I went there, a little card which said, "Do right, and fear no man. Don't write, and fear no woman!"

I propose to refer to current official statements relating to the Franco-Soviet treaty in order to show how the people received the treaty, and how they looked upon it as a part of the general movement toward security and peace.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I assume that it is the Senator's view that whatever may have been the failures of the past, there is no reason now for our continued acquiescence in failure and impotence; but, on the contrary, the very failures of the past are recalled to us in making a further effort toward a world organization and world peace.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator. He points up the ideal very beautifully, as he always does.

I am now talking about official statements. The official statements then current expressed the unanimity of the great powers in interpreting the Franco-Soviet alliance as being in furtherance of the purpose of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

Thus, the French Foreign Minister Bidault, in reporting on this treaty to the French Consultative Assembly on December 22, 1944, emphasized the firm determination of France and the Soviet Union to work with the United States and Great Britain for an effective world security organization.

On the same day General De Gaulle stated that the Franco-Soviet pact was a necessity, and that the realism which inspired it was not exclusive, and was in the interest of all the United Nations.

Let us cross the channel. Mr. Eden, in the House of Commons, responding to questions regarding the treaty, stated that it was in no way in conflict with the security organization proposed at Dumbarton Oaks, and pointed to the preamble—the preamble which I have read to the Senate—recording the joint conviction that the maintainance of peace in the future would require the closest collaboration of all the United Nations, and their joint determination to work together in elaborating a system of security.

Of course, when we start this edifice we expect its architecture to be such that it can be expanded, developed, and made to fit the ever-developing and advancing conditions in the world.

Coming across to our own country, on the day the pact was made public Mr. Stettinius stated at his press conference that he could find nothing in the pact which ran counter to the ideals of world organization. He also pointed to the preamble to which I have referred. In other words, the parties to these three great security treaties, being governments described in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as "the governments having responsibility for such action," thus provided for such action without consulting the Security Council.

Mr. President, I wish to explain the last phrase, "without consulting the Security Council." As I understand the proposed organization, should it be set up as proposed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the United States would forthwith enter into treaties with those countries and with others which come within chapter XII, subdivision 2, to which I have referred, as being "the governments having responsibility for such action," and we should thus be taking a step forward in the establishment of security by taking out of the general international duties of this organization the special business of policing the enemy during the period of pacification. Of course, that would not come under the regional arrangements which require that what the governments do shall first have the consent of the Security Council. This would not be a regional arrangement if the United States were a party to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I merely wish to suggest that there may have been a certain self-serving quality in the statement of Mr. Eden and statements from Washington with reference to the Soviet-French agreement. There is opinion to the effect that we had been giving De Gaulle the "hot foot" and when the treaty was announced there was considerable consternation in Washington. Of course, the making of that statement both in Great Britain and in Washington, was very adroit, and the only thing left to do under the circumstances.

Mr. AUSTIN. I believe we must recognize the fact that man can accomplish nothing by putting agreements in writing, or engraving them on stone, unless he is willing to abide by them, and it is in his heart to give fidelity to the agreements which he enters into. So I feel that the work which we do today necessarily involves such an understanding of the objective, and of what it will cost in the way of yielding independence, that when we enter into the agreement we shall enter into it with full light upon it, and with nothing hidden, so that our people can always be earnest in their devotion to the agreement.

The two distinguished men to whom I have referred made statements to the public relating to the treaty as a part of the great enterprise in which we are here engaged, of undertaking to speak at this moment with the voice of the people. I have faith in what they have said, and I believe the Senator from Colorado has, although I agree with what he has said about expediency. I think this was an expedient thing to do, and one which we had to do from our point of view. There is no doubt that we have made mistakes. I believe that it is necessary to have candor in facing them and correcting them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. The French Pact is definitely within the framework of the general international organization, and constitutes a basis for conviction, rather than doubt, that the United Nations are fighting for a common cause. The question has been asked, Are we fighting for a common cause? I believe that the three treaties to which I have referred, and a treaty such as the one proposed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] entered into, should not be used as a pretext for obstruction, hindering, or delaying, and certainly not for opposing the adoption of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals in writing the basic treaty. I believe that such treaties for the separate policing of Germany are a necessary step in the accomplishment of security procedures. If they can be entered into concurrently with our negotiations for the Dumbarton Oaks Treaty, very well; but if the circumstances require that we choose which one we will work for first I should say take the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, because by setting up that organization we would put a stop to the temptation, and probably to the possibility, of unilateral acts with reference to the kinds of government which are to be erected in the liberated areas and many other questions which touch upon social standards, economic life, and all that.

Let us arrange to have this organization working at the earliest practicable date, partly for the purpose of having a judicial tribunal in which we can have faith, and which will have the authority to decide some of these questions which are certainly justiciable. One, for example, would be, Is this boundary line a line by title or is it not? It would make much difference with the lawyers of the world, would it not, if they knew that one of the contestants was legally right.

This new method of separate policing of the conquered enemy is but one of the important advances over the League of Nations Covenant. There are other differences which I think justfy faith in effective security through the establishment of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I shall now point them out. I do not pretend to point out all the differences, but I do claim that these differences alone justify the adoption of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals just as they are, without waiting to settle the undecided questions which are left open and yet to be decided. Of course, the Big Three may decide some of the undecided questions during their interview and consultation, but if they do not do so and yet agree to call a full-dress meeting for the purpose of writing out the terms of a basic treaty which would establish the organization described in these proposals, I would be for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do I correctly understand the Senator to advance the theory that certain nations, close-lying neighbors, for instance, have a primary responsibility in demilitarizing Germany, as compared to the secondary interest of such a nation as the United States, which is located at some distance?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I answer the question in the affirmative. There are two types of agreements outside of although within the framework in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. One type is regional arrangements, provision for which will be found in section C of chapter VIII. There it will be noted that if regional arrangements are set up, then the Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agency for enforcement action under its authority, but no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

That is one thing, and, as will be seen, it is a limited and restricted agency. On the other hand, there is such an organization as that envisaged by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in which European states and states of the Western Hemisphere join together in a policing organization. That comes under chapter XII, Transitional Arrangements. As will be noted by the title, they are intended to exist only during the period of pacification.

Subsection 2 reads:

> No provision of the charter should preclude action taken or authorized in relation to enemy states—

Do not forget the expression "enemy states"—

> as a result of the present war by the governments having responsibility for such action.

To me that means all the great powers who are engaged in active warfare and who are expected to be responsible because they are competent and are the only countries on the globe that are competent to do the job. That is what I interpret the words "the governments having responsibility for such action" to mean. I think that is an answer or I have tried to make it an answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Going back to the regional agreements, does the Senator from Vermont believe that the provision prescribes the authority which the regional organization may exercise, or does the Dumbarton Oaks agreement say that the over-all organization shall determine whether the regional organization has decided the question properly?

Is permission granted merely to take up the question or may the over-all organization supervise the action of the regional body?

Mr. AUSTIN. There are two points in the question of the distinguished Senator. One relates to organization and one relates to operation.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. As to organization, the answer appears in a section I have not read, which is couched in this language:

> Nothing in the charter—

Meaning the Dumbarton Oaks charter—

> should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the Organization. The Security Council should encourage settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies, either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

Now, as to the operation——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, first will the Senator yield for another question there?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose the Dumbarton Oaks Organization is approached by a regional body, can the Dumbarton Oaks Organization say "We do not like the set-up; it does not come within what we think it should and therefore we deny you the right to form that kind of an organization"?

Mr. AUSTIN. Probably the language could be interpreted in that way——

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the way I read it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Because there is a proviso which imposes the condition that the action taken by the regional agency must conform to the purposes and the principles of the Organization. Otherwise, regional organizations could so disrupt the general organization that it could not live overnight.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree; and I take it from what the Senator has said that he is in favor of the interpretation that we both have given that provision.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am.

Mr. FERGUSON. Otherwise, there would be no over-all body and the regional body might be stronger than the over-all body.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am in agreement, and I thank the Senator from Michigan very much.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. The colloquy between the two Senators has included all I could say about the situation. My understanding is that the Dumbarton Oaks proposal authorizes sanctions or whatever the word may be, regional gatherings and regional determinations, which are to be precisely what the word "regional" indicates, in the first instance, of narrow concern. They are to be solutions of problems which involve, say, two or three nations, and apparently only two or three nations.

I think the Dumbarton Oaks draft as it now stands contemplates that such agreements between two or three member states shall be binding, shall be of full force and virtue, provided they are confined within the four corners, as I

may express it, of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, and the principles and purposes of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think that is correct. That is my view, anyway. I think it is all contained in this phrase, "such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action." Is not that a good phrase? I think it expresses the limitations. This world organization is not going to meddle with Western Hemisphere affairs unless a matter relates to international peace and security. It will be noted that all through the Dumbarton Oaks proposals the organization is not to begin to take action unless there is a threat to international peace. Of course, there is the postulate—the thing that is not necessary to demonstrate, it is so true—that a disturbance of international peace anywhere on the globe disturbs our peace and the peace of every nation which is a member.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Let me interpolate the suggestion that there is nothing novel about the proposal for regional conferences and regional agreements. Senators will find in our communications agreements with the other nations of the world that precise authority for nations to enter into local agreements with respect to international communications. They have full and plenary authority so long as they keep within the confines of the general international agreement. I think, too, in our treaties with respect to safety of life at sea, relating to shipping, provision will be found for local agreements which relate only to the ships of the two or three nations which may be involved and which do not run counter to the general agreements of nations. The administration in working out the Dumbarton Oaks provision has merely made use of a device which is followed in other fields of international relations.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Maine reveal something which occurs in the United States Senate quite often; that is, there is no subject one can bring up in this body but some Member of the Senate will be found who has had special knowledge and experience about it, and now has special judgment regarding it. Here is the distinguished Senator from Maine, who has dealt with the matter of international communications of all kinds, by ship, by radio, by cable, concerning which he has a special knowledge which comes so beautifully into play when we undertake to interpret a new proposal, but dealing with the same broad, general principle. I thank the Senator for his help.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say that I am very glad I interrupted the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I take it, from the Senator's remarks, that he looks upon the Dumbarton Oaks charter as divided into two essential parts, first, the principles which draw the nations together, and, secondly, the means of enforcing the principles on which they agree. As he explains it, I take it that the machinery for enforcing the principles which have been agreed upon is largely like that of a city and its police force. The city adopts certain regulations for the keeping of the peace which it deems to be authorized and proper, which are analogous to the principles of the charter. Then it has a police force to carry out or enforce those principles in the community. It has policemen who have certain beats. It does not use all its police force to police the northwestern or the southwestern section of the city. A policeman keeps order on his beat. He does not call on the central body unless the emergency is so great that he needs the help of others besides himself to carry out the principles agreed upon.

So that even in the "regional" or the "beat" activity, the general principles, as I understand, which bind the nations together, are supposed to be, and are intended to be, the scope which surrounds any nation dealing in regional activities. They must not conflict with the over-all general principles which bind the nations together.

It is often supposed that a nation having primacy in a region might so utilize its primacy as to develop its influence economically, or geographically, or politically, but as I comprehend the situation, within the scope of human failing it is the intention that the primary principle shall always be peace, and that therefore the scope in which a nation can act regionally will depend on whether its activities are within the peace principles of the general organization, to wit, to keep the peace.

So that what we have is really an enlargement of the city council, single policemen, and the whole police force of the city, to keep intact a system of law and order for the government of the world.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator from Maryland has simplified the picture for us.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield first to the Senator from Texas; then I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator, somewhat in the nature of an observation as well as a question, that some features of this document probably have not been given consideration, and I think they deserve it; that is, that throughout is the indication that, whether a matter is regional or whether it is general, resort must first be had to peaceable measures, diplomacy, arbitration, conciliation, mediation, and all the related measures of that nature.

Too much emphasis must not be put upon the thought that ultimately there is the employment, if need be, of armed force. Let me suggest that the armed force not only has its own virtue and virility but that frequently the mere fact that it can be employed will very greatly aid in conciliation and mediation and adjustment, and other peaceable measures, in a dispute which might otherwise result in a breach of the peace.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his observation. I sincerely agree that, as nations, we are not at that stage of self-discipline where we can get along without armed force as the ultimate sanction. We must have the assurance of the existence of armed force ready, able, competent to act swiftly and with certainty whenever a threat to international peace occurs.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, going back to the question as to the regional body, I take it that the able Senator from Vermont understood it as a double-barreled question. I think we agree on one-half of it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to divide the other part of the question into two questions. Let us take for granted that we have the regional organization set up and sanctioned by the over-all organization, or the United Nations organization, which is the name given in the charter. Are the questions which are submitted to the regional body only such questions as the United Nations organization wishes to submit to it? I will ask the Senator to consider that question first.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the question is answered by clause 3 of section C of chapter VIII, reading as follows:

> The Security Council should at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Being informed, then it tests its jurisdiction by asking itself: Are these matters that relate to the maintenance of international peace and security and that are appropriate for regional action? If they are not, we are not then concerned, unless they attain the portent of being a threat to international peace.

Then the Council comes in either way, by invitation, or on its own initiation. It must act in that event, and that action is necessarily through conciliatory means first, and if such means become exhausted, then by military means.

Does that answer the question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am fearful from the language which has been used that it is not clear whether the regional body can initiate its own act, and its own investigation, let us say, or whether it can pass only upon those things which are submitted to it by the over-all body.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me say in a word that the answer will be found in section B of that same chapter, showing clearly that a means has been set up whereby it can perform its duty directly, with certainty and with speed. It will take a great deal of time to read into the RECORD all the paragraphs dealing with the matter, but let me say that I refer the distinguished Senator to section B of chapter VIII to find that, should the Security

Council deem that a failure to settle a dispute in accordance with the pacific method has occurred, it is bound to take jurisdiction, it is obliged to act. We find in clause 4 of section B of chapter VIII:

> Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security—

And so forth. I have read only one sentence. But all through the document will be found authority to act, the power to direct, and yet there is the gloved hand, there is, in the pacific means provided, the hope of humanity that it will never have to use force. As the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations pointed out, if this efficient military power is always available there will be the greatest incentive for pacific settlement and for lifting up the standard of thought and of living, and of beginning to acquire habits of self-discipline which are the only basis on which we can have a prolonged peace. We cannot have a prolonged peace solely by military compulsion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Referring to the point suggested by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], is it not true that the Charter or the compact enables the regional organization either itself to initiate or to consider these problems by reference from the General Council Assembly? As a matter of fact, however, the secondary authority still resides in the Council of the whole organization, because if the regional organization should come to a conclusion which in the view of the central organization would threaten or endanger the peace, it would have the authority to override the regional organization and insist upon some other treatment.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, it might be said that there is the right of a superior body to overrule the regional body if the superior body decides that a wrong decision has been made in an effort to keep the peace.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is all based upon the theory that there must be a threat to the peace of the world, otherwise there would be no power attached to it at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, if the decision of the regional body would threaten the peace of the world, the United Nations body would have the right, under the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, to overrule the decision of the regional body.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is my interpretation.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is also my interpretation, but I was not quite clear from this language that it could of its own motion initiate its own investigation and action. I am glad to get the interpretation of the able Senator from Texas and the able Senator from Vermont on that question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. For what it may be worth, may I voice my concurrence in what the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Texas have said. I take it that the adherence to the Dumbarton Oaks charter does not strip a member nation of all its sovereign authority. It has yielded up certain of its rights, it has made definite commitments under the charter, but it has retained within itself many rights of sovereignty. Included in those rights which are reserved is the power to negotiate with its neighbor states with respect to matters of mutual concern, and which may have in them the threat of peace between two nations. I entertain no doubt at all that under this authority as it will be drafted and as it is now drafted there is the power of initiation in the several regions of the earth. There is in the Council also the power of review. So long as the Council acts within the authority which the member nations repose in it, the Council has the authority in reviewing to superimpose its judgment as to what makes for the peace of the world upon the judgment of two or three member states. I think that is the situation.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think that is the situation.

I now wish to proceed with my statement of the advantages in the proposal. Mind you, Mr. President, I realize we are talking about nothing but a proposal. It is not a treaty; it is not in that form; but, as we go along, I want to point out this difference between the League of Nations Covenant and the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. The League failed to unite for military enforcement all of the nations competent to prevent or repel a threat to international peace. It will be recalled that it made no distinction at all between nations, and it seemed to deal out advice under article X and recommendation under article XVI to a country whether it was large or small, whether it was competent or incompetent. After giving the advice or making the recommendation, then it left to the individual member the responsibility of following the advice or the recommendation, and in that regard it was practically a futility.

On the other hand, as we look at this United Nations proposal, we note that the responsibility for maintenance of order under law is expressly transferred to the organization. It is a great shift. It is the shift from individual effort—that is, unilateral action of a single nation—to organized society responsible for maintaining law and order in the world of nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suppose the corollary to that is that the organization contemplated by the Dumbarton Oaks proposal will have an international military force of size large enough to be militarily successful against any one, we will say, of the Allied nations that might become an aggressor.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is not the way it is set up now, and I doubt if I would be for it if it were. This is only one man's judgment. I think it is safer to regard these armed forces as pooled forces, just as we now regard the United Nations. We are pooling our effort, but we are not integrating our armies. There is no mixture of American and British, Russians and Americans, Russians and British, or French and Americans by nations. There may be an accidental mixture of racial stock, but the identity of the armed forces of the United States is maintained.

How do we unite them? We unite them through the combined chiefs of staff. The operational plans are agreed upon. They are plans which must be talked over and assented to by the various parties who are responsible for the operation. Thus we have a pool of power which we believe will be triumphant, provided we keep this unity.

My idea is to extend this unity into the future, project it into the peace, and have a great pool of power that can be called upon immediately, at any time. A wing of air force might be called from the United States to operate in a neighborhood near to the United States, if that sort of activity were ever necessary, rather than to call for a wing from China to come half way around the world to do it. My idea is that it is a good deal better to keep the forces proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals separate—each country maintaining an armed force which is earmarked or allocated to this duty. That is not provided for in the proposals. There is nothing said about that subject in the proposals, except that a separate arrangement shall be made for this purpose, separate from the establishment of the organization.

Another thing that is separate, and not involved in those proposals, is the authority of our delegate to the Council. Both those subjects are premature. They are not in this debate. They will never be in it except as they are injected into it; and I think they would be irrelevantly injected. We will tackle each question on its own merits singly, so that we can study the problem fully and have a good understanding of it. When we come to the question of appropriating money to maintain an army earmarked for this purpose, that problem will be before us unencumbered and unclouded by the many other issues which are in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Speaking generally, is it not true that if the Council contemplated under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals does not have the authority either to call on an international force or on segments of national forces, the whole structure is worthless, under the theory of the proposals?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true. That is just the point; that is it exactly. That was what was the matter with the League of Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So if one is for the Dumbarton Oaks proposal as it now stands, under its theory one must commit himself to the proposition that the Council or the organization shall have the power to summon, whether from an international body or from the separate countries making up the organization, military forces capable of whipping one

of the most powerful allies, if one of the most powerful allies should be the aggressor.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the forces are not capable of doing that then we are doing a futile thing.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is exactly so. We must face that question. It calls for a good deal of fortitude to face it, too.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But the detail is not in the proposal.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not here.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And the question of voting the use of that power is not in the proposal.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not. We shall have an opportunity, by itself, to deny the power, or to grant it with certain limitations as to magnitude, and so forth.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that the Senator is making a genuine contribution to the study of the subject by bringing out the fact that at the present time we are dealing with something which is uncompleted.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And which, when completed, may present an entirely different aspect from that now presented.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Colorado is correct. I want to go that way. I hope that whatever we do, we will keep the door open for improvements for years to come. It is not a matter of a few days or a few months in our time. It will not be finished by us. We shall hand to our successors in office the tremendous duty of always striving to better what we have done.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator believe that if we endorse the proposal of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement to this point, those who support the agreement to this point will be morally committed to implement this organization with security council power sufficient to organize the force necessary to meet any problem that may arise in the future?

Mr. AUSTIN. I should feel bound that way; but I should not be limited in my thought on the subject of how it should be done. I should feel perfectly free to exercise my judgment about the size of the force, the amount of the appropriation for it——

Mr. WILLIS. And the nature of the problem?

Mr. AUSTIN. And the nature of the authority which will be exercised over it, as well as whether we shall have a string tied to it or not. All those factors are left open to be decided.

Mr. President, I have a sense of dedication to this cause which I think overshadows anything I have ever undertaken, of either a public or private nature. To me it seems that there is nothing so important as providing some security against a disturbance of international peace. That is something that we have never had the courage and the hardihood to do, because we thought it would cost us too much. We are faced with that question. If we are not willing to pay the cost, of course, we shall not have the security. We shall have its alternative, which is certain war, in which my grandchildren will fight, and perhaps die.

That is the cause. Although I should like to have a perfect arrangement handed to us complete in all its details, yet the impossibility of such a thing cannot deter me from moving forward and achieving something good, even if it is not perfect. The only way in which we can progress as human beings is to take one step at a time. Let us take the next step.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I believe the Senator is to be commended for his courageous and forthright statement that he is willing to commit the entire resources and destiny of the United States upon this program.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not know that I had said anything of the kind.

Mr. WILLIS. I should so take it, if the Senator is willing to give to the proposed organization all the force and power necessary to carry out the commitments which the Council might make.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator is stretching what I said far beyond its proportions. In other words, the Senator is trying, in an indirect fashion, to make the argument that the cost of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals would be everything we have. That is an absurdity to which I do not subscribe.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator will not go that far?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has been very generous in yielding to me. I should like to ask one more question.

When the Dumbarton Oaks meeting was held in Washington, a number of Senators made inquiry about the meeting and about what the intention was and what the delegates there were doing. The meeting had received a grand build-up. A great estate was opened to receive the delegates. But when some Senators showed an actual interest in the matter, they were told, "Do not worry yourselves. These are just a bunch of"—in effect—"second-class or third-class flunkies who are doing spadework, and in due course that will be considered by higher levels, and something will come before us."

My question goes to the point that many Senators have relied on that assurance. I know some have. But day by day the Dumbarton Oaks proposals seem to have assumed a jelled status, a status of something which has passed through the higher levels, something which we may now consider as far as it goes.

Will the Senator give me some enlightenment on that point, please?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am ready to state what I know about it. The Senator's question relates to what led up to those proposals; does it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me say that for some 2 years I participated in meetings in the office of the Secretary of State, at which there were experts upon practically every subject which could challenge the attention of the Department of State or the Congress, relating to the possible arrangements after the war for security and peace. In the course of those meetings there were four different drafts of a plan which would be the American proposal whenever there could be brought together representatives of the great powers which are responsible for the victory which may form the cornerstone of peace and security in the future. So all that was done. The fourth copy was finished before the Republican and the Democratic Parties held their great conventions in Chicago.

It was felt that those plans ought not be made public until they were submitted to our vis-à-vis friends—namely, Great Britain, Russia, and China. It was believed that it would be an affront to them to have the public have those plans before they were submitted to the countries which would be most concerned and would be the parties to them. So they were not made public. In the committees in the conventions—I know from what the distinguished Senator from Texas has said publicly and privately that it is true of his committee, as well as of the committee of which I happened to be chairman, the Committee on War and Peace—the members were informed privately of the substance of those plans. The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and I, who were on the Mackinac committee which drafted the proposal to be submitted to that committee of the Republican National Convention, according to publicly known plans, knew what was contained in that American plan. The plank of the Democratic National Convention and the plank of the Republican National Convention on that subject were written with full knowledge of the proposal, and were written in such manner as to make it feasible for us to throw our strength and to have a unity of these two great parties behind the American plan.

We know that the Dumbarton Oaks proposal is substantially the American plan. It may be a coincidence that other countries, such as Great Britain, submitted a plan which is similar in many features, but taken by and large, what we have before us today contains the substance of the American plan.

So far as publicity is concerned, after the meeting, after the American plan had been submitted to the vis-à-vis inspection of the countries which would have to consider whether they would agree to it, it thereupon became public, and has been public ever since. Of course, I believe in having treaties openly negotiated, if they possibly can be, and I see no earthly reason why we cannot openly negotiate the basic treaty for this organization and talk about it, and discuss what happened behind closed doors, and have everything out in the open. If Russia and France have an agreement or a treaty, I think we should have a frank understanding of it. I think it is better to know in advance.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course, I agree entirely with that.

I was referring to the more limited point that at the time when the Dumbarton Oaks proposal was being manufactured there was an attempt to give the Senate the impression—perhaps I am mistaken about it, but I can produce definite debate in the Senate along that line—that the conference was definitely a hush-hush affair, and we were told, "Do not talk about it now, because it is only in the preliminary stages, and must later go to higher levels. Do not talk about it until it comes to us for discussion." But I notice that now it is more or less jelled. I ask, What has happened since the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, what has occurred through the higher levels, which gives the agreement that tentative finality?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is stated right in the submission what it is. I think this is the best way to answer the question:

Statement issued simultaneously by the participating governments.

This is dated October 9, 1944, and the distinguished Senator will remember that that is about the time when the conference rose. I read:

The Government of the United States has now received the report of its delegation to the conversations held in Washington between August 21 and October 7 1944—

The Senator will note that this statement was made 2 days after the conference had concluded its sessions—

with the delegations of the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Republic of China on the subject of an international organization for the maintenance of peace and security.

There follows a statement—

This is the important thing—

of tentative proposals—

I have tried to call attention to that point in my discussion today, namely, that this is nothing but a proposal—

indicating in detail the wide range of subjects on which agreement has been reached at the conversations.

The governments which were represented in the discussions at Washington have agreed that after further study of these proposals they will as soon as possible take the necessary step with a view to the preparation of complete proposals which could then serve as a basis of discussion at a full United Nations conference.

That is all this is. That is authentic. That is the simultaneous statement of the participating governments, and that is what gives these proposals their dignity and status before us. They give us something definite to talk about.

When I say here that I would take them as they are, imperfect as they are, I mean to say that I still hope they can be made more perfect and I am still free to discuss the improvements which I think ought to be made in them. But I can take them as they are for the reason that I wish to see something done in the world to terminate unilateral actions which seem to be necessary because we do not have any organization.

If we could set up the Dumbarton Oaks organization in its present form, without perfecting it, without deciding the question of veto power, without deciding the question of voting, we would, nevertheless, retain the consultative features which are contained in the General Assembly, and the powers which are contained in the Council, because we would create the organization by treaty. We would head off all questions of a unilateral nature with respect to the kind of governments which should be organized in liberated countries, and we would have the means, established by treaty, of handling problems in a cooperative way. That is why I state that I am willing to take the organization as it is. I do not expect we shall have to do that. I am using the debater's privilege of expressing my point as clearly as I can do so. I believe that the proposal in its present form is so far in advance of anything contained in the League of Nations Covenant that we would be performing an act of security and peace by merely taking the proposal in its present state.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield so that I may ask him one more question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am trying to get at the question of the time when we should discuss the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. If it is still tentative and if it has to come back with further amendments, that is one thing. If it has jelled to a point where prudence on our part requires its present consideration, that is another thing.

Mr. AUSTIN. In opening my remarks I undertook to say that my purpose in speaking was twofold. I wanted to provoke from the public a response consecrated to the establishment of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I also wanted to show, if possible, to the four great powers who will be "anon" "up yonder," as it is said, that in the Senate of the United States of America there is a firm conviction on the part of at least one Senator that those powers should in any event call a meeting for the establishment of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, even if they do not change an "i" or a "t." That is the purpose in making my remarks. I am not trying to say to the Senate or to the world that I regard the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as ideal, finished, or perfect. On the contrary, I am trying to prove that they are better than anything which we now have, or ever have had, in a tendency toward security and peace.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is so very generous and so very frank in his answers that I was somewhat disturbed by his reply to the question of the able Senator from Indiana. Do I understand correctly the Senator to say that he would not pledge all the resources of this country in case we entered into the agreement?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would certainly not want to set up a treaty which undertook to pledge to an international organization all the resources of this country.

Mr. LANGER. How far would the Senator go?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would go far enough to enable the central organization to call upon a certain allocated and limited force in dealing with the preservation of the peace. I would be willing to help pass any necessary statute which would set up a court of international justice, perhaps having branches in different regions of the world. All that, of course, would be a separate consideration. I thought that my answer to the distinguished Senator from Indiana was quite candid. I have no idea of abandoning this country to a super world organization. That has never been my idea of what should be done, and I always opposed it when I was asked about it.

I think this proposal is very limited and restricted. It will probably be trimmed down further before we make an agreement, because the agreement will be made only by an act of Congress. The troops and the wings which we will earmark will be determined after debate in the Congress, and both Houses of Congress will pass upon that question as well as upon the question of necessary financial support. I certainly meant no discourtesy and intended no concealment in my answer to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LANGER. No; I said the Senator was very frank. But suppose the Senator agreed, for example, to set aside 100,000 soldiers, and the question then arose, as pointed out by the able Senator from Colorado, concerning trouble with Russia. Would the Senator stop at a hundred thousand soldiers, or if we were once in and more than a hundred thousand men were required, where would the Senator stop?

Mr. AUSTIN. Let us adopt the right ground in connection with this matter. The Dumbarton Oaks proposal does not deal with war except to prevent it. I ask Senators to keep that in mind. It does not deal with the subject of fighting a war. It does not have any bearing upon the exclusive control of Congress over that subject. It is directed toward threats of disturbance of the international peace. The whole design of the plan is for the prevention of war. It does not contemplate war except as it contemplates the suppression and prevention of it. If we look at it in that way, when we come to debate the question of how much of our armed forces we will appropriate to the proposed use—we have not yet arrived at that question—we will debate it in the light of the purpose of the organization and of our treaty.

What I have stated would not interfere with our own thought concerning our general position with respect to military training and preparedness. I now believe, and I think I shall persist in the belief, that we should pass a universal training act, and that we should maintain such a strong organization militarily that our voice for peace will have tremendous weight in the world generally, and with the United Nations' organization in particular. Of course, we do not intend to furnish a great military force to be used by the council of the United Nations. Why? Because they cannot

conduct a war for us, or even declare war for us. I think that distinction has been confused a great deal in public debate. This is not a measure for waging war; it is a measure for preventing war.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that perhaps my colleague has already furnished the information for which I was about to ask. Is that part of our armed forces which is to be allocated to the international police force to be segregated, or shall we furnish so many men, planes, ships, and so on, to the armed services and then give whatever part of our own forces seems necessary when they are asked for?

Mr. AUSTIN. By my colleague's question he indicates an opinion of his own.

Mr. AIKEN. No; I have no opinion. That is the reason I have asked the question.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should prefer to keep the forces unmarked and retain them in our own great general pool so that if we saw fit to respond to a call for armed forces we could take them from any convenient place.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe I can agree with that statement; but I want to make my position clear because I do not want to burn my own bridges. What the Senator and I say about this today must not bind what he and I may do by and by because we may want to change our position on that point when we come to debate the question fully, and when we come to study the question of whether the allocated troops shall be earmarked we shall have to have some special information from the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Air Forces in order to decide the question wisely. We do not arrive at it in discussing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which will be the foundation for an organization in the world which is to operate mutually; but we are to do it, according to the terms of the proposal itself, in an outside agreement which the Congress will make by statute.

Then the manner in which we will furnish our proportion of the world police force will be determined by the Congress after the Dumbarton Oaks proposal or any modification thereof has been accepted by the Nation?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is it exactly, and I am very much in favor of that. I should like to have these questions separated because all of them are full of trouble and they have all got to be debated frankly in order to reach a wise decision.

Mr. AIKEN. I can see plainly the Senator's viewpoint, even though he says it is possibly subject to change, that if we were called upon to furnish ships or troops we might want to take them from Alaska or from Florida or from Hawaii or any other part of the world and not rely on a segregated force.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator, as I recall, suggested that he wanted a court in the organization.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is it the Senator's opinion that that court should have jurisdiction over political matters?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think not. I have never entertained the idea that it was wise for a court of justice to pass upon political questions, and our courts generally refuse to do so, even if such matters are involved in a justiciable question. Often there will be noted in the reports of decisions of our courts the remark by the court, "That is a political question, and we decline to pass on it."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. The reason I asked the question was that when the Congress was requested to enact legislation to adhere to the League of Nations Court, in the debate all Senators who were in favor of that action declared that the Court had no jurisdiction over political matters. Now, if I may, I should like to suggest to the Senator that what killed the League of Nations Court was when the Court took jurisdiction of the German-Austrian Anschluss case. Judge Loder, who wrote the constitution for the Court and was its first president, said to me that in that case the Court took jurisdiction of a political matter which they had no business to do. Since that time we have heard very little about the League of Nations Court, or the Court of International Justice.

I am glad to have the Senator's view that he does not want the world court to have jurisdiction over political matters; and most international controversies are political, if I understand them correctly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I hope that the proposed court will operate on the equivalent of a bill of rights which will comprehend human relations and that the court will be competent and qualified to pass upon such rights and liabilities where they enter into international relations. That is something never contemplated before; it is new and, therefore, the idea has not been widely discussed.

I want to see this court have compulsory jurisdiction, that is, the power to issue a summons to a country, at the petition of another country, for the purpose of a specific determination of a justiciable controversy. I had no idea of debating these details today. I wanted principally to point out the advances, as I view them, in security and peace which we find in the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference over the League of Nations covenants, as a reason why we should give courage and stimulus to the President of the United States in his great mission today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely desire to make an observation. In view of the statements made by the able Senator from Indiana, there seems to be some apprehension about the employment of the resources of the United States, I presume in both material and manpower, for the enforcement of any agreement we might enter into such as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals contemplate. Whatever fears may be justified in that speculation, I suggest that we at this moment are pledging all our resources both of manpower and materials to try to save the American way of life against willful aggressors. This pledge did not come through an attempt to rely upon a league of nations or any other international document. It is here, in my opinion, because we do not have one. The very objective the able Senator from Vermont has pointed out as the aim of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, namely, to keep the peace and eliminate war, is the thing that most thinking people understand. In view of the fact that we now have 11,000,000 men and women in the armed forces, many of whom will never return, and many who do will be injured for life, since our national debt will be increased by the billions, it seems that these factors should be ample reason for every Senator going all the way in supporting the Dumbarton Oaks proposal as a beginning to keep the peace. From that point we can move step by step to try to perfect it in line with what humanity dictates.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in response to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, which I appreciate, let me say that my view is that repression of a threat to peace wherever it may occur is an act of defense of every member of the United Nations. I say that because it is a fixed belief with me that the day has come when communication is so swift and weapons are so far-reaching and destructive that a disturbance of the peace anywhere on earth puts every other nation in the world on defense.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand it, I think the Senator's position is, and, if so, I am in full agreement with it, that henceforth no major nation or no primary power can escape involvement in a war, of more than local consequence, at least, unless it is able to prevent the war itself.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I believe that sincerely, and, as I have said, I have a consecration to the objective I am discussing which I have never had to any other. It is so great that it overshadows any other duty I have in the office of Senator of the United States.

How are we to make this defense of ours effective? Only by pooling our power with that of other nations. That is the only improvement that is before us or possible for us to make over the existing state of affairs, which result in a war once in 25 years or so. A combination great enough should be made feasible by the willing surrender of a degree of individual liberty, individual independence. That is one point on which we have differences of opinion, and I desire to make this comment in the hope that it will be so simple and

clear that at least the position I take will be understood. The point is that the surrender of a certain amount of independence by every peace-loving country on earth is relatively the same, and the consequence is that the relative independence of countries all over the world is exactly what it was before.

In this respect the vague obligations of the League would be supplanted by specific undertakings to be set forth in the charter, and in special agreements therein referred to. One of the grounds for confidence in the plan is that such combined action would operate free from the suspicion of selfishness, exploitation, aggrandizement, or imperialistic purpose. The moral power of such a combination would be assured by provisions for certainty of action and speed of application when a threat to international peace should arise.

A further fundamental difference between the League Covenant and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals consists in the determination of threats to the peace, or acts of aggression and action in respect thereto. The League Covenant provided for advice upon the means by which the obligation of the members to respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members, should be fulfilled. That is a long sentence, but I had to make it so because that is the way it is in the League Covenant.

In the article relating to sanctions the Covenant of the League provided for recommendation to the several governments concerned as to what effective military, naval, or air force the members should severally contribute—notice that, "should severally contribute" to protect the covenants of the League. This is the point: The Covenant did not equip the League with any authority or any organ to act with armed force.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, however, provide the Security Council with power to take action by such air, naval, or land forces, as may be necessary. Here is a significant thing: It sets up a military staff committee to assist the Security Council in plans for the application of armed force.

Another difference—and I call it a tremendous advance—between the League Covenant and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals contains promise of security and peace, in this way: The provision for an international court of justice constituted in accordance with a statute which shall be a part of the charter of the organization is proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. The Covenant of the League, on the other hand, contemplated a court. It would advise about that. But the court was not required to be a part of the organization. An opportunity to the world is now given to establish a judicial system in which the rights that grow out of or are affected by international relations can be peacefully enforced.

Another major improvement in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals over the Covenant of the League consists in arrangements for international economic and social cooperation. Let us not forget that economic peace is a prerequisite of political peace.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals place the removal of causes of war, and the pacific methods of determining and settling controveries among nations, before military interposition. However, they realistically provide for the certainty and the imminence of military sanctions to stimulate the use of pacific methods.

These proposals envisage preventive and enforcement machinery, which the League wholly lacked.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator say that it is implicit in approval of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, as far as it has been evolved, that the Council shall have the power, whether by a majority vote or a unanimous vote, by whatever voting mechanics can be decided on, to put military forces, whether international forces or drawn-upon forces, under predetermined proportions, into action against an aggressor nation among the present Allies?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator say that is implicit?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; not only implicit, it is expressed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator say the same thing is implicit or expressed in the letter addressed by the new Senators to the President?

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask to be excused from answering that question because I should want to examine the letter carefully with respect to that point, and I have not done so. I know about the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, however. They do expressly contain this authority. Let me read the statement:

> Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Does not that answer the question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. After listening to the Senator, it occurred to me that perhaps my question was "off the beam," for in the last analysis the Senators will speak for themselves and give their own interpretation of the letter.

Mr. AUSTIN. I had not thought of that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But under the Senator's theory, if that is not implicit in the letter, then the letter serves no useful purpose and might serve under the Senator's theory a harmful purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know that I should go so far as the Senator has in that comment. My notion is that it is such an important encouragement to the President of the United States in his relations with Stalin, Mr. Churchill, and perhaps someone else, that it constitutes a State paper of great importance. That is my impression of it, and I gained that impression because it endorsed the prompt consideration of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, and it endorsed the prompt consideration of the Vandenberg suggestion about a separate policing force. Those two elements of themselves make that paper, coming at this time, an act of greatness, as I see it. Then there is the quality of its being an all-party pact. Every one of the new Senators, regardless of the party he represents, is a member to that pact. Taken altogether, I am greatly encouraged by it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator agree with me that the significance of the letter would be profoundly different if on the one hand those matters which we have been discussing as implicit in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal are intended by the letter, or if on the other hand they are not intended by the letter, or if there is a division of opinion on that?

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, I could not interpret the letter. It is not my letter. I could tell what I thought it meant to me, but that would not help much on the record. I do not think that there is any excuse or outlet or escape or foot in the door that is visible in that letter. I think it is a very straightforward and clearly expressed letter. Beyond that I do not care to comment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree that we are more or less limited in our speculation on what each of those Senators intended, but from the Senator's standpoint I will ask him, Does he construe the letter as containing the expression to the President of the wish of the Senators who signed it that we shall enter into an international organization, the Council of which will have the powers which the Senator has said are implicit in the powers reposed in the Council proposed by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; that is my understanding of it, and that is all I care to say. I so understand it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that is as far as the Senator can go.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. With reference to the question which has repeatedly come up as to whether, in joining the organization as envisaged in the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, we are pledging our full resources in case it becomes necessary to take military action against one of the great powers, I take it the Senator from Vermont will agree with me that the primary purpose of this organization will be to prevent any future great wars.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. And if it becomes necessary to coerce against its will, at least in the next decade or two, any one of the major powers that will come out of this war victorious—Russia, Britain, or the United States—if it becomes necessary against its will to coerce it into accepting a decision of the Council, or if any one of those powers embarks on military aggression, are we not then in a major war?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, of course.

Mr. BALL. So that the purpose of the organization has then been defeated?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BALL. The point I am trying to make is that the success of this organization is built on the foundation of continued cooperation and confidence among those major allies, and faith in their nonaggressive intentions in the future.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am glad that the Senator from Minnesota has brought out that point, because it is the oaken beam that supports the whole superstructure of this building. Without faith, anything that we put into a treaty will fall, no matter whether we have the peace force of military kind in it or not. If we have to suppress by armed force one of the great powers, we are at war already. We are not dealing with that sort of a thing when we are setting up this organization. We are dealing with the prevention of a threat; that is all. We are not dealing with carrying on a war.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In view of the very interesting remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota, which, I believe, stated the conclusion that the success of any world organization will depend upon the wholehearted support of the major powers of the world, and which has been very ably added to by the Senator from Vermont, we reach the conclusion, then, that any plan of world peace based upon an organization must be subscribed to and supported by every one of the larger powers. Is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And if one of them breaks away from it, then the world organization has collapsed.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. I do not want to beg a question here, but I might observe in passing that I am not so terribly concerned over the questions about voting rights, about veto. What do they amount to? In the final analysis, if we do not have unanimous agreement among all the members of that Security Council, what have we got by way of attaining peace and security?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not discourage any professions of faith that we can make to advance an efficient world organization—and when we endorse our name on a promissory note, we are engaging in an act of faith—but we are not at all prudent if we do not consider what can happen to us by putting our name on that promissory note.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am about to conclude.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield, Mr. President, before he concludes?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I had to be out of the Senate Chamber for a while. I do not know whether the able Senator has discussed subsection 5 of section B of chapter VI dealing with the functions and powers of the Security Council with respect to formulating plans for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments. Has the Senator discussed that section?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I have not taken up the document and discussed it section by section. All I have tried to do, I will say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, is to point out the advantages contained in the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks over the League of Nations. I have pointed out the conspicuous advantages toward security and peace, in the hope that I could summon to the support of the President at this critical moment, discussion and other evidence of great popular support for his effort to have an early meeting of the countries interested in bringing to some sort of definite form these proposals. I have not tried to analyze in detail, chapter by chapter, the different features of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has gone into an extended discussion of the Dumbarton Oaks plan with respect to subsection 5 of section B of chapter VI, which reads as follows:

> In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments, the Security Council, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 9, should have the responsibility for formulating plans for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments for submission to the members of the organization.

Does that mean that the Security Council composed of the component nations shall have the power to formulate a plan to limit armaments of different countries, and submit such plan to the member of the organization, and if the plan is adopted, it would be binding upon all countries?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, my answer is "No." It might be elaborated by simply saying that the language states definitely that such plans would be formulated for submission to the members of the organization. That is very simple language, and the scope of the provision is simply submission. In that regard it resembles the advisory function of the League of Nations. The Security Council cannot prescribe limitations of armament for any nation, whether a member or nonmember, but they can take the whole world situation into consideration and give us their advice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. They can submit a plan.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of what use would it be to have a provision in this system for the formulation and submission of a plan if the plan could not be adopted?

Mr. AUSTIN. That would be a question for us to decide. We could debate it, and if we had a Congress that recognized that it was a good plan, we could adopt it. But we are not likely to be caught in the same trap in which we were caught once before by destroying vessels and throwing our own relative strength out of relationship to that of the armed forces of other countries.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have in mind that today the United States has the greatest Navy in all the world. I certainly do not want to see the time come, under any plan or suggestion, when this country will be called upon to sink that Navy, or a part of it, or divide it with other countries.

Mr. AUSTIN. I join hands with the Senator from West Virginia in that sentiment. I think it is perfectly sound doctrine.

Mr. President, I close with this brief statement. It seems to me that certain war is the alternative to unity in the cause of peace. In other words, we cannot leave the situation as it is, with the responsibility upon individual nations to maintain order among nations under the law. We must have unity of nations in order to do it. Is not the accord of the great powers on these first footsteps toward security cause for assurance that, here a little and there a little, precept upon precept, we shall achieve the objective?

Mind you, Mr. President, these are nothing but proposals, but they are proposals which the representatives of four of the great powers of the world have agreed to submit to their respective governments. At this moment the practical service required of us and of our Government is to give all that it takes to establish the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as an operating authority. As Americans, as fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, wives, and children of those who offer life and sound bodies and minds to the cause of security, we shall consecrate ourselves to the duty which is ours. Let us demand the earliest practicable meeting to establish the Dumbarton Oaks organization.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, on Friday last, with other Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives, I journeyed to Meriden, Conn., to attend the funeral of our beloved friend, FRANCIS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

On that occasion, the Most Reverend Henry J. O'Brien, auxiliary bishop of the Connecticut diocese of the Catholic Church, delivered a very beautiful funeral oration. Mr. Herman H. Angell, of the Meriden Morning Record, has sent me a copy of that address. At this time I wish to read the tribute delivered by the Most Reverend Henry J. O'Brien:

> "I have fought a great fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. As for the rest, there is laid up a crown of justice which the Lord, the Just Judge, will render me on that day" (II Timothy iv: 7, 8).
>
> It is not customary in this diocese to preach a eulogy on the occasion of the death of a member of the laity, nor do I intend to attempt to do so this morning. I would feel remiss in my duty, however, if I did not pay my tribute of respect to the noblehearted

soul for whom we have celebrated mass this morning. He was a big man, big in mind, in soul and heart. He realized only too well we all have an obligation to keep God's law, but he realized, too, a special call goes out to those who have the good will and generosity to accept it. It is a call to a greater service, to a service above the average. He definitely felt he was called to a life of public service; he dedicated himself to it with a generosity of spirit that was characteristic of him. All the great qualities with which he had been so largely gifted by God, he bent to this service. His life indeed was an inspiration to those who had the good fortune to know him.

Formal education, as such, he was forced to forego at an early age. He was, however, keen, inquisitive, and observant by nature. What was lacking in formal education he more than supplied by his reading and experience. Indeed, circumstances threw him among the poor. He learned to know and appreciate their trials and difficulties. It awoke in him a deep sense of social justice.

His genial personality, his clear judgment, his hard common sense, drew the attention of men to him. It opened to him a new field in life and journalism. This gave him the opportunity to study more deeply and to share his opinions with others more widely. There he attracted attention to himself by his interest in affairs of public welfare. He was generally regarded as a man—intelligent, fair-minded, honest, thoroughly upright in character. His personal life was unblemished.

It was but natural, then, in the early thirties during the heavy days of depression, the people of this, his native city, looked to him for leadership. They elected him, then, mayor for two successive terms. So capably and wisely did he administer municipal affairs during those trying days, the people of this district sent him first as their Representative in the House of Congress and then to the Senate. There he remained as our senior Senator from Connecticut for the past 10 years. The glowing tributes he has received from colleagues in the Senate, the general esteem in which he was held in that august body, was nationally recognized. "He was diligent and intelligent, sane and sound in his principles. He had a genius to see things through to their ultimate conclusion. He helped to clarify issues on more than one important occasion and to bring order out of confusion." His opinions were respected by his colleagues even when they felt it necessary to disagree with him; his advice was sought on matters of momentous importance.

He was a humble man, humble in the true sense of the word. He realized he had been gifted by God generously, but he realized, too, he was but the steward of these rich gifts of heart and mind. He wholeheartedly devoted them all to the betterment of his fellow countrymen. He had a burning desire for social justice—he looked forward and bent all his energy during these past few years to a peace founded on justice and charity. Few public men had a deeper grasp and understanding of the social program of the church as enunciated by Leo XIII, Pius XI, and Pius XII than he. It was the basis of the philosophy underlying his zeal for social reform. It was to this he dedicated his life. His selfless service demanded much sacrifice. The long period of separation at times meant the disruption of family life which was so dear to him and separation from his wife and family who were ever a source of inspiration to him.

We in Connecticut are justly proud of him. We Catholics are justly proud of him, for both in his private and public life he evidenced himself always as a true son of the church. The lessons he early learned at his mother's knee were the source of the sterling qualities which had gained for him the respect of all who had the happiness to know him. These deepened as he grew in age and wisdom. He had a deep conviction that public office was a public trust. It was a calling from God. He accepted it generously, and with a generous, wholehearted spirit he devoted himself to it. His advice and counsel would have meant much in the trying days before us. We in this diocese lament his loss as one of our foremost Catholic laymen.

While we are gathered here to pay our last respects to his mortal remains, to extend our condolences to his bereaved wife and family, we should be not unmindful that as he was generous in his service to us in life, we should not forget him in death. Our prayers should follow him before the judgment seat of God. May he yet see the vision of that peace for which he so industriously labored. May his soul and the souls of the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace.

Mr. President, as one of his colleagues in the Senate, I feel certain that all of us would join in expressing the hope and the faith that the perpetual light of God's sunshine will always be upon him and that the soul of this illustrious son of Connecticut may rest in peace.

REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 340.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in section 4, on page 2, line 24, after the word "any", to insert "agreement or", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

(b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress, until June 1, 1947, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance, or to acts in the conduct of such business, and until January 1, 1948, the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall not apply to such business or to acts in the conduct thereof.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

SEC. 6. As used in this act, the term "State" includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, until June 5, 1944, the business of insurance had been regarded as a local matter, and subject to regulation or taxation by the several States. While that view had been contested many times by various insurance companies, various decisions of the United States Supreme Court had fostered and augmented it for a period of more than 75 years, until on June 5, 1944, in its opinion in the case of United States against Southeastern Underwriters Association and others, the Supreme Court held in effect that the business of insurance was commerce and, therefore, subject to the Sherman Act of July 2, 1890, as amended, and the Clayton Act of October 15, 1914, as amended.

Since that decision was rendered, the States have been greatly concerned about the business of insurance, insofar as regulation and taxation are concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand the bill its purpose and effect will be to establish the law as it was supposed to be prior to the rendering of the recent opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I would say that subsection (b), at the bottom of page 2, would allow the provisions of the Sherman Act to apply to all agreements or acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation, and subsection 4 (a) would suspend the application of the provisions of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, insofar as States may regulate and tax such companies, until certain dates or until Congress may act in the meantime in respect to what Congress thinks should be done with the business of insurance.

In other words, the bill would establish a moratorium on the application of the provisions of those acts until the date set forth in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in order to show the importance of this matter to the States, let me say that this morning I received word that Commissioner Charles F. J. Harrington, of Massachusetts, who is chairman of the com-

mittee on Federal legislation of the insurance commissioners body, was advised by William P. J. Hodges, insurance commissioner for the State of North Carolina, that some insurance companies had given notice to their States that they would not pay the tax which is being levied in those States, or that they would pay it under protest. Under the law, it would be necessary to suspend the licenses of such companies and of all their agents. The insurance tax would have to be paid by February 15. In South Carolina, Kentucky, and Tennessee the tax is due on February 1.

So it is advisable that the bill be passed quickly, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Let me inquire whether I am justified in understanding that the bill comes before the Senate with a unanimous report in its favor from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. FERGUSON. The report is unanimous.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the bill is entirely satisfactory to the State insurance companies.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is entirely satisfactory to the insurance commissioners; and the various organizations of insurance companies have, without exception, so far as my knowledge goes, taken the position that it is satisfactory to them. There is no objection. The bill is a compromise measure; it is the best that could be agreed upon at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very much in favor of the bill, and I hope it will pass.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the bill in its present form contemplate that a State legislature may enact laws which would permit agreements in violation of the Sherman Act?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that until June 1, 1947, State legislatures could enact laws which would be in conflict with the Sherman Act, but could not pass laws which would permit either an agreement or an act on the part of an insurance company, or insurance companies, of boycott, coercion, or intimidation. If, in the meantime, Congress passed legislation contrary to the laws passed by State legislatures, such State laws would be nullified because, under this bill, and subject to certain exceptions set forth in the bill, insurance is treated as interstate commerce.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I followed correctly the distinguished Senator, he takes the position that the respective State legislatures may pass laws permitting agreements in violation of the Sherman Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; if the agreements do not violate paragraph (a) or (b) of section 4 of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. I invite the distinguished Senator's attention to that part of the report on page 2 which appears under the heading "Purpose of the bill." It is as follows:

> It should be noted that this bill, by the moratorium proposed therein, does not repeal the Sherman and Clayton Acts, but opportunity will have been granted for the States to permit agreements and contracts by insurance companies which otherwise might be in violation of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

It seems to me that while this bill may not specifically repeal the Sherman Act, it does provide for repeal of the Sherman Act by the State legislatures by permitting them to enact laws which would allow agreements and contracts in violation and in derogation of the Sherman Act. Is that not what the bill would do? I believe that its language accomplishes that very thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I have already stated, the intent of the bill is to permit State legislation along the line mentioned in the excerpt which the Senator has read, if it does not violate paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 4 of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. I invite the Senator's attention to paragraph (b) of section 2 of the bill, reading as follows:

> (b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

That part of the bill is applicable, is it not, to Federal statutes now in existence?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the purpose of the section.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is also applicable, is it not, to any Federal statutes which may be enacted in the future?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; provided the statutes do not specifically relate to insurance.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will pardon me, I agree with him that the language affects only statutes the subject of which is insurance.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or specifically relating to insurance.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. But certainly that part of the bill to which I have referred would allow repeal by State legislatures of the Sherman Act so far as it relates to insurance unless the Congress of the United States should amend the Sherman Act so as to provide specifically either the repeal, invalidation, or impairment of such a State law.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator has used the word "repeal." The bill would not go so far as to repeal the Sherman Act except as there would be a temporary repeal until the dates mentioned in the so-called moratorium section.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the very point which I am making. While the language would not specifically repeal the Sherman Act with regard to insurance or the regulation thereof, it would confer, so far as Congress can confer power on the State legislatures to repeal by State statute the Sherman Act insofar as it relates to the insurance business.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; except paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 4. I do not believe that under the bill a State could pass a law permitting an agreement or an act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us look at that phase of the subject for a minute. We now leave section 2 of the bill and drop down to section 4. Paragraph (a) of section 4 provides for a moratorium, or a suspension of the Sherman and Clayton Acts insofar as they relate to insurance, for a period, respectively, until June 1, 1947, so far as the Sherman Act is concerned, and until January 1, 1948, so far as the Clayton Act is concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Paragraph (b) reads:

> (b) Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

Would the Senator agree to an amendment of the bill which, instead of limiting paragraph (b) of section 4, by the word "section" on page 2, line 23, would strike out that word and insert the word "act"? In that way we would not be limited merely to that one section.

Mr. FERGUSON. The only reason why I believe it should not be done is that the Sherman Act is the only act which relates to boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not believe the Senator gets my point.

Mr. FERGUSON. Perhaps I do not.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will look at page 2, beginning in line 23 of the bill, he will find the following language:

> Nothing contained in this section—

Referring to section 4 of the bill—

> shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

My suggestion is to strike out the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the word "act", so that the language would then read:

> Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I see no reason for not changing the word "section" to "act," because I am of the opinion that that was the intention of all concerned.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it would improve the bill very materially.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps the Senator first wished to make a statement in response to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order to have a clear understanding of the bill, the attention of the Senate should be called to the fact that, as the Senator from Michigan has said, over a long period of years the courts have held that insurance is subject to State regulation. It will also be remembered that the question as to whether the Federal antitrust laws applied to insurance was never decided until the Southeastern Underwriters case was before the Supreme Court. On the day on which that

case was decided the Supreme Court handed down another decision in what is known as the Polish-Alliance case in which it held that the National Labor Relations Act applied to insurance. In the Polish Alliance case the Supreme Court said by unanimous decision that the business of insurance was so affected with a national commercial interest that the National Labor Relations Act, which was passed under the commerce clause, applied to the business. On the same day by a divided Court it held that the antitrust laws applied.

It should be pointed out that every case involving the construction of insurance regulation laws which had been passed upon by the Supreme Court down to the time when the Southeastern Underwriters case was decided involved State statutes. Every such case, so far as I am advised, was brought to the Supreme Court because insurance companies had endeavored to escape State regulation. Before the Southeastern Underwriters case was decided bills were introduced in the Congress to exempt insurance wholly and altogether from the effect of the antitrust laws. Those bills failed of enactment. As the unanimous report of the committee says on the first page:

> The Attorney General, in several appearances before the Judiciary Committee, frankly stated that the Department of Justice had no opposition to an extension of time to the insurance industry in order to make necessary adjustments to this decision.

It is stated in another part of the report, on page 2:

> What is more, the Congress proposes by this bill to secure adequate regulation and control of the insurance business.

Another paragraph, under the heading "Purpose of the bill," reads as follows:

> The purpose of the bill is twofold: (1) To declare that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest; and (2) to assure a more adequate regulation of this business in the States by suspending the application of the Sherman and Clayton Acts for approximately two sessions of the State legislatures, so that the States and the Congress may consider legislation during that period. It should be noted that this bill, by the moratorium proposed therein, does not repeal the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

The Sherman antitrust law contains two primary provisions. The first section of that law, which takes its name from Senator Sherman, of Ohio, makes illegal contracts or agreements in restraint of trade. The second section of the law makes it a misdemeanor for any person or group to make any contract or agreement which monopolizes or attempts to monopolize any part of trade or commerce.

The questions which have been raised by the Senator from Utah prompted me to ask the Senator from Michigan this question: Does the Senator from Michigan conceive that the pending bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee, with the language which I have just read, has the effect of making it possible for a State to legalize contracts in restraint of trade or has the effect of making it possible for any State to authorize attempts on the part of any group of insurance companies to monopolize the business of insurance. I did not understand that to be the opinion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I will answer that by saying that if agreements in restraint of trade or to monopolize amounted either to a boycott and/or coercion and/or intimidation, they would be absolutely void, because they would contradict the bill which is now being considered by the Senate and which it is hoped will be passed today. But certain agreements might be permitted in the States if they did not violate the terms of this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator desire to tell the Senate that it is his purpose and the purpose of the pending bill to say to the State legislatures that laws may be enacted which will permit monopoly to be created in the insurance industry?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator from Michigan to respond to the inquiry before he yields?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to yield to the Senator from Utah so that he may answer the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would rather have an answer from the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will answer it later, if the Senator please.

Mr. MURDOCK. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to the report itself, from which I quote, as follows:

"It should be noted that this bill, by the moratorium proposed therein, does not repeal the Sherman and Clayton Acts but opportunity" is granted to the States by subsection B of section 2 to accomplish this very purpose. Certainly the Congress does not want to do that.

This is the important part of the report, and I think it is in full conformity with the bill itself "but opportunity will have been granted for the States to permit agreements." What kind of agreements? Agreements which do not conflict with the restrictions in subsection (b) of section 4, but "agreements and contracts by insurance companies which otherwise"—"which otherwise"—and I stress these words of the report "might be in violation of the Sherman and Clayton Acts."

Certainly the very purpose of the bill, if subsection B of section 2 is not stricken, is to provide that State legislatures, if they so desire, may relieve insurance companies from contracts in restraint of trade which are prohibited by the Sherman Act, so long as such contracts and agreements do not come within the inhibition of subsection (b) of section 4, which refers to agreements or acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation. The report itself, in my opinion, answers the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I will answer the question of the Senator from Wyoming in the same way the able Senator from Utah has answered it. Just as he read, the bill provides that agreements or contracts may be permitted by State legislature within the moratorium period if they do not violate paragraph (b) of section 4.

As I read the bill proposed by the able Senator from Wyoming, his measure would permit the same thing if the State acts specifically so provided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill which was presented by the Senator from Wyoming contained a section which does not appear in the pending bill, a section which undertook to exempt from the effect of the antitrust law certain types of combinations and agreements, but certainly not such an agreement as would enable any State to be in the position of authorizing the establishment of monopoly. It was clearly with the understanding that the bill was a good-faith attempt not to get around the antitrust laws, or the decision of the Supreme Court, but to enable the insurance industry and the States to accommodate themselves to the decision and to the antitrust laws, that the Judiciary Committee made a unanimous report.

I am somewhat surprise, I am frank to say, that the Senator seems to have taken the position now that the intent is to enable any State which so desires to permit national organizations to monopolize the business of insurance. Have I correctly interpreted the Senator?

Mr. FERGUSON. Subject——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Subject only to a boycott, intimidation, or coercion.

Mr. FERGUSON. In section 4 it is provided "for the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress."

If any State should attempt to pass such legislation, Congress in the meantime could pass laws specifically providing that contracts made thereunder were void, or, if such an act was passed after the moratorium, then it would be void.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Michigan desire that the bill, if it shall be passed by this body, shall be interpreted anywhere as an intention of Congress to permit monopoly to be established in the insurance industry?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; by no means does the bill anticipate that any act would or should be passed which would create monopoly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, does the Senator believe that the bill as it now stands permits that interpretation?

Mr. FERGUSON. It would permit it. I understood the Senator from Wyoming to be familiar with the language on page 2, which was read by the able Senator from Utah, and I think the bill is broad enough to allow a State to pass a law allowing any agreement or contract other than those inhibited in paragraph (b) of section 4. But it is not the purpose of the bill at all to foster monopoly, or to anticipate that any act will be passed permitting or even encouraging monopoly. A State law relating to taxation, a law relating to regulation, for instance, the fixing of rates, or the fixing of the terms of a contract of insurance, which might under some definitions of monopoly be monopolistic, would be permitted under the pending

bill; but if the State law undertook to authorize a boycott, a coercion, or an intimidation, or an agreement to do any one of those three things, then it would be clearly void because Congress would have already spoken, and once Congress speaks on interstate commerce, no State can speak contrary to the congressional declaration.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The bill does not say what the Senator has indicated. What the bill says is that every act of Congress in existence now or which may be enacted in the future dealing with the question of insurance or the regulation of insurance shall not be construed—and that is pretty strong language—"to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides."

So we would do what? We would say to the State legislatures, "You can pass any law you desire with reference to insurance and the regulation thereof which does not involve agreements or acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation, unless the Congress at some future date specifically repeals or invalidates your State law."

I wonder if the Congress of the United States wants to do that.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill does not go as far as that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. My understanding of what the Senate Judiciary Committee wanted to do and what I hoped it would do was that we would by the enactment of a bill of this kind call the attention of the respective States of the Union to the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States had held that the business of insurance is commerce, and knowing that certain hardships were inevitable because of past practice and procedure, it was my intention, and I thought the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary, to say to the States, "For a certain period, long enough for you to take action, you will be allowed to make adjustments of your State laws to harmonize with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States." But under the bill we would not do that. In my opinion, we would do exactly what the Senator from Wyoming implies we would do—that is, invite the respective State legislatures to pass acts which would permit agreements which would otherwise be in violation of the Sherman Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think an explanation of paragraph (b) of section 2 should be made at this time. The purpose of that provision is very clear, that Congress did not want at the present time to take upon itself the responsibility of interfering with the taxation of insurance or the regulation of insurance by the States. We were able to single out and to indicate that we had in mind three acts of which we wanted to make exceptions, because they did not relate to insurance. I read from the bill:

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

Now on page 3, and we find section 5:

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Permit me a further word of explanation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. If there is on the books of the United States a legislative act which relates to interstate commerce, if the act does not specifically relate to insurance, it would not apply at the present time. Having passed the bill now before the Senate, if Congress should tomorrow pass a law relating to interstate commerce, and should not specifically apply the law to the business of insurance, it would not be an implied repeal of this bill, and this bill would not be affected, because the Congress had not, under subdivision (b), said that the new law specifically applied to insurance. I think that makes the bill very clear.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am quite satisfied that it is the intention of the Senator and the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary to grant a moratorium and invite the States to step in and regulate the insurance business. It seems to me that if the Senator would agree to striking from the bill subsection (b) of section 2, and then agree to the other amendment which I suggest in subsection (b) of section 4, that we would do that very thing; but we would not take the long step which has been indicated today by the Senator from Wyoming of inviting State legislation, permitting violation of the Sherman Act as to monopolies and agreements in restraint of trade. I do not believe that any Senator wants to invite any State legislature to step into the insurance field and permit contracts and agreements in restraint of trade or contracts and agreements which would evade the monopoly provisions of the Sherman Act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to ask, Why is not the Senator willing to accept that amendment? It seems to me it is a very proper amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, with this one explanation——

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator say that he will agree to that amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I wanted to make a statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the amendment would clear the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Provided the word "agreement" in subsection (b) of section 4 is understood to relate to boycott, coercion, or intimidation. Is it the interpretation of the Senator from Utah that the word "agreement" in that paragraph relates to boycott, coercion, or intimidation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. With that explanation on the record——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the pending question is on the committee amendment in line 24, on page 2, and that another amendment is not now in order until the committee amendment is disposed of.

Mr. FERGUSON. At the proper time I shall consent that the word "section" be changed to "act."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I hesitate to differ with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], but I want to call his attention to a fact which is, of course, very obvious, that the difficulties of working out the insurance readjustment following the decision of the Supreme Court are colossal. I do not believe anyone who does not come very closely in contact with the insurance business can realize that the decision by the Supreme Court to which reference has been made is one of the most far-reaching ever rendered by that Court. It means that an enormous business which, with the unqualified approval of the Federal Government, has operated for many years in a certain way, must now meet the new and fundamental conditions involved necessarily in any passage from State to Federal regulation. That does not involve merely one but a thousand-and-one different problems to be handled, many of them around the first of the present calendar year.

Ever since this problem arose it has received the closest attention. On June 6, 1944, the day after the decision of the Supreme Court was rendered, I wrote a letter to the President of the United States and asked for a moratorium, and he wrote me a letter in reply. Subsequently, on December 20, 1944, the day after the adjournment of the last Congress, I again wrote the President in regard to a moratorium, to which he replied on January 8. I do not desire to delay the Senate by reading the correspondence, but I ask permission that the letters addressed by me to the President and his replies thereto be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I called the President's attention to the gravity of the situation and asked for a moratorium. His response was favorable, as it was later in answer to my letter of December 20. Of course, no one knows what legislation any State might try to pass. It might try to pass any sort of legislation, but it is extremely unlikely that any State, knowing that at

the end of several years the moratorium provided for in this bill will come to an end, would try to run amok and pass any such law as the Senator from Utah suggests.

In subsection (b) there are several purposes contemplated. The insurance commissioners and many of the insurance companies have been in very great doubt as to how they could operate at this time with respect to matters of collection of premiums, general regulations, the issuing of licenses, and many other aspects of the business. Therefore, it seems very desirable that somewhere in this measure there should be a statement that the right of the States to regulate and to collect taxes should not be terminated or should not be repealed by implication. Otherwise, I think the States may find themselves from time to time in a very serious situation in trying to function. Unless it is clearly stated somewhere that there is not a repeal by implication, such omission is likely to throw restraint upon or put serious hindrance in the way of the States functioning properly. In giving a moratorium to a business and to State governments harrassed greatly by the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court, let us not do so begrudgingly or in a halfway fashion which might prove to be gravely insufficient to meet situations which we cannot today foresee.

EXHIBIT A

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The decision of the Supreme Court yesterday, reversing the long-time settled law in that the Court decided that insurance comes under the supervision of the Sherman Antitrust Act, is I think, one of the most far-reaching which has been rendered for a long time.

Of course it means in substance probably that the insurance industry, one of the largest in the country, will be turned over from the supervision of the States to that of the Federal Government. The demand upon manpower and time of the Federal Government to take over this gigantic industry cannot be satisfied, I assume, without very heavy strain upon the energies of the Federal Government in carrying on our war program.

Several months ago in talking to Attorney General Biddle I urged that if *Paul* vs. *Virginia* were reversed that the Government should not only be slow to attempt to up-set all the existing arrangements authorized by the States, but should also issue reassuring statements that there would be no haste. I have the impression that the Government intends to show some restraint in this matter.

The Bailey-Van Nuys bill has been held in the Judiciary Committee awaiting the decision of the Supreme Court in the case just decided.

It is very fortunate that the insurance interests, although under State control, stood very staunchly during the depression, and I understand that State officials, boards of trade, and insurance interests quite generally have registered vigorous opposition to the suggested shift from State control to Federal.

I have studied the matter carefully for years and have seen no adequate justification for such a shift. It seems to me that such a transfer in time of war, and I may add in a political campaign, is especially unfortunate.

Very respectfully,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 10, 1944.

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: I have your letter of June 6 with respect to the recent decision of the Supreme Court deciding that insurance comes under the provisions of the Sherman Act. You suggest that this would probably mean supervision by the Federal Government.

The Attorney General advises me that he does not believe that this alternative is inevitable or even probable. He tells me that there is nothing in the decision which prevents the regulation by the States of insurance rates as long as that regulation does not interfere with the provisions of the Sherman Act.

Personally, I know of no effort at this time to bring insurance companies under over-all Federal regulation. Whether or not such control were adopted would depend, I think, very much on the attitude of the companies themselves in complying with the provisions of the Sherman Act.

The Attorney General assures me that he is anxious that the insurance companies and the State insurance officials shall have a reasonable time within which to conform their practices and statutes to the decision of the Supreme Court.

With best regards, always,
Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

DECEMBER 20, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing this note in regard to the insurance situation. On June 6, 1944, one day after the very far-reaching decision of the Supreme Court reversing *Paul* v. *Virginia*, I wrote a letter to you emphasizing what I thought was the gravity of the situation. I suggested that you declare a sort of moratorium during which essential adjustments could be made to the new decision. I also requested that you issue a reassuring statement to the industry suddenly facing problems of a grave and unprecedented nature. On June 10 you very kindly wrote me a letter in which your position was, on the whole, favorable to what I had requested.

Since that time the insurance industry, insurance commissioners, certain officials of the Federal Government, Members of Congress, and others have been endeavoring to work out an arrangement which would seem to be adequate. Likewise the status as to State taxation and other forms of State regulation have been questioned in some channels.

The adjournment of Congress has come before such plans could really be carried out. I have been in close touch with Attorney General Biddle, who has been very helpful. It is my impression that he is in favor of a suitable moratorium, but there are some departments of the Federal Government closely involved which do not come under the supervision of the Attorney General.

I again very respectfully suggest that you give expression to some form of moratorium under which State activities could continue freely pending Federal and State legislation which will undoubtedly be passed and put into operation within the very near future.

I am sure everyone is in accord with the idea you expressed in your letter to me of June 10, that the insurance industry which is one of the largest and most important in this country should have every reasonable opportunity for readjustment.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.

JANUARY 2, 1945.

MY DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: In your letter of December 20, you suggest that there should be some form of a moratorium during which insurance companies will have an opportunity to readjust their practices in order to bring them into conformity with the Supreme Court decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters Association case, and during which legislation might be enacted. The Attorney General advises me that several months ago he told the Senate Judiciary Committee that no new antitrust prosecutions against insurance companies would be instituted during a reasonable readjustment period.

The responsibility for the regulation of the business of insurance has been left with the States; and I can assure you that this administration is not sponsoring Federal legislation to regulate insurance or to interfere with the continued regulation and taxation by the States of the business of insurance. But there is no conflict between the application of the antitrust laws and effective State regulation of insurance companies, and there is no valid reason for giving any special exemption from the antitrust laws to the business of insurance. The antitrust laws prohibit private rate fixing arrangements between insurance companies and acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation. The antitrust laws do not conflict with affirmative regulation of insurance by the States such as agreed insurance rates if they are affirmatively approved by State officials.

Senator O'MAHONEY introduced a bill in the last Congress which would have provided for a moratorium from the Sherman Act, except for acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation, until March 1, 1946. This would appear to give sufficient time to permit the necessary readjustment to the Supreme Court decision. I would favor legislation of this general character. It would permit the orderly correction of abuses which have existed in the insurance business and would preserve the right of the States to regulate with full responsibility.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Maryland first. The language of section 2 answers the question:

> The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

That is the insurance business. So the bill specifically provides that the State laws shall apply to taxation and regulation of insurance.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wanted to make exactly the statement to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the Senator from Michigan has made, and that is that nothing could be more emphatic or plainer than subsection (a) of section 2:

> The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

When we go that far Congress expresses itself emphatically that the regulation of the insurance business should be under State law. But when we take the next step in subsection (b) it is an invitation, in my opinion, to do the very thing that I, and I hope the Senator from Maryland, want to prohibit.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with the Senator from Utah that the statement in subsection (a) of section 2 is quite definite and clear. But it has seemed to those who have been working upon this bill that there was some need or at least advisability that there should not be any repeal by implication. The statement beginning on page 1 is a general statement setting forth the purposes.

Since there seems to be doubt in the minds of certain people that there might be repeal by implication or that a general statement might have some crimping effect, it would not be at all unusual if a saving clause were put in the bill. It may not be necessary, but in the spirit of caution I think it might be desirable, especially knowing the very serious problems which have been confronting the insurance companies and the various States to leave them free to meet conditions some of which cannot now be foreseen. We want the companies to understand clearly and we desire the States to realize definitely that the States can go ahead and issue permits, collect taxes, and do the various other things which are necessary to be done. For that reason I think that full and unmistakable emphasis upon that right is essential. It is unnecessary and unwise to create any doubt as to the right of the States to go ahead and function freely in handling insurance.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I agree that it should be very clear that the States can regulate and can tax insurance in all its phases. Section 2, in my humble judgment, is a very clear provision providing for such taxation and such regulation. The language of the bill makes clear the purpose of the legislation, that the taxation problem will be taken care of, and that there will be no excuse for paying under protest or not paying at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking subsection (b) of section 2 from the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few moments on the amendment.

The purpose of the bill would be nullified if the amendment were to be adopted. Today the various States have laws relating to insurance. It would be a physical impossibility to examine, in a short time, all those State laws and their ramifications. One State law provides that the insurance companies may fix rates subject to the approval of the insurance commissioner. Others provide that rates may be fixed if the Commission does not repeal them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does not subsection (a) of section 2 take complete account of that fact, and grant complete protection to existing State laws?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that, as to existing State laws, subsection (a) of Section 2 does so provide.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read it:

> The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

That is complete.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no reason for misunderstanding on the part of any State official or any insurance company or any policyholder with respect to the meaning of that subsection as it applies to existing law.

Mr. FERGUSON. As it applies to existing law, that is correct. However, subsection (b) provides for something further. It provides that no Federal legislation relating to interstate commerce shall by implication repeal any existing State law unless such act of Congress specifically so provides.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator puts his finger upon the precise center of this dispute, or misunderstanding. Let me say to the Senator that, recognizing the complexity of this problem, and the desirability of maintaining State regulation and State taxation, members of the Judiciary Committee who were opposed to the proposal to grant a blanket exemption from the antitrust laws desired to go as far as was humanly possible in the direction of giving the States a clear-cut opportunity to adjust State laws in accordance with Supreme Court decisions and the antitrust laws.

It is no secret that Senate bill 12, introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and myself, and Senate bill 340, the bill which was reported by the committee, are modifications of a measure which was originally drafted by the legislative committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. So there was an effort to work with those groups. In drafting those two bills we sought to spell out each particular law which might apply to insurance. We referred specifically to the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Fair Labor Standards Act. In other words, a good-faith attempt was made to specify every single law which had an application, or might have an application, to insurance.

Section 2 (b) was drafted and written into the bill which I introduced, in the belief, not that it would be interpreted as an additional exemption from the antitrust laws, but that it would be a sort of catch-all provision to take into consideration other acts of Congress which might affect the insurance industry, but of which we did not have knowledge at the time.

I am sure that the Senator from Michigan does not wish to ask the Senate, in view of the interpretation which has been placed upon this section, to enact that provision. To do so would put us in the position of saying that any State, if it so desires, may authorize monopolies. I suggest to the Senator from Michigan that the elimination of subsection (b) of section 2, as suggested by the Senator from Utah, would not in any way, shape, or form prevent carrying out the understanding which was had with State insurance commissioners.

The bill which we drafted grants a clear-cut moratorium for a much longer period than the Department of Justice had originally suggested, which was acceptable to some Members of the Senate and some of the insurance companies. Furthermore, it grants a moratorium from those provisions of the Clayton Act which have to do with interlocking directorates. In that case the moratorium is 6 months longer than that proposed to be granted for the purpose of adjusting State laws to the antitrust laws.

Section 4 provides as follows:

> For the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress until June 1, 1947, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance—

And so forth. I submit to the Senator from Michigan that this represents a good-faith effort on the part of all concerned to extend to the States an opportunity to approach this problem in the light of the Supreme Court decisions and in the light of the antitrust laws.

No one is more ready than I to acknowledge that the insurance industry is a very complex industry, and that opportunity ought to be extended for necessary adjustments. However, the charges which have been made have been made not by the Government but by persons engaged in the insurance industry; not by any Member of Congress but by policyholders and agents and those who have been affected by the insurance industry. It has been charged that improper attempts have been made to monopolize this business.

As I understand, it is not the purpose of the Senate to grant opportunity for such monopoly. It is the purpose to enable the States and the Congress to make a good-faith effort to adjust themselves to the industry and the conditions which now exist; and I trust that the Senator from Michigan will accede to the suggestion made by the Senator from Utah and accept the amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. This whole controversy arose, Mr. President, because of the custom and practice, which had grown up in this country during a period of 75 years and which had been upheld by the courts of the country, of not considering insurance to be commerce. The Supreme Court finally decided otherwise.

Subsection (b), which has been referred to in the present discussion, does not, it seems to me, relate at all to the learned remarks just made by the Senator from Wyoming.

The subsection reads in part as follows:

> SEC. 2. (b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law—

And so forth. The whole crux of the subsection is the word "construed."

The purpose of the framers of the bill, Mr. President, was to provide against a sudden adverse decision by some court in construing this Act or some State act thus throwing the business of insurance into confusion. The word "construed" is the whole crux of that particular subsection. I think to eliminate it would destroy the assurance given by the bill to the insurance business, and I would vote against eliminating it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think it can fairly be stated that today absolute chaos exists in the insurance world, and it has been caused by the decision of the Supreme Court to which we have referred. The pending bill is an attempt to remove and dissipate that chaos by enacting a law by which the insurance companies will be able to abide for the time being.

As I said before, the State of North Carolina, which I am informed uses the revenue obtained from the taxation of such companies for the payment of pensions, has advised us that by February 15 of this year it will be compelled to suspend the licenses of certain insurance companies and all their agents to do business there because the companies have decided that under the present chaotic conditions they do not wish to pay the tax. They do not know whether they should or should not pay it. If subsection (b) is deleted, I am of the opinion that we shall accomplish nothing by enacting the bill; because the insurance companies will still be unable to decide what they can or cannot do, and for that reason they will abide by the provisions of the State laws, and the present chaos will continue.

I think it is fair to say that a great deal of time and attention have been devoted to preparation of the pending bill. The able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is the coauthor of the bill. It was submitted to various insurance companies—fire insurance, life insurance, marine insurance, and casualty insurance companies, and so forth—through the insurance commissioners of the various States, because the Commissioners were aware of the chaotic condition which exists at the present time.

After almost a week of work upon the bill, which in similar form was introduced in the last session, it was possible to reach an agreement under which the insurance companies believed they could work, for the time being, until January 1, 1947, and until January 1, 1948. The two separate dates were provided because we wished to allow sufficient time for two sessions of the State legislatures to be held. For instance, the Clayton Act applies to interlocking directorates. It was the opinion of the insurance commissioners and the insurance companies that it would be impossible to change the interlocking directorate laws of the State unless a considerable period of time were allowed. That is the reason why two dates for the so-called moratorium are provided.

The bill does not provide for repeal of the Clayton Act or of the Sherman Act, because if an attempt were made to repeal them, before they could again become effective it would become necessary to reenact them. So the language of the bill is such as to provide that they will be in full force and effect, except there will be a moratorium for a certain period. Thus there will be no necessity for the reenactment of those laws so as to make them apply to insurance in the future, unless Congress desires to do so by specific legislation.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. MURDOCK addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask whether it might meet the objection of the Senator from Wyoming if the word "heretofore" were inserted in subsection (b), so as to make it read:

> No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law heretofore enacted by any State—

And so forth. That would certainly eliminate the possibility of its application to future State action. My interest is to preserve the State laws of Ohio, for instance, which tax insurance companies and bring in certain amounts of revenue. I do not wish to have those laws changed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in my own right on that point. By the provisions of the bill we are in effect asking the legislatures to put their own houses in order during the next 2 years. The danger of inserting the word "heretofore," as the able senior Senator from Ohio has just proposed, is that the legislatures would be unable to pass any laws which in their opinion might violate the provisions of that subsection.

Mr. TAFT. We wish to have them put their houses in order by adopting laws which do not conflict with the Sherman Act. As I understand the provisions of the bill, it would allow a period of 2 years during which such legislation might be adjusted to the provisions of the Sherman Act or other existing Federal statutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. At the present time, every State rate-fixing authority violates the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, or both. There are many State laws which violate the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. It is our purpose to permit those laws to continue in force and effect until at least 1947 and 1948.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but this section will not cease to be effective in 1947 or 1948; it will go on forever. If the Senator could provide a limit—for instance, until 1947—that would be helpful, although it is difficult for me to understand how it is possible to provide that an act of Congress shall be construed one way for 2 years and another way thereafter. It seems to me it would be necessary to change the language of the section.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would have no objection to inserting the words "until January 1, 1948."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio has put his finger on the crux of the matter. If it is the intention of the Senator from Michigan to provide a moratorium for the States, in order to allow them to put their houses in order, so that their laws may conform to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, then certainly it is inconsistent to include subsection (b) of section 2 in its present form. I am in agreement with the Senator from Ohio in believing that in all probability the amendment offered by me would be fully taken care of if the word "heretofore" were inserted at the proper place in subsection B of section 2, rather than to strike out the whole subsection. The language then would read:

> No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law heretofore enacted by any State—

And so forth. I know the Senator certainly will agree to the adoption of my amendment, with the change suggested by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is not only to permit the States to put their houses in order, but to attempt to do away with the confusion and chaos which now exist, so that at least until the date stated in section 4, the moratorium section, the respective States may enact legislation on such subjects, except as forbidden in the bill. I hope that the Senate today will approve the bill in its present form so that it may be made applicable by February 1 in order that the States may tax and regulate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Earlier in the day the Senator from Michigan spoke to me about the situation in South Carolina and with regard to communications which were received last year with reference to the pending subject. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan has any comment to make upon what others who are interested in the matter thought with regard to the particular section under discussion.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have been in touch with two officers of the legislative committee of the State insurance commissioners and they have advised me that the various commissioners desire that the bill be passed in its present form. So far as I know, no objection to the bill in its present form has been made by the commissioners.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator for the information he has given, which accords with the information I had already received.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Michigan said a few moments ago, the purpose of the bill is not only to afford time to the States to readjust themselves to the decision of the Supreme Court, but to give them an opportunity to function without hindrance. Efforts were made by some persons connected with the insurance business, by insurance departments, and by the Department of Justice, to draft legislation immediately and to come before the Congress with the statement that they thought such legislation was necessary in order to comply with the deci-

sion of the Supreme Court. But after the matter had been given careful consideration it was realized that the drafting of a necessary bill could not be done quickly. Therefore it is highly imperative that time should be afforded for certain studies to be conducted, and they cannot be made unless a moratorium is granted.

It is not now possible to foresee all the questions which may arise for consideration in the future, and it is likewise not possible for us to know what may be the restrictive effect of some of the Federal statutes now in existence. It is gravely dangerous to assume that there are no hidden restrictions which may arise to plague and harass us. Because of the present language of the bill, difficulties might arise and seriously interfere with the work of transition from State to Federal regulation, which is one of the most far-reaching moves with which any industry in this country has ever been confronted. I believe that language should be inserted in the bill which would protect us from such a danger. The insurance commissioners also believe such precautionary provisions should be inserted. Many persons who have studied the matter very carefully feel that obstacles may arise which cannot now be foreseen and provided against, and, therefore, that the bill we pass should be very clear and clean-cut. I believe that is the justification for the provision to which reference has been made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think there is an ambiguity in the bill. Assume that no more legislation were enacted and in 1948 a case should arise involving the question. Does the Sherman Act invalidate any State law under this bill? In section 4 (a) of the bill it is implied that in 1948 the Sherman Act shall again come into force unless something has been done in the meantime. However, in section 2 (b) it is implied that even in 1948 the Sherman Act shall not invalidate any State regulatory law. I think that in that respect the bill is ambiguous on its face. We should straighten out the difference between the two sections.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I would assume that at the end of the period of moratorium the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act would apply.

Mr. TAFT. Paragraph (b) of section 2 of the bill states that "No act of Congress shall ever presume to invalidate a State law on the subject of insurance."

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest that we could remedy the defect by making the subsection read: "Until January 1, 1948, no act of Congress," and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan offer that as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]?

Mr. FERGUSON. I offer it as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If what the Senator from Ohio has said is true, or if there is any doubt of it, it would be well to clarify the language. It was clearly the understanding of those drafting the bill that at the end of 1948 the moratoriums would come to an end.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Michigan state his amendment to the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 2, in line 4, after "(b)", I move to strike out "No" and insert the words "Until January 1, 1948, no."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, as I understand, the pending question before the Senate is my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah offered to amend by striking out paragraph (b) of section 2 on page 2. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has offered a perfecting amendment which takes precedence over the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask the Senator from Michigan to state again what he is offering by way of amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 2, in line 4, after "(b)", I move to amend by striking out "No" and inserting "Until January 1, 1948, no."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask for time to enable me to understand clearly the proposed amendment of the Senator from Michigan. My present understanding is that the Senator offers to amend——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the clerk to read the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after "(b)", it is proposed to amend by striking out the word "No" and inserting the words "Until January 1, 1948, no", so that the subsection will then read: "(b) Until January 1, 1948, no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair", and so forth.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it is my judgment that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would bring about complete harmony between section 2 and section 4. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time in order that the Senate may act upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Utah is withdrawn.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the discussion concerning the amendment to paragraph (b) of section 2. It occurs to me that not only does the proposed act provide for a suspension of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act, but the very purpose of it is to restore the control of the insurance business to the States. If we make the change proposed in this section and say "until January 1, 1948", then the bill in its completeness will end in 1948. The present provision is—and this was the measure reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary—

No act of Congress—

Existing at this time, or passed before this, or to be passed in the future—

shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State * * * unless such act specifically so provides.

I do not think there should be any limitation of time in the provision. We do not want the law to end on January 1, 1948. We want the business left in the control of the States, unless by enactment in the future we specifically state that we do not want something they are doing to be continued.

Therefore, I call to the attention of the able Senator from Michigan the fact that if the language suggested by him shall be written into the bill, this very section will become ineffective on January 1, 1948.

What is the danger of the language as written?

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not at the moment. What is the danger of the language as written, when it provides that no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate a State law dealing with insurance unless the act of Congress specifically states that it is intended so to do? That saves the power of Congress. Why provide an automatic ending of this provision, if it is the intent of Congress today to leave to the States the conduct of the insurance business and the taxing of the insurance business, because if the States cannot control the companies, the States cannot tax them. The companies are refusing to pay taxes to the States, and that is one of the things which have brought forth this proposed law. Why provide an automatic termination upon a declaration of policy by fixing a date of termination?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's suggestion might be pertinent if it were not absolutely contradicted by section 4, which provides that on June 1, 1947, the Sherman Act shall again apply to the business of insurance. If we leave that provision in the bill, the one now being discussed is inconsistent with it, because if the Sherman Act applies to the business of insurance, any State law which authorizes a rating bureau becomes invalid, or those engaged in the business are subject to Federal prosecution for complying with the State law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The only two Federal laws mentioned are the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act, and the purpose of mentioning those specifically is to require the States so to enact legislation as not to violate those two existing laws. If any legislation is enacted in the future, whatever it may be—I cannot contemplate it today—if any law shall be enacted by the Congress on interstate commerce which could possibly affect the business of insurance and bring it within the general term "interstate commerce," it would apply. Why not let the provision stand that it shall not apply unless Congress specifically says in an act that it shall apply to the business of insurance, which we are now trying to return to the States?

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I understand the Senator correctly, he intends by the proposed act to bring about the repeal of the Sherman Act insofar as it applies to insurance.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No, if by "repeal" is meant specific repeal of the act. What we mean to do is to say to the States, "You can regulate insurance, but you cannot provide for anything that will violate the Sherman antitrust law or the Clayton Act, after the dates fixed in the bill, namely, 1947 and 1948.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, if that is what the Senator intends, then certainly what has been called to his attention by the distinguished Senator from Ohio is applicable. What subsection (b) does, and what I object to, is that very thing. It permits the States to repeal the Sherman Act. The Senator does not want that, nor do I. What we do want to do is to grant the States a moratorium during which they can make their State laws conform to the Supreme Court decision, and regulate insurance. But if we pass the proposed law with subsection (b) of section 2 in it, it not only refers to the existing laws of the Federal Government, but to all future laws of the Federal Government. What the Senator from Michigan proposes brings subsection (b) of section 2 in line with section 4, which follows, and grants what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia wants, if I understand him, that is, a moratorium until June 1, 1947.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I see it, two things are proposed by this bill. Not only a moratorium with respect to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act—and we all agree that that is its purpose—but it goes further than that, if I may say so to the able Senator, and carries out the purpose of giving power to the States of regulation of insurance and the taxing of insurance companies, so long as they do not get into conflict with a Federal law. The section before us provides that no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate a State law unless the act of Congress specifically states that the State law is in conflict with the Federal act and is designed to override it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then it is applicable, it does apply, does it not, to the Sherman Act, and also to the Clayton Act, presently, because neither one of those acts specifically repeals or impairs or invalidates any State law?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not agree with that conclusion, because section 4 of the bill specifically says that the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act shall again be in force on the dates mentioned.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what the Senator from Ohio called to the Senator's attention, that there is an inconsistency in the two sections, which is clarified by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not think there is an inconsistency when they are read together. One says that no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate unless Congress specifically says that it shall invalidate. Section 4 provides specifically with respect to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. Subsection (b) of section 2 would apply to all other laws. Section 4 (a) applies to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. I think the sections can be read together. But I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that if he inserts the language "until January 1, 1948," as the time to which that section shall be in effect, he automatically terminates it at that time, and automatically terminates the control of the States over insurance.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, after a little more thought about the language proposed, I am of the opinion that we could make the bill further the purpose we had in mind by not changing it as suggested by the able Senator from Ohio, but changing it in this way, making it read:

No act except the Sherman Act—

And inserting the date—

and/or the Clayton Act—

Inserting the date—

shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

In other words, the case before the Supreme Court was a case applying the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. We wanted to have the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act apply to insurance, but we did not want to go back into all the laws which had been enacted respecting interstate commerce and apply them to the business of insurance. So I should like to have the able Senator from Ohio withdraw his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I did not offer the amendment; the Senator himself offered it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I propose an amendment in line 4, on page 2, after the words "No act," to add "except——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Michigan the phraseology "except as hereinafter provided in section 4."

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we should refer specifically to the two acts by name and by date. I think the language should be:

No act—

And then we should insert the words:

except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That amendment should come in after the word "Congress" and not after the word "act."

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The amendment should come after the word "Congress."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated, so that Senators may understand it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the word "Congress", it is proposed to insert "Except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the language now proposed by the Senator from Michigan is more clarifying than anything he has offered heretofore, and in my opinion, Mr. President, brings subsection (b) of section 2 and section 4 in complete alinement and harmony. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What bothers me about the amendment is that it implies that the measure may invalidate fees or taxes upon such business. The Senator might add at the end of section 4 "or to be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose", and so forth, during that period. The difficulty with the Senator's amendment is that it suggests at least that these two acts, even before 1947, although they do not apply to the business, might possibly invalidate a State law. I do not want the bill to carry that implication.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator explain again just where he would insert his proposal?

Mr. TAFT. At the end of section 4, line 22 on page 2, the Senator might add this language "or to be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State", and so forth.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator feel that the words "shall not apply" are not as broad as the words now proposed by the Senator? We would use language to the effect that the Sherman Act shall not apply; we except it in subsection (b), and then we say it shall not apply. So if it does not apply, I do not see how we can say that it would interfere with the taxation or the regulation of insurance.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps I am unduly concerned, but I am afraid the insurance companies which are doubting the validity of the taxes imposed upon them will not be greatly soothed by subsection (b) of section 2 as proposed to be amended by the Senator, because it excepts the two laws. I think we will then have to look to section 4.

Mr. FERGUSON. We eliminate everything from subsection (b) except two laws, and then we say in section 4 that those two laws shall not apply until certain dates. I think the language now is very clear as to what we mean.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The fact remains that the Sherman and Clayton Acts are excepted by your amendment, therefore they shall be construed to invalidate, im-

pair, or supersede any State laws enacted for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then we say in section 4 that they shall not apply, and that is an all-inclusive application, that they shall no longer so apply.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a conflict. I do not see the necessity for the amendment. It nullifies one of the purposes for which the bill is being enacted. Mr. President, I ask that subsection (b), as proposed to be amended, be now read and I will ask the close attention of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

(b) No act of Congress, except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the pending measure it has two main purposes: First. A declaration of policy by the Congress that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest and that the States shall continue to regulate and tax it, unless Congress specifically legislates on the subject matter to the contrary. Second. A moratorium is declared making ineffective the Sherman and Clayton Acts for a time specified in section 4 (a) of the bill so that States can adjust their laws on the subject. The Judiciary Committee made a careful study of the problems involved and has reported the bill and I believe that the bill as it came from the committee is not ambiguous, but carries out the purposes above set forth by me.

The pending amendment, in my judgment, nullifies the first purpose of the bill. Although the Clayton and Sherman Acts are suspended by section 4 (a), they shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by a State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, if the pending amendment is adopted.

Many insurance companies refuse to pay licenses and taxes in many States, I am informed, because of the Supreme Court decision in United States against Southern Underwriters Association et al., and to now except those two acts, which formed the basis of the decision and, in effect, state that they shall be construed to invalidate State laws on the question of taxation and regulation of the insurance business is bound to lead to much confusion.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it the language now used would be very confusing. The bill excludes all acts except those enumerated. We will have to change the language so as to make all other acts not applicable except the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. Then we except those acts in the next section.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I return to my original suggestion. I do not think the words "shall not apply to such business and the acts or the conduct thereof" are as broad as section 2. It is said there specifically that these acts shall not apply to the insurance business, but that does not necessarily mean that the States might not be deprived also of the power of taxing or regulating because the insurance business is interstate commerce. I do not quite see why, in view of what the Senator now wishes to accomplish, he cannot add to his amendment at the end of section 2 the words I suggested, that no act of Congress shall apply to such business and shall not invalidate, impair, or supersede the law of any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance. Then other acts are covered entirely and the Sherman and Clayton Acts are covered entirely in section 4 (a), and explained in detail.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such language put in the proper place would cover the objection I suggested to the pending amendment. However, I am not advocating it, because I think the bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee is clear. I think all of us agree that the States should retain the right of regulating and taxing the insurance business within their respective borders.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Ohio move that the bill be amended as he has suggested? I have no objection to it.

Mr. TAFT. I do not want to move any further amendment until there is some general agreement as to what we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my opinion that the amendment which the Senator from Michigan has just offered has completely cleared up the situation, and that his comment in response to the Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. The language in section 4, as the Senator from Michigan points out, says that these antitrust laws shall not apply to such business, which means the business of insurance. It would be perfectly impossible, it seems to me, under that language, for a court to say that the Sherman and Clayton laws, which Congress says during this period shall not apply to insurance, shall nevertheless apply to State laws affecting insurance. I think the Senator from Ohio is endeavoring to be oversecure in gaining the point which is covered, it seems to me, by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. The two sections are now drawn into complete harmony, as I see it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We have discussed changing language which has been very carefully studied with respect to the legislation on this subject, and each time a change is made or suggested we look farther down in the bill and we see a conflict with the suggested change. The bill was discussed at length in the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. It was unanimously reported. It has as its purpose giving to the States the control of insurance and creating a moratorium, so called, with respect to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, to fix dates of 1947 and 1948, respectively, and then it provides that nothing contained in this measure shall render the Sherman Act inapplicable if any agreement or act of the State or an insurance company under a law of the State creates a boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the bill is very complete. It was better worked out in committee than it can be here on the floor of the Senate, acting as we are now, almost as a committee. I hope the bill may be passed in the form in which it was reported from the committee after study, and without the shot-from-the-hip amendments which are being offered. I believe that a great mistake would be made if, after careful study of this proposed legislation and framing it in the language in which it was reported, these changes should be made. I hope that the suggested amendments may be rejected, and that the bill may be passed as it was reported to the Senate unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the amendment which has been offered, it provides that no act of Congress, with certain exceptions, shall apply to the business of insurance. Is not that equivalent to stating that the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act shall supersede any State laws?

Mr. FERGUSON. Except that in section 4 it is provided that those two acts shall not apply to insurance.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. First it is provided that they shall invalidate State laws. Then later it is said that there shall be a moratorium. That is not the most felicitous way of stating it. If it can be construed that section 4 clearly modifies section 2 (b), we are safe; but it seems to me that that is running a rather unnecessary risk, because subsection (b) of section 2 clearly states that those two acts shall invalidate State laws.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. If what he says be true, why is it necessary to have an amendment to subsection (b) of section 2 at all? I think we could put both sections together and do exactly what is desired.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am for the bill as it came from the committee. The reason I voted for it was that it would put the regulation of the insurance business in the hands of the States. That is the important thing in this bill. I believe that the amendments which have been suggested would be confusing and conflicting. In my judgment the bill would be better if it were left as it was reported from the committee than if we were to try to amend it on the floor of the Senate. I hope the amendments will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered

by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In section 2, on page 2, line 4, after the word "Congress", it is proposed to insert the words "except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt the pending amendment. I do so for this reason: The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Wyoming have given a great deal of time and attention to this measure. It is not a problem without difficulties. I am satisfied that the purpose of the Senator from Michigan and my purpose are identical. The purpose is to enable the States and the Congress to have time to adjust a very complicated business to a decision of the Supreme Court and to the antitrust laws. There is no purpose to issue an invitation from the United States Senate to the States to enact laws which would establish monopolies in this business.

The moratorium as proposed in the bill, and as now proposed by the Senator from Michigan in his amendment, covers the entire field, and does it in such a way that there can be no misunderstanding. We are extending to the States complete immunity for their State tax laws, and, as stated in section 4, we are granting a moratorium for the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress. I believe the issue is quite clear. The purpose would be attained by the language of the bill together with the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 340) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

(b) No act of Congress, except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress, until June 1, 1947, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance, or to acts in the conduct of such business, and until January 1, 1948, the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall not apply to such business or to acts in the conduct thereof.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

SEC. 6. As used in this act, the term "State" includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], I give notice that when the Senate reconvenes next Monday the Senator from Alabama will move to take up Senate bill 338 to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished friend from Arizona that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] gave notice earlier in the day that as soon as the Senate convenes on Monday it will be his purpose to move to take up the river and harbor bill. I do not think it will require very long to dispose of that bill, in view of the fact that all controversial matters have evidently been eliminated from the bill. After action on the river and harbor bill is completed, I know of no reason at this time why a motion should not be made to take up the bill referred to by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Such a motion will be made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. Struve Hensel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy;

Vice Admiral Frederick J. Horne, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations;

Capt. Frank G. Fahrion, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of February 1943;

Capt. Marshall R. Greer, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of August 1943;

Capt. Peter K. Fischler, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of May 1943;

Commodore Thomas P. Jeter, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Battleship Squadron 2, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944; and

Sundry aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve, and citizens, to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. MCCARRAN), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

T. Hoyt Davis, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the middle district of Georgia, vice Bascom S. Deaver, deceased.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

William M. Payne, to be postmaster at Natchitoches, La.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin C. Wilson to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Myrtus P. Spangenberg to be postmaster at Waymart, Pa., go over until the next session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that all other postmaster nominations on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, all other postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations be confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25, 1945:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania, to be Postmaster General. (Reappointment.)

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Chester L. Sumners, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice James O. Day, resigned.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Leif John Sverdrup, Army of the United States.

To be brigadier general

Col. Courtney Whitney (major, Specialist-Reserve; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William Hood Simpson (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, now invested with rank and title of lieutenant general by virtue of his assignment to command the Fourth Army.

Maj. Gen. Leonard Townsend Gerow (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Albert Coady Wedemeyer (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Anthony Clement McAuliffe (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. David Myron Schlatter (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Clarence Lynn Sturdevant (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Dunbar Pence (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Alexander Russell Bolling (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Clarence Howard Kells (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Wilson Hasbrouck (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Elmer Edward Adler (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Paul Wilkins Kendall (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Philip Edward Brown (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Augustus Keating (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lester Johnson Whitlock (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Gaulbert Weaver (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Arthur McKinley Harper (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Big. Gen. William Caldwell Dunckel (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Price Hays (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Vernon Evans (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Ord Ryan (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edmund Walton Hill (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Hammond Davies Birks (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Booth Spruit, Medical Corps.

Col. James Francis Collins (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. John Carroll Kennedy (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Royal Lehner (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Sabin Ferrin (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Lemuel Mitchell (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt (major, Signal Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Windle Read, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Fowler Fritch (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Selby Harney Frank, Ordnance Department.

Col. Harold Haney (lientenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Rex McKinley McDowell, Dental Corps.

Col. John French Conklin, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Einar Bernard Gjelsteen (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Edwin William Rawlings (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. David Hazen Blakelock (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Sarsfield Power (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Merritt Lowe (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Archer Hagins, Medical Corps.

Col. Francis Hudson Oxx (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. John Brandon Franks (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Cornelius Edward Ryan (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lotha August Smith (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Clarence Charles Fenn (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Bernard Linn Robinson (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. George Francis Wooley, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Benton Catron 2d (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Benjamin Grant Weir, Air Corps.

Col. Robert Merrill Lee (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Townsend Heard (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Cyrus Higginson Searcy (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Fulton McKee (captain, Coast Artillery Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Gustav Joseph Braun (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Pearson Menoher, Cavalry.

Col. John Hubert Davies (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Walter King Wilson, Jr. (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Garland Cuzorte Black (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. James Roy Andersen (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Denis Hackett (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Arthur Lincoln (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. LeGrande Albert Diller (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Day Palmer (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. John Koehler Gerhart (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Keliher, Field Artillery.

Col. Harold Albert Nisley (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr. (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Eugene Lynch Harrison (major, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Harve Johnson, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Marion Van Voorst (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Archer Elmore (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Ward Smith (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Augustus Milton Gurney (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Emons Bert Whisner (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Roy Victor Rickard (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Frederick Phillips (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air

Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Quiskie Huglin (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Lawrence Edward Schick (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Calvert Hinton Arnold (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Irving Hodes (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Clarence McDonald, Medical Corps.

Col. Ralph Parker Eaton (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Max Frank Schneider (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Eugene Ware Ridings (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles Eskridge Saltzman (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Clark Rose (brigadier general, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Victor Emile Bertrandias (major, Air Reserve; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Georges Frederic Doriot (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. William Henry Draper, Jr., Infantry Reserve.

Col. Elliott Roosevelt (captain, Air Reserve; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Bernhard Alfred Johnson (major, Quartermaster Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr., Infantry Reserve.

Col. John Joseph O'Brien, Army of the United States.

Col. Gene William Hall, Army of the United States.

Col. George Hamden Olmsted, Army of the United States.

Col. William Herbert Eaton (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Vincent R. Murphy, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of April 1943.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

George O. Jaquith, June 14, 1943.
Philip H. VonFraenkel, June 22, 1943.
Adrian R. M. Sears, July 10, 1943.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Evert R. Sharp, March 19, 1941.
David P. Andross, March 19, 1941.
John W. Simcock, June 19, 1941.
Edward D. Williams, September 24, 1941.
Daniel L. Martin, May 4, 1942.
William J. Whitehead, June 29, 1942.
Dan G. Frank, June 29, 1942.
Hubert P. Mills, June 29, 1942.
Charles D. Moody, July 23, 1942.
James M. McCracken, Jr., August 25, 1942.
John D. Miller, August 31, 1942.
Robert J. McDairmant, October 12, 1942.

Lt. Charles H. Kretz, Jr., United States Navy, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of July 1940.

The following-named ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Charles M. Quinn, Jr., February 7, 1941.
Solon G. Hale, June 19, 1942.

Ensign James V. Bartlett, D-V(S), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 1st day of October 1944.

The following-named ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Waldron M. McLellon, February 7, 1941.
Thomas P. Cocke, February 7, 1941.
Robert E. Thomas, Jr., February 7, 1941.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Wallace B. Chesterfield, March 31, 1941.
Edward J. Nemecek, February 1, 1942.
Milton Hausman, March 16, 1942.
Edwin A. Glasson, June 1, 1942.
Edwin J. Madden, June 8, 1942.
Earl V. Harrington, August 23, 1943.
William M. Marking, December 6, 1943.
Harold N. Klaser, December 20, 1943.
Frank W. Taylor, January 10, 1944.
Paul H. Wells, Jr., January 10, 1944.
Jack F. Flood, January 17, 1944.
Traver R. Hamilton, July 20, 1944.
James B. Lepley, February 2, 1944.
Ray E. Stevens, Jr., March 20, 1944.
John W. Hazlet, May 1, 1944.
Arthur B. Chevalier, May 15, 1944.
Arthur E. Gustavson, May 15, 1944.
Robert L. Holle, May 24, 1944.
Dennis H. R. Frutiger, June 1, 1944.
Wilbur O. Martin, August 6, 1944.
Don L. Maxfield, August 7, 1944.
Howard C. Hester, August 21, 1944.
Cozier W. Gilman, Jr., September 25, 1944.
Hugh A. Phares, Jr., September 25, 1944.
Edgar H. Lechner, September 26, 1944.
Richard K. Thompson, Jr., September 30, 1944.
William F. Cahill, October 31, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Edwin C. Wilson to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plentipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

George F. Hussey, Jr., to be rear admiral in the Navy to rank from January 22, 1943.

Willard A. Kitts 3d to be a rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from January 25, 1943.

James D. Boyle, to be a pay director with the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from April 18, 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Charles R. Sanderson to be assistant quartermaster on the retired list, with the rank of brigadier general, from December 23, 1944.

William L. McKittrick to be a brigadier general, from June 3, 1944.

Lawson H. M. Sanderson to be a brigadier general, from June 5, 1944.

Christian F. Schilt to be a brigadier general from June 7, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

D. Luther Yarbrough, Athens.
Sadie B. Thomas, Citronelle.

ARKANSAS

Grace V. Webb, Plumerville.

CALIFORNIA

Eugene L. Graffenstein, Di Giorgio.
Charles A. Miller, Gridley.
Manuel C. Joseph, Irvington.
Walter C. Quigley, Mariposa.
William Lais, Perkins.
Joseph Venolia, Spadra.

FLORIDA

Herman E. Wattwood, Titusville.

KENTUCKY

Verdie Whitmer, Bremen.
Henry B. Rappolee, Smithland.

LOUISIANA

Esther B. Dunn, Slaughter.
Leola B. Parrino, Westwego.

MAINE

Susie O. Carver, Beals.
Lucy E. Wilson, Gray.
Albert H. Butterfield, Standish.
William P. MacDonald, Vassalboro.

MINNESOTA

Peter E. Kopacek, Danube.
Peter C. Gravel, Onamia.
Richard M. Odegard, Watson.

MONTANA

Alice A. Van Campen, Reedpoint.

NEBRASKA

Hazel L. Porter, Eagle.
Albin E. Rodine, Stromsburg.

NEW JERSEY

Mabel F. McGrath, Paulsboro.

NEW MEXICO

Gertrude E. White, Melrose.

NORTH CAROLINA

John S. Chapman, Grifton.
Allie Graham Carr, Watha.

OKLAHOMA

Walter W. Hunter, Checotah.
Walter J. Lundy, Forgan.
Hester E. Hathaway, Grant.
Juanita I. Taylor, Marland.
William M. Etter, Oktaha.
Sarah L. Stanton, Putnam.

PENNSYLVANIA

Stewart A. Heffley, Boswell.
Clifford F. Steinmetz, Catasauqua.
Elizabeth A. McBride, Centerville.
Margaret E. Walsh, Lopez.
Joseph Doyle, Mildred.
William A. Thompson, Waynesboro.

TEXAS

Maggie M. Burkett, Andrews.
Cecil R. Chamberlain, Goree.
Walter L. Taylor, Morton.
Jennie Joe Barnett, Paradise.
Leta B. Eidson, Stanton.
George L. Barber, Talco.
Bertha K. Martin, Tatum.

UTAH

Emma M. Russell, Roy.

VIRGINIA

Mabel C. Crockett, Bishop.
Emma P. Heath, Esmont.
Lulu L. Griffis, Midway Island.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ruth E. Thornton, War.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal Spirit, deepen our reverence for Thee and increase the divine within us that it may dominate all evil tendencies. Strengthen us for any duty and prepare us to deal justly and walk uprightly each day. We would that our affections and ambitions be hallowed as ladders by which we may reach the throne of grace. Grant that our labors in this Chamber may reveal Thyself from whom cometh the power to do wisely, justly, and well.

We praise Thee that Thou dost not pluck away our joys when we forget the Hand that gives them, but with patience Thou dost preserve us from wandering desire and disobedience. O God, we are living and dying through most difficult times; days in which men are shedding their mad blood; we wait and pray for that day which shall bring in the federation of all mankind. O Thou who didst touch nothing Thou didst not adorn, who held against every plea of station, race, or condition, in Thee were blended power and pity. In this world of madness, whose fortunes are dust and will soon crumble beneath the heavy tread of mortality, O gird the souls of men everywhere and subdue the murderous conflict between right and wrong. No shadow is so dark, no ignorance is so dense, and no sin is so base but that Thou canst meet and conquer it. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 104) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Accounts: Max Schwabe, Missouri; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania.

Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Anton J. Johnson, Illinois; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; George W. Gillie, Indiana; Edwin Arthur Hall, New York; Ross Rizley, Oklahoma; William S. Hill, Colorado; John Phillips, California; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Appropriations: Walt Horan, Washington; Dean M. Gillespie, Colorado.

Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Jessie Sumner, Illinois; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Frank L. Sundstrom, New Jersey; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Howard H. Buffett, Nebraska; D. Emmert Brumbaugh, Pennsylvania.

Census: J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri; Hadwen C. Fuller, New York; Albert M. Cole, Kansas; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; ——— ———.

Civil Service: Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Augustus W. Bennet, New York; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.

Claims: J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; William A. Pittenger, Minnesota; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Albert M. Cole, Kansas; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures: Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Robert K. Henry, Wisconsin; ——— ———.

Disposition of Executive Papers: Bertrand W. Gearhart, California.

District of Columbia: Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; Jay LeFevre, New York; Sid Simpson, Illinois; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; Gordon L. McDonough, California.

Education: George A. Dondero, Michigan; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Max Schwabe, Missouri; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Ralph W. Gwinn, New York; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania.

Elections No. 1: Clarence E. Hancock, New York; James V. Heidinger, Illinois; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; ——— ———.

Elections No. 2: Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; Augustus W. Bennet, New York; Sherman Adams, New Hampshire.

Elections No. 3: Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio.

Enrolled Bills: B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania; Edgar A. Sharp, New York.

Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; George H. Bender, Ohio; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania; Henry J. Latham, New York; Robert K. Henry, Wisconsin.

Flood Control: Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Max Schwabe, Missouri; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; Sherman Adams, New Hampshire.

Foreign Affairs: Charles A. Eaton, New Jersey; Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Bartel J. Jonkman, Michigan; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; James W. Wadsworth, New York; Charles L. Gerlach, Pennsylvania; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire.

Immigration and Naturalization: Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Wat Arnold, Missouri; James I. Dolliver, Iowa; Edgar A. Sharp, New York; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Indian Affairs: Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; Hal Holmes, Washington; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; Edgar A. Sharp, New York; George B. Schwabe, Oklahoma; ——— ———.

Insular Affairs: Richard J. Welch, California; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Jay LeFevre, New York; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Pehr G. Holmes, Massachusetts; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Carl Hinshaw, California; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Evan Howell, Illinois; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Thomas D. Winter, Kansas; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Wilson D. Gillette, Pennsylvania.

Invalid Pensions: J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Robert Hale, Maine; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; Edward J. Elsaesser, New York; ——— ———; ——— ———.

Irrigation and Reclamation: Dewey Short, Missouri; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; William Lemke, North Dakota; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; John Phillips, California; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Hal Holmes, Washington; ——— ———.

Judiciary: Clarence E. Hancock, New York; Earl C. Michener, Michigan; John M. Robsion, Kentucky; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; John W. Gwynne, Iowa; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Raymond S. Springer, Indiana; Joseph E. Talbot, Connecticut; Frank Fellows, Maine; Earl R. Lewis, Ohio; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts.

Labor: Richard J. Welch, California; Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania; Sherman Adams, New Hampshire; ——— ———.

Library: C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts.

Memorials: James V. Heidinger, Illinois.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Richard J. Welch, California; Fred Bradley, Michigan; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Alvin F. Weichel Ohio; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Ellsworth B. Buck, New York; Robert Hale, Maine; Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Mines and Mining: John M. Robsion, Kentucky; Fred Bradley, Michigan; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; George B. Schwabe, Oklahoma.

Naval Affairs: Harry L. Towe, New Jersey.

Patents: Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Robert K. Henry, Wisconsin; George B. Schwabe, Oklahoma; Howard E. Campbell, Pennsylvania; Augustus W. Bennet, New York; ——— ———; ——— ———

Pensions: William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Hal Holmes, Washington; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; William Lemke, North Dakota; Alvin F. Weichel, Ohio; Howard E. Campbell, Pennsylvania; Henry J. Latham, New York.

Post Office and Post Roads: Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; John C. Butler, New York; William C. Cole, Missouri; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; Edward J. Elsaesser, New York; James I. Dolliver, Iowa.

Printing: Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania.

Public Buildings and Grounds: Pehr G. Holmes, Massachusetts; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; Ralph W. Gwinn, New York.

Public Lands: Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; William Lemke, North Dakota; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Hal Holmes, Washington; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; ———.

Revision of the Laws: John M. Robsion, Kentucky; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; William Lemke, North Dakota; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio; Howard E. Campbell, Pennsylvania.

Rivers and Harbors: George A. Dondero, Michigan; William A. Pittenger, Minnesota; Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; George H. Bender, Ohio; Sid Simpson, Illinois; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; John C. Butler, New York; William C. Cole, Missouri; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Gordon L. McDonough, California; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Roads: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; James W. Mott, Oregon; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Dean P. Taylor, New York; Hadwen C. Fuller, New York; Albert M. Cole, Kansas.

Territories: Homer D. Angell, Oregon; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Dean P. Taylor, New York; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; Gordon L. McDonough, California; Henry J. Latham, New York; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

War Claims: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; ——— ———; ——— ———.

Ways and Means: Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska.

World War Veterans' Legislation: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio.

Un-American Activities: J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a table relating to State aviation laws.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Judge Moscowitz of Brooklyn, N. Y. I am advised by the Printing Office that this will make about 2½ pages and will cost $130. I therefore renew my request at this time to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include Judge Moscowitz's speech, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 21 by W. G. Vorpe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MANPOWER PROBLEMS CONFRONTING AMERICA

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the draft boards in Ohio's Twenty-second District in a very critical industrial area has voiced a very thoughtful opinion on the manpower problems confronting America, through one of its members who happens to be an effective feature writer on our largest paper, the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

I submit this article for the consideration of the Members and will insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD, with the hope that they will want to read this considered opinion of a draft board long experienced in the problems of industry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Polish Welfare Council of Schenectady, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a department on the abolition of daylight-saving time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUSING FOR CONGRESSMEN AND THEIR SECRETARIES

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce again that at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon there will be a meeting in the committee room of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in the Old House Office Building, to discuss the bills that are under consideration relative to trying to get places for Congressmen and their secretaries to live.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish the new Committee on Un-American Activities would investigate the request of California's attorney general, Robert W. Kennedy, to the President of the United States and the Attorney General, Francis Biddle, relative to permitting the dropping of the deportation charges against Harry Bridges.

It seems to me that if we permit these radicals to remain in this country, the first thing we know we will be taken over by them. It is time now, and I give you warning that if you do not do something to prohibit the radicals in this country from getting hold of this Government we are going to be engulfed in the greatest calamity that ever happened to this Nation of ours and the things the boys are fighting for in Europe are going to be lost here at home. Let this Committee on Un-American Activities get busy and get busy at once.

Stiffen the backs of the President and Attorney General that they do not permit Harry Bridges to remain in America. We have had enough troublemakers and rabble rousers. Now we should get rid of one radical, put him on a boat and send him to his native land.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Skeffington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter

from a boy overseas to his father and mother.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and in reply to the propaganda that is now going through the press, I want to serve notice now that the Committee on Un-American Activities means business. We are going to expose those subversive activities in this country from now on. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will stand by us and help us to get the money, since he is on the Appropriations Committee.

We are not going to permit these subversive elements that are surreptitiously organizing their underground opposition to this Government to continue without going after them with all the power we can muster.

I do not care whether they are on the Supreme Court, in the Cabinet, in Congress, in the bureaus, or in private life. We are not going to permit them to destroy this Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 I was granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article. I am informed by the Public Printer that this exceeds the space permitted under the rule and will cost $104. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was ho objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to what was said by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], permit me to express the hope that he knows what he is talking about. I have heard a lot of language since I have been here about what was to be done, and all too often I find that nothing comes of the hope. I know the gentleman means every word he said, but I wonder if he knows what he is up against? If even he realizes how strong are the forces which are opposed to exposing un-American propaganda I hope that he overcomes the obstacles. I hope that he goes through with what he suggests. I am waiting to see. I do not come from Missouri, but still I want to be shown before I begin to cheer or relax. The opposition is sly, it is cunning, it is unscrupulous, it is determined.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that I have realized at all times what we were up against in this fight against un-American activities. I knew what we were up against from the beginning.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May God help you. You will need His help for the Devil himself is on the other side. I hope you succeed.

Mr. RANKIN. The fight has just begun. We are going to succeed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines [Mr. ROMULO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, Little Rock, Ark., may not rank among the larger American cities, but it holds an important place in American history. Sixty-five years ago tomorrow there was born in Little Rock an American, now in his prime, whose life story is already deathless. Gen. Douglas MacArthur is body and soul of America, but we in the Philippines lay claim to a share of his heart.

Today, on his birthday, he is in Luzon. Manila is only a long-range gunshot away. From Manila and back to Manila again—that was his pledge of faith made to 18,000,000 Filipinos, and he has kept that rendezvous.

Whatever the rest of the world may have thought when Douglas MacArthur made the promise, "I will return," in Filipino minds there was no misunderstanding. They knew he would be back.

To them, in the Philippines, he was the living symbol of the integrity of America. He had won their confidence and their trust through his faith in the Filipinos' ability to take their place among the free nations of the world.

That faith was inherited from his father, Arthur MacArthur, who as Military Governor of the Philippines in 1900, instituted the writ of habeas corpus while martial law was still in force.

Douglas MacArthur carried the precepts on—to Bataan. When comparatively few Americans believed in the ability of the Filipinos to govern themselves, MacArthur came out openly in his faith in us. When, in his own country, many considered it foolish and even dangerous to give arms to the Filipinos, he gave up all America held for him to help us, in the Philippines, to organize our army.

In 1934 he came to Manila and surrounding him then like a halo were the glories of five campaigns in World War No. 1, the Rainbow Division triumphs in France, his career as superintendent at West Point and as Chief of Staff of the United States. He began the work of forming half a million men into an army that could, if need came, be the vanguard of American freedom in the Far East.

He remained in the Philippines to see the job of defense through. What held him there? His knowledge of the true character of Japan. He knew that the day would come when his America would need a loyal Philippines that had been trained to fight America's way. He was convinced that the Philippines could be defended.

It was not easy to arm a subject people. He had, too, to meet with the scoffers who opposed all he tried to do, who spoke of the Philippine Army as "MacArthur's Boy Scouts," who laughed at the theory that America might some day require a base in the Pacific, because that delightful little island, Japan, would never dare attack America. And there were those representatives of imperialism who said "the Filipinos will yet turn these guns against Americans."

Douglas MacArthur knew the Filipinos. He was their friend; they were his. He answered his critics, "You are talking nonsense; the Filipinos will use their guns, yes; for America, if ever the time shall come."

Thank God, when the time came, enough Filipinos were trained and armed to help him hold until the last words came from Corregidor:

> Men fighting under the banner of an unshakable faith are made of something more than flesh, but they are not made of impervious steel; the flesh must yield.

All he believed in has been vindicated by time. All he has done has been justified.

For years he had said that when Japan did strike, it would be treacherously. He was justified when Japan launched aggression in Indochina and the mobilization of his Philippine Army was ordered, and President Roosevelt placed him in command of the United States Army Forces in the Far East. He was justified 6 months later when, with no announcement of war, with peace words on their lips and their fingers on the trigger, Japan struck at Pearl Harbor, halfway between San Francisco and Manila.

The strategy he followed is history. It is almost personal history, for much of it was done at the beginning without defenses and with empty hands. The enemy had a hundred bombers to one of ours, and a thousand fighters to our one. They had equipment and all the panoply of war. The Japanese had everything they needed to drive democracy out of the Far East.

We who saw him on Corregidor, with that worn, embroidered, much-maligned cap pushed back, no protection under that lethal sky, counting the Japanese planes dropping their bombs over our ravaged Rock—there on that nub of stone in Manila Bay stood America, endangered, entrapped, but indomitable.

We knew, in the Philippines, how at first he could not bring himself to leave Corregidor even under orders. We heard of that strange imperiled journey by PT boat and by plane to Australia, and

how, landing there, he sent back his pledge: "I will return." In these words we heard America.

That pledge was spoken for the world to hear, but in the Philippines my people took it as a promise and a command. Japanese propagandists dinned into their ears that America had forgotten them. But they knew MacArthur would not forget. They knew America would not let them down. They knew the American people would back him up with men and materials. Once America was aroused, the enemy's doom would be sealed. On his word, they began fighting.

The guerrilla movement began on that promise. The Filipinos gathered up their remnant belongings and scraps of metal and took to the hills and made their own guns, ammunition, and knives. They had no leaders in the beginning. Only his promise.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. A corollary to the gentleman's statement that the Filipinos would not let America down, which has been a great satisfaction to all America, is that America knew the Filipinos would not let America down.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

But behind that promise were the words of their steadfast friend, President Roosevelt, addressed to the Filipino people: "Your independence will be established and protected." That galvanized Filipino resistance. It led them through the jungles and along the cliffs, and into attacks on the Japanese that continued unceasingly for 2½ years.

The promise of a man separated from them by 2,000 miles of sea held them together, and the assurance given them by the President of the United States regarding their freedom led them on, while everywhere else, in the Far East, natives turned against the white man who had lost face and power.

Two and a half years went by while they kept on fighting and their faith continued. They knew MacArthur, the man. They knew his word was his bond.

While they kept the faith with him, what was he doing in Australia?

He had been sent to Australia with orders to hold that endangered continent. Without MacArthur, without American power, Australia might have become a second Bataan. The Australians knew that. They hailed him as a savior. Australian soldiers were fighting elsewhere; white interests were fighting on European land, and the continent down under was practically undefended.

All this time Japan was growing richer and huger and more terrible.

General MacArthur prepared to hold Australia, while Corregidor collapsed, and in Melbourne, we saw one another's tears. Again, he was building bricks without straw.

Men, equipment, guns, planes—all these were lacking. The vast distances out there were his enemies. How could his frail defenses span and hold.

Again, he not only held, he attacked. At first the faint pattern of his offensive may have been imperceptible from America, but the Southwest Pacific area felt the shape of it as mighty pincer arms, built out of practically nothing in the beginning, began stretching out over hundreds of miles.

He had to make every man and every mile count. Not a man died without need. Fighting an entrenched and powerful enemy, MacArthur's lines cleared the air, sea, and jungle ahead mile by mile, cut supply lines, sucked in the invading forces, felt their way through starvation, blockade, and superior forces past the Japanese objectives. Gona, Buna, Lae, Salamaua, Finschafen, New Guinea, Kolombangara, Rabaul, Hollandia, Biak, and then Leyte, Mindoro, Marinduque, and Luzon—where in history has one man done so much with so little?

When on Christmas he sent his message to his men, he revealed a source of his power: "On this Christmas Day, the anniversary of the birth of our Lord, Jesus Christ, I pray that a merciful God may preserve and bless each one of you."

That came from a deeply religious man who regarded the protection of every man set under him as a holy responsibility.

We saw that on Leyte. He had come back to the Philippines, with all the might of America at his back, with President Sergio Osmeña at his side, into whose hands he was delivering the liberated Philippines, a freed land turned over to a freed people. The guerrillas, without distinction, rallied behind their beloved President, and we have in the Philippines today one united people synchronizing their efforts with those of the American forces to expel the hated enemy.

Did General MacArthur value this unparalleled military power given him by his America? God knows he has, for it has held the answer to his prayers. But he valued, too, the little crosses and the unmarked graves all over the Philippines where Filipinos lie who trusted him, fought for America, died for freedom. America gave him its might. To the Filipinos he has said, as a friend speaks: "Give me your tears."

Now he was back on Leyte, its liberator. There he spoke the first words: "I have returned. By the grace of Almighty God our forces stand again on Philippine soil—soil consecrated in the blood of our two peoples."

Words spoken for Filipinos echoing a promise, "I have returned." In Tagalog: "Bumalik ako." Words that reached into the barrios and jungle hiding places all over the Philippines.

He said, on Leyte, when matters progressed with apparent slowness, "I could take Leyte in 2 weeks. But I will not take by sacrifice what I can win by strategy. I owe too much to the mothers and wives in America to risk needlessly the lives of their men.".

And he pointed out a Filipino guerrilla and an American soldier walking arm in arm, and said, "See, in Washington the Filipino patriots fought for equality. You won social equality on Bataan."

Mr. Speaker, today he is on Luzon and what can be said of him? He is a soldier, and as a soldier, he is one who apparently destroyed. He has not destroyed; he has built. Through his understanding of the simple faith of a simple people he has salvaged understanding between two worlds.

You of America, is it not a matter of national pride to know that in a section of the world where white men had lost dignity and were being trampled under the advancing juggernaut of Japanese destruction, that one American remained in the hearts of 18,000,000 Filipinos as an emblem of all they most admired? The gulf between Orient and Occident was cleverly widened by Japanese propaganda, but Douglas MacArthur, as an individual, bridged that gulf, with no sudden protest of friendship, but with a kindly faith expressed from the beginning in a nation and its people.

His sympathetic understanding of the aspirations of a people—it is that that has made him a great statesman as well as a great soldier. In the world today this is a vital demonstration of the strategy of faith. Those who are considered the leaders of thought in the powerful nations, let them show an understanding of the dreams of the oppressed minorities and build through that understanding the permanent rungs that lead to a permanent peace.

Little Rock, Ark. Honor that small American city. It gave the world Douglas MacArthur, who poured over a wounded nation the ointment of human understanding and healed a chasm between continents with a promise as well as a sword. Men like him gave democracy to the world. Men like him will eventually put an end to war.

Mr. Speaker, what can we say of him? Soldier? Statesman? Far-visioned fighter for the peace? Builder of the human values, keeper of the faith? We can sum this up in simpler terms. He is an American, born at Little Rock, Ark., trained by the finest American savants, reared in the simple American code, seasoned in peace and in war. To America he is the hero-strategist who held the Stars and Stripes in its prideful place in the Far East. To us in the Philippines, he is you. He is America.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H. R. 1752.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address on soil conservation delivered by Mr. George Ver Steeg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a tribute to General Chennault.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE LT. CLYDE DOYLE, JR.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that the reason for the absence of our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is due to the fact that on last Sunday his only son, serving in the Army Air Corps of the United States as an instructor in high-altitude flying at Myrtle Beach, S. C., met with a fatal accident in a crash of his plane. He never regained consciousness and passed away on Tuesday night.

Clyde Doyle, Jr., had served as a first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps for some years. He went through the Alaskan and the Aleutian campaigns, was twice shot down, was wounded, and was awarded the Air Medal. He served his country with courage, with devotion, and with distinction. He gave his life to his country's cause in line of duty. I felt it no more than right to state to the Members of the House the great loss that our colleague has suffered and to express, as I know I do, the sentiments of every Member here of the sympathy and solemn and humble honor that we pay both to him, to his wife, and to their gallant son for what they have given to this Nation.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader what the program for next week is, insofar as he can now tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is proposed to start the debate on House Resolution 107, for consideration of H. R. 1752, which is the bill reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs relating to the manpower situation, and to continue the consideration thereof until it is disposed of. There is nothing else on the program for next week that I know of at the present time. It is quite probable that the consideration of that bill will take the greater part of the week, if not the whole week. There is a bill which may be reported out of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the Farm Census, and if a rule is reported on that bill, and if this manpower bill is disposed of in time to consider it, that bill may come up next week. I assume the Committee on Rules will grant a rule on the May bill so that consideration of that bill will be in order for Monday. I have no knowledge as to how long general debate will take. That is a matter the members of the committee will have to agree upon, and whatever they do will certainly be agreeable to me.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

THE SIXTH ARMY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this House welcomes the messages that every once and awhile come from General Romulo, the distinguished Delegate from the Philippine Islands. They give information relative to the war situation in the Pacific which is needed, enriching, and informative to the whole membership.

The other day I listened with a good deal of interest to a résumé of a trip to Italy and to the Italian front by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], in which she very ably depicted the situation there and described what our troops are doing, and how they are feeling, and some of the sacrifices they are making. I could not help but feel, as she painted a very illuminating picture of the Italian front, that there was another front so often ignored and forgotten. Instead of the Fifth Army, which is holding forth so admirably and well in Italy, it is in this case the Sixth Army which is guarding the ramparts of the Pacific and is showing an increasing aggressiveness against the Empire of the Japanese.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thought I would rise today to pay a tribute to the men in the Pacific for what they are doing. It comes a little close to me—and I am sure you will admit that I am speaking in all sincerity—since my own brother is the Infantry captain who commanded the first company that landed on Leyte Island in that campaign. Prior to that, he had seen combat duty for over 2 years. He has since been wounded and removed from the scene of action. Therefore, it is with a particular interest that I rise today to pay tribute to the Sixth Army and to those valiant men who have gone forth from the west coast and who are scattered all over that broad expanse of water and of land guarding the ramparts of America to the west.

At this time I think it is only proper to say that the G. I. bill of rights which was passed last year, and which the House received great praise throughout the country for passing, is in a rather stagnant state of affairs. The Seventy-eighth Congress went home imbued with great satisfaction that they had given the returning soldiers of World War No. 2 all the rights and privileges they would ever need. Yet I think it is only right for us to pause today at the beginning of a new Congress and remark that unless a vigilant look-out is maintained the G. I. bill of rights will become only a scrap of paper. That great Magna Carta for veterans which was passed by this House last year will sink into oblivion and will not be observed or followed and carried out as the last Congress really meant it to be carried out. We must continue the vigilance we have exercised in the past.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution directing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to conduct a continuous investigation and study of the manner in which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is being administered. My resolution provides that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is authorized and directed to conduct a continuous investigation and study of the administration of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which is the G. I. bill, with a view to determining whether such act is being carried out in accordance with the intention of the Congress, and make from time to time such reports thereon to the House as the committee deems advisable.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am a member of the committee to which the gentleman refers, and I am interested in his resolution. I think it is perhaps a good idea. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that at our last committee meeing, which I believe was on Monday of his week, General Hines, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, appeared before the committee and promised us that within a few days we would have a comprehensive report from the Veterans' Administration as to what has been the practical effect of the G. I. bill of rights up to the present time. They are conducting a survey. It may be that after we get that we will see that some other things need to be done. I think perhaps it would be a good idea for the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to make some unannounced visits to some of these veterans' hospitals. That has not been done since I have been in Congress, and not within my knowledge. Some of us have individually done so, but without a great deal of effect.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and is able to speak with some authority, since he served in the last Congress and had a lot to do with the passage of the G. I. bill of rights. May I ask him if he does not feel that continuous vigilance must be maintained on the part of this Congress in order to see that these three fundamental aims, namely, rehabilitation, hospitalization, and reeducation of the veterans, are put into effect?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman. Of course, that is true. There are some things about this G. I. bill of rights that are not working very well, especially the loan provision. No loan has been made in the State of Missouri, for example, from which I come.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is one reason, I might say to the gentleman, that I have introduced this resolution today, because I feel it is incumbent upon this new Congress, and upon the new Members who have just taken their oaths of office. It is incumbent upon the men who have just been elected and who will ably serve, to look into the situation and keep abreast of it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have evidence that the G. I. bill of rights is not being administered in accordance with the terms of the bill?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; I have a lot of evidence.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is the evidence in regard to the loan title of the bill only?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Not only from the loan standpoint but in a number of other respects. There has been increasing evidence in my own particular section, for example that the G. I. bill is not being adhered to in many cases. Let me give the gentleman an example. I visited one of the northern counties in my district and I talked with a man in a bank, a bank officer. I asked him if there had been any move on the part of the Government authorities to educate him along the lines of veterans loans and his answer was that he had not heard anything about it. He said that little attempt had been made in that direction, so far as he could understand, although he had had numerous inquiries on the part of veterans who had already been discharged as to their privileges and what they could obtain under the G. I. bill of rights. He said he could give them little information because he had no opportunity to be cognizant of the situation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am glad to get the information. I will say to the gentleman the only information I have had on it is that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is endeavoring to see that the veteran gets the loan. This complaint has come to me, however, that too much red tape and too many regulations have already been issued in regard to the loan provisions of the bill which discourage the veterans from even applying for the loan.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman. I know that he had a lot to do with the passage of this bill. I know that I can count on him to keep a vigilant eye on the future situation. I am sure that he will be in sympathy with the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to know if the gentleman has had any complaint or any inquiry in regard to the fact that the bill as it now stands provides that the boy who wants to take advantage of the educational title of the bill and also wishes to take advantage of the loan title of the bill cannot do so if he goes to college for 2 years or more because the loan must be applied for within 2 years after the date of discharge.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot mention any examples specifically as far as that goes, but I think the veteran or the soldier as he is discharged from the service has absolutely no knowledge of the provisions of that bill or at least he does have very little knowledge of its provisions. I have had boys come to me who had no idea of what it was about. I do not know what the trouble is, perhaps it is because we need more people in the Veterans' Administration or perhaps it is because we need a better executive procedure. Whatever it is, I am not prepared to state at this time, but I am simply introducing this resolution to charge the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and also the House of Representatives to keep in touch with the veterans. I hardly need to point out that unless we do keep in touch with the returning veterans they are going to turn this whole House over, as well as the entire country, in another 2 or 4 years, because they are not going to permit the Nation to sink into the abyss it did as in 1919 and 1920.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield briefly to the gentleman, and then I would like to proceed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House as well as the members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation would appreciate any suggestion from the gentleman from New York to make the G. I. bill of rights more effective. I want to ask him what he would think about this proposal at the present time. As the bill left the House of Representatives and went to the conference all that the veteran would have needed to do under title 3 of the bill to get a loan was to go into the local bank, or the local lending agency, and lay down his papers and the date of his discharge, and if it was approved as a good loan they would make it immediately and it was guaranteed under the law. There was no contact which had to be made with Washington or the Veterans' Administration unless and until the veteran defaulted in the payment of the loan and then the Government was called upon to make good. When we went into conference we had to surrender that provision of the House bill and adopted the Senate version, which resulted, as I understand it, in two applications being necessary to be forwarded to Washington, involving two transactions costing $15 each charged to the veteran before he could ever get that loan. Does the gentleman not believe that the Government in the long run would save money if we went back and adopted the original House version of that bill and that any extra amount that would be lost to the Government by the loans which were not well made by the local lending agency would be offset by the saving of the extra cost to the taxpayer because of the red tape with which the bill is now being administered?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think the gentleman makes a very good point there. I decline to yield further for the reason that I have a number of subjects that I want to discuss. I only have a limited time.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will yield briefly.

Mr. KEARNEY. Has the gentleman received any complaints from his constituents on the operation of title II, I believe it is, the educational feature of the bill?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; I have received a lot of complaints. I have not time to mention them now, except to say that the 24-year-old clause that was put into title II has proved very unpopular in some cases with which I have had to deal.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman know how many students have entered college under that provision?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have no way of knowing.

Mr. KEARNEY. For the gentleman's information, it is around 13,000.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I hope the gentleman is sure of that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot resist yielding to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The thought entered my mind that while eternal vigilance is very proper does not the gentleman believe that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has done an admirable job?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Oh; I hope the gentleman will not think I am criticizing the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman not believe they are capable without the powers of investigation to follow up and see that the law is administered as intended by Congress?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No; I disagree with the gentleman; I feel that they should have the power.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman realize that his resolution constitutes a condemnation of General Hines and the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman tries to put words into my mouth that I have not uttered. I have the greatest respect in the world for General Hines. I believe he is doing a fine job. Maybe he needs more people to help him; I do not know. But I am saying that unless the House keeps a vigilant eye on what becomes of the G. I. bill of rights the returning veteran is going to lose the privileges which have already been accorded him by the Seventy-eighth Congress. I submit that it is going to take a lot of perfecting legislation, a lot of supplemental legislation. I do not know who is going to prepare it, whether it will be the World War Veterans' Committee or some other committee, but it must be brought out. I hope I may have the cooperation of the gentleman from Massachusetts in getting the matter before the House. I am going to count on him to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can rest assured that there are plenty of veterans of the last war in this House who will protect the interests of the veterans; and there are veterans of this war in the House already. The only thought I had in mind was whether or

not the gentleman believed this great committee of the House of which we are all so proud was incapable under its general powers as a standing committee to do the very thing the gentleman had in mind.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I hope the gentleman will not read into my remarks the idea that I am criticizing this committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not saying that; I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I wonder if he saw the current motion picture This Is the Army. If he did he will remember a scene where a G. I. stood behind the curtain of the stage and presumably was looking at the President who was supposed to be speaking; and the soldier said: "I wish I could go out and shake his hand, for he is the man who raised our pay." I will tell you who gave him his raise, who it was that raised him from $21 to $42 and then to $50; it was this House of Representatives who gave the boys their raise. I appreciate the fact that possibly we do not rate the same kind of propaganda that others or glorified buildings do. I see the gentleman from Mississippi on his feet. I know that he is the man who introduced the resolution to increase their pay from $42 to $50 a month; and I think a lot of the credit should go to him along with the rest of us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Sure, but——

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes, for one only.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I take it, my friend from New York is very well satisfied with General Hines' Administration, and he does not want General Hines investigated, does he?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is not the point, it is not the point at all. This resolution does not authorize any investigation of General Hines. The gentleman is well aware of that.

Mr. McCORMACK. How can a resolution containing such investigatory powers as this be adopted and not result in an investigation of General Hines and the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman will only read my resolution I shall be glad to talk it over with him later.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in agreement with the gentleman's basic proposition.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. My only purpose is to take a step in the direction of protecting the veterans in their rights.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have more confidence in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation than the gentleman has.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I wish to make this observation: That regardless of the ability of the Veterans' Committee, which no one denies; regardless of the number of World War veterans there may be in the House; that this still might not prevent from happening in the future the same thing which happened at the time the Economy Act was passed. At that time, notwithstanding the fact that there were many veterans of the First World War in the House, they were not able to protect many of the veterans of that war from unjust treatment. The same thing could happen again under this administration. For this administration to deny thousands of World War No. 1 veterans their just dues under the guise of economy, would really be funny if it was not so tragic.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is absolutely right; and I continue to restate the premise I have stated before: That unless this House continues to be vigilant, unless they bring out perfecting legislation to extend, to increase and to augment the provisions of the G. I. bill, to see that the veterans' bill of rights, his Magna Charta of privileges is carried out, it will fail in its final program, and I know that the House will bear with me.

Now, let me continue.

I yield to no man in this House in the matter of interest in the veterans. I stand on my record of helping the boys in the service. I am happy and sincere in the hope and the thought that the future will paint a very glowing picture for them.

When they return they must be able to take advantage of these great educational, hospital, and other facilities which the Congress has provided. Unfortunately, however, there was proposed not long ago a project of such great international consequence that if it is carried through there will not be a single veteran in the country taken care of beyond being made a W. P. A. employee. I refer to the idea of constructing the St. Lawrence seaway. Take it from me, if that project ever goes into effect there will not be a veterans' hospital, there will not be a rehabilitation scheme put into effect, there will not be anything done in any small district in any section of the entire country. I submit it would be the greatest debacle, the greatest outrage, the greatest misfortune to the American people if the St. Lawrence seaway project is constructed, and I want to reiterate that at this time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I suppose the gentleman alludes to the fact that if the St. Lawrence seaway is opened, it will permit the importation of cheaply made foreign goods into this country?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not referring to that. I say to the gentleman that I am pointing out it would take millions of people to inaugurate the construction of that project and it would take away the feasibility of local projects, such as the construction of veterans' hospitals, rehabilitation schemes, or educational centers which have been proposed in the G. I. bill and all the other projects that the country is so anxious to see put into effect after the boys get back again.

Mr. DONDERO. The cost of the St. Lawrence seaway to the United States Government would be equal to the cost of 1 day for running this war.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That may be true, but I am not arguing that point. What I am pointing out is that if the St. Lawrence seaway project goes into effect we might as well kiss the G. I. bill good-bye because there will not be enough men or enough personnel to do anything else.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me that the moving picture, "This Is the Army," would be much more true to life if there were a picture of our colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] put in there instead of a picture of the President of the United States when that soldier thanked him for what has been done for the American servicemen?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes. I will add to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] a number of other distinguished men in the House who I think should be recognized also.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know just exactly how the gentleman got the disabled soldiers mixed up with the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Of course, the gentleman comes from Mississippi and he is probably interested in the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I am.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is where we differ.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] that I am a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and I am afraid I know as much about the St. Lawrence project as he does.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think so.

Mr. RANKIN. The St. Lawrence seaway would not cost the Government $1 in the long run. It would pay for itself out of the revenues derived from power.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I did not say a word about cost. What I am talking about is the personnel necessary to construct it. I come from the southern part of New York State and there would not be a single person left there. They would all be taken out in order to construct the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. RANKIN. The people the gentleman refers to, the people of New York, are overcharged for their electricity $195,000,000 last year.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I hope the gentleman will not get into rural electrification.

Mr. RANKIN. The St. Lawrence seaway project would relieve the people of New York of that overcharge.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want the farmers of my district to get rural electricity.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the recent candidate of his party for President has come out as a strong advocate of the St. Lawrence seaway?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not arguing for the candidate of the Republican Party. I am talking for my own district down in southern New York.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, excuse me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman mind advising the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the candidate was not elected? Evidently he does not know that yet. That whole doctrine was repudiated.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not know that there was an election.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Aside from Mr. Dewey as candidate on the Republican ticket for President, as Governor of the State of New York he has come out for the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sorry the gentleman brings the Governor into this. I am talking about my own section.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In his capacity as Governor of the State of New York he advocates this.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. This discussion has wandered far afield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It certainly has.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. There is one thing that has not been mentioned here and that is the progress of the Hall Furlough Clubs. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman has manifested his friendship for the veterans long before he introduced this resolution because up in his district in New York, whatever the number is, there are a lot of veterans who are aware of that fact and they are organizing.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I represent the Thirty-seventh New York District.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman from New York admit that Governor Dewey is his leader?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. He is my leader; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. On this occasion the gentleman is with the leader until the vote comes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not know anything about that. If he will examine my record the gentleman will find it reflects the strength of my convictions. That is how I vote, always have voted, and expect to vote as long as I am in Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am not so sure but what Mr. Roosevelt is in accord with the gentleman's ideas about the St. Lawrence waterway, because during the first 8 or 9 years of his administration, when he had a rubber-stamp Congress, he could have put the St. Lawrence waterway through Congress and put it into operation. But he did not do it, so I am rather inclined to believe he is with the gentleman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That may be, that is his privilege, but that is not the point. I am with my district. I am sure about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well now, the gentleman said he was with his district. I hope the district is with the gentleman, too.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is the best way to have it, I think.

We are getting quite a distance from the veterans. No veterans' hospitals will be built anywhere in the country unless we provide in this House for the adequate construction of rehabilitation and medical centers for the veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman know that the so-called G. I. bill of rights in its very first title covers an appropriation of $500,000,000 for rehabilitation purposes?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Nevertheless, the gentleman knows that the request for these moneys will have to come continually before this House, and the House will have to remain in a friendly atmosphere and have due regard for the veterans in order to put these moneys through. Further, as perfecting legislation is required to help in these projects, to give every man a college education to assure every returning veteran of proper medical care, to assure every boy who returns and takes off the uniform that he will get a square deal and a good job under the sun, there will have to continue to be in this House a vigilant attitude on the part of the membership. Otherwise, the rights and privileges which have been given him under this bill will slip into oblivion and will cease to interest the country.

I submit that if the forces of reaction ever raise their ugly heads as they did after the last war to cause the veteran once more to slink about the streets of every city in the United States in a jaded uniform, selling apples and looking askance at every citizen, it will be one of the most disastrous days that this Nation has ever known. If it stalks the Nation again, disaster and trouble and future misfortune will be the lot of America.

Let me point out what happened in Germany after the last World War when those in power, those who were charged with the employment of the veterans, met the challenge of a returning army of several millions of men with nothing but bread lines, and unemployment. They took the matter into their own hands and gave ear to the dangerous and diabolical ideologies of nazi-ism and fascism that swept over Europe.

The refusal of those in authority to recognize any G. I. bill on the continent of Europe after the last war was the cause of the rise of the hydra-headed viciousness which we are fighting in this war to put down and to conquer for all times.

I hope and pray sincerely that this will never happen again in Europe or anywhere else. I hope that the farsightedness of the House of Representatives, upon whom the responsibilities will have to fall, will prevent the repetition of such a condition.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is the gentleman contemplating an investigation of the hospitalization of World War No. 1 veterans and the hospitalization facilities for the veterans of World War No. 2?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This resolution, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana, simply contemplates a vigilant and a continuous investigation on the part of the World War Veterans' Committee to assure the returning veteran a square deal, of a place in the sun, of an opportunity to earn his daily bread, to raise a family, and to have a chance to enjoy the beneficences of America, and of a just and durable peace. God grant this great Nation of ours can take her place once more in the world, in a world of peace, to assure a course which will guarantee to all nations the spirit of fraternal love which will insure peace, liberty, equality, and fraternity to unborn generations and to millions yet to come.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by the Honorable Robert C. Moore, of Carlinville, Ill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IZAC). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a news story entitled "Labor" from the Birmingham News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Philadelphia Record by the Reverend Daniel A. Poling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I desire to relinquish that time, and ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES BY MAJORITY VOTE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, several times since the Constitution of the United States was originally adopted fundamental changes have been made by amendments. More than a century and a half ago by the original terms of our Constitution it was provided that treaties should be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. That clause in the Constitution remains the same as the day on which the organic law of the new Republic came into being. Twenty-one times by as many amendments has the original instrument been altered. But one-third and one of the membership of the Senate can still reject a treaty negotiated by the Executive, even if it be wholeheartly approved by the vast majority of our people.

The Judiciary Committee of the House in the last session of the Seventy-eighth Congress held extensive hearings on House Joint Resolution 320, introduced by the able chairman of that committee, the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas. Similar resolutions introduced by a number of our distinguished colleagues were also considered involving the same subjects. After painstaking consideration of the voluminous testimony presented by distinguished historians, scholars, and publicists, the committee favorably reported the resolution with a recommendation that it do pass. Unfortunately the measure died on the calendar due to the expiration of the session. Our chairman has now introduced a new House resolution designated as House Joint Resolution 60, followed by a number of other similar resolutions introduced by as many of our colleagues, proposing a like amendment to the Constitution.

Briefly, the resolution proposes to amend the Constitution so that treaties may be ratified by a majority vote of both the Senate and the House. Before such a change can be made the resolution must also be passed by the Senate and approved by the States. That is the process laid down by the Constitution itself to govern proposed changes. It is a wise provision, since it affords ample time for deliberation and debate in the legislature. With a majority of State legislatures meeting in 1945, this is a particularly appropriate time to submit the proposed change in the Constitution for their consideration.

We may expect to hear arguments against the proposed change in the method of ratifying treaties. Some such arguments will be presented on this floor. Others will be heard in the Senate, whose Members naturally are jealous of their prerogatives. Difficulties stand in the way of the proposed constitutional change, or reform. But, my friends, the fact that resistance may be expected in the other branch of the Congress should not discourage any Member of the House who feels that this outmoded clause of the Constitution should be altered and the power of life and death over treaties removed from a minority of the Senate.

Every good American is proud of the Constitution of the United States. As a whole it has long been acepted as a model by free people everywhere. Any attempt to weaken this great instrument would be widely and properly resented and opposed by thinking citizens from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the Great Lakes to the Gulf. By the same token, any sincere effort to strengthen the Constitution by making it more responsive to the will of the rank and file of Americans would be welcomed and supported. The change now proposed definitely is designed to strengthen the Constitution. Otherwise I would not today be giving my support to this joint resolution and urging with the earnestness of which I am capable that the House pass it by a resounding majority.

A very casual search of the history of the Constitution and conditions which prevailed at the time of its adoption leaves no room for doubt that the clause denying to the House of Representatives a voice in the ratification of treaties and requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate was the result of compromise. It was a question whether the new Republic could have a Constitution without this provision governing the ratification of treaties. The Original States were jealous of each other on the one hand and jealous of the Central Government on the other hand. The smaller States were fearful lest they be too greatly dominated by the larger States. All expressed fear lest the Federal Government be made so strong as to endanger or unduly limit the rights of the several States.

When the Constitutional Convention met in 1787 controversy was rife not only on this particular matter, but on other major issues coming before that great assembly. Months were required to bring into being an instrument which a majority of the delegates were willing to sign. Indeed controversy over various issues became so heated at times that members of the Convention despaired of arriving at agreement. Fortunately for that generation and those which have followed, all the States sent as delegates to the Convention outstanding men endowed with the wisdom to know that a compromise was justified when unanimity could not be attained. Otherwise, the new Republic must have waited for years longer to acquire a workable fundamental law.

One issue raised in the Constitutional Convention was that it was called for the sole purpose of amending the Articles of Confederation, which had not been working satisfactorily either from the standpoint of the States or the Federal Government. The wiser men among the delegates demonstrated that the writing of a new Constitution amounted to nothing more than the amending of the Articles of Confederation. A few diehards grew weary and returned to their homes and therefore were not present when the final draft of the new Constitution was signed.

I was greatly interested to learn that the clauses of the Constitution governing the election of Members of the United States was the subject of much controversy in the constitutional convention. Strong men earnestly urged that Members of the other branch of the Congress be chosen by the people directly, just as Members of the House of Representatives are chosen. This issue was the subject of much debate and deliberation and like the clause governing the ratification of treaties, threatened to split the assembly wide open. Ultimately the delegates determined to have Senators chosen by the legislatures of the several States. Senators were so chosen until comparatively recent years, when as a result of the adoption of the seventeenth amendment they were elected directly by the people.

Why was that change made? Primarily because the direct election of Senators by vote of the people of their respective States was the more democratic method of procedure. Who will say that in submitting to the States a joint resolution providing for the direct election of Senators, the Congress sought to weaken the Constitution? Who will rise today and seriously tell the American people that we should return to the original method and have Senators chosen only by the legislatures of the States? That question answers itself. The people of the United States feel that the Constitution was strengthened when the seventeenth amendment gave them the right to determine directly by their votes who should represent the States in the United States Senate. The world and society move forward, not backward.

Today we are asked to vote for submission to the States a proposed amendment to the Constitution providing that treaties shall be ratified by majority vote of the membership of both the Senate and the House. Why is it proposed that the House have a voice in treaty ratification? The reason is not far to seek. Members of the House of Representatives are closest to the people for the simple reason that every other year they must give an accounting to their constituents, while Members of the Senate need give an accounting only every sixth year. Since Members of the House must maintain closer touch with the people in their respective districts, they necessarily are in position better to know what the people are thinking concerning major current issues involving the welfare of this great Nation of ours.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, very recently the people of the United States went to the voting places and chose the President who shall preside over the Nation for the next 4 years. They voted to keep in office during that trying period in our history the man who had carried the burdens of that high office for 12 long years. Not a few Members of the House thought there should be a change at the head of the Government and that a younger man should take over the heavy burdens of the Presidency. A majority of the people determined otherwise and voted to keep Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House. Those who honestly felt that a change was in order and even overdue were not happy over the result of the voting. But, my friends, they accepted that result without question. Why? Because a majority of the sovereign voters of this great country had expressed their will.

We elected our President by majority vote. Members of the House of Representatives were chosen by majority vote. The one-third of the membership of the Senate were elected by majority vote on that same November day.

It is interesting to note in this connection that a majority of the men and women in uniform, whether in training camps in this country or in combat zones overseas, who could not get home to vote, cast their ballots for the reelection of President Roosevelt, and, by the same token, for the election or reelection of many Members of this body.

And while we are speaking of women in uniform voting it is well to recall that the members of the Constitutional Convention in their wisdom made no provision for the participation of women in political affairs. But for the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution women would still be denied the vote in this great and free land, and we would not number among our Members the gracious and able women who now sit with us on equal terms and help make the laws of the land.

My friends, a fundamental change in the Constitution was required before Members of the Senate could be elected by direct vote of the people. An equally fundamental change was required to bestow the right of suffrage upon the women of America.

Every Member of this body recalls vividly that the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments—was not in the Constitution as originally drafted and ratified. Every Member likewise recalls that the Bill of Rights embodies reservations insisted upon by the Original States in certifying their ratification of the Constitution. No Member of this Chamber or of any other legislative body would have the temerity to rise today and say the addition of the Bill of Rights weakened the Constitution or to advocate the repeal of the first 10 amendments to that great instrument.

Yet today when supporters of this joint resolution seek further to strengthen the Constitution by modernizing the machinery for the ratification of treaties and make it more responsive to the will of the people of the United States we find some voicing objections. To my mind they are merely conjuring up mental ghosts. They forget that when the Constitution was adopted most of the continent was little known to a majority of the relatively small population of the young Republic. Communications were meager and slow, not only between the States but between the Federal Government and the governments of other nations.

Times have changed since those rigorous early days. We have the railroad, the telegraph, the telephone, radio with television just around the corner, and aviation, of which few even dreamed in 1787. Verily the world has grown smaller. Space has been annihilated. We know within hours—sometimes within minutes—happenings in countries separated from us by oceans thousands of miles wide. Every day untold numbers of our military airplanes cross those oceans, many of them raining death and destruction on countries whose tyrannical governments sought to deny Americans the right to continue to live as a free people.

Millions of the flower of American youth face ruthless enemies in combat zones literally all over the world, fighting to preserve the citadel of liberty—fighting to put an end forever to the danger of military aggression which 5 years ago plunged the world into the bloodiest holocaust in all history.

Yet some Americans—not all of them Members of the United States Senate—tell us that we must not tamper with the Constitution by attempting to modernize the machinery for the ratification of treaties. When final victory is won over our enemies the millions of men—and women—in uniform who have repeatedly risked their all will want to know that their sacrifice has not been in vain. They will want assurance that their sons and daughters will not be called upon to undergo the terrible hardships which they faced on land, on the seas, and in the air in order that freedom and decency might not perish from the earth. The loved ones of those who gave their all—and the number promises to to be shockingly large—demand assurance that it shall not happen again to the sons and daughters of America and other lands.

What we seek to do is to so alter the machinery of ratification that a minority of the other branch of the Congress shall not have the power to reject a treaty designed to make the world secure against future military aggression. There is nothing sacred or complicated about the ratification machinery, any more than there was about the machinery originally set up for the election of Senators by the legislatures of the States. The latter machinery was changed—modernized to bring it into closer harmony with democratic processes. That is precisely what the pending joint resolution proposes to do with the machinery for ratification. If there ever was any justification for placing the power of life and death over treaties in the hands of one-third and one of the Members of the Senate, the period of justification has long since passed. As stated at the outset, this machinery was set up as the result of compromise in order that we might have a Constitution. We can concede without a moment's hesitation that that compromise was warranted under conditions which prevailed at the time of its adoption. Seriously to contend at this late day that the method of ratification must remain intact regardless of world developments is to stultify ourselves as thinking citizens and Members of the Congress of the United States.

Permit me to say right here that my remarks are not intended to be critical of the United States Senate. My criticism goes to the machinery for the ratification of treaties set up long ago when the Nation was young and conditions wholly different from what they are today. Members of the Senate as now constituted had nothing whatever to do with the clause in the Constitution requiring a two-thirds vote of that body to ratify treaties and denying to Members of the House, the legislative body closest to the people, any voice in ratification. What is true of the Senate today has been true of that body down through the years. Ratification was made a senatorial prerogative by the Constitution. I do not blame Members of the Senate today or in past years for zealously guarding that prerogative.

But, my friends, I do most earnestly appeal to the Senate as now constituted to pass upon this proposed change in the national interest—in the interest of all humanity—as the time approaches for the consideration of treaties to make the Nation and the world secure against future military aggression. I advance no contention that by and large the Senate has abused its constitutional prerogative in passing upon treaties submitted by the Executive. But I do contend most emphatically that in certain predominantly important crises a minority of that body has rejected treaties which might well have changed the course of history and averted the conflagration now sweeping the earth.

I have particular reference to the Versailles Treaty. We all know what happened to it. While a majority of the Senate in that day favored ratification of that treaty and the active participation of the United States in the League of Nations, more than one-third of the Members of that body voted against ratification. The United States emerged from World War No. 1 the most powerful

among the nations of the world. Yet by rejecting the Versailles Treaty a minority of the Senate made it impossible for the Nation to assert its leadership.

Some ask why it is proposed to make the House of Representatives a part of the machinery for ratifying treaties. The answer is clear. The House is closest to the American people for the simple reason that its Members must face their constituents every other year. There is another reason. All legislation enacted by the Congress must be approved by the House. Most treaties require legislative implementation. Such implementation would be more readily approved by the House if its Members shared the responsibility for ratification. Certainly the House would withhold necessary legislative support with great reluctance if it had an active part in ratification. No Member of either body can seriously question the power of the House to vitiate a treaty which the Senate has ratified by refusing to pass necessary supporting legislation. In my judgment, the House would take such a position with reluctance, but the power to do so unquestionably exists. I, for one, would be greatly distressed if the House found itself impelled to adopt such a course.

While feeling very strongly that the House should have a voice in treaty ratification and that ratification should be had by majority vote of both branches—the democratic way—I would be willing to agree to a compromise and permit the Senate alone to approve or reject treaties by majority vote. This would deprive a minority of the Senate of the power of life and death over treaties. Should such a compromise be necessary in order to insure a partial reform in the machinery of ratification it would have my support, in the confidence that at some later time a further change could be effected giving the House its rightful part in the machinery of ratification.

It is my earnest hope that no such compromise will be found necessary. I feel very strongly that if Members of both branches of the Congress give this grave matter the objective study its importance demands no question of compromise will arise and the American people, through the legislatures of the States, will have the opportunity to make effective this long overdue constitutional reform.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, upon the most excellent presentation that he is making of this subject. It seems to me that it is fundamental and one of the most important single steps, perhaps, aside from winning the war, that has come before this Congress.

With reference to the statement that he made on the Senate action of the Versailles Treaty, may I ask this question, Does the gentleman feel that there is much chance that we shall have an enlightened foreign policy, and that we shall build an organization to preserve the peace of the future if we continue this two-thirds rule?

Mr. BRYSON. I do not believe so. I believe it would be greatly to the advantage of the entire country if the ratification machinery was altered or changed as suggested.

May I say also, in response to the compliment paid me by the distinguished colleague, that I read with deep interest his own speech made in this Chamber some weeks ago on this all-important subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PREVENTION OF INFLATION—CRISIS FACED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Government's effort to control inflation we are facing a very serious crisis. While our sons are meeting the supreme test on the battle fronts of the world, we are meeting the supreme test here in our efforts to control inflation. The people who have fixed incomes, fixed salaries, fixed wages, or a fixed amount that they must live on each year, will be the first sufferers from inflation. The first time in history a major power has attempted to control inflation during war time was attempted by our Government and has been attempted by our Government during this war. It has never been controlled before in the history of the world.

ACTUALLY WORKED

Price control has actually worked in our country. We have evidence to substantiate that statement. It has not worked in some other countries, as you know. If we had had no control this time and prices had been left to rise as they did in World War No. 1 when we had no control, our national debt today would be $80,000,000,000 more as of December 31, 1944, by reason of the cost of the war alone. It is an easy matter to determine how much has been saved. Just determine how high prices of certain things were during the first war and how high they have gone during this war, how well they have been kept down, determine how much the Government has purchased from money borrowed by the Government from its citizens, and you can easily determine how much has been saved. Eighty billion dollars saved on the war alone to date is a lot of money, interest on that amount for 1 year is much more than has been spent by O. P. A. and economic stabilization since the war commenced.

The price of steel, for instance, has not gone up 1 penny in 5 years. The price of

The price of steel, for instance, has not gone up a cent. The line has been held on those things that enter into the cost of the war in the greatest way.

By reason of holding down those prices, the cost of the war is $80,000,000,000 less today than it would have been. In addition, the savings to the consumers of America have been $56,000,000,000. So there is a big difference in what we actually have and what we would have had if prices had been unharnessed or uncontrolled.

I could pick out a few commodities, but take sugar, for instance. Its price just after the First World War was five times as high as it is now. Sugar is a very scarce, a limited commodity, one that is much sought after. Imagine how much the price of sugar would go up now if people could just go in and bid against one another for that scarce commodity. Thirty-five cents would not be a good start for the price that would certainly be paid without any controls.

MUST HAVE SUPPORT OF PEOPLE

So O. P. A. has actually worked; price control has actually worked. We have the proof of it. Will it continue to function? Yes; if it has the support of the American people and the American Congress. But we cannot expect it to work unless it has the support of the American people.

GREAT CRISIS FACED

At the end of this year, the people of the United States will have $38,000,000,000 more money earned this year than they have been able to spend for all the goods and services they could obtain. Those dollars are considered dangerous dollars. People would use them to get out and bid against one another for anything they want, to the extent that the prices would go sky high, if permitted. That must not be permitted for their own sake.

May I call your attention to one single thing that represents a great danger in addition to what I have said. The inflation of 1920 was caused when we had no more than 25 percent as much actual money in the hands of the people as we have today. Then the inflation was caused when there was about $53 per capita in circulation. Today there is well over $200 per capita in circulation or almost 300 percent more. There is over $25,000,000,000 in the pockets and tills of the people, in the matresses, and hidden in the different places where people hide money. That money makes a situation where price control is most difficult and where black markets are encouraged to flourish, with that much money. So I repeat, we are facing the greatest crisis we have ever faced here on the home front.

I know orders are issued which we do not like and which we do not see the necessity for, but I do not care how annoying and irritating an order may be that is issued by the agencies that deal with price stabilization, it is unimportant in relation to the importance of saving this country from inflation. So I take this time today to invite the attention of the Members of Congress to the fact that if the Congress does not encourage price control and stabilization in every way there is a possibility that we shall face the same kind of inflation that people are facing in other countries of the world.

NO POLITICS IN PRICE CONTROL

This is a time when there should be no politics in price control. It is unpopular to advocate price control, it is an unpopular thing to say when you say that we should have rules and rationing of commodities, we should have fixed prices, and things like that. People do not like it. It is unpopular. That is the reason I say it is time that we should rise above politics, not have it in politics, but do everything that is necessary to back up and support this program

against inflation. This is no time for criticism that is not the constructive type of criticism. I do not blame anyone for uttering constructive criticism, but nothing can be accomplished by the type of criticism that is not constructive and does not serve any particular purpose. It is not helpful in this fight for price stabilization. So I appeal to the newspapers, the commentators, the public speakers, and those who are constantly before the public with their writings and with their words, to cooperate with their Government in this greatest and most supreme effort that has ever been made to control prices, to the extent that we will save our country from inflation.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am sure we all appreciate the interest the gentleman from Texas has demonstrated in the past in connection with this problem. There is a question I would like to ask the gentleman. It may not be exactly in line with what he is saying here, but I think it is, because the gentleman touched upon the fact that price control is not in itself a very popular thing. Of course, in peacetime I do not think we would want it to become a popular thing because it is a little out of line with our conception of a free economy.

Mr. PATMAN. No; when we are back to full peacetime production there will be no need for it and it should be entirely taken off.

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes; but I just received a letter this morning from a constituent of mine who is in the retail gasoline business. I want to get the benefit of the knowledge which the gentleman possesses about this thing and I would like to have his idea on it. This constituent tells me in analyzing his business he saw his costs had increased more than he thought they should have increased in the handling of his business. So, in the course of his investigation he found out that the refinery from whom he had been buying his gasoline, perhaps through an honest mistake, had increased the price of gasoline to him 1 cent per gallon. When he found that out he made an application to the O. P. A. to increase his retail price since he felt that increase was coming to him. So they sent their auditors out and they went through his books and found out that the refinery had increased the price. They took it up with the refinery and had them make a substantial remittance. However, they made the remittance to the O. P. A., but he cannot get that money.

Mr. PATMAN. There is a law on that.

Mr. RIZLEY. Those are things which happen.

Mr. PATMAN. There is a law on the statute books which permits your retailer to sue in the courts if it is necessary and recover three times the amount that he was overcharged.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am familiar with that law.

Mr. PATMAN. I am sure the gentleman is.

Mr. RIZLEY. There is no argument between the refinery and the retailer. The retailer does not want to recover three times the amount that he was overcharged.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, that is an individual case.

Mr. RIZLEY. I know, but there are many individual cases.

Mr. PATMAN. However, we are not willing to destroy price control because of that.

Mr. RIZLEY. Certainly not.

Mr. PATMAN. We do not want to destroy price control just because of some isolated case which we will admit for the purpose of this discussion does represent an injustice. You see, there are 8,000,000 different commodities and different prices.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understand, but it seems to me that in the administering of the law a lot of these things could be avoided.

Mr. PATMAN. Why certainly, and they are being avoided. Mistakes are being corrected every day. I venture to say they made every effort to correct that mistake.

Mr. RIZLEY. Well, there was not any trouble about it at all. They simply wanted to call it to the attention of the refinery. They paid the money.

Mr. PATMAN. That is an isolated case and I am sure it must be an isolated case. I am not willing to destroy the whole price-control program and I know the gentleman is not willing to destroy the whole price-control program because there might happen to be certain cases of injustice.

Mr. RIZLEY. No; of course not.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe you will find that under Mr. Chester Bowles' administration every effort is being made to correct mistakes which will occur. In times gone by charges were made that the O. P. A. was not making a very strong effort to correct the known obvious mistakes. But that charge cannot be made at the present time. I think they have done a wonderful job, considering that they are dealing with 8,000,000 different commodities and with about 138,000,000 different people. It is a tremendous task. A certain number of mistakes, of course, are to be expected. At the same time, when they are pointed out they should be corrected and corrected quickly. I hope that they will be corrected quickly in the future.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star paying tribute to the rural free delivery man.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, if the progress of time has ever brought this Nation of ours to the place in its history where plain talk is needed, that place has now been reached.

It is agreed by all clear-thinking Americans that the recent removal of Jesse Jones as head of the Department of Commerce is a national tragedy. Much has been said pro and con on this subject, but as yet I have neither seen nor heard any plain talk. If I have a virtue, it is a courage strong enough to stand up over any personal or political expediency and speak my convictions without fear of their results. Before I would be directed in my thoughts and expressions, I would retire from political life.

I want it clearly understood that I realize and concede that it is the right, privilege, and prerogative of the President to select his own Cabinet with the advice and consent of the Senate, and I further realize and concede that it is his responsibility. I equally realize and concede it is my right as a citizen of the United States and as a Member of this House to have and express an opinion with regard to the exercise of that right and privilege.

I think one of the first and most sacred duties of any public servant is to impart facts to the people whom he has been privileged to represent. One of the reasons our country is in its present condition is that on too many occasions those representing the people in different positions of trust have for various reasons failed to disclose facts within their knowledge and permit propaganda to go to the public upon which it forms its opinion. This Nation is under a debt of lasting gratitude to that great American, Jesse Jones, for bringing this matter in its real colors to the attention of the public. Let the public form its own opinions, but let those opinions spring from truth and fact and not from a group of hypocritical, sugar-coated statements that have not even been dipped into the trough of truth.

The President gave over his own signature the following reason for replacing Jones with Wallace:

> Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.
>
> He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited. And I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration.
>
> It is for this reason only that I am asking you to relinquish this present post for Henry, and I want to tell you that it is in no way a lack of appreciation for all that you have done, and that I hope you will continue to be a part of the Government.

After assigning affirmatively the payment of a political debt as the sole reason for the appointment of Wallace, he very forcibly expressed his full confidence in Jones and complimented in high tones his management of the heavy responsibilities the trust carried.

Let us first consider what the duties of this position are. It is the management of the largest financial institution in the world, the control of many billions of dollars in money and property. The economic structure of this Nation rests clearly on this Department, and with the proper management of this Department we survive as a free and independent Nation. With improper management the economical structure of the Nation perishes and the greatest democracy ever enjoyed by a free people likewise perishes. The independence of man will perish and die.

The only source that has questioned the ability of that great American, Jesse Jones, to successfully handle this great task has been that notorious ally of the Communists, who are boring into this Government, that slander sheet known as PM printed in New York City. The only reason it gives for knowing Jones is not competent to handle these billions of the taxpayers' money is that if he lets a dollar out he is going to be assured he can collect it with interest. In other words they want it thrown away. Have we reached such an era of deterioration in this generation that we are simple enough to say that the only branch of our Government that is in business must abandon all rules of business policy and administration?

Now let us analyze this political pay-off and see just who has been paid off. It is well known that at the convention in Chicago the Democrats of the Nation repudiated Henry Wallace and all his revolutionary philosophy, all his zeal for regimentation and Government ownership and control of American enterprise. It was definitely seen that he was a political liability instead of an asset, save and except with the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and its Sidney Hillman and his communistic cohorts, and for this reason he was dropped from the ticket over the protest of Sidney Hillman. The only votes that Wallace could control were radical labor, the C. I. O. gang, and the Communist.

This is common knowledge and no man who is fair and informed will question this statement. Therefore, when Wallace is given the machine to control every heartbeat of American enterprise, who is being rewarded? None other than Sidney Hillman and his C. I. O. gang and brother Communists. God forbid that this gang has placed in its lap the control of this Nation by placing this power in its hands to regiment, socialize, and take over free enterprise and burn from the dreams of those who love America the last hope of maintaining a free state.

Had any of you considered how quickly this great stroke followed the actual taking of the oath of office by the President? The social features of the inauguration could not have been over before this history-making letter was on its way to Mr. Jones. Now be fair with yourself, when did all this happen, before or after the inauguration, at the convention in Chicago or after? You may answer for yourself.

I want to commend our senior Senator from Georgia, the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE, for introducing a resolution, which if successfully passed would at least preserve part of the resources of our Government, and to state that I shall vigorously support the same when it reaches the House. It is, however, a pitiful spectacle when you are forced to move the dog from the kennel to keep his life's blood from being sucked out by the fleas. It would have been so much better to have killed the fleas, as would have been done by the patriots who built the structure of this great Republic. The courage of the personnel of the Congress, Senate and House, must now undergo the supreme test. Will we cast aside thoughts of favors, hopes of political advancement, and serve as the saviors of this Nation, for which our positions were created; or will we permit the destruction of the bulwark of American liberty and permit the ideals for which our boys are fighting to be sold for a mess of political pottage and them to come back to a land where opportunity exists no more, where individual initiative is scorned and anarchy rules? You must answer for your own soul. Will you permit the will of the people to be defeated by powerful minorities and ignored by the servants of the Government?

When the legislature ceases to protect the property or betrays the liberty of the people, then free government is at an end. Freedom is based on reason, knowledge is clearness of thought. Liberty is correlated to the advancement of culture and the progress of civilization. Men can govern themselves by reasoned virtue. To be freemen we must be reasonable. There must be independence of judgment. Is it reasonable to turn these billions of dollars and the power they carry, over to one so totally void of ability to master such a task. If there is anyone who questions the inability of Mr. Wallace to discharge these great responsibilities let them look into his personal business career. It speaks for itself. His total lack of business ability is the least argument against him. It is universally known that he is a dreamer that has never awakened. An idealist who has never had a practical thought. A man who has consistently agreed with and sponsored the ideals and the theories of the C. I. O. and Communist element of this country whose every thought is foreign to, and destructive of, American ideals. He is the man who at every opportunity has taken a broadside at free enterprise, who has consistently sought to regiment our people as a theme and theory of government, and not for emergency reasons. He is the man who not so long ago advanced the idea of abandoning agriculture in the United States, and looking to South American countries for our food supply, taking from us our greatest stronghold of independence. He seeks a social revolution, dreams of setting up a parental government. He boasts of being a liberal. He is the kind of liberal that will give everything possessed by our people away, and leave us perished as a Nation, and our people in a state of serfdom. When our Nation is reduced to this status, you will see Christian religion perish from the world and civilization thrown back bordering on the dark ages.

If you are not convinced get the issues of all the Communist papers for the past few days and see if they are not all supporting him. See if every big boss of the C. I. O. has not endorsed him, save and except the big chief, Sidney Hillman, which, within itself is proof that Sidney has a definite reason for keeping quiet. The PM further boasts that all the bigshot Negroes of New York are supporting Wallace.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In the list of those who have endorsed Mr. Wallace, it might be well to put in Mr. Kaiser and Mr. Higgins, two of the outstanding industrialists of our Nation.

Mr. GIBSON. Would the gentleman like to put in Earl Browder and Harry Bridges, too?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It would not be the first time that Earl Browder or Harry Bridges had supported a good cause.

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman possibly thinks that their entire theory is for the betterment of American life.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be responsible for what I think. I would like the gentleman to state what he thinks.

Mr. GIBSON. If the gentleman is not willing to answer questions, for God's sake keep your seat and do not ask them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think I can answer them in my own time.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Is the gentleman one of those who criticized Henry Wallace for advocating a quart of milk a day for each child?

Mr. GIBSON. That is so childish I would not connect it with the name "child." Is that a sufficient answer?

Mr. SAVAGE. I think so.

Mr. GIBSON. Who is going to milk the cows? Does the gentleman want the job?

Mr. SAVAGE. Does not the gentleman believe that the policy of Mr. Wallace is pretty close to the policy of the administration and would carry out the policies of the administration as well as Mr. Jones?

Mr. GIBSON. I think it is pretty closely related to the policies of the administration, and I may say further that I want every person in the world to have a quart of milk who has got energy enough to milk a cow, but I do not want to send the gentleman out to do that.

Mr. SAVAGE. I believe he was the first man to advocate that. Does the gentleman know that at the inaugural dinner, where the electors of the United States were present, Henry Wallace received a much greater and a much longer ovation than any other of the dignitaries present?

Mr. GIBSON. Greater than the President?

Mr. SAVAGE. The President was not there; Mrs. Roosevelt was.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the gentleman know why he was not? The gentleman seems to be pretty well informed. Why was the President not there?

Mr. SAVAGE. I think that is irrelevant to the question, but I doubt if Mr. Wallace would receive a greater ovation than the President. Nevertheless, there are people throughout the United States who believe that Wallace stands for the things and the hopes for the kind of administration they want, and it seems that the people believe that the only man qualified to take part in government should be——

Mr. GIBSON. I do not yield to the gentleman to make a speech.

Mr. SAVAGE. A businessman, and we are looking for a human administration as well as a business administration.

Mr. GIBSON. A human administration! Would the gentleman on his own time explain what it takes to make a human administration? Is that that dream world that you folks are thinking about where nobody works and where everybody slides through, on a path of roses?

Mr. SAVAGE. It is a world where we will have 60,000,000 jobs so that everybody has an opportunity to work.

Mr. GIBSON. That is right. Now we have the information before us.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Has the gentleman read the very fine editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in support of Mr. Wallace?

Mr. GIBSON. I have not. Who wrote it?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The editor, I imagine.

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman imagines?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. The trouble with you folks is that you imagine too much and know too little. I ask the people of this Nation is it reasonable to think that the C. I. O., the Communist, and the class of Negro leadership that has been a millstone around the necks of the decent Negroes of this Nation, has the best interest of the destiny of this Commonwealth at heart, or are they motivated by selfish and sinister purposes. If these are the people who are to direct the future of the Nation built by the brains of such statesmen as Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and the blood of all the heroes who have made the supreme sacrifice that freedom may live, God pity your children. They do not think in terms of liberty and freedom, of individual initiative, of reward in proportion to effort, but in terms of regimentation, collectivism, and destruction of every principle that has made America great. This is the crowd that Wallace has lived with, thought with, and worked with, and is the crowd that he will continue to work with, or better said, for. It is said that to the victor belongs the spoils, and truly if this crowd is permitted to be the victor in this matter they will spoil everything held dear to the heart of every true American. Do you think he will desert them? He certainly should not, for with them he has stood at all times and they have been his chief support in all his efforts.

It is generally said even by those who oppose Wallace that he is sincere and we will concede that this is true. Generally sincerity is a virtue, but it is doubtful in this case. If he were not sincere we could entertain hopes of reforming him and bringing him back to the good old American way of doing things, but the light has ceased to burn and I see no hopes that the sinner may return.

As said before, the George resolution is meritorious. It will save some of the resources of the Government; but it is not enough. With all these vast sums taken from his control he would still have access, as Secretary of Commerce, to much information from the files and records of all businesses of the Nation. You and every informed person knows what that would mean. Nothing more or less than that Philip Murray, Dan Tobin, Harry Bridges, and other labor racketeers in the country will have access to information from records of every business firm in the Nation that they want.

I hope that the Senate will refuse to confirm his appointment so that those who are fighting on the many battle fronts of the world may at least have hope of returning to a country with a few of the ideals remaining for which they fought.

There is no need for any one to mince words on this subject, as it is commonly known that Wallace is the brains of all the forces who have and are trying to tear down every American tradition and establish total regimentation of man and property in this country.

They shout from the housetops the terrors of a capitalistic form of government. Yet our youth has been told, and properly so, that they should be proud to die for this great country of ours. They know that it has been built from a wilderness to its present greatness under a capitalistic form of government, but yet, while 10 percent of our people are away fighting and dying to protect it, they are trying to destroy it by condemning the system by which it was made great, and a haven for men who love freedom and justice. If this Congress does not stop this crowd, the same bunch that was responsible for strikes and shut downs when our boys were dying for munitions and fighting equipment, and who have become rich out of this racketeering, before they destroy this country, we will not be worthy of our returning heroes.

If this crowd is permitted to socialize this country and my children have to live under the whims of an anarchist, the pages of history will disclose that I opposed the march of destruction that we see every day and fought for the preservation of democracy and the liberties of man in the Nation where civilization has been a symbol of American life.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 1 hour.

REPORT ON HOUSE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE TRIP TO EUROPE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to report on the recent trip of the Committee on Military Affairs overseas. In making this report I do it personally. It is not a committee report but a personal report. I want to take the first part of the time in narrating briefly the course of the trip, the chronological sequence of our trip overseas, and then, in the last part, I shall make some observations and recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, some time last summer a number of Members of this House felt that a committee from this Congress should visit the battlefields of Europe. We felt that this should be done at the proper time and in such a way as not to disturb the commanding officers, whose minds should be on their work, and, at the same time, we could gain first-hand information as to conditions in our armies abroad. We gained the consent of the War Department, and, as guests of the Department, on November 23, at 3:20 p. m., we left the national port of aerial embarkation at Washington.

The party consisted of 17 members of the Military Affairs Committee, together with accompanying officers and crew from the War Department. Col. C. J. Hauck, Jr., was in command of the party for the War Department. Most of the trip was made in C–54 Army planes, which are the regular four-motored Army carrier planes, and the only alteration made on the planes was the addition of seats for our committee.

This inspection trip lasted from November 23 to December 20—4 weeks, to be exact. During this time the committee traveled some 15,000 miles by plane, several thousand miles by automobile, and several hundred by train. We visited installations in England, France, and Italy, and battlefields in France and Italy. We also inspected the bomb damage in parts of England as a result of the earlier blitz and as a result of the V–1 and V–2 bombs. We talked with most of the high-ranking officers of our Army and discussed their problems with them.

After we left the airport here at Washington on the way over, we landed at Bermuda and the Azores, each for a few hours; and then proceeded to London, arriving at an airport about 30 miles outside of the city, Saturday noon, November 25, 1944. After clearing customs and going through the customary greetings, we obtained a hotel room and spent the night in London. On Sunday morning, some of the party went to church and following this, we drove on an inspection trip of the bomb damage of this great city. Our party was especially impressed with the tremendous amount of damage being done to the buildings and the people by the V–1 and V–2 bombs. We especially examined the devastation from one of the V–2 bombs which had fallen just recently and which had destroyed several blocks of flats and apartment houses in a densely populated part of London. Workers were still probing the ruins, looking for the bodies of the dead at the time our party inspected this

scene of brutality. The effects of the earlier blitz bombing was not so apparent as that of the later blitz bombing, although whole blocks which at one time had contained buildings, were cleared away for several miles and at the time we saw them, were smooth as the palm of the hand.

After only 1 day in London, the party boarded a special train which had been prepared for General Eisenhower's use in England and traveled from one place of inspection to another. The train was built along the English plan and contained facilities for the use of the general and his staff while traveling. By using this train, we were able to travel at night and inspect during the daytime.

We first inspected the docks and wharf facilities of Liverpool, watching some of our boats unload their cargoes. It so happened that the Army transport *Chateau Thierry* was there, tied up at the docks, loaded with wounded soldiers returning home. We visited it and fully inspected its accommodations for the wounded.

Following this, in rapid order, the committee visited Speke Field and saw the work being done in assembling our planes and putting them in condition to fly. The work of the British girl mechanics and helpers on the planes was especially interesting to me; and I was told that these British girls are hired by our Army and turned out excellent work for us, saving the armed services of many men for duty at the front.

We then visited the Three hundred and Twelfth Station Hospital and the Three Hundred and Fifth Station Hospital, the latter of which is known as rehabilitation center No. 1, both being located in southern England. At the former hospital, mild psychiatric cases are being treated with most excellent results obtained. In fact, something like 30 percent of these patients are returned to their former combat units within a few weeks and practically 100 percent of them are returned to duty, following about 27 to 35 days' treatment. At the rehabilitation center No. 1, we saw men who had received bone injuries, such as broken arms and legs, in the process of being given special exercises and treatments to restore to the injured member the full and normal use of it. These patients were going thru all kinds of exercises for the purpose of giving suppleness and agility to the injured part of the anatomy. In one instance, we found that some of them were engaged in a simulated attack with rifles firing and guns barking and men running and hugging the earth, all for the purpose of restoring to them the normal use of their bodies.

While in the United Kingdom, we visited two general depots and one quartermaster depot. One of the general depots was devoted to the stocking of an enormous number of automobile parts of every conceivable kind and character. Another one was devoted to salvage operations. In this plant millions of articles such as field ranges, lanterns, helmets, office furniture, typewriters, calculators, adding machines, duplicators, all types of tentage, army shoes, gloves, and all kinds of wearing apparel were being mended, reconditioned, and put in excellent shape for future use by our troops. The chart for this depot shows that materials having a replacement cost of $1,293,186.54 had been completely salvaged at this depot from May 15 to November 24, 1944. In these operations, Italian "cooperatives" and British women are doing valuable work in assisting the soldiers in this important work. Prisoners of war, also, are being used effectively.

On the last day of our stay in England, the committee witnessed a bombing mission take off from one of the Eighth Air Force fields for operations over Germany. On the day we were there the specific target was an oil refinery over Germany; and 1,400 bombers participated in this mission. When they were out of sight, General Doolittle, who is in command, escorted our party to the fighter field, and we witnessed our fighters leave the ground about 1 hour after the bombers had left. There were about 600 to 800 fighters in this operation. One of the features of this mission, which impressed everyone very much, was the early morning briefing—it was 4 a. m.—of the pilots and crew of the bombers. We heard them discuss the mission, refer to the difficulties of terrain and the enemy flak and air opposition, the weather conditions over the target, the place of rendezvous with the fighter planes, and many other things of fascinating interest to every member of the committee. Out of this mission on this day, the Eighth Air Force lost only 4 planes.

On the morning of November 30, the committee flew to Cherbourg, France. We arrived there in time to spend the afternoon visiting the scene of the D-day operation on the Normandy coast. We stood on the beach where the initial landing had occurred, and Col. Eugene M. Coffee, who was one of the first Army engineers to set foot on French soil, pointed out to us just how the operation was handled on Utah beach. He explained how the initial landing occurred, the blasting of great gaps in the antitank wall, the scraping of the bottoms of many small boats on the beaches, the noise of infantry storming ashore, and the withering cross-fire of the enemy's big guns. He explained how a score of large ships were brought over from England loaded with ballast and sunk offshore to form a breakwater harbor for our ships to unload, the constant and unrelenting efforts to rush men and equipment forward to back up the beachhead once it was established and the spearhead as it moved inland. The cemeteries located at Eglise attest in mute language, only too well, to the ferocity of the struggle to gain possession of the Normandy peninsula.

On the following morning our committee flew over the harbor of Cherbourg, which is being used extensively by our Army and Navy, and witnessed from the air the studied and effective work of the German demolition squads. Installations and dock facilities of all kinds had been destroyed beyond hope of salvage or use.

As we flew along the coast we observed the effect of the terrific battle for possession of the Normandy peninsula—the contact point between the British and American forces—upon the small coastal towns, especially at Caen, where it reached its terrible crescendo. At Le Havre we inspected the water front. We saw the German strong points and pill boxes with reinforced concrete many feet thick imbedded deeply in the sands of the beach; saw the many ships sunk in the harbor in such places as to give our people the greatest possible trouble; observed the efforts of our engineers to bridge over the sunken ships and to build suitable temporary port facilities; watched the unloading of ships to the Army ducks and from the ducks to the shore; drove through the warehouses being restored to use; and commented on the tremendous amount of civilian destruction of houses and places of business on the Le Havre water front. It is said that 6,000 civilians perished in the bombing and shelling of the Le Havre water front, before its final liberation.

From the port of Le Havre the committee proceeded to Paris, where rooms were obtained which we used as long as we were in France. On Sunday, December 2, at the E. T. O. U. S. A., with General Lee and his staff, we were briefed on all matters connected with the communications zone. At this point I want to pay a compliment to the general and his staff upon the thorough and most courteous manner in which they gave the committee full information on the conditions prevailing in the communications zone and the many problems which the Army must meet and solve. I am sure that after almost 12 hours of this briefing our committee left headquarters with a far greater appreciation of the tremendous job the running of a war 3,500 miles from home has turned out to be. The tremendous problems of supply and of communications especially impressed many members of the group.

Early the next morning our committee proceeded by automobile to the advanced section of the communications zone and visited a large supply depot there. The impressive thing at this depot was the use of Russian women who had been brought to France by the Germans in doing much of the repair work there. At the same time, we visited a medical depot where a large stock of captured German medical supplies was being assorted by our men. The German names on the boxes and the supplies were being changed for American names and they were all being properly assorted under their American names.

Operating from headquarters, the advanced section of the communications zone, the committee visited a field hospital in Belgium, a heavy automotive maintenance company and certain other advanced section installations. At the same time some of the members of the committee visited the Albert Canal, driving up and down the canal and watching the work of the Army engineers in clearing the canal of heavy obstacles to traffic placed in the canal by the Germans,

rebuilding the many bridges over the canal and repairing the destroyed locks of the canal. This canal is very important to our transportation system in Belgium and France as it connects with the harbor of Antwerp. This part of the committee also visited Aachen, examining its ruins and proceeded up to the front.

The committee left the advanced section headquarters on December 5 and proceeded by car to visit Gen. Omar Bradley at his headquarters. We remained with him for a briefing there and then took lunch with him. The committee stayed 2 nights at Verdun, the place where 750,000 men lost their lives during the First World War. Operating from there, we visited Gen. George S. Patton at his headquarters, discussed his problems with him, and proceeded to drive through an area near Chateau-Saline which had recently been the scene of one of the really bloody battles of the war. Fox holes by the thousands, cross trenches, vacated gun emplacements, destroyed guns and equipment, dead animals, especially horses still in harness, great shell craters, destroyed farmhouses and buildings, deserted villages, all attested to the full fury of the recent attack necessary to liberate this portion of Alsace-Lorraine.

This interesting but gruesome trip ended when we reached Metz. At the time we were there, four German forts were still holding out against us, although our front lines had already moved on to Strasbourg. It is significant to note that on the day of our inspection another one of these forts surrendered. We watched one of our large guns—a 155 millimeter—fire on one of the forts and talked to members of the gun crew. Our committee then returned to Verdun by car. During the course of this trip, at several places the committee passed points where they were under observation of the German guns.

Returning to the Paris area, the committee visited Chartres, France, inspecting a prisoner-of-war enclosure in this vicinity. The purpose of this visit was to satisfy the members of the committee on the handling of German prisoners overseas.

On Sunday, December 10, the committee proceeded to visit General Eisenhower's field headquarters. The general looked the picture of perfect health. He gave us a short briefing on conditions at the front and then proceeded to answer questions. Most of them dealt with lacks and shortages; and I will take the opportunity of discussing them later in this statement. We stayed to dinner with the general and he asked about home and the conditions back here.

This trip required a full day and upon return to the Paris area, on the next day, we visited the Ninth Air Force, planning to witness medium bombers take off from the field on a battle mission. The weather was so bad, however, that the mission was called off and our work was confined to inspecting the landing field, landing strips, planes, and headquarters buildings. After this inspection, later in the evening, we visited General Spaatz at his headquarters. I can recall that while the general received us in a large officers' club, his headquarters was a portable one, located in a large trailer. It had full outside connections and was furnished with office equipment to permit the usual headquarters operations.

The committee left Paris on the morning of December 12, and after spending the night at Marseilles, France, we proceeded to Naples, Italy. Upon arriving there we were received by General Aaker, senior officer present. General Alexander was unable to be present and General McNarney had gone to the front to replace him. We made a brief inspection of the Naples Harbor and noticed the very fine work which had been done by Army engineers in rebuilding wrecked docks over the hulls of sunken ships in the harbor. Loading and unloading was proceeding there at rapid rate.

We proceeded by air to Rome flying over Monte Cassino pitted on all sides by countless shell and bomb holes and circled over the poor and crumbled rubble of what had at one time been the cloistered sanctuary of religion and of learning known to the ages as the Benedictine Monastery. We skirted along the coast and saw the point of landing on the Anzio Beach, the devastation of what had once been the supreme test of Nazi strength and resistance to our victorious armies coming northward from Sicily. The Appian Way, the Pontine Marshes, the wrecks of Nazi planes, equipment, and material—they were all there.

From Rome as a base, we visited the United States Army rest center in Italy. It is located on the spot designated by Mussolini as the location for the 1940 Olympic games and the buildings there are in perfect shape and condition for our use as a rest and recreation center for battle-fatigued soldiers from the front. It has stadia for athletic contests, gymnasium with fine equipment, indoor and outdoor swimming pools, and other equipment. It has a capacity of 3,500 men and 300 officers at one time. We inspected the Sixth General Hospital, a large and well-run institution and then visited the First Replacement Center. At this last-named place, the committee saw the wonderful use being made of buildings and facilities constructed by the Italians and intended for use by Mussolini as a part of his military training. We are using these facilities effectively as an infantry replacement depot.

From the Rome area, the committee moved northward along the coast, passed the Island of Elba where lived the great Napoleon, flew over the leaning tower of Pisa, and stopped at Florence, Italy. We inspected a large, well-equipped, and efficiently operated ordnance depot being used to repair automotive equipment, artillery, tanks, field glasses, range finders, and almost any other type of metallic equipment. Fifty-five hundred Italian civilians were being employed by our Army in this depot in addition to the 5,000 of our own soldiers who are working there.

On the day after our arrival at Florence, the committee proceeded to the front. On the way up we met Gen. Mark Clark, who escorted us to his headquarters just behind the front lines. Since the day was Sunday the committee stopped on the way for the purpose of attending a short church service in a badly shelled and damaged building behind the Italian front. The service was the regular Sunday service scheduled for the men of the Ninety-first Division, and we joined them in the observance. In jeeps spaced 200 feet apart for safety, we proceeded over a U-shaped road, rough and muddy by constant use, to a point where we could see our artillery strafing the enemy positions on a distant mountain peak, the enemy occasionally replying with a burst of shrapnel or high explosive in the field to the left of us.

Leaving this area, the committee visited the Fifteenth Air Force located in south Italy. At one of these bases the enlisted men took entire charge of the party. Under their direction we ate chow with them, accompanied them to their recreation center, which is splendidly built in an abandoned underground quarry and talked to them of their complaints. The last point of inspection of the trip was the headquarters of the Fifteenth Air Force; and on the afternoon before our committee left Italy, we sat in the headquarters and witnessed the operation of tabulating the results of one of our air missions from Italy into southern Germany. As the planes were checked into their bases upon their return, the great blackboard in headquarters tallied the news. It reported weather conditions in Germany and along the route, enemy resistance, and flak conditions; it reported losses and results from the bombing, whether a hit or miss was obtained. I can recall that everyone left this meeting with a heavy heart; over 40 of our heavy bombers had not returned from the mission. At breakfast, the next morning, we were gladdened by the happy news that 20 of these 40 missing bombers were reported to have landed at other fields during the night and were safe.

At 9 a. m. on December 19, the committee left Bari, Italy, by plane and proceeded to Washington by way of Casablanca, the Azores, and Bermuda. We arrived here at the National Airport, December 20, 1944, at 5:20 p. m.

OBSERVATIONS

Mr. Speaker, I have laboriously plotted the major activities of your committee on these 4 weeks of overseas inspection, that you may know of our full efforts to obtain and bring back all facts available to us during this brief time. In summarizing the results of the trip, I want to say that we think it was a most worth-while inspection trip. Your committee talked to hundreds of officers and enlisted men on this trip. We slept with them and ate with them. We feel that we now have first-hand information of their complaints and their problems. We have information we can and will give to you from time to time bearing upon problems vital to the continued conduct of the war.

WEATHER

"Mud, mud, mud," is the way that I would describe the conditions on the win-

ter battlefields of Europe. It is in camp, on the highway, in the fox holes, gun positions and on the front. A high, dry place is chosen today, for an ordnance, ammunition, or supply depot. Turning wheels and falling rain tomorrow turn the place into a quagmire of mud. At times, nothing with wheels can move, and men sink almost to their knees in thick, black, creamy mud as they try to progress. The snow falls, and if weather freezes, conditions improve for a time, only to revert to mud when the thaw comes.

This mean, inclement, but typical French and north Italian weather is one of the greatest obstacles in our advance. I have heard men say, at times, it was harder to fight than the enemy. It certainly is our second problem on the front lines and first with our transportation system. The tremendous job of supplying our armies impressed every member of the committee. The long miles of roadway from the port to the front, cratered with bombs and shells, rough and worn-out with constant use, is a real challenge to our engineers and their fine equipment. It makes necessary the constant use of hundreds of thousands of soldiers to man the long supply lines, rebuild the bridges, maintain the roads, provide gasoline, tires, repairs and parts, for a countless number of trucks and cars.

PILFERING

Then, too, the long supply lines make it necessary that our convoys be guarded to protect them from pillage by civilians, who, themselves are suffering from shortages very acute at times and in many items. In some places, as soon as the head is turned, the pillagers are at work—cigarettes, gasoline, and food—these are the most desirable items. They disappear like a morning mirage unless carefully protected. To punish civilians, cooperation from the local governing authorities is necessary. To protect these supplies initially, many M. P.'s and careful handling of them are necessary. In places in Italy our Army has gone to the length of placing signs on highways warning our soldier drivers not to leave their trucks unattended for a minute, as they may be stolen or pillaged during their absence.

SHORTAGES

The committee studied Army shortages and our "lacks." They found we lacked such things as very heavy tanks, robot bombs and jet-propelled planes. We are short such things as heavy artillery and heavy artillery shells, tires, trucks, and tenting—all known to our Army. In some places, we have been short at times of whole blood.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman speaks of a shortage of heavy tanks. Is the gentleman referring to heavy tanks comparable to those in use by the Germans?

Mr. BROOKS. It is the extremely heavy tank that we do not have. We have a light and we have a medium tank, and they are excellent and do excellent work, but we do not have available for use there the very heavy tanks. The Germans have used some of them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am sure the gentleman, being a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, can advise the House whether or not we have in production tanks comparable to those the Germans are using, if it is not a military secret.

Mr. BROOKS. That is not a part of this trip, of course. However, I call the attention of the gentleman to a press article which I saw recently to the effect that the Army is engaged in producing very heavy tanks. That report is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I saw that in the press, and I thought perhaps the gentleman would confirm it.

AMMUNITION

Mr. BROOKS. We found that, on November 30, the Secretary of War was asked at press conference, "Can you give us information on the present ammunition situation?" To this, Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, replied:

> This situation has been, and is, extremely complicated and equally critical and bids fair to be more so, unless production rates in the United States are greatly increased. In brief, last April—following our experiences in the mountain warfare in Italy where artillery consumption tremendously increased beyond all previous estimates of theater commanders or the War Department— a careful survey of the entire situation was made and it was then decided to increase greatly the heavy artillery, both as to guns and as to ammunition, and to make general increases in artillery ammunition throughout, anticipating an approach to a trench warfare situation during periods of stalemate in the campaigns which had been decided upon, notably the landing in France.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Rail deliveries were partially responsible—port limitations were principally responsible. As both these two factors improve, we are reaching another limitation and that is the availability of ammunition in the United States. We could disembark more if it were available and we could transport across France more if it were available.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We insist on an overwhelming artillery power for the support of our infantry, not merely to gain success in battle, but more particularly to hold down the number of casualties. We foresee still further increased requirements and it is for that reason that every possible measure should be taken to stimulate production in this country.

Soon after this release from the Secretary of War, we all recall that Gen. Dwight Eisenhower made public a plea for more ammunition which, he said, was badly needed by the armies to take care of the fighting to come within the next few months.

Mr. Speaker, when a part of our committee was at the front near Duren, Germany, we encountered five artillerymen engaged in wire-laying operations. They pointed out to us that the enemy was in a little village about one-half mile ahead and had a lookout post in a church steeple. They said, "If we had ammunition, we would take care of that German lookout post." These same men wrote me on December 25, telling me that they had captured this "German lookout and had used it as our own." They again made a plea for increased ammunition, when they said: "We sincerely hope that you have been successful in convincing the people back home that we are in dire need of more shells."

The full text of this letter is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD January 8, 1945, page 124.

I think these statements show conclusively that shortages of heavy ammunition exists, and I am sure that shortages of other items mentioned may be equally well established. These shortages are intolerable and present a challenge to the Army ordnance and to the home front which must be met.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. In the first place, I want to compliment the gentleman for his very fine report on the inspection trip made by this committee. I believe part of the statement which the gentleman just read from Secretary of War Stimson answers in part, at least, the question I was about to ask which was whether transportation was available to take care of the shortage provided the material was there? In other words, is the transportation set-up sufficient to relieve the condition of shortage at the front?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, at first, as the Secretary intimates, transportation was a major problem. It still is a real problem, but quoting his own words, the real problem now has come back to us in the United States of America, and it is our duty here and in our arsenals on the home front to produce the shells that these men who are on the firing line today need in order to protect their own lives and push on to victory for the United States.

Mr. PRIEST. I felt that was true. I just wanted to emphasize that because I do not think we can excuse ourselves here for lack of production on any ground or on any theory that it could not be transported even if we had had the material. I wanted the gentleman to emphasize that and I emphasize it myself. I would like to ask the gentleman a further question specifically with reference to transportation. I have been very much interested in knowing or learning, if possible, to what extent the railroad system in France now being used by the Allies for transportation has been put back into operation following all the bombing which has occurred?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the bombing knocked out the railroad system there. The main thing is the reconstruction of bridges. The rail and cross ties can be put into place in quick order but when it comes to building bridges, the problem is far more difficult and, of course, the larger rivers, like the Seine, present a major obstacle. But the Army engineers are doing a magnificent job in replacing those bridges as quickly as possible. But the gentleman knows to set up a fully working and efficiently operating railway system is a matter not of days but of

months. The railways there are not operating on an efficient basis yet.

Mr. PRIEST. But considerable progress has been made compared to the destruction that was everywhere in evidence?

Mr. BROOKS. Progress is being made and the waterways are being used to a very substantial extent. I might say that in those countries in Europe they are far ahead of us in the use of water channels. Even a small stream is dug out and used for water navigation. So water navigation there is a far more important matter in the way of transportation than it would be, proportionately, in the United States.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I noticed that the gentleman referred to the visit to Aachen. Of course, we who remained behind know very little of what actually transpired except what we read in the newspapers. But it strikes me very forcefully that our military authorities have permitted great numbers of Germans to remain or return to their homes behind our lines. It may run into the hundreds of thousands and before this war goes very much further as we advance it may amount to millions, of hostile German civilians, men, women, and children, who will be permitted back of the American lines.

What I am wondering about is why we do not try to press them forward, to make them become a problem for the Germans to feed and care for, instead of leaving them behind the line, where we have to care for them, feed them, and have to keep an eye on them, as they signal our enemies and maintain a German underground. I did not know whether that had come under the eye of any member of the committee or whether our military leaders have taken cognizance of the fact that to whip the German we cannot give him any advantage, and that they all ought to be driven forward.

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman refers to Aachen, I will tell the gentleman he need not worry about civilians being a problem. The destruction in that city of 165,000 is unbelievable. I did not see one single building there in the whole city which had not been touched to the point where it would be useless. I dare say in the whole city I saw not over one or perhaps two civilians, and what they were doing there may have been with the permission of the Army; I do not know.

Mr. DINGELL. But is it not logical to presume that the newspaper reports were correct that a great portion of the Aachen population remained back of the American lines instead of being compelled to move forward further into German held territory?

Mr. BROOKS. Perhaps that may be so, but I do not know. I can tell the gentleman that they are not living in the city of Aachen.

Mr. DINGELL. I hope they are not living on this side of the line, either. They should be compressed into a shrinking Germany as the Russians are doing.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I also wish to compliment my distinguished colleague on the splendid report he has made. It is very interesting and very instructive. I am wondering if the gentleman's committee had the time to mix and mingle with the civilian population to understand what sort of cooperation we are getting from the civilian population in France and also in Italy.

Mr. BROOKS. We are getting very good cooperation from both. I mentioned a moment ago in this talk the fact that there was one arsenal in Italy employing 5,500 Italians; and even in England we employ what we call there the Italian cooperatives, that is, the would-be Italian prisoners of war, but we are at peace with Italy. They are doing good work.

In France there is a reservoir of manpower which might be tapped to our benefit, and the Army is proceeding to use this reservoir, encountering great difficulties there in the matter of obtaining raw materials to use to fashion the things we need, and great difficulties in the matter of transportation. These factors limit our use of the manpower which might otherwise be available.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. One further question, if the gentleman will permit: We have of course a number of French helping us in actual combat. I wonder how many if any we have of the former Italian soldiers helping us in combat?

Mr. BROOKS. I cannot give the gentleman any figure on the number of Italian soldiers aiding us.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Do we have any?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, we have a few. It may be interesting for the gentleman to know that in France we are getting more volunteer Frenchmen than we are able to equip. We have equipped a number of divisions of French soldiers who are doing fine fighting there on a front in Alsace Lorraine; and we are able to obtain more by volunteer means. They are ready and willing to fight the Germans but we do not have the equipment for them. I dare say that answers the gentleman's other question in reference to the Italians, because if we do not have the equipment for the French soldiers, we do not have it naturally, for the Italians.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. In further reference to what the gentleman has said about the French railroads, we must bear in mind that the Germans carried away or destroyed a great part of the French rolling stock and that the Americans and British destroyed more during the process of liberation. The fact remains, however, that where rolling stock is available on the railroads in France it is being used almost exclusively by the American forces and has rendered a very valuable contribution in the transportation of our supplies.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield further, in connection with the matter of German civilians I believe it is true that only a very few thousands of the original 150,000 or 160,000 people who lived in Aachen have come back to their homes. I believe that in the main we have gained considerable by the fact that some of those civilians have come back, because we are learning something about the administration of civil government within Germany as a result of having those people to work with. We can be sure that most of those that did come back are anti-Nazi. We must remember also that we are not warring on civilians, that we have got to work with those people during the next generation while we try to get Nazi totalitarianism out of their systems and help in the process of reeducation of the German people along democratic lines.

May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Louisiana is to be commended highly for his report. I had many opportunities to observe and appreciate his fine work and this is presented on the same high plane. His committee did a valuable piece of work in visiting the fighting fronts. I have personal knowledge of their contributions to morale and of improvements in the service which they inspired. I think that the value of their work while at the fighting fronts will be seen time and again in the months to come.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has just returned from a tour of duty overseas with the Army, and naturally has a keen insight into conditions existing in France.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, or would he rather finish his general statement?

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentlewoman will agree, I should prefer to finish.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a very fine report.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentlewoman.

FOOD

On the whole, our Army has done a fine job in providing our troops with good, wholesome food. As a rule, Army mess is good; and one eating in civilian places in France and Italy immediately becomes conscious of the inferior grade and quantities of the food served. As we moved among the troops, the complaints about the food were almost negigible which, in itself, is ample testimony of the fine work of the quartermasters in this respect.

HOSPITALS

As the committee proceeded with its inspection, we especially examined into the condition of our hospitals and hospital facilities. We saw the wounded soldiers brought from the front with nothing in the way of treatment, save the simplest form of first aid. We talked to those in the evacuation hospitals, who desired to talk and asked about those unfortunate men whose wounds placed them beyond the condition where lan-

guage was desirable. We saw them transported in ambulances from the evacuation hospital to the general hospitals in the rear. We saw the general hospitals turn them over to the special hospitals, such as those we saw in England; and finally we saw those permanently and seriously wounded on board our hospital ships, loaded and ready for return to the United States.

The evacuation hospitals were, of course, of a temporary nature and were often of frame construction and were even placed in abandoned factories or public buildings. The base hospitals in the rear were, however, of permanent construction and often were the long-established, permanent institutions of France, Italy, and England, efficiently run, modern in all respects and supplied with medical equipment, the delight of almost any doctor. We learned from our contacts the simple rule: "If the wounded man arrives at the evacuation hospital within 2 or 3 hours after he is wounded, his chances of recovery, regardless of the nature of the injury, are increased 90 percent. If he is lost on the battlefield or in the woods for as long as 24 to 36 hours after being wounded, his chances are reduced 10 percent for recovery."

The doctors and nurses at these institutions are doing a marvelous job. The percentage of recovery is twice as high as it has heretofore been the case in any war in which we have been engaged. These medical men and women, in many instances, are literally "cheating the grave" and are bringing back our wounded soldiers to life and health when by normal standards the accomplishment would be impossible. Long hours of labor makes the work exacting. A heavy shortage of nurses under these conditions makes the beneficent work of the heart of these young women the tender subject of one of the truly great sagas of mankind.

USE OF OVERSEAS MEN

The use of Italian cooperatives and local labor in France and the United Kingdom to assist in construction and maintenance work for the Army in Europe is saving the services of many soldiers. In England British girls are doing a fine job for the Army driving cars, doing mechanical work, repair work, and all types of work in the repair and assembly plants there. In France hundreds of thousands of people are unemployed and anxious to work. The Army program of utilizing these potential pools of labor should be continued with the view of relieving our soldiers for combat duty and other essentially soldierly duties. This program saves transportation and saves Army manpower, and it should be encouraged.

ISLAND BASES

In reference to the offshore island bases I wish to say, if anyone has failed to make up his mind as to the importance of the offshore bases which we have acquired in the Atlantic, a crossing of this great body of water will soon give him strong convictions on this subject. These bases are very important—in fact, vital to the future development of American aviation. Our airplanes fly always with special reference to the island bases in the Atlantic. They pause during a crossing for rest, fuel, and repairs. They chart their course by these bases, and they become necessary chains in the great skyways of the world. They, in fact, form the natural travel ways of mankind.

CONCLUSION

The other day my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] presented to this body the story of Gen-Mark Clark's fighting Fifth Army. She presented the pageant of the indomitable courage and heroic hardships of the Fifth Army, especially the infantry, as they advanced from the toe, step by step, almost to the very top of the Italian boot. She showed their perseverance as they stormed rugged peak after peak of those mountains which in northern Italy hold themselves up like "sore thumbs," impregnable, yes, impregnable save to the courage, will, and resourcefulness of the American fighting man. I join enthusiastically with my colleague in what she has to say about the exploits of this Army and its fighting infantry, which truly reaches the outer fringes of the imagination of our people.

Taking not one jot or tittle from the glowing tribute which has justly been paid the Fifth Army of Italy, I would go further. I would cover, for instance, those who fight in France, as well as those who fight in Italy. Under this tribute, I would cover the battalion aid men of the medical department. I would cover those men who go out over the fields of battle with their stretchers and bring back to safety and hospitalization the injured and the wounded.

I would cover the Signal Corps men who lay the wires and maintain the communications so essential to the fighting men on the front, men who by day and night push through the muck and the mire of the road, the field, and the swamp in their efforts to maintain communications. And then there is the Field Artillery man—always maintaining contact with the enemy, always in shelled and bombed gun emplacements, sending over rolling cross-fire and all types of barrages; hitting, softening, and crushing the enemy; aiding, supporting, and protecting the Infantry. They, too, are doing a magnificent work.

And the Army engineers. I would include in this glowing picture of courage and gallantry the men who clear the harbor channels, rebuild the port facilities, maintain the interminable number of miles of roadway, reconstruct under fire the bombed and destroyed bridge spans which cross the major streams of Europe, build and maintain the hundreds of airports which our air forces use all over the world. Yes; I would pay tribute to that little band of engineers which the other day in Belgium lost 80 percent of their number while working under enemy fire, and to those engineers who landed on D-day well in advance of the others to bomb and destroy German coast defenses on the shores of Normandy that a successful landing might then be made.

Mr. Speaker, nor would I close this picture of Army achievement without mentioning the magnificent work of the Army Air Forces, the bomber and the fighter, those vikings of the twentieth century who course their paths across the skyways of Europe, braving the rough weather, ranging in temperatures as low as 40 degrees below zero, risking their lives as they fly in formation through the enemy flak, matching wits with the Nazi in the "dog fights" in the skies, thousands of miles from home, and giving support and strength and comfort to our ground forces, who gaze upon friendly planes as they do upon the benign gifts of heaven.

There are the paratroops, the airborne infantry, the antiaircraft, and a host of others, who are daily performing deeds of valor which make the childhood version of Aesop's fairy tales seem flat and uninteresting.

Mr. Speaker, every part of our Army is rendering real, efficient, courageous, and gallant service. I think every department and organization is entitled to its proportion of credit in the mighty drama which is moving on against tremendous obstacles toward Berlin and toward victory. American people have a right to be truly proud of the magnificent record of our armies. We have a right to be truly thankful that brave men by the tens of millions, under the Stars and Stripes, battle for our safety and our Nation. They should, in fact, daily be grateful to a half million of brave men who have received combat wounds. We should daily sanctify those tens of thousands of gallant men who have given their lives that this Nation might live.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a wonderful report and a very inspiring one. I am indeed privileged to hear it. It will be very valuable particularly insofar as legislation is concerned. The gentleman is a tireless worker for the defense of the United States and for the welfare of those in the armed services. Did not the gentleman find the morale of the soldiers amazing everywhere?

Mr. BROOKS. It is amazing to see those men out in the muck and the mire and the dirt of the winter battlefields of Europe, coming in spattered with mud from head to foot, and yet cheerful, realizing the task and the importance of fighting it through to the end. It is really and truly amazing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In October I found every man said the same thing, "I want to get the job done and go home." That is the spirit that makes the American soldier the finest in the world.

Mr. BROOKS. They all want to get home, as the gentlewoman knows.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The American soldiers love their homes, but they did not ask to come home before the job was finished. It is we who are so

anxious to try to get replacements for them.

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did not the gentleman find a great shortage of wire? I found that situation to be true in September and October. The War Department tells me that there still is a great shortage of communication wire.

Mr. BROOKS. This is correct. I thank the gentlewoman for that additional contribution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is the only contact that the man in the lonely outpost has with the others of his company or his outfit; also positions can be held or lost if they have or do not have communication wire.

Mr. BROOKS. That is very important, and I thank the gentlewoman for a valuable contribution.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Does the gentleman have any comment to make on the work of the Red Cross in Italy? I happen to be personally interested, since my only sister is in that service in Italy.

Mr. BROOKS. I have not covered it in this report, although we did see the work of the Red Cross at various times and in various places. I asked the troops about it, because I know in the last World War there was some criticism of the Red Cross. I found, however, that our troops speak a good word for the Red Cross. I visited what they call the Rainbow Center in Paris, and I saw literally hundreds of troops in there enjoying the advantages offered them by the Red Cross. I know for a fact that it is doing very fine work for our soldiers. I saw evidence, too, of the Red Cross at different points, some points far up along the line toward the front, where they were serving our troops very effectively and doing a splendid work.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First I want to commend the gentleman for having made a very fine and a wholly objective report. It was my pleasure to be with the gentleman on this trip, and I have particularly enjoyed the thorough report he has given to the House.

I was going to ask the gentleman the very question the gentlewoman from Massachusetts asked, about the morale of our men. The thing that impressed me most on the whole trip was the remarkable morale of our men at the front. Their greatest concern seemed to be not their own welfare but an assurance to their people back home not to worry about them, that they were getting along all right.

I add my compliment to what the gentleman said about the Red Cross. He will recall that every place we went, regardless of time, day or night, and regardless of how far up it was, we found the Red Cross hut with the Red Cross girls there serving doughnuts and hot coffee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I was also one of those who had the privilege of visiting the European theater of war, and I would like also at this time to take this opportunity to make a few observations.

There is so much that might be said in making a report of this character, and my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], who has just preceded me, has given an excellent picture of the situation in Europe, especially in regard to the men in the armed forces, and other matters. I will try not to cover any of the matters that have previously been included in the remarks referred to.

On the contrary, I will try to bring to your attention a few of my reactions in regard to the political and economic situation, obtained on my visit to England and France, where I contacted high-ranking military and government officials.

Europe regards the American election as a test of strength which will determine the attitude of the United States toward an international effort to maintain peace.

Europe was too far from this campaign to realize that there are many Republicans who are stalwart supporters of an international peace organization. The feeling there was that the defeat of Mr. Roosevelt would be the death blow to such an effort. Europeans are inclined to think in terms of votes of confidence. The defeat of Mr. Roosevelt would have been regarded as a no-confidence vote, and would have been the worst possible news that could have come to war-weary Europe.

In my opinion the European peoples have suffered such losses and have undergone so much in the way of privation and hardship that they can think only in terms of an effort to prevent the reoccurrence of the holocaust visited upon Europe by this war.

My view is that the United States and Great Britain must spearhead the international peace movement. I am positive the effort will have the cooperation of Russia and France, but I think the latter two nations will have such enormous domestic problems on their hands that they will not be able to concentrate on the United Nations organization in a way which Americans and British are in a position to do.

I was particularly impressed with the praise of General Eisenhower for our military forces. He attributed the high morale of our combatant troops to the fact that the troops know that they are the best equipped, best trained, the best clothed, have the best medical care, and the best weapons of any of the nations in the war. He was loud in his praise of the courage, accomplishments and spirit of all of the men and women in all branches of the armed forces, as well as the backing of those on the home front who furnished the supplies, material, and money, to make it possible to do the job. It is impossible to discuss the military situation for security reasons, but General Eisenhower is highly pleased with developments and is most optimistic for the future, and notwithstanding the fact that winter is slowing up operations, he does not intend to slow up nor give the enemy any respite until a full and complete victory.

I was not surprised to see the results of the devastation done by the blitz of 1940 in London, as well as by the robot bombs which are still coming into London nearly every night. Continued bombing has not affected the great courage of the British people.

I went by automobile from Paris to the invasion beaches in France. No one can appreciate what was accomplished without actually seeing for himself what our forces had to overcome to make the landings. Anyone would marvel as to how it was possible in view of the obstacles, fortifications, concrete gun emplacements, concrete walls and installations all along the beaches.

I was told the Germans were of the opinion that a landing such as was made was impossible. This operation will go down in history as one of the greatest military feats in the history of the world. No other army has shown the courage and sacrifice which was necessary to accomplish this undertaking. The heroism of Allied troops and all branches of the amphibious forces engaged will live forever.

With the recognition of General de Gaulle as the provisional head of the French Government, order is being rapidly restored in the liberated towns and cities. It is my opinion if the Allied powers furnish de Gaulle with the necessary arms and equipment he will be able to establish a strong army and government in France. I have always contended that the peace, security, and economic stability of western Europe cannot be established without taking into consideration France and a strong Government..

Besides arms and equipment France will need fuel and food to carry the country through the winter, but economically France will come out of the war better than most of the nations engaged in this mighty struggle.

Although I am a loyal American first, being of French descent and representing a district that is largely of French descent, I have been particularly interested in France especially in view of the long standing friendship that has existed between the two Nations. You will recall that I have appeared on this floor and in the RECORD many times raising my voice on behalf of the consideration of that great nation.

France faces great internal problems but not insurmountable difficulties stand in the way of the gradual resumption in that country of a normal national life.

I am convinced that in Gen. Charles de Gaulle France has a leader equal to the occasion. I admit it is difficult for Americans always to understand the appeal of a man of General de Gaulle's

type! French people like an element of mysticism in their leaders.

General de Gaulle has the courage of his convictions and is practical in his administrative methods. It is true he thinks he is a man of destiny, but nearly all great leaders have been self-assertive. It is a historical fact that men of destiny do not get along well with one another which makes plain some of the antagonisms which have grown up against General de Gaulle.

France is very unlikely to go communistic. The regimentation of communism does not appeal to the Frenchman who is intensely individualistic.

This does not mean that there will not be a trend to the left and some resort to state socialism, particularly with respect to big business. Big business in France has not always been operated in the public interest. It frequently has been selfish and backward. This was particularly true of the airplane industry and the munitions industry. I will not be surprised to see government corporations take over some of the large private concerns.

The French people are keenly aware of the fact that they have lost prestige. They are very anxious to regain it. The people are almost obsessed with a desire to contribute importantly to the defeat of Germany.

One of the chief causes for dissatisfaction in France is the inability to start their own industries. One of the great needs is cotton. France has a sizable textile industry. An important section of the textile industry is equipped to produce tarpaulins, largely used in France in connection with railroad shipments.

A much larger proportion of freight movement is in open-top cars covered with tarpaulins. These plants were operated night and day during the German occupation but have been idle since the American occupation because of lack of cotton. The French also have tire cord plants which are intact but not in use.

The French prefer to operate these plants for the supply of their troops and feel that lend-lease cotton should be provided for that purpose.

Some of their textile capacity will have to be used for civilian supply. For that purpose they are prepared to pay cash for cotton which they would prefer to buy from the United States if an arrangement can be made under which they will not pay more than the world price. Unless some arrangement is made to that end, and in the near future, these purchases may be made in Brazil.

I was glad to see that President Roosevelt finally gave recognition to the government of General de Gaulle, and with the prestige and benefits which will come from this recognition France will be rapidly rehabilitated politically and economically, and will be able to add a large force to the armed services, and as a result, as I have said time and again before, she will do her part in participating in final victory for the Allied cause, and when peace comes will take her proper place among the great nations of the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an expression of the American League for a Free Palestine which appeared in the New York Post on January 8, captioned "Britain writes new chapter in Hebrew martyrdom. Raise your voice against international intimidation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE G. I. THINKS, TOO

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I claim no right to speak for the men and women in uniform. Already there are too many people who claim to be speaking for them, most of whom know little or nothing about them. But if I know anything about the way the soldier lives and the way he thinks, I am convinced that he is concerned with bigger things than most of us at home appear to be. I am convinced that his thinking is more statesmanlike than that of some of his Nation's statesmen, be they from Hog Heaven Branch or Washington, who still seek to cure all ills with appropriation measures.

The men who fight in the rain, the mud, the slush, the snow and ice of the western front do not discount the enemy, but they think the people back home do. Those cold and grimy G. I.'s who are never warm except in the sweat of battle want to know that the people back home—all of them, not just a few—realize they are in a war, too. Men who live out of a tin can with the stench of death forever in their nostrils wonder about waste at home; waste of manpower, waste of money, waste of the principles for which we fight.

When the word came to France that the United States was clamping down on manpower, that our Government had warned the American people in plain terms that the war is not yet won, that costlier and heavier sacrifices are yet to be made, I heard one American soldier after another say, "It is about time." These were the men from whose ranks were then being taken 5,000 casualties a day. They are the men who pay for mistakes in policy and strategy. They have learned a great deal about what it takes to win a war. They think it is about time the American people, clerks, bootblacks, and bankers, their representatives, their Government, and their generals, learn a little more about what it takes to win a war. This, I believe, is the No. 1 thought with the G. I. overseas.

The G. I. thinks it is about time for the people of the world to know whether the United States must stand alone in its search for a lasting peace which will insure democracy for the little peoples of the world. He wants to see demonstrated the spiritual courage to fight for the right, to rule out compromise. He wants to see relighted the fires of idealism which inspired world faith in this Nation.

The disillusionment which swept over America about the handling of Poland and Greece is not confined to this country. It is felt in Britain. It is felt in France. It is felt by every soldier who fights under the American flag abroad. They fear the rise of those same sinister forces which wrecked the peace conference of 1919. To them it is time for realism now in our dealings with the powers which will be represented at the next peace conference. After the war is won it may be too late to ask about the future of Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, the Ruhl Valley, Korea, or even that of our ally, China.

Those men on the fighting fronts, men whose service stripes show that they have been away from home 2, 2½, and even 3 years, think it is about time that they and their loved ones knew that there will not be a repetition of this horrible mess as soon as their sons are old enough to fight. They do not know it today. They are not convinced by the statements or the inferences from high sources that everything will be all right. They know that it is not all right today, after 3 years in which America as a good ally has sent the best that she has in men and material wherever they are needed, without regard to costs, either in lives or in dollars. They want to see the United States stand vigorously for a world partnership in which all nations, big and small, will operate through the orderly processes of international law. They think it will not be sufficient to depend upon British and Russian need for United States assistance after the war to insure their cooperation in the peace conference.

The G. I. in Southampton, St. Germaine, and Luxemburg wants the President of the United States to be practical, realistic, and if necessary, tough. He believes in his President. He is proud of him. He is proud of the regard which the peoples of the world have for President Roosevelt. The G. I. knows that his President is one of the great Americans of all time. He knows that in his hands, more than in those of any other man alive today, rest the chances of freedom, health, happiness, and opportunity for little people in our time. That is a fearful responsibility. And the G. I. is a little worried about Mr. Roosevelt's determination or lack of determination to out talk Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin on matters of world policy. He knows that Mr. Roosevelt seeks to advance American ideals and leadership by open and free cooperation with the other Allied powers, but he is beginning to wonder if the other powers are playing ball by those rules. He thinks the American team had better begin to think more about the final score and less about the rules.

These men know that many of their number will not come back, and that there will be others who will never be whole again. They know at what a terrific rate the attrition of the western front is burning out men, but they do not think of those things. They are not

afraid of those things. What they fear is futility. They fear that the great effort they and their Nation are making, that the great cost and waste of World War No. 2 may be futile. Their President can dispel that fear. We at home can help him dispel it.

Because of the things I have said, the inference may be drawn that I am concerned about the morale of the American soldier abroad. In answer to that I point simply to the fighting spirit of the men who stopped Rundstedt's breakthrough. Military men know that sheer will power and fighting hearts and those alone stopped Rundstedt. G. I.'s stood in their tracks and took the full weight of that armored onslaught with rifles and bayonets and hand grenades, or whatever weapons were at hand. They slowed it, and then they stopped it, when only a few miles farther lay the rich prizes for which Rundstedt had driven. A little less courage, a little less willingness to stand and hold and die, and disaster could have come to the Allied forces on the western front. It takes morale to do what those G. I.'s did. It takes G. I. guts.

All that I have said is in an effort to make them stronger, to help to pay the debt which I and every American owe to our fighting men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

137. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting an amended certificate from the executive of Arizona, certifying to the appointment of the electors for President and Vice President in that State on November 7, 1944, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1760. A bill providing for Federal aid to States for the acquisition of toll bridges; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 1761. A bill to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1762. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 1763. A bill to provide for making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for soil and water conservation work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 1764. A bill to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1765. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the Agricultural Byproducts Laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1766. A bill to provide for retirement of reservists of the present war at the highest rank held in active service during such war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 1767. A bill to authorize the construction and operation and maintenance of the initial unit of the Mountain Home project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1768. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1769. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been killed in action in World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1770. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 with respect to the retired pay of certain commissioned officers of the Army retired for disability during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1771. A bill to amend section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved August 29, 1935, relative to death benefits, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1772. A bill regulating the amount of interest to be paid by insolvent or alleged insolvent banks in liquidation or in the hands of receivers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1773 (by request). A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to widows of individuals who died before January 1, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1774. A bill to provide for the location, survey, and building of a system of superhighways, three east and west and six north and south highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1775. A bill to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 1776. A bill to create uniformity in the application of revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 1777. A bill to provide free transportation for parents or wives on Government-owned ships and aircraft to the graves of veterans buried abroad; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1778. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Smith River and its tributaries, California and Oregon, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1779. A bill to provide for the regulation of civilian employment to aid in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1780. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to provide for the erection of a tablet in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution urging the institution of Americans All—Immigrants All program; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 105 Resolution authorizing expenses for the special committee provided for by House resolution 88; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 106. Resolution directing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to conduct a continuous investigation and study of the manner in which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is being administered; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Candler Cobb; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1782. A bill for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1783. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Kavanagh; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Jeannette C. Jones and minor children; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of John Jehlik; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Kentucky-Illinois Hemp Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Conrad Newman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1789. A bill to provide for the payment of $20,000 to Clarence Leaon Rounds, administrator of the estates of Gerald Rounds, deceased; Richard Gray, deceased; Virginia Grafton, deceased; and Geraldine Titus, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1791. A bill to alter the service record of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of the White Van Line, Inc., of South Bend, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1793. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Micker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Saldana Agosto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1798. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Theodore R. Flohl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 1802 (by request). A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Weber; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

37. By Mr. FORAND: Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress in relation to the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

38. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition signed by women of Waterloo, Iowa, protesting the ruling of the War Labor Board declaring the brewery industry essential to the war effort and protesting any form of peacetime conscription of youth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. By the Speaker: Petition of the Insular League of Parent Teacher Associations of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the requested liquidation of the colonial system of government in Puerto Rico, and the right of Puerto Ricans to adopt their own form of government; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1945

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, infinite in power and wisdom, we make our approach this day as servants of the Lord Most High. We recognize with thanksgiving Thy claims upon us through the blessings of Thy providence and in the light of Thy great mercy. We would live and move where the nobler elements of life are at the fore, where the voice of life's higher values is distinctly heard, where human wisdom is subject in fellowship to the mind of God.

May the decisions amid the labors and responsibilities of this day be in right perspective in the lives of these Thy servants and of all related bodies of our Government. We would recognize as our chief task in life our part in the building of a better world. In this endeavor, we sense the need of God's creative touch, of His cleansing grace, of His guiding wisdom, and of His uplifting power.

We commit to our Father's care all who are this day in jeopardy by war's destructive agency. We bespeak for them the embrace of Thy strong, pure, and affectionate nature amid the challenges and perils of this hour of crisis and of destiny.

We commend to Thy fatherly care the family of the Secretary of the Senate, whose death brings to a close a life of great faithfulness in this body. Be gracious unto his colleagues in their loss, we pray.

In the name of the saving Christ and for the glory of God we make our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DEATH OF EDWIN A. HALSEY, SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the untimely death of Edwin A. Halsey, the Secretary of the Senate, is a great shock and a deep personal distress to me, as I know it is to every Member of the Senate. Ed Halsey had the respect, the admiration, and the personal affection, and complete confidence of every Member of the Senate of both political parties.

He was the nephew of John W. Daniel, one of the greatest Senators in the history of Virginia. He was born at Tye River, Nelson County, Va., on September 4, 1881. He has never ceased to take a deep interest in all the affairs of Virginia. He was beloved and respected all through Virginia, as he was in the United States Senate.

He came to the Senate as a page nearly 48 years ago, and from that time to this was in intimate personal contact with the Members of the Senate, a record which I do not believe is paralleled in our history. With great tact, wisdom, and courage, he has at all times upheld the dignity and honor of the Senate. In speaking for both of the present Senators from Virginia, Senator GLASS and myself, I wish to express our deep sense of personal loss and our highest estimate of his public service. The loss to the Senate itself is irreparable, but to the people of Virginia it is the more personal loss of a real friend.

He was elected Secretary of the Senate on March 9, 1933, and has served in that important office until now, rendering a service of most complete satisfaction and usefulness. He performed all the duties assigned to him with the utmost efficiency and with complete impartiality. He had charge, in large measure, of the inaugural ceremonies at the White House on January 20 last. As chairman of the Inaugural Committee, time and time again when I saw the strain upon him in the performance of this duty, in addition to the others he had, I urged him, on account of his recent illness, to conserve his health, but he would not spare himself in performing the duties assigned to him.

I know that many Members of the Senate will desire to pay tribute to his memory—to express their deep affection and admiration for him and for his record of great public service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it is with a degree of sorrow and regret which it is wholly impossible to express that I have learned of Colonel Halsey's sudden and untimely death. He was with us in the full vigor of his splendid powers when last the Senate met. Now he treads the valley of the shadow and has been gathered to his fathers.

It would be impossible for me to imagine a more totally competent Secretary of the Senate than Colonel Halsey has been for many years. Indeed, his whole life has been a devoted consecration to efficient public service.

It would be equally impossible, Mr. President, for me to imagine a finer personal character or a more generous friend. Although he was an earnest partisan, he never for an instant failed to be the servant of all the Senate. Republicans as well as Democrats were always the unfailing beneficiaries of his constant courtesies and his superb capacities. He admitted us not only to his great office but also to his great heart.

We shall deeply miss and mourn this able Senate executive, this sterling public servant, this magnificent American, this priceless friend.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join with the destinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in their expressions of regret over the death and loss of Colonel Halsey. I wish to join with them in their words of tribute to his memory and appreciation of his character and great ability. He entered the service of the Senate in 1897, nearly 48 years ago, as

a page. Through the years he worked up from one place to another until finally he held the great distinction and position of Secretary of the Senate. Forty-eight years of loyal, devoted, faithful service Colonel Halsey gave to the Senate and to his country. He not only performed the duties of his office of Secretary of the Senate but he assumed many additional duties in order that he might better help the Senate in its work and be of never-failing assistance to the individual Members of the Senate in the performance of their duties.

He made countless contributions of great and lasting value to the work of this body. He did much to assist the individual Members of the Senate. It is difficult to conceive how the Senate could have had a more thoughtful, a more faithful, a more indefatigable servant than it had in Colonel Halsey. He was the friend of each and every Member of the Senate, always with outstretched hand, endeavoring to lift some of the burdens resting upon the shoulders of Senators, seeking at all times to be worth while to the Senate and to its Members. He contributed greatly to the accomplishments of the Senate.

We shall sorely miss Colonel Halsey, Mr. President. We shall sorely miss his contributions through the passing days and years. His untimely death is not only a great loss to the Senate, but a great loss to the Nation, which he loved so well.

I know that I express the sentiments of all the Members of this body when I say that we extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Halsey, to their splendid son, and to the other members of the family.

Today, as Colonel Halsey leaves us, we can well and truly say, out of the depths of our hearts, in warm affection for him and deep appreciation of what he has accomplished—"Well done, Ed, thou hast been a good and faithful servant."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, my acquaintance with Colonel Halsey began more than 45 years ago. I came to Washington as assistant clerk to the Committee on Commerce of this body in October 1899. Colonel Halsey was then an employee of the Senate. In all the years that have passed he has served in varied capacities, with loyalty and ability, his party, his State, the Senate, and the Nation.

Colonel Halsey was faithful and efficient always. He was gracious, courteous, kindly. I have lost a friend.

> "He is my friend," I said,
> * * * * *
> And lo! the thought of him
> Smiles on my heart—and then
> The sun shone out again.

I shall always miss the sound of his voice that is still, the touch of his vanished hand. But, Mr. President, his virtues, the warmth of his friendship, and his character, will live in my memory throughout all the days of my life.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the great sense of sorrow and loss which we all feel, and which in particular the Republican conference of the United States Senate feels, will be expressed in a formal way by resolutions to be submitted to the Senate by a committee consisting of the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself. I do not know on what day these resolutions will be presented, but probably at the earliest convenient session of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, like the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], I first became acquainted with Colonel Halsey when I also was an employee of the Senate. It was in 1917, when I was serving as secretary to my predecessor, the late Senator Kendrick, of Wyoming, that I first met Colonel Halsey. He was not at that time the Secretary of the Senate; he was occupying another post of responsibility upon this floor.

I can say that those qualities in Colonel Halsey which the distinguished Senators who have spoken this morning have mentioned were quite apparent then. Ever gracious and understanding, he was ready always to meet and to extend to the secretaries and other employees of Senators every aid and assistance which throughout his service as Secretary of this body Senators have found him so ready to extend to us.

He was fair, he was able, he was loyal. He had a broad and intimate knowledge of the history of this body. He was jealous of the honor and the dignity of the Senate. It is difficult for me to believe that we shall easily find a person to measure up to his qualities or to the standard of public service which he established. No burden was too great for him to assume. No request from a Senator, however simple, was ever neglected at his hands.

Mr. President, I speak as one who has lost a friend. I have known Colonel Halsey for almost 30 years. Certainly no man could have given more of himself than did he to the performance of his public duty. It was in truth and in fact his devotion to duty, when he might have been taking care of his health, that brought about his untimely end. His death is a great loss to this body and to all who knew him.

My deepest sympathy goes out to the members of his family, whom he cherished with unalloyed love and devotion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as far back as 1917, I was an employee of this body, and it was at that time that I first met our lamented friend, Edwin Halsey. He had a responsible position in the Senate at that time, which he filled well, and he has continued to perform efficiently every official duty this body has entrusted to him.

I felt that I knew Colonel Halsey well, first as a fellow employee, and later as a Senator. The Senate has lost a very fine public servant. His devotion to duty and unremitting efforts to be of assistance to the Members of this body were, I venture to say, contributing causes to his early passing. We shall all miss him. He was a friend to us all.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, my acquaintance with Secretary Halsey began 6 years ago, when I became a Member of the Senate. There is an aisle in the Senate which divides those who hold different partisan views. Colonel Halsey was the nominee and the choice of Senators on the majority side as Secretary of the Senate. Notwithstanding that fact, in my 6 years of service in the Senate I never saw Colonel Halsey make the slightest distinction, either in his personal service as Secretary or in the work of the Secretary's office, between Senators upon one side of the aisle and those upon the other. This comment applies also to the personal touch which all of us have with the Secretary's office. There never was the slightest distinction between Senators on the majority side, whose nominee and choice he was, and those of us on the minority side.

Col. Edwin Halsey was a most perfect gentleman. I fear we shall not soon look upon his like again.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I have known Colonel Halsey ever since 1917. In all that time I have known him intimately, and with the passing years I grew to appreciate the man more and more. By his courtesy, his friendliness, his willingness to do a service for a friend, and to carry out the duties of Secretary of the Senate, he set an example as an efficient and able official.

Eddie Halsey in my opinion would have been here now if it had not been for his sense of duty. He kept on working many nights when really he should have gone home. His death has created a void in the Senate, but by his character and adherence to duty he has given us a memory of a truly fine public servant.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in January 1937 when the late great Senator Joseph T. Robinson, the majority leader in the Democratic caucus, nominated Colonel Halsey, he made a comment which I have never forgotten. He said, "And now I am going to speak of the best public servant I ever knew, Col. Edwin A. Halsey."

My experience has taught me the correctness of the words that Senator Robinson uttered about Colonel Halsey. He not only spent his life in, but as the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] has said, he gave his life to the Senate. Efficient, faithful, loyal, he was a part of the Senate as perhaps few who are not of its membership will ever be able to be. He loved the Senate and the Senators as the Senators loved him. He will leave behind a memory of public service which will be an example to us all, a challenge to his successor, and something which will ever tug at the heartstrings of those whom he has left behind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, little did I think as I saw Col. Edwin A. Halsey in the performance of his duties at the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States that that would be the last time I would look at this good man in the living flesh. When I learned this morning that this faithful public servant for all these years in the United States Senate had passed to the Great Beyond, to say that I was shocked, is putting it mildly indeed.

When I came to the Senate of the United States 6 years ago one of the first men I met was Col. Edwin A. Hal-

sey. From that hour until his death Colonel Halsey was my close and personal friend. In my early days in the Senate I went to him for counsel and advice in connection with my duties as United States Senator. He gave it honestly and freely. He was truly a conscientious man. I found that the counsel and the advice he tendered was of immeasurable value in smoothing my path as I moved along from week to week and year to year in this old historic Chamber.

Mr. President, every sigh of the whispering wind brings death somewhere, but in this world of tears and trouble it grieves us all the more when one so close, so dear, and so faithful has been taken from our midst. As has been said by many Members of the Senate, his death is an untimely one. Certainly that statement will never be challenged by the Members of the United States Senate or any friend who knew this man. But, Mr. President, Almighty God in His infinite wisdom plays no favorites in this hazardous game of life. In the words of the poet—

There is a reaper whose name is Death,
And with his sickle keen
He reaps the bearded grain at a breath,
And the flowers that grow between.

With deep reverence and a sad heart I extend my lasting sympathy to the devoted and lovely family of Colonel Halsey. May they take solace and comfort in knowing that he leaves behind thousands upon thousands of true and loyal friends who shall forever revere his memory.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was shocked and distressed this morning to learn of the passing of one of my dearest friends, Colonel Halsey. As one of the younger Members of this body, I can only add to what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has just said that many of the younger Senators have benefited through Colonel Halsey's kindness, his generosity, his big heart, and sound advice; and I know that in this body, as has previously been said, he made no distinction between Senators, no distinction between parties.

Mr. President, I have known Colonel Halsey in this body only a comparatively short time, but before then I knew him in the Democratic conventions held in Chicago in 1932, in Philadelphia in 1936, and in Chicago in 1940. At each of those conventions he was sergeant-at-arms to which office he had first been elected by the Democratic National Committee in July 1928, to serve at the national convention held in Houston, Tex. in that year. At many previous Democratic national conventions, beginning almost with the turn of the century, he had served in connection with the press. It is needless to say that in these assignments the same fidelity to duty and ability distinguished him as during the years when he was Secretary of the Senate.

Colonel Halsey rendered yeomen service to the Democratic Party.

We have lost a close and dear friend, and the Democratic Party one of its stalwart and most helpful supporters. When our distinguished friend, the Secretary of the Senate, resigned as sergeant-at-arms last summer, the Democratic National Committee lost one who had made the work of the conventions at times a pleasure, and who had steered us in the right line during the turmoil and struggle of the conventions. Today, in his death, we lose one we cannot replace. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his bereaved family.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, Colonel Halsey devoted his life to the service of his country. He died in that service. He died by reason of that service. Through forty-odd years he was a faithful employee of the United States Senate. Through forty-odd years he was the sympathetic friend of every Senator who sat in this body. We mourn his death. His loss is irreparable.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without saying a word about one of the best and finest friends I ever had. I have known Ed Halsey for more than 30 years. I never knew a more courteous or more kindly gentleman. He was a gentleman on all occasions. He was a gentleman of the old school. I never knew him to do an ungentlemanly act or utter an ungentlemanly word. I think he was one of the finest and noblest characters I have ever known. I do not think I have ever known a man who was more unselfishly friendly. During my whole experience in the Senate I knew always that there was one man in the employ of the Senate who was my friend, who thought of and helped me with my problems. I sincerely mourn his loss. He was a close and intimate friend for 30 years. I was devoted to him. It almost breaks my heart to think of a man like Ed Halsey being taken away in the very prime of life and in the very fullness of his great powers.

As has been stated by other Senators, he was a most capable, efficient, and faithful servant of this body. He was courteous to everyone. No more lovable, more delightful, or finer character was ever connected with this body.

My deepest sympathy goes to his wife and son and other members of his family. They have indeed experienced a great loss; the Senate has suffered a great loss; and the Nation has sustained a great loss.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the tributes which have been paid to our departed and devoted friend. I wish also to join in extending sympathy to his widow and son.

I have not known Colonel Halsey as long as many of you have known him. In the brief time I have served here it has been my pleasure to be associated with him in the bonds of a fine friendship and to receive the benefit of his wisdom, counsel, and guidance in connection with the performance of many of my duties as a United States Senator. I think I can say that I have never had that relationship with one who was more kind, more generous, or more courteous in the service that he rendered to the United States Senate and to individual Members of the Senate. He was always alert, diligent, and conscientious. His loyalty as a friend endeared him to all of us.

He was cooperative and most considerate of us as he helped us to meet intelligently and courageously our responsibilities here. At all times he was bending his efforts, to the maximum of his strength, to perform fully and ably his duties as a public servant. I shall miss him. His death is a great loss, not only to this body, but to the country. At this hour I feel that another great soldier of my country has given the full measure of devotion in public service, and made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I was genuinely distressed this morning when the news came of the passing of Colonel Halsey. I shall always remember his kind and considerate attitude toward me and the other Senators who entered this body 2 years ago. I am sure that my sentiments are shared by other Members who have lately come to the Senate.

Colonel Halsey was strong and devout in his party's beliefs, yet his high sense of fairness was never clouded by partisan feeling. He was helpful to all of us, and particularly helpful to those of us who were newer Members of this body. Not only has the Senate of the United States lost a splendid officer, but each of us has lost a good friend and the country has lost a great public servant.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, even before I came to the Senate, shortly after my election to this body, I received a letter from Colonel Halsey, who then occupied the position of an assistant on this floor. After I entered the Senate, my relations with him were always pleasant. He was a gentleman. He had all the attributes of a gentleman. He was kindly, polite, considerate, and a wise adviser, especially to the younger Members of this body.

Mr. President, one particularly commendable quality in his life and character was his long personal and intimate knowledge of the Senate itself. He studied the history of this body. He was intensely loyal to the Senate. He had a deep appreciation of the high traditions and lofty standards of the American Senate. Oftentimes he spoke to me of those standards and traditions. Oftentimes he recalled the things that he himself had experienced, that he himself had witnessed, that he himself had known personally in connection with the work of this body.

He was a loyal party man; but, as has been so truthfully said by Senators on the other side of the aisle, as an officer of the Senate he did not carry his partisanship into the discharge of his official duties. I found him always to be a wise man. He possessed a wisdom that was born of his long experience here and the observations which he made, as well as his natural good ability and his fine instincts and attributes as a gentleman. He was of great service here. He tried always to be of service to this body. He was always conscious of the finer and better traditions of the Senate, and he carried that consciousness into his private life and into his associations with men in the ordinary, daily affairs of life.

We have had many faithful servants of this body. I can think of many of them who have already gone on. We

shall have yet other faithful servants. But it is to be doubted whether we shall find a man who possesses all the fine qualities of courtesy and gentleness and the spirit of helpfulness and the disposition to do for the Members of this body in the high degree in which they were combined in Colonel Halsey; and at this time in our life, at this time in the affairs of this Nation and of the world, it would be difficult to find another officer who held in such high and reverent esteem the responsibilities of this body, and who loved the better traditions which have made the Senate of the United States great among the parliaments of the world.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing a brief word of regret and sorrow at the passing of Colonel Halsey. From the very first day of my service in the Senate Colonel Halsey made a special effort to be friendly and helpful to a freshman who did not know his way around. He continued that effort during all the time I have been a Member of this body. I feel, Mr. President, that I have lost a personal friend.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce I announce the appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, also as chairman of the Committee on Commerce I announce the appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, whch were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF UNITED STATES WAR BALLOT COMMISSION

A letter from the United States War Ballot Commission, transmitting, pursuant to the so-called serviceman voting law, the report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements of that Board for the quarter ending March 31, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 451) to authorize the continued operation of certain airport control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration—and relating to General Mitchell Field, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress in relation to the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use their best efforts to obtain acquiescence in the matter of the will of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in its unanimous desire to have a national cemetery established in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

POST-WAR COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a petition I have received, signed by J. Richard Williams, of Edna, Kans., and nearly 100 other citizens of Moundy Valley, Kans., and vicinity.

The petition reads as follows:

We, the undersigned voters of Kansas, being of the opinion that the May bill pertaining to compulsory military training after the war for all youth reaching the age of 17 years constitutes a national policy of the Nation, and not an emergency measure, and is so radical a departure from all our historic precedents that we can afford to proceed with caution and certainly without haste; therefore we most hearily request that you use your influence to the utmost to persuade Congress to postpone until the war is over any action on the May bill.

Mr. President, while I have the floor I wish to state my position on this and proposed similar legislation. I believe the advice in the petition I have just read—to postpone, until we have some sort of an idea what the post-war world is like, any decision on either compulsory military training or compulsory military service in peacetime—is sound.

I have not definitely decided how I shall vote on the bill providing for compulsory military training in peacetime. But if the measure calls for compulsory military service in peacetime—in other words for peacetime conscription into the military service at home and abroad—I would say I would vote against it.

The allocation of fighting troops from the United Nations on the western front in Europe this winter does not encourage me to support an international policing program for which we would conscript our boys as fast as they reach the age of 17 or 18.

I present the petition for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—MEMORIAL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred as a part of my remarks, without the signatures attached, a memorial signed by 86 citizens of Wichita, Kans., mostly cattlemen, opposing the confirmation of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and head of the R. F. C. The memorial was sent to me by Ludvig Nelson, a prominent citizen of Kansas.

There being no objection, the memorial, without the signatures attached, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens of Kansas, sincerely ask you to oppose the confirmation of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and R. F. C.

(Signed by 86 citizens of Wichita, Kans.)

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF AIRPLANE CRASHES

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 61), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 307, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 9, 1940; Senate Resolution 119, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 28, 1941; and Senate Resolution 60, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 4, 1943 (providing for an investigation of airplane crashes), is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures thereunder is hereby increased by $15,000. In addition to authority conferred in such resolutions, the committee is authorized to investigate all airplane crashes in air commerce.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM POLICY

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 36) continuing the Special Committee on Petroleum Policy reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 13, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare), is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 417. A bill subjecting to assessment by local drainage districts in the State of Oregon lands acquired by the United States for military purposes and lying within the territorial areas of said districts, and making such assessments liens upon said lands and

providing for the payment by the United States of such assessment liens; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 418. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I introduce a bill entitled "A bill to forgive one-half of the unforgiven portion of the individual income tax for 1942."

I am advised that a similar bill will be introduced in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 419. A bill to forgive one-half of the unforgiven portion of the individual income tax for 1942; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 420. A bill relating to appointments to certain offices and positions in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 421. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 422. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drainage works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 423. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service provided for by the act of December 17, 1943; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 424. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 425. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines caused to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution providing for the observance of October 11, 1945, as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 334) for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE PRODUCTION, ETC., OF FUELS IN AREAS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I submit a resolution continuing the authority of the committee instituted under Resolution 319 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The resolution requests continuation of the authority for the investigation of the production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River. I have informally conferred with the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I request that the resolution be referred to that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942 (authorizing an investigation concerning the production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River), and continued by Senate Resolution 61, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 4, 1943, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, to July 1, 1945.

SURVEY OF THE DISTRIBUTION AND UTILIZATION OF HEALTH PERSONNEL, ETC.

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, as agreed to June 2, 1940 (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services) is hereby further continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Resolved further, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services) agreed to June 2, 1943, is hereby increased by $25,000.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR—LETTERS TO SENATOR BUTLER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have not often requested the privilege of having printed in the RECORD any letters which have come to me. However, I have received this morning a letter from a former Governor of my State relative to the drafting of farm labor. I think the letter states very well the situation in the agricultural areas of the country, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY THE WAY RANCH,
Valentine, Nebr., January 25, 1945.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Congressman CARL T. CURTIS,
Congressman HOWARD BUFFETT,
Congressman KARL STEFAN,
Congressman A. L. MILLER:

The selective-service situation with reference to farms and ranches is serious, and if carried out as has now been directed by State authorities in Nebraska it will come near to denuding agriculture of young and capable help. According to their statement there are approximately 10,000 men on farms between the ages of 18 and 25. One-half of these are to be taken. Heretofore they were in deferred classifications. Already a great many of them have been selected, and have gone or will be going within the next 30 days.

These young men are essential in food production entirely out of proportion to their numbers. They can and do work long hours, under all conditions, whereas older men cannot do that, and in cases where they are the only help in addition to an older man on a farm or ranch it means that production will be greatly reduced when they are gone.

I have in mind a farmer who last year produced about 400 hogs, and operates around 400 acres, as I recall. His last boy has been taken, and he told me that this year he would produce less than 100. Meanwhile there is a shortage of pork. The reduction of hogs in this State for the past year is 39 percent, and 100,000,000 bushels of corn lies on the ground, much of which will spoil unless it is fed up or cribbed.

There is no replacement help available. Those that might be able and willing to work go into war industries for shorter hours, higher pay, and easier conditions of working and living.

Attached is copy of a press release of January 24, 1945, State headquarters, Nebraska selective service. Note the quotation therein of Senator TYDINGS when his amendment to the Selective Service Act was passed by Congress. To me the use of that statement simply dodges the facts. I am not saying that any large section of land will be left uncultivated if these boys are taken. Somebody, somehow will make use of nearly all available land, but production under those conditions will be very, very much less than it would be under proper use. Moreover, it will mean very greatly reduced numbers of livestock, for no farmer or rancher who knows anything about his business or cares anything about it will entrust his animals to inexperienced, unwilling help. I reduced my own herd of cattle very sharply for that reason, and am getting along with one-half of the help I had then, but my contribution to the food supply will be proportionately less.

Farmers or ranchers are having a hard enough time of it as it is keeping their boys at home, for they want to go to war, and many of them are volunteering. The trend now of selective service only accentuates that situation.

The Tydings amendment when it was originally passed and for months afterward relieved the farm-labor situation that had become very acute. Large numbers of farm workers have been taken since then, and the new move to take considerable percentages of those who remain can mean only greatly reduced production of foods and fibers. Increased production during the last 2 or 3 years have not resulted from adequate farm help. Weather has had more to do with it, and no one can tell what the weather will be this year, or any year. If it should be seriously unfavorable the shortage of essential foods could amount to a calamity.

Congress is the only source now of relief. The selective-service boards have been given their instructions, and the majority of them will act accordingly unless they are reassured by the national legislative body.

Thanking you for your attention to this highly important subject, I remain,

Very truly yours,

SAM R. MCKELVIE.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the same subject, I hold in my hand a letter written by a farm wife. Her letter recites in the plainest kind of language the true situation as it exists today on the farms. For the benefit of those who are interested in the subject, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERTY, NEBR., *January 20, 1945.*

Senator BUTLER: Once again it seems that another of those grave miscalculations has been made in Washington, D. C.

I feel it my duty to bring this to your attention. Also, if it seems to have the value I think it has, would like to have you bring it to the attention of Senator WHERRY and Senator CAPPER and anyone else who might be interested and understand what I mean.

The agriculture situation cannot be understood by those who are not actually in touch with it at all times and I shall try to tell you what I see happening.

The young men are being taken from the farms now. The idea seems to be that the work can be carried on by older men. The farmer has produced enormous crops the last 2 or 3 years, not because of a great supply of manpower or equipment.

He hasn't told the world how it was accomplished but it's time someone tells.

In our locality every member of the family worked long and hard all year. Through the planting, growing, and harvesting season we worked 7 days per week and long days at that.

These young men who are now being taken from the farms are the ones who drove the tractors and handled the machinery to raise those crops. They worked from daylight till long after dark many nights. They have lights on the machinery so they can work such long hours. Many of them took their noon and evening lunch to the fields with them and never came to the house till they came in to go to bed.

Why did they work like this? Farmers are not so plentiful as they were a few years ago. Many boys were taken from the farms before anything was done about farm deferments. Many families are trying to carry on and do the work they did before some members went to the service. Many farms have grown larger because the land was there to be farmed and no one to farm it, so they expanded.

Any extra farm help absolutely could not be obtained around here last year, much less in the near future. These older men on whom the Government agencies are pinning their hopes could not do the work it would take to keep our farms producing. They lack the skill, the strength, and endurance of our younger farm hands. Many men who are rather elderly and many who are physically handicapped are doing all they can and much more than they should on the farms now.

The things that a farmer must know cannot be told or explained to anyone in a short time. He must learn by experience and by growing up with it. These boys of today who are from 17 years on up, are experienced far beyond what their ages indicate. They had to take over when older brothers went to the service and they have the ability and judgment of mature men. They possess the initiative and ability to understand the new developments and profit by them. In industry the laborer learns to do the one thing which is his duty to the job he has. He does this day after day.

In agriculture we have to learn to operate so many different kinds of machinery, must know how each machine is assembled, what each part does, how to repair and adjust the machinery. He must understand the different kinds of soil, how and when to handle each type of soil. What to plant and how to plant to best advantage. How to recognize and destroy obnoxious weeds. How to adjust each piece of machinery to make it accomplish the task for which it was made. The machinery must be changed on different sizes of crops, different conditions of soil, different types of soil, and different stages of growth of crops or weeds. Also the farmer must be a fair blacksmith, carpenter, and understand care of livestock as well as the treatment of the farm animals in sickness and emergencies. You can see how impossible it would be to employ one who was inexperienced and accomplish anything, as it would almost be necessary to be with him and show him how, thus taking the time of one experienced man as well as one who was learning how. The person who has not been raised on the farm and does not have the welfare of agriculture in his veins, could not and would not work the long hours and take off so little time as our farm hands do.

Those who have been accustomed to doing this work realize how very necessary it is to care for everything on the farm when it is exactly at the proper stage of development, and they know how a broken piece of machinery can delay the farm operations and what it means in man-hours and machine-hours lost. The experienced farm hand knows just how to handle machinery as to speed and methods to make as few hours lost through breakage and accidents as possible.

It can be seen when one considers the skill and knowledge that a successful farmer must have that he cannot be replaced by three men who do not understand the art of science and who do not have the welfare of the farm in their minds and hearts.

While the boys have been doing the field work the rest of the family have been doing chores, caring for the homestead, helping in the fields where hand work is needed, making and repairing fences, caring for livestock, often making new parts and repairs for machinery, getting the different implements out of storage and ready for work and running the many errands which is a very big job which one can never have completed.

When you take into consideration that many of our farm heads are between the ages of 50 and 75 and the older boys have been taken in the service you can see we can hardly carry on if the rest of our help is taken from the farms. It looks now like there will be much more idle farm ground this coming season than we had last year. Farmers are discussing the situation and county agriculture agents are expecting it.

Next fall will be too late to do anything about it. What could not be planted and cared for this spring and summer can never be reaped in the fall. With the Nation, our servicemen, and many foreign countries to be fed we can't affort to hamper agriculture.

I'm enclosing a clipping from the Beatrice Daily Sun. It is a list of farm sales to be held. This began last August with the heaviest run of sales in the fall I have ever seen. The list has been as long, since early fall, as now, and many days a much longer list, and it will continue until March and longer, if too many farmers are forced to quit because of inability to find help or carry on alone. Think this over and see if we can spare these young men who are really doing one of the grandest jobs of the times and in the face of the greatest handicaps.

Sincerely,

MRS. J. D. SNYDER.

SALE DATES

January 19: Charlie Sykes, 2 miles north and three-fourths of a mile east of Clatonia. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 22: Brunke Schmidt, 2½ miles east of Cortland. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 23: William Paulsen, route 2, Beatrice, Ruyle & Heist, auctioneers.

January 24: Oscar Weichel, 5½ miles west and 1 mile north of Plymouth. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 24: John Parde, 3 miles east, 3 miles south of Pickrell. Ridgley & Ridgley, auctioneers.

January 26: Horse and mule sale at Beatrice Fair Grounds. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 29: John Javorsky, 3 miles west and 1½ miles south of Wilber. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 30: Jim Essam, 2¾ miles south of Davis Confectionery, Beatrice. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

January 31: Andrew Sorenson, northeast of Filley. Leach & Heist, auctioneers.

February 5: William Richtarik, 7 miles west and 1½ miles south of Wilber. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

February 5: H. D. Pearl, 1 mile south and 3 miles east of Wymore. A. M. Porterfield, auctioneer.

February 6: Rudolph Peters, 1½ miles east of Odell. Elmer Novotny, auctioneer.

February 7: Charles Theye, 1 mile south, one-fourth mile east of Odell. Schultes Bros., auctioneers.

February 12: William Broz, 4 miles north and 1½ miles west of Swanton. John W. Heist, auctioneer.

February 14: Menne Schuster, 9 miles northeast of Beatrice.

February 21: Waldos' purebred Duroc hog sale at DeWitt Sales Pavilion. McMurray & Heist, auctioneers.

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, an article written by David Lawrence on the subject of the legal question which has been raised by the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW QUESTION RAISED IN NAMING OF WALLACE—OBSERVER CITES ACT OF CONGRESS BANNING POLITICAL JOB REWARDS

(By David Lawrence)

Did President Roosevelt disregard a law of Congress forbidding political rewards when he sent to the Senate the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator?

The statute referred to became law on August 2, 1939, when it was signed by President Roosevelt. Section 3 reads as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any act of Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election."

This is what President Roosevelt wrote in his letter of January 20, 1945, to Jesse Jones:

"Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

"He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited, and I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration."

REWARD FOR ACTIVITY

The foregoing reveals that the Office of Secretary of Commerce, which was created

by act of Congress, was bestowed on Henry Wallace as a reward for political activity. Neither the President nor the Vice President are exempted from the provisions of the section in question.

If it is "unlawful" for a President or any other Federal official to give a public office as a political reward, is it lawful for the United States Senate to confirm a man who receives the reward? This is a question which bears on the spirit, if not the letter, of those statutes which have long been looked upon as a means of keeping Government free from pernicious influences. Offenses under not only the Federal Corrupt Practices Act but the Hatch Act are subject to fine and imprisonment if convictions are obtained.

There is nothing in the law which limits the making of the promise to any action taken or promise made during a campaign. The bestowal of a reward after the campaign is apparently as much banned as a promise. For the statute speaks of "reward for any political activity," and this logically could not materialize until after the service is rendered and a campaign concluded and the victor is in a position to award his plums to those who have helped him win.

INTIMATION IN WIRE

There has been some intimation that, even during the campaign—in fact, shortly after the convention was held which nominated Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term but rejected the renomination of Mr. Wallace for Vice President—a telegram was allegedly sent by Mr. Roosevelt to Mr. Wallace bearing on the subject of a promise of future office.

William K. Hutchinson, head of the International News Service in Washington, in a dispatch on Monday of this week, said that after the unsuccessful fight made at the convention Mr. Wallace received a telegram from Mr. Roosevelt purporting to read as follows:

"Tell Mrs. Wallace not to make any move to leave Washington. There will always be a place in my household for you."

Mr. Wallace didn't bolt the ticket, but went ahead to give it his active support. For several weeks there was public speculation last summer and autumn as to what post Mr. Roosevelt might have in mind for the retiring Vice President. This telegram, however, would not be persuasive except in relation to the January 20 letter. The words of the statute which bar any reward for political activity alone need to be considered, in view of the fact that the President now publicly admits that he is giving a public office as a political reward to Mr. Wallace.

IRRIGATION AND NEBRASKA'S FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Irrigation and Nebraska's Future," delivered by him at the first annual convention of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, at Lincoln, Nebr., January 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE LEGISLATION—ARTICLE BY ROBERT P. PATTERSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Do We Fight With One Hand Tied, Or With Everything We Have?" written by Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and published in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

A BANKER WHO SERVES AS A PRIVATE—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times entitled, "Banker, 48, Serves as Private in Line," referring to Pvt. (1st cl.) Edward J. Arthur, of Union, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

A CITIZEN ARMY—ARTICLE BY BRIG. GEN. JOHN McAULEY PALMER

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "General Marshall Wants a Citizen Army," written by John McAuley Palmer, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of December 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POST-WAR DEFENSE PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY BRIG. GEN. JOHN McAULEY PALMER

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How to Solve Our Post-war Defense Problem," written by Brig. Gen. John McAuley Palmer, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—ARTICLE FROM COLLIER'S WEEKLY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Do We Want National Health Insurance?" by Amy Porter, from Collier's magazine for January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—EDITORIAL FROM KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brazen Political Pay-off," commenting on the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, published in the Kansas City Star of January 23, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—LETTER TO THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter signed by Benny Austin, relative to the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, and printed in the January 24, 1945, edition of the Washington News, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Forging New Chains," from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of January 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle in tribute to the late Senator Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE TO AUDIT AND CONTROL THE CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of sundry resolutions which I am about to report from that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that, as I understand the situation, the Senator from Illinois desires to have the Senate take action upon a number of resolutions which he is about to report from the committee of which he is chairman. I believe that in the main, if not entirely so, the resolutions would simply extend until July 1 various committees and agencies which heretofore have been set up by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true with respect to a number of the resolutions. Other resolutions would provide for such continuation for the full session of Congress.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that other resolutions provide for the extension of the life of committees which the Senator and his committee believe should be continued in their activities. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the resolutions, unless they are agreed to today the committees concerned will be without funds the day after tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that to be the situation, and I think that is justification for consideration of the resolutions at this time. I should prefer not to have the extensions made beyond July 1; but on the assurance of the Senator that the subjects dealt with by the resolutions are matters of real importance, and that the committees affected are doing work which should be continued, I shall offer no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Maine.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the resolution (S. Res. 45) submitted by Mr. McMAHON on January 22, 1945, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

HATTIE L. LAMBERT

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the resolution (S. Res. 22) submitted by Mr. BILBO on January 6, 1945, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Hattie L. Lambert, sister of John E. Lambert, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 33, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 33) submitted by Mr. GEORGE on January 15, 1945, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 102, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 12, 1943 (creating the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning), as amended by Senate Resolution 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 16, 1943, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation for the Senate with regard to this very important resolution. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was unanimous in its desire that the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning be continued. It was created by the Senate in March 1943 at the instance of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. At that time the Senate appropriated $50,000 for the use of the committee, and at this moment the unexpanded balance is $20,050.32. I have conferred with the able Senator from Georgia with respect to the continuation of the work of the committee. I am a member of the committee. I am advised that before the end of the year has been reached the hearings will probably be completed, and that a final report will be made. The committee will then probably be dissolved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 33) was considered and agreed to.

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF INSURANCE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) submitted by Mr. VANDENBERG on January 6, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of old-age and survivors insurance, under the Social Security Act, in respect to coverage, benefits, and taxes related thereto. The joint committee shall report to the Congress not later than October 1, 1945, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

SEC. 2. The joint committee is hereby authorized, in its discretion, to appoint an advisory committee of individuals having special knowledge concerning matters involved in its study and investigation to assist, consult with, and advise the joint committee with respect to such study and investigation. Members of the advisory committee shall not receive any compensation for their services as such members, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in connection with the performance of the work of the advisory committee.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties under this resolution, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed until the Classification Act of 1923, as amended for comparable duties.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the joint committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE WAR-MOBILIZATION PROBLEMS AND WAR-CONTRACTS MATTERS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably without amendment, Senate Resolution 46, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. President, the resolution provides that the committee shall continue its work until July 1, 1945. The committee was created by the Senate on October 20, 1942. The Senate authorized the committee to expend up to $15,000. The committee has an unexpended balance of $2,345.06, and is asking for no further funds. I am advised that the report of the committee will be completed by July 1, 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 46) reported by Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs on January 25, instant, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 107 and Senate Resolution 216, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to study the problems of war mobilization; and that the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 198 and Senate Resolution 288, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to investigate war contracts, termination of war contracts, and related problems, be and are hereby continued to July 1, 1945.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF THE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an additional amendment, Senate Resolution 18, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 18) submitted by Mr. MCCARRAN on January 6, 1945, which had been previously reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "Seventy-ninth Congress," and insert "Senate from February 1, 1945, until July 1, 1945"; and subsequently reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with additional amendments, in line 7, after the word "continued", to strike out "and may be exercised during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the"; and at the end of the resolution to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 241, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to May 24, 1940, and Senate Resolution 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 8, 1941, and Senate Resolution 39, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1943, and Senate Resolution 294, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 23, 1944 (relating to the investigation of the use of public lands), is hereby continued until July 1, 1945; and the limit of expenditures under such resolutions is hereby increased by $5,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement for the RECORD with regard to Senate Resolution 18, which has been agreed to.

The original resolution was agreed to on May 24, 1940. A sum of $30,000 was authorized by the Senate to be expended by the committee and at the present time there is an unexpended balance of $4,582.87. Hearings are now being held under the resolution. Those in charge of the work have advised me that they will be able to complete their work by July 1, 1945, and make a final report at that time.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS BY WIRE AND RADIO—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 24, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 24) submitted by Mr.

McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. WHITE) on January 6, 1945, and reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce on January 6, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to October 19, 1943 (providing for an investigation of international communications by wire and radio), as supplemented by Senate Resolution 268, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 29, 1944, is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures of the committee for such purposes is hereby increased by $10,000.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THE SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 31, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 31) submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HATCH) on January 11, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 155, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 26, 1943 (relating to an investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power), as amended and supplemented by Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 5, 1944, and Senate Resolution 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to September 5, 1944, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

HOWARD B. SMITH

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 39, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the limit of expenditures contained in Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to December 9, 1943 (authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act), as modified by Senate Resolution 238, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944, there is hereby authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate to Howard B. Smith, the sum of $2,805 as compensation for stenographic services rendered to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in reporting and transcribing hearings held before such committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 197, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I believe that an explanation should be made with respect to the resolution. The resolution involves an obligation which was incurred with reference to Howard B. Smith, who was the reporter for the committee which proceeded under Senate Resolution No. 197. That resolution had to do with the investigation of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act. The sum of $7,500 was appropriated on December 9, 1943, to carry on the work of the committee. Of that amount only $2.01 remains unexpended. I understand that an attorney by the name of Carrol L. Beedy, a former Member of the United States House of Representatives from Maine, was employed as general counsel to the committee. Another gentleman by the name of Glavis was appointed as investigator for the committee. Those two men were fortunate enough to obtain the $7,500 which had been appropriated for the use of the committee, leaving the reporter to hold the bag. I make that explanation to the Senate because, strictly speaking, there is no legal justification for the payment of the obligation, although the reporter really earned his money. With the exception of the sum which I stated, no money now remains in the fund. It would appear that under the doctrine of preferred creditors, the attorney and the investigator took most of the entire fund.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 39), submitted by Mr. AIKEN on January 22, 1945, was considered and agreed to.

STUDY OF AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 16, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been previously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was on line 6, after the word "to", to strike out down to and including the period in line 11, and insert "July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the date for submission of the report called for by Senate Resolution 252, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 30, 1944 (relating to a study into the legal and constitutional authority for the issuance of Executive orders of the President and of departmental regulations), is hereby extended to July 1, 1945.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF STUDY AND SURVEY OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 28, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. Mr. President, I believe that a brief explanation should be made of the resolution.

The Special Committee to Study and Survey the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises has been in existence since October 8, 1940. The Senate has authorized for the use of the committee the total sum of $140,000. At the present time there remains an unexpended balance of $4,596.85, and this resolution seeks an additional appropriation of $100,000.

While in the opinion of the committee, the sum of money asked for is large, yet the testimony before the committee has demonstrated beyond any question that the committee is performing a great public service in the interest of the small businessmen throughout the Nation.

There is one other fact to which I wish to invite the attention of the Senate, but which is incidental to the appropriation of money. I refer to the number of employees who are engaged by the Small Business Committee. They are employees who have been borrowed from the executive branch of the Government to perform necessary services in connection with the functions of the committee. Some time ago the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted a resolution requesting that all committees report to the Senate the number of employees who were being borrowed from the executive branch of the Government to help in performing the services of special committees of the Senate. That resolution was productive of enlightening information. This is no reflection upon the chairman of any special or standing committee who happens to be following this procedure. This procedure is not a new one; however, I am calling it to the attention of the Senate, for whatever it may be worth in determining whether or not the policy should be continued. The Small Business Committee has a great number of employees. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them, but they come from the Foreign Economic Administration, the War Production Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Department of Commerce, the Office of Price Administration, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the War Department. Those employees are drawing in salaries a total of $82,200 a year, which is being paid by the executive branch of the Government, although that branch is getting absolutely no service from them. That is just one committee which is doing that. Other committees of the Senate are doing the same thing. The attitude I take—and I take it not as chairman of the committee but rather as a Senator—is that no individual can serve two masters. The Senate of the United States ought to assume its rightful position in connection with employees from the executive branch and ought either to pay them and take them off the pay roll of the executive departments or else send them back to the executive departments where they belong.

There is involved a very serious question of policy as to how far the Senate of

the United States should go in taking employees from the executive branch, bringing them here, giving them an office in the Senate Office Building, and using them for legislative purposes. We ought to do one thing or the other, Mr. President. We ought to face this question frankly. If the Small Business Committee needs $80,000 worth of employees to carry on its functions it should appear before the proper committee and get the money there, rather than to borrow employees from the executive branch of the Government at the other end of the Avenue.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. The Special Committee on the Problems of Small Business is perfectly willing to have the Senate adopt the policy which has just been suggested by the able Senator from Illinois. I want to point out that at the beginning of the activities of the Small Business Committee we were limited by the Senate to a very small amount to carry on the work of the committee, and had it not been for the fact that we were able to procure the assistance which we secured from the various agencies of the Government we would not have been able to have done the work we did for the protection of small business enterprise. in this country. I am sure the Senator from Illinois recognizes that; but I approve of the suggestion made by the Senator from Illinois that the Senate should adopt some policy and adhere to it.

I wish to point out further that it will be extremely difficult to secure the character of assistance we have secured from the various agencies of the Government merely by employing help temporarily in connection with the work of the committee because the men whom we have secured from the Government agencies are men of vast experience in the problems which confronted the committee, and if now we go out and try to hire clerks and experts to give the assistance to this committee which it has received in the past it would be very difficult, I am sure, to get that kind of help.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. There was some testimony before our committee the other day that if one of these employees were discharged from the Small Business Committee he would have no right to return to the executive branch, even though he is accredited to that branch; in other words, he would be out of a job. Is that true or not true?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not know of any case of that kind.

Mr. LUCAS. There was one witness who has been working for some committee——

Mr. WHERRY. The Liquor Investigating Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; the Liquor Investigating Committee, who came before us and said that in the event the investigation of the committee was discontinued, and no funds were appropriated for its continuation, he would be out of a job; that, although he was attached to the Antitrust Division of the Attorney General's office, they would not take him back. I wondered if the same condition applied to employees, for instance, who have been in the service of the Small Business Committee for 2 years or more, and whether they would have the opportunity to go back and continue to work for the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure that every agency of the Government from whom we have borrowed help will be very glad to take back any of the employees we have, because they are all competent, able men, rendering very valuable service to our committee. I wonder how we would be able to get the same kind of help if we were compelled to hire it in the open market. As the employees who come from the Government agencies are under civil service, they have certain rights, whereas if we hired people off the streets to assist the committee, they would not have the same status.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reply to the Senator is simply that if these employees are not needed in the executive branch of the Government, as apparently they are not, the Senate itself ought to take care of them.

Mr. MURRAY. I think they are performing a service for the executive branch of the Government by their work with our committee. For instance, if we have an employee of the War Department or the Navy Department or any other department which has been carrying on the character of work that the committee has been carrying on in its investigation and study, in my opinion, such employee is performing a service for the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. With all due deference to my good friend from Montana, I take the position that an individual who is in the employ of the executive branch of the Government at $6,000 a year could not be away from that job for 2 years and be of very much value to the executive branch, even though the Government agency still continues to pay him.

I want the Senator thoroughly to understand that I am not attaching any blame to him because he has followed a custom which has become established. I am merely calling it to the attention of the Senate, so that the Senate soon can determine and fix definitely a policy one way or the other with respect to it.

Mr. MURRAY. I am in full accord with the Senator from Illinois. I want to say that the Small Business Committee has rendered a very valuable service to the small businessmen of the country, and the committee would not have been able to do it if it had not been able to secure assistance from various executive departments. When we first started out it was thought that there was no need for such a committee, but when we got into the work and the war production program came on we found that small business was rapidly being extinguished. Through the efforts of this committee that trend was stopped, and so the committee has done a very valuable piece of work for the country, I think, in saving the small business enterprise.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning the work which has been done by the Senator and his committee; otherwise, we probably would not have provided for the committee an additional hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MURRAY. I appreciate that.

Mr. LUCAS. However, if the Senator from Montana or any other Senator who is chairman of a special committee can go to the executive branch of the Government and obtain all the employees he wants in order to carry on effectively the work of his committee, then there is no reason why every special or standing committee of the Senate should not do the same thing. In my opinion, there is no reason why I could not go to the executive branch of the Government and convince them, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, that I need at least six men who are on their pay roll to help me out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In connection with this discussion, a few instances have come to my attention of some of the special committees asking an executive agency to hire certain persons. I believe that is a bad practice. I am in total agreement with the statement made by the Senator from Illinois that if any person is necessary to the conduct of the business of any of these various committees, the Senate itself should provide the funds, and under no conditions should we have to resort to the executive department for aid.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the testimony before some of the special investigating committees showed instances like that of one man who, as I recall, had been on three different pay rolls at different times within 60 days. Am I correct, I ask the Senator from Illinois? Certainly it was within a very short time.

Mr. LUCAS. I have forgotten the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. That leads me to believe that at times unexpended balances are used to transfer employees from one pay roll to another pay roll and then to another pay roll, and the work done under the various pay rolls is not tied together in any way so as to benefit any one activity.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As a new member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I wish to join in the report of the chairman and in the statement he has made with reference to continuing the various committees under the resolutions which have been reported this morning and agreed to.

I wish to state also, with as much force as I possess, that I appreciate the attitude of the committee in approving the appropriation for the Small Business Committee. I happen to be a member of that committee, and I join with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in stating to the membership of the Senate that we need a small business committee of the Senate in order to help the small businessmen throughout the country as various executive agencies issue orders which have a tremendous impact on the distribution and sale of their merchandise. I heartily endorse everything the Senator has said.

I also agree with what has been stated by the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. As I looked at the different proposals pending at the first meeting of the committee, it occurred to me they were conclusive evidence of the need for the adoption of the resolution I presented last August.

I am convinced that the Small Business Committee needs all the personnel it has today in order to do its work. I think it is one of the most important committees of the Senate. I am also of the opinion that if the employees were employed directly, they would be loyal beyond any question. I do not mean to say they are not loyal now; but being employed by a department, to a certain degree they have a loyalty to that department which otherwise they might give to the Senate committee in a study of the problems covered in the investigations.

The junior Senator from Montana appointed me on a subcommittee, together with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If I am correct, we have had about 50 subcommittee investigations, and the subcommittee has done a tremendous amount of work in helping to amend and clarify Executive orders which otherwise cause confusion quite generally clear through the production, the wholesaling, and the retail distribution of the merchandise.

I wish to commend the Senator from Illinois and the committee for the action they have taken. They have served notice on the Senate that it should take notice of this practice, and that we should investigate it. The life of most of the committees has been extended to July 1, and they go before the Committee on Appropriations and establish their justification for an appropriation if they need more employees.

Last August I raised a question about Senate committees borrowing persons from Government agencies and other organizations. Those I had in mind are most often provided by departmental agencies of Senate committees. They are not paid officials of the Senate, and they are not regular employees of the Senate committees.

Almost every Senate committee has at some time had the services of experts and clerical assistants loaned to them by Government departments. Some of these individuals often serve with Senate committees for months at a time. The practice of borrowing Government personnel is a long-standing one. I know there are many reasons why the practice is continued, and I do not arbitrarily condemn it.

From time to time, however, there are aspects of this practice of borrowing Government agency personnel which have appeared to be highly questionable. In a few instances the practice has gone beyond propriety to the point of an abuse of the principles which should govern the work of Senate committees.

Before questioning any feature of a practice of such long standing, it seemed to me desirable to ascertain some facts about it. What agencies are loaning personnel to Senate committees? How many individuals are loaned out in this manner? What annual rates of pay do they receive? What Senate committees are furnished with this personnel? With knowledge about such facts, we could form a better judgment of the propriety of the practice, and what, if anything, we should do about it.

With that thought in mind, I offered an amendment to Senate Resolution 319 in the following language:

> Hereafter standing or select committees employing the services of persons who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof shall submit monthly reports to the Senate (or to the Secretary during a recess or adjournment) showing (1) the name and address of any such person; (2) the name and address of the department or organization by whom his salary is paid; and (3) the annual rate of compensation in each case.

Senate Resolution 319, with this amendment, was agreed to August 23, 1944. Beginning with the end of August and continuing to the present time, monthly reports have been made by standing and special committees, including subcommittees, of persons employed by them who are not regularly employed by the committees or by the Senate itself.

I have observed those reports from time to time as they have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Recently I made a check of the over-all results from the time the resolution was passed up to and including December 31, 1944. The check is, admittedly, a rough one for several reasons. The indexing of the RECORD is not so perfect that it lists each and every one of these committee reports, so I may have missed some, especially those which are not in tabular form. The reports themselves are not all uniform, and that makes an over-all computation difficult. The details of the reports also change from month to month, and there are a few instances of overlapping items.

There is enough about these reports, however, to permit what accountants would call an unadjusted summary of the facts having substantial accuracy. That is what I now wish to place before the Senate.

In the period from the passage of Senate Resolution 319 on August 23 to December 31, 1944, a total of 14 Senate committees reported having borrowed personnel. Of this number 10 are standing committees and their subcommittees.

The number of departments or organizations furnishing personnel to Senate committees totals 26, of which 25 are Government agencies and 1 is a private organization.

The total number of individuals furnished to committees was 97; 95 from Government agencies and 2 from private sources. The average number of individuals on loan to all committees over each month from August to December was 72. This does not mean that 72 different persons were loaned to committees each month. Many of the same people from the same Government agency serve the same Senate committee month after month. My figure simply means that if we take any single month and make an inventory of borrowed personnel, we will find on the average some 72 individuals from outside agencies at work with Senate committees.

The average total annual rate of pay received by these individuals is $253,560. In other words, on the average during any month since these reports under Senate Resolution 319 began, there were borrowed by Senate committees 72 individuals whose annual rate of pay totaled $253,560. Reduced to a simple statistical concept, each month 14 reporting Senate committees are being assisted by an average of 72 outside persons whose average monthly base rate of pay totals $21,130.

I would have Senators bear in mind the limitations of statistics like these. A Senate committee may borrow a Government expert for a single month. Under the simple reports now being made, the committee would report that one employee, along with others, and list his annual rate of pay at, say, $6,500. The committee may have him for 1 month only, and never again, but the facts would be reported as I have given them. We shall never know the true state of affairs until committee accounting is improved to the point where every individual serving a committee is actually paid out of the committee funds for the period he serves, whether it is 1 day, 1 week, or a year. Then committee accounts will show the facts in proper form.

Until we have facts reported in accurate form, we can only rely on estimates, averages, and other statistical assumptions. Within these limitations, the figures I have given do reflect the condition of affairs on this question of borrowing Government personnel for service on Senate committees.

I am not ready to offer conclusions on the facts as they appear to date. I think a longer time experience is needed; and I shall want more accurate accounting detail. It may be possible for me to have the General Accounting Office keep track of these reports and tabulate them. Perhaps the Committee on the Reorganization of Congress will take up the problem. Some supervision over the facts will have to be arranged.

I merely wanted to bring such facts as are presently available to the attention of the Senate; and to say that when the picture is more complete, I expect to present an analysis of them and discuss their broader implications.

Mr. President, the practice referred to by the Senator from Illinois is one about which I think the Senate should arrive at a determination, and I wish to join with the chairman of the committee and the committee in the policy they have adopted. I endorse everything they have said. I think the report is timely, and I hope that without objection the exhibit

I have may be printed in the RECORD, showing the conclusions of the investigation, and giving the statistics.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Individuals borrowed for committee service and total annual rates paid

Committees and subcommittees	August		September		October		November		December	
	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay	Number	Total base pay
Appropriations	4	$19,500	4	$19,500	4	$19,500	4	$19,500	4	$19,500
Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Wartime Health			12	33,200	13	38,840	13	38,840	12	37,600
Military Affairs	4	15,800	2	7,800	2	7,800	4	15,800	4	15,800
Subcommittee on War Contracts	9	29,460	8	31,460	7	19,960	5	20,300	6	22,300
Special Subcommittee on War Mobilization	11	38,440	11	39,000	11	39,000	10	37,000	10	37,000
Naval Affairs	2	[1] +7,512	2	[1] +7,512	2	[1] +7,512	2	[1] +7,512	2	[2] +7,512
Senate Navy Liaison Office	4	[2] +7,104	4	[2] +7,104	4	[2] +7,104	4	[2] +7,104	4	[1] +7,104
Pensions	1	5,000	1	5,000	1	5,000	1	5,000	1	5,000
Public Lands and Surveys, Subcommittee to Investigate Public Lands			2	7,000	2	7,000	2	7,000	2	7,000
Special committees:										
Post-War Economic Policy and Planning	2	[3] 3,700	6	[4] 23,200	1	[5] 3,800				
Investigating the National Defense Program			5	23,100	5	23,100	5	23,600	4	17,600
To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprise [6]	13	36,400	11	28,800	12	35,300	12	35,300	12	35,300
Senate Small Business Committee [6]	10	40,400	11	46,900	11	46,900	11	46,900	12	48,520
Total	60	203,316	79	279,576	75	260,816	73	263,856	73	260,236

[1] 1 person, $162 per month subsistence additional. Also 1 person $91.50 per month subsistence additional.
[2] 2 persons, $132 per month subsistence additional. Also, 2 persons, $91.50 per month subsistence additional.
[3] 1 person, salary unknown. Paid by committee 4 days at $25 per day, $100. Not included above.
[4] 1 person, salary unknown. Paid by committee 4½ days at $25 per day, $112.50. Not included above.
[5] Served 4 days only.
[6] Reported separately, but occasionally commingled.

Senate committees

Department or organization providing and paying individuals	Appropriations	Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education	Military affairs			Naval affairs		Pensions	Public Lands, Subcommittee to Investigate Public Lands	Special committees				Department or organization totals	Private
			Military Affairs	Subcommittee on War Contracts	Subcommittee on War Mobilization	Naval Affairs	Navy Liaison			Post-war Economic Policy and Planning	Investigate the National Defense Program	To Study Problems of Small Business Enterprise	Senate Small Business Committee		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)		
General Accounting Office	2									2				4	
Federal Bureau of Investigation	1									1				2	
District of Columbia Government	1									1				2	
War Production Board		1		1	4							8	7	21	
Navy Department		4		3		2	4						1	14	
Federal Public Housing Administration		2												2	
Office of Price Administration		1			2						1	1	2	7	
Federal Security Agency		1												1	
Veterans Administration		3						1						4	
Federal Works Agency		1												1	
U. S. Army		1									2			3	
U. S. Navy		1												1	
War Department			5	1										6	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation				2								2		4	
Smaller War Plants Corporation				3								1		4	
Farm Security Administration				1										1	
Foreign Economic Administration				1								1	1	3	
Department of Interior					2									2	
War Manpower Commission					2									2	
National Housing Agency					2									2	
Agriculture Department									2					2	
Bureau of the Census										1				1	
Treasury Department										1				1	
U. S. Maritime Commission											2		2	4	
Department of Commerce												1		1	
Private: Starrett Bros. & Eken, Washington, D. C.										1					1
Total for each committee	4	15	5	12	12	2	4	1	2	7	5	14	13	95	1
														96	

Appropriations Committee

[KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August to Sept. 1	For [Sept. 30] Oct. [2]	October (Rept. Nov. 1)	November (Dec. 5)	December 1944
1	John F. Feeney	General Accounting Office	(C. R. 14, p. 7605) $6,400	(C. R. 16, p. 8762) $6,400	(C. R. 16, p. 8264) $6,400	(C. R. 17, p. 8921) $6,400	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3) $6,400
2	Harold E. Merrick	do	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
3	Thomas J. Scott	Federal Bureau of Investigation	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
4	Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	District of Columbia government	(C. R. 16, p. 8261) 3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
	Total		(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500	(4) 19,500

Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning

[WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			August	Special	(Sept. 30 and Oct. 2) September	Oct. 31
1	Claire Cahill	Bureau of Census	(C. R. 14, p. 7604) $3,700		(C. R. 16, p. 8262) $3,700.00	(C. R. 16, p. 8264)
2	Miles L. Colean	Starrett Bros. & Eken, Washington, D. C.	Not known	[1] $100	[2] 112.50	
3	John F. Feeney	General Accounting Office			6,400.00	
4	Harold E. Merrick	do			4,800.00	
5	Thomas J. Scott	Federal Bureau of Investigation			4,800.00	
6	Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	District of Columbia government			3,500.00	
7	Borge Hansen-Moller	Treasury Department				[3] $3,800
	Total		(2) 3,700	(1) 100	(6) 23,200.00	(1) 3,800

[1] 4 days, at $25 per day. [2] 4½ days, at $25 per day. [3] Served 4 days only.

Committee on Education and Labor

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

[CLAUDE PEPPER, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			Sept. 1	As of Oct. 1	As of Nov. 1	As of Dec. 1
1	Lauretta April	War Production Board	(C. R. 15, p. 8154) $3,200	(C. R. 16, p. 8262) $3,200	(C. R. 16, p. 8264) $3,200	(C. R. 17, p. 8844) $3,200
2	Philip C. Curtis	Navy Department	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
3	Billy Gene Durham	Federal Public Housing Administration		1,440	1,440	
4	Doris B. Hazur	Office of Price Administration	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
5	Harald Lund	Navy Department		6,200	6,200	6,200
6	Carl Malmberg	Federal Security Agency	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
7	Eva Jo Marra	Navy Department	1,800	1,800	1,800	
8	Love Morgan	Veterans Administration	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
9	Ruth Morgenstein	do	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
10	Dolores Rashella	Federal Public Housing Administration	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Renee Roth	Federal Works Agency	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
12	Lt. Leslie Falk	U. S. Army	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
13	Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow	U. S. Navy	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
14	Rose Gerber	Navy Department				2,000
15	Jeannette Johnson	Veterans Administration	2,000			
	Total		(12) 33,200	(13) 38,840	(13) 38,840	(12) 37,600

Committee on Military Affairs

[ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, chairman]

Number of position	Name of individual serving committee	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 4) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 6) November	(Jan. 6) December
1	Helen A. Rice	War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief of Staff.	(C. R. 14, p. 7603) $2,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8263)	(C. R. 16, p. 8266)	(C. R. 17, p. 9000)	(C.R.vol.91,No.3)
2	Theodore B. Stathart	War Department, Adjutant General's Office, Civilian Personnel Division.	1,800	$1,800	$1,800	$1,800	$1,800
3	Col. David A. Watt	War Department, General Staff	6,000			6,000	6,000
4	Col. Lewis Sanders	War Department	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
5	Amy J. Tishendorf	War Department, Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of Chief of Staff.				2,000	2,000
	Total		(4) 15,800	(2) 7,800	(2) 7,800	(4) 15,800	(4) 15,800

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR CONTRACTS

[JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman]

1	Marian Bonner	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	$2,300	(C. R. 16, p. 8262) $2,300	$2,300	(C. R. 17, p. 8842)	
2	Kurt Borchardt	Smaller War Plants Corporation	5,600	5,600	5,600	$5,600	$5,600
3	Marion Fostner	Navy Department	2,600	2,600	[4] 2,600		
4	Grace Mayer	Smaller War Plants Corporation	2,000	2,000	2,000		
5	Maj. Wm. E. Nefflin	War Department	3,000				
6	Vernice O'Mullane	War Production Board	1,620	1,620	1,620		
7	Doris Phippen	Navy Department	2,040	2,040	2,040	2,100	2,100
8	Omer J. Regnier	Farm Security Administration	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
9	Sigmund Timberg	Foreign Economic Administration	6,500	[5] 6,500			
10	Bertram M. Gross	Navy Department				6,500	6,500
11	Edna Ruben	Reconstruction Finance Corporation				2,300	2,300
12	Ann Cheathem	Smaller War Plants Corporation					2,300
	Total		(9) 29,460	(8) 31,460	(7) 19,960	(5) 20,300	(6) 22,300

[4] To Oct. 8, 1944. [5] To Sept. 14, 1944.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

[H. M. KILGORE, chairman]

1	Virginia W. Boyce	Department of the Interior	$1,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8263) $1,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8265) $1,800	(C. R. 18, p. 9350) $1,800	$1,800
2	Ann S. Gertler	do	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
3	Hope C. Heslep	War Manpower Commission	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
4	Theodore C. Larson	National Housing Agency	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
5	Fritzie P. Manuel	War Manpower Commission	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
6	Darel McConkey	War Production Board	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
7	Cora L. Moen	Office of Price Administration	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
8	Walter Louis Moore	National Housing Agency	1,440				
9	Elizabeth H. Oleksy	War Production Board	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
10	Francis Rosenberger	Office of Price Administration	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
11	Herbert Schimmel	War Production Board	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
12	Dieyrelie M. Prouty	do		2,000	2,000		
	Total		(11) 38,440	(11) 39,000	(11) 39,000	(10) 37,000	(10) 37,000

Committee on Naval Affairs

[DAVID I. WALSH, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 2) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 1) November	(Jan. 2) December
1	Capt. James A. Saunders	Navy Department, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.	(C. R. 14, p. 7603) [6] $6,000+	(C. R. 16, p. 8263) [6] $6,000+	(C. R. 16, p. 8266) [6] $6,000+	(C. R. 17, p. 8843) [6] $6,000+	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 77) [6] $6,000+
2	Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson.	Navy Department, Potomac River Command.	[7] 1,512+	[7] 1,512+	[7] 1,512+	[7] 1,512+	[7] 1,512+
	Total		(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+	(2) 7,512+

[6] Plus $162 per month and rental allowance.
[7] Plus $91.50 per month and rental allowance.

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

[DAVID I. WALSH, *chairman*]

1	Lt. Frederic A. McLaughlin	Navy Department, Bureau of Naval Personnel.	[8] $2,400+	[8] $2,400+	[8] $2,400+	[8] $2,400+	[8] $2,400+
2	Lt. Joseph G. Feeney	do	[8] 2,400+	[8] 2,400+	[8] 2,400+	[8] 2,400+	[8] 2,400+
3	Yeoman Eleanor W. St. Clair	do	[9] 1,152+	[9] 1,152	[9] 1,152+	[9] 1,152+	[9] 1,152+
4	Yeoman Loretta F. Jochman	do	[9] 1,152+	[9] 1,152+	[9] 1,152+	[9] 1,152+	[9] 1,152+
	Total		(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+	(4) 7,104+

[8] Plus $132 per month subsistence and rental allowance.
[9] Plus $91.50 per month subsistence and rental allowance.

Committee on Pensions

[JAMES M. TUNNELL, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	Sept. 27	Oct. 30	November	December
1	Louis J. Meyerle	Veterans Administration	(C. R. 14, p. 7604) $5,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8261) $5,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8264) $5,000	(C. R. 17, p. 8843) $5,000	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 78) $5,000

Committee on Public Lands and Surveys

[CARL A. HATCH, chairman]

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PUBLIC LANDS

[PAT MCCARRAN, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			September	Oct. 27	(Dec. 1) November	(Dec. 31) December
1	E. S. Haskell	Agriculture Department, Forest Service	(C. R. 16, p. 8263) $5,000	(C. R. 16, p. 8264) $5,000	(C. R. 17, p. 8843) $5,000	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 78) $5,000
2	Elizabeth Heckman	do	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
	Total		(2) 7,000	(2) 7,000	(2) 7,000	(2) 7,000

Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committee	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation			
			August to Sept. 1	Oct. 1	Month left blank November (?)	Dec. 1
1	Joe L. Martinez	U. S. Maritime Commission	(C. R. 15, p. 7992) $3,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8262) $3,800	(C. R. 16, p. 8265) $3,800	(C. R. 18, p. 9351) $3,800
2	Franklin N. Parks	Office of Price Administration	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
3	Harold G. Robinson	U. S. Maritime Commission	6,000	6,000	6,000	
4	Brig. Gen. Frank E. Lowe	U. S. Army, General Staff (listed finance officer, December).	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
5	Lt. Col. Harry Vaughn	U. S. Army, General Staff	3,500	3,500	4,000	4,000
	Total		(5) 23,100	(5) 23,100	(5) 23,600	(4) 17,600

Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises

[JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman]

Number of persons	Name of individual serving committees	Name of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation				
			August	(Oct. 1) September	(Nov. 1) October	(Dec. 1) November	(Jan. 1) December
			(C. R. 14, p. 7604)	(C. R. 16, p. 8261)	(C. R. 16, p. 8265)	(C. R. 17, p. 8842)	(C. R. vol. 91, No. 3, p. 78)
1	Ruth B. Abrams	Foreign Economic Administration	$3,200				
2	J. Russell Boner	Smaller War Plants Corporation	4,600				
3	Agnes E. Crivella	War Production Board	2,700	$2,700	$2,700	$2,700	$2,700
4	Emerald G. Devitt	do	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
5	Elsie A. Digges	do	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
6	F. Preston Forbes	Department of Commerce	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
7	Carol M. Fuller	Office of Price Administration	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
8	Scott K. Gray	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
9	Stella J. Goeper	War Production Board	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
10	Dorothy M. Heckard	do	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Kathleen Kimball	do	1,800	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
12	Elizabeth P. Lucas	do	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
13	Lois M. Miller	do	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
14	Harry J. Evans	Reconstruction Finance Corporation			6,500	6,800	6,500
	Total		(13) 36,400	(11) 28,800	(12) 35,300	(12) 35,300	(12) 35,300

SEPARATE REPORT—SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

[JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman]

1	John W. Nelson	War Production Board	$5,600	$5,600	(7) $5,600	$5,600	$5,600
2	Jessma Oslin	do	1,800				
3	Grace F. Purdy	Office of Price Administration	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
4	Arthur G. Silverman	do	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
5	Lt. George H. Soule	Navy Department	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
6	Lillian Evelyn Spicer	Navy Department [War Production Board Oct.].	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
7	Frederick W. Steckman	Maritime Commission	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
8	Allen G. Thurman	do	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
9	Alfred J. Van Tassel	War Production Board	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
10	Olga Yelencsics	do	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
11	Brainard Cheney	Foreign Economic Administration		6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
12	Margie L. Strubel	War Production Board		1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
13	Vernice O'Mullane	do					1,620
	Total		(10) 40,400	(11) 46,900	(11) 46,900	(11) 46,900	(12) 48,520

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for the figures he has presented. We constantly hear from various sources condemnation of bureaucracy in government. If there is such a thing, we probably contribute to it under the policy we have been following in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution presented by the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 28) was agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate an original resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 55), as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to March 1, 1941; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 11, 1941; Senate Resolution 288, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 17, 1942; Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to January 25, 1943; Senate Resolution 146, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to May 20, 1943; Senate Resolution 235, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1944; and Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to August 23, 1944 (relating to the investigation of the war program), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation, and state to the Senate a few facts in connection with the committee concerned. The committee was organized March 1, 1941. The total amount authorized by the Senate to date has been $500,000. There is an unexpended balance of $102,955.10. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who recently succeeded former Senator TRUMAN as chairman of the committee, advises me the committee will need no more funds at this time.

I might say furthermore that the so-called Mead committee has a great number of employees, but it is employing most of its help directly, and the employees are on the pay roll of the special committee. The committee has only four or five employees who are borrowed from the executive branch of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS, COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 10, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. HILL on the 6th instant.

The amendment was in line 3, to strike out "during the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ until July 1, 1945, an assistant clerk and an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rates, respectively, of $3,600 and $1,800 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish briefly to explain the resolution. There are a number of resolutions in the same category as the one just agreed to, in respect to the termination date of July 1, 1945. Another practice has grown up in the Senate whereby the contingent fund of the Senate is used to employ clerks or additional clerks the entire year for services to be performed for a particular committee. The contingent fund is just what its name indicates. It is a fund from which will be spent money for something that is unexpected, something that happens from unforeseen causes, and which the Appropriations Committee cannot immediately care for. It cares for all special committees. It was never intended that clerks employed

the year around should be paid out of the contingent fund.

There is a place where Senators can go if they wish to have clerks placed permanently on the pay roll. If the chairman of a committee deems it necessary to have an additional clerk or two additional clerks the proper place to present his case is before the Appropriations Committee. So in all these resolutions—and there are some 12 or 15 of them, involving that many clerks—we have definitely provided that the clerks may continue on the pay roll and be paid out of the contingent fund until July 1, 1945. In the interim it will be necessary for the chairmen of the respective committees who are interested in these clerks to appear at the proper time and present their cases to the Appropriations Committee.

The resolutions I am now presenting involve clerks who are attached to the standing committees, with the exception of one, and that is the Committee to Investigate the Conservation of Wild Animal Life, which has been in existence for so long that it has taken on the status of a standing committee rather than a temporary committee. There are two clerks attached to that committee. So that resolution comes within the same category as the other resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution as amended has been agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CONSERVATION OF WILD ANIMAL LIFE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 43, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. BAILEY on the 22d instant.

The amendments were, in line 6 to strike out "$13,000" and insert "$3,250"; and in line 8, after the word "purpose" to insert a comma and "said amount being sufficient for the employment of the two clerks of said committee until July 15, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 246, agreed to April 17, 1930, authorizing a Special Committee to Investigate the Conservation of Wild Animal Life, hereby is continued from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $3,250 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purpose said amount being sufficient for the employment of the two clerks of said Committee until July 15, 1945.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 25, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. OVERTON on the 10th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "during the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That resolution No. 44, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Manufactures to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945, at the rate of $2,040 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 26, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. STEWART on the 10th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "during the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 35, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945, at the rate of $2,040 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 49, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 14, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,880 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 50, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 5, to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 251, agreed to June 4, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 51, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. HILL (for Mr. ANDREWS) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 7, to strike out "until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 170, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 29, 1941, as supplemented by Senate Resolution 326, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 53, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GREEN) on the 25th instant.

The amendment was, in line 6, to strike out "to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "until July 1, 1945", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 28, agreed to January 10, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,220 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect from February 1, 1945, until July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO EXAMINE BILLS, ETC.—EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERK

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 64), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ an additional clerk in his office, who shall, in addition to any other duties if required, perform such duties in connection with the examination of enrolled bills as may be directed by the Secretary. The compensation of such additional clerk shall be at the rate of $3,900 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until July 1, 1945.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. GUFFEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 330, agreed to December 15, 1942, authorizing Committee on Mines and Mining to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. LUCAS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred reported it with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "until" to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANCE BY BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. WAGNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency, hereby is authorized to employ such expert, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all the expenses incurred pursuant to this resolution until July 1, 1945 (which shall not exceed $3,000), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 32) authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an assistant clerk, reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the foregoing resolution (S. Res. 32), with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "until", to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution 15, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 54, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been submitted by Mr. HILL (for Mr. PEPPER) on January 25, 1945.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "until", to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "July 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution 12, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Patents to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until July 1, 1945.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES IN RELATION TO THE NATIONAL WELFARE

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 36, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 36), submitted by Mr. BREWSTER on January 18, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to March 13, 1944 (relating to an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare), is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS FOR COMMITTEES

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 57), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority contained in the following resolutions hereby is terminated after June 30, 1945:

Senate Resolution 129, agreed to May 4, 1939, authorizing the Committee on Mines and Mining to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum;

Senate Resolution 311, agreed to June 23, 1944, authorizing the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum and $1,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent;

Senate Resolution 262, agreed to June 30, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an additional clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum; and

Senate Resolution 153, agreed to June 1, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Claims to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $3,600 per annum.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, agreed to July 10, 1935, authorizing a special committee to investigate the production, transportation, and marketing of wool, as extended, is hereby further extended and continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the said committee may report to the Senate at any time prior to December 31, 1946. The said committee hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $5,000, in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it with an amendment, in line 9, after the name "Senate", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY—MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the clerk of the Judiciary Committee has just come into the Chamber to report to me that a message was received this morning from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who was telephoning from Chicago, with respect to Senate Resolution 17. It is my understanding that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has not reported that resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Nevada has requested me, on his behalf, to enter a motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from further consideration of the resolution. He desires this to be done in order that he may have the opportunity, when he arrives here on Thursday, to bring the matter before the Senate for its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to enter such a motion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On behalf of the Senator from Nevada, I enter that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I inquire the nature of the motion which has just been entered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I stated that the senior Senator from Nevada, who is absent from the Senate on official business, telephoned to the clerk of the Judiciary Committee this morning and requested that I enter on his behalf a motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from further consideration of Senate Resolution 17, which was submitted by the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of extending the work of the Judiciary Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, with respect to the investigation of the liquor industry.

Mr. WHITE. Is this a motion to discharge the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED—PRESERVATION OF COTTON AND WHEAT ALLOTMENTS

Mr. OVERTON obtained the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is a noncontroversial bill on the calendar, namely, Senate bill 338, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I should like to obtain action on it. If any great amount of time is required, I shall not insist on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. OVERTON. I understand that there will be no debate, and that the bill can be disposed of promptly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I believe that to be true.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to preserve the allotments of wheat and cotton. Under the present law, if the allotments are not used for 3 years they are lost. There have been a great many diversions to war crops, and many allotments will be threatened after this year. Many farmers are in the service, and cannot plant their crops.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have made inquiry of such minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as I was able to consult, and I know of no opposition to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "amended", to insert "or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to strike out "acreage used for the production of any war crop, designated by the Secretary, in" and insert "for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 3, after the word "emergency", to strike out "on."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "crop", to strike out "year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "planted to" and insert "a farm on which."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 7, after the word "be", to insert "was planted."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the words "production of", to strike out "such", and in the same line, after the word "war", to strike out "crop" and insert "crops designated by him."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 9, after the word "such", to strike out "acreage" and insert "farm, or because the owner or operator was serving in the armed forces of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in establishing acreage allotments under subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations prescribed by him, may provide that for any crop year (beginning with the crop year 1945, during the present emergency, any farm, with respect to which a cotton or wheat allotment was established for the 1942 crop shall be regarded as a farm on which cotton or wheat, as the case may be, was planted, if the Secretary determines that because of the production of war crops designated by him on such farm, or because the owner or operator was serving in the armed forces of the United States, the cotton or wheat production history of the farm for such year is not representative of the normal history of the farm.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY OUT OF RESPECT TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to state that, upon completion of the necessary business of the Senate today, it is the intention to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next as a mark of respect to the late Secretary of the Senate, Colonel Halsey. Accordingly I make such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may it be agreed that I will be permitted to address the Senate for approximately 10 or 15 minutes?

Mr. HILL. Of course, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that, on the completion of the necessary business of the Senate today, the Senate adjourn until Thursday next as a mark of respect to the late Secretary of the Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Committee on Commerce may have permission to file reports on any legislative or executive matters before it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Assuming that the Committee on Commerce reports during the interim, is it the expectation that the Senate will proceed on some basis on Thursday with the George bill and the nomination?

Mr. HILL. So far as the present occupant of the majority leader's chair knows at the present time, that is the intention.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 35, Calendar No. 21, being the river and harbor bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I pause in the consideration of the pending bill in order to pay a brief but well-deserved tribute to one of the greatest friends the cause of river and harbor improvements has ever had in the history of our country. On last Thursday, at his home in Aurora, Ill., Frank R. Reid passed into the great beyond. Mr. Reid was a Member of the House of Representatives, where he served from 1923 until 1934, when he voluntarily left that service in order to resume the practice of law. While he was a Member of the House of Representatives he was chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, and as such he prepared and had passed through the House, and he aided in passage through the Senate, and aided materially in having approved, the flood-control bill of May 15, 1928, relating to the lower Mississippi Valley. That is a historic enactment, because in it the Congress of the United States declared for the first time that flood control of the lower Mississippi Valley is a national obligation.

After Mr. Reid left the House of Representatives he continued to display an unfailing zeal and interest in flood control and river and harbor improvements. There was not a meeting of the Flood Control Association relating to the lower Mississippi Valley at which he was not present, according to my recollection; and there was not a meeting of the National River and Harbor Congress at which he was not present. At one time or another he held every high position in that congress.

Mr. Reid was a gentleman who made and held friends. He was sympathetic. He was affable. He was one of the most brilliant presiding officers I have ever known. His passing is a great loss to the cause of river and harbor improvement and of flood control in this Nation. I desire personally to extend my condolence to the members of his family. He was a devoted husband and a loving father.

Mr. President, the pending bill is a successor to the river and harbor bill of last session, which was House bill 3961. That bill and the companion bill, the flood-control measure of last session, had a very rocky road to travel. From the time when the Senate reconvened after the November election until the Seventy-eighth Congress was adjourned sine die, those two bills occupied practically all the time of the Senate. The flood-control bill was enacted into law and was approved by the President on December 22, 1944. But the river and harbor bill finally went on the rocks in the consideration of what is known as the Elliott amendment.

After giving thorough consideration to the whole subject matter and, I think, in line with what I said on the floor of the Senate during the concluding days of the debate last December, I conceived the plan of preparing a bill which would be free of any controversial projects whatsoever, and which would not embrace any new projects. My purpose was to have authorization made for quite a large number of projects as to which there was no objection, and to avoid delay in the consideration of the bill resulting from hearings on new projects. So I prepared the pending bill, containing 291 projects which are uncontested, and to which there is no objection. Each of the 291 projects has been approved by the Chief of Engineers. All of them have undergone committee hearings. Each has been voted upon favorably by the Senate. The additional projects which were inserted in the bill, to which there was no objection on the part of the Senate, were agreed to by the House when it adopted the conference report. Therefore, the bill contains projects which have been agreed to in both the Senate and the House, and which have even been agreed to without debate, because all of them are meritorious and none of them are subject to objection.

Among the projects which we have eliminated from the bill—projects which are controversial in their nature—is the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, in Alabama and Mississippi, which had an estimated Federal cost of $66,000,000. On January 2, 1945, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors adopted a resolution providing for a restudy and review of that project. Later on, in due course, a report on it will be made.

I wish to thank both of the very able and distinguished Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL] and the able and distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] for their cooperation with me in connection with that matter, and for agreeing not to offer during consideration of the pending bill, either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, an amendment having to do with the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Inasmuch as I perhaps wielded on the floor of the Senate the ax which did considerable damage to the Tombigbee project, I should like to state that the course which the Senator from Alabama now outlines in respect to a resurvey is precisely the course which I said I would approve. I am very happy that such a course is to be taken. I think that when the conclusive down-to-date report is available from the Chief of Engineers the Senators from Alabama and Mississippi will be entitled to another day in court.

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the Senator from Michigan.

The next project which was eliminated was with reference to the Beaver-Mahoning Rivers in Pennsylvania and Ohio. The total project was to be constructed at an estimated cost of approximately $38,000,000, of which all but $1,500,000 had been previously authorized.

I wish to thank the Senators from Ohio for their cooperation in agreeing to the elimination of this project from the pending bill.

We have also deleted from the bill the Savannah River and Clark Hill Reservoir in Georgia, the estimated cost of which is $28,000,000. We eliminated the project because it was authorized in the flood-control act which was passed at the last session of Congress.

There has also been omitted from the bill the Santee and Congaree Rivers project in North Carolina and South Carolina. The estimated cost of construction of the initial stage of the project was $25,000,000. That item was inserted in House bill 3961 by the Senate. It was agreed to in the Senate but the House conferees insisted on its rejection because local interests desired to be heard in connection with the matter. The House conferees took the position that the local interests had not had an adequate opportunity to be heard. The Senate conferees receded. Therefore, we considered the project as falling within the classification of objected-to projects.

I wish to thank the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] for his willingness to cooperate with the Senate Commerce Committee in the elimination of this particular project from the pending bill.

Mr. President, there are also not contained in this bill the Missouri River Basin multiple-purpose projects. Provision was made in the river and harbor bill at the last Congress for an authorization of $200,000,000 to initiate those projects. However, the projects were authorized in the flood control act of last year, and to include them in this bill would be merely an attempt to reauthorize them. They have therefore been eliminated. However, there remains in the bill the navigation project in the lower Missouri River Basin from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River.

Mr. President, as I stated a few minutes ago, the rock upon which House bill 3961—that noble ship—went to pieces was the Elliott amendment which provided that the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws should not be applicable to lands which receive their waters from the Central Valley project in the State of California. The amendment, which was adopted on the floor of the House last year, is not contained in this bill. When it came over to the Senate for consideration the Senate Commerce Committee recommended its elimination. It was eliminated on the floor of the Senate, but the Senate conferees yielded, and it was restored to the bill. The Senate rejected the conference report and later a motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was rejected, but before a vote could be taken on that motion the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned sine die.

I wish to thank the very able and distinguished Senator from California for his willingness, his splendid cooperation, and his manifestation of patriotism in being perfectly willing that this very controversial item be not included in the pending bill. I understand that the able

author of the amendment, Representative ELLIOTT, has indicated that he will not urge the inclusion of the amendment in Senate bill 35 when it reaches the House.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that this bill does not contain provisions with reference to power and irrigation which were included in House bill 3961. The reason for that is perfectly obvious. The identical provisions with reference to power and irrigation which were included in the river and harbor bill were likewise made a part of the flood-control bill. They were in identical language. The flood-control bill has become law, and therefore the power and irrigation provisions are now law. There is no necessity to include them in the pending bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In other words, section 5 of the flood-control bill which was passed at the last session of Congress, now known as Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, and which made provision with reference to the distribution of electric power generated at the reservoir projects, will apply to the projects in the pending river and harbor bill in exactly the same way that it applies to the projects in the flood-control bill. Am I correct in my statement?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct. Section 5 and section 8 of the flood control act apply not only to the projects contained in the pending bill, but also to all projects under the control of the War Department, whether authorized in this bill, in the flood-control bill, or in any other bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Have any of the projects which were eliminated from the similar bill which we considered before the adjournment of the last session of Congress been restored to the pending bill?

Mr. OVERTON. No; none of those projects has been restored to the present bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Then, the pending bill is practically the same bill which was passed by the Senate during the last session of Congress.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

The estimated cost of the 291 projects contained in this bill is $381,968,332. This is $320,530,000 less than the estimated cost of the projects in last year's bill, or, in other words, almost a 50-percent reduction in the estimated cost. The reduction has been brought about not only by reason of the elimination of controversial projects but also by the elimination of what would be a duplication of projects.

Now I wish to say to the Senate that is the intention, I think, of both the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives and of the Senate Commerce Committee, to prepare later on in the session another river and harbor bill. In that river and harbor bill both committees will consider all new projects which have been reported since hearings on the bill of last year and any project which has not been authorized in the pending bill, and will also consider any controversial projects and also any amendments, for instance, the Elliott amendment or any other amendment which may be more or less controversial in nature, the purpose being to get the pending bill through as rapidly as possible, because there is no controversy in reference to any project or general provision in this bill.

I have a letter from Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, which I wish to take the liberty of reading in part to the Senate as evidence of what is intended. This letter was written on January 12, addressed to me by Judge MANSFIELD, and in it he says:

DEAR SENATOR OVERTON: I have examined with interest Senate bill 35, introduced in your behalf by Senator BAILEY. It is my understanding that the bill seeks to authorize the uncontested projects as contained in the rivers and harbors bill (H. R. 3961), which failed of passage in the last Congress.

I express the sincere and earnest hope that the bill as introduced may be promptly passed by the Senate. If and when that is accomplished, I shall immediately proceed in an effort to obtain similar action in the House. If no controversial items are added, I have every confidence it will be accepted by the House.

Since the bill was reported to the Senate by the Commerce Committee, some few additional reports on new projects have been received and no doubt others will be submitted by the Board and Chief of Engineers from time to time. It is my intention, and in this I am sure I shall have the enthusiastic support of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, to report another rivers and harbors bill to take care of additional projects during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter written by Judge MANSFIELD be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point and also a copy of my reply to Judge MANSFIELD in which I approve the course he outlines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter was as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1945.

Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON,
Chairman, Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, Senate Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR OVERTON: I have examined with interest Senate bill 35, introduced in your behalf by Senator BAILEY. It is my understanding that the bill seeks to authorize the uncontested projects as contained in the river and harbor bill (H. R. 3961), which failed of passage in the last Congress.

I express the sincere and earnest hope that the bill as introduced may be promptly passed by the Senate. If and when that is accomplished, I shall immediately proceed in an effort to obtain similar action in the House. If no controversial items are added, I have every confidence it will be accepted by the House.

Since the bill was reported to the Senate by the Commerce Committee, some few additional reports on new projects have been received and no doubt others will be submitted by the Board and Chief of Engineers from time to time. It is my intention, and in this I am sure I shall have the enthusiastic support of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, to report another river and harbor bill to take care of additional projects during the present session of the Congress.

I think it highly important in the public interest that S. 35 should be enacted into law as soon as possible. While the bill specifically provides "that no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect," there are a number of projects the bill will authorize which already have been certified as "being necessary and desirable in the interest of the national defense." In addition, and as you are of course advised, authorization of the projects will enable the engineers to proceed with the preparation of plans and specifications in order that there may be no delay in the construction of projects if and when they are needed when the war is over.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1945.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 12th instant advising me that you have examined S. 35, being the river and harbor bill introduced in the Senate, and that it meets with your approval.

I am very pleased to observe that as soon as the bill has passed the Senate you will undertake to have it acted upon favorably in your committee and by the House. I am especially interested in your statement that you will later in the year undertake hearings on a new river and harbor bill, embracing projects that have been favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers subsequent to the consideration of last session's bill by the Senate Commerce Committee. I most heartily approve of this course.

I thank you for your continued cooperation in the enactment of this important legislation and can assure you that I shall do all in my power to aid you in the furtherance of your views and plans with respect not only to the pending bill but to future river and harbor bills.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN H. OVERTON,
United States Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I cannot close this general presentation of the pending bill without thanking the members of the Commerce Committee for their splendid cooperation. This bill has been unanimously recommended by the Senate Commerce Committee for passage by the Senate. I cannot refrain from expressing my very deep and warm appreciation of the courtesy and the able counsel which have been given to me at all times by the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. In this as in all other matters in which I have had any occasion to be active before his committee he has been

extraordinarily helpful, patient, and sympathetic.

Mr. President, there are a few committee amendments to the bill, but they are only clerical in nature. The first section of the bill as prepared contained an enunciation of general principles and also the authorization of various projects. On the recommendation of the War Department we divided the first section into two sections, section 1 relating to the general principles enunciated by the bill, and the second section relating to the authorizations. Because of that separation a renumbering of the sections has been required. Those are the main amendments.

There is another amendment to strike out the word "of" and insert the word "for," and then another amendment where there was a typographical error in referring to a House document, and that is corrected. This completes the amendments.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was on page 23, line 6, to strike out "chief" and insert "Chief".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, line 8, after the word "and", to strike out "669" and insert "659".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 39, line 8, after the word "liability", to strike out "of" and insert "for".

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments except for renumbering the sections. Without objection, the amendments renumbering the sections are agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment heretofore offered by me and lying on the table be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 3, after the word "navigation", it is proposed to insert "flood control."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is merely in connection with an item for a preliminary examination and survey. I have no objection to any preliminary examination and survey amendments that may be offered, and therefore I make no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator if there would be any objection to the amendment I left with the committee providing for an examination of the possibilities of deepening the channel to Beaufort, S. C., through St. Helena Sound or through Port Royal Sound?

Mr. OVERTON. Has the Senator the amendment prepared?

Mr. MAYBANK. I sent it to the committee, and have it not with me at the moment. I can prepare it, however. It merely provides for an investigation.

Mr. OVERTON. There will be no objection to it. I do not think it is contained in the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; it is not.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator had a copy of it there would be no objection to providing for a preliminary examination and survey. As I understand, that is all the amendment proposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all, of the channel to Beaufort, S. C.

Mr. OVERTON. There will be no objection to it. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to offer it later, and that it be incorporated in the bill as passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Carolina send the amendment to the desk?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. LANGER] intends to address himself to the bill.

Mr. LANGER. No.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator going to speak before the bill is passed?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In that event there will be ample time for the Senator from South Carolina to prepare his amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Dakota speaks let me say that I have had prepared a list of the projects contained in the pending bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35

Project [1]	Document No.[2]	Federal first cost
Northeast Harbor, Maine.	H. 132, 76th Cong.	$94,500
Isle au Haut Thoroughfare, Maine.	S. 15, 77th Cong.	28,000
Hendricks Harbor, Maine.	S. 40, 76th Cong.	6,000
Portland Harbor, Maine.	H. 560, 76th Cong.	780,000
Portland Harbor, Maine, and the maintenance of Soldier Ledge Channel in Hussey Sound, Casco Bay, at a depth of 40 feet.	Oct. 26, 1942 [3]	(4)
Josias River, Maine	H. 227, 76th Cong.	32,000
Newburyport Harbor, Mass.	H. 703, 76th Cong.	68,000
Gloucester Harbor and Annisquam River, Mass.	H. 329, 77th Cong.	46,667
Manchester Harbor, Mass.	H. 447, 77th Cong.	207,300
Salem Harbor, Mass.	H. 701, 76th Cong.	43,000
Marblehead Harbor, Mass.	H. 85, 77th Cong.	60,000
Boston Harbor, Mass.	Apr. 28, 1943 [3]	660,000
Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass.	H. 394, 77th Cong.	322,400
Weymouth Fore River, Mass.	H. 291, 77th Cong.	200,000
Cohasset Harbor, Mass.	H. 425, 76th Cong.	62,000
Duxbury Harbor, Mass.	S. 115, 77th Cong.	71,000
Chatham (Stage) Harbor, Mass.	H. 456, 77th Cong.	43,500
Wellfleet Harbor, Mass.	H. 557, 76th Cong.	64,000
Hyannis Harbor, Mass.	H. 98, 77th Cong.	62,500
Cape Cod Canal (Onset Bay), Mass.	H. 431, 77th Cong.	48,000
Nantucket Harbor, Mass.	H. 115, 77th Cong.	31,500

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Menemsha Creek, Marthas Vineyard, Mass.	H. 365, 76th Cong.	$37,500
Wickford Harbor, R. I.	S. 105, 77th Cong.	22,000
Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I.	H. 330, 77th Cong.	8,000
Pawcatuck River, R. I. and Conn.	H. 839, 76th Cong.	30,000
Mystic River, Conn.	H. 349, 77th Cong.	20,000
Thames River, Conn.	H. 367, 76th Cong.	(4)
Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.	H. 368, 76th Cong.	72,900
Clinton Harbor, Conn.	H. 240, 76th Cong.	21,900
Guilford Harbor, Conn.	H. 149, 77th Cong.	25,500
New Haven Harbor, Conn., except the further improvement of Quinnipiac River.	H. 307, 76th Cong.	1,673,000
Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.	H. 819, 76th Cong.	529,000
Norwalk Harbor, Conn.	H. 220, 76th Cong.	29,500
Mianus River, Conn.	H. 549 78th Cong.	26,500
Greenwich Harbor, Conn.	H. 125 76th Cong.	31,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway.	Apr. 14, 1942 [3]	1,010,000
Jamaica Bay, N. Y.	H. 700, 76th Cong.	270,000
Jones Inlet, N. Y.	H. 409, 77th Cong.	900,000
Northport Harbor, N. Y	H 109. 76th Cong.	15,000
Peconic River, N. Y.	H. 237, 76th Cong.	20,000
Lake Montauk Harbor, N. Y.	H. 369, 76th Cong.	65,000
Orowoc Creek, N. Y	H. 126, 76th Cong.	15,200
Passaic River, N. J	H. 430, 76th Cong.	(4)
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N. J.	May 20, 1942 [3]	3,390,000
Way Cake Creek, N. J.	H. 624, 77th Cong.	30,000
Compton Creek, N. J.	H. 673, 76th Cong.	16,000
Shark River, N. J.	H. 102, 76th Cong.	118,000
New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway.	H 133, 76th Cong	1,500,000
Manasquan River, N. J.	H 356, 77th Cong.	143,000
Toms River, N. J.	H. 393, 77th Cong.	141,000
Cold Spring Inlet, N. J.	H. 262, 77th Cong.	15,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea.	H. 580, 76th Cong.	1,036,000
Do	H. 340, 77th Cong.	3,380,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, and the maintenance of enlarged channel opposite the Philadelphia Navy Yard.	(5)	(4)
Delaware River at Camden, N. J.	H. 353, 77th Cong.	373,000
Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.	H. 344, 77th Cong.	224,000
Indian River, Del.	H. 330, 76th Cong.	151,000
Nanticoke River, Del. and Md.	S. 69, 77th Cong.	54,000
Susquehanna River, above and below Havre de Grace, Md.	S. 67, 76th Cong.	18,000
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.	June 30, 1942 [3]	2,388,000
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md., and channel in Curtis Creek.	(5)	150,000
Mill Creek, Md.	H. 100, 76th Cong.	4,200
Broadwater Creek, Md.	H. 622, 77th Cong.	30,000
Cadle Creek, Md.	H. 465, 76th Cong.	5,500
Channel to Island Creek, St. George Island, Md.	H. 99, 76th Cong.	10,000
Saint Catherines Sound, Md.	H. 242, 76th Cong.	10,900
Black Walnut Harbor, Md.	H. 217, 76th Cong.	21,000
Town Creek, Md.	H. 219, 76th Cong.	25,000
Duck Point Cove, Md.	H. 241, 76th Cong.	19,500
Lower Thoroughfare, Deals Island, Md.	H. 238, 76th Cong.	22,000
Crisfield Harbor, Md.	H. 457, 76th Cong.	(6)
Pocomoke River, Md.	H. 429, 76th Cong.	4,250
Waterway on the coast of Virginia.	H. 268, 76th Cong.	263,000
Occohannock Creek, Va.	H. 223, 78th Cong.	37,000
Oyster Channel, Va.	H. 716, 76th Cong.	29,000
Onancock River, Va.	H. 358, 76th Cong.	(6)
Tangier Channel, Va.	H. 141, 77th Cong.	10,100
Cranes Creek, Va.	H. 687, 76th Cong.	7,500
Totuskey Creek, Va.	H. 686, 76th Cong.	44,000
Hoskins Creek, Va.	H. 129, 77th Cong.	16,000
Urbanna Creek, Va.	H. 285, 76th Cong.	9,600
Whitings Creek, Va.	H. 582, 76th Cong.	11,500
Broad Creek, Va.	H. 381, 76th Cong.	20,500
Pamunkey River, Va.	H. 671, 76th Cong.	10,000
Appomattox River, Va.	H. 223, 76th Cong.	110,000
Hampton Creek, Va.	H. 559, 76th Cong.	15,000
Cape Charles City Harbor, Va.	May 12, 1942 [3]	158,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Norfolk Harbor, Va.	H. 224, 76th Cong.	$35,000
Little River, Va., maintenance work.	(4)	(4)
James River, Va.	H. 738, 77th Cong.	27,000
Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.	H. 117, 76th Cong.	39,000
Chowan River, N. C., and Blackwater River, Va.	H. 101, 76th Cong.	135,000
Pembroke Creek, N. C.	H. 235, 76th Cong.	9,500
Channel from Pamlico Sound to Rodanthe, N. C.	H. 234, 76th Cong.	5,000
Channel from Pamlico Sound to Avon, N. C.	H. 316, 76th Cong.	16,500
Rollinson Channel,	H. 236, 76th Cong.	27,000
Waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.	H. 239, 76th Cong.	22,500
Neuse and Trent Rivers, N. C.	H. 623, 77th Cong.	11,000
Channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay with Cedar Bay, N. C.	S. 87, 76th Cong.	20,000
Waterway connecting Pamlico Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	H. 99, 77th Cong.	35,000
Do	S. 247, 77th Cong.	7,000
Channel from Back Sound to Lookout Bight, N. C.	H. 746, 77th Cong.	50,000
Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	H. 334, 76th Cong.	54,000
Inland waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, N. C., including waterway to Jacksonville, N. C.	H. 660, 76th Cong.	24,000
Do	H. 346, 77th Cong.	9,000
Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington.	H. 131, 76th Cong.	675,000
Do	S. 83, 76th Cong.	790,000
Northeast (Cape Fear) River, N. C.	S. 170, 76th Cong.	73,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to Winyah Bay, S. C.	H. 327, 76th Cong.	11,000
Winyah Bay, S. C.	H. 211, 76th Cong.	1,260,000
Beresford Creek, S. C.	H. 602, 76th Cong.	21,000
Charleston Habor, S. C.	H. 156, 77th Cong.	1,820,000
Shipyard River, S. C.	Apr. 11, 1942 [3]	246,500
Abbapoola Creek, S. C.	H. 97, 76th Cong.	10,800
Russell Creek, S. C.	S. 41, 76th Cong.	15,500
Savannah Harbor, Ga.	H. 283, 76th Cong.	281,000
Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.	H. 610, 77th Cong.	(6)
Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to Saint Johns River, Fla.	H. 114, 77th Cong.	(6)
Fernandina Harbor and Amelia River, Fla.	H. 284, 77th Cong.	(6)
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean.	H. 322, 77th Cong.	725,000
Do	S. 230, 78th Cong.	3,200,000
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean, and plans for the alteration of channel alinement.	(5)	2,032,000
St. Johns River, Fla., Palatka to Lake Harney.	H. 603, 76th Cong.	290,000
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney.	H. 445, 78th Cong.	25,500
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla.	Oct. 26, 1942 [3]	11,789,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla., Vero Beach.	H. 261, 76th Cong.	7,300
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla., to Sebastian Inlet.	H. 336, 76th Cong.	19,000
Canaveral Harbor, Fla.	H. 367, 77th Cong.	830,500
St. Lucie Inlet, Fla.	H. 391, 77th Cong.	46,000
Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.	H. 530, 78th Cong.	711,000
New River, Fla.	H. 553, 76th Cong.	60,000
Miami Harbor, Fla.	June 24, 1942 [3]	5,781,000
Do	Mar. 19, 1942 [3]	78,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Miami to Key West, Fla.	Oct. 26, 1942 [3]	1,830,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida.	H. 696, 76th Cong.	$208,000
Do	June 5, 1943 [3]	5,100
Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River, Fla.	H. 371, 76th Cong.	3,200,000
Little Manatee River, Fla.	H. 552, 76th Cong.	77,000
Tampa Harbor, Fla.	S. 16, 77th Cong.	189,000
Do	H. 119, 77th Cong.	60,000
Do	S. 183, 78th Cong.	607,400
Anclote River, Fla.	H. 243, 76th Cong.	10,000
Pithlachascotee River, Fla.	H. 86, 77th Cong.	51,000
St. Marks River, Fla.	H. 345, 77th Cong.	71,000
Intracoastal Waterway from Apalachicola Bay to St. Marks River, Fla.	H. 442, 76th Cong.	32,500
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla.	H. 342, 76th Cong.	6,500,000
St. Josephs Bay, Fla.	S. 17, 77th Cong.	(6)
Do	(5)	225,000
Watson Bayou, Fla.	H. 555, 76th Cong.	(6)
Pensacola Harbor, Fla.	Apr. 3, 1943 [3]	162,000
Alabama-Coosa River, Ala.	H. 414, 77th Cong.	60,000,000
Mobile Harbor, Ala.	Oct. 26, 1942 [3]	475,000
Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala. and Miss.	H. 276, 76th Cong.	6,750,000
Do	H. 382, 77th Cong.	115,000
Dauphin Island Bay Channel, Ala.	H. 333, 76th Cong.	88,000
Bayou Coden, Ala.	H. 824, 77th Cong.	6,880
Bayou La Batre, Ala.	H. 281, 76th Cong.	27,500
Biloxi Harbor, Miss.	H. 258, 76th Cong.	4,000
Do	H. 326, 76th Cong.	6,000
Pass Christian Harbor, Miss.	S. 214, 77th Cong.	17,000
Bayou Galere, Miss.	H. 112, 76th Cong.	6,000
Bayous La Loutre, St. Malo, and Yscloskey, La.	S. 116, 77th Cong.	35,000
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to the Gulf of Mexico.	H. 215, 76th Cong.	4,200,000
Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Algiers at New Orleans, La.	S. 188, 78th Cong.	8,000,000
Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La.	H. 594, 78th Cong.	160,000
Calcasieu River and Pass, La.	H. 465, 77th Cong.	55,000
Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway.	H. 428, 76th Cong.	6,300
Do	H. 383, 77th Cong.	48,000
Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway to Harlingen, Tex.	H. 402, 77th Cong.	600,000
Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway.	S. 248, 78th Cong.	25,500
Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.	H. 685, 76th Cong.	10,000
Do	S. 60, 77th Cong.	18,000
Do	S. 158, 77th Cong.	27,000
Neches and Angelina Rivers, Tex.	S. 98, 76th Cong.	23,000,000
Trinity River and tributaries, Tex.	H. 403, 77th Cong.	15,000,000
Lavon Reservoir on East Fork of Trinity River, Tex.	H. 533, 78th Cong.	3,733,000
Houston Ship Channel, Tex.	H. 226, 76th Cong.	21,300
Do	H. 256, 76th Cong.	3,675,000
Do	Aug. 21, 1943 [1]	484,000
Clear Creek and Clear Lake, Tex.	H. 319, 77th Cong.	30,000
Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex.	H. 337, 76th Cong.	70,000
Channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.	Dec. 10, 1943 [1]	120,000
Lavaca and Navidad Rivers, Tex.	H. 314, 76th Cong.	85,000
Do	H. 659, 77th Cong.	348,000
Guadalupe River, Tex.	H. 247, 76th Cong.	8,500,000
Aransas Pass-Corpus Christie Channel, Tex.	H. 544, 78th Cong.	830,000
Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.	H. 335, 76th Cong.	127,500
Do	H. 347, 77th Cong.	635,000
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.	H. 104, 76th Cong.	(6)

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers.	H. 231, 76th Cong.	$10,290,000
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis.	H. 432, 77th Cong.	(6)
Do	(7)	(6)
Do	H. 103, 76th Cong.	11,500
Do	H. 547, 76th Cong.	88,800
Do	H. 263, 77th Cong.	17,000
Do	H. 449, 78th Cong.	(6)
Do	H. 137, 76th Cong.	33,000
Illinois waterway, Ill., and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Ind.	H. 145, 76th Cong.	25,900,000
Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth.	H. 214, 76th Cong.	6,000,000
Scioto River at Portsmouth, Ohio.	(5)	75,000
Coasts of the Great Lakes; harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels.	H. 446, 78th Cong.	2,030,635
Baudette Harbor, Minn.	H. 216, 76th Cong.	15,000
Harbor at Knife River, Minn.	H. 686, 77th Cong.	14,000
Ashland Harbor, Wis.	H. 337, 77th Cong.	24,000
Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis.	H. 228, 76th Cong.	(6)
Green Bay Harbor, Wis.	H. 95, 76th Cong.	56,000
Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wis.	H. 421, 78th Cong.	11,000
Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.	S. 29, 76th Cong.	110,000
Racine Harbor, Wis.	H. 816, 77th Cong.	(6)
Do	H. 255, 78th Cong.	47,000
Waukegan Harbor, Ill.	H. 116, 77th Cong.	34,000
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill and Ind.	H. 233, 76th Cong.	910,000
St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.	H. 129, 76th Cong.	74,000
Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich.	H. 661, 76th Cong.	150,000
Manistee Harbor, Mich.	H. 380, 77th Cong.	147,000
St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal, Bridge Island.	H. 679, 78th Cong.	1,412,000
St. Marys River, Mich., power plant.	H. 339, 77th Cong.	3,500,000
St. Clair River at Southeast Bend, Mich.	H. 309, 77th Cong.	135,000
Detroit River, Mich.	Oct. 26, 1942 [3]	85,300
Sandusky Harbor, Ohio.	H. 328, 76th Cong.	(4)
Lorain Harbor, Ohio.	H. 161, 77th Cong.	30,000
Do	(5)	(4)
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.	H. 232, 76th Cong.	191,000
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, and the extension of the channel in Cuyahoga River, Ohio.	Feb. 14, 1942 [3]	30,000
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio.	H. 321, 77th Cong.	38,000
Erie Harbor, Pa.	(5)	(4)
Do	Oct. 26, 1942 [3]	467,000
Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.	H. 352, 78th Cong.	3,171,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.	Apr. 16, 1942 [3]	108,000
Wilson Harbor, N. Y.	H. 679, 76th Cong.	131,000
Rochester Harbor, N. Y.	H. 139, 76th Cong.	10,000
Sackets Harbor, N. Y.	Jan. 6, 1944 [3]	121,000
Cape Vincent Harbor, N. Y.	H. 363, 76th Cong.	59,000
San Diego Harbor, Calif.	H. 390, 77th Cong.	165,000
Newport Bay Harbor, Calif.	S. 138, 78th Cong.	259,000
Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif.	H. 348, 77th Cong.	(6)
Morro Bay, Calif.	H. 283, 77th Cong.	800,000
Morro Bay, Calif., and further harbor development as desired by the Navy Department.	(5)	(9)
Monterey Harbor, Calif.	H. 266, 76th Cong.	74,000
Monterey Bay (Moss Landing), Calif.	(5)	350,000
Redwood Creek, Calif.	Nov. 3, 1941 [3]	483,000
Oakland Harbor, Calif.	H. 466, 77th Cong.	(4)
Do	(5)	(4 7)
Richmond Harbor, Calif.	H. 715, 76th Cong.	25,000
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, Calif.	H. 217, 77th Cong.	7,600
Noyo Harbor, Calif.	H. 682, 76th Cong.	600,000
Crescent City Harbor, Calif.	H. 688, 76th Cong.	1,610,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Projects contained in rivers and harbors bill, S. 35—Continued

Project	Document No.	Federal first cost
Crescent City Harbor, Calif., and the construction of an inner breakwater.	(5)	$200,000
Chetco River, Oreg.	H. 817, 77th Cong.	190,000
Coquille River, Oreg.	H. 672, 76th Cong.	(4)
Umpqua Harbor and River, Oreg.	S. 86, 76th Cong.	55,000
Umpqua River, Oreg.	S. 191, 77th Cong.	34,000
Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.	S. 119, 77th Cong.	162,000
Depoe Bay, Oreg.	H. 350, 77th Cong.	214,000
Salmon River, Oreg.	H. 551, 76th Cong.	5,000
Bayocean Peninsula, Oreg.	(5)	120,000
Willamette River, Oreg.	H. 544, 75th Cong.	3,600,000
Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho.	H. 704, 75th Cong.	58,625,000
Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.	(5)	50,000
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to the mouth of Snake River, Oreg., and Wash.	S. 28, 76th Cong.	39,000
Do	H. 324, 77th Cong.	30,000
Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.	H. 704, 75th Cong.	49,470,000
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and Bonneville, Oreg.	H. 218, 76th Cong.	45,000
Columbia and Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.	H. 341, 77th Cong.	12,000
Do	H. 630, 77th Cong.	81,000
Baker Bay, Columbia River, Wash.	H. 443, 76th Cong.	170,000
Willapa River and Harbor, Wash.	H. 481, 76th Cong.	30,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River to Aberdeen, Wash.	(5)	160,000
Quillayute River, Wash.	H. 218, 78th Cong.	(4)
Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.	H. 331, 77th Cong.	10,000
Olympia Harbor, Wash.	H. 699, 76th Cong.	88,000
Tacoma Harbor, Wash.	H. 124, 76th Cong.	160,000
Stillaguamish River, Wash.	H. 286, 77th Cong.	35,000
Lake Crockett, Wash.	H. 303, 77th Cong.	225,000
Metlakatla Harbor, Alaska.	H. 138, 76th Cong.	120,000
Craig Harbor, Alaska.	H. 558, 76th Cong.	80,000
Meyers Chuck Harbor, Alaska.	H. 222, 76th Cong.	25,000
Wrangell Harbor, Alaska.	H. 284, 76th Cong.	189,000
Wrangell Narrows, Alaska.	H. 260, 76th Cong.	2,731,000
Sitka Harbor, Alaska.	Mar. 14, 1944 [3]	385,000
Skagway Harbor, Alaska.	Apr. 11, 1942 [3]	16,000
Petersburg Harbor, Alaska.	H. 670, 76th Cong.	80,000
Port Alexander, Alaska.	H. 578, 76th Cong.	31,000
Gastineau Channel, Alaska.	H. 325, 77th Cong.	155,000
Elfin Cove, Alaska.	H. 579, 76th Cong.	38,000
Seldovia Harbor, Alaska.	H. 702, 76th Cong.	50,000
Keehi Lagoon, Oahu T. H.	H. 379, 77th Cong.	(6 9)
Port Allen Harbor, T. H.	H. 180, 77th Cong.	75,000
San Juan Harbor, P. R.	(5)	(6 9)
Ponce Harbor, P. R.	May 21, 1942 [3]	400,000
Fajardo Harbor, P. R.	H. 286, 76th Cong.	211,000
Total, 291 projects.		381,968 332

[1] Listed geographically as in the bill.
[2] Document and Congress; "H" indicates House; "S" indicates Senate.
[3] Date of report of Chief of Engineers, which was not printed.
[4] Maintenance only.
[5] In accordance with report on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.
[6] No additional cost to the United States.
[7] River and Harbor Act, Aug. 30, 1935.
[8] Reduction of $2,100 in cost.
[9] Work already accomplished in the interest of the war effort.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, at the appropriate place in the bill the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] desires to offer as a preliminary survey item the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert in section 5, following the item on Cooper River, S. C., on page 49, after line 6, the following:

Channel from the ocean through St. Helena Sound or through Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 35) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, following my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of letters which I have received during the past few weeks commenting upon the proposed full employment bill, recently introduced by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself.

These letters are from the following officials: Leo T. Crowley, Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration; Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration; John B. Blandford, Jr., Administrator, National Housing Agency.

I should particularly like to call the attention of the Senate to the following statement on the bill made by the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration:

In accordance with our traditional economic concepts the initial burden of achieving continuing full employment is placed upon private, non-governmental sources. Government participation is limited to encouraging and creating the optimum conditions conducive to the meeting of this burden by private enterprise alone. But, if private enterprise cannot alone meet this burden, direct Government investment and expenditures which not only will assure full employment but will add to the wealth of the Nation must, as the bill provides, be undertaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
January 24, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In your letter of December 16, 1944, you ask me for my views on a proposed bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment.

The proposed bill requires that the President shall transmit to Congress at each regular session a report on the estimated number of jobs needed to insure continuing full employment for the coming fiscal year or years, the estimated amount of investment and other expenditures which will provide such jobs, and the estimated volume of prospective investment and expenditures. If prospective investments and expenditures are less than the amount necessary to assure full employment, the President is required to recommend a program for encouraging non-Federal investment and expenditures. To the extent that such expenditures are insufficient to take up the lag the President is required to recommend a program of Federal investment and expenditures.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the objectives sought to be attained by the bill and the approach taken toward that end. Every American able and willing to work has the right to a useful and remunerative job and it should be, as section 2 declares, the responsibility of the Government to guarantee that right by creating conditions which will tend to bring about continuing full employment.

In accordance with our traditional economic concepts the initial burden of achieving continuing full employment is placed upon private, nongovernmental sources. Government participation is limited to encouraging and creating the optimum conditions conducive to the meeting of this burden by private enterprise alone. But, if private enterprise cannot alone meet this burden, direct Government investment and expenditures which not only will assure full employment but will add to the wealth of the Nation must, as the bill provides, be undertaken.

The right to individual economic security, no less than the right to engage in private enterprise, is an indispensable component of a vigorous and healthy democracy. Mass unemployment and the resulting economic insecurity breed the very evils which endanger private enterprise and all other democratic institutions. It is the duty of government to be prepared to meet any threats to its existence from enemy attack it should be no less its duty to be prepared to meet any threats which may arise from economic conditions. The proposed bill recognizes and undertakes to discharge that very obligation.

I have been advised that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
January 22, 1945.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: With reference to your letter of December 16, 1944, enclosing a copy of your bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment," I am happy to make the following comments on this measure, which I understand has not yet been introduced in Congress.

As you know, my associates and I are most interested in the development of an effective program for full employment in the United States. Such a program is intimately related to our general efforts to build a secure and prosperous world in the post-war period. Therefore, it is essential that the specific methods which are employed to promote high and stable levels of productive employment should be formulated with a view to their international implications.

It would be particularly unfortunate if the measures taken by this, or any, government were such as to hinder, rather than assist, the efforts of other countries in dealing with this problem. It should be recognized that in case of a serious threat of unemployment there is likely to be a strong pressure for the use of methods which would attempt to create employment at the expense of other nations. These methods would clearly be self-defeating in character, and tend ultimately to worsen, rather than improve, the employment situation in all countries.

Because of the necessary impact of a domestic full employment program upon our foreign economic relations, there are certain principles which I think should be borne in mind in the drafting of any final legislation on this subject, and in the working out of a specific program. For instance, attempts to create full employment at home, by the stimulation of uneconomic production, would clearly lessen the volume of beneficial foreign trade which we might otherwise enjoy. Similarly, if a full employment program is to provide the maximum material well-being for our people, it should rely substantially on foreign trade and investment as a means of providing employment opportunities. Finally, it would be unfortunate if a domestic full employment program should introduce added rigidities into our economy and thus lead to new restrictions and controls on foreign trade. As you realize, other nations in the past have attempted to further domestic economic programs by resorting to exchange controls, import quotas, and other devices destructive of international economic collaboration.

You will be interested to know that the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy is now studying the international aspects of the full employment problem, including the effect of various possible types of domestic full employment programs upon our foreign economic relations.

The Department has not been informed as to the relationship of the proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
December 29, 1944.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: As requested in your letter of December 16, I have examined the draft bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment (Confidential Subcommittee Print No. 1, dated December 11, 1944) and have given thought to the approach taken therein. I hope that my comments, which are set forth below, may prove helpful to you in the development of a bill for the consideration of the next Congress.

Permit me to congratulate you on having initiated and given impetus to the legislative effort to deal with the formidable problem of involuntary unemployment. There has developed a realization that it is the responsibility of governments to provide an economic framework which will minimize the dislocations that lead to depression and to intervene directly to maintain employment opportunities when other measures fail. At the International Labor Conference in Philadelphia the United States Government accepted and sponsored the principle that each government recognizes its duty to maintain a high level of employment. All other governments present, as well as the worker and employer delegates, joined in voting for a resolution that this principle should be incorporated in the peace settlements. Although there has been an increasing public recognition of this responsibility in the United States, there has not yet been sufficient legislative consideration of the problems involved to result in the framing of legislation.

Much of the structure and content of the bill under consideration appears to me to be highly commendable. The introduction of the concept of the National Production and Employment Budget, with its primary emphasis upon the level of total expenditure necessary to buy the total volume of goods and services that would be produced at the levels of employment contemplated, I consider a constructive contribution. I believe the proposal to establish a joint committee on the Budget, composed of members from six existing Senate and House committees concerned with financial matters, is fully deserving of congressional study. Many other passages in the proposed measure seem to me to be admirably conceived.

The relatively brief period of time available for study of your bill has not been sufficient to enable me to formulate and prepare for you final comments. I am attaching, however, a memorandum prepared for me by A. F. Hinrichs, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, which sets forth a number of considerations germane to the problems dealt with by your proposal which may be of value to your committee. Your immediate objective appears to be to open the problem and its means of solution for discussion. This the introduction of your bill accomplishes. Any reservations I may have would not be germane to the next step which I presume will be taken, namely, a series of hearings and studies of the devices that can be used to achieve the main objective, maximum employment.

Please call freely upon me and the staff of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for assistance. The Department of Labor exists "to foster, promote; and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." No measure could possibly contribute as much to this objective as an act which would assure "continuing full employment."

Due to the limited period of time afforded me for the preparation of these comments I have been unable to ascertain the relationship of your proposal to the legislative program of the President.

Sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
December 28, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your draft bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment" is a proposal of real importance and significance. Any proposal to relate our Federal fiscal policies to our national economy in such a way as to maintain full employment and insure high levels of business activity is worthy of our deepest consideration. Such a proposal is of equal significance to all segments of our economy, including agriculture.

As I have stated many times before congressional committees and elsewhere, the first essential to solving post-war farm problems is maintaining full industrial production and employment of workers, because farmers sell and will continue to sell most of what they produce on the domestic market. Only through full employment at good wages can they have plenty of customers able to pay fair prices for their products.

The consequences of widespread unemployment in this country in the post-war period could well prove to be detrimental not only to the welfare of our citizens who are unemployed, but would be most costly to the rest of our people and to the Federal Government itself. As a matter of fact, another depression might strike at the very foundation of our entire political economy.

We have not had time to make a detailed analysis of your proposed bill. However, insofar as the objectives and the general approach of the bill are concerned the proposal offers possibilities with which we are in complete sympathy. It is my hope that you will perfect and introduce this bill in order that it may be given fullest consideration. At a later date we will be happy to testify or present evidence based upon our further study and analysis of the measure.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
January 9, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have studied with unusual interest the draft bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuous full employment."

When the war is over all of us will turn our hands and minds to the creation of a new and vastly more prosperous America. Full employment at good wages, a better income and a better life for farmers, reasonable profits for businessmen, and security and opportunity for all—these will be the things toward which all of us will work.

The world we live in when the peace finally comes will be an unsettled world—potentially a revolutionary world. If we in America are to carry our full share of responsibility for stability in international affairs, we must have a strong and prosperous economy here at home.

We must make our system work effectively and efficiently in the interests of all of us. We must fully employ all our resources and all our manpower to raise our standards of living, to provide good jobs, vastly improved housing, medical care, and education for every family in the land. If we fail to do this, our system will have failed, and America will have failed to carry out its full responsibility for world economic leadership.

Much the greatest opportunity for expanding production and employment rests with free private enterprise. I am sure that the leaders of industry, labor, and agriculture will do everything within their power to bring about the fullest possible employment of our labor and other resources. But, in the last analysis, only the Federal Government, I believe, can assure the conditions under which free private enterprise can operate most effectively.

I therefore strongly favor the assumption of this responsibility by the Federal Government through legislation carefully drawn and fully debated by the Congress. The draft bill to establish a program for assuring full use of our resources of productive power and of manpower seems to me to be intelligent and practical steps toward carrying out this principle.

The construction of a national production and employment budget for our economy would, I think, represent an important advance in governmental and business planning and policy determination. The proposal to estimate each year the full employment capacity of the Nation and to set off against that capacity the consumption, investment, and normal governmental expenditures which actually are expected in that year is an excellent means of determining the required additional expenditures, private and governmental, which are needed to assure full employment. This method, I believe, is more practical than any proposal to set rigid limits upon the volume of aggregate investment expenditure which would balance our savings at full employment, year in and year out.

The National Budget principle also has the merit of focusing the attention of Congress and the executive agencies, as well as business and the general public, upon the several types of program by means of which aggregate expenditures on goods and services can be increased. I particularly like the provision that programs having the effect of increasing consumption and private investment should be thoroughly canvassed before additional Federal expenditures are resorted to.

Business investment should be stimulated in every reasonable way. New ventures should be encouraged, while monopolies should be sharply curbed.

Unless our businessmen are encouraged to move out aggressively to create new industries, to modernize old industries, and to seek expanding markets, both at home and

abroad, we cannot expect our economy to function fully in the public interest.

However, under the best of circumstances there will be occasions when the full investment necessary to provide full use of our productive capacity will not be forthcoming from private and normal governmental sources. Under these circumstances, the firm assurance that the Federal Government will provide the necessary additional expenditures to maintain markets is essential. For this reason, I am glad to see that the commitment of the Government to step in during the years when private expenditures fall short is clear and unambiguous.

All enterprises undertaken by the Government should, of course, be projects useful in their own right. There should be no unnecessary leaf raking or boondoggling. There are, however, almost unlimited projects of obvious social value which could be included in a long-range public-works program.

A firm commitment by Government to devote to useful public projects any portion of our national resources which would otherwise run to waste in idleness should actually minimize the contribution which the Federal Government will have to make to keep total national expenditures, public and private, up to full employment levels.

It will do this, I believe, by inducing consumers to spend more freely because of greater assurance of stability of jobs and income; by inspiring confidence on the part of business in the adequacy and stability of its future markets; and by assuring State and municipal governments dependable and growing bases on which to finance desirable improvement projects.

The success of such a program requires, of course, that the Federal Government shall have planned well in advance a useful program of public projects, carefully integrated with State and local public works, which could, if necessary, be set in motion on short notice. It would also require vastly improved reporting of the volume of actual and prospective private and State and local government capital expenditure. In this connection, it appears desirable to give closer attention than is explicitly provided in the bill to regional distribution of employment and expenditures.

I hope the bill will be fully discussed by the Congress. Public hearings, with testimony by Government officials and representatives of business, agriculture, and labor, and by other interested persons should contribute greatly to public understanding of the problems which lie ahead of us in peacetime and the best means of their solution.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
December 29, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Let me acknowledge your letter of December 16, asking for my comments about subcommittee print No. 1 of a draft bill "to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment." This will also supplement the acknowledgment of even date of Commissioner Ferguson of the Federal Housing Administration to your letter to him of December 22 on the same subject.

Upon reading this interesting bill, its contents seem to me to lie within that area of broadest general policy where the Congress itself to best equipped to make judgments. If the bill were to be enacted, its operations would, of course, affect the Government as a whole and the country as a whole; but the bill contains no technical materials presently which are peculiar to the problems and experience of the National Housing Agency.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, and reiterating that the content of the bill is within the realm of high policy, my comment, briefly, is as follows:

The objective of full employment, sought first and primarily through the medium of private enterprise, secondly, through public stimulation and assistance to private enterprise, and thirdly, by useful and necessary supplementary programs financed in whole or in part by the Government, is an objective upon which there is now fairly common agreement. It will interest you to know that the National Housing Agency, in its thinking about post-war housing, is pursuing these three lines of approach in the order and emphasis listed. Of course, our estimates of post-war housing need are based upon the consumer need for housing as well as upon the amount of housing construction required to contribute appropriately toward full employment.

Practically all of the policies and activities of the Government, as defined by law, have some direct or indirect effect upon the success of the country in achieving the objective of full employment under our present system of democracy and initiative. Therefore, machinery designed to focus governmental activity more clearly and dramatically upon this objective and to coordinate it more thoroughly toward this end at the highest policy level, seems to me very desirable. It also seems to me that the kind of focus and coorrdination at the high policy level, which the draft bill emphasizes, is even more important than detailed reorganization of existing governmental agencies.

In short, the draft bill deals with our most important problem next to winning the war and the making of a permanent peace, and I think that the provisions of the bill are well thought out. As to whether the mechanics of operation which the draft bill contemplates are the best available methods for the accomplishment of the objective, that would seem to me to be a matter within the province of the Congress and the Chief Executive rather than mine.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that it has no objection to the submission of this report on the draft bill.

Thanking you for the request that I comment upon this draft bill, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. BLANDFORD, Jr.
Administrator.

DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS AND WORLD PEACE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the subject upon which I am about to speak is one I have approached with extreme caution and gravity, realizing fully my role as an American legislator charged with the most solemn duties in what may be the most solemn hour of our Republic. For what is being done and written today concerning a post-war organization of the world by which the peace is to be kept will determine more than any other one thing the fate of our great country. And it is certain to determine the extent of our prosperity, the type of institutions we are to have, and whether in the years to come millions of American mothers are again to weep over the memory of brave sons buried on foreign battlefields their graves marked only by a white crosses.

Mr. President, I shudder—and I use the word advisedly—I shudder to think what will happen to the United States and to civilization itself if the present effort to build a community of nations within the framework of a durable peace does not succeed. I refer to the efforts now being made to create what in effect will be a new League of Nations as symbolized by the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks.

I say these things with the deliberation of a man who is much saddened by the need that forces him to speak. For, Mr. President, we are not on our way to peace. We are following a formula which will lead to certain and even more terrible wars in the future.

Dumbarton Oaks, I believe, or any agreement drawn up on similar premises, is ultimately doomed to failure. I state this not as a personal opinion. It is simply a matter of inevitable cause and effect, based on equally inevitable facts.

I believe, on the other hand, that there is a program which, in this modern world, can succeed, and may maintain the peace. This, too, is not stated as a personal opinion. It is a studied conclusion, again based on an objective analysis of the facts, facts which, if anyone wishes to read them in complete detail, can be found in the brilliant work, The Gentlemen Talk of Peace, by William B. Ziff, a work to which I shall again refer.

I feel that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are the product of a noble and humanitarian point of view. I think it will be accepted by his friends and foes alike that this effort by the President of the United States to create a world organization of peace-loving nations is the product of a desire to see a final end to this terrible business of war. As loyal patriots in this crisis, we have followed our Commander in Chief and have given his program every opportunity to prove itself. Those of us who have been in the Republican opposition feel that on this most important of all issues there has been no other choice to make, and that the President of the United States must in this emergency face the world equipped with a single American mandate—with a united nation behind it.

When in the course of events it becomes clear, however, that the proposals espoused by the President of the United States and the American State Department are based on a totally mistaken estimate of events, and that the result will be to lessen rather than to increase the security of this country in the world of the future, then it becomes equally necessary that we demand a new course, a course in which a proper and judicious mixture of realism is intermingled with the elements of hope and of humanitarian doctrine.

That time may now have arrived. There is little use in deluding ourselves further. The set of ideas on which the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is based cannot succeed. I, for one, hope that they will succeed, and that I am wrong in this estimate, but for reasons which I shall shortly outline for the consideration of Senators, I am prepared to say now that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals not only cannot succeed, they will never be placed into effect even provisionally. This is now perfectly clear to those who can read the signs of the times which are emblazoned on the very heavens. They are as plain as a pikestaff to those with eyes

to see that we are now at what may be the greatest turning point in human history.

I should like to caution the Members of the Senate that this is no longer a matter of party view. It is no longer a matter of saving face for those who may have mistakenly espoused a program which now turns out to be a sorry illusion. It is a matter, fellow Senators, of national life or death.

This is not an academic question concerned with protocol or questions of ordinary political maneuver. This is a question which has already been written in the blood of over half a million American boys and may yet be sealed with the blood of hundreds of thousands more. It is a question which involves the destruction of our property, the wastage of our national resources, and the blasting of the very nature of the institution by which our Republic is to be governed.

In the last World War 10,000,000 men met death on the battlefield. Another 21,000,000 were wounded, in addition to other millions who were listed as missing. Wartime conditions brought about as many as 30,000,000 of other deaths among the civilian population.

The economic and physical costs of this terrific orgy of blood-letting have been estimated as high as $338,000,000,000.

These figures are appalling enough, but they are minor in comparison to what is now occurring. Let me quote from Mr. Ziff's work:

> In addition to the millions who will have been killed on the battlefields when the present struggle is terminated, untold legions will have been permanently crippled, great masses of men will emerge maimed in mind and spirit as well as in body. In military casualties the Germans alone have lost close to 5,000,000 men; the Russians, perhaps 7,500,000; the Chinese, 4,500,000; and the Japanese, somewhere around 2,000,000. The civilian deaths due to the war are upwards of 13,000,000 for China and 11,000,000 for the Soviet Union. Over 3,000,000 Jews have been exterminated by Germany in the abattoirs of Poland. The Poles must have lost among all classes of citizens as many as 4,000,000. At least 40,000,000 people of all nationalities have been torn up by their roots in Europe and perhaps as many as 30,000,000 in Asia. Uncounted millions will have been destroyed by epidemics and disabled by wounds or starvation. The figures of those afflicted with soul-sicknesses and dangerous psychoses will dwarf completely those of any other war in history.

It is pointed out that—

> Without taking into account imponderable losses of economic destruction, the actual cost of the present war was probably over $500,000,000,000 by the beginning of 1944. The United States alone was spending money at the rate of $276,000,000 a day.

In the over-all global cost, World War No. 2 will probably run into the fabulous sum of two thousand billion dollars. Even in these days of astronomical figures this amount staggers the imagination. It is not merely a figure, Mr. President, but it represents steel and coal and oil, chemicals, and a vast accumulation of human energy and effort. It represents a wastage of what should be the inalienable possession of the peoples of the world and the heritage of our unborn children. It spells for the next generation the heavy threat of financial ruin, and promises them the economics of scarcity instead of plenty. It does not take into consideration unseen costs which are virtually measureless. How shall we replace, for example, the minerals from our soil which are now sent so freely to Europe and Asia in the shape of food products, plastics, and other materials derived from agriculture?

A study of these appalling facts should make it clear to anyone that we can no longer dally with the present emergency. We cannot dance after some new Pied Piper of Hamelin.

Impassioned zealots, no matter how noble their motives, may in this emergency prove dangerous to our Republic despite—and I say this after studied thought—despite the fact that they are situated in high places.

Within a short time the President of the United States will again meet in discussion with the Prime Minister of the British Empire and with our other ally, Marshal Stalin, head of all the Russias.

Let us cut away the obscuring cover of fine phrases which hides the real object of this meeting from view. That real object is plain to all of us—it is how to save the peace after it has been won, how to keep the United Nations still united when the war is over.

The misgivings with which the future may well be faced are pointedly brought to our attention by the situation in Europe, for the principal members of the United Nations are now following policies which have little to do with that mutual cooperation so desperately required by humanity which has already endured far more war and blood-letting than it can stand.

The meeting between the three great statesmen is not intended as a pleasant session of routine discussions. It is intended as a desperate effort to mend differences which are now all but unbridgeable.

If this meeting does not succeed, and it appears to me perfectly clear that it will not, then we must start all over again in our efforts to find a basis for a common peace.

Let us survey the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and look into the practical and realistic reasons why they fly in the face of fate.

No matter how one looks at it, the plan is for a new League of Nations—only this time a league with teeth in it. This means we must have a world set-up embracing some 66 independent states and several more, such as Iraq, which are presumedly on their way toward independence.

Of these three-score and six independent states, only four are in a position which could possibly enable them to meet the problems of the present century. Great Britain, unfortunately, is not one of these four. The four are the United States of America, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the Republic of China, and the United States of Brazil. I include the latter country in the category of potential masters of the globe since it fits the circumstances by which tomorrow's power pattern is to be measured. All Brazil lacks today is people.

I remind the Senate that it was Mr. Ziff who wrote that other great realistic work which so strongly influenced our Nation at another critical moment early in the war. It was called The Coming Battle of Germany. His new work is, I think, of even greater importance to the American people. My attention was called to it some 5 months ago when together with others I had the privilege of seeing it in galley form. We can judge the future by the past. During these months I have stood by and waited to see the developments and have been literally amazed to note with what exactness the forecasts made by him have come true. He stated, for example, that the Atlantic Charter would not be backed up by its authors and would be quietly abandoned; that the Soviet Union would install the Lublin committee by unilateral action as the rule of Poland; that our foreign policy would force De Gaulle into the lap of the Soviet Union. He described the situation in Greece in detail and predicted with accuracy the subsequent struggle which has taken place there between the ELAS resistance forces and the British.

Almost in the words subsequently used by Prime Minister Churchill, he forecast that the United Nations would seek to compensate Poland for the territory lost to the Soviet Union by giving her East Prussia and those portions of the Reich east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers, and that the Germans would be removed from these territories by a great population exchange. He forecast the view of the War Crimes Commission set up by the United Nations, which has now finally declined to carry out the previous threats to try German leaders criminally. His statement of the Chinese situation and other situations generally have been coming true day by day with uncanny accuracy.

My attention was further called to all this by a large number of editorials which have been appearing day by day in the various newspapers throughout the country, as well as in my own section. These newspaper editorials have emphasized the things which I have noted and which I express here. Among them is an editorial from a newspaper which has won the Pulitzer prize for the excellence of its editorials, namely, the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, which not only typifies the highest standard of journalism throughout the Nation but also the way the people of our section of the country are beginning to think. In one of these editorials to which I refer the Bismarck Tribune states that unless we elect to do something now, there most certainly will be another war. It calls attention to the fact that "the nature and extent of that war is indicated with probable accuracy by William B. Ziff in his new book, The Gentlemen Talk of Peace."

I have noted the editorials of such representative newspapers as the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, the Jackson (Miss.) News, the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal, the Pontiac (Mich.) Press, the Denver (Colo.) Post, the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democratic Times, the Birming-

ham (Ala.) Age-Herald, and scores of other newspapers, large and small.

The opinions expressed by these publications are not the opinions of people in a few large cities, they are the views of the average run of people of the United States; they are the grass-roots reactions; they are the expressions which you and I must heed if we are to feel the actual pulse of our country and know what the common man is now really thinking.

There is an indication that the people in the grass-roots part of the country at least are becoming confused and angry at all this fumbling and juggling of our national requirements for future peace.

They know, too, the promise on which the Dumbarton Oaks plan is based, and that the small countries like Finland and scores of others are no longer living organisms in terms of the post-war future, and that they will not exist as sovereign entities maintaining their own armies, navies, currency, and diplomatic corps.

Let us take Bulgaria as a single example so that we may see this condition outlined in clear terms. How can such a state discharge the obligations of a modern manufacturing and trading power? It obviously cannot. An independent political fragment, it cannot be compared in terms of organized social strength with such a state as the vital and self-contained United States of America, or the Soviet Union. Such national independence no longer makes sense in terms of economic production, trade, or military relations.

Such states will be forever at the mercy of their larger neighbors. If they are not conquered by force of arms, they will be conquered economically, and perhaps ideologically as well. They are no longer free agents, a fact which we are compelled to consider in our estimate of the nature of the world in which we live.

For we are living in the midst not only of war, but of a tremendous international revolution which derives its force from the great changes technology has brought about. Yesterday Bulgaria could manufacture muskets, or even cannon, as well as any other state. It could attend to the wants of its citizens as easily as could the largest nation, and, if attacked, might hold up the invader for many months until help could reach it.

Today, none of this is the case. Today, in the air age, a small state cannot resist invasion for more than a matter of hours, or, at most, days. Every new invention places it at an increasing disadvantage. Does anyone dream, for example, that Bulgaria can manufacture and mass-produce airplanes, motor cars, and the other paraphernalia of a modern civilization at war or at peace, with the same capacity as the United States or of the Soviet Union?

These are the physical facts which must be considered.

England itself, in the long-term future, will no longer be a great and powerful state, but a small island nation precariously situated off the edge of Europe. If Europe is totally held by a single power, war will find England in grave danger, cut off from her resources in Asia and the South Seas exactly as if she did not possess them. We had some warning of this in the current struggle, when Great Britain was deprived of the rubber of Malaya and the East Indies, exactly as the United States was cut off, although these territories were the physical property of Britain. In the air age such a separation from the sources of material power can prove fatal. Military men tell me that if Europe were held by a single power it would be literally possible to "Pearl Harbor" Great Britain overnight.

The era of finance power also is declining, a circumstance which will prove extremely hurtful to Britain and her future.

I am not an aviation expert. I only present the views of one of the ablest experts in this country. Mr. Ziff argues—and the future will determine whether he is right—

> Our interest in the British situation would arise alone from a single fact which cannot be ignored—geographically, strategically, Great Britain is to us as the eye is to the human brain and the human nervous system. It is an extension of our primary economy. If Great Britain were to go down or to be attached to Europe, the whole chain of island defenses which now secures our hemisphere against assault, would disappear. The situation will be very clear when I point out the great ease with which we are able to attack the Germans without any real possibility of retaliation in kind against us. If Great Britain were in the possession of a hostile Europe, the shoe would be on the other foot, and it would be we who would be under attack. And then, too, there is her Dominion, Canada, with her 3,000 miles of contiguous territory.

To return to the analysis of the real situation which exists, of the four potential masters of the globe, there are only two which fit the conditions under which power can be held. One of these is the United States of America. The other is Soviet Russia. It is these two states alone which can determine whether there is to be war or peace and who will finally decide under what conditions the new world order of tomorrow is to be effected.

I do not urge that we ignore the other states of the world. Quite the contrary. I think that they and their interests must be intimately consulted, but that they cannot be consulted on the basis of the type of organization which has been projected by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. This is only because such an organization cannot exist side by side with the present unequal grouping of sovereign states, with their power politics and partisan hopes and views.

Those who are attempting to implement the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will assert that they will put an end to power politics, and an end to national partisanships, by the creation of world courts and world agreements of various kinds. They admit that none of this worked in reference to the last League, but this time they are going to add force in the shape of police power to compel lawbreakers and criminal nations to keep the peace.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the creation of an international police force is a virtual impossibility. Even if it were created, as Mr. Ziff says:

> The terminal results would be nothing else than the erection of a world superstate. Whoever controlled this world police force would control the globe, irrespective of constitutions or fine legalisms which might be written into the international law. The police force itself would immediately become an object of intrigue and conspiracy, with various groups and states trying to muscle themselves into absolute control. It would form a new Praetorian Guard which would establish itself finally as the ruling caste.

This is pretty well understood today, and the diplomats no longer argue the point. What they do argue, however, is that the world itself can be divided into spheres of influence in which the major states will exercise police power.

I am utterly amazed at the naïveté and innocence which prompt such fantastic beliefs as this. If it is possible, for example, for one large state to police a number of small states, who do you think will be the final boss? How do you think the small states will vote, for example, at the councils of the League? Is it your idea that they will vote against the boss when the boss has both the military weight and the legal right to suddenly come in upon them on one pretext or another and throw the existing regime out on its ear?

Did we not see every evidence of this in the German penetration of central Europe and the Balkans? The Germans took Austria, Hungary, Rumania, and the other states of that region by diplomatic, ideological, and economic means, long before they attached them to the Axis as military appendages. Germany was the big market for its small agrarian neighbors. It supplied them with manufactured goods, and by its control of the money exchange it had the little states always waiting hat in hand, humble supplicants before their wealthy overlord.

This is a situation which, as Mr. Ziff describes it—

> can hardly be altered by some international code which all parties are bound to respect. Any theory of industrial equalization or guaranteed access to markets and raw materials by all countries is compelled to assume a limitation of sovereignty on the part of each state over its own territory. This would mean the end of the state itself and a new social order. As long as the present political divisions exist there are no controls which can be instituted which would have the slightest real effect.

In addition, I should mention another fact. In competition for markets the dictatorial state possesses—ominously for us, Mr. President—immeasureable advantages over a free nation like the United States. A dictator's mere presence as a competitor is sure to involve manipulations, subsidies, and concealed discriminations completely destructive to the law of free enterprise which presumably governs the international market.

For example, let us take one of our largest corporations, such as the Standard Oil Co. In competition with a dictatorial state, the Standard Oil Co. would be as a pigmy compared to a giant. The Standard Oil Co. is, after all, in business to make money. It is not an extension of the State Department of the

United States of America. It cannot be given surreptitious orders by the American military.

But a comparable trade organization, in the hands of a dictatorial state, could easily have other objectives than those of pure trade. Its objectives need not be to make money. They might easily be political, or even military. In any competition, the dictatorial state is able to employ its own kind of bookkeeping, depending upon what the goals are, a condition which our largest corporation could hardly meet.

I tell you this because I would like to make it clear that, in any competition between ourselves and a large authoritarian state for control of the smaller nations—a competition which, incidentally, is certain to go forward, as it did before this war—in such a competition it is we who will lose, since the authoritarian state will begin the struggle with overpowering advantages.

The author states that—

> Each of the major countries involved in the so-called new League of Nations will be concerned with a totally different set of national problems and goals. England cannot give up India without volcanic results in her material situation. China cannot yield on the question of industrialization of the East. The Soviets must seek outlets on warm water. The western states must gaze with frank misgivings on Soviet control of the Balkans, whether by military occupation or by the indirect domination of so-called "friendly" governments.

And he poses the inescapable fact which we have been hesitant to mention—

> The instant the Soviet Union sits on the blue waters of the Adriatic it occupies an impregnable military position, outflanking all that remains of Europe. Europe then would be impossible to hold, should the Soviets determine to devour it.

Let me digress for a minute at this point. I am not anti-Soviet. I am not anti-anything. I am only pro-the United States and pro-peace. I think it would be tragic if through our ignorance of the circumstances now operating in the world, events should finally throw us willy-nilly into conflict with the Soviet Union or any of our other great international neighbors.

I, for one, wish all people in the world well. I see no reason why, if we realistically face the facts, we should not be able to create a new and workable world order in which all of us will be able to retain the institutions to which we are attached and which are part of the tradition and historic views we hold as a people.

Returning to the question of a new League of Nations, it is ridiculous to assume that there will be any free agents in the world, independent of the conditions of power by which the future will be organized. For instance, Mr. President, we now recognize the independent existence of the three Baltic countries, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Can anyone doubt that these countries will in the real sense become a portion of the Soviet Union itself, irrespective of whether they continue on the map as allegedly independent states? Who, then, will govern their foreign views and their voting at any council of states? Who do you think governs that of Iraq, if not Great Britain? And who do you think governs that of Cuba or Nicaragua, if not the United States of America? The idea of their free and independent voting is a fiction which can only in the end lead to the gravest trouble.

It is proposed that there be five great states which will rule the world and sit in the central council of the League, the camouflaged power body which is to determine how events are finally to shape themselves. One of these is the United States; another is Soviet Russia. A third is the Republic of France. France has been ruined and desperately hurt by this war, and apparently is well within the Russian sphere of influence. No ruler in France today can afford to ignore the fact that a single dominant power is emerging on the European Continent, and that the major political party of the French State is now the Communist Party.

Another state is China. The condition of China again becomes one of peculiar and particular interest to us. Let us again face the realities. China and Britain must be at loggerheads in the world of the future. China is a state of approximately 500,000,000 people. The demographers, or students of population increase, tell us that by 1970 China may have a population of 800,000,000, granted that it is allowed to industrialize and to introduce modern methods of sanitation and feeding. An industrialized China of these dimensions, cooped up in narrow coastal areas, will look hungrily toward the south, where are located the great rice-bearing fields inhabited by a kindred people and now in the possession of western nations, principally the British. When 8,000,000 people die of starvation alone in a single year on the Yellow River, we can be certain that Chinese policy will gravitate inexorably toward the rice-bearing areas of Burma, Indochina, and Thailand. The Chinese also will look hungrily toward the islands of the East Indies—empty, rich paradises with immense stores of raw materials, well capable of absorbing perhaps several hundred million settlers. In the air age, these lands can no longer be protected by a far-away island citadel.

If we do not understand in advance the realities of the power forms of tomorrow, it may be deemed certain that the people of many other states do. We haver never had to compete in terms of power politics in the past while others have. The net result is what we have seen in Europe, where the British and the Russians are quietly at each others' throats in an effort to enforce their conception of the future upon the populations of strategically situated European and Asiatic countries.

I believe it is perfectly plain that the British, in their endeavor to install antiquated machinery of government in the shape of monarchial regimes throughout Europe, are not going to succeed. They will fail. The power of the present revolutionary situation in Europe is certain to defeat them. The small, modern state is no longer economically sound.

The British—and ourselves, if we support British policy—will find themselves guilty of the greatest of all political crimes, namely, failure. To the emaciated people of Europe, again to quote Mr. Ziff, "racked in body, sick of the world they live in, humiliated by the very conditions of existence, the declarations of our diplomatic leaders will seem empty and unattractive."

At the best, Europeans will be badly confused as to our purposes and our capacity to wield power. We may even find ourselves in league with the remnants of the old reactionary regimes against the underground groups, a result which would mean a major tragedy to our policy and bankruptcy to American diplomacy.

This type of intervention cannot fail to throw Europe directly into the hands of the extreme radical elements, as was the case when the western nations so mistakenly intervened in Russia after the last war in an effort to crush the rising Communist state. They succeeded only in hardening resistance, and in making certain the success of the Communist state.

Under the Dumbarton Oaks scheme, as it is now envisaged, the struggle for control must go forward. It is inevitable, as it is also, in my judgment, inevitable that we would lose it.

Perhaps the greatest weakness of Dumbarton Oaks is the reliance upon force and power to keep alive an antiquated world. When I say an antiquated world, I mean a world whose political forms have become outmoded, a world of small, archaic states no longer able to fulfill the functions of government, of trade, of manufacture, and defense in relation to their citizens. The result of this hodgepodge can be only a continuation of the old struggle for control, this time under different auspices and under cover of a new League of Nations. The smaller state cannot be an aggressor any more, and the larger state will have been given the moral authority to dominate and conquer its neighbors.

Every American must realize that the grave danger, in or outside of Dumbarton Oaks, with its unrealistic attitude toward the world, is that whoever controls the Eurasian land mass is the potential master of the globe. In short, let us put it in this way: If a single power is able to control Europe, that single power may also be able to control Asia. It certainly will control Africa. It will then have in its possession more than nine-tenths of the population of the world, and a similar proportion of the world's physical resources. Look at the world as a whole, and it will be seen that under those circumstances the United States would be the center of what the military men call a double-envelopment movement. It would virtually be surrounded on all sides. Instead of the great oceans protecting us, we would find Asia only 56 miles away from the northernmost tip of North America. The great hump of Brazil would be nearer to Old World Africa than to the United States.

Those are physical circumstances which we cannot omit examining. The United States is the richest country, the

greatest prize in the world for any future conqueror. It therefore is the one with the most to lose. It must consider most carefuly its relationship to the future in terms of the new facts which have arisen. Either we are going to be able to make a world organization which will work, or we are going to be forced to face the future in such terms as to prevent the creation in the world of any single power overwhelmingly larger than we, or capable of greater potential military and economic strength than our own. To do less than this would be to court disaster.

In chapter after chapter, Mr. Ziff's book traces the ineffectuality of peace treaties in the past. At no time in history have any of the treaties and arrangements which have been made to keep the peace lasted longer than the expediencies of the nations involved. No matter what agreements were arrived at, they were always vacated by the national need or by the arrival of some new political factor or ruler. I challenge anyone to show a single arrangement which, though solemnly entered into, has been lasting. National morality in the long run has always been determined by the national need. One has only to look at the way in which we entered Iran. I do not criticize it. I approve. Similarly, we occupied Iceland and Greenland though they were the properties of a sovereign who was friendly to us. His country was occupied by Nazi armies. I refer, of course, to good King Christian of Denmark.

Despite the fine phrases which have been uttered in reference to Dumbarton Oaks, no concert of powers in history has started out with poorer prospects than this one. Everyone came together and mouthed fine legalisms, but when put to the first test of strength, Dumbarton Oaks shows itself even more flimsy than the previous concert of Europe, which originated in Berlin; or its successor, the late and unlamented League of Nations.

We find the Soviet Union, for example, asserting its willingness to agree to an arrangement, but its unwillingness to allow itself to be policed in case it should be adjudged in the wrong. This, of course, would make a complete farce of any proceeding. We note the Soviet Union refusing to attend the important aviation conference in Chicago on the plea that one of the attending powers, the Swiss Republic, was in reality Fascist. At the same conference we find Great Britain insisting on the creation of international cartels, which, in effect, would freeze the carrying trade of the world. The United States, to its credit, refused to agree, which, of course, meant no agreement whatsoever.

At every turn in the game we see exactly the same result—no agreement. We have noted the Soviet Union and Great Britain struggling with each other over the potential spoils in Europe, a struggle, which as I have stated, is certain to end in British discomfiture. The supporting factors which lend themselves to victory in this struggle are no longer in British control.

It is almost hopeless to believe that we are going to be able to make a Dumbarton Oaks world. Such a league would be based on the most erroneous of all assumptions, that it is going to be possible to create a practical league of nations independent of the terms of the peace conference itself.

This separation from the stream of power facts which dominate the physical affairs of the world can only confine the deliberations within a vacuum and condemn them to sterility. The discussions can be little more than diplomatic shadow boxing and reflect only the exigencies of underlying power politics.

It is dangerous to expect that one can ignore the real factors which are operating in the world, and yet still achieve a successful peace. It is useless to believe, for example, that the Soviet Union can be excluded from warm water ports on all the big oceans by some type of arrangement or agreement, or that Russia will fail to take advantage of its present opportunities to make the Soviet State secure in all directions—in short, to make its position in all respects an invulnerable one. One can hardly blame the Soviet Union for this. Nor can we expect that the shrewd, practical-minded leaders of the Soviet will recede from this position for the sake of the legal Dumbarton Oaks obscurities. In my opinion, it is a certainty that the Soviet Union wants the Dardanelles and intends to have them. This may constitute a problem of the first magnitude which will have to be solved in some way. It is simply purblind for us to ignore this very real element behind the aspirations of the U. S. S. R.

In the same breath it must be stated that Great Britain will not allow its entire physical position to crumble without some proper alternative being offered it. If the imperial world is to collapse, Britain will be a poor nation and perhaps militarily weak as well, unless some method can be found to refit it into a reorganized world. Until such a method is forthcoming, it is certain that the British people, led by their able Prime Minister, will bend every possible effort to make their own position secure, even if it means the use of the terrifying expedients now to be observed in Greece, Italy, and elsewhere.

The same condition goes for China, and for all the other elements which go to make up the world economy. These are the real, the physical elements which exist, and Mr. President, I warn that they can be ignored only at our own peril.

If there is to be a world league which is to keep the peace and to keep the nations of the earth from each other's throats, the time to create it is now. Decisions are being made now by the unilateral action of the powers. The time for palaver is past. If we and the other nations believe in an international league which in some fashion is to keep the peace, the agreements must be made at once. If this cannot be achieved, the Dumbarton Oaks plan must be junked as a diplomatic blunder, and we must reorient our thinking all over again.

We might start by reasoning that though we have already won one world war and undoubtedly will win this one, a third such victory would well-nigh ruin us.

The men who worked at Dumbarton Oaks are unquestionably skilled in diplomacy. They are unquestionably, as is the President of the United States, sincere. So, I believe, are leaders and peace delegates of all of the nations. I think they and all the people are desperately sick of these recurring disasters and would like to see a final end to them. There is, in my judgment, a way by which this can be done. The general outlines to that way have been pointed up briefly in this discussion and in detail by Mr. Ziff.

In my opinion and in the opinion of others in this Congress who have yet to make themselves heard, some such proposal as suggested, represents an alternative to pure isolationism to those who oppose Dumbarton Oaks. If the Dumbarton Oaks plan cannot work, to them pure isolationism is no more satisfactory and will in the end they feel see us disastrously hurt. The great fault with Dumbarton Oaks is the great fault of Versailles.

Without exception the authors of these plans seek the benefits of a peaceful world, but are unwilling to create the conditions which would guarantee it. Their poor, blind caution and conventional old-line diplomacy suffer from that gravest of faults: It is unrealistic. Realism now demands that an end be put to the grab-bag of small states, and that the world be reorganized along lines of the sound, modern economy.

The small state today is merely a battleground in which the bigger states can compete. It serves no useful purpose. A modern, living state must have the capacity to fulfill all functions in reference to its citizens. It must be able to defend them and to provide the raw materials required in industry as well as the electric power and other sources of industrial strength. This means it must stretch over a wide area, reaching into tropic, semitropic, and temperate climes. It must have great space like the Soviet Union so that if it is attacked, it can fall back. It must possess decentralized sources of manufacture, as did the Russians. If the Russian industrial region had ended at the Leningrad-Moscow-Stalingrad line, Russia would today be a vassal of the German Empire.

If the world could be consolidated into a number of regions, each of comparatively equal size, the impulse to war would largely be at an end. None of these regions would be so small as to make attack attractive. Each would posseess the resources and the internal market which would make them largely self-sufficient and able to get along with each other.

The world breaks down naturally into such great regional areas, which Mr. Ziff refers to as "power aggregates."

War between them would not be inviting—

He points out—

and would logically be resorted to only under the most extreme provocation. The differences of these regional units with each other could be resolved by simple agreement since they would no longer be complicated by the fears, suspicions, and temptations provided in the present political splintering of the world.

Thus we would settle at their source all the dangerous questions which unite to create international instability, derangement, dislocation, and disorder. We would create a system of regionalism which would be sane, rational, and genuinely globalist in character.

It is of the gravest importance to us that, whether the world can be so constituted or not, some such arrangement be made in reference to the entire west. By the west I mean North and South America, and the total group of islands which control the approaches to our shores. This would involve a consolidation of North and South America, and experts say, although as a layman I only present their views and do not myself so urge, the British Isles together with the great bulk of the islands of the Pacific are included. Here, they say, would be at once an impregnable military situation, which could be assaulted from no side without the gravest risk on the part of the attacker. Here would be something almost equally as important—an extension of our frontiers into new vistas, by which our economic system could find a new West for exploitation and development. The tremendous surplus of manufacturing instruments and plants which will exist in America after the war could then be usable in the development of these huge territories. They would not be separate from each other, but would possess a common government, a common army, a common currency, and a common and widely expanded prosperity. Here is a plan worthy of the noble imagination of Americans, interested in a prosperous and safe future.

As an American Senator I feel it is nothing more nor less than my duty to present the plan, as distinguished from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, to my fellow Senators upon this floor.

In a day of rocket guns which can spout deadly projectiles 50 miles into the air and bombard our cities across entire oceans, or of massive attacks which military men assure me can be directed against us over the north polar routes or across the narrow gap of water separating Africa from the hump of Brazil, it is clear there will be no security for any of us in this hemisphere unless there is a true hemispheric unity. What is there so frightening about this noble and entirely reasonable proposal? It offers to all the states and all the persons involved tremendous self-contained markets, direct access to all raw materials required by our humming factories, a higher standard of living to all concerned, and the ultimate in cooperative friendship. Above all, it allows for a real security plan which would effectively prevent anyone from attacking the states of this hemisphere, a plan based upon the true long-term mutuality of outlook which should distinguish the west in its view toward the future.

In my judgment and that also, I believe, of other Members of Congress who have yet to make themselves heard, this plan constitutes the only possible alternative to the failure of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

In his own words, Mr. Ziff's proposals "can lay no claim to perfection. Nevertheless it would mean the taking of a tremendous stride forward on the part of the human race in terms of world-wide social organization and would appear to remove the largest part of the instigation to international crime, by adjusting the world's political divisions to its economic frontiers. The major claim to be made for this design is that it fits in with the premises of the workaday world in a technical age. It presents no obstacle to the efficient operation of the earth's machinery or the use of its resources. Man would be able to take his breath for a new plunge forward into eternal progression."

Today, our present foreign policy seems destined to failure, yet many of the gentlemen who belong to my party have elected to bind themselves to this policy and to this failure.

I do not protest because this is bad party policy alone. I do so because it is also bad Americanism. It is unrealistic, unsound, and uneconomic. It destroys the last vestige of independent thinking in this country, and deprives us of the benefit of that great institution which exists even in monarchial England, where it is referred to as "His Majesty's loyal opposition."

The torch has now been thrown to the younger men of Congress, to men who dare think outside the conventional grooves which the ruling political powers have graven for them.

Those who have held so strongly for an international league propound it as the sole alternative to isolationism. This is a sorry untruth which can only confuse the American people as to the real situation and the real issues.

The proper remedy does not lie in any of these extremes. It lies in an intelligently directed regionalism by which the political organization of the world can be brought into line with economic and social realities.

When Mr. Roosevelt returns from his historic meeting with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin, he must have in his hands a commitment from them by which the issues facing the world can be determined now. We expect him to bring back the bacon if there is anything at all to the mission on which he leaves and the premises on which it is based. He must return to us with more than fair promises and glittering words, for the hour is dangerously late. Either he must possess a mandate to which the other great states have subscribed, and an assurance which can be placed into effect now, or we shall have found ourselves confounded by another Versailles, or perhaps even another Munich. The questions of Poland, Greece, Iran, and all the other dangerous questions now confronting the world, must have some practical resolution in terms of agreement now. We must know now what is intended in reference to the future of Germany or we shall find ourselves at each other's throats finally, debating ideological questions and questions of self-interest, when that piratical state shall come to an end and be occupied by the troops of the United Nations.

If the discussions to be held between the three great leaders of the United Nations are again to result without decision, if they turn out to be only a mirage of words, then we must resolutely turn our backs on this fantasy of world leagues and world courts. We must find another and more realistic course by which the ultimate security of our hemisphere will be guarded. If necessary, we must utilize to the full the bargaining power granted us by our present military superiority and economic position.

It is futile to turn to the international league soothsayers. Their schemes have been blasted to kingdom come by the actions of the nations themselves, as well as by the inevitable logic of events. We see all of the states reaching out to solidify their own power, with very little reference to the fine pledges made at Dumbarton Oaks.

We note the Russians taking issue with Kent Cooper of the Associated Press, as to what constitutes freedom of the press and alleging that theirs is infinitely superior to ours. In Yugoslavia Britain it is said to have delayed shipment of relief supplies gathered in the United States, an act which is charged with political implications. We note the British, accused of political terrorism in Palestine, acting against the unfortunate Jews, completely oblivious to the opinions of the Mandates Commission of the all but defunct League of Nations, which charged them with turning the mandate upside down. We see Britain acting with a high hand in India and endeavoring to turn the clock back in the various states of western Europe by imposing the rule of monarchial regimes.

In Poland, the Russians are accused of having liquidated the liberal elements, and of destroying those very patriots who fought in the underground for our side against the Germans.

Mr. President, this morning I picked up yesterday's Washington Star, and what did I find? I found an article dealing with Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, sister of the Indian nationalist leader Nehru, who will speak in Washington tonight. What does she say about Dumbarton Oaks? She says:

> The Dumbarton Oaks proposals for world security simply repeat old talk about disarmaments and sanctions.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We feel capable of solving our own problems and that we have a right to do it without interference. The complete unanimity demanded by Viceroy Wavell and Prime Minister Churchill as a condition for Indian independence could only be achieved in a dictatorship.

So says the sister of the greatest leader in India next to Gandhi.

I have before me a newspaper article headlined London, January 25, as follows:

> Former War Minister Leslie Hore-Belisha said today the Atlantic Charter and Dumbarton Oaks proposals were already "becoming obscured."

We note Lord Woolton, Minister of Reconstruction, urging Britain to undertake a trade war on a big scale and advising his country that they should seek overseas trade "rather than concentrate on filling needs at home." France declares she will never accept foreign inter-

ference or any jurisdiction by a world security organization over her colonies.

Mr. President, that is what France thinks of Dumbarton Oaks. The assurances written in the Atlantic Charter have been disavowed by their very authors under circumstances so tragic as to make all commitments, pledges, and treaties appear worthless.

I have mentioned Britain, Russia, and France, but I must exclude no nation. They are all in the same unhappy position of self-seeking, of attempting to guard their own boundaries and their own future prosperity and security without reference to what may happen to the others.

Must I remind the Senate that these are not events which occurred previous to the Dumbarton Oaks pledges? These are events which have followed Dumbarton Oaks and they are being placed into effect by the cannon and airplanes of our allies and by the inexorable forces of events which are acting without us while our statesmen nobly tilt with the windmills of an international league.

Is it not time that there is inserted in the deliberations of American statesmen a little common sense and a little proper regard for the physical future of Americans? Is it not time that the lives and property of Americans be given some thought in place of this vague set of international pipe-dreams which will be adjudged by history no less silly and no less futile than those which so ingloriously failed when the late and unlamented League of Nations collapsed of its own dead weight?

If there is to be justice, let there be justice for American mothers, for the American taxpayer, and for the American dead whose bodies now rot in foreign soil clear around the globe. If there is to be justice, there must be justice toward all, not only to the struggling states of Europe and Asia but to the dead and wounded, the orphaned, and to the rest of us who now stagger beneath the burden of the most colossal war debt in the history of mankind. If there is to be justice, Mr. President, let there be justice to the millions of unborn, who of right deserve protection against a recurrence of this terrible black night of destructive evil.

Before God, and in the high name of justice, let us determine that this disaster shall not recur again.

Are we to wait forever in this sad valley of delusion called Dumbarton Oaks—wait for still further conferences from which nothing can result; wait for the signing of still more documents, which under analysis will turn out to be as meaningless as those which preceded them? Must our minds remain paralyzed while this is taking place?

We cannot crucify the hopes of mankind upon a cross of phony international legalisms. We cannot continue to remain as we are today, our hands tied, our minds frozen in the psychology of donothingism. Everywhere decisions vital to our continued existence are being taken. The decisions by which the postwar world is being formed are being made now. The face of the future world is being hammered into shape by events and circumstances which we pretend do not exist. And we sit with our hands in the sands of international dope dreams.

Let us put an end to these fantastic dreams of the millennium—dreams which fly into the face of reality. Let us endeavor, in cooperation with our allies, to effect a common-sense reorganization of the globe. In short, let us attempt to place in effect those real measures and opportunities which are open to us and within out power to implement.

Now is the time to act if humankind is to be saved and to be spared another and even more terrifying disaster whose coming is even now discernible.

If in this crisis our eyes are to be blinded by such mirages as those exemplified by Dumbarton Oaks, we shall allow the opportunities for sane and international organization to pass us by. It is we in the Senate who shall have to answer to history for an omission which will be regarded as a crime against the American people, their future, and the future well-being of all mankind.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I regret that more Senators were not in the Chamber to hear the address of the Senator from North Dakota. I do not mean to imply that I agree with him in all his conclusions; but he delivered a thought-provoking and interesting address, and I am glad that I was present to hear it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. It is always a pleasure to hear the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I am glad that he is our neighbor.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR WARTIME CRISES

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I shall not consume much time with the few remarks which I have to make. With the present attendance in the Chamber, I might well ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD without reading, but I shall be as brief as possible.

In the past several weeks American thinking has been changed by startling and rude events. Almost overnight the people of the United States have been moved from a sense of extreme optimism to one of sober concern by announcements of grave conditions on the war front, on the diplomatic front, and at home.

There was the sudden turn on the battlefields of Europe. Allied leaders—both civil and military—altered their sights to a "long bitter road ahead." The crises and strife in Greece, Poland, Italy, and other liberated countries are serious threats to Allied unity. Disturbing diplomatic controversies have come into the open, and the consequent outbursts of public opinion have severely strained harmony and cooperation.

At home the picture is equally disturbing. Widespread shortages—in war materials, labor, food supplies, and other civilian goods—are revealed by administration officials. The slump in war production brought a sharp crack-down on manpower and the curtailment of civilian production. Agitation is growing for a labor draft and more stringent controls over industrial mobilization. Reconversion plans are tossed aside as industry buckles down to military demand. Dwindling stocks of food—"at the lowest point since the war began," according to O. P. A.—led to cancelation of stamps and increased rationing. On every side sober news is reminding the American people "there are still two wars to be won."

Compare this picture with the general climate of opinion generated throughout the country during the summer and late fall. Those were the days when optimism and confidence flew high. Allied armies were winning tremendous victories on every front—there was talk from high quarters of a speedy victory. Winnie and Joe and Frank were the best of friends, with no visible difference to mar the smooth course of their countries' relations. There were comparatively no problems of liberated countries.

At home American labor and industry were highly praised, as they should be, for their superhuman contribution to war production. Civilian restrictions were being eased; rationing was lifted from many products; and the food situation was pictured as growing increasingly better. Plans for reconversion were rapidly going forward—with Government leading the field. War agencies held out hopes of early relaxation of controls. It was an atmosphere of comparative quietude. We almost forgot there was a war.

The momentum of this pleasant state of affairs carried just a little beyond November. Then the sharp reversal set in, which has left our people confused and bewildered. Unable to understand the turn of events, they want to know what happened. What went wrong with the victory that was upon us? What about the plans for reconversion, the stocks of food, war, and civilian materials that were on hand?

The situation calls for a responsible explanation, but before we consider those that have been offered by certain officials of the Government, let us document the conditions which have turned the rosy landscape of last summer into the dark winter now enveloping the situation at home and abroad.

Consider for a moment the public opinion generated from May to November with regard to the home front.

The manpower situation was viewed by officials, with minor exceptions, as satisfactory. Here are a few of the statements:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], in nominating Roosevelt at the July Democratic Convention, said:

> Our industry, our labor, our agriculture, our finance, our manpower * * * have all been fused into an irrestible stream whose momentum will drive the war lords of the Nazis and Nipponese back.

President Roosevelt in a speech to the New York State A. F. of L. convention, on August 22, 1944, said:

> You deserve and have the gratitude of the American people for the patriotic and outstanding production that you have given to our Army, Navy, and our Merchant Marine which are now winning the war of liberation—a record in production unequalled in the history of this or any other country.

Former Senator TRUMAN, in speaking to the A. F. of L., on September 4, said:

Labor has made a magnificent contribution to the war effort.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] stated on October 3:

He [Roosevelt] has led in organizing our resources for total war—so that we have enough men on the fighting fronts and enough war production to back them up.

True, Army and Navy officials, as well as certain production leaders, in August reported lags, bottlenecks in war production, and labor shortages.

But according to official Washington all was well.

On August 23, 1944, Donald Nelson, testifying before the Truman committee, said that all critical munitions programs, with minor exceptions, were being met, and that war industry could not use more than 100,000 of the 700,000 workers released from munitions production.

Two months later, on October 27, 1944, the President said in a speech at Philadelphia:

Never before in history have the soldiers and sailors of any nation gone into battle so thoroughly supported as the American soldiers and sailors fighting today in Europe, Asia, and the Pacific.

During the summer attention was focused on reconversion and the speedy return to peacetime production.

As early as May, Maury Maverick, head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, was urging priorities to small businesses to increase production of civilian items and thus cushion the ultimate transfer from war to peace production.

On June 18, Donald Nelson, of W. P. B., gave industry the signal to move in the direction of conversion to peacetime production by releasing aluminum and certain surpluses to manufacturers. He said that it is essential to prepare now for the return to civilian production.

In August, W. P. B. lifted its ban on the making of hundreds of items directly beneficial to civilian consumers. Included in the list were vacuum cleaners, ranges, washtubs, egg beaters, lawn mowers, and sewing machines.

On September 7, 1944, Mr. James Byrnes filed a report on reconversion providing for a 40 percent cut in war production on VE-day. It promised a relaxation of controls to permit manufacturers a freedom in planning for the resumption of civilian production and a speedy return to civilian production.

October 12 brought the announcement by W. P. B. that it planned to ease the curb on farm machinery production.

A visit was paid by Edward J. Kaiser on October 19 to the White House, where he presented an immediate specific pattern for reconversion, which he said he and other manufacturers could carry into operation right away. According to Mr. Kaiser, the President was tremendously impressed, and official Washington spoke this wise:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in July:

Already we are preparing for the return of our national economy to the practices and conditions of peace.

Candidate Roosevelt on September 23, 1944:

We are even now organizing the logistics of the peace just as Marshall, King, Arnold are organizing the logistics of this war.

Early in the spring O. P. A. provided ration-book holders a breathing spell. Many point values were reduced and some foods were removed completely from the list. In September larger amounts of food—some point-free—were placed at the disposal of housewives.

Marvin Jones, of the War Food Administration, in a letter to Chester Bowles, of O. P. A., said:

It is our view that there are ample and prospective supplies of these products to justify removing them from the ration list.

This was on August 31, 1944.

War Mobilizer Byrnes said of this action:

The release of the rationing restrictions on these foods has been made possible by the magnificent production job done by our farmers and by the processors of food. The War Food Administration, under the able direction of Marvin Jones, is to be congratulated on its accomplishments. The action now announced is in accord with the policy of Government to lift wartime restrictions as quickly as possible. When the supply of other foods make posisble their removal from the ration list they will be promptly removed.

In harmony with the rosy picture at home, all was calm and confident on the war and diplomatic fronts during the summer. Civil as well as military leaders were of the opinion that the Germans were tottering and practically knocked out. Campaign speeches dripped with this optimism.

Former Senator TRUMAN declared on August 31, 1944:

Victory is now in sight.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] joined in the chorus on October 3, 1944, with:

Now that Germany is nearly smashed * * *.

The President said on October 27, 1944:

The war in Europe has reached the final, decisive phase.

The problems of international peace were to be solved easily and smoothly by the personal friendship of three men, by the Atlantic Charter, and the Four Freedoms.

Former Senator TRUMAN said on August 31, 1944:

Under his (Roosevelt's) leadership we have met one crisis after another, in peace and war. Our President has worked with these men during these trying years. He talks their language—the language of nations. He knows the reasons which govern their decisions. At no time in our history has a President possessed such knowledge of foreign leaders and their problems. None has ever so completely won their confidence and admiration.

Mr. Roosevelt said on October 22, 1944:

We have achieved a very practical expression of a common purpose on the part of four great nations, who are now united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on a greater and more difficult enterprise—that of waging the peace—committed to trust in each other, work together as we have done so closely, so harmoniously and effectively in the fighting of the war and, at the same time, in the building of the peace.

James F. Byrnes said on October 30, 1944:

The four leaders have achieved a unity that was considered impossible in the last war, and informed persons know their success has been due in great measure to the patience, tact, and balanced judgment of the President.

Mr. Roosevelt said on November 2, 1944:

I have spent many fruitful hours talking with men from the more remote nations * * * all of them are part and parcel of the great family of nations. It is only through an understanding acquired by years of consultation that one can get a viewpoint of their problems and their innate yearning for freedom.

All was well on the diplomatic front. War nerves had been quieted. Harmony united the Big Three. Power politics was nowhere to be seen. The future was bright and glorious.

And yet, underlying that situation, as with the manpower, production, and food situations at home, there were some ugly facts, as we now know; but the comforting blanket of optimism and tranquillity had been smoothly drawn over them.

Nothing was allowed to mar this picture at home and abroad until after November. Then rapidly and progressively the veneer was torn away and the facts began to show up.

Early in December W. P. B. Chairman J. A. Krug told of serious shortages in critical materials. Speaking at a meeting of the N. A. M., he said, "40 percent of our war production is lagging," and he called upon industry to man the plants to the fullest. Mr. Krug, James Forrestal, Robert Patterson, and Paul McNutt called for more labor for war production by the application of employment ceilings and priority controls, with no civilian production if it would require labor needed for the war program.

On January 1, 1945, James F. Byrnes vigorously demanded a tightening of selective service, cancelation of priority and allocation rights for nonwar plants, suspension of racing, compulsory service for IV–F's, and strengthening of W. L. B. enforcement powers. He said:

We must direct our efforts to channeling this released manpower into critical war programs and industries needed to support them.

All along the line the post-election outlook on the production front quickly lost its previous note of confidence. In December General Somervell told of critical shortages, and gave little hope of relaxation to industry, even upon the fall of Germany.

On December 16, W. P. B. froze civilian-goods production at current levels, and blocked its own earlier plans for expansion of civilian production in 1945. All reconversion plans were stopped cold.

On January 18, 1945, W. P. B. Chairman Krug announced that industrial alcohol and aluminum were back on the crucial list and that sheet aluminum production was 50,000,000 pounds below

requirements. Inventories of metals are the lowest since 1942.

Philip Wilson, W. P. B. vice chairman for metals and minerals, said that the Army Air Forces' plan to furlough enlisted men to work in aluminum mills would help fill the need for 5,000 additional workers.

And so production, which had reached miracle proportions in the summer and was to be geared to reconversion, was tightened all along the line.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. One of the great aluminum mills in my State of Oregon was closed down because of what was said to be an overproduction of aluminum. However, a considerable amount of the taxpayers' money was spent in building a great aluminum plant in Canada. Am I to understand that the Senator has evidence that there is now a shortage of aluminum?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have been quoting from Mr. Krug, who announced that aluminum and alcohol had been returned to the crucial list. I thank the Senator for his valuable contribution.

The food situation grew suddenly darker in December. Controls were clamped back on and rationing tightened. According to Price Administrator Bowles, "supplies of commercially canned fruit have been short for several months" and civilian supplies are "at the lowest point since the war began." Mr. Bowles now ruefully admits that there was an error in judgment.

In his message to the Congress, on January 6, 1945, the President called for "the total mobilization of all our human resources for the prosecution of the war."

Selective service now demands more recruits. The President also said:

> The Selective Service Act should be amended to provide for the induction of nurses into the armed forces. The need is too pressing to await the outcome of further efforts at recruiting.

It has since developed that the shortage of nurses was known all summer.

The forces that seemed to lay calm and unperturbed on the diplomatic scene through the summer months have since exploded with disruptive fury. The Atlantic Charter was only scribbled notes. It now develops that the Big Three have not seen eye to eye for many months with respect to a great number of extremely crucial situations.

The clashes between British, Russian, and American foreign policies were touched off by the situation in Italy, when Britain virtually vetoed Count Sforza as Italian Foreign Minister. Then came unrest in Belgium, which was put down by British soldiers. The political turmoil in Greece was like a stick of dynamite; one touch and allied harmony was badly shattered. The upheavals in Poland have driven sharp wedges into international peace. Each one of those crises indicates that grave differences exist between the major powers on the basis of future international peace.

Forgetful perhaps of last summer's rosy outlook and harmony between the Big Three, President Roosevelt said in his message of January 6, 1945:

> Perfectionism may obstruct the paths to international peace * * * the statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and every one of this war-torn world's tangled situations.

War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes said on January 1, 1945:

> We have already made one too early start toward reconversion. During the spring and summer a wave of optimism swept the United States and our allies. We had to undo what had been done on reconversion.

This, then, is the story as explained by official sources: One, that an unforeseen resurgence of the Nazi war machine is the cause of our present difficulties; and, two, a charge that the American people were responsible for a premature optimism—a relaxation and let-down in the war effort. By this explanation it is sought to fasten our current troubles on two conditions seemingly outside official control, but the explanation does not explain. There are too many questions unanswered, and there is still an accounting to be made.

If optimism—false and ill-based as it is said to be by many high officials—brought about the present state of affairs, there must have been something radically wrong last summer. Optimism does not spring forth native from the soil. It is a quality which responds most to cultivation. The important question is, Was the optimism of last summer and fall affirmatively fostered; and if so, by whom?

Our people have been ready at all times to follow honest and courageous leadership. They know well that a war must be won; and they need only to be told plainly what is required of them. But how can our people be otherwise than confused when the Government itself gives them a mixture of unfounded optimism, conflicting statements, and concealment of important and bitter facts within the sugar-coated pill? How can our people know what is required of them when their Government blows hot and then cold?

First, we were led to believe by the declarations of high Government authority that the war was almost over, and barely 2 months later we are being grimly reminded that there are two wars to be won. Industry was given the go-ahead on plans for peacetime reconversion, and when it was halfway through the intersection the red light flashed it to a halt. At one moment labor is praised to the heavens for the superb job which workers have done, only shortly thereafter to be reprimanded for slacking on the job. Amid assurances of ample supplies, ration restrictions are removed from consumer goods, but barely do we adjust ourselves to point-free shopping when new and more drastic controls are imposed.

Is this change in the fortunes of war the real cause for the crack-downs now sought to be imposed?

The answer to that question is a simple one. Reverses are always to be expected in war. And when they come they compel greater efforts behind the battle lines and on the home front. But can we use the Nazi break-through in December as an excuse for the present crack-downs? On the contrary, it is quite possible to say that the military reverses in December were aggravated by the failure last summer to do those things which would have strengthened the military later in its hour of need.

The Administration cannot escape the consequences of its own actions. It cannot squirm out of the stubborn logic of events. Last summer the administration took credit for the military victories as a brilliant testimonial to the Commander in Chief. It was then that they boasted of abundant supplies of men and equipment. It was then that they spoke of production miracles. Administration spokesmen breathed the heavy optimism that Germany was finished, and the war just about over. Administration agencies fostered the talk of reconversion. The administration cultivated the optimism.

How strange it is, too, that the potlitical confusion and controversy in Europe did not come out into the open until after November? The Greek situation had been rumbling beneath the surface for months, but no real information about it was permitted to jar the notes of harmony piped to us before November.

A similar controversy enveloped the Polish situation. The deadlock between British-supported Poles in London and Soviet-inspired Poles in Lublin existed all summer—in fact, ever since the Russians had stopped before Warsaw, sacrificing the Polish underground forces in that city.

In Italy conditions had been openly growing worse for months, but this, too, remained in the shadows of hushed diplomacy.

Why were production, manpower, and rationing controls relaxed from May to November? The people were not responsible for the wave of optimism—they were deceived by it and they are now the victims of it.

On January 1, 1945, in expiation, Mr. Byrnes declared that glowing prophecies will no longer be heard until they are sound. The administration made those prophecies—and Mr. Byrnes' statement is the clearest and most damaging admission that the country was misled by false prophecies.

If the manpower situation is now critical, the administration's tactics are responsible. Let me show by a simple piece of evidence how true this is. In a sincere and revealing letter to former Senator TRUMAN, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1945, on page 149, the vice president of the Beech Aircraft Corporation, which has an excellent production and labor record, declared:

> During the months of October and the early part of November we experienced great difficulty in retaining our working force at a constant level. * * * We consider that this was an entirely natural development which was caused directly by the overoptimistic statements made by many of the most

prominent individuals in positions of high authority among the Allied Nations, with regard to early termination of the European War. The public press at that time carried almost nothing but statements about post-war reconversion, cancelation of contracts, termination, cut-backs, and post-war planning. The Government officially acted through its various agencies to continually warn the manufacturer of these factors and to prepare him for these anticipated events.

It is no wonder that this strong emphasis * * * should have produced the result which it did produce, that of inducing people to leave war industries to seek peacetime jobs. The reaction was entirely normal for people with American traditions of self-reliance.

Similar evidence can be produced to show that the production let-down and the present gravity of the food and supply situation stem from the same tactics.

Here, then, is the pattern. From May to November we have glowing accounts of military victories, predictions of early peace, eulogies of harmony and unity between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, paeans of praise for the Commander in Chief, and a love feast over production miracles, manpower surpluses, and foods too plentiful for rationing.

But after November everything is wrong. This pattern does not happen by chance. It is too obvious to require an explanation. Either failure in planning or gross ignorance of conditions by those who should know better, are alone to blame. Production, manpower and food shortages do not appear overnight. When they come—as they did in December—they reflect conditions of 6 months earlier.

And now to retrieve the consequences of such mismanagement, the controls are being tightened, as though manufacturers, workers, farmers, the boys whose physical defects kept them out of the armed forces, and all the rest of us, were the ones responsible for the let down.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank those of my Republican colleagues who are present for being so patient as to remain until this late hour to listen to a few remarks I shall make this afternoon on a matter which I believe to be of extreme importance to the people of the United States. I also wish to thank the Acting Majority Leader for his patience and indulgence in waiting to this late hour.

Mr. President, within a few short weeks there will be held in the city of Mexico a very important continental conference, at which there will be present representatives of the various nations of the Western Hemisphere, to discuss matters which, in my opinion, will be of more importance to the United States than even the matters which have been discussed this afternoon by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that the interest of the United States, as a post-war proposition, will be within the continents of the Western Hemisphere, and it is with reference to that particular hemisphere, that I beg the indulgence of the Senators who are now present while I make a few brief remarks.

More than 135 years ago—in 1810, to be exact—distinguished citizens of Chile ventured the idea of a confederation of states embracing all the countries of Spanish America, and in the following year declared themselves in favor of an alliance of all American nations. In 1818 the Argentinean, San Martin, and the Chilean, Bernardo O'Higgins, looked forward to the formulation of some sort of a continental plan of unity. The great Simon Bolivar, the George Washington of Spanish America and the creator of five republics, brought together, in the city of Panama, in 1826, the delegates of the American republics, and in so doing he gave expression to the fraternal aspirations of a goodly part of the Western Hemisphere. The flame of pan-Americanism was periodically rekindled by Peru from 1846 to 1864, and it can be said that the United States of North America did not hold itself aloof from this continental ideal from the very beginning.

From the most humble efforts, apparently fruitless, the ideal of a genuine inter-Americanism is today emerging triumphant, for with the passing of years since the struggles for political independence, this ideal has not faded into the oblivion of idle dreams, but, on the contrary, new personalities have appeared on the American scene to carry forward with honesty, sincerity, intelligence, and enthusiasm the torch of pan-Americanism, and to champion the principle of the equality of American states and their absolute rights and privileges as sovereign and independent nations.

From its inception the ideal of pan-Americanism has emphasized the absolute equality of American states, and this regardless of territorial extent, population, economic wealth, or military strength. These guiding tenets of inter-American relations reached their summit of expression at the Eighth International Conference of American States held at Lima, Peru, in 1938, when our Secretary of State, the beloved Cordell Hull, was moved to observe that "in our Conference we have demonstrated our unshakeable determination to respect the integrity of individuals and of states, to uphold the sanctity of the pledged word, and to make needed changes through the orderly process of consultation in a spirit of mutual accommodation."

Let us not speak today of the many set-backs suffered by the inter-American ideal throughout the Americas and throughout the years, for the time has come to center our attentions and efforts upon every possibility which will bring the republics of the Western Hemisphere into a closer union. In order fully to comprehend the practical reasons which should impel us to nurture more intensive and extensive relations with Latin America, it is necessary to penetrate into the economic field, and to examine, even though superficially, the tremendous contribution of this area to the present war effort of the United Nations.

The Latin-American republics are predominantly agricultural, although they are indeed the sources of important mineral products. These republics are only moderately industralized, and are dependent upon imports of manufacturers and semimanufacturers for the maintenance of their light peacetime industries, transportation, and consumer goods. Therefore, their normal trade with the United States is largely the exchange of raw materials for manufactured goods.

The United States, self-sufficient in many agricultural products but deficient in certain strategic materials for its manufacturing industries, is now a major importer of all Latin-American minerals, and these products can be added to sugar, coffee, hides, and skins, which have been major import items during years of peace. Fibers and crude rubber will be accorded high priority positions until supplies are again available from far-eastern sources. Wartime needs and the disruption of normal trade channels have accentuated the essential requirements of the United States and of the Latin-American republics, and the trade between them since 1940 has reflected the measure of this dependence and the ability of each to serve the other. The United States has released manufactures to maintain their national economies, together with such special equipment as will aid the various countries in expanding operations in those fields of production which are important to the United States for the prosecution of the war.

The same needs are bringing about such improvements in manufacturing technique and in the substitution of less strategic materials and synthetic products by the American manufacturers and such a desire for industrialization by the Latin-American republics that it is quite possible that the nature of the present interdependence may be modified during the next decade. Nevertheless, it has been fully demonstrated that the resources of the Latin-American republics are of inestimable value and that it would be most unfortunate if the United States did not have full access to them.

To mention one very critical material, the case of copper affords an excellent example of the importance of the Latin-American field. Although the United States long has been the leading country in the production of refined copper, economic conditions indicate that this will not continue to be the case many more years, because, first, our domestic copper reserves are being rapidly depleted, which in turn is associated with higher costs of producing copper; second, no new fields of copper ore have been discovered recently in the United States; and third, other countries, particularly Central and South Africa, and Chile have large fields of high-grade copper ores which can be processed very cheaply. The United States has dropped already from first to third place in copper exports during the last decade. Our less favorable copper ore situation is further indicated by the fact that the average percentage of copper in our ores has dropped from 1.41 percent in 1929 to approximately 1.10 percent in 1941, according to the United States Bureau of Mines. Estimates by various metallurgists as given in a report by the United States Tariff Commission as of January 1, 1944, indicate that there are available approximately 24,000,000 tons of copper reserves

in the United States. Our post-war annual consumption has been estimated by the Director of the American Bureau of Metal Statistics, at 850,000 short tons of new copper. If this amount were produced annually, it would lead to a depletion of our known reserves at the end of the next 25 or 30 years. Unquestionably our Latin-American neighbors can assist us not only in conserving our copper reserves, but also in building up a stock pile. Various metallurgists, according to the American Mining and Metallurgical Engineers Report of 1937, have estimated that the Latin-American countries have reserves of at least 30,000,000 short tons of copper. Of this amount 28,000,000 short tons are estimated to be in Chile, and of this 95 percent is controlled by American capital.

With appropriate modifications, the same story can be related with reference to Latin America and the supply of such critical materials as tin, petroleum, quartz, fiber, cinchona (quinine), rubber, and many others.

As stated before, the economy of the Latin-American countries, considered as a whole, is predominantly agricultural. The transition to an industrial economy is hampered by both material and cultural factors. Among the first, we need mention only a scarcity of coal and oil, poor location of ining of the available mineral resources, inadequate transportation facilities due especially to topographic conditions, and scarcity of capital, equipment and technicians. Of the less tangible influences, probably the most important are an indifference to material gain and progress as these are conceived in industrial countries, and the relative absence of a business spirit and a spirit of enterprise among the wealthier and more influential classes. Widespread poverty and lack of purchasing power among the great bulk of the population is a major barrier to extensive industrialization.

Foremost among the factors favoring industrial growth are a wide variety of rich mineral, forest, and agricultural resources and abundant potential supplies of hydroelectric power. To these must be added a growing population, an awakened national consciousness, a rising spirit of business enterprise, and favorable governmental policies. In their desire to achieve greater economic stability and independence, and to raise the standard of living of the masses through a more balanced economy, the governments of the more progressive Latin-American countries have adopted extensive programs for the aid and encouragement of manufactures. More recently the United States, in pursuance of its good neighbor policy and its war production program, has done much to further this development. Finally, newer technical developments in the field of the chemical industries, electric power and air transportations appear likely to free Latin-American industry from some of the handicaps under which it has labored in the past.

It is important to know also that the present war crisis has both stimulated and hampered the growth of manufacturing in Latin-America. The industries chiefly to benefit have been those relying on domestic raw materials and producing for general consumption, such as textiles. The extreme scarcity of shipping, combined with Allied restrictions upon exports, has reduced customary supplies not only of finished manufactures but also of much needed machinery and indispensable materials from abroad. Although the activities of some manufacturing industries have been curtailed as a result of these conditions, on the whole there have been substantial increases in production in the war years, both to meet domestic needs and in some important instances, to supply a rising export trade to other Latin-American countries and even to the Allied Nations. It is clear that the effect of the present global war has been greatly to accelerate the trend toward industrialization in Latin-America. While some painful readjustments will come at the end of the present war boom, manufacturing will undoubtedly resume its peace time course on a higher level than in the pre-war years.

From the viewpoints of both Latin America and the United States, the requirements of hemisphere defense call for a far greater degree of industralization in our sister republics to the south than prevailed at the opening of the present conflict.

Thus it is, that of all the projects and plans, of all the schemes and aspirations, receiving the attention of our Government during these tense and perilous times, there is none which, from both a practical and idealistic point of view, calls for more sincerity and earnestness of effort in the post-war period than the stimulation of the good-neighbor policy among, and the establishment of a united front by the nations of the Americas. But let us be realistic about these matters. In my opinion the success of pan-Americanism should not, for it cannot, depend exclusively upon the cold and calculated aspects of the mutual material benefits to be derived therefrom. True, pan-Americanism must build its foundations, not only upon the granite of pragmatic considerations, but also upon the marble of cultural respect and understanding. We can learn much from the literatures and arts of our neighbors, and it is to the authors and creators of these, the real lasting values of a people, that we must go if we are justly to appraise the less tangible, but certainly the most workable key to mutual good will and successful intercourse.

It does not require superior sagacity to understand the sensibility of the pan-American ideal; and the only reason why the movement had to await an international crisis to receive any real attention from our Government is simply the almost complete lack of interest in or knowledge of Latin America on the part of our citizenry and leaders alike since the birth of the Republic. It has often been stated that the lack of a considerable group of informed citizens may become a real danger, particularly in a country like the United States where foreign policy is based largely on public opinion; at least, this has been so during the greater part of our history. The sad truth is that such a lack does exist at the present time in the United States with reference to Latin America. We talk about Russia, England, France, and other countries. After the war our interest should be south of the border. The real irony of the situation lies in the lack of knowledge on the part of the American people with respect to Latin-American affairs, and the little interest, apparently, they have in Latin America. To be sure, there have always existed small groups of thinking citizens who made every effort to nurture pan-American relations, but even in university and governmental circles their voices were too weak to be heard above the din of other issues, perhaps far less important. The present world crisis has brought into focus not only the desirability of practical pan-Americanism, but also the need for such a scheme if we are to witness the healthy operation of plans for hemispheric solidarity.

In discussing the general features of the good-will policy toward Latin America, naturally I have dealt in generalities. However, in order to appreciate the problems involved, I only have to call attention to one specific matter, and that is the treaty now before the Senate, made by this country with the Republic of Mexico, involving the distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers. That treaty was agreed to between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, through consultation between, and the advice of, the State Department of this country and the Office of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Mexico.

In my opinion, the policy of good will between the two countries was certainly attended to in considering this convention. No one would accuse the Honorable Cordell Hull, until lately Secretary of State for this country, of not being a patriotic and loyal American, and of not protecting American rights in an equitable and just way, or of being in favor of giving away American rights that should be protected. I have always maintained that the greatest characteristic of the American people is its emphasis of fair play. In arriving at the agreements of the convention between Mexico and this country on the distribution of the waters indicated, I firmly believe that the State Department took full care of the rights involved.

Everyone knows that in coming to any kind of an agreement, a spirit of give-and-take is necessary. We know that the water reserved for the citizens of Texas in the treaty are derived from the Mexican side of the border. Hence, it appears only fair that in dealing with a foreign country this country should also be fair. But there are in this country individuals—few, thank goodness—who would want Mexico to provide all the waters for the necessities of Texas, but at the same time would be unwilling to do something for the Republic of Mexico. There are people in this country who feel that only our rights should be protected.

If we are to have good will, we also must entertain some respect for the rights of other governments. Also, I have always maintained that the Republic of

Mexico is the key to our standing in Latin America. If we do not treat that Republic in a fair way, following just and equitable principles, what are the other countries south of Mexico to say? If we do not treat our nearest neighbor justly, what are they to expect?

By the kindness of the people of New Mexico, I happen to represent that State in this august body. No one knows better than do the people of New Mexico that most of my time is devoted to their interests; and in this instance, I feel that the treaty now being considered by this body takes care of New Mexico's interest, and at the same time indicates to the world at large that we in New Mexico are not motivated only by selfish interests in dealing with a friendly foreign nation.

I consider it imperative to add my voice to that of those Americans throughout the hemisphere who zealously support the principle of inter-American unity, toward the end that the establishment of a sincerely conceived plan of action will be an actuality, and that this plan be perpetuated for the mutual benefit of all the Americas in every field of human relations after we have effected the peace which we so anxiously await.

REPORT BY ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD ON STRATEGIC MATERIALS (S. DOC. No. 5)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested in the address of the Senator from New Mexico, and especially in that part of it which concerns the strategic and critical materials which the United States has been receiving from Latin America during the present war. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a report made by the Army and Navy Munitions Board and submitted to the Senate on January 6.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF LESLIE L. BIFFLE AS ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 63), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Leslie L. Biffle be, and he is hereby, appointed Acting Secretary of the Senate, and that said Acting Secretary be, and he is hereby, empowered to do and perform all official acts pertaining to the Office of Secretary of the Senate not specifically devolved on the Secretary by law, and under the same responsibilities now devolved on the Secretary; that he so continue during the further order of the Senate, and that the salary of the said Leslie L. Biffle be continued the same as now received by him as the Secretary to the majority of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the Acting Secretary of the Senate may take the oath of office.

There being no objection, Mr. Leslie L. Biffle advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE APPOINTMENT OF ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. HILL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 65), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the appointment of Leslie L. Biffle as Acting Secretary of the Senate.

FLORAL WREATH FOR THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE EDWIN A. HALSEY

On motion by Mr. BYRD, it was

Ordered, That the Acting Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to purchase a floral wreath on the occasion of the funeral of the late Secretary of the Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey, the cost thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

POEM IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there may be printed a poem written in tribute to Colonel Halsey by Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWIN A. HALSEY

E-very Member of the Senate
D-own unto the smallest page,
W-onders why dear Colonel Halsey,
I-n the flower of his age,
N-ow, at such a time, should die,
A-nd bid them the last goodbye.

H-e, a friend to everybody,
A-lways ready to help, stood
L-ooking for a chance to render
S-ome assistance, when he could.
E-ven down unto the end;
Y-ea, he proved a ready friend.

F-ar and near, Ed Halsey's praises
R-ightly will for years be sung,
I-nside and outside the Senate,
E-verywhere, the old and young,
N-ow, in their deep sorrow sing,
"D-eath, O Death! how sharp they sting!"

I-n this hour's grevious sorrow,
N-one can soothe, but God alone.
D-eath's the dawn of faith's tomorrow
E-ver God cares for his own.
E-ven in Christ's latest breath,
D-id He triumph over death.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Vincent R. Murphy, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from April 11, 1943;

Several officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade);

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign;

Lieut. Charles H. Kretz, Junior, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant;

Several ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign;

Ensign James V. Bartlett, D-V (s), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade);

Several ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign; and

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as I must leave the Chamber, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have a nomination on the Executive Calendar confirmed. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of H. Struve Hensel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Struve Hensel of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there are also on the Calendar five other nominations in the Navy. The first is that of Frederick J. Horne, a very distinguished officer, to be admiral, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations. There are also a number of nominations in the Marine Corps. I ask unanimous consent that all these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Navy and Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER NOMINATION RECOMMITTED

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Myrtus P. Spangenberg to be postmaster at Waymart, Pa., which nomination previously had been passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that, without objection, at the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the nomination will be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of T. Hoyt Davis, of Georgia, to be

United States district judge for the middle district of Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William M. Payne to be postmaster at Natchitoches, La.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

DEATH OF EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I offer resolutions, and I request unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 66) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Col. Edwin A. Halsey, late the Secretary of the Senate.

Resolved, That the Acting Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Secretary of the Senate, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Wallace Murray, of Ohio, now Director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Herman B. Baruch, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Sydney, Australia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29, 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

H. Struve Hensel to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

T. Hoyt Davis to be United States district judge for the middle district of Georgia.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Frederick J. Horne to be an admiral, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

Frank G. Fahrion to be a rear admiral, to rank from February 21, 1943.

Marshall R. Greer to be a rear admiral, to rank from August 28, 1943.

Peter K. Fischler to be a rear admiral, to rank from May 11, 1943.

Thomas P. Jeter to be a commodore, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Battleship Squadron 2, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from October 20, 1944.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Jack C. Scott
William H. Whitaker
John B. Berteling
Elmer P. Thompson, Jr.
Robert R. Read
Albert L. Clark
Stanley V. Titterud
Warren H. Keck
George W. Bubb
George W. Carrington, Jr.
William F. Lane
Andrew S. Farago
Albert E. Leonard
Francis J. Stutler
Roland A. Marbaugh
Donald F. Dickey
Charles B. Spradley
James E. Garner
Ernest B. Ford
Richard M. Bickford
Ira Goldberg

POSTMASTER

LOUISIANA

William M. Payne, Natchitoches.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, unto us have been committed heavy responsibilities; be ever present here, for it is so difficult for us to be always wise and strong. In all ways qualify us for excellent service and grant that we may realize the sanctity of politics. Help us to combat the aggressions of the strong against the weak and the rich against the poor. O draw us nearer to Thee as we say to our souls: "Oh, for a man to rise in me, that the man I am may cease to be."

Holy Spirit, we pray for the constant presence of Thy wise guidance; under the spell of big horizons, broaden us with a self-revising estimate of our enlarging outlook. Grant that our dominant strength may not pale in defending the standards of an ever-changing world. Back of the tragic unrest of the suffering and appealing multitudes in the pathways of war, speak, Almighty God, first to the life of each human being, then to the larger life of our Nation, and then to the vaster life of humanity. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter of resignation, which was read:

JANUARY 26, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

TOM PICKETT,
Member of Congress,
Seventh Congressional District, Texas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 24, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Virginia my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Third District of Virginia, to become effective February 15, 1945.

Yours sincerely,

DAVE SATTERFIELD, Jr.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 25, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the authority granted by section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did on January 17, 1945, elect JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan, and DANIEL A. REED, of New York, to be members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to fill vacancies caused by the retirement of Wesley E. Disney, of Oklahoma, and Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts, and to serve with the following other House members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of such joint committee: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON of North Carolina; JERE COOPER, of Tennessee; HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota.

Respectfully yours,

R. L. DOUGHTON, *Chairman.*

DIRECTORS OF THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members of the House: Mr. BLOOM, New York; Mr. GRAHAM, Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public

Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Committee to Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. FORAND, Rhode Island; Mr. TALBOT, Connecticut.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. KEOGH, New York; Mr. BUCK, New York.

BCARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. SASSCER, Maryland; Mr. HÉBERT, Louisiana; Mr. PRICE, Florida; Mr. HESS, Ohio; Mr. KEEFE, Wisconsin.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, section 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. CANNON, Missouri; Mr. COX, Georgia; Mr. REECE, Tennessee.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 55, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy, to fill existing vacancies thereon, the following Members of the House: Mr. BROOKS, Louisiana; Mr. SPARKMAN, Alabama; Mr. BRADLEY, Pennsylvania; Mr. BATES, Massachusetts; Mr. KEARNEY, New York.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 60, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, to fill existing vacancies thereon, the following Members of the House: Mr. LEFEVRE, New York; Mr. SIMPSON, Illinois.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have seven privileged resolutions from the Committee on Accounts allocating money from the contingent fund of the House for expenses for the special and select committees and for the new standing committee. I present the first resolution (H. Res. 97) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 237 of the Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, House Resolution 11 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, House Resolution 65 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, House Resolution 20, Seventy-eighth Congress, and House Resolution 75 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate the conservation of the wildlife resources of the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $7,500, effective from January 3, 1945, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. That the official committe reporters shall serve said committee at its meetings in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a second privileged resolution (H. Res. 108) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 465 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 55 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Post-war Military Policy, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $7,000 in addition to the unobligated balance of the sum heretofore made available during the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and investigation or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] chairman of the Committee on Post-war Military Policy, appeared before the Committee on Accounts together with the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. The Committee on Post-War Military Policy was set up in March of 1944, and the Committee on Accounts granted the committee $25,000. During the last session the Post-War Military Policy Committee did not use all the money that has been allotted to it and had an unexpended balance of approximately $18,000.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] told the Committee on Accounts that he felt $25,000 would be sufficient to carry on the work of his committee for the next 2 years unless something unforeseen should develop. He previously had made a similar statement on the floor. The Committee on Accounts, therefore, recommended that the unexpended balance of approximately $18,000 be made available to the Committee on Post-War Military Policy and recommended that an additional amount not to exceed $7,000 be provided.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a third privileged resolution (H. Res. 109) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1945, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation in monthly installments for the employment of the following employees to the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

Clerk, at the rate of $3,900 per annum.

Assistant clerk, at the rate of $2,640 per annum.

Assistant clerk, at the rate of $2,100 per annum.

Janitor, at the rate of $1,560 per annum.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, this allocation does not cover the salaries and expense of the investigators. That is a matter that will have to be taken care of later, is it not?

Mr. COCHRAN. No provision has been made for any expenses for investigation. This is simply for the clerks every standing committee is entitled to. This is a unanimous report of the committee. The members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, both the chairman and the ranking member, stated that the committee had held a meeting and are in agreement. While this does provide for an additional assistant clerk, the Committee on Accounts felt it was justified in granting one because of the fact that they have 80 file cases and about 20 unopened boxes full of papers, and because the files are not cataloged or indexed; further, because when any individual from any one of the Government agencies comes before the committee they feel that some official of the committee should be present while that person is looking over the records.

Mr. RANKIN. I am familiar with that phase of the situation, because I was present at the meeting, but I just wanted to serve notice now that this amount does not cover the salaries and expenses of the investigators and assistant investigators we are bound to have to pursue the investigations of un-American activities.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Just why does a permanent committee have to spend $1,560 for a janitor? What does the janitor do? In looking over the legislative bills, I found something like 30 janitors on the pay roll. Little committees like the Committee on the Territories have a janitor. I do not know what they do with them. I do not know what the janitors do or why the committees have to have them. Why spend that money for janitors? If you want to reorganize Congress, here is a pretty good chance to do it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Time and again the effort has been made to change the word "janitor" to "messenger." I do not know what they do, but I do know they must keep the committee rooms clean.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Why do they have to have a special messenger? Cannot the clerk look after it, or can he not call a page? Committee after committee that meets once or twice a year has a janitor. I do not know what in the world they need a janitor for. The Committee on the Territories, next to me, has not met three times a year, I believe, but it has a janitor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Do not blame me. Your Committee on Appropriations takes care of such appropriations.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I am not blaming the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. Blame the Committee on Appropriations. Let me say the Monroney committee might take care of that when the Congress is streamlined.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. But I do blame the gentleman because he brings out a resolution here providing for another janitor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Because every other committee of the House has one, and further because this man must look after some large rooms as well as keep the files clean.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That does not excuse this one.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HART. I agree in great measure with what the gentleman from Michigan has said, but if there is one committee that I know of that does need a janitor it is this committee, because of the tremendous mass of filing material and the number of filing cabinets and the size of the room in which these are to be contained.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I have a lot of filing in my office, and I do not have a janitor to do it. My clerks do the filing.

Mr. HART. I am not attempting to justify the general practice of furnishing janitors to committees, but I do say that if there is any committee in this House for which a janitor can be justified it is this one.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] appeared before the Committee on Accounts last week, together with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The House has set up the Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee. It is the duty of the Appropriations Committee to provide funds for the employment of committee clerks and their assistants, but it has always been the policy of the Committee on Accounts to provide funds temporarily for the payment of clerical assistants until provision can be made in an appropriation bill.

Under the resolution introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] the Committee on Un-American Activities is provided with a clerk at a salary of $3,900 per annum; an assistant clerk at a salary of $2,640 per annum; a second assistant clerk at a salary of $2,100 per annum; and a janitor at a rate of $1,560 per annum.

These salaries will be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until provision is made for them in an appropriation act.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] told the Committee on Accounts that there are some 70-odd filing cabinets filled with valuable records and papers that were accumulated by the Dies committee in addition to a great many boxes containing papers and a large amount of material which has been received from the three regional offices of the Dies committee. They are most anxious to obtain a clerk and the other employees mentioned in the resolution in order to properly preserve and take care of these records and begin to function as a regular standing committee of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 110).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 18, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by H. Res. 550 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and continued by House Resolution 16 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and House Resolution 66 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on the Civil Service, not to exceed $30,000 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available for conducting the studies and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. The chairman of the special committee the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] requested $75,000. The Committee on Accounts, in keeping with its policy of trying to reduce expenditures, recommended that the House Civil Service Committee be provided with $30,000 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available. The unexpended balance at the present time is approximately $13,000, out of a total of $84,500. The committee recommended the desirability of continuing the investigation but in view of the fact that it cost approximately $71,000 during the 2 years of the Seventy-eighth Congress, it felt the appropriation should not be as large as was requested by members of the committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 111) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 408 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 60 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed the unobligated balance of the sum heretofore made available during the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], chairman of the Post-War Economic Policy and Planning Committee, as well as the ranking members of the committee, the gentlemen from Tennessee [Mr. REECE and Mr. COOPER] appeared before the Committee on Accounts last week. This committee was created during the last Congress and an appropriation of $100,000 was provided for their studies and investigations. They have spent approximately $30,000, leaving a balance on hand of approximately $70,000.

The House continued the Post-War Economic Policy and Planning Committee under House Resolution 60 of the Seventy-ninth Congress for a period of 2 years. Both the chairman and the ranking members of the committee stated they felt that the committee would be able to carry on its work with the unobligated balance of the sum heretofore allocated.

The resolution does not provide any new funds but simply carries the old balance forward.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM IN ITS RELATION TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 112) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 294 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and continued by House Resolution 18 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and House Resolution 64 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the national defense program in its relation to small business in the United States, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $45,000, effective from January 3, 1945, in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available for conducting the study and investigations authorized by said House Resolution 18 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or any subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the committee appointed to study and investigate the national defense program in its relation to small business in the United States, appeared before the Committee on Accounts last week together with members of his special committee. This special committee was authorized in the Seventy-seventh Congress, and has been continued in each succeeding Congress since then. For the years 1942, 1943, and 1944, the special committee was granted funds in the amount of $92,500 and the total expenditures for these years amounted to a little over $90,000, leaving a balance of approximately $2,000 on January 1, 1945.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] stated the committee desired to expand its activities into other fields, including taxation as it affected small business. The Committee on Accounts felt there is now considerable duplication of effort in connection with tax studies by the Congress and felt that a further investigation by the Small Business Committee into this field was not justified. We have now the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which is composed of members of the House Ways and Means Committee and members of the Senate Finance Committee. We appropriate $75,000 for their experts every year. There is also a special committee studying post-war taxes in addition to the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the Senate Finance Committee.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] submitted a budget in which he estimated that his expenditures for the fiscal year of 1945 would be $90,000, which is as much as this committee spent during the period since its inception.

The Committee on Accounts recommended that the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] be reduced by one-half.

The Senate has a committee that is also looking after the interests of small business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEEE TO INVESTIGATE ACTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 113) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 102 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 88 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to investigate acts of executive agencies which exceed the scope of their power or authority, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $30,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the select committee appointed to investigate acts of the executive agencies which exceed the scope of their power or authority appeared before the Committee on Accounts this morning, together with members of the select committee.

This committee is serving as a check upon the action of Government agencies in carrying out various laws passed by the Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Accounts I felt that this jurisdiction belonged to the Committee on Expenditures in the executive department. That all such complaints should be filed with the Committee on Expenditures and that there was no necessity of having this special committee. The Committee on Accounts, however, agreed to allocate $30,000 to the select committee appointed to investigate acts of the executive agencies which exceed the scope of their power and authority.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable Ben Dean, of Grand Rapids, Mich., president of the Kiwanis International.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Democratic Steering Committee commending the services of the retiring chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. ROBERT CROSSER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a communication which I have received from Mr. Crowley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from an organization in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of other special orders that may have been heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House today for 15 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I make at that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, first, to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article which I have written, and secondly, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Sunday edition of the Hartford Courant entitled "Connecticut

War Workers' Production Leading Nation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt of law and a copy of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Richard L. Neuberger, entitled "A Dissenting Opinion on Congressional Junkets."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a table relating to unemployment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem, The O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from a publication called the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NONESSENTIAL TRAVEL

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a directive by Mr. James F. Byrnes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, and each case to include some resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include an analysis of the bill which will be under discussion today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a letter from an important constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CARE OF PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the constantly mounting number of American prisoners of war is clear evidence of the increasing desire on the part of the relatives and friends of those concerned to see that their welfare is adequately protected so far as possible.

The American Red Cross and other agencies are doing a splendid job in this field. There are many people, however, who feel that the Congress has a further legislative responsibility in this matter. As evidence of the growing concern of American citizens over this problem, may I say that I have recently received petitions from hundreds of good American citizens requesting that the Congress take action to provide for more equitable treatment in the matter of promotions and pay grades for our prisoners of war. These petitioners respectfully call attention to the fact that our prisoners of war in Germany and Japan are for all practical purposes unable to speak for themselves. They feel that these prisoners of war are prevented through no fault or failure of their own from engaging in active warfare and that they suffer day by day as great hardships as many of their comrades on the fighting front. Their status as prisoners of war indicates and demonstrates their valor in the performance of their duty toward their country.

These petitioners maintain that an injustice is being perpetrated upon our prisoners of war because of little hope of receiving higher ratings, rank, or pay status. These good patriotic citizens, in their exercise of the fundamental right of petition to the Congress, request immediate action to the end that legislation may be provided to give suitable and proper recognition to our prisoners of war group.

I am today filing these petitions with the House Military Affairs Committee in the hope that it may challenge the attention of the membership of that great committee and stimulate and crystallize action in this field.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix by including a statement by Mr. Hal W. Kennedy, assistant deputy county counsel of Los Angeles County.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution by the Daughters of the American Revolution endorsing the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK R. REID

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker—

We saw not the lift of the curtain,
Nor heard the invisible door,
As he passed where life's problems uncertain
Will follow and vex him no more;
We lingered and wept on the threshold,
The threshold each mortal must cross,
Then we laid a new wreath down upon it,
To mark a new sorrow and loss.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce the death last Thursday afternoon at his home in Aurora, Ill., of my predecessor, Hon. Frank R. Reid. Prior to his congressional career, he had served as State's attorney of his county, as assistant United States district attorney, as representative in the Illinois General Assembly, and as special assistant corporation counsel of the city of Chicago. Ten years ago he voluntarily relinquished the seat he had occupied in this House for 12 years. His interest in its activities, however, never waned, and, as a visitor, he was frequently on the floor at every session of Congress, excepting this, since his retirement. His service in this body was constructive and his advancement rapid. As a freshman Member, he was assigned to the Committee on Flood Control.

In 2 years he was its chairman. He was intensely interested in aviation, and early recognized its tremendous importance as an adjunct of the Army and Navy. This and his innate sense of justice were, without doubt, the motivation for his acceptance of the responsibility as chief counsel for the late Col. William—Billy—Mitchell in his court-martial trial in 1925 for criticizing the Army's air-force policy. His brilliant defense of that officer, while unavailing to a court steeped in Army discipline, aroused a hitherto dormant public to the realization that our country's success in future wars, if we had any, was in direct proportion to the adequacy of our fighting power in the air. The Army found the defendant guilty; the public acclaimed him as a martyr. In later years when the intervening hand of death had removed Colonel Mitchell from his earthly sphere, his attorney, Frank Reid, had the satisfaction of witnessing the complete exoneration of his client, the removal of the stigma against his record, and a tardy recognition of his keen foresight and brilliant services by promotion, posthumously, to the rank of brigadier general.

It was during Frank Reid's incumbency as chairman of the Committee on Flood Control that the great Mississippi River flood of 1927 occurred with its tremendous toll of human lives and destruction of property. His dynamic energy and untiring service at the time and following that catastrophe will ever be remembered by the people residing in the valleys of the Father of Waters and its tributaries. In a fortnight, he had become a national figure. No man living did more to arouse public interest in the necessity of effective flood control than did Frank R. Reid, None exerted more influence to commit Congress to a definite plan to prevent or minimize future similar disasters. As president and as a member of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, he, after his retirement from Congress and even until the time of his death, exerted his energies and continued his activities for this much-needed control of streams and protection of homes and businesses.

Those of us who knew him well enjoyed his explosive pent-up energy, his unselfish desire to serve, his rather brusque mannerism, and his celerity at repartee. He dearly loved a joke and could take as well as give. There has always been a certain amount of confusion between him and me on account of the identical pronunciation of our respective surnames. I recall the many times be chuckled and appreciated the humor in an incident which took place a few weeks after I had succeeded him as a Member of this House, when one of the Capitol employees in attempting to distinguish between us had characterized him as "the ex-Mr. Reid."

Now Frank Reid is no more. He brought with him to this Chamber kindness, energy, independence, and constructive leadership. He retained those attributes even unto death. The Nation and the State of Illinois have profited from his service.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday afternoon at 3 o'clock the Honorable Frank R. Reid, a former Member of this House, died at his home in Aurora, Ill.

Several days before I had been notified that he had suffered a slight stroke and, though I was grieved at the sad news, I was not at all surprised because of the strenuous life which Frank Reid lived and the tireless energy he poured forth in every task he undertook.

When I was first elected to this body 16 years ago, as a young man I was assigned, at my personal request and the generous consideration of Mr. Reid to the Committee on Flood Control of the House, of which he was then chairman. This was shortly after the most disastrous flood in our history, when the Mississippi River, with torrents of water poured into its channel from the Ohio, Missouri, and other tributaries, broke its bounds, overran its banks, flooded hundreds of thousands of acres of our most fertile farm lands, washed away bridges, inundated houses, destroyed livestock, and drowned hundreds of people.

No one can imagine the appalling damage to life and property—which ran into tens of millions of dollars—which that flood caused in 1927 unless he traveled down the valley in its tragic wake.

Frank Reid saw it all, understood it thoroughly, and out of a heart which beat in sympathy for suffering humanity he succeeded, in the face of overwhelming odds, in driving through Congress the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, appropriating $325,000,000 for flood control in the Mississippi Valley.

Calvin Coolidge, who was then President, nearly fainted when he signed the bill, because up to that hour it was the largest peacetime appropriation in the history of our Republic.

After serving 12 years in the House from the Eleventh District of Illinois, in the Sixty-eighth to the Seventy-third Congresses, inclusive, Mr. Reid voluntarily retired in January 1934 to resume the practice of law. Often he told me that he spent 12 years in Congress, but that was 10 years too long, and even urged me to leave Congress—not that he despised nor had little respect for this body but he knew our problems, difficulties, and heartaches, the disappointments and despair as well as the victories and glory.

After leaving Congress, Frank Reid never lost his interest in it. He divided his time about equally between Chicago, New Orleans, and Washington. He enjoyed a wide and profitable practice, for which he was eminently qualified. After graduating from the University of Chicago he graduated from the Chicago College of Law, served as county attorney, State's attorney, assistant United States attorney, and as president of the Illinois State's Attorneys Association. Before coming to Congress in 1922 he served as a member of the Forty-seventh General Assembly in Illinois, and later was secretary of the Illinois League of Municipalities.

Mr. Reid first won national fame by acting as chief civil counsel in defending the late and lamented Gen. William Mitchell. The history of Billy Mitchell's trial some day will be fully written, and when it is the name of Frank R. Reid will shine in deathless splendor.

Frank Reid was a brilliant lawyer. He possessed a quick, alert, and hair-trigger mind. His knowledge was wide, his information accurate, and his insight keen.

At times he was blunt and abrupt; at others he could be caustic and sarcastic; but never in the 16 years I have known him—in times of trial and of tranquillity—did I ever hear him utter a profane, vulgar, or dirty word. On occasions people misunderstood him, but his hard, marble exterior covered a tender heart and a gentle spirit.

There was nothing maudlin or sentimental about Frank Reid. He was all wool and a yard wide, genuine to the core, and loyal to the end. Sometimes I accused him of whistling to keep up courage and he would only smile. He possessed a restless spirit and he was a hard driver—but never did he drive anyone as hard as he drove himself.

After leaving Congress Mr. Reid never lost his interest in problems of flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, conservation, and utilization of our water resources. He took an active part in all waterways organizations and for several years was president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I had the honor to succeed him as president of that organization for the past 6 years, but no man in all its history did nearly so much for its successful operation as did Frank Reid. His name is a household world not only in the Mississippi Valley, but everywhere that waterways and their related problems are discussed.

It is safe to say that no man in our generation and perhaps no one else in future generations will do more for the development of our rivers and harbors,

the control of floods, the conservation of our soil, and the utilization of our water power than our late and lamented friend.

Born in Aurora, Ill., he married a lovely girl in Aurora, Ill. They have 5 fine children and 10 grandchildren. To us who knew him so well it seems rather fitting that he should have died in Aurora where he was born, lived his life, and among the people whom he loved so well.

John G. Neihardt, one of my constituents and America's greatest epic poet must have had Frank Reid in mind when he wrote :

Let me live out my years in heat of blood.
Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine.
Let me not see this soul house built of mud,
Go toppling to the dust—a vacant shrine.
Let me go quickly like a candle light,
Snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow.
Give me high noon—and let it then be night.
Thus would I go.
And grant me, when I face the grisly thing,
One haughty cry to pierce the gray, perhaps.
O let me be a tune-swept fiddle string,
That feels the master melody—and snaps

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I served for 10 years in this House with Frank Reid, and during that entire time I served as a member of the Committee on Flood Control under his chairmanship. A warm personal friendship developed between us. I respected, honored, and loved him. He was a very extraordinary person—a hard worker and one of the ablest men I ever knew. There was in his make-up all the elements of greatness. He rendered valuable services to his country which sustains a great loss in his passing.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I gladly join in tribute to the memory of Frank R. Reid, who passed away at the age of 65 on January 25, at his home in Aurora, Ill.

Frank Reid was elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress and served through the Seventy-third Congress. Throughout his term of 12 years he was a member of the Committee on Flood Control. During his second term, in the Sixty-ninth Congress, he was made chairman of the Committee on Flood Control and served as chairman with distinguished ability for 6 years.

The great flood of 1927 in the Lower Mississippi Valley occurred while he was chairman of the Committee on Flood Control. He immediately assumed leadership in promoting flood control along the lower Mississippi River. He was in contact with all of the flooded areas during the progress of the overflows, and he repeatedly visited and inspected all sections of the lower valley, conducting public meetings following the flood. He was instrumental in promoting public meetings not only in the valley but throughout the country to mold public sentiment for flood control as a national policy. Comprehensive hearings under his bold and courageous leadership were conducted by the Committee on Flood Control. No one contributed more than he to the crystallization of public sentiment in favor of legislation for the control of floods as a national responsibility.

When he voluntarily retired from Congress his interests in the improvement of rivers and harbors continued. Few, if any, public meetings to promote the improvement of waterways were held during his term as a Member of Congress and after his retirement up to his death in which he did not participate and in which his influence was not felt in behalf of the continued improvement of our natural resources.

Frank R. Reid will long be remembered, especially in the lower Mississippi Valley, for his untiring efforts in behalf of protecting the most important valley in this or any other country from floods.

At the time of his passing he was engaged in the preparation of a valuable publication devoted to waterways, known as the National Rivers and Harbors Reporter. He continued to the very last to advocate the improvement of the rivers of the United States as among the most valuable of the country's resources.

Frank R. Reid had a keen mind. He was an indefatigable worker. He was courageous and devoted to the last to the progress and welfare of his country.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I esteem it an honor to speak on behalf of the State of Louisiana, to join my colleagues in tribute to the memory of a former Member of the Congress, the Honorable Frank R. Reid, Sr., of Illinois, who died in his home town of Aurora on the 25th of January.

While I did not have the privilege to serve with Congressman Reid during the 12 years that he was a Member of the Congress, it was my pleasure and good fortune to know him personally, and his friends in Louisiana were legion. As a member of the House Flood Control Committee and as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Congressman Reid was one of the leaders in this country in flood-control matters, and many times visited Louisiana attending meetings to help give relief and solve the question of protecting this country from recurring floods which were so disastrous in human lives and property damage.

I well remember meeting Congressman Reid in Louisiana when he accompanied President Hoover on an inspection trip during the great Mississippi River flood of 1927, and many times thereafter at flood-control meetings. Not only did he have a brilliant record in the Congress, and served his great State of Illinois with distinction, but he deserves great credit for his efforts for flood control in the entire Mississippi River Valley. Congressman Reid was a friend to Louisiana and to the entire South. He was a lovable man, a great public servant, and his work lives after him. At this time I am reminded of a quotation by Byron:

But there are wanderers o'er eternity
Whose bark drives on and on, and anchor'd
n'er shall be.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anything that could be added to the tributes that have been paid to our former colleague, Hon. Frank R. Reid. I can endorse and underwrite everything that has been said concerning him. I served on the Committee on Flood Control under his chairmanship and was a member of that committee until I became a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs some years ago. I was a member of that committee when the flood of 1927 occurred that was one of the greatest and most disastrous in history. I know what Frank Reid did in that great emergency. He was a great chairman and the work that he and his committee did has done much to prevent disastrous floods.

It has been said that the way to find out a man and to know him is to serve with him in Congress, but when you serve upon a committee with him is when you really find him out. Frank Reid was an able, a loyal, and a patriotic American, who rendered great service to his country. I mourn his loss.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. My regret at learning of the death of Frank Reid is not based upon his great services on flood control, but springs from my friendship for him that was formed during those services he rendered back in the trying days when Gen. Billy Mitchell, one of the outstanding heroes of America, was being persecuted because of his great vision and his urgent demand for an adequate aviation corps.

I was one of the men who fought along with Mr. Reid here during that contest. The last time he ever appeared on this floor he came over, laid his hand on my shoulder and said, "John, I don't think the people now think that you and I were so badly wrong when we were battling with Billy Mitchell for the building up of an aviation corps."

Two of the best friends I have ever had in my life grew out of that fight, Gen. Billy Mitchell himself, one of the finest souls I have ever known, one of the greatest heroes of America, and one of the worst-treated men this Nation has ever seen, and Frank Reid, who went through the battle here trying to stave off his court martial.

If Mr. Reid had been successful and General Mitchell could have had his way there would have been no Pearl Harbor,

Japan would never have dared to attack the United States, and probably millions of American lives would have been saved.

This Nation will never know what it owes to Frank Reid for his patriotic efforts in that great contest. May his noble spirit rest in peace; and may his "lofty scene be acted over in states unborn and accents yet unknown."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I arise with a heavy heart today to pay a tribute to our former colleague and our real friend, Frank Reid. I saw him in the city of New Orleans late last year at a large meeting of the Mississippi River Association; and I watched him unselfishly give of his time and efforts there, as on many other occasions. Frank Reid, who died in Aurora, Ill., Friday afternoon, sincerely and actively devoted his life to the cause of the development of the great Mississippi Valley. He gave of his ebbing strength even to the very end of his life for this cause, and we who live in the lower end of the valley are profoundly grateful for his foresight, ability, courage, and utterly unselfish leadership in presenting the problems of the valley to the people of the United States.

The Members of the Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives has sent a joint letter of condolence to his widow. This letter portrays our deep sorrow, but everywhere in the lowland country where men have sought to harness the river waters and have fought the ravages of the flood, there is sorrow today. A great leader has gone; but he lives still in the hearts of our people.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, to different persons words have different meanings. The word "great" is an example. To some a certain person is greatest of all, while to others he is a demagogue. One visits an inauguration and sees in the man all the regal look of a king—to some he is even God's anointed. Another sees in him self-will in action. All of us are inclined to call the man great whom we like; yet, at the same time, we are unable to see the good qualities in anyone whom we do not like.

Today the test of a true statesman is to have an open mind—to give up his preconceived prejudices. Then, in the words of Henry Van Dyke, and then only do we "think without confusion clearly." In every walk of life there is a distressingly large number of individuals who will go to great lengths to avoid mental exercise. Even greater numbers are hindered by their emotions or self-will, and even self-pity, from thinking unselfishly.

I have been seeking to find the acid test for true greatness. For a score of years, scholars have endeavored to define it. Not long since, a group of eminent scholars and philosophers of the world, including Dr. H. G. Wells, sought to name the seven greatest persons in the world. A former member of this distinguished body, Bruce Barton, discussed it at length in one of his books. It is not of so much interest as to the names of the persons chosen as it is that a definition of greatness can be wrought from the list of names. The real test is this: "That life is the greatest which costs the world the least and gives to the world the most in return."

One thousand names of men and women, great and near great, are on a list and all eliminated but seven. Remember, now, they were chosen not because of religious standing or faith, but by using this test given. Here are the names and the reasons:

First on the list was the man Jesus. He was chosen, not because He was the most religious man, but by reason of the fact that He cost the world nothing and gave to the world everything, even what was mortal in His own life, for the redemption of the world.

Second on the list was an old man, who could have been the ruler of his subdivisions had he chosen to be a handshaker or a honey fugler and sought to be popular. But he dared to speak the truth—yes, the truth—in order that men may be free. Yes; he, too, cost the world nothing, but gave his all—his life—that men might know the truth. I refer to Socrates, of course, who was compelled to drink the poisonous hemlock.

Third on the list was the only American in the group. A man born as lowly as the Son of God. His first meal was a little goose grease off the end of a string which Mrs. Sparrow placed in his mouth, at the same time saying, "It would be better if Nancy's baby could only die, because he ain't got no chance." We know his life. He had nothing but sorrow and suffering. Yes; Abraham Lincoln cost the world very little, but gave his own life to save this greatest of nations and for the freedom of a race.

Fourth on the list is a lady. Her prayers resulted in visions, then convictions; and with the aid of Divine Providence she conquered mighty enemies and was betrayed by those whom she saved. Joan of Arc cost the world so little, but gave her all; and in the end, like Bruno, went heavenward in the chariot of fire.

The fifth was Asoka. He was placed on this list as the most unselfish man who ever walked the globe and who not only gave himself but completely forgot himself.

Sixth on the list we have a man who did not suffer martyrdom but suffered much worse—banishment. He saved the people of Austria-Hungary and was banished by those whom he saved. I refer to Louis Kossuth. He loved those who in the world's terms said they were his enemies, and in his famous speech at Birmingham, after suffering, he said, "I did not save the people of Austria-Hungary. They saved me." It has been said that the three greatest orations ever delivered were Christ's Sermon on the Mount, Kossuth's speech at Birmingham, and the speech which John Brown made to the judge who sentenced him to death.

The seventh, and last but not least, on the list is Savonorola, priest and prophet, who likewise cost the world practically nothing, but in the end was compelled to forfeit his life because he loved the lowly and the weak.

Why do I mention these names in discussing the life of William McKinley? I think it better illustrated this way:

I must tell you of a little girl. She was compelled to listen to a crank deliver an address on a street corner. The crank was ranting, "I tell you there is no heaven. I tell you there is no heaven. I can prove there is no heaven." The little girl looked to the face of her father and said, "Daddy, then why doesn't he go to h—— and quit making so much fuss about it?"

I think we have one of the greatest in the person of William McKinley, who demonstrated more love for his fellowmen than any citizen of this country—without making a fuss about it.

William McKinley, twenty-fifth President of the United States, was born in Niles, Ohio, in 1843. He was educated at Poland Academy and Allegheny College, though he never finished his course in the latter institution. In 1861 he volunteered in the Union Army and entered the Ohio Infantry as a private. He served 4 years, rising by merit to the captaincy of his company and to the rank of major when mustered out in 1865.

Entering politics as a Republican, he was elected to Congress in 1876, and was reelected for six successive terms. In 1882 his election was contested and he was unseated, but he was returned at the next election. In 1890 a Democratic legislature grossly gerrymandered his district, making it easy to defeat him for reelection.

His reputation in Congress rests chiefly on the tariff bill that bears his name. This bill and his able advocacy of it before the House distinguished him as the leader of the Republican Party on the tariff question.

In 1891 McKinley was elected Governor of Ohio by a large plurality and was reelected in 1893. In 1895 a systematic canvass in McKinley's behalf for the Presidential nomination was instituted by his supporters and was continued until the convention of 1896. He was nominated, and, after an extremely bitter campaign on the issue of the gold standard versus free coinage of silver, was elected as champion of the gold standard.

President McKinley's first term is memorable chiefly for the occurrence of the Spanish-American War. That his policy during 1896–1900 was acceptable was shown by his unanimous renomination and by his reelection in 1900 by an electoral majority of 137. His second term began most auspiciously but ended tragically. On September 5, 1901, he visited the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, that day having been set apart in his honor and called the President's day. On the afternoon of the following day, while holding a public reception in the Temple of Music, he was shot twice by Leon Czolgosz. The wounded President was removed to the residence of John G. Milburn, president of the exposition, and he died there September 14.

One time while a Member of this Congress of these United States of America, friends from the district which he had the honor to represent reported to Congressman McKinley that enemies back in the district were circulating malicious

gossip about him and that he had better make a public reply. He answered, "I have no enemies. My constituents have a right to express what they claim to be their opinions. I need criticism and I love those who criticize me. They help me most."

Conciliatory and gracious, respectful of his opponent's point of view, he never would consent to belittle those who did not see eye to eye with him. He would have been shocked, and his great heart would have recoiled in horror at a "smear" campaign. Never pugnacious, never profane or vulgar, never self-assertive, he sought no quarrels, he put on no airs, he cherished no ambition to be the master of anyone, he refused to indulge in personalities.

Members of Congress, might this not be a charter of action for all of us? If we love our enemies we lose them. The man who indulges in personalities or gossip is talking about himself. The man who smears, either by public utterance or by use of the printed page, exposes his own cheap biography to public view and places his asininity on parade.

Selfish groups did not intimidate Congressman McKinley. He never followed a personality. He stood for Principle. His only concern was, "Is it right?" And to those who could not share his convictions he was so affable and genial, so friendly and sincere, so kind and generous, so humble and genuine that people who differed with his policies did not for an instant distrust him. People believed him, consequently they believed in him.

One day in this great body a Member, who was temporarily under domination of self-righteousness, endeavored to coin a phrase "Midwest isolationist." We do not know how the other Midwestern States reacted to the remark, but we of Ohio followed the example of William McKinley. We hold no resentment. Never reply to an untruth. Let me direct your attention to his last address setting forth his views on the future of America:

Geographic and political divisions will continue to exist, but distances have been effaced. Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. God and men have linked the nations together. No nation can longer be indifferent to any other. And as we are brought more and more in touch with each other, the less occasion is there for misunderstandings, and the stronger the disposition, when we have differences, to adjust them in the court of arbitration, which is the noblest forum for the settlement of international disputes. We have a vast and intricate business built up through years of toil and struggle, in which every part of the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or undue selfishness. Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention. Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. The period of exclusiveness is past. Gentlemen, let us ever remember that our interest is in concord not conflict; and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war.

Post-mortem eulogy is only back pay. For our living great we have only epithets; only for our dead epitaphs.

Long before men, who were too lazy to think, were calling others whom they wished to discredit such names as "Communists," "isolationists," "Fascists," "visionary daydreamers," "pink professors," our beloved McKinley from the then forward Midwest—as it always has been and it is now—reflected his beloved Ohio as one of the first internationalist Congressmen and later as one of its first internationalist Presidents.

The leader of the majority side of this great deliberative body, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] once said, "To me a philosopher is a man who seeks the truth." A man unselfishly guided seeking the truth soon lives the truth. Many of us will need that this week. May we have that guidance which McKinley had while we are adjudicating this great question we will be debating this week. May we have this courage which will automatically guide the truth-seekers to refrain from any statement unless we are led by that truth in these critical hours. If millions of men have courage over there, surely we can have the moral courage to do what is right in the great issues debated this week as well as the great issues which will follow regardless of consequences to ourselves. Is the issue on which we are asked to vote this week imperative and needed, or is it one which if adopted will place free men in shackles and chains? Rightly guided like the great martyred McKinley and thoroughly garrisoned with this truth which guided him, we will have the courage to do right as He gives us to see it right. The harvest of right action needs no word of explanation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and second anniversary of the birth of William McKinley. At home in my native city of Canton, Ohio, where President McKinley spent most of his life, citizens are honoring his memory by wearing a carnation—his favorite flower. At church services and a birthday banquet, expressions of love and reverence are being expressed in a more formal way.

With the recurring birthdays, fewer and fewer persons are living in his home town and in the counties he represented in this Chamber who can say they were his intimates. The old anecdotes of his career from the mouths of contemporaries are being kept alive by persons who never knew him. The lawyers who spoke with him from the same political rostrum in his home county, as well as the Democratic stump speakers who campaigned against him, are gone. Those of us who are left must resort to the cold-written history to learn about him and his brilliant career.

We in this body have particular reason to pause a moment in his memory. He was a political product of this body, starting from here after seven terms of distinguished service on his upward march to the Governorship of Ohio and then to the Presidency of the United States. His career is proof that earnest and intelligent application in this body often leads to higher preferment.

As a Member of Congress from his home county and some of the adjacent counties that were a part of his district, I count it fortunate that as a boy I heard him speak often from the famous McKinley porch in Canton and, therefore, I carry in my memory an exact picture of his fine countenance and presence.

APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTORS OF THE COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the act of June 10, 1872, 17 Statutes 360, the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women the following Members of the House: Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 107 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 8 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule on the May bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 which the Committee on Rules brings to the House for consideration. Eight hours' general debate has been proposed. The members of the Committee on Military Affairs thought that time reasonable, and the Committee on Rules agreed. The reporting of this bill, however, is not to be taken as an indication that all members of the Committee on Rules are enthusiastic about it as written. I think it fails and fails woefully to satisfy the demands of public opinion. The public is looking to the Congress for a work-or-fight bill, and this is no such measure. It is hardly more than a pretense and an illusion, and unless it is strengthened by amendments giving it real substance, making it at least in part what the country is entitled to, I shall be indifferent as to whether it is

adopted or thrown out. I think the question is so important that the Members of the House should strive as best they can to be present during the 8 hours' debate.

I have no particular desire to attack the measure. My complaint is that it is hardly more than a gesture and fails to meet the needs of the hour.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is the gentleman satisfied that legislation of this kind meets the constitutional requirements?

Mr. COX. I do not think that there is any constitutional objection to the measure. I am simply doubtful if the good that could possibly result from its adoption would even remotely compensate for the injury that will result.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me in my thought that the gesture in this bill will do a lot more harm than good in that it promises to solve a problem that confronts the Nation, and this bill utterly fails to solve that problem.

Mr. COX. I will let the gentleman's question stand. I am not satisfied with the bill, and I question if the good will offset the bad.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Georgia has stated, this measure provides for an open rule. It also gives sufficient time for extensive debate and unlimited amendments. That gives us all the opportunity of a comprehensive consideration of this measure.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, I am undecided whether or not I am for this bill. My decision will probably be decided by the presentation of the older Members of this body, both Republicans and Democrats alike, whom we all greatly admire. In addition, the nature of the amendments will play a very important part in my decision, as well as the validity of the arguments advanced in the course of the debate.

We recall with deep satisfaction that since the declaration of war there has been no dissension among this membership which as a body have wholeheartedly and conscientiously supported all legislation deemed essential to bring this war to an early and successful conclusion; establish an equitable world peace and to bring our boys back home. At the slightest request of the Chief Executive we have given him untold billions and have clothed him with unprecedented powers for the successful prosecution of the war. Complete harmony to this end has existed and in this purpose there has been no partisanship.

It is with regret that we, having proceeded with the indicated harmony deemed essential in the war effort, have been confronted with the continually bickering and squabbling among some of the executive departments—dissension in the State Department resulting in complete reorganization; cabinet members drunk with power fighting each other for more power; overlapping and conflicting bureau directives. At this moment we are confronted with the spectacle of the replacement of a tried and experience administrator to make way for one untried and unexperienced, and this situation precipitated by the President for the declared purpose of paying a political debt. Both the Congress and our people are seriously wondering why it is necessary to bring to the service physically handicapped men for the prosecution of the war while Mr. Roosevelt for political reward has eliminated the admittedly capable and experienced administrator, Jesse Jones, from a post which is so essential to the over-all prosecution of the war. There is no complacency or lack of cooperation on the part of the American people except as it may have been inspired by utterances from the executive departments themselves. Immediately before the election our people were told that the war would be over in Europe before December. We were told that there was no shortage of anything for our fighting men. In a concluding speech our people were assured by the President that equipment was complete to the last cartridge. Ration points were lowered on everything. We heard of reconversion on every hand. Our executive department boasted of the many cancelations of contracts. Plants were being shut down. Men working in these plants were discharged and were complaining of actual unemployment. That was before election. Now we find higher ration points than ever before. Now we hear of shortages in war equipment so serious that the President is demanding this labor draft bill with the prospect that in the near future there will be demanded a general draft of all civilians. Before election we heard nothing about a coal shortage. Emergency after emergency has been the shibboleth and battle cry of this administration. As you know, the question of a new miners contract comes up shortly. Who is doing anything about it? I venture the assertion that there will be no action taken to successfully anticipate this emergency. When the war is successfully ended we will have a peace emergency. This will be followed by others.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to read an extract from a Minneapolis paper apropos the remarks he is now making?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The title of the article is "Poorly Clothed Yanks Freezing on Western Front." It is by Jack Bell who is with the Seventy-seventh Division in Belgium. He says:

> Fifty American soldiers sat in a big room. Their eyes were red. Their faces drawn. They had not shaved for several days. Their combat jackets and trousers were wet and muddy. On the floor beside each were his shoes, socks, and overshoes. The doctors went down the line examining their bare feet. The men flinched as the medics lightly pressed unnatural white or bluish spots. Their feet had been frozen.

They had been frozen according to this article because the boys had no dry clothing to change into. Presumably, the clothing which should have gone to these boys over on the western front had been sent to other countries.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Surely.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the gentleman from Minnesota would like to have a lot of fellows in this country stay out of the war plants and thus keep those 50 soldiers from having the necessary uniforms and shoes and so forth to keep their feet from being frostbitten and to make them more comfortable?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman wish to be put in the position of condoning the lack of clothing on the western front as pointed out by this article? Would the gentleman explain to the House what the great Committee on Military Affairs, of which he is the able chairman, is doing to rectify this situation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield any further.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am not condoning anything. I am trying to get these fellows to work to furnish these troops.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sorry I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

I express the hope that all these will be determined with that far-sighted statesmanship as will make possible that our young men and women in the armed services and those not old enough for service, all, who have never lived a normal American life, will find that out of this confusion of administration and the holocaust of war there may yet come to them the peace, contentment, and opportunity of American life to which they are entitled as a heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every Member of this body is impressed with the seriousness of this pending legislation. We all know that it involves grave constitutional questions. We all realize its serious implications. The very fact that this membership will give to this debate their constant attention is indicative of the seriousness of which it is regarded and the further fact that at this time they have not determined their course of action, which course will depend largely on the earnest debate which will ensue.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to enter into a political discussion or undertake to answer some of the political observations made by my friend who has just preceded me because this bill is too important a bill, bearing on the conduct of the war and the life of our Nation, to have the debate befogged by partisan considerations. I take the floor at this time to discuss the bill generally and urge that we view it from one angle, and that is the national interest of the United States of America. The

pending bill, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said, is only a limited national service act.

But I cannot agree with my dear friend in his statement that it is an illusion. The bill will do a lot of good, if enacted into law, in connection with the conduct of the war. I would not take issue with my friend from Georgia if he said the bill does not go far enough; but the bill in its present form certainly is a contribution, and if enacted into law, will make a real contribution on the homefront toward the winning of this global war.

It is a limited National Service Act, applying only to men between the ages of 18 and 45. The purpose of the act is to assure production of those things necessary to win the war. The passage of the bill is in the national interest of our country.

Those of us who were here a few years ago voted for the Selective Service Act. By our votes we voted to induct those covered by that law into our armed forces to fight and, if necessary, to die for our country. We used compulsion by operation of law, to take human beings from their little world, from their families, from their every-day walks of life, to serve, to fight, to die if necessary, that our country might live. The history of this war shows that this generation of Americans who are in our fighting forces have risen to the heights of greatness. The historians of tomorrow will record the greatness of the youth of this generation.

The purpose of this limited bill is to give to those in uniform, our fighters at the front, our sons, our relatives, our friends, our fellow Americans, the weapons of war necessary to win. This bill is a marked step in that direction. In my opinion, as I have said before, because of that, the national interest of our country calls for its passage. Yes; the sacrifices being made by millions of Americans, those who are serving in our armed forces, and certainly those who have paid the supreme sacrifice, call for the passage of this bill, and even more, I will admit, but at least for the passage of this bill. You and I voted to have men fight for and, if necessary, die for our country. The least we can do is to vote to have, when noncooperation exists, men work for our country in time of war. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY], we cannot permit fear or any other human emotions to interfere in doing for country what is our clear duty. And that is—to pass this bill.

The present bill is an important one. It is an improvement over the bill as introduced. That is to be expected. The hearings in the committee in executive session, as was natural to expect, made improvements in the bill. According to the account carried in the newspapers it was reported out of committee by a vote of 20 to 5.

The American Legion supports the bill. I have a very fine observation made by the National Commander Scheiberling, of the American Legion. In an article appearing in the January issue of the magazine, American Federation, he ably and effectively said, in part:

> As our armed forces are fighting for total victory, we must give them total support. This responsibility does not rest with any one organization or group of organizations. It rests with the American people—all of us. * * * If we fail our fighting men, they must be prepared to share the blame equally. And if we do fail our fighting men, it won't matter who is at fault. Our whole way of life will be gone.
>
> The American Legion's position on the production of the tools of war is straightforward and simple. We are pledged to no interruption in the flow of equipment and supplies to our fighting forces; no gaps in the ranks of voluntary manpower needed to produce the tools for victory.

The press generally supports the bill editorially, and in this connection I quote from an editorial entitled "War Work Bill," that appeared recently in the Washington Post:

> As it stands, the bill would invoke a minimum of coercion to fill all essential wartime jobs. First, it would freeze men of military age in the jobs they now hold by voluntary choice. They could shift to other jobs, however, with the consent of their Selective Service boards, and the right of appeal would be preserved. Second, if manpower shortages should still be in evidence after this freezing, registrants in nonessential industries could be requested by their draft board to shift to war work. Then, if still further action should be necessary to attain full production for war, registrants could be ordered to take essential jobs they are qualified to fill. To avoid compelling any one individual to work for any one employer, the workers would have to be given "a reasonable choice of employers." In other words, they would be required to work for their country at war and not for the benefit of any employer.

Without discussing the details of the bill at this time, as I shall probably enter the debate on the bill when it is considered under the 5-minute rule; on the one hand we have groups who, in good faith but erroneously oppose; on the other we have the great national interest of our country. You and I are elected to represent hundreds of thousands of American citizens. We are here in a representative capacity, and our people have imposed upon us the duty and responsibility of acting for them in this chamber for their best interests and the best interests of our country.

As I said, without bringing political considerations into this debate, because this bill transcends politics, and I hope the debate will continue along the line of non-political argument, confined to a discussion of the merits of the legislation, you and I are here as representatives of our constituents and as Americans charged with the duty and responsibility imposed upon us by the Constitution, we have the vote in this Chamber representing the hundreds of thousands of citizens back home. They have selected us. The duty and the responsibility rests upon us. I respectfully submit that in the exercise of this responsibility we must approach the problem fearlessly and with the best interests of our country uppermost in our minds. Imperfect though this bill may be in the opinion of some—the situation calls for its passage. The bill may be amended in this particular or that particular, but I hope and urge that this bill, in substance, be passed by this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 107 makes in order the bill H. R. 1752. This resolution was reported by the Committee on Rules following a rather lengthy hearing on H. R. 1752, which is, perhaps, popularly known as the work-or-fight bill. I am not certain just how much "work" it provides for, and certainly it does not provide for any "fighting." Instead of that, it is really a work-or-pay-a-fine bill, or a work-or-go-to-jail bill.

The bill is filled with inconsistencies. Very frankly, I am not certain what it contains. I do not know what many of its provisions mean, and I am not alone in this position, because the members of the Committee on Military Affairs who reported this bill seemingly could not agree among themselves as to what many of the sections of the measure really mean.

I question greatly the constitutionality of this bill. This is a matter, as I understand it, that the Military Affairs Committee did not discuss in their hearings.

I do not know just exactly what the need for this legislation may be, for seemingly no widespread investigation has been made to learn what the needs for manpower in the various war plants in this country really are. I do know that many reports have been coming to us of the wastage of manpower. I do know that many, many war plants have been closed down in the last year. I do know that other war plants have had their production restricted as the result of orders received from those in power here in Washington.

I do not know whether this bill is an antistrike bill or a labor bill. Section 2 prohibits any voluntary stoppage of work by any individual. That could be taken to apply to strikes. But, when the question was asked whether or not this would prevent a man from striking, some on the committee said "Yes," some said "No." Before our committee some said, "We will let the local draft board pass upon the question as to whether or not it is a legal strike." Of course, in many war plants there are a large number of men working who are registered with different draft boards. So you might conceivably have a situation where one draft board would say it is illegal for you to strike and to quit your job, and if you do you will go to jail. Another draft board might say it is a legal strike. Then, on the other hand, those in the classification of 18 to 45 might not be permitted to strike, while men over 45 would be.

There is also a question as to whether or not a man who may be drafted under this bill may be compelled to take a position where he will be forced to also join a union against his will.

Labor generally is opposed to this bill. Management seemingly also is opposed to the bill. On the other hand, the men charged with the military safety of this

country have told the Committee on Military Affairs, and through that committee the Rules Committee and the House of Representatives, that its passage is necessary. There is a question in my mind whether the men who lead our military forces know as much about getting production out of the factories of the country as do the men charged with heading the management thereof, or the men who represent labor.

I am firmly of the conviction, however, and I hold to the opinion, that were it not for the fact that those high in this administration had totally underestimated the needs of this Nation for war, if they had not been wrong in their judgment as to what would be required of the productive facilities of this country, this bill would not be before us now.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing, that I believe this rule should be adopted and that the House should give this bill its most careful consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I can see from the way this debate is shaping up that this is probably one of the most controversial measures that we have ever had before the House. In the light of present conditions I think it is equally one of the most crucial and one of the most important. If this were peacetime I think I could find just as many objections to this type of legislation as any Member of the House. I am willing to concede it is full of errors, full of things we do not like, probably ambiguous, and I am willing to concede also any of the objections that any Member wants to make to it; yet I do not think that is the question or will be the question in our ultimate and final vote on this bill that we will have to decide.

Maybe this measure should never have come to the floor of the House; perhaps it was a mistake to have agitated the subject at this late day in the war; but it is before us, it is here and we are going to have to vote upon it. We will have to tell the country and the armed forces whether we are going along with this type of legislation. I am not here to contend that any Member of this House could not have written a better bill. I suppose we all think we could have written a better bill. But that is not the question. This is the measure that we are here to vote upon. It is on this measure, when you come to vote aye or nay on the final passage, that you are going to have to ask your conscience, both Democrats and Republicans, whether in this hour, notwithstanding our objections, you can give a vote of no confidence to the Chiefs of Staff of the American armed forces. That is the question involved here and no other question. Many of us are going to vote for this measure with deep reluctance, and with deep misgivings.

It has been said in the press that I intend to offer certain amendments. I could offer a whole lot of amendments. I think there would be a lot of amendments that would improve this bill. But so far as my present intention goes I do not expect to offer any amendment. I shall support some amendments, and I shall oppose others but I cannot at this moment think of any amendment that the enemies of this measure can put on here that is going to drive me away or cause me to cast a vote of no confidence in the Chiefs of Staff and our Commander in Chief in this critical period of the war. I expect to support the measure no matter what you put on it.

This debate so far has taken a wide range. It looks like we are going to debate everything from the necessity of rationing food to the foreign policy of the State Department. Many of us are going to talk about a better method of settling this thing. There are going to be all sorts of suggestions that we ought to do this, and that, and the other. As a rocking-chair general, I do not yield to any man. I am just as good a rocking-chair strategist as any of you. I expect I can tell General Marshall more ways to win this war than he ever dreamed of. The trouble with them is that they are all cockeyed, and the only difference between us rocking-chair generals and General Marshall is that he knows what he is talking about. He has told this Congress that this law is necessary, and during the consideration of the measure by the Committee on Military Affairs the President, your Commander in Chief, did the very unusual thing of writing to that committee and saying to them what I am saying to you now, that notwithstanding your objections to the details of this measure, notwithstanding the fact that many of us could have written, as we will concede, a better measure, notwithstanding that we believe there are certain defects in it—notwithstanding all these things, this is a necessary measure for the winning of this war, and he urged us to pass it.

Let us boil this thing right down to what it is. This Congress, without political consideration, both Democrats and Republicans, from the time we began the preparation for this terrible conflict back in 1940, without regard to party, has given to the President and to the armed forces every single measure that they have asked for as a necessary thing for the conduct and successful conclusion of this war. This is one time when we seem to be in danger of faltering. There is but one question involved here, as I said before, can we afford to tell the country, can we afford to tell the boys in the trenches all over the world that we are going to deny them one single thing here in this very critical hour, probably the most critical hour? Are we going to deny them one single thing that the Commander in Chief has asked us for and that the Chiefs of Staff have asked us for? That is the only question involved in the passage of this bill. You can talk about any number of things that you wish to talk about. You can bring in any unrelated subject, but there is but one thing involved here, and that is are you this first time in the history of legislation over this war going to give a vote of confidence or a vote of no confidence in this administration and in your Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman were convinced in his own mind, having regard to his responsibility as a Member of this body, the civil government, that the passage of this bill would decrease production rather than increase it, would he still feel compelled to support it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is an academic question. I do not believe it. As a matter of fact, I believe the very contrary of that.

Mr. HALLECK. Is not that the fundamental question that everyone must resolve? Will it increase production or will it decrease production?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is just where I do not agree with the gentleman. I think the only measure we have before us is this measure, and this is a measure that the Commander in Chief says he needs; this is a measure the Chief of Staff says he needs. I think their judgment about how to run this war is better than mine, and I intend to abide by it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we are not presently discussing the bill, we are discussing the advisability of considering the bill. The only question before the House is, Shall the House bring up this bill for 8 hours of general debate, and then read the bill section by section under the 5-minute rule, so that every Member of the House may offer such germane amendments as he or she may see fit, that is, to perfect the bill?

Certainly this is not a political bill. It must not be a political partisan bill. We are in a war and we must win that war, not Republicans, Democrats or new dealers, but all of us. I agree very often with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who just spoke, but I do not agree with him that there is just one question here, which is, Shall we vote for this bill as it is written even without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," in order that we may show to the world that we are expressing a vote of confidence in our military leaders? I believe in our military leaders, but I shall not support any bill which I am convinced is not good legislation just because this group demands it. The gentleman from Virginia of course means that he will vote for perfecting amendments, and maybe I misunderstood him. I am sure that no person or group of persons controls him, and that in the end whatever he does will be the judgment of the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, and no one else.

The purpose of this work-or-fight bill as stated by the report of the committee, is to provide a means of meeting during wartime the manpower requirements in civilian activities, occupations, and endeavors found essential to the war effort. I take it that we are all in harmony with this purpose. It is an admirable and laudable purpose. What we are trying to do in the bill is to write a formula—a rule of action—that will accomplish the objective.

At the moment I do not know whether I am going to vote for this bill when it is finally whipped into shape, or whether I am going to vote against it. Possibly I might vote against it today. Again I may vote for it after I have heard the debate and had the benefit of the committee's explanation.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only politics that makes strange bedfellows. I just do not remember the time when apparently all organized labor and organized management, ranging from the C. I. O. to the National Manufacturers' Association, have come to Congress unitedly supporting specific legislation. This anomalous condition is worthy of more than passing notice. I do not believe these groups are united and marching arm in arm on this issue because of personal affection or a desire to be helpful one to the other. However, the IV–F men who come under the penalty provisions of this bill must render service in the manager's factory and under the labor rules and regulations made legal by virtue of compliance with the National Labor Relations Act. The Congress would hardly be warranted in ascribing any motive to the attitude of these two groups other than a sincere belief on the part of each that this bill will not work; that is, that it will not get the additional production necessary in the war effort.

If after the evidence is all in and the arguments are closed, one is convinced that this bill is more likely to retard production than it is to help production, then his duty is clear. Of course, no one can give a positive answer. Personally, I do not want to embark upon a new philosophy of attempting to draft certain members of society and place them in designated factory work without giving to them much of the same consideration given to others who are drafted and placed in the military service. In a democracy there must be equality under the law.

Mr. Speaker, it is seldom indeed that so many Members are so much at sea as to just what their duty is in connection with legislation. This is no time for prejudice, emotion, or political partisanship. It is a time for deep thought and sincere and patriotic action.

For my part, in the final analysis I am going to do that which my conscience tells me is for our best interests in the end, and I am sure my constituents would not want me to do otherwise.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, we have had some very splendid statements here, some very laudable statements, and some statements made upon a very high plane of patriotism and duty. I almost feel a bit presumptuous in attempting to add anything to what has been said. I do want to say that I regard this bill as a most momentous one. I regard this hour as a most momentous one. I regard the crisis in which the country finds itself as most momentous and I regard the position of the boys in uniform in the fox holes and on the high seas under the frozen conditions which exist on the fighting fronts as most momentous. I cannot bring myself to believe that any man or woman who has enjoyed the confidence of their constituencies sufficiently to be selected by them to represent them in this House of Representatives in this momentous period of the country's history would be small enough or would be unpatriotic enough to do otherwise than as they regard their patriotic duty under the conditions which face us. I am sure that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] felt and meant what he said. I am sure my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] meant and felt what he said. I think one did not understand the other. I think they both have in mind what you and I have in mind, namely, to endeavor to give the support to those boys over there which they are entitled to receive from us at this time. I do not think my friend from Virginia meant to say that this bill could not be improved upon. I think he knows that it can be improved upon. Of course, you and I and no other person has a monopoly on how this bill should have been written.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield briefly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will give me the opportunity to correct the gentleman from Michigan, I never said I did not favor any amendment to the bill. On the contrary, I said that I would.

Mr. COLMER. That is right. I think I understood the gentleman. None of us has a monopoly on the correct version. There are some amendments I want to see written in this bill. Time would not permit a detailed discussion of them. There are some amendments that should be written into this bill, and I may want to have an opportunity to say something about it myself later on. I do want to say this: Some 2 weeks before this bill was introduced originally by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], a man of courage and of great patriotism, I began working on a bill to try to attain this objective. I wrote a bill with the help of the legislative counsel. Unfortunately I did not get the views of the military authority, and, of course, when I went before the Committee on Military Affairs, not being a member of that committee, I did not expect to get very far with my viewpoint after the military and other agencies of the Government had gotten together on the so-called May bill.

I say that in fairness to everybody. There is no criticism of anybody, especially of the Military Affairs Committee. It was their responsibility to write this bill and recognize it.

I would not say that, regardless of the form this bill took, I would vote for it, but I will go this far along with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that it would be pretty hard to find something that could be put into the bill that would prevent giving my voice and my support to those boys on the fighting front.

Nobody in America has made any sacrifice in this war with the exception of the boys who are over there and those who are in distress in soul and heart and mind, who are left behind to grieve for them. The rest of us are more prosperous and better off than ever before. Most of us are living better than we ever lived before in our lives. The only sacrifice, I repeat, has been made by those whom you and I have called into the uniform of their country. Why should not the man who stays at home be forced, if necessary, to make some contribution to this war effort? Who will rise and tell me now in the brief time I have remaining, that the same Congress which reaches out and taps the young, virile manhood of this country on the shoulder and tells them to come in and put on the uniform of their country and go over there and die for it, has not also the authority and the duty to reach out and tell the other man who is getting higher wages than he ever got and who is living better in most instances than he ever lived, that he must make his contribution to the winning of this war? Mr. Speaker, the fact that no one rises to challenge this statement is indicative of the fact that it is unchallengable.

A moment ago I spoke of the bill which I had introduced to meet this situation which now confronts us. And while I realize that without the backing of the War Department, the Executive, or those responsible for the war effort, my bill would have little chance of passage, I am still, nevertheless, of the opinion that it was an all-out and forthright approach to the problem. In fact, my objection to the bill under consideration is that it is another weak attempt to meet a real problem. I have learned in my service here that when we attempt to enact a bill to meet a problem of the country, that we compromise in an effort to meet the objection of so many segments and groups of our people that, in the end, the legislation fails to squarely solve the problem and too often the result is so much eyewash. That is what happened in the Smith-Connally bill, when we set out so boldly to do something about strikes in war industries during the war. Nevertheless, my desire to approach some degree of equality of sacrifice by all of our people in this war impels me to the support of this measure, unless it is too badly crippled by further weakening amendments as we consider it.

My own approach to the problem in my bill to which I referred, nevertheless, I think, was more forthright.

Briefly, the bill would set up another branch of the military forces to be known as the supply forces. All persons subject to the provisions of selective service, who are in a deferred status, would automatically be included in a pool known as the supply forces and be placed on inactive status subject to the call of the President as Commander in Chief to render such service as is considered essential to the war effort. When the services of such person so deferred were needed for the war effort, he would be called from inactive status to active status in the supply forces. The provisions of the bill would apply to, first, those persons presently deferred because of physical disability, the so-called

IV–F's, who are not presently engaged in essential war work and who could pass a prescribed physical examination; second, those persons not engaged in an occupation essential to the war effort; third, those persons who are enjoying occupational deferment but who strike or leave their jobs; fourth, those persons who were engaged in a job essential to the war effort who acquired a record, after the passage of this bill, of willful absenteeism for which there was no reasonable justification; and, fifth, all other persons subject to the provisions of the selective-service law not herein enumerated who are not specifically exempt by law.

The bill also provides that net profits on war contracts in excess of $10,000 shall be limited to 6 percent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time, 11 minutes, to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include some brief excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. While the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] was addressing the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] asked him whether he believed there would be more production or less production in the event of the passage of this bill, and I believe the gentleman from Virginia did not answer that question. So I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he thinks the only thing that should govern our votes is the fact that President Roosevelt wants it, or are there are some other things that should govern our votes, and what are those things?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think there are three or four important questions to determine. I approach the discussion and consideration of this bill with an open mind. It should not be political or partisan in any sense. I think the first thing to determine is whether or not this legislation is necessary; second, will the provisions of this bill increase or diminish production; and third, is the bill as finally submitted, constitutional or unconstitutional.

As far as I am concerned, therefore, in the consideration of this bill I shall constantly keep these main issues before me. The matter before us at the moment is the consideration of the rule. I favor the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have had granted to me time to discuss another matter. With the Speaker's indulgence I shall use the time allotted to me to speak on this other matter. Because I have so much to say and my time is so limited I regret that I shall not be able to yield. I am going to to speak on the equal-rights amendment.

EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1945, I introduced House Joint Resolution No. 71 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which is as follows:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress and the several States shall have power, with their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This amendment shall take effect three years after the date of ratification.

This resolution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution.

At lease 7 other Members of the House have introduced identical or similar resolutions, and approximately 73 Members of the House have joined as sponsors in supporting this suggested amendment.

A similar amendment was introduced in the House and Senate of the Seventy-eighth Congress. These were referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and House. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate reported the resolution favorably. A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee made a unanimous favorable report to the full committee, but the full committee did not take favorable action.

The National Woman's Party, headed by Miss Alice Paul, has since 1913 spearheaded in the movement to secure equal rights for men and women without regard to sex. Miss Paul was a very active and effective leader in helping to secure the franchise for women. Thirty-one national organizations of women and teachers have endorsed this proposed equal-rights amendment. They are as follows:

General Federation of Women's Clubs.

National Education Association of the United States.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

National Woman's Party.

National Association of Women Lawyers.

Women's National Democratic Club, Inc.

American Medical Women's Association, Inc.

American Society of Women Accountants.

American Women's Society of Certified Public Accountants.

Osteopathic Women's National Association.

National Association of School Secretaries.

National Council of Women Chiropractors.

Women's Auxiliary to the National Chiropractic Association.

Association of American Women Dentists.

American Federation of Soroptimists Clubs.

American Alliance of Civil Service Women.

American Council for Equal Legal Status.

National Association of Women.

National Association of Colored Women.

Mary Ball Washington Association of America.

Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Mothers and Women of America, Inc.

Congress of State Societies.

Pilot International.

St. Joan Society—Catholic Women.

We, The Mothers, Mobilize for America.

Alpha Iota Society.

Avalon National Poetry Shrine.

Wheel of Progress.

League of Professional Women.

Industrial Women's League for Equality.

These organizations represent a total of about 3,000,000 women, from every walk of life.

In introducing the resolution I not only seek to carry out the wishes of those 31 organizations of women, but to carry out the direct and specific pledges of the Republican national platforms of 1940 and 1944. These planks were unanimously approved by the Republican National Conventions, 1940 and 1944. The plank approved by the Republican National Convention at Chicago in 1944 is as follows:

We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women. We favor job opportunities in the post-war world open to men and women alike without discrimination in rate of pay because of sex.

As we recall, the Democratic platform in 1940 was silent on this important question. As evidence of the growing interest and acceptance of this proposal by the two major political parties, the Democrats aproved a plank in their platform in 1944 in which the following language was used:

We favor legislation insuring equal pay for equal work regardless of sex.

We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women.

It can be seen that the two great major political parties stand committed in favor of this proposed amendment. President Roosevelt and Senator Truman, Governor Dewey and Governor Bricker, as well as each and every Republican and Democratic Member of the House and Senate in accepting their respective nominations and in approving the platforms of their respective parties, and in receiving the support of the voters of the Nation, stand pledged to submit this amendment for the consideration of the people of the several States. Being a delegate to each of those national conventions and helping to adopt the platform, and being elected on the platform in 1940 and 1944, I feel in honor bound to do what I can to carry out this pledge of my party and myself.

Our distinguished Republican leader of the House, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, who gave

valuable aid in having the equal-rights plank placed in the 1944 Republican platform, said:

I am for the amendment absolutely and unqualifiedly.

Former Senator John W. Townsend, of Delaware, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, in commenting upon this plank in the Republican platform, stated:

The Republican Party is proud to have been the first to carry the banner of equality for women. I am wholeheartedly for the amendment and believe it will not be long before it will take its place beside the suffrage amendment in our National Constitution.

The distinguished Senator, WARREN AUSTIN, of Vermont, who presented the equal-rights amendment to the platform committee, said:

This amendment is very close to my heart and I am particularly gratified that it will be placed in the Republic platform. I had the honor of submitting the favorable report of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to the Senate in the spring of 1944 and I am very happy that it has now been approved by the whole Republican convention.

The proposal received the commendation of Governor Wills, of Vermont; Governor Bottolfson, of Idaho; Governor Schoeppel, of Kansas; Governor Vivian, of Colorado; Governor Bacon, of Delaware, and former Governor Landon, of Kansas, as well as other governors.

Hon. Harrison Spangler, who was chairman of the National Republican Committee at the time of the convention of 1944, assured the National Woman's Party before the session of that convention began, that he had no doubt that the Republican Party would adhere to its traditional stand for justice and equality, and again endorse the amendment. Following the endorsement of the amendment, he congratulated the women workers of the Republican Party for its consistent championing of this great cause.

Hon. Henry P. Fletcher, general counsel of the National Republican Committee, the Honorable B. Carroll Reece, national committeeman from Tennessee, and scores of other Republican men and women of national prominence, commended the Republican convention on its action and are supporting actively and effectively this proposal.

This amendment merely provides that there shall be no discrimination against women or men on account of sex. We know that many of our Federal laws and some of the laws of each of our 48 States, as well as some of the ordnances of cities and towns, discriminate against women on account of their sex.

On the other hand, some Federal, State, and city laws discriminate unfairly against men, and deny to them the equal protection of the law. A case in point is the law which protects women against industrial poisons, but fails to give the same protection to men exposed to exactly the same dangers to health and life. Under the proposed amendment, no such discriminatory laws would be valid.

There are approximately as many women citizens as there are men. These discriminations against a citizen or group of citizens is undemocratic and un-American.

Can anyone say that women are less intelligent or less patriotic than men? Statistics show that women own 65 percent of the savings accounts, 40 percent of all real estate, 60 percent of the total national wealth, and they are beneficiaries of 80 percent of the more than 60,000,000 insurance policies outstanding. They have struggled heroically and patriotically in the building of our Nation, from the landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock in 1620 and the earliest settlements in Virginia. They have carried on in loneliness and sorrow while their fathers and husbands and sons won glory on the battlefield, and they, too, have gone to war as nurses, WAC's, WAVES, MARINES, SPARS, and WASPS.

They have gone down in the valley of the shadow of death and brought forth sons and trained these sons who have defended our country on land and sea, in the air, and under the sea. They have nursed and trained our children, brought joy and comfort, honor and success, to their husbands, sons, and daughters. They have been the builders and the chief supports of the three great pillars of our national structure—the home, the school, and the church. They have taken an active and intelligent part in the office, the shop, and the mill. They have come to the Nation's rescue in helping to provide food, clothing, ships, planes, guns, tanks, shells, and other munitions of war.

Who can say that men have surpassed them in science, art, music, literature, or government, when they have had a chance, even though they have been discriminated against by Federal and State laws?

It was the heart and leadership of a woman that gave us the Red Cross, the Y. W. C. A., and many other great organizations, that touched the heart strings and the purse strings of the men and women of the world in aid of the needy and the distressed of every land, of every race, creed, and color.

The home, the church, and the school; and these great humanitarian organizations could survive without a man but not without a woman.

If this amendment is ratified by three-fourths of the States, on and after 3 years from that time there can be no discrimination by Federal or State laws on the basis of sex. This does not mean that there will be no difference between men and women in abilities, or in industrial, political, or social opportunities. It merely means that in the enactment of laws by Congress and by the legislatures of the several States, and by the ordinance of cities, neither men nor women shall be discriminated against on account of sex.

This proposed amendment will not introduce any new principles into the American conceptions of justice and right. It will simply bring our Constitution and laws into harmony with the great fundamental principles upon which our Nation was founded, and for which we are fighting today.

Let it be understood that the proposed amendment is no attack or reflection on the millions of industrious, patriotic, home-loving, God-fearing American fathers and husbands who sincerely and dearly love their wives, children, and homes. It provides merely that there shall be no legal discriminations against fathers, husbands, mothers, wives, or any other persons on account of sex.

FIFTY CENTURIES OF STRUGGLE

In the beginning of recorded history people were divided into two groups, one of which was a very small group whose members arrogated to themselves the right to become emperors, kings, dictators, and masters over the others, and a much larger group, classed as dependents, slaves, or servants. They were governed without their consent. They were held in subjugation by force. They yearned to be free. They desired religious, political, social, and industrial freedom. They struggled through the centuries. Millions of them gave their lives for freedom. Occasionally empires and kingdoms were overthrown and the people enjoyed temporary liberty.

Finally the British barons wrested from King John that great document, the Magna Carta. A few of the important rights of the barons were set out in writing, which King John was forced to sign. The common people and women had very little place in that great document. This large group struggled against oppression. Thousands of them left their home in Europe and sought homes in the New World. But the long arm of power and might of the few reached across the Atlantic and imposed their will upon those who came here seeking religious, political, social, and industrial freedom. After nearly 80 years of struggle, in the American Revolution we broke the power of those oppressors.

Our founding fathers wrote the Constitution. It is an immortal document. It is as high above the Magna Carta in human rights as the heavens are high above the earth. We achieved religious, political, social, and industrial freedom for the white men of America. But in that great instrument we sadly neglected to recognize the rights of white women, black men, and black women. Black men and black women remained slaves; white women for the most part were denied social, political, economic, and industrial liberty.

We fought another great war to save this Nation and to free black men and black women. We adopted the thirteenth, the fourteenth, and the fifteenth amendments that made black men and black women free, and gave the black man the right to vote. But white women and black women were denied the right to vote. Until the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted, women, like idiots, aliens, and convicted criminals, were still without the right to vote except in a few States. I never could understand why we denied our mothers, our wives, the mothers of our children, this great group of patriotic, liberty-loving citizens, the right to vote and placed them in a class with idiots, criminals, and aliens.

It was my great good fortune to be a delegate to the Republican National Convention at Chicago in 1916, and to serve

as a member of the resolutions committee in that convention. A very substantial majority of that committee wrote a plank into the platform urging that American women be given the right to vote on the same terms as men. The convention approved that plank in the Republican platform. In 1918 I was elected a Member of the House of Representatives. I was sworn in on March 4, 1919. President Wilson called an extra session of Congress, and after the House was organized and certain preliminaries were disposed of, the first vote that came up in the House was the adoption of the resolution proposing the amendment to the Federal Constitution giving American women the right to vote. It was my pleasure to vote for this resolution. It was adopted, and later ratified by the States and became the nineteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution. American mothers, wives, and sisters had the ballot. They were no longer classed with criminals, idiots, and aliens.

But American women are not entirely free politically, economically, socially, or industrially because of discriminatory laws passed by Congress, by legislatures of the several States, and by city ordinances.

This proposed amendment will remove those discriminations and prevent the enactment of any more such laws in the future. It will make American women citizens of this great Nation in truth and in fact. Then American women can rejoice with American men in the realization of the dreams of the common men and women of 50 centuries ago.

In the near future I hope to discuss more in detail discrimination against women by reason of sex in the Federal and State laws and in the ordinances of towns and cities.

In the community-property States, all property acquired by either spouse after marriage, except that acquired by gift or inheritance, is community property and belongs theoretically to the husband and wife equally. But, as a matter of fact, the husband usually has sole control of it during the marriage and can use or dispose of it without the consent of the wife. Cases have been brought to the courts, and the right of the husband has been sustained to deny her the right to support her own children by a previous marriage out of the income she has earned after marrying him. In some States he can will away his share of the community property, but she cannot will away a cent, if she dies first, even to her own children. And in some States she has to pay an inheritance tax before she can take possession of his share of the community property if he dies first; but, if she dies first, he enters automatically into possession of her share, without paying any inheritance tax.

Equally unfair are many laws relating to property rights under the common law.

In some of the States, a woman may have, by her own efforts, bought and paid for lands, or she may have inherited the lands; yet she cannot sell these lands or any interest in them unless her husband joins in the conveyance. Any conveyance made by her without his joining in is null and void. On the other hand, the husband with real estate in his own name and perhaps acquired largely by the intelligence, industry, or funds of his wife, can legally sell and convey the lands. Of course, if the wife should outlive the husband, she could assert dowry rights.

In many other States the earnings of the wife and minor children belong to the husband. In some jurisdictions the mother may be a woman of excellent character, industrious, and the real head of the family, while the husband may be the opposite type. Yet the father is favored as the legal guardian of the children. This is sometimes very unfortunate. I remember a little fellow, 8 years of age, who had both his feet cut off by a railroad train. The railroad denied liability. It was necessary to institute an action against the railroad. The father insisted on his legal right to be appointed guardian of his young son. The mother was an intelligent, hard-working woman with most exemplary habits. The father was just the opposite. The railroad agents, knowing the unreliability of the father, without consulting me or the mother, entered into a compromise settlement, settling the lawsuit for $250. We managed, after considerable effort to have this settlement set aside and finally collected from the railroad approximately $13,000. This mother would never have thought of selling her child's two feet for $250 if she had been joint guardian of her child.

I know a man not far from my home who had a wife and 12 children, ranging from a few months to 16 years of age. They were all at home. They owned no land, no personal property except their meager clothing and household goods and one fine Jersey cow. The mother was responsible for the family having one cow. The cow was the mainstay of the family. The father traded that fine Jersey cow for an old second-hand Ford car. No persuasion could have induced that mother to have made such an improvident trade. But under the laws of Kentucky the father had the legal right to swap the family cow for this old Ford.

In many States married women are not permitted to teach in public schools, or if a woman should be a teacher and marry, she would forfeit her right to teach even though she might be the sole support of her husband and children. These laws do not apply to men.

In one or more States women are not allowed to hold a position as clerk, secretary, or stenographer to any committee of the legislature. In many jurisdictions the causes or grounds for divorce are much more rigid against women than against men. In a number of States matters relating to women are still governed by the old common law, or its principles. The old common law gave very little recognition to the political, economic, social, or industrial rights of women. In some States men may marry again on same day on which a divorce is granted them, while women must wait 10 months before they can again marry.

In some States and some cities women may be required to work longer hours than men and receive less pay for identical services. There is no State in the United States in which there are not one or more glaring discriminations under their respective laws against women on account of sex.

In many States intelligent, loyal, and patriotic women do not have the rights accorded to aliens and persons convicted of crimes in this country.

May I repeat that this amendment merely proposes that neither Congress nor State Legislatures nor city councils may pass any law that will discriminate against women or men by reason of sex. There is no more reason for discrimination of this sort than there would be for discriminating against men or women in the right to vote.

We should, without further delay, submit to the States for ratification this constitutional amendment and grant equal justice under the law.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, my criticism of this measure is that it does not go far enough. It is not a work-or-fight bill. Until the Congress adopts such a measure it will have failed to recognize that total war calls for total service.

DID THE PRESIDENT VIOLATE A STATUTE?—MORE THAN JUST ANOTHER PAY-OFF

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one familiar with the political situation which has existed during the last several years should be amazed by the booting of Jesse Jones out of the Department of Commerce and the attempt to install therein Mr. Henry Wallace.

The amazing aspect of the removal and the reward is the candor and the brutal frankness with which the President puts on fair, clean, white paper the sordid, brutal nature of his action.

The political corruption of this administration has long been a matter of common knowledge. Several years ago a Senate committee, controlled by members of the Democratic Party, disclosed that money appropriated by Congress for the relief of the needy and the unfortunate, the hungry, the cold, and the sick had been used for political purposes. That is a matter of record.

The deal by which the Communist, Earl Browder, was released from the Federal penitentiary in return for his political support for the fourth-term candidate, was equaled only by the corrupt methods by which Boss Tweed, Tammany Hall, the Pendergast and other city political machines attained their ends.

The administration's blocking of legislation which would have ended one phase of Dan J. Tobin's teamsters' racketeering in the city of New York was paid for by the political support of Tobin's union in the last election.

Payments of Federal money have been made, first to one group and then to another, each with the idea that it was bread cast upon the waters, which, when

it returned, would take the shape of ballots in the box. Over and over again the administration has paid, by the granting of special favors, for the political support of Phil Murray and the Communists in his organization.

In the last campaign, when the ungodly and subversive Communists crawled into bed with the President, instead of kicking them out, he merely told them to roll over.

A Democratic Member of the other body, as long ago as June of 1937, from the floor of the Senate frankly and accurately said:

> The last election was carried by people who were getting favors from the Government, people who were subsidized by the Government, people who were on relief rolls, and people who were sanctioning the invasion of private property and its occupation, as is being done now.

Jesse Jones, because of his honesty, his competency, his square dealing, had the confidence of the Congress, and billions of dollars were voted, extraordinary powers were granted, to the agencies which he headed because the Congress believed the money would be spent, the power exercised, by Jesse Jones, in the interest of national welfare. He has been a faithful public servant and as his reward he is publicly kicked out of the Cabinet to make way for Sidney Hillman's P. A. C.'s 1948 Presidential candidate.

To Mr. Jones the President wrote:

> This is a very difficult letter to write—first, because of our long friendship and splendid relations during all these years and also because of your splendid services to the Government and the excellent way in which you have carried out the many difficult tasks during these years.

Did the President find it difficult to put on the mask of hypocrisy? Did his conscience hurt him because he was about to sneak a knife into the back of an efficient public servant?

In the second paragraph of his letter, the President wrote that he had told Wallace at the end of the campaign, and note that phrase—at the end of the campaign—that, because of his services in the campaign, he deserved almost any job which he—Wallace—thought he could satisfactorily perform. So Wallace picked the job—a job in the Cabinet, the one in which he could do the greatest harm to American institutions, to American business, which he has consistently berated; in which he could have the greatest opportunity to remake America—and the President gave it to him.

The President was careful to state that "at the end of the campaign" he had promised a job to Wallace.

If a job, directly or indirectly, by word, letter, or by inference, was promised to Mr. Wallace prior to the election, in return for political support during the campaign, then President Roosevelt violated section 249 of title 2 of the United States Code, which reads:

> It is unlawful for any candidate to directly or indirectly promise or pledge the appointment, or the use of his influence or support for the appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment, for the purpose of procuring support in his candidacy. (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, sec. 310, 43 Stat. 1073.)

Business—political and other kinds of business—is transacted through word of mouth, by writing, or by agreements which are implied.

There is an implied promise where the conduct on the part of one leads another to believe that, if certain things are done, the one doing them will be rewarded.

Was Mr. Wallace led to believe, by word or act, or by surrounding circumstances, that, if he relinquished his ambition, his desire to be the Vice-Presidential nominee in 1944, or, if defeated in that ambition, he wholeheartedly supported the New Deal, he would receive some reward? If he was, then he was "promised" something.

Was there, prior to Wallace's appointment as Secretary of Commerce, an understanding, explicit or implied, between the President and Mr. Wallace that Mr. Wallace should have some political position with the administration in return for support of the President, the administration, the New Deal cause, during the then pending campaign?

In the New York Times of July 12, 1944, under date of July 11, Arthur Krock wrote:

> Four years ago, when the President was informed on the telephone by his floor managers at the Chicago convention that the leaders were about to nominate him for a third term but were resisting his selection of Henry A. Wallace as running mate Mr. Roosevelt sent word that his acceptance would be conditional on the choice of Mr. Wallace.

That is a statement to the effect that Mr. Roosevelt would not accept a nomination at the hands of his party unless Mr. Wallace was rewarded by being nominated as Vice President.

That statement on the part of the President is sufficient to show that, in 1940, the President was at least willing to exert his political power to give a political nomination to Mr. Wallace.

On July 14, 1944, and prior to the Democratic National Convention, according to the New York Times, the President wrote a letter, which reads as follows:

> THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON
> *Hyde Park, N. Y., July 14, 1944.*
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: In the light of the probability that you will be chosen as permanent chairman of the convention, and because I know that many rumors accompany all conventions, I am wholly willing to give you my own personal thought in regard to the selection of a candidate for Vice President. I do this at this time because I expect to be away from Washington for the next few days.
>
> The easiest way of putting it is this: I have been associated with Henry Wallace during his past 4 years as Vice President, for 8 years earlier while he was Secretary of Agriculture, and well before that. I like him and I respect him and he is my personal friend. For these reasons I personally would vote for his renomination if I were a delegate to the convention.
>
> At the same time I do not wish to appear in any way as dictating to the convention. Obviously the convention must do the deciding. And it should—and I am sure it will—give great consideration to the pros and cons of its choice.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
> FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
>
> Hon. SAMUEL D. JACKSON,
> *Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Ill.*

The convention was held. Sidney Hillman was demanding that Mr. Wallace be given the Vice Presidential nomination. On the question of whether the President then deserted Mr. Wallace and agreed to accept Mr. TRUMAN, I find no direct evidence. We do know that Mr. Wallace acquiesced in the arrangement and the query naturally arises, Did the President, directly or indirectly, promise, by inference or otherwise, to give Mr. Wallace a position with the administration, and did Mr. Wallace acquiesce and in return campaign for the fourth term?

James B. Reston, in a special to the New York Times, which was published August 11, 1944, wrote:

> President Roosevelt recently reassured Vice President Henry A. Wallace that he wants him to have an important place in the Government if the Roosevelt administration is returned to office in November.
>
> Mr. Roosevelt is said to have sent a message to Mr. Wallace congratulating him on his fight for the Democratic Vice Presidential nomination and telling him that so long as the present administration remained in office an important post would be open to him.

Was that statement by Mr. Roosevelt held out as an inducement to Mr. Wallace to do a little campaigning for the fourth term and thereafter, because of it, did he speak for the administration.

If Mr. Wallace thinks or feels as does the average, normal human being, he must have been somewhat disappointed by his failure to receive the Vice Presidential nomination. Undoubtedly, Mr. Wallace knew that, if the President desired to exert his power at the Chicago convention, he could have forced through the nomination of Mr. Wallace.

If Mr. Roosevelt had said in July of 1944, as he did prior to the convention of 1940, that he would not accept the Presidential nomination unless Mr. Wallace was nominated as his running mate, does anyone doubt but that Wallace would have been nominated as the Vice Presidential candidate?

Disappointed and chagrined as he must have been because of the President's refusal to go all out for him, did Mr. Wallace need encouragement in order to bring him out wholeheartedly, enthusiastically, and vigorously in support of the fourth term? If he did, he must certainly have received it when the President sent him a message telling him that "so long as the present administration remained in office an important post would be open to him—Wallace."

Was the "important post" to which the President made reference and which he promised would be open to Mr. Wallace "as long as the present administration remained in office" to be a gift or a reward for past services, or was it held out as an inducement for Mr. Wallace to get into the collar and really plow in the political field a few furrows which would bring home the votes at the November election.

Perhaps we are not justified in saying what was in Mr. Roosevelt's mind when he gave Mr. Wallace the assurance of an important post in the administration "so long as the present administration remained in office." We are justified, however, in looking at his words; and the Times quotes Mr. Roosevelt as telling Mr. Wallace that he wanted him to have an important place in the Government if—just note that word "if"—the Roosevelt administration is returned to office in November.

Was that a gentle hint that the prospect of a job would be made better "if" Mr. Wallace got out and campaigned?

Did Mr. Wallace know the meaning of that little word "if"? Did that sentence mean that "if the Roosevelt administration is returned to office in November"; did it mean that "so long as the present administration remains in office," a political job would be open to Mr. Wallace, "if" Wallace went out on the hustings and did his stunt; and if his efforts were successful and the President was reelected, Wallace would get a job? If it did and the President so meant it and Wallace so understood it, then did the President violate the statute?

Are we justified in believing that Mr. Wallace understands ordinary language, is actuated by ordinary intelligence? Would not the average man under like circumstances be led to believe and understand not only that if the administration remained in office he would get a job but that if he wanted a job he had better get out and see that the administration was returned to office at the coming election?

In his article of the 26th, David Lawrence asked if the President disregarded another statute forbidding political rewards when he sent Wallace's nomination to the Senate. Lawrence quoted section 61b of title 18 of the United States Code, which reads as follows:

> It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any act of Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election."

He then cited the President's letter of January 20, 1945, to Jesse Jones and stated that the President attempted to give the office of Secretary of Commerce to Mr. Wallace as a reward for his political activities. But if he did, that alone would not be a violation of the statute.

Mr. Lawrence overlooks the fact that a man may be rewarded for political activities without violating any statute. The statute to which he makes reference and the one which I have cited makes it an offense only if the reward is given in fulfillment of a promise, express or implied, for political support.

As I read the two sections, if an individual goes out and without any promise of reward by way of appointment to a political office supports either a candidate, an administration, or a program, there is no reason why he cannot be rewarded for his support.

On the contrary, if his support is given because of a promise of political preferment, express or implied, then if the reward is bestowed as a result of that promise, the one giving it is guilty of a violation of both sections.

If Mr. William K. Hutchinson, head of the International News Service in Washington, in his dispatch quoted by Mr. Lawrence was correct, in his statement that Mr. Roosevelt, prior to the election, sent Wallace a telegram reading: "Tell Mrs. Wallace not to make any move to leave Washington. There will always be a place in my household for you," and if Mr. Roosevelt intended by that wire to advise Wallace that he would have a place in the administration in return for Wallace's support, and later Wallace, relying on the promise, supported the administration and was appointed to be Secretary of Commerce, then it might be said that the President had violated the sections above referred to.

If the foregoing quotations are true, is it not the duty of the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, to institute an investigation, present the matter to a grand jury, to ascertain whether Mr. Roosevelt, in appointing Mr. Wallace, has violated section 249 of title 2 of the United States Code, part of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, or section 61b of title 18?

It might be well to call Mr. Reston and all those who are familiar with political events at the Chicago convention and since, so that the people may know whether the Chief Executive has been unjustly maligned or whether a Federal statute has been violated.

Is there a fairly well-defined public opinion that the appointment of Mr. Wallace was in part influenced by the fact that he had, during the campaign, as the President wrote, "displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country," and that Wallace's campaigning was inspired by the hope of a political reward?

Some people seem to believe that the appointment was in part a reward for political service rendered during the last campaign. A searching investigation should be made so that, if that opinion is unfounded, the people's faith in their Chief Executive may be reinforced.

In brief, the question is, was the appointment the fulfillment of a promise, direct or implied, made to Mr. Wallace in return for his political support?

Whether the President did or did not violate a Federal statute, it is now evident to the youth of the land that a faithful, honest, efficient public official, who has given years of his life to the service of his country, can and will be publicly kicked out of office in order that a political supporter, who has few qualifications for the job, may be rewarded for that support. What a disgusting, nauseating example to put before the innocent, honest, patriotic youth of America who heretofore have believed that the good and faithful servant would at least, if not rewarded, be treated justly.

The President, by his own letter, stands disclosed, not as a man thinking first of the interest of his country, of an efficient administration, but as one who will advance his political interests, the political interests of his friends, at the expense of the public service.

The President's letter was amazing only because of his confession that he was using a public office and public funds to pay a private political debt.

Back over the years, the youth of our land have been told to look to the official acts of Washington and Lincoln as examples of honesty, of truthfulness, of faithful public service, devotion to one's country. The boys and girls were inspired to follow in the footsteps of those true Americans—to strive to be honest, truthful, self-sacrificing, and wholly devoted to our country and its institutions.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt's firing of Jones, whose record of disinterested public service he praised, to make available a highly important public office as a reward for political work, is a sorry, sordid example to place before American youth. It tends to disillusion them, impair their faith in public officials. The President should give more thought to the war, less to the political arena.

Harry Whiteley, editor of the Dowagiac Daily News of Dowagiac, Mich., on the 22d last expressed views which are similar to those of many an editor outside the great metropolitan districts. It is as follows:

> One of the first of the campaign pay-offs is revealed today as the announcement is made that Henry Wallace, he of the cowlicky hair, is to replace Jesse Jones, the pillar of financial stability, in the office of Secretary of Commerce. So far as we are concerned it fits the pattern that a small majority of the voters wished on themselves. Not having any responsibility in the matter we expect to sit back and watch the writhers writhe and the left-wingers cheer, without a pang for either of them, and no self-pity. The raw brutality, the simpering sentimentality, and the cold-blooded political practicality of the appointment should leave us stuttering, gasping for breath and alarmed for our sacred institutions, but it doesn't. It leaves us sort of sick a good deal like seasickness, but we have been tossed by the waves for 12 long years so why should we not be getting used to it? We have in this replacement the complete picture of new dealism in its natural, raw state. Mr. Jones, long the hero of the cash boxer, the exemplar of business as practiced by the New Deal when it first went into the lists, having run his course in the fullness of time, gives up to the delightfully naive—or isn't he naive—Wallace with the unkempt hair and the rough-carved mug, whose eyes, filled with the light of mysticism, are nevertheless turned directly on the glory seat, and whose strategy is to cash in to the full on the present wave of paternalism and land himself right in the chair of the Great White Father, providing he can ever wear the present occupant down and out. Mr. Wallace has played the game according to the old story books. He has risen from the ranks and made his sacrifice and contributed his philosophy, which is to solve all the world's problems without much work and revamp our social and economic structure here at home so that instead of the dread ogre of capitalism which has throttled the worker and made slaves out of everybody, to their great profit, we shall have the fine upstanding figure of the labor organizer in the person of the outlander Sidney Hillman, leading the way to fame and glory, at the country's expense. And instead of a chicken in every pot and two cars in every garage, we are to have eternal bliss in the way of social security in which everybody supports every-

body else but no one does too much work. That is the ultimate goal and now, under Henry Wallace, we expect to reach it immediately, or possibly not later than we get the war over. It is all so simple and we now have so simple a mind to direct the economic phases—a mind in tune. As we said before, we enjoy these scenes no end, having no responsibility for them. We like to see the Rooseveltian plan unfold itself in such grand exhibitions as this, and we only hope that the dear old country which has punished itself with so many penitential flagellations the past 12 years will not faint under the latest impositions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. Crowley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1752, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on the 8th day of December 1941, the Congress of the United States passed a resolution in which it placed subject to the will and disposition of the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States the entire personnel of the Army and the Navy. It declared war against Japan, and to effectuate that declaration and bring about the winning of the war with complete victory it placed at the disposal of the Commander in Chief the entire resources of this Nation.

Prior to that time the Congress of the United States, believing that we saw approaching war clouds, had enacted what is known as the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 which brought into the armed forces up to that time about two and one-half million young men of this country. In order that that declaration might be made effective the Congress later extended the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and that extension will terminate, unless the Congress takes other action, on the 15th day of next May, less than 6 months. The pending bill (H. R. 1752) is an amendment to that act.

When introduced, that bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. We conducted rather extensive hearings at which we undertook to give reasonable opportunity to those who were for and those who were against it. I think we did a fair job of that. I have enjoyed rather than resented the debate here today on the rule, some of which was rather critical of the bill but that is within the right of the Members of the House of Representatives. I hope that when I undertake to discuss this bill on the merits that I will confine myself to such statements as will enable me when I vote to vote consistent with my talk.

I want to get over to the membership of this committee the admission that I, myself, am not entirely satisfied with the bill. I wanted a work-or-fight bill. I wanted it so that when a man was reclassified he would be made immediately available for induction in the armed forces if he refused to go to work. What this bill actually is, in my judgment, is a bill to provide a system by which a man must either work, fight, or go to jail or pay a fine. But it is surrounded with all kinds of precautionary protection to the man who is to be inducted.

Let me now give you briefly some of the salient things about the bill.

First of all, the bill does not come into effect until all methods or means by voluntary action have been exhausted. I do not want you to forget that. It is compulsory only as a last resort.

The bill provides that, in addition to his liability for training and service in the land or naval forces, every registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not a member of the armed forces or not exempt or deferred from training and service shall be liable to perform work in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort.

It provides that any man between 18 and 45 may be directed to leave nonessential work and enter war work as near his own community as possible.

It provides that veterans have a preferred status as far as being directed into essential work is concerned. The Selective Service may postpone calling veterans for war jobs.

The bill provides that any man directed into war industry must be given a reasonable choice of employers with the right to appeal under the provision of the Selective Service Act if a decision adverse to him is rendered.

It provides that conscientious objectors may be excused from civilian war work and directed to take employment in the national interest.

It provides for the determination of essential war plants and facilities on the basis of geographical areas—and I think this is vitally important—types of activities, types of occupations within activities, and types of plants, facilities, and farms, and that determination rests with the Director of War Mobilization or any agency authorized by him.

It provides that local selective service boards are given the responsibility of determining whether any registrant shall be frozen into a job or be directed into more essential war work.

The bill also provides that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall from time to time after conference with other agencies, including labor, agriculture, and government, certify or cause to be certified to the Director of Selective Service the extent to which in the various areas the plants, facilities, and farms are available for recruiting by management, labor, agriculture, and government, and whether or not they have failed to meet the emergency. That means, of course, if they have already met it by voluntary methods, he does not have to make a certification. That comes back again to the proposition that it is not mandatory until voluntary methods have been exhausted.

The penalty provisions do not apply unless a person against whom they are sought to be enforced is found to be guilty of willfully violating the act; in other words he must be a willful violator.

A person volunteering for or ordered to employment shall receive the same travel and subsistence pay during such travel that he would receive if the request constituted an order to report for induction at the place of his employment, and similar travel and subsistence back to the place from which he was first requested or allowed to travel, by making application within 30 days after the date of separation from the employment.

Finally we give all of these men who may be inducted into industry, under what has been called "compulsion," the benefit of the provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, and that is the act which Congress passed to give to the courts the right to suspend the enforcement of executions and judgments, to refuse to oust a tenant, and to provide for his defense by the district attorney in the district where he resides. Those are some of the general provisions that have been made in the legislation in order to constitute a safeguard for all of these men so as not to be caught by too stringent a form of legislation. As I said awhile ago, I make no apology for believing that a man who deliberately refuses to work or deliberately fails to work in an essential war plant at home, in perfect safety, in order that the men on the battle fronts of the world may have the munitions and arms and equipment and clothing, ought to be inducted into the military service without ceremony and required to take a gun and go to the battle front. Those are my views. They may be a little strong, but it is just what I believe, and I am frank enough to tell it to you.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did the gentleman and his committee find out about how many men and women were engaged in essential war plants of the country?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Philip Murray, of the C. I. O., testified, my recollection is, that there are about 53,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many workers is it proposed to obtain by this bill? How many men and women do we need in industry?

Mr. MAY. We need 900,000 for the armed services and 700,000 for industrial work, or 1,600,000 total.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Now, do those persons who are drafted or taken in under this procedure receive the same wages as those who are there in the plants; that is, those who have gone in voluntarily?

Mr. MAY. Why, of course, they will be put on the same wage scale as those who have already entered those industries. I am sure there will not be any employer in industry who would want to start out discriminating between his employees because the Government said to certain of these employees, "You must come in and work here."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am coming right to that point. We know there are tens of millions who have gone in voluntarily and are working in those plants. They are not given the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. Upon what theory do we give to those people who have stayed out and who refuse to go in, whom we now have to force in, on what theory do we give them additional benefits over those who have already gone in? I am asking the gentleman for information.

Mr. MAY. Upon the same theory that the Congress proceeded on when we passed the bill here to authorize the migration of people from one section of the country to another to aid in the agricultural effort in other parts of the country, when we passed an act providing, I think it was, $100,000,000, to provide for their transportation to and from work.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But this goes a little further. It gives these people these benefits that the soldiers and sailors have. It gives them civil rights and exemptions, such as exemption from being dispossessed for nonpayment of rent and exemption from a judgment being levied against them, and so forth. My point is—and I am asking for information—why should this group be favored in that respect over those who are patriotically going in and doing the job without being forced to do so?

Mr. MAY. Those who have already been in the jobs for 2 or 3 years have been provided for with reference to their transportation, so far as the Army had to do with them and so far as the Navy had to do with them. We merely state that these men who are required to work in these plants where perhaps they do not want to go, if they do go and work there, they ought to have their transportation to and from those plants.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As a committee, we would want to have this information. We do give them an added inducement, do we not, to go into these plants and work?

Mr. MAY. Well, we hope they will regard it as an added inducement, and that by reason of it they will not hesitate to go in, and that this bill would become effective under a voluntary system.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am not referring to transportation. I am referring to the civil benefits for soldiers and sailors.

Mr. MAY. I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I must yield to some other gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am interested in paragraph (n) (1) on page 1, with reference to classification of farmers. I am interested in knowing how far the Director of War Mobilization may go in saying to one farmer or one class of farmers "You will have to close down your farm and engage in something else." For instance, under this bill will the Director be able to say to a cotton farmer or to a cane farmer, "You have to cease farming operations and go to Nebraska and raise wheat"? Would such a thing be possible under this bill?

Mr. MAY. I do not think it would be possible. Furthermore the plan of the bill as contemplated by the committee is that men shall be utilized in the community where they live, just as far as possible. If a man owns a cotton farm in Georgia it would be against the spirit of the legislation to move him to California to grow fruit, or to move him up into Michigan to grow potatoes, or to Nebraska to grow wheat. I have no idea in the world that a man with the experience, intelligence, and patriotism of Mr. James F. Byrnes would resort to any such method. The gentleman, of course, knows about as much about what is in his mind as I do, and I am not speaking about his mind. I am perfectly willing, however, to risk the judgment of Justice Byrnes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Did I understand the chairman to say that where a man refused to abide by the law, and was convicted, he could pay a fine or be sent to jail for the violation?

Mr. MAY. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Suppose he goes out from jail or leaves the courthouse after paying the fine and continues in his wayward conduct, could he be placed in jeopardy twice for the same offense?

Mr. MAY. According to my reading of the Constitution he could not be placed in jeopardy twice for the same offense. I think that is expressly prohibited in the Constitution.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is true, then the man who paid the fine would be excused.

Mr. MAY. He would be excused, for that particular violation, but he would be like a man who is charged with carrying a concealed weapon and who had been convicted once. If he carries that weapon on a different day, he has committed a separate offense and could be convicted again.

Mr. MICHENER. Then the Government would have to start proceedings all over again, serve notice, and go through all of it?

Mr. MAY. I do not anticipate there will be many men who will pay a fine of $10,000 under this law; neither do I anticipate there will be many of them who will want to go to jail for 5 years. Consequently I think the penalties in this bill will operate to the same extent that penalties operate in existing laws. They deter men from violating the law, particularly if the penalties are severe, as they seem to be in this legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. Psychologically I agree with the gentleman, but in drafting a law I have always thought it better to think of possibilities rather than probabilities. My other question is this: As I understand the gentleman, he said that conscientious objectors would not be required to engage in war work. Does that mean that a man, by claiming he is a conscientious objector, will not be required to work in any industry that is engaged in making equipment which the boys at the front need?

Mr. MAY. That question will arise in the local draft boards where the man is known by the members of the board. He is their neighbor, and they will know about him as well as about his good or bad faith. They will determine the question of his good faith. If they know about him and know what his practices have been and what his conduct has been in the past they will determine it and decide it and decide where he shall work and direct him to do it. If he disobeys that order, then he is subject to the penalties of this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I understand the bill, it does not require any employer to hire a registrant who might apply for work. Is that correct?

Mr. MAY. I do not believe it does.

Mr. COLE of New York. What happens in case a registrant is directed by Selective Service to apply for work, he applies for work but the employer refuses to hire him?

Mr. MAY. It would be his duty to go to a plant where he could be hired. In the first place, the local draft boards will not send men to plants which have an adequate supply of help but will send them to some plant in the vicinity of the man's home where there is a shortage of manpower. If there is none in that community they will look around the surrounding communities, referred to in this bill as an area, and find a place there for him.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the mere application by a registrant for a job does not exhaust his responsibility; apparently he must seek until he finds one; or will the effort be made to find one for him? Furthermore he is paid nothing for the extra trips he makes trying to find a job. Is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may answer the question?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman from New York will turn to page 4 of the bill beginning with line 13 and refer particularly to line 23 he will find that when the individual receives the notice from his draft board it is up to him to apply for employment and accept it when tendered to him. So, if employment is tendered to him he has discharged his obligation and is through unless his draft board should send him to another plant. But his obli-

gation specifically is to make application and to accept the employment tendered.

Mr. MAY. I believe the gentleman from Texas misunderstood the question of the gentleman from New York. The question is: When he has been sent to a plant and is rejected whether he must go to another plant.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is one of the questions.

Mr. KILDAY. Whenever he is directed by his local board he has the specific duty to perform what his board directs him the same as a man directed to report for induction.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I understand, the registrant must apply to a plant for work and if work is tendered to him he must accept it.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. If he is rejected then, according to the Chairman's statement he must go to some other plant and make application. Is there any end to it?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill does not spell out the regulations to be adopted or the system to be followed, but it is contemplated that he will be directed where to apply for employment; and when he has done that he has discharged all the duty incumbent on him.

Mr. COLE of New York. And does he receive travel allowance for making these applications?

Mr. KILDAY. No; he receives travel allowance for going to the place where he is assigned to work.

Mr. COLE of New York. Assuming that he is hired.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. But if he is not hired he gets no travel allowance?

Mr. KILDAY. He is not going to a place unless he is hired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the bill contemplates that the draft board shall have authority to send a registrant to a particular place without the approval of the employer at that plant.

Mr. KILDAY. It does not. I do not want to take up all the time of the chairman, but it will take a great deal of time to go into the bill in detail; it will require a great deal of discussion.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield for a question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I wish to ask the gentleman two questions: First, Is it true as reported in the press that the question of constitutionality was not considered by the gentleman's committee? And, second, a related question: Why did the committee discriminate against the class of male citizens from 18 to 45, who may be ill, disabled, or otherwise disqualified to do the work required of others included in the bill?

Mr. MAY. Answering the first question as to the committee's not considering the constitutionality of the legislation, any such report is entirely in error. The committee studied at length the subject of the constitutionality of the bill and sought the advice of counsel, consulted the decisions of the courts and determined for itself that it would be constitutional; or at least voted it out after discussing it.

In answer to the second question as to the age group 18 to 45 being discriminatory, it is not discriminatory as between those within the age group. The question of whether we should have gone up to 60 years or any other age is a question that the committee decided, and in its judgment the committee included the age group 18 to 45, the same as that now fixed in the statute for inductions for military service.

There is one other thing here I want to make clear for the committee and that is a statement that you have heard here on the floor today to the effect that this is an antistrike bill. It is not anything of the kind. It does not deal with the question of strikes at all.

The question whether or not this is an antistrike bill was raised in reference to section 2 in the Rules Committee, and we left it up to the members of the committee to determine for themselves just like the House Military Affairs Committee determined the matter for itself. We were asked whether or not should a hundred men quit a job or strike, they could be inducted as strikers under the provisions of this law and if that constituted a violation of it. The issue hinges entirely on the question whether or not a man's relation of employee to his employer has been broken. Under the decision of the courts, particularly in the case of *Jeffrey De Witt Insulater Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (91 Fed., 2d ed., 134) that matter has been settled. In that case the question arose in this way: A bunch of workers had gone on strike. They were negotiating with their employer. The employer succeeded in getting enough of them to go back to work and resume operations on a particular day. When operations were resumed the group that were involved in the difficulty continued to stay out on strike. The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit expressly held that there was no termination of the relationship of employer and employee, but that they were just a bunch of men out there saying to the employer, "When you accede to our demands we are ready to go back to work." They held that the relationship never having been terminated they did not come within the provisions of the act.

This bill was written with a view of avoiding that very difficulty.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few minutes to speak about certain proposed amendments that we have heard discussed which will probably be offered. I did not oppose granting an open rule because the House of Representatives has a high degree of intelligence and its Members have great capacity to discriminate between what they ought to do and what they ought not to do. Therefore this bill comes to you under an open rule with the privilege of offering any amendment you want. However, I want to caution you against extraneous matter being injected into what we have tried to make a simple, plain, easily understood manpower bill.

We had up both of the controversial amendments which I understand are to be offered, and the committee rejected them because we did not want to split the House of Representatives into two opposing camps, fighting over something that is not material to the vital question of backing up the men on the battle fronts of the world or over our home front manpower problems. We all know they are plenty difficult.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are two questions to be settled here; they are plain and simple, and so far as I am concerned, I have already definitely settled them.

The first one is, are we going to take the advice and suggestions of the leaders of certain outside minority groups, or are we going to follow the suggestions and advice of our military leaders to whom we have delegated the responsibility of winning the war?

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. MAY. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In the report that the gentleman's committee filed on this bill there is incorporated a letter to the President from General Marshall. May I inquire of the gentleman if General Marshall was not addressing himself to the gentleman's bill then pending before his committee, which was really a work-or-fight measure?

Mr. MAY. General Marshall's letter was not directed to the committee, but it was joined in by Admiral King of the Navy and sent direct to the President of the United States, as I recall it merely suggested the military needs without reference to any particular bill.

Mr. COX. That letter was dated January 16.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. COX. The bill then pending before the gentleman's committee was a work-or-fight bill; is that not true.

Mr. MAY. I thought it was a work-or-fight bill.

Mr. COX. And not the bill that the gentleman's committee reported, the committee refusing to approve the bill to which the general was addressing himself when he wrote the President.

Mr. MAY. I will tell you how that happened. The committee very earnestly considered the propositions that were presented, and they were all presented. We were trying to bring to the House of Representatives, as I said a moment ago, a piece of legislation, without controversy, that everybody could support. We considered all those things and rejected them. I did not get, as I told you, what I wanted, and I never do. It is the result of deliberation and thought and discussion and information received. I want to say here now that the members of the Committee on Military Affairs never did a finer job of trying to cooperate with each other in this difficult situation. We brought here what we think is a bill without extraneous matters injected into it. We think it is a work-or-fight bill, very largely. We think it will do the job of getting the necessary manpower, and of controlling it after we get it, in the production of war materials and supplies for our armed forces. If we had not thought that, we would not have brought it to the floor of the House.

A court in the trial of matters coming before him listens to the witnesses in person and his findings of fact, unless palpably contrary to the evidence, are upheld on appeal and that is a sound rule. I think it applies with like justification to the procedure of a congressional committee whose members hear and cross-examine the witnesses.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Then what is the bill that the gentleman has brought in other than a bill to compel the IV–F's, so-called, to get into war industry? Is that what the substance of the bill is?

Mr. MAY. The first bill that I introduced provided that the Selective Service Bureau should reclassify anyone who was not at work or who refused to work and make him immediately available for induction into the armed forces. It stopped there. But the committee in its combined judgment decided that we had better adhere to the penalties set forth in the original Selective Training and Service Act, which provides for a fine of $10,000 and imprisonment of 5 years, either or both.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman permit me to say that the bill does what the National Selective Service Act already does. They are doing it out in my State, sending these IV–F's to defense plants to work. They have been doing that. I think that is generally true all over the country.

Mr. MAY. The administration and the war leaders asked for legislation, and they wanted the authority of the Congress of the United States rather than a mere set of regulations by any bureau, even though it is the same penalties set up under the Selective Training and Service Act. I think most Members of Congress feel that we should govern our people by law rather than Executive decrees.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman will agree with me that it is generally understood that the draft boards are sending IV–F's into defense plants, and have been for some time, to work.

Mr. MAY. They are sending anybody that qualifies under their regulations to go into the military service. I may say that this is not confined only to IV–F's, but there is a group of some four or four and a quarter million men classified as IV–F's within the ages of 18 and 45, and I think that is too great a reservoir of manpower to be dissipated and not utilized. I am still, Mr. Chairman, for the principle of work or fight.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I am yielding myself only a few moments at the present time to make some observations on the general situation in consideration of this bill. Later, at the close of the general debate, I shall take more time to answer any questions to be asked at that time.

This is not a new subject for the House of Representatives. It has been before the Congress for 2 years. About 2 years ago the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy asked for a National Service Act. At about that time two Republican Members, one in the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and one in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], introduced such legislation. Lengthy hearings were held in both the Senate and House committees, consuming weeks. There are pages and pages of testimony on it. General Marshall and Admiral King have also upon numerous occasions asked for a National Service Act.

I cannot help but be reminded that the situation today is not entirely unlike one 3 or 4 years ago, when questions of necessity were raised and questions of provisions were raised. This bill today is in effect nothing but a National Service Act for all males between the ages of 18 and 45. It does not include women. It was introduced in the House as a so-called work-or-fight bill, but the military compulsion features were removed from the bill by an overwhelming vote.

I believe most people today look upon, and certainly all men in the service feel, that the American Army and Navy uniforms are sacred to patriotic service for our country. We have not reached the time when we will ever degrade that uniform by saying, "You work or have the privilege of wearing the uniform." I may say that the testimony of the Navy Department was completely against any idea of military compulsion. From a practical point of view, the Navy testified, they had no use for any more IV–F's, and the Army said they could find very little use for them, anyway, and they had enough at the present time.

One point has not been mentioned in discussing the provisions of the bill. There are 7,000,000 men in the United States between the ages of 38 and 45 not in the military service, a very large pool. It is much larger than the IV–F pool. Those men are all available for assignment to farms or to wood lots or to various avocations at certain periods of the year when extra services will be required.

I do not look upon this bill as perfection; far from it. It is half-baked still.

Some of the questions that are raised are as to the necessity. I remember that the question of necessity was raised in this House on the extension of selective service only 90 days before Pearl Harbor, and some of the very men who voted to disband our Army are here today. Possibly they have the best right to oppose this bill of any Members of the House. It was a question of necessity then, it is a question of necessity now.

We say that the President said nothing about it before election. I do not think he did say very much about it. But the Army had asked for a National Service Act before that. Both parties throughout the campaign, while they may not have said too much about the necessity, and may have led a great many of us to believe that the war was going better than it was, stated their implicit confidence in our military leaders. I heard Governor Dewey make the statement on several occasions that, were he elected, he would continue the present superb leadership and back them to the limit. I heard many others say the same thing.

None of us expected Von Rundstedt to create the bulge. The bulge cost us a terrific number of men and the extreme hardship of fighting in the wintertime has caused us even more men. It has cost us at the rate of 3 to 1 in loss of equipment as against loss of equipment in normal temperatures and normal climates. We have all made mistakes. I have made mistakes on some of my votes. We made mistakes in predicting how the war was going. America is a Nation of extremists and it was only natural many thought the war would end October 17—November 5—December 23—oh, wonderful, but it did not end. At least I can say I never have thought it would end easily. We are now at hardpan. That is where we are today. We are at the hardpan. We have driven the enemy across France and across Belgium and now we are at the gates of Germany. Anybody who thinks it is going to be easy, even from now on, is wrong. It is costing us lives, thousands of casualties every day and thousands of tons of equipment. I know of no better person to speak on necessity than General Marshall. General Marshall has testified in the strongest terms not only favoring this piecemeal measure but for a real National Service Act. You are going to hear some very passionate objections to this bill; and it is very easy to find reasonable grounds on which to base the objections.

Certainly I do not hope to see many men on this side of the aisle raise objections on the basis of arguments of the P. A. C. It is very easy to lift words from their mouths as to whether production will go up or not. It is, to be sure, within their power to slow down production. We have reached the point where practically every family in the United States has a son or a nephew or brother in the Army or Navy. We have reached the point where almost every family in the United States has had a casualty somewhere in the picture, either missing or wounded or who has passed on forever. Regardless of who is President of the United States, or whether he has made mistakes; regardless of who is in control of the labor organizations; regardless of who is head of the National Association of Manufacturers; regardless of how either party acts upon this bill in this House, I think the time has come when the average American citizen wants to be told what is the thing to do to win the war as quickly as possible and to lose as few more lives as possible. I think they are willing to listen to us, if they have not heard from anybody else.

The greatest no man's land in this bill in line with questions is: Is it an anti-strike bill? It is neither; because it does not say. There should be in this bill, for the benefit of labor I am talking now, provisions which say: "Nothing within the provisions of this act shall be construed to be against labor's full right to collective bargaining, maximum hours and overtime." If that were written in the bill the question asked by one of the gentlemen on the Committee on Rules would not be in order. This bill does not make absolute demands on any man. He has some choice as to whether or not he will go into an open or closed plant. But I think if we only put ourselves in the position of the young man with a rifle

overseas who believes in collective bargaining and believes in labor unions and in their right to strike—he may have an only brother or somebody there—I do not believe he would say, "he ought to join certain labor unions." No.

In addition to the provision for labor, that nothing in the act will mitigate against collective bargaining and all the rights now enjoyed by them, there must be a provision giving any man the right not to join a union if he so chooses to do. I may say for the benefit of those who have inquired about the matter that such an amendment, covering both points in full, is going to be offered, and if that amendment is not agreed to in the House, I hope there will be a roll call on this proposal.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, when this proposal first came to the House I was one of those who was skeptical as to the necessity for it. I believe if you will refer to the early part of the hearings you will see I could not conceal my skepticism in the questions propounded to various witnesses who appeared before the committee. However, our purpose in holding hearings, as always, was to determine the true situation as it exists. After having spent the weeks which we did spend in the consideration of this bill I am now convinced that it is essential to the war effort.

In that connection I would like to say to you the hearings prove that within the first 6 months of 1945 there is necessity for 1,600,000 additional men. Nine hundred thousand of those men are to enter the armed forces—the Army and the Navy. That is the program of the War Department. Those are the demands placed upon the Selective Service System. The quotas will go out accordingly and they must be met as quotas under the Selective Service System must be met.

In addition to that 900,000, because of the stepped-up production program, 700,000 additional men are required in industry. In applying the demand for 900,000 to the inventories which we have in the Selective Service System, we find we are able to get 570,000 men for the armed forces out of the registrants and those becoming 18 years old during this period of time. That means that 330,000 men within military age must be taken from necessary industry and from necessary agriculture. Therefore, we have not only 330,000 men who must be replaced in necessary industry and agriculture, from men not now occupied in essential positions, but, in addition, 700,000 men; therefore a total of 1,030,000 men in the United States who must be channeled out of unnecessary activities into necessary activities.

Those figures are official. They are not denied. The 900,000 is the figure of the War Department, based upon more than 700,000 casualties on the battlefields throughout the world and for the military campaigns which are projected for the immediate future.

All production agencies agree that the 700,000 men are necessary to meet the expanded production. As against those positive figures, vouched for by the President; the Chief of Staff; the Chief of Naval Operations; the War Production Board; the Selective Service System; Gen. William E. Knudsen, the production genius now on duty with the War Department; and others who are principally concerned in equipping and maintaining and commanding the Army, we have some vague expressions from Philip Murray, a representative of the A. F. of L., and a representative of the National Manufacturers Association.

Incidentally, the representative of the National Manufacturers Association spoke against the bill for 2 hours and then admitted that he had never read it. Those are the only things that you find in this record opposing the positive recommendations of those you expect to win the war for you. I say to you I take my stand with General Marshall and Admiral King. Those who prefer to accept vague insinuations of Philip Murray and the A. F. of L. may take their stand where they please.

Now let us get to the mechanics of this bill. There seems to be objection from the same individuals in one instance because it is not rigid enough and in another because it is entirely too rigid. The bill is adequate for the purpose contemplated. It is neither harsh nor oppressive, but it is adequate.

In the first instance the bill defines the obligation of men between 18 and 45 in the United States in connection with the support of the war, and incidentally the men between 18 and 45 are the ones now liable for military service under the law, and men in that age bracket who may not be physically qualified, or who may not be acceptable to the Army because of their age for total military service, are called upon by this bill to do what they can for the war. We are calling upon them for very little when compared to what must be endured by the men sent to the front.

We next provide, Mr. Chairman, that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion or such agency as he may designate—and understand that the permission to delegate the authority is with reference to this phase of the bill only—shall certify the plants and types of activity which are essential to the war effort.

The bill then provides that any man between 18 and 45 employed in essential industry or essential agriculture shall not leave that employment without the permission of his local draft board and without a justifiable reason.

The Director of War Mobilization must confer with representatives of management, labor, agriculture, and Government in determining the occupations and areas in which the critical shortage of labor exists. So while it is the responsibility of the Director of War Mobilization, action must be taken only after consultation with all of the other elements involved.

Mr. Philip Murray's principal objection to the bill was that he wanted to hold up action on it while we had a conference of those various agencies, yet all the time that provision was in the bill requiring such a conference of those agencies, and it is preserved in the bill.

In following up the detail of how this will work out as to the first section only, the man who is working in an essential industry must stay there or secure the permission of his draft board to leave. That is subject to appeal the same as any other decision of a selective-service board and to the very same appeal agency as the men now ordered to the military service enjoy. After this decision has been made by the Director of War Mobilization, after conference with the representatives of industry and labor, he will certify to the Director of Selective Service the type of men needed, the categories, and what not. The Director of Selective Service will direct his local boards to make a request upon the registrants of those boards to enter industry. They are then given a period of time in which they may voluntarily enter industry. Understand, now, that is the second opportunity to volunteer, because before there is any certificate from the Director of War Mobilization, a campaign is conducted by management, labor, Government, and agriculture to secure those employees. When this fails the request goes out; then the second period to volunteer; then, if a sufficient number do not volunteer, the local boards will direct the individuals within the categories mentioned and with the skills required to seek employment in the industries where they are required. If a man fails to stay on the job where he is frozen, he will be subject to exactly the same penalty as if he had been a registrant ordered for induction into the Army but refused to comply. He will be subject to trial in his own local Federal district court for violation of the law.

Why should we demand any less of a man that we have working in an air-conditioned airplane plant or airplane engine plant at high wages, with overtime, and having the privilege of staying at home with his family, if he is within the same age brackets as those who are sent off to die? Why should you demand any less or expect any less from him than from the other men?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. What do you do with the fellow who does respond, is assigned to a plant, and then stalls on the job to the extent that he does not produce anything and the employer discharges him? What becomes of the status of that individual under this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. That individual would be in the same situation as any one else not employed in essential industry. He is no longer employed in essential industry and he is in the same category as others similarly situated. Mr. Chairman, if he fails to accept employment as directed by his local board, he will also be subject to the same penalty as the man who refuses to report for induction.

Now, certain statements have been made here on the floor. I realize when opposition develops, any opposition that

may produce results is as good as any other opposition. There is some opposition here because this is not strictly a work-or-fight bill and I understand the gentlemen who use that term mean that you either work at a plant or you are inducted into the armed forces. The Army and Navy have told us that they have no desire for, nor need, and cannot utilize a work corps to be composed of men who would be put in the armed services, yet not physically qualified for full military service and deprived of the rights of a soldier and the benefits of a veteran. If they were placed in a work corps you and I know they would do nothing with them but feed them or have them rake leaves or something similar.

One of the principal objections to the original bill was that it provided for a work corps of that kind. Your committee took that provision out which leaves it so that every man in the military age group capable of performing military service may be assigned to full military service under the bill and those others who refuse to do what they should do and what they are directed to do are subject to civil penalties after trial in a civil court.

Now, none of us were very anxious to have to adopt this sort of legislation, because it is a rather new departure. We have made the penalty clause rather complete in protecting the men who may be brought to trial.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a couple of questions?

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. TABER. Why was the top limit of 45 placed in this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. Under existing law men are subject to induction for military training between the ages of 18 and 45. This places upon the same bracket the obligation of supporting the war. There is no reason in my mind why the men in this reasonable classification of 18 to 45 should not do what they can do the best and those who are not rendering military service should do exactly what their brothers in the same age bracket are doing, that is, supporting the war.

Mr. TABER. I do not think that that answers the question.

Mr. KILDAY. I am sorry.

Mr. TABER. The key to that is this next question. Are there in the pool of 4,000,000 men who are listed, those who are not engaged in war work such as is defined in the bill, enough people to fill the requirements?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know what 4,000,000 the gentleman refers to. I take it that is the IV–F group.

Mr. TABER. That is the group referred to in the President's message and in Mr. MAY's statement on page 2 of the hearings.

Mr. KILDAY. The 4,000,000 is the IV–F group. But in addition to that you have your age bracket of 38 to 45 in which there are 7,000,000 men.

Mr. TABER. Was there any inventory of those who were not engaged in war work sufficient to base the bill upon?

Mr. KILDAY. Not in the 38 to 45 group, because for a major portion of the time they have not been subject to active military service and have, therefore, not been classified. We cannot tell until they are classified just where they stand. They have not been called upon to request their occupational deferment nor have they had a physical examination, and therefore we do not know very much about them. But with these classifications and the inventories we have of them, we feel sure there is a sufficient number in the pool to take care of the shortage.

Mr. TABER. Why should the top limit of 45 be applied to those who are required to work in the factories?

Mr. KILDAY. I thought I made that clear. We were trying to make a reasonable classification. We placed the military service in the bracket 18 to 45 and then within that age bracket those who were not qualified by reason of age or physical condition should serve the same as their brothers in the same age bracket. The classification should be reasonable.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. If I understand the gentleman, and I am asking purely for information, because of the gentleman's great knowledge of this bill, the fundamental principle of this bill is to get people who are not working in essential employment into jobs that are critical?

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. I live in a town where the most critical industry is a foundry. They need foundry help and cannot get people to work in that foundry because of the character of the work. This law goes into force and effect, we will say, and you have a pool of men that are available to be put to work. Under the provisions of this law is it not the duty of the local selective-service board to give the registrant called under this law a reasonable choice of employment?

Mr. KILDAY. Within the category certified; yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. If there is only one critical occupation in a community, then do I understand it is the gentleman's contention that the local selective-service board could order any registrant to that one job without any choice as to the type or character of employment?

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman that it is not my concept that a man in this war should have the right to choose to work only in his own town. When the opportunity for volunteering comes, and he is then told the categories of labor and the skills needed in the area in which he is to be employed, if he prefers that choice rather than working in his home town, then he will have to go to the place where employment is available, as near his home as possible.

Mr. KEEFE. He has the choice then under the provisions as shown on page 5, subsection (c), which says:

> It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

That is what I am trying to understand in the situation as it might relate to the gentleman's town or my town where the critical employment is employment in which they cannot get people to work. If you direct a man to go to that one place, a foundry, and work, can he under this bill say, "You have not offered me a reasonable choice of employment, and I refuse to go to that place to work"? That is what I should like to have the gentleman explain.

Mr. KILDAY. I should like to be relieved of explaining the language the gentleman has just read, because I opposed it in the committee, and could never understand what it meant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Let me use my time and I will try to explain it the way I see it. I do not like legislation setting down in so many words "that a man shall be given a reasonable time to do this, that, or the other." The way I want legislation written is to set it out in such a way that he is given that reasonable opportunity. The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion is permitted to certify the necessary employment and the areas after consultation with industry, who know where those things are, and with labor and everybody else, but before he can make that certification he has to conduct his recruiting campaign for those areas. So in that instance the man in your town has a reasonable choice. He may say, "I am not going to sit here and be sent into that foundry because the law says the Director can follow this up with a request and then a direction. I am going over to the next town and get me a job over there in the airplane plant." But if he does not do that, then when the directive comes through he still has another choice. He has his choice on two occasions, not in words only but by the mandatory provisions of the bill. So you are going to "direct" only the adamant, recalcitrant man.

I tell you now that, in my humble judgment, when the first call for volunteers goes out you will, in almost every case, get all the help you want, but on the second call for volunteers I think you will get them all. My prediction is that you will never try a man under the provisions of this act and that you will very rarely direct him into the particular plant where his services are most required.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas draws any distinction between the Government's right to draft a man to fight and the Government's right to draft a man to work.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman and I argued that out in the Committee on Rules the other day. I should like to take a day sometime to discuss the Constitution with the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should be very happy to be enlightened on it, if the gentleman will do it.

Mr. KILDAY. Our power is to raise and maintain armies. It is not armies

of men; it is armies equipped with munitions of war.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is there a difference between drafting a man to work for the Government and drafting a man to work for private employers?

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot see the distinction. If we are going to maintain in this country the profit system and depend upon it to produce weapons of war, and they are not able to get the men to turn them out in the time required, then I am not ready to quibble about whether you are putting them to work for a private employer. What I want to know is who is going to get the product. If the Army and the Navy are to get it, I say it is perfectly constitutional.

I prefer not to continue this discussion further at this time.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there anything in this bill that would permit or authorize the drafting of a man already in an essential industry for another industry that the War Manpower Commission or the Director of Mobilization would think even more essential?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not think so.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand, if a man is once in an essential industry, he is not subject to this bill unless the War Manpower Commission or somebody else holds that his industry is no longer essential. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. KILDAY. He would have to stay there unless his local selective-service board would permit him to leave. I was trying in the little time I have left here to find the provision which I think takes care of the gentleman's situation, but at the moment I cannot find it and should like to discuss it with him after a while.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He is speaking very intelligently on this bill and I should like some information on it.

From my experience with war industries, having many of them in my district, I find that there are two categories of men. The first category includes the man who tries to obtain a job in a war industry but is not properly qualified for any position and consequently goes from place to place and is turned down by all of them. Naturally, he is a IV–F to start with. What happens to him?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know what you are going to do with the fellow who just cannot do a day's work. I guess we are going to have to get along without him.

Mr. HINSHAW. I mean what happens to him under this bill? Is he subject to be fined $10,000?

Mr. KILDAY. No; he is not. If you will read the bill, you will find his obligation is to make an application for employment and to accept such employment if it is tendered to him. If the employer has his record with the U. S. E. S., as he will have, and knows all about him and that he is a nomad, then of course he is not going to tender the employment and he has discharged his duty. Of course, we do not want that sort of a fellow cluttering up a war plant anyhow.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right.

Mr. KILDAY. Therefore you have not lost anything.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am asking the gentleman to elucidate for the RECORD. After all, people will read the RECORD and will hear about it. There is one more category involved. We all know, of course, that the Army has allowed certain men to go into the Reserve on an inactive status in order to fill highly skilled positions. In my area in recent months there have been large-sized layoffs in certain industries, such as the shipbuilding industry and in certain portions of the aircraft industry. Those men temporarily, of course, do not have work available to them and there are a good many thousands of them who are now laid off. Do they have to wait until it is determined that their industry is going to start up again before they can get a job or are they to go into the military service and then be taken out at a later date to carry on these very important activities?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill contains a provision to the effect that a man who has served in the Army and is a veteran may be exempt from service under regulations that the Director may prescribe. I am frank to state to you that that is not in any final form. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] suggested that something should be in the bill, even if we had to work it out at a later date so that if we get to conference it would be germane at the conference and could be worked out.

Mr. HINSHAW. What about the laid-off men? In the Calship, for example, in California they recently laid off 8,000 men because they were not assured of orders. A good many of those were of course in one category and some in others.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, they were men not engaged in a necessary industry. They will be subject to the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. But on the other hand their skills are very necessary to industry and they ought to be given the opportunity to work at their highest skills for the benefit of the war effort.

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman I do not care what kind of bill we pass here, if we do not have a sensible administration of it then there is no use passing a bill. The bill provides that the Director of War Mobilization and reconversion shall detail men to the Selective Service System from all the agencies to advise them with reference to matters of this kind. So I take it the U. S. E. S., which is charged with getting labor for these plants, would send in advice to them, "Let us not take the Calship yard men because the yard has a new contract." Or they will say, "Here, we have men in the Calship yard that we can take to another shipyard to fill the skills in their line."

It is going to require careful administration. That is the reason I insisted on the local selective-service boards having that duty and not giving it to any bureau of the Government to send in hired employees to direct the men as to what they shall do, but to leave it in the hands of the patriotic volunteer American citizens who serve on the draft boards and who are neighbors and friends of the people affected.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one more question? In other words, here is a large area with a great many draft boards in it. Of course, the members on the draft boards, each individually, can have one idea and others have another, and there is no very general coordination to the degree which is necessary so that they can carry out these various instructions.

Mr. KILDAY. Well, we have that situation with reference to the Selective Service. Not only can the registrant appeal but the Government can appeal. I think we have it pretty well coordinated now, and this is going to be the same system, with all of their previous experience and the same organization controlling it.

I am going to have to ask the gentleman to excuse me. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is a hypothetical question. It goes entirely to the matter of compliance and not to the merits of an open or closed shop. This is the question: Suppose a registrant in a community is ordered to report to work in a certain war production industry, giving him a reasonable choice of those industries. Suppose it is in a community where there are all closed shops. Or suppose that the work which has to be done is all done in a closed shop.

The registrant reports. He says, "I am ordered to go to work in your plant, and I want to go to work." The labor recruiting officer says, "All right. This is a closed shop. Join the union and you can go to work." The registrant says, "I am ordered here to work and not to join a union." Then he says, "You cannot work." The question is, has this registrant complied with the law or not.

Mr. KILDAY. That could be discussed pro and con for a long time and no one could convince the other, but, coming to the point of a man in a community in which they are all closed shops, the man who does not agree with the closed shop idea is ordinarily in the minority. The draft board does not have to send everybody to that area. If you have sensible administration of this law, your draft board will inquire whether he objects to joining a union. If that is all there is in that district, surely they would not send him there. On the other hand, I think as a matter of law, if they refuse to accept him, having made application, and they decline him because he did not come under the terms of their closed-shop agreement, they have not tendered him employment, and he has complied with the law. That would be my opinion.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman's committee was so kind to us this morning that I could not refuse to yield.

Mr. COLMER. I call the gentleman's attention to page 2, section 2, "a registrant liable to perform such work," and so forth, "shall have a duty not to voluntarily discontinue such employment" and so forth. Under that section if a

man willfully goes on strike, does he come under that provision?

Mr. KILDAY. He does not, under the consistent rulings of the Federal courts. They have held consistently that a man who goes on strike has not discontinued his employment. He is still an employee, though not working. The relationship of employer and employee continues to exist, so he has not voluntarily discontinued his employment, and he would not be subject to law. In addition, he would be able, if charged in court, to defend himself on the ground that he had a justifiable reason for leaving his employment. The right to strike is a legal right, and therefore is a justifiable reason for leaving his employment.

Mr. COLMER. Then does not your language say that the local board has determined that it is the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such employment, under the wording of the last sentence of that section?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. He has to apply to his local board, but you will have to read the cases and get the legal meaning of "voluntarily discontinue employment."

Mr. COLMER. Then if a man goes on strike, the local board says that he left his employment in the best interest of the war effort?

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, no. Now, I refuse to yield any further on that question.

Mr. COLMER. But you did yield to me. Let us follow that up.

Mr. KILDAY. You and I can reason anything out to an absurd conclusion.

Mr. COLMER. Now, the gentleman has been so nice to me.

Mr. KILDAY. I am going to have to refuse to yield any further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to finish what I started with the gentleman from Mississippi. Where a man strikes he is not discontinuing his employment, under the consistent rulings of the courts of the United States. Then the other part, that the local draft board has concluded it was in the best interest of the war effort, of course, is just an absurd deduction from the previous statement. It is clear that he would not be subject to the law. But I never did get to tell you what happened to the fellow who complies with the regulation. If he volunteers, as he is requested to do, or if he accepts employment as he is directed to do, he then would have, if employed in a Government-owned plant, the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Commission, as to injuries or sickness due to his employment. If he is in private employment he would have the benefits of the workmen's compensation laws of the State in which he is employed. So that during the time he is employed he would be protected that way.

There is another matter that I deem to be a matter of basic justice in connection with legislation of this kind: We would not be justified in passing legislation of this kind unless the men affected were protected with reference to the positions which they held at the time they were directed to discontinue them and go into temporary employment. Many of these men are in industries which are classified as nonessential, but they have long seniority and pension rights. Many of them may be reaching 45 years, the age at which perhaps industry would rather have a younger person so they could avoid the burden of pensions and payment of unemployment benefits from sickness. Those are very valuable rights to such men and we should give them the right to come back to their previous employment when their temporary war service is over, the right to go into those plants and take the positions they had before. This bill provides that they shall have the right to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Some question was raised as to the application of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. This bill gives to those men who have to change their employment by the direction of the draft board and whose income is reduced by reason of such changed employment the benefit of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. Not every man who goes into the armed forces is relieved of his debts during the war period but only to the extent that his ability to pay has been diminished by his military service. It still is an obligation to the extent of his ability to pay. But if by reason of war service his income is reduced, this means his ability to pay is reduced, and to that extent he is given relief. When he comes back he must pay his debts. The law will protect his insurance by guaranteeing payment of premiums and give him 2 years after he gets back within which to take it up. So we give the man who volunteers or who takes a job at the direction of the draft board this protection, and I think you will all agree with me that we should give it to him. I hope you will agree with me further when I say that during my 6 years of service here I have never seen as good a job done on a piece of legislation as I have in trying to work out a solution for this most difficult situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, it is neither easy nor pleasant to oppose my chairman or a majority of the members of our Committee on Military Affairs.

It is even more difficult to support the position of an organization that has opposed one in an election.

However, any Member of Congress is or should be big enough not to allow personal friendship or animosity toward any individual or organization to unduly influence him in casting a vote on major legislation.

The philosophy back of this particular bill is so fundamental and the foundation upon which it rests is so basic that all personal considerations must be entirely forgotten.

Mr. Chairman, modern wars are won or lost by total populations. Every man, woman, and child is directly and vitally affected. Today's war is everybody's war. It is fought not only by the men in the front lines of combat but also by the people on the home front—those who work in factories, in forests, in mines, and on farms—who produce the food, fiber, and the weapons of war.

Often innocent women, helpless children, and decrepit old men in distant cities and remote areas are the ones who perish first.

Logically, since it is everybody's war, everybody should share equally—as far as is humanly possible—the burdens and sacrifices of war. From a realistic and practical point of view this never can be, but it is the ideal toward which we should strive. This being the case, the manpower problem must be faced and answered before all the other complex and intricate problems can be solved.

That there is a manpower muddle today cannot be denied. However, it is for the most part a man-made problem created by the overlapping, conflicting, and duplicating agencies of government. Not shortages but shortsightedness has produced it.

The Army asks for one thing, the Navy demands another; the War Manpower Commission moves in one direction, the Selective Service in the opposite; the Director of War Mobilization announces one program, while the Commander in Chief keeps all of them in a dither by never determining a strong, definite policy or placing authority and responsibility under a single head.

Through cunning, trickery and deception, a vacillating and cowardly administration has intimidated those responsible for enacting laws and promulgating regulations, and at the same time has frustrated administrative and enforcement officials. The confusion and chaos of our present manpower problem has been produced not so much by a shortage of either materials or men but by bad management, mistaken calculations, and maldistribution of what we have.

If there be a shortage of war supplies and matériel, it is due not so much to the lack of facilities or shortage of manpower, but to a division of authority between management and labor, between Government and the people, which has all but eliminated the element of responsibility for results.

Certainly every Member of this House wants to see increased production. There is no difference of opinion or dispute among us so far as the purported objective of this particular bill is concerned. We all want more planes, ships, tanks, guns, and ammunition with which to fight this war. Always, it is better to have too much than to be caught with too little.

On my questioning of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, it was admitted that Von Rundstedt's drive in the middle of December was due to neither the lack of weapons nor lack of manpower on the western front. One great problem now is transportation. Miles of supplies and millions of tons of equipment are bulging American warehouses. They can be seen in trains on

our sidings, lining our freight yards and stacked high on our docks at ports of embarkation. When one views all the matériel we have assembled in England he wonders how the island keeps from sinking. Because of the immense damage done to transportation facilities, it is as difficult to get supplies from the ports of Europe to our front lines as it is to get the goods from here to Europe. It would seem, therefore, that manpower shortage is more exaggerated than real.

Those of us who oppose this legislation contend that if we had a full or even an efficient utilization of manpower, this legislation would be unnecesary. The truth is, we have not a shortage of manpower but a waste of manpower and in certain plants where the Army and Navy have stated that additional workers were needed, labor and management have discovered that a surplus existed and men and women have been laid off.

This proposed legislation is based upon opinion rather than factual data. No census has been taken or a survey made in a thorough and exhaustive manner of the needs for additional workers in our war plants. It is true that there is a shortage of manpower in some while there is a surplus of manpower in others.

No earnest or sincere effort was made in the beginning to ascertain by volunteer agencies just what our manpower needs are. For the most part our committee listened only to Government officials rather than to witnesses who possess first-hand knowledge of this baffling problem. The Senate committee is acting more wisely by visiting shipyards and inspecting war plants personally to see for themselves what the picture really is.

It is admitted that there are some shortages but these shortages are local and spotty. This bill seeks to solve a local problem on a national basis. It would subject 99 percent of the laboring men of this country between the ages of 18 and 45, who are honest, loyal, industrious, and patriotic, to rigid regulations and compulsion in order to reach the other 1 percent that is now needed for war work. We have been told that our war industries will need anywhere from 90,000 to 700,000 additional men during the next 6 months—but no one can be sure of the figure given us. Why should we penalize the many good men in order to reach such a few bad ones? Whatever shortages exist should be dealt with locally through cooperative methods, and the foolish and futile attempt should not be made to solve the difficulty by a blanket law of compulsion.

No man in this Chamber has a higher regard or greater admiration for General Marshall and Admiral King and our other great military and naval leaders than I have—so long as they fight the war and stay in their own fields.

Nevertheless, I do feel that the leaders of industry, labor, agriculture, and our civil government are better qualified to speak about the problems of production and of manpower in our plants, factories, on our farms, and in our mines than are the military and naval strategists.

Bear in mind, gentlemen, that American labor—the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and other labor organizations are opposed to this bill; that the leaders of American industry—the National Association of Manufacturers, and similar organizations—are against this legislation; that for the most part the leaders of agriculture are opposed to it. The American farmer is our most independent citizen and forever wants to remain free.

If we have a shortage in production what are the causes for it? Here are some:

First. Low wages—in some industries such as our foundries—which should be raised.

Second. Bad working conditions—inadequate housing, unsanitary surroundings, and long and difficult transportation from residence to factory.

Third. Idleness, produced not so much by inherent laziness as by industries engaged in war work on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. As long as the wages of the worker are guaranteed, with a 10-percent profit to the employer, the employer cares not so much how many he hires or how hard they work, because the more he spends of the taxpayers' money, the more profits of 10 percent he will reap for himself.

Many of our large defense plants are full of men and women who spend some 30 to 50 percent of their time stalling or loafing, gambling or reading, sleeping or talking. The Senate committee found this to be true at Norfolk and all of us have seen much of it in plants we have visited and have heard it from our own friends working in war plants, and whose honesty we do not question.

Fourth. Hoarding of labor which was vicious some time ago but which largely has been eradicated through cooperative efforts between labor and management and the War Manpower Commission. With all its faults, under the War Manpower Commission on which is represented Government, labor, industry, and agriculture, many past abuses have been abolished. Government itself has been and still is one of the worst hoarders of labor. The armed forces have sinned, too.

Fifth. Absenteeism caused by illness, accident, and other factors which cannot be cured by legislation.

Sixth. Turn-over in plant personnel due largely to cancellation of contracts, changes in designs, and methods of producing equipment; due to the very flexible nature of war itself.

Seventh. The overloading of certain plants in congested areas with contracts that should go to available plants with idle men in other areas. Many contracts should be farmed out to smaller firms.

Eighth. Work stoppages, strikes, and lock-outs. Most employers and workers are honest and patriotic Americans. They have sons, daughters, brothers, and husbands, fighting on every continent and on every sea. Their blood as well as their hands is in this war.

But there are a few buccaneers in business and certain racketeers in labor who have put their own individual welfare above the Nation's and who have sought personal gains and private profits instead of backing up our fighting men. Of course, these individuals are despicable and deserve only the contempt of all true Americans. They should be and could be properly punished under existing law if this administration would carry out the mandates of Congress.

What we need in this respect is not more legislation but some honest, efficient, and fearless administration. The immediate application of the work-or-fight principle requires no additional legislation.

Perhaps this bill was designed to prevent a particular threatened strike, but this administration should not attempt to accomplish by indirection and surreptitiousness that which it is afraid to do by direction. And Congress should not be made the "goat" for the Executive's failure to enforce our present laws. Is someone trying to "pass the buck" to us?

Ninth. Cancellation or termination of contracts—cut-backs ordered by the Army and the Navy themselves; the widespread belief created among our people by high Government officials last fall that the war in Europe would soon end and that victory was just around the corner; the Washington talk of reconversion perhaps contributed more than anything else to the lag in production or the failure to accelerate it.

If we have a shortage of the weapons of war today, it is due not to the shortage of manpower or materials but to overoptimism created last autumn before November 7. More than 1,500,000 men and women left war industries—most of them left because of lack of war orders, not because of lack of patriotism. Many of these workers were literally forced out of employment, while others left jobs voluntarily because they were led to believe that Germany would soon be defeated. Naturally, they were looking after themselves and their families by getting jobs in peacetime industries.

The Aluminum News Letter, which reached our desks only yesterday, states:

> In 1944 the aluminum industry went far enough "over the top" in supplying war needs to permit W. P. B. to close down entirely a number of Government-owned aluminum plants.

The small-arms plant in St. Louis, in my State; the Weldon Springs Ordnance plant in St. Charles County, Mo.; the ordnance plant in Lowell, Mass.; and many other similar plants all over the country were curbed in their production or completely closed and thousands of men and women were thrown out of employment—all because we were lulled into a sense of false security—not only by the daily press and magazines, by certain Members of Congress, but by the Army and Navy as well, and certainly not the least by the Commander in Chief.

Last October we were short of nothing, except votes. In Philadelphia and Chicago we were told how great was our production, how victorious were our arms, how soon the boys would be coming home, and how 60,000,000 jobs in peacetime would be furnished. The majority of the people—though a rather small majority—believed this rosy picture that was so glowingly and glibly painted for them.

Then something happened in the middle of December and suddenly we have discovered a great shortage of manpower

and of production in the weapons of war. The shortage is not because of the lack of manpower but because of our mistake in judgment and of our failure to utilize the manpower that was available. Now to cover up the mistakes that were made it is proposed to set up a straw man and knock him over.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation might cover up the mistakes, the erroneous judgment, and the miscalculations of those in high authority, but it will not achieve its alleged objective.

History has proved and experience has shown that free labor has been and is always more efficient and productive than forced labor. With all our faults, mistakes, strikes, and bad management we have demonstrated to the world that American free labor can and has outproduced the slave labor of Germany, Japan, and Italy combined. The miracle of this modern age is the industrial output and productive capacity of America.

At this stage of the war are we going to raise up a Hitler in America to get rid of one abroad? Are we in this trying hour going to abandon the freedom for which our men and women are fighting and dying? Are we going to adopt the system which we are paying so much in blood and treasure to destroy? Has democracy failed and we must now employ totalitarian methods to destroy dictatorships? This conscription is the quintessence of the Nazi-Fascist philosophy we are fighting against.

This bill, sir, is merely to get the American people in the harness and to reduce our people to penal servitude. We are not justified in punishing the many for the weaknesses or misdeeds of the few. Give the majority of our people credit for intelligence and patriotism. We might force, under the threat of severe penalty, certain Americans to enter a factory, but we cannot force such individuals to work without wasting twice the effort we would get out of them. Place a drafted worker alongside a voluntary worker on the assembly line and you will weaken the morale of both. It is impossible to legislate patriotism, industry, or morality. What all of us Americans need in this dark hour is more internal conviction and less external compulsion. I hold in disdain as much as my chairman does the bowery bum, the pool-hall loafer, or the man who cowardly hides behind a tractor instead of a tank, or a cow instead of a machine gun. Remember, however, that food is the primary weapon of war and that Napoleon said: "An army fights on its stomach."

It is a bit strange, Mr. Chairman, that such legislation as this—seeking more governmental power and control over the lives of our citizens—should now be considered by this body, just after Congress has established a board composed of three men—former Senator Gillette of Iowa, former Governor Hurley of Connecticut, and Lieutenant Colonel Heller of California—to dispose of $100,000,000,000 worth of war equipment and goods declared by the Army and Navy to be surplus. And do not forget that today in many of our States producing critical war materials there are thousands of American men and women drawing unemployment compensation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not necessary and if enacted into law it will not work. Most of our industrialists who deal with labor and the problem of production daily have estimated that the delay, confusion, and red tape that such an act would inject into a factory would cut war production from 10 to 15 percent instead of boosting it.

This proposed legislation is not progressive, it is oppressive; it is not liberal, it is reactionary; it looks not forward but it looks backward; it belongs to the Old World, not to the New World. If for one moment I thought the enactment of this bill into law would increase our production I would be wholeheartedly for it. Instead, I feel that if passed it would retard rather than accelerate production; it would create untold confusion; it would lead to the loss of our civil liberties. Powers that are once delegated or given away are never easily or willingly returned. Because it is contrary to conscience, repugnant to reason, and obnoxious to the spirit of our traditions and institutions, I cannot support it.

Sir, I am against this bill because I want to keep America a land where every man can walk the earth his own king, the equal lord of every other man, to go his own way, work out his own will, weave into the warp and woof of the magic days the dreams that haunt, the duties that inspire and urge him on.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, there seems to have been some confusion about the type of legislation which the Chiefs of Staff, General Marshall in particular, requested from the Congress. The question has been raised as to whether General Marshall wants the bill which is now before us, or whether he prefers the work-or-fight bill which was originally introduced; I would like to call your attention to page 7 of the report which was filed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] from the Committee on Military Affairs in support of this bill. On that page is a letter from General Marshall and Admiral King in which they point out the positive need for legislation without any attempt to tell the Congress how the legislation should be worded or in what manner or through what agency the legislation should be administered.

I would like to read two short paragraphs from the letter:

> As the agents directly responsible to you for the conduct of military operations, we feel that it is our duty to report to you the urgent necessity for immediate action to improve the situation relative to the acute need for young and vigorous replacements for the Army and Navy and to provide the necessary manpower to increase the production of critical items of munitions, accelerate ship construction, and effect the rapid repair of damaged vessels.
>
> You are intimately familiar, Mr. President, with the great importance of regaining the offensive on the western front and pressing it, together with operations against the Japanese, with constantly increasing intensity in the months to come. To this end, therefore, we feel that the United States should make every conceivable effort to enable the armed forces to carry out your instructions.

This, I hope, will plainly show that General Marshall is concerned only with the necessity for adequate authorization for meeting manpower shortages wherever they exist and that he makes no attempt to express to the Congress any preference on the wording of the needed authorization.

Now I would like to discuss the legislation which is before us.

I think it is within reason to say that war—if war must be waged—should be total war. All of the Nation's resources should be engaged. If one man can be called upon to risk his life, to accept the harshness and the misery of life at the front, to undergo the hazards and the terrors of battle, there can be but small compunction about asking another man to give his work where it will be most effective, or asking another to lend his wealth or his factory for like purposes. Deliberately I say we should have had total mobilization immediately after Pearl Harbor. Had we done so, I believe the war might already have been won, that those who are to die henceforth might have been spared.

At this late day it is more difficult—much more difficult—to adjust ourselves to the requirements for manpower draft. It is doubly difficult for me to accept the need for manpower draft as an actual and compelling one until I have seen the Government take the lead in eliminating waste of manpower. I have not seen that. I would like to see this Government undertake a coordinated drive to eliminate waste of manpower in its own agencies. I believe that such a drive based on patriotic principles could be highly effective. No reasonable person will deny that there is waste of manpower wherever the hand of the Government reaches. There is manpower waste in the Government-financed war industries. There is manpower waste in Government offices. There is manpower waste in every military and naval post. I deplore it. It is inexcusable. But it exists, and I realize that we shall continue to have it. That in itself is a powerful argument for a manpower bill because a manpower bill will provide the direct authority and the responsibility for coordination and correlation of manpower needs, for more equitable distribution of manpower, for a central authority which can order an end to practices which now contribute to manpower waste.

We cannot base our consideration of this measure on what might have been or what should have been. Regardless of all the objections which can be raised, there remains one fact which outweighs all of them. The Commander in Chief and the Chiefs of Staff have stated that the United States must have a manpower draft—now—if we are to insure sufficient matériel for the proper prosecution of the war. They know the needs of the armed forces. We do not. We, today, are not concerned with pointing out the mistakes of yesterday. The men in uniform are not concerned with dissertations on the mistakes of yesterday. However regrettable they may have been, we cannot supply tomorrow's needs of the matériel of war by pointing out yesterday's mistakes of policy or strategy. There are always mistakes in war. Today we are

concerned with the supply of guns and ammunition which are needed now and in the months to come. Without a manpower draft there may not be shells enough on the western front to insure the success of the drive which is shaping up. There may not be enough gasoline for the planes and tanks which are so essential to present-day military operations.

There were not enough in 1944. We have actual figures on the shortages in many items. Those figures are contained in the hearings which have been presented to you in support of this measure. I would like to point out that there was a shortage of 6.2 percent in artillery ammunition, of 11.5 percent in mortar ammunition, of 7.8 percent in 105-millimeter howitzer ammunition, of 9.2 percent in bombs and grenades, of 6 percent in trucks. These are but a few items. Shortages have a way of showing up at the worst possible time. It is not sufficient to have ample supplies through 11 months of the year. A shortage during the crucial twelfth month may undo all that was accomplished before.

More shells and gasoline at critical periods last autumn might have kept the Germans off balance, might have prevented the winter stalemate, might have brought a quick end to the war. They might have prevented the Rundstedt counter-offensive, with its heavy casualty lists and its destruction of supplies.

Always when there is a shortage of vital war material or of the machines of war, human hands and human bodies must fill the gaps. There are stalemates. The casualty lists lengthen. We at home do not pay for mistakes or shortages. The men at the front pay for them. For us at home it may not make much difference whether or not we pass a manpower bill. The war would drag on a few months longer, and some people would like that. They are getting rich on war prosperity. But to the men in uniform it would make a difference. To the people they left back home it would make a difference.

The general purport of this bill is to say that the Government will apply compulsion if necessary to get citizens to produce the arms required by other citizens it has drafted to stand on the battle fronts. It is a modified, half-way national service act, for men between the ages of 18 and 45.

In its new form the bill is not strictly a work-or-fight law, but a work-or-get-fined law. Most of the 18,000,000 covered by it are men whom the Army does not want, so there is no point to drafting them for combat or labor battalions. The need for them is in certain vital war industries. In September 7.5 percent of the workers in such industries quit. It is to keep them on the job and to enlist others that the May bill would provide fines, backed up by jail sentences.

The need for it has been stated emphatically by the Commander in Chief, the War Department and the Navy Department. They are the ones who should know. They are charged with responsibility for the conduct of the war.

It would not be good politics to support the measure. Every one of us who does so will lose votes by it. There are elements within labor and capital which are bitterly opposed to it. Some of them already are making their threats. Obviously both groups are sufficiently well financed to sponsor opposition for any of us who refuse to bow to them. The people who will appreciate our action are a silent group. Many of them are far from home. They are overseas in uniform. They cannot do much to show their appreciation. But, appreciation is not important when a measure of this consequence is involved. The real question is one of right or wrong. It is a question of the lives of men. It is a question of keeping the faith. No argument can change these fundamental facts. It is right to support this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, whatever action is taken by Congress on a national service law at this time will go down in history as one of the most important actions taken by Congress during our entire national history. The action taken on H. R. 1752 will be looked to as a precedent from this point forward in all matters pertaining to the exercise of congressional power in wartime. For that reason it is especially important that we keep clearly before us the real purpose of the bill and that we do not undertake to incorporate in this bill legislation regarding controversial but very closely related subjects on which there has been no adequate preparation.

Briefly stated, the purpose of this bill is to freeze, so far as reasonably possible, employees engaged in essential industry or agriculture and to direct men to leave nonessential occupations and enter war work. Those two objectives are certainly in the national interest and if carried out successfully will go far toward making our war program more efficient and more satisfying to each and everyone of us. Probably even more important than that, such a program will assure our men now serving on the battle fronts that we on the home front are backing them to the limit.

Our needs for increased war production are very great. The bill, H. R. 1752, should induce men to enter employment in essential war industries voluntarily and to stay on the job. This bill is not a cure-all but it will be a help. The number of cases of violation of such a law should be extremely few.

Those of you who think there is greater need for reduction in feather-bedding by industry and for antistrike laws and for elimination of waste of manpower already employed in war production are not really proving a case against the true purposes of this bill. Even though Congress acts on all these other matters, there is still need for some law directing our energies to essential war production and to put an end to idleness of those who can and should be working in war production. We must increase our production of war materials beyond anything heretofore attained by our workers on the home front and this will tax our entire Nation to the utmost if we are to win this war as quickly and efficiently and effectively as possible.

Our people will not approve militarism within our industrial and agricultural structure and they will not approve extreme measures of regimentation by the executive and administrative branch of Government. I have done everything within my power to help develop the bill before us today with proper safeguards against militarism and regimentation in industry and agriculture.

Following the First World War, I joined actively with the various veterans' organizations, and especially with the American Legion, in advocating some form of universal draft for any future war in which we might become involved. Practically every veteran of the First World War returned to civil life thoroughly convinced that any future war should be waged by the entire able-bodied manpower of our Nation. This belief of the veterans of World War No. 1 culminated in the proposal by the American Legion in 1922 that would authorize the President in time of war to draft labor, control capital and industry, and stabilize prices, and this proposal was the outgrowth of a sincere determination to equalize the burdens of war.

Both major parties adopted planks in their platforms in 1924 supporting the universal draft, and such a plank was retained in the Republican platform of 1928. In 1930 the War Policies Commission of Congress investigated and studied methods of equalizing the burdens of war and removing the profits of war. During and following that investigation, discussion on the House floor indicated a fear that any universal draft would include the drafting of labor, capital, and industry, and that capital and industry could not be drafted without compliance with the fifth amendment requiring the Government to pay just compensation for property taken for public use. This discussion resulted in the adoption of an amendment to the resolution providing that the War Policies Commission "shall not consider and shall not report upon the conscription of labor."

Having carefully observed these developments, I watched with great interest the reaction to proposed manpower legislation such as the Austin-Wadsworth bill, H. R. 1742, in the Seventy-eighth Congress. When it came before the Committee on Military Affairs 1 year ago, extensive hearings were held, but no bill of this kind was reported to Congress by the committee prior to this bill. During the summer and fall of 1944 the general feeling throughout the Nation was that the war was so nearly won that it would be unnecessary to enact further legislation governing the use of our manpower in this war. About the middle of November, however, the record of shortages of certain items of war materials began to show up for various reasons. It is not my purpose here to place the blame for these shortages on any man or group of men because no human being could possibly have estimated in advance the exact proportion of our war materials that would be needed on all of

our fighting fronts. The volume of supplies needed was bound to vary tremendously with the extent of military operations and in the matter of ammunition particularly the volume consumed exceeded that of any military operation in the world's history. We suddenly faced the need of increasing our war production quickly. The first warnings were issued by the War Department officials in November that we needed to step up our production, but these appeals were not immediately effective because of the general opinion throughout the Nation that the war was practically over. Untold numbers of workers drifted away from war production and into jobs that appeared likely to be more permanent. Industry was ready to start reconversion to civilian production.

It is true that our production record for this war has been magnificent, in spite of the concern of both industry and labor regarding reconversion and permanent jobs. No one is condemning either industry or labor in any way. But, when our own great record of production must be still further increased because of the tremendous stepping-up of the war tempo, ways must be provided for immediate results if this new production is to be most effective and most helpful to our war effort.

The reconversion of industry to civilian production can be delayed rather effectively under existing laws and regulation. But there is need for labor legislation along the lines proposed in the bill now under consideration. There is no such law on our statute books, and until the German advance in the Ardennes in December, public thought during the past year would not have supported enactment of such a law, although such a measure would have had wholehearted public support at the time of Pearl Harbor.

I look upon the bill now under consideration as a necessary insurance policy against any future unbalance in our war program. The extent of its enforcement will be small compared with the extent of its influence in causing people to enter and to remain in essential war work.

Legislation of this type might impose a degree of militarism and arbitrary regimentation if not carefully developed with adequate safeguards.

The Army and Navy officials expressed their opposition to any type of work corps under direct military jurisdiction, and certainly industry and labor do not favor such a system as was provided in the bill H. R. 1119, the predecessor of this bill. Early in the hearings, I expressed my vigorous opposition to any provision that would make the drafting of an individual into the armed forces a penalty for his violation of this or any other law. The Military Affairs Committee is strongly opposed to such practice and the penalty section of this bill was changed to one calling for civilian penalties of fine or imprisonment with jurisdiction in civilian courts.

The possibility of growth of arbitrary regimentation under such legislation was well illustrated during the course of the hearings when I questioned Judge Patterson and Judge Hay and other witnesses, only to find that in their opinion the powers granted in the bill, H. R. 1119, as then written, were construed by them to be broad enough to enable the administrative agencies to compel a qualified registrant to work for a specified private employer for private profit. From the hearings you will note that I questioned the constitutionality of any legislation granting that power. I need not enlarge upon the possible extreme abuses of such arbitrary power. Most Americans would object to an arbitrary order for them to start to work for a certain private employer or go to jail. The objective of this legislation is to require qualified registrants to go to work in essential war production and not to authorize any such arbitrary regimentation.

Except for the fact that we are at war, this bill contravenes the thirteenth amendment of our Constitution. The power given to Congress in section I of the Constitution to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy, is so far-reaching in wartime as to uphold many laws that would be considered unconstitutional under the thirteenth amendment in peacetime. You will note in the committee report that the Federal, district, and circuit courts have held that service by an individual can be required on "work of national importance under civilian direction in time of war." There has been no ruling as yet, however, on the extension of war powers to include the forcing of an individual to work for a designated private employer for the employer's private profit, but in my opinion any statutory grant of such power would be held unconstitutional.

The war powers of Congress and the need for the exercise of those powers are sufficient to support legislation requiring men to work in essential war production if they come within specified classifications. There is also a good argument for the constitutionality of a law freezing men already employed in essential war production because of the great national interest in maintaining efficient war production throughout the war. Certainly any high rate of turnover of manpower in our war-production industries can cause a most serious curtailment of war production when increased production is most needed. I cannot support any legislation that gives the power to force a man to work for a designated private employer for private profit. In my opinion, there is no justification for the grant of such a power and it would be contra even in wartime to the provision of the thirteenth amendment prohibiting involuntary servitude.

In order to assure the bill's constitutionality, I offered in committee the limitation set out at the end of paragraph (4) (C) which appears at lines 3 to 5, on page 5 of the bill, making the entire sentence read:

> It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

In my opinion, the adoption of this amendment helps to make the bill constitutional, and insofar as this bill is not in conflict with the Constitution, I am glad to support it to speed up our war-production program and our entire war effort to the limit of our national power.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has given a lot of thought to the expression "reasonable choice of employers for whom to work." The gentleman comes from an agricultural area. How would the gentleman interpret that provision?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I should like to have the bill so administered that the agencies ordering the registrant to go to work would give him the choice of at least a reasonable number of employers, and then I would leave it to an interpretation of the court as to what a reasonable number might be. I can readily see how the number of opportunities should be extended more in some branches of work than in others. It would be extremely difficult to predict what number of agricultural employers would be a reasonable number.

Mr. BROOKS. Also the area, as to the number of war plants and the number of opportunities, might affect the number of certifications.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Absolutely.

Mr. BROOKS. So that in one area a reasonable number might be a limited number and in another area it might be unlimited.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Absolutely. I gave a great deal of thought to that in trying to arrive at what would be the proper number, and decided that the best thing to do would be to have the amendment call for a reasonable number and let the number vary with the different situations that might arise.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss a national service bill that will affect all Americans alike, or as nearly so as is practicable. We have here a bill that proposes to deal with the ages of 18 to 45. We have made little discrimination regardless of whether the men are IV–F's or soldiers returned from the battlefronts with an honorable discharge. I want us first to bear that in mind.

I make no controversy on the recommendation of the President with regard to a national service law. I would not argue as to General Marshall's and Admiral King's recommendations to the Congress. But there are a few things which I do want to discuss with you in detail. There was introduced in the beginning a work-or-fight bill. We struck out the fighting feature and went back to the penalties of the Selective Service laws. This bill according to the newspapers was amended on various occasions, and I am sure you have kept up with the daily press. We have executive sessions, the secrecy of which I shall not violate here in my remarks. But I think I am free to discuss matters that have been printed in the press with regard to the deliberations on this measure in executive session. We find that this bill was amended to where the War Manpower Commission would not be utilized but junked and scuttled. But we find again

in reading the bill before us for consideration that the Selective Service Board has been set up for this function. So we know that is true, because most news stories that come to our attention unrepudiated are accepted as true. That is the bill as we find it before us today. We further find that the Tydings amendment was being given the test, that the Selective Service Director had sent out an order on the day we convened here in Congress to the State Selective Service directors. The order was, reading that part which affects those coming under the Tydings amendment:

I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interests of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of the existing conditions agriculture like our other war industries can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25.

Then we find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23 a directive by General Hershey which was inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], which states as follows:

The directive of January 3, 1945, State Directive Advice 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment.

The opinions and findings contained in State directive advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local board in determining the classification of registrants in the age groups 18 to 25. Section 5–K of the Selective Training and Service Act known as the Tydings amendment places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal in the case of the individual registrant, whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Now, you can appreciate, along with me, the state of confusion that existed for the young farmers of America, 300,000 in round numbers, who have been classified as essential to agriculture when this was published on the morning of January 4 in the newspapers.

Many of them were liquidated immediately. Many of them since that date have joined the armed forces. Among the group, according to the statistics of the Selective Service Board, 40 percent were or will be rejected for not being physically able. That 40 percent, in all probability, will never return to the farm, and agriculture suffers the more.

I am sure you are familiar with the Tydings amendment, but in order to refresh your memory I will read from the Selective Service Act as amended. This is section K:

Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

Now, the order that went to the Selective Service Board did not take into account the obtaining of someone to take the place of one of the 300,000 farmers that fell within that age group. Farming with most of these 300,000 is a very skilled occupation. In the handling of heavy equipment, particularly in the breadbasket of America, it is necessary to have skilled operation of the equipment and machinery which we have, even though most of it is old.

We found further on reading the newspapers that we amended the bill where no person would be obliged to join any labor union or organization unless he really chose to do so. We found, also, from reading the papers that every person volunteering for employment under section 4 shall have the right to join any union or organization, but no such person shall be obliged to join any such union or organization if he should not freely choose to do so. But as the House has received the bill, we find this amendment has been deleted from the original bill.

At this time I want to take off my hat and bow to the Representatives from the grand old State of Arkansas, where I was born, and the Representatives from the State of Florida for having nerve enough to submit to the people of their States a constitutional amendment, which was adopted in both instances, where you cannot operate a closed shop in those States. And such would be the case in Oklahoma, if such an amendment were submitted to the people of that great State.

We have dealt severely, as is necessary, in raising an Army. The Congress of the United States has been considerate of the soldiers in the passage of the G. I. bill and many other good laws. But we are now taking into account 7,000,000 American citizens and we are saying to them that we are going to utilize their services in the Army and war plants until this war is over.

But we leave the union organizations untouched. The closed-shop unions can and will demand dues and fees from a man who is drafted by his government to work. Before he can seize a tool, he must pay that supergovernment which our courts have upheld. He must pay tribute before he is permitted work; yet he will receive a most severe penalty should he refuse to work.

I propose to offer amendments to take care of this labor situation. I propose to offer an amendment to safeguard the Tydings amendment. I propose to offer an amendment to require utilization of the War Manpower Commission instead of junking it and scrapping it and spending a billion dollars setting up a new organization to handle the manpower of the country. One would think that the original bill was good but it has been entirely rewritten and even given a new number. The old bill was 1119. This bill is 1752. The provisions of the original bill have been changed to such extent that any Member of Congress in my opinion is justified in offering any amendment designed to temper the bill with justice to the man it affects. We are protecting labor; we are protecting industry, we are guaranteeing reasonable returns on investment up to 6 percent; we are tolerating cost-plus contracts, where a lot of manpower is lost and not utilized in production today. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] who spoke of the visit of a Senate committee to some of these activities and finding at first hand what was going on in the way manpower is being wasted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, since this law affects the entire Nation, let us try to make it just, let us not give in to the labor leaders and their organizations as against the 85 percent of the unorganized people of America; let us not give in to industry as against 85 percent of the population of America. One of these days our boys will be marching home. On this very day, this very morning I received a letter from one of my constituents who has served overseas. I have it here should anyone care to see it. It comes from my home town. The postmark is there. It was written on the 27th, just the day before yesterday. This man is writing about this bill, and I will read an excerpt to you from this letter. It is an excellent letter, a good letter:

You can tell those Congressmen that argue for the C. I. O. and closed shops that it will be a sad day when this war is won and they have to stand and look millions of veterans in the face and explain why they have to pay to get a job after they have fought to keep the country free. Are we going to let them down?

Now, don't get me wrong. We all love the U. S. A. and what it stands for. But we sure don't approve of the way Congress has let the labor racketeers pull the wool over their eyes.

The labor racket is worse than Al Capone's gang. He didn't force people to become members. This is not just my opinion. Thousands feel the same way. I have listened to them all over this country.

They just don't have the guts to say so. But you can tell the world the veterans will say so when they come home. And if something isn't done about it before they get home, they will not only talk but will show action as well. We don't want them to come home to find their own country in a mess.

I'm for the working people 100 percent. But I am getting tired of being told to go to see the business agent. And he tells the working class just how much to kick in or not work. And if those union stool pigeons don't think the soldier feels that way just ask any one of them they meet on the street that has a battle ribbon on his blouse.

I could read on. That reflects the views of an ex-serviceman. I have several letters here, but in the limited time allotted me I cannot read them to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, this subject is so large it is impossible to tackle it and to say much about it in the course of 10 minutes. However, the basic facts are that 900,000 men will be needed for military service by June 30, 1945, while we are told by the Army and the Navy that 700,000 workers will be needed for essential industry within

that time. So far as the 900,000 for military service are concerned, no question can be raised. They will be secured by 150,000 volunteering for the Navy while they are still 17 years of age. A large part of the remainder will come through the Selective Service boards, about 420,000, and the balance will be coming from the occupational-deferred groups. As to these persons who are in the occupational-deferred groups, there are some interesting figures. Of physically fit men under 26 years of age, only 40,000 are in industry today, and of those 40,000 said to be in industry, many are doctors, chemists, and other persons with peculiar assets who certainly are not going to be called forward to serve in the Army. Sixty thousand are in the merchant marine. The balance, about 360,000, are on the farms.

We are told by those who came before us that they do not expect to get any men out of industry under 26 years of age for the military services. If they get any it will be very few, because they have combed that class very closely. Any man under 26 in industry today is a key man and cannot be spared. Of the men in the merchant marine probably some can be replaced by older men. Out of the 360,000 on farms, they say that 180,000 can pass the draft requirements. That is where 180,000 are coming from. Whether or not there will be replacements for them is another thing.

If I can judge from the farmers who came in to see me in the last few days while I was home, they expect their boys to leave the farms and they are pretty certain they are not going to get replacements. The balance of the men needed for the services will come from men in the age group from 26 to 29, more from industry perhaps than from farms. However, I was told by a man who is chairman of a selective-service board and a very able citizen that they combed that class pretty thoroughly. Any man who is between the ages of 26 and 29 today in a big industrial plant is a man who by experience has become a toolmaker, a diesinker, or holder of some other important job for which no other person can be trained in less than 6 months and for some jobs in not less than 18 months. Certainly that group is not going to be hauled out of industry merely by the passage of this bill. Selective Service will not take them.

How do the people back home feel about this bill? I have been wondering, as you have, while we have been here in Washington. I was interested in picking up the Worcester Telegram, a paper with a circulation of 130,000, the biggest circulation of any newspaper in Massachusetts outside of Boston. Reading from its editorial dated Thursday, January 25, 1945, I find this statement:

> On one point, there can be no question. War production must be kept up, whatever the inconveniences or the hardship to civilians. Here at home, where many of us are getting high pay, and most of us are living in comfort, we cannot fail to do the little that is required of us to maintain the fighting men who are making the real sacrifice at the front.
>
> Any fair service act can be accepted, and the public will support it, if the need for it can be demonstrated. But the two groups most directly concerned with the practical business of war production, the leaders of organized labor and the leaders industrial management, are agreed that the situation can be better met without compulsory war work.
>
> The sensible thing would be to let those men demonstrate that they can get together and solve this manpower problem. If they can't, and the emergency continues, Congress can act. But, as matters stand today, the arguments for a service act are not wholly convincing.

Back home in Springfield I personally took the time out to call upon labor leaders and upon heads of important industries employing thousands of men. Their position was about the same as the position given in the Worcester Telegram. Let us wait 30 or 60 days before passing any bill like this. Let us permit the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the heads of industry to get together after the War Department and the Navy Department have told us what they need, because they have not told us up to date. "We think we can do it without this legislation. We are sure we can do it without this legislation, and we know that we can do it better without this legislation as it is now written than we can with the legislation." That seems to be their position.

I was interested in the Springfield papers, both the Republican paper, the Union, and the Democratic paper, the Springfield Daily News—the Daily News being the largest Democratic paper outside of Boston in Massachusetts. In the Springfield Daily News editorial of January 22, 1945, they indicate their opinion, and I will use the closing words:

> Assuming there is a shortage of 4,000,000 workers in key industries (and that figure may be large) Congress should hesitate to place 40,000,000 Americans under a workers' draft to meet the deficiency. That would be giving Government bureaucrats too much power over far too many people to cope with the problem. Moreover the so-called crisis will ease off immediately if the Russian-Allied offensives succeed in smashing the German war machine by spring.

The position of the Union is expressed in an excerpt from their editorial of January 22, 1945. The editorial speaks for itself:

> Is it not possible that the present manpower crisis stems, at least in part, from the incompetence of the manpower administration? That question is inevitable, in view of the failure at the top in so many other divisions of war-program administration; the deplorable mismanagement of our food production and supplies, for instance. If the manpower shortage is remediable without legislation creating what amounts to the labor battalions mustered by Hitler and his Tokyo opposite number, if a change of administration can lead to a sufficiently effective use of civilian workers to do the job without passing oppressive laws, then a change is mandatory.
>
> At least there is room for argument about current proposals. And Congressmen who insist on argument and who oppose the labor draft are performing a signal service for the country, for they are determined not to abandon the Government of freemen until every means of preserving it, even in a war crisis, has been exhausted. Let us not look upon them as obstructionsts or politically inspired critics. The necessity for breaking down the traditional barriers containing democratic practice has not yet been proved beyond doubt.

I feel that certain amendments ought to be offered to this bill before anyone would vote for it. One of them is to limit the time within which it is to be operative. As the bill comes before us today, it is going to operate until we get through with the Japanese war. It does not seem to me that we need any such period of time to keep 53,000,000 persons, who are our workers, covered by legislation of this kind. I think that we should make it 6 months or make it a year. Make it the year 1945. Close it out as of December 31, 1945, if the German war is over at that time. If the war is still on, or if the need can be shown at that time to be great enough to require such legislation, then we will have proper opportunity in which to renew it.

Another amendment which I think should be adopted is on page 2 of the bill. I believe that a man who is given the power of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion should not be given the right to delegate it as provided in line 5. Congress does not know today and it will never know to whom he will delegate the power. Thereafter he will not be responsible. There will always be some agency, some other person, to hide behind. If Mr. Byrnes is going to be the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion let him sign whatever documents have to be signed so that the Congress can always go to him and say, "You are the person responsible; it is not Mr. McNutt, Mr. Jones, or whoever else happens to be holding office as head of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, or some other agency." Let us not have that division of authority which these bureaucrats love to have down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Let us put the responsibility in one man and then we will know where we stand.

Another amendment which I think might well go in is brought to my attention by the fact that the papers in Springfield recently were telling us that they are bringing in Jamaicans, colored people, to take up employment in my city. By the way, you would be interested in the Friday Evening Union of last week, which says that Smith & Wesson—I think everybody in this room knows who Smith & Wesson are, great revolver manufacturers—have a cutback coming, that 200 employees will be dropped in 2 weeks. Cut-backs are coming all along the line today in the production of what we would think to be the most needed weapons of war. People are going out of Smith & Wesson. There are going to be jobs for them, to be sure, in other industries.

So, in the Springfield area, we have at one and the same time the picture of American workmen being dropped from the pay rolls of industry while alien workers are coming in large numbers to work in other plants. Nothing portrays more clearly the type of manpower shortage which we have today in our country. It is a shortage of common laborers, men who are of an age and physique which will permit them to perform the hardest kind of manual task. They are needed in the heavy tire industry and in the foundries. Their pay is in

the lower brackets and not commensurate with the abilities of skilled workmen. According to the testimony on pages 281, 349, and 350 of the hearings, there are experienced American workmen who are Negroes who are not able to get work in plants because of discrimination against them. Both major parties at their conventions last year wrote planks into their platforms, pledging support for legislation which would eliminate such unfair practices. I believe that a provision in this bill would both redeem those pledges and be helpful in overcoming such manpower shortage as now exists.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot stop a football game at the end of the third quarter and conclude you have the game in the bag because you are ahead and again have the ball on the enemy's 1-foot line.

After Pearl Harbor, America started on an all-out effort to win this war.

Immediately our military leaders to whom is assigned the duty of carrying out the problems and battles of war unleashed their best efforts in a terrific movement to get our fighting forces under way and well equipped to do the job wherever called upon. Month after month our tasks have multiplied, and today we face as momentous and important war problems as of any time since the outbreak of this war.

Before I go any further, let me state that I well realize that, both as to the military and home front, mistakes have been made. Mistakes were bound to happen. Others might well have been avoided. And I want it emphatically understood that I am of the opinion and belief that the dilemma in which we find ourselves at the moment certainly is not the blame of our fighting boys at the front, of Congress, the rank and file of labor, or industry. Somebody last fall just failed to see the true picture of the war and, if it was known, failed to acquaint the American people with the truths and facts connected therewith. There is no use crying over spilt milk. Mistakes, costly and regrettable as they may be, cannot be retrieved. One thing certain is, that they must not be repeated.

Therefore, today we have this drastic bill before us which permits the freezing of men in jobs and the drafting of men not now employed in essential labor, into war work. I repeat, it is drastic and something on which I had hoped we might not be called upon to act. The whole idea of involuntary service in private employment is rather repugnant to good Americans. That simply has not been our way of doing things in this country. It is not our style. Our American standards and patterns have always been cut out of better cloth.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I listened to all the testimony of the various witnesses who came before our committee. It was both interesting and informative. Never before, however, have I seen such directly opposite views expressed as that voiced by the proponents and opponents of the bill. There were good arguments on both sides, and I believe it would prove of benefit to all of you to read the complete hearings. Our committee worked diligently day after day to bring forth the best possible bill. It has its shortcomings and may be improved through amendments from the floor. I hope so, for I know of one or more amendments, defeated in committee, that I feel should be in the final draft. One such amendment is the so-called Andrews amendment, which is in the Austin-Wadsworth bill, whereby any individual drafted to work in any plant is given the privilege and right to either join or not join a union of his choice. This amendment certainly is not anti-union, but it simply retains to the individual a right which he as an American citizen is entitled to. I have never been able to understand by what reasoning any United States citizen could be forced to join a union when working on a Government contract. To me that is un-American.

The details of this bill have been explained by our chairman and also set forth in full in the report which accompanies the bill. I am not going to repeat such details. I do want to call your attention, however, to section B, page 4, which emphasizes the voluntary participation made possible to any individual who is capable of filling a wartime job. Only, and I repeat, only in case he refuses to accept such employment will he be subjected to the penalties of the bill. Somehow I want to believe that when the public is made fully aware of the seriousness of the situation we face, ample hands will be found available to voluntarily fill all labor requirements. That, I say, is my hope.

Everyone in this House knows that war is waste and destruction. Everyone does or should know that there is a waste of manpower in our factories and plants today. Each Member must have received, as I have, untold numbers of letters telling of instance after instance where individuals complain that they do not have enough work to do, are not permitted to work long enough hours or are not permitted to turn out as much work as they are able and willing to do. Both Phil Murray, C. I. O. head, and Mr. Crawford, chairman, National Association of Manufacturers Executive Committee, testified that there is now available enough manpower to do the job requested of labor and industry. Frankly, I don't believe I am far off in saying that there now exists, as an over-all picture, three men doing the work that two men could well do. That is a most regrettable statement of what I believe to be a fact. I do not think Congress can cure such an ill through legislation.

But, Mr. Chairman, and this is the crux of the whole matter as I view it. Under Secretary of War Patterson and Under Secretary of Navy Bard, in speaking for our armed services, emphatically stated that we need some legislation of this type now. Secretary Patterson stated:

> As we see it, the manpower needs of the armed forces, and of the war industries that support the armed forces, for the first half year of 1945, will aggregate 1,600,000 additional persons. That is made up of 900,000 for induction into the armed forces, Army and Navy, for military service, and 700,000 additional persons in war production, in war-supporting industries.

I seriously doubt that any Member of this House has the vaguest idea as to what our military requirements will be for the next 6 or 12 months. Neither do we know when the war will end. All plans, policies, and determinations must be left to our military leaders under the head of our outstanding Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall. I have often said that if it is possible to derive any blessing from any war, then the greatest blessing to come to America out of this war has been that great soldier, General Marshall. All of us here realize that he knows his business. Somehow I like to depend and rest my case on his decisions. Approximately 20,000,000 fathers and mothers of today have placed the fate of their loved ones in this man's hands. They trust him; so do I. Who am I to loudly voice my opinions from a military angle against those of General Marshall?

It seems to me that we today are up against a situation that calls for action. If we are to win this war, men and materials must be made available. We must keep loading the guns our boys are shooting. God forbid the day when any of our boys might be defeated or killed through a lack of sufficient weapons or ammunition to carry the fight to our enemies.

If in this still great and glorious country of ours we can place our fingers on the shoulders of the young men of this land and send them out to fight and die, then how in the name of all that is just, can we ever possibly deny them the things to fight with in order that victory will be ours. I was one of those who, before the war, did everything I could in an effort to keep this country out of war. But it was not to be. Now we are in it and have been for over 3 years. The day of victory is going to be ours. We cannot backtrack now. Let us get every American into this fight up to the limit of his or her abilities. And right there let me pause to say that it is regrettable that the McSwain bill calling for taking the profit out of war was never put into law. You may recall that bill passed the House in 1935 by an overwhelming vote, 368 ayes to 15 nays. Had that bill passed, all the Nation's manpower, industry, and resources would have immediately been drawn into the war effort before declaration of this war. I still would like to see such a law on our statute books. It might help avert any repetition of this vicious conflict in which we now play so big a part.

Members of Congress, it may be that with the help of every good and loyal American, our armed forces cooperating with our allies can finish off our two world enemies during 1945 and 1946. In the meantime, let us throw everything at them that we have, in a grand push to terminate the loss of life, waste, and devastation that we encounter every day.

No, this bill is not perfect. This isn't the type legislation we like to vote for. Maybe it won't work out as smoothly as it is expected. There is a legal question as to its constitutionality but, regardless, I somehow feel deeply the need to do something about the matter right now. We have this bill here because of the one

objective that is being sought, and that objective is solely to meet an emergency manpower problem. I do not like the bill, for it takes us off on a tangent or foreign road from good, sound American doctrine, privileges, and rights. But, regardless of how bad the taste of the medicine this bill offers, I believe we have to take it. I can see no other alternative. The issue is clear—are we to throw our every resource into this battle, or not? We cannot take chances. We face the real question of whether we are now going to completely throw ourselves into this war effort when so badly needed. Just remember, the boys who are fighting and dying are not stopping to ask questions at this moment. They will ask such questions and speak their pieces when they get home. Now they want action from us—more men, more materials. General Marshall and Admiral King say we need this legislation. Under such conditions I can do nothing else but support it, unless the bill is drastically amended when up for consideration under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am going to direct my remarks at a part of this bill which has not been discussed this afternoon.

I intend to vote for this measure. I do so not because I believe it is the best manpower bill which could be brought forward, but becaue it is the most likely to pass. I endorse the intent of the bill. But its administration, I predict, will be hopelessly confused and entangled.

When this bill was before the committee for final action, it contained provisions for sensible, economical, and experienced administration of the job freeze and job transfer procedures. These provisions did no violence to the intent of the bill. They simply authorized, for the purpose of legally controlling the employment of men 18 to 45, the continued functioning of the vast employment exchange, manpower control, and management-labor committee machinery which this Congress—year after year, by appropriation—has recognized, approved, and supported.

If I had read this bill as it is now written, without knowledge of the tremendous mobilization of men and women into war plants and supporting activities by the War Manpower Commission—and into agriculture by the War Food Administration—I would have never guessed that a labor allocation machinery, providing for management and labor participation, was already in existence. I would have thought that this bill intended to create in these war years a manpower mobilization machinery for the first time.

What the bill, in fact, will do, unless amended, is to create additional machinery, duplicating machinery, machinery that can only confuse and disrupt the extensive system of recruitment, referral, and transfer, bulwarked by management and labor sponsorship, that already exists.

In 1933, the Congress created a Nation-wide system of public employment offices under Federal-State control. Prior to Pearl Harbor, the employment service system was gearing itself to meet the labor demands arising out of defense production. On December 19, 1941, 12 days following Pearl Harbor, this system was temporarily placed on a Federal basis, so that Nation-wide mobilization of workers for expanding war industries could be expedited. In April 1942, by Executive Order, this system became the operating structure of the War Manpower Commission. During 1942, '43, '44, and up to the present minute, the War Manpower Commission has applied itself to the job of recruiting and transferring millions of workers to war production, with the help of management and labor committees. It has operated a tremendous interarea clearance system to move needed workers out of surplus areas. It has held millions of workers on essential jobs by its stabilization program, worked out cooperatively with management and labor. It has become the only agency with up-to-date and relatively accurate information on labor utilization and the rapidly changing labor requirements of different war programs and plants. It has undertaken, with management and labor support, an area-by-area program for moving less-essential workers into urgent jobs by employment ceilings and priority referral.

The War Manpower Commission has done and is doing these tasks with no law except the self imposed, informal law of workers and unions, employers and trade associations, voluntarily agreeing to abide by hiring controls they themselves helped to formulate.

This system of Nation-wide manpower control, founded on the voluntary cooperation of labor and management, has had to create many techniques and procedures. No manpower control system could operate without them. The manpower control system which Selective Service under the present bill must create also will not operate unless comparable duplicating procedures are created.

There is one way to avoid this duplication. There is one way to strengthen and to utilize the tremendous manpower machinery that already exists and that will continue to exist after this bill is enacted. That one way is to restore to the bill the intent of the committee's earlier amendments which would have authorized the Director of War Mobilization to designate the War Manpower Commission—and for agriculture, the War Food Administration—as the agency to which male workers 18 to 45 would be referred for placement and the agency which would determine, with the assistance of its management-labor committees, whether a worker's present job or future job was in the interest of the war effort. If there is some doubt as to the agencies which the Director of War Mobilization actually would designate, this doubt could be removed by writing into the bill the requirement that the Director of War Mobilization designate referral and placement agencies.

Let us look at the realities of the situation. The Selective Service System has 6,500 local boards. They are part-time voluntary boards. They are already overworked. They know how to select and induct men into the armed forces. They have done and are doing this job magnificently. But they have not done active recruitment and placement of war workers.

The War Manpower Commission, on the other hand, has 1,507 full-time local offices and other part-time or itinerant offices, staffed with 2,000 people whose full-time business is manpower recruitment, referral, and stabilization. The Commission has 177 area offices and about 336 area management-labor committees. The local offices carry on placement, recruitment, transfer, and manpower control, under employment stabilization plans. Management and labor have worked with the area offices in developing these plans and are actively participating in carrying out these plans. It is the management-labor committees of the Commission which hear and decide worker and employer appeals under the plans.

The area and local offices together have recruiting specialists, utilization consultants, labor-market economists, and so on. They are, as I say, in the manpower business.

All these local and area offices throughout the country are tied together by State and regional offices and a Washington headquarters office. In each area, State, and region, and in Washington, there is an actively cooperating management-labor committee. By means of this extensive organization, the employment trends and labor needs of urgent production for plants and areas throughout the country are determined. This method of keeping track of our war manpower situation is working so well that Justice Byrnes recently designated the War Manpower Commission as the sole agency responsible for the coordination and issuance of manpower information. By this means, also, all male workers without regard to age—except World War II veterans—and in some areas women workers as well—must be hired with the consent of the employment service and must take jobs that have a high priority rating unless there is some good cause for refusing. And I would like to say here that when you have a voluntary manpower control system which cannot remedy substandard wage situations, which cannot pay transportation costs, nor promise adequate housing, you are bound to have many perfectly justifiable reasons for not taking a priority job.

I know that the War Manpower Commission has not operated perfectly. I know that there are some people who have chosen not to comply with the rules, and since the rules were essentially voluntary, very little could be done about it. Important employers have kept War Manpower Commission utilization consultants out of their plants so that no question could be raised on the labor needs they reported. Less essential employers have tried to buck the employment ceiling program so they would not have to give up workers to war industry. Many essential employers have given written releases to workers indiscriminately and then complained that the War Manpower Commission was not stopping

turnover. Some individual workers have found ways and means of getting jobs without a release. Some individual workers have managed to turn down priority after priority job in order to take a less important job of their liking.

In spite of all this, the war mobilization job done by the Commission without the power of compulsory assignment has been amazing. Up until last month, the manpower demands of our war effort, by and large, had been successfully met. Almost without exception, the shortages which face us now are not the result of failures to meet manpower demands in the past. They are the result of changed schedules dictated by changed battle conditions.

I think it would be foolhardy to throw aside the machinery, the procedures, the management-labor cooperation, the technical experience that has done this job. I think it would be eminently reasonable to recognize this machinery and to rely upon it for referring and placing workers, for determining when and where workers are needed, for deciding which workers should be transferred to urgent jobs, and for certifying that it is or is not in the best interest of the war effort for a particular worker to leave the particular job he is in.

I can think of nothing more wasteful of public funds or confusing and disheartening to the workers and employers of this country than to have a new agency—new in the sense that it has not handled civilian manpower problems—setting up a new and competing system to allocate workers of a particular sex and age while the responsible manpower agency, responsible for mobilizing all the other millions of workers, is tossed aside to continue its operations as best it can.

When I vote for this bill, it will be with the greatest misgivings as to its administrative effectiveness. I hope it will be possible now or later to rectify what I believe is a most serious error in the bill as written. I can see no good reason, no public interest, against correlating the appropriate Selective Service authority in this bill with the placement, referral, stabilization, and appeal authorities of the War Manpower Commission. As Judge Hay told our committee, there has been built up, through the cooperation of industry, labor, the procurement agencies, and the War Manpower Commission in their local areas, an intelligent system of selecting urgent war activities and assigning priorities with respect to jobs in relation to their importance to the war. The system includes an appeals machinery of joint management and labor panels, locally and up the line. I urge that we build upon this machinery and that we incorporate our intention so to do in H. R. 1752.

May I read into the RECORD at this time a brief description of the War Manpower Commission machinery through which existing manpower controls operate:

EXISTING MANPOWER MACHINERY

I. WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION ORGANIZATION

For administration of the manpower programs, War Manpower Commission organization consists of (1) a headquarters organization in Washington; (2) 12 regional manpower organizations covering all States in the United States, and Hawaii and Alaska; (3) State manpower offices in each State; (4) area manpower organizations covering local labor market areas; and (5) a network of local employment offices. Organizational units in the field are headed by regional, State, and area manpower directors.

II. LABOR MARKET AREAS

The entire country is divided into labor market areas each of which represents that geographic area within which resident workers normally find their employment and local employers normally find their labor supply.

III. MANAGEMENT-LABOR COMMITTEE

Management-labor committees have been set up at national, regional, and area levels of War Manpower Commission administration. These committees are made up of representatives of management, labor, and where necessary agricultural, at the various levels. The manpower director at each level is the chairman of the management-labor committee at that level.

The management-labor committee functions (1) to advise the manpower director regarding formulation and operation of the applicable employment stabilization plan; (2) to assist in securing voluntary compliance with provisions of the plan by acquainting employers, workers, and the public with the need for and applicability of the plan; and (3) to hear appeals from actions of the War Manpower Commission under the plan and to recommend to the Manpower Director decisions on appeals.

IV. MANPOWER PRIORITIES COMMITTEES

Manpower priorities committees are set up in each administrative area of the War Manpower Commission to assist the manpower director in setting ceilings for individual establishments and in determining the relative priority of manpower needs of employers.

The manpower priorities committees are comprised of representatives of (1) the War Manpower Commission; (2) the War Production Board; (3) the Selective Service System; (4) the Navy Department; (5) the War Department; and (6) where advisable, representatives of other important claimants for manpower, such as the Civil Service Commission, the War Food Administration, the Maritime Commission, and others. The manpower director is chairman of the manpower priorities committee.

The manpower priorities committee is to make recommendation to the manpower director on the basis of production urgencies determined by the production urgency committees of the War Production Board and pertinent manpower factors in individual establishments.

V. APPEALS PROCEDURE

Any employer or worker who claims that any action of the War Manpower Commission under the employment stabilization program is unfair or unreasonable as applied to him, or is conconsistent with regulations under the program, may appeal such action to the area management-labor committee.

He may appeal beyond the area management-labor committee to the regional management-labor committee, and finally to the chairman of the War Manpower Commission. Hearings on appeals are not subject to rules of evidence, but are conducted informally.

Each party to the appeal may present his own case, or he may be represented by a member of his labor or trade organization or by any other person freely chosen by him.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill before the House today is the result of unfinished business. It is here because the executive department failed to lay down a sound business and labor policy which should have been enunciated immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

This has not been done, and 3 years later with the fanfare of trumpets and hysteria and a hurricane of propaganda the buck has been passed to the Congress and extreme pressure for the passing of a National Service Act.

The result has been that cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors have been allowed to hoard labor and establish prices which have added billions to the cost of building our military machine. It has placed a premium on idleness of employees in many of the war plants; has set an example that has slowed down production and increased the waste of manpower for the past 3 years. It has wasted tremendous sums of the people's money who have given it in a most patriotic manner with the hope that every dollar they have invested in bonds would be so spent that it would bring victory to American arms at the earliest possible date. It is a gross injustice to the people, dangerous to the financial solvency of our Government and at this late dates places this responsibility upon the Congress which has been neglected by other departments of the Government. It is a responsibility that I believe the Congress can meet and certainly should meet and solve at this time. If it is not solved the most profligate waste in the history of this Nation will continue to lower the morale of our people.

With all deference to the chairman and the Members of the Military Affairs Committee, I do not believe the National Service Act which they have recommended offers a genuine solution to this most vexing problem. It does not go to the core of the problem. It seeks to acquire 900,000 more men for military service within the next 6 months and 700,000 more men for essential war industries within the same period. Its purpose is to get this great number of men from the young men coming 18 years of age and from the very lean manpower now engaged in the civilan economy of the Nation, from the farms which are already short of manpower, from those employed in small businesses and from distribution of services to the civilian people of our country.

Is this course necessary? The Director of War Mobilization, representing the executive department, does not and cannot know under existing conditions. This problem cannot be properly approached until it is determined whether or not the manpower we now have in the war plants of the Nation is sufficient; if it is properly distributed and fully employed in production. This National Service Act should not be passed until that is determined.

Practically every Member of Congress continues to receive mail pointing out that there is a tremendous hoarding of manpower, particularly in the cost-plus-fixed-fee war plants, and that there is a wastage of manpower in most of the plants of the Nation. Thousands of patriotic men throughout the Nation have quit work in war plants after waiting days, weeks, and months for work because they were too patriotic to draw their checks in these critical times without being allowed to work in the plants

where they were supposed to be employed. Many men who are and have been employed in war plants have told me this story, have told it to you, and to the press of the Nation. This story has been told to the citizens all over the land where their friends and neighbors have been employed in these plants. This condition not only has lowered the morale of many of the laboring men but to a certain extent lowered the morale of the American people. This bill does not provide that a thorough investigation of this matter be made in the solution of this problem. This bill proposes to herd more men into these already congested areas, which will add greater confusion in these plants and will not increase production.

The Barrett bill—H. R. 1803—which will later be offered as a substitute goes to the very core of this manpower problem offering a real solution. It provides first that the draft boards of this country, in cooperation and conjunction with the manpower committees located in these industrial centers make an investigation of the hoarding and wastage of labor in these plants. It arms them with the power of subpena to take testimony under oath, to determine how much labor is being hoarded and wasted and provides the machinery whereby at the close of an investigation of a plant the number of men found unnecessary for production in such plant can be transferred to the plants where there is a real shortage of manpower. It also provides that the draft boards shall begin an immediate reclassification of all the manpower between the ages of 18 and 45 with the exception of those in I–A which will give all of those including the over 4,000,000 IV–F's an opportunity to volunteer their services for essential war work under their signature. There are one and a half million other than IV–F's in this pool which pushes this total to be given an opportunity to volunteer their services to 5,500,000 men.

When this bill is placed in operation, instead of driving more men into the war plants of the Nation under threat of fines up to $10,000 and jail penalties, the Barrett bill provides for opening the gates of these overstaffed war plants and taking out of these plants surplus labor which is on the payroll and unemployed and which will give those a chance to exert greater efficiency in the plants and provide for this surplus labor of skilled mechanics to be transferred to plants where they are really needed.

I feel certain that when the draft boards offer these five and one-half million men a chance to volunteer for war work that at least 10 percent of them will sign up; yes, in my opinion, a great majority of them will. But if only a minimum of 10 percent volunteer for such service that would amount to 550,000 men. They say they only need 700,000 men and they do not need them all the first month but this is the number they estimate they will need by the end of 6 months. Is this Congress ready to say that the patriotism of our people on the home front is so low that if given a call to serve by the draft boards that 10 men out of 100 would not respond? I have more faith in our people. I want to approach and solve this problem in the American way. We will fail if we attempt to solve it in the totalitarian way by force and the threat of heavy fines and jail penalties.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that there are over 16,000,000 men now in essential war work. It is further estimated by some of the best industrial engineers of the Nation that some 20 percent of the effort of this manpower is not being utilized due to the hoarding and wastage of labor. If this investigation by the selective service boards and the War Manpower Commission finds that only 10 percent of it is not being fully utilized that would amount to 1,600,000 men. This means 1,600,000 men added to the 550,000 men previously referred to will give us a manpower pool of 2,100,000 men.

The Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Byrnes, and the leaders of our military forces say that we only need a million six hundred thousand men.

I think the Barrett substitute offers a sound, sensible approach to this problem. These thousands of draft boards, in cooperation with the various manpower committees already set up in the industrial centers, can make a quick and effective survey, reporting it back to Selective Service, War Manpower Commission, and to the Congress of the United States.

It will decentralize the problem and will bring the power of public opinion, with all of its force, back of these boards in the various localities in the United States. It will put the cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors, the Army and the Navy, the Federal bureaus, and the Government on notice that there is a real movement on at last to stop the hoarding and wastage of manpower anywhere and everywhere it can be found in the Nation. If this bill is passed the hoarders of labor in the war plants of this Nation will begin at once to set their houses in order to avoid the fierce condemnation of the people and the Congress of the United States.

It is my opinion that if we can approach this matter through the Barrett substitute that you will find so much skilled labor hoarded in the war plants now, so much wastage of labor that very few of the great numbers of men who will sign up who are now in civilian service—that very few of them will be taken from this very thin reservoir of labor into the war plants of the Nation. I believe the Barrett substitute offers a great opportunity for the Congress to solve this manpower problem and solve it in a way that will strengthen the entire economy of the Nation and stop the continuance of unnecessary waste in billions of dollars which under the present arrangements has helped to push the national debt to a dangerous height.

Mr. Chairman, I am against this National Service Act recommended by the committee, because I believe it to be unconstitutional. I believe it clearly violates the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution which provides against involuntary servitude.

Congress and the Constitution are, in my judgment, the two most sacred and the two most important pillars to sustain the future liberty and democracy of this country, to which a confused people all over this land pin their dwindling hope and faith. I, for one, do not want to further shake their faith.

I am against this bill because I believe that free labor under patriotic leadership will bring about greater production than will forced labor.

I am against this bill, because in my judgment it is not necessary and because I believe it will not help solve our production problems.

Mr. Chairman, in summing up the matter it seems to me that the Congress must decide whether or not it is wise to substitute the Barrett bill, which will provide for the first time for a Government agency to investigate and offer some supervision as to how our billions of dollars will be spent in the war plants, some check and control over the cost-plus contractors, and the 16,000,000 men employed, or whether we shall continue to back away from this problem and in an effort to get greater production empower the Government with heavy fines and jail penalties, to draft and force maybe a million more men into the war plants of our country without knowing in what places they are needed and in many instances add to our confusion and add to the cost of producing our war equipment with billions of dollars of unnecessary waste in the expense of the people of our Nation.

I hope now that this problem has come to the Congress, that we can deal with it in a courageous and forthright manner, finding the proper solution.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 107, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by me to the Secretary of War, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, on the question of bread rationing for the Italian people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by myself relative to the action of the Department of Justice in filing another antitrust suit today against a cartel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by

Mr. R. B. Caywood, president of the National American Wholesale Grocers' Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MOBILIZATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill which I have introduced today, H. R. 1803.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is a trait of human nature not to blame yourself when things go wrong. In this respect governments are no different than individuals. Manpower is America's No. 1 problem today. Last summer Government officials and high-ranking military men were talking of the early defeat of Germany. Reconversion was one of the main topics of debate. The War Production Board was working out a plan of procedure which would permit new production of civilian goods. As early as last August men began to leave their jobs in war plants to get back to civilian work. There was great debate about what to do with the enormous surpluses of war materials that American industry and labor had produced. About a million and a half men and women left war industry and filtered back to civilian jobs with a postwar future. Many of them left because of a lack of war orders. There was a wholesale departure of war workers from their jobs, both voluntary and under compulsion. Now many of these individuals are confronted with the threat of work, fight, or be penalized.

About 364,000 young men from 18 to 25 have been deferred because they work on farms. Notwithstanding the fact that the production of food and fiber is such a vital part of the war effort the draft boards were instructed to reexamine these registrants with the idea of the strictest possible interpretation of the Tydings amendment.

Some people attempted to blame the IV–F's for a shortage of manpower. They were branded something akin to slackers. Yet no responsible agency has ever given the IV–F's the proper guidance and told them precisely what they should do. General Hershey made the statement that in his opinion 90 percent of the boys classified as IV–F's would voluntarily do anything they could in furtherance of the war effort. I venture to say that 99 percent of these boys would patriotically and voluntarily respond to a call from their Government and go anywhere or do anything.

Until recently officials said the 300,000 war workers would be sufficient to man the war plants. Now we are told that 700,000 men will be needed in the next 5 months, and at this moment 140,000 men are needed in the war-production plants of the Nation. The businessmen and the laboring men of America are bewildered and puzzled as to just what is the manpower situation today; 9,300,000 men and women are employed in munition production; 8,600,000 are engaged in agricultural activities; 34,300,000 are engaged or employed in other than nonagricultural and nonmunition activities.

We have a great reservoir of skilled mechanics and laboring men in the over 9,000,000 people presently employed in munition production. The woeful waste and hoarding of manpower in the cost-plus-fixed-fee plants of America is scandalous, to put it mildly.

Recently I received a letter from an inspector at Hill Field, Ogden, Utah, in which he stated:

No nation, America or any other, can sustain a program of waste such as I refer to.

I have witnessed thousands of man-hours wasted and millions of dollars.

I have witnessed B–24 airplanes, known as Liberators, bombers which could easily have been repaired, put under the saw and hauled out to the scrap heap. We reconditioned 26 B–24's at Hill Field so as to fly them to Florida to put them under the saw for scrap.

I saw gasoline dumped in the sand in lots ranging as high as 200 gallons at one time, no, not dirty gasoline, but gasoline which was put in an airplane and because the fuel cells leaked it was drained and not used in trucks or other equipment, but hauled out and dumped on the sand by men who could not obtain enough gasoline to get to work without lying to a ration board.

On January 1 we instituted a time-card system that had been tried here before and had proved a failure with the result that hundreds stood in line for 2 hours to get into the clockhouse, and although they were supposed to clock in by 7:30 a. m., many of them were still in line at 9:30, and a bulletin was put on the board to the effect that if they clocked in before 10 a. m., they would not be considered tardy.

I have seen times when it took 7 days to get a part from the warehouse that was located less than a quarter of a mile away because of the red tape involved. Yes, the part was there, and the mechanics needed it to repair our fighting machines, but we had to go through channels to get it, with this kind of a result.

We have now in Hangar No. 2 an airplane known as airplane No. 42–52288. It is a B–24, yes, a Liberator bomber, which cost about $300,000; four engines and it will use about 250 gallons of gasoline per hour, and we have equipped this airplane with fine flooring, inlaid linoleum, chairs that cost $111.16 each, loud speaker for the radio, ice box, etc. We have put in a little over 4,500 hours of manpower and an estimated $10,000 in equipment and this airplane is to be used by Gen. G. H. Beverley to fly around over the country with.

We have a fuel cell known as self-sealing so that when it is punctured it will seal itself from leaks. Now, some of these cells are equipped with a fitting which would no doubt cost about $5, but we have been forced to condemn the entire cell which would cost about $500, because they say they are unable to obtain that fitting from the fuel-cell manufacturers.

At Hill Field, I have never heard one person complain of working too hard, but I have seen them quit by the dozens because they could not work. Thousands of man-hours are wasted each and every month by some clean-up order because some general is coming through, and many times they don't even enter the hangars.

A few days ago I received a letter from a man formerly employed in the production-engineering department of a nationally known corporation which is building naval aircraft on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, in which he stated:

One morning our supervisor came hurrying through the department telling all of us to get the lofting tables uncovered and cleaned off and to have plenty of blue prints opened out to give the appearance of great activity for he had been notified that the local draft board was to pay us an inspection visit during the day. Sure enough, later in the day, our visitors arrived and they were shown prints and lay-outs and templates, etc., all of which made quite an impression on them, as to the importance of the department in contributing to the war effort. Little did they know that a great deal of what they were shown was old and obsolete material.

As a matter of fact, half of the men in the department of several hundred, had no real work to do and could have been dispensed with. The plane had long since been in full production and only a limited number of men were needed to take care of occasional and slight changes of design that were made from time to time. Yet the force is kept at full strength, even at the present time. Whenever a patriotic and conscientious loftsman or engineer sickened of such loafing and hoarding of manpower and tried to get a release to seek more useful war work, he was blocked as much as possible by the department head.

Why? Because if the department had been reduced in size to actual need there wouldn't have been much left for the supervisor to be the head of, and, after all, Uncle Sam was, and is, paying the freight, so the company didn't care and always sided in with its supervisors in fighting releases. Multiply this by thousands of cases over the country of a similar nature, wherever cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts are in force, and you have the cause of most of the labor hoarding and shortage.

There would, no doubt, be a big howl from interests that now are riding along with the taxpayers paying billions.

Recently I received a letter from an engineer who inspects various private contractors making parts for Navy equipment, which reads as follows:

In my present work I am in daily contact with machine shops that are making parts for naval ordnance. The work involves making surveys of plants to see if they have the proper facilities, equipment, personnel, etc., to make various parts for the gun that my company is producing in the naval ordnance plant that it is operating. We have field men, such as myself, in various parts of the country, for we are thus enabled to utilize the

facilities of small plants in numerous communities in the war effort. This same pattern is followed in practically all war work. After orders are placed with these vendors for the component parts they are to make, I then follow up on the work to see that no delays occur in production. These delays can be caused by numerous reasons, technical questions, tooling questions, difficulty in obtaining special materials, etc., may arise, all of which I must iron out to assure the early start of operations. However, once the work is underway, in most cases it will run along smoothly until the parts are ready for naval inspection offices in all parts of the country and at each step a part is supposedly inspected. For instance, John Doe, the vendor, buys some S. A. E. 1020 steel to make a part. He buys it from a warehouse that in turn bought the metal from a steel mill. The Navy demands that it be inspected at the mill, then again at the warehouse. After John Doe has made the part it is again inspected before being shipped. If a special finish is required, such as Parkerizing, and the vendor sublets this to a finishing shop, it has to be inspected there. Now each time inspection takes place delay occurs. The warehouse, for instance, notifies the local naval inspection office that it has some steel to inspect. This may be at 10 o'clock in the morning. Maybe an inspector will show up by 5 o'clock the next afternoon. He may be an ex-drug or grocery clerk who has taken a course in reading a micrometer, but the chances are 100 to 1 that he's not a metallurgist and doesn't know any more about metal than my 8-year-old boy. Nevertheless, after he arrives he feels of the metal to make sure it isn't Swiss cheese. He then fills out numerous red-tape reports and the metal is officially pronounced to be steel. Now, if the inspector didn't sleep well the night before and he has a grouch on he can get contrary and order a piece of the metal shipped to a naval testing laboratory for a chemical and physical test. Believe me, these naval labs don't break any speed records in running their tests. They take (now get this, for it is a fact) from 2 to 4 weeks to make their tests, and all the time the metal is lying in the warehouse, and the vendor may have machines idle for want of the material.

Now this sort of foolish delay takes place at each step. If this same metal later on in manufacture has to be plated or parkerized, samples will again have to be submitted for laboratory tests with another delay of weeks. The other day I had several hundred parts with lugs welded on their sides. The local naval office was notified that they would be ready for inspection on January 13. The naval inspector showed up on January 19 to place his blessing and stamp on them as really being welded. All this time my company was needing these parts badly to avoid a hold-up of the assembly line. This is the sort of thing that makes a person boiling mad, especially when an admiral with all his gold braid, and no industrial experience, gets up before a congressional committee and fires a broadside that the solution to speed-up industrial production is to draft labor. He may be the best admiral in the world, but he should keep quiet on something he knows nothing about.

But the final pay-off on this naval inspection set-up being a complete farse, lies in the fact that after all the "horseplay" and make-belief inspection, when the parts are received at the assembly plant, they are really inspected by qualified men who have all necessary equipment, and so forth, to do the job right. The parts are either accepted or rejected. All the previous inspection does'nt mean a thing for if the final inspection rejects a part, it is rejected no matter how many former O. K.'s have been put on it. When you stop and realize that this same thing occurs all over the country every day, the effect of millions of resultant lost manhours is a catastrophe.

If civilian items followed the Navy type of inspection, an automobile would cost probably $50,000 and a few hundred thousand would be a peak yearly production instead of millions and the cars wouldn't be a bit better. It's demoralizing to a vendor and to the men in a plant to work excessive hours in rushing to get out parts that are badly needed, only to see them lay around for days awaiting inspection before being released for shipment.

Senator MEAD made the following statement, after his committee investigated the Norfolk Navy Yard:

Program after program on the "must" list is described as short of labor. One such "must" is the ship-repair program. Norfolk Navy Yard, which both builds and repairs ships, employes over 38,000 people. It is said to be short more than 4,000 workers for essential programs. But in this yard the subcommittee found excess manpower, wasted labor, hoarded labor, and enforced loafing.

We also went through several ships. Here is what we found: Each of the members of our subcommittee personally saw idleness and loafing on a big scale. Men stood and sat around in groups smoking and talking right on the decks of vital fighting ships. Their bosses were not to be seen. The men themselves think there are to many of them on the job. They say they are unable to do an honest day's work. They brought these complaints to us and brought them before our committee after they were sworn.

A mechanic who has worked in three Army airfields has the following to say:

I have worked at three Army airfields in the United States and at all of them I have found the same condition: About three men for every job—and personnel departments constantly advertising for more.

Highly trained mechanics—trained at Government expense—sit around twiddling their thumbs, or are given inconsequential tasks which any schoolboy could do after a half hour's instruction. To occupy their time some make gadgets for themselves, using Government-owned materials and tools.

Men who have sons at the front and whose one desire is to be allowed to work and work with all their might for their fighting sons over there come to empty benches morning after morning and are told to sit tight and look busy. At night they go home to read of their sons being short of shells in France because of workers' failure to produce. How about management's failure to produce. How about management's failure to coordinate the workers?

In the December 20 issue of a London magazine, there is a picture of Mr. Churchill's son-in-law and an Army officer, accompanied by a news item stating that they had paid a visit to some of the 3,000 men in our Engineer Corps who are working on the demolition and repair of London houses. Now, I know how much the people of London have suffered, but it seems to me that our men were not inducted into the Army to do such civilian jobs abroad.

Now these situations are not isolated cases, but on the contrary they are typical of conditions existing in many of the cost-plus-fixed-fee plants of America. Management can correct many of these abuses with little or no difficulty. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American laboring men is honest and patriotic and anxious to do a full day's work to put the means of warfare in the hands of our boys in the front lines. Their own boys are fighting and dying, and I am positive that they will wholeheartedly cooperate in a program to clean up this situation.

Officials state that while we need 148,000 men in critical industries at the present time, that we will need 700,000 industrial workers added to the force, working on munitions and supporting industries, in the next 5 months. Our greatest need at the present time is for ammunition, tanks, heavy trucks, tires, radar, ship construction and repair. It is estimated that we will need 300,000 men for critical industries; 200,000 for supporting industries; and 200,000 for arming the French forces. Now, over the last 5 months it is estimated that industry will lose 200,000 men to the armed forces and accordingly, it appears that between now and July 1, according to the military estimates, we will need 900,000 men to work in war activities. I am convinced that we can find a proper solution to our manpower problem without resorting to enforced labor, which will reduce the morale of the laboring men of America. If we will but tell the American people the exact conditions confronting them, I am convinced that we can get the wholehearted cooperation of management and labor and correct this situation on a voluntary basis and in an American manner.

We have four and a half million of our young men, who through no cause of their own, are classed as IV–F's. It is estimated that two and one-half million of them are already employed in essential war plants. It is estimated that 500,000 of them are maimed and physically disqualified from working in these plants. However, it is estimated that one and a half million are available for work in war activities or war-supporting activities, and I am convinced that if they are called on a voluntary basis that very few of them will refuse to go wherever they can be of service to their country. In the second place, the one and a half million people who left war work last fall should be called and requested to return to war activities. During the first 6 months of 1945, it is estimated that 360,000 men will receive noncasualty discharges from the armed forces and many of these will be available for civilian work. Some high officials of the War Manpower Commission estimate that some 500,000 to 800,000 men can be taken out of the war plants of America without lessening the efficiency of the plants.

An official of the War Manpower Commission recently made the following statement:

The amount of labor required for present and foreseeable war production is for the most part already on the employment rolls of the country. A 5 to 10 percent improvement in manpower utilization would be sufficient to provide all necessary labor. There is not a factory in this country which could not easily improve its utilization to this degree if management and labor become utilization conscious. Resulting action could add the equivalent of five hundred thousand to eight hundred thousand to the labor force. This potential must now become a national goal. In order to bring this about we must continue to expand and apply more vigorously the successful measures now in use, and in

addition there should be greatly renewed effort by management and labor. The national management-labor policy committee of the War Manpower Commission might very well be the spearhead of this expanded effort. Certainly this committee could readily devise ways and means for drawing upon so rich a source of manpower. It is looked to by management and labor for leadership on all matters affecting manpower. This committee has nation-wide contact with regional and area management-labor committees and is, therefore, in a unique position to provide constructive leadership and to enlist the support of local committees for any program designed to obtain the maximum utilization of manpower.

George B. Trundle, Jr., who is the owner of one of the large engineering companies of America, being the Trundle Engineering Co., during this month made the statement that with better planning and more hard work on the part of both management and labor, the productivity of the laboring people employed in our industrial plants could be increased from 10 to 20 percent. He made the following statement:

Let's go into that subject of manpower. Is there really a shortage? Frankly, I doubt it. I will agree that as the shifting fortunes of war place new emphasis upon various types of production, we find manpower supplies not properly located geographically with respect to requirements. This is a handicap, but not an insuperable one, if adjustments are made with intelligence and with full cooperation upon the part of both management and labor. The question is—is our supply of manpower sufficient to accomplish the renewed production job required and, in my opinion, the answer to that is definitely "yes."

You may well be inclined to challenge this statement. You may say, "With all the men and women who have gone to war, we have many less productive workers in the country than we had when the war started. How can we do a maximum production job with fewer workers?"

The primary responsibility for the solution of the problem lies, in my opinion, with management.

It is up to management to do better planning, to establish better controls, for more efficient and more economical utilization of materials, machines, and men.

A lot has been said, these days, about the failure of labor to produce what it should. But the fact remains, as I have said so many times, that labor is only as efficient as management plans for it and gives it the tools with which to work.

But, on the other hand, labor must cooperate completely with management if the job is to be done. Workers must produce more.

I'm not thinking about speed-ups. All I mean is that every worker should stay at his machine or his bench and do a fair job every hour of his workingday. It's simply a matter of making good use of time.

And this doesn't apply only to the men at the machines. It applies also to the sweepers, and the oilers, and the repairmen. It applies to the foremen and the superintendents.

The waste of manpower is a severe drain on our manpower supply. Absenteeism, turn-over, and maluse of labor are widespread. The list of causes which make for ineffectiveness are numerous and they vary with each establishment. The solution of this problem must go back to each locality in the country and depend upon the patriotism of the American people to get the job done as quickly as possible. In the last analysis, it must be done on a plant-by-plant basis.

The War Manpower Commission has 25,860 employees. They have 550 local United States employment service offices scattered over the country. They have 500 expert utilization consultants. They have made over 5,000 utilization surveys and have accomplished splendid results. In one plant alone, the War Manpower Commission was able to reduce the labor requirements by 15,000 without impairing production. An outstanding example of this is the solution of the heavy rubber tire problem. The War Manpower Commission was convinced that better utilization was possible in Akron, where most of the heavy-duty tires are made. Twenty-four utilization consultants were assigned to survey the five major plants. These surveys were finished early in August, just at the time when public attention was directed to tire shortages. The surveys are good illustrations of the utilization methods. A variety of factors were impeding production and these could only be uncovered by a utilization study. As a result of findings, accepted and promoted by both management and labor leadership, immediate improvement in output occurred, so that 60 days later the increase in heavy-duty tire production was 35 percent over August 15, with several hundred less employees.

The seriousness of the situation cannot be denied, but I am convinced that we can appeal to the patriotism of labor and industry in America in such a way that public sentiment will demand the correction of these abuses on a voluntary basis. Because I feel that compulsory labor is a denial of the very thing for which our boys are fighting abroad, I have endeavored to formulate a plan whereby free labor and free industry can accomplish the purpose without regimentation. The workers can be drafted, but their will to work must come voluntarily.

I have introduced a bill which I believe will solve the problem in a true American way. My bill requires the Selective Service boards of the Nation to make an adequate occupational classification of every person between 18 and 45. Those who are available for work in war activities or war-supporting activities will be asked to agree in writing to voluntarily accept employment in those industries. I am convinced that a large reservoir of manpower will be found on a voluntary basis. Many of those who left war plants last fall and thousands of the IV–F's will be channeled into war plants through the War Manpower Commission. The War Manpower Commission is required to investigate the hoarding and wastage of labor in the cost-plus-fixed-fee plants in America. To my way of thinking, the War Manpower Commission will find in these plants the skilled labor that will be more than sufficient to furnish the requirements of critical plants in less than 60 days.

I commend my bill, H. R. 1803, to you for careful study. It is my proposed intention that this bill will be offered as a substitute for H. R. 1752, presently under consideration. The bill reads as follows:

H. R. 1803

A bill to provide for the total mobilization of the Nation's manpower in the present war with the aid of the Selective Service System

Be it enacted, etc., That the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended—

(1) By inserting before section 1 the title heading:

"TITLE I—TRAINING AND SERVICE IN LAND AND NAVAL FORCES"

(2) By striking out "this act" wherever appearing therein, except where it appears in sections 10 (a) (1), 10 (b), 10 (c), 15, and 16 and inserting in lieu thereof "this title"; and

(3) By inserting at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE II—UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER FOR CIVILIAN WAR AND WAR-SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES

"DECLARATION OF POLICY AND INTENT OF CONGRESS

"SEC. 21. The Congress hereby declares that in order to effectuate, on a voluntary basis, the total mobilization and most effective use of the civilian manpower of the Nation in support of the war effort, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive investigation and reappraisal of the civilian manpower of the United States.

"SEC. 22. The Director of Selective Service is hereby directed (a) to provide for the registration and adequate occupational classification of all registrants liable for training under title I of this act, except those serving on active duty in the armed forces and those exempted or deferred from training or service therein by 5 (c) (1) or (d) of title I. This registration and classification shall be conducted through the local boards of the Selective Service System in conjunction with the War Manpower Commission who shall furnish to such boards such expert, technical, and other assistance and personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(b) Upon request from the War Manpower Commission to require the local boards to furnish to the United States Employment Service a list of the names and addresses of registrants available for employment in war or war-supporting activities, including agriculture, for voluntary assignment of such registrants to civilian or Federal employment in furtherance of the war effort in accordance with the determination of essentiality and priority requirements made by the War Manpower Commission.

"SEC. 23. The Director of Selective Service shall, as hereinafter provided, direct the local boards to conduct an investigation of the use of civilian manpower within their respective jurisdictions for the purpose of ascertaining whether the maximum and most effective use of such manpower is being made for the best interests of the war effort. The local boards shall use the services and facilities of the War Manpower Commission to conduct such investigation which shall include in-plant surveys whenever and wherever necessary to accomplish this purpose. For such purpose the War Manpower Commission may, wherever necessary, employ expert and technical personnel by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923. In the utilization of the services and facilities of the War Manpower Commission, the local boards shall operate under the supervision, direction, and control of the various area directors and management-labor committees of the War Manpower Commission where such are available. They shall report their findings forthwith to the Director of Selective

Service and to the War Manpower Commission, together with a statement of the number of persons in their respective jurisdictions available for service in war and war-supporting activities; and said agencies shall forthwith make a full report thereon to Congress. Wherever any board and/or War Manpower Commission area director and the management-labor committee, acting together or separately find indications of wastage or hoarding of labor or situations wherein labor is not being used to the best interests of the war effort in either Federal or private employment, the employers, the employees, and/or the employees' representatives shall be required to cooperate fully in such investigation, and in the selection of skilled and other employees to be released for other employment. After determination that such worker can be more effectively employed in war work and that either the worker does not have good cause for refusing to accept such employment or the employer fails to furnish adequate justification for the retention of said employee, the War Manpower Commission shall thereupon require his release. In order to aid the Selective Service local boards and the War Manpower Commission in the exercise of the additional duties required of them under this title, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may assign to such boards, in an advisory capacity, representatives of such other agencies of the Government as he may deem advisable.

"SEC. 24. The boards are hereby empowered to subpena persons to appear before them and give evidence upon such matters as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and for such purpose the provisions of section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence) are hereby made applicable to the powers of such boards.

"SEC. 25. The Director of Selective Service shall prescribe regulations to provide the necessary traveling expenses and subsistence allowances during travel and until commencement of work, of persons volunteering under this title for civilian or Federal employment, or service in a locality other than that of their residence: *Provided*, That travel expense and subsistence shall be computed in the same manner and on the same basis as under the standard Government travel regulations. On or after the date of a determination that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in the war effort, or on or after the date of his being involuntarily separated from such employment, he shall receive similar travel and subsistence back to the place from which he was first allowed travel under this subsection (or, at his election, to his home if that is not farther distant), if application is made therefor within 30 days after such date.

"SEC. 26. Any person who volunteers for service under this title, or who is required to relinquish regular employment to undertake such service shall, upon application to his employer within 40 days after the termination of such service, if it is determined that his services are no longer necessary in war or war-supporting activities, be entitled to be restored to his former position, or to a position of like seniority, status, or pay, unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make such restoration impossible or unreasonable. This section shall not require the reemployment of any such person by any State or political subdivision thereof, but it is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that such person should be restored to his position with such State or political subdivision or to a position of like seniority, status, or pay. Nothing in this section shall supersede any of the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

"SEC. 27. Nothing in this title shall affect in any manner any of the provisions of section 5 (k), or any other provisions of title I.

"SEC. 28. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HITLER HOPES FOR SOFT PEACE TERMS AND PROPAGANDA TO ENABLE GERMANY TO REBUILD FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the German delegates to the Versailles peace conference wrote a book a few years ago entitled "Documents and Thoughts on Versailles." The author, Count Brock-Randzau, who later became the first Foreign Minister of the German Weimar Republic, told of a caucus that was held by the German delegation to Versailles in May of 1919, at which he quoted himself as having said at that time:

Our enemies had better watch out. They have won the war, but they may lose the peace.

Thus, even before the terms of the Treaty of Versailles had been agreed upon, leading Germans were conspiring to evade its terms and defeat its purposes. History records that conspiracy to have been a success.

Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt, who along with Cordell Hull has been a pioneer in the crusade for a world organization to make and enforce a durable peace following this war, in his recent message to the Congress stated:

Peace can be made and kept only by the united determination of free and peace-loving peoples who are willing to work together.

The President's statement carries a lot of meaning. We know that following the last war the peace that was made was not kept. We know it was not kept because the free and peace-loving peoples were not united and were not willing to work together in the enforcement of its terms. We know the statement of the German delegate was based on the reasoning that there would be lack of Allied unity, lack of Allied determination, lack of enforcement.

SOFT AND INEFFECTIVE PEACE TERMS WILL LEAD TO THIRD WORLD WAR

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, we know the Nazis will attempt to make that history repeat itself. In their plans to rebuild and rearm for another war, the Nazis will again undertake to bring about lack of Allied unity. Again they will depend on lack of a real and effective world organization of the United Nations that would be able to thwart their sinister military plans and ambitions. Therefore, the lessons of the past 25 years become of increasing importance in the making of the plans to prevent future wars.

There seems to be no delusion in the mind of anyone about the Japanese and how they must be dealt with in the postwar period. But in the case of Germany, various proposals have been advanced and various schemes put forward. In this regard many people seem to ignore the lessons of history. From what has happened during the past quarter century we know one thing with force and certainty: That if soft and ineffective peace terms should be applied to Germany at the end of this struggle, the world will soon again be ablaze with another war far more horrible and destructive than anything that has ever gone before.

GERMAN CRAZE FOR CONQUEST MUST BE DESTROYED

Mr. Speaker, the pan-German creed that glorifies war and conquest, has been nurtured and sustained by the Junkers military caste and has been aided and abetted by the German people. That craze for conquest finds it embodiment in Adolf Hitler today. But the same psychosis that raised Hitler to power stood behind Bismarck and the Kaiser and many of their predecessors. And unless something is done to prevent it, the same forces will rally around another Hitler—another fuehrer—in the not far distant future. It follows that any treatment of Germany after victory has been achieved, which does not include a program for the destruction of that will for war, will leave Germany a strong and dangerous nation.

It will be recalled that the Treaty of Versailles recognized that disease and that recurring danger. As a treatment applied to the disease, the treaty ordered the Junkers-dominated German general staff abolished. The German Army was limited to 100,000 men. But those provisions were evaded and were not kept. There was no effective enforcement.

VERSAILLES TREATY WAS NOT ENFORCED

The general staff in reality never ceased to operate, but continued under various disguises. The Weimar Republic that was set up as a supposedly peace-loving, antimilitaristic outfit, was really used from its very beginning as a smoke screen for the general staff.

What happened to the limitation of 100,000 men in the German Army, as provided in the treaty? It was evaded by means of a rapid turn-over in the German Army trainee program. It was not long until a million Germans had goose-stepped their way through a short period of intense military training under the admiring eyes of the Junkers.

The Versailles Treaty further provided that no export or import of war materials was allowed by Germany. A strict limitation was put on the manufacture of armaments. Germany was allowed to retain 6 battleships, 6 light cruisers and 12 torpedo boats. To bring about the enforcement of these and other provisions, Allied commissioners were appointed.

But time and again the treaty was violated and evaded, and little was done about it. Factories were camouflaged and began in secret to build guns and munitions, as some Germans have in recent years boastfully disclosed. A psychological war was begun under the direction of Dr. Alfred von Wegerer, a prominent member of the general staff. Propaganda against the Versailles Treaty was organized. They preached the false doctrine of nonresponsibility for the starting of the war. They claimed the treaty was too hard and was not workable. They implored world sympathy.

The Allies, war-weary and busy at home, failed to act. As a result by 1927 all Allied enforcement commissions had been abolished. Such conformity as there was to the disarmament clauses of the treaty was gone by the time of Locarno. By 1925 German rearmament was well along. From 1925 to 1929 the German budget for the army was almost double over the preceding 4 years. Loans and credits were secured, and the German militarists and industrialists quietly built an industrial base for all-out rearmament.

MUST ENFORCE EFFECTIVE PEACE TERMS OR FACE ANOTHER WAR

Mr. Speaker, some one wisely said that we must first kill the bear before we can skin it and tan the hide. A grim and bitter struggle yet lies ahead. But the leaders of the United Nations have recognized the imperative need for some preliminary planning. That was the reason for the Dumbarton Oaks conference, which prepared the groundwork for a permanent organization of the Allied Nations to make and enforce the terms of peace that are agreed upon. There is much assurance from the fact the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia have at various times made expressions which indicate they are in substantial agreement on many of the essentials of the peace program and what the terms of peace must include.

All these nations agree the war must end with total victory. That includes complete occupation of the Reich. In addition, we know that Germany must be totally and completely demilitarized. That must continue not for years, but for decades. It must be enforced by police power and the necessary force of arms. There must be no room for rearmament by subterfuge or evasion. The Junkers caste must be made a myth and the general staff forever abolished.

A United Nations Crime Commission to deal with war criminals has already been set up and is functioning now. The subhuman beasts of the Gestapo and all other German war criminals, from top to bottom, must be arrested and made to fully account for their crimes.

There will be the matter of accounting for Nazi barbaric practices with death chambers; their murders of some of our own captured troops, and of countless thousands of civilians; their many other acts of starvation and of despotism that have horrified the civilized world. The Germans must be made to rebuild and restore much of their ruin and destruction, and return and replace and compensate for their stolen gains.

We know there must be an abolition of German war industries; rigid postwar control of Germany's chemical and metallurgical industries; elimination of the German aviation industry, as suggested by our State Department. There must be sharp supervision over Germany's international trade and foreign financial investments, and the United Nations must institute a long-range program of reeducation of the German people. They must be made to know that when they use their power and might for evil ends "the massed angered forces of common humanity" will rise up against them to strike them down.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, we know that any and all of the terms of peace will be meaningless unless they are enforced.

After victory has been achieved and as the United Nations go about the task of making and enforcing peace terms that will prevent another war upon human rights and Christian principles, there will always be the knowledge of the capacity of German scientists, if permitted, to invent new methods and means for the destruction of human lives. The V–1 bomb and the V–2 rocket have let loose visions of what may come next. The rocket bomb streaks through the stratosphere at 2,500 miles per hour. Methods of mass destruction of lives and property too horrible to contemplate are visualized by many scientists today. The next war, if there is one, will indeed be a V–10 war.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that unless the terms of that peace are made firm and unequivocal, unless the terms are sternly and relentlessly enforced throughout the foreseeable future, we will not have kept faith with the gallantry and sacrifices of our millions of fighting men. Our failure in this task would mean that hundreds of thousands among our bravest and best will have died in vain. Such a failure would go down as one of the greatest tragedies in history.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for January 29 and 30, on account of important official business.

To Mr. POWERS (at the request of Mr. TOWE), on account of serious illness in his family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m). the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 30, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold hearings, Tuesday, January 30, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on:

H. R. 685. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest.

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

H. R. 689. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, January 31, 1945, to begin hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

There will be a meeting of bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 o'clock p. m., Wednesday, January 31, 1945, begin public hearings on H. R. 541, a bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

138. A letter from the Acting Chairman, United States War Ballot Commission, transmitting the report of the United States War Ballot Commission, pursuant to Public Law No. 277, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Election of President and Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

139. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of a letter addressed to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, certifying that the Post Office Department is within the quota set by that Bureau under date of September 30, 1944, for each of the appropriation units involved; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

140. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

141. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

142. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to make it a criminal offense for certain escaped convicts to travel from one State to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting tables of bankruptcy statistics, with reference to bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated in the United States district courts during the fiscal year, ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting the ninth report by the War Shipping Administration of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (Public Law No. 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 107. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1752, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 97. Resolution providing expenses for continuing the investigation authorized by House Resolution 75; without amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 108. Resolution authorizing the expense of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 55 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 109. Resolution providing for the employment of a clerk, assistant clerks, and janitor to the House Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 110. Resolution providing for the payment of the further expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 66 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 111. Resolution providing for funds for expenses of conducting the study and investigation of the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning authorized by House Resolution 60 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 112. Resolution providing for the further expenses for conducting the study and investigation of the national defense program in relation to small business in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 113. Resolution providing additional funds for the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Which Exceed the Scope of Their Power or Authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1646. A bill to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1401) for the relief of Frank Franklin, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 1803. A bill to provide for the total mobilization of the Nation's manpower in the present war with the aid of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1804. A bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska," approved June 5, 1942; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1805. A bill to provide for procurements without advertising; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 1806. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 1807. A bill to authorize the admission of Alaska into the United States as a State; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1808. A bill to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 1809. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1810. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1811 (by request). A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1941, entitled "An act to strengthen the national defense by creating the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army, and for other purposes," so as to decrease by 4 years the length of active service required prior to permanent appointment in the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1812. A bill to authorize an award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 1813. A bill providing that commissions on postal money orders be paid to postmasters of the first, second, and third classes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 1814. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to improve international collaboration with respect to meteorology; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1815. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 1816. A bill to provide for promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 1817. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 1818. A bill relating to the acquisition of certain property within Mount Rainier National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1819. A bill authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington, in securing their allotments; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1820. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable States to provide medical care for recipients of public assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 1821. A bill to name a dam on the Little Missouri River in Pike County, Ark., and the reservoir created by the same; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1822. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 62 years old; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1823. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1824. A bill to provide for the creation of conservation authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1825. A bill to provide that veterans needing prosthetic appliances will not thereby be deprived of opportunity to take civil-service examinations; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1826. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 so as to extend the time within which members of the armed forces may pay income taxes falling due prior to or during the period of military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1827. A bill to amend sections 4 and 313 of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended with respect to disposition and removal of housing; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1828. A bill to provide for the payment of accumulative or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or the District of Columbia before the expiration of such leave; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1829. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1830. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish headstones or markers for graves of honorably discharged war veterans, notwithstanding discharge, other than honorable, from any prior or subsequent

service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 1831. A bill to equalize State old-age assistance payments and to provide burial allowances under title 1 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 1832. A bill to provide pension, compensation, or retirement pay of not exceeding $20 per month to all veterans without dependents while being furnished hospitalization by the United States or any political subdivision thereof; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 1833. A bill to provide for the burial in the national cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 1834. A bill to prescribe the procedures of legislative investigating committees and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution authorizing the broadcasting of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. Res. 114. Resolution providing for studies and investigations with respect to the disposition of surplus property and with respect to the administration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RYTER:

H. Res. 115. Resolution declaratory of the aims and purposes of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 116. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to fisheries on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a seamen's bill of rights; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fishieries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Viola Theriaque; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 1837. A bill for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 1838. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of A. G. Bailey against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1839. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Eugene Wesley Gayle, personally and as administrator of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1840. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach and others for compensation for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1841. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1843. A bill for the relief of Nelson Bell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1844. A bill for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of Domenico Strangio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1846. A bill for the relief of James M. Hiler; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Francis X. Servaites; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1848. A bill for the relief of Max Hirsch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1849. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ora R. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Louise Zerweck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1851. A bill for the relief of the widow and three children of Greenfield Payne; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of R. H. White Transfer & Storage Co., of Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1853. A bill for the relief of Col. J. M. McHugh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Thomas Sumner; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Ern Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Southwestern Drug Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mona Mae Miller, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1858. A bill for the relief of W. E. Cary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. Res. 117. Resolution for the relief of William A. Pixley; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Forence Mowers and 28 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United State for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

41. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Janesville, Wis.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who makest men to be of one mind, hear our prayer. As the world is choking through the most inhuman chapter in its long, tragic history, we pray that the spirit of the Christ may move among all its staggering wickedness and be led to the real glory of truth with its security; O do Thou match against the world's hard sin the salvation of Thine only begotten Son. May the enslaved peoples turn from their fears and suspicions and forge freedom and cooperation on the anvils of faith. Give them life where weakness abounds; life where blunders are fatal and disunion fails. Dear Lord, wherever there are heartbreaks, sorrows, and deep losses, lay Thy tender hand upon them and make them to know that in the Man of Galilee is the power to save to the uttermost. Heavenly Father, hear Thou the prayer of Thy children of other years who toiled unto weariness in sun and dark:

"Grant us, O God, Thy protection;
And in protection, strength;
And in strength, knowledge;
And in knowledge, knowledge of the right;
And in knowledge of the right, the love of it,
And of God, and of all existence."

In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatlin, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 35. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

S. 338. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat; and

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution providing for a study of certain phases of old-age and survivors insurance under the Social Security Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 64):

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the

United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ an additional clerk in his office, who shall, in addition to any other duties if required, perform such duties in connection with the examination of enrolled bills as may be directed by the Secretary. The compensation of such additional clerk shall be at the rate of $3,900 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until July 1, 1945.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 65):

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the House of Representatives be notified of the appointment of Leslie L. Biffle as Acting Secretary of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 66):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Col. Edwin A. Halsey, late the Secretary of the Senate.

Resolved, That the Acting Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn until Thursday next.

RESIGNATION FROM BOARD OF VISITORS, NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker of the House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept my resignation from the Board of Visitors for the United States Naval Academy.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. HESS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors, United States Naval Academy, to fill an existing vacancy thereon, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert an address by Dr. Alexander Guerry, vice chancelor and president of the University of the South, before the New England Society of Charleston, S. C., on December 22 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the regular legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a timely newspaper article written by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance of America, which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American on January 21, 1945, on the Moscow-inspired Polish Lublin Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 5, at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's desk, my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two Treasury statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two different topics: in one to include an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and in the other to include an address delivered by me in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a resolution of the Italian-American Labor Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune, of Johnstown, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Watertown Daily Times, of Watertown, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two speeches recently made by me in Vermont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a broadcast from overseas by Ted Malone, relative to a bomber christening by one of our colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very short editorial on the subject The Duties and Responsibilities Facing This New Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF CANNED FOOD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the newspapers I read the amazing statement by Mr. Marvin Jones that the civilians of the country face a shortage of 18,600,000 cases of canned fruit and vegetables.

Mr. Speaker, just last week I took 20 minutes here in the House to discuss the food-production outlook for 1945. Last Sunday night, while listening to the radio, I heard Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, confirm some of the things I had to say concerning the food problem and what's ahead.

Appearing on the We the People radio program, Judge Jones had this to say in answer to the question, "Why is our food problem more acute now than it has been before?":

Because the needs of the armed forces are greater this year—just like the need for more men in the Services and in war plants. These needs are bound to be greater with the Nation engaged in full-scale wars in Europe and in the Pacific.

Judge Jones wisely pleaded with our people to again grow victory gardens and preserve food from these gardens and from fresh market supplies for home use.

I commend Mr. Jones for his clean-cut reply to the question of "What are our prospects of meeting the new food goals?"

He said:

It is going to be difficult. The need for war equipment has made it much harder to secure supplies that farmers badly need. The number of skilled workers on farms has decreased. To make up for this decrease, older people, women, and children, entire families have worked long hours. Right now, the farm population is nearly five million smaller than in 1940. We're just entering the most critical year of the war. It is critical on the battle fronts; it is critical on American farms, where the food for victory must be produced. Our 1945 goals are even higher than last year's. We need 363 million acres of crops—an area larger than France, Germany, and the British Isles. This means hard work on the part of every American. It means growing and conserving and sharing our food, for food is the fuel of victory. I am confident that no American at home will hesitate at any necessary work and sacrifice in the light of sacrifices our young men and women from every neighborhood in America are making every day on the battle fronts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a plan for old-age security forwarded by a constituent in the Ninth District of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an article.

Mr. ROE of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an article from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include excerpts from an article in the Boston Record.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Henry Kaiser.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ARMY NURSES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a letter I recently addressed to Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk on the subject of the proposal to draft nurses:

Maj. Gen. NORMAN T. KIRK,
The Surgeon General,
War Department, Washington, D. C.:

I was very much interested in the testimony which you and Gen. George F. Lull recently gave before the House Military Affairs Committee on the proposal to draft nurses.

From the experience of the past few weeks, however, it seems clear that very many nurses throughout the Nation are willing to join the Nurses Corps on a voluntary basis. I would like to remind you of the fact that not so long ago, the WAC's conducted a very intensive campaign for enlistments in that branch which was accompanied by widespread publicity, which brought to the attention of girls throughout the Nation the needs of our armed forces for women. It occurred to me that both the Army and Navy, before pressing for conscription, might institute such a campaign for the enlistment of nurses for your respective services, forthwith, utilizing all publicity agencies, both public and private, presently at the command of the Government.

If it is felt that voluntary enlistment of this character might result in placing disproportionate burdens upon some communities, I suggest that this might be circumvented by establishing quotas for various geographical areas, thus insuring that there will be no impairment, or as little impairment as possible, of existing nursing services in order that essential and vital needs of civilian hospitals, institutions, and individuals may be met.

Naturally, I will be most appreciative of your consideration of these proposals and look forward to your answer.

With usual good wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order to address the House for 10 minutes on yesterday which I forfeited. I wish now to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes next Monday following the special orders that have already been entered. At that time I wish to discuss the bill to provide housing for Congressmen and their secretaries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the statement many times already during this session of Congress that we are going to be very frugal in the matter of Government expenditures. Let me in this connection call attention to the fact that last year up to this date, the 30th of January, we had spent $29,110,000,000. This year so far we have spent $32,086,000,000. We see therefore that the rate of spending has increased considerably, and, I can add, unnecessarily.

The national debt now stands at $233,461,621,522.39, a terrible, terrible, terribly great sum.

Mr. Speaker, we must be careful in everything we do, and I want the Members of the House to watch all the requests for expenditures that come before us, and to cut them down where they are unnecessary. If we are going to save this country we have got to economize in the cost of operation of government. Let us act and do so now before it is too late. Where will you get all this money. It will bend the backs of our children for many generations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point a 1-minute speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the press tells us that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] asked 100 leading American citizens to give him the definition of subversive activities. Not even being 1 of the 1,000,000 leading Americans, I was not favored with such a request, and my innate modesty and lack of aggressiveness prevented me conveying my idea directly to him.

However, as one of the 138,000,000 American citizens, permit me to put on the record my definition of a subversive act:

Knowingly creating or circulating false statements, with intent to lessen the confidence of the people in an executive, judicial, or legislative official or procedure, as an aid to the destruction of constitutional government, is a subversive act.

For several years there has been a widespread, persistent drive to, by false statements, create in the minds of the

people the belief that many of the Members of Congress are disloyal.

If the Congress is to continue to have the confidence of the people and to function as was intended by the framers of the Constitution, is it not imperative that the newly created Committee on Subversive Activities should call before it those who have questioned the loyalty of Members of Congress and learn how much, if any, truth there is in the charges which have been made. If it should appear that there are disloyal individuals in Congress, they should forthwith be expelled; and if an investigation should show that the false charges are knowingly and willfully made, those making them should be prosecuted, and if there is no law to punish such an offense, legislation should be put upon the books which will end the practice.

No one has a desire to do away with free speech, but under the guise of free speech, one who knowingly aids in the effort to overthrow the Government by the making of false statements should not go unpunished. Let them talk, but if they spread subversive propaganda, let them be punished.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement prepared by the N. A. C. A. Post-war Military Policy Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a column by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that on tomorrow and the next day and the day following, if the pending bill is before the House, recognition will not be given to any Member to proceed for 1 minute at the beginning of the session. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the pending bill yesterday I mentioned two amendments which I expect to introduce at the proper time. I was about to refer to the third one when my time expired. However, both the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1944 in effect provided a plan for the establishment of Federal legislation in the form of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. It seems to me that at some point in this bill, which will be passed tomorrow or the next day, provision should be incorporated seeing to it that people in the United States, regardless of race, creed, or color, shall have a chance to work without any discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Members refer to the testimony of Mr. Murray of the C. I. O. which shows that certain people are being unfairly discriminated against at this time. On page 281 of the hearings Mr. Murray stated that—

> I think that one of the things that I think is really disgraceful is to hear so many complaints about labor shortages while so many able-bodied women and Negroes are idle and want to work, and cannot get work in particular localities throughout the United States.

Such an amendment will fulfill party pledges and provide needed manpower at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

JANUARY 30, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I present herewith my resignation as member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

Sincerely yours,

W. STERLING COLE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 1752, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, on December 8, 1941, every Member of this House who was a Member on that day voted for a resolution declaring war upon Japan. I should like to read in the beginning of my remarks the concluding sentences of that resolution:

> *Resolved,* That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States, is hereby formally declared and that the President be and he is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan and to bring the conflict to a successful termination. All of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Following that there was a similar declaration against Germany. Let me say at the out-set that I expect to live up to the promise I made on that solemn day. As I see this bill the boys on the western front in Europe today, and likewise the boys in Luzon and on every other fighting front of the world, are not the only ones on the firing line. We Members of the Congress, representatives of a great people, are also on the firing line. Those boys will watch our votes on this bill with interest.

Pursuant to those resolutions passed on December 8, 1941, which had the unanimous approval of this Congress except that there was one vote against one of the resolutions, the people of the United States, with absolute unanimity, set about to see to it that liberty and justice be preserved, not only in this country, but throughout the world. Our Army and Navy and the other agencies of government began immediately to raise an Army and a Navy that would meet the situation.

On the day that we voted for those resolutions, the Army of the United States—which I know more about than I do the Navy when it comes to facts and figures—comprised about 250,000 men. In these past 3 tragic years there have been inducted approximately 12,000,000 of our boys and girls in the Army, and the Navy, and the Marine Corps fighting for us and our allies in all the far-flung fronts of the globe.

Sometimes when I think of that, I get a little reminiscent because I remember that when I became a member of the Committee of Military Affairs in 1932, the first witness of any importance to appear before than committee was the new Chief of Staff, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and he had at his side his young executive assistant who knew all of the answers that the General did not know. This young man, then a major, became so popular with the committee that the members soon came to call him Ike, and today he is Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the Allied forces in Europe.

General MacArthur came there that day to plead for a bigger and better Army, because at that time we had approximately 118,000 men and 12,000 officers. In executive session he told us of the threat of a possible attack by Japan against us, yet most of the committee and the overwhelming majority of the Congress paid him little attention.

I only hope and pray that as we begin to consider new legislation in this Congress we will pass a bill making sure that we will never be so unprepared again as we were on the tragic day of Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

I am not here to pay any high encomiums to any Army or Navy officers or to the spirit of our people, but as I said, from that Army of about 250,000 men at the time of Pearl Harbor, we now have 12,000,000 in the armed forces. We have been marching forward and winning victories on every front. We have the finest Army and the greatest Navy in all the world, and most of it has come about in the last 4 years.

General MacArthur, to whom I referred, is now probably 30 miles from Manila. I imagine the proudest day in his distinguished career will come, and I hope within the next few days, when he and his fine American officers and men

march up the main streets of Manila and he changes his statement from "I will return" to "I have returned."

Likewise, on the western front in Europe, with General Eisenhower, to whom I also referred, with the aid of men like Patton, Bradley, Patch, Clark, Simpson, Hodges, and all the rest, who are writing the brightest pages in all our history, and with the help of our great allies, the Russians, on the eastern front, I hope and pray they are marching forward to an early and glorious victory.

I sometimes wonder what sacrifices we have made here at home. You think of those boys, many of them scattered all over the world, who have not even seen home for 2½ or 3 years. I should like to see my boys, myself, because they are over in the Philippines. I should like to get this thing over just as you would, and as soon as possible so that we can get all our boys back home to their loved ones. I sometimes wonder what sacrifices we have made, except those who have had the great sorrow of having a son or a daughter killed or wounded. We are living in a land of plenty and of affluence. We have had just a few curbs on us, with respect to gasoline or shoes or groceries or something like that, but there have been no sacrifices that I know of. About the only thing we have been asked to do at home is to buy bonds, and if there is any such thing as a good investment that ought to be it, and besides they draw interest.

The situation has become so serious that we have already had more than 700,000 of these boys killed or wounded on the battle fronts of the world. The casualty list for this last month will be close to 150,000. The way the casualty reports are coming in, it will not be long until that list will show at least a million casualties. In addition, 450,000 of our boys are in the hospitals of the world today, not all of them from combat wounds but thousands sick from pneumonia, influenza, trench foot, and various other ailments.

Our situation is now such that we must keep up our offensive. We cannot and must not let up for a single minute. Our problem today is, where are you going to get replacements and how are you going to get more munitions? We have to trust somebody in this terrible crisis, and especially our military leaders. As for myself, I am willing to trust those who are in command and in charge of our military activities. I propose to back them up 100 percent. At the top of that list I would place Gen. George C. Marshall, because there is no man in all the Government in whom I have more confidence. He is truly a great man and in my judgment the outstanding military leader in the world today.

So I think as a preface to what I have to say about this bill there ought to be some evidence as to the necessity for this kind of legislation, and I should like to proceed in line with what is happening before we get down to the details of the bill, because certainly it is important that we all know and feel that this sort of legislation is an absolute necessity. None of us would favor it in peacetime. If you do not trust our military leaders, if you think some armchair strategist or some rocking-chair general, as somebody referred to him yesterday, knows more about the present crisis than the heads of our Army and Navy, then there is no use to debate this bill. But if they have the confidence of the people of the United States, and I assert that they do, then I believe that General Marshall and Admiral King and their associates should be listened to and followed so that this bill can be enacted into law at the earliest possible moment. Time is of the essence. The Germans and Japs are giving no quarter.

In that connection, too, assuming that the Army and Navy chiefs know what they are talking about, and that an actual necessity does exist for this legislation, then I claim that it is the duty of those who are opposed to this bill to offer something better in its place. This is no time for politics. It is no time for hate or prejudice. It is a time for big thinking and big acting. It is a time for patriotism, and it is a time for dispassionate and calm judgment as to what we are going to do to meet the situation and back up our boys on the fighting front. I am going to quote briefly from the letter that General Marshall and Admiral King wrote to the President and which the latter sent to our committee with request for immediate action:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the agents directly responsible to you for the conduct of military operations, we feel that it is our duty to report to you the urgent necessity for immediate action—

I emphasize those words "urgent necessity for immediate action"—

to improve the situation relative to the acute need for young and vigorous replacements for the Army and Navy and to provide the necessary manpower to increase the production of critical items of munitions, accelerate ship construction, and effect the rapid repair of damaged vessels.

Personnel losses sustained by the Army in the past few months have, by reason of the severity of the weather and the fighting on the European front, taxed the replacement system to the breaking point. The Army must—

Note they do not say "the Army should." They say "the Army must"—

The Army must provide 600,000 replacements for overseas theaters—

When?—

before June 30, and together with the Navy will require a total of 900,000 inductions by June 30.

Losses or wastage of equipment due to the German offensive and winter fighting conditions must—

This is a "must program," if we are going to follow it—

Losses or wastage of equipment due to the German offensive and winter fighting conditions must be made good, and there must also be provided the equipment for 8 French divisions and for accumulation of reserves and equipment which do not exist at the present time. It is estimated that 700,000 industrial workers must be added to the force producing Army and Navy munitions and supporting industries in the next 6 months if our urgent needs are to be met.

What are we going to do about it? Are we going to argue here for days over controversial and extraneous amendments while our boys are fighting and dying by the thousands on every battle front all over the world?

Who is going to offer something better if this bill is so bad as some declared it to be yesterday? Mr. Chairman, I have read only a part of the statement of General Marshall and Admiral King. Now, then, let us quote further from the record. I ask you to read the printed hearings on this bill if you want the truth. I am just trying to talk this thing out with you as Member to Member and friend to friend to try to determine what is best to meet the problem. Those appearing for this bill and saying that it is a must program and something has to be done immediately if we are going to back up our boys are General Marshall, Admiral King, Under Secretary of War Patterson, in whom I have great confidence and in whom I believe you do also; Under Secretary of the Navy Bard, Lt. Gen. William Knudsen, the great production king, who is in charge of the war-production program, from whom I shall quote in a minute; J. A. Krug, head of the War Production Board; Judge Marvin Jones, head of the War Food Administration, and a high official of the American Farm Bureau. They are all for this bill. In mentioning the last two let me say that the friends of agriculture have nothing to worry about. They are fully protected, and this bill will prove that they have been benefited. More than 3,000,000 men have left the farms since Pearl Harbor, and most of them to work in industry where they hoped to get higher wages. This bill freezes men now engaged in essential agriculture.

So let us find out what the actual facts are before we get to the terms of the bill. The military leaders all say there is necessity for some kind of legislation. Let me quote briefly from General Knudsen. I wish you would all read the hearings about the life of General Knudsen. He was modest about it. He did not want to tell it but the chairman insisted that he tell something of his experience. As a poor boy from Denmark he came to this country and got employment as a bicycle mechanic. From that humble beginning he came to be head of General Motors. He gave up a salary of $150,000 per year to work for the Government for nothing. He said he did it because he loves America and what this country has done for him. Here is what he said about the production program, and that more manpower is going to have to be provided to turn out these munitions of war. I will quote him briefly:

I visited, during '42, '43, and '44, 1,000 factories in the United States and inspected the operations that were going on.

To give you an idea of what that involved, it involved traveling 180,000 miles by air, and last July I was attached to Wright Field, in Dayton, and given the job of consolidating the production and maintenance of airplanes. That involves some 14 depots and 6 district offices in the United States, and it employs 300,000 people, of which 16,000 are officers, 80,000 are military enlisted men that are being trained to be service groups in combat, and 210,000 are civilians. At the moment I am short of help.

Before I went to Dayton I had critical jobs to look after. One of them was ball bearings. I visited the entire ball-bearing industry and went through the plants, and they

were short of help at that time. I also had the tire job. I visited every tire plant in the United States. They were short of help. In fact, they had machines standing idle at that time. The situation is somewhat improved, but not sufficiently to carry on.

As you know, the program was reduced in the early fall of last year. In fact, it was reduced in the summer of last year because we thought then we had enough. Now the program has been increased again, and on heavy ammunition it is several times larger than it was last summer. On airplanes, I am not getting many more airplanes to make, but they are heavier; consequently the job is going to be bigger, and on the trail of that has come a prospective shortage of aluminum sheet, heavy sheet, which we are now working on.

So I cannot stress enough the advantage that we will gain from getting these places manned as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMASON. General Knudsen said further:

Anything done that can be done to keep the people on their job. If a man quits after we have spent 6 months on him and we get a new one, we have to start all over again and train him.

I find I am consuming more time than I intended, so I will not read further, but I would like to refer you to page 39 of the hearings, to the testimony of J. A. Krug, head of the War Production Board. He said more munitions must be produced now for our soldiers and sailors in both Europe and the Pacific, and they must have it at once.

So if General Marshall, Admiral King, General Knudsen, and Mr. Krug, who are in charge of men and production, do not speak with knowledge and authority, there is no use for us to proceed further. But assuming these men are telling the truth, what is the situation? I quote again from the record. General Marshall says we must have 900,000 men for the Army and Navy and 700,000 for industry. The selective-service officials advise us they have raked the bottom of the barrel, including the 18-year-olds. Only 570,000 men are available from all sources for the next 6 months except those physically fit for military service and now engaged in essential industry and agriculture. That leaves 330,000 physically fit men who will have to be pulled out of industry and agriculture.

With 330,000 taken out of industry and agriculture and inducted into military service plus the 700,000 needed for industry to meet General Knudsen's program means 1,030,000 people; and I would like to know where you are going to get them except with some kind of legislation like this. I heard friends of mine yesterday on the floor and in the cloakrooms say that this bill is unconstitutional. Having practiced law a good many years, I recognize that as a kind of an attorney's alibi when he has a hard case. That is always the excuse offered here when a Member is opposed to the bill. Unconstitutional. When Uncle Sam reached out and touched 12,000,000 boys in this country, your boys, my boys, countless thousands of others and said: "You get in the uniform, you get in the fox holes on the western front, you go down into New Guinea and stay there for 2 or 3 years, then proceed on your way to Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Leyte, on to Luzon, you fight and die if need be for your country." We are in an uncompromising war, a war to the death, the most devastating in all the annals of history. Do you say that this same Government cannot put its finger on other men and say: "Here, young man, or old man"—anybody up to 45 under this bill—"you get in some war plant or on some farm and help make some of the necessary munitions and supplies of war in order that these soldiers and boys may have something to fight with." Such argument is ridiculous in the midst of total war. As for me, I am voting to give the men in uniform the highest priority and then see to it that all others do their duty.

This committee for 3 straight weeks with almost full attendance every day struggled with this bill and the bill was reported out by a vote of 20 to 5. It has been carefully prepared by the best legislative experts in this Capitol. If you have anything better to suggest, tell us about it; but let us not amend the bill by giving it the kiss of death. Let us not load it up with amendments that have nothing in the world to do with it because this is a war bill; this is not a labor bill, and neither is it a fair employment practice bill. We have passed the Smith-Connally bill, which has caused enough division among our people. Labor and industry have done the most magnificent job that any country has ever known.

Oh, yes; there have been a few strikes. There ought not to have been any in wartime, but regardless of the merits or demerits of the anti-strike or open shop controversy this is a war bill. Likewise, this is no time to divide the Members of Congress or the people of the country on something like the Fair Employment Practice Act that my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] mentioned a while ago. You have a fair employment practice by executive order today and there have been some poor and ill-advised efforts at enforcing it. Some of you want it, many of you do not. Down in my country the Negroes, Mexicans, and everybody else, regardless of race, creed, or color are treated fairly. Legislative committees are now considering both of these matters. Let them be brought up and considered in the regular way. I am pleading with you that you do not offer controversial amendments to this strictly war bill. There may be some minor amendments needed to perfect the administration of the Act and about which I might agree; but I believe when highly controversial amendments are offered they should all be voted down. Let this House pass this bill as it is and send it to the other body and later to conference. Then we will have some chance of passing a bill that General Marshall and all of his assistants will be proud of. What I plead for in this tragic and crucial hour is unity. It is inconceivable to me that you can reach out and induct our boys into the military service to get shot or killed as 700,000 of them already have been, yet you cannot go out to night clubs, pool halls, and many other similar resorts and tell their habitues that it is high time they were getting into some kind of essential war work.

It is high time everybody was getting into some kind of war work. If they will not do so voluntarily, then we need this law. I am not trying to arouse an undue sense of patriotism, but I just wonder what the boys over in Italy think about this bill. You heard some Members of the committee that went abroad this winter talk about conditions over there, especially those who visited General Mark Clark's outfit in the mountains of Italy. Those boys have been taking it on the chin, thousands of them still holding the line, lots of them in the very thick of the fight since the beginning of the Italian campaign, and with no replacements. They are tired and exhausted. Many of them have not been home for three years. We need some rotation but it cannot be done without replacements. This bill will give it to them. Now, with the bottom of the barrel touched, with these 900,000 men not available except to take 330,000 out of industry and agriculture, answer me, please, what is wrong with this bill?

The bill says that every male citizen between 18 and 45 must go into some essential war work. The committee refused to place the recalcitrant into work battalions or any form of forced labor. We first give him an opportunity to volunteer. If he does not do it, then his neighbors, his local draft board, who know him and his circumstances, say he must go to Willow Run or some other war plant and help make bombers, shells, or some other war necessity.

The only thing you do when he refuses to go is to prosecute him, just exactly like you prosecute the draft evaders under the selective-service law.

I want to make a prediction. I base it partly upon the fact that even a discussion of this bill has put untold thousands of men of all ages into the war plants of America, where they are happy and getting along all right. I make the prediction that if you pass this bill there will not be a hundred prosecutions under it in all the country. War-work evaders, like draft evaders, will not have the nerve to face their neighbors; and if they are that sort of people, they ought to be prosecuted.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the gentleman does not realize just what he said when he stated there were 700,000 killed so far. The gentleman meant casualties?

Mr. THOMASON. Casualties, yes. I thank the gentleman for the correction.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman stated that the local draft board could also say to John Jones, "You go to the Willow Run plant." I do not think the gentleman intended to convey the idea

that under the terms of this bill a selective service board could say, "You must work for this particular plant or that particular plant." It must give him a reasonable choice of employers.

Mr. THOMASON. I stand corrected and I thank the gentleman. I have followed this bill pretty closely from the beginning. The bill provides that the work inductee shall be given a reasonable choice as to where he shall work. He may go to any plant he wants to provided he has the approval of his local draft board. That is the way it should be. It is fair and democratic. Local draft boards have done a marvelous job and it is certain they will treat their neighbors and friends with justice and consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman from New York had in mind is that there is a minimum of coercion and compulsion in the bill.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes, exactly so.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to ask the gentleman a further question. He referred in very thrilling terms to the sacrifices made by the men at the front, particularly at the Italian front and the western front. At the outset of the gentleman's remarks he said: "We in Congress here are on the firing line." I agree with the gentleman. What I would like to have the gentleman do, if he will, is to amplify that statement, that we here today in the consideration of this bill are on the firing line, also we have got to evidence the courage that the men at the front are evidencing.

Mr. THOMASON. Some of my colleagues on the committee who have just come back from the European war fronts can answer that question better than I. I would not have to have their testimony to convince me, with 18,000,000 in this country between 18 and 45 years of age, over 4,000,000 of them IV-F's, about a million of the 4,000,000 already engaged in essential industry or agriculture, that we cannot pass fair and just legislation that will get out of that vast number 900,000 for the Army and 700,000 for industry, as requested by General Marshall.

Of course, we Members of Congress are on the firing line, and ought to be. The fathers and mothers of our fighting men are watching us, as they should. We are their representatives and owe them a duty. I am sure we will not fail them. We must all do everything humanly possible to get this horrible war over as soon as possible and our boys back home. I believe this legislation will hasten the day of victory. I think it will delay victory and have serious repercussions if we fail to pass this bill.

Let me say, lest I forget it—and I know that every member of the committee shares my feelings—that this bill is no reflection upon the so-called IV-F's. There are thousands of them all over the country who are just as patriotic as your boys and mine who are already in the service, and who would give anything in this world if they could get into the service. This is to provide the sinews of war, have every man covered by the bill in war work, see that he is properly placed, stop turn-overs and absenteeism.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman has made a wonderful speech. There is only one thing about it that bothers me, and it bothers me very sincerely, and I want the gentleman to know that I am as much in earnest about this matter as he is. But it seems to me that the committee has one weakness in its case, and that is this: if we really mean that we are going to call upon all the resources of this Nation, that we ought to call upon the resources in the plants and factories just the same as we do the men, and if this bill carried that provision on the same basis, there are a lot of us who could go for it with tremendous enthusiasm. But we are worried as we can be about that feature.

Mr. THOMASON. I am not going to argue that with my very able and sincere friend, but I will say this—and I know a lot of people, and I share that belief myself—that if this bill does not get the job done, then this Congress must pass a national service act, and the quicker the better. This is all-out war. I regret that this bill is necessary. But it is the best we can get under the circumstances as I see it. When you say under the terms of this bill that every man between 18 and 45 should be in some kind of essential work, then you give him the opportunity to volunteer, and you do not throw him into a work battalion and stigmatize him. When you then give him the benefit of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act, when you give him workmen's compensation under proper conditions, when you give him travel pay to and from his work, who is hurt by it?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I want to compliment the gentleman on his speech also. I think we all want to do whatever is necessary to win this war but we have honest differences of opinion about how we should go about it. Much has been said about the 4,500,000 IV-F's the gentleman has referred to, when we do not know, as a matter of fact, that there are any great number of those IV-F's today that are not in war industry. No official of this Government has thus far been able to establish the fact that they are not in essential industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMASON. I agree with the gentleman's statement, but Selective Service informed the committee that they did not know how many IV-F's there were in essential industry or essential farming. I think every one of us could look around our own community and find a lot of fine young men who perhaps have tried to get into the armed services and failed. But it will not hurt for the local draft boards to re-examine and reclassify them so that they can get into essential war work if they are not now in it.

But I come back to the proposition that General Marshall says he must have 900,000 men for the Army and 700,000 for industry. You can induct every man now available for military duty and you will have only 570,000, and if you take 330,000 out of industry, there is no place or way to get replacements except with this kind of legislation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. May I call the gentleman's attention to the statement of the War Manpower Commission in which they indicate that the need is 148,000. The military has indicated a need of 900,000, as the gentleman has said. Is the War Manpower Commission right or wrong?

Mr. THOMASON. I would say they are wrong, because I know this, and with all due respect to the War Manpower Commission, when it comes to a statement by General Marshall and Admiral King and Under Secretary Patterson that we must have 900,000 men in the next 6 months, and there is no other place to get them, I will take the word of our military leaders, who have never yet misled or misinformed us.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman knows General Marshall and Admiral King never endorsed this kind of legislation to get these men.

Mr. THOMASON. This House knows General Marshall well. I was in conference myself with him not long since, together with the chairman and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]. General Marshall has never told and never will tell Congress how to run our business. Your question was asked him. I know this bill is satisfactory to him if it does the job. All General Marshall wants is 900,000 men for the Army and Navy by the 1st of July, and it is up to us to get them. In conclusion, I beg of you to support this war bill substantially in its present form and not kill or cripple it with controversial amendments. I am going to vote for whatever is necessary to get the job done and win the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, purely to accommodate the Members on both sides of the aisle, may I ask the chairman of the committee if I am correct in thinking that it is his intention to complete the general debate today?

Mr. MAY. If possible, yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We started the general debate at 12:20, so, with 5 hours of general debate remaining, we should complete the debate by 5:20.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is my understanding that we have considerably more time left on this side than on that side of the aisle.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, since so many requests for time have been made, to give the Members on this side some idea of when their time to speak will come.

The next speaker will be Mr. JOHNSON of California, followed by Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. LEMKE at 1:50, Mr. FENTON at 2:10, Mr. WADSWORTH at 2:30, Mr. HALLECK at 3:20, Mr. DIRKSEN at 3:30, Mr. HOFFMAN at 3:40, Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey at 3:50, Mr. JENKINS at 4:05, and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana at 4:15. Following them in order will be Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DONDERO, Mr. RICH, and Mr. VURSELL. Of necessity, the times I have given are approximate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include some facts and figures on production.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they the gentleman's own facts and figures?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. They have been assembled by me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXPEDIENTS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, during 3 years of war and a steadily tightening labor supply the Nation has flopped from one expedient to another vainly attempting to channel labor into essential war work and to hold it there. The results hardly constitute one of the brighter chapters of the war.

W. M. C. ESTABLISHED

In April 1942 the President created the War Manpower Commission "for the purpose of assuring the most effective mobilization and utilization of the national manpower." The purpose was laudatory, but the Commission's functions were only general.

In September 1942 the United States Employment Service—U. S. E. S.—was transferred to the War Manpower Commission, bringing together agencies working on a common problem.

VOLUNTARY ANTIPIRACY AGREEMENTS

One of the great problems of the early months of the war was wide-scale piracy of workers from one employer by another. W. M. C. attempted to arrange voluntary agreements among important employers to stop pirating workers.

But coverage under voluntary agreements was limited and there was nothing to prevent a worker, freed by his present employer, from shifting to less essential work. And there was nothing to aid a new and perhaps critical war industry get the help it needed.

W. M. C. POWERS DEFINED

One year after we entered the war, the President issued an order broadening the powers of W. M. C. This specific authorization was contained in the order:

No employer shall retain in his employ any worker whose services are more urgently needed in any establishment, plant, facility, occupation, or area designated as more essential by the Chairman pursuant to this section. (Sec. 5 (b), Executive Order 9279, December 5, 1942.)

Here at last was authority to channel labor into essential plants. The only persons untouched were those who were idle and preferred to remain so.

What happened?

Just about nothing. Not until the fall of 1944 did W. M. C. issue any headquarters instructions to deal with any kind of a program under this authorization, and there have been only a handful of small experimental programs. If the reason for lack of action was inability to enforce rulings under this authority, the results were still no better.

MINIMUM WORKWEEK

In February 1943, a Presidential order established a Nation-wide minimum workweek of 48 hours. The War Manpower Commission was authorized to make exceptions, and today there are a large number of communities where the 48-hour rule is not applicable. How much additional labor this ruling provided is anyone's guess.

EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION

In October 1943, the W. M. C. issued an order with the stated objectives of eliminating wasteful labor turn-over in essential activities and directing the flow of scarce labor where most needed in the war program.

This order requires a worker transferring from an essential war plant to clear through the U. S. E. S. and to have a letter of availability from his employer.

But while this was aimed at checking turn-over in essential industry, the situation was far from checked. Witness the fact that in the last year and a half the Navy hired 270,000 workers in its continental navy yards only to end up with a net loss of 11,000. Further, there was nothing in the program to induce a worker to leave nonessential employment for essential work.

WEST COAST PLAN

In the fall of 1943 the critical manpower situation on the west coast came to a head. In September 1943, Justice Byrnes set up the west coast manpower program, and this became a model in 1944 for all tight labor markets.

There are two key parts to this plan:

First. A production urgency committee is set up in a tight labor area under the general direction of the War Production Board to determine the urgency of all production and services in the area and inform W. M. C. of approved production schedules or requirements.

Second. A manpower priorities committee is set up for the same area and under the general direction of the W. M. C. This committee fixes ceilings on total manpower employment.

MANPOWER CEILINGS

In July 1944 the W. M. C. adopted a program with three main points: First, manpower priorities committees for all groups I and II areas—tight labor areas; second, an employment ceiling program for all groups I and II areas; and third, a program of priority referral for all male workers in all areas.

But ceilings alone do not do the job. It does not matter how many workers an employer uses if they are of a skill not needed for more essential work. Nor does it help the war production if, in response to a ceiling cut of 5 percent, the employer drops a group of elderly women workers for whom no war jobs are available in that area.

The priority referral plan is a system of exposures. No person is obliged to take either the first, second, or even the third job offered to him by the U. S. E. S. and very few restrictions have been placed on the right of an individual to reject referrals or exposures.

FURLOUGHING SOLDIERS

But while the Government went from one half measure to another, bottlenecks arose in critical production programs that called for immediate action.

We began to release trained soldiers needed for combat to jobs in civilian plants that our normal manpower machinery had been unable to staff. In 1942, we released more than 400 soldiers for work in copper mines. Again in 1943, an additional 4,544 were released to the mines. Successively we have sent soldiers into the aircraft industry, tire plants, ammunition plants, foundries, and textile mills making cotton duck. Altogether 16,500 have been released, and requests are now pending for additional soldiers to help produce tire fabric, aluminum sheet, and bombs.

These releases were made in desperation and are a measure of the indication of the failure to provide the manpower our munitions plants need.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the conclusion that you may come to as to this bill depends a great deal upon your approach to these matters: First, the need to be served; second, whether this legislation will solve the problem; third, your idea as to what group we should keep primarily in mind when considering the legislation.

First. The need for this legislation is based upon incontrovertible testimony that our manpower needs for the first half of this year are, 900,000 men for the armed services and 700,000 for war industry of all kinds, including farming.

To get the 900,000 men for the armed services will require us to take 330,000 men from deferred war workers now in war plants. Thus you see we will need not only 700,000 in addition to those now in war plants but an additional 330,000 to replace those who will leave to enter the armed services. In other words, we will need 1,030,000 men to enter war industries of all kinds during the next 6 months.

Second. Will this law, now under consideration, solve the problem?

My considered conviction is that it will. The bill is thoroughly misunderstood. It is simply a bill for getting men capable of performing the work involved to work in plants or farms essential to the war effort.

The method is for the Director of War Mobilization to provide a list of such

industries, plants, farms, and so forth. Then he shall certify to the Director of Selective Service that in such industries or in certain areas not enough men can be obtained by the voluntary method to meet the manpower requirements. The Director of Selective Service shall then find the men on the selective-service rolls who are able to perform the work and are not already on deferment to essential industries. These men shall be requested to enter some essential industry as designated by the War Mobilization Director. If they do not—after these two opportunities—then they shall be considered in violation of the selective service law, the same as any inductee who refuses to obey the orders of the board having jurisdiction. I am convinced, and so is Under Secretary Bard, that less than 2 percent of those involved would ever be in violation of this act. They would gladly go into some war work. Most of them are IV–F's and they would welcome an opportunity to do something to help those who are in.

Now, why has not the method we have been operating under worked as well as we had hoped? The War Manpower Commission, theoretically, has an overall picture and holds meetings with the Army, Navy, W. P. B., and the Maritime Commission. In the first place they are a board without statutory authority; they exist by the whim of some Executive order, drawn by some subordinate and they have neither the dignity nor the authority of law. Then they seem to be drunk with power and feel that if they are not the center of everything that goes on, it will fail. They have had meetings with the governmental groups and with management and labor and yet we are in this plight today. Why? Because the problem of production is in one aspect a local problem, but it has national and international ramifications. My point is this: In total war the whole program is so enmeshed and so highly technical that shortages are not great overall shortages, but are shortages in some special thing, equipment, or service. Here are the percentages of various shortages in 1944:

	Percent
Medium heavy artillery ammunition	6.2
Mortar ammunition	11.5
105 howitzer ammunition	7.8
Bombs, grenades	9.2
Heavy trucks	6.0
Air-borne radar	22.4
Dry cells for batteries	23.8
Cotton duck	13.7
Tires, heavy truck	9.7

And that is not a complete list of the shortages. It is all I have got the survey on up to this point.

Do you not see the situation, my friends? A shortage in one single part of a program, no matter how small the part may be, may bog down a whole program. Let me illustrate: If a small part of the Signal Corps program bogged down and the shortage was reflected at the front, a whole drive might bog down. If we lack only a small part of some type of ammunition, we could not use that type of ammunition and a whole part of our artillery program might bog down; a small part of a bomb sight, or of an engine, or a landing gear might prevent a whole group of planes from going into operation. What I want you to see is that an infinitesimal part of the program, when measured in percentage, can easily and it has bogged down a whole program and a big drive.

Take another illustration: We all know how vital ships and transportation are in this war. Just think of what will happen if we have not the ships to carry the loads we need to keep our men completely supplied so they will never know or even fear a shortage. If the absenteeism of the shipyards could be cut in half, it would solve the ship problem. Here is the turn-over in 1944 in three private shipyards in California:

Yard A, from 9.7 to 15 percent, an average of over 12 percent per month.

Yard B, from 12.5 to 16.1 percent, an average of over 14 percent per month.

Yard C, from 7.6 to 15.5 percent, an average of over 11 percent per month.

If the turn-over there is halved—and it could be halved by the operation of this bill, by freezing men on their jobs until they furnished a good excuse to leave—it would solve this transportation problem without any new blood fed into the plants.

Now, about the local situations: Someone must have a national picture of the whole situation. A surplus of labor in New Jersey does not mean there is no need for the making of a critical article in Seattle, and where there may be an extreme shortage. The Director of War Mobilization authorized by law fills that spot. He will have the various agencies—W. M. C., W. P. B., Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and so forth—keep him informed and project the picture far enough ahead so that he can make the designations and the certifications provided by this law and have the men and the production required to make success certain. This has not been done to date. We now have the set-up, under this law, that will assure this; and, thank God, we have a good man in the job—former Senator Byrnes. He will make this program work if they let him alone. The C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. are good organizations. But they are not superhuman. They have not the national picture or the facilities to get it that the Director of War Mobilization has. They can point out weak spots here and there, but they do not really understand the whole problem. The military geniuses that we have do understand it. They can tell the Director of War Mobilization what they need and when they need it, and with the machinery we have he will get it for them. The very conference that these great labor leaders are now pleading for will be held under this act, because it requires that very thing. Here it has the dignity of law and the authority of a congressional statute. And the final order to go to work will be made by that grand group—of which I was once a part, and of whom I am tremendously proud—the Selective Service organization. It is claimed the Selective Service is a military group. My gracious, it is not a military group. It is a civilian group, and the workers are largely volunteers. Army and Navy officers have been detailed to work and supervise the operation of the law, but they are really on a civil assignment.

Just think what we are doing and you will understand the common sense of it. We are asking deferred men, who are able to do the work required, to get into war work to help those at the front get what they need. The man who takes that job was deferred. The man who took his place may be killed or maimed and but for the deferment the man we are asking to work would be killed or maimed. In that case a soldier or sailor actually gave his life for a deferment and also for his country. That actual situation can be recalled by almost every selective-service board.

Third. Now, as I said, it is important, to the conclusion you will make as to this bill, to know what group you are primarily thinking of in enacting this legislation. Are you thinking of some individual who may be inconvenienced or even done an injustice by this law? I am only secondarily, although I would not do any person an injustice voluntarily. I am thinking of that great body of men and women—about 11,000,000 now—who are fighting the battles of the Republic, that we may be secure and America may live to fulfill its destiny. Half of them are on fighting fronts. Think of it, 1 out of 20 of that group—700,000—have already been maimed or killed. And we have more coming. Are they clothed properly, do they have the ammunition, the guns, the planes, the vehicles that they need to carry this war to the enemy and keep the pressure on till the end arrives? When we once get the pressure on and build up momentum it is important that the Army keep rolling. That is the way to push back and wipe out the enemy. That great group of gallant men cannot be short of any one of the thousands of things they need. They must have an oversupply of everything if we are going to fight the war the way we should and if we are to save lives. That doughboy and his comrades should never have the haunting fear that "We might be short of something." He should know he will have everything he needs so he can give everything he has got to bring the victory quickly. That is why I wish every Congressman could live and fight with a machine gun outfit, as the ranking minority leader of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], did in the other war. That is why I wish our Congressmen could have the experience of fighting with the infantry, artillery, and the other branches in combat as many of our colleagues in this House did in the World War. That is why I wish some of our Congressmen could roam the skies, sitting behind a machine gun, and kill or get killed in the great battles of the skies. That is why I wish some of our colleagues could live on the ships at sea and stand watch in the bitter cold or the stifling heat, looking for the enemy and when he finds him join the battle and either kill or get killed.

My friends, you all think of those men. I realize that. But I think we should think of them a little more than we do. I think we should not be so squeamish because some person on the home front

might have to work in a job he does not like or might have to put up with bad housing conditions. We do not want to have to impose those conditions on our fellow citizens, but we may have to in a minor degree, to give that man out yonder what he needs. We want to do something, no matter how feeble it may seem, to let him know that he is our main concern. We want to let him know that, to the capacity of our power, we are determined that he should get all he needs and more so he can win and win at the least cost. We want him to know we are his friend. He is thinking just like we are. He is wondering what we are doing and are we remembering and thinking of him. In the A. E. F. were some fine poets in 1918. They wrote some interesting poems. My favorite one is entitled "Just Thinking." It illustrates the psychology of the doughboy of 1918, whose son is his counterpart today. With your permission I want to recite it. Here it is:

JUST THINKING

Standin' up here on the fire-step,
Lookin' ahead in the mist,
With a tin hat over your ivory
And a rifle clutched in your fist;
Waitin' and watchin' and wond'rin'
If the Hun's comin' over tonight—
Say, aren't the things you think of
Enough to give you a fright?

Things you ain't even thought of
For a couple o' months or more;
Things that'll set you laughin',
Things that'll make you sore;
Things that you saw in the movies,
Things that you saw on the street,
Things that you're not really proud of,
Things that are—not so sweet.

Debts that 're past collectin',
Stories you hear and forget,
Ball games and birthday parties,
Hours of drill in the wet;
Headlines, recruitin' posters,
Sunsets 'way out at sea,
Evenings of pay days—Golly—
It's a queer thing, this memory.

Faces of pals in home burg,
Voices of women folk,
Verses you learnt in school days
Pop up in the mist and smoke
As you stand there grippin' that rifle,
A-starin', and chilled to the bone,
Wonderin' and wonderin' and wonderin',
Just thinkin' there—all alone!

When will the war be over?
When will the gang break through?
What will the U. S. look like?
What will there be to do?
Where will the Boches be then?
Who will have married Nell?
When's that relief a-comin' up?
Gosh! But this thinkin's hell!

—*Hudson Hawley.*

The thinking and the wondering of those doughboys is hell. But we want them to think, at least, that we are thinking of them and that we are doing something for them. We want them to know we are their friend, so when they come back they can look us square in the eye, shake our hand and say to us, "You were my friend." This bill is the best way for us to show them we are their friend. It will give them all they need and more, at the time and the place they need it, to clean out the enemy and win the war. It will raise their morale and the morale of those loved ones they left behind whose every waking hour has been one of suspense and anguish. My vote is going for this bill, and I would be glad to have you join me in making it unanimous.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield briefly.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Could that not be done under existing law?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I doubt it very much. I do not think they could put men in industry under existing law.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Has it ever been tried?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It has been tried and in one case I know of it failed, because the law at that time gave the boards no power to enforce their suggestion that the registrant go into a war plant.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was called to the phone during the gentleman's speech. Just as I left I heard the gentleman mention 12,000,000 men in the various branches of the armed forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Eleven million.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The exact figure is 11,900,000. Only 7,236,000 of these are abroad. Why is it not possible to get some of the 4,674,000 men as replacements?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is a collateral question. I think it is possible. The War Department is working on it now.

The thought I want to drive home to you is that to raise the 1,600,000 additional men needed this bill is necessary. Those men out yonder are asking themselves, What is Congress doing? Is Congress willing to help us? This bill is asked for by General Marshall of the Army, by the Commander in Chief, by Under Secretary Patterson, Under Secretary Bard, and Mr. Krug of the War Production Board.

Let me point out furthermore that those who objected to this bill, from labor and industry, it developed, had not examined the bill, had not read the bill, did not know its specific contents. They were talking about a universal service bill, not about this one.

This bill will boost the morale of the men on the fighting fronts, it will dignify the work of the IV–F's; it will stabilize the work by telling men where they should go to enter honorable work to help their comrades in arms.

This bill in my opinion is the one thing we need to push up the production that will win the war quickest and save the most lives. I think we should vote for this bill; I think we should let our vote be unanimous to let the boys know we are willing to do anything, we as Congress can do, to win the war more quickly.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I wish the gentleman would tell us what he thinks of the statement by the War Manpower Commission that we need only about 148,000 additional men.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I simply do not agree with that statement. The War Manpower Commission has no statutory authority, so their rules and orders are frequently disregarded. That is my candid opinion. I believe that the Selective Service organization utilizing the facilities of the employment offices and manpower agencies will make a definite success of it and we will not have any more critical shortages of things needed at the front.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I cannot possibly do in 18 minutes what I want to do, but I thank the chairman very much for having given me this much time.

My position on this bill is approximately as follows: I am moved very deeply, I am influenced very deeply, by the arguments directed largely at my emotional feelings by the proponents of the bill; and I say that with no disrespect for those arguments. I can see that for Congress to fail to take action since we have a bill before us on this matter might be serious indeed. I want the right thing to be done. As earnestly as the gentleman from California who just preceded me, or the gentleman from Texas, I stand ready to do anything that can be done that will actually put into the hands of America's fighting men whatever additional weapons and equipment they need to defend themselves and to win this war. And I am ready to vote for those things that I am convinced will help even if I think there are features of the measure which are not right. But I do not see that it answers the question as to the best way to do that job merely to say that the job needs to be done, and I am of the opinion that in the debate two considerations have been conspicuously absent. One of those considerations is specific answers to why we are having substantial lay-offs right now, specific figures comparing future manpower needs with the present situation, some features of which are to say the least confusing. Some of the lay-offs are caused by increased productivity per worker, some of them by contract cut-backs, some of them by bad management. I believe we should have an answer as to where those people are needed and should be utilized. They themselves want to know. For the blunt truth is: our people would be producing far more today than they are, had it not been for the tragic mistake of overoptimistic predictions about the end of the war which were spread abroad last summer.

Let no man consider this legislation without realizing that the complaint of America's men and women workers today is that they are not given enough work to do. Let no one forget that 90 percent of the IV–F boys would give anything if only they could get into the Army. At this very moment our people, realizing how serious the situation is, are flocking back to the war plants.

And the situation is serious, critical; upon the events of the next few weeks and months will depend the future hopes of mankind. Let Congress do nothing which would dampen the spirit that now pervades our country. That is the main reason I hope we can put in shape here a bill that we can pass in good conscience.

I think the second question is the human factor of morale, the vast importance of having all men and women feel this is a demand upon all of the American people equally, that all resources are truly being called upon, that what is being asked of one is being asked just as much of the fellow above him. All of this is of tremendous importance. For our purpose is increased supply, actual increased supply for the men who bear the whole brunt of this war, and that increased supply will come in part from more workers, but, equally important, it must come from the same or a better will to produce on the part of the men and women who have written the greatest production record in the world's history.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said over and over again that we are seeking to marshal all our resources and, as I said when I interrupted the gentleman from Texas in his magnificent address, I would have no concern about this matter whatsoever if I could feel that this bill really did that. But it does not. We are considering this bill against a background. We are considering this bill against a background of a Congress that refused to say that there should be a top limit on the amount of income any individual should have from this period of war, against the background of a tax system which even today leaves vast loopholes for some, though it is severe indeed on others; we are considering it against a situation where, as a matter of fact, the profits for all manufacturing concerns for the 3 years from 1941 to 1943 were $5,000,000,000 after taxes and where the leading 1,200 corporations of the United States have added $6,000,000,000 to their working capital in the midst of this war. Mr. Chairman, Congress has not taken the profit out of war. It has only started. Even renegotiation of war contracts will end on June 30 unless we act to reverse former action.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment which I think will correct this feature. The amendment will provide that insofar as Congress requires labor to work in war plants it will take the private profit out of the results of those men's labor. It will come as close as possible to making it so we will be calling upon men to work for their Nation. Anyone in the midst of war can fight for that. It is wrong, it is fundamentally wrong, to say that we will demand the labor of one man to work for the private profit of another. I am going to try to correct that in the bill—to make the bill live up to the principle of marshaling all our resources.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Would that same line of reasoning apply to a soldier?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it does.

Mr. O'NEAL. A soldier should not be called until we stop the excess profits?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The soldier works for the Government, the soldier is drafted into the Army of the United States and he wears the uniform of the United States. He fights for no one's profit. He fights for his country.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman does not mean he would stop all progress so far as the war is concerned from our standpoint while this is being adjusted?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Of course not. I said in the beginning I would not. I said if I believed a measure would help even a little to supply our men, I would vote for it, although I might believe there were wrong things in it.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is the answer.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not see any reason why this objection cannot be corrected in this bill, nor do I see any reason why Members have got to be asked to vote for a bill that does not do both of those things at the same time. I think we can be fair and just all around in this bill if we want to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. When the gentleman states that he wants to draft men to work for the Government, I wish he would amplify that. Does he mean drafted by Government plants?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will amplify that by saying I will be satisfied if the gentleman will support an amendment which will effectively take any profit out of the enterprises in which we require these men to work.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Has the gentleman the formula there?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think I have.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If it is all right, I will support it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think I have it. That will be a matter to be considered later.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming the gentleman's amendment is not adopted, will the gentleman take the position—I hope not—that he will vote against the bill?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the majority leader that I said three times I was not taking that position. I may also say to the gentleman that everything I do on this floor from now on, so far as the consideration of this bill is concerned, will be done because I hope to get a measure out of here that the Members of the House can vote for with a clear conscience and vote for with reasonable assurance it will actually produce more of the equipment our men may need. That is what I want to do. I agree there are more fundamental measures to increase production than I think this bill can be. I believe those measures should have been taken—should be taken. They have to do with better utilization of labor, with wage inequalities, with other things. But I also agree that we here in Congress have to act not alone as we would like to act, but in such fashion as to make clear to our fighting forces that we stand squarely behind them and will do anything that conceivably might help them at all.

Mr. Chairman, I shall address myself now to a substitute bill which I believe will accomplish more in increased production than will the committee bill. As most Members know, I have a substitute proposal to offer for this bill. I am going to advance that substitute proposal because I honestly believe it will be a better approach to this problem. Over and over again speakers have addressed the House today on the subject of the waste of labor in nonessential occupations, occupations in some cases that are not only not contributing to the war effort but which are actually harmful to it, and that those people should be making a contribution to the war effort. Of course they should.

What is the direct way to get at that? The direct way to get at that is to put a ceiling on those occupations and be able to enforce that ceiling so that the proper agency can say that there shall not be more than a certain number of men or that there shall not be anybody employed in those occupations. It appears to me that is the first and most essential step. I think we could get down to a food, clothing, and shelter basis in this country, as long as our men are fighting on the war fronts as they are, and I do not think it would hurt us a bit.

How would I do it? I would say, as Justice Byrnes did say, "You cannot win a war by having horse racing." That was stopped, but that was only a beginning. My substitute amendment will give the War Manpower Commission, as set up at present, with the proper cooperation of management and labor in this country, which it has, the power to put manpower ceilings on every industry; for instance, those engaged in the manufacture of liquor, those engaged in night-club business or anything else you want to name, the manufacturers of jewelry, the fur trade, the manufacture of luxury clothing, or anything else. Second, it will provide that all workers released from nonessential jobs can only be reemployed through a referral by the Manpower Commission to an essential war industry. This solution to the problem can draw upon all the cooperation of management and labor. It is based on the system voluntarily worked out between them. This substitute bill will not raise the question about drafting men for private profit which I spoke of a moment ago and about which the gentleman from Kentucky and the majority leader are so concerned. I believe it is a fundamental American principle that I am speaking about. I feel deeply about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I only have 10 minutes, and I would like to finish, if I may.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman referred to me. I am not exercised. I

only asked a question and the gentleman answered it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry. I apologize to the gentleman and I apologize to the gentleman from Kentucky if I have spoken impatiently. But some of these things seem to me so important and I have so little time to speak of them. This proposal of mine would involve the implementing of a piece of machinery that is already working, not perfectly of course but working just the same. I think it is questionable whether we want to pass legislation that will take some time to get into operation. I think there are strong arguments in favor of taking the scheme already in effect, trying to improve it, and putting teeth in it so that it will work, and that is the basis of my offering the substitute amendment which I shall offer. If I did not believe that would do the job, if I did not believe it would do it, I would not offer it. When it is offered there will be opportunity given the Members to discuss it and decide what they want to do. I shall include at the end of my remarks the full text of my substitute amendment.

All I am trying to get at here in connection with this bill, as I said a moment ago, is to try to get a bill which will have the maximum effect in actually getting increased production. The human factor in that situation is one of fundamental importance. And this effort will largely fail unless we do this job in such fashion that all our people believe we tried our best to be fair and just.

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California, in the nature of a substitute: Strike out all of H. R. 1752 after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a) the Congress hereby declares as among the purposes of this act (1) to permit the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, and of the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers; (2) to reduce wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration; (3) to channel available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort; (4) to make available, for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort; and (5) to promote the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

"(b) The Congress further declares that the effective mobilization and allocation of our available manpower necessitates cooperative action by all Federal departments and agencies responsible for production, procurement, and manpower in determining the relative urgency to the war effort of various products and services and in establishing and maintaining a proper balance between the war production in any given area and the manpower available to that area.

"(c) The Congress further declares that there is no intention by this act to modify existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay, or collective bargaining or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any labor controversies or questions.

"(d) The Congress hereby directs that to the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and Government agencies.

"SEC. 2. The hiring, rehiring, and solicitation for the purpose of hiring or rehiring, of individuals by employers, and the acceptance of employment by workers, shall be conducted in accordance with the following subsections of this section:

"(a) An individual who at any time during the preceding 60-day period (or such longer or different periods as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall prescribe) was engaged in an essential or locally needed activity may be hired only if, (1) such individual is hired for work in an essential or locally needed activity or for work to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission, and (2) such individual presents a statement of availability from his last employment in an essential or locally needed activity or is referred by the War Manpower Commission or is hired with its consent as provided herein.

"(b) An individual shall receive a statement of availability from employment in an essential or locally needed activity if, (1) he has been discharged or his employment has been otherwise terminated by his employer; or (2) he has been laid off for an indefinite period or for a period of 7 or more days; or (3) continuance of his employment would involve undue personal hardship; or (4) such employment is at a wage or salary or under working conditions below standards established by State or Federal law or regulation; or (5) such employment is at a wage or salary established or approved by the National War Labor Board (or other agency authorized to adjust wages or approve adjustments thereof) as warranting adjustment or consideration for adjustment, and the employer has failed to adjust the wage in accordance with such level or to apply to the appropriate agency for such adjustment or approval thereof; or (6) such employment is with an employer who the War Manpower Commission finds, after notice and opportunity to appeal, has not complied with this act or with any regulation or order thereunder, and who is continuing his noncompliance after such finding. Statements of availability shall be issued promptly to individuals entitled thereto on such forms and in accordance with such procedures as the Chairman may be regulation prescribe.

"(c) If an individual is employed at less than full time or at a job which does not utilize his highest recognized skill for which there is a need in the war effort, the War Manpower Commission shall upon proper application refer him to other available employment in which it finds that the individual will be more fully utilized in the war effort.

"(d) To the extent necessary to provide manpower in the numbers and kinds needed for war production and essential civilian services in situations of manpower shortages, the Chairman may by regulation (1) provide that any or all categories of individuals in any or all areas, activities, or occupations may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission or in accordance with arrangements approved by the War Manpower Commission; (2) establish fair and reasonable employment ceilings limiting the number of workers or of specified types of workers which may be employed in any establishment or place of employment during specified periods; and (3) require the release by an employer of any or all categories of individuals in his employ whose services are urgently needed elsewhere in production or service of more importance to the war effort.

"(e) The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the referral of individuals pursuant to this act and governing the making of arrangements with public or private agencies, organizations, or persons for the hiring of individuals pursuant to subsection (d) (1) of this section: *Provided*, That such regulations shall include the following referral standards:

"(1) To the greatest degree consistent with war needs, workers who may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission shall be given freedom of choice as to the jobs they wish to accept, and employers shall be given freedom of choice as to the workers they wish to employ.

"(2) Good cause for refusing a referral to a job without prejudice to further job offers shall include (i) any case in which the worker, if he accepted the job, would be entitled to a statement of availability or be eligible for a referral on grounds of underutilization of skill or less than full-time work; (ii) any case in which wages or working conditions in the offered employment are not reasonably comparable to those prevailing for similar employment in similar establishments in the community; and (iii) any case in which his acceptance of the job offered would, over an objection presented in good faith by the worker, require him to join or resign from, or refrain from, joining a labor organization.

"(3) The decision to refer an individual shall be based on qualifications essential for performance of or suitability for the job, and shall be without discrimination as to race, color, creed, sex, national origin, or, except as required by law, citizenship.

"(f) (1) No employer shall release a worker on grounds that this act or any regulation or order thereunder so requires until after the War Manpower Commission has advised the employer that the worker shall be released. The War Manpower Commission shall so advise the employer only after the worker has been interviewed by the War Manpower Commission or afforded reasonable opportunity therefor, and a determination has been made either (a) that suitable work is available to the worker, the worker does not have good cause for refusing referral to such work and an employer to which the worker has been referred by the United States Employment Service has agreed to hire the worker, or (b) that the worker has been afforded a reasonable opportunity for an interview and has failed to report for the same, or (c) that the worker has refused without good cause to apply for or to accept suitable work to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission.

"(2) In the case of any individual whose employer has been required to release him from a position (other than a temporary position) in his employ under the provisions of this act or any regulation or order thereunder and who thereafter (a) has accepted employment or employments to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission and has continued therein as directed by the War Manpower Commission, (b) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (c) makes application for reemployment within 10 days after notice by the War Manpower Commission that he is no longer required in war work, such person shall be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay under conditions and with rights and privileges similar but subordinate to those prescribed by section 8 (c), (d), and (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

"(g) The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the establishment of employment ceilings pursuant to subsection (d) (2) of this section. Such ceilings shall be based upon a consideration of (1) the extent to which the employer is utilizing his available work force, (2) the relative importance to the war effort of the product or service in which the employer is engaged, and (3) the extent and nature of manpower shortages impeding the successful prosecution of the war.

"(h) No employer shall advertise or otherwise solicit for the purpose of hiring any

individual if the hiring of such individual would be subject to restrictions under this act except in a manner consistent with such restrictions and with such regulations as the Chairman may prescribe in order to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 3. The Chairman shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him by the War Manpower Commission under this act or any regulation or order thereunder is unfair or unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with such act, regulation, or order. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in the regulation, the determination made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable such regulation shall provide for tribunals so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management and labor interests in the locality. Such regulation shall contain reasonable provisions for the representation of any individual or other person by the labor or trade organization of which he is a member or any other representative freely chosen by him.

"SEC. 4. No provision of this act shall be applicable to (1) the employment of an individual in agriculture; (2) any Territory or possession of the United States, except Alaska and Hawaii; (3) employment by a foreign, State, county, or municipal government or their political subdivisions or their agencies or instrumentalities, or to the hiring of any of their employees unless such foreign, State, county or municipal government or political subdivision or agency or instrumentality has indicated its ability and willingness to conform with this act; (4) employment in the ligislative or judicial branches of the Federal Government; or (5) persons while in active service in the armed forces of the United States.

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby created a War Manpower Commission which shall be under the direction of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission (herein referred to as the "Chairman"). The Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $15,000 per annum. All the provisions of this act and of any regulation, rule, order, or other requirement prescribed thereunder shall be administered by the Chairman. The Chairman may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, and shall fix the compensation of such employees in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Chairman in any case in any court.

"(b) The War Manpower Commission shall be composed of one representative of each of the following departments and agencies, to be designated by the respective departments and agencies, subject to the approval of the Chairman: The Department of War, the Department of the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the War Production Board, the United States Civil Service Commission, the National Housing Agency, the Selective Service System, and such other executive departments and agencies as the President shall determine. The Chairman shall consult with the members of the War Manpower Commission in carrying out his responsibilities under this act.

"(c) The Chairman shall appoint a National Management-Labor Policy Committee to be selected from the fields of labor, agriculture, and industrial management and shall consult with the members thereof in carrying out his responsibilities. The Chairman shall also provide for the appointment of regional and State or area management-labor committees whose members shall be similarly selected and who shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the ccurse of the administration of this act. Members of any such committee may be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923 as amended. These committees shall be utilized by the Chairman in connection with hearings and appeals provided under section 3 of this act.

"SEC. 6. The Chairman, in carrying out the provisions of this act, is authorized—

"(a) to issue, amend, rescind such rules, regulations, orders, or other requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act. Any rules, regulation, order, or other requirement under this act may contain such classifications and differentiations with respect to individuals, employers, occupations, establishments, activities, and localities, and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as, in the judgment of the Chairman, are necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act;

"(b) to delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority vested in him under this act to such officials, employees, or other persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose;

"(c) to accept voluntary services in connection with the administration of this act, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such property, equipment, and supplies as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(d) to utilize the services of any and all departments, agencies, officers, and agents of the United States, and to accept the services of State and local agencies and their officers and employees in carrying out any provision of this act and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to reimburse such State and local agencies and their officers and employees for services rendered for such purposes.

"SEC. 7. (a) The provisions of sections 2 (a), 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable under this act, except that the words 'subsection (a),' wherever they occur in those provisions, shall be replaced for the purposes of this act by the phrase 'this act.'

"(b) The President shall prescribe the extent to which any wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in any employment commenced or continued in violation of this act, or any regulation or order of the Chairman thereunder, shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other Government agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

"(c) Precedence shall be given by the courts to the trial of cases arising under this act.

"SEC. 8. As used in this act—

"(a) 'Agriculture' means those farm activities carried on by farm owners or tenants on farms in connection with the cultivation of the soil, the harvesting of crops, or the raising, feeding, or management of livestock, bees, and poultry, and shall not include any packing, canning, processing, transportation, or marketing of articles produced on farms unless performed or carried on as an incident to ordinary farming operations as distinguished from manufacturing or commercial operations.

"(b) 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"(c) 'Essential activity' means any activity, so designated by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, after finding that it is—

"(1) an essential war activity, including the production, repair, transportation, or maintenance or equipment, supplies, facilities, or materials required in the prosecution of the war by the United States;

"(2) an activity required for the maintenance or development of essential war activities; or

"(3) an activity essential to the maintenance or development of the public safety, health, welfare, or interest.

"(d) 'Locally needed activity' means any activity other than an essential activity, so designated by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, after finding that it contributes to the prosecution of the war in a critical labor-shortage area, and meets standards prescribed by the Chairman to insure the full utilization of manpower.

"(e) 'Employment', 'work', 'hire', 'rehire', 'employ', 'employer', or words of similar import shall include any contract, arrangement, undertaking, or relationship whereby or under which an individual undertakes to perform a service or services for another, irrespective of the resulting legal relationship between the parties.

"SEC. 9. The provisions of this act and all rules, regulations, orders, and other requirements thereunder shall remain in force during the continuance of the war or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.

"SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, many of us who served in World War No. 1 have sons in the service now, and I believe we all have the best interest of the country at heart, the only problem being how best to acquire the results we want.

I am opposed to this bill for many, many reasons. I can give only a few in the 15 minutes allotted to me.

In 1942 and 1943 I spent 14 months in studying defense production in various parts of the country, visiting 47 plants. In 1944 I went through the ammunition, bag-loading, and powder-making plants, spending approximately a year in the study of that production. Before I got very far in going through the plants with the superintendents—I spent 2 weeks in the Detroit area alone—I was able, I believe, to forecast before I got through the plant the kind of production record that plant had. For instance, I went through a certain tank-welding plant in the Detroit area. Before I went through the superintendent was cursing the men, telling me how he had a 19-percent absenteeism record and that the men were no good. Before I got through the plant I had the feeling that the men were cursing the superintendent under their breath as we were going along. I did not have to go to the company records to determine that the production record of that company was bad. The morale was bad.

The next day I went through another large plant, and I am going to mention this plant by name. It was the Cadillac motor plant in the city of Detroit. I went through that plant side by side with the superintendent. He met his men with a smile and they met him with a smile. All through the plant I found signs appealing to patriotism, appealing to the men to be on the job and not to be absent from work. I did not have to go

to that company record to find that they had made a splendid production record and had a small absenteeism record.

I repeat what I said when I finished that job—that industry and labor had done a magnificent job of production, and they did it under a voluntary labor system. No fight-or-go-to-jail bill, as this has been labeled all over the country, no ball-and-chain system trying to tie men to a machine, is going to improve that record. Such a system will reduce instead of increase production.

Without a doubt a great deal of the sentiment in favor of a national service law has been created by statements circulated through the press and over the radio that we were short of ammunition on the fighting front. The other day I heard a statement made by a commentator over the radio that American artillery, during the recent "battle of the bulge," were limited to one shell per gun per hour. This man stated he was connected with General Eisenhower's headquarters and had been on the ground at the time of the battle. At the same time Lieutenant General Somervell, Chief of the Army Service Forces, was quoted as saying there was no ammunition shortage during that battle.

Over a year ago I began to study ammunition production. During the spring of 1944, I visited a majority of the shell-loading and bag-loading plants. I made a trip through Virginia, across eastern Tennessee, the full length of Alabama, back north through Mississippi, across western Tennessee, across the toe of Kentucky, into Missouri, the full length of Illinois, as far north as Dixon, back south through Indiana, as far as Charleston, across Ohio, West Virginia, and back into Washington. I have before me complete information showing the number of pounds of each type of chemical powder and explosives manufactured both in Government-owned, company-operated, and in private plants, month by month from 1941 through and including the first 4 months of 1944.

A great deal of this information is and was of course confidential. I believe I can give you enough information however to let you decide whether or not there was a real shortage of ammunition. While I have the information on every type of powder and explosive, I shall give you the information only on the two principal items, TNT and smokeless powder.

During the month of November 1943, there was produced both in Government-owned, company-operated, and private TNT plants nearly 179,000,000 pounds of TNT. In April 1944, this had been cut back to 96,000,000 pounds, a cut-back of 84,000,000 pounds per month. This cut-back came gradually, month by month, from November to April. At that time we had 128 TNT lines constructed with the following status of these lines:

Operating lines	48
Stand-by lines in operating plants	11
Excess lines in operating plants	9
Lines in closed plants	48
Loss by explosion	1
Lines converted to manufacture of N. S. for Air Corps	11

Thus we see that out of 128 TNT lines that had been constructed only 48 were operating. The following plants had been closed at that time:

Lake Ontario Ordnance Works, Youngstown, N. Y., closed down in June 1943.

Pennsylvania Ordnance Works, Williamsport, Pa., closed down in January 1944.

Keystone Ordnance Works, Meadville, Pa., closed down in January 1944.

Weldon Springs Ordnance Works, Weldon Springs, Mo., closed down in January 1944.

I visited the Weldon Springs plant while it was being dismantled and have a complete report on that plant. It had 18 TNT lines and in October 1943, just 4 months prior to its closing down, it had produced over 25,000,000 pounds of TNT. The reason for the closing down of these plants was due to process changes and new methods. We were producing 100,000 pounds of TNT per line per day as against an estimated 33,000 pounds per line per day. The man-hours per line per day remained practically the same. The same crew produced three times the TNT they did under the old process.

SMOKELESS POWDER PLANTS

Now let us take smokeless powder production. In April 1944 we had 25 smokeless powder lines. Twenty of these lines were being operated and 5 were kept in stand-by condition. A monthly production of smokeles powder was reduced over 24,000,000 pounds between April 1943 and April 1944. Our requirements in November 1943 were reduced approximately 25 percent. Three lines of the Gopher Ordnance Works were declared excess and no operating organization had been activated. We started out with four bag-loading plants. We ended up by having two.

BAG-LOADING PLANTS

We closed down the Mississippi Ordnance Plant at Flora, Miss., and the New River Ordnance Plant at Dublin, Va. The reasons given were because "it became apparent that requirement of these items would be reduced by reason of a change in that type of warfare from a shell to a bomb war." Another reason given was that "improved production efficiency in existing plants indicated favorable output equivalent to 100-percent increase over the original rated capacity."

COMPONENT LOADING PLANTS

Of the four component loading plants at Sciota, Vigo, Sangamon and Arkansas, the Sciota and Sangamon plants were closed "because their schedule could be absorbed on component loading lines favorable at larger shell and bomb loading plants."

AMMUNITION LOADING PLANTS

We had in April 1944, 244 ammunition loading lines. In going through the plants as late as June 1944 I found line after line and hundreds of thousands of square feet of space not being used and yet within 3 months and before the German counteroffensive we found stories being circulated about the great shortage of ammunition. The powder, explosives, and shells produced at that time were the shells and powder we were supposed to use a few months later during the European offensive.

THERE IS ALWAYS SOME AMMUNITION SHORTAGE

It can be assumed that there always is and always will be a shortage of a certain type of ammunition or a shortage of ammunition in certain areas. We find that we are using more of one type and less of another type of ammunition due to what is called the fluidity of war. We find new weapons coming in which have to have a new type of ammunition with a new reserve. We naturally cannot supply ammunition on hundreds of miles of frontage for a major offensive or defensive operation. If an attack comes and there is any element of surprise of the attack by the enemy, there will be naturally a shortage of ammunition and guns until we move our troops up to meet that attack. All the production of ammunition in the world will not remedy that situation.

SMALL-ARMS AMMUNITION

I was informed last June that our estimate of machine-gun shells was based upon 300 shells per machine gun per day in foreign service and 50 shells per gun per day in this country. I was further informed that we were not using at that time 50 shells per day per machine gun in foreign service; that small-gun ammunition was piling up and we had too much and production was being curtailed.

CHEMICAL PLANTS

I not only visited powder and shell-loading plants, but I visited chemical plants that make the chemical required in making the powder and explosives. The closing of a powder or TNT plant meant, as a rule, the chemical plants were also closed. In the face of the above facts, statements have been circulated and recirculated throughout the country making the folks back home believe that their boys have not enough ammunition to defend themselves from the enemy in an attack or to carry on an offensive.

NO LABOR SHORTAGE

Attempts have been made to blame labor for a so-called labor shortage. Not in one instance was I told that the reason for shutting down plants was a labor shortage. There was no labor shortage. Labor was doing a magnificent job. As stated before, TNT lines whose capacity was estimated at 33,000 pounds per line per day were making 100,000 pounds per line per day, and this with practically the same labor.

In other words, labor was producing three times the TNT under the new process that it was expected to produce under the old. Man-hours were reduced in practically every field. For instance, in January 1943 it cost $27.28 and took 9.88 man-hours to load a thousand-pound bomb. In February 1944 the same work was done with 4.31 man-hours at a cost of $16.48. In January 1943 it cost $19.36 and took 7.25 man-hours to load a 500-pound bomb. A year later the cost dropped to $9.29 and it took only 3.15 man-hours to load the same bomb.

In January 1943 it cost $3.05 and took 1.21 man-hours to load a 155-millimeter shell. A year later the cost dropped to

$1.81 and the man-hours to 0.567. In January 1943 it cost $16.60 to load 100 20-millimeter shells with tracer and it took 8.40 man-hours. A year later the same job cost $6.35 and took 2.20 man-hours. In January 1943 it cost $16 to load 100 M52–PD fuzes and took 9.30 man-hours. A year later the same job dropped to $9.54 and took 4.25 man-hours. In January 1943 it cost $16.91 to load 100 M20–A1 booster chargers and it took 7.66 man-hours of work. The unit cost dropped a year later to $7.98 and it took only 3.43 man-hours. These are but a few illustrations of the reduction in man-hours and the kind of job that labor did.

The same reduction in costs is found in the manufacture of chemicals. To charge or imply that labor did not do its part and that there was a labor shortage in ammunition production or that if there is an ammunition shortage that labor was responsible for it is certainly unfair and doing an injustice to labor.

FREE LABOR MAKES MAGNIFICENT RECORD

This magnificent labor record was not made by having labor tied to a machine with a ball and chain. It was achieved under a voluntary system. We started from scratch without merchant ships, without a Navy and without enough equipment for 100,000 men. We built millions of tons of ships that are spanning the oceans of the world. We equipped 12,000,000 men with arms and ammunition. We built the largest merchant fleet in the history of the world. We built the largest Navy anyone ever dreamed of. We furnished our allies with billions of dollars worth of equipment, tanks, guns, ships, supplies, and so forth.

All this was done during the past 4 years under a voluntary labor system. Now when we have built all this material and equipment, when we have armed and equipped 12,000,000 men and it is only a question of maintaining and replacing that equipment, we are told to abolish the voluntary system and adopt a fight-or-go-to-jail bill. We are asked to replace the voluntary system with a "ball and chain" system. No hysterical appeals can convince me that "the ball and chain" system or the fight-or-go-to-jail system or whatever you want to call it will produce more than has been produced under the voluntary system by free labor during the last 4 years.

REPORT OF JUNE 21, 1944

I made a report on June 21, 1944, on Ordnance Ammunition Production to the House. This report can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. This report was submitted to the Army Ordnance and to the Under Secretary of War for correction and approved by them as far as the facts were concerned. The Army Ordinance Association, which is a civil organization, adopted it as Army Ordnance Report No. 6, published August 21, 1944, and I was informed some 30,000 copies were circulated. I have some of these copies in my office. I stated at that time that the Army Ordnance Department and both industry and labor had done a splendid job. At that time there was a great deal of criticism because the Army had built plants which had been closed down or were perhaps never opened. I covered that field I thought rather thoroughly and in defending the Army in closing down these plants I made the following statement:

When we first entered the war, our forces all over the world were being driven back—always for one reason, "too little, too late." The phrase "too little, too late" was heard all over the world. In going through the plants I found old posters still up, urging large production, quoting that phrase "too little, too late." We lost the Philippines, Singapore, Indochina, Java, Sumatra, Dunkerque—always "too little, too late." In view of this, it is impossible for me to find it in my heart to criticize the War Department for having too much ammunition or equipment on time or ahead of time. This war will never be lost by having too much powder, explosives, ammunition, and equipment. We came very near losing it by having too little.

In speaking of labor at that time, I used the following language:

While it is rather difficult to say who should be given the most credit, there is no question but that outstanding credit must go to more than 200,000 loyal workers who have been employed in the powder, explosives, shell-loading, bag-loading, and chemical plants. Without them there could have been no production. These workers as a rule came from the cities, hills, and farms of Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and a dozen other States. They came from the highways and byways of life. Thousands of housewives left their homes, and farmers left their farms to work in these plants. Men and women who knew nothing about powder making are making this most complicated product. Men and women who had never had the first lesson in factory safety helped to make one of the most outstanding safety records in the Nation. Some of these people drove 30 and 40 miles before and after work. Farmers milked their cows in the morning, worked all day, and went back to milk them again at night and do farm work. Housewives prepared breakfast for their husbands, went to work in the factory, came back home after factory hours to do their housework, and prepare plans for the next day. I found a great many Negro people in these plants doing fine work. In the heart of the South I found a bag-making and bag-loading line with all Negro workers doing splendid and efficient work. These people are entitled to credit. * * * As I went from plant to plant visiting line after line, I was more and more impressed that here was America at work. The spirit of Americanism, love of country, and the desire to serve on the part of these thousands of loyal workers who are employed in this industry did much toward making this splendid record.

There was no labor shortage in the ammunition-producing areas then, before the cut-back, and it is rather difficult to convince me that there is a labor shortage now. As far as the ammunition production is concerned, the passage of this bill, in my humble judgment, will not add one pound of powder or explosive or one shell, big or small, to the sum total required to win this war.

In conclusion permit me to make this one observation: If anyone votes for this national-service bill with the thought that he or she is going to increase production of powder, explosives, or ammunition by one pound or one shell, I think they are going to be badly disappointed. Voluntary labor, both organized and unorganized, has responded during this war to every call the Government made. They have increased production after they had passed the point where further increase was thought impossible. They worked long hours and drove sometimes as far as 40 miles to and from the factory each day. The May bill, known as the work-or-go-to-jail bill, will destroy the splendid morale we have had in the ranks of labor. Compulsion will never increase production, and let me say again this bill will not add one pound of powder or shell to the ammunition supply of America.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for calling the attention of Congress to this gross wastefulness. Is it not true that there were hundreds of plants erected throughout he country which were never used, which resulted in a terrible waste of manpower?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. When I came into the Ravenna Ordnance plant in Ohio, in February 1942, that plant was operating at 22 percent of its actual capacity. These plants had a productive capacity of 140 percent to 160 percent of their rated capacity.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. In the production of rubber the output has jumped 30 percent per man per day in the last 2 years. One coal miner today produces 4 tons more each day than he produced 2 years ago. The workers in our aircraft factories are producing 83 percent more per man per day than they produced 2 years ago. The whole record has been that production has gone up, and employment and the number of employed workers has simultaneously gone down.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Despite the fact the draft has taken thousands of men out of the coal mines and thousands of others have left coal-mine areas to go into defense plants, the coal mines produced something like 30,000,000 more tons of coal last year than they ever produced in the history of the country, and it was done under a voluntary system.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. They built one plant at Amarillo, Tex., which cost more than $30,000,000, and it never produced one single thing; and other plants costing millions of dollars have even been dismantled.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I have here the cost of every plant that is producing powder and shells. I have here the production of every pound of powder and explosives, month by month, and the total production. I have here the number of plants, the names, and the cost of those plants.

That plant at Weldon Springs which was producing 25,000,000 pounds of TNT per month was being wrecked and torn down.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee for the War Department, of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In the fiscal year which ended last June, the gentleman's committee had recommended appropriations to the extent of $32,000,000,000, which remained unobligated, of the War Department appropriation for that fiscal year, presumably because of the shutting down of these plants, which was done voluntarily by the War Department?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Thirty-two billion dollars was given back to the United States Treasury for various reasons. One of the reasons was that mentioned by the gentleman.

When one hears talk about ammunition shortage, when you scatter stories over the country that these boys are having one shell per hour per gun, throwing the fear of God into the hearts of the mothers and fathers of this country, I am wondering just why that sort of information is being given out. I am wondering whether it is put out for the purpose of putting pressure on the Members of Congress to pass this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I hesitate to interrupt the very able gentleman, who, I think, knows as much about this problem as any other individual in this country and who is one of the most valuable Members of Congress, but last week in Paris General Somervell said we must have a great increase in the production of small arms; yet they closed many small-arms plants in this country late last fall, as the gentleman knows. At the same time, General Somervell issued that statement, he also stated to the world that General Eisenhower, at this hour, has such an adequate supply of war materials that he can begin a major offensive now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I was told that we based our ammunition for machine guns upon the basis of 300 shells per gun per day in foreign service and 50 shells per day over here; that we were not using 50 shells per gun over there, and that we had so much machine-gun ammunition that we were closing down the plants and curtailing production because we did not know what to do with it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman has made a very important contribution. Some reference has been made to General Somervell. Sometimes people say something in France for the benefit of the Germans.

Mr. SHORT. Well, it should be accurate for all the people.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Just a moment. Some of the references to the plants closed down have been for certain chemicals and materials for which we are not in dire need today. I am looking at the Army ordnance report by Representative ALBERT ENGEL, dated August 21, 1944, in which he says the War Department used good judgment in closing down the plants.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Certainly. I was making a very favorable report. I commended the War Department. I was trying to explain to Members of the House why they were closed down. The reason they were closed down was because we had so much ammunition and so much powder that we were not justified in keeping them going.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has been around these various plants. Does the gentleman think that General Marshall or members of the Staff know more about production than, for example, the men who are working in the factories at Ford, General Motors, and United States Steel?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. When a question was asked the Under Secretary of War in our subcommittee regarding ammunition, the Under Secretary of War referred to the gentleman from Michigan, who is now speaking to you, for the answer. General Marshall, Admiral King, and War Department officers know very little about production. They are fighting men and not production men.

Mr. SHORT. They are not supposed to know.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. They do not know production. They are putting their word up against that of the National Manufacturers' Association and many men who do know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the remarks which have just been addressed to this body by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. I do not question the accuracy of any of the figures he gave.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Every figure I gave was submitted to the War Department first and approved by the War Department both in the particular service involved and in the Secretary's office.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is all right. I had already said I did not question the figures the gentleman gave. The gentleman, however, mentioned only two or three things out of the hundreds that go into what we call munitions of war. The fact that some TNT plants have been shut down does not argue that we are not short of munitions. The statement made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] in respect to plants manufacturing rubber does not belie statements made to us by General Patton in Luxemburg in December that his greatest pressing need at the time was heavy-duty truck tires. He said, "If you cannot give me new tires, give me 300,000 tire patches so I can keep my army moving." The person looking at the figures given by the gentleman from Missouri with reference to rubber production would say there was no shortage of rubber; but there is General Patton out on the front who tells us what he needs, and he needs rubber badly. General Bradley tells us the same thing, and General Eisenhower and General Clark. Every one of them without exception told us they were badly in need of camelback to retread their tires, badly in need of patches to keep those tires running, badly in need of tires of every type; and there is a shortage there regardless of what may be said here.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I know the gentleman has vast information on this subject and I respect his opinion and that is why I am asking this question: Conceding everything the gentleman says to be true and not doubting it for a moment, will the gentleman address himself to the proposition as to how the passage of this bill will produce a single bit of improvement in the production of tires, camelback, or anything else? This question is being raised in the minds of Members of this Congress who would like to have it answered specifically.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be very glad to answer that question when I get to it, but I am trying to reach it first by answering the very forceful argument that has just been made to us on the floor of the House to the effect that there is no shortage of munitions.

When Judge Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, was testifying before the committee he was talking about failure to keep up schedules of production and I asked him to give us a break-down as to the lag in the programed production for 1944 and also as to the stepped-up schedule of production in order to meet the increased requirements.

Judge Patterson has just sent a letter to the chairman of our committee, dated January 29. I have a copy of that letter in my hand and I would like to read some of it because it is not printed in the hearings:

> When I testified before your committee on January 11, 1945, with respect to H. R. 1119, which has since been amended in committee and reported as H. R. 1752, Mr. Sparkman requested that I submit a statement showing the "must" or critical items which are below requirements or behind schedule, together with an indication of the extent of the deficits involved. You concurred in this request.
>
> The following data are furnished accordingly. Some of the information not relating to the War Department or only part having to do with War Department schedules has been obtained from the War Production Board.

He takes them up item by item, and I want you to listen to some of these items. He refers to heavy artillery ammunition. The gentleman from Michigan said that General Somervell had put out a statement that there was no shortage of ammunition on the western front. I heard some commentator over the radio state that General Somervell said that we had

a stock of supplies over there that was sufficient for General Eisenhower to start an all-out offensive. I do not know as to that, but I do know that General Lee, who is in charge of supplies for the whole European theater of operations, told us that ammunition was being rationed to the guns on the western front, and he gave us the exact figure, which I am not going to give. He told us unmistakably that the rationing was lower than it ought to be. I do know that men who were in field artillery batteries on the front line, enlisted men and officers as well, told us it was terrible to be rationed and limited the way we are with this ammunition. "If there is anything that you can do, get the ammunition to us," they said to us.

I want to read to you what Judge Patterson says about heavy-artillery ammunition:

HEAVY-ARTILLERY AMMUNITION

Production of heavy-artillery ammunition during the last half of 1944 fell 6.2 percent below the schedule which was considered feasible productionwise on June 30, 1944. Total requirements for 1944 were actually greatly in excess of this schedule. For a sample of the more critical items, it is estimated that production during 1944 was more than 35 percent short of total requirements and that stock on hand at the end of the year was 54 percent below the total authorized stock level plus unfilled demands.

We cannot afford to have those armies on the western front fire down to the very last round of ammunition they have. In order to keep them properly supplied there must be a reserve there somewhere all the time that they can draw on and back in the rear areas there must be a reserve. It is a continuous flow from factory to the ports, to the storage areas, to the dumps up at the front, and to the guns. I wish you would listen to this. He states that the stock on hand at the end of the year was 54 percent below the total authorized stock level plus the unfilled demands.

Production of all heavy field artillery ammunition during the first half of 1945 must exceed the last half of 1944 by 89 percent if current schedules are to be met.

I just do not see how in the face of these facts from people who certainly are charged with knowledge about this program, such as Judge Patterson, who heads up that part of the War Department looking after the scheduling of these programs, it can be questioned that there is a shortage of heavy artillery ammunition.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. When were those estimates made up by the War Department which they found short?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does not matter.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. It does matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say this——

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Because you have to give them time to make it up.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman has asked me a question. Let me give the answer.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. All right. Answer it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It matters not when the schedules are made up if they are what is needed today. This is under date of January 29, 1945. Judge Patterson admits, and we all admit, that the schedule that was made up for 1944 was not sufficient to meet the requirements. They have stepped up that schedule, and nobody questions that. I am not saying that the conditions the gentleman found to exist when he made his inspection tour did not actually exist. Because he says they existed, I say they did. But regardless of that, these are the figures given today.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman himself says that they cannot schedule up one day and produce the next, but give General Motors and Chrysler an order for the ammunition and see how fast they turn it out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They do give them orders.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. See how fast they turn them out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And they schedule them on the best information available at the time the schedules are made. Of course, those schedules are made subject to change according to the change in needs.

I am not going to read all of this in detail, but I do plan to put it into the RECORD for everyone to read:

JANUARY 29, 1945.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPARKMAN: I am enclosing copy of a letter which I am this day sending to Judge May in response to your question about schedules and requirements when I was testifying before the Military Affairs Committee on H. R. 1119.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

JANUARY 29, 1945.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, House Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE MAY: When I testified before your committee on January 11, 1945, with respect to H. R. 1119, which has since been amended in committee and reported as H. R. 1752, Mr. SPARKMAN requested that I submit a statement showing the "must" or critical items which are below requirements or behind schedule, together with an indication of the extent of the deficits involved. You concurred in this request.

The following data are furnished accordingly. Some of the information not relating to the War Department or only in part having to do with War Department schedules has been obtained from the War Production Board.

Heavy artillery ammunition: Production of heavy artillery ammunition during the last half of 1944 fell 6.2 percent below the schedule which was considered feasible productionwise on June 30, 1944. Total requirements for 1944 were actually greatly in excess of this schedule. For a sample of the more critical items, it is estimated that production during 1944 was more than 35 percent short of total requirements and that stock on hand at the end of the year was 54 percent below the total authorized stock level plus unfilled demands. Production of all heavy field artillery ammunition during the first half of 1945 must exceed the last half of 1944 by 89 percent if current schedules are to be met.

One hundred and five millimeter howitzer ammunition: Output during the last 6 months of 1945 was 7.8 percent under the schedule as established on June 30, 1944. Here again, the schedule, which was based on presumed production capabilities, did not fully cover requirements. For the year 1944, it is estimated that total production was 23 percent short of computed requirements and that, at the end of the year, stock on hand was equivalent to only about 50 percent of the amount required to fill authorized stock levels and meet current unfilled demands. Deliveries must be increased sharply during 1945. Production for January through June is scheduled to exceed that for the last half of 1944 by 44 percent and further increases are required thereafter.

Mortar ammunition (60 millimeter and 81 millimeter): Production during the last half of 1944 was 11.5 percent below the June 30 schedule. For the year 1944, production of these shells was over 30 percent below computed total requirements. Stock on hand at the end of 1944 was approximately 72 percent less than the amount required for authorized levels and to meet current unfilled demands. Present schedules call for an increase of 38 percent in production during the first half of 1945 over that achieved during the last half of 1944.

Small-arms ammunition: Past deliveries and current stock position of this category are generally satisfactory. Production during 1944 was maintained at low levels, however, because of the satisfactory stock position. Recent expenditures have been high; stocks are being drawn down; and current experience indicates an even higher level of consumption during 1945. It has been necessary, therefore, to step up production. Schedules for the first half of 1945 call for a 50-percent increase over output during the last 6 months of 1944.

Heavy artillery and replacement components: Deliveries during 1944 met established production schedules but fell 15 percent below the amount required to satisfy total requirements. As of the end of the year 1944 stock on hand was 46 percent under the amount required to fill authorized stock levels and meet current unfilled demands. Production for the first 6 months of 1945 is scheduled to exceed the last half of 1944 by 24 percent.

Mortars (60 millimeter and 81 millimeter): Requirements for these weapons were increased sharply during the latter part of 1944. As a result, stocks on hand at the end of the year were at extremely low levels, and were more than 85 percent below the total required to fill authorized stock levels and meet current unfilled demands. Production must be increased sharply to overcome this shortage. Present schedules call for output during the first half of 1945 three times that achieved during the last half of 1944.

Tanks: Here again recent increases in requirements have resulted in an extremely short supply position. As of the end of the year 1944, stocks on hand for the principal items were approximately 80 percent below the total required to fill authorized stock levels and to meet current unfilled demands. Deliveries for the period January through June 1945 are presently scheduled to increase 19 percent over output during the last 6 months of 1944 and further increases in these schedules are likely.

Heavy-heavy trucks (over 2½ tons): Deliveries for the last half of 1944 fell below the June 30, 1944, schedule by more than 20 percent. For a sample comprised of substantially all of the important vehicles, it is estimated that deliveries in 1944 were 14 percent below procurement requirements, and

that stock on hand December 31, 1944, was 44 percent under the amount required to fill authorized stock levels and meet current unfilled demand. Production during the first half of 1945 is currently scheduled to exceed that for the last half of 1944 by 12 percent and further increases for 1945 are in prospect.

Light-heavy trucks (2½ tons): Production during the last 6 months of 1944 was 12.9 percent below the schedule established as of June 30, 1944. Stock on hand for the more important items in this category as of December 31 was 65 percent below the total necessary to fill authorized stock levels and to meet current unfilled demands.

Air-borne radar: Output during the last 6 months of the year 1944 fell 22.4 percent below the schedule as of June 30, 1944. Deliveries during the first half of 1945 must better performance during the last half of 1944 by 31.9 percent.

Field and assault wire: Requirements have been increasing sharply as a result of battlefield experience. Deliveries during 1944 were about 7 percent below computed requirements. Stock on hand at December 31, 1944, was more than 60 percent under the total of authorized stock level plus current unfilled demand. Deliveries during the first half of 1945 must exceed those for the last half of 1944 by more than 50 percent to satisfy increasing demands in this field.

Dry-cell batteries: Production during the period July through December 1944 fell nearly 24 percent below the mid-year schedule. Under current schedules, deliveries during the first 6 months of 1945 must exceed the last half of 1944 by 27 percent.

Cotton duck: Production for all claimants during the last half of 1944 fell 13.7 percent below schedule. Deliveries during the first quarter of 1945, although forecast at 12 percent greater than the fourth quarter of 1944, will fall approximately 25 percent short of current requirements (which do not provide for making up previous deficits).

Heavy duty truck and bus tires: Production for all claimants during the last 6 months of 1944 was nearly 10 percent behind schedule. Although scheduled production for the first quarter of 1945 is nearly 13 percent in excess of that for the fourth quarter of 1944, a 30-percent increase would be required to meet minimum requirements. Large deficits have been accumulated as a result of operations with below-minimum stock levels, elimination of spares from vehicles, removal of tires from deadlined vehicles, and similar conservation measures.

Critical aircraft programs: This group includes the B-29 long range heavy bomber, the A-26 attack bomber and other critical Army and Navy aircraft, and accounts for approximately 40 percent of the 1945 aircraft program. Total production for the period June 1, 1944, through December 31, 1944, fell approximately 23 percent below the schedule established as of the beginning of the period. Present schedules call for sharply increased output in these programs throughout the first 6 months of 1945. Requirements for many of these aircraft are practically unlimited.

Navy rocket program: This program has increased tremendously in the last few months. Production in 1944 fell approximately 4 percent short of requirements but requirements for 1945 are now more than 10 times those for 1944. The production schedule for January, although double the actual December 1944 output, is substantially below requirements for the month. Because of such substantial deficits during the early months of the year, production for the year 1945, as now scheduled, is 14 percent below total requirements for the year.

Navy high capacity ammunition (6-inch and over): Production during the period June 1, 1944, through December 31, 1944, fell nearly 4 percent below the schedule as of the beginning of the period. Output for the entire year 1944 was approximately 9 percent below requirements. The schedule for 1945 calls for an 85-percent increase over total production obtained in 1944.

If there is further information which you desire, please let me know.

I wish to take this opportunity of expressing the War Department's appreciation of the careful consideration and prompt action on the part of your committee with respect to the legislation in question.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Copy to Congressman JOHN J. SPARKMAN.

Those are the shortages.

May I now answer the gentleman from Wisconsin, for I am just coming to the point about which he was concerned, and that is how this kind of legislation may be calculated to help make up this shortage. I do not suppose this bill pleases anybody 100 percent, but we of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I believe the House and the country as a whole, are convinced that those people whom we have charged with responsibility to conduct this war and of getting our ammunition out came to us telling the truth; that they are scraping the bottom of the barrel in manpower. Of course, there are pockets here and pockets there where there is an excess of manpower. There are doubtlessly pockets here and pockets there where there is a waste of manpower. But we know also there are pockets here and pockets there where there is a shortage of manpower.

What this legislation does, reduced to a very simple statement, is this: It gives authority to recruit in an orderly manner and to place the manpower where it is most needed. There is no power under the sun today for anybody to dry up manpower wastage, for instance, in a factory. We hear a great deal about manpower being wasted in the factories. It is being wasted in some of the factories, but there is nobody under the sun who can go to that factory and say to them, "You must cut down the number of people you are working here." You can say it but you cannot enforce it. Perhaps you could enforce it by cutting out the allocation of materials but then you would cut out production. You would be cutting off your nose to spite your face.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Nobody has the power to clean up those pockets. Nobody has the power to reach out into the poolroom or the beer parlor or into any other nonessential plant or job or work or whatever it is and to say to that man there, "We need you in essential war work, we would like for you to go over there, and we would like for you to go voluntarily, but we want to say to you that if you do not go voluntarily and we need you we are going to compel you to go." Everything up to this point is wholly voluntary. This simply gives the authority to apply that degree of compulsion that may be necessary against the recalcitrant who refuses to cooperate in the war work.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be desirable to have the power to place those ceilings and make those ceilings mandatory upon employers in nonessential industries as well as to operate on the individual worker?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman knows I would have been very glad to see some such program put into effect away back, months and months ago. I would have been very glad to see something done to give us an orderly placement of manpower, but it was not done. Now we are up to the point where we cannot play around any longer. In effect General Marshall says, "You have given me the job of winning this war. I have made commitments to General Eisenhower and to General Clark and to General MacArthur. Are you going to let me fulfill those commitments, are you going to let me hurl the shells at the enemy, or are you going to force me to hurl a boy with a rifle with a bayonet at its end at the enemy?" The choice is one or the other. There is no way around it. We can save lives by giving them ammunition. We cannot give them the ammunition they need under our present system of manpower mismanagement, if you want to call it that. I do not know whether it is so much mismanagement as it is our own failure to implement those who are charged with the responsibility of handling manpower with the authority to use that manpower in the way in which maximum production may be obtained.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. When they complained of rationing munitions, did they not at the same time admit that it was a transportation problem and not one of production?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman heard that said very recently by high authority, I am quite sure.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I cannot help what I may have heard. I also heard others say what Judge Patterson said here. Forget your transportation and remember that he said that our stock piles are dangerously low. That is a problem, too. Of course, transportation has entered into it, but it is not the prime problem.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has attempted to answer my question in part, but he does not go quite far enough.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall try to answer more completely.

Mr. KEEFE. Is there anything in this bill that will exert any compulsion upon John Doe, whom you may order to a plant, to produce a full day's work? Is there anything in this bill to cover the situation in a plant where experience shows they can produce 50 items a day per man but the rules say that 10 items

are all they should produce? Is there anything in this bill to break that type of bottleneck in production?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is nothing in this bill affecting any of the problems the gentleman mentions. The gentleman knows we cannot legislate on matters such as that. You cannot say to a man, "Under legislative authority you must turn out so many units this day." You can place him at the job, you can place him in a war plant, but you must depend upon his patriotism and upon his Americanism to give an honest day's work to the job.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to know if there is anything in the bill allowing an employer to discharge a man who comes into the plant if that employee does not render satisfactory service?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are a thousand details that are not in the bill. Something must be left to regulations and to general practices of employer and employee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot conscientiously support this slave bill. It is not only unconstitutional, but it is also un-American. It will not help the war effort, but hamper it. It is dishonest because it is based upon false premises and false propaganda. It is a labor-baiting and a labor-insulting bill. It would substitute involuntary labor for free labor. It just does not make sense.

It is the result of the needless waste of funds, material, and even lives of an incompetent bureaucracy. It is the desire of a few brass hats and a small bureaucratic-dictatorial clique, who would regiment the entire civilian population and then because of their incompetence in handling the situation, prolong the war.

The time has come for Congress to call a halt. We have arrived at the parting of the road. We will either accept dictatorship and slavery—government by bureaucracy—or we will repudiate it and preserve the Republic. Slave labor is not compatible with the American way of life. My father fought 4 years in the Civil War to abolish it. Lincoln's proclamation did abolish it. The thirteenth amendment prohibits its resurrection.

I repeat this bill is not compatible with our Constitution nor with the habits of our people. The reason that we are winning this war is because of the remarkable record made by free labor and a free people. We have repudiated the yoke in the past, and I hope we are going to repudiate it now.

We are tired of being bossed and bulldozed by the little incompetent autocrats in the various alphabetical set-ups. There are now over 2,170 Federal bureaus and agencies lording it over the people. These employ over 3,300,000 men and women, the overwhelming majority of which perform no useful labor, create no wealth, but consume it. They hinder progress. They hamstring our activities and destroy democracy.

Up to date they have issued more than 76,541 directives. These one-man-made laws contradict and confuse. Nearly all of them are made without authority of law and in violation of our Constitution. They have produced lawlessness, hardships, and disrespect for all laws. They have caused loss of manpower and womanpower, and are responsible for waste and graft. In place of surrendering more power, Congress should take back some of the power that it has already unconstitutionally surrendered.

The time has come that the executive, the legislative, and that means us, and the judicial branches of our Government remember that war does not abrogate the Constitution. The time has come when official Washington must again respect the Constitution as the supreme law. I repeat every Member on this floor took an oath of office "to uphold and defend the Constitution and the laws made pursuant to its provisions against all enemies foreign and domestic"—mostly domestic. General Marshall, Admiral King, and the President took the same oath and I call upon each and all of them to join me in observing that oath.

Before General Marshall and Admiral King ask the Members of Congress to violate the thirteenth amendment—to violate their oath of office—let them clean their own house. The waste of manpower and material in the Army and the Navy is nothing short of a scandal. After their investigation of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Senators MEAD and FERGUSON say that the waste of material and manpower is nothing short of treason.

The present abuse and ignoring of the Tydings amendment by the Selective Service should be a warning to us, especially since there is plenty of manpower without wrecking the farms by taking necessary and essential farm labor. I repeat let them clean their own house, and then they will have plenty of manpower and plenty of material without raping agriculture, and without this unconstitutional slave bill.

The time has come that we speak plainly and let the War and Navy Departments know that we are not blind to the things that are going on all about us. In place of debating this unconstitutional act, Congress should immediately put an end to this waste and hoarding of manpower and material not only in the Army and the Navy, and in the cost-plus factories, but also in all Government set-ups.

I know that it is human nature to grasp for more power when you do not even know how to use that which you have. There already has been too much abuse. As I came to the Capital this morning, I again saw stacks of tires that were illegally extracted from their owners 4 years ago. In every small town and village and in every city there are still piles of tires that were taken from the people by the W. P. B.

Now they tell us that these tires are worthless. Then, why did they take them away from the people who used them and who needed them? The time has arrived that Congress, in place of giving more power, take back the power that it so generously surrendered to a tyrannical and ignorant bureaucracy.

This is the responsibility of each and every one of us. It is a responsibility that we can only discharge in accordance with our own conscience. The thirteenth amendment prohibits involuntary servitude except as a punishment for crime. Section two of that amendment places the responsibility of seeing that it is observed upon Congress. It does not authorize Congress to abrogate it under false pretext.

We all know that in time of war the military arm must have full and complete control of military operations, but a declaration of war does not abolish the Constitution nor abrogate the Nation's laws. Congress must still shape the policies that govern the civilian population. The people demand that Congress accept this responsibility, that it once more write the Nation's laws in keeping with the Constitution.

The flimsy and spurious arguments we have heard on the part of some on this floor will not excuse their action nor vindicate their conscience. Fortunately, the Constitution is not like the Atlantic Charter; it does not consist of just notes. It is a finished and duly executed instrument, and we took an oath to uphold and defend it.

We are all equally eager for victory, but we will not surrender our Constitution nor our Government to an incompetent, dictatorial bureaucracy. We deny that we will have to abolish our form of government in order to win this war. We proclaim that it is only because we had a republic, and not a dictatorship, that we have won our wars in the past; that it is only because we are a free people that we are winning, and are going to win, this one.

If there is a shortage of war implements, or manpower, then it is because of the blundering of the War and Navy Departments and the war agencies. It is because we have already given to these bureaus more power than they know how to handle efficiently—too many blank checks. Not only have billions of dollars and unknown quantities of material been wasted, but billions of manpower-hours as well.

Any businessman can tell you that, at least, one-fifth of his time is wasted in trying to keep up with the red tape and confusion of the alphabetical set-ups. Any farmer can tell you that he has made countless trips, burned up gas, and worn out tires trying to get a cream separator or other necessary farm equipment.

Go into any store, and purchase a few cents worth of goods, and you will stand in line and wait while the seller and the buyer count points—waste manpower, lose tempers, wreck nerves. Then think of the 3,300,000 Federal employees wasting not only their own time, but your time. Some of these lay awake nights figuring out new rules and regulations—more red tape and confusion.

We know that the greed for power is more dangerous than the greed for

money. The trouble is not that we have given too little power to the Executive and the war agencies, but too much—more than they have been able to use wisely. Our intelligence was insulted when we were told that approximately one out of every two of our young men is unfit for military service. We smiled when baseball and football players were classified as IV–F's or for limited service. We knew that anyone who can play baseball or football can render efficient service on a battlefield.

We were amused when we were told that men over 30 are unfit for combat service. We know from our own personal experience and knowledge that many of the over 4,000,000 IV–F's, as well as many over 30, are capable and willing to render real service in the armed forces. We know that many of those classified as IV–F's and for limited service attempted, but in vain, to serve their country.

A few of the IV–F's were reclassified for limited service and were allowed to volunteer. These men want to serve their Nation, but they tell us that their time and energy is not only being wasted, but that the Government is wasting its money and transportation space sending them from one part of the country to another—to school.

Again, there is hoarded labor in every cost-plus industry. We know that the manpower problem is not due to a shortage in men, but a surplus of loafers. Nearly all defense plants operating on a cost-plus basis have many men and women in excess of their real or actual requirements. Many of these workers want to increase production, but are not permitted to exceed the machine or department quota under penalty of losing their jobs.

Most of the large defense plants are full of men and women who spend from 30 percent to 50 percent of their time stalling or loafing and in rest or clubrooms, gambling, reading, sleeping, and talking. I have scores of letters from men who state that they are compelled to loaf and waste time.

Here is one from Detroit, Mich.:

I was born on a farm. I am now a war worker and the loafing in the plants is just awful. Three hundred men and women doing the work that should be done by 30. I know it is the same in other plants. Some work only 2 or 3 hours per day. Spend more time playing cards than they do working.

Here is one from California:

Just a note. I am an everyday worker. I worked here in the navy yards. I couldn't bite the hand that feeds me so I quit. General Hershey does not need to take the farm boys that are doing just as much as our boys on the front. He can go to the navy yard here and find 10,000 men that do not do one thing but only to be on the pay roll so his boss can get more money. I know. I was there.

After listening to the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], it ought to be clear to everyone that this bill is an attempt to cover up official blunders and mistakes. It is an attempt to blame labor for that for which others are responsible. It would appear that if this bill had been passed at the beginning of the war, and if the power given under it had been misused as the power that has been given has been abused, that then the war situation would be far more serious than it is now. I am confident it is not necessary for us to ape Hitler and enslave our own people in order to defeat him.

This bill is unnecessary. General Hershey, speaking before over 200 Members of Congress, said:

I do not like to be a witness that does not answer everything he should. * * * I believe you are asking me, in substance, what power I need to take over the administration * * * of the manpower of this country. Personally, I do not believe anybody should take it over. * * * I do not believe Congress should give to anybody a lot of power. * * * You must realize that democratic processes are slower, but I do not want to have the power to walk into any place and say, "You do so and so."

This bill is opposed by all organized labor except the Browder affiliates. It is opposed by the Railroad Brotherhoods, by the United Mine Workers, by the C. I. O., and the American Federation of Labor. President Green writes:

The manpower problem can be dealt with in a constructive way and solved—not through resort to compulsion and force but, instead, through the better utilization of available manpower. There is no shortage of manpower. It is a question of the proper utilization of available manpower. * * * American workers have shown * * * that free, voluntary labor can outproduce forced labor.

Let me warn my friends on both sides of the aisle that the time has arrived that we stop insulting American labor. The hostility toward organized labor by the paid false propaganda over the radio and the metropolitan press and theater must stop. Organized labor consists of 48 percent of our population. They have 48 percent say about the Government under which we and they live. Forty-eight percent of this Government is theirs.

American labor has done a marvelous job during this war. Not only have they supplied our own armed forces with clothing, munitions, and implements of war, but in addition have supplied over one-half of the war implements and equipment to our allies. They, too, are getting tired of being regimented—of Government by bureaucracy. We surely cannot get their continued support by continuing to slap them in the face. To pass this bill will create disunity.

Again may I state to my colleagues in all sincerity, that we cannot kick labor in the face for 3 years and 11 months and make love to them for 1 month and expect them to have any respect for us. All that labor asks is honesty of purpose, loyalty to our Nation and loyalty to our form of Government, and that we observe the Constitution.

If we are going to ignore the Constitution and draft labor, then labor will demand that we draft material. No; they will not stop there, they will insist that we draft all men physically fit including Members of Congress.

We are at war. This war does not belong to a little clique. It belongs to all of us. It is not a social event for the international 400. It is a war in which our sons are doing the fighting and dying, so that the form of Government established by Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, and preserved by Abraham Lincoln, may survive. Let us highly resolve here today that the thirteenth amendment shall not perish from the face of the earth.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable regret that I find it necessary to oppose H. R. 1752, a bill whose purpose is to aid in the successful prosecution of the war by providing means of meeting, during wartime, the manpower requirements in civilian activities, occupations, and endeavors.

I dare say that there is not one of us who is not in full accord with the objectives of this bill, but its provisions for labor conscription are certainly not our only recourse for solution of any manpower shortage that might exist.

But, after attending session after session of our committee hearings, after listening to all the witnesses, I am firmly convinced that the procedures as outlined in this bill will tend not to produce efficiency on increased production, but rather to create confusion, discord, and possibly in a short time, industrial strife and chaos.

Twelve years ago today Adolf Hitler, the Austrian paperhanger, seized control of Nazi Germany and started out on a campaign of bloodshed and destruction which he claimed would put Germany in control of the world for at least a thousand years.

Yes, 12 years ago Hitler opened his campaign of ruthless rule by putting into effect his theories of compulsory military might and forced labor. Yet today, although he hoped to conquer the world for at least a thousand years, only after 12 short years Hitler's downfall was never more imminent. His forced labor failed to produce the materials and supplies to successfully combat the challenge of free American labor and industry backing up our fighting men and those of our allies on the far-flung battle fronts.

Yes, once again involuntary servitude has failed its master, and the right of freedom will soon again prevail in the many occupied countries whose citizens Hitler made his labor slaves.

Yes, our boys are fighting and dying at this very moment to preserve the freedom they are guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States, the right guaranteed under the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, which provides, and I quote, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except, as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

As a veteran of World War No. 1, and as one who had the opportunity to recently inspect our European battle fronts, I believe I know some of the problems that confront us. Certainly, I do not subscribe to any argument that would say that labor, industry, or agriculture

have not done their share in this war. In fact, there is no argument on that score because everybody admits that labor, industry, and agriculture have done a magnificent job.

Likewise, our armed services and those charged with their leadership have and are doing a successful job in pushing back our foes. And I am confident that they will continue to throw them back until victory is finally ours.

I am likewise confident that the folks back home—those in labor, industry, and agriculture—will see to it that our boys over there will be fully equipped and supplied with all the necessary implements to do their job, with or without this legislation.

Now what is the real reason for this proposed legislation? We must all realize that in a war of such magnitude there are bound to be reverses and there are bound to be miscalculations in procurement and supplies—we are all human. I have the utmost confidence in General Eisenhower and his commanding generals. They were all very frank about the fact that there was a shortage of heavy caliber ammunition. They did not censure anyone or blame anyone in particular about that shortage. Their greatness—and they are all great—was reflected not in asking us to use a club on industry or labor, not in accusing procurement of having fallen down in their calculations, but in admitting that the German is perhaps tougher than we all thought he was, and asking us to see to it that they get enough material to do the job.

Likewise, I would ask you all, my colleagues, to read the joint letter of General Marshall and Admiral King, addressed to the President on January 16. Nowhere in that letter can it be claimed that they have asked for this legislation. They do ask for young and vigorous replacements for the Army and Navy which they say are acutely needed, and to provide the necessary manpower to increase the production of critical items of munitions, accelerate ship construction, and effect the rapid repair of damaged vessels. And I believe they should get them. Incidentally, I do not recall that either General Marshall or Admiral King asked for this type of legislation when they addressed us last Wednesday in executive session, and I have a high regard for both of them as chiefs of their respective services. Well, then who does want this bill? This bill, as you know, supersedes H. R. 1119 which wanted to put some of the IV–F's into special labor units.

When the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, was before our committee he admitted there was no shortage of anything in this country to carry on a war, but rather the reason for this legislation was maldistribution. He also said that strikes and work stoppages had not materially affected production, nor had the question of manpower entered into the German counteroffensive. I certainly agree with Judge Patterson that the great fault, if any, lies in maldistribution—maldistribution of plants. Surely they cannot blame Congress for that.

How I recall begging Procurement of both Navy and Army to place some of these plants in my area where we had plenty of unemployment in the early days of this crisis. But no, they had to place them in other areas that were teeming with war industries. Consequently many thousands of workers migrated out of our area in leaving their homes to go to congested places where they had to sleep in boarding houses in which the beds were working three shifts.

And when they talk of ammunition shortage I am reminded of the time when we tried to get an ammunition plant in my area. Instead they took it to a neighboring county, condemned fine property and farms, and then built the plant. After it was completed they never produced a pound of powder or ammunition, either large or small caliber. It is now being utilized as a storage depot.

They built an aluminum plant in my district. After about 1 year of operation they shut it down due to a surplus production of aluminum. Men were thrown out of work, and now they are reconverting to a repair depot which absorbed some of the men laid off by the aluminum plant. But a great many man-hours of productivity were lost. And what is true in my particular area in cut-backs and no contracts is, I am informed, true throughout the country.

I am informed that with the constant change in munitions and supplies resulting from battle experience, cut-backs and run-outs of contracts are constantly releasing war-plant capacity and thousands of skilled workers.

These war plants are equipped with the modern types of machinery most needed in the war program. They have machine shops manned by experienced, skilled workers. Each of these war plants is a production unit which has developed a high degree of efficiency because the machines are there in place and the skilled workers have learned to work together in teams to turn out the largest possible amount of war work.

When it is necessary to cut back the work contracts to such a plant, or when the contract runs out, a highly efficient unit is ready to take on more war work. If work is not allotted to this plant a highly efficient operating unit is lost to the war effort.

Skilled workers, and also less-skilled workers, released from such a plant cannot for some length of time reach as high a degree of efficiency in another plant. Their efficiency is due in part to the teamwork that has been developed by the work force as a whole in the plant where they have worked for some time. In a new plant they have to readjust themselves and learn new techniques.

Therefore, failure to allot contracts to a plant which is a going concern represents a serious loss of time and efficiency in getting out war production.

Many cases are reported in different cities where the Army and Navy Procurement Services have failed to make use of efficient war-production plants and have not been awarded new contracts when existing contracts have been cut back or ran out.

Now, if the Army and Navy are really concerned about the manpower shortage, it would be far more effective to award contracts in such a way that the thousands of skilled workers who have developed a high degree of teamwork and efficiency in these plants could continue to do war work in the plants where they are now employed. This would be the most efficient way to use such manpower.

Then again many of the workers in these plants are in so-called loose labor markets where they cannot change to war work in other plants because no other plant in the locality needs their particular types of skill. To make their skills available to the war program they would have to move to some other locality.

That is what is happening to thousands upon thousands of our workers—maldistribution of labor and industry. This is where management, labor, and Government should get together in the common interest.

Furthermore, what else are these cut-backs and contract cessations doing? Along with throwing thousands upon thousands of people out of work they are increasing the number receiving unemployment compensation.

According to the latest figures of the Social Security Board which have just become available for the month of December 1944, the total amount of unemployment benefits paid in an average week of December was $1,198,701. This does not include payments to applicants whose applications are being processed or pending action, and the average weekly number of initial claims in this category is 28,411. That is, first claims filed by individuals at the beginning of a new spell of unemployment, and which are not included in the $1,198,701 weekly unemployment benefits being paid out in the last available report which as I stated was for December 1944.

The unemployment benefits paid out by Social Security do not include the unemployment compensation being paid under the G. I. bill of rights to veterans of World War No. 2, who are temporarily out of employment. These payments are increasing as our returned soldiers discharged from the armed forces are endeavoring to secure employment.

Cut-backs and run-outs of war work are releasing thousands of war workers. For instance, in Detroit one of the major centers of war production, lay-offs have been so prevalent in the last 3 months that Detroit can no longer be considered a tight labor market and the War Production Board is actually asking the military to place contracts in Detroit.

The number of persons receiving unemployment compensation in November in the State of Michigan was 502 percent above the same month in the previous year due to the lay-offs in war work throughout the State.

Unemployment compensation has increased greatly in other States having large amounts of war work. The manpower balance sheets will show that in November 1944 unemployment compensation increased over November 1943 in

Connecticut, Delaware, Utah, and California, rising in Connecticut to 255 percent. Time will not permit citing the rapid rise of compensable claims for unemployment insurance in December of 1944 as compared with the same period in 1943 in such war-production centers as Detroit, Flint, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Cleveland, Portland, and Fort Worth.

In many instances it has been made to appear that workers were deserting war jobs. The figures from the Social Security Board prove once and for all that workers were being laid off, and were not quitting—unemployment compensation is not paid to persons who quit.

Hoarding of labor and waste of manpower is becoming so glaring, particularly in navy yards, as shown by the Senate committee investigating war activities, that a reexamination of these places should take place. Again, maldistribution.

In conclusion, I believe that our governmental agencies getting together at the conference table with labor, industry, and agriculture will result in the solution of any problems that might exist. I believe that there are two or three proposals that might be considered and may be offered as substitutes, and I refer particularly to the bill introduced by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

But whatever we do, I hope we will not inject foreign or totalitarian methods for that of our American way of life.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly discussed. After having talked to many Members of this House, I am convinced that many of them do not yet have their minds made up completely.

I realize we are facing here a very great question which must be solved. Had I not made the recent trip with the Committee on Military Affairs to Europe, I state to you frankly that I, too, would have been much more hesitant to make a decision as to my stand on this question.

Much has been said yesterday and today with reference to this bill. If I understand the bill correctly, management, labor, and Government will have a free hand to work out the manpower problem, and then if they fail we will furnish them a great pool of available manpower covering the ages of 18 to 45.

Furthermore, I am of the opinion that we can win this war even if this legislation is never passed. However, I am firmly convinced that we can win much more quickly if we have legislation of this nature.

A long-drawn-out war will mean additional casualties, a tremendous increase in the national debt, and increased difficulty in establishing a permanent peace. President Roosevelt, the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, Admiral King, and many Army and Navy officials have stated that this legislation is essential.

Those of us who have been on the battle fronts and have observed the work of boys who have been overseas from 2 to 2½ and 3 years realize what it means to them. They are watching this bill, they are watching this country, and they are watching this Congress. We cannot afford at this hour to let them down without passing legislation that certainly will furnish them equipment and material they need.

We have heard a great deal about who is responsible for the shortages we now have. Some people want to say there are no shortages. If you will refer to pages 410 and 411 of the committee hearings you will find that the testimony given before our committee showed the following:

Colonel SANDERS. I would like to present some facts here which I think will bring this picture into better relative proportions. I have listened to all the testimony presented here. The witnesses against the bill have emphasized the tremendous production schedule. All the witnesses for the bill acknowledged that, but it is not the question on which the Congress has to decide, nor is it the critical situation. The critical situation is the fact that we have not reached certain necessary objectives which were possible objectives.

I will read one paragraph of a memorandum I prepared a year ago:

"The production figures are so large as to be without any standard for comparison, and the accomplishment so remarkable as to virtually stop that critical analysis so essential for insuring future accomplishment of vital objectives. But such analysis must be made if we are to foresee in time to enable us to take the necessary preventative measures, to meet those obstacles likely to arise during the coming year."

Now, it was stated by a number of the witnesses that we accomplished our objective in 1943 when we did not have this wave of optimism or some of the other factors that were pleaded as the reason for the present situation.

In 1943 we had not accomplished our objectives. In the airplane production program, we were 9,000 planes short of our objective, and that objective was one which had been scaled down by 30,000 planes from the original objective in order to get an objective which it was felt could be met on the basis of materials and labor available.

Naval construction was met on combat ships, but was short in 1943 28 percent on auxiliary ships, of which only 176 were completed out of 244 planned, and patrol and mine craft were 20 percent behind, a shortage of 270 out of 1,336 planned vessels.

In ordnance, we were then short in 90-millimeter ammunition, 23.6 percent; 105-millimeter ammunition, 11.6 percent; antipersonnel mines, 36.3 percent; multiple gun carriages for 50-millimeter guns, 37.3 percent.

I won't read all of these but just the more significant.

Armored cars, utility, 53.7 percent; in trucks and tractors we ran shortages from 9.7 percent up to 16 percent; in Signal Corps equipment and radio sets, we had shortages ranging from 16 percent to 45, 54, 64, and 74 percent; in engineer generating sets, we were short 48 percent; in transportation equipment for the Army, we were short, in small freight or passenger vessels, 30.9 percent; in medium tugboats, 32 percent, in medium cargo barges, 29 percent; and in Diesel electrical locomotives, 24.1 percent.

But let us assume for those who want to place all responsibility on the leaders of the War Department—and I do not mean to excuse them—that those leaders miscalculated. Let us suppose they thought the Air Force would knock the Germans out of the war. Let us suppose they thought that after we invaded and drove them back into their homeland they would give up and quit. Let us suppose that is the whole problem, yet that does not change the situation that our boys on the front are seriously short of the heavy ammunition which will be required to apply the final knockout blow to bring victory in the end.

I wish it had been possible for the Members of this Congress to have had the first-hand information on our true situation on the western front as outlined to us by the generals on the front—General Eisenhower, General Clark, General Bradley, General Hodges, and the others. This war is larger, much more terrible, involving greater numbers of men and quantities of materials than is possible for laymen such as we are to comprehend, though we may have the figures submitted to us.

War is a changing proposition. Our generals have done a great job of planning and putting into execution their plans. Our boys have fought a courageous fight. They have moved millions of tons of supplies, thousands of vehicles, guns, and millions of pounds of ammunition. Most of this they have had at the right place at the right time.

There is one thing they have not yet had control of, however, and that is the enemy and his planning. In many cases our armies, anticipate as we can, have been called upon to expend literally tons of ammunition, sacrifice many guns and much material for one purpose where they had massed it for another. In each such case they must then mass new ammunition, additional guns, and more supplies. As stated, most of this comes from having to change our plans because of changed enemy offensives and plans, which, plan as we may, we have not been able to control at this time except by the expenditure of additional matériel, guns, ammunition, and supply, in addition to our loss of fine American boys.

As explained to us, the success of any offensive depends upon our ability to follow through. We must have everything on hand to start our offensive. We must be able to expend supplies, ammunition and matériel. We can only afford to expend it by having a constant stream of such supplies moving from the factory to the front and having no vacant spots between factory and front.

If we open a place in the enemy lines unexpectedly, we can utilize it only if we have expendable ammunition and supply to throw into the breach.

General Marshall, who above all others, is charged with maintaining this stream of supplies, tells this committee the stream is not large enough. He tells us that if we are to fully exploit our every opportunity to whip the enemy soundly and as soon as possible, we must increase our production. After listening to the reports of the generals at the front, while I cannot repeat their statements, I know how they feel, and the information on which General Marshall makes his request.

This Congress pledged all the Nation's resources, all the manpower to wage this war when the declaration was made.

I feel that certainly we have no one who will object to working in essential industry in order to give to these men on the fighting front every gun, every shell, everything they need to win and win quickly, thereby to save American lives and give each boy a better chance to return. I believe that if this bill becomes law, there will be little need for anyone to be prosecuted under its terms. The very passage of the bill calls attention to our serious situation—to our needs. The men on the fighting fronts are the sons, brothers, and relatives of those on the home front. If we pass this bill I believe the patriotic American citizens on the home front, IV–F's and others, will gladly go into a war plant, on the farm or into other essential industry, if thereby they can make it a little easier, a little safer for our boys risking their all in the snow and ice of Europe and literally all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill, while not perfect, should be passed. Many features are not as I would have written them. Yet we cannot overlook the great objective to which this bill is aimed. I believe a failure to pass this measure would bring comfort to our enemies and would be one of the greatest demoralizing blows possible to American boys fighting on the war fronts of the world.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is suspected by a goodly number of the members of this committee that I have taken a very, very deep interest in this problem for more than 2 years. I cannot contend that I have mastered it, but I will admit that my convictions concerning it are fundamental. In the time permitted me it is not possible for me to tell the whole story. Perhaps I can sketch a few events with comparative brevity. Prior to Pearl Harbor there was a marked increase in our industrial effort, but it was not then conceived in any such dimensions as we now conceive it. The attack on Pearl Harbor aroused the country and it became evident to everybody that we must launch into a production effort of a size and character never before visualized, much less undertaken. The vast expansion commenced early, we will say, in 1942. The need for munitions was extreme. The Army and the Navy had little, if any, in sufficient quantities. Industry all over the country was appealed to by the contracting departments and scores and scores of plants went to work, many of them in an effort to produce things which they had never produced before. The call for workers, of course, was immense, with the result that vast migrations occurred back and forth across the country to areas like Detroit, Baltimore, and the Pacific coast, and many, many others that we can remember. People were hired as fast as they arrived at the plant, whether they had experience or not. The people who went to work were impelled by good motives and, incidentally, of course, tempted by wages higher than they had known in times of peace. The congestion in certain industrial areas was distressing. We know of hundreds of thousands living in trailers and in tents and in shacks of one kind or another. Under such a situation, which was utterly without system of any kind, it was inevitable that there should be a wastage of manpower; in some places there being too much labor and in others too little. The employer, anxious to get to work in turning out the things that the Government demanded he turn out, and put upon a schedule, was tempted to employ more people than he really needed, thinking it was better to have too many than to have too few. In some regions it was difficult, if not impossible, for the employer to find enough manpower.

There was no system whatsoever through 1942. By the autumn of that year the situation became acute, as everybody remembers; so acute that Mr. McNutt, who had then just been made Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, stated before a committee of the United States Senate in October 1942 that in order to bring order out of chaos and to assure orderly production in quantities sufficient a National Service Act was inevitable. That was his opinion. I regret very much that he did not continue thereafter urging that solution. However, the military services at that time, doing their level best to look into the future and to estimate the terrific demands that would be made upon us in this war, became deeply concerned; and in 1943 the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, begged the Congress to enact national service legislation which, they said, for the long pull of war would serve us best.

A bill was introduced on that subject, with which some of you are familiar, in February 1943. Extensive hearings were held upon it before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and also before the House Committee on Military Affairs. The bill was known as the Austin-Wadsworth bill. No action was taken upon the matter at all.

Things went on very much as they had before, but the situation was so difficult, and increasingly so, that the War Manpower Commission resorted to every conceivable device with which to cure it, and to achieve, if possible, the orderly distribution of workers. That is the fundamental difficulty, from a practical standpoint. That has always been the problem. So, the War Manpower Commission, backed up by other agencies of Government, issued directive after directive, even indulged in threats, directed both at the employer and the employee, exhortations of every kind and description, in an endeavor to bring about, indirectly, the orderly distribution of workers, without having any law on the subject.

I confess I was dismayed from time to time at the character of those efforts, because, instinctively, I have always believed that when an obligation is to be performed by a citizen in a democracy that obligation should be defined by statute, and that we should not ever confide to a bureaucracy, directly or indirectly, the power to tell individuals what they shall or shall not do. Of course, the War Manpower Commission had no such power. So it found itself resorting to threats. The thing did not work. The disorderly conditions persisted. In the meantime the war effort itself expanded beyond dimensions that scarcely any of us dreamed of. It is now apparent that consumption of material week by week and month by month in this war is going to be a great deal larger than we ever expected a year or more ago.

Referring to the efforts of the War Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service, may I call your attention to what has happened very recently? I quote from an article in the New York Times of January 28, 1945. It carries the dateline Elizabeth, N. J., January 27, and it reads as follows:

Despite the current extensive campaign for workers to fill jobs in Union County war plants—

And those campaigns are often characterized by threats—

Despite the current extensive campaign for workers to fill jobs in Union County war plants the goal of 2,100 set January 1 still was short by approximately 70 percent today. War Manpower Commission officials at Newark yesterday—

This is only 4 days ago—

admitted failure of their campaign for 20,000 additional workers in the critical war industrial area in northern Jersey which included Essex, Union, Hudson, and part of Bergen Counties. A net gain of 26 workers was recorded in Union County yesterday, bringing the total net increase since January 1 to 628, or approximately 30 percent of the estimated need. The net gain for the last 4 days totaled 227, the largest advance in any like period since the start of the campaign.

Mr. Chairman, I quote that incident not for the purpose of reflecting in the slightest degree upon the patriotism of our people, but more to give me an opportunity to describe or estimate what I believe to be an important element in public psychology. This is not the only instance in which it has proved difficult or impossible to get people to volunteer to leave nonessential work and to go into essential work. It has happened in many, many places, but this is the last and most up-to-date incident.

Unless I am very much mistaken the trouble is this: Let us say the Government goes to John Smith, employed in a nonessential industry, a man who has potential skill, and says to him: "Smith, you are needed in such and such a war plant; why do not you go over there and help out?"

Smith says in many, many instances: "I am perfectly willing to do that, perfectly willing to do it if Bill Jones will go."

You go to Bill Jones and he expresses like willingness, says he is perfectly willing to do it if John Robinson, another neighbor, will do it. The sum total of their observations is: "Treat us all alike and we are perfectly willing to go." That is the psychology of this situation, Mr. Chairman. It has been proved time and time again during the desperate efforts made by the War Manpower Commission to fill this need. We have had many experiences of that kind in different fields. We have had it several times in our history where men hesitate to volunteer for

a job, be it in the Army, Navy, or industry, unless they know that everybody else like them is to assume the same obligation.

In every instance in our history where the law has stated to the people—the law made by the representatives of the people in Congress assembled has stated to the people that all people, all citizens, owe an equal obligation, an equal duty to their country, the people have risen and accepted it. That has happened again and again.

So from the very beginning of this discussion I have been convinced that the mere statement in a statute passed by the Congress to the effect that every competent adult owes it as a duty to his country to do what he can to save it in whatever work his capacity suits him for would have the overwhelming majority of the people behind it. The trouble is, Mr. Chairman, we shrink away from these things; we hesitate, apparently, to reach the fundamental and declare it as part of the democratic process. The principle upon which national service is founded is a democratic principle—all to be treated alike. So during all these weary months I have been hoping and praying that we would have a bill presented to us which would declare that principle, confident as I am, despite opposition from certain quarters, that when it is put on the statute books the American people will say, "All right, where do you want us to go? We will work."

I am well aware of the fact that there are those who disagree with me. I do not question their sincerity. I merely thought you might bear with me as I express my convictions.

Now, about the present war. It is almost impossible, perhaps utterly impossible, for a single individual like myself or any Member of this House to visualize its extent, the enormous dimensions of it. In listening to Admiral King and General Marshall the other day at the Congressional Library, I got a pretty fair conception. I came out of there—and I have no doubt you did—fairly staggered by the size of this task. We are fighting, in one sense, two wars, and the battle areas are 12,000 miles one from the other—one in the European area and the other in the far Pacific.

I am but a layman; my judgment may not be reliable—I do not boast that it is—but I venture the assertion that when history is written it will turn out that each of those wars will have been the greatest military undertaking in the history of the United States—and I say each of them. We have two of them on our hands at the same time.

Wastage of material, consumption of materials, are going on and on and on. No doubt some miscalculations were made with respect to the consumption of military material. We all make miscalculations. Lots of people made miscalculations as to when the war was going to end, but they did it innocently and we shall not blame them.

Miscalculations also will be made again and again before these enormous undertakings are brought to a successful conclusion. But there is one thing we must not do. We must not calculate in the wrong direction. We would better make up our minds that those 900,000 men are actually needed in the armed services and that they would better be produced as soon as possible and trained; and that the gaps left in industry due, in part, to the withdrawals from industry to go into the armed services, would better be filled and filled as soon as possible.

The point is, as I have seen it all these years, we must do it in an orderly fashion. We cannot do it with a "hip, hip, hooray" method. It may be effective here but utterly ineffective next door.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. So, Mr. Chairman, while this bill does not go as far as I would like to see it go, for, as some of you probably know, I have believed from the beginning that all civilian adults, men and women, should carry the obligation, nevertheless it is a step and a most important step toward an orderly solution of this problem.

There are many things in the bill that some of us do not like. Some of us may offer amendments to it. Whatever the result may be, unless it is an amendment to substitute an entirely new measure, I shall support the bill. It is a step, in my judgment, toward the truth; the truth that all men are created equal. Created equal, they owe equal obligations. I know there is opposition to it. I have attended a good many conferences of some of the leaders of organized labor and some of the leaders of industry. I do not question their sincerity. The worst I can say about that opposition is that it may not visualize the whole field. It is quite natural for the manager of a plant to hold to the opinion that no one can tell him how to run his plant; that no one can tell him how to recruit working people. I can understand in some instances how the managers of plants do not like governmental regulations or interference.

I can understand how managers of plants may suspect legislation of this kind may cause some trouble amongst his employees. But, of course, the truth of the matter is, as skillful as our management has been and entitled to great praise, the turn-over still going on in our plants is just distressing. It has run as high as 80 to 85 percent a year in the shipyards and in aircraft factories, and there is no orderly way to stop it. There is a terrific waste of manpower and money. I think I understand the feelings of leaders of organized labor. They are very, very jealous, and properly so, that no law shall ever interfere with the freedom of working people. I should oppose any law in time of peace that would interfere with the freedom of anybody. But, Mr. Chairman, when the life of our country is at stake we all must give up some element of our freedom and that, in my judgment, is the question before us this afternoon.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I realize this bill is not perfect in every respect, yet the Commander in Chief states that its passage is urgent and imperative. General Marshall and Admiral King both have informed Members of the Congress that they must get action immediately in order to complete their assignment in the winning of this war.

During the recent campaign, I promised my people that if they would send me here to become a Member of this august body—to raise me from the minor to the major leagues, as it were—I would support and help the President upon all measures necessary toward winning the war and writing a just and lasting peace. On November 7 my people of the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky kept their part of the bargain, and when this and other bills which affect the proper conduct and hasty conclusion of the war are up for passage, I shall keep my word to them—my obligation to and my faith in my buddies now serving overseas.

Mr. Chairman, it was my honor to serve in this present war for a period of 2 years. I would be in uniform today were it not for the fact that I was retired due to physical disability. While a member of the armed forces of this country I respected my Commander in Chief's orders. As a Member of Congress I respect his requests.

A vast number of our fighting men who are in fox holes overseas feel that we here on the home front are letting them down. I want to read to you excerpts from a letter which has just been received from the son of a very dear friend of mine who resides in Kentucky.

I quote:

Maybe you think the war is over, but it is far from that. There are shortages in ammunition and supplies over here and we can't fight without them. We are beginning to feel like we are being let down. We know you have been making good money while we get a measly $50 a month, not much more than enough to keep us in cigarettes; while you live in luxury, in good, warm houses, we live in fox holes and shiver from cold and hunger; and our shelter is the bullets flying over our heads while we expect to get one any minute.

But we stick it out in any kind of weather and never quit until we have won our battles, so why should you quit? If we risk our lives all of you could stick to your jobs and furnish us with what we need to win the war.

Probably you think the news you hear from over here is some propaganda, but I can assure you it isn't. I am sure none of you realize what the score is, but I wish each and every one of you could spend 1 hour on the front line, then you really would be glad to work. If the people back home don't want to back us up, then I don't see any use of us fighting. It seems some of you think only of yourselves and don't care whether any of the boys come home again or not. The Germans have landed troops behind our lines and are pushing our men back some, but this wouldn't have happened if we had had the ammunition.

So folks, think this over a while and leave the peace time jobs go and go back to defense work, for we need your help. I know what I am talking about. I am a soldier over here and I am telling you straight. Go back to work and don't lose 1 minute.

Pvt. CHARLES W. LIVERS,
Somewhere in France.

Some of you Members may be worrying about domestic complaints, but I am sure that you will agree with me that it is far better to hear the local hue and cry of sore toes trampled upon here at home than to hear the mournful wail of one of our brave lads stricken in mortal combat and lying in the throes of death, all because his supplies were too little or too late.

I urge you G. I. Members of this Congress, who served in this war—I urge you Legionnaires and veterans of other wars—I urge you new and old Members, Democrats and Republicans alike, to join with me in supporting our Commander in Chief. Let us fire the shot today in these Halls of Congress that will be heard around the world, and which will give comfort, courage, fortitude, and confidence to our fighting men, and at the same time toll the death knell for all of our enemies.

Unconstitutional, they say. I am just a country lawyer and I do not believe in curbstone opinions, but if we can draft a man to leave his family to train, to fight, bleed, and even to die, and that is constitutional, then I submit to you that it should be a relatively simple matter for us to draft a man to work, to fashion the tools for him to use in his fighting.

I know not what opinion the rest of you may have insofar as this bill is concerned, nor how you may vote, but as for me—I am going to vote "aye" so that my returning buddies will know that I did not desert my Commander in Chief under fire; and that I did not let them down, when victory was within their grasp.

If bad news should reach the President concerning the war—God grant that it shall not come from the Congress of these United States, in that it turned a deaf ear to his request for the manpower necessary to achieve an early victory. In Heaven's name I urge you not to gut or emasculate this bill with too many amendments.

Now is the time, and this is the place to strengthen the President's hand as he formulates plans to sit with de Gaulle, Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek. Let us give him the tools to win this war, to get the job done. Let us stop this bloody slaughter as soon as humanly possible, so that we can write a just and lasting peace—yes, peace—"Forever and a day, till these walls shall crumble in ruins and moulder in dust away."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. The gentleman being a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules and not having had sufficient time yesterday, we have increased his time to 15 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the courtesy of our very able ranking member on the Committee on Military Affairs. I have tried to condense what I have to say and shall try to present it in time so as to not unnecessarily detain the Committee.

It has been said and it is true, of course, that this measure is of extreme importance and should be considered in that light. No one should be for this bill just to push people around. It is said we need a greater production of military and essential civilian goods and this bill is the one way to get it. So it seems to me that the real question is, Will this bill increase or decrease our production?

Now I listened to the very able speaker who just preceded me. Surely those things which he said should inspire—yes, things like that have inspired—the great productive system of this country to outproduce the whole world. Why, of course, we want maximum production. That is the thing for which we strive. The real issue is, how shall we get that production? I am very much afraid that legislation such as is here proposed will in the long run decrease rather than increase our production.

What is the issue that is presented here? As I say, it is not whether we want to win the war. There is no difference among us on that objective. On that we all agree. But there is difference on what will best further the attainment of that objective.

The issue presented by this bill is, Shall we abandon the voluntary system of employment and go to the involuntary system of employment? Shall we abandon that great free system of ours that I say has done so well and go to the involuntary system provided for in this bill? And in my consideration of this bill there is another thing that I dare to mention here. Perhaps I am a little outmoded, but I do believe in the Constitution of the United States. The committee cites certain requirements for public service as justifying this proposed legislation.

To my mind there is a great controlling constitutional difference between requiring a man to serve the Government, either in the Army or on the jury or any place else in the pay of the Government, and requiring him, under compulsion, to work for another individual, not the Government, and for the profit of that individual.

I am quite clear that the decision just handed down in the Montgomery Ward case has pretty well put an end to the contentions of those who hold that just because we are at war the Constitution no longer means anything. I think the provision against involuntary servitude is yet there. Yes, and I still think the provision having to do with eminent domain, the taking of private property for public use, is still there, and I think we should not have it otherwise.

There is another thing upon which I want to comment, because reference has been made to it. Some say that since it is alleged that the heads of the Army and the Navy want this legislation there is nothing for us to do but to go along with them. With that I respectfully disagree. Consistently have I yielded to the military leaders the power and authority to run the war at the military fronts. But, ladies and gentlemen, this is not a matter of the military front. This is a matter of the home front. It is a matter of home-front production, and as such, it is a matter for me and my responsibility as a civilian officer of the Government. With no disparagement of the military, it is my sincere conviction that the leaders of industry, agriculture, management, and labor are better qualified to determine what will increase production on the home front and what will not increase it.

However, on the merits of this matter and having regard simply to the question of increasing our production, I have said for a long time that no dictator nation can lick this country of ours because the productivity of men enslaved by a state can never equal the productivity of freemen. I shall be slow to abandon that conviction, and it seems to me that that is the issue here involved. I believe in the greater efficiency of a system of free economy, operating with individual enterprise and free labor. Who will deny that that system, our system, has not sustained that belief? That proof was completely clear until certain things happened. Before the election and during the campaign the promoters of the fourth term stated time and again that our production was all that anyone could ask, it being understood, of course, that the administration was responsible for it. I look at some of my good friends on the other side of the aisle, and they may say, "Now, look out, you are getting over into politics." My view in commenting upon this situation and some other things I want to mention does not stem from politics. What has happened has happened. It is past. But if there has been some slacking off of production, if manpower problems have been increased, then it is not politics but it is just common sense to take a look and see what happened to cause that slacking off. If it was not the fault of the system we should know it.

We were told that every bullet and shell was going to the right place in the right quantities and on time. More than that, we were led to believe that the war was next to over. Yes, and under the leadership of General Somervell, cut-backs in all sorts of war plants across the country were begun in 1944. Do you recall that our summer recess was cut short to rush us back here to Washington to enact post-war legislation? What was the inevitable result? Our people were lulled into a feeling of false accomplishments; workers began moving from war plants to civilian plants; there was a general slackening off of production due to the conviction on the part of many that we could begin to coast. The impressions created in the campaign undoubtedly did much to win the election; I do not know what they did about winning the war; but it does seem passing strange to me that while right before the election our production was going along splendidly and was doing everything that needed to be done, now, right after the election, it is going so badly we are asked to pass this sort of compulsory control-of-labor bill. I mention that because it kind of makes me take a look at the reasons why we are being urged to support this legislation.

The thing we need more than anything else on earth if we are to solve our problem of production is that the people be told the plain unvarnished truth about

our situation. Our people, labor, management, and all, have never failed to respond once they knew definitely and clearly the job to be done. They will respond again as they are already responding since they have been told of the critical need for more production.

I checked into some of these figures. I am informed that in the spring and summer and early fall of 1944, due to these impressions that went out over the country and to cut-backs, about 1,500,000 workers left the essential civilian war plants. Do you know what happened in December? The trend reversed, and, I say, reversed, because people are beginning again to get the truth. The figures show that 50,000 have gone back into production in the so-called "must" production lines in the month of December. While the figures for January are not yet complete, my information is that it now appears the figure for this month will be 100,000 going back into the production plants and essential industry. If this be true why is not this the answer? Who is there who will contend that the 1,500,000 who at one time were in the war plants of the country will not go back to those plants once they know the need for their services exists? I say they are patriots; their boys are in the service; they will go into these jobs once they know what the situation is.

This measure would apply compulsion to civilian employment. Certain men would be frozen in jobs which they could not leave except by permission of their local draft boards. Others will be told where to go to work. That is what will happen to labor when this bill becomes law. It is nothing short of compulsion. Others could be ordered to leave jobs they now hold and take jobs in other employments.

Employers of labor with whom I have talked insist that this bill will decrease production, not increase it; and they support their contention with their own experiences. For instance, even under present regulations certain employees cannot leave a job except by permission. I am told that when such permission is refused the efficiency of the employee drops until his employer is quite ready to give him a release.

I have been worrying about this problem for a long time. The summer before last I went back to my congressional district in the short recess we had. I got together with the Rotary Clubs, chambers of commerce, farmers, everybody back there in my district; and among other things in those nonpartisan appearances—and sometimes I can be that way—I discussed the pros and the cons of compulsory manpower draft. Then I threw the matter open to discussion and asked: "What do you people think about that sort of system? Will it improve our production?"

Out of the hundreds who expressed an opinion, two said they were for it, and they were a little put out because the men in their respective operations were too inclined to drift out on them on occasion. But the rest of them said, "No; let us continue with this great free system that is ours and we will do a better job. We will show these dictator nations that they cannot compete with free people when it comes to producing the goods of war."

We all know what happened when the Government took over the railroads in the last war. Continuing private operation of the railroads with free labor in this war has accomplished so much better results that the value of our system is clearly established.

No one can deny that this is an extreme measure. Why do we not do some of the lesser things which would step up our production, free us of hampering restrictions and limitations, and fully utilize the great possibilities of our free voluntary system before enacting such a measure as this? As a matter of fact, even if we pass this bill in the House of Representatives this week, it will be many weeks before it can begin to operate in any considerable degree. We have gone along through 3 years of war without it. Why would it not be smart to say to management, labor, and civilian Government agencies, "Here is the job to be done. Here is what the Army and Navy say must be done. It is up to you to get the job done. Get down to business and work this out. America is depending on you. Forget minor differences. Eliminate for the duration those restrictions and limitations and obstacles to full production. We are going to give you 30 days, or 60 days, or 90 days to prove that you can do the job. The situation is serious. Our boys, your boys, at the fronts must have the tools and implements they need." My guess is that if we do this, we shall earlier win the war than if we adopt the legislation here proposed. And that seems to be the conviction of management and labor, the people who should know most about production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not like this bill and have not liked it from its very inception. I fail to see how it is possible to get a good day's work out of a man through legislation. It is true that when you draft a man into the Army through legislative processes and the enemy starts shooting at him he is going to fight back—but there is nobody shooting at you in a war-production factory.

Congress, in its seventy-sixth, seventy-seventh, and seventy-eighth sessions, has given the President every power he asked for to make men work. Either those powers have been inadequate, which I doubt, or it is more likely they have not been used by the President who was a candidate for reelection and, therefore, permitted union leadership to run hog wild.

Mr. Chairman, it is an unfortunate state of affairs when men judge their patriotism by the amount of money they have in their pockets. I fear, unfortunately, that is the root of much evil at the present time because I have talked to far too many men who are working in defense plants who have said to me that regardless of the fact that their own flesh and blood is at the front, and perhaps dying at that very moment, their interest in this war is concentrated on the fact that they are making more money than they have ever made before and they intend to do everything they can to continue keeping their pockets flush with blood money. Fortunately, this state of mind is not Nation-wide. True, that is a most unfortunate state of mind but that it does exist cannot be denied.

We have another unfortunate situation at hand today, Mr. Chairman, about which I want to devote the balance of my remarks. I refer now to a situation which exists in my own district and probably in but two other districts of this Nation where we have some so-called conscientious objectors in camp. One of these three particular camps is located in a little town called Germfask, Mich., in Schoolcraft County, in my district. There are somewhat less than a hundred in the personnel of that abandoned C. C. C. camp but they have created so much trouble and, in fact, have been such a disgrace to the flag of this Nation which they refuse to defend, that I have had numerous communications concerning them.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with those who are bona fide conscientious objectors. I recognize that there are the Mennonites who by and large base their belief on the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, as recorded in St. Matthew, chapter 5. Their basic belief is in loving your enemy—or loving thy neighbor as thyself. They believe that by doing good rather than evil all would be well in the world; that good can overcome evil in our daily life. They believe that one's life should be based on the power of love and good will over the power of physical force of men. The Mennonites—founded by Simon Menno—a Hollander—began their cult way back in 1525 in the vicinity of Zurich. They were soundly persecuted for their belief in the teachings of Jesus that love is more powerful than any force in the world and over 5,000 members of this faith were killed within a short time—but they still cling to their honest beliefs and those of them who have settled in Pennsylvania have been a force for good rather than evil in our country and I have no quarrel with them as sincere conscientious objectors. Furthermore, I have been reliably informed that where they have been encamped during the war their camps maintained at the church expense have been kept meticulously clean, admirably disciplined and, furthermore, they have not failed to perform any reasonable task assigned to them by the work superintendent. They are certainly a credit to our Nation and have discharged their duty to the Nation fully in keeping with their religious precepts and I have absolutely no quarrel with them. Some of our finest people come from Mennonite stock as, for instance, Selective Service Director, General Hershey's grandfather was himself a Mennonite.

There is a second group of conscientious objectors known as the Dunkards which is very similar to the Mennonite faith but they believe in triple baptism in honor of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The Dunkards originally came

from Holland in 1609 and settled in Pennsylvania and are known today as the Church of the Brethren. General Eisenhower's father was of the Dunkard faith. And then, we have the third branch of religious conscientious objectors known as the Quakers about which I need say very little because they are of unquestioned loyalty to their beliefs and to their adopted Nation. Herbert Hoover is of that faith.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say that at Germfask and at two other camps in this country we have a class of inmates whom I cannot call conscientious objectors. They merit no sympathy on the part of this Congress. They should be made to work or fight. The question is how to do it by legislation and without destroying the efforts and the good work being done by true conscientious objectors.

I have seen the Germfask Camp on numerous occasions and I have discussed its operation many times. Recently, I received a telegram from a minister in Manistique, Mich.—which is about 30 miles away from Germfask—reading in part as follows:

Public indignation has been aroused by repeated visits to our city by Camp Germfask conscientious objectors to a point of threatened violence caused by their attitude and other actions while in the city.

Immediately upon my contacting Selective Service headquarters, the city of Manistique was placed on a permanent "out of bounds" status which means that while the inmates of that camp are always subject to arrest and prosecution for any violation of a local ordinance when in the city or in fact anywhere else, from that time on their very presence in the city of Manistique would be the subject for Federal prosecution. Here apparently was the trouble.

I am in receipt of a letter from the prosecuting attorney of Manistique which reads in part as follows:

The people of this community are very tolerant. They respect the religious beliefs of any sincere group and have no quarrel with conscientious objectors per se.

The rub results from the conduct of the objectors while in Manistique. It is well known that they refuse to do any work that will promote the war effort and that they are averse to any discipline whatsoever. Several nights a week a Government truck drives them some 30 miles into Manistique where a great number of men spend their time in taverns. They attempt to date girls in the high-school library, in churches, and on the street. Several have complained to local ministers that the people of the community are antisocial, as they fail to provide "victory girls" for the camp personnel. People cannot reconcile such an attitude with any fervent religious belief.

And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that as one Member of Congress I not only cannot condone such an attitude but I am in thorough disgust and would enjoy the opportunity to slap down anyone who wraps himself in the folds of Old Glory and demands his rights under the Constitution and who comes forth under a phony guise as a conscientious objector and demands "victory girls" be supplied him. I can conceive of no lower vermin in our Nation.

And then the prosecutor goes on to say about these men in Camp Germfask:

The men are averse to any law enforcement which affects them. Their outspoken arrogance is accompanied by a stiff confidence in ultimate victory in any prosecution, as they have an apparently inexhaustible fund of money and hired attorneys that respond immediately to their call.

We have one case involving a conscientious objector who was convicted of securing a Michigan resident trapping license when in fact he was a resident of the State of North Carolina. This individual was tried in justice court, convicted and fined $10 and $8.50 costs. He appealed to the circuit court of Schoolcraft County and was again convicted, and his attorney from Lansing is now taking steps to appeal to the Supreme Court of Michigan.

We are satisfied that any prosecution we may institute will ultimately find its way to the Supreme Court. My budget is not adequate to permit me to contest $10 game cases in the Supreme Court of Michigan. Any further offenses committed at the camp will have to be handled in Federal Court.

With the ever-growing casualty lists, it is most repugnant to the public to have these men come to Manistique in a Government truck when local citizens cannot secure 5 gallons of gasoline to attend the funeral of a deceased relative. It is also obnoxious to any good American to have these men come into Manistique and attempt to indoctrinate the youth of this community with their ideas and attempt to win converts to their cause. This has a very disastrous effect on public morale and unless something is done, I regret to say that I am fearful for the success of the future War bond drives in those communities adjacent to this camp.

Some people do not relish the idea of their bond dollars maintaining camps where able-bodied men refuse to work, flaunt the law, destroy Government property, and come and go at will with impunity. I do not subscribe to this line of thought, but it does exist in some minds.

With the acute manpower shortage the public feels that these men should be placed under the jurisdiction of the War Department. There they will be subject to discipline, which is totally lacking in the camp. Then they could be placed in military camps in this country where they can do some type of work that will at least relieve some able-bodied soldier for combat duty.

I have received a letter from a camp mate of this apparent law violator in which he states that his case is being referred to the American Civil Liberties Union. I think that is enough said to show where they get their legal strength and their background.

Mr. Chairman, the people in my district not only resent very much that Camp Germfask has been selected as one of the three to handle these incorrigibles or phony draft dodgers—and that is what they are in plain English—but they are sick and tired of seeing them coddled by the Government. I hope that I can find some way in the next few days while this bill is under consideration of drafting an amendment to this bill which will give the constituted authority all the power they need to adequately deal with these people. We cannot blame the Army for not inducting them into the Army because they are too yellow to fight and they probably would cause some good man to lose his life while he was dodging to get out of their way while they ran to the rear, and we certainly cannot expect them to do any work because the law as presently interpreted reads that if they even move their arms they are theoretically working, and so it is a difficult problem with which to cope, but I certainly hope that when this bill is ready for amendment under the 5-minute rule that I will have been able to work up an amendment that will cope with this most distressing and disgusting situation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a letter written me by one of these boys at Germfask together with a copy of my reply, both of which are self-explanatory.

A man is being held incommunicado today in the Manistique jail as a result of a highly irregular court proceeding. Yesterday I made an attempt to visit him and was told by Sheriff Hewett that "the orders of the court" were that Marvin Cook be held in solitary confinement. Hewett informed me that this also precluded the possibility of Cook receiving mail.

Cook was convicted of securing a resident hunting license under false pretenses, even though he gave the date of his arrival in Germfask to the clerk and was told that he was within the prescribed limits necessary for a resident license. Later investigation showed that he lacked 3 weeks of being within this limit. When the case was pushed by Prosecuting Attorney Sheehan, of Schoolcraft County, he was sentenced by the justice of the peace to 15 days. Cook then secured the services of a lawyer in Lansing, Mr. John Brattin, and appealed the case to Judge Runnel's court. Following presentation of the case in Manistique, the judge withheld his decision. In the meantime, Brattin returned to Lansing. One week after the trial Cook was called before Judge Runnel in Newberry, Luce County, and sentenced to 30 days plus $40, or 40 days. Sentence was passed without the knowledge of his lawyer and he was taken immediately to the Manistique jail, where he is now being held under the circumstances described above.

There is reason to believe that Cook will want to appeal this decision to the State supreme court, but there is no way of finding out unless his lawyer makes the long trip from Lansing and makes a determined effort to consult his client.

The importance of this case is not so much the 40 days involved, as the procedure, which, you will realize, denies Cook his basic civil rights. I am giving you this story for whatever action you may see fit to take. The details are also being given to the American Civil Liberties Union in Lansing and New York.

My reply to this letter reads as follows:

I have your letter of January 18 at hand and noted with reference to your friend, Marvin Cook. I have previously heard of this case from the prosecuting attorney who has informed me that this young man was convicted of securing a Michigan resident trapper's license while he was still actually a resident of North Carolina. Of course, having known the prosecutor for many years as a reputable, outstanding citizen, I take his word for that statement.

I want you to know that I have had innumerable complaints from reputable and responsible citizens of Manistique about the conduct of the members of your camp at Germfask. To me they are so nauseating and disgusting as to rile my temper to no ends.

We in Congress have sought to give every reasonable protection to honest conscientious objectors. From the reports that have been made to me, you men at Germfask have, by and large, by your conduct in Manistique,

in Newberry, and in other cities of northern Michigan, given every indication that our confidence in you has been misplaced and that you are indeed unworthy of the protection which we have granted you. You have refused to do an honest day's work out of uniform. You have refused to contribute to the war effort. You have sought to wrap yourselves in the folds of the flag of this country, and demanded its protection, while at the same time being too damn lazy to either fight for it or work for it; and I say to you—and to your whole camp—that as long as that attitude prevails, you will get no sympathy, nor protection, nor any more replies from me or from my office.

We have down in this vicinity another conscientious objector camp of those of the Mennonite faith. I have been told by inspectors, who have visited that camp that they have been doing a very sincere job. I have been told that they maintain the most excellent discipline and most orderly, clean, sanitary camp and I have been told further that they have been steadfast in their sincerity to carry out any and all reasonable work tasks that have been assigned to them. For them, I have the utmost respect. For them, and those who are truly conscientious objectors, the Congress has been more than glad to provide protection.

On the other hand, based upon my own observations on numerous occasions last summer—which was, perhaps, unbeknown to the membership of your camp—based upon the repeated criticisms that have been addressed to me by letter and in person from citizens of your area, and, lastly, based upon some insulting and demanding type of letters that I have received from your personnel, I say to you and to your entire camp, frankly, you have no sympathy coming from me. Instead of that, I want you to know—as I want the citizens of northern Michigan to know—that when we consider the so-called work-or-fight bill next week, it is my intention to offer an amendment which, if adopted, will mean exactly that to all of you up there of the type of this Marvin Cook. Who are you—whether you are backed by the American Civil Liberties Union or not, and all their money to hire attorneys for you—to demand your rights and the protection of the American flag that you are not only refusing to fight to preserve but for which you are too lazy to work?

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want it distinctly understood that I have the utmost admiration for hundreds—perhaps even thousands—of true conscientious objectors in other camps and in other projects all over this Nation who, while being true to their belief that they should not take a life, are nevertheless subjecting themselves personally to all kinds of risks in making their wholehearted contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

For instance, it is my understanding that 250 of these men are at the present time acting as human guinea pigs in order that medical science may discover how to treat some of our more prevalent diseases. Some 2,000 are working in State hospitals to care for those who are not able to care for themselves. A thousand of these men are working on dairy farms as dairy-herd testers and in agricultural experiment stations to produce the needed food for the Nation. Some 120 are members of a trained paratroop forest-fire fighting brigade in the huge forests in the Pacific Northwest. There are 200 of these men doing sanitary work in Florida and Mississippi—and even abroad in Puerto Rico—but the good work being done by the true conscientious objector does not absolve the rotten element in Germfask. Again, it is true—even in this camp—that not all are themselves a rotten apple at the core, but, unfortunately, they are contaminated by those who are.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if I were convinced that H. R. 1752, the bill we are considering this afternoon, would shorten this war by 1 day or 1 hour, or would save the life or prevent the injury of 1 man, or if I thought it would in anywise contribute to the prosecution of this war, of course I would not hesitate for a moment to support it with all the enthusiasm at my command.

I know there are many Members on the floor of this House who feel the same way. Of course, we all want to do everything necessary to support our military leaders in bringing this war to a definite and successful conclusion. They have done a marvelous job. It ought to be understood here and now that neither General Marshall nor Admiral King has asked for this particular legislation. They have expressed the urgent necessity for replacements in our armed forces and the urgent and immediate need for certain kinds of equipment and munitions. The question involved is how best these needs may be supplied in sufficient amounts and as promptly as can possibly be done.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us this afternoon is not the best answer to that demand. This bill is not a work-or-fight bill. It is really a bill that says in substance to a group of men 18 to 45 who are not permitted to join the armed forces that they are compelled to work in certain designated plants or industries operated by private concerns, and if they do not take those particular jobs, they will be jailed, or if they have money, pay fines.

Mr. Chairman, labor and industry have been commended for the marvelous job they have done in the production of war materials of all kinds, not only for our own armed forces but the armies and navies of our allies. Do not forget Russia is on the way to Berlin this afternoon using American tanks, and planes, and guns and munitions of all kinds. American free labor has out-produced all of the other countries of the world combined. This has come about because it was free labor and not what some describe as slave labor.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not a National Service Act. If that were true, it would be a different story. This bill does not even apply to industry. It just applies to registrants whom the armed forces will not accept. Why limit the age to 45 years? Why not extend it to 60 or 65? Mr. Chairman, I am convinced there is a better alternative and a much more democratic method of solving this problem, and I want to present it to you. At the conclusion of my discussion I shall include an amendment that I shall offer at the proper time. I feel it will go far in solving shortages of manpower and speeding production to bring this war to a successful conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, the flagrant waste and hoarding of manpower within many of our plants is a disgrace to this country. Not all plants are doing it, but far too many.

There is no shortage of manpower in this country. Assistant Secretary Patterson hit the nail on the head when he said we have a maldistribution of manpower and a lot of mismanagement of manpower. The question is then how to remedy the situation.

In the first place civilian employment in the Federal Government could be cut by several hundred thousand, if we could get the agencies to cooperate, but they are not doing it. The reduction of unnecessary employment and elimination of unnecessary activities would help the armed forces as well as farm and war industries.

This bill seeks to make men in the IV–F classification the scapegoats of the administration's failure to provide an intelligent and far-sighted manpower program. A few days ago the chairman of the House Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman SABATH, charged there are thousands of commissioned officers doing menial and routine tasks whose jobs could be performed by others not fit for combat service. I do not want to be misunderstood. We have thousands of commissioned officers performing routine duties and need to be kept in their particular positions. We all understand that, but there are many others who could be doing more important jobs in the prosecution of the war. The solution is not national-service legislation for men rejected for Army service by threatening them with fines and jail sentences. The administration must be at a loss for ideas if this is the best solution it has to offer at our most crucial period, and after 3 years of war. Nothing could be more undemocratic, more totalitarian, or contrary to the ideals for which we are fighting. Let me repeat: If the principle of this legislation is sound why not enact an all-inclusive National Service Act and be done with it?

Much has been said with respect to farmers and farm deferments. Much has been said about the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not asking that all farmers be deferred, but I do call your attention to the fact that farmers have furnished and are now providing a big share of the boys on the battle fronts of the world. Look at the casualty lists and you will find plenty of evidence. But, Mr. Chairman, there is no group in this country who has worked harder and for longer hours and more faithfully than the farm men, women, and children of all ages who have worked day and night in the production of the biggest food crops in years. They have done it in spite of handicaps of all kinds, and they have done it while their own sons and brothers are on the fighting lines.

Mr. Chairman, there are thousands of men and women performing services inside and outside the Government not essential to the war effort. Are we going to take essential men from the farms and from factories while men in Govern-

ment, and unessential work outside the Government, are doing things that are not required in the war effort? I also maintain there are thousands of men rejected who are capable of holding many jobs now being done by men who are physically fit for more important duties.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides that all male citizens classified in category IV–F be reexamined with a view of giving such men physically and mentally capable the opportunity to perform noncombat duties in our armed forces. My amendment provides that those in the IV–F category be utilized as far as possible in the armed forces before essential farm and plant workers are inducted. It further provides that the War Manpower Commission make a full and complete duty of the utilization of civilian manpower in this country and to submit a report once each month to this Congress. The report would include the names and locations of the plants and the facilities investigated together with the production records and such other information as may be helpful in securing an overall picture of our labor situation.

From the days of our Continental Army to the present this is the first time, to my knowledge, that the precious birthright of every American fighting for his country in the Army of the United States has been lowered to the point that it was considered comparable to a prison sentence without rights, benefits, and honor, or that such treatment would be afforded a citizen of the Nation for the failure of the Creator to provide him with a perfect physique.

Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the induction of IV–F's who fail to secure war jobs and who are physically and mentally capable of performing thousands and thousands of noncombatant jobs now being performed by officers and enlisted men needed on the lines. In fact, that is what I have proposed. I am not merely opposing for the sake of opposition. I have an alternative which, I believe, is more acceptable to labor and to industry and to the American people than the bill that has been offered. I am convinced the measure I have submitted will do far more toward bringing this war to a successful conclusion than the proposal under the May bill.

Let us analyze the situation from the facts and figures that have been presented. Evidence at the hearings developed the following: During the next 6 months the armed forces will require an additional 900,000 men for military duty and 700,000 for war industries. Now, let us examine what is proposed. The 900,000 men for the services under the plan are to be taken from the farms and the war plants. So instead of requiring 700,000 men for the war plants, industry will require about 1,500,000 and this 1,500,000 will theoretically be called from the IV–F's under threat of induction into special labor battalions or penalties without any rights. The shifting of labor from one district to the other will be under the direct control of the Government. It would seem to make this plan work the Government will need to control the plants.

The procedure is not only undemocratic, but it is awkward and inefficient. Industry will be required to train and bring to top production in the space of 6 months at least 1,500,000 men who, for the most part, are white-collar workers totally unfit for factory work.

Mr. Chairman, this late hour is not the time to precipitate arguments, discussions, and dissension which can be avoided by the simple expedient of drafting IV–F's not now engaged in war work into noncombatant and other jobs in the armed forces which do not require the same physical standards that are required for men in more hazardous positions and by following the proposals outlined in my bill.

Mr. Chairman, the acid test is whether a department or agency in this Government is required in this crucial period, and whether the work of those agencies that are necessary may be conducted with fewer employees. The Government should set the pace and put its own house in order with respect to utilization of manpower before making demand for this drastic legislation.

Mr. Chairman, we should go one step further and do away with a lot of unnecessary activities for the remainder of the war period, dispose of a lot of luxury services, and other things. Is there anyone on the floor of this House who would say that the thousands of men and women who are employed in the manufacture and distribution of beverages are helping to bring this war to a successful conclusion? We certainly can get along without beverages for a while. Look at the number of people who are employed in the cocktail lounges, the gambling places, and things of that kind. Do they help in the war effort? Chauffeurs by the hundred in and out of Government could certainly be used for more important jobs. Just a little examination into this situation by the War Manpower Commission would show hundreds of thousands of jobs that could be dispensed with until this war is over. Mr. Chairman, this measure, after compelling a man to accept a job assigned him or go to jail, then provides transportation to the place of employment and return home when through, or dismissed, and allows him the advantages and benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act. How are the men and women on the same projects who volunteered to take these jobs at good wages going to feel about that sort of thing? A man works under compulsion to get these benefits.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished majority leader says we must view this legislation in the interests of the United States of America. That is exactly what I am trying to do. I disagree with those who say a vote against this bill is a vote of no confidence. If that be true, it is a vote that says at this late hour we do not have confidence in American labor and American industry to finish the job.

Mr. Chairman, just a few months ago newspapers and radio commentators and men in high places gave the American people to understand that we had a big supply of men in our armed forces and stressed especially the tremendous surplus of war materials of all kinds. We were told the amount was so great that in a short time much of it would be glutting the markets of the world. Legislation was submitted to deal with surpluses. The American public got the idea the war was almost over. Many plants were closed down, and thousands of employees thought they would soon be out of jobs.

Mr. Chairman, those in charge of the prosecution of the war ought to keep the people informed just as near as can be done. They have a right to know all the facts. It is their sons and brothers who are fighting and dying in this war. They should have the information, good or bad. Of course, we have had reverses. Tell the people about it. Tell them of the dire need of equipment and material. This war can and will be won by the united efforts of the American people. Congress has declared it to be the policy of the Nation that every citizen should serve his country at the hour of national peril in the capacity for which he is best fitted. Industry, agriculture, and labor have done an extraordinary job in the production of food and materials never before achieved in the history of any country. Tell the American people of the need of the production of goods, and they will get it. They will not fail. We are at the final and crucial stage of this war. The need for manpower and material is greater than ever before. Every American in every walk of life ought to give his energy, his skill to the prosecution of this war. He should do it now. What we need is the mobilization of agriculture, labor, industry, and government to carry out their responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, if this challenge is properly presented, not one of these groups will fail to do its part. They are Americans. Congress should demand here and now that representatives of labor, agriculture, business, and industry meet immediately with officials of this Government responsible for furnishing manpower and materials for the prosecution of the war. Tell them of their responsibility that is theirs and ours. That responsibility is to bring this war to a definite and successful conclusion at the earliest hour and with the least loss of life. I still have confidence in America and the American people. Tell them of the needs of this crucial hour. Cut out a lot of nonessential activities and things. Neither labor, nor industry, nor agriculture, nor any other group will let this country down. They have not done it yet. They will not do it now.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall expect to offer an amendment to the pending measure. I trust you will read it carefully.

Mr. REES of Kansas offers the following amendment: Amend H. R. —— by striking out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"SEC. 1. That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection, reading as follows:

"'(n) (1) Any man who upon physical examination is found to be not physically, mentally, or morally qualified for combatant training and service shall be examined for the purpose of determining whether he is physically, mentally, and morally qualified for performing any noncombatant or limited duties and activities of a character performed by members of the land or naval forces who are physically, mentally, and

morally qualified for combatant service. If he is found upon such examination to be so qualified for any such noncombatant or limited duties, he shall thereupon be classified as available for induction immediately upon his failure to be regularly engaged in essential war activities, as defined by the War Manpower Commission or by subsection (k). Whenever his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), finds that he is not regularly engaged in any such essential war activity, it shall thereupon forthwith forward him for induction into the land or naval forces for noncombatant or limited duties or activities of the character performed by members of such forces who are physically, mentally, and morally qualified for combatant duties. If he is found acceptable to, and is inducted into, such forces, he shall be employed by such forces to replace at least one such member, who shall, upon being replaced, be assigned to active or reserve combat units or to other duties more essential to the prosecution of the war than those then being performed by such member.

"'(2) Examination for classification under this subsection of those men who are in the classification IV-F on the date of the enactment of this subsection shall be completed within 60 days after such date, and until such time as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion certifies that the manpower requirements of the land and naval forces cannot be met by the induction and replacement program provided for in this subsection, no man shall be inducted into such forces otherwise than pursuant to this subsection.

"'(3) Men inducted into the land or naval forces pursuant to this subsection shall have all the rights, privileges, and benefits which are applicable in respect of men inducted under other provision of this act, except that no such man shall be entitled to any payment on account of the disability which made him not qualified for combatant training and service or any disability arising therefrom not incurred in direct connection with service in the land or naval forces, unless eligibility for such payment accrued prior to his induction under this subsection.'

"SEC. 2. The War Manpower Commission is hereby directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the utilization of civilian manpower in the various plants, mines, and facilities in the United States engaged in manufacturing, mining, producing, distributing, or transporting any articles or materials which are or may be required for the war effort or which are or may be useful in connection therewith, and upon the 10th day of each month following the effective date of this act the War Manpower Commission shall submit a progress report of the Commission's activities during the previous month to the Congress containing at least the following: (1) Names and locations of plants, mines, or facilities investigated; (2) production records and employment figures for the past 3 years; (3) reports on Federal Bureau of Investigation of slow-downs or work stoppages; (4) records of strikes, absenteeism, and labor turn-over; (5) findings with respect to idleness, loafing, and any and all failures to utilize completely the time, skills, and abilities of all employees; and (6) recommendations of the War Manpower Commission as to what steps should be taken to utilize more fully the civilian manpower in the various plants, mines, and facilities investigated."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is rather interesting to observe the dissident spirit that ranges on both sides of the aisle as we consider this controversial bill. It is remindful of other days when there was other controversial legislation before us. It is remindful of those days long ago when we dealt with cash-and-carry and with repeal of the Arms Embargo Act. It is remindful of the days when we dealt with conscription and other legislation that was incidental to conflict. How remote that seems now. All the tumult and spirit have gone and we tried to submerge our every endeavor and address our every talent to only one end, that is the business of victory. Can there be peace or full freedom or contented living until the victory is achieved. Victory—and early victory is so needful before we emerge from the darkness.

I think that is the antidote for this cleavage and for this dissension of spirit and for the unrest that we experience at the present moment. At least I find some outlet in the fact that I am going to do that which is in the interest of victory. I am going to vote for this bill. If it is faulty now, there rests within our own powers the curative force to make it better. To describe it as faulty is but a slender refuge in an hour so critical as this.

I remember another day in this Chamber, the 8th of December 1941, and also the 11th of December 1941, when I sat away over in yonder corner and responded to the intonations of the reading clerk as he called my name on the roll. I voted to declare war on Japan and on Germany. It is refreshing to go back to that declaration of war because there is a phrase in that declaration that most of us have forgotten. The last phrase in that solemn pronouncement is as follows:

And all the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress.

That is the last phrase in that solemn declaration of war and I voted for it. When we pledged all the resources of the country we pledged them totally for a total war. That declaration of war, which sent and is sending young men to endless dreamless sleep recites that "all" of the resources of the Nation are pledged to victory. By our solemn votes we so decreed. It became a sacred pledge and shall we forsake that pledge now?

There is opportunity now in perspective to see the fruit of that vote. That was nearly 1,150 days ago. How long it seems. Who fully expected that conflict would endure so long? How little we appreciated its full impact upon everyday life. And that impact continues until victory has been written in the azure sky. You know it is so easy to talk about casualties, but let us talk about your casualties and about mine; something more than Mrs. Jones' boy down on Summer Street, or Mrs. Winter's boy down on Green Street. When you talk about totals it is one thing. But they must be personal to be fully appreciated. Observe sometime how forceful are the pronouns in the Lord's Prayer. When we speak of your casualties and my casualties, how close they come. But these are my casualties for 1944. There is the glory roll. On this typewritten chart, compiled by the folks in my office, are the names of young men who lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, and who are today enshrined in imperishable glory in the shrine of the living heart. Look at that long and glorious list. Those are the dead, the wounded, the missing, and the prisoners for 1944 alone from the Sixteenth Congressional District of Illinois. There are 635 names on that list. When you live with that gray, grim host of young men whose feet go marching down to eternity, it makes a difference. So you see those are my casualties, and they have rolled out of the vote that I freely and willingly cast in this Chamber in December 1941. They are a part of the 150,000 who have been killed. They are a part of the 60,000 who are prisoners in cold enemy camps. They are a part of the 75,000 who are reported missing. They are a part of the 431,000 now languishing in hospitals.

They are the victims of the Four Horsemen. But there is a fifth horseman of the Apocalypse. While Scripture does not describe him, he is surely there—the horseman of the wounded and disabled, the horseman of the bereaved and widowed and orphaned. You will understand the better when I reveal that General Hines reported to us recently that already 373,000 young soldiers are carried on the compensation rolls of the Veterans' Administration and that by June 30, 1946, the number is expected to increase to 993,000. That is nearly a million men. They are the casualties who pay and pay and pay. And as the philosopher wrote so long ago, every casualty diminishes me because I am of mankind.

But in all this was a resurgent ray of assurance. It was in the competency of our military leaders and the abiding faith which we had in them.

Recently I walked down State Street in Chicago and there was an oil portrait of Gen. George C. Marshall. I said, "Thank God, we have leadership like that." I saw an oil portrait of Admiral King and I said, "Thank God we have leadership like that." Oh, what accolades we place upon them and with what gusto we reaffirm our faith and confidence in the military and naval leadership of this Nation. Great men. I marveled at the poise of General Marshall in the Library the other day as I thought of the tremendous responsibility that is placed upon his shoulders; with what celerity and with what sincerity he talked about the Burma Road, and the Pacific theater, and the Middle East, and the European theater, and indicated a complete competence for the job that has been entrusted to him. Try to imagine yourself in his position—conferring with his staff—issuing orders for the disposition of troops—approving plans that mean death and destruction, and then think of the assurance and swift certainty with which he goes about this monumental task.

So they come now, these great leaders, Admiral King and General Marshall, fortified by Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Hay, by Mr. Patterson, by Mr. Bard, and by all the rest, and they say, "We need manpower." For what? For replacements that have almost, in the language of that letter to the President, "reached the breaking point."

I saw Maury Maverick, one of our old colleagues, at lunch this noon as he came

into the restaurant. He had just come back from overseas. Maury Maverick, you know, was a great soldier. As I recall, and I may be corrected on this, he received either a piece of high explosive shell or shrapnel fragment in the upper end of his spine, and it took the best doctors of Mayo's a long time to restore his physical well-being.

He is an old soldier of the last war. He was there where the grim business took place. He just came back. He said yesterday, "DIRKSEN, some of the men have been in the lines for 120 days." Great conscience! I thought we were doing pretty well when we were up there in the advance sector for a week at a time in the last show. It does make a difference. That is the job that General Marshall is telling about, the replacements, the manpower for damaged ships, for repair work, and for industry. These leaders, appointed to direct these military operations and confronted with the very human problem of weariness, fatigue, and suffering are asking for aid in the form of legislation to meet those problems. I am thinking nc of the 700,000 casualties in the mass. I am thinking of the 685 youngsters that I used to see in the front row of the high schools in my district, that I used to talk to on Armistice Day and Memorial Day, and there they are, inscribed on a deathless glory roll.

It is for these that General Marshall and Admiral King are asking; it is for their comrades in arms that they are asking. It is for replacements, for manpower to repair damaged ships and new ships and new weapons and new devices that they are asking. Shall we say "No" to that request? Shall we substitute our judgment for theirs unless we are sure of our ground? Is any one of us, knowing that involved here is human destiny, willing to substitute a limited judgment based upon observations in a single congressional district, willing to substitute a judgment for that of the Chief of Staff with his perspective of the whole problem, unless we are pretty sure of ourselves?

The casualties on this glory roll are mine; to them and to those who may already be marked by the moving finger of destiny for that same roll of glory I owe a duty. I must help if I can. I want no act of mine to prolong this awful thing. I am going to help them through the instrumentality of this measure if I can, because there is one question to which I have no answer. If I go back home and the father of a couple of youngsters who are either over in Europe or over in the Pacific says to me, "The Chief of Staff asked for it and you did not give it to him," what have I got to say? That is one time when every answer will recede from my mind and I will have nothing to say because I will not know what to say.

I may use some of the argument that has been advanced on the floor. I may say, "Well, my good sir, in response to you who have two sons over there, I was informed that this bill would not work." And he will say, "How do you know unless you try it?" I will say, "It was a step in the direction of totalism," and he will say, "Yes. A grocer cannot sell a pound of round steak without a ration stamp, and the little dry-goods store on the corner cannot sell a house dress over the ceiling price, and the industrial consumer of coal can get only as much as W. P. B. tells him he can."

Yes; there is an administrative absolutism in the land today. I know it full well. How can it be escaped in time of war. Every step we have taken, every power we have delegated is more restrictive than the one before. Will there be surcease from all this until the victory is won?

I examined the Federal Register the other day. Guess how many administrative orders we will have from 1941 to 1946, inclusive; administrative orders giving direction to everything. The number will be 182,000. There will be 90,000 pages in the Federal Register embodying administrative orders of legal effect and general applicability, under which we seek to achieve a victory. Victory has its price and not the least of that price is the surrender of life by young men. He may remind me of that.

I may say, "There is too much waste." Goodness knows I have seen it. During the various campaigns last spring and last fall I journeyed into 30 States. I saw acres and acres of vehicles that could not be used and weapons and devices and instrumentalities that were outmoded, but the war had changed, the needs were new. In the report of General Marshall he talks about new weapons and new devices. All war is waste. Its very essence is destruction and change. Hasten, then, the victory.

I might have said, "The headlines indicate that Germany is going to cave in and I did not think the bill was necessary." Well, we have all miscalculated. I can read you quotes from Eisenhower and Halsey, from Generals Mark Clark and Somervell, from General Marshall and even Mr. Patterson, where they thought this business would be over before 1944, but the grim and brutal business still continues. I was one of those who miscalculated. I thought it would be over a long time ago. But in my case it was the expression of a fervent hope rather than the rendition of a judgment based upon facts. So those answers are not going to avail, because here is an appeal for our help.

I might have said, "The whole manpower situation has been botched." Well might he say, "Shall it be botched the worse by making no effort to help our military leaders?"

I might say, "The bill was faulty." Well might he say, "Are you and your colleagues without power to remedy the faults and without authority to improve it?"

Finally, I might say, "Well, the headlines indicated that Germany was about to capitulate and there would then be no need for such a measure." His reply might well be, "How can a legislator gamble on headlines rather than realities?"

How true that would be. I know we esteem Germany as our chief foe. We regard Japan as a mop-up job. But is it not just possible that that very belief might develop a let-down when hostilities end in the European theater and aggravate in even greater degree the very problem which we now face, as we turn with greater vigor to the foe in the Pacific.

So we get around to this. Suppose this bill fails. What about those who are weary of battle and who are fatigued in spirit over on the other side? Suppose the Yank or the Stars and Stripes carries a headline, if this fails, a juicy headline which says, "Congress Lets G. I.'s Down." Maybe it would not be written, but it could be, and what a horrible effect upon morale it would have.

We hear so much today about when they come back, this great windrow of twelve or fifteen million young Americans, and there is general agreement that when they come back they will take over. Will it ease the disillusionment, will it assuage the bitterness to let them down now before they come back?

As between Mr. Crawford, who is a very eminent industrialist, and Bill Knudsen, who is so skilled in production, and who has served the country so well and with whom I visited some years ago in the new Vega airplane plant in Los Angeles, Calif., I will put my chips on Knudsen as against Crawford, the president of the National Manufacturers' Association. How could one do otherwise as he seeks the facts upon which to predicate his best judgment?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Does the gentleman from Illinois think it would be good policy to equip as many French divisions as possible to take the place of our own young men in the front line?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very definitely so, and in the Marshall report he says we need equipment for equipping eight French divisions.

So I am going along with the man who is directing the military destinies of this country. I used to be an ordinary shavetail in the last war. I served 18 months overseas. I know nothing about global strategy. I have to depend on somebody. When the Chief of Staff says this is what he needs, I do not want the pages of history that are yet unwritten to stand up and mock me years from now and say, "You didn't give him what he asked for and so the war may have been prolonged."

One other thought: We talk about those who are manning the battle stations far afield. There are some others who are manning the battle stations too. By averages there are or will be probably 30,000 fathers and 30,000 mothers in every congressional district in the United States who have sons and kinfolks in battle somewhere. Those are battle stations. Those are battle stations of the common heart as they keep eternal vigil, torn ofttimes between the hope that a youngster is alive and the fear that, being carried in a missing status, it will become permanent and he will not come back. Yes, there is a great army of those who are keeping faith, manning the battle stations of the home front. So when General Marshall and Admiral King say they need 900,000 replacements because

we have reached the breaking point and when they say there must be 600,000 in industry, what choice is there, Mr. Chairman, except to go along and hold up the hands of those to whom we with faith and confidence entrusted the direction of this huge military endeavor unless we can offer something better? Can we do less for those who serve the silent battle stations of the home front? Unless some better and more effective proposal is presented, I shall want to go along with the men of poise and of recognized ability who are conducting this war to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion and say, "General Marshall, Admiral King, you have asked us for these tools; you have asked us for this assistance; you have asked us for these weapons. I in my humble fashion am going to hold up your hands and give them to you."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, many of us believe that the only issue involved in this legislation is whether its adoption will increase or decrease production for war.

Seldom do I disagree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Never have I heard him practice what is sometimes referred to as demagoguery, but each of us can, at times, be mistaken and in my humble judgment the gentleman from Virginia yesterday was utterly mistaken when he said that the only thing involved here in the consideration of this bill was whether we were going to give a vote of confidence or a vote of no confidence in this administration and in our Chiefs of Staff.

Prior to that statement sarcastically he had stated and I quote:

> As a rocking-chair general, I do not yield to any man. I am just as good a rocking-chair strategist as any of you. I expect I can tell General Marshall more ways to win this war than he ever dreamed of.

I know of no one in this House who would presume to tell General Marshall or anyone on the staff how to do the fighting, how to plan or win the war. Certainly I have never in any way criticized the manner in which the war has been fought, nor do I recall that other Members of the House have criticized the General Staff or anyone connected with it.

It is the duty of the generals and the admirals and those serving under them to direct the course of the war. They are trained in the science of war and so long as they confine their activities to their profession, I doubt if anyone will venture to criticize them. None of them, however, is trained in production. Production is not the purpose of their training. When it is a question of what they need, of how much they need, when and where they need it, their judgment should be followed. But when they step aside and venture into a field in which they know little, either by training or experience, there is no reason why we should follow them. Rather industrial and labor leaders.

Let the General Staff tell us what it needs, how much it needs, when it must have it, and where it shall be delivered, then let us turn over the question of production and transportation to the seaboard, to those in this country who are skilled in production.

Do those who insist upon the passage of this bill think that General Marshall and Admiral King know more about when and where and how quickly they can get a bolt or a million bolts, a battleship or a dozen battleships, a B–29 or a hundred B–29's, a hundred or million tons of steel, than does the management of Ford, General Motors, United States Steel, or in a hundred other plants? Do they know more about production and how it can best be obtained than do the leaders of those labor organizations whose members are engaged 24-hours a day in production?

To my mind, it is as presumptuous for General Marshall or members of the General Staff to attempt to tell those who are experts in production how to get production as it would be for management and union labor leaders and workers to attempt to dictate war policy.

There is evidence, undisputable evidence, that the Army and the Navy, not on the war front but where they have entered civilian business, have wasted manpower just as it has been shown that management and labor have wasted some manpower.

The military men are not trained in economical production. They are trained to carry on war, which we all know is carried on regardless of cost, which always results in waste, for war is waste.

In the judgment of many of us, there is no manpower shortage at the present time. Many of us are firmly convinced that voluntary efforts will bring greater production more quickly than will regimentation.

Many of us are firmly convinced that the passage of this measure is unnecessary; that if passed it will result in less production. That is the reason why some of us will vote against its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, a stranger listening to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would probably get the opinion that those of us who do not agree with him in his support of this bill are unpatriotic and disloyal. That, as he in substance puts it, "we are letting the G. I.'s down." Now, he is the only one who has said things which might frighten some timid political soul into voting for this bill. Attention has just been called to statements made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] which might have that result.

The gentleman from Illinois said that as he walked around the streets of a city he saw oil paintings of our generals and our admirals and he thanked God we had them. So do I. And the gentleman might join me, as I know he will, in thanking God we have General Motors and Ford and U. S. Steel, a thousand other industrial plants, and production men and hundreds of thousands of workers who have produced, who are turning out the materials for which the generals and admirals asked, the things that the men in the service need.

Do you think for a moment that if General Marshall were asked the question as to how we should produce a bomber or how we should increase the production of steel, he would venture to lay down the procedure the men in factory or mill should follow to make or produce the bomber—turn out the steel? Do you not believe that those who are in charge of industry, the production men, and the men and women who are working in war industries, know more about how to get the materials which General Marshall says he needs than does the general himself? In my judgment he would be the first to say they do.

Let me repeat, the only issue here before us is not the one the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], put, i. e., a vote of confidence or lack of confidence in the General Staff or the Commander in Chief. That is not the issue. The issue is how can we get the most and the best in the quickest possible time for those who are on the fighting lines.

Nothing will be gained by waving an imitation bloody shirt. There are in this body many who will no longer be frightened by statements that a particular vote is in support of or against the armed forces; that it is necessary in order to win the war to follow every whim or fantasy of someone connected with the administration.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is one of the Nation's most eloquent orators. His reference to those who from his own district had sacrificed their lives in this war was a very moving one—perhaps it brought tears to the eyes of some of the Members and in other surroundings and under other circumstances it would be very appealing, but here on this floor, addressed to the Members of this House, it was just—just another Fourth of July oration. When he intimated that those of us who did not vote for this bill were letting the fighting men down and would be so characterized by those men, he was talking nonsense.

Before me I see a gentleman who came to this House this month who has four sons in the service and who intends to vote against this bill because he believes the bill will lessen—not increase—production. No wilder stretch of the imagination can justify the thought that that man, with four boys in the service, is letting his own flesh and blood down. He intends to vote against the bill because he sincerely, honestly, believes in so doing he is voting for increased production.

Nor can I follow the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. He used many words but boiled down, his thought is, at least as I understand it, that General Marshall having spoken, we should blindly follow him, even though the issue was not one of military strategy or method.

If the general should ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to produce an additional thousand gallons of milk from his great dairy herd on that magnificent farm of his, would the gentleman turn over to General Marshall, or some officer appointed by him, the management of the herd, the feeding, the milking, the processing of the products? My guess would be that

he would say, General, you will get your milk and my men on the farm and in the dairy will see that you get it.

Let the generals and the admirals direct the fighting; let them tell us what they need, then leave it to the civilians here at home, who are just as patriotic as members of the General Staff, to get for the armed forces the things the General Staff tells us are needed. The task of the General Staff in directing the course of the war is so big that it has no time to waste in telling the farmer how to grow potatoes, the worker and the factory operator how materials needed for the carrying on of the war are to be produced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, during my 10 years in this body I have consumed very little time on this floor, but I am moved to say at least a few things about this bill.

Let me say at the outset unless this bill accumulates too many warts in the shape of F. E. P. C., and so on, I shall vote for it. I am going to vote for it if they tack on some things that I do not like, for the simple reason I am willing to bury my personal feelings about some of the smaller issues, and walk up square in the harness in these extreme times.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARDEN. I hope the lady will not disturb me.

I have listened to some great speeches here today. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and others; but certainly those three stand out. They were utterances of real statesmen. I cannot agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who consumed the major portion of his time in pointing out things that had gone wrong in the past. Yes, we have made mistakes, and we are going to make some more. That is not inconsistent with the history of the gentleman from Indiana or myself. We both have made mistakes. The gentleman from Indiana complained of extreme measures. These are extreme conditions and it requires extreme measures to cope with them. I have been receiving some mail lately. I have a letter in my pocket now from this boy who wrote in December that they were rationing shells on the western front more carefully than we were rationing sirloin steaks in America. I for one will not take that lying down. I am at least going to try to help relieve that situation. This bill will not hurt any good American citizen who is willing to do his part in this war; it will not inconvenience him. But I say here and now: If there is a man in our midst, be he workman or not, who is able and in position to make a contribution toward the winning of this war but will not do it voluntarily, he should be made to do it, and then if he persists in his refusal, remove him from the society we seek to protect. That is how keenly I feel this situation.

I am not willing to pit my judgment against the Marshalls and the Kings and the men who come in and tell us what they must have in order to win the war. No; I will not do that.

When we started this war we loaded on to the war wagon social gains and economic progress and folks began to make money and the party was on. What a terrible hour this is that a Member of this body could unfurl a sheet bearing as many names of fine young men who are casualties as did the gentleman from Illinois. As far as I am concerned I say: "Close the party." This should have been every man's war from the very beginning. For 25 years I have said that if we ever had another war it should be every man's war and not 5 percent of the men go to the front to fight and 95 percent stay home and make money. I have always felt that way and now on a day like this we need more men in the plants. More men in the services and the workmen's rolls are dwindling, yet we come here and say we must not use compulsion, we must not coerce anybody, we must not inconvenience anyone. No; some would claim convenience, comfort, and plenty. This is a day of service, and this is the day when I believe we have an opportunity to draw this war a little closer, a little nearer to a successful conclusion. If it did not bring the war to a conclusion more than 1 hour earlier, then according to the casualty lists that have been left on my desk every day for the last month there would be several hundred lives of fine young men saved, and I am willing to try the remedy. Who are we to begin to question the recommendations that have come to us? We are playing for table stakes. If we lose, we lose all. When we win, we win the right to continue to live as free, honorable, decent citizens as we have always striven to be. Even the possibility of their being right should command our respect, our attention, and our support. Too many have been content with assuming that the boys on the foreign fronts can win somehow. They always have. We have two fronts in this war, the home front and the battle front. The home front must stand firm and not give ground to the enemy.

This may be somewhat repetitious, but I should certainly like to have someone who is of a different opinion try to answer the arguments presented by the gentleman from Illinois. I want someone to step down in this well and take the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the speeches of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], and attempt to answer those speeches. I do not see how they can be answered. I believe I know what the people of America, the good citizens of America, are willing to do. I do not think all of them realize the seriousness of the hour. I regret that every citizen in America could not have the information that was given us at the Library the other day by General Marshall and Admiral King, but those wiser than I say it would not be proper to pass that information out.

Mr. Chairman, the very talk of this bill is doing some good. It may be an unloaded gun. But I think it will work with anything like sensible administration. It will be a great contribution to the war effort. I intend to support the bill and I hope the House will pass it overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that no one approaches consideration of this bill with a more disturbed state of mind than I do. I spent most of Sunday studying and going through the entire record of the hearings and in studying the bill and the report. I confess to you that I have never seen during the time I have been here so little justification in the record for such a bill as we have before us today.

On the other hand, I have been here long enough to realize that there are certain things outside of the record of which I have my own knowledge, information and observation on which to come to some conclusions. I am frank to say that this bill does not reach some of the viciousness which exists in certain of our production conditions and which necessitates either administrative or legislative action. I say that to you in all seriousness. I recognize that there is a great argument against this bill and I find myself in agreement with much which has been said against the bill, except when I get back to the one final question.

I do not think we need this bill for 95 percent of the fine labor that has made the greatest production possible in this country. I do not think we need it for the farmers who have worked 12, 14, and 16 hours a day. I refuse to say that this bill means we are attempting to stigmatize that kind of people. Sadly we are trying to hit at a very small minority, or the small problems which may become the large problems as the war goes forward.

Mr. Chairman, I was tremendously moved by the powerful and emotional appeal made by my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I think it was probably the greatest emotional appeal that I have heard since I have been in the House. Before I heard that speech, the thought that went through my mind again and again was that I had to face some day a corporal who was over in the Infantry in Germany; I had to face a little gunner on a bomber; I had to face the thousands and hundreds of thousands of boys like unto them who are in this service either in Europe or in the Pacific, and that I had to answer them some day if I chose to vote against this bill. I cannot find enough arguments to cause me to vote against this bill. I recognize, and I am not criticizing anybody who does vote against this bill, that it is a legislative mess. It is a mess which we, as Members of the House, are not responsible for. But I still come back to the proposition that I am just as suspicious of the motives behind this bill as I am suspicious of the administration of it. I still cannot say "No" to the principle that we have got to have this or we have got to

have that in connection with the war effort. I do not think some of them know any more about it than I do, I am sorry to say, but nevertheless that is their responsibility. I believe that my responsibility begins and ends when I vote according to the best of my convictions. I think I have stood here and voted when there were as few as four of us who voted as I did. I happened to be one of 16 who voted against the draft of the 18-year-olds, and I have never regretted that vote.

I hope we can bring out a better bill than we have now. I have come to the definite conclusion that I refuse to be put in any compromising situation, and I take the responsibility of answering to my people back home for my vote, but I am going to vote for whatever bill comes out of here.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It occurs to me that there ought to be a compromise on that. I come from the Middle West. If you recall, that is the birthplace of the Republican Party; where the Republican Party started up on a somewhat similar issue. This forced labor will never work in the Middle West. You cannot get the production. But on the other hand, it may very well be true, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said, that in that section forced labor is the only answer, and the same may be true with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Why could not this matter be left to State rights? Has the gentleman studied that question at all? Our people seem to be different.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me answer the gentlewoman from Illinois in this way: I think that this is purely a psychological piece of legislation. It is psychological as to what we are trying to get at, if I may say so to her, to try to get certain people into this war work, and it is, I think, psychological to the boys over there who have been fighting in the mud and the snow of Europe, or the mud and heat of the Pacific.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Do not forget that this bill is going to affect their fathers and mothers. They do not want forced labor here like they have in Russia.

Mr. O'HARA. I have the same fear that the gentlewoman from Illinois has. I have the same fear, but I am still going to vote for it.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true that the nations who have this type of legislation, this system, are losing the war, and are we now to admit that our democratic system is all wrong? They have been telling us it is all wrong for a number of years. Are we now to say it is all wrong and we must adopt their system in order to defeat their system?

Mr. O'HARA. My answer is that I hope we never reach that point. Unfortunately, however, we have taken too many pages already in legislative ways from the books of other forms of government, in my opinion.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does not the gentleman believe the greatest national service act this Nation has ever had or ever will have is the determination of a free people to remain free?

Mr. O'HARA. That is exactly right.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman has said that this bill has solely psychological objectives. Does the gentleman believe there was some psychology in the mind of the man who told the teamsters' union on September 23, prior to the election, that labor and management had done a magnificent job? Was there psychology in his mind when he lauded labor for the fine support on the home front they had given our boys in the front lines? Was that psychology, too? Was that inspired by psychology?

Mr. O'HARA. I am sure the gentleman's question answers itself, but we still come back to the proposition of where are we going from here. Who knows? I do not know, I am frank to say. What will be the problem tomorrow I do not know. What will be the problem a year from now I do not know. General Marshall and Admiral King are sometime going to have to answer to the American people whether we did or did not extend ourselves too much.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman in his allotment of time.

Up to this time the debates on this bill have been very interesting, some have been eloquent and some have been profoundly persuasive and convincing. The entire membership of the House on both sides of the aisle have manifested great interest in these debates and they have indicated a great interest in the substance and purpose of this bill. I am afraid that in some cases we may have lost sight of the merits and purposes and the ultimate consequences that may result if the bill should pass; and instead have allowed ourselves to be carried away by sentiments of loyalty to the military and naval leaders.

There can be no issue raised between us with reference to our appreciation of the great genius and skill of our military and naval leaders. And again any one Member of this House is as loyal to and sincere in his appreciation of the efforts of those who fight and die as any other Member. Glorious have been the achievements of our men on the threescore battlefronts of the world.

The report of the Military Affairs Committee which accompanied this proposed legislation also has extended itself on the wings of eloquence in an effort to bring support to this measure. In this report the committee says:

> We must marshal our full strength and resources to keep the battlelines moving forward. It is unthinkable that we give the men who are fighting and dying for us less than our full support.
>
> We must produce the weapons they need, in the quantities indicated, and on time.
>
> If we fail, our young men pay with their lives.

By this language the proponents of this measure and those who prepared the committee's report would, by inference at least, give the impression that anyone who might vote against this bill would fail our young men who give up their lives. With me I feel with all my heart that the best possible service I can render to those who are fighting the battles of our country on the battlefields and in the fields and factories of the Nation is to cast such a vote as I feel will be consonant with my oath to support and defend the Constitution and with my belief that a vote against this bill in its present form would be a vote that would encourage the fighting forces of our country by supplying them more adequately with the munitions of war. I am supported in this viewpoint by an overwhelming number of the producers of the Nation—both large and small—and by an overwhelming majority of the faithful and patriotic workers in the shops and factories and fields of the country who have given expression to their opposition to this bill.

What is the real purpose of this bill? Personally I feel that the real purpose of this bill is to make it a forerunner for a full and complete national service act which will be presented to Congress sometime later and to make it a forerunner of legislation providing for total conscription. In other words, it is the forerunner of regimentation by statutory enactment. Such a regimentation will be more complete and more autocratic and more oppressive than is the almost total regimentation that now envelops the country by reason of administrative directives. Those who support this measure and who are largely responsible for the issuance of the report of the committee, to which I have heretofore referred, state in succinct language on page 3 of their report just what this bill is expected to do. Let me read you what this report says:

> The measure is designed, as far as possible, to encourage those of draft age who are neither in uniform nor in war industry to transfer voluntarily into essential work without formal order from their local boards.

Let me dwell on this language a few minutes. This report says that this measure is designed as far as possible to encourage those of draft age who are neither in uniform nor in war industry to transfer voluntarily into essential work without any formal order from their local boards. A person of draft age who is neither in uniform nor in war industry can be easily reached by the draft boards now.

Many months ago this Congress passed a Selective Service Act which has been in vigorous operation all over the Nation since the time it was enacted. This Selective Service department has now had a great deal of experience with handling millions of men and it is thoroughly familiar with all phases of the problem of building up an army. Any man within the draft age who is neither in uniform

nor in a war industry is still within the draft and there is nothing in the world to prevent the draft boards of the Nation from taking any and all of these individuals if that is necessary. The only reason anyone within the draft age is not in uniform is because he is not physically fit or because he has been deferred. No doubt, a very large number of men could be taken into the Army who have heretofore been rejected because of physical disabilities and who could fill many places in the Army if they were assigned to limited service. No doubt, there are many men in the Army and Navy doing limited service that could be called to active service and their places could be taken by men who have been heretofore rejected for physical reasons. A ready example to which the papers of the country have often referred is seen in the athletes who can play the most strenuous athletic games, including football, yet who have been rejected for Army service because of physical disabilities. They may be physically unfit for all military purposes but they surely are physically fit for some military duties. Likewise, no doubt, there are many thousands who have been deferred as technical men or as keymen whose utility in this respect may have changed from the time when they were deferred and they can now be recalled. It has been repeatedly stated on this floor that the Army and Navy will need 900,000 additional men. This number can be made up without resort to force and duress and without resort to the passage of this legislation that would virtually transform our Nation from a nation of free labor into a nation of forced labor.

I am not one who maintains that this legislation itself is unconstitutional. I am strongly inclined to the belief that it would be constitutional because the Constitution provides that it should be the duty of Congress "to raise and support armies" and "to provide and maintain a Navy." The Constitution further provides—it not only provides but it makes it the duty of the Congress—"to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

It is because of these constitutional provisions that I am opposed to transferring the problem and duty of raising and providing for armies and navies over to the generals of the Army and the admirals of the Navy. In justice to them, they do not ask for this power. Today, instead of spending our time in lauding the leaders of the Army and the Navy, we had better spend our time in impressing upon ourselves the fact that the Constitution places upon us as representatives of the people the responsibility of raising and maintaining armies. This is not only our privilege but it is our duty. The two strongest and most fundamental principles of the American Government are these: First, the principle of the power of the purse, and, second, the principle of the power of the sword. The Constitution explicitly gives both these powers to the Congress of the United States and when it does give to Congress these powers it at the same time gives to Congress the responsibility. The admirals of the Navy and the generals of the Army cannot declare war. The President of the United States cannot declare war. The Supreme Court cannot declare war. The Congress alone has this power, and any man who was a Member of Congress the day after Pearl Harbor realized that not only does the Congress have this power, but the Congress has this responsibility. Likewise today as a Member of this Congress, I feel my responsibility keenly. I feel that I should not be carried away by eloquence and sentiments and surrender the rights of the Congress over to any other institution of the Government under the spell of oratory and eloquence. Ours it is to assume this responsibility and I feel sure that this Congress is going to do so.

I maintain that in time of war the Congress can call upon and employ all the resources of the Nation in order to defend the Nation and to insure its perpetuity. It is by reason of this power that the Congress has been able to reach out and to select the young men of the Nation and to compel them to come forward and serve as soldiers. That is what the Constitution meant when it said that the Congress had the power to raise up armies. The Congress likewise has the power to take the civilians and to take the property of civilians, if necessary. So far in the history of the Nation the most that Congress has ever done is to draft the manpower of the Nation within certain limitations. Just a little over 3 years ago we started from nothing and have built up probably the greatest Army in the history of the world and without a doubt the greatest Navy in the world. We have done this without compulsion except the compulsion of the draft. Surely with the great and magnificent start we have in production and with the great Army and Navy we have, we surely can carry on without resorting to forced labor and without confiscation of property.

We have set up a great organization known as the selective service, or more generally known as the draft. All over the Nation men have served on these draft boards. That service has been a most thankless one. On the draft boards of the Nation have appeared many sincere and patriotic individuals. They know by this time all about practically every person within their respective districts. They know who are patriotic and courageous, and likewise they know who are slackers and cheaters. What we need is a strong, assertive attitude by those who have the power to enforce the draft laws of the Nation.

We also have set up in our country by legislation what is known as the Manpower Commission. The very duties of this Commission are the duties that are sought to be taken over under the provisions of this bill. If this bill passes there can be no justification for the continuance of the Manpower Commission. On the other hand, if this bill is defeated, the Manpower Commission can set forth in a courageous and assertive manner, together with draft boards acting likewise, and within a few days the required number can be secured for the armed forces of the Nation. Why do I make this positive statement? Because I know that these two organizations feel that they can do this job if they are given the proper opportunity, encouragement, and support.

We have heard much today about the manufacture of munitions of war. I would not cast an aspersion on the workers of the Nation because there is no question but that the farmer and his wife and his children all over the Nation have worked harder in the last year or two than ever before and have produced more. The same can be said of the coal miners and the same can be said of the restaurants, the railroads, and in fact about everybody, including the little shopkeepers who have been trying to keep their stores in operation. I do not know that the same can be said of many of the large factories, especially those that have been operated exclusively under the direction of the Government. I hear many complaints from many people that many of the workers in these plants, maybe not through any fault of their own, have been wasting a great deal of time and have been what we commonly call loafing. I daresay that much of this has been due to the fact that too many men and women have been employed. In many instances the management has been lax because it was spending Government money and knew just how far it could go and what it could do in that respect.

So, Mr. Chairman, with the finest feeling toward all those who disagree with me, I still maintain that it is not necessary at this time to embark upon a new program involving force and duress. Never yet have the springs of American patriotism gone dry. I do not think they have gone dry now. Let us not be so anxious to embark on this program when it is not necessary and when the employers of the Nation and the workers of the Nation say that they can and will meet every demand made upon them.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, prior to the consideration of the May bill now before the House of Representatives I wrote to all of the 16 selective-service boards in my district, asking for their comments upon the proposed legislation. I have received answers so far from 12 of the 16 boards, and to assist in the debate on this subject quote from several of them. The Sixth Iowa District is an agricultural district and the selective-service boards are concerned principally with selecting men for the armed services from farm communities. Following are the quotations:

Just a word to give you our view of the draft situation now before Congress. We are not so interested in inducting all our farm boys who are under age 30 as we are to be able to reclassify our IV–F men. Of whom we have between three and four hundred and we presume there are a like number in most counties. Men who have been turned down at the pre-induction stations as long ago as 1, 2, 3, and 4 years. Men who have kept right on with their personal work and business, many of them in heavier work than they

would be subject to in the United States Service. Truck drivers, auto repair men, gas station attendants, clerks, grocers, insurance, pool hall, bowling alleys, etc. Men perfectly fit for anything except combat service and training. Men in non-essential activity. Men turned down by too high physical standards, by the medical exam doctors, the majority, for some small ailment that could, if necessary, be corrected in a short time by Army doctors. These men could just as well be working for Uncle Sam in noncombat service, releasing more able men for more important duties.

We trust such a law can be passed, that would compel the examining doctors to lower the standard, and require induction of IV–F men.

As to the II–C men of draft age deferred for farm work, we are now skimming the farm help and calling many more of the farm boys than formerly. But aiming not to deplete a farm of necessary help where it would cause that land to stand idle. We are inducting them, leaving barely enough help to get along making the fathers and those who are left get right down to bedrock to get crops in, harvested, and the work done.

However, it would be folly and would not justify the expense to send all II–C men up to age 30 for a physical exam. Knowing they could not all be inducted even if passed. It could not be a group induction, would have to be sorted out—taking those we know can be spared and deferring those whom we know could not. We feel we must abide by the Tydings amendment, or at least, until it is repealed. We can see no good purpose in having all II–C men under 30 examined, if we are not going to induct all of them.

Just at present, what we are mostly interested in, is 425 IV–F men, many of them young, who could just as well be in limited service in the Army, as to be lying around the pool halls and beer parlors or in nonessential activity.

We do know that there is a certain amount of wasted manpower walking our streets without thought from them of how they could aid in the war effort. Unfortunately the majority of this type of manhood is outside of the jurisdiction of the local boards. In other words, they are men over age 38. They won't work in defense industries nor will they help out in agriculture. Something should be done to force this type of labor into critical or essential work.

It would seem that as much authority should be given by law to direct rejected and limited-service registrants into work in support of the war effort as is exercised in directing able-bodied men into the armed services.

This board is being asked to take every replaceable man under 26 years of age off the farms. Men over 38 years of age, rejected and limited-service registrants cannot, under present regulations, be ordered to replace these men, nor to replace other able-bodied men who are ordered for induction.

This board is of the opinion that there can be no other decision than to grant permission to exercise authority to demand men in the above-named categories to do their part in support of the war effort.

* * * If qualifying young men can be selected and inducted into the armed forces, it should follow that qualifying men should be drafted into industry and agriculture.

We would like to see a law enacted—and we believe all other selective-service boards would, too—where the IV–F's could be placed in agriculture to release many of the 18-through 25-year-old registrants, and it wouldn't be out of place if the selective-service boards were given authority to draft men up to 38 years, or even 45 years, for farm work; that is, for seasonal labor, whenever needed. For example, men in that latter age group could be assigned to work for so many hours a week to help the shortage of farm workers. A regular schedule of hours could be set up so that all men in that age group would be contributing to getting the food production required, and yet the younger men would be available for the armed forces.

We have in this city one of the worst cases of nonessential employment, taking employees away from necessary business, and there is nothing can be done about it until you Congressmen do something.

Mr. AREND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH].

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Chairman, the proposed National Selective Service Act pending before our House requires our most careful consideration. It is one of the most important and far-reaching pieces of legislation that we have had to consider since the beginning of this war.

I have conducted a survey among many war workers, industrial leaders, and farmers, and have garnered much information which has convinced me that this piece of legislation is vicious, un-American, and entirely unnecessary.

If it is true that only about 700,000 workers are needed to put war production on a basis that will meet the requirements of the armed services, I am convinced there are many thousands of men in Federal agencies that can be deleted from the pay rolls without affecting the efficiency of those departments.

In my survey with workers in certain war plants I have been told that in many, many instances they do not have enough work to keep them busy for even 40 hours a week.

Many examples have been cited in war plants where men in certain departments stand around with nothing to do, while in others there is a decided shortage of manpower, but management will not issue transfers to those men in overstaffed departments so that the shortages in others may be overcome. Such a hoarding of manpower by some industries engaged in war work on a cost-plus basis is causing such adverse criticism and lowering of the morale of labor that it will be difficult to convince them that legislation of this kind is necessary.

Our country is in a great crisis and our liberty and very existence are at stake. So deeply do I feel on this subject that I believe it is not too much to expect that for the duration employers, employees, and unions on the home front should make a determined effort to adjust their labor disagreements without resorting to strikes and lock-outs.

Selfishness, arrogance, intolerance of the rights of others, self-interest and unwillingness to compromise should during this emergency be all subordinated for the common good. It may well be that an interruption at this time in the flow of any goods may directly or indirectly affect our armed forces, thereby resulting in added loss of life or in prolonging the war. As good American citizens none of us want that to happen.

The peacetime privilege of engaging in prolonged labor disputes should be voluntarily suspended for the duration. A tribunal has been established to accomplish peaceful settlement of labor disputes during the war emergency.

Loyalty to our country and our fighting forces should influence disputants in such labor controversies to refrain from waging a campaign against the use of this machinery, but rather should lead them to make every effort to fairly present their disputes before this tribunal and then be guided by its recommendations, even though no method is provided for the enforcement thereof.

I have a deep respect and admiration for the high-ranking Army and Navy officials, their opinions and judgment on military and naval affairs; but their suggestions on how to control civilian industry should not necessarily determine our national policy.

A National Service Act at this time is unnecessary. If it is passed it will be the beginning of regimentation and enslavement of small business, industry, and the American worker not connected directly with war industry. We have led the world in production as freemen, and it is my opinion that certain elements of our Government are attempting to lead us along the paths of totalitarianism against which our boys are fighting on the battle fronts all over the world.

I am quite certain that if the people of this Nation were told the true facts and conditions that exist in the war industries of the Nation, and if the Government agency that administers the needs of industry would halt this unnecessary waste of manpower, there is no question that American labor, American industry and American agriculture would do everything necessary to get the job done on a voluntary basis.

I want to say to you that I have had years of experience in industry as a worker, years of experience in small business, and I believe in my honest conviction that this bill will destroy the initiative that small business, small industry, and the American workingmen in small industry have in this country today.

I have always voted and raised my voice for every bill that would actually help win the war, but I shall not vote for this bill because it is destructive of our liberties given to us by our Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the question before the House on the pending legislation is, whether or not production will be increased.

I, for one, am of a different opinion. If I, for a moment, knew production would be increased, I would support this bill.

I, like many, do not know just exactly what the need for this legislation may be. No widespread investigation has ever been made to learn what the needs for manpower in the various war plants in this country really are.

I do know, however, that in many war plants in Chicago, right now and at the present time, are cutting back and reducing their manpower, because they are waiting further orders from the War Department.

I do know that war plants have been closed down in the past 3 months, because their production has been restricted as the result of orders received from those in power here in Washington.

One of the largest plants in Chicago, at this very moment, is laying people off

because the contract they received is expiring. This plant was especially built for war production, at a large sum of money, and they will have to practically shut down, until somebody here gives them the green light to go ahead on some future contract, if any at all—and I refer to the Studebaker plant.

Having been out of Congress for the past term, one learns plenty about the allocating of war contracts. They are not always allocated to those best able to do the job, and in many cases they are given to war plants already loaded with war contracts, that cannot, and are not equipped to, turn out in production the type of material which a new contract calls for. Much delay is encountered by the prime contractor in subletting the subcontract under this system, whereas, if the contract were allocated to the plant best equipped in the first place, expediency would be the essence of delivering the goods when most needed.

In 1940, I was one of those who saw the danger of small manufacturers going out of business because they had no contacts in Washington, even plants which were capable of manufacturing much-needed equipment essential for war work. Somehow or other, they were not wanted and could not get any consideration by those who were in charge of this program, namely, the War Department and the War Production Board, and some day I am going to tell the story of what I encountered. Delay after delay seemed all right with them, until their friends were jockeyed into a position to receive these contracts, and everyone here knows that, while our boys went without much-needed equipment.

If this legislation is deemed necessary, it has not been because of the fault of industry or of labor to deliver the goods when called upon, for citation after citation has been conferred upon both for the splendid job they have been doing toward the war effort.

I, like many others here, firmly believe this is a local problem and could be solved in communities where the need exists, for after 3 years of war I think the shifting of manpower has stabilized itself.

If I can make myself believe that the passage of this bill will work, and is necessary, I would gladly support it.

Compulsory labor is a denial of the very thing Americans are fighting around the world to preserve.

Two years ago the President, in a message to Congress, asked enactment of labor-draft laws, primarily to prevent strikes. The manpower situation was more serious then than it is today, yet the problem was solved without such a law.

Production will, in my estimation, suffer by labor compulsion, because there is no substitute for the initiative and willing effort of free men. Free labor and free industry are the combination that has made and can preserve our American economy—and, particularly, in war.

What will be the attitude of the drafted man, working alongside of a voluntary worker, in a factory? Will it damage the morale of a drafted man, working in the kind of work he is not adapted for? Will it delay production? Of course it will.

I, for one, do not wish to see the military authorities in control of production, or industry, because they do not know enough about it, and, based upon past performance, will not help.

Yes, they are doing a great job in their own line of endeavor, and I congratulate them for their splendid accomplishments, by the many victories, day by day.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask your indulgence briefly to discuss this bill. To me there are two propositions. First, is the bill necessary? Second, will the bill, if enacted into law, tend to equalize the measure of sacrifice?

For the answer to the first question I accept the testimony of the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral King. I have implicit faith in their ability, their judgment, their patriotism, and their integrity.

A week ago this day I received a letter from a dear friend of mine who commands a company of infantry on the western front. I should like to read an excerpt from that letter:

> We are making progress, slowly, painfully, and at considerable cost. There are endless stretches of mud, mire, and filth and the low places are flooded. The scenes can never be adequately described. They have to be seen and endured to fully realize the conditions. And the rain or mist is constant and incessant. There are not outside clotheslines in this country. The clothes would rot before they could dry if hung in the open, and that is no exaggeration.
>
> We jumped off on this push on November 8, and it has been the hardest yet. Our division is still in the line ever since we hit the beaches. It is too long without a rest.
>
> The worst part of the whole thing is that the war would now have been over, if we had not run out of gasoline and ammunition in September.
>
> This is a statement of cold, hard facts to those of us who know. Now it will take longer and cost more. In front of us right now are the pill boxes, forts, and gun emplacements of the Siegfried line.

That from one in the line.

I support this bill for that reason if for no other. I believe it will tend to equalize the measure of sacrifice. I think today of those who lie beneath the sands of a hundred beaches in the South Pacific, those who lie beneath the ever-changing waves of the sea, who speak from underneath the sea. I think of those who lie beneath the ever-shifting sands of north Africa, who lie beneath the white crosses of Italy and of Normandy and of Belgium, and of the others yet to come. The least we can do today is to try in some way to equalize the measure of their sacrifice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed and concerned; and because of that concern I do violence to that precedent which requires that a new Member should remain silent.

I do not speak for General Marshall, or for the admiral of the fleets, or for the President of the United States; neither do I speak for the American soldier because no man is worthy of that, but I do speak of the American soldier. Mr. Chairman, Members speak of liberty, speak of justice, speak of sacrifice, speak of mother hearts and mothers' concern.

Sir, these hands are bloody with the blood of American soldiers that have been picked up during the past year who know the price of victory. And I see crosses before me of American boys bearing names of men who could fill these empty seats one by one. I have seen great American bombers burst in a thousand burning pieces and have looked up and counted the parachutes. When there are only 8, and there should be 10, then you know the price of liberty. When you see the white crosses one by one, then you know where American mothers' hearts are.

I ask one thing: That before you vote for or against this bill you get out from under this artillery barrage of pros and cons, that you crawl on your belly into a foxhole with mortar fire all over you and the clattering of machine guns in your ears and think about it for a moment or two. I have searched this bill from beginning to end, Mr. Chairman, but cannot find in it one single phrase that says that American labor must go to work under machine gun fire, or artillery fire, or mortar fire; that when his buddy with whom he is walking drops he does not have time to pick him up. I find in this bill not one word which says to American labor that it has got to live in the cold, in the bitterness and the bloodiness of battle.

When the American soldier is told to pick up a machine gun, I want him to be able to reach back and get hold of a gun.

When you vote for this measure, of course you will have to do something you do not like to do. I love liberty, freedom, and justice. I had the privilege and honor of offering my life, and when the American soldiers know that America has the same courage that they have they will be heartened. I pray that the American Congress will have the courage to shed whatever political blood is necessary to give them a boost.

I do not know whether this measure will give the soldiers more guns or more ammunition, but I know what it will do. You are dealing in American hearts and American spirit. I know that it will give them a lift after 20 or 30 hard long months in the trenches. The soldier will have spirit there, if he knows we have the same courage to take the chance he did.

Before you vote against this bill, get into the fox hole of your own conscience and see whether or not you ought to take a stand, or stab, at something for the American soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter

I received from and one written to William Green, American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we are here on a very solemn occasion, a trying hour it seems to me, for we will have to determine what we shall do with what has been generally termed a war work-or-fight bill. I do not believe that there is anyone in the House of Representatives who does not want to do the right thing on this bill. The Members are more interested in the winning of this war and how to do it than anything else and they are giving every ounce of their energy and very careful consideration to aiding and assisting the men who are now on our far-flung battle fronts.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see one boy destroyed unnecessarily. I want to protect the boys in the fox holes, on the high seas or wherever they may be. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are getting off on the wrong foot in this bill.

I have heard it stated yesterday and today with reference to this legislation that there is a superstition whether it will do just what it is intended to do. The authors seem to be very skeptical of its real value. There is talk about this bill being a psychological bill. If that is all you have to offer, and the majority feel that way, they should think twice before voting. I am desirous of doing the best for our people and the country.

May I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the situation as I observed it last fall—August, September, and October—when I was at home attending to my own business. The thought in the minds of everybody was that the war would soon be over and it would not be long until Germany cracked, then things will ease up and we will be ready for reconversion. Everybody was told by Washington to get ready for reconversion. All the people back home talked about that. They were told the war was over—just about. The people were getting ready to celebrate the day of victory. People in the cities wanted to know what we were going to do in September and October just as soon as Germany collapsed. The administration led the people of this country to believe that the war was about over. That came from people in Washington. Why, oh, why? The American people were disillusioned. Hours and hours were spent in every city trying to find out whether we should celebrate on the same day, if the war ended before 3 o'clock in the afternoon, or wait until the next morning. I was not for any hilarity—I wanted the people to go to their churches and thank almighty God—if victory came.

You cannot blame people for leaving war jobs and trying to get into jobs whereby they can take care of themselves in the future in permanent industry, because they know the war jobs will soon cease. That was the attitude of my people in the Fifteenth District of Pennsylvania. I say to you that we do not give the American public the opportunity to go ahead and do the things that are necessary to win this war. If this Administration had told the people that we were in a serious position and that we needed men to continue in industry, free American labor would have stayed on the job and would have worked to that end, because they want to support the boys on the front; they want to save the lives of their men; they want to furnish the materials, the ammunition, the food, and the clothing that they need. The farmers were working hard and everybody was doing what they thought was the best thing to do. I say the responsibility was right here in Washington that they did not do more. It is not hard to point out those responsible for our condition.

So what do we find? In December things were not going as good as we thought they ought to go with the war. The first thing we knew, Germany pushed through and they took a great deal of our ammunition and materials that were placed there for our own boys, and we were caught short.

I insert here the letter of William Green, of the A. F. of L., and my reply.

I received a similar one from Philip Murray, of the C. I. O.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1945.

Members of Congress:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to express to you my personal and official objection to H. R. 1752, which is sponsored by Congressman MAY, chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs. This measure is highly objectionable to working men and women represented by the American Federation of Labor, all of whom cherish as a common heritage the principles of freedom, liberty, and democracy. H. R. 1752 embodies within it the principles of totalitarianism, the substitution of governmental compulsion for voluntary action on the part of those who serve in the army of production. It is indeed contradictory for our armed forces to fight, sacrifice, and die in order to wipe out and destroy totalitarianism and the totalitarian form of government abroad while at the same time through the enactment of legislation, we impose it upon free labor here at home.

The manpower problem can be dealt with in a constructive way and solved—not through resort to compulsion and force—but instead, through the better utilization of available manpower. There is no shortage of manpower. It is a question of the proper utilization of available manpower. Labor stands willing and ready to cooperate wholeheartedly and completely in every way through constructive planning designed to bring about a full and complete utilization of available manpower. American workers have shown during the period which has intervened since Pearl Harbor that free, voluntary labor can out-produce forced labor.

The principle of force and compulsion runs through every section and line of H. R. 1752. It has for its purpose the substitution of military for civilian control over those employed in all lines of industry. It is my opinion that if Congress believes that in view of the critical nature of the present war, it is necessary to make a comprehensive investigation and reappraisal of manpower in the United States, it should utilize the civilian agencies such as the War Manpower Commission which has functioned so well and which has served so effectively. The duties of selective-service boards should be confined to the induction of draftees into the armed forces and the civilian agencies set up should be obligated to deal with the utilization of available manpower. The civilian agencies which have been and are functioning so well could deal with the problem of labor hoarding and labor assignments to war material production plants. They could also deal effectively with critical areas where for various reasons local war manpower shortages exist. Because of membership training and experience in dealing with the war manpower problem ever since the War Manpower Commission was created, these men are qualified to act and serve in a more practical and satisfactory way than could any new agency which might be created.

I respectfully urge that Congress follow this wise and constructive course in the consideration and enactment of legislation relating to war manpower and war manpower problems.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

JANUARY 27, 1945.

Mr. WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: I am in receipt of your letter of January 26, addressed to Members of Congress and naming the reasons why you oppose H. R. 1752, a bill to draft the manpower of this Nation for war work.

I am very much interested in reading your reasons for opposing the bill, and think I can truthfully say that I could oppose this bill for the same reasons. It is for the same reasons that I would oppose this bill that I oppose many of the things the American Federation of Labor is doing in its compulsion of free labor to join the A. F. of L., or the C. I. O., or any other union, before a job may be secured in industry.

In the past labor organizations have done everything possible to force men to join unions, even against their will. I have always opposed that feature of labor unions. Understand, I am not opposed to unions in the principle that if a man wishes to join it is his right and privilege, but I am opposed to coercion being used.

The old saying, "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink," is quite applicable to many proposals in the May bill. You can put a chain around free labor and take a man to a job, but you cannot make him work, nor am I one who would want to force such a thing. If the American people are made to realize the necessity for war work, I think they will respond to the call of our Government.

Now I realize that labor, through the A. F. of L. and C. I. O., have given their no-strike pledge to the Government. Yet the papers today carry the following news, dated January 26 from Chicago:

"Production at the Goss Printing Press Co., which holds Government contracts for war material including gun mounts and rockets, was at a standstill today as the result of a strike called by the International Association of Machinists, district 8 (A. F. of L.).

"Approximately 600 workmen were called out of the plant yesterday on the claim set forth by James McDonald, union business agent, that the company had violated an agreement made in October 1942, regarding employment of women."

Now if any disagreement exists, why do they not arbitrate instead of striking, when we need to produce guns for the armed forces? And if the pledge given our Government is any good, you and other labor leaders should take the lead in stopping these strikes which are unnecessary.

I shall be happy to discuss these issues with you any time, and shall be happy to discuss H. R. 1752. Now I say to you that for the same reason you do not want to shackle labor under the provisions of this bill, I oppose having labor shackled to the

point where men are forced to join a union. I could write this same letter to the president of the C. I. O., and it is just as applicable to that group.

Personally, I believe I am going to vote against H. R. 1752, for the same reasons that I oppose the penalties you put on labor when it comes to joining unions. I want to be just as fair as I know how, and also want to be patriotic in doing the things that are essential in bringing about the successful and quickest possible end of this war. I hope that these principles will be carried out at all times, and that is what I am trying to stand for in the operation of government.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Very respectfully,

ROBERT F. RICH.

The reason I asked to insert the letter of William Green—I might just as well have inserted the one from Mr. Murray—in this RECORD, and my reply to him was this: I have always opposed coercion of labor, compelling them to join labor unions. I felt it was wrong to compel a laborer to do what he did not want to do himself. I have always taken the position it was wrong for a manufacturer to compel his people not to join a union if they wanted to. I believe in free labor. I am an American citizen, and I want to believe that free America is the kind of America that we are going to get the best results from. So I do not want the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. or you to believe I have to clear this with Sidney Hillman, because I am going to support now what the labor unions want. I do not want their support when I am wrong, nor do I want their support at any time, if I have to do it, to do the thing that is wrong. When I cast my vote for this bill it is not because I am seeking to get on the right side of organized labor. I am trying to do my duty as I see it. I believe in organized labor, and I want to help them. But I do not believe in coercion.

When we had the Executive order last fall compelling men to be frozen in industry, we had more trouble with the people that worked in our industries than at any time in the history of our country, because they felt as if we were telling them they had to stay there, and then they wanted to find out if they could not move to other jobs, labor was not free. We never had any trouble, because we always helped labor and cooperated with them in the things that they did, and aided in their needs. Labor will do more work when free. Like the old proverb, "You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink." You can take a free American laborer and put the chains on him and take him up to a job, but you cannot make him work. He resents it. It will take two men behind him to compel him to work. Thus the loss of manpower. You know what happened when they ordered the sit-down strikes. Why men sat down and did not do anything. Nobody could make them work. That is just what is going to happen here. But if you give every free American the opportunity and tell them the needs to try to help these boys at the front, you will find they respond. They are patriotic citizens; they know we are at war. Then after 3 or 4 months, if there are any who do not respond and they refuse to work or to help the boys at the front, then I will be the first one to put the screws on them and make them work or fight. But I want to give them the opportunity first.

I think that this is a very serious time. I do not agree with everything that has been said on either side. No finer speech could be made than that made by my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I liked his talk. He was talking about these boys. But he has to determine in his own mind what he thinks is best for those boys. I want to help them just as much as my good friend from Illinois, and I know he thinks I do. But I just disagree with him, and I have the right to do that. We all want to attain the same results. Now it is a matter of judgment we display in attaining that end.

I think I am going to get better results if I vote against this bill which so many of you have said is not the kind of a bill you want but that you will try it. You will take a chance on it. I will bank on free labor; I know it will work; it always has worked in America.

When the boys come back from the front, and I hope that every one of them will, I will say, "Gentlemen, I have lived in a free America all my life. There we give people the opportunity to do things. When we tell them there is a necessity to save our country, they will rise to the opportunity and will do what they think is necessary to save those boys. Convince them and our job is finished. When they go to a job in some manufacturing establishment, they will work at that job and give you all that is in them. They will produce on the farms all the foodstuffs they need and they will produce all the ammunition and shells and guns that General Marshall and Admiral King want."

I feel confident that we will do that and do it in a better fashion if we do it through a free America and through free labor than if we do it through labor that is driven to the task. They drive labor in Russia. They drive labor in Germany. That is autocratic government. Here in America we have always had freedom, we believe in freedom, we want freedom, we want to win the war. We will win the war. Tell free America what you want and labor and industry in America will produce it. Tell them the truth. No need now for camouflage. I am now and always have been against a dictator. I am now and always have been against communism. I am for free America, I am for free labor—it is our country, it is our heritage. Give us liberty or give us death. Give us liberty and we will furnish for General Marshall, Admiral King, et al., and our boys guns, ships, ammunition, clothing, food, drugs. And we will keep what the boys are fighting for—freedom.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have spent an afternoon in this House when I have heard quite such a great and constant appeal to the emotions of the Members of the House, which probably will be extended through the press. The names that have come up in speech after speech have been those of General Marshall and Admiral King, then following that the statement that we must get the equipment to win the war into the hands of the boys overseas. Following that there was some talk about meeting the boys when they come back. I do not believe General Marshall, whom we all admire, and Admiral King would want to tell this Congress how to increase production in this country because they have never been trained in production, they have been trained to do the job they are doing there now.

I think it is time for the Congress of the United States to get down to bedrock and try to figure how we can meet this problem. Before we can figure out how we can meet this problem it is necessary, I think, to find out what it is.

Someone has asked if there is not a compromise. I think there is a compromise, one that can be based on actualities and on sound reason. I understand a substitute will be offered for this bill known as the Barrett bill, which I think may well be that compromise. It suggests that you look before you leap. It suggests that we empower the draft boards of this country, implemented by the various manpower committees, to make an investigation, to go into these plants to find out where we need the manpower, to find out where we have more manpower than we now need, to take testimony under oath, to make an investigation of the hoarding and wastage of manpower, and, in connection with the Selective Service, to find out what is the reservoir of men in this country and how to meet the production problems.

Is it not sensible to approach it along that line instead of substituting emotion for reason in our debate? There is a pool of 18,000,000 men in essential war industry today. There is a pool of 5,500,000 men that are not. Under the Barrett bill, the substitute to which I refer, these 5,500,000 men will be allowed to be classified and to come in and sign whether or not they are willing to go wherever the war effort needs them. Does the Congress believe that less than 10 percent of these men are so unpatriotic they will not sign up when they get their first call to service through the local draft board with the power of public sentiment there on the home front surrounding them? I am one of those who will not believe that you cannot get 550,000 of those men out of the IV-F's and others in this pool of 5,500,000 men. I think we can get 550,000 men. Out of the 18,000,000 can we not increase that by 10 percent by opening the gates where there is a hoarding of manpower rather than pass this bill to drive more men to where there is more manpower now than is being used in some of the war plants?

You cannot increase production by overloading plants that are already overstaffed. You can increase production by taking such surplus labor out of such plants and sending it to plants where it is needed.

The May bill does not go to the core of the trouble. It will not help. It may if enacted reduce production on the one hand and add billions of unnecessary expense to our national debt.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, before I begin my prepared talk I want to say in answer to the remarks made by my very dear and good friend who preceded me that he reminds me of, and his proposition vividly recalls to my mind, the old saying, "Nero fiddled while Rome burned."

Mr. Chairman, we are considering a National Service Act, as that is what the bill is called that we are now debating. It has been repeatedly said during the debate that this is not a perfect bill, and in that statement I agree, as the bill does not meet my approval in every respect. I realize, though, that the committee that brought this bill to the floor of the House has been pressed for time; therefore, it is my opinion that if the demands were not so acute and the needs for such legislation were not so real and immediate as the hearings show the conditions to be, I am sure the committee could have and would have worked out a more concise and complete bill.

The evidence, according to the hearings, shows an immediate need for a National Service Act now, and they have brought out the present bill under an open rule, and I believe we can improve the bill here on the floor by amending the same, which, I trust, will be done in one or two particulars, and if this is done, I can then in all good conscience support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have always favored and supported a Universal Service Act in time of war. I believe it is the fairest way to carry on a war, as such an act requires all of the citizens to contribute to a war effort, and if I had had any say, such an act would have been included in the original Selective Service Act. It is coming rather late now, and I do not know what the success will be in passing this act, but those who have the responsibility of carrying on our war to a successful conclusion say that it is necessary and that an immediate need for the same now exists. I believe they are in a better position to know the needs than we know here in the House, and for that reason I am willing to accede to their wishes, as I believe a universal service act is the best means of bringing about an equitable contribution to the war effort.

I have received letters from organizations and from individuals protesting the passage of such legislation, and among one of the first arguments they make in opposition to same is that such a measure would be and is unconstitutional. Having given the Constitution some study, I cannot agree with them on this statement. There are two provisions in our Federal Constitution which, to my mind, authorize such legislation, and they are embodied in the terms of article I, section 8, where it states, "The Congress shall have power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." And under the same section, it is further provided "to raise and support armies." It has been repeatedly held by our Supreme Court that that provision of the Constitution, which authorizes the Congress to raise armies furnishes sufficient grounds for a National Selective Service Act for soldiers in time of war, and it will be noted that it is as much the duty of the Congress to support the armies as it is to raise them, and any means used, as provided in the act before us, to support the Army we have raised by a national draft, is as constitutional as the original Selective Service Act. Not only is it constitutional, Mr. Chairman, but this act is fair, as I stated before, in placing the burden of carrying on the war on the shoulders of all of us—not just a part of us—and the passage of this act or of similar legislation, in my opinion, will have a wholesome effect upon our enemies abroad. It will further illustrate to them, if we have not already done so on the field of battle, that we are in this thing to see it through and to bring it to a successful, victorious conclusion whatever be the cost.

I cannot understand how we can object to a draft law that will draft men to work to support an Army of men who have been drafted to fight for their country and, if need be, give their lives for it, in order that we on the home front might be free and that civilization might live. I cannot understand such patriotism, if it be patriotism.

I can understand why some will object to the bill in its present form. I know they will object, and should object, and I object to it in its present form. It must be amended if it is to be a national service act and if it is to receive my support. Many think, and I think, that the shortage of manpower, if there is a shortage, is brought about by bungling on the part of the War Department and by strikes, absenteeism, loafing, and the closed shop. I have talked with hundreds of men who are working and have worked in defense plants, and they all complain bitterly about the loafing of the men, and without one single exception they state that if they were permitted to work—that is, to do an honest day's work—that from one-third to one-half of the men working could turn out twice the amount of work they are now and have been turning out. One man told me not more than 15 days ago that he had been on the pay roll 8 months, and that if permitted to do so he could have done as much in 3 weeks as he had done in 8 months. If such information as I have received had come from only a few of the men that I have talked to there could be and would be some doubt about it. But when they all tell me the same thing in substance and effect, then I am bound to believe there is something to what they say.

Another man told me that the only men in the plant where he had worked who were actually working were some old men who were in his opinion over 60 years of age, who were doing more work than any of the employees in that camp. He said they would not loaf or agree to loaf, and that they were doing twice as much as the younger men. I could name special case after special case where I have received information of loafing in Government plants, but that will do no good at this time. It is water gone under the mill. It will not now save a single American soldier's life. I bring it up here in order that something might be done in the future to limit such conditions.

In my opinion there are now plenty of idle men who are willing to work and who want to work, but they do not want to pay a tribute to a labor union in order to render a patriotic service for their country in time of war. They do not believe it is right for them to be forced to do so, and I do not believe it is right, and I do not blame them. The right to work and the freedom to work is a sacred right. It is just as sacred as any of the freedoms announced by our Commander in Chief—the decree to work for one's livelihood is of divine origin, and for a labor union to collect tribute on that right and be upheld by our Government in so doing, does not, in my opinion, exemplify democracy or Americanism. To me it smacks of nazi-ism and fascism, and I say to you that if this Congress passes legislation that would force an American citizen to work and at the same time force him to pay tribute to a labor union or any other organization, for the right to work, and then, if he fails to pay that ungodly tribute, to make him a criminal and fine him $10,000, or put him in prison for 5 years, or both, such an act itself stinks of nazi-ism and fascism, and I will say that if such is done in this Congress, there never was issued in the history of the world, by any of the ruthless dictators, a more undemocratic decree.

For the last month or more the weekly newspapers in my home county have carried a one-eighth page advertisement for hands to work in a Government plant at Camden, Ark., and I have with me now two of the papers in my district carrying the same advertisement, although Camden, Ark., is some 350 miles from my home. This advertisement was for hands to work in a Government plant. I was told about 2 weeks ago that 15 Texas men, some of them from my home county, went up to Camden to go to work. They were told that they were needed and could get jobs, but would have to clear with the union first. They then went to the union and the union wanted $150 from each of them as tribute money to clear them before letting them work. These men were descendants of those who gave their all at the Alamo. They were descendants of those who wore the blue and the gray. Yes, they had red American blood in their systems. They believed in the American principle of "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." They refused to pay this tribute and went home. Do you believe they committed a crime? Certainly not. But if you pass this bill in its present form, you would by law or, I had rather say, by an act of Congress, classify them as criminals. The lexicographers of the world have agreed that the best definition of law is a "rule of action commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong," and I believe that we—that this Congress, as well as all others—should heed well this definition of law when we go to pass legislation.

I have in my hand here a copy of a letter that the Associated General Contractors of Highway Engineers of Texas had written, through their representative, to the Under Secretary of War, Judge Robert Patterson. This letter is dated January 13, and I want to read you two paragraphs from that letter which, so far as I know, has not been answered, and I am sure that it cannot be answered satisfactorily:

Tuesday, January 9, bids were submitted to Army engineers at Karnack on approximately $500,000 for work around the ordnance works. Before bids were opened the engineers announced that upon orders from Washington they would not be opened, because there was reported to be a labor dispute. * * * The next day bids were returned to the contractors. One of them was called to the office of the operators of the ordnance works and told he could have the job if he would agree to do it with all-union forces. Upon acceptance of this arbitrary offer (which was a violation of the law), he was given 30 days in which to force his regular employees, who live in or near Marshall, Tex., to join a union or face discharge.

May I ask you, does this illustrate the shortage of manpower, or does it illustrate to you a wastage of manpower? If an amendment is adopted giving the American citizen the God-given right to work for the Government in time of war without having to pay tribute to a labor union, I am frank to tell you that the manpower shortage will be solved, and that within 10 days there will be plenty of hands to do all the work the Government wants. The American people demand that such a provision be in the National Service Act. In fact, it cannot be a National Service Act without such a provision. If it is put in the bill before us I shall gladly support same, but without such an amendment the act cannot represent the wishes of the American people nor the wishes of our boys who have been drafted to fight on the far-flung battle fronts. It would be just as American to require the draftees in our armed forces to pay a tribute to a labor union in order to fight for America as it would be to require civilians to pay a tribute to labor unions to work for America in time of war.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to those in favor and those opposed to this bill, H. R. 1752, which will amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and designed for the purpose of mobilizing our civilian manpower in an all-out, immediate, and above all an imperative effort to help in the conduct of the war, and to prevent further bloodshed by our boys who are wondering right this minute why we are bickering over trivial flaws when they are stopping the bullets of our enemies without flinching and under conditions that may not be to their liking.

I have heard the objections of labor to the bill, as voiced by Mr. Murray, Mr. Hines, and others, and every effort has been made in the committee to amend the original bill to satisfy those objections. Possibly there may still be certain objectionable features to the bill on the part of labor but none of these are of real serious consequence.

Also, I have listened to the objections of business, as voiced by Mr. Crawford, of the National Association of Manufacturers, and many of his objections have now been overcome, as well as the objections of the agricultural people. In other words, the Military Affairs Committee has done everything within its power to offer to Congress a bill that will accomplish the results for which it was intended with practically all of the objectionable features removed. Certainly no one wants to offend labor, business, or agriculture, but something must be done to increase the supplies to our fighting men and buoy their spirit.

Much has been said about the waste of manpower in war plants, navy yards, and other places. Also, about the inefficient use of labor, and in certain instances the hoarding of it. All of these statements are definitely true. If we had a perfect situation as to the operation of our war plants in the furnishing of both materials and labor, there would be no need for this legislation now. We have made mistakes, yes, plenty of them, and we will continue to make them both in industry and in government. The war came upon us suddenly at a time when our Nation was totally unprepared, but everyone here and throughout the world has paid tribute to American ingenuity, and the part played by industry, labor, and government in overcoming what seemed like an insurmountable task, but in doing it we have not attained perfection, and we never will.

About a year ago I saw a beautiful war poster depicting the Army, Navy, Labor, and business marching arm in arm with great determination along the road to victory, and while it outlined perfect teamwork behind which the American people rallied, it was hard to keep all of the forces in step through no fault of their own. Rapid changes were made to meet new conditions. Implements of war became outmoded and designs of ships were changed, resulting in cutbacks, change orders, and the reconversion of our war plants from time to time. With these constantly changing conditions we could not help but have labor surpluses, lay-offs, and labor hoarding. The Army plan calling for the geographic distribution of our war industries contributed much to our labor and material problems, but had this country been bombed or invaded, it would have proven a very wise and necessary decision. Still it contributed in no small way to our labor and production problems.

In a change of circumstances we must change to meet the situation quickly, and that is how wars are won. Suppose, for instance, that we had no Selective Service Act and depended upon voluntary enlistments to build our Army and Navy. Would it have reached its present size and the degree of efficiency that it has now reached? The answer is decidedly "No," and the same holds true on the question of this legislation. Voluntary recruitment will never do the job. Therefore it is imperative that our industrial facilities and the home front keep pace with our war front. It is just as essential to draft our labor forces to win the war quickly as it is to draft our fighting men. The cooperation of both means the only sure road to victory.

Boiled down to bare facts, it is simply a bill designed to hasten the war's end and save American lives. But it does more than that—it strengthens the spirit of our fighting men throughout the world at a time when they need it most. I am one of your new Members who was never in this building until last week, having been in the armed forces until January 3.

During my Army service I traveled many thousands of miles visiting war plants, Army camps, and hundreds of Government installations. I have seen mistakes made and manpower wasted both in our fighting forces and in industry, and this condition will continue to prevail because of the size of the job before us and the sudden changes that are continually made because of war strategy.

Labor and business do not like this bill and they are right. The agricultural interests also feel there are many things wrong with it, and certainly we must agree with them. Also I feel the same way about it personally, but this is the time for sacrifices. The legislation is only temporary legislation that is designed solely to give our Nation the "knock-out" punch that will defeat our enemies quickly and save American lives. Let us strengthen the spirit of our fighting men on every front and show them that we are wholeheartedly behind them. Let us end this war quickly without unnecessary bloodshed and bring them home to their dear ones.

The provisions of this bill with all its deficiencies are needed at this present moment, and its goodnesses far exceed the few objectionable features that we may care to criticize.

I urgently believe we should pass this bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, it is seldom you have to listen to me but on this occasion I must ask your indulgence for a few moments. This bill, H. R. 1752, as it now stands, looks very simple and those who prepared it no doubt have good intentions; but I do not think what they are seeking can be accomplished with this legislation.

The War Manpower Commission has all the authority it needs to correct the present labor shortage if they would cooperate with management and labor. What they would like to have is enough power to snap the whip and force both management and labor to submit to their ideas. Both management and labor as a whole say this legislation is not necessary and that it will not help the situation but will only delay production. I believe industry and labor can and will and in many instances have already solved this problem and production is at its peak. The people in labor and industry understand this problem more than anyone else. They are always working for labor-saving devices and, left to themselves, I

believe they could do a better job. I believe the War Department should stick to its own job of winning the war and not try to blame the reverses in Europe on labor conditions in this country. After the cancelation of contracts by the War Department last summer and fall people left their war jobs and sought other means of livelihood in less essential industries. The War Department certainly would object to management and labor coming in and telling them how to run the war. These are two separate and distinct professions but are interlocked to serve one purpose, that is: Win the war. I think the War Department and labor and management should work together, but try not to overlap or override one another's jurisdiction. If they will cooperate and work together, we will get some place in winning this war.

The only place where there is any real shortage of manpower is in a few of the undesirable trades where the wages are low and the work is hard and heavy. This could be corrected very easily and quickly by raising the standard to the standard of the other crafts with lighter, cleaner work and higher wages.

I also believe that in many of the larger war plants there is a labor surplus, and that after a 5- or 10-percent allowance for turn-over this extra help should be released with a free hand to go where they think they can best find work suited to themselves. We want to keep free labor here in this country. We do not want to do anything to take the liberty they now possess from them. We do not want any of the European labor ideas placed as a yoke about our necks here in America. I have handled labor for a number of years, and have seen with my own eyes what has happened working on both cost-plus and contract. We can solve this problem and have a surplus of labor if we eliminate cost-plus after the experimental stage. Then we could contract the building of guns, ships, tanks, planes, and so forth, and the whole problem could be solved without any legislation. Or, is this legislation part of the program laid out to control civilian life? And that is one thing we must be careful of. While the boys are fighting for the freedom over there, we do not want to be responsible for losing them here.

Please listen to sane, cool, common sense, and do not rush into something we do not need and that will be hard to get rid of once it becomes law. I am asking you to defeat this bill at the present time.

The following is a quotation from a report of the Conference on Post-war Readjustment of Civilian and Military Personnel—I quote:

> Those in the services will constitute the only large group of persons over whom the Nation could exercise any degree of direct control, and it would be dangerous to surrender the possibility of this control until post-war conditions are fully known.

Is it possible that they want to place labor and civilian life in this same category and prevent the free movement of labor and civil life? Gentlemen, I ask you to defeat this unnecessary legislation.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, again and again we were told previous to the election on November 7 that everything was moving along gloriously. And now we wake up a couple of months later and find nothing is moving along satisfactorily.

So the Military Affairs Committee rushes into action and submits to us H. R. 1752—work-or-fight legislation—amending the Selective Service Act, and I am fearful that if this legislation does pass that nobody will know what it is all about.

Suddenly Selective Service wakes up and finds we have to have 900,000 more men.

Now, we are not the only ones fighting this war. We have the Allies with us. What about finding sources of supply of manpower from the Allies instead of concentrating right here in this country, digging up all the manpower necessary to fight the war?

What about the 3,000,000 men I understand they have available in France, and what about the million men I understand they have available in Italy? Why not equip these groups and let them get in and do some of the fighting without digging up another 900,000 men here?

Certainly we all pay tribute to the British Empire, its dominions, colonies, mandates, and protectorates, in fact, all parts of the United Kingdom, for the magnificent effort, the courage, the fortitude, and brilliant performance of those men and women who have carried on whether in Britain during blitz, Dunkerque, Dieppe, north Africa, Italy, France, Germany, on all fighting fronts, a performance that has won for them the undying gratitude of the people of the world.

However, let it be said that we, too, the United States, have played a magnificent part and the fighting youth of American armies, with their determination, fortitude, and courage, performed unbelievable deeds, turned what looked like defeat into victory, so we too have made an outstanding contribution and we are now in the final effort for a total victory which will lead the world out of this cataclysm of war in which it is now engulfed and crush forever the ruthlessness of the Nazi power.

In this all-out war effort there should be equality of sacrifice among the Allies. The British people have made tremendous sacrifices and taken a terrific beating, which we fully understand and realize, and we have responded to their appeals with everything at our disposal. But let it be understood that we have our American boys in this war, who have been and are fighting and dying in all parts of the world, and we, too, have suffered terrific losses in Germany, in France, in north Africa, in Italy, in India, in China, in Burma, and throughout all of the South Pacific on all fighting fronts.

So, when all is said and done, we are giving our all to the fullest extent of our ability in lend-lease equipment, ammunition, planes, and manpower.

We have no imperialistic ambitions for acquisition of lands in any part of the world and certainly we will not remain in China or India or Malaya or Singapore or north Africa or any part of continental Europe when this war is over. So we are fighting to maintain in the post-war world the economic life of other great nations and their people. Gladly and willingly we are doing our part.

On the western front the ratio of troops is 73 percent American, 22 percent British, and 5 percent Canadian. Forty percent of the boys now being inducted into the service are 18 years of age.

Yet, the Dominion of Canada, our neighbor, with a compulsory military overseas service law on the books as of August 1942 failed to take action for the conscripting of men for overseas duty unless they volunteered, that is until December 1944 when 15,600 men were ordered shipped out, and, 7,800 of them failed to report, according to news reports.

Upon inquiry I find in Canada that the draft for military duty covers men from 18½ to 42 years of age, inclusive. Until December 1944 drafted men were not sent overseas unless they volunteered in spite of a law that provided that they could be sent out for active overseas duty.

Originally the Canadian law, the National Service Mobilization Act of 1940, had provided that services of drafted military men would be confined to Canada and the territorial waters thereof. This act was amended by the National Resources Act of 1942 repealing section 3 of the original act which became a law on August 1, 1942, following the plebiscite of April 27, 1942; although this law was made operative through an order in council.

The opposition with which it met upon the occasions of debate was such that it was not put in effect until December 1944, and you know the results.

Now, let us take a look at Australia, who has turned in a magnificent performance but whose back was up against the wall a couple of years back and was begging us for men and supplies to repel the Jap invasion. They had a law which read:

> That members of the defense forces who are members of the military forces shall not be required, unless they voluntarily agree to do so, to serve beyond the limits of the Commonwealth or any territory under the authority of the Commonwealth.

This act was changed in February of 1943 to take in a little additional territory known as the Southwest Pacific zone, which about covers New Guinea, parts of Borneo and Netherlands East Indies, or the approach to Australia from the north.

Here is the law:

> Defense (Citizens Military Forces) No. 2 of 1943
>
> An act to authorize the service of members of the citizen military forces in the Southwest Pacific zone for the duration of the present war
>
> *Be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, the Senate, and the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Australia, as follows:*
>
> 1. This act may be cited as the Defense (Citizens Military Forces) Act of 1943.

2. This act shall come into operation on the day on which it receives the royal assent.

3. In this act "the Southwestern Pacific zone" means the area bounded on the west by the one hundred and tenth meridian of east longitude, on the north by the Equator, and on the east by the one hundred and fifty-ninth meridian of east longitude.

4. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Defence Act, 1903–1941, or in the National Security Act, 1939–1940, any member of the citizen military forces may be required to serve in such area contained in the Southwestern Pacific zone as is specified by proclamation, and the power to make regulations in pursuance of those acts, or either of them, shall extend to the making of regulations in relation to any such member so required to serve in that area, and to the service of the member in that area.

5. This act shall continue in force until the expiration of 6 months after Australia ceases to be engaged in hostilities in the present war, and no longer.

Or in other words, if we get caught in the Philippines and need some help, no Australian troops, as I understand it, could be sent in to give us a lift unless they personally volunteered for active overseas service beyond the territorial limits set up in this act. I am of the opinion the Philippine Islands would be out of this zone.

In South Africa, service in the defense forces was still on a voluntary basis in August 1944.

Now what I cannot understand is that we have no hesitancy about sending our men anywhere—to any fighting front in any part of the world.

I can take rather graciously the outright sale of 58,000 American-made machine tools which originally cost the United States $166,000,000 to the British Government for $31,500,000, but when it comes to these 18-year-olds who are fighting this war, and as a Canadian wrote me, and I quote:

I regard it as a matter of principle—the principle of equality of sacrifice should be maintained. We cannot put up with the domination of the majority by minority on this principle when the minority viewpoint seems based on sentiment without any real basis of reason.

I want it understood this is an attempt to interest our allies to put up their manpower on the same basis as we are because this is only fair to the Canadian and Australian boys who have done the fighting and dying and who have turned in records in north Africa, Dunkerque, and Dieppe that will live forevermore. Their valor will go down in the history of the world. And, it is a fact that the overwhelming majority of Canadians favor selective service and the voting in the plebiscite in 1942 was 2,945,514 yes, to 1,643,006 no. Some Canadians argue that a volunteer serviceman makes a better fighter than a conscripted man but let me tell you that any man lying in a foxhole with a machine gun splattering around him who reaches out and touches a buddy does not care whether he be a volunteer or a conscripted man, high or low, rich or poor, Catholic, Jew, or Protestant; he is glad to have any man alongside of him.

So, I am concerned about our 18-year-olds who are being sent into the lines with limited training and are being killed in action daily.

Let me read from a communication from Canada. I quote:

What number of men Canada has in the various theaters of war I cannot say. We do know some are in Italy, some on the western front, and some have been posted for other theaters. But what we are concerned about now is the presence in Canada of from 70,000 to 80,000 fully trained men. Some of them having been several years in the Army and who have been maintained in this country at a cost per year variously estimated as from $250,000,000 to $300,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. And these men are being kept in Canada because the order in council to authorize the sending of them abroad has not been passed.

Well, after pressure, it was passed on August 1, 1942, but nothing was done about sending men overseas from this group until December, 1944.

I have a great regard for the leadership of Prime Minister Churchill and Joseph Stalin, and I wish that we had their type in America to look after our interests.

Recently I picked up the paper and read Hal Boyle's article entitled "Yank Victims of German Atrocity Found in the Snow," and I quote the article:

The weeks beneath the snow have given some faces a set expression of eternity. But some lie with the mouth half open as if in protest. One soldier clutches his stomach. The back of another soldier's head is blown off. One medic with a bullet hole through his red cross armlet lies starkly straight. Birds or small animals have eaten out his eyes. They have partly destroyed several bodies.

A number of soldiers lie huddled together as if for warmth. The most lifelike is one young red-faced boy who lies on his back with a gloved hand raised childlike to his eye, as if to ward off a bullet or wipe away a tear.

Sometime ago I got a communication from Canada, and I quote:

By now we have an Army of somewhere between 70,000 and 80,000 thoroughly trained men. Some of them trained to a point of utter weariness. But, they are draftees and unless, and until, the Government passes the Order in Council, they cannot be sent out of the county.

Now, what the results might have been if we had had another half million men in the lines in the last Nazi push on the western front I cannot say; I do know it would have helped. Even if we had had another hundred thousand where the Germans broke through it would have been a great help and might have saved thousands of lives.

The time has come to talk straight. Listen to what was said in an editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Sunday, January 21, and I quote:

When it was discovered that volunteers were insufficient to fill replacement needs overseas and the Prime Minister King would do nothing about it, Defense Minister Ralston resigned. This brought Parliament back into the picture. The upshot was that instead of enforcing universal conscription for service anywhere as the Government had been empowered to do in the Plebiscite of 1942—it was decided to draft only enough men for current needs.

Back of this hedging, of course, was King's desire to keep in the political good graces of Quebec Province from which his party draws the bulk of its support. Because of King's timidity, because an unholy, unsatisfactory compromise, Canada is faced with one of the most delicate situations that can confront any Nation in war—mutiny in the armed forces.

The people, if not the Parliament, should realize that the only way to correct it is to send King over the fence and inaugurate a policy of full conscription.

I think we are making in this country of ours a pretty fair contribution and I take as proof the statement of Prime Minister Churchill when he said that American armies have done almost all of the fighting and have lost 60 to 80 men to every one of theirs on the western front since the Germans launched their bitter counteroffensive on December 16.

Now we are concerned about where we are to pick up some 900,000 men. Let me say to the Members that if we had the same kind of a law on the books as the dominions have, there just would not be anybody over there fighting this war. What about these 3,000,000 Frenchmen and 1,000,000 Italians we hear about? Why not get them outfitted and equipped and have them do some of the fighting?

So, I say now that the dominions ought to go all out with their manpower like the rest of us and make no exceptions, no reservations. There is no question but what the Canadian people want such action. They indicated that in the plebiscite of 1942.

There is no one in America who is not proud of Canada's achievements in the war effort; not alone those of her fighting men but of her contributions from industry and agriculture. But, we are all in this war together and there should be no discrimination either in this Nation or in the British dominions, when a man is eligible, as to whether he should or should not be conscripted for overseas service.

Mr. Chairman, let me say it will not be the Atlantic or the Pacific that will protect the sacred liberties enjoyed on this continent, but it will be all of us working together and fighting together to eliminate from the world the ruthlessness of Nazi aggression.

We might as well be realists. All wars are economic wars. After World War No. 1, what happened? Let it not happen after World War No. 2; waking up to find that we have been fighting a war not to bring about a just and lasting peace in the world but to protect and maintain the economic supremacy of other nations.

I trust that the policies of His Majesty's dominions, colonies, mandates, and protectorates will adopt the same policy we have and make no exceptions as to overseas service nor confine their fighting activities to any particular home-front sector.

The next time we start a push on the western front let us have the manpower there to follow through and complete the job.

As far as this bill is concerned I have reached no decision. I feel we are doing our share and are going all out. I would feel more inclined to support this legislation, if I believed we were not doing our bit, so let us not be stampeded into hasty legislation that we may later regret.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection reading as follows:

"(n) (1) In addition to the liability for training and service in the land or naval forces, every registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not a member of such forces on active duty and is not exempted or deferred from training and service therein by section 5 (c) (1) or (d) shall be liable to perform work in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort. For the purposes of this subsection, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him, shall from time to time by regulations designate, and certify to the Director of Selective Service, the plants and facilities, and the activities therein, in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, and the farms and agricultural occupations and endeavors essential to the war effort. In making such designations, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may make classifications on the basis of geographical areas, types of activities, types of occupations within activities, and types of plants, facilities, and farms.

"(2) A registrant liable to perform such work who is now or hereafter employed by an employer, or now or hereafter self-employed, in an activity or agricultural occupation or endeavor which is so certified shall have a duty not to voluntarily discontinue such employment unless his selective-service local board (subject to appeal in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2)) has determined that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such employment.

"(3) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall from time to time (after consultation with the appropriate representatives of management, labor, agriculture, and Government) certify or cause to be certified to the Director of Selective Service the extent to which, in the various areas, the plants, facilities, and farms described in paragraph (2) are unable, through the operation of paragraph (2) and by voluntary recruiting by management, labor, agriculture, and Government, to meet their manpower requirements in the activities, occupations, and endeavors so described.

"(4) Upon receiving such a certification for a particular area, the Director of Selective Service—

"(A) shall designate the categories (by age and other status) of registrants who are liable to perform work under paragraph (1) and who are not deferred under subsection (k) or by reason of being engaged in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, from which categories men capable of performing the work involved shall be called before calls are made from other categories. In designating such categories the Director shall first designate categories which include registrants who are, by reason of their age and other status, the type of men he deems can transfer to such work with the least disruption to the civilian economy and to themselves in comparison with men in other categories, and may exclude, or by regulations provide for the exclusion, from any category as designated, of those types of veterans (discharged or released from active duty in the land or naval forces under conditions not dishonorable) whose exclusion from such category the Director deems fair and equitable;

"(B) shall direct the local boards in such area, and also local boards outside the area to the extent that he may deem necessary, to request their registrants within the categories so designated to become employed, within a time fixed by the Director, in the activities, occupations, and endeavors covered by the certification;

"(C) if the requirements of certification have not been met under subparagraph (B) within the time fixed, shall direct the local boards in such area, and also local boards outside the area to the extent that he may deem necessary, to order (subject to regulations prescribed by him) registrants within the categories so designated and capable of performing the work involved (in numbers sufficient to meet the requirements of the certification) to make, within such time as he may prescribe, application for employment in the activities, occupations, and endeavors specified in the certification and to enter upon such employment when accepted therefor. Such orders shall be subject to appeal in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2). It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

"(5) In order to aid the selective-service local boards and the appeal boards in the exercise of the additional duties required of them under this subsection, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may assign to such boards, in an advisory capacity, representatives of such other agencies of the Government as he may deem advisable.

"(6) A registrant who is found, in the same manner as is provided in subsection (g), to be conscientiously opposed, by reason of religious training and belief, to participation in war in any form, and whose opposition thereto is found, in such manner, to include opposition to participation in civilian war activities shall, in lieu of being ordered to make application for, and to accept, employment in any such activity, be ordered to make application for, and to accept, employment in another activity in the national interest.

"(7) Nothing in this subsection shall affect in any manner any of the provisions of subsection (k).

"(8) Nothing in this subsection shall affect the powers under other provisions of this act with respect to the classification and selection of persons for, or the induction, or deferment from induction, of persons into, the land or naval forces; or preclude the Selective Service System from classifying and selecting for induction any registrant who violates a duty imposed upon him by this subsection or preclude the land or naval forces from inducting such a registrant."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have agreed that the first section of the bill would be read and that then the Committee would rise, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the first section of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is my purpose to offer at this point a substitute. In view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], is on his feet and ready to move that the Committee do now rise, I shall expect to be recognized the first thing tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized tomorrow.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM, of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 107, had come to no resolution thereon.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 30, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Conservation of Wildlife, on which I have served for several years.

Very truly yours,

PEHR G. HOLMES.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 75, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee to Investigate All Matters Pertaining to the Replacement and Conservation of Wildlife to fill the existing vacancies thereon the following Members of the House: Mr. GEARHART, California; Mr. HENRY, Wisconsin.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of the remarks I made today on the pending legislation a letter from the Under-Secretary of War to which I referred in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a prayer given at the inauguration of Gov. R. Gregg Cherry, at Raleigh, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] may have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by General Hershey of the Selective Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks today an amendment which I expect to

offer to the pending bill and also a copy of a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein some data on Federal aid to education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by Mme. Wei, the wife of the Chinese Ambassador.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an analysis of H. R. 1572.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 1 hour.

PEACE—IF WE WANT IT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, late last August the gentleman from South Carolina, Congressman JAMES RICHARDS, and I went to Europe as two members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in an effort to bring back what information we could on three matters which are frequently before our committee. First, the effectiveness in the battle areas of lend-lease and lend-lease in reverse; second, the needs and the administrative efficiency of U. N. R. R. A.; and, third, the problems which will confront the United States in the post-war era, together with the possibilities of developing ways and means for establishing and enforcing permanent peace.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and I spent nearly 5 weeks in the United Kingdom and in Europe. We conferred with a great many officials and private citizens, not only of England and France but of other members of the United Nations. We talked with literally hundreds of officers and men in the United States armed forces. We visited battle areas, bombing bases, barracks behind the lines, hospitals, and other places, where G. I.'s were eager to talk to us and we were eager to talk with them. We talked with businessmen and taxi drivers, with cabinet officers, and street-corner orators, with prominent citizens and members of Parliament as well as the common run of citizens assembled in the pubs and crowded in the underground bomb shelters.

To the best of our ability we tried to bring back a cross-section of what our men in uniform are thinking and of the prevailing lines of thought running through the various strata of the economic life of our associates in this war. We did not limit our study to the grandiose plans of the great men in public office although we did counsel long and profitably with these public men of affairs. We were also interested, however, in the opinions and plans of the little men in the shops and on the streets who comprise the great background of community thought which, in the final analysis in any democratic government, nourishes and supports or nullifies and stifles the proposals made by public men.

Both the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and I, in our own way and on earlier occasions, have expressed ourselves in regard to the operations of lend-lease and concerning our findings in connection with U. N. R. R. A. We shall probably have more to say, each in our individual capacity, on these subjects when they once again become matters for legislative consideration by Congress.

Today, therefore, I want to limit my remarks to the third of our objectives in visiting Europe last September and October, namely, the problems of the post-war era and the paths which seem most clearly to point to permanent peace. Obviously, I speak for myself alone and in the main I have not even discussed the proposals I am about to make with my good and respected traveling companion, the great and able Democrat, the gentleman from South Carolina, Congressman JAMES P. RICHARDS.

Let me say, first of all, that it is with deep humility and considerable hesitation that I take the time of the House to discuss what I consider to be the outline of a program which can make for permanent peace. Far abler men than I have voiced their ideas on the building of a lasting peace, and I am encouraged to add my thoughts to the growing collection of testimony on the subject only because, first, it is the most important problem confronting humanity at this juncture of history; second, in a republic such as ours it is only by the free exchange and the critical examination of many ideas that we can finally arrive at the optimum course of action for preserving peace; and, third, since the men who should have most to say about the plans for peace—the men fighting in the battle areas—are not here to express themselves, I think it only right that I should bring to you some of the thoughts on the subject which they conveyed to me as I talked with them last fall in England, in France, and elsewhere overseas.

Let me say, further, that the proposals which I am about to make do not represent a finished and completed plan of action but rather they are suggestions for an approach to world peace which I consider workable, which are of the type that almost immediate action can be taken on them, and which are amenable to refinement and development as they are given further study should sufficient citizens deem them to have merit enough to warrant continued examination.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS YET REMAIN

Mr. Speaker, we hear much these days in the nature of debate as to whether the United States should join this or that type of world organization to preserve the peace of the world, following victory in this war. I believe it fair to say that today the vast majority of our citizens, the gentleman from South Dakota now addressing you among them, favor the United States exerting in the field of peaceful post-war relations the same type of sturdy and effective leadership our armed forces are now so successfully exerting in the field of battle. Most of us feel that cooperation with other nations of the world is essential after the war. Most of us believe and hope that some type of world organization can be created which will provide for the adjustment of differences between nations without resort to war. All of us hope that war may be forever outlawed as a means of settling international disputes once victory crowns our efforts in this conflict.

There is little difference among us, Mr. Speaker, concerning the heart hunger of all Americans—it is for a just and permanent peace. Where the differences arise is over the details of establishing a world organization, the authorities to be given to it, the recognition which it will give to smaller nations and the peoples of races colored other than white.

Disputes take place over how much sacrifice of sovereignty our Republic can make and still remain secure in its defense and sure that its influence can be sufficiently exercised to move the world upward rather than finding ourselves submerged in a universal whirlpool pulling humanity downward. Who shall have the voting power? Who shall control the police force? Shall imperialism, or self-determination, or enforced democracy, or unchallenged communism, or universal capitalism, or recognized monarchies, or diluted fascism either be the universal order or be specifically denied to individual nations within or outside the new world organization? How large should the police force be? All agree, of course, that it should be large enough to stop Japan or Germany or Italy from ever charging across their new post-war borders again to start a career of aggression. But should it be large enough to combat the British or American navies or to defeat the Russian armies should any of these, through some weird distortion of future objectives, ever engage in aggressive acts?

YESTERDAY'S FRIENDS ARE TODAY'S FOES

The answers to these questions are not all clear, Mr. Speaker, and men of good will still disagree among themselves about the imposition of international rules of cooperation, good behavior, and police power when they apply to present members of the United Nations. Yet, all but the most unrealistic must recognize that the greatest fallacy in international logic is the assumption that we can have permanent world peace merely by making certain that those against whom we are presently arrayed shall not start another war. If such illogical reasoning had dominated our thinking for the last quarter of a century, we would indeed be in a sorry fix in our war with Japan since the Japanese Empire was one of

our allies in World War No. 1, and in that conflict Italy also fought on our side.

Nations have a habit of changing both friends and foes in the bloody history of battles. At any stage of history it is always tragically true that today's friends may become tomorrow's foes. To assure permanent peace we must devise methods which not only hold in check our present enemies but which also make certain that they operate with equal effectiveness when applied to all present members of the United Nations, including the United States.

While we in the United States are of one mind that imperialism and aggression shall never form a part of our national policy we must realize that no matter how sacred our own good intentions the citizens of other lands need more than that to induce them to accept for themselves restrictions and regulations which we in this Republic might prefer to see applied only to others and not to ourselves. Self-interest is still a prime rule of survival for all nations, great or small.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. I am glad the gentleman from South Dakota has stressed the undisputed fact that among the world's family of nations it is eternally true that yesterday's friends may be today's foes. History is filled with evidence bearing out the truth of that statement. Unfortunately this fact continues to be a blind spot in the thinking of many of our contemporary speakers and writers and I am afraid the present administration sometimes overlooks this lesson of history.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is unfortunately true, but we cannot change the facts of history; we must accept them as we find them.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further because the hour is late and I want to get into other pertinent points of this address.

PUTTING REALITY INTO RHETORIC

While the problems that must yet be solved are prodigious in the matter of developing an international organization which we can all support, I am not one of those who hold the pessimistic view that it cannot be done. We shall and we must continue trying. No recital of pious platitudes and glittering principles no matter how long or eloquent will assure the world of lasting peace. It is the method and machinery for putting those pretty phrases into actual operation which puts reality into our rhetoric. It is here that a world-wide area of agreement is actually needed. It is also the specific proposals, the concrete plans, the devilish little details that make or mar the achievements of idealism.

A hundred resolutions of intent are not as important as a single resolution in support of a specific step in the colossal job of weaving a pattern of good international behavior in the post-war world. Resolutions of good intention such as we have already passed in Congress too greatly resemble a general reformation against sin which studiously avoids detailing any of the personal vices which we propose to correct. They sound well, but they accomplish little in this world of stern reality.

A great philosopher, Seneca, once said, "If you would speak with me, define your terms." We Americans should recognize, and I am sure we do, that neither our domestic policy nor our foreign policy can operate successfully without consideration for the other. Neither can operate in a vacuum. Each should supplement and reinforce the other. When the one conflicts with the other it must result, sooner or later, in the one nullifying the other. Consequently, one or both is certain to fail unless they have been developed coordinately. As we proceed with each we must define our terms.

ISOLATIONISM AND INTERVENTIONISM ARE DEAD LABELS

There are some who say, "What is good for America is good for the world," and others who argue "What is good for the world is good for America." I presume the former group represents what is called nationalism or isolationism and the latter group what we call interventionists or extreme internationalists. In my opinion, both isolationism and interventionism have ceased to mean anything significant in this country and have ceased to define important groupings of public opinion.

For my own part, in the pre-Pearl Harbor days I never considered myself either an interventionist or an isolationist. I did not fit comfortably under either of the then prevailing labels. So, for lack of a better designation, I then called myself an "insulationist." I favored making America and the Western Hemisphere as strong and effective a modern military establishment as possible, and I favored keeping the United States from taking steps which would needlessly involve it in two great wars simultaneously and before we were prepared. As I said many times in those pre-Pearl Harbor days, I favored full international cooperation for maintaining peace and promoting progress but I favored "insulating" ourselves as much as possible from the ravages and cruelties of war. Thus the term "insulationist." In earlier days, when the decision was an issue, I was known with reservations as a League of Nations Republican. Yes, Mr. Speaker, before Pearl Harbor, I was an internationalist in peace and an "insulationist" in war. I still am. There is, however, no guaranty that either intervention in foreign affairs or isolation from them will bring permanent peace and tranquillity to America. Neither is a patent medicine with a miraculous cure-all for international problems. Either of them can do more to wreck than to win human happiness, if intelligence is not exercised in their application. Simply to commit ourselves to an international organization without analyzing carefully its mechanics of operation, its controls, its objectives, and its infringements upon self-determination may, actually, purchase more of future war than it does of sustained peace.

Thus it seems the acme of human folly to proclaim we are for or against participation in an international organization to preserve peace unless at the same time we weave into the fabric of our resolution something of the pattern of procedure and purpose we would have such an organization undertake. Again, sir, I say we must define our terms.

As for me, I am convinced today as I have always been that the United States as a Nation cannot enjoy permanent good health surrounded by a world which is seriously ill nor can we enjoy permanent peace in a world which finds a large part of itself repeatedly at war with other substantial parts of it. I think that it is also an accurate corollary of that statement to say that neither can the world enjoy permanent peace and good health in an era in which the United States is seriously ill in an economic, social, or political sense.

I therefore favor a program of international cooperation—exercised through an international organization if it can be appropriately developed—which within our means and to the full extent of our ability will help bring better government, tolerant attitudes, sustained peace, and improved economic conditions to other portions of the world. While remembering that our first patriotic concern must be for America we should also recognize that in nations as in neighborhoods, what helps others helps us, and what helps us helps others.

MY CREED AND MY CONVICTION

I stated on May 10, 1943, in an address in Constitution Hall here in Washington when I participated in a public forum sponsored as part of the United Nations discussion series:

> I believe the United States should extend the hand of Christian fellowship and friendly helpfulness as far and as fast as other nations will reach out to take it in a firm and sincere resolve to work together to preserve peace and to eliminate the evils and inequalities which provide the seeds of resentment and of war.

That, Mr. Speaker, is my creed and conviction. I had earlier expressed it in an address in Baltimore commemorating the diamond anniversary of the Elks Lodge of that city and on several occasions I have reaffirmed it on the floor of this House.

In determining what the earmarks of "an organization appropriately developed" should be, I believe there are four factors which our statesmen should bear in mind as we begin shaping the actual details and defining the specific mechanics of such an organization. These four factors are:

1. OUR NATIONAL SECURITY MUST BE SAFEGUARDED

We must avoid anything in the post-war world which would endanger the security of this Republic. We must pray and we must work for the best, but we must be prepared for the worst. Our Army, Navy, and Air Corps must ever be strong enough to protect the position of the United States while we strive to perpetuate the peace of the world. We must always be willing to do our part to keep the world from engaging in a crazy contest of armament building, but we must

not permit our good faith to induce us to weaken ourselves so that, relatively, we lose the prestige and the power which now are ours. As the mightiest armed force in the world today which is contributing the most to winning this war we have a duty and a right to maintain our position in the years to follow victory.

2. OUR SOLVENCY MUST BE SAFEGUARDED

A bankrupt, insolvent America can do little to influence world behavior wisely. We must be strong financially to be influential idealistically. Thus, our ambition to help others must never exceed our ability to finance what we undertake. If it does, we help nobody, but we hurt ourselves and destroy the confidence which others have in our integrity. We must always cut our pattern to fit our financial cloth.

3. OUR SYSTEM OF SELF-GOVERNMENT MUST BE SAFEGUARDED

Believing as we do in freedom, we must protect here at home that which we seek to project abroad. We cannot inspire others to follow the processes of democracy unless we retain the *functions* as well as the *forms* of self-government in the United States. It follows, therefore, that the people of America must participate in the formation of a peoples' peace and that due constitutional procedures must be relied upon in the development of any post-war program which is to be effective. It is also essential that the men who are actually fighting this war should be given something to say about the type of program and/or the international organization that is to follow the victory which their sacrifices will have won.

The pagan philosophy that young men should fight the wars and old men in high places safe at home should alone exercise the judgment which either involves countries in war or which promises to prevent future conflicts has no part in a republic dedicated to the principles of self-government. It is well that we plan and prepare now for world cooperation to follow this war, but it is a wretched point of view to hold that completely firm commitments should be made at this time by those at home without an opportunity for consultation with or ratification by the men whose heroism on the field of battle is making possible our free decisions in the post-war world. I, for one, have little sympathy with the idea that those whose blunderings may have been responsible for the failure to avert this total global war should now have a monopoly on making the decisions of the future.

In this Republic there should not be those who, when 11,000,000 citizens are in uniform away from home, would arrogate unto themselves the sole right to determine what dividends should flow from the sacrifices of those now making them on the field of battle. This time let us hope that the young men who fight the wars will also be given something to say about what is to result from their fighting.

4. OUR SOVEREIGNTY MUST BE SAFEGUARDED

We in the United States number less than 140,000,000 human beings. The world had a pre-war population of 2,140,000,000. It is axiomatic, therefore, that if the United States is to exert its rightful influence upon the other peoples of the world, it must exert that influence as a unit rather than through its separate citizens acting and voting as single individuals, in a world-wide association in which each citizen's influence is equal to each of the other 2,140,000,000 human beings inhabiting the world.

With more than 2,000,000,000 citizens living outside the United States it is clearly obvious that our power for good would be comparatively insignificant if national sovereignty were to be sacrificed to the point where a mere counting of noses or of votes were to determine policies in any world-wide organization. As a national unit, as the richest and most powerful nation in the world, the United States can and should exert a tremendous influence for human betterment, world peace, and economic advancement, but with all sovereignty submerged we could exert virtually no directive strength in world leadership.

To protect what we have, and to promote what we feel to be right, the United States must retain its sovereignty if it is to work effectively with other nations to raise the world's levels of human decency and civilized conduct. To merge this country into world citizenship without protecting the power of this great country to exert its united influence for good would do more to set back human progress than to stimulate it.

In working with others, we may well have to forego certain prescribed functions of sovereignty and we must learn to exercise certain of these functions in harmony with other right-minded nations, but while we reach for the stars we must keep our feet on the ground. Otherwise we deceive ourselves and defraud others of the dividends which can accrue from world leadership by the United States but which cannot be produced by the unorganized and unharnessed efforts of 140,000,000 individual citizens of the United States regardless of their good intentions and their high ideals.

THE PATH TO PERMANENT PEACE

Mr. Speaker, I come now to the immediate problem of maintaining lasting peace for which all of the foregoing is but a background for my reasoning. I come, too, to the plans for peace and for preparedness which I mentioned in the beginning of this address as having discussed with men and women in uniform overseas when I was in England and France last fall. I now want to discuss my proposals for the establishment of permanent peace as they have developed from my own study and from these observations and these conferences and as they fall within the framework of the considerations set forth thus far in this discourse.

AN INTERNATIONAL PEACE PATROL OF THE AIR

Mr. Speaker, I believe the establishment of an international peace patrol of the air can successfully, definitely, and permanently avert another major war. I say this categorically and without reservation. I believe the time is here when the world can have permanent peace if it wants it. It can have it without nations seriously sacrificing their sovereignty, without their foregoing their cultural or political ideals, and without the expenditure of such enormous sums for national armaments that economic progress and human happiness are denied to common citizens.

Mr. Speaker, by making a realistic approach to the problem of lasting peace the world now has an opportunity of turning the most awful falcons of war into effective doves of peace. The airplane which has brought death and disaster to so many as an implement of war can now be utilized to bring security and peace to all humanity for all future time to come.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, that the United States take the initiative in requesting the other members of the United Nations to join it in establishing without delay the basic foundations for operating an international peace patrol of the air after this war. This peace patrol of the air can be staffed and manned by volunteers from among the fighting pilots and their officers who are now using air power so effectively in helping to turn the tides of war in our favor on every battle front.

The details of operating the peace patrol of the air, its size, its rates of compensation, its home bases, the extent of its prerogatives, its directive agency, and the like can be determined by experts in the art of national defense and can be easily agreed upon because they require no serious encroachments upon national sovereignty and they avoid the perplexing problems growing out of agreements for complicated international organizations.

Reduced to its simplest, though not necessarily its optimum form, but still comprising the nucleus of a force sufficient to sustain a permanent peace, it could operate as follows. At the start, 5,000 military planes could be selected from the best now being operated by the armed services of the United Nations with 1,000 planes being home based on each of 5 strategically located air bases in the world.

Depending on what progress the world makes in regulating and controlling its post-war armaments, both in the air and on the land and sea, the size of this international peace patrol of the air can and should be expanded to many times more than 5,000 planes if necessary to enforce the peace.

More bases could be dedicated to this purpose as it becomes wise or necessary. But for the purpose of explaining my proposal, I am using 5,000 planes and 5 bases as an illustrative figure to demonstrate the way the peace patrol of the air would work.

Due consideration should be given to selecting a wise ratio of fighter and bomber planes, of superbombers and of transports, of photographic observation planes, of amphibious and land-based planes, and of all modern types of military planes. Suggested quotas for volunteers to man these planes and officer their operation might well follow the general percentages of men whom the

respective members of the United Nations now have engaged in the aviation services.

Where any nation fails to fill its quota by volunteers or by any other method it uses to select them, the quotas should be opened to other nations desiring to supply the manpower.

Until and unless some other more comprehensive world organization is developed and entered into by all of the major members of the United Nations, I would place the directing control of this International Peace Patrol of the Air in the hands of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, England, Russia, China, and France, which would set up some type of supreme control headquarters for this purpose similar to the existing pattern represented by the supreme headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces now operating in Europe under the able direction of General Eisenhower. One member of this staff would serve as chairman, with the office rotating among the five members, and the vote of three of the five members would control the policies of the peace patrol and determine when and where it should strike should use of the force become necessary with unexpected promptitude.

On matters of policy, each member of the joint staff would secure his instructions from the properly constituted authority of his own country—which in this country would be Congress—but where immediate use of the police force became necessary the supreme control headquarters would be authorized to strike at once in conformity with clearly defined policies governing the extent of its activities and determined upon in advance by the governments thus cooperating.

Mr. Speaker, I propose this International Peace Patrol of the Air might originally be based on the airports now located as follows: Stephensville, Newfoundland; Preswick, Scotland; Cairo, Egypt; Natal, Brazil; and on one of the great air bases in China which American Army units have built. These bases have been built by the money of American taxpayers either as a direct part of the expense of this war or under lend-lease agreements and I suggest this country donate these ports for the use of the air peace patrol and that the countries in which they are located donate the land on which they are located for the same purpose. Thus internationalized, these great air ports could be used to win the peace with the same effectiveness that they are now being used to win the war. They could also be used for commercial air traffic by all of the nations of the world but they would be under the direct management of the International Peace Patrol of the Air.

As to the financing of the activities of this patrol, whatever its ultimate size, I propose that each country contribute to the cost in direct proportion that it contributes personnel to the international peace patrol. The cost, at worst, will be infinitesimal as compared with the cost of war or even with the cost of maintaining military establishments of the vast size necessary if nothing tangible and direct is done to make future wars impossible.

It is my thought that the joint chiefs of staff of the United Nations as heretofore defined and which will direct the activities of this air patrol should be authorized by their respective governments to select, train, and deploy the units of this patrol so that it can operate to literally make future aggressive wars impossible. I would give the directing heads of this police force of the air the authority to order it into immediate action against any country which sent its armies or navies into war against any other country in the world. With no more than 24 hours' notice to the offending country, this air force should be empowered to fly military formations over the borders of any nation starting its war machines out beyond its own borders with instructions to bomb into oblivion any military units and establishments found within 10 miles of that border after the notice to cease and desist warlike actions had been served on the offender.

TEN POINTS IN THE KEEPING OF A PERMANENT PEACE

So much for the actual activity of this peace patrol of the air in making future wars impossible. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me elaborate a bit on why and how this peace patrol would achieve its sacred responsibility of putting an end to war. Here are the reasons based on the lessons of this war, together with the collateral stipulations which would make the starting of a future war a virtual impossibility or at worst a short-lived suicidal effort on the part of its instigator.

First. While air power has not proved sufficient to permit any nation in this war to win victory with it alone, air power has demonstrated its strength sufficiently so that it is now obvious that any nation which lacks both defensive and offensive air weapons is helpless in modern warfare.

Second. As part of this program to outlaw all future war by use of quick and immediate air force rather than by relying only on pious promises and glib sounding international compacts, I propose that after victory is won in this war our enemy countries be entirely stripped and kept divested of all offensive and defensive air power. This must include antiaircraft defenses as well as planes themselves together with the factories and equipment designed for making weapons of these types. It must of course include the new air weapons of this war such as the robot bombs, the great V–2 rocket bombs, and other offensive and defensive inventions capable of defense against air power or of carrying destruction to others in the form of winged death or long-distance missiles. It must also include poisonous gas and implements for using it since gas is an airborne weapon and its potentialities as a weapon of war are too great to trifle with if the world wants permanent peace.

Third. The personnel of the International Peace Patrol of the Air in addition to its volunteer flyers and ground crew should include from each country able and mature men in like ratio to the volunteers, assigned with diplomatic rank and from among specialists experienced in inspecting, evaluating, and analyzing weapons of war and factories capable of manufacturing them. These men should carry appropriate identification credentials cloaking them with authority to visit all factories and testing laboratories for military equipment in all countries of the world, including the United States. Thus we could be assured that our present enemy countries were being kept completely disarmed from the standpoint of all offensive and defensive air equipment including poisonous gas, and the world could be assured that among present friendly powers there was developing no maniacal race of armaments.

At least quarterly, these representatives of the peace patrol should publish reports written in every language and make alike available to every country of the world showing the status of military preparedness in every country, not only from the standpoint of defensive and offensive air weapons of war, but encompassing all implements of war.

Fourth. Planes of this air patrol should be painted a distinctive color reserved for them alone and they should be authorized to land without charge on any public airport in the world at any time.

Fifth. Members of the air peace patrol should wear distinctive uniforms save for some of the specialists in the inspecting service who could operate in plain clothes, when desirable, but only when supplied with proper identifying credentials.

Sixth. With all present enemy countries permanently stripped of all offensive and defensive weapons and planes for air war, the other nations of the world should enter into collective agreements regulating the extent to which they, themselves, would be permitted to expand their own armaments of the air and their other military establishments.

A working rule of thumb for determining the size and scope of future air power and preparedness might well be that at any future time the comparative air war strength and military might of each nation in the world should be relatively the same as it is at the conclusion of World War No. 2, except for the aforementioned provision that the countries presently at war against the United Nations shall never again be permitted to develop any offensive and defensive air weapons. The quarterly reports by international military experts which I propose will prevent any nation, friend or foe, from secretly developing a dangerous and disproportionate military might.

Seventh. Whatever decision the world makes concerning other future armaments, however, the air power of all nations should be regulated as above suggested so that air force can be used primarily for the prevention of future wars and to give security to nations which have demonstrated their willingness and intention of living as good neighbors without aggressive acts of war. The functions of air power should be reserved essentially to patrol the peace.

Eighth. The International Peace Patrol of the Air should emerge immediately following this war while the men and equipment now being used in the fighting are readily available. This pro-

posal neither demands nor denies the necessity of forming a comprehensive international organization to preserve the peace and to better international living conditions. If such an international organization eventuates, the direction of the International Peace Patrol of the Air can gradually be turned over to the directing agency of that organization. If such an international organization, on the other hand, fails to eventuate, fails to attract the membership of all major nations, or fails to develop promptly after the war, the joint chiefs of staff as presently constituted are in position to begin directing the activities of the peace patrol the day after peace arrives.

Ninth. Participation in the International Peace Patrol of the Air should be open to all present members of the United Nations and to all present neutrals in the ratios already outlined. No nations should be compelled to participate but if many do eventually a sixth or seventh representative can be added to the chiefs of staff comprised of the members from the smaller nations selected by them on a rotating basis. If either the United States, England, Russia, France, or China should fail to join in the formation and functioning of this peace patrol the remaining major powers should proceed without it and that country's representation should be given to other nations desiring to participate.

Should any such nation refuse to participate, which now seems highly improbable, its acceptance should still be sought for permission to inspect its armament plants and use its airports. Only where such permission is denied should a country be excepted from those receiving the quarterly reports.

Denial of such permission would be notice to the world that that nation had something to conceal. It would be an advance warning signal of trouble. It would afford right-minded nations an opportunity to consult together to take stock of the situation before trouble veered into warfare and to take whatever protective or corrective steps that might be necessary. As part of the articles of peace, however, it should be specifically provided that representatives of the peace patrol should have access to the airports and the armament plants of our vanquished foes for all time to come.

Tenth. Much of the work of policing the peace and of ordinary armed forces of occupation could be undertaken by this peace patrol. It is foolhardy to believe that once we have defeated the Axis we can withdraw all our forces and depend upon our enemies to establish order, maintain equity, and conform with the articles of peace.

On the other hand, American soldiers, sailors, and airmen will not want to be stationed for long periods of time in foreign counties doing a gigantic police job far away from home. However, members of the Air Forces are eager to continue flying. They will welcome the opportunity to volunteer to become members of the peace patrol, since this will permit frequent visits home and will assure them a distinguished career of flying and of public service. Within 24 hours a great portion of this vast flying police force could converge on a certain trouble spot and without modern defense against air power an offending country can be forced to give up war as a means of settling international disputes or of satisfying international pride. For a nation to start a war without adequate offensive and defensive air power would be to invite quick and certain disaster for itself.

A G. I. PLAN FOR PERMANENT PEACE?

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed these proposals with many people both in this country and in Europe. I have advised with distinguished American airmen such as my good friend Col. Roscoe Turner of Indianapolis and they have assured me that by reserving to air power the missions of peace we can prevent nations from acquiring the essential machinery for war. Many a G. I. in France and England has told me that he does not want to be assigned as a member of an army of occupation for any length of time. Americans do not take to soldiering in peace and are not candidates in large number for membership in a mercenary army. Once war is ended they want to return to their homes, their schools, and their various means of livelihood.

On the other hand, tens of thousands of our young flying heroes are eager to take up careers in aviation. Ordinary peacetime flying opportunities will accommodate only a small percentage of these ambitions. I am confident that many over 10 times as many volunteers will petition for membership in the International Peace Patrol of the Air as it can possibly utilize.

In discussing this plan while overseas, many a young airman told me, "I would jump at the chance to serve in such a peace patrol of the air." One especially enthusiastic young flyer in France told me, "Congressman, go back and tell America that this is the G. I. plan for permanent peace." Other G. I.'s might not share so radiant an enthusiasm but I am sure we can get the cream of the crop of able flyers of every country in the world and these young men can be provided with permanent careers at good pay, and with the satisfaction of knowing they are engaged in the most important business in the world—the business of making future wars impossible.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my idea that this peace patrol of the air alone can fill the needs of the post-war world for international cooperation. Disputes between nations and international differences will still arise. The use of arbitration, the orderly development of an appropriate international organization to give countries the opportunity to work together in the solution of great problems, a world court in which to adjudicate peacefully the arguments which used to lead to war—all of these will still be desirable and utilitarian. But all of these without the use of force to make their decisions effective will not prevent a future war. This is the job for a police force with ability to act promptly and effectively. The International Peace Patrol of the Air would comprise such a force.

PEACE—WITH SECURITY, SOLVENCY, SELF-GOVERNMENT, AND SOVEREIGNTY

For the first time in history the world has access to a police force which can operate both on land and sea and which can cross continents and oceans in pursuit of its duties. It can secure peace without establishing the hazard that in our desire for peace we shall instead reap only the frightful dividends of more frequent war. It does not infringe upon the constitutional rights of the free people of this country to determine when and against whom we shall go to war and it does not delegate to one man the fateful decision of when or whether the young men of this country are to risk another rendezvous with Mars. Instead it sets up an international police force of the air, dedicated to a specific purpose defined by clear-cut policies shaped by the constitutional governing bodies of all participants.

It does this, Mr. Speaker, while preserving for the United States and every other country the four essential factors of security, solvency, self-government, and sovereignty which I mentioned earlier in this address.

Members of this peace patrol would function not as Americans or as Russians or as Britons but as members of an international police force, directed by an international control board, striking down wars virtually before they have had a day in which to get under way.

This force would strike not as a war commitment by any of the participating powers but as an avenging force for peace, representing the convictions of all countries that war is never again to be used as a means for aggrandizement or as a device for seeking justice against real or imaginary wrongs.

Countries could still resort, if they must, to disputes with their neighbors, to name calling, even to economic strife, but war would have been completely outlawed by dedicating to the patrolling of the peace the use of air power. Without such weapons for either defensive or offensive use, any nation, great or small, is powerless to wage effective war against neighbors, near or far.

OUT OF THIS WAR COMES THE PATTERN FOR PERMANENT PEACE

Out of this war has truly come the lesson which can prevent all future war. The world is now able to secure permanent peace if it wants it. As we go along in our thinking, refinements and additions to this proposal will steadily develop and in this we should call freely upon the experience and ideas of men now in uniform, but the working, operative, effective nucleus of a program to preserve peace permanently is now at hand.

An international peace patrol of the air set into motion at the end of this war can prevent our ever again being either participants or witnesses in another great war. It can stop wars at their source by driving warlike hordes back inside their own boundary lines before the march of Mars gets under way. When those now in uniform return we should also advise with them not only concerning the extended and expanded use of this air patrol but with regard to

more comprehensive forms of world organization and cooperation.

There can never be a big war without having it originate somewhere by some nation striking out across its borders or beyond its shores on a mission of destruction and no country lacking offensive and defensive weapons for air warfare in this modern world can withstand the devastating attacks which a peace patrol of the air could bring down upon it. The only way to prevent big wars is to stop little wars at the very start if it is impossible to stop them from beginning.

It is well that we now discuss plans for the post-war world and that we argue the great opportunities and the troublesome details of international organizations for cooperative effort and for striving toward the goal of permanent peace. Let this continue and let us all prayerfully hope for perfection in these endeavors but without delay and with realistic determination let us now set up the pattern for an international patrol of the air and prepare to put it into operation with the dawn of peace.

We should do this so that never again may a disillusioned world be plunged into the suffering of war because men have planned too slowly or too short-sightedly or because their glorious dreams of peace have lacked a satisfactory method of enforcement.

We can now have peace—permanent peace—if we want it.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 35. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 338. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 31, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, January 31, 1945, to begin hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

There will be a meeting of Bridge Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 o'clock p. m., Wednesday, January 31, 1945, to begin public hearings on H. R. 541, a bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

This hearing postponed, subject to call of the Chair.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

146. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the United States Office of Education for the 1944 fiscal year; to the Committee on Education.

147. A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering the operations of Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1944, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

148. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

149. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the twenty-fourth national report, Disabled American Veterans, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1859. A bill to amend the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. R. 1860. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a duplicate of Porterfield scrip certificate No. 53 to the Muskegon Trust Co., Muskegon, Mich., as trustee of the John Torrent trust; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1861. A bill to provide duplicate posthumous awards in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1862. A bill relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1863. A bill providing for the same retired rank for officers by virtue of having occupied the same command; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1864. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drainage works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 1865. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 1866. A bill to forgive one-half of the unforgiven portion of the individual income tax for 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 1867. A bill to reopen the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1868. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land and naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1869. A bill to extend the time for filing certain applications for insurance payments under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1870. A bill to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1871. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to extend the time within which veterans may apply for the loan benefits provided by such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1872 (by request). A bill to amend paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, so as to increase the basic monthly allowance to handicapped veterans while receiving vocational training and to provide uniform increases of pension or compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 1873. A bill to provide for the conveyance to former owners after the present war of certain real property acquired by the United States by condemnation for military or naval purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 1874. A bill to increase the number of cadets of the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1875. A bill to grant certain veterans' preference benefits to certain persons who serve in the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in the present war; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to reimburse uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1876. A bill granting an increase of pension to Robert Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Maj. William Peyton Tidwell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Waymon H. Massey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, Ralph Demert, and the estate of Lon Thurman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1880. A bill for the relief of Harold M. Ensley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1881. A bill for the relief of R. I. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1882. A bill for the relief of R. L. Whittington, Mrs. R. L. Whittington, and Mrs. J. B. Whittington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Jess Willard Dean and his dependents; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1884. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harrison H. Bradford; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1885 A bill to authorize the presentation to Edward R. Egan of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise A. Ellison; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leroy A. Robbins; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of James Leon Keaton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of New York:

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Anna Mattil and others; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of the estate of Peter G Fabian, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 1891. A bill for the relief of the Grandview Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Babcock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

42. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Typographical Union, No. 94, of Jersey City, N. J., favoring the immediate revision of the Little Steel formula in order to bring wages in conformity with prices, and so memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to this effect; to the Committee on Labor.

43. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the adoption of House bill 451; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Righteous art Thou, O Lord, and true art Thy judgments; we therefore pray Thee to bow down Thine ear, for we are poor and needy. When we feel the sorrow and sting of sin, let the healing shadow of Thy Cross rest upon us, giving peace and comfort to the waiting soul. Thou who art the way out of every wrong and the escape from brooding regret, help us always to lift our feet in the royal march of Christian character.

We pray today for the triumph of faith, for the dominion of hope, and for the ruggedness of courage. Inspire us to overcome the trammels of smallness and local boundaries, and behold Him who surmounted every barrier and became the Son of Man for the salvation of all races. Enable us to make full proof of our calling by marking the lines of our conduct, by self-restraint, by living up to our ideals, and by the recognition that forgiveness is a higher law than resentment. O do Thou take away the things which are divisive and would hinder our union and mutual cooperation, that we may write in the life of our country chivalry of soul and the testimony of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 30, 1945.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052–a), I have designated Hon. ANDREW J. MAY, Hon. R. EWING THOMASON, Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS, Hon. DEWEY SHORT, and Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS, members of the Committee on Military Affairs, as members from this committee to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy.

Very truly yours,
ANDREW J. MAY, *Chairman.*

THE COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced yesterday that he would rather not recognize Members today or tomorrow to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, production last year of 620,000,000 tons of bituminous coal set an all-time record. Yet the consumption of coal in the war industry and the shortage of other types of fuel, such as oil, gas, and wood, in a winter of great severity created an unprecedented demand. Coal operators with whom I have conferred tell me that the best answer to the current coal shortage in 17 Eastern States is a 48-hour workweek in the bituminous coal fields.

According to the report received today from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of the Department of Labor, the average number of hours worked in the bituminous coal fields in 1944 was 43.38, and the average of workdays lost by reason of absenteeism was 11.96. It will be observed that absenteeism among coal miners was considerably above the national average.

In World War No. 1 the first action taken by the Congress to assure full production was to suspend for the duration of the war the 8-hour day. In the spring of 1942, when the Smith-Vinson bill was pending before the Naval Affairs Committee and we were trying to win the war on the home front on the basis of a 40-hour workweek, I pleaded for an hour with the committee to write into the bill a provision suspending the 40-hour law for the duration of the war. It was a depression spread-the-work device wholly incompatible with an all-out war effort. We would not have before us today a compulsory work bill if we had adopted a 48-hour workweek when we entered this war. Our military program has suffered from our failure to do so; and if our farmers had not voluntarily worked a 60-hour week and longer, this would have been for us on the home front a hungry winter as well as a cold one.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a prayer of General Patton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain communications from the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by William Henry Chamberlin, noted news commentator, entitled "By What Moral Right?" concerning the attitude of Russia toward the smaller nations of Europe. According to the views set forth by Mr. Chamberlin, it would appear that our Russian ally is not guided by the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The SPEAKER. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from one of the leading papers of Nevada on the pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Director of the Emergency War Pipeline, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal, and further to extend my remarks and include a statement by Col. Lynn C. Barnes, district engineer of the United States Corps of Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include in one an address delivered by me in New York City on January 23; in another an address delivered by me in New York City on January 24; and in the third an address delivered by me in Chicago, Ill., on January 27.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 6]

Beall	Jennings	O'Brien, Mich.
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Okla.	Powers
Dickstein	Kefauver	Sabath
Eaton	LaFollette	Satterfield
Eberharter	Mansfield, Mont.	Trimble
Gardner	Merrow	Wasielewski
Hart	Morgan	West
Hébert	Murdock	White
Heidinger	Norrell	Winter
Horan		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 401 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1752, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday we had completed the reading of section 1. Amendments are now in order to section 1.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in order to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make this inquiry for the benefit of Members on both sides of the aisle. It is my understanding the chairman has no disposition to rush this matter or to shut off debate. It appears there is a great number of amendments to be offered. For the benefit of a number of Members who have inquired of me concerning this matter, am I correct in understanding that it is not the chairman's intention to continue beyond 5 o'clock this evening?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, it is not our intention to continue beyond 5 o'clock unless at that time something comes up which makes it necessary to continue further with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I thank the gentleman. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to be exacting in these matters. I want to go along with the membership as much as possible, but I do hope we can expedite the consideration of the measure without unnecessary delay.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended—

"(1) By inserting before section 1 the title heading:

"'TITLE I—TRAINING AND SERVICE IN LAND AND NAVAL FORCES';

"(2) By striking out 'this act' wherever appearing therein, except where it appears in sections 10 (a) (1), 10 (b), 10 (c), 15 and 16, and inserting in lieu thereof 'this title'; and

"(3) By inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'TITLE II—UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER FOR CIVILIAN AND WAR-SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES

"'DECLARATION OF POLICY AND INTENT OF CONGRESS

"'SEC. 21. The Congress hereby declares that in order to effectuate, on a voluntary basis, the total mobilization and most effective use of the civilian manpower of the Nation in support of the war effort, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive investigation and reappraisal of the civilian manpower of the United States.

"'SEC. 22. The Director of Selective Service is hereby directed (a) to provide for the registration and adequate occupational classification of all registrants liable for training under title I of this act, except those serving on active duty in the armed forces and those exempted or deferred from training or service therein by 5 (c) (1) or (d) of title I. This registration and classification shall be conducted through the local boards of the Selective Service System in conjunction with the War Manpower Commission, who shall furnish to such boards such expert, technical, and other assistance and personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"'(b) Upon request from the War Manpower Commission to require the local boards to furnish to the United States Employment Service a list of the names and addresses of registrants available for employment in war or war-supporting activities, including agriculture, for voluntary assignment of such registrants to civilian or Federal employment in furtherance of the war effort in accordance with the determination of essentiality and priority requirements made by the War Manpower Commission.

"'SEC. 23. The Director of Selective Service shall, as hereinafter provided, direct the local boards to conduct an investigation of the use of civilian manpower within their respective jurisdictions for the purpose of ascertaining whether the maximum and most effective use of such manpower is being made for the best interests of the war effort. The local boards shall use the services and facilities of the War Manpower Commission to conduct such investigation, which shall include in-plant surveys whenever and wherever necessary to accomplish this purpose. For such purpose the War Manpower Commission may, wherever necessary, employ expert and technical personnel by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923. In the utilization of the services and facilities of the War Manpower Commission, the local boards shall operate under the supervision, direction, and control of the various area directors and management-labor committees of the War Manpower Commission where such are available. They shall report their findings forthwith to the Director of Selective Service and to the War Manpower Commission, together with a statement of the number of persons in their respective jurisdictions available for service in war and war-supporting activities; and said agencies shall forthwith make a full report thereon to Congress. Wherever any board and/or War Manpower Commission area director and the management-labor committee, acting together or separately, find indications of wastage or hoarding of labor or situations wherein labor is not being used to the best interests of the war effort in either Federal or private employment, the employers, the employees, and/or the employees' representatives shall be required to cooperate fully in such investigation and in the selection of skilled and other employees to be released for other employment. After determination that such worker can be more effectively employed in war work and that either the worker does not have good cause for refusing to accept such employment or the employer fails to furnish adequate justification for the retention of said employee, the War Manpower Commission shall thereupon require his release. In order to aid the selective-service local boards and the War Manpower Commission in the exercise of the additional duties required of them under this title, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may assign to such boards, in an advisory capacity, representatives of such other agencies of the Government as he may deem advisable.

"'SEC. 24. The boards are hereby empowered to subpena persons to appear before them and give evidence upon such matters as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and for such purpose the provisions of section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence) are hereby made applicable to the powers of such boards.

" 'SEC. 25. The Director of Selective Service shall prescribe regulations to provide the necessary traveling expenses and subsistence allowances during travel and until commencement of work of persons volunteering under this title for civilian or Federal employment or service in a locality other than that of their residence: *Provided*, That travel expenses and subsistence shall be computed in the same manner and on the same basis as under the standard Government travel regulations. On or after the date of a determination that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in the war effort, or on or after the date of his being involuntarily separated from such employment, he shall receive similar travel and subsistence back to the place from which he was first allowed travel under this subsection (or, at his election, to his home if that is not farther distant), if application is made therefor within 30 days after such date.

" 'SEC. 26. Any person who volunteers for service under this title, or who is required to relinquish regular employment to undertake such service shall, upon application to his employer within 40 days after the termination of such service, if it is determined that his services are no longer necessary in war or war-supporting activities, be entitled to be restored to his former position, or to a position of like seniority, status, or pay, unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make such restoration impossible or unreasonable. This section shall not require the reemployment of any such person by any State or political subdivision thereof, but it is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that such person should be restored to his position with such State or political subdivision or to a position of like seniority, status, or pay. Nothing in this section shall supersede any of the provisions of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, as amended.

" 'SEC. 27. Nothing in this title shall affect in any manner any of the provisions of section 5 (k), or any other provisions of title I.

" 'SEC. 28. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.' "

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with inasmuch as the bill was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2 days ago, and numerous copies are available to the membership here on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am for the substitute, but I object also. I want it read in full.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additonal minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which is offered in the nature of a substitute to the committee bill, seeks to avoid direct coercion of American labor. It would accomplish just two things. It would give the local draft boards the right to reclassify registrants and to provide jobs for them, or offer them jobs on a voluntary basis. It would permit the Federal agency to pay round-trip expenses for a man assigned to a job away from his home. It also gives the War Manpower Commission additional authority.

I believe it is recognized by us here, and by responsible people in Government, in industry, and in labor organizations that labor is being hoarded and wasted in many essential industries. I think it must be admitted that Government agencies and Government-operated plants are among the worst wasters of manpower. This amendment would give the Manpower Commission legal authority to survey all Government and private activities and to force full utilization of manpower. Both labor and management recommend this as the first essential toward solution of our manpower problem, and I believe the War Manpower Commission has been seeking just such legislation.

I do not question the sincerity of those who champion this committee bill, but I do believe that many of its advocates have become just a little emotional and sentimental about this legislation. I hope they will let their sound judgment guide their decision. Some of my colleagues have asked: What would you say to the ex-serviceman, the combat soldier over in Europe or down in South Pacific when he comes back and you tell him that you voted against a labor draft? I would answer by asking this question: What are they going to say to this combat man when he comes back from his fight against tyranny and totalitarianism to explain why you voted to shackle his father or his brother—10,000,000 of whom are doing a marvelous job in war industry.

I am convinced there is no real necessity for this legislation. Who sponsors it? Who asks for it today? The President has said he believes it is necessary. I do not question his sincerity; maybe he does believe it is necessary. War and Navy Department officials have spoken for compulsory legislation. J. A. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board, also insists that labor conscription is necessary. This is the man who just a few weeks ago, according to the press, said that the Congress of the United States—you men sitting on this floor together with the Members of the Senate—were responsible for the ammunition shortage. On the other hand, labor and management both almost unanimously warn that coercion will hamper rather than help war production. Who knows more about the manpower situation in this Nation than the executives of the industries which must produce these munitions, planes, tanks, and weapons, or the labor organizations whose members do the work in the plants?

I have great admiration for Judge Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, but he is a lawyer; he was a judge on the bench when he came down here. It is his job to get production, that is true; but does he know anything about employing labor? Does he know anything about translating a blueprint into a tank or a gun? I could say the same for other witnesses who testified in behalf of this legislation. I frankly say to you, Mr. Chairman, I would rather trust the judgment of the men and women in labor and industry who have so far done such a miraculous job in supplying our men and women at the fighting fronts. It is said that General Marshall and Admiral King wrote letters supporting this draft legislation. I read the letter that General Marshall sent up here, and I challenge anybody to show me anywhere in that letter that he asks for this legislation. Of course, he asked for more men and more production. We are going to see that he gets both. He will get his 900,000 men by July, and he will get them without this legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. And the letter that General Marshall wrote to the President which was transmitted to our committee applied to the work-or-fight bill and not to this particular May bill now before the House. When General Marshall was invited to come down and testify before our committee, he was too busy to appear. That is how strong he is for the legislation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I will support any legislation no matter how drastic it may be if it is shown to be necessary to our troops at the front; but I cannot support this legislation in the present form, because I am convinced it will do more harm than good.

Consider the joint report of the Department of Labor and the War Manpower Commission, released last month. It shows that there is no shortage of manpower. One million one hundred thousand workers left war industries last year, yet production was up. Other responsible estimates say as many as 1,500,000 people have left war plants. What has become of those 1,500,000 workers? They have not disappeared into thin air. Some, of course, have entered the armed services. A committee witness estimates that from 300,000 to 500,000 of them are now in uniform. That still leaves about 1,000,000 former war workers available. Most of those who left essential jobs in recent months did so because they shared the optimistic belief prevailing last summer and fall that the war in Europe was all but over. They can be brought back into essential jobs without coercion.

Mr. SHORT. Since the German counteroffensive by Von Rundstedt in the middle of December, over 100,000 of them have voluntarily gone back into war industries, 63,000 in the last 2 weeks of December, and over 50,000 during the first 2 weeks of January.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I understand that is true.

Here is another item in addition to that backlog of a million workers. The armed forces are releasing every month an average of 70,000 men. Many of those men are able to go into industry. They are eager to get jobs back home. I believe

it was Mr. Hines of the American Federation of Labor who testified before our committee, and you will find it in the hearings, that his organization had placed 41,000 in 1 month, 50,000 in another, of these returning World War No. 2 veterans in war industry.

It is variously estimated that we will need from 70,000 to 700,000 men in industry within the next 6 months. You may choose your own estimate, but I think the War Manpower figures are the most accurate available. They should know about the manpower situation; and they say that 300,000 will be adequate. I believe that one source alone, the pool of returning veterans, can just about meet the requirement as War Manpower Commission estimates it.

Now, much has been said about the IV–F's.

In the President's message he referred to some four million men now in this classification. Advocates of draft legislation want to reach that great group of men. We tried for days to find out exactly how many IV–F's there are in war industry, but nobody knows. It is known that 500,000 of that group are so physically handicapped that they cannot work in industry; that another million of them are actually employed in essential industry. That leaves some two and one-half million about whom we know nothing. It is assumed many are in nonessential industry. Also that many are plainly dodging their clear duty in this emergency. The assumption may or may not be correct. But assuming them to be entirely accurate, I do not want to draft men and chain them to their jobs, just to reach a few IV–F's who lack the patriotism to get into essential work. Please let me avoid even the slightest reflection on the patriotism of the men who have been classified IV–F's. I know many of them have tried their very best to get into the service and have been rejected. Many of them have appealed to me, and I have tried to help them get in. Maybe there are a few men who have been, as my esteemed chairman said, loafing around the pool rooms. Maybe there are a few neurotics and diabetics that the services could not take, because they would be liabilities in any capacity. But shall we draft all the labor in this country to reach those few?

This committee bill even goes further. It might get a few slackers, but it would give them benefits that the 10,000,000 men and women already in industry are not getting. It would give them the same rights and privileges given those boys in the infantry I saw fighting on the western front. What will the battle-front soldier say about this when he comes back? He will say, "You have given to the slacker over here the privilege that I have been given for combat service."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And with tremendously more pay involved.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. In addition to those benefits he would get the industrial rate of pay. He would receive transportation from home to job and back. I do not think this Congress wants to enact that kind of legislation. We have given you a substitute here that I think will reach this problem through voluntary cooperation. And it gives the War Manpower Commission the authority to force proper use of available manpower.

We had a witness before our committee who worked for the General Electric Co. at Schenectady. I was negotiating with the War Manpower Commission at the time he testified about a situation in Fort Wayne, Ind., where this company said it was short a few hundred men. While this witness was testifying he said there were 8,000 workers at the General Electric Co. in Schenectady out of work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In Fort Wayne, perhaps, they were short three or four hundred men on a very critical war item. This witness testified further that the Schenectady plant of General Electric was set up to do the same work that was short of manpower in Fort Wayne.

How can labor conscription ever correct such situations? Obviously, the answer here rests with the procurement agencies and management, which must improve production planning and scheduling.

Would it not be much easier to shift work than to move squads and battalions of workers in such cases? Possibly this is expecting too much cooperation from Government agencies.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I received a letter yesterday from a workingman who was discharged from the Kaiser shipyard at Vancouver, Wash., in which he stated that hundreds of men were discharged last week because they did not have work for them to do, and on the same day they hired 1,500 new green hands from Texas. Is the gentleman aware of what is taking place in some of these plants, hiring new men where they do not have a need for them?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is just exactly what this bill is intended to get at. It directs the War Manpower Commission to make a complete survey of the situation. I understand the War Manpower Commission is already staffed to do that very job.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. In corroboration of what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has just said, representatives of both the American Federation of Labor and of the C. I. O. testified that in many plants in different parts of the country where the Army and Navy have said there was a shortage of manpower, upon investigation, industry and labor both discovered that instead of there being a shortage there was really a surplus, and men and women were actually being laid off. This substitute bill will give us a scientific, thorough, exhaustive survey before we undertake any drastic legislative action.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think most of us know that the armed services do not utilize their available manpower to the fullest extent. I have a letter before me, received the day before yesterday from a Seabee in the Navy, stationed at Quoddy Village, Maine. In that letter he tells me there are 2,000 Seabees who have been in foreign service. They have slight disabilities. As you know, Seabees are skilled craftsmen. But 2,000 of them are sitting up there doing absolutely nothing. And this skilled man appeals to me to persuade the Navy Department to let them go out into industry and take these jobs crying for skilled labor.

While the example is not offered as typical of all service installations, it can be duplicated time and again. The inquiries of the special subcommittee of my Committee on Military Affairs, set up through my suggestion, prove how frequently both military and civilian agencies of government are hoarding and wasting manpower.

I urge you, therefore, to consider my substitute bill carefully. You are given an opportunity here to vote for a bill that both industry and labor would like to see enacted. I believe I can assure you that these people know better how to recruit industrial manpower and to fulfill our war needs than anyone else. I urge your support of my substitute.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: Page 6, after line 6, add a new paragraph, to read as follows:

"Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to modify or otherwise affect in any way existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay or collective bargaining, or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any labor controversies or questions: *Provided*, That every person assigned to employment under this section shall have the right to join any union or organization of employees, but no such person shall be obliged to join any such union or organization as a condition of his employment if he should not freely choose to do so."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to ask whether this amendment is offered to the substitute or to the first section of the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. It is offered to the first section of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is being offered to the first section of the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that by the introduction of this amendment I have somewhat violently changed the

subject, at least potentially. It is necessary for me to offer it at this time in order that the Committee may pass upon it in accordance with proper parliamentary procedure. Section 1 of the May bill is at present open to perfecting amendments and this is the only opportunity for me to offer it. When section 1 is perfected then, as I understand, the question goes back to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment in order to clarify and strengthen this measure. I want it understood, however, that in the event it should be rejected by the Committee I shall still vote for the May bill. I believe from the bottom of my heart that our greatest objective is the approval of the May bill as reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. I think, however, the May bill in certain respects would be advantaged by clarification, and I have these thoughts in mind about it. It has been contended and charged very widely, for example, that the May bill is an antilabor bill; that it is an antistrike bill. It has been portrayed in that fashion far and wide. I am myself convinced that the committee in reporting it had no such intention. But doubts will arise about it and they should be done away with. As a matter of fact I have never believed it either wise or practical to attempt what is known as antistrike legislation. I do not believe it can be done effectively. I do not think it should be attempted. There are no such provisions in existing labor laws as would forbid strikes, and the omission of such provisions is, I think, wise.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it the opinion of the gentleman, as I understand it to be the opinion of the Committee on Military Affairs, that the May bill as it now is before the House, could not be used; that is, its penalty provisions could not be used in the event of a strike?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is my opinion and it is derived largely from the very able remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] in discussing that very question.

Mr. Chairman, we have an important body of law upon the statute books relating to employer and employee relationships, such as the National Labor Relations Act, and other acts. Under those laws provisions are made for the carrying on of bargaining between employer and employee. None of us wants to interfere with that. There are provisions in those laws with respect to minimum wages and maximum hours. I do not want anyone to rise in the event of the enactment of the May bill and state in view of the fact that a new element is introduced, we will say, in industry as a result of the operation of this bill, that those laws are in any way undermined.

So this amendment is intended to make it absolutely clear that the act itself does not modify or affect in any way existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay, or collective bargaining, or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any controversies or questions. Frankly I think it would be wise for the Congress to declare that. It would clear the atmosphere.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Of course, the gentleman knows that under existing law, particularly section 7 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, collective-bargaining agreements are authorized and provided for. In the event a labor organization has entered into a contract with its employees in a particular plant, plant A, for instance, if your amendment is adopted which provides that that man who is sent to plant A is not required to join that union, is that not an interference with a negotiated and concluded agreement, which does require each employee of a closed shop to pay dues when he enters?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If my amendment were adopted, there is no doubt whatsoever that for the duration of this war that contract would be suspended, in the manner covered by this amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Please let me continue just a moment.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like clarification of that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the stress of war, may I remind the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], many, many contracts are suspended. In this very bill there is a provision to the effect that those who are assigned to work under its provisions shall be the beneficiaries of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act. What does the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act do but suspend contracts?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act, amongst other things, protects a man who is drafted into the armed forces from the obligation to pay interest on a mortgage on his home which he has had to leave. That is suspension of a contract. The same way with the payment of his taxes. In a sense, that is suspension of a contract.

Hundreds and hundreds of industrial plants have had to suspend contracts when the Government has come to them and said: "No matter what you are doing under contract with your customers, you have got to stop doing that and go to work for the war." There is nothing new in this proposal that a contract may be suspended, in the interest of the war effort.

It strikes me that in view of the crisis which confronts us, no sensible man should object to the temporary suspension of a contract, which I have dealt with in this amendment. It would injure no one. It is a temporary matter. These employees who are going into these plants are temporary employees. In all probability a large number of them will be perfectly willing to join a union. Well and good. But if they do not, shall they be denied employment that the Nation requires of them? We come down to the fundamental question there, which I think should be made clear.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I just want to point out that in every case the suspension of a contract is in favor of the man who is inducted. So it would be under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It leaves him free to go in or not to go in. It protects his individual rights. That is the same principle we have followed in every other instance where we have suspended contracts in favor of the inductee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I proceed just a little while longer in this discussion?

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not offered in a spirit of hostility to organized labor. I cannot see how it would injure organized labor in the slightest degree. The bargaining power in a plant which is operating under a closed shop will still lie with the union; no power will be taken away from it whatsoever. The hours of labor will still be protected in accordance with the agreement between the union and the employer. The minimum and maximum wage provisions will all stand undisturbed, the union holding its position. The men who may go into war plants under the provisions of this bill will, we all know, be a small minority, comparatively, of all the people employed in a plant. Their advent in a plant will not be dangerous to the union in the slightest degree. No social gains whatsoever will be surrendered. But we must determine whether or not when a man is assigned to a job by the Government of the United States he shall take that job without conditions being imposed by somebody else. That is my plea.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The Selective Service Act is built upon the principle of the closed shop; so is this legislation. Under the closed shop we have made prodigious gains in production. The gentleman is asking that that be discontinued in plants producing war goods.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. KEEFE rose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I must yield first to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman in the first portion of his amendment sets forth what he alleges to be protection of labor's rights, particularly collective bargaining; but as a realistic proposition the gentleman knows that there can be no collective bargaining unless there is a union which has a majority of the employees belonging to it. Collective bargaining becomes a mockery unless there is a collective bargaining agent for the workers. Experience shows that their only valuable agent is a labor

union; yet the gentleman would destroy the union by the last sentence of his amendment and thereby he nullifies all of the allegedly prolabor language in his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot agree with the gentleman from New York. When these new workers go into a plant they will find that the union, be it a closed shop or merely an organized plant, is in charge of collective bargaining; and the union will always have a majority of the employees. The question simply is: Shall we make a man pay a fee in order to serve his country where he is most needed? That is all.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. As a practical and realistic approach to the problem, may I ask the gentleman what would happen if John Jones, ordered to report to plant A to work under this proposed legislation, is asked to join a union but refuses, and the employer says to him, "I cannot hire you because you do not belong to the union." He then goes back to his draft board and says, "I have reported in accordance with your orders; now, what are you going to do about it"? There is nothing in the gentleman's amendment or in this bill which says to the employer that he must hire the individual that the draft board sends to him. Consequently, if he can be relieved of his responsibility because of his refusal to join the union and the employer refuses to hire him for that reason, then employee B, who does belong to the union, can quit his job, go right down to his draft board, and say, "I want to volunteer for service under this new plan," and he can then go back to the employer and get the benefit of the soldiers and sailors civil relief and say, "I do not have to belong to the union." Would that have the effect, in the gentleman's opinion, of destroying or making it possible to destroy unions operating in the war plants of this country?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not think so.

Mr. Chairman, may I make a few observations in connection with the machinery provided in this act? It states here on page 5:

> It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

All right. That is all right so far as it goes. This registrant prefers in his own mind to work in a certain kind of job. He goes to a plant and he finds that he cannot be employed unless he joins a union. He goes back and reports that fact to the draft board but adds: "There is another plant which offers work which I think I would like." So he goes to that plant and there also meets the same reply. Unless I am mistaken, that man has complied with the provisions of this act. Nothing more can be done about it. He has been given his reasonable choice, but in the following out of the matter it becomes impossible. It is not his fault. I do not think the language at the top of page 5 deals with this situation with sufficient clarity and strength. I believe in asking a man where he would prefer to work. If he says, "I would rather work in the Smith plant," all right, he goes up there. He is assigned to that plant. When he gets there he should be employed. That is where he wants to go, that is where he is needed. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Assume that this draftee presents himself for employment and he is told he must join a union. He says he will not join a union at all. Therefore he cannot work in that factory. The question I want to ask is this: The union has established its collective-bargaining rights and those rights are protected by law. No man can work there unless he does join the union. If the May bill without any clarification becomes law, as a matter of fact, there is an inconsistency between the law passed by the Congress establishing the union and giving it collective-bargaining rights, and the later law, the May bill, passed by the Congress. Would not the last law repeal the first law if it is inconsistent with the first law?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all. There is no disturbance whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would not take the time of the Committee today for a moment if it were not for the deep concern I have about this legislation. If I did not think it vitally necessary for the war effort to pass a bill I would not take your time. In speaking upon this amendment and others that will be offered, for purposes that are mine I do not have to argue the merits of this amendment or others.

As far as the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana is concerned I cannot but think it is nothing more than a pious appeal for people to do what they have already been appealed to do. I want legislation. I think I know the temper of this House. I think I know that there are a hundred men in this House who are going to vote against any bill on final passage. I have watched this House operate. Some people say this is not needed; that legislation of this sort is not necessary. In 1941, a few weeks before Pearl Harbor, I remember honest, conscientious men and women said that we did not need to extend the Selective Service Act because in all probability we would not need an Army soon. I heard that argument made with respect to practically every measure brought before the House of Representatives during our years and months of preparation to defend ourselves. If their judgment had been taken, what would have been our situation at the time of Pearl Harbor? What would have been our situation 12 months after Pearl Harbor? I do not know. You do not know either, but I think it would have been pretty bad.

Any amendment placed on this bill that is going to lose it a large block of votes, whatever merits it may have, is a dangerous amendment. I am certainly not criticizing the author of this amendment because if there ever was a man in the House of Representatives who has stood 100 percent during the years for preparedness, it has been the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. But in my opinion, today, sir, you are assuming a tremendous responsibility; one that I do not like to see you assume.

I believe that the adoption of this amendment will lose this bill on a final roll call from 50 to 75 votes. I do not have to take a position on the merits of this amendment. That is not what I am talking about. If this amendment is adopted, then others will be offered, and then others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have watched bills in this House. Many times I have seen committees of the House disclaim and disown their own bills when many amendments were adopted.

If this amendment is adopted, we may get into the gleeful pastime of adopting other amendments. I want to say this: I have seen men get up on the floor of this House and say they would support this legislation even though it was a mighty poorly drawn bill, and so forth.

Judge Patterson said he could operate under this bill as it is written. The Army and the Navy say that they can operate and do the job of getting the 900,000 men into the armed forces and the 700,000 men and women in industry that they say are vitally needed for replacements on the battle fronts and for places on the fighting line.

If this bill had never been brought to the floor of the House, that would be one thing. Even if the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations, whom the boys out on the battle fronts look up to as their leaders in the Army and in the Navy, had not said that this is needed in order to prepare the instruments with which our men are to defend themselves and fight the enemy, what are these men, who have been on the battle fronts so long without relief, and who have already taken more at the front than any of us thought mortal men could bear, going to think if we do not pass a bill?

If this amendment is adopted, it is my opinion, as I say, that it will lose the bill on final passage 50 to 75 votes, and that is a sizable group. Then some-

body is going to offer the so-called F. E. P. C. amendment, and if that is adopted it will lose the bill 50 to 75 votes. Adding these to the number of Members who are probably going to vote against any kind of a bill and you have in the neighborhood of 250 Members who will vote against the bill. That is a responsibility which under the circumstances I do not feel like assuming.

It has been said that we in America are optimists. Men supposed to be well informed sat in my office in June 1943, and said that this war would be over by September of that year. When it was not over by September, they said certainly Germany could not live through another winter; but it did.

If you want a bill, if you want to satisfy the boys out there who are doing their part and more than their part, you had better vote down all of these amendments that will eliminate support and go on and pass it, so that the men who are at the helm of our destiny may go ahead and do the things they thing are necessary in order to win this war.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, we started the consideration of this bill today by the offering of a substitute amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. We now have before us for discussion the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to perfect the first section of the bill. I also wish to offer one or two amendments to the first section in order to perfect it. I wonder if we should first dispose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York before taking up anything further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. We should first dispose of the Wadsworth amendment.

The Chair understands that the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has sent an amendment to the Wadsworth amendment to the desk. Does he wish to offer it now?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to offer it at this time.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, it must be perfectly apparent to every Member of this body that the further along this discussion goes the more confusing the issue becomes.

Mr. Chairman, I have carefully listened to all of the debates on the pending bill. Out of the welter of emotionalism that consideration of this bill has generated, a few basic conclusions may be stated.

First. Every Member of this body without exception wants to do everything possible to aid the courageous men and women who are fighting our battles at the front.

Second. Despite the political assurances given prior to November 7, 1944, that all was well, the hard, cold facts demonstrate the necessity for continued all-out production.

Third. Mistakes of judgment as to manpower and matériel requirements have been made.

Fourth. Present considerations of past mistakes and politically inspired distortion of truth will not in themselves relieve either the shortages of manpower in the armed services or relieve the bottlenecks of production.

Fifth. Our job now is to get on with the war effort, through the fullest and most complete utilization of all the productive capacity of the Nation.

Reasonable-minded men and women are in agreement thus far. Disagreement arises over the means and methods to be employed in achieving a common purpose. The proponents of the pending legislation point out the deficiencies that exist and contend that the enactment of this legislation will relieve the situation. They admit that free and voluntary labor acting in cooperation with the genius of industry have resulted in unparalleled production records. In the face of this admission so freely expressed by the proponents of this legislation, they still insist that compulsory conscription of labor is necessary, and thus have brought this bill to us for consideration. They say the bill is imperfect—that many of its provisions are not understandable. None of the proponents can give assurance that the enactment of this legislation will relieve our productive effort from a single element that has brought about the alleged shortages. They say we should have faith in the Commander in Chief and in the Chiefs of Staff and blindly enact this legislation because they contend the Commander in Chief has asked for it.

I want to give to the Commander in Chief and to those charged with the responsibility for successfully carrying on our war effort every aid and assistance. My responsibility as a legislator, however, compels me to ask some questions in order to determine the proper course to pursue. I cannot blindly, under the stress of temporary emotionalism, vote for legislation the proponents of which have up to date utterly failed, in my judgment, to justify. The simple question is, Will the passage of this legislation provide the manpower needed for the Army and the Navy relieve the shortages of manpower in industry and agriculture, and bring about the increased production necessary to relieve the admitted shortages? If I believed it would do this, I would unhesitatingly support it. Until I am so convinced, however, I cannot vote to substitute conscription and compulsion under threat of dire penalty, for patriotic, voluntary effort.

I have read the hearings in this matter. They all relate to H. R. 119, originally offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]. The thesis of that bill was entirely different from that embodied in H. R. 1752, the bill now under consideration. We have no testimony in specific reference to the pending legislation, and nowhere, either in the hearings or in the record of these debates, is there to be found specific information as to how this legislation in operation will relieve the bottlenecks of which we complain. There is nothing in this bill that will eliminate the staggering waste of manpower and matériel which is admittedly present in much of our war productive effort. There is nothing in this bill that will relieve our productive effort from the costly waste of manpower involved in plant jurisdictional disputes. There is nothing in this bill that will give assurance of the utilization of the highest productive effort of the men and women presently employed in industry. There is nothing in this bill that will relieve our productive effort from the smothering effect of slow-downs, production ceilings, and so forth.

Because of these facts, no witness has been able to testify that the enactment of this legislation will actually and realistically relieve the situation of which we complain. General Eisenhower, General Patton, General MacArthur, Admiral King, and General Marshall have been crystal-clear in their demands that what they want is guns, ammunition, trucks, and supplies, and a direct approach to the solution of the problem of shortages which involves something far greater than the mere enactment of this legislation. What they seek is the instilling in the hearts and souls of the people on the production front in America of a consuming passion to produce without restraint and without restriction from any source. Labor has made a remarkable effort, which can be improved, provided we enact wise legislation. You cannot put into the souls of the people of America the desire to work and produce by the enactment of legislation. There is nothing that can supplant the will and the determination and the patriotic desire to produce under a voluntary free system in America. That is why labor and management have joined hands in opposing the enactment of the present legislation and why the arguments which were presented as they appear in the hearings have great compelling force.

On the other hand, because of the psychology which has swept the country, generated by the emotionalism of the appeals which have been made, I cannot see my way clear to deny any type of legislation and to say to the President, and General Marshall and Admiral King and General Knudsen, "No, we refuse to give any measure of relief." To maintain such an attitude, in my judgment, would be to fail to meet our responsibility as legislators. We have a system in vogue today based upon voluntary action and developed in the crucible of experience. That program is involved in the regulations of the War Manpower Commission, which have generally been accepted by management and labor-management committees as being the orderly solution for the immediate problem before us. I am one of those who believe that the Congress should adopt the substitute to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. This substitute removes most of the objections to the pending bill and puts some teeth into the present program of the War Manpower Commission. It proposes to

give statutory authority for: First, the establishment of employment ceilings; second, the use of controlled referrals to regulate hiring; third, authorizing compulsory release of employees in excess of the number permitted individual employers under manpower ceilings; and fourth, the enforcement of such regulations not against the employee but against the employer, through proceedings comparable to those used to enforce price ceilings, under the Price Control Act.

This program has the entire complete support of management and of the leaders of labor who have worked so diligently in the creation and stimulation of labor-management committees throughout the Nation. Those familiar with the operations of this plan know that it will, so far as legislative enactments can, help bring about the results which we so fervently hope to achieve. The implementation of the present voluntary plan of the War Manpower Commission will result in the utilization of the far-flung machinery of that organization which is now in operation throughout the country. It should cause no unrest in the ranks of organized or unorganized labor and will have the full and complete support of management.

Each of you received this morning from the National Manufacturers' Association a complete analysis of this proposal and they put their stamp of full and complete approval upon it. I can say to you that it is my understanding that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and its organizations fully endorse and support the proposals in the Voorhis amendment; and I know that many great labor leaders in the country support the provisions of the Voorhis amendment.

Here is a program that those who are interested in production instead of mere regimentation can support. Here is a program that will stand the test. Here is a program that clearly distinguishes between free labor and conscript labor. Here is a program that will get the job done. I sincerely plead with my colleagues to accept this substitute.

It will not do merely to delay by having further and more extended consideration and study, as is suggested in the Barrett bill, H. R. 1803. Time is of the essence in this matter. The shortages complained of must be relieved now and not 6 months from now.

All of the fears of confusion, regimentation, conscription, and compulsion that are found in H. R. 1752 can be eliminated, and under the provisions of the Voorhis substitute free American labor can go to work under proper restraint and stimulation and actually produce the implements and munitions of war that are needed.

The Barrett bill is better than the present bill, but I ask you to give earnest consideration to the proposal to be offered by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and there you will have a solution to many of the troubles that are bothering you in your thinking on this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the first proposition to be voted on by the Committee will be the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I wonder if we can get an agreement to limit the time?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means the amendment to the bill itself. The gentleman does not concede that is a perfecting amendment, does he?

Mr. MAY. No, but the gentleman offers it as a perfecting amendment. I understood it was originally offered as a perfecting amendment to the Harness substitute but upon further advice I understand it is an attempt to amend the original bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on that particular amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman refer to the Wadsworth amendment?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman not wait a few minutes before making his request so that debate can go on a little while to see whether we need 30 minutes or less?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request for the time being.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Wadsworth amendment, which provides that every registrant requested to accept employment shall have the right to join any union or organization of employees, but no such person shall be obliged to join any such union or organization if he should not freely choose to do so.

I believe that I speak the sentiment of the great unorganized American masses and practically all the men in the armed forces when I object to our Government, while attempting to place every male person from 18 through 45 years of age in some war plant, directing him to some closed-shop plant where, if he does not pay union dues, he does not work, and if he does not work he violates the law and has to go to jail under the terms of this measure. Having our Government send men to jail for not joining the unions is, to me, like throwing the Constitution out the window.

Why should free American laborers pay tribute to not only a labor union but a political organization such as the P. A. C., which has admitted before committees of this Congress to having made campaign contributions to defeat a goodly number of us?

I know there is one district in the United States, the Third District of Oklahoma, that is very much opposed to labor levying a tax on unorganized labor before they can work for their Government. I believe, if this question should be submitted to the voters of Oklahoma, that it would be overwhelmingly adopted by a vote of 5 to 1.

The Wadsworth amendment, in substance, was adopted by the Military Affairs Committee of the House, then for some reason was later stricken. It is not new to this measure, and, as I view it, nothing is to be gained by sparring around and not getting down to the real issue, which is whether to give the unions the power of a government to levy a tax on the manpower of America, whether they wish to join a union or do not wish to join a union. It is outrageous that we should provide a penalty for violating some union regulation that would deprive a citizen of his liberty. I know I reflect the sentiment of the great part of the American people, and I am very much in favor of the adoption of the Wadsworth amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wadsworth amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, known as the Wadsworth amendment, close at 2:20, and that 5 minutes of that time be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how will the time be divided?

Mr. MAY. The Chair will determine the allocation of time.

Mr. HOOK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Any analysis of the Wadsworth amendment will demonstrate conclusively that the amendment is not in the interest of protecting the fundamental rights of American labor. On the contrary you will find that that amendment will bring about the complete destruction of the organized labor movement in this country. The very last sentence of the amendment makes provision against requiring anyone to live up to the labor relations existing in any particular plant.

If we set up an exception because of refusal to join a union, then why not set up other exceptions, for instance, because one may not like the wages nor the working conditions of a plant to which he is sent? Is the gentleman from New York ready to grant an exception in that case? How about an exception for one who may not like the sanitary conditions in a particular plant? Are you going to permit him an exception under those circumstances? If you start making exceptions for those who are opposed to labor conditions which require union affiliations you might as well go right down the line and grant exceptions to meet the objections of everyone.

You say that the objective of this bill is to increase production and produce the material that is needed. If you are interested in production, and you want it, the best way not to get it is to adopt the Wadsworth amendment. It will cause chaos in industry. It will cause disruption. It will retard rather than advance production. Some gentlemen are going to support this amendment because of their antiunion bias. That, I can understand, for they are concerned less with production and more with the destruction of organized labor.

I can also understand the position of the gentleman who preceded me because

he has consistently opposed organized labor and its rights in this country. Therefore, I address my remarks to those who want to vote for this bill because of its expressed objective—to increase production. If you want to increase production, then certainly do not adopt this amendment. The adoption of this amendment will retard production because it will disrupt the existing relationship between labor and industry.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is a good lawyer and understands the labor problem. Does the gentleman feel that this bill as reported by the committee will increase production?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I believe that if this bill is enacted as is—and it could be improved by turning the administration of the law over to the War Manpower Commission—it will aid in increasing production which is so vitally needed in the interest of speedy victory. That is why I am going to vote for the bill. However, if you adopt this antilabor amendment, which is not necessary, which as a matter of fact will hinder production, then this will no longer be a bill to increase production. Then it becomes strictly an antilabor bill. Then you are using this crisis as a subterfuge to smash and destroy the organized labor movement in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If you adopt this amendment, then we will be justified in voting against this bill, not alone from the standpoint of protecting the interests of labor but from the patriotic standpoint that this amendment will disrupt labor and management conditions as they exist and will disrupt rather than increase production. This amendment negates the objective of the bill. It defeats the very reasons for the enactment of this serious legislation.

May I add this further thought: When the gentleman from New York speaks about guaranteeing the right of collective bargaining and the laws with regard to wages and hours, he must bear in mind that you can talk of collective bargaining, you can talk of wages and hours, you can talk of the rights of labor, but collective bargaining, wages and hours, and the rights of labor become a sham and a mockery unless labor is organized and unless there is a union to protect and defend those rights.

Adopting the gentleman's amendment sets off dynamite that will blow organized labor to pieces. There will not be a single labor union in this country able to protect the rights of organized labor as well as the unorganized working people of this country.

The Wadsworth amendment is a union-busting amendment submitted to the Congress under the guise of a crisis. It does not advance the patriotic objective of the bill, it defeats it. The Wadsworth amendment would destroy organized labor, disrupt industry and labor relationships, and retard production.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, the so-called Wadsworth amendment, close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, the proponent of the present amendment said he could not see how it could be an antilabor menace. Because of his honesty, I can agree with him. He cannot, I believe, see the antilabor consequences in his amendment or any other antilabor move and I can, after 8 years of observation, realize the reason why. The only arguments I have heard by the proponents of this bill were based on passion and emotion. This, I believe, because of lack of sufficient facts to substantiate their claims for the need of this legislation. What happens? There is no provision in this bill which provides that an employer shall accept a registrant sent to him. And just as soon as the registrant is sent by the local board to the employer the employer can say, "No, I do not want that registrant. He cannot work in my plant." Where is he going to get a job? What are you going to do with the registrant? Let us see now what happens under this amendment. The employer can say, "That man belongs to a union. That man wants to join a union. I therefore will not accept him." Thus through the method of this amendment they could break down every union in the country.

This bill as proposed affects only males. How about the millions of women in this country who are very patriotic citizens and who have done so much in the war effort? Nothing is said about them. How about the minority groups?

Let me say to you that if manpower were properly utilized, if labor and industry and Government would get together as has been proposed, manpower utilization could be brought about so that there would be no labor shortage in this Nation. Oh, I hear them say, "You are short of powder, munitions, tanks, tires and so forth." There is no shortage of materials in this Nation. There is no shortage of materials at this time for the armed forces. I noticed that most of the men in the well of this House in arguing for this bill said that the shortage showed up on the western front after September of last year. Well, let me tell you why. It is not a matter of transportation. It is a matter of docking facilities. Over on the western front they had flotillas for docks and during the September storm those flotillas in large part were destroyed. Only one was left. They did not have the docking facilities to bring the materials in. But in this Nation you have an abundance of materials produced by free labor and free industry and it is about time that we, recognizing the fact that free labor and free industry have brought about the greatest production that has ever been known in the history of mankind, let us not destroy that by enacting this bill which will destroy production in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I do not see the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], on the floor at this time. I expect to vote for this bill. I think that probably many Members will vote for this bill who voted against increasing the original service under the draft bill from 12 months to an indefinite period of time. I think it was a little unfortunate that the distinguished gentleman from Texas made reference to that in the way he did. Certainly he did not accurately state the position of many who voted then. Many of us who did not believe we should break faith with those whom we promised they might take a year of service and then go into the Reserve will vote for this bill. We will vote for this bill because when we get into war we believe in doing what it takes to win the war.

Everyone who knew the original Selective Service Act in any detail knew that the men who had taken their 12 months of training and immediately went into the Reserve were liable for Reserve duty 5 minutes after that first 12 months expired. The Army would never have been disbanded; whoever had 12 months' training had 10 years of Reserve liability. But lay that aside. The issue that we confront now is whether or not, being in the war for which we voted, stating that we would pledge all of our resources, we intend to carry it out when a situation arises that we are told this is what is needed.

I intend to vote for the bill with or without the Wadsworth amendment, but I am for the Wadsworth amendment. I think some Members in their appeal have put this thing on too low a level. The very idea that if the Wadsworth amendment should be adopted and should become law, a single loyal laborer would quit his war job because somebody might be put beside him who did not want to join a union. That is an insult to labor. If organized labor is destroyed in this country, if its position is weakened after this war, it will be because of the low level of the appeal that has been made by some of its so-called leaders.

There were a couple of war projects in my district. Some of the organizers came in and wanted them run on a closed-shop basis. They said these can never be built without it. I said if you will keep your hands off of the situation, the union men and nonunion men will go out there and work hand in hand to get them done on time. My people want to win the war. They want to back up their boys and make it possible for them to come home as soon as possible.

They did. They made a record on those jobs.

If we want to win this war in the shortest possible time, let us pass the legislation necessary to do it.

I remember a broadcast that came from the Southwest Pacific the morning after Mr. Byrnes had announced that possibly following VE-day there would be some let-down in production. This broadcast came from the men in the Southwest Pacific and said that there had not been such sadness in the camp since the war began, because they felt that when the priority war in Europe was over they would be forgotten. One reason why this bill should be passed is to send word to those boys who have been over there 3 years and more that they are not forgotten; that we are pledging all of our resources to the war on both fronts until both wars are completely won.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York, since it is my well-considered judgment that the bill should be so amended as to give men drafted for war work free choice whether or not to join a union. Without such amendment I fear Congress will establish a precedent which will come back to curse it; an indefensible precedent for the conscription, coercion, and drafting of men for union membership, requiring them to join a union or go to jail.

Such a law would be intolerable and unenforceable, and should not be countenanced. I am not unmindful of the fact that many defects in this bill, as we pass it, will have to be ironed out in conference. This House is not ab initio the court of last resort. So when we have done as best we may I shall vote for the bill, and hope for the best.

And, while I am at it, may I say, as I probably should not, that there are many things in this bill which I do not like. Could I dictate the policy or the strategy I would have something else and different. However, this bill in its broader aspects has the approval of those on whose judgment I must rely, namely, those responsible for utter defeat or victory, militarily, at home and abroad.

Stripped of all emotionalism and of the harangue and of the demagoguery which has accompanied it up to date, I shall vote for the naked bill with whatever warts are on it, and as an emergency war measure; sponsored by those who have proven their competence up to date, to direct our military and naval strategy and policy toward winning the war.

It seems to me that for me to assume to know more than they do as to what is necessary and as to what must be done, some way, would be a historical reversion matched by assumptions of Congresses heretofore in an undertaking to take away the management of the war from those to whom the power and authority has been delegated, which those who read history know has always resulted disastrously. So, as I said before, and for the reasons I have given, and for other reasons which I have not given, I shall vote for the bill to the end that those charged with the responsibility for the victory may have the credit therefor.

I am going to vote for the bill upon the basis that those who are running the fighting war abroad and at home, know what they are talking about, and to the end that victory may come at the earliest possible day at the least cost of lives and treasure. That is their great responsibility.

Those upon whose judgment I have a right to rely assure me that the passage of this bill will accomplish those things and is necessary in order to attain that which we have set out to accomplish.

I am listening to these people rather than to the pressure groups from big business or labor unions who might in my opinion better devote their attention to the production of matériel and to supplying the necessary ammunition to the Army and to the Navy to enable those who are running the fighting war to win it by supplying the boys on the fighting front with the weapons with which to defend themselves and us.

What a tragedy that there should be a necessity for such a law! We should be ashamed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 125, noes 169.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MAY and Mr. WADSWORTH.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 142, noes 178.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: Page 2, line 14, after the word "farms", strike out the period, and insert a colon, and the following language: *"Provided, however,* That the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may not certify to the Director of Selective Service for the purposes of this section any plant, facility, or farm which discriminates in employment because of race, creed or color or which fails to file with the Director of War Mobiliation and Reconversion a declaration that it will accept for employment any individual without regard to race, creed, or color."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I am bringing before you this amendment because I believe that this is the best and perhaps the only opportunity that we will have to pass upon legislation of this kind in this Congress. Our beloved Speaker has told us that he would like to have the bill which has been presented to you by the committee passed in its present form without amendment. I feel that we should amend the bill. I shall vote for the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] in preference to the committee bill, unless amendments are added to the committee bill. The committee bill can be improved upon and I hope we will not be limited to its present provisions finally.

The committee bill, as I see it, is not a sufficient piece of legislation. I think all of us saw in the Washington Post this morning the news item which stated:

The Senate Military Affairs Committee started drafting a revised version of the May bill yesterday, which would return to the Office of War Mobilization, and through it other interested Government agencies, such as the War Manpower Commission, the responsibility of directing men into essential industry. The May committee left this power with selective service local boards.

Even before this House acts on this bill the Senate committee is already placing its stamp of disapproval upon it.

The issue, as I see it, covers two propositions. First of all, the Army services need 900,000 men before June 30. Those 900,000 men are going to be forthcoming, and, so far as the provisions of this bill are concerned, they will not add or substract one man from the armed services. They will be forthcoming, 150,000 by 17-year-old men who volunteer for the Navy before they become 18 years of age. Four hundred and twenty thousand will be inducted by Selective Service from men who are now I–A or who will become I–A by becoming 18 years of age, or for other reasons, between now and June 30, 1945. The other 330,000 will have to be taken from the farms and from industry. On the farms today there are 360,000 men under 26 years of age, of which we are told 180,000 can pass the physical requirements of the draft. That means a large number will come from the farms. In industry there are only 40,000 under 26 years of age who would go into I–A. They are, in part, doctors, chemists, skilled men, trained engineers that no selective-service board is going to take. About 60,000 are in the merchant marine. Some of them can be replaced by older men; therefore, we must look to the age period from 26 to 29.

So far as industry is concerned, I received a letter today from a member of a draft board in Springfield who told me that they have already put into I–A as many as they could of the men between 26 and 29. When they call these men in, after placing them in I–A, down comes the representative from industry and tells and shows and proves to the selective-service board that those men are just as essential today in that industry as keymen and cannot be spared as they were at the time the selective board deferred them. And they continue to defer them. However, the 900,000 will be forthcoming.

Then there are 700,000 who are going to be needed in essential war industries. That is the outside figure, and there are no supporting data for it. It is a guess

as far as anything in the hearings in the way of evidence is concerned. We are told by the Department of Labor, speaking through the C. I. O., and also I think through General Knudsen, or at least one of the witnesses for the Government, that "about 14.,000 are needed as of today." That was at the start of the hearings on January 10, and already 3 weeks have gone by and that crisis is already over, if there was a crisis on January 10 with reference to the shortage of manpower.

Another 154,000, which will bring it up to 300,000, will be needed by June 30, 1945, in essential industry, and those are all of the places that must be filled between now and June 30, 1945. Those will be forthcoming.

There will in addition be about 330,000 men needed to replace men who will enter the armed services. The testimony is uncontradicted in the hearings that these numbers will be forthcoming, and they will be forthcoming without much difficulty. For instance, we are told that more than half of the 700,000 involved represent women; in other words, as far as manpower is concerned, you can cut all of the figures more than in two. But make it 50 percent, and you need 350,000 men. Of the 350,000, 100,000 of these are young men who will become of age between now and June 30, 1945, and will not be eligible for induction due to not being physically fit. There are 100,000 taken care of.

Then let us look at the figures for those persons who are returning as veterans and going into industry. We are told, and again, these figures come from the Government, that in July they placed 50,000 veterans in jobs in industry, 62,000 in August, 60,000 in September, and 63,000 in October, and the 63,000 who were placed came out of the quota of more than 80,000 veterans who applied for jobs. The number of veterans who are applying for jobs is increasing month by month. But assuming that it was 60,000 a month, and basing it on the 6 months from January 1 to June 30, 1945, you have 360,000 men coming from the armed forces.

Labor and management have testified through witnesses that where more war orders are placed they work more efficiently. They will take up a lot of the jobs for which apparently the Army think they are going to need men merely by adding on extra hours of work. Today in industry they are not averaging even 48 hours a week. It is somewhere around 45⅔ hours a week.

If there is a manpower shortage at all, let us see where there is another manpower reservoir from which a sufficient number of men can be taken which would fill the bill without requiring so much legislation and so much worry. That group consists of the colored persons in the United States today. In the recent elections I think most of us went before the public and if we stood on the platforms of our respective parties, we stood for the proposition that there should be no discrimination against the colored people of the United States. As a matter of fact, to read the pledge of my own party platform, the Republican Party platform, adopted in Chicago, we find this short phrase:

> We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

The Democratic platform is not in that language, but it is to the same effect. Now let us see what is going on. I, like several others in the House, have introduced a bill to set up a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. I believe such a bill may be reported out of the Committee on Labor at this session. I talked with the chairman of that committee, and I find that there is little likelihood of a rule being given. That means that such a bill, if it were to be presented on the floor of this House and debated, would have to go through a discharge petition, and by the time the discharge petition is signed and it is ready for action, June 30, 1945, will have passed. If this emergency, on the basis of which we are voting for this legislation today, really exists, we ought to secure the benefits of this pool of manpower and the benefits of the work of these Negroes who are just as anxious to work as any white people. In my own home city of Springfield last week several hundred Jamaicans, colored people, were brought in to work in our factories and our mills, such as the United States Rubber Co.'s factory at Chicopee. More of them are going to come from Jamaica. I do not see why, if there are American colored people who want jobs in our industrial plants, they should not be given those jobs. For instance, so far as the jobs are concerned up in the Springfield area, and I think you will find it true in other areas, the lack of manpower, if there is any, and I doubt very much that it is as serious as has been portrayed, the lack of manpower is not in the skilled jobs. They are laying off, according to last Friday's Springfield Union, 200 skilled workers at the Smith & Wesson revolver factory. At the same time they are seeking men in other plants. What are they seeking them for? They are seeking them as common laborers in factories, I am told, in the tire companies, where they have to throw around big, heavy tires which it takes a man who is pretty near I–A to do. You are not going to use skilled operators for that kind of work. Therefore, no board or no manpower commission is going to take such skilled men and put them on unskilled work unless they have to. There is no apparent need for it.

In view of the fact that my party and the Democratic Party also have indicated they feel there should be no discrimination against the colored workers of America, I want this amendment to have your earnest consideration.

Let me call attention to page 349 and page 350 of the hearings. Mr. Llewellyn, of the United Auto Workers, testified—and you have the volume of the hearings before you—in answer to a question by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]:

> Based upon the manpower available—that is, if they will use the women and Negroes that are available—I think it can more than take up the slack.

That was in reference to manpower in the Detroit area.

Then he goes on to say——

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. Not until I have finished.

He goes on to say:

> Mr. MARTIN. Well, is your study such that you could generalize to the entire Detroit area on the basis of your study of the Ford Motor plant and say that that condition prevails rather generally throughout the Detroit area?
>
> Mr. LLEWELLYN. It does. It does as far as women and Negroes are concerned.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. And by that you mean most able-bodied men taken into the armed forces, from the Detroit industrial area, you would expect to be replaceable by Negroes and women?
>
> Mr. LLEWELLYN. That is right.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. Who are experienced workers?
>
> Mr. LLEWELLYN. Yes; that is correct.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. Who have been laid off?
>
> Mr. LLEWELLYN. That is right.

That is the situation which applies elsewhere.

Let us turn to page 281, to the testimony of Mr. Philip Murray, and see what he has to say. What is his position? It is stated on page 281:

> I think that one of the things that I think is really disgraceful is to hear so many complaints about labor shortages while so many able-bodied women and Negroes are idle and want to work, and cannot get work in particular localities throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. I continue reading:

> Mr. JOHNSON. You mentioned about the women. Now, is that true, that matter of discrimination against workers who are not white? Is that true to any great extent?
>
> Mr. MURRAY. You mean about the colored situation?
>
> Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.
>
> Mr. MURRAY. It is true, broadly speaking; yes.
>
> Mr. JOHNSON. In what parts of the country?
>
> Mr. MURRAY. Well, it is true particularly in the South. It is true in many sections of the North, and we can cite innumerable examples.

A lot of you people who are from the South have different problems than we have in the large industrial cities in the North. But up North we need this type of workmen. I would like to see them given an opportunity to work. In voting for this particular amendment anybody on either side will be voting in support of the pledge contained in his national party's platform.

My home city of Springfield has fortunately had few cases of discrimination against the employment of colored people. A few have been reported to me by individuals. The evidence shows that in Detroit and here in the city of Washington today such cases of discrimination run into the thousands, which indicates

the need for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, my good friend took most of his time in presenting arguments against the bill. When he concluded I was wondering in my own mind just how he was going to vote. He said that if the bill reported out of committee were amended—I presume to agree with his views—he might vote for it; otherwise he would vote for the substitute. That argument is difficult for me to follow.

Getting back to the amendment, it is hostile to the best interests of this bill. If I were an American of the colored race such an amendment would operate on me in a manner to make me feel resentful. We have a commission appointed by President Roosevelt through Executive order which is now functioning. This amendment cannot accomplish anything more than the present Commission can accomplish. What those Americans of colored blood and others want is a permanent condition, and this amendment does not bring that about. This amendment does nothing that is not already done by Executive order. If anything, this amendment, if adopted, might interfere with the operation of the Commission which is now functioning and which was established by Executive order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. A bill is now pending before the Committee on Labor, one that was reported out in the closing days of the last session, dealing with this subject. That is the bill wanted by those who favor legislation of this kind. The pending amendment adds nothing to the rights of any American citizen no matter what his race, color, or creed may be, no right that does not already exist by law or Executive order. This amendment if adopted will interfere with the passage of this bill. This amendment is not necessary in this bill. On these grounds I oppose the amendment at this time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that the bill we are considering here, H. R. 1752, is a temporary statute and runs only until the 15th of next May, unless we extend the original Service Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. This amendment does not bring about a permanent F. E. P. C. It does not give any greater rights than already exist in the Commission appointed by Executive order, and, if anything, adoption of the pending amendment might interfere with the operation of the Commission that exists now as a result of the Executive order.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. Will he agree to bring to the floor that bill which will provide for establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission if I withdraw the amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that I would like to see him withdraw his amendment, but so far as the gentleman from Massachusetts now speaking is concerned, that bill is before the Labor Committee. It was reported out of the Labor Committee last year. The gentleman himself said that he believes the bill will be reported out of the committee again.

Mr. CLASON. It will not get to the House. It will not get out of the Rules Committee, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not say the gentleman is correct. As a matter of fact, I do not believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As a member of the Rules Committee, I dislike very much to have the two gentlemen from Massachusetts determine what the Rules Committee is going to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts who is speaking has not undertaken to do that. I have made no comment as to what the Committee on Rules will do. My good friend from the Springfield section of the State is the one who made that statement.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman will use his influence, perhaps we will not have any difficulty.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, on the ground that adoption of this amendment would be hostile to the best interests of the bill, on the ground that this bill is necessary to be passed in the national interest of the country, on the ground that this amendment is a meaningless gesture, it is not permanent and the proponents of legislation of this kind fight for permanent legislation, on the ground that there is a commission already in existence now having jurisdiction and appointed as a result of Executive order, on the further ground that the adoption of this amendment might interfere with the work of that commission and that the amendment is unnecessary, I urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Clason amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I brand this amendment as a cheap partisan trick to play upon racial prejudice in order to defeat a bill which should stand or fall on its own merits. I, incidentally, am opposed to this bill for reasons which I will explain later. I do not believe that there is any sincere concern on the part of the proponents of this amendment for its passage. This amendment has erroneously been called a F. E. P. C. amendment. This it most emphatically is not. The F. E. P. C. is a committee set up by Executive Order No. 8802 of the President of the United States. The passage of this amendment will not in the slightest help the Negro worker or the worker of any minority any more than he is being helped now. Under Executive Order No. 8802 administered by the Fair Employment Practices Committee there can be no discrimination in industry during wartime.

What we are interested in is a permanent F. E. P. C.—a permanent act of this Congress which will forever, in wartime and peacetime, rule out discrimination in public and private employment.

It is the cheapest and lowest form of politics to play upon any subject as delicate as is the subject of race in connection with legislation which is distinctly of a nonracial character. This bill should stand upon its own merits. It should be passed on its own merits or rejected on its own merits. It is a disservice to this country at any time to insincerely bring in the idea of race. If the Members on the other side of the aisle are so interested in the F. E. P. C. let them come forward, stand up, and be counted when the bill is reported out of the Committee on Labor.

I am against the May-Bailey bill for the following reasons:

First. The local selective service boards are not equipped to deal with the recruitment of manpower for war production.

Second. No provision is made for appeal from decision by the selective service board.

Third. The War Manpower Commission with its local labor management committees and farm committees now has the power to prevent workers from leaving essential war jobs.

Fourth. There is no provision whatsoever for appeal from arbitrary determination by a local selective service board that a worker should not leave his present war job, in spite of adverse working conditions.

Fifth. Although labor is to be drafted, there is no provision whatsoever for the drafting of industrial facilities and capital. Through the proper coordination of the procurement agencies, the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission, with their already existing labor-management-farm committees, we can "get the right man in the right place at the right time."

Sixth. Admiral King and General Marshall did not ask for this specific legislation. Mr. Batcheller, Chief of Operations of the War Production Board, said that current shortages were only 22 percent due to labor shortages.

And finally, I am opposed to this bill because it fundamentally negates the entire American tradition of the freedom of contract. I will never subscribe to the philosophy that the end justifies

the means. We are out to win this war, but not just another victory. We want to win a permanent, people's democratic victory. We cannot gain a moral victory with immoral means. This bill is immoral. It is totalitarian. Its passage would mean that in the "land of the free and the home of the brave" we have reverted to slavery, not just of the blacks but of the entire American working class.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Clason amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 113, nays 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 6, line 6, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "except that registered male nurses performing duties comparable to the duties performed by members of the Army Nurse Corps female or the Navy Nurse Corps female, when inducted into the land or naval forces, shall be inducted only as commissioned officers."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that a point of order has been made against this amendment for several reasons. Over the country during the past few days we have heard nothing on the part of the authorities but a demand for nurses: Nurses needed in our armed forces; nurses needed in the hospitals in every community in the land; nursing facilities are very greatly needed. Yet today the proponents of this bill refuse to consider the drafting of male nurses into some sort of service to the country at large. This bill could provide that. I know that the issue will come before this House before too long regarding the possibility of getting nurses from somewhere. There are 6,000 male nurses in the armed forces of the United States. They have not been recognized. No commissions have been allowed them. However, in some situations male nurses are just as important as women nurses. They have been found in some cases in this ghastly war to be imperative to the service in attending the wounded men at the front.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is the gentleman aware that the Army Nurse Corps under the law is a female corps?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I understand that, but I think it is time that consideration be given to commissioning male nurses. I know a great many persons in my district have written me on the subject. They advocate that some recognition be given to men who perform the same nursing duties as women in the military services of the United States. I think the time has come when we should consider this problem. I know the gentlewoman will agree with me that they have some place in this whole program.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it is a most interesting matter for the gentleman to bring to the consideration of the Congress. I hope he will bring it up again when the nursing situation is brought before the House.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentlewoman. I know her interest in the nursing situation will bring about some consideration of this problem.

There is one more point in support of this argument. In some of the intense battles in which the armed forces have been engaged it has been necessary for male nurses to be brought up to the front and put into places women should not be permitted to go. Unfortunately, there is no provision for commissioning these men, in spite of the fact that they have been inducted into the armed services as buck privates and have no opportunity to show their nursing ability.

I am sorry this amendment cannot be considered. I think it should be considered before this debate is over. It seems strange that in spite of all the need there is for nurses, according to the War Department, no action seems to be forthcoming. We can get all the nurses we want here today by drafting male nurses and making it possible for them to be commissioned and recognized as such, just as women are.

This action will be a lot more popular than drafting women, and more satisfactory to the women themselves.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 2, line 4, after the word "reconversion", strike out the comma, and in line 5 strike out the words "or the agency designated by him."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be interested in the vote on the Fair Employment Practice Commission bill when it ultimately is reported out of committee. In view of what has been stated here on the floor this afternoon, I believe all of us who are in favor of such legislation will be entitled to have it brought to the floor of the House for a vote. I certainly shall be looking for the support of those who spoke against my amendment as being out of place in this bill, when the time comes.

As far as this amendment is concerned, when this bill first came to the committee for consideration it was provided that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion should be personally responsible for any regulations or orders issued under this law. Thereafter, in the course of the discussions, an amendment was offered which appears in the first six words on page 5, "or the agency designated by him." We were told straight to the point that the purpose of those words was to take away from Mr. Byrnes or whoever might happen at the time to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion the responsibility behind the issuing of any regulation or order.

One of the things that I find fault with and that I find the people back home find fault with today is the ability of persons to delegate to others in Washington duties for which they ought to be responsible. I feel that those words ought to be stricken out and the language left just as it was written in the original bill, so that Mr. Byrnes or whoever may be the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall be responsible for any regulation issued. Otherwise it may be Mr. McNutt, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Jones, or Madam Perkins, and no one will know who issues the regulation or why it should be carried out. If Mr. Byrnes does it, then we will know, and I think we will all be more willing to follow the rule or regulation laid down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 5, line 5, after the word "work", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That so long as the provisions of this subsection shall be in effect all contracts and subcontracts for the production of war material for the United States shall be subject to renegotiation and for this purpose, regardless of the provisions of any other law, all powers to renegotiate war contracts which were in effect on December 31, 1944, shall remain in effect and shall be so employed as to effectively remove the profit from war contracts and to provide net earnings to contractors in an amount not to exceed what would constitute a fair rental payment to the contractor if the Government were leasing the facilities employed by such contractor from him."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been drawn for a very simple purpose. If this amendment is adopted it will make of the bill before us an equitable measure. Member after Member has addressed the Committee and made an appeal for the support of this bill on the ground that in the declaration of war we pledged all our resources to the prosecution of the war. This bill provides for the requirement that people should work in war plants. As I stated in my remarks a couple of days ago, I believe that without question in time of war the Government of the United States has the same right to require of any citizen service to his Nation in another capacity as it does in the capacity of service in the armed forces provided the Government does not require of one individual that he work for the private profit of another individual. In my judgment this bill does require that. If my amendment is adopted it would not be true. For under my amendment, although the ownership and operation of the plant would remain as it now is, renegotiation would be continued and it would be the instruction of the Congress that that renegotiation

should be carried on in such a fashion as to recover all profits from war contracts. But it would leave to the contractor a net earning equivalent to what a fair rental upon his facilities would be if in fact the Government were renting those facilities from him. This amendment would take the profit out of war. If we mean what we say about pledging all resources to the war or if we desire at all equality of sacrifice, no objection will be raised to this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I do not want this proposal to be confused with my substitute amendment to the bill which I cannot offer, of course, until later. This present amendment is offered in the event that that substitute fails of adoption, which I earnestly hope it will not. Of course, if the substitute is adopted it will take the place of the May bill. But if the May bill remains the bill upon which we must finally vote, then I want it to be an equitable bill. I want it to be such a bill that we can go to the people of this Nation and say, "Yes; we drafted men for the armed forces and therefore we are drafting labor, but we are also asking of property a corresponding sacrifice on the home front by taking the profit out of war."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the pending bill for two reasons: First of all, this is a manpower bill, in the form of an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] attempts to extend the Renegotiation Act, within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee, and relates to war contracts rather than to personnel.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM). The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there any portion of the bill in the opinion of the Chair, which relates to the question of compensation to be paid to workers, who would be drafted to work under this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised whether there is anything in the bill about compensation. There is something relating to travel pay, but nothing as to compensation, in the recollection of the Chair.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It occurred to me that if there were something that could be so construed, the question of profits might be related to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not believe the amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYTER: On page 5, in line 5, insert:

"(5) When a registrant volunteers for or is ordered to employment pursuant to this paragraph, the employer shall have a duty to accept such registrant for employment unless the employer has a reasonable belief that such registrant is not qualified for such employment."

Renumber the remaining paragraphs on page 5.

Mr. RYTER. The purpose of this amendment is to plug and remove a clearly unjustified condition that now remains in the bill in favor of employers.

The proposed bill, without this amendment, imposes a duty and responsibility upon labor without imposing a similar and collateral duty on the employer. Under this bill a laborer must volunteer or be ordered to take employment; but having volunteered or having been ordered to take employment, there is no guaranty offered to him that the employer must extend to him the employment that he seeks. The employer then is given a free hand and may, with impunity to himself, do the very thing that the employee may not do, under a law which imposes a severe penalty and jail sentence.

The absence of such provision in this bill may also have the effect of curtailing the number of reasonable choices that would be extended to the employee under the law; and in order to impose an equal responsibility and duty upon labor and industry alike, I urge favorable consideration of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, as this debate goes on and the different amendments are discussed I am more firmly convinced that this bill will hinder, not help, the war production of this country. We were just discussing, for instance, the proposed so-called F. E. P. C. amendment. I happen to know something about the F. E. P. C.; I was a regional director of the F. E. P. C., and I will say to the distinguished leader of the majority, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], that there is discrimination as to race, creed, color, religion, and national origin throughout this Nation. Right here in our own Capital City, too, notwithstanding his cry to the contrary. Discrimination? Yes. How about the Capital Transit Co. that has refused to hire qualified Negroes to run their busses and streetcars while you people stand upon the streets shivering and the people who want to get to work in the war agencies here in Washington lose time every day? How about Houston, Tex., where there are two schools for the training of welders: One, the Todd-Houston Shipbuilding Co. and the Brown Shipbuilding Co., which trains only white welders, and the Government school that trains all, regardless of race, creed, or color. The Government school trained thousands of skilled welders and because of their color, because they were Negroes, they could not be hired in either plant; they had to leave Texas and go into the war industries up North because they were discriminated against because of their race. Let me illustrate by the following facts:

UNDERUTILIZATION OF MINORITY WORKERS IN THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

War Manpower Commission reports that the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry will need 99,000 additional workers. Yet many shipyards refuse to employ Negroes except as unskilled laborers. Although Negroes constitute 12.4 percent of the total employees in this industry, they are generally not upgraded to do welding, riveting, or other skilled tasks. The pattern varies widely. Some shipyards use Negroes in a great variety of skills. Others refuse outright to use them. The Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., of Mobile, Ala., using Negroes for skilled jobs, announced recently that its Negro workmen had set a record in constructing a new 22,000-ton oil tanker which was built in 61 days. The Delta Shipyard Co., in New Orleans, recently hired more than 100 Negro welders.

On the other hand, discrimination is practiced by the following companies:

Missouri Valley Bridge & Iron Co., Evansville, Ind.: This company, making vital LST landing craft, employs more than 17,000 whites but only 700 Negroes. The company refuses to promote or hire Negroes as welders despite critical need for welders.

St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co., Jacksonville, Fla.: This company employs 12,000 whites and 1,500 nonwhites, yet refuses to employ Negroes as learners or apprentice welders because of the opposition of the local metal trades council which has a closed-shop contract.

Bethlehem Fairfield Shipyards, Baltimore, Md.: This plant, employing about 35,000 persons, has refused to hire Negro women in any capacity other than as janitresses. When pressed to hire Negro women as well as white women, it stopped the hiring of women altogether. W. M. C. estimates that there are 3,000 to 5,000 Negro women available for shipyard work in Baltimore, some of whom have been trained in Government schools at Government expense for semiskilled work in shipyards.

Richmond Shipyard, Richmond, Calif.: The Kaiser Co. operating this shipyard is unable to employ Negroes in skilled jobs under the jurisdiction of the International Association of Machinists because Local 824 of that union refuses to admit them. The International Association of Machinists has a clause in ritual which bars the admission of Negroes.

Todd-Johnson Shipyards, New Orleans: This company has 4,000 employees, of which only 460 are Negroes employed only as laborers.

Todd-Pacific Shipyards, State of Washington: Less than 1 percent of its staff are Negroes, although Negroes constitute as much as 10 percent of the staff of other west-coast shipyards.

Lake Washington Shipyards, State of Washington, employs 5,000 employees, but only 33 Negroes.

Brown Shipbuilding Co., Houston, Tex.: This company employs 14,000 workers, of which 1,100 are nonwhites used exclusively as laborers. Despite a need for skilled welders and a paid training course given by company, it rejects skilled Negro welders, including graduates from United States financed vocational school for Negroes.

Todd-Houston Shipbuilding Co.: Total employees 17,000, 1,500 nonwhites. Negroes are used only as laborers or helpers. Company refused to hire Negro welders although 1,500 trained in a free Government defense school. Rejected graduate welders leave Texas for west coast or east coast. Three hundred graduates of welding school still available in Houston.

Todd Galveston Dry Docks: Total employees 3,400; nonwhite, 1,000. Negroes never used above helper classification in last 25 years, despite intense effort to recruit new workers. Experienced Negro "helpers" used to break in white inexperienced "mechanics."

DISCRIMINATION IN STREET TRANSIT AND TELEPHONE INDUSTRIES

The War Manpower Commission, in a recent survey of 700 cities having local transit systems, found that less than 25 companies employ Negroes on platform positions—that is, as motormen, or bus or streetcar conductors. The majority of the companies employ Negroes only in service occupations, as track walkers and as helpers in garages and repair shops. In the industry as a whole, of a total of 300,000 employees, about 20,000 Negroes, or 6.7 percent, are employed. Some of the principal cities in which Negroes are denied platform positions are: Washington, D. C.; Baltimore, Md.; Louisville, Ky.; Kansas City, Mo.; Oakland, Calif.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Gary, Ind.; Indianapolis, Ind.; St. Louis, Mo.

The telephone industry, with perhaps one exception, does not employ Negro women as telephone operators, the sole exception being the New York Telephone Co. Some of the major subsidiaries of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. which discriminate against Negro women are: New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; Pittsburgh Telephone Co.; Chesapeake & Potomac Co. of Baltimore; Ohio Bell Co.; Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., offices at St. Louis, Topeka, and New Orleans; Southern California Telephone Co., offices in San Diego and Los Angeles.

F. E. P. C. ST. LOUIS DECISIONS

Following public hearings held in August 1944, the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice issued a series of seven decisions finding that seven St. Louis companies engaged in discriminatory employment practices against Negroes. A summary of the findings follows:

1. McQuay-Norris Manufacturing Co.: This company manufactures small arms ammunition, employs more than 2,000 persons. Although it employs more than 500 women and has a critical need for more employees it refuses to employ Negro women. Latest W. M. C. figures indicate that there are 4,000 Negro women seeking employment in St. Louis. In addition, the company confines Negro men to janitor and unskilled laborers' jobs regardless of their qualifications.

2. St. Louis Shipbuilding and Steel Co.: This company is engaged in the manufacture of warships and employs about 1,300 persons but employs Negroes only in custodial jobs.

3. Bussman Manufacturing Co.: This company manufactures fuses and other war material, employs about 1,400 persons, refuses to employ Negro women, although it has employed 1,100 white women.

4. Amertorp Corporation: This company manufactures torpedoes for the Navy. Although one-third of its employees are women, it refuses to employ Negro women.

5. Carter Carburetor Corporation: This company is engaged in manufacturing essential war material. It refuses to employ Negro women although it has many white women in its employ.

6. Wagner Electric Corporation: This company manufactures electrical equipment for the armed forces. It employs 2,500 persons, of whom 1,600 are white women. It refuses to employ any Negro women.

7. U. S. Cartridge Co.: This company is engaged in the manufacture of small arms ammunition, employs more than 10,000 persons but arbitrarily restricts the percentage of Negroes to 10 percent, the population ratio in St. Louis. When the company reaches the top of the Negro quota, it refuses to hire any more Negroes although it needs manpower.

If this bill is adopted, you will freeze those people down there into common labor and their skills will not be utilized in the war effort. That is why I say to you this bill will hinder the war effort and not help it.

How about the case of the boilermakers? How about the railroad cases? How about cases right down the line where they have been discriminating against people because of their color, their race, or their creed?

Mr. Chairman, it is about time we looked at this thing from the viewpoint of whether it will injure or help the war effort. Do you mean to tell me that the blood of one man is more precious than that of another, whether he be Jew or gentile, Catholic or Protestant, white or black? The black man stops a bullet just the same as the white man, and a black man can use a machine just as well as a white man. A black man can turn out war-production materials just as well as a white man. Then why stymie them? Why freeze them in jobs where their skills will not be utilized? Let us give them the rights of citizenship to which they are entitled. This bill will hinder war production. It will create slave labor. When the Communists and the Bourbons lie down together I am suspicious, because they both believe in slave labor. Defeat this bill and save democratic America. Keep America free so that the boys will not have fought in vain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: On page 4, line 6, after the semicolon add the following: *"Provided, however,* That such regulation shall give full consideration to title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is, I believe, essentially noncontroversial. Under the wording of subparagraph 4 which runs from the middle of page 3 to the top of page 4 of the bill, the Director of Selective Service is given the right to promulgate rules and regulations with respect to returning veterans who have been discharged from the service under the G. I. bill of rights. A great many of those veterans have already been assigned to various schools and universities throughout the United States; in fact I know that here in the District of Columbia in the month of September some 600 men were assigned to different schools and universities in order to carry out our promise that the returned veteran would have the right to continue his education.

Section 4 cuts directly across the privileges that have already been granted to returned veterans and allows the Director of the Selective Service to assign these men to jobs in industry if he sees fit.

The amendment I have offered merely states that in the promulgation of these regulations he shall give full consideration to title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, namely, that he shall take into full consideration the promise of an uninterrupted education which we have given to returning veterans. It affects them only.

I am told that the War Department has no objection whatever to this amendment. I am told also that undoubtedly the rather hazy wording of this paragraph can be cleared up at a later date when the matter comes to conference between the two bodies of Congress, but it seems to me in carrying out the statutory obligation that we have we ought to make it clear that as far as the returned and discharged veterans are concerned, we are not going to abrogate what we have already put in their bill of rights.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the matter, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted it will be impossible to take any of these men who have been honorably discharged and place them in work provided for in this bill.

Mr. HERTER. It would not make it impossible but in the drafting of the regulations full consideration would have to be given to the promise that has already been made.

Mr. MICHENER. That "full consideration" is just some more language that is indefinite and that can be toyed with and interpreted in different ways. If we mean those men are not to be taken by virtue of this law then why do we not say so?

Mr. HERTER. The reason for not saying so is that a situation might arise in the case of some individuals who have returned to complete physical fitness who have had only a very brief tour of duty in the armed forces and have been discharged and have not yet elected to go into a university or into a school to continue education where they might well be directed into a factory which is essential to the war needs.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is true, then here are two boys who come home together, afflicted in like manner. One of them immediately enters school. The other man goes home to rest for 2 months. In the meantime we pass this

bill. There would then be a differentiation between the treatment accorded those two honorably discharged soldiers afflicted in the same way.

Mr. HERTER. I do not think so. Under any sensible regulations that might be issued, these men would have to be exempted.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not remember particularly the language in the other bill to which the gentleman refers, but, if I recall correctly, it seems to me that the serviceman has a limited time in which to elect to go back to school. If that be the case and he is assigned to industry by the selective-service board, he would lose all rights given him. I believe the gentleman should withdraw his amendment, bring it in in proper form to insure against that and so that the returning soldier may be assured of an education.

Mr. HERTER. I may say to the gentleman that as far as the entire paragraph is concerned the wording of it is very loose. That, I believe, will be admitted by members of the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman's amendment seek to extend the G. I. benefits to those who may be drafted under this bill, or does it seek to protect the returned and discharged veteran in the benefits to which he would normally be entitled?

Mr. HERTER. It would preserve to the discharged veteran his rights under the G. I. bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the Committee on Military Affairs considered this very question in connection with the provision which we put in the bill that protects discharged veterans who are asked to and do take jobs in a war industry. We preserve their rights under the 90-day provision that has been inserted in the law.

We leave it to the discretion of the Selective Service System to make whatever regulations are necessary in order to protect the interests of the veterans. If this amendment is agreed to, it will relate only to the subject of those in the schools, whereas the bill is written so that the selective-service people can protect all of their rights, including those in the schools. This amendment is not necessary and does not help the situation at all.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Under the G. I. bill of rights the specific right granted to the veteran to elect to continue in uninterrupted education can be abrogated completely by selective service under the language as it now appears in the bill.

Mr. MAY. I do not think that Selective Service, not being authorized by the G. I. bill to do so, can make any regulation that would affect the provisions of that act. They can regulate only pursuant to the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act, and consequently the amendment which the gentleman offers, while I am wholly in accord with the idea advanced, does not help the situation at all.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is my understanding that a somewhat lengthy bill dealing with the entire subject that the gentleman from Massachusetts is interested in has been submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs only a day or so before this bill was reported, and the provision in this bill which leaves it up to the Selective Service to define and write regulations was not put in this bill for the only reason that by the time this bill gets to conference, if it does, then complete regulations covering the entire matter can be written into the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman will agree that the rights of the returning servicemen should be preserved, even though the language in this bill is broad enough, so that they will be protected.

Mr. MAY. If there is any question about it, when it comes to conference, I, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs will stand 100 percent for the veterans, because I have always done that and will continue to do that.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure of that, but his rights should be protected at all events.

Mr. MAY. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HERTER) there were—ayes 110, nays 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Page 4, line 6, after the semicolon insert "and the Director shall exclude from the mandatory provisions hereof those veterans who have been honorably discharged from the armed forces."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is to do just one thing. As you read the language at the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4 it says that the Director of Selective Service may by regulation exclude certain veterans.

All I am asking is that these men who have already honorably served, some of them overseas for long periods of time and through several major engagements, some of them who have already been once drafted for service—who have already once had their homes broken up—shall not again be subjected to a draft for labor with the consequent breaking up of new homes, many of them established through the assistance provided by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

As far as the voluntary phase of the bill is concerned, I think the record will show that 75 percent of these returning veterans able to work are going into war-supporting industries. I think it is only fair, and it cannot hurt this bill in any way, shape, or form if the committee will accept this amendment, to exclude from this labor draft these men who have honorably served in the armed forces during this war.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman's amendment and think it ought to have approval.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is opposed to the adoption of this amendment for the very reason that it is far-reaching, much more so than it has no doubt been regarded by the gentleman who offered it. There are thousands and thousands of men who have been discharged from the armed services after very short periods of service. If this amendment should be adopted, it would prohibit the Selective Service System from considering these men either for work duty or for service in the armed forces a second time. It is not anticipated that the Selective Service System will induct very many of them, but it would be precluded from using them for manpower, however much they wanted to work.

We protect those who do go into an actual war job by providing a limitation on the time in which he is to seek a new job. Further, if he ha seniority rights in the job which he left to go into the service originally, those seniority rights are protected by this legislation when he returns or when he ceases to work in a war job.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, supplementing the words that have already been said by the distinguished chairman of this committee, I call attention to the fact that thousands upon thousands of these veterans who have been released from service were released on their own request. They were released in order that they might return to their homes to enter essential industries. This was made one of the terms of the release of several hundred thousand of these veterans. To say now to those men who have been released at their own request and have returned to essential industry that "You may not serve the Nation in an essential industry when you have been released from the service for that very purpose," presents a rather anomalous situation. They want to serve in essential industry, they are serving in essential industry, they were released from service in order to serve in essential in-

dustry, and they should continue to serve in essential industry.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would not the gentleman agree that a man who has been discharged from the service and is entitled to compensation for injuries or wounds, and so forth, which means a compensable amount of 10 percent or more, should be exempted from the terms of this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. I agree with the gentleman. I have thought that a man who wears the Purple Heart ought to be exempted. He has done his full share of duty to the Nation. On the other hand, that situation would not be reached by this amendment. This amendment would merely complicate the situation. I think it can be reached by regulation, as we outline in the bill. I believe it should be reached in that way.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman from Louisiana and the chairman of the committee both will make that statement here on the floor of the House in order that it may be some measure of compulsion upon the Director of the Selective Service System when it comes to making the regulations. I should be delighted to hear the gentleman from Kentucky confirm that statement.

Mr. BROOKS. I will do my full part in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan: On page 5, line 16, after the word "civilian", strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert: "Activities engaged solely in the production or distribution of war material shall, in lieu of being ordered to make application for, and to accept, employment in such activity, be ordered to make application for, and to accept employment in another activity, not so engaged, selected by the local board."

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively simple amendment to which I hope the Committee will not object because the purpose of it is twofold. First, to exempt the true conscientious objector:

(a) From working in a plant whose entire output goes to the armed forces;

(b) From working for a carrier or distributor who transports or distributes products to the armed forces only; and

(c) From making a product used only by the armed forces.

And, second, to force the conscientious objector to accept employment not contrary to the above as ordered by the local board, thus not allowing him to pick and choose what he will do.

This amendment is designed to deal solely with a very unfortunate situation existing in three conscientious objectors' camps in the United States that are under direction of the Selective Service System. One of them happens to be in my district about 1 mile from Germfask. General Hershey's office tells me they are without legal authority to cope with a most distressing situation which a recent American Legion convention has by formal resolution described the camp at Germfask as a cesspool of iniquity.

I want to read a letter at this time which I just received from the judge advocate of the Michigan Department of the American Legion, the Honorable Richard J. Nebel, of Munising. It is as follows:

I have just returned from the mid-winter conference of the Upper Peninsula Association of American Legion Posts and the fifth zone of the State of Michigan comprising the Legion posts of the Upper Peninsula, 40 in number.

It was brought to our attention that the so-called objectors' camp located 1 mile from Germfask in Schoolcraft County, near Blaney Park, is running without control of any officials. There are approximately 65 objectors—there are actually about 100—of which it is estimated not over 8 are really religious objectors. The rest are crackpots of all descriptions, principally of communistic leanings, who are permitted to send out literature, distribute same, interfere with the few real conscientious objectors, spoil food, destroy Government property, threaten and assault the camp manager, invade surrounding territory causing the people of Newberry, Manistique, and Munising humiliation, shame and disgrace by their conduct, and in general deporting themselves in an unpatriotic manner.

We were told that both Newberry and Manistique had forbidden the inmates of this camp to enter their confines. Of course, there is no law for that. But the point is that the Government of the United States should not permit this humiliation upon the citizens of the Upper Peninsula and cause them to take the law into their own hands.

This camp was built with the idea of having the inmates work on the Seney Federal Wildlife Reserve. Mr. Johnson, the superintendent of the reserve, is a high-grade type of patriotic citizen, a veteran of the last war. I have every confidence in him. I believe that this matter should be investigated at once. There isn't any question that gross indecency and sexual perversion are taking place, that Government property is being destroyed, that the camp is entirely out of control, and that greater crimes will ensue unless this camp is put under the protection of the War Department and properly run by the military police.

Of course, that is impossible under the law. The letter reads further as follows:

Either that should be done or immediately ship that crowd of subversive inmates to prisons for prison confinement and discipline.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we do have a very, very serious situation up there. General Hershey's office tells me they are absolutely without any power to control it.

I believe General Hershey's office feels that this amendment which I have suggested to the pending bill would be entirely in order and would give them the control they need over this camp. I hope no objection will be raised to it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell you how dangerous this situation is up there in Germfask. I want to say right here and now that some innocent people are apt to suffer as a result of bloodshed unless those in charge of this camp are given some control over them. If the membership will read my remarks in the RECORD yesterday, on pages 616–618, they will learn more about this distressing situation than I have time to discuss here today, but I warn you, unless conditions change at Germfask, and change fast, some of our good, law-abiding citizens up in that country are apt to take the law into their own hands, they are apt to personally injure or perhaps kill some of these inmates, who have been deporting themselves so disgracefully, and the first thing you know one or more of these inmates is going to be seriously hurt and then, of course, it would not be he who will be hauled up in court but is apt to be some citizen whose patience has run out.

We are not used to that type vermin in our midst, and if need be our otherwise law-abiding citizens up in that country will deal with them straight from the shoulder. The trouble is this sort of tripe are backed by the American Civil Liberties Union and its seemingly inexhaustible stream of lawyers hired by funds ample enough to carry their cases to the highest courts of the land. On the other hand, you cannot expect either our local prosecuting officers, operating on a very limited budget, or even our Federal district attorneys to clutter up the courts with a bunch of cases involving such riff-raff.

The situation is so serious, Mr. Chairman, that this American Legion group, recently assembled, is on record with this formal resolution which they have sent me and which I read to you now:

Be it resolved, That the Attorneys General of the United States of America and of the State of Michigan take steps to immediately investigate the deplorable conditions that exist at the so-called objectors camp at Germfask in Schoolcraft County and bring and institute proper legislation to remedy this cesspool of iniquity; and be it

Resolved further, That our Congressmen and Senators from the State of Michigan be requested to cause an investigation of Camp Germfask with the principal purpose of putting this camp under proper control.

Moved by William Kuivenen and supported by Art Gilbert. Carried.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, recently my attention was directed to the rising tide of resentment and criticism among veterans of World War No. 2 because of the issuance of an indistinct, cheap, and unworthy discharge button which has been issued so as to protect these patriotic sons and daughters against the unwarranted and irresponsible jibes of some thoughtless people who should know better and should

guard their expressions. Instead of serving this intended purpose of identifying our returned and honorably discharged veterans, a cheap plastic imitation of what ought to be a real mark of distinction and honor does just the opposite.

The reasons are obvious; the discharge button is too small, indistinctive, and inexcusably cheap. Instead of being made of bronze or other suitable metal, it is a gilded plastic mold, about on par with products heretofore made in Japan. Just why the War Department singled out the veterans for a penny-pinching policy is unknown and unexplained, but I believe that Members of this House ought to ask the question and insist that immediate remedial steps be taken by the War Department to issue a badge, a medal, or call it whatever you will. It should, however, be substantial, distinctive, and worthy of the patriotism, valor, and sacrifice of these citizens who have given more than their share for America in the conflict on the battlefields and who are now giving more on the production line to back up their buddies at the front. Remember that beneath the toil-greased shirt may be found the indelible scar of a German or Jap bayonet or bullet. Penny-pinching is not in accord with the attitude of the American people, especially when applied to our veterans.

I trust the War Department will take cognizance of these remarks and will exercise proper discretion in correcting an irksome and a humiliating problem.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the Congress. This has met with great resentment on the part of many of our returning servicemen and I trust some proper action will be taken to remedy the situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to join my colleague from Michigan in his remarks. I have had similar complaints. I think something should be done by the War Department or Veterans Administration to correct it, in order that these men may have a proper insignia to distinguish them.

Mr. DINGELL. I am grateful to my friends for their expressions in this matter. In my city of Detroit there is brewing a storm of protest right now because of the cheap, plastic, insignificant, little emblem that has been given, that does not serve the purpose. Something should be done. Whenever we give discretionary power to the War Department they should use it properly for the benefit of the veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming may be authorized to speak for an additional 5 minutes, due to the fact that he was the author of the bill that is offered as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The distinguished gentleman from Texas said that the Harness amendment was nothing more than a pious appeal to the people of America. The production of free enterprise and free labor in America has amazed the world. That production has enabled us to put the tools of war in the hands of our boys on every battlefront, and in addition we have been able to give valuable assistance to both Britain and Russia. I am convinced that if we appeal to the patriotism of the American people we can accomplish more through voluntary action than through any compulsory method. It seems to me that any benefit that might come from the May bill would certainly be offset by the compulsory proposals of that bill. Free labor in this country will do the job if but given the chance.

The Harness substitute for the committee bill proposes to use the facilities of the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission to solve this problem. In the first place, the draft boards of America are required to call up every man from 18 to 45 years of age except those presently in the service for the purpose of adequate occupational classification of each registrant. Those not now engaged in war activities or war-supporting activities or in other essential work will be called upon to state in writing whether they will voluntarily respond to a call from the proper governmental agency to work in the war effort.

A few weeks ago we were told that 300,000 men were needed in the war plants. They now state they will need 700,000 before July 1. What do they need 700,000 men for? They say they need 300,000 in the critical industries of this country, 200,000 for war-supporting industries, and 200,000 to arm the French. But bear in mind that at this moment they need only 150,000 in the critical industrial plants. The rest of them are anticipated to be needed between now and the end of June. In addition to that, they propose to take 200,000 men from industry and place them in the Army. The total requirement, therefore, between now and the end of June amounts to 900,000 men for essential war industry.

Where are we going to get them? In the first place they are pointing the finger at the IV–F's. It is estimated that are four and one-half million IV–F's. Two and one-half million are estimated to be employed in war plants today. Five hundred thousand IV–F's are maimed and disqualified from working in industry; but there are a million and a half able to work in industry and it is my idea that if they are called before the draft boards, 99 percent plus of those IV–F's will go anywhere or do anything on a voluntary basis. A million and a half men went back from the war plants last summer when high Army people told us that the war against Hitler would be over by the end of 1944. These men can also be channeled back into war industry on a voluntary basis. They went to work in the war plants voluntarily before and they will do it again. In addition to that, in the next 5 months 300,000 men will be discharged from the Army other than for casualty reasons. From those 3 items we have a pool of over 3,000,000 men to call on for volunteers.

My bill in addition to all these things will require the draft boards of the country and the management and labor committees of the War Manpower Commission to investigate every defense plant in America to determine the wastage and hoarding of manpower. In these cost-plus-a-fixed-fee plants millions of man-hours are wasted. There is our great reservoir of skilled workers—9,300,000 of them. Engineers have said that conservatively we can eliminate 10 percent of those people—900,000 men—and carry on the work more efficiently. The War Production Board itself has stated that they can take from 500,000 to 800,000 men out of munition work in this country without interfering in the least with production.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Will not the gentleman from Wyoming who is really the author of the bill which has been offered as a substitute for the committee bill explain to the House how the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission will cooperate to bring about these results?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The Selective Service System under the Harness amendment is required to work under the supervision and control of the area director and the management-labor committees of the War Manpower Commission. They would send consultants into every one of those plants. They could hire outside technical help and go to the plants to find out if there is any wastage or hoarding of labor and in addition to that we are appealing to the working people of America to come in and give that information voluntarily to the draft boards. I am convinced there are millions of people working in the defense plants in this country who will go before their boards and voluntarily give them information about such scandalous wastage of labor that will rock the Nation. But if necessary they can subpena either management or labor to disclose the facts.

When they find evidence of surplus labor the War Manpower Commission can enforce the release of those men for work in critical plants. The amendment under consideration provides that the local draft boards and the management-labor committees of the War Manpower Commission shall conduct in-plant surveys in every one of these defense plants and rout out the unnecessary labor in those plants. They will apply manpower ceilings on noncritical industries. High engineering authorities in this country say that from this pool of 9,300,000 men

employed in munitions work that conservatively 10 percent can be selected from those plants and used in the critical industries and not interfere with their production in the least.

The War Manpower Commission has 25,860 employees. They have 1,550 local United States Employment Service offices scattered over the country. They have 500 expert utilization consultants. They have made over 5,000 utilization surveys and have accomplished splendid results. In one plant alone the War Manpower Commission was able to reduce the labor requirements by 15,000 without impairing production. An outstanding example of this is the solution of the heavy rubber-tire problem. The War Manpower Commission was convinced that better utilization was possible in Akron where most of the heavy-duty tires are made. Twenty-four utilization consultants were assigned to survey the five major plants. As a result of findings accepted and approved by management and labor leadership, immediate improvement in output occurred and within 60 days tire production was increased 35 percent without an increase in manpower.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I suppose I come from one of the greatest production centers in the country, the Detroit area. I have appeals from both labor, management, and industry that there is no manpower shortage in that area and that there is no necessity for this legislation. The job can be done on a voluntary basis.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. One of the most serious things in this May bill is not its effect on labor but is the fact it says to the little businessman in this country: "Liquidate your business, which we will need after the war, and get yourself some kind of a job either in Government or in an industry that is essential or you go to the Federal penitentiary or you will be fined." I hope the gentleman can assure us in what I want to know. Can the gentleman assure us that there is nothing in his bill that will force men to liquidate their business in the way that the May bill does?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Absolutely, and it will be wholly unnecessary because the Manpower Commission and every engineering company in this country that has examined into the situation states they can get the men right out of the war munition plants and under the volunteer system there will be an abundance of manpower that will not seriously interfere with civilian economy.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I am in favor of the gentleman's substitute; however, I am concerned with section 25, line 21, which states:

> On or after the date of a determination that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in the war effort or on or after the date of his being involuntarily separated—

And so forth. Who will determine when his services are no longer needed? Could a draftee under this bill be retained in some innocuous position, such as dusting off shelves or writing up price tags, doing something that will not contribute to the war effort in an industry that has been declared essential? Who will determine when he is to be released?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The War Manpower Commission will release the men and may I say to the Committee that, in my opinion, is a very important part of this bill. The War Manpower Commission has the power under this bill to go into these various plants and when they find that there is a wastage or hoarding of labor, then they will call upon management and upon labor and labor's representatives to cooperate with them in the selection of men out of that plant to be released. The bill provides that if the man cannot show good cause or if the employer cannot show justification for retaining him, then the War Manpower Commission can order the release of that man and the skilled men not needed in these defense plants will be sent to a critical plant. I have never heard of a man quitting work in a defense plant because he was required to work too hard but I have heard of hundreds who quit because there was no work at all. This is a home-front problem and this bill looks for labor and management working together to solve the problem. In this instance both management and labor oppose the draft system and favor a voluntary plan, and I submit that in this problem they are peculiarly qualified to give us the best counsel and advice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Harness substitute and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, reserving the last 5 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Harness substitute and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, reserving the last 5 minutes to the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute motion. I move that all debate close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana that all debate on the Harness substitute and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana) there were—ayes 130, noes 140.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 146, noes 137.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky as amended by the substitute.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. By virtue of the action just taken, the debate on this amendment is scheduled to end at 10 minutes after 5.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the proposed work-or-fight legislation has been offered to the American people just 3 years too late. If we ever needed it, the time was in December 1941. Then we stood totally unarmed, completely unprepared to fight the war into which we were plunged. Today, after 3 years of conflict, our Nation has produced the greatest output of military supplies and equipment in the history of mankind. We have done it without a National Service Act. It has been done by the American people without the exercise of military compulsion.

To pass this legislation now is equivalent to saying that industry and the workers of our country have not met their responsibilities. Who can say this in the light of the achievement already recorded? Neither the administration nor the military leadership is offering any complaint of a lack of essential supplies. There is nothing but a conjecture that by the middle of 1945 we may need additional thousands of men for both the service and for our factories.

I find here a contradiction. The President's message to Congress was predicated upon a belief that the war in Europe would be over by the middle of this year. If that is true, we shall not need to continue the process of large-scale inductions indefinitely into the future. We should be able to maintain our armies and our allies fighting in the Pacific without the need of additional thousands of employees because the supplies which are now used to fight the European war could be sent on to the Pacific.

But apart from this contradiction in the administration's proposals for selective service as opposed to the anticipation of the approaching end of the European war, there is still another basic objection to the proposed legislation.

To assure a supply of 700,000 workers and 900,000 additional soldiers, the proposal before us would place 18,000,000 men under Government control. That control is justified for military service to preserve the Nation. It is unjustifiable for the purpose of compelling work for private employers under the American tradition.

I am opposed to placing power in the hands of any administration, no matter what administration that might be, which vastly exceeds the need expressed by that same administration.

No man would use a 14-inch cannon to hunt a duck. The Federal Government is asking for a cannon, when by its own admission it does not need one. If the power is to be granted to the Federal Government with the understanding that it will not be used, it should not be asked. Moreover, it should not be granted.

Our people have come a long way in the last 3 years. They do not want their lives regimented any more than is absolutely necessary for the winning of the war. We might have been sold on a National Service Act after Pearl Harbor. We cannot be stampeded into such legislation after Rome, Paris, and Warsaw.

According to statistics, there are employed in industry today approximately 16,000,000 people.

I am convinced that with better planning and more hard work on the part of both management and labor, the productivity of these 16,000,000 people can be increased from 10 to 20 percent. This would more than offset today's estimated manpower shortage.

Not only do I think that from an overall standpoint we have enough manpower—I think that with few exceptions we have enough facilities.

It seems to me just too bad to start now, in the middle of our full-scale fighting effort, to make large quantities of new machine tools, build new plants, start new housing projects, move people by the thousands around the country, in the face of a transportation shortage, and go through all of the motions that will be reflected in increased output only a year or year and a half from now.

That is no answer. We cannot win the war today on what we can produce in the latter part of 1945 and in 1946. There is not time for that sort of planning to achieve the desired result. The need for increased output is immediate. Our fighting men are asking for more shells and more guns today.

The solution does not lie in new machines and new plants and new housing and mass transfers of people. The solution lies in more output per plant, per machine, and per worker.

Management of industry and management of labor, you are being challenged by the generals and the admirals on our fighting fronts. You, Mr. Industrialist, can meet this challenge by tightening up your controls, your planning, and your scheduling.

You, Mr. Labor Management, can meet this challenge by adhering to your no-strike rules, by reducing absenteeism, and by persuading your members to produce at 100 percent.

There is an answer to the manpower situation, and it is a simple answer.

The answer is work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it my understanding that the chairman of the committee will move to rise at about 5 o'clock.

Mr. MAY. I told the gentleman this morning that if we were not close to a conclusion of the bill we would rise about 5 o'clock. I will try to keep my word. That is the reason I wanted to close debate earlier, so that we could get rid of this amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] would agree that we might quit at 5 o'clock and we will have 5 minutes on each side tomorrow to conclude the debate on this amendment.

Mr. MAY. Well, if we have that time left, of course, it can be equally divided. I want the last 10 minutes of the time for the committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Well, if the gentleman would move to rise at 4:45 that would leave 15 minutes and we will take 5 minutes and you can take 10 minutes.

Mr. MAY. That will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, there has been much law discussed and there has been much impassioned oratory on this bill, but it simmers down simply to two points. On one side we have the President and his military aides asking for this bill and on the other side we have American labor and management saying it not only is unnecessary but very liable to hurt production in the war effort. Those who say this bill should be passed have a feeling that we need compulsion. Those who are opposed to it say that we do not. Those two arguments add up to zero. There is only one good argument for passing this bill that I have heard. It was expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], who is Speaker of this House. It was expressed yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It is simply this, it is the effect on the morale of our troops which the defeat of this bill may have.

I would like to call attention to the fact that this is not the first time the President of the United States has called for the conscription of labor. I would like to quote to you a part of his language contained in the veto message on the Smith-Connally Act of June 25, 1943, when he said:

> I recommend that the Selective Service Act be amended so that persons may be inducted into noncombat military service up to the age of 65 years. This will enable us to induct into military service all persons who engage in strikes or stoppages or other interruptions of work in the plants in possession of the United States.

In that message he asked for the power to conscript all labor, meaning men and women, up to the age of 65 years, who went on strike in Government-operated plants; and then he said in the next paragraph that the only alternative to that was universal service. Now he asks for the power to conscript labor for the purpose of increasing production. If that is what he wants it for, I think the American people should listen to those who are engaged in production.

I hold in my hand several telegrams, copies of which no doubt have been sent to every Member of this House, from the leaders of the organized labor groups, including in my case the California State Federation of Labor and the Los Angeles Central Labor Council. Not taking those messages as finally conclusive, I determined to call one of the leaders of industry in my general area on the telephone, a man who is responsible for the production in an enormous shipyard and who is engaged very actively in the war manpower question. I asked him if he had read this bill. He replied that he had. Then I asked him what effect he thought it would have on production. Listen to what he said: "It would insert into our plant a miscellaneous group of people, most of whom did not want to be there in the first place, and it would therefore badly upset production."

He said: "In the second place, we must consider the effect on the persons who are now employed here. This type of legislation will take the starch out of them."

That is from one of the largest production men in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to my unanimous consent granted, I include three telegrams as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 30, 1945.*
Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

For reasons expressed in my letter of the 26th please oppose the May bill and support substitute H. R. 1803 as introduced as after a lapse of 80 years we cannot restore involuntary servitude and expect to solve our problems.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 30, 1945.*
CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

California State Federation of Labor is vigorously opposed to May conscription bill and requests that you support the noncompulsory substitute, H. R. 1803.

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary, California State Federation of Labor.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 30, 1945.*
Congressman CARL HINSHAW,
Washington, D. C.:

Two hundred and fifty thousand members of the American Federation of Labor in this area through their elected delegates have unanimously expressed complete disapproval of the May conscription bill providing for slave labor. We urge support of the noncompulsory substitute bill H. R. 1803 and again respectfully ask that you oppose the May bill.

W. J. BASSETT, *Secretary,*
Los Angeles Central Labor Council.

BURBANK, CALIF., *January 31, 1945.*
Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The San Fernando Valley Central Labor Council respectfully requests you to oppose May conscription bill and support substitute H. R. 1803.

CARL M. HAYES,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Under authority granted to extend my remarks I include the following:

Mr. Chairman, what is wrong today—so wrong that we need to give compulsory powers to the President to force

men to work in war industry? Last summer while people were making up their minds whom to vote for, the war was seemingly almost over. Even Mr. Churchill joined in the general optimism and said the war could end in 1944. We in Congress were urged to prepare legislation for post-war reconversion and for the disposition of surplus property. There was urgency given to that legislation. The War Production Board even made some material allocations to civilian goods production in plants that were engaged in war production. Cut-backs were made in war production in some categories. Tires were allocated to civilian use and gasoline was made available, rationing restrictions were eased materially, and there was much public discussion over how soon our boys would be returned to their homes at the war's end. Could those actions have been for the purpose of creating a happy and grateful state of the public mind because an election was soon to be held? I am unwilling to believe it. I am unwilling even to think that the war effort could have been so sacrificed on the altar of political expediency. For if that were true, Mr. Chairman, it would necessarily follow that no confidence could be placed hereafter in any statement made by the heads of this administration. And that is not all. Mr. Chairman, the evidence is damning, because the election results had barely been finally determined when the clamps began to descend again on the civilian economy and then set-backs struck our armies in Europe. Had our armies advanced too fast for supplies to catch up with them? What military commander does not know the necessity of keeping his logistics in close coordination with his tactics? That is strategy.

What is the evidence on this bill? It can be summed up in two sentences. The President and his military chiefs say they have to have the power to conscript labor to conduct the war. Labor and management in war industry say it will impede production if anything, but at least it will not aid production.

Impassioned orators on this floor say that to defeat this bill will cause a serious lowering of morale among our boys on the fighting front. That is the only valid argument I have heard that adds up to more than zero. It is an important argument, too. But the other arguments add up to exactly zero. They counterbalance each other. That is to say, the bill should not have been born at all. If it had died a-borning, there could not now be the question as to any effect its defeat might have upon the morale of our boys at the front.

Is this the first time the President asked outright for the power to conscript labor? No. Let me quote to you the President's own words in his veto message on the Smith-Connally Act. He said this on June 25, 1943:

> I recommend that the Selective Service Act be amended so that persons may be inducted into noncombat military service up to the age of 65 years. This will enable us to induct into military service all persons who engage in strikes or stoppages or other interruptions of work in plants in the possession of the United States.

In that message he asked for the power to conscript all labor, meaning men and women, who went on strike in Government-operated plants, and said the only alternative was universal service. Now he asks that power to increase production. In other words, he wants the power to conscript labor and industry and agriculture.

This bill is a long way short of the President's desire. It merely puts on a little compulsion. It does not invoke the Articles of War. It applies only civil penalties. But the President is willing to accept this slice if he cannot get his whole loaf.

What can be the matter with the Military Affairs Committee of this House. Why does the committee bring in a little bill like this one. Is it reluctant to bring in a bill giving the President the full power to conscript all men and women between the ages of 18 and 65 years? If, as members of the committee say here on this floor, we must support the Commander in Chief and the military heads by giving them everything they ask for, including all the powers they want, then why does the committee now come here with this bit of crust instead of the whole loaf that the President demands?

There can only be three reasonable answers to that question.

First. That the committee members themselves are unwilling to grant those powers to the President.

Second. That the committee believes that such a measure would be roundly defeated on the floor of this House if it were brought here, which means that the country itself would not stand for it.

Third. That the boys in the fox holes would be deeply disheartened by the knowledge that our country had gone totalitarian, the very thing they are fighting, while they were not here to prevent it.

Mr. Chairman, our boys abroad want strikes stopped. Does this bill stop strikes? The committee says it has nothing to do with strikes or prevention of strikes.

Mr. Chairman, our boys abroad are running short of some important items, we are told. Will this bill increase production? American industry and labor say "No." They are the producers and should know best.

Mr. Chairman, our military leaders say they need replacements. Will this bill bring them replacements? The Selective Service Act already gives them the power to draft replacements.

Then what does this bill do anyway? This bill gives the President power to use compulsion upon every male between 18 and 45 to stay in whatever war-production job he may hold, or to take whatever job may be offered him. Does it make him actually work if he does not want to? No. It just makes him resentful and less liable to do his utmost.

What is the right answer to this production problem? Is it compulsion? No; the right answer is leadership, and a wider use of fixed-price contracts or bid contracts.

Where is the voice of such leadership? Where is the voice of the duly elected Commander in Chief? Is it raised? No. Why not? Is he just a little ashamed of having allowed the workers in our war factories to get the idea that they had better hustle back to their peacetime jobs before somebody else got there first? I wonder. But this is the time for leadership—not the whip. American workers do not need a whip, Mr. Chairman. All they need is to be told the truth—the unvarnished truth—and they will do their part with a will. Let the Commander in Chief call upon them to redouble their efforts and they will respond.

I am sorry this miserable bill was brought to this floor. I am sorry that it did not die a-borning in the fertile mind of its distinguished author.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is here—and the only good argument I can find to vote for it is the effect that its defeat, now that it is here, could have upon the morale of our boys who are facing our enemies. They have been misled into believing that this type of legislation will increase productive effort at home.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the Harness substitute, H. R. 1803. If that fails I shall vote for the Voorhis substitute. If that fails it is my present intention to vote against H. R. 1752, the May bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, what we are interested in is getting greater production. The Barrett substitute if you will bear with me and give me your attention whether you are against our position or not, the Barrett substitute provides that you give an opportunity to volunteer to everyone not now working in essential war plants; and this will touch maybe 5,000,000 men. Is there anything wrong with that? If the draft board calls them in and asks them to sign up in their own community whether or not they are willing to go anywhere the draft board wants them to in essential war industry, do you not think that the power of public sentiment there on the decentralized home front will get 10 or 15 or 20 percent? I think 75 percent of them will volunteer for essential war work. And it answers the question that the gentlewoman from Illinois propounded. There is a very thin line in the services left for civilian production in this country; it is thin on the farm, and among the little business people. The purpose of the Barrett bill is to protect that necessary home front and not thin that labor market further unless it is absolutely necessary to the war effort to do it. How do we protect that home front? We protect it and we look forward to greater war production because the second arm of the bill for the first time implements the selective-service boards in connection with the War Manpower Commission and instructs them to go into these defense plants and determine whether or not there is a hoarding and a wastage of labor. If they determine there is a hoarding and wastage of labor in these plants, then to the plants that have a

shortage after the declaration is made these people will be transferred.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said that there is no compulsion after you have declared a labor shortage. Let me say to you men who are in favor of implementing the War Manpower Commission that three of the most able men of the War Manpower Commission helped us write this bill, and they told us it would do the thing they wanted to do, the thing that the administration would not permit them to do. They showed us charts and graphs where when they were able to get into these plants, convinced us that they did find a hoarding of labor and that this bill would help to get greater production.

With reference to compulsion, may I say that after a thousand men are found in plant A that are not needed, they are then referred to plant B where there is a shortage. What is the compulsion? The compulsion is in the fact that the War Manpower Commission has control of the priorities for material for all the plants of this Nation and every man employed in these war plants practically has to be employed through the U. S. E. S. The compulsion comes about in this way: When he is declared surplus and the suggestion made that he go elsewhere to work, if he refuses to do so and is of military age and qualification he may be taken into the military service. If he is without that category then he can no longer get unemployment insurance, and he cannot get a job in any other plant because he must enter through the U. S. E. S. That is the compulsion that the War Manpower Commission is working under now, and it is entirely effective and efficient.

My thought is that you cannot solve the labor problem in the country unless you find out where the shortages are and where the overstaffing is. There are 600 engineers and consultants down there now; yes, many thousands of them working for the War Manpower Commission. They have the facilities and training. They can make the decision, and they, in conjunction with the selective service draft boards of this country, working together, may determine the surplus, declare that surplus and the compulsion that must be resorted to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, what is the proper way to get greater production? A great many of you people have been priding yourselves on being leaders in social legislation. You are throwing all that out and turning the clock back. You are now voting for fines and jail penalties. You are assisting the powers that are trying to get more men in these overstaffed war plants the same as you are going to drive them into the understaffed plants, all without investigation. Certainly that is not the right way to reach this manpower problem. In private business you would not implement people to drive more men out of the thin lines of service, off the farms, and away from the small business of this country, destroying the home front by driving more men into plants that are already overstaffed. There are 18,000,000 people working in the United States war effort today and there is no question but what at least 10 percent of them could be released from their present services and turned over to plants in which a shortage exists. You would get the skilled mechanics that are now on the pay roll of the Government because the Government is paying the bill, taken and put into those areas where labor shortages exist rather than bringing in the unskilled rookies at the expense of the civilian economy of the country and adding billions of dollars to the war debt.

There is no rhyme nor reason for passing the May bill, but, in my judgment, there is a sound argument for passing the Barrett substitute.

The National Association of Manufacturers, the National Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and many other laboring organizations have endorsed the Barrett substitute. These are the groups who must provide this extra production. They say it can be done under the provisions of the Barrett bill. They say it cannot be done so effectively under the May bill with its fines, jail sentences, and compulsion. These organizations are right. The Members of Congress will act wisely if we follow their advice.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the debate both pro and con on H. R. 1752, known as the National Service Act, and sometimes called the work-or-fight bill. There is nothing in this bill that will make a man fight; it should be called work-where-the-Government-wants-you-to-work-or-go-to-jail bill, or it could be called a bill to do away with voluntary enterprise in America. We want to do everything to help win the war, and I think we must decide whether or not, in our opinion, this bill will help production and bring an early victory. I personally do not feel it will. I believe the passage of this legislation, H. R. 1752, as it is now written, will cause confusion among the workers and employers, lower the morale of our soldiers and civilians, and in this way prolong the war.

We are told General Marshall, Admiral King, and other leaders want this bill. We have a high regard for and great confidence in General Marshall, Admiral King, and all of our military leaders. They are wizards in military and naval tactics, but I do not feel they have sufficient knowledge of how to operate a farm or an industry. They are not trained in the production field; they are trained in the tactics of war. I believe that General Marshall, Admiral King, and all military leaders want production, not simply the May bill or any other bill. They want our boys at the front to have the necessary food and equipment, so when a drive is started they can continue on to victory and not have to stop and wait for supplies.

One point that impresses me is that no one seems to know just how many men are needed for production—some say 148,000 and others as high as 700,000. If no greater number than indicated in these figures is needed, why not obtain them from the 3,000,000 people who are now on the Federal pay roll? I firmly believe the number needed to give this necessary increase in production can be taken from the Federal bureaus which are so overstaffed, and can be placed in essential industry without hindering the efficiency of the bureaus and departments from which they are taken. I feel the biggest hoarder of manpower is the Federal Government itself.

This bill is not wanted by labor or industry—the two groups which are responsible for, and have the greatest knowledge of, production. I certainly would not want to place Green, Whitney, Murray, Crawford, and other labor and industrial leaders in charge of our military tactics, and neither would I want to place our military leaders, Marshall, King, and others, in charge of production.

This compulsory labor bill would give the Director of War Mobilization the right to tell you and me that we would have to resign our present positions and work for someone else, although we may have no knowledge of the work we would be assigned, and this work might be hundreds of miles from our homes and families. Are these the principles of a republic? Is this what our sons and daughters are fighting for?

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, this bill, as it is now written, which would place us under the dictates of one man, is a "dictatorship" bill, and should be defeated. Let us forget our greed for power and unite to produce, in order to win the war and return our boys and girls home to a free country at the earliest possible moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if I were convinced the passage of the so-called May bill would shorten this war by 1 day or 1 hour, or save the life or prevent the injury of one man in the armed forces, of course I would support it. I resent implications from certain quarters that a vote against this bill, or vote for any other measure, is letting anyone down.

Our distinguished majority leader says we must view this legislation from the interests of the United States of America. That is exactly what we are trying to do. Everyone on the floor of this House wants to do what is right for our fighting men and for our country. There is no argument about that. General Marshall and Admiral King say they are going to need more men and also more material of certain kinds. We want them to have it and we will see that they get it.

Mr. Chairman, there are some of us who feel this measure will not do the job and that there is a better approach to the subject. This is not a work-or-fight bill. It says in substance that men between 18 and 45 not permitted to join the armed forces are compelled to work

in certain designated plants, operated by private concerns, for profit, or be jailed or pay fines. It also provides, however, that in addition to transportation expenses, that after he is put into a job he will be endowed with all the rights and privileges of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act. What is the volunteer worker who has faithfully performed his duties going to feel when this man who takes a job under compulsion and works alongside him? But, worse than that, what is the soldier on the battle front and the man on the high seas, the fellow who has lived in fox holes and in the muck and mud for 2 and 3 years—how is he going to feel when you tell him you supported a bill giving this fellow a job with a big wage and then endowed him with the rights and privileges designed especially for the service men and women of this country? If you can explain that away, I would like to hear you do it.

Mr. Chairman, labor and industry have been commended over and over, through the press and by men in high places in Government, for the marvelous job in the production of war materials of all kinds. American free labor has outproduced all other countries in the world combined. Incidentally, the May bill does not apply any compulsions to industry.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] made a splendid address in support of the May bill. He dramatically talked about the Government tapping the boy on the shoulder and compelling him to join the armed forces. I wonder if we might not go a little further and tap governmental agencies and find whether they may be able to get along without a lot of unnecessary employees, as well as eliminate a lot of activities not necessary at this crucial time. Why not tap industry on the shoulder and ascertain if there is hoarding in certain places, as alleged many times on the floor of this House. Find out if cost-plus is wasting manpower in some of our plants as has been charged by Members of this House. You do not cover that in the May bill. Why not tap the distillers who are right now working under a 30-day "holiday" granted by the Government to use their thousands of employees and consume five and a half million bushels of corn to make alcohol for liquor. You know about it. How do you justify it? Tell me. Why not ask the distiller who is making big war profits whether this is his best contribution to the war effort? If you want to be sentimental, or rather reasonable, look around and tap a lot of others who are in nonessential activities; yes, cocktail lounges and a lot of other places where money is lavished and wasted while men are fighting and dying in Europe and the South Pacific today. I say to you it is a shame and a disgrace, and you know it. Cut out a lot of nonessential activities that employ thousands of people and you will have a problem of finding jobs for them. The problem is mismanagement and maldistribution.

Mr. Chairman, only a few months ago, men in responsible places in Government declared the war was almost at an end. People thought it was practically over. We were told of huge surpluses of material. Many plants were shut down. Industry and labor were praised for the wonderful accomplishments. We talked of reconversion and surpluses, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this is the war of every American citizen. Of course, we have had unexpected reverses. Tell us about them and be plain about it. We do need replacements. We need certain material and need it badly. We need an immediate mobilization of industry, agriculture, business, and labor, and all the rest of them. Congress should demand that representatives meet now with those responsible for providing men and materials. Tell them what you want and you will get it. They did it before, and they will do it again. After 3 years under our present system, its a little late to try this sort of legislation. Use the machinery we have, and add the provisions of the amendment I have submitted, or the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] and there will be no occasion for the adoption of the May bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the so-called Barrett substitute which has been offered by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. I am for that substitute primarily because it represents to my mind an effective approach to the solution of the problem with which we are dealing. It is an effective approach because it proceeds on the way of the voluntary method that has done so much for us already. It provides specifically for certain actions on the part of the local draft boards calling into play, too, the efforts of the War Manpower Commission to search out in the various localities the wastage of labor, the hoarding of labor, and the improper use of labor, yes; and then to point the finger at those situations to bring about the full utilization of available manpower in essential war production. Beyond that it provides that upon certain findings there is vested in the War Manpower Commission the right of compulsory release of employees. That has to do with the matter of manpower ceilings about which we have heard so much and which many believe is the most effective statutory approach to the problem.

There is another thing on which I would like to comment. I said in a talk I made here yesterday that to my mind the employers of the country ought to know more or as much about how to solve this problem as any other group in the land. The employers by and large are organized in the N. A. M., that is the National Association of Manufacturers. Now, the so-called friends of labor frequently complain of the N. A. M. in right bitter tones. I think it fairly can be said of the May bill that it strikes not at the employer but at the employee. It might well be that an employer not motivated by patriotic and just instincts might say, "Well, I would like to have the men frozen in my plant. I would like to have the Government by compulsion drive men into my plant if I need them." So I say that the N. A. M. and the employers generally of the country cannot be said to have a selfish interest in their opposition to this legislation. But they are opposed to it. They ask us to turn it down. There is no particular reference to the Barrett substitute or the substitute that may be offered by the gentleman from California. But in their recommendations I find much to support the voluntary method expressed in the Barrett substitute.

I want to read a few paragraphs from a release and statement made by the N. A. M. and its president to the Committee on Military Affairs in the other body in response to a letter addressed to them on this legislation. It bears out my contention that the passage of the May bill will decrease and not increase production.

This is what they say:

> We realize that the mere phrase, "work or fight" has immense appeal to a public bent on victory. We recognize as well that to those with sons and daughters in the thick of battle it seems only just. Management also has sons and daughters at the front and is as anxious for victory as any other group of citizens. However, our experience in the so-called miracle of war production causes us to point out that ill-considered pressure legislation to get 300,000 workers would backfire badly and could ruin the production efficiency of the hard-working millions in war production.
>
> The net of such legislation would be a gain of 1 to 5 percent more workers at the expense, in the considered judgment of management, of a 15- to 20-percent slump from current production—the exact reverse of what is sought and is at a cost far too high for a psychological experiment. Instead of forcing labor through such legislation and creating strife among the good producers, the association has suggested legislation to Congress that would enable the Government to place a ceiling on civilian employment, the only big source of trained help. Workers thus released from civilian production would have a choice in war jobs without creating the compulsion complex in employees, which might generate a national slow-down of dissatisfied workers.
>
> The public popularly hold to the belief that if you can conscript to fight, you should be able to conscript for work.
>
> Yes; you can conscript for work. But this is not the issue. The point is what will bring the most production.
>
> Managers of American industry have been extremely reluctant to embrace any form of compulsory labor. This has been based on its long experience in dealing with American workers and because this experience has convinced management that compulsory labor does not produce as efficiently as freemen. The record of production since Pearl Harbor justifies this belief.
>
> Arguments have been advanced that compulsory-service legislation is needed to boost the morale of our armed forces; or that it is needed to mobilize or punish a minority of Americans who may not be contributing their full share in the war. Our position is that such legislation will not help war production, whatever else it might do for national morale either overseas or at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, there is only one test as to whether this legislation—H. R. 1752—should be enacted into law. That test is very simple; it is the same test I have previously urged must be applied to other proposals of

this kind: Will it increase production and help win the war?

The working people of America, in every industry contributing to our war effort, have patriotically responded to the emergency by producing both the requirements of war and the necessities of life on an ever-increasing scale to meet those requirements.

The field of shipbuilding, with which I am intimately acquainted through my service on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, is but a single example of their great effort. In the month of December 1944 alone our American shipyards delivered 145 merchant ships of more than a million and a third deadweight tons. During the year 1944 they constructed 1,677 ships with an aggregate capacity of 16,343,436 deadweight tons. The shipbuilding industry has revolutionized shipbuilding and established all-time world records little dreamed of even during the present decade.

Repressive, repulsive, and coercive legislation will not increase production. This record to which I have referred was made by free and untrammeled American labor.

This problem cannot be solved by emotional speeches such as those to which we have listened during the past few days. It can only be solved by cold, hard facts of which this House is not sufficiently informed.

Mr. Chairman, I have been told by the very best of authority that Britain is now building ships for neutral Portugal for that country's post-war trade. Further, I am under the impression that much of the material going into those ships has been furnished by this country on lend-lease. This is going on while we are standing here debating the passage of legislation that will tend to destroy the morale of American workingmen.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because it is contrary to principles this country has maintained and fought for in every major war in which it has been involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support and vote for this bill, H. R. 1572. To do so would be the fatal error of going in the opposite direction from our real objective. Every American wants to do everything possible to support our men on the fighting fronts, even if it calls for total conscription of all materials, machinery, and manpower. This bill does nothing of the kind, nor any part of it. On the other hand, our fighting forces would not want us, and none of us want, to do anything that will destroy our production efficiency and at the same time destroy the fundamental freedom they are fighting for and wish to preserve at all costs. This bill will do just that. That is the real issue in this legislation. It is the fight between the supporters of a foreign, modified, and reformed communism known as state capitalism and the supporters of American private enterprise.

The New Deal procrastinations, indecisions, conflict of authority, clash of personalities, lack of understanding, delays, and failures are again upon us since Donald Nelson was exiled and banished to China. They were the bane of our production effort when Sidney Hillman was at the head of our Office of Production Management. The Truman committee blew the lid off this deplorable situation with the result that Mr. Roosevelt was forced to desert his state-capitalism friends and turn to private enterprise, to Donald Nelson, to bring order and success out of chaos and failure. And what was the result?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. For the gentleman's information I call his attention to a statement by former Senator TRUMAN which deals with this subject and appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

From the moment Donald Nelson took charge there was begun a record of production for war which outstripped all the other nations, allies, and belligerents together, and which excited the wonder and admiration of the entire world. To what did this proponent of free enterprise ascribe this success? This Chairman of the War Production Board said, "We call our secret weapon the initiative, intelligence, and 'know-how' of the free American workers."

Thus for nearly 3 years the American private enterprise system showed its superiority over the foreign New Deal theories. But the New Dealers banished Donald Nelson to China, and in a few short months here we are again in confusion and chaos with his successor, and they propose a freak compulsory labor law. Its freakishness is beyond description. But just take one feature. Because of a few slackers it proposes to brand millions as such, and then force them to work, giving them travel allowances, veterans' employment rights, and the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, all of which are denied the voluntary workers with whom they must mingle.

If this would not breed discord and confusion and seriously interfere with war production, I ask what would.

Many other convulsive features can be cited, but it is unnecessary. The bill has none of the earmarks of an aid to production for the war effort, and all the earmarks of socialization, regimentation, and destruction of the American way of living. We may expect, and are experiencing, until another election is in the offing, a tremendous resurgence of the State capitalism New Dealers to regiment the American people under the guise of patriotism. In the whole range of administration activity their actions do belie their tongue.

It was just called to my attention that even in the sugar situation the administration is giving the lie to its hue and cry of a shortage of labor by a regulation of December 26 last.

Shortly after sugar rationing was instituted, O. P. A. issued instructions calling for the pasting of sugar ration stamps to a gummed sheet. The original provision, however, exempted all retailers who did not take in a minimum of 250 stamps per week. This eliminated most of the small independent and delicatessen type of retailers. Subsequently, however, as the manpower and help situation became more acute, all distributors were eliminated from this requirement.

The regulation of December 26 now calls upon everyone to paste their sugar ration stamps to the gummed sheets. The small independent retailer has more than he can handle in reports, regulations, and so forth, and is compelled to spend a great deal of time in filling out these regulatory reports. I am advised that the larger chains estimate that in order to fill these requirements, it will be necessary for them to hire between 40 and 50 people each. Probably a survey of the whole country would show that several thousands will be required merely to fix the sugar ration stamps to the gummed sheets, and literally tens of thousands of independent retailers will have to stay up into the wee hours of the night complying with this present senseless regulation of O. P. A.

O. P. A.'s explanation is that this step is necessary and required because gangsters are now counterfeiting sugar ration stamps, which as you know, are good for 5 pounds of sugar.

It is, therefore, necessary for them, in order to check these violations, to have the stamps affixed to sheets so that they might be examined by the regional offices to determine the counterfeits. They estimate they will be able to save at least 100,000 tons of sugar.

Inquiries have been unable to locate anyone at O. P. A. who has actually seen a counterfeit ration stamp. They say it is impossible for them to advise retailers as to the description of these stamps.

Here is another example of unnecessary Government control merely for the sake of regimentation. If there is counterfeiting of sugar rationing stamps, this does not seem to us to be the proper method of correcting the situation. O. P. A. has the authority and control from the sugar refiner through to the retailer. The method of correcting a condition, such as alleged exists, would be in starting with the refiner rather than the retailer. Rather than to be pressing for a national service act, it would appear to be more sensible to examine into the demands and uses of manpower where it is unnecessarily being wasted.

We do well to examine this and similar legislation carefully, for the New Deal, with its thousands of adherents in key positions, its ability to exert pressure in every domain of our national effort, even the Army and Navy, is constantly busy at its objectives, which are opposed to the best interests of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, the type of man you are going to force into war work by the adoption of H. R. 1752 will not prove a very willing nor a good worker.

Military leaders ask for volunteers when there is a tough job to be done, although they have the power to force any

man to perform any duty that they might deem necessary.

I do not think the American people need to be harnessed and compelled under the threat of reprisal to man the jobs and keep our fighting forces supplied with the tools of war. The American people do not respond to force of threat and reprisal. No liberty-loving people will. But I do think that they will respond willingly and effectively as volunteers.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a choice today between the American way of doing things which, despite temporary set-backs, has proven most efficient and successful in meeting the problems of fighting and winning this war, than the "decree" methods of force and threat of punishment, the demand for blind obedience of the leadership in the name of the state. We have seen that system fail again and again and again. We have seen that system lead to strife and human misery again and again. Twice in the last 25 years that system has plunged the world into war. And having that choice, Mr. Chairman, why choose the way that has failed? Why choose the way of our enemies—Germany and Japan?

I urge the defeat of H. R. 1752—May bill—and the adoption of H. R. 1803—Barrett bill.

The well-being of our fighting men comes closer to me, perhaps, than to all but one other Member of this House. I would have five of the best reasons in the world for voting for this bill if I thought, for one moment, that it would help in the slightest way my five sons who are in the armed forces or assist in the least in bringing them home sooner.

But I do not think that it will do that. On the contrary, there is good reason to believe that this measure violates the thirteenth amendment which says that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist within these United States." And I believe, further, that we are in effect capitulating to the Fascist military and totalitarian methods of our enemies, just as they predicted we would.

Finally, I firmly believe that we would be imposing upon all Americans those very conditions that exist in Europe and thus defeat the very purpose we are fighting to abolish.

We Members of Congress have a very grave duty to perform. We must keep faith with these boys whom we have sent to fight in the four corners of the world. We must constantly guard against the type of legislation that will weaken our system of government and our way of life, for the preservation of which they are giving their lives.

Again I urge the defeat of H. R. 1752 and the adoption of H. R. 1803.

On the title page of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives there is inscribed this quotation from Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice:

BASSANIO. And I beseech you wrest once the law to your authority: To do a great right, do a little wrong.

PORTIA. It must not be; * * * 'twill be recorded for a precedent, and many an error, by the same example, will rush into the state.

I urge the defeat of H. R. 1752—May bill—and the adoption of H. R. 1803—Barrett bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the tentative understanding that was agreed to here today, which I do not believe was in the form of a unanimous consent request, I now ask unanimous consent that debate on the Harness amendment and all amendments thereto on tomorrow be limited to 15 minutes of which 5 minutes is to be allotted to and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], the remaining 10 minutes to myself to be allocated for the committee's closing argument.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I thought that was the understanding we had.

Mr. MAY. I am stating it for the RECORD in the form of a consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two letters that were published in my home-town paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain statistics at the point in the RECORD where I discussed the so-called F. E. P. C. amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Edgar A. Hawley, Chicago Negro Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks made today a statement from a former Member of the other body, together with copy of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

ALLISTER COCHRANE, 43 YEARS OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago today Allister Cochrane, a young man from Detroit, was called upon as a substitute to report the debates in this House. From that day, Mr. Speaker, without interruption, Mr. Cochrane has continued to render invaluable and faithful service to the House of Representatives. He has endeared himself to every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle in this and every one of the 23 Congresses he has so ably served, from January 31, 1902, down to the present.

It is doubly fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we should pause for a few moments today to pay our respects and to acknowledge our indebtedness to this faithful servant of the people. In addition to marking the forty-third anniversary of Mr. Cochrane's employment by the House, this day also marks the seventy-sixth anniversary of his birth. It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Cochrane cannot be present today to receive our personal felicitations but he is now at home recovering from a severe surgical operation. Fortunately, I am informed that his recovery is such that he expects to resume his duties as Official Reporter of Debates in the near future. I am sure I speak for every Member of this House in saying that we rejoice in the prospect of his early return.

Mr. Cochrane came to this House January 31, 1901, as a substitute reporter, and served in that capacity for two sessions. He was then appointed Official Reporter of Debates by Speaker Cannon of Illinois. At the time of his initial appointment he was employed as official reporter for the circuit court of Wayne County in Detroit under Judge Carpenter and had obtained a leave of absence from that position to accept a special assignment in Washington. He was called in as a House reporter suddenly and without an opportunity to

prepare, but, in the opinion of his early associates, he "handled the job like a veteran" from the first day, and he was induced to continue his service.

From that time he has served under 10 Speakers, including Speaker Henderson, namely, Cannon, of Illinois; Clark, of Missouri; Gillett, of Massachusetts; Longworth, of Ohio; Garner, of Texas; Rainey, of Illinois; Byrns, of Tennessee; Bankhead, of Alabama; and the present incumbent, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

In addition to reporting debates in the House, Mr. Cochrane was called upon to render like service at international conferences and special congressional proceedings at times when the House was not in session. Outstanding among these special assignments was the Hague International Conference of 1907, and the famous Lorimer trial in 1911–12.

I deem it a very special privilege, Mr. Speaker, to be able to call these facts to the attention of the House. Like most of the Members of this House, especially those of us who have had the honor of serving here for any length of time, I have always held Mr. Cochrane in the highest esteem and have admired him for his unfailing devotion to the Congress and to our great Nation. Without employees like him the American Congress could not function effectively, and it might well be that its reputation as the greatest parliamentary body in the world would never have been acquired.

As members of this great deliberative body we are continually in the debt of our tried and faithful employees—every one of them, from the newest to the oldest, from the humblest to the highest. Mr. Cochrane, who has served this House longer, with few exceptions, than any present employee, typifies in the highest degree the loyalty, the industry, the efficiency, and the devotion of congressional employees as a whole.

We in Michigan are proud indeed of the fact that Mr. Cochrane, although born in Canada, was raised and educated in our schools, and, in the best of American tradition, worked his way through the Detroit College of Law, from which he was graduated in 1898.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call Allister Cochrane my friend. On this his seventy-sixth birthday, and his forty-third anniversary as a reporter of debates in the House, I salute him and wish him a complete and early recovery from his present illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain telegrams and letters in connection with the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an extract from the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE PUERTO RICAN SITUATION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, to emphasize the significance of my subject, I wish to read some brief but revealing quotations from the writings of a widely discussed public servant who at this time does not directly hold office in the Federal Government but nevertheless occupies a position of influence which is a genuine concern of Congress.

Here are the quotations—six of them:

1. For we have a century and more of development to undo. * * *

2. The first changes will have to do with statutes, with constitution, with government. We shall be changing once for all, and it will require the laying of rough, unholy hands on many a precedent. * * *

3. It has already been suggested that business will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis; it is literally meant. * * *

4. It is a logical impossibility to have a planned economy and to have businesses operating its industries, just as it is also impossible to have one within our present constitutional and statutory structure. * * *

5. Complete economic planning is possible only when there is public ownership and control of the means of production. * * *

6. The most hazardous situation to a man of family is to have the fee simple ownership of land.

Mr. Speaker, here are the philosophy, thoughts, and the purposes of a man who, over a decade ago, vowed that he would "roll up his sleeves and make over America." This man who wishes to undo the progress this country has made under the American system, who wishes to destroy our precedents, who advocates a planned and controlled economy, and hopes to eliminate private enterprise and the private ownership of farm land—this man is Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell.

And these were not mere empty words, for it was not long thereafter that Dr. Tugwell was given the opportunity to put into practice some of his theories of government and economics, and he became one of the original administrators of a planned economy. It is unnecessary for me to recall to your mind his record, first, in connection with the Rural Rehabilitation Administration, and, later, with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, in which scarcity of production was adopted as the remedy of our current agronomic ills. You will recall also that, within a comparatively few years, the Tugwellian program was rejected as being entirely too extreme and too foreign to the American philosophy of government, and he was retired to private life.

But the retirement was short lived, for he soon was brought back into public life and again was given an opportunity to effect his plans for a socialized economy. This time his efforts have not been felt directly by the American people, and there has been no general outcry against his practices for the reason that our people have neither known of his activities nor experienced the regimentation which his ideologies entail.

Technically, he does not appear in the Federal picture, since he has been operating in a sphere geographically outside the United States, but he nevertheless is functioning, as of old, under the American flag. And in a comparatively short space of time he has succeeded in his plans for economic regimentation on a scale far more comprehensive and complete than he ever could have dared to propose for continental United States.

Lest you think that he has forgotten or forsaken his plans for remaking the United States, let me remind you that he obviously still hopes to make a comeback in the national picture. In discussing one of the most fundamental phases of the planned economy he now is perfecting in Puerto Rico, Dr. Tugwell said, "It has obvious implications for the South," referring to the Southern States of our Union. The plan in question, Mr. Speaker, calls for Government ownership and operation of the Nation's productive farm land.

In connection with a study of the effect of the law which limits corporate holdings of farm land in Puerto Rico to 500 acres, Dr. Tugwell was sent to that Territory in March 1941 as special representative of Secretary Ickes, whose Division of Territories and Island Possessions has the general responsibility of administering Federal matters affecting the island. While there, he was in close touch with the leaders of the Puerto Rican Legislature which enacted two of the laws which form the initial steps in his totalitarian program. Although he denies any responsibility for them, by their very nature the conclusion is inescapable that his was the brain which started the wheels in motion.

Subsequently, in August 1941, Dr. Tugwell became the appointed Governor of the Island of Puerto Rico, as successor, with the exception of a brief interim appointee, to Admiral William D. Leahy, admitted by most Puerto Ricans to have been the best of all American Governors. This appointment gave Dr. Tugwell the wide-open opportunity to achieve his life's ambition, and the developments of the past 3 years indicate that he is well on the road to success. As Governor, he is the representative of the Government of the United States in Puerto Rico and, as such, should refrain from involvement in local matters of political partisanship. However, even before his appointment, he developed a close working arrangement or alliance with one of the major political parties and began his program for government socialization. By the clever, but improper, expedient of distributing government appointments to the partisans of his ally, he was able to obtain enactment of legislation necessary to round out his program. Already, in the opinion of many responsible Puerto Ricans, the Tugwell administration has seriously impaired much of the good that America has done in Puerto Rico during the 45 years that those people have been under the American flag. Having failed in his determination to undo the century of development here in the United States, he has, in the minds of many, succeeded in undoing the half century of American development in Puerto Rico.

No one can be mindful of certain recent laws of Puerto Rico and not come to the conclusion that there has been developed the nucleus for the most fantastic, fascistic system of government imaginable. It is unbelievable that such a system would be allowed to exist anywhere under the American flag. And yet it does exist, and the reason is that those in the Federal Government who are directly responsible for Puerto Rican affairs are either too preoccupied with wartime responsibilities to recognize what is happening or else tacitly approve the scheme. Certain it is that the American people would want to have no part of it.

But what are these enactments which embody the heart of the Tugwellian philosophies and give lifeblood to his declaration that complete economic planning is possible only when there is public ownership and control of the means of production? The plan is amazingly simple to have come from so complex a mind. By the comparatively simple device of some five or six public corporations or authorities, all manner of economic life on the island is placed in jeopardy by the threat of being brought under governmental control, domination, or outright operation.

The first of these was the land authority, created by the Puerto Rican Legislature in 1941, which has an annual administrative budget of $200,000, and an appropriation of 2,000,000, with authority to issue its own bonds, guaranteed by the people of Puerto Rico in the ultimate amount of many millions of dollars. Moreover, the funds available to this and other of the new authorities can be, and in some cases already have been, increased far beyond these totals by the insular legislature.

This authority is controlled by seven members, all of whom are appointed by the Governor. It is authorized to put an end to large landholdings by corporations, partnerships, or trusts, and to create new landowners and provide means for farmers and slum dwellers to acquire lands. Immediately one notes a striking similarity between the rural rehabilitation program, fostered by Dr. Tugwell here in America in the middle thirties, and this resettlement program inaugurated in Puerto Rico. Under authority of this law, several thousand acres of land have been purchased by the government, subdivided into small plots of 5 and 10 acres and assigned to those individuals who are in desperate economic distress, but who also qualify from political considerations.

But more important, still, the lands of two large companies have been purchased by the land authority and are today being operated by the authority itself, through so-called lessees who actually are nothing more than employees of the government. The authority has announced its intention to acquire, this year, the lands of a half dozen more organizations, totaling perhaps 100,000 acres in all. According to official statements, these lands are not to be divided into small farms, but are indefinitely to be owned, cultivated, and operated by the government itself, through the land authority. Thus, each worker on these thousands of acres of sugar land, and every field manager and superintendent, is to be, in effect, an employee of the government or solely dependent on one political group for his rice and beans and for his very livelihood.

The next of the schemes was the creation of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, which has an appropriation of nearly a half million dollars and authority to borrow up to five million. This authority is governed by a board composed of the Governor and two other public officials, both of whom are appointed by the Governor. It has the authority to conserve, develop, and utilize the water resources of Puerto Rico; to acquire by purchase, lease, and condemnation, water- and power-development properties; to produce, develop, and sell water or electrical energy, and to determine, charge, and collect rates or fees for the use of its facilities. Already, under the authority of this law, all privately owned power companies with but two minor exceptions have been arbitrarily taken over by the government and placed under government control and operation.

The next of these government agencies is the planning, urbanizing, and zoning board, consisting of three members appointed by the Governor and having an annual appropriation of $100,000. The power of this authority is to prepare and adopt a master plan for the development of Puerto Rico, including the character, location of the land, minerals, water, vegetation, and animal life; present and possible utilization for mining, power, irrigation, flood control, navigation, drainage, domestic and industrial use of water, fishing, recreation, and general welfare; and of residential, commercial, manufacturing, recreational, transportation, communication, institutional, governmental, and public-utility facilities, and operations by whatsoever desirable categories. The recommendations of this board, after being approved by the executive council, which is composed of the Governor and six other Puerto Rican officials, four of whom are appointed by the Governor, have the force and effect of law unless nullified by an act of the local legislature. As its name indicates, this board is where the planning and the scheming are done and where the program is prepared for imposing the heavy hand of government on all manner of human endeavor.

Next on the list of public corporations is the transportation authority, created in 1942, which has an appropriation of $1,000,000 and authority to borrow up to $5,000,000, and is controlled by a board composed of the Governor and two other persons, both designated by the Governor. This authority has the power to develop, improve, own, operate, and manage all types of transportation facilities and services in, to, and from the island of Puerto Rico and may exercise all rights and powers necessary or convenient for carrying out such purposes. This is not a governmental agency to regulate the rates and the services of a public-transportation system comparable to our own Interstate Commerce Commission. This is an arm of government empowered to own and operate any and all kinds of transportation whether by rail, by ship, by airplane, or by bus, and powered either by steam, electricity, gasoline, or any other source of energy. Under this authority the government has already acquired or intends to acquire motor bus lines, the railroad system, trolley systems, and even some taxi organizations. In short, it provides authority for government ownership of all modes of transportation.

Further on the list is the communications authority, also created in 1942, with an appropriation of a hundred thousand dollars and a bonded authority of $5,000,000. It is controlled by a board of directors of five persons who are chosen by the Governor and two other persons, both of whom are designated by the Governor. It is empowered to develop, improve, own, operate, and manage all types of communication facilities in, to, and from the island of Puerto Rico and is granted all rights and powers necessary or convenient for carrying out such purposes. Here again it is not a question of regulating the rates and services of communication companies, as is done by our own Federal Communications Commission. This is Government ownership of every kind of communication, whether by telephone, telegraph, cable, wireless, or radio. Already the Government owns and operates the telegraph system on the island and is now in the process of purchasing the telephone system. Soon it will have in operation, no doubt, Government radio transmission stations and will be in a position not only to dictate what types of programs will go out over the air but to determine what each program itself shall be. Not only is this actually Government ownership of all communications but it also very definitely is an opportunity to perpetrate an infringement of the right of freedom of speech.

Another of the new ventures is the enlargement of the authority of the Public Service Commission so that the commission now has power to regulate every company and person engaged in the manufacture, processing, or refining of sugar and has the same powers to examine into affairs of the sugar companies that it formerly had over ordinary public-utility companies. In addition, it has the power to fix prices, standards, rates, and manufacturing conditions; to determine cutting and grinding periods; to inspect accounts of sugar companies, and to determine the value of sugar properties. While the power of this commission is not as broad as that of some of the other authorities, there is sufficient latitude in the power to regulate the sugar industry, so that to all intents and purposes it amounts to Government control and domination of the industry which directly and indirectly accounts for about two-thirds of Puerto Rico's employment and more than half its total income from private sources.

Now comes the Development Bank, created in 1942, with an appropriation of $500,000 and controlled by a board of directors chosen by the executive council, which is composed of the Governor and six other persons, four of whom are appointed by the Governor. As originally conceived, the bank has

the power to accept government and other deposits, to loan money, and to issue bonds, promissory notes, and other obligations.

It has the power to act as agent of every kind of life, fire, accident, casualty, automobile, and other insurance; to manufacture, purchase, or acquire, hold, own, dispose of, invest, trade, or deal in goods, merchandise, real and personal property of every description; to acquire, hold, use, sell, or assign letters patent of the United States or any foreign country, as well as licenses, inventions, improvements, processes, copyrights, trademarks, etc.; to control, to supervise any undertaking constructed or acquired, and to govern the rendering, sale, or exchange of transportation facilities; to carry on any other business necessary, manufacturing or otherwise.

Not only is the bank authorized to engage in the usual banking pursuits but, in addition, it is empowered to carry on any kind of business enterprise, either on its own account, or through agencies or instrumentalities created by it. This bank, coupled with the Development Company having an annual appropriation of $500,000 and a borrowing capacity of $5,000,000, again dominated by persons selected through the influence of the Governor, is in a position to regiment, either directly or indirectly, the entire economic life of the island. There is not a conceivable type of business activity in which the government, through these instrumentalities, could not engage, and the top man is the Governor—Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell.

Further than this, information comes to me that the insular government has immediate plans to engage in all types of insurance activities, the operation of steamship lines, the appropriation of all private banks and consolidation with the Development Bank, the acquisition of all sugar mills, the operation of air lines, the reorganization of the judiciary to remove all judges and court officers who are not in sympathy with the present-day trend there. There are proposals to require the division of profits with employees, the fixing of rents at 6 percent of the assessed values of the properties, and many other plans for so-called social justice. It is reported that the government is contemplating taking over all the rum distilleries on the island—the goose which has laid the golden egg for Puerto Rico—as will later be shown.

Mr. Speaker, living under a government such as exists now in Puerto Rico, it is small wonder that the thinking people of the island are genuinely frightened. Not only does new capital refuse to invest in needed enterprises to give employment to the people, but many of the investors who have been established there for years are liquidating their holdings and coming to the mainland where they can obtain the kind of protection they thought they would have when they invested in Puerto Rico in the first instance and expected to be given the kind of treatment America had given to her continental citizens. Moreover, to date, those who are withdrawing their funds from Puerto Rico for the most part are not the outsiders—continental Americans—but native Puerto Ricans. The island's own people are the ones who are fearful of the Tugwell program. Viewing the situation in Puerto Rico as it exists today, one can readily understand the claim that Governor Tugwell has undone a half century of development in Puerto Rico.

No doubt there are some here who would assert that it should be of no concern to us if this is the kind of government the Puerto Ricans desire and that we should not undertake to dictate to them. Those persons are correct to some degree, but most certainly we do have not only the right but the duty to interfere when it is known that the funds which finance all these socialistic schemes come from the American taxpayer. Who is to protect the interests of American people but we here in the Congress? Maybe Puerto Rico should have the right to do these things, but not with our money. Under the law, the customs receipts on foreign goods sold in Puerto Rico are rebated to the treasury of the island. So is the internal revenue tax on rum which, in normal times, approximated three million dollars but which has steadily increased in past years, until in 1944 it approached one hundred million dollars. In one form or another—as rebates, relief appropriations, and the like—the United States Government has spent in Puerto Rico or made available to it more than half a billion dollars since 1900. I repeat, it is our money, money from the Federal Treasury, which Dr. Tugwell is using for this far-flung social experiment which he has perpetrated on the people of Puerto Rico and hopes to transplant in the 48 States at the first opportunity.

What a beautiful picture this represents for any public official sharing Dr. Tugwell's concept of life and government. He has the ideas, the local government has put the stamp of legislative approval upon them, and the United States is footing the bill with the huge rum tax and other concessions. Even Mussolini in the heyday of his career would have been green with envy. National socialism has been nurtured in Puerto Rico to a degree comparable to the national socialism that is known as communism in Russia, fascism in Italy, falangism in Spain, and nazi-ism in Hitler's Germany—the system that we imported from Europe and adopted in part as a New Deal in the United States. It is an utter negation of the republican form of government guaranteed under our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has a direct, though remote, responsibility for the welfare of the 2,000,000 inhabitants of Puerto Rico, virtually all of whom are citizens of the United States. It is with genuine reluctance that I feel compelled to bring this situation to your attention this afternoon, for I would much prefer that the people of Puerto Rico should work out their own destinies without undue interference or dictation from us. In the past, the Congress has given to Puerto Rico generously of our material resources but has given them little, if any, of what might be termed spiritual guidance in matters of economics and government. The Organic Act of Puerto Rico, adopted nearly 30 years ago, established a Puerto Rican Legislature and gave to the people of that island the authority to enact such laws as might be thought desirable, subject only to a veto, either by the Governor, by the President of the United States, or by the Congress. In times past, numerous acts of the legislature have been vetoed by the governors, and on occasion, they have been vetoed by the President but, as yet, none of the Puerto Rican legislative enactments have been nullified by the Congress.

In this instance, of course, it cannot be expected that the Governor would veto the very laws which he was instrumental in having adopted. I have awaited action by the President, but there has been none; and, in fact, the Department of the Interior, which has administrative Federal responsibility for the island, has indicated its approval of Governor Tugwell's regime. Consequently, convinced as I am that this program is both foreign to the American philosophy of private enterprise and of constitutional government, and harmful to the eventual best interest of the people of Puerto Rico, there is but one course for me to follow and I cannot allow further time to pass in bringing this serious matter to your attention.

It would be far preferable for us not to be critical of the practices followed by the Puerto Ricans. But this is an unusual situation. This program was not initiated by the Puerto Ricans in the first instance. The program is the product of the ideology believed in and advocated by the Governor who, nominally at least, is the representative of our Government on that island. It is entirely natural for the Puerto Rican to believe that Dr. Tugwell has the support and approval of our Government. While it may be that he has the endorsement of this Government as judged by the silence of those who have authority to speak out, I assert that Dr. Tugwell does not reflect the thought of more than a small segment of the population of this country.

The time has come for Congress to direct its eye to what is happening down there. We owe it not only to ourselves but, to a vastly greater degree, we owe it to the Puerto Ricans who, a generation ago, through the misfortunes of war, quite unwillingly came under the American flag. The immediate course which we should follow is, to my mind, threefold. First, Governor Tugwell should be replaced. Legislation to this effect is now pending before the House. Second, the set of laws which were enacted under his guidance and which border on communism should be annulled either by the Puerto Rican Legislature or by this Congress, preferably by the former. Third, Congress should guide the use of all rum tax revenues over and above the largest amount received by Puerto Rico in any one year prior to the war, to insure that these special funds will be used in a way that will improve the welfare of the people, as was originally intended, instead of being dissipated on socialistic programs which work against their interests.

But, sir, this is not enough. Puerto Rico needs our help, not from the standpoint of dictation or control, but rather

from the broader viewpoint of cooperative counsel and advice. Many, many things must be done if the fear, the poverty, and the insecurity of the people is to be overcome. It comes with little grace for us to criticize the so-called colonial practices of other nations when we are guilty of such neglect of and indifference to our own external problems. I am confident that, given proper thought and careful handling, the relationship between Puerto Rico and ourselves can be vastly improved, economic conditions can be made better, and social and cultural and educational opportunities on the island can be improved. Moreover, the people can be given genuine hope for a brighter future, in which they can anticipate either complete independence for themselves or some other type of association with us which will preserve the close feeling of unity which many Puerto Ricans have with us and which will be, at the same time, mutually advantageous to both peoples.

Our duty to Puerto Rico and our own people requires that this serious problem be faced soon and with candor and vision.

As a first step, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Congress take appropriate action to constitute a new Federal office charged with responsibility for studying and administering the affairs of Puerto Rico and other dependencies, including those which may come within the sphere of this country at the end of the war.

At the present time we have no unified policy with respect to the administration of Territorial or colonial affairs. Congress never has taken the time to give this exceedingly ticklish problem the thoughtful study it demands. Instead, we have been content to adopt piecemeal measures which are no credit to this Nation. The problem admittedly is a difficult one, but that is all the more reason for setting up the machinery needed to solve it.

Unless we make adequate provision for resolving this problem, we face a repetition of the costly failure in Puerto Rico, where we aimlessly have provided funds to the extent of more than half a billion dollars in the last 45 years without providing any permanent help to the people of the island and without effectively meeting the obligations of the United States to the island and its people.

Already I have introduced legislation calling for the formation of an agency within the Federal Government, charged with responsibility for seeing that the Puerto Rican problem is satisfactorily dealt with and that the affairs of other Territorial areas are administered in an intelligent and enlightened manner. Congress must meet this problem head on before very long. Much grief and international embarrassment can be avoided by starting to work on it at once.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SPONSORS OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a list of Members of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced the equal rights resolution which proposes to write the following amendment into the Constitution of the United States:

> Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.
>
> Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
>
> This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification.

I am privileged to announce that the following 74 Members of the House, representing 31 of the 48 States of the Union, join me as sponsors of the resolution and will give it their cordial support:

FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama; RICHARD F. HARLESS, of Arizona; JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona; FADJO CRAVENS, of Arkansas; W. F. NORRELL, of Arkansas; CLAIR ENGLE, of California; JACK Z. ANDERSON, of California; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, of California; CHET HOLIFIELD, of California; CARL HINSHAW, of California; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California; JOHN PHILLIPS, of California; ED. V. IZAC, of California; PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, of Delaware; J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida; PAT CANNON, of Florida; JOE HENDRICKS, of Florida; DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida; COMPTON I. WHITE, of Idaho; WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois; EARL WILSON, of Indiana; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, of Iowa; JOHN M. ROBSION, of Kentucky; JAMES DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana; H. STREETT BALDWIN, of Maryland; THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., of Maryland; GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland; ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan; MARION T. BENNETT, of Missouri; WALTER C. PLOESER, of Missouri; D. LANE POWERS, of New Jersey; HARRY L. TOWE, of New Jersey; LEONARD W. HALL, of New York; LEO F. RAYFIEL, of New York; ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, of New York; JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, of New York; BERNARD W. KEARNEY, of New York; EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, of New York; GEORGE F. ROGERS, of New York; HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina; ZEBULON WEAVER, of North Carolina; WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota; CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, of North Dakota; P. W. GRIFFITHS, of Ohio; J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio; VICTOR WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma; HERBERT J. MCGLINCHEY, of Pennsylvania; DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon; WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania; JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN, of Pennsylvania; WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., of Pennsylvania; DANIEL K. HOCH, of Pennsylvania; JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; B. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee; CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont; RALPH H. DAUGHTON, of Virginia; HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia; JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., of Virginia; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia; FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming; FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr., of New Jersey; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine; JAMES H. TORRENS, of New York; JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, of New York; ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., of New York; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts; EMORY H. PRICE, of Florida; SAMUEL A. WEISS, of Pennsylvania; ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, of Massachusetts; RICHARD WELCH, of California; and OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas.

This is the eighth time I have introduced the equal-rights amendment in as many successive Congresses. At the request of the ladies who had battled so heroically for the equal-suffrage amendment through much travail to final victory, I find introduced the equal-rights resolution in the Seventy-second Congress on January 11, 1932. It was known as House Joint Resolution No. 197 of that Congress.

As a newspaperman I had sympathized with them in their fight for suffrage and with my pen and my voice I have fought with them. When they decided to take the next step toward the emancipation of women, with equal rights as their objective, I found myself no less sympathetic with them.

In the next, or Seventy-third, Congress, I introduced the equal-rights resolution and obtained for it the honored place of House Joint Resolution No. 1 of that Congress.

It now takes its place again as House Joint Resolution No. 1 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Its primacy on the calendar of resolutions introduced in Congress is in keeping, I believe, with its importance from the standpoint of social welfare and the national interest. It is the natural and inescapable corollary of the amendment which gave women the right of suffrage. If women are entitled to the status of citizens, as they are under the equal-suffrage amendment, they are entitled to the rights of citizens. That is irrefutable logic.

The discriminations against women in the constitutions and laws of various States are no less grievous now than they were when I first introduced the equal-rights resolution in 1932. The equal-rights amendment, if adopted, would bring to full fruition the age-old struggle of women to attain the complete stature of position and influence to which they are entitled as creatures of God, under all of the canons of justice. It would do this by repealing at one swoop an almost infinite variety of State enactments and local ordinances that discriminate against women in various ways and forms. It would truly place woman on an equality with man and that is where she belongs. If women are capable of working at the forges and lathes of the defense plants of our country; if they are good enough to serve with infinite devotion as WAC's and WAVES and SPARS in the black hours of our history, when the fate of freedom and all we hold

dear is trembling in the balance, certainly they are good enough to be entitled to enjoy equal rights with men under the laws of the land, and the refusal of that right is a scarlet stain on our flag.

When the resolution was first introduced and the ladies who proposed it began their long struggle to secure its adoption, there was no dawn of hope to hearten them as there is today. Jeers and not cheers were their portion. But recently there has come a realization to many homes of this country that the proposal is one of intrinsic merit, that it is in the interest of good government and that its adoption would make the Constitution a rounded and completed instrument of equality and justice. As this feeling has grown, the amendment has made distinct progress, securing a favorable subcommittee report of the Judiciary Committee of the House and a favorable report of the full Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

But the most epochal development in the advancement of this amendment occurred last summer when both of the national political conventions adopted planks approving the amendment and going on record in favor of submitting the resolution to the States for ratification in the manner prescribed by the Constitution. I submit for the RECORD the text of these planks as follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT PLANKS

FROM REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, 1944

We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women.

We favor job opportunities in the post-war world open to men and women alike without discrimination in rate of pay because of sex.

FROM DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, 1944

We favor legislation assuring equal pay for equal work regardless of sex.

We recommend to Congress the submission of a Constitutional amendment on equal rights for women.

I invite the attention of my colleagues in Congress to these solemn platform pledges. I decline to be cynical as to the future. I have faith to believe that these promises will be redeemed. We now have a fine opportunity to demonstrate to the country and to the world that political platforms are binding after the election as well as during the campaign.

VETERANS' DISCHARGE BUTTONS

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is a rising tide of resentment and criticism among Veterans of World War No. 2 because of the issuance of an unworthy discharge button which has been issued so as to protect these patriotic sons and daughters against the unwarranted and irresponsible jibes of some thoughtless people who should know better and should guard their expressions.

Instead of serving this intended purpose of identifying our returned and honorably discharged veterans, a cheap plastic imitation of what ought to be a real mark of distinction and honor does just the opposite.

The reasons are obvious: the discharge button is too small, indistinctive, and inexcusably cheap. Instead of being made of bronze or other suitable metal, it is a gilded plastic mold, about on par with products heretofore made in Japan.

Just why the War Department singled out the veterans for a penny-pinching policy is unknown and unexplained, but I believe that Members of this House ought to ask the question and insist that immediate remedial steps be taken by the War Department to issue a badge, a medal, or call it whatever you will.

It should be substantial, distinctive, and worthy of the patriotism, valor, and sacrifice of these citizens who have given more than their share for America in the conflict on the battlefields and who are now giving more on the production line to back up their buddies at the front. Remember that beneath the toil-greased shirt may be found the indelible scar of a German or Jap bayonet or bullet. Penny-pinching is not in accord with the attitude of the American people, especially when applied to our veterans.

I trust the War Department will take cognizance of these remarks and will exercise proper discretion in correcting an irksome and a humiliating problem.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. NORRELL (at the request of Mr. MILLS), indefinitely, on account of important official business.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution providing for a study of certain phases of old-age and survivors insurance under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Rules.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, February 1, 1945, to begin hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

150. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Baldwin Bros. Paving Co. against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

151. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

152. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

153. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement to the effect that no exchanges pursuant to the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C. sec. 869), were consummated during the calendar year of 1944; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

154. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting recommendations for amendments to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

155. A letter from the Director, Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting the second quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive papers. House Report No. 46. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1808. A bill to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 37. A bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 685. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign

Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1633) for the relief of Raymond Crosby, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1893. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for the inclusion, for purposes of calculating benefits under such act, of time spent in vocational rehabilitation by veterans injured while in the armed forces; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 1894. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 1895. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7–17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of the basic crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1896. A bill to provide proper observance of Victory Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1897. A bill to waive the charge for migratory-bird hunting stamps sold to members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMES of Washington:

H. R. 1898. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims with respect to the taking of lands in the southeast portion of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 1899. A bill to establish a system of unemployment insurance in the maritime industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1900. A bill to provide uniform dependency allowance for veterans of the Regular Establishment and other veterans who receive pension or other monetary benefits for service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1901. A bill to authorize the naturalization, and the admission into the United States under a quota, of Koreans and descendants of Koreans; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1902. A bill relating to the trial of the issue of just compensation in the case of condemnation of property for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1903. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Missouri Pacific Railroad Co. (Guy A. Thompson, trustee) to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Ouachita River near Camden, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 1904. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 1905. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 1906. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to cause to continue to completion the collecting, editing, and publishing of the official papers relating to the Territories of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1907. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1908. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, sex, color, lack of color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Rocky Brook Mills Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Frank Lore and Elizabeth Vidotto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Bernard Oxenhandler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Aloysius G. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1914. A bill for the relief of Maurice J. Symms; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Joseph Margavio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1916. A bill granting an increase of pension to Celia A. Chappelle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of John R. Jennings; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, giver of all spiritual grace, author of everlasting life, we come today with a strange yearning, for there is a lonesome place against our sky. Thou knowest that upon our spirits is the sadness of farewell as we think of a loved, familiar, stalwart form who will walk with us no more. We mourn the passing from our side and sight of one who seemed to gather into his own noble bearing the long traditions of this shrine of a people's faith and hope. We think in tender recollection of one who literally gave his life to public service, who from early youth in the ascending roles of duty built the strength of his manhood into the vast concerns of this body. Now he has answered the one clear call. On this very afternoon, when all that is mortal is being lowered to rest in his native soil, in our hearts we would honor his cherished memory, "who more than self his country loved, and mercy more than life."

We remember that the daily petition of the sessions here was the most sacred religious altar of his own devotion. We think of him entering this Chamber at the daily call to prayer, standing here for so many years at noontide, years of peace and of war, in times of calmness and of contention, listening with reverent heart and bowed head as the divine sovereignty was recognized and divine help implored for the deliberations of this Chamber where his highest joy was centered and whose faithful servant he was.

Now that we shall see his face no more, in grateful remembrance we recall his genius for friendship and the qualities of mind and heart which lifted his human understanding and sympathies so far above mere partisan interests and loyalties. It stills our hearts to know that—

"He cannot be where God is not,
On any sea or shore;
Whate'er betides, Thy love abides,
Our God, forevermore."

In the name of that One who conquered death and is the resurrection and the life. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, a Senator from the State of Nevada, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 29, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

THE LATE COL. EDWIN A. HALSEY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Republican conference and the committee appointed by it, I desire to present a resolution relating to the passing of Colonel Halsey. It is as follows:

Whereas Col. Edwin Alexander Halsey, the Secretary of the Senate, died on the 29th of January 1945, the Republican conference of the Senate, in session on that day, thereby saddened, and affected by a sense of great loss: Therefore

Resolved, To express hereby, and record, the esteem and honor in which its members collectively perpetuate his memory:

Edwin Alexander Halsey was born at Fern Moss, Tye River, Nelson County, Va., September 4, 1881.

At his untimely death he had served his country in the United States Senate with extraordinary efficiency and consideration for its Members, regardless of party affiliation, for more than 47 years.

This service had included different posts, such as page, assistant in the Press Gallery, assistant to the majority secretary on the floor, majority secretary on the floor, and Secretary of the Senate since March 9, 1933.

He was an author of numerous articles relating to the history and current life of the Senate which were published in magazines and newspapers. Under his direction there were published valuable official documents, among others:

1. Development of United States Foreign Policy. Addresses and Messages of Franklin D. Roosevelt (S. Doc. No. 188, 77th Cong., 1942).

2. Domestic Stability, National Defense, and the Prosecution of World War No. 2. Legislative and Executive Background 1933–44 (S. Doc. No. 224, 78th Cong., 1944).

3. The Electoral College (S. Doc. No. 243, 78th Cong., 1944).

4. Enactment of a Law. Procedure on a Senate Bill (S. Doc. No. 155, 73d Cong., 1934, and later editions).

5. Factual Campaign Information (1944 and earlier editions).

6. Manner of Selecting Delegates to National Political Conventions With Information on States Holding Presidential Primaries (1944).

7. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States Introduced in Congress from December 6, 1926, to January 3, 1941 (1941).

8. Senate Election Cases From 1913 to 1940 (S. Doc. No. 147, 76th Cong., 1940).

9. Veto Messages, 1889–1941 (1941).

He was also the author of many articles relating to the history and background of the Senate published in magazines and in newspapers.

The memory of Colonel Halsey is treasured because he dealt with his fellow man with a gentleness and charm which was the natural expression of his character. His genuine friendship was helpful to many when they needed a friend, and it was a delight at all times to Senators with whom he served.

The Republican conference of the Senate expresses its profound sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Halsey, and to their son, Lt. Edwin A. Halsey, Jr. It directs that this memorial be sent to them, and requests unanimous consent that it be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

By its committee:

Mr. AUSTIN, of Vermont,
Chairman.
Mr. CAPPER, of Kansas.
Mr. WILEY, of Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution presented by the Senator from Vermont on behalf of the Republican conference will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, last Monday when the Senate received the announcement of the death of the Secretary of the United States Senate I was unable to be present to join in the brief tributes which were paid to him on that day. I desire now in only a few words to express my feelings in regard to the public service and the public life of Col. Edwin A. Halsey and my profound sorrow at his premature and untimely death.

It is given to few men to serve in the public interest as long as Colonel Halsey served. Coming here as a page boy under the appointment, I believe, of his uncle, former Senator John W. Daniel, of the State of Virginia, he served in one capacity and another a total of 48 years, I think, continuously. In every position of public trust which he occupied from the day when he came into this Chamber as a boy in knee trousers until he died last Monday he distinguished himself by devotion to duty, and by a high conception of his obligation to the Senate and to the country and to good government, no matter whether the station which he occupied was humble or high.

I believe that if any man exemplified the Christian virtues of fellowship and love for his fellow man, Colonel Halsey exemplified those virtues in an outstanding degree.

We all witnessed throughout the years his courtly attitude and his conduct toward Senators without regard to partisanship, and toward all the employees of the Senate, down to the page boys occupying a station once held by him.

In his activities in behalf of the political party of his choice, in his activities as a citizen of the State of Virginia, in his activities as a man, Ed Halsey measured up as completely to all the requirements and heavy obligations as any man who ever served the public within my knowledge or recollection.

I mourn his death as a public servant, as the Secretary of the Senate, but I mourn it as a friend also.

Always alert in his attention to the duties of the position which I temporarily occupy here, always alert to the physical, moral, and spiritual aspects of the high dignity of the Senate of the United States, his death is a severe loss to us in any capacity in which we may regard him. His place will not be easy to fill officially or personally.

For his memory we shall always cherish the greenest of recollections and appreciation.

May God bless his soul and keep him unto the eternal day.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on February 22 next.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and an agency of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] I make a report to the Senate of two Senators appointed by the Senator from Virginia, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to visit West Point. The designation by the Senator from Virginia is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE.

To the Senate:

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the act approved May 17, 1928, I hereby appoint the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to represent the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy during the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

CARTER GLASS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND CHAMPLAIN CUT-OFF—RESOLUTION OF BURLINGTON (VT.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit to the Senate a letter from the executive secretary of the Burlington (Vt.) Chamber of Commerce in which it is stated that the board of directors of the chamber of commerce unanimously favor the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and the Champlain cut-off. I ask that the letter embodying the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURLINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Burlington, Vt., January 27, 1945.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senator from Vermont,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: The following resolution was unanimously adopted by our board of directors at the meeting of Friday, January 26, 1945:

"Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway would open this Nation's ports on the Great Lakes to most of the freight-carrying vessels of the world, thus furthering the already favorable competitive position in world trade of our great industries of the Middle West; and

"Whereas the Champlain cut-off as an integral part of the seaway would considerably shorten distances, reduce hazards, and lower costs of shipping between Great Lakes ports and our east coast ports; and

"Whereas such a development would, in our considered opinion, encourage certain industries, requiring low-cost shipping for heavy or bulky raw materials or finished products, to locate in this area; and

"Whereas additional hydroelectric power might be made available in this area, thus making this location even more attractive to new industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this chamber go on record as urging the Congress of these United States to give further serious consideration to appropriate and enabling legislation in order that the project, including the Champlain cut-off, may become a reality; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered immediately to the Senators and Congressmen from Vermont."

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
Executive Secretary.

SEPARATION OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND THE R. F. C.—NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also wish to read a brief telegram just received from the president of the Vermont

State Farm Bureau, of Burlington, Vt. The telegram is as follows:

BURLINGTON, VT., *January 31, 1945.*

Senator GEORGE AIKEN,

George Washington Inn:

Directors of the Vermont State Farm Bureau at Montpelier today recommended that the R. F. C. be separated from the Department of Commerce and that the R. F. C. be administered by a commission of three, the Secretary to be ex officio member of the commission. The directors further voted in favor of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce.

ARTHUR PAKARD.

I may state, Mr. President, that the Vermont State Farm Bureau is an organization of approximately 10,000 farm families in my State. I request that the telegram be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram presented by the Senator from Vermont will lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received resolutions adopted by the seventy-fourth annual meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture on January 12, 1945, which suggest a number of important recommendations with respect to the western-farm program. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR

Grimly we enter another year of global conflict. Our first and only immediate job is to win the war. We rededicate ourselves to this ghastly business as the only hope of a better world through victory that will secure lasting peace to a bewildered people. We again freely pledge all of our resources and utmost efforts to that end.

AGRICULTURAL POLICY MAKING

We again insist that producer representation and opinion be fully recognized in developing national and international policies concerning production and distribution of agricultural commodities, and that the farm industry be represented on any agencies dealing with these all-important problems, as well as at peace conferences.

WORLD TRADE IN WHEAT

In view of the fact that United States wheat exports from 1915 to 1940 averaged over 152,000,000 bushels annually, we are unable to subscribe to the proposal of the International Wheat Council that our share in the world post-war trade in this bread grain be limited to 72,000,000 bushels a year. Compliance with such terms would necessitate drastic restrictions on plantings throughout the main Wheat Belt of the Nation.

WORLD ADMINISTRATION

While recognizing the need for some international organization to guide world affairs, we strenuously object to the United States becoming the paying member of any group so formed. News which reaches the grassroots indicates that other nations are long on plans and authority but hesitant on supplying cash to activate supervision. Let us be forever mindful of our own interests, for what is our country profited if it shall succor the whole world and lose its rightful heritage through impoverishment?

"FILLED" MILK

We hail as epochal the recent unanimous decision of the United States Supreme Court in upholding the State supreme court and the Kansas dairy law prohibiting sale within the State of milk in which vegetable oils have been substituted for natural butterfat. The successful prosecution of this case by the State board of agriculture gives a needed sense of security not only to dairy investors everywhere but as well to public health.

FARMS FOR RETURNING WAR VETERANS

Much is currently being said about establishing returning servicemen on farms. Such cases must, of course, be handled individually, but we think it prudent to warn that there is no new land not already included in our farms and that in general men and boys of farm background and experience will have the greatest chances of making a success of this vocation.

MISSOURI BASIN DEVELOPMENT

We endorse the proposed development of water resources in the Missouri River Basin under plans prepared and works constructed and operated by existing Federal agencies—the Army engineers and United States Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with the several States, all of which are directly responsible to the people for their actions in these matters, and thus hold inviolate the fundamental principles upon which our federation of States was founded.

WATER USE

There is urgent need for legislation that provides a system for appropriation of water for beneficial purposes. A recent court decision left Kansas without any effective statutory procedure for the appropriation of water and without administrative procedure for the initiation and perfection of water rights.

We appreciate the work done by the Governor's committee on appropriation of water in studying this matter, and ask that the committee's proposed legislation be introduced into the legislature after the public has been informed of the provisions of the proposed bill, such publicity to be made through the Kansas press.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

Under war stress it has been impossible to keep Kansas roads and highways up to their normal condition or to add to the mileage already improved. We favor prompt, long-time planning to the end that these arteries of commerce be restored, extended, and made adequate and safe for post-war traffic.

Agriculture is a primary industry in Kansas and for that reason farm-to-market roads should be given primary consideration.

FLOUR ENRICHMENT

Kansas is the premier wheat-producing State—our mills turn out more flour than those of any other State; thus Kansas flour is an important article of commerce—in some form, it is eaten universally. While not chargeable alone to wheat products, certain elements are said to be lacking in the national diet, and bread is considered the most logical item to fortify in these respects. We favor such enrichment additions to Kansas flour as will adequately protect the health of consumers, and which, at the same time, will assure this Kansas wheat product its preeminent position in channels of trade.

PACKAGE WEIGHTS OF WHEAT AND CORN PRODUCTS

In order to establish uniform package weights for wheat and corn flours, corn meal, hominy, and hominy grits throughout the United States, we are in favor of Kansas legislation which will prescribe weights which may be offered for sale in unbroken containers. Net weights of 2, 5, 10, 25, 50, 100, and multiples of 100 pounds are proposed, and these should meet ready acceptance among consumers.

BUTTER SABOTAGE

We are amazed at the advice proffered by an economic counselor of the United States Department of Agriculture, who, in a recent agricultural outlook conference at Washington, is quoted as saying that it is time for this country to find another spread for its bread and use milk for its food value and not for butter. Butter is the balance-wheel of the dairy industry and provides a profitable market for millions of small producers who otherwise would be forced out of the dairy business because of a lack of available markets for whole milk. Substituting vegetable fats for butter is not practical from a Kansas dairyman's economic viewpoint. The counselor's plan is impractical. If the criticism is made on the grounds that there is not enough milk and butter to supply the demand, then the obvious answer is to produce more of both.

PREDATORY ANIMALS

Despite increased bounty payments made for coyote scalps, these predatory animals increase in number and continue to inflict heavy losses to livestock and poultry raisers of the State. We believe additional means of eradication should be authorized by the legislature if these pests are to be properly restrained—either an organized plan of cooperation between the State and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior, or else a State agency charged with the control of these predatory animals.

KANSAS SCHOOLS

We want Kansas to be a leader in education and we favor legislation which will broaden the tax base for elementary and high school support and thus insure better educational opportunities for Kansas boys and girls. We urge that the legislature provide ways and means to insure sufficient funds for our State schools of higher education, and that the various student fees be eliminated.

WHEAT VARIETIES

The wheat variety problem is growing in seriousness in Kansas and constitutes a direct threat to the reputation and future prosperity of the State's wheat industry. Revision, modification, or supplementing of present grade standards seems advisable.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

We believe that for the best interest of the Kansas farmer, daylight saving time should be abolished.

PROHIBITION OF THE TRANSPORTATION OF BEVERAGE LIQUOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter in the nature of a petition I have received, addressed to the War Mobilization Director, signed by Mrs. Fred Kirkpatrick and 22 other citizens of Dodge City, Kans., expressing views upon some policies now being followed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1945.

To the Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,

War Mobilization Director,

Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned, parents and friends of sons in the armed services, commend your action stopping dog and horse racing as an aid to the war effort by conserving transportation and manpower.

We endorse your suggestion to restrict all large conventions to relieve our overcrowded

railroads by reducing travel and dim-out of electric advertising to save coal.

We observe the President's request for universal manpower control by law and also his order to General Hershey to draft farm labor.

Though working long hours the farm industry is now dangerously understaffed, farm foods, meats, canned goods, sugar, etc., cannot now be brought freely. Shoes, cotton goods, lumber, hardware, farm implements, and other elemental necessities are also scarce. However, it is possible to buy beer and liquor at all hours without restriction. Railroads and farm producers, have to date done a magnificent job but face the possibility of a break-down.

We, therefore, in behalf of our men under arms; respectfully petition; to aid the manpower shortage; to relieve overburdened carriers; to help our understaffed farms; that you immediately order all beverage liquor transportation stopped, just as you have stopped racing.

MRS. FRED KIRKPATRICK.
(And 22 other citizens of Dodge City, Kans.)

REPORTS OF THE COMMERCE COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 23th ultimo,

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, reported it on January 31, 1945, with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 30) thereon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS

Mr. BAILEY, also from the Committee on Commerce, on January 31, 1945, reported adversely the nomination of Henry A. Wallace, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Commerce and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 1) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, on January 31, 1945, reported favorably the following nominations:

Raymond M. Stone to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from December 16, 1944;

Sundry boatswains, gunners, machinists, and pay clerks for promotion in the United States Coast Guard; and

Electrician Rolla W. Sicafoose to be chief electrician in the United States Coast Guard, to rank from March 1, 1942.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Marino Bello; with an amendment (Rept. No. 31).

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 298. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 32).

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. Res. 20. Resolution continuing Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress, agreed to August 16, 1935, as amended by Senate Resolution 261, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 29, 1942, relative to the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; with amendments (Rept. No. 33), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

H. R. 1427. A bill relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange; without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 427. A bill to repeal section 3 of the act approved April 13, 1938, as amended, relating to hops; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 428. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.;

S. 429. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.; and

S. 430. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON:

S. 431. A bill for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 432. A bill to increase the period of limitation on actions against railroad carriers for recovery of overcharges from 2 to 4 years; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 433. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to eliminate the requirement that not less than 15 percent of the principal of insured mortgages upon farm property be expended for improvements; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 434. A bill providing for Federal aid to States for the acquisition of toll bridges; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Gimm; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 436. A bill to equalize State old-age-assistance payments and to provide burial allowances under title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 437. A bill for the relief of W. S. Burleson; and

S. 438. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to partition certain lands in Cleveland County, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 439 (by request). A bill to authorize the appointment of graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, or any of the five State Maritime Academies, to the line of the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate bill 440, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 441. A bill granting an increase of pension to Tina Newlon; and

S. 442. A bill to increase the rate of pensions for widows of Spanish-American War veterans from $30 to $45 a month; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 443. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of Casa Grande Valley Farms project, Arizona, pending disposal thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 444. A bill to reinstate Walter C. Smith with the rank of first lieutenant and to authorize his retirement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 445. A bill for the relief of Herman Platt; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT OF RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference. This is a bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and I ask to have the bill printed in the RECORD together with an explanation of the purposes of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 440) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of August 4, 1939, entitled "An act to provide a feasible and comprehensive plan for the variable payment of construction charges on United States reclamation projects, to protect the investment of the United States in such projects, and for other purposes" (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That (a) for the purpose of providing for United States reclamation projects a feasible and comprehensive plan for an economical and equitable treatment of repayment problems and for variable payments of construction charges which can be met regularly and fully from year to year during periods of decline in agricultural income and unsatisfactory conditions of agriculture as well as during periods of prosperity and good prices for agricultural products, and which will protect adequately the financial interest of the United States in said projects, obligations to pay construction charges may be revised or undertaken pursuant to the provisions of this act; and (b) for the purpose of providing opportunities for settlement on productive, owner-operated farms by returning servicemen, emergency industrial workers, and others, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to investigate, plan, design, construct, settle, develop, operate, and maintain, in the humid as well as arid areas of the United States, projects for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsections (c) and (g) of section 2 of said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, are hereby amended to read, respectively, as follows:

"(c) The term 'project' shall mean any reclamation or irrigation project, or any project for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, including incidental features thereof, authorized by the Federal reclamation laws, or constructed by the United States pursuant to said laws, or in connection with which there is a repayment contract executed by the United States pursuant to said laws, or any project constructed or operated and maintained by the Secretary through the Bureau of Reclamation for reclaiming lands by irrigation or drainage or other means.

"(g) The term 'organization' shall mean any conservancy district, irrigation district, water users' association, drainage district, or other organization, which is organized under State law and which has capacity to enter into contracts with the United States pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws."

(b) Section 2 of said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby

amended by adding thereto subsection (1) reading as follows:

"(1) The term 'water users' shall include the beneficiaries, as determined by the Secretary, of any project for reclaiming lands by drainage or by land clearing."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 8 of said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed in the manner hereinafter provided to classify or to reclassify from time to time but not more often than at 5-year intervals, as to irrigability and productivity, or, in the case of other than irrigation projects, as to productivity alone, those lands which have been, are, or may be included within any project."

SEC. 4. Section 9 of said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto subsections (f), (g), and (h) reading, respectively, as follows:

"(f) In connection with any project for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, the findings to be made by the Secretary under subsection (a) of this section shall include also findings on (1) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to drainage or land clearing and probably be repaid by the beneficiaries of the project; (2) the classes of landholders and land users who can properly be regarded as beneficiaries of the project and the manner in which the construction charges should be distributed among them; and (3) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to Federal responsibilities in connection with the public health or other matters of general public benefit.

"(g) No construction of any project, division of a project, or supplemental works on a project, for reclaiming lands by drainage or by land clearing shall be undertaken until an organization, satisfactory in form and powers to the Secretary, or, where no such organization is in existence, individual beneficiaries of the project, whose qualifications and responsibilities are satisfactory to the Secretary, shall have entered into a repayment contract or contracts with the United States, in form and substance satisfactory to the Secretary, providing, among other things—

"(1) that the part of the reimbursable construction costs allocated by the Secretary to drainage or land clearing shall be included in a general repayment obligation of the organization or individual beneficiaries; that, where the contract is with individual beneficiaries, the repayment obligation shall be secured by a first lien on the reclaimed land or in such other manner as the Secretary deems to be in the best interests of the United States, but no lien so created shall render any land subject thereto legally ineligible as security for any loan otherwise authorized to be made or guaranteed by any agency of the United States for the repayment of which reasonable security exists, giving due consideration to the amount and terms of such lien; and that, where the contract is with an organization, the distribution of construction charges may be varied by the organization in a manner that takes into account the productivity of the various classes of lands and the benefits accruing to the lands by reason of the construction: *Provided*, That no distribution of construction charges over the lands included in the organization shall in any manner be deemed to relieve the organization or any party or any land therein of the organization's general obligation to the United States;

"(2) that the general repayment obligation of the organization or individual beneficiaries shall be spread in annual installments, of the number and amounts fixed by the Secretary, over a period of not exceeding 50 years, and that, to the extent deemed appropriate and practicable by the Secretary, the amounts of the annual installments may be varied in accordance, as near as may be, with the normal and percentages plan provided in section 4 of this act;

"(3) that the first annual installment shall accrue, on the date fixed by the Secretary, in the calendar year after the Secretary announces that the construction contemplated in the repayment contract is substantially completed.

Any such repayment contract may include provisions requiring the observance on lands within the project of such farming practices as may from time to time be recommended or prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of preventing or reducing surpluses of those crops with respect to which national surpluses, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, have existed for the 3 crop years last preceding the execution of the contract, and such provisions shall remain effective as to crops for which national surpluses have been so determined to exist until such surpluses have ceased to exist for any 3 consecutive crop years: *Provided*, That no such provision shall be construed as disqualifying any person for the grant of any benefits, in connection with farming operations within the project, to which such person would otherwise be entitled by law. No such provision shall, in any event, be incorporated in any such contract without prior consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(h) In connection with the investigation, construction, or operation and maintenance of any project for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, the Secretary is authorized to utilize (1) in such manner as the President may direct, services, labor, materials, easements, or other property, including money, supplied by any other Federal agency, for which the United States shall be reimbursed in such amounts as the President may fix for each project, division of a project, or supplemental works on a project, within the limits of the beneficiaries' ability to repay costs, as found by the Secretary under subsection (f) of this section; and (2) such services, labor, materials, easements, or property, including money, as may be contributed by any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipal corporation, or other organization, or individuals, if, in the judgment of the Secretary, the acceptance thereof will not impair the title of the United States to the project works and will not reduce the probability that the project beneficiaries can meet the obligations to the United States entered into pursuant to subsection (g) of this section and the Federal reclamation laws. Moneys received and accepted under (2) of this subsection shall be and remain available for expenditure for the purposes for which contributed in like manner as if said sums had been specifically appropriated for said purposes. Any project for reclaiming lands by drainage or by land clearing, upon which a report and findings have been submitted by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this section, and which the Secretary has certified to the President as having engineering feasibility, shall be deemed authorized and may be undertaken pursuant to this act, notwithstanding that the estimated cost of project construction may exceed the total of the allocations made in accordance with this section, if the President has found that services, labor, materials, easements, and other property, including money, for the construction of the project should be made available to the Secretary by other Federal agencies to the extent found necessary by the Secretary to make up the difference between the estimated cost of project construction and (1) the part thereof to be met by expenditures of moneys appropriated, or otherwise made available, for project construction on the basis of the allocations made under this section, together with (2) such services, materials, money, easements, and property, including money, as non-Federal agencies or parties have agreed to contribute and the Secretary has found acceptable under this subsection."

SEC. 5. Said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto section 20 reading as follows:

"SEC. 20. (a) All payments made to the United States under repayment contracts on account of reimbursable construction costs of projects for the reclamation of lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, including penalties collected for delinquencies in such payments, and all other receipts from such projects, except operation and maintenance collections, shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. All charges collected for the operation and maintenance of any such project, including penalties collected for delinquencies in such charges, shall be available for expenditure for operation and maintenance of such project in like manner as if said funds had been specifically appropriated for said purposes.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary for the investigation, construction, operation, and maintenance of projects for the reclamation of lands by drainage or by land clearing, and to carry out the provisions of this act relating to such projects, which moneys shall be reimbursable to the extent required by the Federal reclamation laws. Out of funds appropriated for the Department of the Interior for the investigation of projects for the reclamation of lands by drainage or by land clearing, there may be made available to the Geological Survey and the Fish and Wildlife Service such sums, not exceeding the amounts appropriated therefor, as the Geological Survey or the Fish and Wildlife Service may require for the purpose of carrying out investigations of geological, hydrological, and biological conditions and other matters pertinent to such projects. The construction of projects for the reclamation of lands by drainage or by land clearing shall be undertaken, insofar as practicable, in the order of their relative priority of usefulness, as determined by the Secretary, to the end that preference shall be given (1) to projects that present the best opportunities for the settlement of returning veterans on productive, owner-operated farms, and (2) to projects that present the most favorable ratio of estimated benefits over estimated costs."

SEC. 6. Said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto section 21 reading as follows:

"SEC. 21. The Secretary shall establish the maximum size of farm units within each project for the reclamation of lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing in accordance with his findings as to the area sufficient in size to constitute a productive, owner-operated farm. No such project shall be undertaken until and unless the owners of lands whose individual holdings exceed the maximum area of a productive, owner-operated farm unit as so established shall have agreed for and in behalf of themselves, their heirs, executors, and assigns, by contracts in form, substance, and legal sufficiency satisfactory to the Secretary, (a) that they will sell such part of their lands as may exceed the maximum area of a single farm unit at the appraised value of such excess lands, as determined by the Secretary, without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project, and (b) that the Secretary shall have

an irrevocable power of attorney to sell in their behalf any such excess lands, not theretofore disposed of by said landowners, at the appraised value thereof: *Provided*, That any sales by the Secretary pursuant to such option shall, unless otherwise provided in writing by the landowners, be only for cash and only upon terms that will require the landowner to surrender possession of all of his excess lands at substantially the same time."

SEC. 7. Said act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto section 22 reading as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) For the purpose of assisting in the investigation, settlement, and development of projects for reclaiming lands, including logged or cut-over lands, by drainage or by land clearing, and for the purpose of assisting settlers on such projects in the solution of financial and other problems related to the establishment of a sound agricultural operation, the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, with the State in which any such projects are located and any of its agencies or political subdivisions, and with private organizations that may be interested in the development of any such project.

"(b) In connection with any project for reclamation by drainage or by land clearing, the Secretary shall have the same authority with regard to the utilization of lands owned by the United States as he has in connection with other projects undertaken pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws.

"(c) In connection with the construction or operation and maintenance of a project for reclamation by drainage or by land clearing, the Secretary shall have with respect to construction and supply contracts, and with respect to the acquisition, exchange, and disposition of lands, interests in land, water rights, and other property and relocation thereof, the same authority, including authority to acquire lands and interests in land and water rights with titles and at prices satisfactory to him, which he has in connection with other projects under the Federal reclamation laws."

SEC. 8. This act, together with the act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), as herein amended, is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws, act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto. This act may be cited as the "Drainage and Land Clearing Act of 1945."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MURRAY in connection with the bill is as follows:

There are worth-while possibilities in a program for the reclamation of excessively wet lands in the United States. It is appropriate that such a program be combined with a program for the reclamation of logged or cut-over timberlands suitable for agricultural development. It is appropriate particularly in view of the fact that in many cases projects for reclaiming lands suitable for agriculture will involve both drainage and the removal of stumps and logs. In parts of the South, for instance, some of these projects will require preliminary drainage followed by a program of stump removal. In the Great Lakes States some of these projects will involve the reclamation of an area consisting in part of logged or cut-over timberlands and in part of bogged lands. This bill is an implementation of the suggestions made by Senators and Representatives that the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior ought to undertake projects for reclamation by drainage and for the reclamation of logged or cut-over lands within as well as without the boundaries of the 17 westernmost States. It may well be that some projects of this character could be undertaken very soon and completed in time to make their contribution to the war food program. In any event, a number of important projects of this nature could be planned now and be ready for undertaking in the postwar period.

The argument has been advanced rather persuasively that the Bureau of Reclamation is authorized already to construct purely drainage works in the 17 westernmost States. There is doubt as to whether such legal authority exists. This proposed legislation would remove that doubt. It would serve the additional purpose of authorizing the Bureau, in the humid as well as in the arid areas of the United States, to construct drainage works and to engage in the reclamation of logged or cut-over timberlands suitable for agricultural production.

The drainage of lands is a matter of engineering. The preliminary requirements are in no wise different from those governing the irrigation of arid lands, the construction of inland waterways, the prevention of floods, the conservation of water, or any other important engineering development. These matters all involve engineering and physical factors, the control of which may extend beyond the area immediately under consideration. Any great project of wet-land drainage is far above the plane of merely local ditching for the purpose of draining a few farms. If such work is to be prosecuted intelligently and purposefully, the actual construction must be preceded by topographic surveys, measurement of stream flow, consideration of necessary capacity of channels, both natural and artificial, and their permanence, investigation of geologic conditions, and study of all related phenomena. The actual development can be prosecuted only by an agency composed of competent engineers and others with a background of experience in such matters. The tragic mistakes that have been made in the past in connection with the construction of certain ambitious drainage projects—mistakes due in large part to ignorance of geologic and hydrologic factors and a failure therefore to make a thorough investigation of geological and hydrological conditions—should not be repeated. The best assurance obtainable that these mistakes would not be repeated would be to have the projects constructed under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior so that, by cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Geological Survey, they could be planned and constructed with due regard for all appropriate factors.

The proposed bill provides for opportunities for cooperation among the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Agriculture in the planning and construction of these projects. Joint investigations by these agencies, in cooperation with the Geological Survey and State agencies, may well result in the uncovering of great possibilities for drainage and clearing projects, in certain areas. Along the Mississippi River, for instance, behind the flood-control levees constructed by the Corps of Engineers, lie many thousands of acres of lands. These lands are extremely fertile. They would be eminently suitable for the settlement of many families now engaged in farming poor lands. They would make desirable locations for returning servicemen.

The proposed bill provides for drainage projects and projects for the reclamation of logged or cut-over timber lands in accordance with established State land-use policies. Some of the States, in the forefront of which is Wisconsin, have adopted zoning policies and others are striving toward zoning policies which would prevent uneconomic development. The policies of the States should be respected and implemented. The highest degree of cooperation with State agencies is possible under the proposed bill.

Developments undertaken pursuant to this bill should be planned with due regard for the preservation of the country's great wildlife resources. Assurance of such regard would be contained in legislation vesting authority to plan and construct these projects in the Department of the Interior, under the jurisdiction of which the Fish and Wildlife Service keeps a watchful eye on any group or movement threatening those important resources. The keen interest of the States in the maintenance of their own preserves should likewise be accorded full weight. The history of some drainage projects indicates that they have been more destructive of wildlife than productive of agriculture crops.

Sound planning and adequate construction are not enough. A proper regard for the ends to be served by these projects requires safeguards of an economic nature. The drainage program and the program for the reclamation of logged or cut-over timberlands must be such as to result in a healthy and stable farm economy based to the fullest possible extent on individual ownership of family-sized agricultural units. If these programs will not serve that purpose, they should not be undertaken. Legislation authorizing these programs should make adequate provision for reimbursement, to a practicable extent and in a workable manner, of construction and other costs. It should also contain assurance that these works shall not be constructed for the benefit of large acreages in the hands of a favored few. It should contain assurance that large acreages shall be subdivided into farms of reasonable size which shall be available at proper prices. It should make provision for land classification and for the prevention of speculation in lands. The reclamation law contains provisions of this kind. The Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior has had experience in their administration.

There may be those among the stanch friends of reclamation in the West who will have their doubts as to the advisability of the Bureau of Reclamation engaging in activities which would extend its jurisdiction to other areas. They should be assured that extension of that Bureau's activities beyond the 17 Western States would not result in any reduction of the Bureau's program in the West. On the contrary, the organization now devoted to that program would continue unimpaired.

Finally, this proposed legislation would assist materially in the preparation of plans for our returning servicemen. Many of these men were farmers before the war, and will want to resume farming. Many others will no doubt want an opportunity to become farmers after the war is over. To this opportunity they are entitled. The great areas now available for irrigation farming and those which will be available for irrigation farming in the future are not enough. By the enactment of this bill the Congress would make it possible to undertake now the preparation of definite plans for additional projects which would help serve the needs of these veterans and also of many people now engaged in the production of war necessities.

If and when this proposed legislation is enacted into law and the moneys therefor are appropriated, necessary investigations will be started promptly and recommendations for particular projects will be made to the Congress from time to time.

PRINTING OF LAWS RELATING TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the manuscript of the laws, agreements, Executive order, proclamations, etc., relating to the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, passed and proclaimed from 1890 to 1944, inclusive, to be known as Laws Relating to the Five Civilized Tribes

in Oklahoma, 1890 to 1944, prepared under Senate Resolution 60, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed 30 additional copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and 30 additional copies for the use of the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES WAR BALLOT COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 6)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the United States War Ballot Commission, with certain of the accompanying exhibits, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED PATENTS AND INVENTIONS OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND CONTRACTORS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the President has transmitted to the Congress and there has been referred to the Senate Committee on Patents the second report of the National Patent Planning Commission on Government-Owned Patents and Inventions of Government Employees and Contractors. This document is less than 50 pages in length, and, as chairman of the Committee on Patents, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNITY—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Unity" delivered by the Vice President at the Democratic victory dinner in Philadelphia, Pa., January 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIRTHDAY MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a message from the President of the United States read by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in a broadcast from the White House in connection with the observance of the President's birthday, which appears in the Appendix.]

CITATIONS BY THE KIWANIS CLUB OF NEW YORK TO CERTAIN NEW YORK NEWSPAPERS—ADDRESSES BY SENATOR HAWKES AND NICHOLAS ROOSEVELT

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him presenting citations from the Kiwanis Club of New York to the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the Sun, and the World-Telegram, and an address by Mr. Nicholas Roosevelt, assistant publisher of the New York Times, in accepting the citation, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR FRANCIS MALONEY

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the City Council of New Britain, Conn., and four editorials regarding the death of the late Senator Francis Maloney, which appear in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS IN THE SOUTH—EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials commenting on an address by Hon. James A. Farley in Birmingham, Ala., which appear in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fight Now Shifts to Washington," from the Beaver Press, of Beaver City, Utah, issue of January 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TEXTILE INDUSTRIES UNDER FEDERAL CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM THE PASSAIC (N. J.) HERALD NEWS

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "All Textile Industries Now Under New Federal Control" from the Herald News, of Passaic, N. J., Friday, January 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD numerous communications received by him on the subject of military airplane accidents, which appear in the Appendix.]

DEATH SENTENCES OF ASSASSINS OF LORD MOYNE IN CAIRO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a group of distinguished citizens, leaders in all walks of life, have appealed to the King of Egypt to commute the death sentence which was passed last week in Cairo on two young Palestinian patriots. Those who signed the appeal include Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House majority leader; Arturo Toscanini, the world famous conductor, humanitarian and anti-Fascist; and Rabbi Eliezer Silver, copresident of the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States.

The appeal reads as follows:

Two sons of Israel in desperation over unconsolable plight of their brethren in Europe committed on Egyptian soil deplorable act of assassination. Regardless our unequivocal disapproval of this act, we believe that background of full gamut of agony, despair, and death of millions of Hebrews in Europe and continuing suffering of survivors in that inferno constitute sufficient reason for leniency. We therefore respectfully request Your Excellency to plead with His Majesty the King to commute death sentence to imprisonment, taking into consideration sufferings and youth of condemned. We believe such an act of mercy will be in tradition of great Egyptian civilization and will further good will and friendship of peoples of earth. Eyes of compassionate people everywhere are looking for His Majesty's gesture of justice and mercy.

Rabbi Eliezer Silver, copresident, Union of Orthodox Rabbis, and president Agudath Israel; Arturo Toscanini; John W. McCormack, House majority leader; Senator William Langer; Andrew L. Somers, Member of Congress; Sigrid Undset; Louis Bromfield; Judge William S. Bennett, cochairman, Emergency Committee To Save the Jewish People of Europe; Judge Oscar W. Ehrhorn, past president, National Federation of Church Clubs; Arthur Szyk; Konrad Bercovici; Dean Alfange, vice chairman, Liberal Party; Alix Wilf, executive director, American League for a Free Palestine; Harry Louis Selden, cochairman, American League for a Free Palestine; Rabbi Benjamin Hendles, cochairman, National Council Emergency Committee; Rabbi Morris M. Rose, copresident, Union Zionist Revisionists United States of America; Isaac Zaar, member editorial board, Jewish Morning Journal; Mordecai Danzis, chairman, editorial staff, Jewish Day; M. J. Nurenberger, member editorial board, Jewish Morning Journal; May Lewis; Karin Michaelis; Prof. Johan J. Smertenko; Rabbi Baruch Korff; Mrs. John Gunther; Mrs. Louis Untermeyer; Stella Adler.

Simultaneously a special appeal to the Egyptian Prime Minister was cabled by Dr. Syud Hossain, chairman of the National Committee for Indian Freedom.

This act of understanding and friendship toward the Jews of Palestine on the part of this prominent Moslem leader is both significant and encouraging in the light of the many tales which are being told of the strife and hostility between Moslems and Jews. I quote Dr. Hossain's appeal:

As chairman of the National Committee for India's Freedom and member of the Indian Moslem Caliphate Delegation in 1920, I earnestly and respectfully urge you to exercise clemency toward the young Jews, Eliahu Hakim and Eliahu Bet Souri, now under sentence of death. As a follower of Mahatma Gandhi I cannot condone violence, still less political assassination. But in this case there are powerful and just grounds to temper justice with mercy. These young men are obviously no ordinary criminals, but the victims of circumstances. They acted from no motives of personal gain or malice, but under instigation of desperation and bitter spiritual anguish. Crimes similarly committed by other young men, even during this war, have been treated with sympathetic understanding by civilized public opinion. In this case the extenuating factors are, if anything, more potent. The Jews have suffered more than any other single group in the present world tragedy of hate and violence, and these young men symbolize the sufferings, the bitterness, and disillusionment of their people. Alike on grounds of high political expediency and common humanity these two young men should be spared. Furthermore, clemency on your part, I feel sure, will meet with the warm approval of the peoples of India and Islam. It will also accord with the historic tradition of Egypt which gave asylum to the Jews in earlier centuries when also they were the victims of persecution in Europe. Fraternally and respectfully.

DR. SYUD HOSSAIN.

Mr. President, I was very happy to sign this appeal. On January 15 I raised the question of the complete censorship which surrounded the trial in Egypt, which prohibited the publication of one word of what the two young men said were the motives which drove them to their desperate act. The trial lasted for 7 days, 6 of which were taken up by the defense. These included long hours in which the two accused made lengthy personal statements. All we know now is that the two young men are to be hanged, but as yet, even after the verdict has been passed, the American correspondents in Cairo have been prevented from cabling about the trial to their newspapers. So incensed were the American correspondents that they elected a special delegation which protested to the authorities in Cairo and asked permission to cable the arguments of the defendants, but this was denied.

Mr. President, it is a problem of elementary justice, not only toward the two youths; it is a problem of elementary justice in the interests of the tormented Hebrews of Europe, that the whole story be told; that their tragic situation and the callousness of the British Colonial Administration which slams the doors of Palestine in the face of these people and which has led to the dark, despairing act of the two youths, be brought to light for world judgment.

Mr. President, I wish to appeal to Mr. Churchill, the Prime Minister and leader of our great ally, not only to exercise compassion and mercy in this particular case, but to delay no longer the abrogation of the present British policy in Palestine which he himself so bitterly and strongly condemned in 1939, when it was first announced by the late arch appeaser, Neville Chamberlain, and which is directly responsible for the tragic death of Lord Moyne, as it is directly responsible for the tragic death of hundreds of thousands of innocent Hebrew men, women, and children in Europe.

LIBERATION OF AMERICAN PRISONERS IN LUZON

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this morning the office of the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States has announced the liberation, under the direction of General MacArthur, of several hundred Americans who have been prisoners of war of the Japanese Government. Several of the boys liberated were from my State of New Mexico, several thousand of our New Mexico boys having been made prisoners by the Japanese in their conquest of Luzon. Surely the American people are entitled to rejoice in this announcement, and to entertain the hope that in the near future the other American youths who are now prisoners will also be liberated.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD D. McKIM, JR.—KILLED IN ACTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I beg the attention of the Senate for 2 minutes while I read into the RECORD a letter which I think will mean much to the people of America, as it is an example of what has happened a great many times, not only in the one city where we are today, but in many of the large cities, and in many of the smaller places, reaching into every section of our land. The letter refers to the loss of a son in service.

Mr. President, it happens that this letter was written by a major general in the Marine Corps to the father of a boy who was killed in action. I am proud to have the opportunity of reading this letter into the RECORD this morning, not only for the reasons I have stated, but for the further reason that the father to whom the letter was addressed was a close associate and buddy of the Vice President of the United States in the First World War.

With the Senate's permission, I should like to read the letter into the RECORD. It is addressed to Mr. Edward D. McKim, Sr., 750 North Fairacres Road, Omaha, Nebr., is signed by Maj. Gen. G. B. Erskine, United States Marine Corps, and is as follows:

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
HEADQUARTERS,
THIRD MARINE DIVISION,
FLEET MARINE FORCE,
CARE OF FLEET POST OFFICE,
San Francisco, January 3, 1945.

Mr. EDWARD D. McKIM, Sr.,
Omaha, Nebr.

MY DEAR MR. McKIM: I have just learned that until now you have never received a letter from your son's commanding officer, and I should like to tell you how sorry I am that there has been so long a delay. May I extend my deepest sympathy to you in the great loss you have suffered; your boy was a splendid officer, and you have paid a heavy price for our victory at Guam.

Your son's company commander was killed within a few days of Edward's own death, but I have talked this morning with a number of men from his platoon who were with him constantly until the end. He landed shortly after H-hour on the 21st of July; the beach at that time was under intense fire, much of it from a group of three caves which the Japanese had heavily fortified. Your son gathered his platoon and proceeded to eliminate these positions one by one; his prompt, skillful, and courageous action doubtless saved us many casualties during the unloading operations along the beach.

The following day, as his company moved up into the line, your son was struck in the arm by a mortar fragment. It was a painful wound, but he refused to be evacuated and continued to lead his platoon throughout the days and nights of bitter fighting that followed. Once, when the Japanese had succeeded in penetrating our lines, he organized and led a counterattack which restored our positions.

By the 26th of July Edward's platoon had suffered heavy casualties, together with the rest of the company, but they had held fast against countless attacks and steadily pushed the Japanese back. That afternoon the men were ordered to dig in for the night and organize a defensive position. The sector was quiet at the time, and about 4:30 a. m. your son walked about 50 yards forward of the lines to inspect the stringing of some barbed wire. A few minutes later a machine gun opened fire from the left, wounding your boy. He was carried back to our lines and died almost at once, only a few minutes after he had been hit. I believe the end came too quickly for him to suffer.

Everyone to whom I have spoken has praised the care he took of his men, his coolness in action, and his fine leadership. He was determined, above all, to do his duty, and there can be no doubt that he did so splendidly. He will serve as an example to us all in our future battles, and his name will not be forgotten.

With kindest regards, I am,
Very sincerely,

G. B. ERSKINE,
Major General,
United States Marine Corps.

Mr. President, I wish it were possible thus to acknowledge the sacrifice that each and every one of the hundreds of thousands of lads is making, but this serves as an example of what they are doing, and because of the close connection of the lad's father to Vice President TRUMAN, I am glad to have had the opportunity to read the letter into the RECORD.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY—MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a motion made on January 29 by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on behalf of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from further consideration of Senate Resolution 17, which the clerk will report by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 17) continuing the authority for investigation of the alcoholic beverage industry and increasing the limit of expenditures.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the motion be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion will be passed over without prejudice.

The Chair announces that morning business is now concluded.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the motion is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business should be rejected, would it then be in order to move to proceed to the consideration of the George bill, or any other legislation on the Legislative Calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would be.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. PEPPER, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the pending motion, and in connection with the nomination of Mr. Wallace and the so-called George bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement released by me to the press.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President was given his fourth mandate from the people last November. Henry Wallace was one of the many issues of the Presidential campaign. The country was on notice that in the event of his reelection the President intended to elevate Mr. Wallace to a place of high responsibility to assist in carrying forward the economic and social policies which the President had promised.

The action which the President has now taken and the nomination of Mr. Wallace which is now before the Senate should occa-

sion no surprise. It is but the natural course of events. The question now arises as to whether the Senate shall undertake to exert its veto power over the President's choice.

I have always adhered to the view that the selection of the members of his Cabinet is the personal prerogative of the President; that he should be free to select his own counselors and advisers without congressional interference unless the person of his choice was manifestly unfit, by reason of mental incapacity or moral delinquency.

I recognize, of course, the responsibility imposed on all Members of the Senate by the constitutional provision that Presidential appointees to certain offices, including members of the Cabinet, shall be subject to senatorial consent and confirmation. It is not for the Senate to exercise veto power over Presidential nominations for the Cabinet except for the gravest causes. Approval, in the constitutional sense, of the President's appointment by no means implies commendation of the President's choice or concurrence in the views of the appointee.

With respect to Henry Wallace, his integrity is not challenged. He has had previous service as a Cabinet officer—as Secretary of Agriculture. He has been the nominee of the Democratic Party for the Vice Presidency of the United States, elected by the people to that office, and served out his term. At no time has there been any serious criticism of his conduct or service.

It is his social and political philosophy that is now called into question—his ideas plus the question of his business capacity and sagacity. These are matters that lie within the province of the President and for which he must accept full responsibility. I am not disposed to refuse to accede to the President's choice of Mr. Wallace, regardless of my personal disagreements with some of the ideas that he has expounded. I shall vote for his confirmation.

The question of the divorcement of the R. F. C. and its many subsidiary lending agencies from the Department of Commerce stands on a totally different footing. It is a matter of governmental organization, the determination of which is preeminently a prerogative of Congress, the legislative branch of the Government.

The merger into the hands of a single individual, first, of the power and duties and heavy responsibilities that are implicit in the headship of any of the regular departments of the Government, and second, the enormous power and responsibility and administrative labor that attaches to the headship of the Federal Loan Agency, is a dangerous arrangement that invites bad management by reason of the multiplicity of tasks. It is not a question of personalities. It is a question of efficiency and sound placement of responsibility in governmental administration.

The transfer of the Federal Loan Agency to the Department of Commerce that was done by Executive order, and with one man holding both posts, was a mistake. It ought never to have been done. The bill now before the Senate offered by Senator GEORGE does no more than seek to correct this mistake and prevent its repetition. A bill to do this is long overdue.

I believe this measure should be enacted and I intend to vote for it regardless of whether the pending nomination of Mr. Wallace is confirmed, rejected, or withdrawn. I believe that this measure should be enacted and the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries restored to the status of a separate agency of the Government, regardless of who may hereafter be appointed by the President to head the agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

Mr. TAFT (after having voted in the affirmative). I change my vote to "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—41

Bailey	George	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gerry	Robertson
Bridges	Gurney	Scrugham
Brooks	Hawkes	Smith
Buck	H'ckenlooper	Stewart
Bushfield	Hoey	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Capehart	McCarran	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Wherry
Connally	McKellar	White
Cordon	Millikin	Wiley
Donnell	Moore	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

NAYS—43

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Austin	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Barkley	Kilgore	Pepper
Bilbo	La Follette	Russell
Brewster	Langer	Saltonstall
Briggs	Lucas	Shipstead
Burton	McFarland	Taft
Chavez	McMahon	Taylor
Downey	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Mitchell	Tunnell
Fulbright	Morse	Walsh
Green	Murdock	Wilson
Guffey	Murray	
Hayden	Myers	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Hatch	Reed
Ball	Mead	Wagner
Chandler	Moses	Wheeler
Glass	Radcliffe	

So Mr. BAILEY's motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the vote by which the motion was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair recognized the Senator from Kentucky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio desires to make his motion to reconsider, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the vote be reconsidered.

Mr. BRIDGES. I second that motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like the Senator to understand my viewpoint about the matter. I intended to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the George bill, in view of the defeat of the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. Therefore, I insist on the right to make that motion at this time, having been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator yielded to me for the purpose of making the other motion, and I made the other motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair informs the Senator from Ohio that he is not precluded from making that motion at any time.

The Chair recognized the Senator from Kentucky. Unless he yielded for that purpose, he still has the floor.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the George bill, Senate bill 375, Calendar No. 27.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. On that motion, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I understand that on this vote he would vote as I am about to vote, and therefore I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I neglected to announce, when the name of my colleague [Mr. HATCH] was called, that he is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would vote "yea." Let me add that if he had been present when the vote was taken on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], he would have voted "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent on account of illness. If he were present and were permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—83

Aiken	Green	Myers
Austin	Guffey	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Scrugham
Burton	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	La Follette	Smith
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Cordon	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Downey	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Mitchell	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Willis
George	Murdock	Wilson
Gerry	Murray	

NAYS—2

Stewart Thomas, Idaho

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	Hatch	Wagner
Ball	Mead	Wheeler
Chandler	Moses	
Glass	Radcliffe	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Federal Loan Agency, created by section 402 of the President's Reorganization Plan No. I under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1939, shall continue as an independent establishment of the Federal Government and shall continue to be administered under the direction and supervision of the Federal Loan Administrator in the same manner and to the same extent as if Executive Order 9071, dated February 24, 1942, transferring the functions of the Federal Loan Agency to the Department of Commerce, had not been issued.

SEC. 2. All powers, functions, and duties of the Department of Commerce and of the Secretary of Commerce which relate to the Federal Loan Agency are hereby transferred to the Federal Loan Agency to be administered under the direction and supervision of the Federal Loan Administrator.

SEC. 3. The unexpended balance of the funds made available to the Secretary of Commerce by Public Law 365, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 28, 1944, for administrative expenses of supervising loan agencies, shall be transferred to the Federal Loan Agency to be used for the administrative expenses of that Agency.

SEC. 4. No functions, powers, or duties shall be transferred from the Federal Loan Agency under the provisions of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or any other law unless the Congress shall otherwise by law provide.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on page 4, line 6, after the word "agency", I offer to amend the committee amendment by inserting the following: "(together with the respective personnel, records, and property, including office equipment, relating to the exercise of such powers, functions, and duties)." The amendment is merely to make clear what otherwise might not be clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to which the bill was referred and which has reported it favorably, I think it is appropriate for me to make a brief statement.

It will not be necessary to go into the matter at any great length. The text of the bill is simple, and its meaning is clear. I think that the passage of the bill is of great importance. I question whether there will be any great amount of opposition to it. The committee conducted thorough and interesting hearings upon the bill, and heard from its author, from Hon. Jesse Jones, and from Hon. Henry A. Wallace. There was some demand for further hearings, but the committee felt that the matter had been very thoroughly thrashed out, and so it reported the bill.

The objective of the bill is to take away from the Department of Commerce those agencies headed by the R. F. C. which have been chiefly described as the lending agencies. The bill would by no means affect all the lending agencies of the Government, but only those agencies which were transferred either in actuality, or by virtue of their functions, by the President under the First War Powers Act. The bill would establish them once again as independent agencies, and would separate once again the Federal Loan Administrator from association with the Secretary of Commerce, which association was authorized by the President.

With that statement, Mr. President, I believe it is appropriate for me to yield to the author of the bill, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and ask him to express his views to the Senate. He did so with very great eloquence before the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not care to go into an extended discussion of the bill because, by its terms, it is simple and easily understandable. For the purpose of illustrating my good faith in introducing the bill, I merely invite attention to certain facts which are extraneous to the record.

I am aware that in some quarters, which are ill-advised and uninformed, a motive far different from that which I have had in mind has been ascribed to me in the introduction of the bill. It so happens that I was invited to sit in at the earliest conference of citizens and legislators which was held and which recommended and, in a measure, outlined the original Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. As every Member of this body knows, that occurred under the administration of Mr. Hoover at a time when there was increasing unemployment. There was an inability or an unwillingness on the part of banks to extend credit, and a collapse of business was threatened. Following the conference to which I have referred, there was introduced the bill which became the original Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. That act has been, of course, greatly expanded in the years since its enactment. However, its primary purpose has remained the same throughout its history. Certain amendments were made to the organic act itself in order to take care of unusual situations such as floods, destruction by cyclones, hurricanes, and other like catastrophes.

When the Reorganization Act of 1939 was passed the President was authorized by that act to transfer by order the functions of agencies of the Government, and he issued Reorganization Plan No. I. That was in April 1939. Section 402 of that plan created the Federal Loan Agency, and brought it, as well as certain other corporations associated with or subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, within the jurisdiction of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. By the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1939 the plan would have become law in any event after it had been on file with the Congress for 60 legislative days unless in the meantime some affirmative act had been taken amounting to a disapproval of the order by the Congress; but on June 7, 1939, the President himself approved Public Resolution 20, Seventy-sixth Congress, which provided that plan No. I should take effect July 1, 1939.

It will be recalled by Members of the Senate who were then in service that a resolution had been passed authorizing the holding of two offices, to wit, the office of Administrator of the loan agencies and the Department of Commerce by one and the same person, to wit, Jesse H. Jones, but with the provision that only one salary, namely the salary provided for the Secretary of Commerce, should be received by him. At that time there were some of us who doubted the wisdom of permitting the two offices to be held by one and the same person. There was some discussion on the floor and in committee on that resolution, but upon the assurance that it would not serve as a precedent for future legislative action no opposition was actually offered. I may say, Mr. President, that some of us who doubted the wisdom of the ac-

tion taken at that time have subsequently given study to this matter.

Now I call attention of the Senate to the fact that the special committee of which the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman has had under study for some time the agencies of government, particularly the corporations created by the Congress and authorized by the Congress, and some legislation has been under study and, I may say, is in course of preparation.

It was believed by that committee—and I am a member of it—that many of the agencies were operating under very loose authority and without necessary legislative safeguards, restrictions, and limitations. Therefore, I had given study to this matter long prior to the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress. It had again occurred to me, and had been under consideration by me, that it would be advisable to introduce a bill to separate and to return to the administrator of the Federal loan agencies the various functions and organizations transferred to the Department of Commerce by the President under Executive order under date of February 24, 1942, under the First War Powers Act. Actually the then Secretary of Commerce was acting as the Administrator of the loan agencies and, of course, as Secretary of Commerce; but, for some reason, the President issued his Executive order transferring the R. F. C. and certain loan agencies enumerated in Plan No. I under the Reorganization Act to the Department of Commerce. So, Mr. President, the bill is designed to accomplish exactly what I think should have been permitted to remain as the legal status of these several loan agencies from the beginning.

I do not think it necessary to enter into a long discussion, because I am quite sure that all Senators have examined the various loan agencies, are familiar with the tremendous scope and power of those agencies, and have given consideration to the return of those agencies, all created by the Congress, to an agency directly responsible to the Congress and which can be reasonably controlled by the Congress itself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the language in the report on page 5. At the end of the second paragraph on that page it says with respect to the powers which have been granted the R. F. C. and which may be granted in the future:

> The greater the necessity for the exercise of extraordinary powers the greater becomes the responsibility of Congress for bringing the exercise of those powers more immediately under its scrutiny, and only by such action can the Congress discharge its direct responsibility for the Nation's welfare.

Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would care to make any comment as to whether or not the bill now before the Senate establishes any procedure whereby greater scrutiny by Congress can or will be exercised of this agency?

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator that the bill does not, except that it takes the necessary first step, as I think, to return these agencies to an independent status, subject, of course, to such legislation as the Congress may enact.

I may explain, if the Senator will permit me, that I did not include what I believe to be very pertinent provisions in the bill, because I was of the opinion that the Commerce Committee, not being a legislative committee which could consider the various loan agencies or which had initially considered the loan agencies, should not be asked to go into the question of prescribing additional limitations or restrictions on these agencies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I recognize the soundness of that view, but I desire to ask the Senator whether it is his opinion that Congress should now consider, through the proper committee, the imposition of regulations and control whereby the Congress can exercise a greater degree of direction over the activities of these loaning agencies?

Mr. GEORGE. I certainly do; I think it is imperative; and I may say that the Senator from Vermont, I believe, and the Senator from Virginia have both presented me with amendments which would subject the R. F. C. and the various other loaning agencies to the scrutiny of the Comptroller General and require the Comptroller General to make an annual report. So far as I am concerned, I would not resist that type of an amendment even on this bill, but in the first instance I did not think it proper to ask the Commerce Committee to give consideration to the organic act of any one of the loan agencies, the Commerce Committee not having jurisdiction over them, but it did have, I think, clearly, jurisdiction over the Department of Commerce and over what should go into or be kept out of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that the adoption of any amendment or any provision which would extend to the General Accounting Office the power to audit the R. F. C. would not of itself provide Congress with the supervisory powers which, in my judgment, Congress should exercise.

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all; I did not mean to say it would be exhaustive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator did not.

Mr. GEORGE. But the amendments themselves contemplate a pretty rigid scrutiny by the Comptroller General, with a report to the Congress at stated periods, which would presuppose at least congressional scrutiny of the agencies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I wish merely to say that, in my judgment, this whole incident, and the pending bill particulary, present a challenge to the Congress. There can be no doubt that Congress has allowed these vast powers to gather around the R. F. C. in a manner which I am sure was not understood in its aggregate until the hearings upon the bill were conducted. If Congress now, having full knowledge of the vast powers over our entire system which are vested in the R. F. C. and its affiliated organizations, should permit this matter to drift, it would be a very sad day, in my judgment, both for the Congress and for the country.

Mr. GEORGE. I fully agree with the Senator. I have no doubt that the members of the committees having legislative jurisdiction over the agencies themselves will take appropriate steps to tighten the control of the Congress over the agencies.

Mr. President, I have now said all I care to say regarding the merits of the bill. I merely wish again to emphasize the fact, which is a fact, that for some time I contemplated offering a bill of this character, which, but for the question of jurisdiction to which I have referred, would have been much more comprehensive than the bill actually now before the Senate.

I do not believe any Cabinet officer should be given the vast powers which are granted under existing law and Executive order to the Department of Commerce. I say that for the reason that the Cabinet officer himself becomes the actual adviser of this body. The Secretary of the Treasury has an all-powerful voice in the making of taxes, the enactment of revenue acts. Every other department sends in its opinions, as it should, of course, but it has a very strong influence in shaping and controlling the activities of Congress.

I do not believe any Government officer, I care not who he may be, should be clothed with this vast power, which so vitally affects the commerce, the industry, the finances, and, indeed the whole business of the country, and can so certainly influence its social and political life, as the Department of Commerce might today affect and influence our lives.

I therefore believe that the Congress owes the duty to the American people of taking this initial step, to be followed by other effective steps to constitute these lending agencies by congressional action in such a way that the Congress can better scrutinize, control, and direct their affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in view of the vote I shall cast on the bill, and my attitude on it. I feel that it is my duty to do so because I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency when the original Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was passed, during the Hoover administration.

As we all know, at that time the economic condition of the country had come to a pass where credit was unavailable from the ordinary sources of credit for legitimate business, for manufacturing industries, and for other purposes for which money is usually loaned. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was set up to bridge that chasm, and to function largely where private lending agencies were unable to function.

I do not have the act before me, but my recollection is that in the original law we provided that loans should be made with such security as practically to guarantee the repayment of the loans to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation,

so far as security could do so. It was set up originally as a lending agency, the Congress recognizing that the Government had sources from which to obtain money and credit which private institutions did not possess, or, if they possessed them, they were not in a position or were not willing to make the money available to the business world.

Later the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was amended, whereby the original rigidity of the security requirement was somewhat modified to provide that such security should be exacted of the borrower as to make it reasonably sure that the loan would be repaid.

I mention these things because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was not created as an eleemosynary institution. It was created as a lending agency, with restrictions thrown around it by Congress itself so as to make it reasonably sure that the money loaned would be repaid to the Government. That was regarded as wise, because the money loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was obtained either by taxes collected from the people, or by loans made by the people to the Treasury of the United States, from which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in part got its money, the rest of it being obtained by issuing bonds guaranteed by the Government. So that it was the same thing in a different garb.

The war came on, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was expanded, and Congress authorized the creation of subsidiary corporations, such as the Rubber Reserve Corporation, and the Defense Plants Corporation. Following the floods of 1937 I myself, in conjunction with the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Bulkley, introduced a bill creating the Disaster Loan Corporation, to make loans to those who had been damaged by the floods.

When the war came on, of course, the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries were inevitably and inseparably connected with the war effort. The power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries was expanded by Congress and by Executive order. That was inevitable, but the time will come, if it is not now here, when Congress must consider the whole picture of the function of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiary corporations. Congress, it seems to me, will be required to consider whether the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by any revamping of the law itself, or by any expansion of the Corporation's functions, or any adjustment or rearrangement of its facilities shall become an agency for dealing primarily with social questions rather than financial questions, admitting the inability of separating the two in a sense, because every time a bank loans money to a borrower it creates a social situation which may be to the advantage of the borrower or to his associates in business or to his employees. When we created the Disaster Loan Corporation for the benefit of the river valleys which had been devastated we undoubtedly affected the social welfare of people who were eligible to obtain loans and did obtain loans. But that was not the primary consideration. We made these loans through the Disaster Loan Corporation because banks were not in a position to do it, and because the terms of credit had to be a little more generous than a bank would be justified in giving.

So that I myself, having gone through the history of the R. F. C. on the Banking and Currency Committee, take the position that we must at a very early date consider what function the R. F. C. and its affiliates are to perform in the post-war period. It ought not to be left to chance. I think we must consider legislation of that sort, and, so far as I am concerned, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction over legislation affecting the loan agencies, I shall myself feel it incumbent upon me to urge at the earliest date that we decide what is to be the function of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all its affiliates.

Mr. President, I wish to say another thing. The President by order No. 1, under the Reorganization Act, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out, set up the Federal Loan Agency. Mr. Jesse Jones was made the head of that Agency. The President desired to appoint Mr. Jones Secretary of Commerce. According to Mr. Jones' statement in the hearing, he did not seek that appointment; he did not seek this double duty. Later on when it was again suggested, Mr. Jones replied—and as I recall he so stated in his testimony—that he could not hold both offices under the law. It was then that Mr. Jones was requested to take whatever steps were necessary to cause Congress to enact a law which would refer only to him by name, authorizing him, notwithstanding any law then in existence, to occupy the position of Secretary of Commerce at the same time he occupied the position as head of the Federal Loan Agency. That was back in 1940. The measure was promptly passed by both Houses, and I dare say that Congress was induced to pass it largely because Congress felt that Mr. Jones had done a splendid job as head of the R. F. C. and other lending agencies, and that if he was to be Secretary of Commerce also. Congress did not wish him to be required to give up the control of the lending agencies. I believe that confidence of Congress was justified, for I think, and I am not at all hesitant in saying so, that Mr. Jones did a splendid, outstanding job as head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and as head of the lending agencies after they were consolidated and he was appointed Administrator.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The President of the United States also felt the same way, as indicated by the verbiage in his letter to the Honorable Jesse Jones asking him to resign, did he not?

Mr. BARKLEY. The President stated in his letter substantially what I have stated.

Mr. TOBEY. Exactly. I simply wanted the Senator to bring that out.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President's letter speaks for itself, and I agree with what the President said concerning Mr. Jones' record. I have repeatedly so stated here on the floor, and it has been my attitude in the Banking and Currency Committee, as every member of the committee knows.

Two years ago the President issued an order transferring certain functions of the Federal loan agencies to the Department of Commerce or to the Secretary of Commerce. I have forgotten whether the order transferred them to the Department or to the Secretary, but I believe to the Department of Commerce. I am sure that in the President's opinion he had some good reasons for making that transfer, but I do not know what that reason was, because Mr. Jones, being both Secretary of Commerce and the head of the Loan Agency, occupying both positions by the consent of Congress, was in charge of both, and it was like taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another of the same pair of trousers.

Two years ago, Mr. President, I had occasion to express my opinion about the consolidation of the duties of the Secretary of Commerce, and also about the extra Vice Presidential duties of Mr. Wallace, who was at that time head of the Board of Economic Warfare. During the rather unfortunate newspaper controversy between Mr. Jones and Mr. Wallace about the purchase of critical materials, I was asked by a very high authority in the executive department of the Government what I thought about it, and I said what I thought, and I am going to repeat here what I said. I said that I believed that any man elected Vice President of the United States, the second highest office within the gift of the American people, ought to devote his entire time, so far as his official duties were concerned, to the performance of his duties as Vice President; that that was a full-time big man's job if it was looked after properly, and that therefore I did not believe the President ought to have made or ought to have retained Vice President Wallace as head of the Board of Economic Warfare.

I notice in the newspapers that the new Vice President has adopted that theory by saying that he is not going to do anything else except be Vice President, and since his retirement from the office, the former Vice President, Mr. Wallace, has in a newspaper interview, announced that he does not believe the Vice President ought to be saddled with any other duties except the duties of the Vice President. So we all agree about that.

At the same time I said I thought the job of being Secretary of Commerce was sufficiently important to occupy the entire time of any man. It is a Cabinet position. It is a high honor. That office deals with our industrial and commercial life, both domestically and internationally, and I believe that any man who is appointed to a Cabinet position, whether it be Secretary of Commerce or other Cabinet office, though the Secretary of Commerce was the position especially

under discussion, ought not to be "saddled," if that is the proper term, and using the quotation from the Vice President, with another job as big or bigger than that of being Secretary of Commerce. I thought that the Secretaryship of Commerce was a full-time big man's job, and that being Administrator of the Federal lending agencies was also a full-time big man's job, and that the two jobs ought not to be combined. That was my opinion 2 years ago; it is my opinion now, and that explains that my attitude respecting the George bill has not been induced by the appointment of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, I believe the George bill cught to be passed. I think it will be passed by the Senate by a very large majority, and I will say that I have every assurance from the other end of the Capitol that it will be taken up, if passed here, and promptly disposed of over there. What the President will do with it I am not in a position to say, but that is not our particular concern at the moment. In spite of the enthusiasm of those who think that as it is now constituted and created the R. F. C. and the Federal loan agencies, without any further enactment of Congress or without any restrictions, or without Congress charting the highway to be traveled by the R. F. C. and its affiliates, ought to constitute themselves, under present conditions, the sole and only post-war agencies for the doing of many things which we have in mind as necessary when the war shall end, I believe Congress would not be justified in sanctioning such action.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to express my complete agreement, Mr. President, with the policy which the majority leader has just announced.

I shall now ask the majority leader a question in order to satisfy a burning curiosity which exists on this side of the aisle. The majority leader is appearing in the Senate today with some covering over his left optic. A Democratic caucus was held this morning. None of the Senators on this side of the aisle were permitted to be present at that caucus. To satisfy the curiosity of some of us on this side of the aisle, I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky whether there is any connection between the condition of his left optic and the Democratic caucus held this morning?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will answer the Senator frankly. If the Republican Members of the Senate had allowed us on this side of the aisle to sit in on their caucus held the other day respecting Henry Wallace, we would have reciprocated by inviting them to sit in on ours.

Mr. REED. None of our Senators appeared in the condition in which the distinguished Senator from Kentucky appears today.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope none of the minority members will ever appear on the floor of the Senate in the condition in which I appear at the moment. I probably look more like Dead-Eye Dick than a United States Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kentucky knows how deeply I sympathize with him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will explain to the Senator why I am wearing this patch. The Senator may recall that during December I had an ulcer on the cornea of my left eye, which healed, and I thought there would be no further difficulty. Ten days or 2 weeks ago it recurred, and I had to resume my incarceration in the hospital. It has again healed, and I hope it will not again recur. However, the doctor told me that I ought to wear this patch on my eye to protect it from wind; and I thought I ought to wear it in the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. I wished to give the background of my position on the George bill, which I intend to support when it comes to a vote. I hope it will be enacted into law.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate. While I have the greatest respect and deference for the views of Senators who are supporting the pending bill, in the present state of the record I am not in a position to be in accord with those ideas. Without taking the time of the Senate, therefore, and without endeavoring to repeat the sentiments which I feel on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS ON S. 375

As Mr. Wallace said in his testimony before this committee, it is obvious that the occasion for the introduction of S. 375 was the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce by President Roosevelt. Further, as Mr. Wallace said in his testimony:

"There are some who have suggested—perhaps in an effort to save my feelings or face—that this separation of the lending functions from the Commerce Department is desirable because of my alleged lack of experience in such field. Let me say that this talk does not fool me or the American public. You know and I know that it is not a question of my 'lack of experience.' Rather it is a case of not liking the experience I have."

Further in his testimony Secretary Wallace spoke of his own experience as follows:

"For 8 years I was Secretary of Agriculture. During that period the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration were under my supervision. During that period these agencies loaned over $6,000,000,000. We made 11,500,000 separate commodity credit loans and 1,208,000 rural rehabilitation loans. We arranged the financing to permit 20,184 tenant farmers to buy their own farms."

In addition to this experience as Secretary of Agriculture for 8 years, Mr. Wallace was Chairman of the Supplies, Priorities, and Allocations Board in the most critical period of the defense effort. Later Mr. Wallace did pioneer work in setting up the Board of Economic Warfare. Mr. Wallace has traveled extensively through the United States, South America, Europe, and the Orient on behalf of the United States Government as Vice President of the United States. Mr. Wallace is admittedly one of the foremost students of economics and political science in this country.

As Vice President during the last 4 years he sat in the meetings of the President's Cabinet; by virtue of his several positions he has been in intimate contact with the mobilization of the Nation's economy for the war effort.

No question has been raised as to Mr. Wallace's integrity, his intelligence, his industry, or his general competency. No single case of either bad administration, lack of foresight, or competence in the performance of any of the very responsible duties which have been under his charge, has been pointed out by the opposition. Indeed, the opposition has referred to no subject, no book, no statement, nor act of omission or commission on the part of Mr. Wallace which gives rise to the bitter fight which is being made in the Senate to keep him from being Secretary of Commerce and having general supervision of the lending agencies of the Government in the same way that Mr. Jesse Jones has occupied the office of Secretary of Commerce and exercised those supervisory functions for the past 4 years.

One cannot escape the conclusion, therefore, that as Mr. Wallace further said in his testimony:

"The real motive underlying these suggestions for stripping the Department of Commerce of its vast financial power has, of course, nothing to do with my competence to administer these powers. The real issue is whether or not the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its giant subsidiaries are to be used only to help big business or whether these powers are also to be used to help little business and to help carry out the President's commitment of 60,000,000 jobs.

"In other words the question is really one of whether this committee, the Congress, and the American public want these enormous financial powers utilized and invested in free America—in a prosperous America."

The bill then presents the issue which Mr. Wallace posed in the question "Shall we approach the problems of peace with the same boldness of conception, the same courage and determination, as we have approached the problems of war?"

Mr. Wallace presents simply, courageously, and clearly the policies which he would pursue in the performance of the duties of Secretary of Commerce as they now exist.

He takes as his premise the preservation and stimulation of free enterprise and the promotion of the well-being of all the people of America. He tells this committee that if he is confirmed as Secretary of Commerce with supervision over the lending agencies that he will administer the agencies in the spirit of those policies. To use Mr. Wallace's own words:

"For I can tell you here and now that if the R. F. C. is left in the Commerce Department, I will use its powers in the interest of all the American people."

And, Mr. Wallace says with equal candor:

"If the Congress does not feel that the powers of the R. F. C. should be exercised in such a way as to further the objectives which I have set forth here, then I respectfully urge the Congress to take the R. F. C. out from under the control of the Commerce Department."

In his statement of policies, Mr. Wallace specifically enumerates the economic bill of rights embodied in the President's message to Congress as follows:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation;

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom

from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

"The right of every family to a decent home;

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

"The right to a good education."

Mr. Wallace then in his address to the committee commented upon and amplified the eight points in this bill of rights of the President, and disclosed his general views and ideas with respect to the implementation of each of those points. Nowhere did Mr. Wallace intimate that he would exercise any authority which was not within the scope of the statutes governing the lending agencies now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. Nowhere did he question the necessity of having the approval of Congress if he were to attempt to exercise any authority not now conferred upon the Federal lending agencies. In fact, unlike his predecessor, he stated that if he were in charge of the lending agencies he would come to the Congress and seek legislation from the Congress permitting him to carry out the specific policies and projects which he thought were in the public interest and within the scope of the lending agencies generally. Specifically, in contrast to the policy of his predecessor, he stated that he thought the lending agencies should be subject to the audit of the Comptroller General and under the general supervision of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Wallace, therefore, far from manifesting any desire to ignore the statutes or the sentiments of Congress has shown every respect for the laws by which he would be governed in the administration of this agency and for the opinion of the Congress in the performance of his duties.

Not only did Mr. Wallace affirm his belief in private enterprise but the burden of his whole address to the committee was to show that the lending agencies properly employed could be a great bulwark to private enterprise in the United States and in the world. He went further and set out specific suggestions as to how he would help private enterprise by making credit and capital available for foreign trade, for small business and for new enterprises, and for the stimulation of the economy of those parts of the country which heretofore have not kept pace with the more favored regions of the Nation.

The most severe critic of the former Vice President cannot find in his address to the committee one objectionable word, in our opinion.

On the other hand, he shows an understanding of our economy and the world economy which is sorely needed in one who is to direct the agencies under the control of the Federal Loan Administration. He shows an understanding of the principles which must govern our foreign trade, of the economic significance of full employment and of the lack of full employment in this country. He shows an understanding of the necessity of the free flow of investment capital essential to the progress of the Nation. He grasps the significance of education and of health as the firm foundation upon which the Nation can be strong.

Mr. Wallace made the statement to the committee that the first problem facing him was the winning of the war; second, the winning of the peace; and third, the providing of full employment for the people and adequate markets for the business and agriculture of the Nation.

Mr. Wallace proved himself to be a farseeing man by his efforts to build up stock piles of rubber as early as 1939, by the research program which the Department of Agriculture carried on in the field of rubber production while he was Secretary, and by his activities in developing sources in South America for strategic and critical war material, even before the war.

Few men who have ever appeared under similar circumstances have more courageously and candidly opened their minds to a Senate committee than did Mr. Wallace to this committee.

Why then the bitter opposition to Mr. Wallace? Why are Senators determined, even before Mr. Wallace is to be confirmed, to strip the office of Secretary of Commerce of these lending agencies? What is the alleged lack of experience and lack of confidence to which Senators refer without giving any indication to what they have in mind? Why are some Senators determined to prevent Mr. Wallace from being confirmed as Secretary of Commerce with the lending agencies stripped from it? The only rational conclusion which one can arrive at, is that those who would strip the Secretary of Commerce of the lending agencies which are now supervised by him, are opposed to what Wallace stands for and believes in and are opposed to the objectives which he has stated will guide him in the performance of his duties.

We agree with Mr. Wallace and not with his opposition. We believe not only in Mr. Wallace's integrity and his competence and his efficiency, but we believe also in the objectives which Henry Wallace symbolizes. We believe in the America which Henry Wallace is trying to help build. We believe that the things Henry Wallace believes in are essential to the maintenance and the growth of private enterprise in America. We believe that only if the office of Secretary of Commerce and all the Federal lending agencies are administered in the spirit of what Henry A. Wallace believes in, and in the interest of furthering those policies Henry A. Wallace laid down to the committee, can we have a fully employed and a prosperous America.

We believe that if Henry Wallace had 1 year of opportunity as Secretary of Commerce to direct the policies of the lending agencies now under that office, he would do it with such administrative competence and such wisdom of policy that it would meet with the overwhelming approval of the people of the Nation and of the Congress.

Accordingly, we cannot conscientiously refrain from saying that stripping the office of Secretary of Commerce of supervision of the lending agencies, if Henry Wallace is to be the incumbent of that office, would be a tragedy not for Henry Wallace but for America and to a considerable extent for the entire world. The Nation needs Henry A. Wallace in this place. The farmers need him. All businessmen, large and small, need him. Both labor and capital need him. The President needs him. The Congress needs him.

The undersigned, therefore, earnestly hope that in its wisdom the Senate may not, either out of misunderstanding or out of any other motive, hurl a boomerang which will, possibly missing its victim, come back to do greater harm in the long run to the people's representatives and the people themselves.

We oppose at this time, therefore, the enactment of S. 375.

CLAUDE PEPPER.
THEODORE G. BILBO.
JAMES M. MEAD.
WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

JANUARY 31, 1945.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill because I have always been in favor of scattering power as much as it can be scattered; but so far as the bill accomplishing any real purpose is concerned, I do not believe that it would accomplish any purpose whatsoever.

The real difficulty with the R. F. C. is that its powers are grossly excessive. We gave unlimited power to the R. F. C. to go into any business having the remotest relation to the war—and that means any business. We gave it power to form corporations for that purpose. We gave it so many billion dollars that no one knows how many billion dollars it has. The laws are scattered through the books in such a manner that it is almost impossible to calculate the amount involved. I believe it has the power to borrow about $14,000,000,000 and relend it. It probably still has about $5,000,000,000 that it can lend for any purpose whatsoever.

When the bill which expanded it most came before the Senate for consideration in June 1940, former Senator Danaher and I opposed it. We succeeded in cutting down slightly the powers which were granted to the R. F. C. The R. F. C. came before Congress in May 1941, and again we endeavored in the Committee on Banking and Currency to hold its powers down as much as we could, but we were overridden. Finally a sort of compromise was reached.

The great difficulty in this whole situation is that we have given too much power to the R. F. C. As to the distribution of powers, there is no reason in the world for this bill except the desire to limit Henry Wallace, so that although he may become Secretary of Commerce, he may not also exercise the powers of the R. F. C. There is no other reason for this bill. Obviously it would not have been introduced except for that purpose. Mr. Wallace recognizes that fact. In his testimony before the committee he recognized that that was the only reason for the introduction of the bill.

Members of the Senate feel that Henry Wallace is not competent to administer the R. F. C. It is not a question of his competency to administer the Department of Commerce and the R. F. C. together. The only possible reason for this bill is that many Senators have no confidence in Henry Wallace, because they do not believe in his philosophy, and that by taking this power away from him they can in some way limit him. I believe that is a vain effort, because under the First War Powers Act we have given the President power to transfer and consolidate departments. Tomorrow, the moment Mr. Wallace became Secretary of Commerce, the President could place in his charge the Foreign Economic Administration, which has the export-import bank, which controls the United States Commercial Company, with a capital of $1,000,000,000. The day after that he could tell whoever was in charge of the R. F. C. to give the United States Commercial Company another $5,000,000,000; and a man appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate could not well refuse to carry out such an order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the Senator feel that the educational value of this nomination and all it has precipitated may make it opportune for the Congress to reconsider some of the vast grants and

transfers of power which the Senator has always questioned, and which I have always questioned? Perhaps Senators on both sides of the aisle who have given such enormous grants of power because of confidence in a man—which is a poor basis for legislation—may not be disposed to place some further restrictions on the powers both of the President and of other executive officers.

Mr. TAFT. I hope that may be the result; but that is not the result. Apparently the nomination of Mr. Wallace will be confirmed, if the Senate chooses so to vote, for the position of Secretary of Commerce alone, before any such reconsideration can take place. I am quite confident that it would require a fairly long time. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation involves the whole problem of how far Government is to continue in the lending business in the post-war period. That is a very involved and difficult question. I doubt very much whether it will be decided in the next 6 months or the next year. I hope such a study may be undertaken. I hope the present situation will promote the undertaking of such reconsideration. I believe we have reached the point where we could well repeal section 1 of the First War Powers Act, which was taken from the Overman Act of the First World War; but I do not believe that will be done. I have not seen any pressure on the part of the administration to cut down its own powers; and it is very difficult to organize against the administration to reduce its powers.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe we must distinguish between the administration and the Senate, in view of what is happening here today. It seems quite evident that a considerable majority of the Senate is disposed to take away some of the powers, or at least to prevent their transfer into the hands of the Secretary of Commerce. I think it is fair to point out that it was not possible, in the bill before the Commerce Committee, to go beyond what was done, because of the question of jurisdiction which is involved, and because the Commerce Committee clearly recognized that it had no right to enter the domain of the Committee on Banking and Currency. But certainly there is afforded an illuminating illustration of what may now be possible in view of changed circumstances.

Mr. TAFT. I can tell the Senator what would happen in the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any other committee, if a bill to limit the powers of the R. F. C., or otherwise reduce bureaucratic power were to be introduced. The chairman of the committee, under pressure from the administration, would postpone hearings from month to month. Finally there would be hearings, and then the committee would not be called together to act. In the end we might accomplish some results; but, as a practical matter, up to this time, at least, Congress has not taken away any powers that I know of. It is a very difficult thing to do practically.

When the price control bill comes up it will be pointed out that the post-war period is just as important as the war period, that it is still an emergency period, and that it will be a difficult matter.

I do not say it should not be done. I only say that, so far as we are concerned now, and in view of the nomination of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, what we are attempting to do is wholly vain unless we do what the Senator from Maine has suggested, namely, unless we repeal the War Powers Act, for Mr. Jones himself appeared twice before our committee, and said the R. F. C. does not determine policy. He said, "If the War Department tells us to build a war plant, we build a war plant. If the Navy Department tells us to build a Navy plant, we build a Navy plant. If the Foreign Economic Administration tells us to make a loan in South America, we make the loan; because," he said, "we do not consider ourselves a policy-making organization."

It is true that Mr. Jones may have exercised a little restraint; he may have balked a little, and may have taken some matters to the President; but in the ultimate analysis, under present conditions the head of the RFC is obliged to accept the orders of the various departments which administer policy. So, if Mr. Henry Wallace had assigned to him, as he may have, the Foreign Economic Administration, and if he directed the R. F. C. to make a loan for a pipe line in Arabia, I have no doubt whatever that under the existing Executive orders the head of the R. F. C. would feel obliged to make such a loan.

So far as the real purpose of the bill is concerned, namely, to deprive Mr. Wallace of powers which the Commerce Committee does not think he is qualified to exercise, I say that purpose is not effectuated by the bill. Every argument against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace as R. F. C. Administrator applies equally to the question of the nomination and confirmation of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not also true that if the country is under the danger of the malign influence of the views of Mr. Wallace, it would be perfectly possible, regardless of whether he was in authority, for him to carry out those views if the President chose to use him in some such way as he has used Mr. Harry Hopkins, for Mr. Harry Hopkins, in Rome, has been announcing the foreign policy of the administration and the changes which have occurred, although, so far as I know the nomination of Mr. Hopkins in any capacity has not come before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if I may correct the Senator, let me say that Mr. Hopkins' name was before us. His name was presented to the Senate as Secretary of Commerce. His nomination was confirmed by a vote of 58 to 27. I think I can even tell the Senate the names of the Senators who voted against the confirmation of his nomination, namely, most of the Republican Senators and also the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the then Senator King of Utah, and the late Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana. They voted against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hopkins, at that time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, let me say that I was referring to Mr. Hopkins in his present incarnation as sort of a combination of Rasputin and Colonel House and Svengali. So I think it should be made clear that we are not in any way whatever eliminating the evil influence Mr. Wallace has by his defeat for any office, but rather we would contribute to the aspects of martyrdom which undoubtedly will earnestly be urged.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, apparently the Senator has a new argument for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, namely, that although he is not competent to exercise the broad powers of Federal Loan Administrator, he will be a martyr unless we confirm his nomination. It seems to me that argument is wholly illogical. Certainly I never heard urged before the argument that we should confirm the nomination of a man to an office, although he is incompetent, merely because if we do not confirm his nomination he will be a martyr. As a matter of fact, if Mr. Wallace becomes Secretary of Commerce he will sit in all Cabinet meetings at the White House. But the Federal Loan Administrator will not sit in those meetings and Mr. Wallace's views as to what the R. F. C. Administrator will do will certainly be far more important in that position than will be the views of the man who may be made the Administrator under the set-up proposed by the pending bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio has spoken about Mr. Wallace's incompetence. From what the Senator from Ohio has said, I think it is evident that the question is not whether Mr. Wallace is incompetent. The proposition is that he is too competent; he is too able and too effective for the views which he holds. I realize that Senators may well differ with him respecting his views. But the question is not one of whether he is incompetent. If he were weak, if he were a bungler, if he had not been effective, if he had more or less failed and did not know how to do a job, and if his record did not show that he knew how to do a job, there would not be so much worry and so much distress and so much opposition about his nomination. It is because he is effective that those who do not share his views oppose his being placed in a position in which they know he will be competent and effective from his viewpoint.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator is going to vote to take away from him the powers of the Federal Loan Administrator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to be perfectly frank with the Senator. I should like to see Mr. Wallace have the

loaning powers. I do not favor the passage of the George bill, from the standpoint of taking away from Mr. Wallace the loaning powers. I have been in politics a long time, and I know there are times when it is necessary to make a virtue of political necessity. If I should vote for the George bill, it would only be because I am so anxious to see Mr. Wallace's nomination as Secretary of Commerce confirmed. I would do it because I knew that such a vote would be necessary in order to have Mr. Wallace's nomination as Secretary of Commerce confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator recognizes that a majority of the Senate is unwilling to trust to Mr. Wallace the powers of the Federal Loan Administrator which have so long been exercised by Mr. Jones.

Mr. HILL. I recognize that a majority of the Senate is unwilling to turn over to Mr. Wallace, effective and competent as I believe him to be, the administration of the lending agencies, holding the views he does.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on the question of the nomination and qualities of Mr. Wallace, I shall be glad to speak when the nomination is before the Senate. Apparently the administration and Mr. Wallace himself are afraid to submit his name to the Senate on the question of nominating him as Federal Loan Administrator. That is the reason for the present proceedings. That is the reason for the refusal to go into executive session. It is the reason for the motion the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] proposes to make, namely, to postpone for a month or more the question of the consideration of Mr. Wallace's nomination.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I must say that what the Senator from Ohio said about the futility of proposing to amend the R. F. C. Act because of his anticipation of what the chairman of the committee would do, namely, that he would not hold hearings, compels me to state that it seems to me that it is well to bear in mind that the chairman of a committee is the servant of the committee. I do not think any chairman has the right to "sit" upon any bill which a majority of the committee desires to consider.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, let me say that I did not intend in any way to reflect on the particular Senator who is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. No.

Mr. TAFT. I only wished to point out that the administration is far stronger in its control of the committees, in being able to block legislation, than it is in being able to force legislation of its own through the Senate. That is always a natural situation. Questions and considerations of committee procedure are necessarily far more largely a question of organization.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. My only suggestion was that it is very difficult to put through a bill against the administration, even though possibly when the bill comes to a vote on the floor of the Senate a majority of the Senate is in favor of its passage. It is quite true that that should not be the condition, but it is the condition in every legislative body, and usually the only chance there is to get at a proposition is when the majority party or the majority administration come to the Senate and request something. Then, of course, they must submit their proposition directly. I did not mean to reflect in any way on any particular committee chairman, but I simply refer to the condition of any legislative body.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I understood that when I referred to the chairmen of all committees. I do not think a chairman has a right to "sit" o na bill or on an amendment to a bill which has been referred to a committee, if a majority of the committee desires to consider the proposed piece of legislation. So far as I am concerned, with the pending bill as it now stands I am not satisfied. To a considerable extent it means what the Senator from Ohio has said it means. I understand amendments are to be offered to place the R. F. C. organization under the General Accounting Office. That should have been done a long time ago. As the Senator from Ohio has said, the R. F. C. is not a policy-making organization. The policies are left to too many Toms, Dicks, and Harrys to handle and shovel out the funds. I am not sure that the bill should not be referred to the committee for further study, and to rewrite it so as to safeguard not only the policy-making functions with respect to loans, but also to provide an independent audit by the General Accounting Office. Too many funds are shoveled out for many purposes. I doubt not the legality but the good sense of allowing the War and Navy Departments to call for billions upon billions of dollars and having some department hand the money out to them. It seems to me to be a very haphazard way of doing business. Perhaps that is the reason there is so much waste in public funds today.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I think we could well cancel perhaps four or five billion dollars of the R. F. C.'s loaning powers, but there would be strenuous opposition if such a proposal were made.

Mr. President, I repeat that the real purpose of the bill obviously is to take away from Henry Wallace the powers to which reference has been made. I am willing to vote for the bill. I was the only Senator who expressed doubt when we passed the bill giving to Mr. Jones the right to exercise both powers. Nevertheless, the functions are very similar. If we were to assign the R. F. C. to any department it would be to the Department of Commerce. I shall vote for the bill only because I believe it to be wise not to repose too many powers in one man; but I think, without question, that the bill shows an entire lack of faith in the ability and philosophy of Mr. Henry Wallace.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I do not believe any human being, whether it be Mr. Wallace, Mr. Jones, or anyone else, is qualified to handle all the money which is in the control of the R. F. C. I think the power is altogether too great to entrust to any one individual. I am hopeful that some of the amendments which I understand will be proposed will, to a large extent, remedy the difficulty, but I still believe that the bill should go back to the Commerce Committee for entire revision of the policy which is involved.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the problem presented in the Commerce Committee was one of jurisdiction. All the grants of power under the R. F. C. were considered in the Banking and Currency Committee. The only reason the pending bill came to the Commerce Committee was that it proposed to take away powers now exercised by the Secretary of Commerce, over whom our committee has jurisdiction. But any attempt to invade a field which was not then occupied would have been an encroachment upon the jurisdiction of other committees, so I think the Senator from Georgia and the committee were entirely in accord. We could not go beyond the immediate objective of the George bill, which was to divorce the R. F. C. powers from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand the accuracy of what the Senator has said; but I think it would be perfectly proper to send the bill back to the committee for revision, and to put in additional safeguards in order to protect the funds. To my mind it is unheard of that thirty or forty billion dollars should be handed out merely because someone in authority says "We must have $5,000,000 for this and $5,000,000 for that," and Jesse Jones says, "We must hand it out to them because they determine policies and we only give them the money." It seems to me that such a proposition is ridiculous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is printed and lying on the desk an amendment which I had intended to offer to the pending bill. The amendment would call for a simple audit of the agencies and corporations created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. However, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has an amendment which would go considerably further than the one which I had intended to offer, which calls for a simple audit of those agencies at the end of the year by the Comptroller General. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia is in better form and is more satisfactory than the one which I had intended to offer. I hope that the amendment which he is about to offer will be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment as amended has been agreed to. It will be necessary for the Senator from Virginia first to ask for re-

consideration of the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The committee amendment as amended is before the Senate.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 5. (a) The financial transactions of all Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit shall begin with the current fiscal year.

(b) A report of each such audit for each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit of each corporation and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus, or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the several corporations, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. The report shall also show specifically every program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

(c) The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of all Government corporations as provided in section 5 (a) of this Act may be paid out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized for the purpose: *Provided*, That by agreement between the General Accounting Office and said corporation the expenses of said audit may be paid from funds of such corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour has expired. There being no unfinished business before the Senate, the consideration of the bill which was taken up on motion earlier today will be continued.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. May I inquire of the Senator whether this amendment has been prepared in consultation with the Comptroller General or his office?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that it has been.

Mr. GEORGE. And it can be administered without undue interruption of the corporate functions of the various loan agencies?

Mr. BYRD. The amendment does not cover, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, any question involving the making of loans except to report to Congress any loans illegally made, but does cover the auditing of loans after they are made.

Mr. GEORGE. It simply covers the auditing?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; it does not give the Comptroller General the right to deny the making of loans, but anything that is done that may be of an illegal character, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. The Comptroller General would merely report to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to inquire if the auditing will cover the transactions which have taken place during the past several years?

Mr. BYRD. No; the auditing is to start with the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. MURRAY. It would seem to me, inasmuch as the R. F. C. has not been subjected to audit or examination and has not been required to make any report, that the audit ought to cover transactions which have occurred during the past several years.

Mr. BYRD. The R. F. C. has not been audited by the Comptroller General; it has been audited by competent auditors, and the reports, as I understand, are made at certain periods to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but, because of the confidential nature of some of the reports on account of the war, they have not been made public.

Mr. MURRAY. Would the Senator be agreeable to having his amendment amended so as to make it apply to past transactions?

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that I would have no objection to that, but the R. F. C. was organized in 1930, and it would be a vast undertaking to audit all its transactions since that time.

Mr. MURRAY. I suggest that the audit should not go back further than to cover the period of the war effort so as to include the loans and transactions during the past several years. I know of some loans which have been made in connection with which the facts would seem to indicate that there was a reason why there should be an investigation and an audit.

Mr. BYRD. So far as I am concerned, I would have no objection to it if the experts are available. I think the R. F. C. should have been audited from the very beginning.

Mr. MURRAY. I suggest that the date of the audit be fixed as of the commencement of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator have any objection to making the provisions of the amendment applicable to the present fiscal year rather than waiting until the next fiscal year?

Mr. BYRD. I think that is an excellent suggestion, and, after I make my statement, if the Senator will prepare the amendment he has in mind, I shall be very glad, so far as I am concerned, to accept it.

Mr. AIKEN. In connection with the matter brought up by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] it seems to me that the Comptroller General would necessarily have to go somewhat into the past in order adequately to carry out the provisions of the amendment for the present, would he not?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. Many of the loans were made of course some time ago and are still outstanding.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he has a copy of his proposed amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; I hand the Senator a copy.

Mr. President, in explanation of this amendment I should like to state that there are 56 Government corporations, and that 20 of them are audited by the Comptroller General and 36 are not required to be audited by law or have not submitted to audit by the Comptroller General.

I should like first to read to the Senate a list of the Government corporations which are now audited: The Commodity Credit Corporation is audited; the Export-Import Bank is audited; the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is audited; the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is audited; the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., is audited; the Federal Public Housing Authority is audited; the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Co. is audited; the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation is audited; the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the Institute of Inter-American Transportation; the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., the Inter-American Navigation Corporation, Prencinradio, Inc., the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Smithsonian Institution, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the United States Housing Corporation, the Virgin Islands Company, and the Welfare and Recreational Association of Public Buildings and Grounds, Inc., are all audited. The corporations mentioned constitute the 20 which are now audited.

It is proposed by this amendment to require that the other 36 corporations,

the names of which I am about to read shall be audited in the same way that every other agency of the Government is now required to be audited by general law. The 36 corporations include American President Lines, Ltd., Banks for Cooperatives, Cargoes, Inc., Colonial Mica, Copper Recovery Corporation, Defense Homes Corporation, Defense Plant Corporation, Defense Supplies Corporation, Disaster Loan Corporation, Electric Home and Farm Authority, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Home Loan Banks, Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, Federal Land Banks, Federal National Mortgage Association, Inland Waterways Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Panama Railroad Co., Petroleum Reserves Corporation, Production Credit Corporations, Puerto Rico Cement Corporation, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, RFC Mortgage Company, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, Rubber Development Corporation, Rubber Reserve Company, Steel Recovery Corporation, Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, apparently, is audited, but the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., is not.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the Senator's amendment does not cover the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is different from the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. The Tennessee Valley Authority is already audited.

Mr. HILL. It is already audited under an act of Congress, as the Senator recalls. I was wondering, as the Senator's amendment is now drafted, whether there would be any danger of its language being construed to cover the Tennessee Valley Authority. Has the Senator given any thought to that?

Mr. BYRD. I cannot conceive that there would be, for it is already audited.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is already audited under a special act of Congress. The Comptroller General, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Congress really entered into an agreement for the auditing and how the audit should be made. I notice the Senator's amendment prescribes certain details perhaps with reference to the audit of the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries. I may say that I am in favor of the Senator's amendment, but, not knowing its effect, I should not want to do anything to repeal, modify, or change the special T. V. A. Act.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that I understand the Comptroller General thinks that the audit of the T. V. A. is now satisfactory, and this amendment will leave it to his discretion as to what kind of an audit shall be made. It does require, however, that every corporation be audited in accordance with the terms of the amendment.

Mr. HILL. But it is the Senator's opinion that the T. V. A. would not fall under the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. That is my opinion, unless the Comptroller General desired to utilize this amendment instead of the present law.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is the Senator from Virginia aware of the fact that the management and control of the Board of Economic Welfare, as it existed prior to the changes instituted 2 years ago, audited their own accounts and were in full control of their finances without any outside agency, such as the General Accounting Office, having anything to do with it at all?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator is correct about that. In addition to those corporations I have already mentioned as not being audited, the Textile Foundation, Inc., is not audited, the United States Commercial Co., which is one of the corporations the Senator has just referred to, is not audited. Others are the United States Spruce Production Corporation, the War Damage Corporation, the War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., the War Hemp Industries, Inc., War Materials, Inc., and the Warrior River Terminal Company. That is a list, Mr. President, of 36 agencies of the Government which have the power to make loans. The total authority of the various corporations, of which 20 are now audited and 36 are not, is $33,207,000,000, as of March 31, 1944. Some of the authorizations have been increased since that time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me add that the sum mentioned nowhere near represents the amount of money which these corporations handle in their purchase and resale, particularly at this time, of essential materials of war.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is entirely correct about that, because this is a revolving fund. The great danger and menace of these corporations is that Congress authorizes certain corporations to borrow certain amounts. The funds have been used as revolving funds to be expended for other purposes.

Let us take, for example, the R. F. C. The R. F. C. up to this date has actually loaned $45,000,000,000, from an original authority of about fifteen to sixteen billion. In other words, it has pyramided three times by reason of the fact that the payments which come back to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are then loaned time and time again as often as they come back.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me add again that these corporations have done an enormous business in buying and selling strategic materials at one price and reselling to the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission at a marked-up price, so that they have financed themselves by many hundred million dollars of additional sums, the aggregate of which nobody knows. I think the Senator will find that in the case of rubber alone the rubber which is sold by the Rubber Reserve Corporation—which controls all the rubber anyway—to the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission is marked up 17½ cents a pound above the price at which it is sold for civilian consumption. There have been witnesses before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who have testified that there is also a mark-up in the price of alcohol, and, for aught we know, there may be a mark-up in the price of steel and aluminum and everything else bought by these corporations and resold to the Army and Navy. Therefore, in effect, if they do not get the money they want from Congress, they are enabled to finance themselves from the appropriations to the Army, Navy, and Martime Commission, and no one in the Congress feels like objecting to the amounts which those agencies request. We have no control over that situation whereby subsidiaries of the R. F. C. buy at one price and can sell to the War Department at three times that price if they see fit to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the situation referred to by the Senator from Vermont is much more fortunate than one whereby the R. F. C. would make loans on such a plan that the Government would lose money rather than make money on the transaction. After all, this fund is not only to promote the war effort, but to aid business, and there is no reason why the Government should not make the loans on substantially the same lines as those on which private banks would make them. I know the Senator does not mean any criticism by what he has said, but I should much prefer to have profits shown as a result of the operations than to have a deficit shown because the loans were insecurely financed or poorly managed.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would be perfectly possible to show innumerable cases in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made unfortunate loans to private industry, and then the War Department or the Maritime Commission or the Navy Department bought the plants on which the bad loans were made, at prices in excess of the value. So the Defense Plants Corporation, which made the loan in the first place, is always in the black by reason of throwing loans over onto some other agency.

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be true, but, taking the over-all picture, it is a good one. I have also read recently of many concerns going to banks to obtain capital in order to enlarge so that they could fulfill Government orders and requests, and the banks would not agree to make the loans. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation would then make the loans and resell them at a profit to the very banks which refused the original loans. So that the very magic of Mr. Jones' name and his prestige in the business world has given loans a standing without which they would not have had any chance of being financed, if the Government had not first entered the field. Therefore, my interjection into this colloquy is only to compliment over-all good management of the concern, without endorsing each loan, because it has been conducted in such a way that the taxpayers, who put up the original sum, have not had the

sums they advanced depleted. That is a splendid picture, as against one showing that, whereas $17,000,000,000 might have been the initial fund, only $12,000,000,000 remained, and the other $5,000,000,000 had gone down the rat hole. So, while there may be a profit, if we are going into the business of financing private industry, we should never do it at a loss, unless in some extreme case of national defense, where there is no other alternative, and the necessities warrant it.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator. One other policy has been adopted with the corporations which, in my judgment, is unfortunate; that is, that the Commodity Credit Corporation, for example, is paying subsidies out of a fund that is supposed to have been granted to the Corporation for the purpose of lending. Of course, it is nonrecoverable. The R. F. C. has likewise paid very considerable amounts for subsidies which cannot be recovered.

My judgment is that these corporations should be confined strictly to their lending authorities, and not be permitted to make what is equivalent to an appropriation, to be made out of funds provided to these corporations for loans. The loans should be made on a businesslike basis, and should be recoverable.

In connection with what the Senator from Maryland has said, I should like to point out that the R. F. C. has only about one-half the lending capacity of these various corporations. When we speak of the corporations, our thoughts go to the R. F. C., which is the most gigantic banking organization the world has ever known, with facilities to borrow $17,000,000,000, and then to reloan the funds as they are paid back, making them into a revolving fund.

As a matter of fact, the other corporations have in the aggregate about the same lending capacity as the R. F. C.; in fact, they have a little more. The Commodity Credit Corporation, for example, has a $3,000,000,000 lending capacity, but I see a billion and a half more has been recommended, making it four and a half billion dollars. That in itself is one-third as large as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation fund.

Mr. President, of course my amendment in no way completes the obligation the Senate and the Congress have to restore to Congress the control over these vast appropriations. A proposal will shortly be presented by the Senator from Nebraska and myself in an attempt to go further and restore to the Congress the authority to control these corporations in an effective way so as not to interfere too much with their operations. That is very difficult legislation to prepare, but the pending amendment will secure for Congress information with respect to what these corporations are doing, which is not now fully available, and is very difficult to obtain.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to ask to make an interpolation dealing with the situation raised by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in connection with the discussion of this very matter. As the Senator from Virginia knows, I am in most cordial sympathy with his proposals, which provide for long-delayed auditing and accounting.

There was in the course of a public discussion on the radio a challenge regarding the so-called Dawes loan of $90,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the suggestion was made by one of the Members of this body that there was something irregular in connection therewith. In justice to Mr. Jesse Jones, who was the Administrator then, I secured from him a statement of facts, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, indicating that that loan, which was made not only for the benefit of the bank, but for the benefit of 100,000 depositors, was completely paid back, and there was also a profit of some five or six million dollars.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1945.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your request for information as to the status of the $90,000,000 loan to the Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, which was made June 1932, beg to advise that cash collections have been $98,600,000, with remaining collateral to the approximate value of $5,000,000, a total recovery of $103,600,000.

The expense incident to the preservation of the collateral and the administration of the loan has been approximately $3,500,000. This is equivalent to collection of the principal of the loan, plus expenses, and approximately $10,000,000 interest.

Sincerely,

JESSE H. JONES.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope it will be the pleasure of the Senate to adopt this amendment providing a long-delayed audit of the transactions of these various corporations. The amendment has been worked out in cooperation with the Comptroller General. I emphasize again that it does not give to the Comptroller General the power to reject or to disapprove of the loans made by the corporations. I do not think that would be practicable. It requires an audit of the loans after they are made, of the expenses of the various corporations, and of the losses which occur, as well as any profits.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has suggested that the auditing begin as of July 1, 1941. I personally have no objection to that suggestion, though I do not know whether it would necessitate a large amount of work when probably the accountants are not now available.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not accept the amendment, because I can foresee the trouble the bill will run into in the House if the amendment is adopted. If anyone wants to examine the R. F. C. back to the date of its origin, that is all right; but let it be done as an examination, and not as an audit made at this late date. The adoption of such an amendment as this will certainly invite opposition. I had hoped for the adoption of the simple proposal of an audit beginning with the current year. I think that is quite proper. That would not result in the raising of any question as to jurisdiction by any committee which has jurisdiction with respect to the creation of these various organizations or which has reported measures creating them. It seems to me it would be ample to begin the audit with the current year.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator from Montana that the clerk of the committee has just informed me that the Accounting Office has stated they would not have the accountants necessary to make the audit going back beyond the current year.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will say, if the Senator will permit me, that I am proposing a further amendment to the second paragraph of the amendment with reference to the reports of the audits, which would provide that the audit covering transactions prior to July 1, 1945, shall be made at the earliest practicable date, so that we would not place any burden on the General Accounting Office which it could not perform.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator mean the reports covering the present audit?

Mr. MURRAY. No; the audit that will go back to the year 1941–42.

Mr. BYRD. While I have no objection whatever to going back to 1941, I agree with the Senator from Georgia that that would place such vast work upon the General Accounting Office that they could not keep up the current audits. It applies to all the corporations. The Senator's proposal would require the General Accounting Office to make reports, of course, on the corporations which are already audited, and there are 20 of them, and as the Senator no doubt knows there is a great scarcity of expert accountants who are capable of making such audits.

Mr. MURRAY. It would be within the power of the General Accounting Office to determine when and how they would make the audit, but they would not be required to finish it, or to report the audit until they had the personnel with which to do so.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator's amendment reads:

The audit shall cover all financial transactions occurring after July 1, 1941.

That would be a mandate, in my judgment for the Comptroller General to start back in 1941.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. He would have to start back 3½ years ago, which would prevent us from getting the current audits. I think it was a great mistake that Congress made no provision to require these audits sooner, but if we go back too far then the current audits will be delayed.

I should like to perfect my amendment along the line suggested by the Senator from Georgia, that the audit start at the first of the current fiscal year. The amendment offered by me provides that it start at the first of the next fiscal year. The suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, if agred to, would

make the audit start on July 1, 1944. I wonder whether that would satisfy the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. No; it seems to me that it is important that an audit and an investigation of all the transactions should be made, and that the public should know what has transpired during the years I have indicated. It seems to me the bill would be imperfect if it did not cover that period.

Mr. BYRD. I think it ought to be done, but does not the Senator agree with me that if, at this particular time, we undertake to audit all the transactions 3 or 4 years back we will not keep up the current audits which we are very anxious to do?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am in full sympathy with the objective of the Senator from Montana, but I am wondering if an audit beginning July 1, 1944, for the current year, would not give a pretty plain indication of what had been going on in the previous 3 years. Congress would know pretty well from the audit of the current year, it seems to me, whether it would be advisable to go back any further. Personally I would favor the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana, but I would not want to jeopardize what the Senator from Virginia proposes to do by insisting upon that amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would it not serve the purpose of the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Montana both if the audit were to be made permissive up to July 1, 1944, and to be made mandatory from July 1, 1944, on? Then, if the accountants were available, the Accounting Office could go back and make the audit over the previous years. If the accountants are not available, they could at least keep the audit current from now on. The Senator from Montana could have his amendment so worded that the Accounting Office would do the work if they could find the personnel to do it. In that case the purpose of both Senators would be served and no harm would be done respecting the current audit.

Mr. MURRAY. I will say that I have no desire to place any impossible burden on the General Accounting Office, but it occurred to me that it was very important that an audit of this character should be made, even though it requires a considerable amount of work to go back over past transactions.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator from Montana be willing to accept the suggestion made by the Senator from Maryland that the audit be made permissive before July 1, 1944, and mandatory after July 1, 1944? That is a year sooner, I will say to the Senator, than I had proposed.

Mr. MURRAY. I will accept that.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Georgia. Does the Senator from Georgia think the suggestion made by the Senator from Maryland is a good one, to make the audits permissive prior to July 1, 1944, and mandatory thereafter?

Mr. GEORGE. I think we are likely to have the whole thing thrown out in the House if that proposal is adopted, because it would look like an investigation. I think the House committees will insist on saying in each instance whether the audit should be made going back that length of time, and I think we will become involved in a squabble about it, and the result will be, I am afraid, that the proposal will be thrown out. I have no objection to the audit being made at any time over the whole period of the life of the corporation, but this does not seem to me to be a very appropriate time to provide for it. I had hoped that a simple audit, starting with the current year, would be provided for; that would not create any friction in the House, and I believe the House would accept such a provision.

Mr. MURRAY. If it is merely permissive it seems to me that it should not precipitate any trouble in the House. The General Accounting Office will determine whether or not it has the personnel to engage in the examination or audit of the accounts as far back as 1941, and if it does not have the personnel it is not required to make the audit.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I propose to perfect the amendment offered by me. In the last sentence of subsection (a), after the words "begin with the", I propose to strike out "first" and insert "current"; and after the words "fiscal year", to strike out "commencing after the enactment of this act." I understand, Mr. President, that I have a right to perfect the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. BYRD. It would mean, then, that the audit would begin with the current fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification of the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the last sentence of subsection (a) in the Byrd amendment, after the words "begin with the", it is proposed to strike out "first" and insent "current"; and after the words "fiscal year" to strike out "commencing after the enactment of this act", so as to make the sentence read "The audit shall begin with the current fiscal year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it is important that all Government lending corporations be audited, but I wish to point out that only a very small fraction of the job is done when we require an audit. An audit in no way limits the powers of the corporations. I doubt very much if the corporations have exceeded their legal powers. It is desirable to see that there shall be no dishonesty. It is desirable to see that the R. F. C., for instance, does not go beyond its powers; but its powers are so broad that that is hardly possible under the present circumstances. It seems to me that the mere passage of this bill ought not to excuse us from going ahead and attempting to delimit the Corporation.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the bill should contain the further provision that every Government corporation should be required, as Government departments are required, to submit at the beginning of the year a budget of what it expects to spend and for what it expects to spend the money. Possibly Government corporations cannot be held down to as close restrictions as apply to Government departments, but something ought to be done to see that the program is submitted to Congress and approved in advance.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska and I have prepared such legislation, to be introduced today, but we are not offering it as an amendment to this bill, because it is very complex in character. We want to have it thoroughly discussed and referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. TAFT. I am delighted to hear the Senator's statement.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator will find the situation fully protected.

Mr. TAFT. There is one further question of policy. In my opinion, no Government corporation should be formed under any State law, and no such corporation which is formed hereafter should proceed without a charter approved by Congress, in which the powers of the corporation are fixed by Congress, and not by a charter filed in Delaware, New Jersey, or some other State, where charter powers are very liberally granted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator feel that this amendment is a step in the right direction?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but it is only the least important of the steps in that direction. I think the other steps are more important than this. I am in favor of this provision.

Mr. LANGER. It should have been done a long time ago.

Mr. TAFT. It should have been done a long time ago.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I am not satisfied with this bill, but in view of the statement of the Senator from Virginia that the proposed changes are so complicated that it is difficult to legislate on the floor of the Senate, I gladly accept his explanation.

The formation of corporations in Delaware by the Federal Government to handle public business has evidently been done for the purpose of getting away from the authority of the Congress. I understand that fifteen or twenty corporations have been incorporated under the laws of Delaware. For years that State has been looked upon as furnishing a corporation privileges, rights, and power to do anything it might wish to

do. It seems to me very reprehensible for the Federal Government to incorporate a business under such legislation as is permitted in Delaware and thus enable it to get away from the authority of the Congress.

I look with a great deal of anticipation to the future. I hope the Senator from Virginia will bring in some amendments, with the sanction of the appropriate committees, to see that these funds are better protected. I do not mean to cast any reflection upon the administration of Jesse Jones. It has been said here that he has admitted that he has nothing to do with the policy. Whenever a request is made for several billion dollars, he deems it his duty to furnish the money. That is a peculiar way to transact business. I doubt if it could be excused even during war. There should be some policy by which demands upon all these funds could be approved or disapproved. I hesitate to vote for this bill; but under the circumstances I shall do so, although I think possibly the most important thing is yet to be done.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator. The Senator understands that the pending amendment relates only to auditing, does he not?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand that.

Mr. BYRD. The legislation which he desires is being prepared and will be introduced within the next week. It is very difficult legislation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I shall look forward to such legislation with a great deal of pleasure and hope.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator's amendment require all corporations of the Government to be audited?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; just as other agencies of the Government are audited.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is every agency included in the Senator's amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall vote for it with a great deal of pleasure.

The VICE PRESIDENT The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	O'Daniel
Austin	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Burton	La Follette	Smith
Bushfield	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Taylor
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Tobey
Cordon	Magnuson	Tunnell
Donnell	Maybank	Tydings
Downey	Mead	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Mitchell	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
George	Murdock	Willis
Gerry	Murray	Wilson
Green	Myers	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been requested——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a moment? I failed to offer a perfecting amendment providing for expenses. I ask unanimous consent that it may be offered and read at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. That is agreeable, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, and will be read by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

(c) The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of all Government corporations as provided in section — of this act shall be paid out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized for the purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask either the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Georgia whether the amendment, as perfected, would require the General Accounting Office to audit in advance of a loan?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Kentucky was absent at the time when that point was explained. The amendment does not provide any authority to require a preaudit in advance of a loan.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wished to make sure of that point.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; Mr. President; as I have said, the amendment does not give authority to the Comptroller General to disallow a loan in advance.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Virginia. I was unable to be on the floor at the time when his amendment was under discussion. There are several agencies of Government which lend money which now are paying for their own audits. They are required to pay the General Accounting Office an amount of money sufficient to defray the cost of making the audit. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia would not have the effect of repealing those provisions of law.

Mr. BYRD. The amendment provides that the Comptroller General may utilize existing organizations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that. The General Accounting Office, however, audits the Farm Credit Administration, but no appropriation is made for the General Accounting Office in that connection, the theory being that the Farm Credit Administration is a business administration or organization and should be audited anyway, and it is required to pay for its own audit.

It occurs to me that some of these other organizations should be required to pay for their own audits. If they are set up as business organizations they should pay the expenses of their audits. I know of no reason why special appropriations should be made to pay for the expense of making the audit by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that not all the audits are paid for by the corporations concerned. Some of them now are paid for by the General Accounting Office.

I have no objection to having the Senator modify the amendment so as to have it provide that those already paying for their own audits shall continue to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. It occurs to me that we should have one policy regarding the matter.

Mr. BYRD. I think so, too. We have not heretofore required an audit of all of the 56 corporations, and we must make some provision to finance the cost of these new audits. If the Senator thinks the corporation should pay for its own audit, I have no objection to having that done, so long as the audit is made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Please understand that I am heartily in favor of the Senator's amendment. I was one of a handful of Senators who voted in favor of providing for an audit when the matter was previously before the Senate; but it seems to me that if these institutions are supposed to be operating along business lines, the corporation or concern itself should pay for the audit, rather than to have it necessary for the Congress to make a special appropriation of funds from the Treasury for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that it seems to me that some of the 56 corporations are not operated along business lines.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps I should say that in theory they are operated along business lines.

Mr. BYRD. I would not like to see the amendment rejected because of that point. The amendment was suggested on the part of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should not object in respect to the 56 corporations. But if

the amendment had the effect of repealing other laws which now provide that Government corporations shall pay for their own audits, that would be a different question.

It seems to me there should be one fixed policy in respect to all these corporations, regardless of whether they are in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or in the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that it is my understanding, and I think it is a fact, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all its subsidiaries and affiliates already are subject to an audit of their own, and already have the funds with which to conduct such audit.

The amendment would merely provide for an authorization so that the Committee on Appropriations could work out that matter, as I imagine, in determining whether additional funds should be appropriated for that purpose, or whether sufficient funds are now available.

Mr. RUSSELL. I realize that, but as I understand the amendment—let me say that I was not able to hear it very well when it was read—it provides that the expenses shall be defrayed by appropriations to the General Accounting Office and such necessary appropriations are authorized.

If the R. F. C. is now paying for its own audit, I think it should continue to do so, even though an appropriation for that purpose is authorized to be made to the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am in general agreement with the Senator's understanding, but I do not know that on the floor of the Senate we can work out the details of an arrangement to make such funds available to the R. F. C. and its affiliates in making their own audits. Certainly there should not be any duplication of appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. But certainly we are dealing with a considerable sum of money in this connection, because when we changed the law so as to provide that the Farm Credit Administration should pay for its own audit, that had the effect of reducing the appropriations for that agency by some two and one-half million dollars annually, which was the cost of making the audit of the Farm Credit Administration alone.

Other Government corporations operate on a much vaster scale than does the Farm Credit Administration, and the cost of making audits of them undoubtedly will run into millions of dollars a year. If they are now paying the expenses of having audits made by private auditors, it certainly occurs to me that the General Treasury, which does not receive a great deal of consideration in these times, should not be charged with the expense of having the audits made, and the obligation should not be transferred from the corporation upon which it now rests over to the General Treasury, with the resultant necessity of making an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest to both Senators that the language will cover the purpose of the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] if it is changed to read as follows:

> The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of all Government corporations as provided by section — of this act, shall be paid out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, unless previously otherwise provided, and appropriations of such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. That would take care of those that are now paying for their own audits, but it still would not provide any over-all policy which would apply equally to all the corporations which have been organized by the Congress.

Mr. BYRD. The language is merely an authorization. Could not the policy be worked out in an appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it could if the amendment did not make it mandatory for the General Accounting Office to have appropriations for this purpose.

Mr. BYRD. An amendment was heretofore agreed to making it mandatory to have audits made. It would seem that we could finance them in some way.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am entirely in accord with the attitude which the Senator has taken. I was one of a corporal's guard which supported him with regard to a similar amendment 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. BYRD. Perhaps it would be satisfactory to change the word "shall" to "may."

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be satisfactory if a provision could be framed which would give some authority to pay the costs.

Mr. McKELLAR. By changing the word "shall" to "may" the Appropriations Committee would have charge of the matter and they would see to it that no duplication took place.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Virginia in paragraph (c), after the word "act", by striking out the word "shall" and inserting the word "may"; and by changing the period at the end of the amendment to a colon and adding the words: "*Provided*, That by agreement between the General Accounting Office and said corporation the expenses of said audit may be paid from funds of such corporation."

Mr. BYRD. I accept the amendment of the Senator from Georgia as a modification of my amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Would the modification suggested by the Senator from Georgia mean that the agency must agree to an audit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it would mean that.

Mr. BYRD. The amendment heretofore agreed to would make it mandatory.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it could be worked out in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BYRD. Is there any question in the Senator's mind that the money would be made available?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all. In other words, there is no question that the audit would still have to be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment the Senator from Virginia has offered as paragraph (c), unanimous consent having been granted that the amendment might be offered at this stage in the consideration of the bill.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I understand that, if he were present and voting, he would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McCARRAN (when Mr. SCRUGHAM's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent because of illness. If present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—74

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McClellan	Tobey
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Cordon	Maybank	Walsh
Donnell	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Morse	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	Willis
Ferguson	Myers	Wilson
Fulbright	O'Daniel	

NAYS—12

Chavez	McMahon	Murdock
Guffey	Magnuson	Pepper
Hill	Mead	Taylor
Langer	Mitchell	Tunnell

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews	Glass	Scrugham
Ball	Hatch	Wagner
Chandler	Moses	Wheeler

So the bill S. 375 was passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky when he intends to have a call of the calendar. There are two naval bills which will take a very brief time and which the Navy Department is anxious to have considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be possible to call the calendar this afternoon provided the procedure which I am about to suggest does not take too much time; but I think we ought to clean up this situation before we proceed to the consideration of other business.

Mr. WALSH. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Capt. Victor Bradley Vare, Jr., Army of the United States, to be first lieutenant, Medical Corps, in the Regular Army, with rank from August 26, 1944;

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law;

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army;

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law;

Angus J. Gallagher, of Ohio, for appointment as administrative officer in the Selective Service System under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; and

Blynn T. Shafer, of Ohio, for appointment as assistant chief, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended;

Brig. Gen. Raymond H. Fleming, of Louisiana, for appointment as State director of selective service for Louisiana under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

NOMINATION OF FRANK C. WALKER

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the Executive Calendar, I send to the desk a favorable report from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on the nomination of Gen. Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania, to be Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

COL. ELLIOTT ROOSEVELT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of the military record of Col. Elliott Roosevelt, as compiled by the War Department. I do so in view of the fact that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has reported the nomination of Colonel Roosevelt to be a brigadier general, and the nomination of Colonel Roosevelt to be a brigadier general will come up on the call of the Executive Calendar the next time the Senate has an executive session after today.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COL. ELLIOTT ROOSEVELT

I. APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONS

A. Appointed captain, Specialist Reserve, September 23, 1940.

B. Transferred in grade to Air Reserve, February 21, 1941.

C. Promoted to major, Army of the United States, on March 26, 1942, to rank from March 1, 1942.

D. Promoted to lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States (Air Corps), August 6, 1942.

E. Promoted to colonel, Army of the United States (Air Corps), March 22, 1943, effective on February 23, 1943.

F. Promoted to colonel, Army of the United States, March 11, 1943.

II. SERVICE

Colonel Roosevelt was called to extended active duty on October 7, 1940, in the grade of captain, and reported to the Matériel Command, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio. On April 24, 1941, he was transferred from Wright Field to the Twenty-first Reconnaissance Squadron at the Newfoundland Air Base, and began a survey for the establishment of ferry routes across the North Atlantic. This duty took him to Greenland, Iceland, and England. On September 10, 1941, he was ordered to Kelly Field, Tex., to take a course in navigation, and from there to Brooks Field, Tex., as a student in an aerial observer's course. Upon completion of this latter course on December 15, 1941, he was ordered from Brooks Field to duty with the Sixth Reconnaissance Squadron, Muroc, Calif. On February 26, 1942, he was assigned to the First Photographic Group and proceeded overseas for duty in North Africa. Since that time Colonel Roosevelt has been on continuous duty overseas in North Africa, Sicily, Italy, the United Kingdom, and France, commanding photographic reconnaissance units. At the present time he is commanding the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photographic Reconnaissance Wing, European Theater of Operations, with an approximate strength of 5,000 officers and men.

III. DECORATIONS AND COMMENDATIONS

A. The Distinguished Flying Cross awarded December 23, 1942, while a member of the Third Photographic Group, Twelfth Air Force by command of General Doolittle (citation attached).

B. "Commander of Ouissan Alaouite" awarded January 23, 1943, by the Sultan of Morocco.

C. Air Medal awarded May 8, 1943 by General Spaatz (citation attached).

D. Letter of commendation dated October 12, 1943, from the commanding general, Army Air Forces to Colonel Roosevelt commending him for his work in reorganizing the reconnaissance program of the Army Air Forces (copy of letter attached).

E. Legion of Merit awarded December 25, 1943, by General Eisenhower (citation attached).

F. Letter of Commendation dated September 28, 1944, signed by Lieutenant General Bradley, commanding general, Twelfth Army Group to the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photographic Wing (reconnaissance) commanded by Colonel Roosevelt commending this unit (copy of letter attached).

(NOTE.—Colonel Roosevelt, to date, has a total of 1,100 flying hours. Of these 1,100 hours, 300 have been on combat missions. Colonel Roosevelt has recently piloted single controlled planes on 303 combat missions. A single controlled plane has but one pilot. And on each of these flights he has been the pilot.)

HEADQUARTERS, TWELFTH AIR FORCE,
A. P. O. 650, December 23, 1942.

GENERAL ORDERS NO. 10—AWARD OF DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

Under the provisions of AR 600–45, as amended, and pursuant to authority contained in circular No. 6, Allied Force Headquarters, October 19, 1942, the Distinguished Flying Cross is awarded to the following-named officer in the name of the commanding general, European theater of operations:

Elliott Roosevelt, O398475, lieutenant colonel third photographic group, Twelfth Air Force, United States Army. For heroism and extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flights. As a member of parties making aerial surveys of important ferry routes, Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt participated in long and dangerous flights over Arctic, sub-Arctic, and equatorial regions, many of them being over water and uninhabited areas. On one expedition Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt was the only member who made every operational flight. As a result of his experience and energy, he has been of great assistance in the establishment of ferry routes. As commanding officer of a photographic group assigned to the American forces in north Africa, Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt personally participated in many flights deep into hostile and heavily defended areas acting as observer, navigator, photographer, and radio operator. He made these flights voluntarily with complete disregard for his personal safety, as he well knew the extremely vulnerable characteristics of his unarmed airplane. The efficiency of his photographic group as proven by the valuable information it has obtained, is due in a large degree to the ability, leadership, and inspiration of Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt. His courage and skill reflects credit both upon himself and the military service.

By command of Major General Doolittle:

HOYT S. VANDENBERG,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Chief of Staff.

Official:

P. M. WHITNEY,
Colonel, Adjutant General's Department, Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS, NORTHWEST AFRICAN AIR FORCES,
A. P. O. 650, May 8, 1943.

GENERAL ORDERS, NO. 70—AWARD OF AIR MEDAL

1. Under the provisions of AR 600–45, as amended, and pursuant to authority contained in Circular No. 50, Headquarters NATOUS, April 5, 1943, the Air Medal is awarded to the following-named personnel, Air Corps, United States Army, residence as indicated, in the name of the commanding general, north African theater of operations, for meritorious achievement while participating in five sorties against the enemy.

* * * * *

Elliott Roosevelt, O398475, colonel, Benbrook, Tex.

* * * * *

By command of Lieutenant General Spaatz:

E. P. CURTIS,
Colonel, U. S. A. A. F., Chief of Staff.

Official:

WILLIAM W. DICK,
Colonel, A. G. D., Air Adjutant General.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
HEADQUARTERS, ARMY AIR FORCES,
Washington, October 12, 1943.

Subject: Commendation.
Through: Commanding general, Northwest African Allied Air Forces.
To: Colonel Elliott Roosevelt, commanding officer, Northwest African Photo Reconnaissance Wing (Prov.).

1. The careful and thorough work you have performed in the reorganization of the reconnaissance program of the Army Air Forces is most pleasing to me and I desire to commend you for your contribution to this important project.

2. Your practical experience has been of inestimable asistance in establishing plans and procedures for the use of Reconnaissance Units in the field and in setting up new tables of organization based on the actual needs of present-day warfare. Your advice and counsel have also been most helpful in revising our training program in this country, forming the present Reconnaissance Command of the Third Air Force and setting up the necesary staff branch in this headquarters.

3. The thorough knowledge you have of these matters and your wholehearted cooperation at all times reflect great credit upon yourself.

4. A copy of this letter will be made a part of your efficiency record.

H. H. ARNOLD,
General, United States Army,
Commanding General, Army Air Forces.

HEADQUARTERS, NORTH AFRICAN
THEATER OF OPERATIONS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
A. P. O. 534, December 25, 1943.

GENERAL ORDER, NO. 164—AWARD OF LEGION OF MERIT

Under authority contained in section IV, War Department Circular No. 131, dated June 3, 1943, a Legion of Merit Medal is awarded in the name of the President to each of the following-named individuals:

* * * * *

Elliott Roosevelt, O398475, Colonel, Air Corps, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services from November 1, 1942, to October 30, 1943. By his dynamic energy and inspiring zeal, he built the small photographic and reconaissance group which he commanded, into a photo reconnaissance wing which controlled the preparation of photographic intelligence for all planning staffs and operations in the theater. His keen insight into the invaluable aid of aerial photography, and the knowledge of its practical application, enabled him to make an outstanding contribution to the success of the Tunisian and Sicilian Campaigns, and of the initial operations in Italy. Entered service from Benbrook, Tex.

By command of General Eisenhower:

E. L. FORD,
Brigadier General, G. S. C.,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

H. V. ROBERTS,
Colonel, A. G. D.,
Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS, TWELFTH ARMY GROUP,
A. P. O. 655, September 28, 1944.

Subject: Letter of Commendation.
To: Commanding Officer, Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photo Wing Reconnaissance, A. P. O. 634, United States Army.
Through: Commanding General, Eighth Air Force.

1. It is desired to express the appreciation of Twelfth Army Group for the outstanding work which has been accomplished by the officers and men of your command.

2. The A–3 and A–3 Progress Sections have at all times been ready and able to execute exacting requests from the Army Group for aerial photos, mozaics and the reproduction of prints. The officers and men of these sections have appreciated the fact that in practically all instances, due to the rapidly moving situation, the time element has been a vital factor, and have exerted themselves to the utmost to meet the commitments in time to have their work be of value.

3. By their untiring efforts the laboratory section of the Wing has produced vast quantities of prints which have proved of great value to the Army Group. It is especially desired to bring to the attention of each officer and man the importance of the work which has been accomplished by them.

4. The Seventh Photo Group has accomplished at considerable loss in planes and personnel, the flying of many hazardous missions in a manner which reflects great credit upon their own unit and Photo Reconnaissance Aviation as a whole.

O. N. BRADLEY,
Lieutenant General, United States Army, Commanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

HENRY A. WALLACE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry A. Wallace, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Commerce, which nomination had been adversely reported.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the further consideration of the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce be postponed until the 1st day of March next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to speak to my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. The Presiding Officer was about to put the question. I did not understand that the Senator from Kentucky desired to speak.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to speak to the motion very briefly, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. President, in view of the action taken by the Senate on the George bill, which has been overwhelmingly passed, it seems to me that the further consideration of the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce should be postponed for a sufficient length of time to enable the House of Representatives to act upon the George bill and to enable the President to act upon it.

There are Senators, I think, on both sides of the Chamber who will vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce alone, after the separation of the lending agencies from that Department, but who will not vote for the confirmation of his nomination with the lending agencies still retained in the Department of Commerce. In order that those Senators who wish to vote in that way may have an opportunity to do so, I think it desirable, and it is fair to those Senators, fair to the Senate and fair to the President and to Mr. Wallace and also to the country, that they should be given an opportunity to cast that sort of vote if the contingency arises that they can do so without the question being tangled up with the lending agencies.

I have, I may say, the assurance of authorities of the House of Representatives that if the George bill passes the Senate it would be promptly taken up and disposed of in the House of Representatives.

As we all know, the President is on the verge of a very important conference that may hold the fate of our Nation and the world in its hands, and I am sure that no Senator is desirous to do anything that would be misinterpreted by the Nations who will be engaged in that conference or be misinterpreted by other nations of the world as to the attitude of our own Congress in regard to the President's full authority and his backing by us in dealing with other nations in this important conference.

I have every reason to believe that the House of Representatives will act upon the George bill promptly and favorably.

I took it upon myself a few days ago through the White House to inquire what would be the President's attitude toward the George bill in the event it passed both Houses. I have just received through the White House a message which I desire to read to the Senate. It seems to me that in this message the President has acted wisely and in a fashion that shows his desire to cooperate with the Congress in the situation which now confronts it. I will read it. This is a message, just received by me from the White House, which was sent, of course, to be transmitted to me in response to my previous inquiry in order that I might inform the Senate and the country and especially the Congress. It is in quotations, and is as follows:

In 1942, when I transferred certain functions of the Federal Loan Agency to the Department of Commerce by Executive order, I provided that they should be returned to that Agency 6 months after the conclusion of the war or sooner if the President or Congress should decide upon an earlier date. Therefore, should the Congress return these functions to the Federal Loan Agency at this time by the George resolution, I would approve the measure.

It seems to me that that is a categorical and definite answer to the inquiry, so that the Congress will have no doubt and the country will have no doubt about what the President will do in the event of the final passage of the George bill. I think, in fairness to the President and to the Congress and to Senators who are willing and who desire to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace purely for Secretary of Commerce that the motion I have made to postpone further consideration of his nomination until March 1 gives ample time for the other branch of Congress to act on the George bill and for the President to act in accordance with what he says he will do when the measure reaches him.

That is all I have to say about it. I hope that the Senate may vote upon the motion I have made without undue delay.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to acquiesce in the desire of the majority leader to postpone consideration, because I think a vote under present circumstances would be a confusing vote to take, one very difficult, perhaps, for some Senators to decide on.

I merely wish to give notice that I am just as much opposed to the confirmation of Mr. Wallace after the powers are taken away from him as before they are taken away from him; I think it makes no difference whatever. I am quite willing that the battle on Mr. Wallace should be postponed until the first of March, when the Senate will have full time to consider the remarkable repudiation by the great majority of the Senate of Mr. Wallace's qualifications to hold any important office in the Government.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I happen to be one of those who have looked with disfavor upon the nomination of Mr. Wallace, not because of lack of appreciation of his delightful personal qualities, but because of his philosophy of government, as it has been disclosed in his speeches and his writings—a philosophy with which I am at complete odds. I think the suggestion made by the majority leader is a wise one, and I hope it will be acquiesced in at this time.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader what his attitude would be if on March 1 the George bill had not become a law. My object is to be assured that before we vote on the nomination which it is now intended shall be postponed, we shall be assured that the bill which has just been passed will have become an act, signed by the President. Of course, I accept the President's assurance. Would the Senator agree to support the motion on March 1 in the event the bill had not become a law at that time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I not only will support it; I will make it.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], to postpone the consideration of the nomination of Henry A. Wallace until March 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond M. Stone to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant.

The nomination was confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar, for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

ANTONIO RUIZ

The bill (S. 72) for the relief of Antonio Ruiz, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Antonio Ruiz, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his two minor children, the late Samuel Ruiz and the late Rosalie Ruiz, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by them when a United States Army airplane crashed into their home in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 22, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JOHN T. COOPER

The bill (S. 76) for the relief of John T. Cooper, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of John T. Cooper, postmaster at Hartselle, Ala., in the sum of $179. Such sum represents a shortage in such account caused by the loss of such sum from the money-order cash drawer at such post office during the night of October 24, 1940.

PERKINS GINS

The bill (S. 167) for the relief of Perkins Gins, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the statutes of limitation, so far as they bar the cotton linter claim of Perkins Gins, a corporation of Memphis, Tenn., formerly the claim of Perkins Oil Co., also a corporation of Memphis, Tenn., arising out of purchase contract numbered 3418, entered into by the said Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn., predecessor of said Perkins Gins, of Memphis, Tenn., on September 16, 1918, with the United States of America be, and the same are hereby, waived and revoked.

SEC. 2. That the said claimant is hereby authorized to file within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act its said claim and have the same adjudicated by the Court of Claims of the United States.

GALEN E. WALTER

The bill (S. 243) for the relief of Galen E. Walter, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Galen E. Walter, Pony, Mont., who allegedly sustained an injury on May 9, 1942, while employed as a forest guard at the Gallatin National Forest, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim within 6 months from date of the approval of this act: *Provided*, That no benefit shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

LINDON A. LONG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 77) for the relief of Lindon A. Long, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lindon A. Long, of Dothan, Ala., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor son, Emile Long, who died as the result of injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Dothan, Ala., on June 3, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OSCAR GRIGGS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 177) for the relief of Oscar Griggs, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$4,505.14"; and on line 8, after the words "by him", to insert "and for medical and hospital expenses incurred", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oscar Griggs, of Lauderdale County, Tenn., the sum of "$4,505.14, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him and for medical and hospital expenses incurred when he was shot on the night of December 29, 1943, by members of a party of soldiers of the United States Army, when, in the performance of his duties as sheriff of Lauderdale County, Tenn., he was attempting to quiet a disturbance by such soldiers in the town of Ripley, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENEFITS TO DISCHARGED MILITARY OR NAVAL PERSONNEL OF ALLIED OR ASSOCIATED NATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 294) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit certain benefits to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the best explanation of the bill I can offer is to refer briefly to the report of General Hines, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who recommended the bill. He says:

The proposed legislation would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, upon request of the proper official of the government of any nation allied or associated with the United States in the present war, to furnish, in his discretion, to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any such government at such rates and under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, medical, surgical, and dental treatment; hospital care; transportation and traveling expenses; prosthetic appliances; education, training, or other similar benefits; and to make medical examinations, social investigations, and other reports pertaining to such persons. Under the bill any agreement entered into pursuant to this authority shall provide that such services shall be paid for by the Government of the Nation requesting the same and that any amount received by the Veterans Administration as reimbursement for such services shall be credited to the appropriate appropriation of the Veterans Administration for the fiscal year during which expenditures were made pursuant to this act.

General Hines also points out that under section 202 (14), World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, the Veterans' Administration is authorized to furnish transportation, medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies and appliances to such troops, but the proposed legislation is intended to establish a reciprocal agreement under which the Veterans' Administration may in its discretion make these payments to the veterans of nations now allied with us, but at the request and at the expense of the foreign governments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator feel that sufficient safeguards are contained in the bill through the provision for repayment? I ask the question because I observe in lines 6 and 8, on page 1, a broad degree of discretion is extended to the Veterans' Administration. The power which is granted is to be exercised by the Administrator "in his discretion," to quote the words of the bill, and he is then empowered, in line 8, to make such rates and to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary.

I call attention to that, Mr. President, because it is an example of a type of legislation which has been followed in the past by Congress to a rather extraordinary degree. It is my feeling that the time has come—certainly if it has not come, it is rapidly approaching—when Congress should hesitate to extend discretionary powers to any executive agency without greater scrutiny than has been practiced in the past.

Mr. GEORGE. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. The whole purpose of the proposal is that the Administrator may in his discretion do certain things; but on page 2 of the bill it is provided that—

Any agreement entered into pursuant to the authority of this act shall provide that such services shall be paid for by the government of the nation requesting the same.

So that it completely relieves our Government of any obligation. It is discretionary with the Veterans' Administration whether the Administrator shall undertake to make these payments to the discharged veterans of any Allied nation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But in no event would the payment be made at the expense of the Government of the United States?

Mr. GEORGE. That is true; and it would not be made unless General Hines first had with the foreign government an agreement which was satisfactory to him. I think it can be said of General Hines that he is a most excellent administrative officer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 294) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, upon request of the proper officials of the government of any nation allied or associated with the United States in the present war to furnish, in his discretion, to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any such government, at such rates and under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, medical, surgical, and dental treatment, hospital care, transportation and traveling expenses, prosthetic appliances, education, training, or other similar benefits, and to make medical examination, social investigations, and other reports pertaining to such persons. Any agreement entered into pursuant to the authority of this act shall provide that such services shall be paid for by the government of the nation requesting the same. Any amount received by the Veterans' Administration as reimbursement for such services shall be credited to the appropriate appropriation of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year during which expenditures were made pursuant to this act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the committee report on Senate bill 294 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 11) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 294) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill would authorize the furnishing of certain veterans' benefits to former members of the armed forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in the present war. Such benefits would be furnished only upon request of the Government of such nation and upon its agreement to reimburse the United States for any expenses incurred by it in furnishing such benefits.

The purposes of the bill are outlined in further detail in the following letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1944.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

SIR: There are forwarded herewith two copies of a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes," with the request that same be introduced and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, upon request of the proper officials of the government of any nation allied or associated with the United States in the present war, to furnish, in his discretion, to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any such government at such rates and under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, medical, surgical, and dental treatment; hospital care; transportation and traveling expenses; prosthetic appliances; education; training, or other similar benefits; and to make medical examinations, social investigations, and other reports pertaining to such persons. Under the bill any agreement entered into pursuant to this authority shall provide that such services shall be paid for by the government of the nation requesting the same and that any amount received by the Veterans' Administration as reimbursement for such services shall be credited to the appropriate appropriation of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year during which expenditures were made pursuant to this act.

Under section 202 (14), World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, the Veterans' Administration is authorized to furnish transportation, medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies and appliances to discharged members of the military or naval forces of those governments which were associated with the United States in World War No. 1 and who come within the provisions of laws of such governments similar to those of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and to utilize similar services, supplies, and appliances provided for discharged members of the military or naval forces of those governments in furnishing such benefits to the discharged members of the military or naval forces of the United States living within the territorial limits of such governments and entitled to benefits under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator. Following enactment of Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, as amended, this authority was modified by a provision contained

in paragraph VI, Veterans' Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended by Public Law 866, Seventy-sixth Congress, October 17, 1940, limiting the furnishing of hospitalization and medical treatment in foreign countries to veterans who are citizens of the United States and who are temporarily sojourning or residing abroad for disabilities due to war service in the armed forces of the United States. Similarly, under title III, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, loans may not be guaranteed for veterans residing outside the United States, nor are unemployment allowances under title V thereof payable except to veterans residing in the United States.

Subject to this limitation on the furnishing of hospitalization and medical treatment, guaranty of loans, or unemployment allowances to veterans of the armed forces of the United States while residing in foreign countries, there is sufficient authority under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to contract for furnishing any of the services or benefits provided thereunder to such beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration. However, there is no authority similar to that provided in section 202 (14), World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for furnishing similar services or benefits to discharged members of the military or naval forces of nations allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2. The proposed legislation would grant such authority and permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish to discharged members of the military or naval forces of nations allied or associated with the United States in the present war, who may be residing in the United States, certain services and benefits at the expense of the government of such nation requesting the same.

The legislation herein proposed by the Veterans' Administration is deemed desirable and its consideration at an early date is recommended.

Request for reciprocal agreements with respect to veterans' benefits has been made by the Dominion of Canada which has recently established under the Department of Veterans' Affairs Act of October 18, 1944, a Department of Veterans' Affairs, the minister of which is empowered thereunder, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, to make regulations with respect to reciprocal or other arrangements with the government of any country for furnishing similar benefits, services, and supplies to persons who served in the naval, military, or air forces of any such government.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Respectfully,

FRANK T. HINES, *Administrator.*

FURNISHING OF WAGE INFORMATION TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AGENCIES

The bill (S. 184) to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage record information to State unemployment compensation agencies, was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think this is an important bill, of which we ought also to have some explanation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this is rather an important bill, but it has one very simple objective, and all its provisions point up to that one objective. It authorizes the Social Security Board to furnish wage records to State unemployment compensation agencies. It is intended to be for the benefit of the States, because some of them, at least, do not have these records. They can obtain them from the Social Security Board. The Social Security Board is in position to furnish them at a very nominal expense, and the bill provides that they be furnished at a very low or nominal expense, but in no event to exceed the actual cost of the service to the States. That is the sole purpose of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 184) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"FURNISHING OF WAGE RECORD INFORMATION TO STATE AGENCIES

"SEC. 1108. The Board is authorized, upon request of any agency charged with the administration of a State unemployment compensation law and to the extent consistent with the efficient administration of title II, to furnish to such agency, for use by it in the administration of such law, information from or pertaining to wage records, including account numbers, maintained by the Board in accordance with section 205 (c): *Provided*, That such agency agrees to make payment therefor in such amount, if any (not exceeding the cost of furnishing such information), and either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Board. A State agency may make such payment by authorizing deductions from amounts certified by the Board under section 302 (a) for payment to such State. The amount received from, or deducted from the payment to, any State in accordance with this section shall be covered into the respective appropriations, as determined by the Board, from which the expenses of furnishing such information are paid."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee on Senate bill 184 may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 10) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 184) to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage-record information to State unemployment compensation agencies, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Social Security Board to furnish State unemployment commissions with wage data, including account numbers, upon the request of States and upon their agreement to reimburse the Federal Government for the actual cost of this service, either by direct payments or by authorizing deductions from grants for administrative expenses. The Board would be authorized to eliminate the charge in cases where the amount involved is too small, or the administrative inconvenience in determining the cost is too great, to warrant the making of a charge for the service.

Further explanation of the need for, and purposes of, the legislation are set forth in the following letter from the Acting Federal Security Administrator:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, January 4, 1945.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a legislative proposal to authorize the Social Security Board to furnish old-age and survivors insurance wage-record information to State unemployment compensation agencies.

The Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Board has wage-record data for all persons covered under title II of the Social Security Act. The States also maintain records which contain this type of information for all employees covered by the State unemployment-compensation laws. Substantially all of the data in the State records is contained in the Federal records, the employer being required to furnish this information to both the Federal and State Governments.

This procedure is burdensome for the employer and costly for the Federal Government, since State expenses for administering unemployment compensation are paid by the Federal Government.

During the last fiscal year the total expenditure of the 51 State agencies for the collection, processing, and use of State wage records amounted to approximately $3,000,000. The Social Security Board can furnish reproduced wage cards to these agencies for approximately $433,000 annually. While the States would have some continuing static cost with respect to the maintenance and use of wage records, it is estimated that the annual net saving in Federal grants of administrative funds to the State agencies would be between $2,000,000 and $2,500,000. There would be also an incalculable saving to employers from the elimination of the necessity of reporting wages to State agencies.

The principle of State compensation for the use of these Federal records was approved by the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies in October 1944 in the following resolution:

"Whereas there are economies in the processing of reports by an exchange of services between bureaus of the Federal Government and State agencies; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the conference that legislation is favored authorizing State agencies to accept Federal funds for services rendered Federal agencies and Federal agencies to accept reimbursement for services rendered State agencies."

The proposed bill would authorize the Social Security Board to furnish the State unemployment compensation commissions with wage data, including account numbers, upon the request of States and upon their agreement to reimburse the Federal Government for the actual cost of this service, either by direct payments or by authorizing deductions from grants for administrative expenses. The Board would be vested with the discretion to eliminate the charge when the amount involved was too small, or when the administrative inconvenience in determining the cost was too great to warrant the making of a charge for the service.

The proposal is, I believe, particularly timely because many of the State legislatures are expected to consider the enactment of measures this winter to extend employer coverage under the State unemployment compensation laws to employers of one or more, in line with the coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system. If the States give retroactive wage credits to employees of these small employers, such employees will receive much-needed protection against the hazards of unemployment during the reconversion period. However, it would be both costly and impractical to

require small employers to file wage reports for prior quarters. Use of old-age and survivors insurance transcripts in this interim period to determine the benefit rights of such employees would be highly desirable.

The proposal would also have the advantage of permitting the States to destroy old records which they are required to use only on rare occasions, thus saving costs of storage and maintenance. In cases of fire, moreover, such as occurred in the Montana agency, use of the Federal records offers the only adequate and economical solution.

I shall appreciate it if you will be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the proper committee for action.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed bill to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WATSON B. MILLER,
Acting Administrator.

BROADCASTING OF NONCOMMERCIAL CULTURAL OR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The bill (S. 63) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting, after section 329 of such act, a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 330. It shall be unlawful for any person, or any person representing an organization or group, to interfere with, intimidate any person or persons, hinder, extort, delay, prevent, or conspire with other persons for the purpose of hindering, delaying, interfering with, or stopping the production or transmission, by means of any radio station of any noncommercial education or cultural program presented by any academically accredited and tax-exempt educational institution, prepared and planned for presentation by radio or in the process of being transmitted by radio stations, and it shall likewise be unlawful for any person as a part of a group or organization to threaten or intimidate any other person for the purpose of preventing by group action the operation of any broadcasting station while preparing for or in the operation of broadcasting such noncommercial educational or cultural programs, unless such interference, work stoppage, or group action is part of a general action for other purposes and is of general and broader nature or purpose than to prevent or interfere with the broadcasting of such noncommercial educational and cultural programs: *Provided*, That such radio station or stations have agreed to broadcast such programs and that no service, money, or other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid or promised to, or charged or accepted by, such station from any person for broadcasting or agreeing to broadcast such program and no service, money, or other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid or promised to, or charged or accepted by, the persons producing or participating in such program from such station or from any commercial sponsor for services rendered in producing or participating in such program.

"DEFINITION

" 'To conspire,' for the purposes of this section, shall mean to plan with others, to hold meetings for the purpose of planning, to take action as the result of a plan or purpose—such as united stoppage of work at a radio plant, or to write communications urging interference by action or by word of mouth to induce action for the purpose of interference."

PHILIP KLEINMAN

The bill (S. 311) for the relief of Philip Kleinman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Philip Kleinman, of Salem, Oreg., the sum of $495 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him in securing medical and hospital treatment of his physical disabilities attributable to injuries sustained by him, in the course of duty, while he was a member of Company G, Twenty-sixth Infantry, United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

HARRIET B. RICKARDS

The bill (S. 312) for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans Affairs is authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds available for payments of adjusted-service credits and the installments due to dependents of deceased veterans, as provided in the act of May 19, 1924, as amended, the sum of $385.80, to Harriet B. Rickards, of Seattle, Wash., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for the proceeds of seven checks drawn during the fiscal years 1937 and 1938 to the order of Mary Ellen Butler, the deceased mother of the said Harriet B. Rickards, such checks having been for value received, properly endorsed by the said Mary Ellen Butler and her right to the proceeds thereof transferred to the said Harriet B. Rickards prior to the death of said Mary Ellen Butler on August 28, 1939, though not presented for payment prior to such date: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

G. F. ALLEN

The bill (S. 315) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in an amount not to exceed $709.51, for items suspended or disallowed.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of former disbursing clerks of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, for items suspended or disallowed, not to exceed the amounts stated: M. V. Bates, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Lansing, Mich., $33,774.03; Ivan Carrico, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Charleston, W. Va., $8,376.77; W. F. Cramer, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, District of Columbia, $58.62; T. A. Dillon, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Indianapolis, Ind., $127.50; O. Kanngiesser, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Albany, N. Y., $21.47; D. E. Love, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Santa Fe, N. Mex., $93.80; L. S. McCracken, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, San Francisco, Calif., $234.70; S. S. Ogdon, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Jefferson City, Mo., $11.48; J. W. Reynar, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Raleigh, N. C., $300.08; F. R. Shaw, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Jefferson City, Mo., $55.01; L. V. Witcombe, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Harrisburg, Pa., $16,800.75.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and all former disbursing clerks operating under the Division of Disbursement for the amounts of all suspensions and disallowances raised and not covered by sections 1 and 2 of this act, or which may be raised, against the said chief disbursing officer and former disbursing clerks on account of payments made in accordance with vouchers certified by duly authorized certifying officers during the period December 16, 1933, to March 31, 1942: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall certify that in his opinion there is no evidence of fraud on the part of the said chief disbursing officer or disbursing clerks in connection with such payments.

SEC. 4. No charge shall be made against the certifying officer responsible for the certification of vouchers pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order No. 6166, dated June 10, 1933, and any charge heretofore made against any such officer, shall be removed, for the amount of any payment for which credit shall be allowed under sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, where the head of the department or establishment concerned, or his duly authorized representative, shall certify to the Comptroller General of the United States that the payment appears to have been made without fraud on the part of the certifying officer.

SEC. 5. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of W. O. Woods, former Treasurer of the United States, and W. A. Julian, Treasurer of the United States, for sums not to exceed $1,164.93, and $63,334.51, respectively, representing unavailable items in their amounts as former Treasurer and Treasurer of the United States: *Provided*, That any recoveries heretofore or hereafter made in respect of any of the foregoing items, may, in the discretion of the Comptroller General of the United States, be applied to offset unavailable items of a similar character hereafter arising in the accounts of the former Treasurer and Treasurer, respectively, upon a showing that such unavailable items have occurred without fraud on the part of the former Treasurer or Treasurer.

SEC. 6. There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $10,224.08, of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of $30 shall be credited to the account of T. A. Dillon, former Treasury-State disbursing clerk, Indianapolis, Ind., disbursing symbol 45–01–30, to the extent necessary to adjust an overdraft resulting from an overpayment by check No. 6,432,824, dated August 23, 1938; (b) not to exceed the sum of $1,728.46 shall be credited to the Treasurer's account to the extent necessary to adjust unavailable items resulting from certain shortages, the amount of a check paid on a forged endorsement, the difference between the value of a stolen package of currency and the amount recovered, and

the value of three checks which were lost in the Office of the Treasurer of the United States after payment; and (c) not to exceed the sum of $8,465.62 shall be credited to the account of Edwin H. Dressel, superintendent, United States mint, Philadelphia, Pa., to the extent necessary to adjust an unavailable item representing the contents of a bag containing gold coins the absence of which from a vault in the Philadelphia, Pa., Mint, was discovered during February 1937, such coins having a face value of $5,000, and increment of $3,465.62 resulting from the reduction in the weight of the gold dollar.

G. F. ALLEN

The bill (S. 317) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer of the Treasury Department, for the sum of $1,000, base pay, and $48.30, overtime, a total of $1,048.30, paid by him to Dr. Paul S. Taylor, of Berkeley, Calif., as compensation in excess of $5,000, plus overtime, for personal services rendered during the period from July 1, 1943, to June 13, 1944, and to cancel any claims against the said Dr. Paul S. Taylor and the pay-roll certifying officers of the Department of the Interior for the excess compensation so paid.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is further authorized and directed to allow, out of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for salaries in the Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the claim of the said Dr. Paul S. Taylor for the sum of $375, base pay, and $18.11, overtime, a total of $393.11, representing the balance due him for compensation for personal services which he rendered during the period from June 14, 1944, to June 30, 1944, as a consulting economist of the Department of the Interior.

MRS. AMY McKNIGHT

The bill (S. 335) for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Amy McKnight, widow of George McKnight, a former employee of the War Department at Fort Peck, Mont., whose death on February 20, 1936, is alleged to have resulted from pneumonia contracted while in the performance of duty prior to February 12, 1936, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized to receive and consider her claim under the remaining provisions of the said act: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

FURLOUGH OF OFFICERS BY SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The bill (S. 219) to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1442, Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 228), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "and Marine Corps, and any officer of the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating as part of the Navy. This section shall not apply to reserve officers of such organizations," so that said section when amended shall read as follows: "The Secretary of the Navy shall have authority to place on furlough any officer on the active list of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and any officer of the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating as part of the Navy. This section shall not apply to Reserve officers of such organizations."

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The bill (H. R. 621) to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the report to accompany House bill 621.

There being no objection, the report (No. 19) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 621) to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled, "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize a permanent increase in the number of students in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps from 7,200 to 14,000 and to authorize a temporary increase to 24,000 until the expiration of 1 year after the cessation of hostilities in the present war.

The Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps was established by act of Congress approved March 25, 1925, and authorized an enrollment of 2,400 students. Between 1926 and 1940 units were established in 11 universities. An act approved September 11, 1940, changed the limitation from 2,400 to 7,200 students. At the present time 6,500 students are enrolled and units are established at 27 colleges or universities.

The Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps is an economical method of producing Reserve officers and the product is a well-trained naval officer, fully capable of taking his place in the fleet when the need for his services arises.

Departments of naval sciences and tactics are set up in the universities to provide essential naval training throughout a college course of normal length. In peacetime each student devotes approximately 4 hours per week to naval work during his 4 years in college. This is exclusive of outside preparatory time. The students participate in one or more practice cruises during which he receives practical instruction of his winter academic studies.

The curriculum of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps course embodies navigation, ordnance and gunnery, marine engineering and electricity, seamanship, and communications. The students also study naval history, aviation, and military and international law.

Upon graduation all students who have successfully completed the 4-year course in naval science and tactics and are physically qualified are given commissions as ensigns in the Naval Reserve or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps. A limited number are also commissioned in the line and staff of the Regular Navy and the Marine Corps.

The Navy Department informed the committee that graduates of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps have distinguished themselves as officers in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and during the last few years have proved an invaluable addition to the strength of the Naval Reserve in active service.

During the present war, the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps was inadequate to meet the increased needs for naval officers, and the Navy V–12 college training program was adopted. At the present time there are 131 undergraduate colleges in the V–12 program with a total enrollment of approximately 50,000 students. On July 1, 1945, it is expected that there will be not more than a total of 30,000 students and that this number will be reduced considerably thereafter. The committee was informed that no more students will be enrolled in the Navy V–12 program and that it is the intention of the Navy Department to reduce and finally eliminate the V–12 program and consolidate it with the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units. It is believed that the expansion of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps can best be accomplished by converting to this program the best facilities now in use by the V–12 program. This conversion of facilities would proceed progressively as the V–12 program is curtailed. Under this expansion the trainee complements at present Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps colleges would be increased and new Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units established at certain universities and colleges. Those institutions to receive new Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units fall into two classes:

(*a*) Institutions with enrollments sufficiently large so that a peacetime Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps can be supported, and

(*b*) Smaller colleges which have no commitments to the Army for Reserve Officers' Training Corps units and which have been enthusiastic and successful in administering the V–12 program.

If the bill is enacted into law, Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units will be established in approximately 23 additional colleges or universities, making a total of 50.

The committee is of the opinion that it will be necessary to maintain a large Navy in the post-war era, and that the additional officers required, over and above the graduates of the Naval Academy, can best be obtained from graduates of the Naval Resrve Officers' Training Corps.

A similar bill passed the Senate of the Seventy-eighth Congress on December 14, 1944.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

SIGURDUR JONSSON AND THOROLINA THORDARDOTTIR

The bill (S. 314) for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir was considered, ordered to be

engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jon Sigurdsson as attorney in fact for his parents, Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir, of Hafnarfjordur, Iceland, for and on their behalf, the sum of $4,070.85, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son, Thordur Sigurdsson, who was fatally injured when shot by an enlisted soldier in the Army of the United States on November 8, 1941, at Hafnarfjordur, Iceland: *Provided*, That the claimants accept such sum in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "facilities", to insert "including housing for civilian employees," and in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,500,549,500" and insert "$1,500,539,500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report to accompany House bill 626 printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 23) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the word "facilities", insert the following: "including housing for civilian employees,".

Page 2, line 15, strike out the figures "1,500,549,500" and substitute therefor "1,500,539,500."

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the appropriation of $1,500,539,500 for the establishment or development of naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent works as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land.

The bill also provides that the approximate cost indicated for each category required, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but the total cost shall not exceed $1,500,539,500. This flexibility is necessary in order to permit the authorizations herein contained being effectively carried out, thus allowing for changes as the military situation may develop.

The bill as submitted by the Navy Department is divided into 12 categories, each category representing the work under the cognizance of the various bureaus and offices of the Navy Department. The break-down of the bill into these categories is as follows:

Summary by activities

Ship-repair and laying-up facilities	$230,222,000
Fleet-training facilities, amphibious and operational	12,000,000
Aviation facilities	59,416,500
Storage facilities	19,950,000
Marine Corps housing and training	14,190,000
Ordnance facilities	65,500,000
Personnel training and housing facilities	40,022,000
Hospital facilities	28,519,000
Shore radio facilities	3,230,000
Naval Research Laboratory	225,000
Miscellaneous structures and facilities	41,265,000
Advance-base construction, material, and equipment	926,000,000
Total	1,500,539,500

In view of the confidential nature of a considerable number of projects submitted by the Navy Department it is not considered advisable or desirable to publish in this report a confidential break-down of the various individual items making up the total of the bill.

The committee was advised by the representatives of the Navy Department that the items submitted had been thoroughly screened by the field and in the Department and that reductions had been made from the original submissions by the field in the amount of some $340,000,000, representing approximately 40 percent of the total of the bill. The committee was further advised that all of the projects submitted had an important bearing on the prosecution of the war and were considered essential in order that the necessary training, storage, aviation, Marine Corps housing, ordnance, personnel, hospital, radio, and research facilities be provided for the support of the fleet.

A brief description of each of the categories of the projects is as follows:

SHIP-REPAIR AND LAYING-UP FACILITIES, $230,220,000

The projects under the heading fall into the following classes:

(a) Expansion of west coast naval repair facilities to handle the work expected to develop out of the war in the Pacific.

(b) Improvement of existing naval facilities to permit their most effective use for the work of ship repair. This includes the conversion of existing shipbuilding facilities.

(c) Accommodation of vessels of the Reserve Fleet.

These projects are required to develop the repair facilities commensurate to the magnitude of the program as visualized for the fiscal year 1946 and includes the rearrangement and conversion of the various yards and stations to increase the repair output and to provide those additional facilities found necessary in the present operations of the yards. There is included under this heading an item of $99,850,000 to provide berthing and maintenance facilities for inactive ships. These consist of piers, wharves, services, shop facilities, and limited custodial housing for ships placed in inactive status so that they can be properly maintained for instant recommissioning.

FLEET TRAINING FACILITIES, AMPHIBIOUS AND OPERATIONAL, $12,000,000

The projects provided under this heading are based not upon an expansion of the training facilities but upon expected changes to be made in the methods of training brought about by the development of new weapons and the changing technique of combat. The successes of our Navy over the Japanese have been due largely to our better developed weapons and our superior training in the use of these weapons. It is considered essential that all personnel entering the combat area have the best and most up-to-date training that it is possible to provide.

AVIATION FACILITIES, $59,416,500

During the current fiscal year and in previous years it has been necessary to forego the construction of many important facilities, because of limitations of material and labor markets. Projects in the present bill will round out the stations with facilities necessary for increased efficiency of operation, but which it has not previously been possible to provide. Some of the facilities now required are needed to replace construction accomplished under pressure during the early days of the war from materials that have not withstood the test of time. The changes, in the character of warfare, including jet propulsion, rocket projectiles, and greater emphasis on flight fighting and air support of ground troops, require additional facilities for both operational and base training. Lessons learned from combat experience require constant change in technique. Such changes are rapidly reflected in short facility requirements and the program submitted by the Navy Department is based on the fulfillment of these requirements.

The House Committee on Naval Affairs reduced the authorization for aviation facilities from $74,500,000 to $59,416,500, a reduction of $15,083,500. This amount was intended for the construction of a naval air field at or near Annapolis, Md., for the training of midshipmen. Several members of the House Naval Affairs Committee were of the opinion that this project required further study before they could give their approval.

STORAGE FACILITIES, $19,950,000

The projects submitted under this heading are those considered by the Department to be absolutely necessary to take care of storage and warehousing of supplies and equipment which must be kept in stock and readily available for shipment to various units of the fleet and shore establishments as the needs arise. It is essential that adequate storage facilities be provided, so that no lack of material and supplies will exist at times when they are critically needed. The provision of storage facilities is a constantly changing problem and continuous supervision is maintained to make the most efficient use of existing facilities as well as to anticipate future requirements.

MARINE CORPS HOUSING AND TRAINING, $14,190,000

The construction projects under this heading during 1946 are necessary to provide the essential training and housing facilities to keep the Marine Corps in the best possible fighting trim and to develop a unit ready in all respects to meet the enemy. The items submitted have been examined thoroughly by the Commandant of the Marine Corps and have been sent to the committee as being essential for training activities of the Marine Corps for the coming fiscal year.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES, $65,500,000

The items presented to the committee under this heading fall into four general groups; namely, research, production, storage, and handling, personnel. The scope of these groups may be summarized as follows:

(a) The need for additional facilities or completing new facilities for the development of new and novel ordnance and improvement of existing ordnance designs.

(b) The need of increase in production facilities for new types of ordnance and the need for alteration of production facilities to improve safety.

(c) The need of increase in storage facilities to keep the material reserve for the maintenance and replacement of naval ordnance in service, including battle damage replacements, and the ammunition for the increase both in number and type of weapons and to

provide an enlarged supply line to keep an adequate flow of this material. This category likewise includes such items as improvements in rail facilities, transfer depots, and the like.

(d) The need to increase personnel housing and recreational facilities in isolated areas and to obtain facilities enabling replacement of personnel by mechanized equipment in the face of dwindling civilian manpower and because of heavier production and distribution demands.

Each item included in this category has been thoroughly screened by the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance before submission in this bill. The Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance has stated to us that each item in the bill is considered essential for the effective and efficient prosecution of the war. Some of the items presented—for example, ammunition storage—were couched in general terms because the Bureau of Ordnance, while foreseeing the need for storage in the capacity set forth, cannot at this time determine precisely where the storage should be constructed nor the exact type of buildings which would be required. Nevertheless, the experience of the Bureau indicates definitely that the funds requested are necessary to meet the present program.

PERSONNEL TRAINING AND HOUSING FACILITIES, $40,022,000

The items included in this category have been determined by the Bureau of Personnel to be essential and are as modest as possible to carry out its mission of housing and training of the officers and men of the Navy. The items submitted are those necessary to round out existing installations and to provide minimum requirements for rehabilation and retraining of personnel returning from combat and for housing of families of naval personnel. The maintenance of morale among persons serving in naval forces is dependent upon the provision of housing for families in localities where such accommodations do not exist. This need is especially acute on the west coast. The rehabilitation of personnel suffering from malaria, filariasis, and battle fatigue is an important project and vital if such personnel is to be returned to normal usefulness either in military or civilian life. The authorization requested is a minimum one but essential to the preservation of morale.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES, $28,519,000

The estimates submitted by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery for inclusion in this bill embrace major repairs to the existing naval hospital plant, the provision of additional facilities in connection with the rehabilitation program for patients and the acquisition of an additional 10,000 beds to provide a total of 90,000 beds in the continental Navy hospitals at the end of the fiscal year 1946.

SHORE RADIO FACILITIES, $3,230,000

The projects included under this category contemplate a continuation of the program started last year and the items submitted are toward this end. The items include facilities for precision frequency measurement and control of naval shore transmitters, for aeronautical communications and safety devices involving electronic applications, and for preparation, storage, and shipment of communication publications. Other projects, though important, have had to be held up for lack of engineering talent to process them. These projects are included in the requested estimates and are designed to develop the shore communication services to a high point of efficiency.

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, $225,000

The items submitted under this heading are to provide housing for scientists and other technical personnel in the Naval Research Laboratory now located on the Chesapeake Bay, where suitable housing does not exist and where it is essential that adequate housing be provided to properly house the high-grade technical and scientific men now engaged in technical research.

MISCELLANEOUS STRUCTURES AND FACILITIES, $41,265,000

The items submitted under this heading are those essential to the upkeep and maintenance of the shore establishment, including power, sewer, water, fire protection, communication, and other miscellaneous facilities not covered specifically in other categories and which are essential to the satisfactory operation of the naval shore establishment. These projects vary greatly in magnitude and are required to meet changing conditions and to provide for unforeseen failure in services wherever they may occur.

ADVANCE-BASE CONSTRUCTION, MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT, $986,000,000

These funds are required to provide the necessary material and equipment for overseas construction where the combat areas may exist or be extended.

Vice Admiral Horne appeared before the committee and stated that the Navy Department felt this sum was the minimum needed to permit it to successfully prosecute the war.

Since July 1, 1940, the Congress has authorized appropriations to the Navy for naval public works projects totaling $7,143,847,361.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

GRANT TO CANTON, OHIO, OF LAND WITHIN UNITED STATES NAVAL ORDNANCE PLANT

The bill (S. 213) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States Naval Ordnance Plant at Canton, Ohio, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for use as a public highway, under such conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip of land containing approximately one and forty-four one-hundredths acres, 25 feet in width off the north side of the northwest quarter, section 18, township 10, range 8, Canton, Stark County, Ohio, and extending from Raff Road, southwest, west to the township line between Canton and Perry Townships.

SEC. 2. That if any part of the above-described lands hereby granted to the city of Canton shall be used for any other purpose or purposes, or shall cease to be maintained by the city of Canton for the purpose for which granted, such part shall revert to the United States.

GRANT OF EASEMENT TO OAHU RAILWAY & LAND CO.

The bill (S. 216) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in and over a 40-foot strip of land at Pearl Harbor Navy Yard in Halawa, Ewa, Aahu, T. of H., containing approximately $2^{278}/_{1000}$ acres, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department, in consideration of that company's waiving and relinquishing any and all claim to compensation for the taking by the United States of the company's right-of-way easement over and across approximately $2^{577}/_{1000}$ acres of land described in condemnation proceedings pending in the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii entitled "United States of America, petitioner, against Certain Lands at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, and Oahu Railway and Land Co., a corporation, defendant," being civil No. 403.

EXCHANGE OF LAND AT EASTPORT, MAINE, AND CONVEYANCE OF ROADWAY EASEMENT

The bill (S. 217) to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer, under such conditions as may be approved by the said Secretary, to the city of Eastport, Maine, without cost to the city of Eastport, Maine, all right, title, and interest in and to the following parcels of land situated on Moose Island, Washington County, Maine, metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the War Department:

Parcel 1: A parcel of land containing eight and ninety-four one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying south of the southerly shore line of Carrying Place Cove, being that parcel of land formerly owned by Andrew J. Malloy and being bounded on the south by the northerly right-of-way line of Deep Cove or Barrett Road, on the east by a parcel of land formerly owned by Mrs. E. B. Townsend and on the west by a parcel of land formerly owned by David C. MacNichol.

Parcel 2: A parcel of land containing nine and eighty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying south of the southerly shore line of Carrying Place Cove, being that parcel of land formerly owned by Mrs. E. B. Townsend and being bounded on the south by the northerly right-of-way line of Deep Cove or Barrett Road, on the east by the westerly right-of-way line of said road, and on the west by the easterly line of a parcel of land formerly owned by Andrew J. Malloy.

Parcel 3: A parcel of land containing nine and fifty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying between the southwesterly right-of-way line of the Maine Central Railroad Co. and Maine State Highway Numbered 190, being bounded on the northeast by said right-of-way line and on the northwest by two parcels of land now or formerly owned by C. H. Bishop and W. J. Murphy, respectively.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War, in consideration of the transfer hereinabove authorized, is further authorized, on behalf of the United States, to accept from the city of Eastport, Maine, without cost to the United States, all right, title, and interest of the city in and to the following-described parcels of land situated on Moose Island, Washington County, State of Maine, metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the War Department.

Parcel 1: A parcel of land containing five acres, more or less, adjacent to the northerly shore line of Carrying Place Cove, being bounded on the east by a tract of land now or formerly owned by R. C. Emery and on the west by a tract of land now or formerly owned by Melinda Taylor.

Parcel 2: A parcel of land containing fifteen and twenty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying west of the westerly right-of-way line of the Maine Central Railroad Company and east and south of a large parcel of land now owned by the United States of America.

Parcel 3: A parcel of land containing four acres, more or less, lying between the easterly right-of-way line of the Maine Central Railroad Company and the westerly right-of-way line of Indian or Carlow Island Road.

Parcel 4: A parcel of land containing nine and five-tenths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying easterly of that parcel of land described in section 3 hereof as parcel 1, being bounded on the north by the southerly shore line of Passamaquoddy Bay, on the west by a parcel of land belonging to the United States of America, and on the southwest by the northeasterly right-of-way line of Indian or Carlow Island Road.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is further authorized to transfer, under such conditions as may be approved by the said Secretary, to the city of Eastport, Maine, without cost to the city, a permanent easement for roadway purposes, in, over, and across the following-described parcel of land situated on Moose Island, Washington County, Maine, a metes and bounds description of which is on file in the War Department:

Parcel 1: A parcel of land containing twelve and eighty-three one-hundredths acres, more or less, lying in the northwesternmost corner of Moose Island, and being formerly owned by heirs of Anderson.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. WHITE subsequently said: Mr. President, I have broken my glasses, and for the time being I am deprived of sufficient sight to read a bill dealing with an exchange of land in Maine.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will gladly loan the Senator my glasses, though his eyes are younger than mine.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator, but I cannot compete with the Senator in respect to the matter of good eyesight.

On page 4 of the calendar, Order No. 24, there is a Senate bill authorizing, apparently, the transfer of land from the city of Gulfport, Maine, to the United States. There is no city of Gulfport in Maine. The city in question in Eastport, Maine. May I be advised with respect to that matter?

Mr. BREWSTER. I will advise the Senator that the bill provides for the transfer of lands to the city of Eastport, Maine.

Mr. WHITE. And is the city of Eastport named in the body of the bill?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, in both the bill and the report on the bill the name Eastport, Maine, is used.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from Maine that the clerk advises the Chair that the bill refers to "Eastport," and not "Gulfport." The bill has been passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS AND ORDERS FROM BRAZIL

The bill (S. 221) to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson are hereby authorized to accept from the Government of the United States of Brazil such decorations, orders, medals, and emblems as have been or may be tendered them, hereby expressly granting the consent of Congress required for this purpose by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution.

LEASE BY NAVY OF CERTAIN LANDS IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIF.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 218) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after "one-thousandths", to strike out "(0.258)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to lease for a period not to exceed 25 years, upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, to the Southern California Telephone Co., a corporation, organized under the laws of the State of California, a parcel of land situated in section 32, township 9 south, range 6 west, San Bernardino base and meridian, consisting of two hundred and fifty-eight one-thousands of an acre, more or less, comprising a part of the United States Marine Corps training area, Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, San Diego County, Calif., and a parcel of land situated in Pueblo lot 1311 of the Pueblo Lands of San Diego County, Calif., consisting of an acre, more or less, comprising a part of the United States Marine Corps rifle range, Camp Matthews, in said county and State, the metes and bounds descriptions of which said lands are on file in the Navy Department, for the construction, maintenance, and operation of repeater station facilities: *Provided*, That when the lands shall cease to be used for said purposes, the lease shall be automatically terminated and the lands shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby authorized to execute on behalf of the United States all instruments necessary to accomplish the aforesaid purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the calendar.

INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF EXEMPTION FROM S. E. C. REGULATIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not like to be impatient with Senate committees, but ever since last August the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has had before it a very simple proposal contained in a bill which I introduced at that time, to increase from $100,000 to $300,000 the exemption from S. E. C. regulations for the registration and control of the issuance of securities. The measure has the approval of the S. E. C. It is greatly in the interest of small business which finds it difficult to comply with all the requirements of the S. E. C. in respect to the financing affecting it. There seems to be no reason in the world why the bill should not be passed, yet ever since last August it has been reposing in the pigeon holes of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have twice written the distinguished charman of the committee asking that he give some attention to the bill. I simply wish to assert that I am pretty nearly through waiting, and I give notice that unless there can be some sort of action within a reasonable time, I shall offer the bill as an amendment to some other pending measure in the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection I will say to the Senator that the bill to which he refers was introduced last August and was not acted on in the last session because for a good portion of the time thereafter the Senate was not in session. It has been impossible for me, for various reasons, to attend very many of the sessions of the committee since the Senate convened in January. I will take the matter up with the chairman as soon as possible and see if some action cannot be obtained.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. There is no reason in the world why there should be any controversy over the measure, but I am sure the able Senator from Kentucky will sympathize with me in my impatience over the long and, as I believe, unreasonable delay.

Mr. BARKLEY. I can sympathize with and appreciate any Senator's impatience, because I am afflicted in the same way myself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am glad to have the sympathy of the Senator from Kentucky.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the business of the day having been concluded, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1945:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Raymond M. Stone, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from December 16, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL IN THE NAVY, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO RANK FROM APRIL 11, 1943

Vincent R. Murphy

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

George O. Jaquith, June 14, 1943.
Philip H. VonFraenkel, June 22, 1943.
Adrian R. M. Sears, July 10, 1943.

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS, WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

Evert R. Sharp, March 19, 1941.
David P. Andross, March 19, 1941.
John W. Simcock, June 19, 1941.
Edward D. Williams, September 24, 1941.
Daniel L. Martin, May 4, 1942.
William J. Whitehead, June 29, 1942.
Dan G. Frank, June 29, 1942.
Hubert P. Mills, June 29, 1942.
Charles D. Moody, July 23, 1942.
James M. McCracken, Jr., August 25, 1942.
John D. Miller, August 31, 1942.
Robert J. McDairmant, October 12, 1942.

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTER, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM JULY 1, 1940

Charles H. Kretz, Jr.

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS, WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

Charles M. Quinn, Jr., February 7, 1941.
Solon G. Hale, June 19, 1942.

TO BE ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 1, 1944

James V. Bartlett.

TO BE ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS, WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

Waldron M. McLellon, February 7, 1941.
Thomas P. Cocke, February 7, 1941.
Robert E. Thomas, Jr., February 7, 1941.

TO BE ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS, WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM DATE INDICATED

Wallace B. Chesterfield, March 31, 1941.
Edward J. Nemecek, February 1, 1942.
Milton Hausman, March 16, 1942.
Edwin A. Glasson, June 1, 1942.
Edwin J. Madden, June 8, 1942.
Earl V. Harrington, August 23, 1943.
William M. Marking, December 6, 1943.
Harold N. Klaser, December 20, 1943.
Frank W. Taylor, January 10, 1944.
Paul H. Wells, Jr., January 10, 1944.
Jack F. Flood, January 17, 1944.
Traver R. Hamilton, July 20, 1944.
James B. Lepley, February 2, 1944.
Ray E. Stevens, Jr., March 20, 1944.
John W. Hazlet, May 1, 1944.
Arthur B. Chevalier, May 15, 1944.
Arthur E. Gustavson, May 15, 1944.
Robert L. Holle, May 24, 1944.
Dennis H. R. Frutiger, June 1, 1944.
Wilbur O. Martin, August 6, 1944.
Don L. Maxfield, August 7, 1944.
Howard C. Hester, August 21, 1944.
Cozier W. Gilman, Jr., September 25, 1944.
Hugh A. Phares, Jr., September 25, 1944.
Edgar H. Lechner, September 26, 1944.
Richard K. Thompson, Jr., September 30, 1944.
William F. Cahill, October 31, 1944.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAINS, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

John H. Reeder	Lars A. Sande
Roland M. Sykes	Ludwig Ehlers
Charles H. Bartlett	Viktor Svensson
Ashley H. Calder	Thomas F. Sullivan
Theodore A. Bratz	William U. Fulcher
Elmer M. Chandler	Floyd D. Overhauser
John Donnelly	Edward J. Williams
Robert Chivas	John M. Joseph
William M. Prentiss	Charles Ehmann
Ora Doyle	Leonard M. Cannon
Walter A. DeVine	Ragnar Andersen
Alexander C. Cornell	Neils C. M. Johnson
Roy Stockman	Hans A. Jensen
Elroy B. Dunphy	George M. Walker
Marion M. Mitchell	Elmer J. Uebel
Thomas A. Cosgrove	Frank Bronski
Michael J. Seibert	George H. Lybrand
Charles W. Radke	Arthur I. Roberts
Almer T. Hovland	Ray Thorp
William E. Long	William J. Dongian
Joel A. Osterberg	Thomas J. Lusk
Norman D. MacLellan	Sheldon A. Russell
Olaf L. Laveson	

TO BE CHIEF GUNNERS, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

Louis E. Rattan	Leonard T. Toner
Robert L. Addy	Winfield S. Nevins

TO BE CHIEF ELECTRICIAN, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

Rolla W. Sicafoose

TO BE CHIEF MACHINISTS, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

Wilmer R. Bomberger, Jr.	Ralph J. Davidson
	Francis E. Harris
Chester M. Galutia	Harry J. Reynolds
Harry V. Winebar	

TO BE CHIEF CARPENTER, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

George A. Merritt

TO BE CHIEF PAY CLERKS, TO RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1942

John R. Harris	John C. Collins
Richard Hewitt	Linnie Thompson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We have heard with our ears, O God, and our fathers have told us what Thou hast done in their times of old; may grace be given us to follow in their train. Unto Thee will we pay our vows, for in Thee do we put our trust; may we never be put to confusion. Mercifully grant that in Thy wisdom our influence may be against selfishness and hold our Republic on the foundations of freedom and justice for all.

As we approach Thy footstool, Heavenly Father, we pray Thee, give comfort to the poor and the distressed in those storm-swept sections of our land; be with those who are bereft by accident or in need and let the Master's rule of life prevail in human hearts and homes. Deepen our concern for the countless unfortunates and for those who wear the chafing yoke of hard service. Be most gracious unto those men who live and die for freedom with love for home in their hearts. Guard our President with Thy providence and endue him with wisdom and understanding as he meets issues pertaining to human destiny. O fill all hearts with praise and gratitude, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Social Hygiene Society of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON asked and received permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and received permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks made by me yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a manuscript entitled "America, Italy, and the Atlantic Charter." The Government Printer informs me that the cost thereof will be $121.40. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida [Mr. SIKES] had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that that may be canceled and that he may be permitted to speak for the same time on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting an address before the Court of Common Pleas on the naturalization of citizens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a presentment by the Federal grand jury in the southern district of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Brigadier General Bliss, of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a copy of a telegram relating to Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE MAY BILL

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House today, as I see it, is How can we best uphold the hands of our military leaders and back up our boys in the front lines? Will the passage of the May bill help to do those things? Will the passage of the May bill tend to increase or tend to decrease production? Practically every responsible labor leader in the Nation says the enactment of the May bill will tend to slow down production. Practically every responsible manufacturer says the same thing. They are the men who have performed miracles of production during the past 3 years. We have been lauding the results they have brought about. Do they know their stuff? Should we listen to them?

We are told that a vote against the May bill is a vote of lack of confidence in our leaders, General Marshall and Admiral King. I do not agree with that statement. I believe a vote for the May bill is a vote of lack of confidence in American industry, covering both labor and management. This is a question of production we are dealing with, not a question of military strategy. It is a question of production strategy, if you want to call it that, and our production leaders should know most about that.

In my maiden speech in this House 8 years ago I called John L. Lewis a labor racketeer, the greatest labor racketeer we had in the Nation. At that time he was organizing his C. I. O., dividing the ranks of labor into two hostile camps. A little later in another speech on the floor I compared John L. Lewis with Sam Gompers, the "grand old man of labor." In that speech I eulogized Gompers and criticized Lewis. I urged Lewis to go to the fountainhead of the trade-union movement and get a new baptism of the real religion of labor as preached and exemplified by Gompers. The policy of John L. Lewis was always a policy of "rule or ruin," while Gompers' policy is summed up in the following words taken from one of his speeches:

> One fact stands out in bold relief in the history of mankind's attempts for betterment. That is that when compulsion is used, only resentment is aroused, and the end is not gained. Only through moral suasion and appeal to man's reason can a movement succeed.

Perhaps Members of Congress can learn something from the words of Sam Gompers, "when compulsion is used, resentment is aroused, and the end is not gained." I shall vote against the May bill, because I do not think its passage will tend to stimulate production, and I shall vote for the Harness substitute because I think its passage will tend to increase production.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HARNESS AMENDMENT TO THE MAY BILL

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Association, representing a million two hundred fifty thousand men, has issued the following statement in support of the Harness amendment to the May bill presently under consideration by the Committee of the Whole, which is as follows:

> We support H. R. 1803 as a substitute for the May bill and still maintain that there has been no evidence introduced justifying compulsion. We still believe that voluntary procedure and with a close check of the hoarding of men in industries, will solve the problem and by doing it that way it will maintain the morale, loyalty, and patriotism, whereas the other will be destructive of all three.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Chapman	Judd	Powers
Cole, Kans.	Kearney	Sabath
Cravens	Kefauver	Satterfield
Dawson	LaFollette	Sheridan
Dirksen	Larcade	Sumner, Ill.
Eaton	Lewis	White
Fernandez	Murdock	Winter
Gwynne, Iowa	Norrell	
Heidinger	O'Brien, Mich.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 401 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1752, with Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if I believed H. R. 1752, known as the committee or May bill, or any substitute bill offered as amendment thereto which contains force or compulsory provisions, would save one life, produce one more tank, gun, or shell, or shorten this cruel war by 1 day, it would have my support and vote. Because I do believe that it will not increase production but, on the contrary, will retard production and injure our war effort, I shall vote against it.

A little more than a year ago we were informed by some of the highest ranking officers, military and civil, in our Government that every schedule for the production of the implements of war had been fully met, with one exception. The miracles had been accomplished. One, the speed by which the Nation changed from peace to war production. Second, the amount of war material provided. Industry and labor wrote a new chapter in production to carry on war never before equaled in the history of the world.

It amazed ourselves and baffled our enemies. It had been achieved by the voluntary and patriotic response of the Nation. Compulsion or force was absent. Loyalty and devotion to country and home spring from the human breast. They are born of the spirit. They can neither be legislated nor created by force of law. The best national service act we have ever had or can have—and I hope always will have—is the determination of a free people to remain free.

The proposed legislation before us would place chains on free hands. It would discourage millions of our workers who are nobly doing their part and destroy those values of the human soul which shape the destiny of the Nation.

This is a war between freedom and slavery. To place shackles on all our people, whether engaged in or out of defense work, is to establish here what our armed forces are fighting to destroy abroad. The record of production thus far exhibits to an astonished world, that the torch of freedom and self-government is still burning fiercely within the American people. Nothing will ever destroy that precious jewel as long as we live as a free people.

The bill before us intimates lack of production and manpower shortage. If production lagged, it has been occasioned by an overoptimistic view of our own military strategists on the termination of the war.

The allegation of manpower shortage is emphatically denied by both labor and management. A recent visit by a Senate committee to the Norfolk Navy Yard and its findings show conclusively that in a Government-established war-production plant there was no manpower shortage. It did find manpower wastage, and their report was nauseating, to say the least, to every loyal American.

I believe a better coordination of our Government agencies charged with the responsibility of war production with the industrial and labor forces will provide the answer for increased production. Involuntary servitude must not be injected into our scheme of life.

From labor and management in my district has come the most forceful denial of manpower shortage. Industry, in response to my inquiry of sometime ago, is against the legislation now under consideration, and both assert there is no necessity for it. From the Pontiac (Mich.) Manufacturers Association I received the following reply:

> Answering your question in regard to manpower shortage, we do not think that a national service act would be the American way of working ourselves out of the difficulties.

Pontiac and Detroit, Mich., are large industrial and production centers.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I believe the interests of our country and our courageous and heroic fighting men and women will be best served by voting against the bill before us and all amendments which involve force or compulsion.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side, 5 minutes, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the brief time allotted to the consideration of the Harness-Barrett substitute, I prefer not to yield. In summarizing the arguments for those who are supporting the Harness substitute, which is actually the Barrett bill, H. R. 1803, I want to briefly tell you what the substitute does and then present to you, with your indulgence, the arguments in behalf of the substitute, which I think are effective arguments against the May bill.

First. The substitute for the first time gives us a complete and adequate occupational classification of our manpower between 18 and 45 by the local draft boards.

Second. For the first time we will call on those whose services are unnecessary in other essential industries to volunteer for work in critical plants.

Third. It empowers the War Manpower Commission to establish manpower ceilings so that nonessential industries cannot overstaff their force.

Fourth. It requires intensive investigation and in-plant surveys of hoarding and wastage of labor in cost-plus-fixed-fee plants. It requires management and labor to cooperate in such investigation and in the selection of employees to be released for work in critical plants. It gives the power of subpena to the local boards and authorizes the War Manpower Commission to release selected surplus skilled employees.

It has been said on this floor that it is absolutely necessary to pass a bill. I do not agree with that attitude toward legislation. "A good bill or a bad bill, pass a bill," we are told. "We hope it is good, but good or bad, for the effect it will have on the armed services, pass a bill." The May bill has been referred to throughout the press as a work-or-fight bill. Is it? It is a work-or-jail bill. The men it attempts to reach are the men who have been rejected by the armed forces as unfit to fight and so we are going to not draft them and put them in the armed forces—they do not want them; instead, we are going to draft them and put them into war plants or put them in jail.

The benefits extended in the May bill to these new draftees for labor put a premium on the little bit of "slackerism" that has been found in the United States; and, thank God, there is very little, but whatever small amount of "slackerism" there may be it will now be paid by the Government a premium.

Compulsory labor is not effective labor; industry and management agree wholeheartedly on that. I believe we all agree, proponents and opponents of the May bill, proponents and opponents of the Harness substitute, that hoarding in many plants throughout the country is prevalent. The Barrett-Harness substitute eliminates hoarding and effectively enlists labor for war work. The May bill may well accentuate hoarding because it drafts additional labor without doing anything effective to stop labor hoarding.

For the many who profess their devotion to the cause of free organized labor this is a test vote—do not forget it.

For those who profess and proclaim their devotion to the cause of free and independent small business, this is a test—do not forget it.

For those who profess their devotion to the traditional system of American free competitive enterprise, this is a test—do not forget it.

For those who profess their determination to protect at home the free institutions which our fighting men are fighting for, this is a test—do not forget it.

To those who have proclaimed the need of over-all conscription or a National Service Act—I say to you that the May bill is a mockery—why should we draft a part of labor without drafting all of labor; why should we draft labor at all without drafting management and capital?

What wise words were spoken in 1940 when a prominent labor leader said to labor that if you draft Roosevelt for a third term he will draft you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is agreed by all that this is one of the most difficult and complicated problems we have had to face. Your committee found it to be so when we considered it for approximately 3 weeks. In my opinion the debate here has emphasized the fact that it is a very highly complicated and involved problem. I do believe that the debate here on this measure has been one of the best we have experienced within the last few years. In view of the complicated nature of the bill I find it hard to believe that members of the committee will vote for a substitute, write legislation on the floor, which has not been considered by a committee, which has not been given consideration by those who have been in contact with the problem and know what is involved in this highly technical and controversial measure.

I call your attention to the fact that the Barrett bill, which is now before us as the Harness substitute, was offered in the House on Monday of this week, January 29. Is it possible that the House is going to adopt in toto a provision which was introduced after consideration of this bill had been authorized? I cannot believe it will be adopted without consideration or any deliberation or any consultation by those who are interested in solving a very difficult question affecting the war.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. With reference to legislation affecting the manpower of the Nation, I want to say that anything that stops short of outlawing the closed shop and strikes against the Government fails to do complete justice to the people fighting this war, but certainly, in view of what Admiral King and General Marshall have said and what we know as to the stress of the moment, it is inconceivable that this committee would substitute for the pending measure which carries such a limited amount of force, such a meaningless amendment, which is nothing more nor less than a refuge for people with tender feet.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, it is quite significant that this substitute has been offered and is supported by those who have consistently opposed all legislation on this subject. It is also quite significant that those organizations and individuals who have opposed all legislation are now flooding you with telegrams to substitute the Harness amendment for the bill which the committee has reported to you. I think there is high justification for the remarks that our Speaker made yesterday that the Harness substitute constitutes nothing more than a pious appeal to people who have been appealed to on many occasions.

It has been said that many thousands of people have gone back into industry during the month of January. That is also highly significant because on the 6th day of January the manpower proposal was filed in this House and when it became known throughout the country that we did propose to utilize our manpower, people have voluntarily gone into industry.

Under the May bill two opportunities for volunteering are provided with compulsion for those few recalcitrants who refuse to abide by what is to the best interest of the Nation. They may be forced into industry. You will continue that voluntary shift from nonessential to essential occupations only if the May bill is adopted. To defeat this measure or to bring out another pious appeal will put a stop to the volunteering which is going on now, the result of the pendency of this legislation, and that will be continued unless this bill is adopted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us the real necessity for this kind of legislation. Is it because we are short of matériel for the armed forces? Is it because we are short of manpower to produce that matériel?

Mr. KILDAY. Let me answer the first question.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Let me call attention to one other thing. The gentleman was on the western front a few weeks ago when he heard these soldiers ask for different kinds of equipment. I hold in my hand a Surplus Reporter magazine from the Treasury Department which shows 184,000 gasoline cans that they say they are short.

Mr. KILDAY. I decline to yield further. I think one of the greatest blows to democracy and our ability to function in time of war was displayed on the floor the other day when the gentleman from Alabama was forced to make known on the floor of the House, and for public consumption, the exact stock piles that we have on hand of critical materials. I wonder how much effort our military intelligence would have had to put forth to get the same information as to the German supplies. I wonder how many lives of American boys would have been sacrificed in securing that information, yet to overcome such statements as the gentleman has just made on the floor it became necessary for that secret and confidential information to be disclosed.

Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made here that this has been requested by the President of the United States, General Marshall, and Judge Patterson but that they know nothing with reference to production. They formulated the production program, they placed and distributed the orders and have been responsible for the tremendous production efforts. True, because they were properly placed and properly distributed, and they did know what was involved in the production effort. We are handling quite an unpleasant task, true. Oh, I remember back in August 1941, we had a very difficult and unpleasant task when we were considering the lengthening of the term of service under the Selective Service Act. I compliment the gentleman from Indiana on the energy he expended in preparing his speech and marshaling his facts, but he could have saved that energy by reading the report in which he joined. In that report opposing extension of the term of service of men inducted he said:

> The President in his message of July 21, 1941, to the Congress on this subject declared "that the danger today (to our national safety) is infinitely greater" than it was a year ago. Gen. George C. Marshall in his testimony before our Committee on Military Affairs likewise states "that a national emergency now exists." However, neither the President nor the Chief of Staff would elaborate upon this broad general statement. No specific evidence and no definite data were offered to substantiate their contention. When pressed to give reasons for his blanket and dogmatic statement General Marshall said "unfortunately, it is not in the public interest to make a public statement of all we know."

And again:

> With all deference to both the President and the Chief of Staff, it is our opinion that the crisis today is not as grave as it was 1 year ago or when the selectees were first inducted into the military service.

That was 4 months and 6 days before the attack on Pearl Harbor, and with exactly the same language now used in opposition to this bill. The argument would seem to be here now that we should accept General Marshall's evaluation of the strategic problem, but that he knows nothing about production. In August 1941 they refused to follow the recommendation of General Marshall on the matter of strategy. It was as appealing an argument that was made then as is made here now. It was so appealing, in fact, that we were able to lengthen that service by only one solitary vote in this House. At that time our national security hung in the balance, just as General Marshall and the President have stated in connection with this bill.

If you are interested in promoting the war effort, if you are interested in getting the ammunition to the front, I hope you will vote down the Harness substitute and adopt the bill reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana) there were—ayes 125, noes 154.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HARNESS of Indiana and Mr. MAY.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 177, noes 187.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Strike out all after the enacting clause of H. R. 1752 and insert the following:

"That (a) the Congress hereby declares as among the purposes of this act (1) to permit the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, an dof the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers; (2) to reduce wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration; (3) to channel available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort; (4) to make available, for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort; and (5) to promote the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

"(b) The Congress further declares that the effective mobilization and allocation of our available manpower necessitates cooperative action by all Federal departments and agencies responsible for production, procurement, and manpower in determining the relative urgency to the war effort of various products and services and in establishing and maintaining a proper balance between the war production in any given area and the manpower available to that area.

"(c) The Congress further declares that there is no intention by this act to modify existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay, or collective bargaining or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any labor controversies or questions.

"(d) The Congress hereby directs that to the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and Government agencies.

"SEC. 2. The hiring, rehiring, and solicitation for the purpose of hiring or rehiring, of individuals by employers, and the acceptance of employment by workers, shall be conducted in accordance with the following subsections of this section:

"(a) An individual who at any time during the preceding 60-day period (or such longer or different periods as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall prescribe) was engaged in an essential or locally needed activity may be hired only if, (1) such individual is hired for work in an essential or locally needed activity or for work to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission, and (2) such individual presents a statement of availability from his last employment in an essential or locally needed activity or is referred by the War Manpower Commission or is hired with its consent as provided herein.

"(b) An individual shall receive a statement of availability from employment in an essential or locally needed activity if, (1) he

has been discharged or his employment has been otherwise terminated by his employer; or (2) he has been laid off for an indefinite period or for a period of 7 or more days; or (3) continuance of his employment would involve undue personal hardship; or (4) such employment is at a wage or salary or under working conditions below standards established by State or Federal law or regulation; or (5) such employment is at a wage or salary established or approved by the National War Labor Board (or other agency authorized to adjust wages or approve adjustments thereof) as warranting adjustment or consideration for adjustment, and the employer has failed to adjust the wage in accordance with such level or to apply to the appropriate agency for such adjustment or approval thereof; or (6) such employment is with an employer who the War Manpower Commission finds, after notice and opportunity to appeal, has not complied with this act or with any regulation or order thereunder, and who is continuing his noncompliance after such finding. Statements of availability shall be issued promptly to individuals entitled thereto on such forms and in accordance with such procedures as the Chairman may by regulation prescribe.

"(c) If an individual is employed at less than full time or at a job which does not utilize his highest recognized skill for which there is a need in the war effort, the War Manpower Commission shall upon proper application refer him to other available employment in which it finds that the individual will be more fully utilized in the war effort.

"(d) To the extent necessary to provide manpower in the numbers and kinds needed for war production and essential civilian services in situations of manpower shortages, the Chairman may by regulation (1) provide that any or all categories of individuals in any or all areas, activities, or occupations may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission or in accordance with arrangements approved by the War Manpower Commission; (2) establish fair and reasonable employment ceilings limiting the number of workers or of specified types of workers which may be employed in any establishment or place of employment during specified periods; and (3) require the release by an employer of any or all categories of individuals in his employ whose services are urgently needed elsewhere in production or service of more importance to the war effort.

"(e) The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the referral of individuals pursuant to this act and governing the making of arrangements with public or private agencies, organizations, or persons for the hiring of individuals pursuant to subsection (d) (1) of this section: *Provided*, That such regulations shall include the following referral standards:

"(1) To the greatest degree consistent with war needs, workers who may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission shall be given freedom of choice as to the jobs they wish to accept, and employers shall be given freedom of choice as to the workers they wish to employ.

"(2) Good cause for refusing a referral to a job without prejudice to further job offers shall include (i) any case in which the worker, if he accepted the job, would be entitled to a statement of availability or be eligible for a referral on grounds of underutilization of skill or less than full-time work; (ii) any case in which wages or working conditions in the offered employment are not reasonably comparable to those prevailing for similar employment in similar establishments in the community; and (iii) any case in which his acceptance of the job offered would, over an objection presented in good faith by the worker, require him to join or resign from, or refrain from, joining a labor organization.

"(3) The decision to refer an individual shall be based on qualifications essential for performance of or suitability for the job, and shall be without discrimination as to race, color, creed, sex, national origin, or, except as required by law, citizenship.

"(f) (1) No employer shall release a worker on grounds that this act or any regulation or order thereunder so requires until after the War Manpower Commission has advised the employer that the worker shall be released. The War Manpower Commission shall so advise the employer only after the worker has been interviewed by the War Manpower Commission or afforded reasonable opportunity therefor, and a determination has been made either (a) that suitable work is available to the worker, the worker does not have good cause for refusing referral to such work and an employer to which the worker has been referred by the United States Employment Service has agreed to hire the worker, or (b) that the worker has been afforded a reasonable opportunity for an interview and has failed to report for the same, or (c) that the worker has refused without good cause to apply for or to accept suitable work to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission.

"(2) In the case of any individual whose employer has been required to release him from a position (other than a temporary position) in his employ under the provisions of this act or any regulation or order thereunder and who thereafter (a) has accepted employment or employments to which he has been referred by the War Manpower Commission and has continued therein as directed by the War Manpower Commission, (b) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (c) makes application for reemployment within 10 days after notice by the War Manpower Commission that he is no longer required in war work, such person shall be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay under conditions and with rights and privileges similar but subordinate to those prescribed by section 8 (c), (d), and (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

"(g) The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the establishment of employment ceilings pursuant to subsection (d) (2) of this section. Such ceilings shall be based upon a consideration of (1) the extent to which the employer is utilizing his available work force, (2) the relative importance to the war effort of the product or service in which the employer is engaged, and (3) the extent and nature of manpower shortages impeding the successful prosecution of the war.

"(h) No employer shall advertise or otherwise solicit for the purpose of hiring any individual if the hiring of such individual would be subject to restrictions under this act except in a manner consistent with such restrictions and with such regulations as the Chairman may prescribe in order to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 3. The Chairman shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him by the War Manpower Commission under this act or any regulation or order thereunder is unfair or unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with such act, regulation, or order. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in the regulation, the determination made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable such regulation shall provide for tribunals so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management and labor interests in the locality. Such regulation shall contain reasonable provisions for the representation of any individual or other person by the labor or trade organization of which he is a member or any other representative freely chosen by him.

"SEC. 4. No provision of this act shall be applicable to (1) the employment of an individual in agriculture; (2) any Territory or possession of the United States, except Alaska and Hawaii; (3) employment by a foreign, State, county, or municipal government or their political subdivisions or their agencies or instrumentalities, or to the hiring of any of their employees unless such foreign, State, county, or municipal government or political subdivision or agency or instrumentality has indicated its ability and willingness to conform with this act; (4) employment in the legislative or judicial branches of the Federal Government; or (5) persons while in active service in the armed forces of the United States.

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby created a War Manpower Commission which shall be under the direction of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission (herein referred to as the "Chairman"). The Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $15,000 per annum. All the provisions of this act and of any regulation, rule, order, or other requirement prescribed thereunder shall be administered by the Chairman. The Chairman may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, and shall fix the compensation of such employees in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Chairman in any case in any court.

"(b) The War Manpower Commission shall be composed of one representative of each of the following departments and agencies, to be designated by the respective departments and agencies, subject to the approval of the Chairman: The Department of War, the Department of the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the War Production Board, the United States Civil Service Commission, the National Housing Agency, the Selective Service System, and such other executive departments and agencies as the President shall determine. The Chairman shall consult with the members of the War Manpower Commission in carrying out his responsibilities under this act.

"(c) The Chairman shall appoint a National Management-Labor Policy Committee to be selected from the fields of labor, agriculture, and industrial management and shall consult with the members thereof in carrying out his responsibilities. The Chairman shall also provide for the appointment of regional and State or area management-labor committees whose members shall be similarly selected and who shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the course of the administration of this act. Members of any such committee may be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. These committees shall be utilized by the Chairman in connection with hearings and appeals provided under section 3 of this act.

"SEC. 6. The Chairman, in carrying out the provisions of this act, is authorized—

"(a) to issue, amend, rescind such rules, regulations, orders, or other requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act. Any rules, regulation, order, or other requirement under this act may contain such classifications and differentiations with respect to individuals, employers, occupations, establishments, activities, and localities, and may

provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as, in the judgment of the Chairman, are necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act;

"(b) to delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority vested in him under this act to such officials, employees, or other persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose;

"(c) to accept voluntary services in connection with the administration of this act, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such property, equipment, and supplies as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(d) to utilize the services of any and all departments, agencies, officers, and agents of the United States, and to accept the services of State and local agencies and their officers and employees in carrying out any provision of this act and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to reimburse such State and local agencies and their officers and employees for services rendered for such purposes.

"SEC. 7. (a) The provisions of sections 2 (a), 3, 4, 6, and 7 of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable under this act, except that the words "subsection (a)", wherever they occur in those provisions, shall be replaced for the purposes of this act by the phrase 'this act.'

"Any person who, in violation of the provisions of this act or any regulation or order thereunder, willfully hires, rehires, or solicits an individual, or accepts employment, or fails to comply with an employment ceiling, or to release individuals, or fails to submit information or permit inspections, or investigations, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to the penalties provided for violations of the provisions of sections 2 (a) (1) and (2) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III, 'Priorities Powers' of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended.

"(b) The President shall prescribe the extent to which any wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in any employment commenced or continued in violation of this act, or any regulation or order of the Chairman thereunder, shall be disregarded by the executive departments and other Government agencies in determining the costs or expenses of any employer for the purposes of any other law or regulation.

"(c) Precedence shall be given by the courts to the trial of cases arising under this act.

"SEC. 8. As used in this act—

"(a) 'Agriculture' means those farm activities carried on by farm owners or tenants on farms in connection with the cultivation of the soil, the harvesting of crops, or the raising, feeding, or management of livestock, bees, and poultry, and shall not include any packing, canning, processing, transportation, or marketing of articles produced on farms unless performed or carried on as an incident to ordinary farming operations as distinguished from manufacturing or commercial operations.

"(b) 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"(c) 'Essential activity' means any activity, so designated by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, after finding that it is—

"(1) an essential war activity, including the production, repair, transportation, or maintenance or equipment, supplies, facilities, or materials required in the prosecution of the war by the United States;

"(2) an activity required for the maintenance or development of essential war activities; or

"(3) an activity essential to the maintenance or development of the public safety, health, welfare, or interest.

"(d) 'Locally needed activity' means any activity other than an essential activity, so designated by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, after finding that it contributes to the prosecution of the war in a critical labor-shortage area, and meets standards prescribed by the Chairman to insure the full utilization of manpower.

"(e) 'Employment,' 'work,' 'hire,' 'rehire,' 'employ,' 'employer,' or words of similar import shall include any contract, arrangement, undertaking, or relationship whereby or under which an individual undertakes to perform a service or services for another, irrespective of the resulting legal relationship between the parties.

"SEC. 9. The provisions of this act and all rules, regulations, orders, and other requirements thereunder shall remain in force during the continuance of the war or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.

"SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. McCORMACK (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this amendment in the nature of a substitute has been printed as has the bill H. R. 1779, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, but that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment which I have offered is, as the majority leader has just stated, printed in the form of a House bill, H. R. 1779, and it also appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 602 under date of Tuesday, January 30. Any Member who desires may read the text of the bill at that place in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, my substitute will provide for giving statutory authority and certain enforcement powers to the system of manpower availability which is now in effect, which has been developed through the months by the cooperation of management, labor, Government, and other elements of the population, but which is up to this time operating without statutory authority, without any power of enforcement. My amendment will make it enforceable in areas where it may become necessary and only to the extent necessary. This system has already been put into effect in a number of places in this Nation. I have here a clipping telling the way in which it was put into effect in Pennsylvania where a ceiling was placed upon employment in a certain brewery industry, and the men formerly working in the industry were transferred into essential war production. It seems to me desirable in the first place that if we can solve this manpower problem on the basis of the machinery now operating it would clearly be of great advantage from the point of view of getting speedily the increased war production we want over a proposal to substitute a brand new program involving the putting of all the work into the Selective Service System which has had no experience in the channeling of workers into employment and which will inevitably have to use these other agencies. This will mean duplication of effort and further complexity. In the second place, and most important of all, my proposal will avoid what seems to me to be the element in the May bill that is positively dangerous, namely, a situation where you take an individual and compel that individual to work not for his Government but for a private employer in a profit-making enterprise. That, it seems to me, is a fundamental objection to this legislation.

As I said before in the House, the only thing that is more serious—and I emphasize the fact I do think it is more serious—is the drafting of men into the Army of the United States and sending them off to fight a war. In my opinion, that takes precedence over this other wrong. Nonetheless, if we can accomplish our purposes without having to commit an act of violence to something that is very close to the very basis of American life and government, let us do it.

The machinery under my substitute would be as follows: It would give mandatory power to the War Manpower Commission in areas where manpower shortages existed to enforce ceilings on employment in industry. It would give mandatory power to this Commission, under my substitute, to say that there shall not be a hoarding of labor, that there shall not be more people employed in a given industry or plant than are actually needed in that industry. Over and over on this floor Members have gotten up and emphasized that that was one of the major faults at present and one of the most important things to be corrected. My substitute goes directly to that problem. The May bill, I respectfully submit, does not. The very machinery of my substitute is to give power to the War Manpower Commission to say that as long as this war lasts and our men are dying on the battle fronts of the world, we are going to produce less fancy furs or fancy clothing or liquor, we are not going to have as much entertainment, we are not going to have as fancy service in hotels.

In areas of labor shortage it is possible for the War Manpower Commission to say that no one shall be hired in that area except upon referral to the War Manpower Commission. In other words, they can say first: "You have got to release workers from nonessential industries"; and, second, "Those workers in becoming reemployed have got to go through the War Manpower Commission," which means they will be referred to various places of employment where they are most needed for war production. But it will use existing machinery and no man would be compelled to work for the private profit of another.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this proposal would recommend itself to any person who is sincerely desirous

of accomplishing in the most rapid possible manner the main objective of increased war production. Under my proposal we would be able to gain the end of actually and certainly being able to shift workers from nonessential occupations into war production and we could do it without the loss of one of the most precious things in American life, namely, the will of free men to do their job for their country, not because they are compelled to do it but because they want to do it. If we can preserve both of those things at once, Mr. Chairman, let us do it.

Now, my bill is not a bill without compulsion. It has penalties in it. It has penalties against three things. It has a penalty for violation of a ceiling, it has a penalty against a man who in a tight labor area takes a job without being referred to that job by the War Manpower Commission, and it has a penalty against an employer who solicits a worker or hires a worker without referral in areas of shortage where the War Manpower Commission has declared that these mandatory provisions shall go into effect. They do not go into effect every place. They go into effect in areas of manpower shortage.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Does this provide for a ceiling in war industries where there is hoarding of labor at the present time?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It does. I refer specifically to the following provision in my substitute:

> The Chairman shall by regulation prescribe reasonable standards and procedures governing the establishment of employment ceilings pursuant to subsection (d) (2) of this section. Such ceilings shall be based upon a consideration of (1) the extent to which employer is utilizing his available work force.

And that applies to all industries, essential and nonessential as well. You have the power to do these things. A plant cannot have more workers unless it needs them. You can say that to a shipyard or an aircraft company which has a surplus of labor as well as to a nonessential employer.

The penalties provided by this bill are the same as the penalties provided for in the War Powers Act for violation of priorities and allocation orders. The penalties are applicable to the three types of violations that I spoke of a moment ago. I hope that is clear. Under my substitute, violations are misdemeanors; under the May bill they are felonies. Some of you who are attorneys will know the difference between those two things.

I am as earnest and sincere as any Member on this floor to see and do everything we can that will shorten this war by 1 day or get one gun to a soldier, if it need be. If I did not believe that the proposal I have brought forth here would do that, I would not offer it. May I preface it by saying that I have not perfected this substitute alone. It has been carefully drawn, I assure you, not by me but by people who have done an excellent job of drafting, and it is right.

The bill, furthermore, comes to you today with the recommendation on the part of people most experienced in the work of actually performing a production miracle for which America has been responsible, who say that they believe that this approach to the problem is a better approach than running the risk of compulsory labor.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. May I ask the gentleman, referring to the language at the top of page 8 of his bill, line 4, subsection 2, if that language is broad enough to enable the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to take a man out of one newspaper and put him into another, on the ground that the first newspaper is better equipped for news coverage?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the gentleman, with all due respect, that this does not cover the newspaper business, because I do not think he could say that that was in a field where he could do that. I think he could put ceilings on employment on all newspapers, but I do not think he could do what the gentleman says; not for a single moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The other day a group of us were talking to General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, and he stated that he could put into the armed services anybody between the ages of 18 and 45, except that there was a limitation in the Draft Act permitting the departmental heads or the heads of agencies of the Government some latitude. Would this reach any surplus or hoarding of manpower by the Government itself?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman wants to know whether this would reach the hoarding of manpower by the Government itself. On page 9, section 4, there are enumerated types of employment and geographical areas where this bill would not apply. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill does not apply to employment in the legislative or judicial branches of the Federal Government, which means it does apply in the executive branch of the Government. That is the answer to the question.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What remedy does the bill provide in cases of hoarding of manpower, whether by the Government or industry?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just covered that, I may say to the gentleman. He will find that the whole machinery of this bill is to operate by the imposition, compulsory if needed, of ceilings upon employment; and ceilings can be placed upon employment and enforced under this bill in order to prevent hoarding or waste of men and women's labor and to require employers to utilize employment to the best possible extent.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it places plenary powers in the hands of the War Manpower Commission, headed by Mr. McNutt, to do that which in the discretion of Mr. McNutt should be done to accomplish the purposes of the May bill; limited, however, only by the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not quite sure that I understand the gentleman's question. But may I say this. Certainly my substitute does not give Mr. McNutt the power to draft that the May bill gives. It gives him by law the very powers he now exercises by Executive order, and adds enforcement power. There is nothing in this bill that is not the result of working out by trial and error methods and by real consultation with the labor management committees that have been associated with this. The safeguard with regard to referral, the safeguard with regard to fixing of ceilings, the enforcement powers, and all the rest of them, are things that have been worked out in practice in this country over the past months and, therefore, it seems to me, should be considered even more deeply.

The essential thing in connection with the question just asked by the gentleman from Michigan is that we are enacting into law here now and giving mandatory enforcement powers to what already has been set up by Executive order without mandatory enforcement powers. That is about what we are doing.

I should like, if I may, to run through this bill. I am going to begin at the bottom of page 2, and I am going to read very briefly some parts. This is from the section on purposes:

> The Congress hereby directs that to the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use made of existing hiring channels—

In solving the problem.

We come to the enforcement section, which is section 2. That is the heart of the bill.

The first provision is that no individual who was engaged in an essential or locally needed activity may be hired by anybody else unless he gets a referral from the War Manpower Commission and a statement of availability. That is the system that has been in effect, but under this it would work, and you could control turn-over by that method.

The bill states in the next subsection, (b), the circumstances under which

statements of availability shall be granted, and sets fair and just circumstances and reasons why a man may come and ask for a referral from one job to another, if his reasons are good and if he is going to continue to be employed in war production.

Then it states, and I ask the gentlemen who have asked me about hoarding to notice this:

If an individual is employed at less than full time or at a job which does not utilize his hightest recognized skill for which there is a need in the war effort, the War Manpower Commission shall upon proper application refer him to other available employment in which it finds that the individual will be more fully utilized in the war effort.

Now I take up the main provisions of the bill, which I want to read to you:

To the extent necessary to provide manpower in the numbers and kinds needed for war production and essential civilian services in situations of manpower shortages, the chairman may by regulation (1) provide that any or all categories of individuals in any or all areas, activities, or occupations may be hired only upon referral by the War Manpower Commission or in accordance with arrangements approved by the War Manpower Commission; (2) establish fair and reasonable employment ceilings limiting the number of workers or of specified types of workers which may be employed in any establishment or place of employment during specified periods; and (3) require the release by an employer of any or all categories of individuals in his employ whose services are urgently needed elsewhere in production or service of more importance to the war effort.

If my substitute is adopted, we can pass a bill which can solve the manpower problem and whose passage can be hailed not only by our men overseas as a means of helping to meet their needs but by labor and management and all the rest of the people on the home front as an endorsement of the efforts they have so far made, as an implementation of those efforts with the power of government, and as, I believe, the best available solution of this problem.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. How will the gentleman's bill get at the individual who is not now engaged in any war activity?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. By means of employment ceilings upon employment in nonessential activities in areas of manpower shortage.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In other words, the gentleman's bill will only penalize those who are already working in war industries and will not get at the individual who is not working?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; that is not true. What I thought the gentleman had reference to was the women at home now who might be drawn in. They are the people that the bill, I admit, would not reach. But it would reach every person who is now employed throughout the Nation in every nonessential activity. The only sizable group of people it will not reach are the housewives who are still at home. I submit there are not many people in America today who are in that situation, and I think that small number, almost all of whom are women in my opinion, who might not come under the terms of this bill, is utterly insignificant compared to the gain for a nation which goes directly at the problem by the method of my bill, which avoids the necessity of drafting one man to work for the private profit of another. It therefore can get at this problem without sacrificing the moral values which I believe are most important to production itself and of course of great importance to the individual.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In the first paragraph of section 2 of the gentleman's bill, subsection (a) it says, "An individual who at any time during the preceding 60-day period was engaged in a war activity." Where in the gentleman's bill does it cover a person who in that preceding 60-day period was not engaged in such activity?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Certainly it does.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Where does the gentleman's bill cover that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman mean where a person is not engaged in any industry at all and was not working at all?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As long as they are women who are staying at home, it does not cover them. I explained that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am referring to a man subject to the draft.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Any man subject to the draft is subject to the draft. That is the first point. Any person who is working any place in this country is covered by this bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Suppose he is not working?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The bill makes it possible to impose a ceiling on employment requiring manpower referral for work in some essential war occupation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has well stated the comprehensiveness of his bill. I say it is much more comprehensive than the committee bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The committee bill only takes in registrants between the ages of 18 and 45. The gentleman's bill takes in all those in that category who are now either in essential or nonessential industry and in addition it takes in all of those over the age of 45 who are in essential or nonessential industry.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman's bill will affect many more people than the committee bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have risen to take this time in order to refute the statement made by my good friend the gentleman from Indiana in reference to the shortage of matériel, especially of critical materials at the present time. I desire to call the attention of this body to the fact that there is a lag in production of critical materials and that this lag in production has existed for some time. It has become increasingly acute in the last few months. I want to call the attention of this body to the fact that on November 30, at a press conference, the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, made this statement in reference to the shortage of ammunition:

This situation has been and is extremely complicated and equally critical and bids fair to be more so, unless production rates in the United States are greatly increased.

Mr. Chairman, within 10 days after that statement was made by the Secretary of War here in Washington, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower from his headquarters in France behind the enemy's lines made a special plea to the people of the United States to increase the production of ammunition which he said was sorely needed by his armies on the western front.

Then following that statement, one by one the high officials of both the War and Navy Departments have made pleas to our people to increase production, not only of ammunition but of all critical items needed for war purposes.

The War Production Board turns out month by month a report of present production and of needed production for the future. I hold in my hand a portion of the report put out by the War Production Board several days ago showing needed materials—critical items—at the present time. I want to give you the figures covering those items.

For instance, there is the item "critical aircraft," a very important item to our war effort. According to the War Production Board report, an increased production for January of 27 percent is needed in this one item.

There is "artillery ammunition," and an increase for January of production of 14 percent is needed.

There is heavy "field artillery" for January an increase of 5 percent over the December production is needed.

There are "mortars and mortar ammunition" great increases are needed.

There is "communications wire," which is vital for our communications on the front, an increase of 11 percent is needed.

"Bus and truck tires," an increase of 17 percent in January over the December production is needed.

"Cotton duck" in which an increase of 3 percent in January over December production is needed.

"Military dry cell batteries" of which an increase of 49 percent over the preceding month was needed.

If we go down the line and take up one item after another such as the item "Navy rockets," of which an increase of 92 percent in January over December production is needed, we find the War Production Board calculated a needed increase of production of many of them for every month from January, February, March, and straight on through the entire year 1945.

The same situation prevails with reference to "Navy high capacity ammunition." In this particular item, there is a scheduled increase in production vitally necessary for every single month during the year 1945. Likewise, "mortars and mortar ammunition" comes in for an increased production during every month in the current year 1945.

These things all arise at a critical time in our production schedule. They come up at the very time when the Army is calling for 900,000 additional men for the armed services. They come up at a time when the war plants of the country are calling for 700,000 additional men, plus 200,000 additional men who will be needed for our war plants to replace those taken out for the armed services.

Now there is presented to you this bill. It is presented to you who sat on this floor and voted for a declaration of war against Germany and Japan. I can recall sitting in this Chamber when we passed the resolution pledging the full resources of the Nation to the support of this war effort. At the time that resolution was passed this Congress meant exactly what the resolution said and that was everything.

When we face this crisis of production on the home front and the war crisis on the battle fronts, we need every support we can get to wind this war up shortly and effectively. Mr. Chairman, the bill presented to you today has for its intention the giving to those men the very best there is in the way of equipment to carry on this fight overseas. This measure has the purpose of keeping the muskets in the hands of those fighting men overseas. It has for its purpose the manufacture of ammunition to go into those weapons in order that they may carry on. It has for its purpose, Mr. Chairman, the giving to those men a fair chance to defend themselves and come back alive. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the bill will shorten the war, will save American lives, will bring victory more quickly to us and our allies, and it should be passed. It is a question of all-out wholehearted support of our fighting men wherever they may be, in Europe or in the Pacific. I want my vote cast for a bill that will give that support, wholehearted, all-out support.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the January report of the War Production Board be printed to show past production and the needed increases in certain critical items. The report follows:

THE OVER-ALL PICTURE

As to the over-all picture, total munitions productions and war construction for December, critical and noncritical, according to preliminary figures reached $5,445,000,000. This was an increase of 1 percent over the $5,404,000,000, of November but 2 percent behind the $5,546,000,000 scheduled for the month. This pattern of moderate gains over November but small deficits from the December schedule was followed by most of the major groups:

Total December production (critical and noncritical), preliminary

	Percent gain over November	*Percent deviation from December Schedule*
Aircraft	+2	−2
Ships (including maintenance)	−6	−4
Guns and fire control	−1	0
Ammunition	+3	−1
Combat and motor vehicles	+7	−1
Communications and electronic equipment	−1	−4
Other equipment and supplies	+3	−2
Total munitions	+1	−2
War construction	−2	0
Total munitions and war construction	+1	−2

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to inflict myself upon you again in this debate. There are a few things, however, sir, that we need to make clear. While I feel there is absolutely no necessity for any legislation on this subject I voted for the Barrett resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] as a substitute; I shall vote for the Voorhis bill as a substitute.

Let us really come now, in the words of the prophet, and reason together. First, I want to thank the ladies on the floor for their sweetness and you gentlemen for your kindness in not objecting to giving me 5 additional minutes; I appreciate that.

General Marshall and Admiral King or any other of our military authorities are not on trial. Those who oppose this bill have as high confidence and as great faith and as much respect, and I would even go further and say affection, for them as the stanchest advocates of this measure. That holds for Judge Patterson, too. But put a few stars on a fellow's shoulders or a little gold braid around his arm, and there are a few idolators, there are a few who will bow down and worship Baal on this side and on that side; and the first point I want to make is that this issue is not at all political because we are split wide open on both sides of the aisle; there is no politics in it. I respect these admirals and generals, but they are human beings. Their judgment is not infallible—even on military matters. I am sorry but we have men over here on the Republican side who worship stars and love gold braid; and if Henry Stimson or George Marshall should take a pill they would move first.

Mr. Chairman, the first thing is, this is not political. Of course, politics were played last fall, but I will not even go into that because I do not want to prejudice or weaken my case with some fellows over here who are tottering mugwumps. You know, a mugwump is one who has his mug on the wrong side of the fence and his wump on the other. You care more for your little seat in this House than you do for the welfare of this country and the safety of our boys. Oh, we have had a lot of emotional appeal, flag-waving, breast-feeding, turning red in the face, and the dropping of maps, all full of sentimentalism, sound and fury, wind and water.

Those of us who oppose this bill have flesh and blood in this war, on every continent and every sea. We are as anxious for those boys to come home as you fellows who would try to make it appear that anyone who opposes this vicious and indefensible measure is un-American and not for the boys at the front. That is tommyrot.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. HALLECK. Not so long ago we had a controversy about a soldier-vote bill. Some of us wanted the soldiers to have the whole ballot, a legal State ballot. It was said of us all over the country that we did not want the soldiers to vote. But what develops now? Stimson says that the men who wanted to vote did vote. Even in the States where the Federal ballot, the so-called bobtailed ballot, was legalized, they did not want it. It was said the soldiers would find out who was telling the truth and they will know the truth about this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Let us not bring politics into this. There are no politics in it. But the gentleman is 100 percent right—as he usually is.

Mr. Chairman, General Marshall, Admiral King, or any of the others are not on trial here. We love them and we respect them. Of course, we have got to because we have brothers and nephews in the service and we try to get along with them. But we do not care about that. Let them act in their own sphere. Generals and admirals should stay in their place. They have an applied science to prosecute this war. They are the military strategists. A lot of these parlor generals and pink-tea strategists that you see in Washington, and you see them at times, come up to your office and try to tell you how to win this war. What right have the military to tell business, labor, and industry, men who are qualified by lifelong experience, what to do? Industry and labor are both opposed to this bill.

What is it for? To cover up mistakes and miscalculations? Bickering and bungling on the home front? The only trouble between a general and a civilian is that the Army is never wrong. Was it ever wrong? I served and you served in it. Was it ever wrong? Never. They are infallible, impeccable, and Christ-like on this earth. I will not say where they will go afterward. We admit we are wrong at times. One must take orders in the Army. There is no humility.

This is not political, and the Army and Navy are not on trial.

Now, then, what is the other big thing? Mr. Chairman, I have never stood before

the House in the 16 years I have been here with an interruption which I did not welcome; I have never pleaded with the Members more earnestly than I am now.

Will this bill accomplish its objectives or will it fail?

I told you two or three days ago that if you take a drafted man and put him alongside a volunteer worker in a factory, you are going to weaken the morale of both. I deplore the fact that we have parlor and poolroom loafers and bowery bums. I know you cannot legislate patriotism, morality, or industry. I know that under our free system of enterprise, with all of its faults and weaknesses, with its strikes and stoppages and shortcomings, we have produced a miracle in this war.

History has proved and experience has shown that free labor is more effective, more efficient, and more productive than slave labor anywhere in all the world. That is the reason we have whipped Italy and are crushing Germany and Japan. We have done it on the home front as well as on the battle front. The men and the boys on the firing line, the miners who dig the leaded zinc down in my district, or the coal in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Illinois, and Kentucky or the copper out in Utah and Montana, are the ones who have hewn the block, whether it be in my district or whether in the far-off State of Washington. The miners, the farmers, the foresters, and the workers in our munitions industry are soldiers in this war.

We have too many men in one place; we have too few in another. We lulled them into a false sense of security last fall. All of us are to blame. I do not want to blame any particular individual. I think the Congress itself was to blame. The public was to blame because of the reports in the newspapers, and in the magazines and because of statements by our great military leaders who are not infallible, even when it comes to predicting when a war will end.

I do not want to embarrass them. I hesitate to do it. I curb myself today. I could quote you from our greatest military and naval leaders who thought this war was going to be over soon. They canceled contracts; they terminated contracts; they closed one factory after another all over this country and threw thousands of people out of employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. That is enough. There should not be any debate on this. Five minutes is too long, Mr. Chairman.

Here we are haggling. When we started in this war, defense and war plants sprang up like mushrooms all over the country. Farmers, bootblacks, soda jerkers, and people from every walk of life flocked to those centers and they were hired. If you could hit a nail and saw a board, you were paid a carpenter's wage. We had to do it. We were racing against time.

Yes; I have close, personal, intimate friends on the Democratic side. That is the reason I am talking to them.

We had to hire these workers in war plants quickly. We had to get things going in a hurry. Time was of the essence. Do you know what they have done? Do you know what free labor has done in 3 years' time? Free labor, without a whip over its head, without somebody putting a harness and collar on it and gouging it and saying, "Get in there and work," has done the job. Under this bill, you would have to keep two good men watching one scoundrel who would produce nothing.

The coal miner today is producing 4 tons more of coal a day than he did 2 years ago. In England, under compulsion, he is producing only 1 ton. They sent their representatives over here, and they carried back an adverse report on their own system.

Take the rubber industry. We are producing 30 percent more rubber in all of our synthetic rubber plants per man per day than we produced 2 years ago. They have learned the know-how. Experience is a great teacher.

So much for coal and rubber. Let us take one other item, the aircraft industry. The workers in the aircraft plants today, because of improved methods of production, because of more efficient tools, because of the experience they have gained, are producing 83 percent more per man than they produced 2 years ago, and they have done it without slave labor, without a Nazi government.

Are we going to raise up a Hitler here to get rid of one abroad? Are we going to adopt a system against which our boys and girls are fighting and dying? Are we going to confess that democracy has failed and that we must adopt totalitarian methods in order to destroy dictatorship?

Mr. Chairman, over 3 years ago, on December 7, 1941, we started from scratch; we started from nothing, but we have supplied an Army and a Navy and a Marine Corps and a Coast Guard of 12,000,000 men; we have supplied Great Britain, and we have supplied Russia, yet here in this late day in the war we are asked to adopt Hitler's methods. I do not believe the soldiers at the front want us to do it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that after every storm there is a calm. I hope that while I undertake to discuss the pending amendment with you very briefly you will have calm consideration and consultation with your own good judgment.

I have been wondering, if I could have a manuscript of the discussion of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri on the radio a night or two ago, and line it up beside the speech that he made here this afternoon, how much similarity there would be.

Mr. SHORT. Thorough consistency, sir.

Mr. MAY. Out there he was for American industry, and then he wanted to regiment it and commandeer it, take the profits out of it, and mandatorily put it at the disposition of the Government, after it had shown its great performance. Here he lauds it to the sky again. I wonder just where he does stand. What does this measure present to us here?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not true under the terms of the proposed Voorhis amendment that the Director of War Manpower, namely, Mr. Paul McNutt, would have the direction and control over every worker in America who is not engaged on a farm?

Mr. MAY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. THOMASON. Yet, we hear talk about bureaucracy.

Mr. MAY. I am going to discuss how much that means to the people of this country before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield to the gentleman just now; I am sorry.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I was just going to comment on what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] said.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I do not have time and cannot yield.

Mr. THOMASON. That is my understanding according to the answer the gentleman made to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment offered as a substitute is H. R. 1779 and was introduced in this House on the 25th day of January, 7 days after the hearings were closed on the bill H. R. 1119. At no time did either the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] or the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, ask that either of the two bills be taken up for consideration by the House Committee on Military Affairs. Yet, I wonder today why we do have legislative committees in the Congress. I wonder why they are required to go out and hold weeks and even months of hearings if we are to substitute a bill 15 pages long, without consideration by a congressional committee, for a bill that has been studied by such a committee and on which thoughtful deliberation has been had.

I want to call attention to the fact that this substitute does one thing which I am sure nobody in this House wants to vote for. In the first place it sets up in section 7 a "kangaroo court" in an executive department of the Government. It provides that the penalties of the War Powers Act shall be applicable.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is no "kangaroo court" involved there, but it does provide for the penalties, and that is the penalty section of the bill which I explained.

Mr. MAY. Then let us see if there is a kangaroo court. The language is as follows:

The Chairman shall by regulation—

That means the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission—

provide an opportunity for hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him by the War Manpower Commission under this act or under any regulation or order thereunder is unfair or unreasonable.

That vests in the War Manpower Commission Chairman the power to set up a tribunal to determine whether or not a man shall have imposed upon him the penalties of the Second War Powers Act. Those penalties are provided for in the act. The $10,000-fine penalty is the same as is provided in what is called the May bill. But here there is provided a 1-year jail sentence whereas the May bill provides for 5 years. So that if a man violates any order or regulation adopted by Mr. McNutt, then he is subject to trial. It does not stop there. I call your attention to the fact that in line 22, page 8, it provides the determination made after such hearing shall be final.

Now where are the civil rights of a man? He will go to a district court and demand a trial when the penalties of the May bill become operative? We provide that he shall have a trial.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. This section is a section to give him a hearing before his case ever goes to trial. No one can be punished under this section. In the penalty section it says, "upon conviction."

Mr. MAY. Certainly you cannot impose a penalty until the party is convicted.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. This section is a safeguard against the very thing the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. MAY. Why do you provide that it shall become final? How are you going to open it up in a judicial trial?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It means that the ruling of the War Manpower Commission as to whether or not a man shall have referrals to a new job or shall not, shall be final, after a hearing, if he asks for it.

Mr. MAY. It does not relate to referrals. It relates to everything that the man shall do.

I am sure the membership of this House is not anxious to vest in an administrative agency of the most powerful and dangerous bureaucracy that has ever been set up in any country, the right to say what a man's final rights shall be. In other words, he has done something for which he is brought to a hearing, whatever it may be. This says that hearing shall be final. The only thing left to a judicial tribunal will be the question of the penalty.

Now, there is another provision in this bill that makes the provisions of sections 1, a, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title 3 of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, applicable under this act, except that the words "subsection a," wherever they occur in these provisions shall be replaced for the purpose of this act by the phrase "this act."

So that you will set up an executive agency downtown, a tribunal to establish the facts upon which the man shall be tried subsequently if he ever gets to a court. I think it would justify a proceeding by writ of habeas corpus to take a man from the jurisdiction of the War Manpower Commission, to give him a trial in the courts of justice. I do not think the House would act wisely, regardless of what you may think of the action of the House Military Affairs Committee, in adopting as a substitute a measure with all the ramifications, difficulties, and problems that are involved in a bill of 15 pages, without any consideration other than the brief debate on the floor of the House.

In addition to that, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] aptly said the other day—and the membership of this House has confidence in him, not only in his patriotism and his wisdom, but in his judgment of legislation. He appeared before our committee and testified on the national service legislation more than a year ago. We have been considering this character of legislation for 2½ years. We have held hearings and hearings and hearings. They are printed and available to the Congress. One of the volumes contained 1,060 pages. The hearings on this particular bill contain several hundred pages. There are other hearings available. Yet, nobody proposing these substitutes ever asked a single time for a moment's time in connection with the hearings.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The provisions of the present bill provide that the Director of War Mobilization may assign to selective-service boards experts from such other agencies as they may need in an advisory capacity. All of the provisions of the Voorhis bill can be carried out by those agencies in an advisory capacity under the Director of War Mobilization for the benefit of the selective-service boards. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAY. That is correct, and that provision is in the so-called May bill, H. R. 1752.

Furthermore, the bill provides that the local boards in the Selective Service System to whom is left the question of the determination of a man's availability or nonavailability for work or his assignment to any particular job shall be determined by those local boards. It provides that the Director of War Mobilization shall call upon the War Manpower Commission and such other agencies of Government as he may direct for assistance and aid. As stated by the gentleman from New York, there is no effort to dethrone the War Manpower Commission, but the House Committee on Military Affairs after months and months and even years of study—and I think I can say it is practically unanimous in its judgment—believes that the administration of these laws should be left in the Selective Service System. I recall, but will not repeat here on the floor, many comments with respect to some of these executive agencies. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The War Manpower Commission has had a great deal of experience in the problem of employment. Has the Director of the War Manpower Commission been heard? The last expression I ever heard from him was that he was against compulsory-manpower-draft legislation. Why did not the Committee on Military Affairs inquire of him as to his present position in respect to the May bill?

Mr. MAY. I may say to my friend from Indiana that I believe he was overseas at the time the hearings were conducted, but we did have his representative, the Assistant Director, Judge Hay, before the committee. He testified on the matter, and his testimony appears in the printed hearings.

Mr. HALLECK. Just one further question: Has any effort been made to obtain the present judgment of the Director of the War Manpower Comission since his return to this country?

Mr. MAY. I made no such effort. I had no idea that he wanted to be heard further than sending the Assistant Director up here. The Assistant Director testified before the committee for some 3 hours.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I will say that Mr. McNutt testified before the committee at great length last spring on the very same subject, and at this time we had the benefit of the testimony of the Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. It is true that the Director of the War Manpower Commission was against this proposition originally.

Mr. MAY. He was first against it; later, I believe, he was for it; and still later he was against it again; and I do not know just where he stands.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In answer to what the gentleman from New York said about the possibility under the May bill of using other agencies in an advisory capacity, it seems to me that it is a very different matter from doing what my bill does, namely, to give powers of enforcement of ceilings. I believe these two things are quite different.

Mr. MAY. I quite agree with the gentleman that there is some difference in them.

I wish now to call attention to a matter which to me is very significant. You know, sometimes little things act as threads, as clues, as straws in the wind, that enable one to find out how things are going.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer for the consideration of the House a few reasons in addition to those given by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs why the Voorhis substitute for the bill before us should be defeated.

For some time now, Mr. Chairman, representatives of labor and management have requested that there be a joint meeting of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and other interested Government agencies with the War Manpower Commission, before compulsory legislation of any type were passed. The gentleman responsible for the utilization of war manpower on the home front is Mr. McNutt. I believe it safe to say that Mr. McNutt has never held any such hearings as these requested by labor and management.

These same representatives of labor and management have testified before our committee on numerous occasions during the past 2 years that no compulsory legislation was needed, because manpower had been improperly utilized under the voluntary system. They testified again and again that the true facts about manpower had never been given either to our committee or to the country by the War Manpower Commission. In short, labor and management for the past 2 years have been laying the failure of the manpower problem not at the door of the Congress for failing to pass legislation but right in the lap of an ineffectual War Manpower Commission.

It is exceedingly difficult for me to understand, in view of their charges, how labor and management could possibly welcome the continuation of the very system of which they have so long been complaining. It is very difficult for me to believe that labor and management are going to be pleased to give into the hands of the very man and the very agency which they have charged with such dire failures, the tremendous statutory powers that the Voorhis amendment bestows upon them.

It seems to me that the friends of labor and management should very carefully consider these far-reaching and drastic powers imbedded in the Voorhis substitute to our bill. They should look very thoughtfully at the consequences of such powers.

I urge you and ask my colleagues to examine the workings of the Allentown, Pa., plan. It is an example of what would happen if we were to pass this Vocrhis substitute. I ask you to consider the result of the indiscriminate regimentation suggested by this substitute before you accept it in preference to the provisions for an orderly distribution of labor, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] called it, contained in the bill before us now.

If we pass the Voorhis amendment what we shall be doing here is to give a vote of full confidence to the War Manpower Commission. This would be an extraordinary action indeed when one remembers that not only the record of our committee hearings but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself is full of indictments of labor, management, and of the general public of the way the War Manpower Commission has handled the manpower problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentlewoman be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, this Voorhis substitute would give statutory recognition to Mr. McNutt's commission. Under this substitute he would have the power to close arbitrarily any business, large or small, when he, in his discretion, chose to close them. The only defense to this analysis of one power of the substitute bill is to say that the War Manpower Commission will be honest, fair, and wise at all times. The honesty and the fairness of Mr. McNutt cannot be challenged, but the consistent wisdom of the War Manpower Commission is certainly open to plenty of argument. This substitute bill would also mean that employees who were thrown out of their jobs by the imposition of a War Manpower Commission ceiling on the number of workers that could be employed in their factory or business would subsequently be forced to work where the War Manpower Commission told them they would have to work—or they would starve.

We have long talked about work-or-fight legislation in this House. And I believe we do have work-or-fight legislation now. We have talked about work-or-serve legislation, which was the type of legislation I introduced a year and a half ago in this House, then known as the IV–F bill. Today we have before us legislation which we may call and is called work-or-jail legislation. But this Voorhis legislation might best be called a work where you are told or starve in the street bill.

Therefore, it seems to me that before we pass this Voorhis bill everyone who is a friend of just ordinary people as well as those who are friends of the labor groups, and the employer groups and the industrial groups, should look well before they leap. There is no doubt that in our long delay in bringing out the committee bill before the House, and in our debates here upon it, we have shown our natural distaste for any type of compulsory legislation. But in our dislike, and our unhappiness in having to pass any form of compulsory legislation, do not let us strain at the gnat of this committee bill and suddenly turn around and swallow the Voorhis substitute camel.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have an agreement here as to the limitation of time.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. May I say that the committee has been allocated time and each Member has asked for additional time, and that there are some of us here who would also like some time.

Mr. MAY. I am not trying to rush it. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Let us go along for a time and see how things work out.

Mr. MAY. We have been here for some time now.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. And some of us have not had the opportunity to speak. We have waited 3 or 4 hours to talk now.

Mr. MAY. We will not get through today if we do that.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Suppose we do not get through today?

Mr. MAY. We will be here tomorrow then.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Then we will be here tomorrow. What is the difference?

Mr. MAY. I hope we can be reasonable. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 35 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW and Mr. LEMKE objected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 1 hour.

Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. LEMKE, Mr. HOFFMAN, and Mr. LECOMPTE objected.

Mr. MAY. Apparently there will be objection to anything I ask.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of many Members of this House who has great respect for the ability and sincerity of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. I think, however, it is most unfortunate that at this late stage in the discussion of this important and critical measure a substitute 15 pages long is offered, that was introduced in the House only 5 days ago and has had no specific consideration before the committee to which you have delegated the duty of looking into such legislation. I do not share the views of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and neither do I think his ridicule and sarcasm regarding our great military leaders was deserved. I have the greatest faith in them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Briefly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say I agree with what the gentleman has just said. I should like, however, to point out that my bill was introduced 1 day after the committee bill came into the House, that I introduced it as soon as I knew what the committee bill was going to be, and that I have spoken about it and had it printed in the RECORD in full twice.

Mr. THOMASON. I repeat that I never question the sincerity of the gentleman from California, because I have a lot of admiration for him, but at the same time we must face facts as they are. Your committee in charge of this character of legislation had daily hearings except Sundays for 3 weeks, and we heard everybody who wanted to be heard. We heard the military leaders and we heard the leaders of labor and industry. Not only that, but the Director of War Manpower was overseas and he sent his very able assistant, the late Judge Charles M.

Hay, there, and he testified before the committee.

After mature deliberation, I repeat, and I said this on the floor of the House a couple of days ago, we brought here what in my judgment is a safe and sound bill that will accomplish the desired results. We must meet immediately the situation that General Marshall and Admiral King have told us about. And how does the committee propose to administer it? We proposed that the local draft boards should be the ones who would select the men in their communities who would be subject to some kind of duty, and put them into essential war work.

I undertake to say that there are not 10 men in the House—in fact, I doubt if there is a single one except the author of the bill—who have carefully considered the import and the far reaching effects of this substitute. Let us be frank about it. I do not share the feeling that some have expressed against the Director of War Manpower. I think that, everything considered, Mr. McNutt has probably done a good job. I am one of his many admirers. I am sure that the U. S. E. S. has done a good job. But this bill gives to the Director of War Manpower, regardless of his name or politics, absolute control over every worker in America except those that are on the farms.

If you read the lines on page 8 between lines 20 and 23, you will find that the Director of War Manpower has absolute and final determination of what shall be done about every worker in America except those on the farm and those, I believe, in the employ of State and local governments.

You could not even employ a man to mow your lawn except with the approval of the Director of War Manpower. If you follow through the provisions of section 2 amending the act of June 28, 1940, you will find that you also give to Secretary Morgenthau control over all of the money and profits of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about the power being vested in the local boards. Today, in spite of the Tydings amendment, under the instructions of General Hershey and regardless of the law, in violation of the law, our local boards are sending the farm boys into the service. Why should we give him any more power?

Mr. THOMASON. That sounds like an isolated case.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They are not isolated cases.

Mr. THOMASON. I know that the Tydings farm amendment is fully protected and preserved by the May bill. In fact, it is strengthened.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman about his impression of section 4 on page 9. Insofar as no provision of this act shall be applicable to the employment of any individual in agriculture, that excludes all agriculture?

Mr. THOMASON. That is right.

Mr. O'NEAL. Under (3) it says "the hiring of any of their employees in any political subdivision or municipal government." Does that mean that any young man who might be in the street cleaning department will not be subject to it?

Mr. THOMASON. Absolutely.

Mr. O'NEAL. There is just one more. Under item 4 it says: "Anybody employed in the legislative or judicial branch." Does that mean any man who might be working on the Hill or who is a bailiff in the police court or in the district court would not be subject to any of this?

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman is absolutely right. Now then, let us face the issue. If you are against this bill in the form it is, and I am referring to the May bill, let us be frank and say so and vote against it. But I just do not see how, especially in view of the talk we hear about bureaucracy and dictatorship, I do not see how you can go along now and give the Director of War Manpower, no matter what his name is or what his politics may be, absolute control over nearly every worker in America. Let us leave this power and authority with local boards instead of centralizing all power in some bureau in Washington. I plead with you to defeat this amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I see by the Washington Post that the Senate is figuring on a bill which is along this line. Has the House any license to feel that if it passes the bill with the safeguards now in it the House conferees will stand up?

Mr. THOMASON. I am not able to speak for the House conferees. There are no conferees now for the bill has not yet passed this House and has not even been considered by the Senate. I think it safe to say the conferees will carry out the expressed will of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of seeing if we cannot by unanimous consent agree on a time limit.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I discussed the situation with our leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I know we want to be as liberal as possible so as to take care of everybody who wants to speak on this amendment. It seems to me we might agree on closing debate on this amendment at 4 o'clock, and I make that suggestion to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the last three speakers consumed at least 30 minutes in opposition to the Voorhis amendment. Some of us have waited here a long time. I think we are entitled to express ourselves the same as anybody else. I do not think we ought to limit the time at present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if we agree on 4 o'clock, I think that would give sufficient time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there was something said that we might not be here tomorrow. So far as I am concerned, if I can keep the House here tomorrow we are going to stay. So there is no use cutting off debate for that reason.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1½ hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1½ hours.

The question was taken; and the motion was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I just want to point out first that a committee consisting of the heads of the chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the major farm organizations, meets regularly with the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. That is in partial answer to the gentlewoman from Connecticut. In the second place, my amendment, much to my surprise, is being attacked by members of the committee because it is too severe. Frankly, I expected the opposite. I expected them to attack my amendment because it was not strong enough in its mandatory provisions. Instead of that we are told it gives too much power. The power it gives is exactly the same power that is now being exercised under Executive order by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. This gives it statutory standing. That is all. It gives him the same powers that are being exercised in consultation with the heads of management and labor. Furthermore, the position of management has been made very clear that this is the kind of legislation they want, and I am confident labor will feel vastly better about my substitute than about the May bill.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to supplement the statement of the

gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] by presenting testimony from the president of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, Mr. W. T. Holliday. He is a member of the management and labor advisory committee for region 5, including Ohio, Michigan, and Kentucky. I quote him:

I would like to say in passing that I think the War Manpower Commission has done a perfectly magnificent job. It has worked quietly but most effectively under its limited powers. It has been a very democratic organization in that in every region and in every war-production area representatives of management and labor have been enlisted as advisory committees, to whom all problems were submitted, and by whom all appeals from rulings of the United States Employment Service have been reviewed. The harmony between the representatives of management and of labor on these committees has been a splendid thing. It has been very seldom that we have not been unanimous in our views, and so far as general policy is concerned in region 5 advisory committee, there has been no divergence of opinion.

I direct this to your attention in reply to the attacks that have been made on Mr. McNutt, obviously to prejudice some of the people who, whether for good reason or otherwise, have some feeling about Mr. McNutt. His name has been injected into this debate in order to influence the votes of some of the Members to whom the name "McNutt" is an anathema. It is most unfortunate that this has been injected into the debate as it has no place here. The testimony of the president of Standard Oil—Ohio—is ample evidence of the efficiency and quality of the service rendered by this Commission.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. MAY, referred to kangaroo courts. The country is full of them. You have them in O. P. A. and every other division. If you are legislating against kangaroo courts, then remember that you voted for them on many, many previous occasions.

I believe the committee is attempting to use a great big monkey wrench on a small nut when the size of the instrument needed is the Voorhis amendment; that is an amendment that would fit the nut. It is perfectly amazing to me that you would harass 15,700,000 men in this country in order to get the 148,000 men in those areas where a reshuffling would do the job.

I believe the Voorhis amendment will do exactly what is necessary at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting for the last couple of days for an opportunity to discuss this bill with the Members of the House. Far be it from me to do anything, to vote for any measure, or to speak any word that would impede the conduct of the war. I hope what I do here will be a contribution rather than an impediment. I do not, however, want to be in the position to place the problems of my district before the national interest to the extent that I would selfishly vote to consider the home problems as paramount to the first aim of America, that is, to win the war and to win the peace that will follow.

I am sure that the necessary steps will be taken in order to remove the objectionable conditions which exist at home so that we might in turn contribute our share at home to the war effort.

My predecessor in Congress wore out shoe after shoe after shoe going around this town from department to department to department trying to get them to do something to put the people of northeastern Pennsylvania to work, but without avail. Then this House and the Senate unanimously named a commission to go up to northeastern Pennsylvania to study the problem of the area. The committee came back and reported and after reporting made recommendations that something be done by the departments in order that the people might be given work, but again without avail. Right here in my hand is a map showing 8,000 vacant houses in northeastern Pennsylvania, 30,000 people gone out of the area, and today 5,000 are walking the streets without jobs, yet we hear the threat "work or jail." I say yes, somebody ought to go to jail—those responsible for the maldistribution of these factories throughout the country. They are the ones who ought to go to jail. Listen to this allocation of war work. On January 16, $3,500,000 more to Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; $18,000,000 to Akron, Ohio; $10,000,000 to Akron, Ohio; $7,000,000 to Akron, Ohio; $1,000,000 to Akron, Ohio; $500,000 to Akron, Ohio—Government plants; yet when we go to them they say we cannot have a plant in northeastern Pennsylvania.

I am asked by this bill to say to my people who are begging for work, who have 41,000 boys in the armed services, who have casualties second to none in the country, who want to help the war—I am asked to say to them by this bill that some draft board outside of the area, under section 4 (b), may say to my 5,000 men with the other thousands, "Go to Akron, Ohio," or elsewhere. I am not against this bill in the sense that I want people to stay on the jobs they are now doing. I want the turn-over to stop; I want the war completed and won at the earliest possible date; but for God's sake, I say to these men in Washington, look to northeastern Pennsylvania and give us a chance to help win the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to say some of the things I did not have time to say when I spoke on this bill the other day. I have been very much concerned about the talk of shortage of ammunition, particularly in the battle for the bulge and on the western front. I have a 20-year-old boy in that battle. I know how his mother felt when the story came over the radio that they were allocating one shell per gun per hour. I think I know how the mothers of the millions of boys across the seas feel when they hear stories of that kind. I say there was no permanent shortage of ammunition in the battle for the bulge. There might have been an area shortage. The German Army put against us the finest panzer and infantry divisions they could muster, under the finest leader they had, Marshal Von Rundstedt. They hit us at the weakest spot where we had neither men nor ammunition nor guns and they drove us back into France. It took time to get ammunition, guns, and men into that area, but we got them there. When we did, Patton, Bradley, and Montgomery drove Von Rundstedt and his finest panzer and infantry divisions back into Germany. We licked them thoroughly and completely. The War Department tells us that we inflicted 4 casualties on their army to 1 received by our Army. There were 100,000 German casualties and we had one-fourth that number. How did we do that if there was a shortage of ammunition on that front? How did we drive the German Army back into Germany? With broomsticks? You do not lick that kind of an army by firing 1 shell per gun per hour.

We produced in this country during the years 1942 and 1943 and the first 4 months of 1944—in 28 months—over 6,000,000,000 pounds of powder and explosives of every type and kind. We produced nearly 1,600,000 during the first 4 months of 1944. We did this with free labor, with men and women who drove as far as 40 and 50 miles a day in all kinds of weather to their jobs, worked their shift and drove 40 to 50 miles back home again. That is what free patriotic labor did. We did not do it by chaining men to machines with a work-or-go-to-jail law.

In 1942 we produced 2,100,000 tons of artillery shells and 28,125,000 bag-loaded propelling charges. In 1943 we produced over 4,000,000 tons of shells and over 26,865,772 propelling charges. You will note that while we produced less propelling charges, the weight of the shells was almost double.

This meant heavier shells. During the first 4 months of 1944 we produced 1,509,431 tons of shells and over 16,000,000 bag-loaded propelling charges. We produced, during the first 4 months of 1944, shells at the rate of four and a half million tons per year, and bag-loaded propelling charges at the rate of 49,000,000 per year. We did this with 2 of the 4 bag-loading plants closed down.

What did the War Department do with all this ammunition if they are short now? And yet fear is driven into the heart of every mother in the country by telling them there was a shortage of ammunition on the fighting front. Can it be that this type of propaganda is being used to create sentiment for the May bill? All this production was by

free labor, by men and women who were appealed to by patriotic motives, by men and women who drove miles to and from their work.

In 1943 when I visited the Willow Run plant I drove 35 miles out of Detroit, all the way to Brighton before I could find a room. I found men and women driving as far as 40 miles over icy roads to this plant in subzero weather—25 to 30 degrees below zero—to do a day's work, and then drive back again after work. Then you talk about loyalty of workers.

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing that concerns me very much.

You will recall that a few months ago Mr. Morgenthau issued a statement that we were going to make Germany an agricultural nation. He told the German people what they were fighting for at a time when they did not know what they were fighting for. He put the finest piece of propaganda into the mouth of Goebbels that you could put into the hands of an enemy propagandist. They used it, and from then on the German Army began to fight, as the newspapers reported it, with a frenzied fury. That statement cost thousands of American lives. Then the Allies began to divide Germany before we had won the war. Our State Department has approved a plan of helping to move the Polish population into German territory. That meant the German people would have to move out of their homes. If the German people needed any further reason for fighting, we gave it to them. They have redoubled their efforts and fought with renewed fury.

We broadcast stories that we are short of ammunition. They are using that propaganda. Are we going to let Hitler, Goebbels, and Himmler tell their people now that the American worker is not behind this war? Are you going to pass the May bill and tell our enemies that we have to put men in jail or threaten them with jail in order to get them to work in war plants? If we pass the May bill it will place another piece of propaganda into the hands of Hitler, Himmler, and Goebbels; propaganda that could cost thousands of casualties. When you do you will be broadcasting the greatest lie that has ever been broadcast in the history of this country. You will be questioning the patriotism of the finest group of workers that any nation ever had.

The May bill ought to be defeated by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I previously made on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion, based on more than 25 years' experience in dealing with employer-employee relations, that the May bill will not accomplish the results here sought. Neither do I believe it will accomplish the requests made by our chiefs of staff, General Marshall and Admiral King.

I make this statement, as I said, because of my experience in dealing with labor problems at the grass roots; personally listening to the grievances of labor, both real and imaginary, and the complaints of employers, both real and imaginary. It has been my life's work to attempt to iron out these differences.

Let me say at this point that not once in 25 years has there been a stoppage of work on the part of any men whom I have represented, either in negotiations of contracts or the settlement of disputes.

I am satisfied and I am sure every one of you will agree with me, that General Marshall and Admiral King are little concerned about the number of men employed in war industries. They are interested, and vitally so, in only one question as far as civilian life is concerned—they want production of tanks, guns, ships, planes, and all of the implements of war which will protect the lives of our boys and speed the day when they may return to their own fireside. You want the same thing; the people of my district and the people of this Nation are demanding the same thing. I too want to speed the day when my son will return, and my three sons-in-law, fathers of my grandchildren, will return. But my conscience will not permit me to support the May bill. I could take the easy way and hide behind the skirts of someone else and say, "Well, they asked for it; it is not my responsibility."

I say it is my responsibility. I do not want to send to our boys who are enduring the tortures of hell that we may continue to live a free democratic life in a land of plenty a crumb when the whole loaf is available for the taking.

The proponents of the May bill have stressed getting the poolroom bum into war industries; they have stressed getting the entertainers and the white-collar workers into war industries. General Marshall and Admiral King said, we want production now. An efficient production worker is not made over night. It takes months, and years in some cases, to properly train this type of worker and by the very nature of the past occupation of the persons mentioned, and their physical stamina, it would be difficult for them to rapidly take their place in the scheme of things in production work. Production managers and foremen will testify that nothing slows down production more all along the line than throwing in a group of untrained workers.

The May bill does not hit at the heart of the problem—immediate increase in production. It merely channels into industry more workers, and we all know from official investigations by Congress that in many cases production is slowed down because there are already too many employees getting in each other's way.

The Voorhis bill, which I can and will support, drives straight to the mark. It does first things first. It determines the requirements and supply of labor and permits a governmental agency, the War Manpower Commission, which is already trained in this work, to distribute the supply of skilled and trained workers where most needed. It restricts the number of employees in less essential industries. It has control over employers as well as employees. The May bill is silent on these vital questions.

The Voorhis bill puts responsibility on both the worker and management. The May bill puts all of the responsibility on the worker, and the penalty for noncompliance is a jail sentence or a fine. So I am sure no one will claim it is a work or fight bill. It is merely an ultimatum—get into a factory, whether you are able to accomplish anything or not, or go to jail.

Management does not want the May bill. They know that persons in their factory, shop, or mill are of little or no value to them unless they are there by choice. Labor does not want the bill, because they are proud of their record as freemen in helping management achieve a record of production that was thought fantastic a few short years ago and which by far out-strips the production record of any country that has had forced labor.

There is no surer way to bring about lack of cooperation and inefficiency than not having uniform rules and regulations and conditions of employment in an establishment. The May bill makes fish of some and fowl of others. It freezes to the job all male workers between 18 and 45, but permits the workers from 45 to 65 to leave at will. And Congress agreed that the age of employability runs to 65 when it passed the Social Security Act.

The May bill gives additional benefits, rights, and privileges to the workers who will be channeled into war industries over those who, voluntarily, have previously engaged in the production of war materials. Such persons on being ordered into employment are in the same status as if inducted into the armed forces, and have all of the rights and privileges of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The May bill would change the relationship between all male employees from 18 to 45 now engaged in war industries, with their foreman, superintendent, and management. They will, rightly or wrongly, feel that every reprimand, suggestion, and many of the assignments to particular jobs, are given simply because of the changed conditions and because of the governmental order that they remain on the job. In other words, they will feel that they are being taken advantage of, getting the worst of it, simply because their status in the establishment is different than male workers over 45, and all female employees.

It is my opinion that compulsion will tend to reduce rather than increase production. If we know human nature at all, we know that compulsion will result in a feeling of anger and resentment, and who is there that will say that a person in that frame of mind will be as efficient as the person in a normal state of mind? These resentful workers will be thrown in contact with many others who have been forced into the job and some who are there by choice and who are contented because they are not under compulsion. Under a condition of this kind, there can be no other result than bickering and quarreling and a total lack of

cooperation among the workers in the establishment. There is no other condition that will slow down production as much as this lack of cooperation and quarreling among workers.

Now just a word about those who are forced to leave one job and take another. It is my opinion that in most cases the income of the individual will be reduced. It is the natural thing for an individual to want to earn as much as possible, so it can be rightfully assumed that if there were better paying jobs available which the individual was capable of filling, he would have long ago made the change. This opinion was borne out by reports of the United States Employment Service in my own district when they listed the number of jobs available and the wage range. By far the greatest percentage of jobs available were in the low-wage brackets.

I have before me at this time a statement issued by Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, regional director of the War Manpower Commission for the New York City area, in which is listed the company name, the number of employees desired, and the wage rates. The jobs and wage rates are as follows:

	Per hour
6 male power-press operators	$0.75
1 spark tester, male	.92
2 rubber-mill men	.92
1 machine operator, male	.85–.95
1 lead-press operator, male	1.00–1.10
1 weigh-up man	.78
4 unskilled male workers	.70–.90
10 male spot welders	75–.85
7 male power-press operators	.70–.80
3 male packers	.70–.80
2 molding die sinkers	1.45
4 tool and diemakers	1.45
5 tool and die makers:	
First class	1.20–1.40
Second class	.90–1.20
10 male machinists:	
First class	1.05–1.30
Second class	.80–1.05
3 male sheet-metal workers	.75–.85
1 male guard	.75
123 unskilled female workers	.55
47 unskilled male workers	.68
5 male machinists	1.00
5 male millwright helpers	.68
2 male grinders	.90–1.48
1 male oiler	.89–1.07
1 pipe-fitter helper	.80
5 male janitors	.68
1 male packer	.68
1 male experimental machinist	1.00–1.34
235 female trainees	.60
38 male laborers	.65–.70
10 male packers	.66–.94
8 male mounting-machine operators	.65–1.03
8 male spooling-machine operators	.65

This indicates very clearly that with the exception of very highly skilled workers, the positions open are below the going rate for employees.

The May bill would make it necessary for the local draft boards—and when I say this I am mindful of the fact that the members of the local draft boards are friends, neighbors, and members of the same community as the persons they are dealing with—to order or suggest, under penalty of a jail sentence for noncompliance, that a man change his position and reduce his income. It is an established fact that people adopt a standard of living commensurate with their income, so it will mean the worker and his family will be compelled to adjust their standard of living downward, a condition which is most resentful to all of us. The resentment will be multiplied many times when the condition takes place because of an order by a person of equal standing in the community and who in many instances is not covered by the law himself. So the resentment will not be confined to the place of employment but will spread among neighbors, relatives, and friends, and will disrupt home life and community life at a time when we need a united people, all working toward the one goal.

You might say our people are too patriotic to take the positions I have enumerated, but I think I need only call your attention to the griping and complaining that practically all of our citizens, including ourselves, have done at times over rationing and other restrictions which have been necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. And, mind you, we gripe even though we know this rationing and these regulations apply to everyone alike, which is not so in the case of the May bill.

I have read the transcript of the hearings of the committee, I have listened to debate for 3 days, and I am compelled to say that the advocates of this measure have appealed more to our emotions than to our mind. They have urged passage of this bill primarily because it will supposedly lift the morale of our men on the fighting fronts and will put fear into the hearts of our enemies, but I say let us not make a gesture and pass a law that will in all likelihood do harm rather than good. Let us keep faith with our men on the fighting fronts. Let us pass the Voorhis bill which will, in my opinion, actually speed the placing of every weapon, every device, every bit of material they can possibly use, in the hands of our gallant servicemen. Let us pass a bill that will not only lift the morale of our fighting men, but will give them the things they need to fight with, a law that will not only put fear in the hearts of our enemies, but one that will destroy and conquer them, and bring about the day when we can once again live in a world of peace where families will be reunited and there will be an end to this period of death and destruction.

I am perfectly willing to answer to my constituents for my vote against the May bill and my answer will be that employer organizations opposed and labor organizations opposed on the grounds that it would do more harm than good. The National Association of Manufacturers has publicly made the following statement:

> It is our sincere and honest conviction that this legislation, as now drafted, will breed discord and confusion, will be inadequate as a solution to the manpower problem, and may seriously interfere with war productions.
>
> In spite of shortages in a few specific items, industry is still performing a miracle of production. (See release of W. P. B., January 22, 1945, exhibit B.) Approximately 80 percent of war production is on or ahead of schedule. It would be a national tragedy to adopt any program which would endanger this present scale of output. Yet the bill, H. R. 1752, could do precisely that.

Surely these two groups, labor and employers, understand production problems far better than lawmakers or militarists.

The defeat of the May bill will not preclude Congress from passing a law such as the Voorhis bill, which the above-named groups both agree will in fact put such controls and regulations on management and labor as to bring about the maximum production in the shortest possible time.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I shall pay my further respects to the May bill. I shall rename it "May's delight." It is the kind of legislation that the distinguished and battling chairman enjoys. He is a seasoned battler along this line. He holds no punches and delivers them smilingly. Yet there is something strange about the situation in which we find our distinguished chairman. We find him not only in a battle with organized labor, but we find him on the side of Browder and affiliates. He got himself all tangled up with the Daily Worker.

Politics may make strange bedfellows, but war makes stranger ones still. In the name of war things have been and are being done to an unsuspecting public that one would not dare dream of in peacetime. In the name of war we find the modern triumvirate going into the same bed in Poland, Finland, and the Balkan states—nations for whose territorial integrity we entered the war.

The triumvirate that claimed that we were fighting for the "four freedoms"—for the now defunct Atlantic Charter—is sound asleep in the same bed while freedom shrieks not only in Poland, Finland, and the Balkan states, but in our own Nation. It is a strange world—a changing world—in which freemen are losing their freedom, and we are no exception unless we arouse ourselves and refuse to follow those who would lead us into darkness.

This bill, if passed, will cause confusion. It will not only be "May's delight" but "Browder's delight" also. It will create the dissatisfaction that Browder desires. If you can regiment labor—draft the civilian population to work for private corporations—then you can regiment and draft material, and Browder's desired dictatorship will become an accomplished fact.

This bill will not only create confusion but hardships. It will not increase production but decrease it. It will create hatred. What Member of this body will want to face the wrath of a man with a large family, who is today employed as a mechanic and his wages fixed by the War Stabilization Board at $50 a week, and who tomorrow is transferred to another locality where he will receive but $26 a week? You will not only have taken him unconstitutionally and placed him in involuntary servitude—in a corporation for profit—but you will have cut his wages in two. You had better think twice before you do that.

Again, I am opposed to this bill because if it is passed you will increase the obligations of our Government by billions for many years after the war is over. Then these men who are being drafted and put under the control of the Government will demand the same benefits given to those in the armed forces. You cannot justify this legislation. Organized labor will furnish you a million men if you want them. There is no shortage of labor, but there is a shortage of intelligence—a bungling and a blundering by those in charge of our war efforts.

I know that there is not a Member on this floor that has not a son, a daughter, or some relative in the armed forces. I know that we are proud of them, that we admire their courage, their ability, their ingenuity, and their accomplishments on the field of battle. We gladly bask in their reflected glory, but I challenge the right of any Member to stand on this floor and use their names in a vain attempt to justify this unconstitutional slave bill.

These sons and daughters of this Nation are giving their lives, their limbs, their health, and their all to crush the brute force of dictatorship. They are proving to Hitler and the dictators everywhere that a democracy can win a war. They are proving once and for all to all the world that only a free people can win because they have something to fight for.

I feel that not a single supporter of this bill can justify and square his conscience except on the grounds of political expediency. You may ease your political conscience temporarily, but the ghost will return and haunt you. You will receive the just condemnation not only from our sons when they return but from a more calm and enlightened public opinion.

You will not be permitted to crucify American labor upon the altar of falsehood and slander—upon the blunders and mistakes of others. Labor has furnished its full quota of fighting men and its full quota in the field of production. They have performed a miracle. They have supplied half the world with arms and munitions and war implements, and kept our own Army going in spite of official shortcomings.

Oh, I have heard the remark that the wise thing to do is to vote for this bill, because the Senate will kill it. My answer is that we have no right to hide behind the skirts of the Senate. This House has done that on several occasions. It did it on the so-called Gestapo bill. The responsibility is ours. It is here and now.

I repeat, this bill is opposed by every labor organization but the Browder affiliates. It is opposed by industry, by the American Chamber of Commerce. It is opposed by every lover of true liberty and is opposed by the heart, the soul, and the conscience of America.

Whenever the day comes that love for our country and patriotism fall so low that this kind of bill is necessary, then the Republic that you and I have cherished and loved, the Republic that the world has looked to as a model of justice, will be dead. Then we will have surrendered all that is sacred and good to the human race.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I had more time, I should like to pay my respects to the May bill, particularly its infamous proposal to put conscript labor at work for private profit. I am opposed to forcing any man to work for the private profit of another. But I choose to take the limited time at my disposal to speak on the basis of my personal experience concerning the major features of the Voorhis substitute amendment.

For the past 3 years I have been assistant to the vice chairman for labor production of the War Production Board. In the course of that work I did considerable liaison with the War Manpower Commission, particularly in developing the west coast manpower program, with special emphasis upon shipbuilding and aircraft. During that time I have seen the labor-management committees of the War Manpower Commission function very efficiently and function in such a manner that the voluntary consent of labor and management alike to the controls which the War Manpower Commission have developed has been obtained.

I regret that an effort has been made to have this House believe that present War Manpower Commission regulations are the result of bureaucratic meddling and bungling. Far from it. Every important War Manpower Commission regulation, those to which the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] now proposes to give statutory approval, have been developed with the full consent of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Manufacturers Association, the C. I. O., the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the leading farm organizations of this country. All important W. M. C. regulations, before promulgation, have been submitted to the National Labor Management Committee of the War Manpower Commission, which includes outstanding citizens such as Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O.; James Patton, president of the Farmers' Union, and others. They have given their consent to the rules and regulations which are now incorporated in the Voorhis bill. After the regulations have received the full consent of the top leadership of those organizations they have been perfected at local and State levels to meet any peculiar local conditions through consultation with the appropriate officials of these same organizations.

Many times various minor changes have been made to meet local conditions. One of my objections to the May bill is that it does not establish machinery to deal with local situations. It attempts to deal with the manpower situation purely as a national problem. But the real problems are in some given area. That is the crux of the manpower problem; these situations must be dealt with by local people if they are to be solved.

Just as the gentleman from Ohio has in his possession a resolution from the area labor-management committee of War Manpower Commission in his district, so I have one from the Wisconsin-Illinois-Indiana area, which I desire to read into the RECORD along with the names of the members of the committee:

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has endeavored to perform the enormous task of mobilizing and allocating the labor force of this country for war; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has effectively performed the task of training the labor force of this country to meet the needs of war production; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has effectively performed the task of increasing the utilization of war workers by extending the minimum workweek and bringing about better personnel practices; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission is taking the steps necessary to meet current manpower problems; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission has accomplished all this by means of a voluntary program with full cooperation of labor and management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Management-Labor Committee of the War Manpower Commission for the Sixth Region, composed of: Mr. L. H. Hill, vice president in charge of industrial relations, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; Mr. J. L. Palmer, first vice president, Marshall Field & Co.; Mr. Lester N. Selig, president, General American Transportation Corporation; Mr. J. T. Gillick, chief operating officer, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad; Mr. H. S. Vance, chairman, Studebaker Corporation board; Mr. Joseph Germano, district director, district No. 31, United Steel Workers of America, C. I. O.; Mr. George A. Haberman, president, Wisconsin Federation of Labor; Mr. Paul Russo, international representative and assistant director, region 4, United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; Mr. Reuben G. Soderstrom, president, Illinois State Federation of Labor; Mr. Thomas S. Roe, secretary-treasurer, Illinois State legislative committee, Order of Railway Conductors, hereby declares its opposition to any type of legislation providing for compulsory service by civilian workers; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the committee forward copies of this resolution to every Senator and Representative in the United States Congress representing the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, and to the President of the United States.

You will note their opposition to compulsory legislation.

If you will read carefully the letter on the May bill that came from President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, you will note he endorsed the work which the War Manpower Commission has done and urged that if controls have to be exerted, they be in civilian hands.

All of you have read numerous articles and listened to many speeches telling us that the future of America depends upon effective cooperation between Government, management, and labor. During my campaign for Congress I said over and over again that I believed if Government were to function efficiently, if the war were to be won in the quickest possible time, if we were to have prosperity in the post-war world, the duly designated leaders of our functional economic groups should participate in administering legislation affecting the vital interests of labor, management, and agriculture.

The War Manpower Commission has established such machinery and has obtained excellent cooperation. The May bill provides only for consultation at the

national level. I am for the Voorhis amendment because it does provide for constant contact with our basic economic groups at all levels, and we know that those groups are for the basic policies contained in the substitute before us.

Why not continue this successful teamwork and give it the statutory power it needs? I believe in building on the basis of successful experience in the American tradition of freedom and cooperation. That is why I shall vote for the Voorhis substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield. That is one reason I asked for the additional 5 minutes, in order to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to thank the gentleman very much.

I have found considerable discussion on the floor about a provision in my bill which appears on page 6, line 7 through line 10. This provision has to do with the right of the worker to refuse referral to a job. It says that under certain circumstances a worker can refuse referral. That is, he can ask for referral to a different war-production job. One of the grounds on which he can do that is "any case in which his acceptance of a job offered would, over objections presented in good faith by the worker, require him to join or resign from or refrain from joining a labor organization."

Now, what does it mean? It means this, that if I go to the War Manpower Commission office and I am a member of the A. F. of L., and they try to refer me to a shop where I would have to join the C. I. O., I can refuse that referral and ask for another referral where I do not have to change my union affiliation. Or it means that if I do not belong to any labor organization I can ask for a different referral, if the referral is to a closed shop that I do not want to join. Or if I happen to belong to a labor organization and they refer me to a shop where I could not join that one, I can ask to be referred to one where I could join. It does not say, as other amendments have said, that it shall be within the power of the War Manpower Commission or any other Government agency to say to a man, "You must work in a certain place," and then say to him afterward, although there is a contract between employers and workers, "You do not have to abide by that." It does not say that. It does say the other.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is one fact in connection with this substitute, H. R. 1799, which I had intended to bring out for the benefit of the committee and those members who are vitally concerned with the personal rights of labor.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you listened intently to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. In the course of his remarks the gentleman pointed out how certain statements made by members of this administration, no doubt unwitting of the consequence thereof, have been used as food for propaganda to stimulate the Axis Powers in their fight against us. Everyone knows that propaganda is one of the most important weapons of war. Everyone knows that newspaper items that come out of the United States and little statements made by executives in the United States have vital effect upon the people of this country.

In my own area, which is a very important one in war production, certain statements, no doubt made unwittingly last summer and in the early fall, led literally thousands of people to go home.

Why? Because they were given the idea that the war was almost over, that we were about to engage in peacetime production, and that if they were smart they would hurry home and get a peacetime job. As a matter of fact, the war plants in my area in advertising for their help, used the slogan, "A wartime job that will carry through to peacetime." So literally thousands of them went to their homes in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, and perhaps as far as Illinois and Ohio. What is it going to take to get them back into the plants either in my area or your area? It is going to take leadership, Mr. Chairman, and telling the truth to these people, the unvarnished truth, that their services are still vitally needed by their country. Then they will go back without any trouble.

But if you pass this May bill, what are you going to do? You are going to advertise to the Axis Nations the best propaganda we can find to persuade the dictatorships that slave labor is right. What is the best propaganda to fight them with? The best propaganda I can find is to let the dictatorship nations know that dictatorship and slave labor can get the hell licked out of them by democracy and free labor.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield very briefly.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy the gentleman has pointed out the necessity for telling the American people the truth. A lot of unnecessary censorship I believe is responsible for our present condition.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am quite sure of it. I talked to a great many of the workers myself. They were all anxious for that peacetime job if peace was soon to be a reality.

On yesterday I attempted to show that the argument of the President and the military leaders of our country that they needed this bill to win the war was completely offset by the argument of labor and management which are charged with the actual production for war that the bill would in fact hinder war production and said at that time that the argument put up by the gentleman from Texas, the beloved Speaker of this House, and the gentleman from Illinois, the only good argument that could be found for the bill, was the effect its defeat might have on the morale of our soldiers if they received the information in the wrong way. Let me say that if you want to save lives, if you want to help our boys win, let us continue to prove to the dictatorship nations that democracy and free labor can just lick the hell out of them any old time, now or in the future. Going into totalitarianism here will only tend to give force to their belief that dictatorship is right and democracy wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a correction be made. In printing the bill, page 12, line 16, a technical mistake was made. I ask unanimous consent that parentheses be placed around the figures "3," "4," "6" and "7," in line 17. The reference would be incorrect if this were not done. I ask unanimous consent that parentheses be placed around them.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. The Chair did not know the gentleman was a member of the committee or the Chair would have recognized the gentleman earlier.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I find myself today in the difficult position of being a new member on the Committee on Military Affairs and in being opposed to the National Service Act as now outlined. I believe I owe a deep responsibility to my President, to the military leaders of this Nation, to my colleagues on the committee, and to the chairman of my committee. But I owe a deeper responsibility to my own conscience and to the millions of workers in America who have voluntarily created the greatest production miracle the world has ever known. I owe to them the confidence which they have won. I owe to them the protection which they deserve and which this bill takes away. I cannot put under compulsion the fathers, mothers, sisters, and brothers of our fighting forces. I cannot put the chains of slave labor on the relatives of those members of the armed forces who are fighting the nations who have already enslaved their people. I cannot put the chains of slave labor on those discharged veterans who have returned to what they believe is a free country. I cannot compete in oratory with the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me. I cannot compete with them in appealing to you on a sentimental or emotional basis. I can only in my feeble way call upon you to reason on this subject and to believe me when I say that before the Members of this body and before the God I worship I am sincere in my beliefs.

If the May bill, so-called, contained the comprehensive provisions of the program advanced by the American Legion after World War No. 1, namely, total conscription of money, machines, and men, it would at least have the virtue of consistency. But it does not. If it contained the six provisions which our President asked for a year ago, it would be a national service act. But it does not. It is discriminatory, partial national service. In my opinion, the May bill approaches the problem piecemeal and imposes discriminatory regulations upon a portion of the population, leaving altogether free from any sort of control a great portion of the population now working in the defense plants, and I speak of the womanpower, I also speak of all those over the age of 45.

I will support the Voorhis amendment because it is more comprehensive in its scope, it covers the complete manpower situation and not just a portion of it, and it does not impose the severe penalties which will make it a felony to break some of the regulations which might be imposed. It is a reasonable extension of the present voluntary production system.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not true there are many men between 45 and 50 years of age, for instance, who are more able to do hard work in these war industries than many of the men in the age group from 18 to 45?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has spoken correctly.

Mr. SHORT. So it is class legislation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is partial legislation directed toward one class of our working population. It conscripts labor not for the sole benefit of the Nation but also for the private war profits of the owners of industry. It does not conscript nonessential or unused factories or compel management to perform contracts in those factories. It does not compel management to accept workers now discriminated against for various reasons, including race. It does not protect labor from transfer from a wage of $1 an hour in one industry to a wage of 40 cents an hour in another industry. Therefore, that in itself is wrong. It ignores the 3 years of experience of the cooperation production committees, of the Manpower Commission, which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER], who has had 3 years experience himself on those committees, outlined to you a moment ago, and I wish he had had more time to speak to you from his practical experience on the problems of management and labor coordination. It substitutes the selective-service boards as referral boards and classification agencies of individuals, and I submit to you that they are not capable of performing that function. Their function is built up along different lines of deciding whether a man is qualified for military service under regulations which have been given them, and it duplicates the work now being done by the U. S. E. S., which has to do properly with the referral and classification of workers. It makes no provision for transfer of a worker from an obnoxious employer, or an employer who becomes tyrannical or imposes working conditions or wages even, speaking of a separate industry, such as a 40-cent wage, instead of $1 an hour. I think that it imposes an impossible administrative burden on the selective-service boards because it will immediately throw into consideration at least ten and one-half million new individuals to be classified, indexed, and handled. Many of these individuals are already classified in the records of the United States Employment Services. Thus we see confusion and duplication of referrals and classification of skills. For 3 years now the U. S. E. S. in cooperation with local and area manpower committees have been developing methods of referrals and procedures of classifying workers. Now we are preparing to ignore and nullify a system that has by trial and error proven to be successful.

I submit that when you talk about the different volunteer boards in your own district and the type of men that are on them, who have had no previous experience in management-labor relations and in the classification of industrial workers, it is an impossible burden to ask these already overburdened men and women to perform this additional, tremendous burden.

We have been asked to pass this bill because of the recommendations of the heads of the military forces of our country. I have voted and acceded to every request of the military forces in military matters where they are supposed to be experts; they now ask me to do a thing, the purported purpose of which they say is to increase production. No one can speak to me about my lack of concern. I have members of my own family fighting in the armed forces, and when I cast my vote on this bill it will be in a way that will give those members of my family and your family additional guns, tanks, and ammunition. I submit to you that the heads of the military forces are not capable of passing on this problem. This is not a military problem. I submit to you that the heads of the military forces of our country have not been 100 percent right in their own field, although I respect them highly. During the years of 1943 and 1942 we had repeated predictions on the part of our military leaders that the war would soon be over. I include in my remarks the following quotations from our military leaders and the names of those who made them.

MILITARY AUTHORITIES' PREDICTIONS ON END OF WAR

Admiral William F. Halsey on January 1, 1943:

Nineteen hundred and forty-three will see * * * complete, absolute defeat for the Axis.

Gen. H. H. Arnold in February 1943:

I have an appointment in Berlin a year from today.

Lieut. Gen. Mark W. Clark in November 1943:

It is my hope and belief that before November 1944 the battle for Europe will have terminated in a smashing victory.

General Eisenhower in December 1943:

The Allies will win the European war in 1944.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in August 1944:

Victory over the Germans is not far off.

Gen. George C. Marshall in December 7, 1944:

Before this statement is published, hostilities might have terminated in the European theater.

I place these quotations in the RECORD not to discredit the military leaders, but to prove to the Members of this House that our military leaders have not been infallible in their judgment regarding military matters. Why then should we regard their recommendations in a field foreign to their training? That is, the field of industrial production.

I would not accept the judgment of Philip Murray, William Green, or any other labor leader on a military problem. I would not accept the judgment of Frederick Crawford, chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers, on a military problem. But, gentlemen and ladies of the House, I would accept the combined judgment of these men in matters of production. Here is their advice:

ATTITUDE OF LEADERS RESPONSIBLE FOR PRODUCTION

N. A. M.—One hundred and fifty State and local industrial associations:

If national manpower legislation could provide the answer, industry itself would be the first to call for the enactment of a national service law. But the very nature of the manpower problem today is proof positive that national legislation—a blanket law—would not and could not solve the crisis.

Labor—William Green, American Federation of Labor:

The manpower problem can be dealt with in a constructive way and solved—not through resort to compulsion and force—but instead, through the better utilization of available manpower. There is no shortage of manpower. It is a question of the proper utilization of available manpower.

Mr. Murray, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

We are today abreast of or ahead of most war production schedules. Where we are not it is due to step-ups in a few lines of war products, or to errors in scheduling by procurement agencies. We must correct and overcome these situations by joint cooperation between labor, industry, and the war agencies.

And I want to comment at this time on a few suggestions as to how we can improve existing production schedules without resorting to the slave-labor philosophy contained in H. R. 1752.

First. All procurement contracts of the Army, Navy, Maritime, and Treasury should be placed by a central procurement agency, avoiding the confusion, competitive bidding, and overlapping purchases now existing due to the separate procurement agencies named.

Second. Proper allocation of contracts with regard to available facilities and manpower, regardless of size of plant.

This would utilize the tremendous facilities of small plants throughout our Nation, who have, to a great extent, been ignored in favor of the 7½-percent portion of industry in the big-business category.

Third. Authorize the United States Employment Service to register all workers now engaged in nonessential industries between the ages of 18 and 60, classify their skills, and offer them essential work. Give them the protection of their present pension and seniority rights. Pay their transportation expenses to the area where they are needed and provide them housing facilities when they are located. Protect their earning power against hardship, reduction, and protect their contractual obligations.

Continue to have faith in the American way of free enterprise, free labor, and the civil rights of the Constitution which prohibits involuntary servitude. Continue to give American free labor the chance to produce the guns, tanks, ammunition, food, and planes to destroy the principal exponents of slave labor, the Axis Nations. In our anxiety let us beware of losing the freedom of our people at home, while our boys are dying to preserve it on the far-flung battlefields of the world.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky if it does not come out of my time.

Mr. MAY. I am perfectly willing it not come out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. JENNINGS. All right.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time will that give those who have not spoken?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have not had an opportunity to speak on this bill, and I want 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 40 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time will that give us who desire to be heard?

Mr. MAY. The 40 minutes will be apportioned among those wishing to speak.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Ten minutes has already been granted by unanimous consent to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 40 minutes, not including the time allotted to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. IZAC, Mr. VURSELL, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. HOFFMAN objected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I will revise that request and ask unanimous consent that the time be limited to 1 hour, including the time of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration by this House is the most far-reaching and drastic measure affecting the persons, the liberties, and the lives of the civilian population of this country ever pressed for passage in any Congress of this Nation. If enacted into law by our votes, the life, the liberty, and the person of every man and boy in this Nation between the ages of 18 and 45 years will absolutely be in the hands of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. He can freeze them in their jobs. He can say to those engaged in industry and on the farm and in every other line of human activity, "Leave your home, leave the place of your residence, leave your present job, and go to the job that I designate for you."

Let us consider this all-inclusive language of the bill. Men may be forced to work in what is designated as war production or in support of what is vaguely designated as in the interest of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is the gentleman referring to the bill, H. R. 1752, or to the Voorhis amendment?

Mr. JENNINGS. I am talking about the bill, H. R. 1752.

I cannot support this measure because in my opinion it is violative of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of this country, which reads as follows:

SECTION 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The first section of amendment XIII is self-executing, that is to say, it does not require any congressional act to make it effective, because by its terms it is inhibitory. It is not within the power of Congress to sanction or to create or to set up machinery that results in slavery or involuntary servitude except that the man upon whom it is imposed shall have first been indicted and tried before a jury of his peers and convicted of a crime, part of the penalty of which is hard labor.

Now, let us just talk about the facts of life for a little bit. What have we done in this war effort? We have shifted from a basis of peacetime production to a basis of wartime production, and what we have done through free labor, through the cooperation of ownership, management, and labor, has been and is the envy and the marvel of the world.

I represent a district which is one of the largest in population in this country, almost 500,000 men and women and children. It is a cross-section of America. We are engaged in every form of productive activity, in agriculture, in mining, in manufacturing. Forty-five thousand of our boys have been builded into a living organization of offense and defense, and they are fighting all over the world.

I have seen the labor of my district at work. I have seen them go into the mines in the morning and come out at nightfall, grimy with the dust of the mines. I have seen them on the farm work from sun-up until dark. I have seen them in the great aluminum plant at Alcoa in my district, 13,000 in number, make aluminum for our war plants, 50 times as fast as Hitler can make it. I have seen them in other plants making all of the intricate and effective implements of warfare. These people in my district, in common with the men and women who work in your district, look upon this bill as a bill sanctioning and imposing on them slave labor.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Thousands of men in that Alcoa plant were forced to go out of work because of Army cut-backs, because of a surplus supply.

Mr. JENNINGS. Whatever shortage of munitions may exist, and I doubt whether it does exist, is due to the bungling and mistakes and misjudgment of those above them. It is not labor's fault.

I will introduce to you a witness whose veracity, I take it, few who are supporting this bill would question. I am going to read the words of this witness which he delivered in a public address when he sought the highest office within the gift of this people. After recapitulating what we had done for our allies, the British, Russians, the French, and all who are fighting on our side, he used these words:

All of these operations have to be planned far in advance, and that does not mean merely drawing arrows on maps. It has meant planning in terms of precisely how many men will be needed, how many ships, warships, cargo ships, landing craft, how many bombers and how many fighter planes and equipment, and what types of equipment down to the last cartridge.

None other than the President of the United States said that a little more than 90 days ago.

This bill is harsh in its terms and anyone violating its requirements may be indicted in the United States district court and if found guilty of a willful violation may be punished by imprisonment of not more than 1 year or by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The power of Congress to raise and support armies and to declare war or to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, in my opinion, has no application to the proposed measure. There is a vast difference between the power of the Congress to provide for the national defense by a compulsory Selective Service System

and this attempt to draft men and boys and to compel them to enter the employ of a private individual or a private corporation engaged in private enterprise.

I have carefully examined all of the authorities cited by the report of the Committee on Military Affairs in the effort of the committee to afford legal justification for the enactment of this measure. None of the cases support the proposition; none of the opinions justify the enactment of this measure because no Federal district court, no United States Circuit Court of Appeals nor the Supreme Court of the United States in any opinion has ever held that the Government has the power to compel a citizen to submit to "slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." No Federal court in this land since the adoption of the thirteenth amendment in 1865 has ever upheld a law such as it is proposed to enact by this bill. This is true because Congress has never heretofore enacted such a law.

This Nation fought and won the Spanish-American War, it fought and won the First World War, without resorting to any such measure.

We have fought this war, the greatest in which we have ever been involved, for the past 3 years, have raised an armed force of 12,000,000 men and women, have clothed, fed, and equipped them without resorting to slave labor.

Whoever drafted the report in support of the pending bill was so hard put for an authority to support it that he cited the case in which the Supreme Court of the United States held that this Government has the power to require a Jap to observe a curfew regulation requiring him to be in his own home after a certain hour at night—*Hirabayashi* v. *U. S.* (320 U. S. 81), at page 93. And in an effort to bolster the position of the supporters of this measure, the case of Heflin against Sanford, reported in One Hundred and Forty-second Federal Reports, second edition, page 799, is cited, in which the Court held:

> Where by law able-bodied male persons between 25 and 45 years were required to labor on the highways of the county for 6 days each year, failure being punishment as a crime and such a person was convicted and on habeas corpus contended there was violation of the thirteenth amendment—

It was held that such service, like compulsory service in the Army, on juries, and the like, was no violation of the amendment—meaning the thirteenth amendment.

It is thus seen that the only kind of service that the Government may compel the citizen to render is a public service. There has never heretofore been an attempt made to compel the citizens to work in private industry for a private employer engaged in private enterprise for a profit to the employer.

I have also carefully examined all of the cases cited on page 6 of the report of the committee. These are cases in which persons claiming to be conscientious objectors were classified as such by their draft boards and who, when called for induction into the civilian public service camps where they were required to perform labor at a small compensation per month, failed to report and were indicted, tried, and convicted, and sentenced to prison, and on appeal their convictions were affirmed. Some of the cases arose on an effort of these conscientious objectors to be discharged from such camps by resorting to the writ of habeas corpus. The courts uniformly held in all these cases that the classifying of these persons as conscientious objectors and their relief from service in the armed forces by the terms of the Selective Service Act is an act of grace on the part of the Congress and the Government and that they cannot be heard to complain if, instead of being inducted into the armed forces, they are inducted into a camp where labor useful to the public is performed. They are not required to work in private industry for a private employer who realizes a profit out of their labor.

Congress in an effort to enforce the thirteenth amendment by appropriate legislation has passed statutes known as the Peonage Statutes. These statutes denounce as a crime the holding of a citizen in peonage—that is, compelling him to perform involuntary labor in discharge of a civil debt or obligation. In certain States an effort was made to circumvent the Federal laws against peonage by resorting to this expedient: A person desiring to obtain the labor of a prisoner confined in a jail or work house on some minor offense would enter into a contract with the prisoner under the terms of which the person desiring to obtain the labor of the prisoner would assume the payment of the prisoner's fine and costs and the prisoner would contract with such person to work for him until the amount of his fine and costs had been worked out at so much per month. The Federal courts have uniformly held that such a contract is involuntary servitude, is illegal, and in violation of the thirteenth amendment. Speaking of the purpose of these antipeonage statutes, the Supreme Court of the United States used this language:

> The purpose of this section (referring to the section forbidding involuntary servitude) was to strike down all laws, regulations, and usages in States and Territories which attempted to maintain and enforce, directly or indirectly, voluntary or involuntary service or labor of any person as peons, in liquidation of any debt or obligation. (*United States* v. *Reynolds* (235 U. S. Sup. Ct. Repts., p. 133).)

It is seen, therefore, that insofar as any attempt has ever been made in this country, since the adoption of the thirteenth amendment, to impose upon any citizen of this land involuntary servitude or the obligation to perform labor for a private individual in private industry such illegal attempt has been stricken down by the courts, either in enforcement of the thirteenth amendment or the enforcement of the Federal statutes against peonage.

And it has been said in the course of the debate on this measure and in justification of many of the flagrant usurpations of power and illegal trespasses against the lives, liberties, and property rights of the citizens of this country by this administration that such violations of the citizens' rights are sanctioned and justifiable because we are engaged in war and that an emergency exists. In the case Ex parte Milligan reported in United States Supreme Court Reports 71, page 2, it is held:

> Neither the President, nor Congress, nor the judiciary can disturb any one of the safeguards of civil liberty incorporated in the Constitution except so far as the right is given to suspend in certain cases the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. Justice Davis, in delivering the opinion of the Court in the Milligan case and in stressing the supremacy of the supreme law of the land and the sanctity of the rights of the citizens guaranteed by the Constitution and the wisdom of our ancestors in providing these safeguards, used the following language:

> Time has proven the discernment of our ancestors; for even these provisions, expressed in such plain English words, that it would seem the ingenuity of man could not evade them, are now, after the lapse of more than 70 years, sought to be avoided. Those great and good men foresaw that troublous times would arise, when rulers and people would become restive under restraint, and seek by sharp and decisive measures to accomplish ends deemed just and proper; and that the principles of constitutional liberty would be in peril, unless established by irrepealable law. The history of the world had taught them that what was done in the past might be attempted in the future. The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false; for the Government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence; as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to throw off its just authority.

This act is the culmination of a determined effort to strip the citizens of this country of the protection afforded them both by the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution and the fifth amendment, which provides:

> No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

The creeping paralysis of arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of the citizen has found expression and sanction in the words of the President, who in his annual message to Congress, January 3, 1936, used these words:

> In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

Any instrument of public power capable of providing shackles for the liberties of the people is a menace to the rights of our people regardless of who exercises such power.

Again the President said in his address in Madison Square Garden on Saturday, October 31, 1936:

I should like to have it said of my first administration that in it the forces of selfishness and of lust for power met their match. I should like to have it said of my second administration that in it these forces met their master.

It is significant that the far-reaching and unprecedented powers sought by this administration under this bill were not mentioned until after the November 1944 election. This bill is but another step in the march toward a communistic form of government in the United States. It may well prove the last and final step on the road that carries the people of this country into what every Communist in the country is driving toward, a communistic state. It is significant that this measure is supported by the Communists of the country. This measure, in my opinion, will cripple and reduce rather than strengthen and increase production. Its enforcement will require the time and labor of thousands of men who might otherwise be employed in war industry. It will create confusion and resentment in the minds of millions of loyal men, women, boys, and girls who are now engaged in an all-out effort to produce the implements of warfare. It is another illustration of the insatiate greed of this administration for power and more power. It has never surrendered any power that has been delegated to it, and it has never failed to abuse and go beyond the limits of the powers granted to it. Last year as a notable example of its disregard of the rights of the citizen, we witnessed an administrative agency of the Government through the employment of the armed forces carry Sewell Avery, a man 70 years of age, out of his office in Montgomery Ward's place of business in Chicago. I hold no brief for Sewell Avery. He seems to be able to take care of himself. But the feet of those, who, with armed might at the point of a gun, carried him from his place of business, now stand at the door and on the threshold of every workingman between the ages of 18 and 45 in the land. They resent it; their employers resent it; their sons and daughters in the armed forces resent it. This act applies to our veterans, and its heavy hand may deprive them of their liberty and force them into slave labor. The people of this country were not born with saddles on their backs to be ridden, or driven, by anyone desiring to place shackles on their limbs or to be their master. This measure is uncalled for. It is opposed by ownership, management, and labor. And I am unalterably opposed to its enactment and shall vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, it is with keen reluctance that I find myself opposed to the request of our Commander in Chief and his military staff. Only once in the past 4 years have I voted against any major legislation that they requested. There has been much partisan debate on this May bill but there is only one issue before the House, and that is: Will the proposed legislation—the May bill—provide the necessary manpower requirements of the Army and the civilian labor needs, and, second, will the enactment of this bill increase production of vital implements of war. That is all. The only way I can gage this whole situation is by the facts which I intend to submit to the Committee for its consideration.

We must first read and bear in mind the report of Senator MEAD's committee, formerly the Truman committee. We know there have been no greater administration followers than Senator MEAD and Senator KILGORE, and certainly their report would not be biased. Yet after spending 2 days in the Norfolk Navy Yard with over 38,000 employees, the Navy maintains there is a manpower shortage of 4,000 men. The Mead committee, in its report, said they found men making "knicknacks" and employees falling over each other upon the decks of warships. Yet, the Navy says there is a manpower shortage at Norfolk.

I want to make a few remarks about the district which I represent, the largest heavy steel industrial district in America. I will show you actual statistics in a moment where we produced more steel in my district alone last year than was made by the entire Nipponese Government. We came within 50,000 tons of the entire production of Germany. Here is what the Director of the War Manpower Commission for Western Pennsylvania says in a letter to me dated January 31, which I received at noon today:

Shortage of manpower in the Pittsburgh Area IX of the War Manpower Commission (Allegheny, Beaver, parts of Westmoreland and Washington Counties) does not warrant passage of work or fight legislation in my opinion. Congressional action to put teeth in present W. M. C. manpower control program would be the answer here.

How can I justify my action to the boys overseas and to my constituents by voting for the May bill? Here are the production records of the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania—which speak for themselves—of our cooperation with the rest of the Nation to outproduce the world in shells, planes, tanks, and guns:

The world record for pig-iron production was broken by the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Edgar Thomson plant, Braddock, Pa.

The world's production records were broken by blast-furnace crew twice within 1 month in Rankin, Pa., when 42,131 net tons of steel were produced during the month of March of last year by 31 men, all of whom received personal citation by Robert Patterson, Under Secretary of War.

Pittsburgh Steel Foundry Corporation of Glassport, Pa., shattered an all-time production record for 1944, producing 100 percent for war and not 1 pound of goods for civilian orders.

United States Steel Corporation, world's largest industrial empire, with large facilities in my district in Homestead, Duquesne, Clairton, Mifflin, and Braddock, revealed an all-time production peak in turning out over 40,000,000 tons of steel.

A new world's record for iron production was set last month, and also during 1944, by the National Tube Co.'s blast furnaces, setting an iron record in the United States.

The Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation broke many steel-production records during 1944, establishing new highs for the months of March and April. A new high record in the production of plates for ships was also made in May.

The National Tube Co.'s Christy Park works, McKeesport, Pa., set a world's record in shell production. A work crew during a 24-hour period produced 7,014 forgings without a rejection.

The Homestead Steel Works of the United States Steel is far ahead of schedule in producing 30-inch armor plate for giant battleships.

In view of this unbelievable record of production by free labor, how can I conscientiously vote for a conscription of labor?

There are other more competent authorities who share my belief and I want to quote them:

Maj. Gen. Levin H. Campbell, Jr., Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, said in a Pittsburgh address last year:

You are producing the world's finest weapons, from rifles to tanks and Flying Fortresses that are rolling off the production lines, in such quantities as to confound the enemy. My hat is off to all you steel makers.

Donald Nelson, former W. P. B. chief, lauded production miracle in America, greatest in the world, and said we have now reached the victory peak of production and it is now only a question of proper allocation and procurement.

How do the boys overseas feel about this legislation? I interviewed 17 families in my area with two or more boys in service, in each of which families at least one son has made the supreme sacrifice, and every family except one opposed the May bill, for conscription of labor.

PARENTS OPPOSE

Our distinguished colleague, Congressman A. B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, with five sons in the service, is opposed to the May bill.

I want to read an excerpt from the letter of a father in my district—with four sons in the service, one of whom has been permanently disabled—about labor conscription, and I quote:

I wish to register my opposition to any such measure because it is my firm conviction that it is both un-American and will work irretrievable harm to democratic institutions.

I have four sons in the service, or rather I did have, one is already permanently crippled, so I have every possible reason, personal as well as patriotic, to desire the earliest possible ending of the war. I know they would strenuously oppose a national service act as the very antithesis of what we have been told they are fighting for.

MEAD COMMITTEE SAYS "NO"

With the evidence I have to verify the findings of the Mead committee, that is, hoarding of manpower in my own district, and with the record of production I have submitted, I urge this House to grant the power and authority to the War Manpower Commission, in coopera-

tion with labor and management, to go into each plant and check the manpower situation, and maladjustments will be rectified. There is now clear-cut evidence of malutilization of labor that will not be alleviated by a national service law. The voluntary system has worked wonders to date; let us continue it in the future and help speed the day of victory and aid in bringing our boys home as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we have been told by the proponents of the May conscription bill, H. R. 1752, that the Army and the Navy will need 900,000 additional men by June 30, 1945, and that there will be needed an additional 700,000 men and women in essential war industries.

The President and the Selective Service have all the laws and powers and authority necessary to secure the 900,000 additional men and more. General Hershey the other day said that under the powers of Congress, he can place every male between the ages of 18 and 45—numbering 18,000,000 men—in the armed services regardless of their circumstances or conditions except—the administration had inserted in the Selective Service or Draft Act a provision giving almost unlimited power to the heads of various Federal departments and agencies to determine whether or not officials and workers in these departments and agencies may be exempted from the armed forces. This provision should never have been put into the draft law to give Government officials and workers a preferential status. Investigations made by various committees—some of them of the House and Senate—disclosed that more than 300,000 young men, a large majority of whom are single, and all are in good health and subject to the draft, and who are performing for the most part clerical work for the Government, are exempted and kept out of the armed services.

I have many times denounced, and I am today denouncing, this partiality and favoritism to this group of Federal officers. They are not performing essential war services that are comparable to the young men who have been taken from the farms, mines, shops, plants, mills, railroads, and industries and of the country.

It is a notorious fact that the Federal Government is the greatest hoarder of manpower in the Nation. Recent records disclose that there are now 3,009,000 Federal officeholders. There was an increase of over 300,000 in the year 1944. Hardly anyone attempts to deny that there are at least a million more persons on the Federal pay rolls than are needed. The May conscription bill will not reach nor correct this partiality and favoritism existing in favor of employees of the Federal Government.

Why does not the Military Affairs Committee of the House bring out a bill amending the draft law, so as to make these 300,000 able-bodied young men subject to the draft? This would reduce the alleged requirements of the Army and Navy to 600,000. If the same rate of volunteering for the Navy of young men under 18 carries through to June 30, 1945, it will bring to the armed service an additional 150,000. There will be another 420,000 young men who will become of age before June 30, 1945 and who will meet the physical and mental requirements.

These 4 items would bring into the armed services 1,170,000. There are 18,000,000 boys and men now between the ages of 18 and 45 who are not in the armed services. The Selective Service has the power to dip into the 18,000,000 and get whatever number the armed forces may call for to take care of the 900,000 which it is said will be required for the armed service by June 30, 1945.

However, some are insisting that an additional 200,000 men and boys should be taken from the farms. Who does not realize the great importance of the production of food, feed, and fiber? We must have these to win the war; these must come from the products of the farm.

According to their numbers, more men have been taken from the farms than from industry or any other activity. There can be no serious question but that the 900,000 additional men in the service can be secured. The President and the Director of Selective Service have been granted all the power that they have sought or need to secure all the men necessary for the armed services. The American people and every Member of Congress will follow the recommendations of our generals and admirals in charge of our armed forces and in the direction of our war efforts. They must have all the men that in their opinion they need for the successful prosecution of the war. I certainly would not set my judgment against theirs as to the need for 900,000 additional men by June 30, 1945.

WORK-OR-JAIL BILL

The country has been led to believe, through the press and over the radio, that we have before us a work-or-fight bill. Mr. MAY, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, did introduce such a bill (H. R. 1119), but he and his committee abandoned this bill providing for "work or fight," and he introduced a new bill (H. R. 1752), the work-or-jail bill. This work-or-jail bill is the bill that is before us for consideration and not the work-or-fight bill.

This bill gives to various agencies of the Government the power to conscript all men between the ages of 18 and 45, about 18,000,000 in all. The committee abandoned the work-or-fight bill because there was no basis for such a bill, as the President and the Selective Service had all the power necessary to induct into the armed forces any or all of the 18,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 45 when the generals and admirals say they only need 900,000 by June 30, 1945.

We have already pointed out how easy it would be to secure these 900,000 men by June 30 next. Under the work-or-fight bill, if a man refused to work he could be put into the armed services. There is nothing in this bill that provides for placing these 18,000,000 men in the armed services. It does provide, however, that these men may be conscripted for work, and required to work, and be sent to any part of the United States or elsewhere, to work on any job or task to which they may be assigned. If they fail to respond they are subject to a fine not to exceed $10,000 or 5 years in the penitentiary, or both the fine and imprisonment. It can be seen at once why this is designated the work-or-jail bill.

Bear in mind these men will not work for the Government as soldiers, sailors, or marines work; but they must work for private companies or for individuals engaged in production, on farms, railroads, in mines, shops and mills and factories, for profit. Those in our armed services work for their Government and their Government is not engaged in activities for profit but for the defense and welfare of the Nation.

The question arises, Can private citizens under the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits involuntary servitude, be required to work for private concerns or for individuals who are carrying on a business for profit for themselves?

Under H. R. 1752 persons could be taken off their own farms and away from their businesses, or from their stores or shops, and thereby have their business destroyed. They could be required to go and work for some other individual and help him carry on his business for profit.

Under H. R. 1119, the work-or-fight bill, any citizen could be inducted into the armed forces, and, as such, his Government could require him to perform any service within his abilities but it is quite different being drafted for the Government in the defense and for the welfare of the country, and working for private concerns and individuals who are engaged in business for profit.

I cannot believe the Senate will place its stamp of approval on H. R. 1752.

WE MUST PROVIDE ALL MEN AND EQUIPMENT NECESSARY

The War and Navy Departments say they need additional munitions of war, and we are told by some that it would require 700,000 additional men and women by June 30, 1945, to provide the additional equipment. The War Manpower Commission, whose job it has been during the war to study the needs of the necessary manpower for our war-production facilities, says that less than 160,000 additional men will meet the requirements. I certainly shall not interpose my judgment against the generals and admirals as to the number of additional men required for the armed services, neither will I question what they say they need in the way of additional equipment and munitions. Our grand and heroic defenders should have all the help and all of the munitions, as well as an abundance of food and ample and suitable clothing, and a substantial surplus besides. Let us meet their requirements without stint, in order to win the war at the earliest moment possible.

Our generals and admirals have been trained from boyhood in the sciences of war. They have special experience and

knowledge about the needs and requirements for the battle fronts. They use what the home front provides. Our generals and admirals are not experienced or specialists in production. I have not received from my district one letter, telegram, or other communication from industry, management, agriculture, or labor in favor of the May bill, H. R. 1752, but have received literally hundreds of communications from industry, management, farmers, and labor in my district strongly protesting against it.

INDUSTRY, MANAGEMENT, LABOR, AND AGRICULTURE

The proponents of this bill insist that the best way to procure this additional equipment is by force—the conscription of 18,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 45. This policy is insisted upon by those who are not experienced or trained in production. Industry, management, agriculture, and labor insist that a policy of force will not increase but decrease production. It will hurt and not help. The real question to be determined by us is what is the best course to follow to secure increased production. Is it force or patriotic cooperation? Who is best able to advise us as to the better course, those without experience in production, or those of long training and wide experience in that field? We should not be carried away by emotion or sentiment. We should look at this matter realistically. We should call upon those who produce our war needs and find out the best way of meeting the requests of our generals and our admirals. Some of the proponents of this legislation, waving the flag and with great emotion, have insisted that we adopt H. R. 1752, without a single amendment, not even to the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." Our Speaker took the floor and insisted that there should be no amendments adopted. They attempted to tell us that General Marshall, Chief of Staff, and Admiral King, Chief of Naval Operations, wanted this particular bill. I find no words or statement from them whereby they put their seal of approval on H. R. 1752. I doubt if they would undertake to tell the Congress, or those in charge of production, how they should organize the agencies of production. Some of those who have spoken with great emotion pointed out that we must adopt this particular bill and without amendments or hurt the morale of our men in the armed forces. Some of these proponents have no one in the armed services, while many of us, who look with misgivings on this bill, have sons, nephews, and brothers in the armed forces, and overseas. My only son, although married before Pearl Harbor, volunteered and has been in the service for nearly 3 years, and my nephews who were physically able and old enough to volunteer; and this son and these nephews are overseas. I am sure they would desire you and me to examine this whole matter with great care and do the very best thing possible for them and for our country.

I have tried to inform myself as to what is the best thing and I hope that I may have the courage to do what appears to me in good conscience to be in the interest of our people and our country, and when I do that it will be the answer to my son, my nephews, and the others when they return.

FREE LABOR OR CONSCRIPT LABOR

Judging from what our admirals and generals say that we need additional munitions and materials of war, and others have estimated that this might require the services of 700,000 additional men and women in industry and agriculture before June 30, 1945, although the Manpower Commission, that should know better than any of us, says that it will not require more than 160,000. The simple question is, Can we secure better results through the cooperation of industry, management, agriculture, and labor acting with the Manpower Commission set up by Congress, as provided in the substitute bill, H. R. 1803, offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana, of the Military Affairs Committee, or the other substitute bill offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California, or will we secure better results by the conscription of enforced labor provided in H. R. 1752 before us? We look to our commanders and fighting men to use effectively the ships, guns, planes, shells, tanks, and other war materials that we have furnished them, and what a wonderful job and what a glorious record of courageous and patriotic achievement they have made! On the other hand, to whom must we look to provide the ships, planes, tanks, guns, shells, food, clothing, oil, gas, coal, and other munitions of war? Do we not have to look to and depend upon industry, management, labor, agriculture, and our Manpower Commission, cooperating together, to produce adequately and, yes, even more than our fighting forces say they require? There must be no shortage at any time or at any place.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers' Association, other business organizations, a great majority of the farmers of the Nation, the Railroad Brotherhoods, truck operators, the American Federation of Labor, the United Mine Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, for one time have united, and with one accord they declare that free labor and not conscript labor is the answer. Conscript labor will not increase but will decrease production. Enforced labor will hurt and not help in producing this necessary equipment and munitions. They are joined in this view by those conducting our Manpower Commission. They are vigorously opposing the May conscript bill, H. R. 1752, and almost as a unit are giving their support to the substitute bill, H. R. 1803. These groups are specialists in the field of production. Can we in good conscience ignore their protest?

American labor is not the only one protesting against this bill. A most vigorous protest comes from the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, industry, management, and agriculture.

The American Association of Manufacturers said in part in a very illuminating statement in opposition to this bill—

Management of American industries have been extremely reluctant to employ any form of compulsory labor. This has been based on long experience in dealing with American workers, and because this experience has convinced management that compulsion does not produce as efficiently as free men. The record of production since Pearl Harbor justifies this belief.

President William Green says—

Our great production record was achieved in spite of manpower wastage in plants on cost-plus basis, and waste in Government controlled plants, navy yards, etc. These wastages can no longer be tolerated.

Mr. Green also states—

that conditions exist in navy yards and many other plants working on cost-plus basis as we know from our representatives, and especially is that confirmed by Senator MEAD'S statement to the United States Senate. This bill (H. R. 1803) gives the authority necessary to correct this condition. Manpower is adequate to meet the demand under a free system and there is no need for compulsion.

Hon. Donald Nelson, the great industrialist and the greatest production man in the United States, stated in one of his written reports:

We call our secret weapon the initiative and intelligence and know-how of free American workers.

Hon. Joseph Keenan, W. P. B. Vice Chairman, stated:

Labor's morale, her sense of participation, have been so heightened that they broke all records.

Industry, management, labor, and agriculture have set about to build up a great cooperative program.

First. To give the legislative authority for War Manpower Commission. The War Manpower Commission today was created by Executive order. It is without legal status. It could only recommend.

Second. Establishment of employment ceilings.

Third. Use of controlled referrals to regulate hiring.

Fourth. Authorize compulsory release of employees in excess of the number permitted individual employers under manpower ceilings.

Fifth. Enforcement of such regulations, not against the workers but against the employers through court proceedings comparable to those used to enforce price ceilings under the Price Control Act.

Sixth. Reemphasize by management in plant practices to increase production and eliminate labor hoarding.

Seventh. Reemphasize by labor on increasing production with workers now available.

Eighth. Community publicity campaigns.

The Federal Government is the greatest hoarder of labor, according to the reports of investigating committees of the Senate. There is particularly in the cost-plus plants a great excess of labor, and this is true as to the ship yards and other Government-operated industries. You can see that the program here provides that there shall be established employment ceilings. In no plant are they permitted to hire more people than are reasonably necessary to carry on the work in that plant, and as H. R. 1803 and the Voorhis bill would correct these conditions and carry out these recommen-

dations but the May bill does not reach any of these conditions or situations, and this plan provides for punishment of employers who violate their ceiling number as we now punish persons who violate ceiling prices under the O. P. A. This program has the backing of the War Manpower Commission and many other Government officials who are interested in production. Let us not forget that all of these great agencies of production, including labor, assert most positively that the May bill will reduce and not increase production.

PARTIALITY AND FAVORITISM

Let us keep in mind that the May bill deals only with persons between the ages of 18 and 45. Under the present laws, the draft boards deal only with the induction of men into our armed forces. The May bill brings into the picture the conscription of labor. They will have much to do with sending people all over the country. I mean those who have not gone into war activities, except it freezes into their jobs the millions who are now employed in war-work activities. It was stated on the floor by one of the proponents of this measure that this would pick up the bums in poolrooms and other joints. If any of these bums or others are picked up and conscripted between the ages of 18 and 45, they will receive special treatment under the May bill.

First. They will be paid their transportation to their place of employment and return after their employment ceases.

Second. They will be granted all the rights and privileges provided under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. They will receive special consideration as to debts they owe, taxes, and holding leased property, and so forth, and at the end of the war they are guaranteed other employment as soldiers, sailors, and marines. How could there be a more flagrant case of partiality and favoritism? When they are assigned to work and go to a factory that has a closed shop they must join the union, or if they are opposed to joining the union, they will not have to work at that shop or factory. There is nothing in the May bill giving the employers the power to discharge any worthless, trifling person that may be picked up under this conscription bill. Let us bear in mind that there are tens of millions of patriotic, industrious workers that are already in these plants and other millions will go voluntarily when they know that their Government needs them, but they do not get the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. They have not been paid their transportation to their work and will not receive their transportation back home.

It does not take a wise man to see what effect this preferred treatment of draftees will have on the millions of other loyal, industrious, patriotic workers. These millions will, no doubt, insist that they receive like treatment, and if it is refused, what discord and dissension will it develop. We can see at a glance that the loyal, patriotic, industrious workers are penalized under this bill, while those who are forced into war work will be rewarded. How will our soldiers, sailors, and marines feel when they learn that these drafted war workers will receive perhaps $50 to $100 per week or more and be put on the same footing as soldiers, sailors, and marines under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act who are in our armed services, offering their lives and giving their lives on a base pay to start with of $50 per month and giving $22 or more of that to needy dependents back home?

I have always placed our defenders first and I shall continue to do so. I could not in good conscience vote for any bill that discriminates against the millions who are already in war work and the millions or more who are more than 45 years of age and against our soldiers, sailors, and marines. We have been warned that if we voted against the monstrosity of a bill that has not been endorsed by General Marshall or Admiral King and has been denounced by industry, management, labor, and agriculture, that we will likely be defeated. My conscience tells me that we are right in opposing this bill, and I would not exchange what I believe to be right for any tenure of office I might receive in the future.

These proponents of the bill seem to forget that there are more than 50,000,000 people employed in this country in industry, agriculture, transportation, and other activities. We have approximately 12,000,000 men in our armed services. I am satisfied that 85 to 90 percent of these come from those engaged in industry, agriculture, transportation, and other activities. Let us repeat again that the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Manufacturers Association, those engaged in transportation, agriculture, management, and labor are opposed to the May conscription bill. Millions of boys have been taken from the farms and the mines, from the railroads, the shops, mills, factories, and the offices of this country. They in one capacity or another left industry, management, labor, and agriculture to go into our armed services. These boys are fighting against totalitarianism; they are fighting for liberty and freedom on the seven seas and the 5 continents of the world.

Must we in adopting this bill change the policy of this Government from its beginning? We had the institution of slavery in this country for a long time. The black man was compelled to work for private citizens who were engaged in profit-making activities. We fought a war to get away from that. Now we propose to adopt it for white men and black men alike who happen to be between the ages of 18 and 45. Those who know the problem of production say we can do a better job with free labor than with conscripted labor. We have amazed the world in our productive enterprises with free enterprise and free labor. Starting from scratch we have built the greatest Navy in all history. We have the best equipped, best clothed, and best fed Army in the world, and we have the best transportation system in the world. Our farmers with millions of their boys away in war have broken all production records in 1943, and still better in 1944. What a wonderful job has been done on the railroads, the bus, and truck lines, the air lines, in the mines, factories, shops, mills, and on the farms. Yes; we provided for ourselves and furnished billions of dollars' worth of munitions and other war equipment, food, and other supplies to our allies and with that wonderful record of achievement and the experience that it has brought to us why should we now disrupt all of this management and cooperation and enter upon a new and untried program and one that is vigorously opposed by all those engaged in production. What a story this is to go to the totalitarian governments that Americans had to be threatened with jail before they would produce. They can point to the fact that a democracy is all right in peacetime but it cannot carry a nation through a war. Let us improve our program and profit by the experience we have gained, and I have no doubt as to the results.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I cannot say much in the time allotted me. I will oppose this bill if I am the only one left to oppose it. I do so on this ground: it is an honor and a duty for everyone to come to the defense of the Nation in time of war. That is why we have men and women in the armed services, ready to sacrifice their all. The Constitution requires that we provide for the national defense and therein lies the power to draft men in the way we now do. Can you show me any place in the Constitution where we say anything about taking a man from civil life and putting him in John Jones' factory so that John Jones can make some profit? You cannot show it to me because it is not there. We draft our men to safeguard our sovereignty, to protect the homeland, to bare their breasts to the enemy that all the people of our country may be protected—we draft them to fight for Uncle Sam.

The men and women in industry in this country have done a wonderful job. Now, you are going to spoil it all. You are going to say, "We have just been fooling with you people. You are no longer free. You are slaves. We are going to see if we cannot push your nose into the dirt and get more out of you." More what? More production? No; not more production, because the effect of this bill will be the opposite. You may get more profits for the fellows who have been fixing up the profit side of the ledger all these years. Let me read of an instance of what I mean, taken from this book of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Here is a little aircraft corporation. Just before Pearl Harbor, the executive vice president gave himself $2,325 a year. Right after Pearl Harbor, he gave himself $89,000 a year, plus high profits made by his company. So, now we want to take men and women out of the various walks of life of this country where perhaps they are only making a fair living and put them at an arbitrary wage some place where somebody can make a lot of profit out of their labor. Forced labor to make profits for the owner of

the plant or business. Is there any justice in that? If this bill ever becomes operative—and I predict it will not—God help our country. The Constitution does not provide for it; none of the laws of our land have ever provided for it, and I will not be a party to it now. We will gain something if we keep free labor going to the bat for the men at the front; and, furthermore, when those men come back from the front, under this bill you are going to do the same thing to them; you are going to say, "It is all right, buddy; you served pretty well over there, but we have got to get a little bit more work out of you to make a little more profit for John Jones' machine shop down the street."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I want the RECORD to show that the gentleman from California now speaking [Mr. IZAC] is a great American patriot with a most enviable record of service in the Navy of his country.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, let us get away from all the window dressing in the bill and come down to the crux of it. It is this: Are we willing to draft men to do forced labor so other men and businesses can make profit out of this war? Are we willing to do this, at the same time refusing to draft capital and all the other national resources? I am not, and I now so declare myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am opposed to the May bill. I am supporting this Voorhis substitute which is pending before us. It does not provide plenary power to Paul McNutt to run the manpower of the country, as has been claimed, but limited powers, which are defined in the substitute, to carry out the manpower system now in effect.

The fundamental differences between the May bill and this substitute can be seen by comparing the two penalty provisions. The penalty clause of the substitute now before us reads as follows—and I urge you to follow it because the great difference between the Voorhis substitute and the May bill is that in the May bill the penalty of jail is for a man who refuses to take a job; in the Voorhis substitute you do not have that forced-labor provision among the penalties. Here is the way it reads:

> Any person who in violation of the provisions of this act or any regulation or order thereunder willfully hires, rehires, or solicits an individual or accepts employment or fails to comply with an employment ceiling or to release individuals or fails to submit information or permit inspections or investigations shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

It goes on to provide a penalty of not more than 1 year in jail or a fine up to $10,000. Note that there is no criminal penalty to force a man to take a particular job. That is a great deal different from the May bill, which provides the same penalty for a man who refuses to take a job as for a man who refuses to take his place in the draft.

This May bill is described by its proponents as a national service bill for men from 18 to 45. The heart of the proposal is that draft boards, who draft men to fight, who now have the power to force men to work or fight, are to be given the additional power to draft men to work who cannot fight.

They say, "If we draft men to fight and die for their country, we should also draft them to work for their country." This is a compelling emotional appeal, but will not stand the test of reason because this labor draft is different from our military draft.

Selective service was proposed as the democratic way to raise an army; it was so democratic and patriotic that volunteering for military service was frowned upon and was finally forbidden, for the average man. When it comes to military service, the patriotic citizen of a republic must not say where or how he wants to serve, but must wait for his government to tell him where he is needed. The same argument about democracy is used to justify this forced labor measure, but in the next breath the proponents say it will not be used very much. The whole emphasis in the bill, in this debate, is upon volunteering for war work, and the processes of the selective service are to be used only as a shameful last resort, as a threat of punishment to coerce the laborer into volunteering. There is nothing democratic about drafting a few laborers out of millions who are doing as they please. There is nothing democratic about giving these labor draftees travel pay, relief from civilian obligations, and rights to their former jobs, when none of the millions of patriotic volunteer workers receives these benefits.

There is another great difference between this bill and the military draft. When we draft a man for military service we, the Congress, determine his pay, and his working conditions; we take care of his dependents, his post-war opportunities. There is nothing like that in this bill. It sets up machinery for forcing an American citizen to work for a private employer, upon that employer's terms. That is forced labor, involuntary servitude, slavery. We surround it with none of the dignity or security which we give to the men drafted for military service. Instead of making induction into the labor draft the highest form of patriotic duty of a citizen, as we have attempted to do in our military draft, we make it an alternative form of punishment. By this bill we are saying to every man below 45, "If you do not volunteer for a war job you will be sent to jail, or to forced labor." With all due respect to my brethren who are approving this procedure, I think it is undemocratic and un-American.

Furthermore, it is highly inefficient as a means of securing war production. It is most significant that labor and management, who know the most about production, say that this bill will hinder, not help, war production. They know that unwilling workers are inefficient workers; that our country has out-produced the world by using free labor.

Here are some of the causes of the manpower shortage that the proponents admit are not touched by this bill:

Cut-backs caused a loss of over a million and a half workers to industry last fall; this bill will not prevent cut-backs.

Absenteeism causes a man-hour loss of 24 times the present manpower shortage; this bill will not prevent absenteeism.

Manpower shortages are often in the skilled groups of workers, and a transfer of skilled workers from one essential industry to another even more essential is the only way to meet such a shortage. This bill does not enforce such transfers.

Strikes have caused losses in production; this bill has nothing to do with strikes.

Not a single Member of this House, not a single administrative official, not a single military man, is claiming that this bill will solve our manpower problem or our production problem. All are placing primary reliance upon the patriotic, voluntary cooperation of labor and management and Government.

The main arguments for the May bill are: First, it will not be used much; second, it will make the men in service feel good. I oppose setting up a system that is so bad, so objectionable, that it will not be used. I do not think the soldier's morale will be improved by an ineffective bill. Loafing and striking and absenteeism and slow-downs and cut-backs are hurting our soldier's morale right now, and these are not touched by this bill.

Our Speaker has argued that regardless of the merits of this bill, we must pass it unchanged, now that it is on the floor, so that the headlines that the soldiers see will read well. That is proposing the kind of thing we hated in the last war—kidding the troops. The men in this war hate that, too.

The men who want this bill are the military men who direct military operations so well and who have bungled so badly on their decisions on the supplies they need produced. They have also bungled badly on their whole judgment of civilian morale. They are our servants, not our masters. We want to restrain, not increase, their power over us; we want to get rid of their domination, with gratitude but with relief, as much and as soon as possible.

Let the military experts do the fighting, and the production experts do the producing; let us pass laws the producers, labor and management, say they need, and not this half-baked measure that nobody needs and only the militarists want.

This Voorhis substitute gives the force of law to the system of voluntary cooperation between labor and management and Government which is working fairly well now. It puts no man in forced labor, but punishes the chiseler employer and the slacker worker who refuses to cooperate with this voluntary system of ceilings for employers, and availability certificates for employees. It is all that management and labor and the War Manpower Commission say they need to meet the military demands for production. It throws out the entire May bill, with its labor draft. This substitute is not perfect. Under any system we adopt there will be slickers and slackers who evade their full duty to

their country. Their only punishment may be the contempt of their neighbors and of the returning servicemen, but that punishment will last a long time, and come up in many ways. We should adopt this substitute, and then let the word go to our fighting men that Congress has done its part to speed up production, and has refused to adopt at home the system they are fighting to destroy abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, for several days I have been listening to the debate and reading articles both for and against the conscription of labor. I have tried to look at these problems from the position of a physician, which I know best. As a physician, it seems to me that the present legislation to force individuals between the ages of 18 and 45 into certain types of labor is not complete. Indications are that the House will pass the measure. This patient, lack of manpower and shortage of war materials, has been a sick one but only just recently. The patient is showing signs of recovering without this legislation.

It will be remembered that early last summer many predictions were being made by military leaders, including Churchill, Eisenhower, and men high in military rank in this country, that the war would be over in 1944. It was only natural that the laboring man would leave industry and seek something permanent for himself and his family.

This Congress was called back into session to enact some reconversion legislation. All might have been well had we not underestimated the strength of the enemy. The patient would not now be ill or need a prescription if the cutbacks had not been ordered by the military. Factories were closed. Ammunition lines were closed. Small arms plants were being reconverted. Great cut-backs occurred all along the line. This cannot be blamed upon the individual working in the war plants. It cannot be blamed upon this Congress. If there is anyone at fault, it must be the military experts who ordered the cutbacks.

I say that the patient is already recovering because evidence presented to this Congress shows that thousands of workers are now returning to the essential production of war needs. This rapid return of the workers who had left the war plants will continue without this legislation.

The prescription that Congress is writing is not complete. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] suggested an ingredient to this prescription which should have been accepted by this House if the prescription is at all necessary. Certainly, without this ingredient, the right to work and the right of the individual to either join a union or not join a union is fundamental. If we are to keep in this country a system whereby one segment of society, and in this case it is the selfish, greedy racketeer of labor, who says that you cannot work unless you join a union and pay for the right to work and in some instances they were not even a member of the union, then American liberties and democratic government is in jeopardy. The check-off system and the maintenance of membership established in war plants should not be tolerated. The lack of this ingredient in the prescription that Congress is writing will certainly cause some trouble in the near future.

The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] offered an important ingredient to the prescription. The House rejected this suggestion. He was offering some fundamental truths and ideas which would help make our body politic a much stronger and healthier individual.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] offered a substitute which, in my opinion, is the right prescription to make this giant of production, America, a strong, active producing organism which will meet all the requirements of the military in the American way. Some have stated that the substitute bill is a mouth without teeth. It is my firm belief that the teeth in the so-called May bill may well hinder and keep the patient from recovering.

I am just as certain as I am standing here today that if labor, management, industry, and agriculture would receive the proper appeal through an evangelistic selling, much like we sell our war bonds, that there is a great need for additional labor that these four giants of this country would arise and meet the emergency without the compulsion, the jail sentences, and the fines which are being inserted in the May bill.

There are other things that our Government and Congress should do and I enumerate them as follows: We should eliminate the waste of manpower existing in so many of our factories. The Mead committee put their finger upon one institution wasting manpower and there are many more doing the same thing. I have received a number of letters from individuals who quit war plants because they were not permitted to do a full day's work. Some of these patriotic men and women said there were four or five people for every full-time job.

A system prevalent in many factories of limited production should not be tolerated. The military released some 4,000 men from the Army who knew something about the making of rubber, truck tires, and so forth. Recently, one of these men told me that he could produce in 4 hours the work assigned to him for 8 hours. That condition should not be permitted. Men should be encouraged to produce all they can in the critical industries. No slow-down or feather-bedding of production in these critical areas should find a place in American industry during these critical wartimes.

The cost-plus contract has been one reason that industry has hoarded labor. It has been impossible for industry to know what demands might be made by the Government so it is only natural they would keep additional workers on hand.

The Government should lengthen the day of labor in the critical plants from 2, 4, or 6 hours if it need be in order to produce results. The average week of labor in this country is less than 46 hours in all of our war plants. Labor in our allied nations averages from 60 to 70 hours. The soldier fighting our battles is kept constantly many hours in the trenches when it is necessary. The farmers of this country are averaging more than 70 hours a week producing the necessary food and fiber needed by the world. Is there any reason why the hours of labor could not be extended, particularly in the plants where known shortages of material now exist? This ingredient has not been added to the prescription being offered to the country.

There is no question but what there are many nonessential activities besides horse racing which are permitted to continue. Why are not some of these activities eliminated?

The evidence submitted to this House indicates that in some areas there are thousands unemployed and drawing unemployment compensation insurance. Would it not be reasonable to try and get a better distribution of workers befor this legislation is enacted into law? Does any Member of this House feel that forcing more individuals into war plants when we have the cost plus, the limited production, and the improper distribution of workers in effect, will remedy or help cure the patient? It may well add to the difficulties of the Nation.

There are many Members who will vote for this work-or-jail bill. They do it not because they like the prescription but because some of our military leaders have said that it was necessary. In this connection, let me point out to the House that the generals in the war are not only conducting the activity in the war theaters, but are controlling the domestic economy as well. They have wanted this power for a long time. They control the War Production Board, the O. D. T., and other vital governmental agencies. I question the wisdom of this House permitting the generals to direct the domestic economy. It is their job to fight the war. They should leave the production job and all of its ramifications to the captains of labor and industry who know how the job should be done. If this Congress passes the May bill they are ignoring the experts and generals on the home front who know production and labor problems. If we continue to let the inexperienced generals guide domestic economy, we can only find further chaos and needless regimentation at home.

Yes; the Members of the House feel that some legislation should be passed. They are voting for the bill, knowing that the other body may well present a more rational prescription to the country. The conference committee may then be able to work out something which would be more effective than the one now under consideration.

It may well be that the progress on the eastern and western fronts will soon find this war in its final stages. It may soon be shown that labor, management, and industry has outrun the expectations of the country and supplied all the implements of war required by the generals. This legislation will then not be necessary.

There has been much emotional appeal in this Chamber and not enough light on the problem before us. We have heard that there was a shortage of ammunition which permitted the breakthrough on the bulge. A careful analysis does not indicate that this was a fact. Were we not surprised by the enemy? Did we not have fewer men and less equipment at this particular point? Was it not a matter of distribution of war equipment and ammunition? Did not our American soldiers, when this ammunition and equipment was properly distributed, push back the finest panzer divisions that Germany had to offer? Was it not done at a 4 to 1 loss to the Germans? Does anyone in this House think that this was done with broomsticks or clubs? This was accomplished with tanks, gun, armor piercing shells, and the courage of our soldiers. It was not from a lack of ammunition and fighting equipment.

I am fearful that the Members of the House have been unduly influenced by the military leaders. As a physician, I cannot concur and prescribe a prescription which does not cure the patient. Yes; which may even make that patient worse and leave unhealed the many sores created by the mistakes of the military and evils existing in our war plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, during an experience of more than two decades in public life I have learned that one of the safest guides for official action is the old maxim: "Be sure of your facts, then go ahead."

I have listened carefully to the debates on the pending bill, H. R. 1752. From these debates I have gleaned the following facts:

First. The President of the United States did not ask for the pending bill, nor has he specifically endorsed this measure.

Second. Neither General Marshall nor Admiral King has asked for the passage of the pending bill.

Third. Neither the War Production Board nor the War Manpower Commission has asked for the passage of the present bill. Instead, official spokesmen for the Manpower Commission have definitely stated that they did not believe that this bill would solve the problem of speeding up production of critical war matériel.

Fourth. The president of the American Federation of Labor, the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the president of the National Association of Manufacturers have repeatedly stated that they did not believe that the bill under consideration would speed up war production or give to our armed forces the additional munitions and other military supplies which they so urgently need to press the war to a successful conclusion.

Fifth. The pending bill will permit the use of conscript labor in privately owned industrial plants for private profit. Such use of conscript labor is repugnant to one of the fundamental concepts of the American way of life and is probably a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

Sixth. In urging Congress to adopt a National Service Act as the most efficient and democratic way of insuring full production for our war requirements, the President said:

> In adopting such legislation, it is not necessary to discard the voluntary and cooperative processes which have prevailed up to this time. This cooperation has already produced great results. The contribution of our workers to the war effort has been beyond measure. We must build on the foundations that have already been laid and supplement the measures now in operation, in order to guarantee the production that may be necessary in the critical period that lies ahead.

The President, at the same time, called upon Congress to enact a National Service Act "for the total mobilization of all of our human resources for the prosecution of the war."

The pending bill does not mobilize all of our human resources for the prosecution of the war. It proposes only to conscript labor, and leaves capital free, in many instances, to reap a profit out of the products of this conscript labor.

Mr. Chairman, the men whose genius has accomplished the greatest job of war production in all of the history of the world are not in favor of this bill. They are the experts upon whose judgment Congress should depend in its efforts to increase the marvelous volume of war production which has already been attained. They believe that another approach to this problem would be more effective than the approach proposed by this bill, and they have had proposed substitutes for this measure which they advise us to enact into law immediately.

When the bill to conscript the young manpower of America for military service was passed by Congress in 1940, many of the Members of both Houses of Congress sought to allay the apprehensions of organized labor by repeated statements that one of the primary purposes of this measure for the national defense was to preserve free labor in America. They said, over and over again that Hitler and the other totalitarian dictators of Europe had imposed a slave economy upon their peoples, and that America was going to conscript its young men for military service in order to prevent the possibility of such an economy in this country. There were repeated assurances to labor that if the problem of national defense ever became so grave that it might seem necessary to extend conscription for other purposes than military service, the principle of conscription would be applied to labor and capital alike.

But now the proposal is to make this initial extension of conscription apply to labor alone. What has become of the old argument that labor and capital should be treated alike in any future extension of conscription? Why is it deemed necessary, at this time, to conscript labor alone, and leave capital the only free agent in our national economy?

Mr. Chairman, in common, I am sure, with every Member of Congress, I am willing and eager to vote for any measure which will assure to the men of America's fighting forces at the earliest possible moment the matériel which they need to bring this war to a speedy and victorious conclusion. But, when I apply the maxim of my legislative experience, "Be sure of the facts, then go ahead," to the pending bill, it does not meet the test. Factual support for the enactment of this specific measure is enirely lacking.

I voted for the substitute measure submitted by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and I shall vote for the substitute proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. Both of these proposed substitutes have the endorsement and the factual support of the leading experts on war production in America. Upon their recommendations and advice I feel that the Congress can confidently rely.

Mr. Chairman, the principal argument I have heard in conversation with Members of this House in favor of the passage of this bill is that we owe it to our boys overseas to give them a psychological lift in their grave task of winning the war. But, Mr. Chairman, if this bill will not do the job of increasing war production, its passage will merely raise a false hope in the hearts of our fighting men. To such a false encouragement I cannot subscribe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said on both sides of this question concerning the effect it will have upon the citizenry that is engaged in the manufacture of war materials and the great demand that the military forces are making upon us to provide ways and means for increasing production. I am not going to take all of the time that has been allotted to me, as short as it is, because I want to give you some pungent facts that I think should have some effect on the vote on H. R. 1752. I am opposed to the bill.

I have here a bulletin issued by the Treasury Department stating that there is put on sale surplus commodities amounting to 161,407 Ford spring leaves that are no longer needed for the war effort.

Another item, 71,225 Chrysler automobile parts. It takes a lot of labor to make that many parts. They are no longer needed. Still we are being told that we need a bill to conscript labor, to produce the very things we are selling to the public for a song. You know how much the public pays for these things at auction.

Another item, 20,998 Diamond T replacement parts, including many accessories necessary in the manufacture and the assembly of automobiles.

Another item, 134,469 hats. That is in the cotton-fabric category.

Another item, 184,503 5-gallon cans. What are we going to put this conscripted labor to work at when, on the other hand, that is only a partial inventory of the tremendous amount of surplus commodities that are now being offered to the public?

Another item, 37,430 5-gallon cans with handles, all equipped and ready to use, but no longer needed for the war effort.

This is only a partial report, a weekly report, if you please, of the tremendous quantities of unnecessary war material that we have produced and are now selling to the public for nothing. Think of those things when you pass this bill which, as has been said here, and I agree, is undoubtedly unconstitutional, because you are putting the civilian population of this country into involuntary servitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I address my remarks in connection with the Voorhis amendment to those Members of the House who have been or are defenders of labor. I do not address my remarks to those who though having voted for the Smith-Connally bill now seek to justify their opposition to the May bill by pretending a sudden interest in labor. Having voted for the Smith-Connally bill they do not fool anyone by their alleged interest in the rights of American labor.

Page 6 of the Voorhis bill provides an exemption from being required to accept the referral if one is referred to a shop where he is required to join a union. So you have right here in this Voorhis bill practically what we defeated yesterday in the Wadsworth amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have only 3 minutes. The gentleman has made his explanation.

Of course, the gentleman is going to say, "But if he refuses to work in that particular plant to which he is sent, the Commission may send him to another plant." But let us be realistic about this proposition. Unionization is by areas. John Jones is sent to A plant in that area. It is unionized. He comes back and says, "You cannot make me work there; that is unionized. They require me to join a union." So what plant are you going to send him to?

If in that particular area we find thorough unionization, and if the War Manpower Commission and the military authorities state that we need, say, 5,000 men in that area which is in critical need of manpower, what are you accomplishing by this language? You are accomplishing what the Wadsworth amendment would have accomplished. You are bringing about pressure on what? On the union contracts between labor and management, pressure on the closed shop and union contracts between labor and management. Therefore, by this language you are undermining the closed shop and the union shop. Even though the gentleman did not intend it as such, this language is definitely antilabor, and no prolabor Member can vote for the Voorhis amendment with this language in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, consideration of this legislation is certainly making some strange bedfellows. I find that a large group on the right who have always opposed communism are joined in their support of this bill by the Daily Worker and by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who just addressed the House. I am getting confused a little when I find myself alined with the C. I. O., and if I did not do some independent thinking of my own I would not know what to do. There is no partisan alinement for there is but one issue. That is, how can we get the greatest production. We who oppose the bill are convinced that free labor will give us greater production than will administration regimented labor.

Here is the gentleman from New York who spoke yesterday from that great city of Brooklyn, who is a spokesman for labor. He said that the passage of this bill would mean that "in the land of the free and the home of the brave we have reverted to slavery, not just of the blacks but of the entire American working class." The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] tells us that we should vote for a bill which in my opinion imposes a system similar to that of Hitler, destroys the freedom for which our men are fighting. If the generals and admirals will tell us what they want and if the administration will keep its fingers out, the workers and the industrial leaders will give us production.

In addition to the reason I gave the other day for opposing the bill, let me call your attention to this fact. I would not trust this administration to administer civilian business under any circumstances, and I will give you one reason why. This House gave it authority to draft young men. The Congress wrote into the law the Tydings amendment. Then the other day along came the President and said it was more essential that we should draft the young men from the farms than follow the selective-service law. When the head of the Government assumes to disregard a statute I am through granting it additional power. Throughout the country the local draft boards, acting under instructions from General Hershey and the State directors, are taking into the ranks young men off the farms who by the express provisions of the law are exempt from service. That is a strong statement but it is true.

When the President and the selective-service officials and the local boards—and I do not blame the local boards—acting under them will violate the laws passed by Congress and shanghai farm boys who are exempt, I do not propose to vote for any bill to give them more power. Today I dropped into the hopper a bill which will probably get nowhere but which, if it became a law, would make it the duty of the officers in command when those boys reach the units, when there is proof offered that they have been taken contrary to law to discharge them and send them home there to stay until they are drafted in a lawful manner. It is about time that the Army authorities and the administration conduct themselves in accordance with the laws which Congress passes. If the officers charged with administering the law can violate it without being called to account, then we no longer have government by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, it had been my purpose not to say anything with reference to this amendment or the May bill, but for the 25 years or so that I have served in this House I have followed a certain procedure with reference to the Constitution and the laws made thereunder. I shall adhere to the philosophy of free labor, free enterprise, whether in war or in peace. There are certain fundamental principles which have made this country great and made it free. We have had many wars and many battles and we have won them. We have won them with free labor, and with free fighting men. I thought before you voted on this bill, if you are not emotional or hysterical under pressure, you might give heed to the words of calm wisdom uttered by one of the founders of the Federal Constitution. In describing the effect of a tyrannical government upon a citizen he said:

> A person appears in view—pale, trembling, emaciated, faltering in his steps, not daring to look upwards, but, with marked anxiety, rolling his eager eyes on every side. Who is he? He is the slave of * * * a tyrannical government. He is afraid to act, to speak, or look. He knows that his actions and his words, however guarded, may be construed to be criminal; he knows that even his looks and countenance may be considered as the signs and evidences of treacherous thoughts and treasonable conspiracies; and he knows that the suspicion of his masters, upon any of these points, may be fatal; for he knows, that he is at the mercy of those who, upon the slightest suspicion, may seize or hang him—who may do whatever they please with him, and with all those who are dear to him. What effect must this man's situation produce upon his mind and temper? Can his views be great or exalted? No. Such views, instead of being encouraged, would give offence; and he is well aware what would follow. Can openness and candor beam from his soul? No. Such light would be hateful to his masters; it must be extinguished.

Now I ask you, for what are our boys fighting and dying and becoming maimed and blinded? Is it to set up any such system of totalitarian control or any such tyranny as you find in these bills? You know it is not. It has never entered their minds that they are fighting for any such set-up as this and it is not worthy of Congress to put any such totalitarian bill on the statute books of this country. The virus is too dangerous and too malignant to be introduced into our system of free government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the other evening I had the privilege of listening to the broadcast of a testimonial dinner in New York City. Mr. Kaiser was one of the main speakers at the dinner in honor of Mr. Henry Wallace. The following morning I received this letter from a friend of mine who is working in the Kaiser shipyards at Vancouver, Wash. The letter adds to the confusion not only of the Members of

the House of Representatives but also of labor. I want to read that letter to you:

VANCOUVER, WASH., *January 24, 1945.*
Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: My husband and I have been out here for a couple years working in the Vancouver ship yards. He is still working as a rigger and I was a journeyman electrician. A few days ago they began laying off and when it came my turn I went along with the others. Well and good, if the work is slack and I can truthfully say it had been slack on the outfitting docks where I worked. But when I went down to the United States Employment Office to register for my unemployment insurance, the place had standing room only. Naturally, I thought they were there for the same thing, but when I finally had my turn the man at the desk said they were new hires. In fact, he stated that 1,500 were in from Texas that day and they had to hire them. You can imagine how I felt—after my training and $53 initiation fee in order to work, and here they were hiring green help.

This is the question in my mind and everyone else right now, is Kaiser getting (shall we say) a rake-off on each new hire or is the union to blame? My union claims they can't do a thing for us, that it is out of their hands.

Every radio program says something about manpower shortage and stay on the job. What is the answer? It's too big for a mere worker, but didn't think it would hurt to let someone know who could probably investigate. The final question in my mind is, will these people be laid off too like I was, and hundreds like me? By the way, my craft was not the only one hit either, but I speak of what I know happened to me and what I found out is taking place here.

Sincerely yours,

A WORKER.

I have read the letter from my friend in the Kaiser shipyards, because it is typical of what has been found to exist in hundreds of large war plants now engaged in the production of war materials under a cost-plus contract system. It has a direct bearing on the legislation before us, in the May bill, which proposed to draft labor for war work at a time when many war plants have tens of thousands of men on the pay rall, who do nothing but draw their pay.

The investigations now being made by the Senate Mead committee, daily disclose that the large war plants operating under the cost-plus contracts, are continuing to hire workers far in excess of actual production needs. Of course, the manufacturer does not care about the expense, because the greater the pay roll, the greater will be the profits.

Furthermore, the Government itself is the greatest hoarder and waster of labor. Out of the 3,500,000 civilan employees on the Government pay roll today, at least 1,000,000 of them could easily be spared for military service or for war work. Instead of demanding the passage of this bill, the Executive Department should do some house cleaning as an example for industry.

Let me also add, that there is no need for this legislation, as the administration now has ample authority to deal with the labor problem to provide the necessary workers for the plants in which additional labor is needed. The Selective Training and Service Act, the Manpower law, and the regulations of the Army and Navy, give adequate authority to the Executive Department to place all men from 18 to 45 in the armed forces or in essential war work. Why does the administration not do what it should do, instead of coming to Congress demanding the passage of the May bill, which is not satisfactory to anyone?

I am convinced that results will not be secured in production by the use of forced or drafted labor. A patriotic and free American worker will deliver the goods, as he has so splendidly done for more than 3 years of war. Industry says that forced labor will lower production. Organized labor makes the same statement. Both are against the bill to draft labor. They claim that this problem can be solved without the need for legislation which will draft every American worker. If we are to do more drafting, then let us draft everyone, including capital, industry and all persons.

Of course, every Member of this House, and every American want our fighting men to have an abundance of the best fighting equipment, material, and food. There is no difference of opinion on that score, which is evidenced by the record since our country began preparing for war in 1940. There is an honest difference of opinion as to the best method for getting results. I agree with industry and labor that the best results can be secured by voluntary and free labor. In my opinion, the administration bill proposes an un-American policy, which means nothing less than forced or slave labor, directing the imposition of jail sentences and heavy fines against those who are not willing to be moved about the country on the order of some Washington bureaucrat. The administration can now deal with such individuals, without the need for this legislation. They can be put into the Army, which has already been done in many instances. I cast my vote for H. R. 1803, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] which provided for a voluntary method to solve the labor problem. I regret that the House did not adopt this substitute proposal, as I am convinced that the labor-shortage problem in certain areas could have been solved by industry and labor in a voluntary manner.

The May bill will no doubt pass the House today. I hope that when the Senate takes it up for consideration, a voluntary plan will be perfected through cooperative arrangement between Government, industry, and labor, so that maximum production will be promptly secured of all vital war materials and equipment. When such a bill is returned to the House, I will give it my wholehearted support.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall take but a minute. I would like to turn back the pages of history for 1 year. Right in this House when we were considering the soldier-vote bill a year ago General Marshall, the Army and the Navy, and others high in authority, and even a Presidential message, claimed that dire results would follow if we passed the long-ballot bill. The Congress, which has always laid down the great policies of this Nation throughout its existence, failed to be deterred by propaganda, and we passed the long-ballot bill. Yesterday Secretary of War Stimson gave out a statement that the soldiers had preferred the long ballot to the extent of over 2,000,000 of them using it. Only about 100,000 or a little more used the short ballots. In other words, we were right 99½ percent. About one-half of 1 percent of the soldiers backed up the judgment of the Commander in Chief and those people on the floor of the House who thought we were going to lose the war unless we gave the soldiers an opportunity to vote the bob-tail ballot.

Now, we have about such a situation here today. There was a statement made yesterday that the Barrett bill was only a pious hope. The same thing was said last year when we were considering the soldier-vote legislation, that it was only a pious hope that the Governors of the various States would call their legislatures into session to implement their laws and put them in line with the pattern of national legislation that we were about to lay down. So I think the Congress has a precedent to take matters into its own hands and not be too greatly influenced by such a parade of witnesses. This Congress cannot increase production by the passage of the May bill. This Congress should not hazard the passage of such a bill, which may greatly slow down production rather than increase it. Referring again to the soldier-vote bill, I want to insert this editorial from the Evening Star:

THE SOLDIER BALLOTS

Secretary Stimson's report on the use of absentee ballots by service men and women, while expressing dissatisfaction with some complexities of the present law, indicates that the President was very wide of the mark when, a year ago, he told Congress that the soldier vote bill was a "fraud" on our fighting men and on the American people.

Severely criticizing the State ballots and the voting procedure set up in 1942, Mr. Roosevelt said it would be no less difficult for soldiers to vote under the 1944 law. Perhaps he was right, but the fact is that, difficult or not, about 2,800,000 service ballots were cast in the 1944 Presidential race. In 1942 the service vote was negligible, some estimates placing it at less than one-half of 1 percent of those eligible to vote.

Mr. Stimson said that he had no "authentic" figures for the total number of State absentee ballots and Federal ballots cast last year. It is interesting to note his assertion, however, that in 10 States which approved the Federal ballot and reported to the Army, 28,136, or 2.2 percent, of the eligible persons used the Federal ballot, while 446,974, or 34.6 percent, used the State absentee ballots.

That would indicate that the State ballots were not as objectionable to the troops as some of the preelection partisans would have had the country believe. No doubt these partisans were convinced that the service vote would be preponderantly for the President (it was about 3 to 2 in his favor) and feared that any difficulty in voting might prejudice his election. Now that the campaign is over and the verdict in, their more extreme complaints against the voting law can be dismissed. Some valid criticisms remain, however, as indicated by Mr. Stimson, and appropriate steps should be taken to meet them before 1946, in the unhappy event that we should still be at war when the elections of that year are held.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I do not for a moment question the sincerity of purpose of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. However, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs in the House I respectfully urge that the House do not adopt the gentleman's amendment.

After careful consideration, the House Committee on Military Affairs rejected a proposed amendment which would have taken the authority out of the selective service local boards and would have permitted the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion to place that authority in Governor McNutt, the U. S. E. S., or any Executive-order agency, or other agency of his choice. The committee was informed by proponents of that amendment that it was intended to delegate that authority to Mr. McNutt and the U. S. E. S., if that amendment were adopted. For that reason, the committee members rejected that proposed amendment. They wanted to be sure that the uncompensated members of the selective service local boards would be the ones to make the vital decisions that would be involved. They did not want to have anyone else or any other persons given that authority. According to the newspapers, that same amendment is being urged upon the Senate committee. I feel confident that when the Senate committee looks into the matter it will come to the same conclusions and will react the same way the House committee has reacted.

I respectfully urge you to give this question your best consideration. I do not see how we can possibly do anything but make a czar or dictator out of War Manpower Commissioner McNutt should the amendment offered by the gentleman from California carry.

Mr. McNutt has been War Manpower Commissioner for the past several years and yet at this very time we necessarily must pass some type of legislation, as the May bill, so that we can bring order out of chaos in the labor field of which he has charge. For years I have consistently voted against granting additional power to any bureaucrat and I am not going to start now. Over 6,000 draft boards in this country have, as a whole, done a splendid job and I feel they can and will conscientiously administer this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any way in which we could mess up our manpower situation worse than to give more authority to the Manpower Commission and Paul McNutt, the greatest failure in this administration; still it is proposed that we now turn over to him the recruiting of the labor for our war plants.

Personally I do not believe there would be a shortage of manpower if they were properly organized and if some of those who claim to represent labor would urge their people to full performance rather than try to create watching jobs. But I do believe it is necessary at this time when we make a move that we put it in the hands of people who have been found somewhat trustworthy. Frankly, I would rather trust the local selective service draft boards than I would Paul McNutt considering the manpower picture we have had to look at for so long, the bungling and the damage they have done to the war effort.

I shall not vote for this amendment.

I shall, unless damaging amendments are offered, feel obliged to support the bill that has been offered by the committee, because I believe that if it is properly administered and those in charge of the local draft boards do their very best to be fair and square they can do it without damage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is recognized.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss for a very brief period the so-called Voorhis amendment.

From the very beginning of this discussion, which has now lasted for nearly 2½ years, I have been thoroughly convinced that if we were ever to employ the element of compulsion upon any citizen of the United States, be it for military or industrial service, we should leave the administration of it close to the people and keep it close to the people rather than centralize it in Washington or even, indeed, centralize it in bureaucratic headquarters in the several areas in the country. From the very beginning I have insisted that if we were to legislate on this subject at all we should and must take advantage of the Selective Service System with its 6,500 local draft boards composed of people who live in the community in which the potential soldier or worker lives, who know that man, know his family, how he lives, how he has lived for years, what his skills are. They have a complete record of them all. I have believed that any final decision that is made must be made by those men of the draft boards who are his neighbors and who know all about him. By contrast, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California removes that function of selection—and the element of selection must enter into these things—completely away from the local draft boards and entrusts it to a bureaucratic organization headed by an official in the city of Washington and proposes to clothe that organization, the War Manpower Commission, with power practically to govern the economy of the United States. It may go into any plant in the country and tell it what to do. It may tell the people discharged from those plants that they must in turn go to another bureaucratic organization—the Employment Service—and there be told where to work. If for some reason they do not go to work, what happens to them? Is there any appeal in the proposed amendment to a committee of the man's neighbors? None whatsoever. The appeal is to a kangaroo court established within the bureaucracy, and if that court decrees against this man, he is not permitted to be employed by anybody in the United States except on a farm. Literally that is what you are coming to if you adopt an amendment of this sort. It is bureaucracy to the *n*th degree, and I make an appeal to the men on our side of the aisle, who time and time again in the last 12 years have begged and implored for a restriction upon the growth of bureaucracy in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues, with whom I have worked for 14 years, will not put me down either as an associate or supporter of Earl Browder. I was fighting Earl Browder and his beliefs before Pearl Harbor, and I have been fighting his beliefs since Pearl Harbor.

For the benefit of my good friend from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], who loves the farmers like I love them, I want to read a telegram which I received from one of his neighbors across in Minnesota. This telegram is addressed to me and reads as follows:

> Please pass your bill at once. I am 72 years old and tired trying to run a 50-cow farm when a lot of men will neither work in essential industry or fight.
>
> W. F. SCHILLING.

Mr. Chairman, that is the result of the work of the Manpower Commission, and when these gentlemen talk about the mess in the shipyards and in the plants up and down the Pacific coast and all around the eastern seaboard, I ask them, Who has had control of civilian labor for the last 3 years? The War Manpower Commission. It is the agency that has given you the mess that has been referred to so often in this debate. The Selective Service Bureau up to this time has had nothing to do with anything except military necessities, in manpower. Now, for the first time, we are allowing them to invade the field of private employment.

I wonder if the gentleman here who said that the American Legion had favored national-service legislation knows what they favor now? Here is a telegram I received yesterday:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 31, 1945.*
> Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
> *New House Office Building:*
> Since the inception of the American Legion we recommended enactment of a Universal Service Act to conscript all resources of this Nation in time of war. More recently we urged enactment of the Austin-Wadsworth bill as part of such universal service law. While pending May bill does not accomplish complete universal service or complete national service, the American Legion urges passage by the House of such May bill. The leaders of our armed forces have informed the Nation that such a law is necessary to support our fighting men at the battle fronts. Therefore, we respectfully urge the enactment of H. R. 1752 without amendment.
>
> FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
> *Executive Director, National Legislative Committee, the American Legion.*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Not just now. I have only 5 minutes. That telegram was from the legislative representative of the American Legion.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman would yield.

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I want it to be fully understood by the Members of the House that the American Legion has not had a national convention since this bill has been proposed. That telegram, in my estimation, is not the consensus of opinion of the veterans of the last war.

Mr. MAY. Maybe the gentleman does not know as much about that as the representative of the organization here in Washington, who is their legislative liaison officer.

If we have a mess in the industries of this country on the labor question, the War Manpower Commission that has had absolute domination of it for the last 3 years is responsible for it. If the Democrats on this side of the House—and I am calling you Democrats—and if the Republicans on this side of the House have gotten square away from the old centralized idea of Alexander Hamilton and have gotten around to a complete endorsement of local self-government much more so than we have, are you going to vote now, when you have the question presented clearly to you, to take it out of the hands of the local people in the local communities, in 6,500 of them in this country, and centralize it under the domination of one dictator in Washington in a Federal agency set up by statute? Let us preserve the principle of local self-government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VOORHIS of California) there were—ayes 71, noes 205.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEWART: On pages 4 and 5 strike out lines 22, 23, 24, and 25, on page 4, all after "scribe", and lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on page 5, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "to such agencies as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may designate for such purposes, for referral to employment in the plants, facilities, and farms specified in the certification and to accept the work to which he is so referred within the specified time. It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith. Such order shall be subject to appeal in accordance with such regulations as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may prescribe. Registrants so referred shall be given a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to go into a lengthy discussion. This amendment is understood, I am sure, by every Member of Congress. I think under its present provisions the May bill creates a new agency and which will be too cumbersome. It would cost too many billions of dollars to create this new agency to handle the manpower situation and junk the agency that now has the control of manpower especially during these trying times.

This amendment was in substance placed in the May bill while in committee and was later stricken. I am sure you all agree that the War Manpower Commission is the only agency of the Government that has the machinery to put these people to work.

They speak of the local selective-service boards. The local selective-service boards have done an excellent job and should receive compensation if they are to replace high paid officials and not have to continue to give from twice to possibly many more times of their time they are now giving. I am sure they would do an honest job if the new agency would give traveling expenses to the 6,500 local selective-service boards of America to where they could investigate and make a study of the various war activities and plants throughout the country.

Of course the War Manpower Commission has made mistakes. We have all made them, and we are going to make many more mistakes before this war is over; we have made more than one mistake, the greatest of which was the failure of the adoption of the Wadsworth amendment.

I wish to call to your attention on a straight-out issue without a lot of conversation and a lot of talk, that the War Manpower Commission is far better prepared than the selective-service boards are at this time or will be a year from now after spending millions of dollars.

We have done our duty as we see it, we have supported the Wadsworth amendment and several other amendments to make this a better bill. We are unalterably opposed to the provision that leaves open the question of forcing an unorganized worker to join a union and shall support any and all amendments that proposes to cure this evil.

Under the circumstances that our leaders of the armed forces advise the passage of this bill will shorten the war. I shall support it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I have heard a lot of discussion here today, some of it very difficult to understand in view of the sources from which it has come on both sides of the aisle. I do not say that with any intention of assailing anyone, but this legislation has certainly caused some strange bedfellows. It is not partisan. There is a division on both sides of the aisle.

I think the Committee on Military Affairs has labored long and earnestly to follow the recommendations of the President. I have supported labor on every vote since I have been in this House. When the President of the United States says to me that this is a recommendation of his that is necessary for the war program, I find it difficult not to accept his recommendation. I want to vote for some kind of legislation that will give him what he says is necessary for the winning of the war.

The May bill is still the legislation we are considering because all substitute amendments have so far been defeated. I think, though, that it can be improved. I do not think the local selective-service boards are equipped well enough to handle the work and the terrific task which would be imposed upon them by this legislation. I know that in the big industrial districts they just will not be able to function, they will break down, and chaos may result if we do not place the administration of this program in the hands of an agency which has been set up and established for it.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma and the others which he will offer to follow it will improve the May bill. It will take the administration of it from the hands of those who are not equipped to carry out the provisions of the bill and put it in the hands of an agency which has the personnel and the machinery that is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will give thoughtful and earnest consideration to the proposal of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, quite often in legal practice we find cases before the court in which counsel speak quite a bit about the law and very little about the facts. When they have a good case they talk about the facts. I would like to ask the chairman and members of the committee two or three questions to get some facts and clear up some doubts in my mind. First, how many additional Federal employees will this bill call into employment?

Mr. MAY. I would say that if it calls any in there will be very few for the reason we provide in the bill that it shall be administered by the Selective Service Bureau which already has an organization of 6,500 local boards and a headquarters here in Washington. In addition to that the bill provides they shall call upon the War Manpower Commission and on the War Mobilization Director for advice and information relative to any individual employed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That brings up the next question. Where will the advisers for the 6,500 local boards come from? Are they available now?

Mr. MAY. They have their advisers in the set-up. But they are also to call upon the local U. S. E. S. or any other agency of government for any additional information which they do not have.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We now have this picture of these local draft boards who have done a magnificent job, and I saw what they did as an appeal agent for nearly 3 years. These men have worked tirelessly day and night, week in and week out, without pay. Many of them have already died from overwork on the draft boards and many of them by their exertions have had their lives shortened. In most of these offices they have a chief clerk and two or three stenographers. Will there be more persons needed in each one of those offices to give these local boards more help to do this job which is an added burden upon the three-man board—the extent of which cannot be foretold?

Mr. MAY. I am of the opinion they will not need any further clerical as-

sistance or any other kind of additional personnel, but if they do the gentleman of course knows that the Congress should give them whatever they have to have in order to carry out the war program.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Then another problem arises. In many of these counties—and these are practical problems which you are going to have to face—there may be five boards in one county. That county will have within it men who are working in a war plant in an adjoining county. What is the machinery of getting the information that you want these boards to have to determine when the call will be made, how it is going to be gathered and made available, what men will be affected, and how are the orders to be imposed upon those men to be drafted?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. One of the provisions of this bill provides that the War Manpower Commission and other governmental bureaus may appoint to each selective service board experts in an advisory capacity to assist them with its problems.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is exactly what I am asking about. Do you have these 6,275 experts to appoint to these boards? And secondly, will they be mere advisers or will they tell the boards what to do?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. We have a shortage of manpower and we are going to get some more men to travel to each local board to tell them what to do.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is one of the doubts I had in my mind; that is what I was trying to clear up.

Mr. Chairman, other questions arise to which lack of time prevents full answer.

For instance, what type of manpower is needed, in what plants, in what localities?

Will this measure prevent draining labor to one area from another where it is also needed?

Will this legislation bring about production or will it produce more confusion in the field of labor and production?

And last, but by no means least, Is this legislation constitutional? Does it not border upon the very totalitarian control that we are fighting against on many foreign fronts?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEWART) there were—ayes 33, noes 175.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEELAN: Strike out section 1 and insert the following as a substitute for the bill:

"That section 2 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every citizen of the United States, and of every other person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 45, to present himself or herself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.'

"SEC. 2. Section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'The President may, in his discretion, whenever, in his opinion, the successful prosecution of the war so requires, take possession on behalf of the United States, of any or—

"'(1) All manufacturing and production facilities in the United States;

"'(2) All transportation and communication facilities in the United States;

"'(3) All facilities in the United States for the wholesale or retail distribution of articles or commodities;

"'(4) All banks and other financial institutions and facilities in the United States;

"'(5) All mines and other natural resources in the United States;

"'(6) All farms in the United States engaged in the production of agricultural commodities for market;

"'(7) All other facilities in the United States used in, or in connection with, any trade or business; and use and operate such properties, through such agencies of the Government as he may designate, in the interests of the war effort and in the interests of the civilian economy during the present war. In designating the Government agencies to operate such properties, the President shall, so far as practicable, designate as the agency to operate any particular class of property, that agency whose responsibilities are most closely connected with properties of such class (as, for example, the Department of the Treasury with financial institutions, the Department of Agriculture with farms, the Department of the Interior with mines and certain natural resources, etc.). The compensation to be paid for the use of property of which possession is taken by the United States under this paragraph shall be fair and just.'

"Sec. 3. Section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(n) (1) Every registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not a member of the land or naval forces on active duty and is not exempted or deferred from training and service therein by section 5 (c) (1) or (d) shall be liable to perform work in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort whether or not such registrant is also liable for training and service in the land or naval forces. For the purposes of this subsection, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him, shall from time to time by regulations designate, and certify to the Director of Selective Service, the plants and facilities, and the activities therein, in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, and the farms and agricultural occupations and endeavors essential to the war effort. In making such designations, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may make classifications on the basis of geographical areas, types of activities, types of occupations within activities, and types of plants, facilities, and farms, and also on the basis of the relative importance of each.

"'(2) A registrant liable to perform such work who is now or hereafter employed by an employer, or now or hereafter self-employed, in an activity or agricultural occupation or endeavor which is so certified shall have a duty not to voluntarily discontinue such employment unless the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him (subject to appeal in such manner as such Director shall by regulations prescribe), has determined that it is in the best interest of the war effort that he or she leave such employment, or unless such registrant has been requested to volunteer for, or has been ordered to, other employment pursuant to paragraph (4).

"'(3) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall from time to time (after consultation with the appropriate representatives of management, labor, agriculture, and Government) certify or cause to be certified to the Director of Selective Service the extent to which, in the various areas, the plants, facilities, and farms described in paragraph (1) are unable, through the operation of paragraph (2) and by voluntary recruiting by management, labor, agriculture, and Government, to meet their manpower requirements in the activities, occupations, and endeavors so described.

"'(4) Upon receiving such a certification for a particular area, the Director of Selective Service—

"'(A) shall designate the categories (by age and other status) of registrants who are liable to perform work under paragraph (1) from which registrants capable of performing the work involved shall be called before calls are made from other categories of such registrants. In designating such categories the Director shall first designate categories which include registrants who are, by reason of their age and other status, the type of registrants he deems can tranfer to such work with the least disruption to the war war effort and the civilian economy and to themselves in comparison with registrants in other categories, and may exclude, or by regulations provide for the exclusion, from any category so designated, of those types of veterans (discharged or released from active duty in the land or naval forces under conditions not dishonorable) whose exclusion from such category the Director deems fair and equitable;

"'(B) shall direct the local boards in such area, and also local boards outside the area to the extent that he may deem necessary, to request their registrants within the categories so designated to report, within a time fixed by the Director of Selective Service, to such agencies as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may designate, for referral to employment in the activities, occupations, and endeavors covered by the certification;

"'(C) if the requirements of the certification have not been met under subparagraph (B) within the time fixed, shall direct the local boards in such area, and also local boards outside the area to the extent that he may deem necessary, to order (subject to regulations prescribed by him) registrants within the categories so designated and capable of performing the work involved (in numbers sufficient to meet the requirements of the certification) to report, within such time as the Director of Selective Service may prescribe, to such agencies as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may designate, for referral by such agencies to employment in the activities, occupations, and endeavors specified in the certification and to enter upon the employment to which so referred when accepted therefor. Such orders shall be subject to appeal in such manner as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulations prescribe. It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith.

"'(5) It shall be the duty of an employer to whom a registrant is referred under paragraph (4) (B) or (C) to accept such registrant for employment.

"'(6) Nothing in this subsection shall affect the powers under other provisions of

this act with respect to the classification and selection of persons for, or the induction, or deferment from induction, of persons into the land or naval forces; or preclude the Selective Service System from classifying and selecting for induction any registrant who violates a duty imposed upon him by this subsection or preclude the land or naval forces from inducting such a registrant.'

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after paragraph (C) thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "If such position is in an activity, occupation, or endeavor not designated by the appropriate Government agency as being in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, and if—

"'(i) such person, within 90 days after being relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization (whether before, on, or after the date upon which this sentence takes effect), becomes employed in an activity which is so designated; and

"'(ii) such person continues to be employed in an activity which is so designated until (a) section 5 (n) ceases to be operative (disregarding any period not exceeding 15 days between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment), or (b) he has secured a determination by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him (subject to appeal in such manner as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulations prescribe) that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, whichever is the earlier;

the period beginning with the date upon which he first becomes employed in an activity, occupation, or endeavor which is so designated and ending with the date on which section 5 (i) ceases to be operative, or with the date of such determination, whichever is the earlier, shall be disregarded in computing the 90-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made.'

"(b) Section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(j) Any registrant—

"'(1) who becomes employed as a result of a request or order under section 5 (n) (4); and

"'(2) with respect to whom it has been determined under section 5 (n) (if such subsection is still operative) that it is no longer necessary for him or her to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort;

shall be entitled, in respect of the position left by him or her in order to become so employed, to the benefits of subsections (b), (c), (e), and (g) of this section to the same extent as if he or she had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which the determination provided for in paragraph (2) is made (or on the day on which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, if he or she is still in any such employment on such day and no such determination has been made), and had been given the certificate referred to in subsection (a).'

"Sec. 5. Section 10 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof two new subsections reading as follows:

"'(f) A person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment under section 5 (n) (4) shall receive the same travel, and subsistence during such travel, which he or she would receive if the request (in the case of a volunteer) or order (in other cases) constituted an order to report for induction at the place of such employment; and on or after the date of a determination under section 5 (n) (2) that it is no longer necessary for him or her to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, or on or after the date upon which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative (if he or she is employed in such an activity on such date), or on or after the date of this or her being involuntarily separated from such employment, he or she shall receive similar travel and subsistence back to the place from which he or she was first allowed travel under this subsection (or, at his or her election, to his or her home if that is not farther distant), if application is made therefor within 30 days after such date.

"'(g) A person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment under section 5 (n) (4), shall be paid with respect to such employment compensation at a rate which will result in such person's receiving for each workweek of such employment at least as much as he or she was receiving for any workweek (designated by him or her) of his or her last previous employment which was not an employment entered upon pursuant to a request or order under section 5 (n) (4), and in addition (if the employment for which he or she volunteered, or to which he or she was ordered, does not permit him or her to live at his or her home) shall be furnished with living quarters, or be paid in lieu thereof such reasonable allowance for living quarters as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulations prescribe.'

"SEC. 6. Section 11 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: 'No individual shall be subject to the penalties of this section for having violated any duty imposed by section 5 (a), except for willful violations thereof, and—

"'(a) in the case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (2), it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to show (1) that he or she made application for a determination described in section 5 (n) (2), and (2) that the denial of such application was not based on a fair consideration of his or her application; and it shall also be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to establish a determination by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him (which shall be subject to appeal in such manner as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulations prescribe) that he or she had a justifiable reason for not complying with such duty;

"'(b) in the case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (4), it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to show (1) that he or she made timely application for revocation or modification of the order under section 5 (n) (4), and (2) that the denial of the revocation or modification requested was not based on a fair consideration of his or her application.'

"SEC. 7. Section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting '5 (n),' after '3 (d),' and by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: 'The provisions of section 5 (n) shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose.' As used in this section the term 'date of the termination of hostilities in the present war' means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is the earlier.

"SEC. 8. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 107 a new section reading as follows:

"'SEC. 108. The benefits of this act shall extend to a person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment pursuant to section 5 (n) (4) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if—

"'(a) the application for such employment constituted an order to report for induction into the land or naval forces;

"'(b) such employment constituted military service;

"'(c) entering upon such employment constituted induction into the land or naval forces; and

"'(d) the period beginning with the date of entering upon such employment and ending with either (1) the date on which such section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, or (2) the date of a determination under such section 5 (n) that it is no longer necessary for him or her to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, or (3) the date on which he or she violates a duty imposed by paragraph (2) of such section 5 (n), whichever of such dates occurs first, constituted the period of military service.

For the purposes of this section the period during which the relief and benefits provided in section 106 are to be in effect shall in no event extend beyond 30 days from the date of making application for employment.'"

Mr. MAY. I desire to make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAY. I do not care to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Connecticut on the point of order.

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for our consideration a bill which is termed a limited conscription or national-service bill. Statements have been made on the floor that this is a total war and that we must face it with total measures. However, we have under consideration an act which will only conscript labor. I propose in a permissive sense, to permit, if and when the President of the United States in his discretion says that it requires such action, to take over and operate for the common good, any facility of the United States. If that is not germane to the bill under discussion, then I do not know what national-service legislation is.

Mr. Chairman, evidently acting upon the advice and suggestion of the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission, the President of the United States has called our attention to a condition existing in our civilian productive effort of war materials which has resulted in what has been subsequently termed "spot shortages" and "spot surpluses" of manpower.

To correct this condition, the President has recommended and the Military Affairs Committee has favorably reported out a bill which would compel employment on the part of all eligible registrants between the ages of 18 and 45 in an industry essential to the war effort.

On January 11, 1944, more than 1 year ago, the President also, at the suggestion of the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission, suggested a similar law, but at that time he tied his request in with a mandate that the Congress enact a realistic tax law, the continuation of the Renegotiation Act, a cost-of-food law, and the continuation of the stabilization statute of 1942. All of the President's wishes in these respects were not adhered to, and for that reason no national-service legislation was enacted at that time.

While it is contended that the Federal Government now has the power to draft capital and property, you all know this is a very moot question. As a matter of fact, several cases on this subject are now pending in the courts. While I am willing to subscribe to the advice and counsel of our military leaders as far as our military requirements are concerned, I do not agree that they are the best judges as to how these requirements may be met insofar as our civilian population is concerned. I suggest, therefore, that we not approach this problem on a piecemeal basis but on a plane which would make the sacrifices necessary for the winning of this war somewhere near equal. That is what the amendment I have offered hopes to accomplish. The enactment into law of this amendment would grant permissive powers to the President in those instances where he felt the successful prosecution of the war would require it to take over any property or resource of the Nation and cause such property or resource to be operated for the common good, just compensation being paid therefor.

The amendment would also provide, as does the present bill, for selection of registrants by the Selective Service but assignments to essential plants by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Director. It also contains provisions for reimbursement for expenses of living quarters for those people who are ordered or who volunteer and are accepted, to perform work in a place which would make it impossible for them to live at home, and a provision that employers must accept employees under the same conditions and subject to the same penalties as employees who are ordered to perform work would be subject to if they failed to comply.

I think the amendment, which I have offered, is a fairer, more just approach to this difficult problem, and it will preclude the necessity for any other compulsory measures in this fast-changing war picture, the Directors of which say they are unable to prophesy, with any degree of accuracy as to what their needs will be for any great length of time in advance.

We also have pending before the Congress a bill which would, if passed, give our Selective Service boards the power to draft nurses. Here again we are singling out one segment of our population and imposing a restriction upon them, not shared by others. This proposed amendment, as you will note, provides for the registration of both men and women between the ages of 18 and 45, so that if, when and where their services become necessary to the war effort, they may be so assigned.

While I still am unconvinced that there is a need for this type of legislation at this time, if me must have it, let us make our sacrifices equal; that is the American way.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment prevails.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEELAN] offers to the pending bill a rather voluminous amendment, comprehensive in its nature. The amendment undertakes to confer upon the President the power to conscript all manufacturing and production facilities in the United States, all transportation and communication facilities in the United States, all facilities in the United States for the wholesale or retail distribution of articles or commodities, all banks and other financial institutions and facilities in the United States, and so forth and so forth.

It is much broader, much more comprehensive and far beyond the scope of the bill presently before the committee, H. R. 1752, which is very definite, specific, and restrictive in its nature.

The Chair does not believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut is germane to the bill and sustains the point of order.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House while I make a brief statement with respect to my views on the pending bill.

I frankly state that I do not like the bill. In our industrial-labor relations, I am against coercion and force. I have always believed that industry should be free. I still do. I have always believed in free labor. I still do. Our traditional policy of keeping labor and industry free has worked. It has worked so well that our production record during the war is nothing short of miraculous.

With respect to labor I have no delusions as to the coercive features in the bill. When you freeze a man to his job under penalty that if he leaves the job he will be fined or imprisoned, you are using coercion. When you say to a man who is not working, "get a job"—when you say to a man who is working, "I am not satisfied with the kind of work you are doing, and if you do not change jobs and secure one in an industry that I consider to be essential to the war effort, pay a fine or go to jail," you are using coercion.

Coercion is not the American way, nor is it, in my opinion, the way to increase the production of those things essential to our war effort. It would be much better, it seems to me, for management, labor, and agriculture to get together and work our labor problems out in the traditional American way. Had this been unsuccessfully tried, I would be among the first to advocate coercion or force or any other means thought necessary to bring forth the men needed to produce the implements of war and the food and fiber necessary to supply our fighting men.

What am I going to do? I am going to do what I think every other Representative should do with a clear conscience—I am going to vote for the pending bill. And I have reasons that satisfy me in laying aside my own views and voting for the pending bill.

In the first place, our Commander in Chief and the heads of the Army and Navy, as shown by the committee hearings, are demanding the passage of this bill. This being true, what else is there left for me to do? Prior to Pearl Harbor, and since, I have backed up by my vote every war effort, and to this policy I shall unswervingly adhere. I have confidence in the men in charge of our war effort. That confidence is justified by the results that they have accomplished so far. While, as I have frankly stated, I have misgivings as to the effectiveness of the bill under consideration, those in charge of the war effort, and in whom I have confidence, have asked for it, and I shall comply with their wishes by voting to give them the legislation for which they have asked. These men know a great deal more about the war effort than I. They have, so far, directed it in such a way as to produce results, and results are what I am looking for. I am willing, until we get through with the war, to surrender any preconceived ideas I may have as to manpower and production, to the opinion, judgment, and wishes of those in authority. In war we have to place men in authority to direct. There is no other way to successfully prosecute a war. Having placed them in authority to direct, my duty, as I see it, is to follow and carry out, as far as I can, their directives. The old kitchen philosophy, "Too many cooks spoil the broth," is a pretty good philosophy to follow in time of war.

Another reason: It has gone forth that those directing our war effort want the legislation we are now considering. Our fighting men know this, and are expecting us here on the home front to back up our war leaders just as they are backing them up on the battle front. If it goes forth that we have turned our war leaders down, what effect will it have upon our fighting men? It will, I am afraid, to say the least, lower their morale. Our fighting men are not going to take time to debate and quibble over coersion, force, and this, that, and the other. If this bill is defeated, they are going to assume that there is something wrong, radically wrong, here on the home front; that Congress is not backing up the war effort in the way it should; and that, in all probability, because there is a fight going on between Congress and the war leadership, their chances of bringing the

war to a speedy conclusion will be lessened. We cannot let this happen.

Then, too, our failure to back up our war leaders will be used by the Nazi propagandist in an effective way, in such a way, I am afraid, that will strengthen the morale of the German people. And we cannot let this happen.

The agitation of this legislation has already had a wholesome effect. I am in hopes that the effects of the passage of the bill will be such that none of its harsh provisions will ever have to be put into effect.

In closing, let me express the hope that before this legislation reaches the Senate that those in charge of our war effort will give further thought to our manpower situation. If they do, I believe they will advocate, in principle, the provisions of what is known as the Voorhis amendment which, I am persuaded, is the correct approach to the manpower problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after paragraph (C) thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "If such position is in an activity, occupation, or endeavor not designated by the appropriate Government agency as being in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, and if—

"(i) such person, within 90 days after being relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization (whether before, on, or after the date upon which this sentence takes effect), becomes employed in an activity which is so designated; and

"(ii) such person continues to be employed in an activity which is so designated until (a) section 5 (n) ceases to be operative (disregarding any period not exceeding 15 days between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment), or (b) he has secured a determination by his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, whichever is the earlier;

the period beginning with the date upon which he first becomes employed in an activity, occupation, or endeavor which is so designated and ending with the date on which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, or with the date of such determination by his selective-service local board, whichever is the earlier, shall be disregarded in computing the 90-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made."

(b) Section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(j) Any registrant—

"(1) who becomes employed as a result of a request or order under section 5 (n) (4); and

"(2) with respect to whom it has been determined under section 5 (n) (if such subsection is still operative) that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort;

shall be entitled, in respect of the position left by him in order to become so employed, to the benefits of subsections (b), (c), (e), and (g) of this section to the same extent as if he had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which the determination provided for in paragraph (2) is made (or on the day on which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, if he is still in any such employment on such day and no such determination has been made), and had been given the certificate referred to in subsection (a)."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been assured by business managers, including a manager in one of the Nation's greatest war industries, that we are 100-percent right in opposing this bill because of its disruptive consequences. It would be wrong to rely upon General Knudsen as an expert witness for this kind of question—though he too advised against labor regimentation in order to solve the foundry problem. General Knudsen is, perhaps, the country's best expert at looking at a machine and telling how a man can work it more efficiently. But management is not the field in which he is expert.

I am assured that we are right in believing that this bill would have a disruptive and unpredictably dangerous effect upon war production. As soon as it becomes law, men in little businesses all over the Nation—though they may be more necessary to the economy than any Government planner apprehends in advance—will start to tumble out of present jobs. Men in oil stations, banks, grocery stores, truckers, taxi drivers, and so forth, not knowing whether or not they will be drafted and punished a few months later, will begin scurrying about trying to beat the next fellow getting into some job likely to continue to be considered jobs for which deferment would be granted—for example, into the already overmanned Government or, perhaps, into the domestic branch of Red Cross, already overmanned, I am told, with former W. P. A. and N. Y. A. officials. As Under Secretary Patterson originally testified, it is not so much a manpower shortage as maldistribution. I am assured that the manpower shortage exists only in sporadic and isolated instances which may or may not be eliminated by this bill. This bill would be more likely to aggravate than solve the problem. Because the little trucker or oil-station keeper or what not will not have the information to know how much the economy and war production depends upon his saying where he is. Nor will his local draft board know.

I will not follow blindly General Marshall's endorsement of this legislation, because I know how blindly General Marshall has to follow the Commander in Chief in order to remain Chief of Staff. You ought to remember, for example, that it was only indignant public opinion that kept him Chief of Staff after he asserted himself at Quebec.

Perhaps even if he knows the economic dangers inherent in this bill General Marshall believes that it cannot matter now in view of the war situation in Europe. I suppose that there is no use emphasizing what the war situation really is. Beginning last March and all last summer, when workers were virtually invited to leave war jobs by the optimistic propaganda, some of us who are truthful persons tried to warn that we were reliably informed that the optimism was unjustified. That we were reliably informed by military men that there would be fierce Nazi resistance to the United States armies in western Europe, costing us an estimated 500,000 casualties or more. And also, that the Russians, instead of synchronizing their attack as agreed, would probably go looting in the Balkans and end up in a deal with the Germans, since their peace terms which, for many months, they have broadcasted six times daily, leave the German Army virtually intact. The public preferred to believe the optimistic propaganda which hooted us down and later, after the Nazi offensive, cried "Surprise! Surprise!" Now that the Russians seem to be almost in Berlin this bill seems to be chiefly for psychological effect.

But, we ought to know by this time that New Deal "psychologistics" are often downright moronic—the Morgenthau plan announcement, for instance, and the unconditional surrender policy, which the Russians save hundreds of thousands of lives by not using. Probably the psychological effect the new dealers most want to create by means of this bill is to show the soldiers that although the administration has been drastically criticized for not getting tough with labor, they are really willing to clap down on labor—this, of course, being a time when they can assure the labor leaders privately that the war in Europe seems likely to be over before laboring men have time to begin resenting this slave-labor law.

But the fortunes of war are so reversible that you and I dare not feel certain that this bill will not be used. The possibilities for abuse of power under this bill are well nigh inexhaustible. It is the last long step toward giving the same slave-labor power over our citizens that the Russian Government has over its citizens, or the Nazi government has over Germans.

The damaging effects of this bill will begin to be felt as soon as it seems at all likely to become law. The competition to be sure to get a job which will remain essential as long as the new law lasts will start immediately. Not only minors in college, but also men in all kinds of little and big businesses all over the United States, will endeavor to find berths where they know they will be safe. A criminal sentence stares them in the face unless they get such jobs and a man will be trying to get such a job before the next fellow does. Many will leave the jobs in which they are now engaged, liquidating their little businesses if necessary. The general exodus is going to cause chaotic disruption the extent of which cannot be estimated in advance.

It would be easy to vote for this bill and avoid criticism. But it seems that you cannot do a good job of trying to preserve our Republic and also avoid criticism. As Emerson said, "For nonformity the world whips with its displeasures."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, stripped to its essentials, the bill before us, H. R. 1752, involves only one question—will it increase or will it decrease needed war production?

If it will increase such production it should be enacted. If it will decrease production, its enactment will be a cruel deception to G. I. Joe.

Whose answer to the question should we accept—those whose experience and knowledge and expertness lie in fields other than production, or those who know production through producing?

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations join in stating that this bill will decrease production. They are experts. Theirs is the advice which should be followed on this question.

H. R. 1752 should be defeated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the decision as to how to vote on this bill is most difficult for me. In talking with many Members on both sides I find it is proving difficult for many of them, too. A good case and unimpeachably valid reasons can be presented for the bill and also against it.

I doubt that the legislation is actually necessary to accomplish the desired end, namely, greater production in certain categories where shortages unquestionably exist. I suspect it represents in part an attempt to imply that the primary blame for these shortages is on the shoulders of labor and management—that is, the civilian citizens of this country—when as a matter of plain fact the real origin of most of the shortages is elsewhere, miscalculations by some military leaders, unwise allotment of contracts to areas already overburdened, sudden stepping-up of demands for new models, underutilization of the manpower already at work in war plants, and so on.

Yesterday I received a letter saying:

> If you vote for the bill to draft war workers you should also at the same time try to provide something for them to do, as most of them in the plants are already standing around without enough to keep them busy. Go through a plant sometime when they haven't got a special day arranged for you ahead of time, and you'll see what I mean.

Two days previously a constituent wrote complaining that he has been working on the swing shift in a certain war plant in my State and has not had 2 hours of real work to do a single night in the last 3 months.

Most of all the difficulty in getting adequate manpower is due to confusion in the public mind regarding what the real needs and the real prospects are. There have been so many conflicting reports every week from equally official Government agencies, both military and civilian, that the average citizen is almost forced to give up in disgust, or at least hopelessness.

There is reason to doubt that enactment of this bill as it is will show results until the acuteness of the need for it is already past. I hoped we would adopt the Barrett substitute as an essentially sounder measure and actually more practical in getting results. I fear the May bill may increase rather than decrease confusion in our whole manpower problem, may lower rather than raise morale on the home front, may disturb rather than quiet the widespread uneasy misgivings regarding the steady concentration in Government of more and more power over the lives of American citizens. That is, I fear the bill will not do much good and may do real harm on the home front.

And yet we are constantly told on highest authority that it is necessary to pass it for the sake of the effect on the men in the armed services. I doubt that it will do much good to the morale of our soldiers. But if to reject it, now that it has been brought before us, might conceivably do some harm on the war front, then I feel under solemn obligation to resolve any possible doubt on that issue in favor of the war front. I must, therefore, vote for the bill with misgivings.

One aspect of the matter has not, to my knowledge, been frankly mentioned but ought to be. At the end of the European war there will inevitably be a letdown here at home. If a better job is not done in explaining to the people of the country the full implications of the war in the Pacific than has been done hitherto, then there may be a real need for the bill in order to compel people to stay at work until the war against Japan is fully completed. It may be some of our military and civilian leaders have this in mind in their using the emergency on the western front to urge its enactment now. If so, then I express once more, as I have many times in the past, my regret that so many of our leaders still fail to understand the American people, still imagine we have to be hoodwinked, or cajoled, or tricked, into doing what is right and necessary for the defense of this land. When will they realize that this is our country too? That we also belong to the team? That whenever they will start laying the cards frankly on the table before us in full, frank confidence and candor, they will get response from us, voluntarily and eagerly given, that will far surpass anything the Nation has ever done. The way for them to get fullest support to ultimate victory is not by seeking to manage our thinking and emotions by manipulation of news and propaganda in the best Hollywood advertising manner. It is by their beginning really to believe in the democracy they so frequently talk about, by beginning to trust the American people to make the right decisions if given the plain truth.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 3. Section 10 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:
>
> "(f) A person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment under section 5 (n) (4) shall receive the same travel, and subsistence during such travel, which he would receive if the request (in the case of a volunteer) or the order (in other cases) constituted an order to report for induction at the place of such employment; and on or after the date of a determination under section 5 (n) (2) that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, or on or after the date upon which section 5 (n) ceases to be operative (if he is employed in such an activity on such date), or on or after the date of his being involuntarily separated from such employment, he shall receive similar travel and subsistence back to the place from which he was first allowed travel under this subsection (or, at his election, to his home if that is not farther distant), if application is made therefor within 30 days after such date."

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BIEMILLER: On page 8 strike out lines 17, 18, 19, and 20 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "ment under section 5 (n) (4) shall receive transportation, including transportation of dependents and household effects to the location of such employment, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, provided that the cost of such transportation shall not exceed $300 for any one worker, his dependents and household effects, and shall not exceed the amount allowable for civilian employees of the several departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government under the standardized Government travel regulations; and on or after the date."

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, as the bill now reads, transportation allowances are given only to the man who volunteers or is ordered to another place of residence. I am proposing in this amendment that when a man volunteers or is ordered to go to another place of employment he shall also be given allowances for his family and his household effects, not to exceed $300 for any one such trip.

I think we recognize that if the law is going to function there will be men with families who will be required to move from one place to another. It seems to me that the least we can do in those situations is to permit the family to be moved along with the worker. In other democratic countries that have legislation of this nature this is a usual provision in such laws. Most of them, in fact, go a good deal further. I am not, at this time, proposing anything beyond permitting families to be kept intact, and that wives and children and their necessary household effects can be moved along with the worker.

I think the adoption of this amendment would bring more volunteers under the act than you would get otherwise. I think it would be a matter of simple justice to any worker who is required to move by order.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that this legislation is before the House. In the first

place, no testimony has been presented showing there is a shortage of manpower. Secondly, industry has been and still is capable of furnishing any and all material that can be transported to our fighting fronts. I say I think it is unfortunate that we are considering this legislation because it does not start to reach the real problem of production in this country. The Military Affairs Committee well knows that there are some problems of production that are basic. What we need is a better utilization of the manpower available.

As one Member of Congress I regret very much that we have failed as a legislative body to assume our full responsibility to the boys at the front and to our people at home. One constructive thing that Congress could do, and should have done years ago, was to amend the Wages and Hours Act and the National Labor Relations Act. We enacted legislation for the 40-hour week to spread labor. It seems almost unbelievable that we should fight a war with a 40-hour week. It just does not make sense.

The National Labor Relations Act should be amended so that labor would be equally responsible with industry when it comes to showing the responsibility for production of war material. Under existing law an employer cannot discharge an employee without the approval of a Government agency. The employer cannot even discuss labor conditions or wages with his employees without violating the law. This reaches heights of absurdity, especially in the smaller communities where the employer and employees live across the street from each other, where their children attend the same schools, and where they have the same community interests.

I know of my own knowledge of a case where a labor leader from Chicago went into a small rural community and began organizing a unit in an industry employing less than 40 people. He was not very successful because the men were satisfied with the hours, the wages, and the working conditions. Finally he conceived the idea that he would ask some of the men if the employer or boss had discussed their wages and working conditions with them. One or two men frankly stated they had discussed wages and the hours of work. The labor leader immediately filed a suit through the National Labor Relations Board and this small concern has been through two courts because of a violation of this act.

It was my privilege to visit personally 2 years ago with one of the large employers of labor in the Nation. As a matter of fact, he was using 40,000 employees in one plant. At the time I was there they were having labor trouble, and I made inquiries concerning it. The housing was not good, the transportation was most difficult, and I thought I could readily see why some of the men and women would be dissatisfied with working in that plant. In visiting with the owner and manager he advised me that if he could fire three people tomorrow morning the labor troubles in that plant would be solved, but he could not fire them. It seems almost unbelievable that we would have legislation of that type on our statutes during a war.

During this debate we have heard much discussion about the War Manpower Commission. They have had a difficult job, but they are also responsible for much of the confusion and wastage of manpower.

Wichita, Kans., is one of the large airplane producing centers of the Nation. When the aircraft factories of that city were asked to step up production on B–29's they were assured by the War Department and War Manpower Commission that they would be given every consideration in securing the thousands of additional help needed. What did they do? They started running large newspaper advertisements in Wichita, which was already a critical area. As usual, it developed that the manager of the aircraft plant had much more knowledge of securing production than either the War Department or War Manpower Commission. After many conferences and much delay the War Department and War Manpower Commission consented to the use of two 10-hour shifts per day instead of the regular three 8-hour shifts. What happened? The production requirements were met and exceeded in a very short time. They did it by using less employees instead of more.

This administration has so bungled the manpower problem that now it becomes necessary for Congress to enact draft or work legislation. I do not think it is necessary to enact the legislation in order to secure production. I am rather fearful, however, that it is necessary to vote this bill in order that our boys on the battle fronts will not misunderstand the Members of Congress. We voted to induct them into the military service and certainly that required more courage than to vote to put a man into essential industry where they will receive the highest wages in our Nation's history and have the privilege of working under the best of working conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER, of Kansas: Add a new section 4 on page 9, after line 9:

"SEC. 4. (a) Before any proposed regulation or order to be prescribed under this act by any governmental agency exercising powers granted herein or authority conferred hereunder, other than intraagency administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of its activities or inter-agency rules governing relations with other agencies of the Government, shall issue, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the President of the Senate for the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House for the House of Representatives.

"(b) The draft of such proposed regulation or order shall be immediately assigned to the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, for study to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be effective upon approval by the committee on Military Affairs of either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either, or, unless previously disapproved, may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including, the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(c) For the purposes of this act the committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the Members are just a bit impatient; but if they will forget the psychology of the situation, they will realize that after all it is actually only 4 o'clock and it is yet early in the day. Incidentally, if this matter of the 5 o'clock hour irks any of you, why, you can give us some assistance in returning God's time to the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I was greatly interested in the remarks of the chairman a few moments ago, and on another occasion today when he made some statements about the powerful bureaucracies in this country and the fear of one dictator here in Washington. That is one of the reasons why this amendment is proposed. A similar one was offered to the Surplus War Supplies bill, a bill which we were told we should vote for because Mr. Will Clayton was to administer it. But Mr. Clayton is not administering it. We are told Mr. Byrnes will administer this bill. Maybe he will and maybe he will not. The practice provided for by this amendment is not difficult to carry out. It merely says that when any one of these agencies, whether it is the War Manpower Commission or whether it is the Selective Service or whether it is the Director of War Mobilization, when they propose to issue a rule, order, or edict they must send a copy of it to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. Then it would be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and that committee, or a subcommittee, which knows every word and paragraph of and semicolon in this bill, and which knows the intent and purpose of it, can scan that rule, order, or edict and see for themselves whether the regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of power is proposed. If such a provision had been inserted in many of the laws which we have passed heretofore we would not now be in a position of condemning many of the bureaucratic agencies for some of their questionable rules because Congress would have kept control over its legislative child, would have seen that it obeyed the will, the intent, and the purpose of Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I gladly yield to the chairman.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, any regulation made by either the Selective Service Bureau, or the War Manpower Commission, or anybody else would have to come to the Congress and be considered by the Com-

mittee on Military Affairs of the two bodies before it could become effective?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; any rule they might propose that comes as the result of this May bill.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think that that might so delay the induction of people in this country quite a bit and may delay the furnishing of manpower to the armed forces?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; it could be done almost immediately. If that rule or order is in conformity with the intent, spirit, and purpose of this law, it would take any committee or subcommittee very little time to decide it. In this bill you are dealing not merely with property, you are dealing with men's lives, hence supreme care must be exercised.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. To carry out the gentleman's idea it seems to me it would be necessary for the Committee on Military Affairs to report a bill in every instance.

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; they would not report a bill at all. This amendment gives your committee the power of veto over any regulation which is not in conformity with this law, and the report is made to the agency itself. How convenient it would have been if such a provision had been in the law when General Hershey sent out this memorandum or order telling the draft boards, in effect, to ignore the Tydings amendment. That would have had to come to the committee first, and the committee would have said, "That is not in conformity with the spirit, intent, or purpose of the bill as we passed it."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say that General Hershey issued no such order.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Well, that was the effect of the order, and was so understood by the local boards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 11 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "No individual shall be subject to the penalties of this section for having violated any duty imposed by section 5 (n), except for willful violations thereof, and—

"(a) in the case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (2), it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to show (1) that he made application to his selective-service local board for a determination described in section 5 (n) (2), and (2) that the denial of such application was not based on a fair consideration of his application; and it shall also be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to establish a determination by such local board (which shall be subject to appeal in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2)) that he had a justifiable reason for not complying with such duty;

"(b) in the case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (4), it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to show (1) that he made timely application for revocation or modification of the order under section 5 (n) (4), and (2) that the denial of the revocation or modification requested was not based on a fair consideration of his application."

SEC. 5. Section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting "5 (n)," after "3 (d)," and by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "The provisions of section 5 (n) shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose. As used in this section the term 'date of the termination of hostilities in the present war' means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is the earlier."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

We are almost at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill. Some of us have earnestly tried to amend the bill into such form as would assure production but also be in accordance with American principles. Substitutes, the Barrett bill, my bill, and all amendments have been defeated. Our efforts have failed. We have the May bill before us.

I have already expressed some of my convictions about the legislation. At the moment I want to repeat some of them. Free American workers have performed a production miracle in this war. The strength that comes from freedom is and always will remain superior to any other system. I feel impelled to say once again, as I have before, that I think this type of legislation violates a fundamental principle upon which our country is founded. It would not do so if it were drafted in such fashion as to require work for our Nation but to avoid compelling the labor of one man to be exerted for the private profit of another.

Had my amendment to take all profit out of war contracts been adopted, we would have an altogether different choice before us, one where it would be possible for a Member to cast a vote for something that would be right. As it is, from my view, I will be doing a wrong act whether I vote for the bill or against it. In my opinion, a bill of this character should never have come before the House. For as I believe I have made clear in the debate there are available in my opinion other and much better methods.

I must say in fairness, however, that I think if the committee was going to bring in any bill of this particular character at all, it has surrounded this bill with about as good safeguards as could have been provided. I refer particularly to the provision that voluntary recruitment shall be tried first and, if successful, no compulsion will be used, and to the provision that every worker shall have a reasonable choice of employers.

I do not believe that even at this hour we have the answer to things that confuse our people, as to why for example, this legislation should come before us at this time when there are substantial lay-offs taking place; as to why it is necessary for us to be asked to put this most extraordinary and unprecedented power upon the people in fact of the fact that, after all, the basic mistake was not theirs but was made last summer when they were told on highest authority that they should prepare for an early end of the war in Europe and when such substantial cut-backs were made in war production.

To my mind the arguments that have been made against this bill have been better, on the whole, than the arguments that have been made for it, except for one. That argument is not that the President asked for the bill or that outstanding military leaders whose field, after all, is not industrial production, asked for it. That one argument, I remember best as having come from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE]. Mr. LYLE made his maiden speech in the House a couple of days ago. He said nothing so very different perhaps from what other Members had said, but he said it as one who only very recently was on the battle front himself. He asked us to remember that several million young men around the world will be listening for the result of this vote. And as we are deeply concerned about injustice and inequity in this bill or elsewhere, the paramount consideration as long as the war lasts must be these young men who are carrying the load, facing exhaustion and death. For they who had least of all to do with the making of this war are that young generation which through history has been drafted to go out to fight and die that other people may be free.

As we close this debate the war they are fighting in the snow and sleet is in a critical stage. We are at a place where any action that could be—and we know it would be, however unfairly—termed an evidence of unwillingness to back them up would be a blow to their spirits which we must not deal them. We must not do anything that might be interpreted as a return to the disastrous overoptimism and lack of understanding of the tremendous task of our fighting forces which pervaded the nation last summer. And so my vote will be cast for the bill.

Just one message is going out after the House votes. American soldiers are not going to know about the Harness substitute or my substitute or any of the amendments that have been offered. They will only know that the House either did or did not adopt a measure that was brought before us—even though, as I believe, mistakenly—for the alleged purpose of trying to increase war production and increase their supplies. The only news that will go out will be whether the House voted "yea" or "nay." I cannot vote "no" for the simple but compelling reason that, were the House to defeat the bill, I am convinced the news would be carried to the men and boys at the front in such a manner as to make them feel we had let them down. Right now, especially, that would mean discouragement and bewilderment to them. I am by no means sure that the passage of the bill will actually get any additional equipment to our men. I hope it will. But I am sure its defeat would rob them of spirit.

And as one who believes a new progressive movement in the people's interest must be built, I look into the future, too. I even look ahead to the possibility that Congress might get down to business and take the profit out of the war, that it might make a sincere effort to adjust the basic wrong in this legislation. And for a very important reason I want my vote to be understood as the vote of a Member who has stood the best he knew how for the rights of the common people of this Nation. I want them to get credit for my vote. Yes; I want American workers to get credit for my vote, no matter how they may feel against me for casting my vote as I do. For, should this bill be defeated by the votes of people like myself, who are known as supporters and friends of men and women who labor in factories and on farms, a certain group in this country would find in that fact grist for their mill. The group I speak of are those who are at present working so cleverly and so relentlessly to try to drive a wedge of misunderstanding and bitterness between the men in uniform and the workers on the home front, workers who have so far met every production demand which they have understood. This bill cannot and will not be passed without the votes of Members who are known as progressives, as friends of the common people and the people who work. These votes can defeat the purposes of those who seek to use deception to divide soldier and workers and farmer and thus to keep monopolistic privilege in places of power. For by our votes we will be saying for the people of America, "We are ready to lay down even a sacred right, even to do it while no corresponding sacrifice of wealth and property is required, if by our action we can help in any way at all our men at the fighting fronts."

Let every one of us who votes for this bill resolve that at the earliest possible moment consistent with the war situation we will strike it from the statute books. And it now becomes even more than before our solemn duty to prepare against any possibility of a day coming when there will be mass unemployment in this land. Some of us will be back in the well of the House and we will call on Members of the House to join with us in seeing to it that policies are followed which can be effective in maintaining for all people whom this bill affects, as well as for all the men in the armed forces, their basic rights of American citizenship.

This is no hour to talk about the end of the war. America is grimly determined tonight. Her teeth are clenched; her fists doubled. This mighty Nation is going through with this war as fast and as hard as human endurance can do it. And we will not again leave in spirit the sides of the men that fight. My substitute amendment would have been a vastly better way than the May bill to implement that determination, for by it we could have taken the froth of luxury and self-indulgence from our economy while the war lasts and we could have ended labor hoarding. But the House turned it down for reasons I still cannot understand. The Senate, I predict, will act otherwise.

But I cannot close without this: A day will come when it is all over, and then the men and women who took even this bill and still outproduced the whole world, used even this measure to increase their production more and more—as they will do—will find their recompense; for then, if there is breath in my body and the bodies of others here, we will strip inordinate power from places where it does not belong—in government, in monopoly, anywhere—and build a nation in which human beings will come first, as America through the years has promised. We will build a nation in which the wrongs of war will be requited, in which we shall do justice, first, to our soldiers, sailors, and marines, and, second, to those on the home front, who, though they knew someone had blundered, went ahead, as they will, and did their duty by their sons and brothers overseas to the limit of their ability.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 10, line 15, strike out all of line 15 and insert "February 1, 1946" and strike out all of lines 18 to 23, inclusive.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to fix a definite date to which this bill will apply. Under the proposed law, it is to apply until the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war. In other words, even though the war with Germany may come to an end and the need for this legislation is no longer with us, yet this particular bill will continue in force until after the Japanese war is over. We have been told by high authority that the Japanese war may last for a period of 4 or more years. It is quite possible that after the war with Germany is over and we can concentrate on the Pacific war the need for this bill and the regimentation of 53,000,000 workers will not be necessary.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There is also a provision in here that Congress may terminate this act at any time that it may want to.

Mr. CLASON. This bill in fact surrenders control of the situations covered by its provisions until the end of the Japanese war, the period for which this bill shall run. I would like to see the Congress control the period by a definite limitation and not by resolution. If we do, I feel certain it will be much easier for many on the Republican side to vote in favor of the bill. To leave power in the hands of people in Washington in the departments to carry on under the terms of this bill indefinitely appears to me to be a faulty part of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman's amendment strike out of the bill the provision which gives the Congress the right to pass a concurrent resolution terminating it at any time?

Mr. CLASON. No; it does not.

Mr. MAY. I understand it does.

Mr. CLASON. No. It strikes out line 15 and all of lines 18 to 23, inclusive, and leaves in lines 16 and 17, so that the Congress would have the right to pass a concurrent resolution at any time before February 1, 1946, if it saw fit; otherwise the law would run until February 1, 1946. By that time we should know how it will work. Otherwise this whole matter may come up on May 15, 1945, and we will have all this to go over again before we really have a chance to work out the terms of the bill, if it passes.

Mr. Chairman, I offered an anti-discrimination amendment yesterday. The Speaker said he thought it would cost 50 to 75 votes if it were included. I am interested in a newspaper article which I show you that reads that CLASON'S sponsorship of the anti-discrimination amendment might corral enough Republican votes for the bill to assure its passage through the House. Whatever way you look at an amendment its effect looks different to some one else.

I was also interested in what the majority leader said. In effect he stated he was against my amendment because he wanted to vote for the bill and he was afraid if he voted for the amendment it would perhaps prevent passage of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is not quoting me correctly. I opposed his amendment because it was unnecessary. I stated that there was a commission under Executive order already in existence and that the amendment had no place in the bill and was unnecessary.

Mr. CLASON. At any rate, as near as I can get it—and I perhaps misinterpreted the gentleman's remarks—it was to the effect that being in the bill, it would hurt the bill so far as those who perhaps wanted to support it were concerned.

Another speaker who followed said that he was opposed to it and later indicated that he intended to vote against the bill. At some later date, whether on May 15, 1945, or February 1, 1946, or whenever the F. E. P. C. bill does come out of the Labor Committee, has a rule, and reaches the floor, this issue is going to be voted on again. I appreciate the fact that since that amendment was defeated yesterday, many Members on the Democratic side have come to me and said that they were in favor of such legislation and intended to support it in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 85, noes 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will not keep you 5 minutes, so just give me a minute or two of your attention.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as resenting very much the intemperate remarks made by certain speakers here today with regard to General Marshall, a man who has earned not only the respect but also the affection of every real American. History will pass on his conduct of this war, and when that history is written General Marshall's magnificent leadership will no doubt form one of its brightest pages.

I know that in the heat of legislative battle many intemperate remarks and speeches are made, but at least we should confine such speeches to the bill before the House.

General Marshall should have our prayers, not unfair, vicious criticism of things we know little about. There are parts of this bill that I do not like but I intend to follow the leadership of the Commander in Chief and the heads of our armed forces who are responsible for the conduct of the war. The sons of America are fighting all over the world. My first responsibility is to them. I shall discharge this obligation as I see it. Vote for this bill and pray that it will help to bring about an earlier termination of this tragic war.

I yield to no person in my devotion to the working men and women of my country but I believe I have as much of an obligation to the workers on the battlefields of Europe and Asia as I have to those at home.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened patiently for 4 days to find one logical reason to support this bill. I am impressed with the contention that we must have a bill because of the psychological effect its approval here will have on the fighting fronts throughout the world. We are not fooling or deceiving or duping the G. I. Joes. That was attempted with the bobtail ballot. What are we doing today? Millions of letters have gone overseas to our sons and daughters, and they know about the confusion on the home front and the maladministration.

Just a few minutes ago the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs referred to a telegram which he received from the American Legion urging support of this bill because it allegedly approximates universal service. Back in June of 1941 there was an opportunity presented to this House to prevent the hoarding and the wasting of manpower in war industries, to take the profit out of war; yes, to prevent profiteering. I urge every Member to examine roll call No. 65 on June 9, 1941, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] to outlaw cost-plus contracts. This was lost 175 to 179, and I particularly urge the 9 Democratic Members of the House Committee on Military Affairs who were members of that committee at that time to examine that roll call. You as well as all of us then had an opportunity to show good faith in complying with the requests of the American Legion to adopt universal service. Examine that roll call and you will find out how you failed to keep faith with the veterans of the first war and to take the profit out of this war. You approved the vicious cost-plus contract system which is largely responsible for the hoarding and misuse of manpower in war industries. You encouraged the conditions which have made possible overstaffing and criminal abuses in the large war industries.

We have heard recently about the investigations and revelations made by the Mead committee in some of the plants operated by the Government. Were those revelations conducive to improving the morale of our soldiers?

I have here reports from the United States Civil Service Commission showing the status of civilian employment in the Federal Government. On December 31, 1943, the total number of civilians on the Federal pay roll was 3,007,000. On December 31, 1944, the total was 3,309,000, or an increase during 1944 of 302,000. So during the last calendar year, when the Nation faced a critical manpower situation—when our farms were being denuded of farm labor and the small businesses of this country were deprived of essential labor—what did benevolent old Uncle Sam do. Why, he added 300,000 civilian employees during the last year.

Can you fool G. I. Joe and make him think there is some psychology in this bill? No. He knows about the bungling and the failure to utilize manpower fully on the home front, while he is making sacrifices and giving everything in the service of his country.

I should like to read a paragraph from a letter I received this week from a responsible constituent at Pocatello:

> We have heard a lot recently about a manpower shortage. I am wondering if the Army has been informed of that fact. The 1st of November things began to slow up out at the Army base west of Pocatello. By the 1st of December signs were definite that the base would be closed. A number of the civilian employees at the base have tried since that time when they first learned of the closing of the base to get a release to go to work somewhere else. To date none have been released. I was informed last night by one of the men that in the last 6 weeks he had done nothing but play poker because there just is nothing to do. From my conversation with other men out there I find that is generally the case. The thing I would like answered is why such things need occur—if we are really short of manpower.

I call these facts to your attention because I, like every Member of this House and every American citizen, want maximum production in order to win the war. Passing ill-advised legislation merely because it may have a psychological effect in improving the morale of our armed forces is not advisable in this critical hour.

I am eager to do everything possible to insure an early decisive military victory and make possible the united support of both labor and industry in the production of essential war supplies and equipment. However, I am informed by the War Production Board that military production during 1944 was 12 percent above 1943. Representatives of industry and labor—those who are responsible for production—are vigorously opposed to any compulsory labor-draft legislation at this time. Certainly there is room for improvement, but this can be accomplished under existing laws, and by telling the people the truth, instead of misrepresenting the facts and indulging in ill-advised optimism over the early ending of the war—as was done last summer.

I am not in accord with the contention of many proponents of the May bill that it will have a psychological effect in improving the morale of those in the service. They need ammunition, not meaningless and worthless gestures. Therefore, I shall vote against this measure because I sincerely believe that it would retard not accelerate production.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 6. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 107 a new section reading as follows:
>
> "SEC. 108. The benefits of this act shall extend to a person volunteering for, or ordered to, employment pursuant to section 5 (n) (4) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if—
>
> "(a) the application for such employment constituted an order to report for induction into the land or naval forces;
>
> "(b) such employment constituted military service;
>
> "(c) entering upon such employment constituted induction into the land or naval forces; and
>
> "(d) the period beginning with the date of entering upon such employment and ending with either (1) the date on which such section 5 (n) ceases to be operative, or (2) the date of a determination under such section 5 (n) that it is no longer necessary for him to be employed in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, or (3) the date on which he violates a duty imposed on him by paragraph (2) of such section 5 (n), whichever of such dates occurs first, constituted the period of military service.
>
> For the purposes of this section, the period which the relief and benefits provided in section 106 are to be in effect shall in no event extend beyond 30 days from the date of making application for employment."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 10, line 24, strike out all of section 6.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if I thought the passage of this bill would shorten this terrible war by 1 day or by 1 hour, or would save the life or prevent the injury of one man, of course I would support it wholeheartedly just as any other Member of this body would do if he were convinced it would do that very thing. I am convinced it will have the opposite effect.

The amendment I am submitting strikes from the bill all of section 6. This section gives the individuals forced into these jobs all of the benefits and rights allowed in the Soldiers' and Sail-

ors' Relief Act. Read the section for yourself. It says "Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act" is amended to include this group.

The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has told us a number of times this measure is intended to gather up a lot of pool-hall loafers and bums, and so forth, and make them work in industry. Of course they ought to work. Everyone ought to work at tasks that are worth while. After he forces these men into industry, and has agreed to pay transportation clear across the country and back in some cases, and pays industrial wages, it is agreed the particular group included in this legislation, shall have the rights and benefits that are allowed to members of the armed forces under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act. That act was designed for them and for them, only. I want to add right here the great majority of the men included under this legislation are not bums or pool-hall loafers.

There has been considerable talk about what the boys in the armed forces would think about our action on this legislation today. What, I ask you, are they going to think when they discover you have included this provision in this legislation? Then, I ask you also, what is the man who has been working faithfully on his job, many miles from home, going to think when this new man comes in to work alongside, whether he be the pool-hall loafer or not? How will he feel when the new recruit who gets the same pay says, "I had my way paid to this job. Not only that, but I was awarded the rights and benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act."

These benefits are not for the man who stayed on the job and who has been there all the time. The proponents of this measure are blowing hot and cold on this legislation. You regiment the men classified in the IV–F category. Men who did not refuse to go into the armed forces, but were turned down by the armed forces because they could not qualify. You regiment them and put them in the job selected for them, or go to jail. Then you turn right around and excuse yourselves for seeming to be harsh, and tell them after all you want to give them benefits not accorded other workers who have stuck to their jobs. "Consistency, thou are a jewel."

Now, someone is going to say this is not as important as it seems. I say to you it is important. The inequity, the principle of it is not right and you know it. If you want to extend these privileges, including transportation expenses, to all workers in war plants, that is different, but to do it for a particular group in order to sort of pacify them, just does not make sense and you know it.

I know the hour is late, and I realize the leadership of the House on the majority side has insisted and has told those on his side that all amendments must be voted down. Members of the committee, you know this amendment is right. I trust you will support it.

Mr. Chairman, one thing more, I was disappointed to hear Members say on the floor this afternoon they did not like this legislation, the May bill, or its implications, but might be misunderstood if they did not support it. Misunderstood by whom? I ask. A vote on this measure is too important and far-reaching to apply but one test. The question is whether it is right and for the best interests of the people of America.

I would like to add that proponents of this legislation say the fact that this legislation is even being considered has caused increased employment. I will tell you what has caused increased employment. Industry and labor have been told we were mistaken in thinking there was a huge supply of certain kinds of munitions on hand, but the facts are there is likely to be a scarcity because of reverses on the European front. Tell industry, labor, and agriculture, and the people of this country the gravity of the situation. Tell them the facts. The American people can take it if they know they are getting the facts. Cut out a lot of unnecessary activities in which thousands and thousands of men and women are engaged, and you will get everything you need and want.

So I may not be charged with failure to offer suggestions on this very important matter, I call attention I submitted a bill to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that would, in my opinion, have solved the problem. The committee did not see fit to even consider it.

Our military leaders did not ask for the May bill. General Marshall did not even testify after being invited to do so. These leaders did say they will need more men and more of certain munitions. I do not believe the May bill is the best way to do it, not at this late hour.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I expect to vote for the bill. Regardless of the position of the gentleman from Kansas on the bill, however, I am certainly for his amendment. I think the House should know what his amendment proposes and understand it clearly. The section which he proposes to strike out is that which would amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act by extending its benefits to the people who will be drawn for industrial or farm work under this bill and—I quote from the bill—to the same extent as if the application for such employment constituted an order to report for induction into the land or naval forces, or that such employment constituted military services.

Thus the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act would be amended to give to these people inducted for labor the same exemptions, the same protection against eviction for nonpayment of rent, the same relief from payment on installment contracts, the same relief from taxes and numerous other benefits that Congress has set up for the soldier or sailor away from home, unable to make his payments, unable to answer summons, and unable to make out tax returns. The gentleman from Kansas does not believe we should put these new industrial inductees on the same basis and neither do I.

Mr. Chairman, the most thrilling story that has come out of the war, in my opinion, is a story in the papers today of the rescue of the 513 men in the Philippines. Because it is pertinent at this point, I want to read you just a few paragraphs from that story:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S HEADQUARTERS,
Luzon, January 31.

In a daring raid 25 miles behind the Japanese lines, 400 picked men of the Sixth Ranger Battalion and Filipino guerrillas last night rescued 513 veterans of Bataan, Corregidor, and Singapore from an enemy prison camp. * * * 486 Americans, 23 Britons, 3 Netherlanders, and 1 Norwegian—all that remained. Hundreds of others had been sent to work in Japan. Other hundreds had died.

All but two of the men were brought out alive. * * * The enfeebled hearts of the two men flickered out when they were in sight of American lines.

Nearly 100 were so weak from malnutrition, disease, and 3-year-old wounds that they could not walk when they were cut loose from Japanese bondage.

Now, then, are you going to give the new industrial inductees the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act set up for those hero prisoners? Let me read further:

The commando raid, ordered on short notice when intelligence reports disclosed the whereabouts of the camp, was such a success that General MacArthur decorated every man in the force.

The lean and ragged captives received the homage of thousands of American soldiers * * * who formed an impromptu honor guard, flanking the military highway down which the rescue party passed.

It was the last of many marches for the rescued men—marches which began with the brutal "death march" of Bataan.

The freed men showed their happiness despite their sores and ulcers, wasted bodies, and ragged clothes.

Some looked helplessly up from litters. Others were proudly erect. There were old men with gray hair and dazed, sunken eyes. Some were surprisingly young and almost at their normal weight. Others were limp from beri-beri.

Their shirts were tattered. Shorts were patched and repatched. Several officers still proudly wore their emblems of rank. There were battered campaign hats, overseas caps, and one pre-war type helmet.

Their sentiment was expressed by Capt. James B. Prippe, Los Angeles, former provost marshal on Corregidor. He said:

"The thrill of seeing those green-clad Rangers storm into the prison camp last night will never quite leave me."

My but I would like to have been there, to have shared in that thrill; but I would not like to tell those men who have been away from home, suffering those tortures, that Congress was proposing to give equal civil-relief benefits to the new draftees for war jobs at wartime pay.

But if section 6 stays in the bill it is proposed to do just that. These new inductees who will be paid workers' wages, who will be working in the United States, will get the same benefits under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act as those men who were rescued on Bataan, the same rights and benefits as the men who rescued them have been promised. Such benefits ought not be offered to the men inducted for labor at regular wages. The amendment of the gentleman from Kansas should prevail.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to call to the attention of the House some facts. The argument has been made that by this section we are giving certain benefits to these people. The inference to be drawn from that is that the benefits under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act are positive benefits, or that they are benefits that are guaranteed; that we are giving them something; that they are absolute. As a matter of fact, that is not true. What the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act does is this: It provides that when a man goes into the service—and under this section we say the man who goes into work under the provisions of this bill—whose ability to discharge his obligation is adversely affected by the change, then he is protected. Then he is entitled to the benefits under that act.

There is one other thing that I want to call attention to and that is this, that they are not absolute. They are given within the discretion of the court. The judge must be convinced that the man's ability to discharge those obligations has been adversely affected by his change in status. Unless he is so convinced there is no obligation on him whatsoever to extend the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act to that person.

Someone has said we ought not give it to these men who are going to work under the terms of this bill, whereas it is not given to those who are voluntarily at work already. I simply want to call attention to this fact that even though that may sound good, you must remember that the person who is at work voluntarily has had plenty of time to adjust his personal affairs. Therefore, perhaps the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act would not be worth anything to him anyhow, because his ability to handle his obligations has not been adversely affected, whereas we are going to snatch up the men covered by this bill hurriedly and give them a change of status that may affect adversely their ability to discharge their obligations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I will say there is merit in the point of view of the gentleman from Alabama. But the Military Affairs Committee has proved the fact that military policy, as a feature, was removed from this bill. While there may be some reason, the fundamental provisions of this act, which the amendment seeks to remove, are unfair to every man in the armed services and are unfair to every man working in a plant who has been there before. I substantially agree with the gentleman from Kansas and hope his amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 125 and noes 155.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. REES of Kansas to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 139, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY: Page 12, line 3, add a new section, reading as follows:

"It is the intent of the Congress in the administration of this act that the penalties provided herein cannot be imposed by administrative or Executive directive, or order, or otherwise, against any inductee who shall choose to select a labor union of his choice for membership, or who shall refuse to enroll or place his membership in any labor organization or union, as a condition precedent to his employment."

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, when the Congress voted a formal declaration of war against various of the Axis Powers, we pledged to back that declaration with all the resources which our country possessed, including all of our manpower if necessary. We have mobilized and sent into every land and clime American boys to fight and die, and we have promised to back them on the home front with everything we have.

None of us, at least those of us who profess to believe in a republican form of government, like regimentation, excessive Government control of manpower, or anything else connected with our economy. We realize, however, that when the country is at war, great and extraordinary powers must be given to the executive branch of the Government. These extraordinary war powers which, of necessity, must be taken away from the people and given to the executive branch of the Government when our country is at war, are always a threat to our system of Government.

Fortunately, however, heretofore in our country, the executive branch of the Government has been anxious to surrender these extraordinary powers and return them to the people immediately that the war was over and the emergency no longer existed. We hope, and we must see to it, that the same policy will be pursued when this war is ended and peace shall come again.

This bill that we are now considering, H. R. 1752, which has been referred to throughout the country as a work-or-fight bill, is, as I view it, a limited national service act. By that I mean to say it is a national service act for all men up to and including the age of 45. Only the extreme exigencies of a global war, such as we are now engaged in, would warrant even consideration of the bill by the Congress.

The only question for determination by the Congress in respect to this particular bill, as I see it, is: Will the legislation augment the present machinery that has heretofore been set up by the Congress for the prosecution of the war and assist those who are responsible for carrying out all phases of the war effort to do it more efficiently, bring the war to a successful conclusion more quickly, and, above all, reduce materially our casualties?

If the proposed legislation will accomplish, or even aid in the accomplishment of these objectives, then of course no one should, or would, oppose this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I shall certainly find no fault, or shall I criticize, those who may hold opposite views in respect to this legislation. I have read every word and line of the hearings conducted by our Committee on Military Affairs. The evidence is as conflicting and the expert opinions as varied as the number of witnesses testifying as to the accomplishments of this bill, when it becomes the law.

After reading all of the testimony and the reports accompanying this bill, and after listening to arguments that have been made by the various members of the committee, I am persuaded that the proponents have made out their case by at least a fair preponderance of the evidence or, as the lawyers would say, by the greater weight of the testimony.

This being true, I shall vote for the bill and if I err, I shall err on what I believe to be the side of the 12,000,000 young men and women whom we have sent to fight and die on and over every sea, and on and over every land, where war is being waged.

Now, let us look at the record, let us see who says that we need this law. Who are the witnesses, and what are their qualifications concerning the matters about which they testify?

First we have the Honorable Robert P. Patterson; he is the Under Secretary of War. He says the bill is necessary. Then we have Mr. Ralph A. Bard, the Under Secretary of the Navy. He says, and I quote, "the Navy Department strongly recommends favorable consideration of this bill." Another witness, Mr. J. A. Krug, Director of the War Production Board, who testified, and I quote, "The War Production Board endorses the bill without qualification."

Another is Judge Charles M. Hay, Chairman and Executive Director of the War Manpower Commission; also Col. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., Deputy Administrator of Selective Service, and Lt. Comdr. William S. Knudsen. We all know who he is.

Then we have Col. Lewis Sanders, consultant to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, in everyday life an industrial engineer, and who has been chief of the Reemployment Division of Selective Service from the time it was organized until January 1944. Also Marvin Jones, who for 20 years was a Member of this House, now a Federal judge, who holds the temporary position of National War Food Administrator, and as such, responsible for the necessary food and fiber for our armies and our civilian population as well. He says we need this legislation.

Also Mr. Ogg, in charge of the Washington office of the American Farm Bureau. All of these many men testify that in their opinion the legislation is necessary and will aid and assist in the promotion of the war effort.

Opposing the legislation, we find Mr. Albert Hamilton, of Vienna, Va., appearing on behalf of the Socialist Party; Mr. Lewis G. Hines, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Phillip Murray, president of the

Congress of Industrial Organizations; Rev. Donald Herrington, who appeared in behalf of the Workers' Defense League; also John J. Mankowski, a member of the executive board of District 6, Mine, Mill, and Smelters' Union; Leo Jandreau, a vice president of the United Electrical and Radio Machine Workers of America, an affiliate of the C. I. O.; Irving Abramson, president of the New Jersey State Industrial Union Council of the C. I. O.; Percy Llewellyn, a member of the executive board of the United Automobile Workers; Frederick C. Crawford, president of Thompson Products, Inc., and chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers; Martin H. Miller, national representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

All of these men oppose this bill and give as their reasons, among others, that the legislation is not necessary. They are apprehensive that the bill will have the effect of curtailing production rather than increasing production of the necessary tools and implements of war. They refer to the bill as a slave labor bill.

These, in the main, constitute the witnesses both for and against the bill, and the reasons given by those for as well as those opposing the legislation. It is, of course, generally known that General Hershey, of Selective Service; Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff; Admiral King, and General Arnold, as well as War Mobilization Director Byrnes, have requested legislation of this character and favor the enactment of the proposed bill.

Now for a brief discussion of the amendment I have offered. We have heard a lot of talk here during the past 4 days about free labor. We have heard it charged here on the floor of the House that those who vote for this bill are opposed to free labor. This statement has been made by several gentlemen whom the P. A. C. take credit for bringing here in the recent election. And others like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who in construing legislative intent take the position that anyone who offers in good faith clarifying amendments are either labor haters or labor baiters. They relegate to themselves all wisdom as to legislative intent.

Now what does this amendment that I have offered do? It does this and no more: It tells those who shall hereafter administer this act, if and when it becomes law, that they cannot say to a man who belongs to a particular labor union that he must join some other union before he can work, and in the event he refuses to join some union other than the one of his choice, he is exempt from the penalties of this bill.

In other words, they cannot fine him or put him in jail for refusing to join a labor union not of his choice and he is likewise exempt from paying a fine or going to jail if he refuses to join any union. It has been said by members of the committee that this bill will not compel any man who does not want to to join a labor union. If that is true, what possible harm could come from an amendment that specifically says so?

The facts are that, after the Wadsworth amendment was defeated yesterday, many of the commentators in the country construed the defeat of the Wadsworth amendment otherwise, and it was repeatedly stated over the radio last night and this morning, after the Wadsworth amendment was defeated, that the Congress had refused to exempt those who are to be drafted to work pursuant to this legislation from joining labor unions or to select a union of his own choice.

We know that during the past few years strikes have been called and production of vital war materials stopped because of jurisdictional disputes between various labor organizations, and I want this legislation to be crystal clear that a man who belongs to the C. I. O. cannot be fined or put in jail because he refuses to become a member of the A. F. of L., or vice versa, and that he cannot be fined or put in jail because he refuses to become a member of either of these organizations.

This amendment should be adopted.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to stop these proceedings for even a moment because I know everybody wants to get through and go home. We have done a good job here so far. I hope we are not going to spoil it now. This is just another effort to make this bill unpalatable to the people who are having a struggle anyway in going along with it. It is a slap in the face of labor, that is what it amounts to. It is a slap in the face of labor. The bill does not require any man to join a union, as was said here yesterday, and when he answers the call under this bill and presents himself for employment he has complied with the act and no penalty attaches to him. He can refuse to join a union. If he does so he cannot be penalized. He has complied with this act.

The legislative counsel has personally assured me that that is the law as it is written in this bill. Why make it harder for men on both sides of the aisle who are friendly with labor and who want to vote for this bill to go along? I hope we will vote this down as we did the Wadsworth amendment yesterday and as we have done others. Let us pass this bill and give the armed services the support the Commander in Chief and the Chief of Staff and the Admiral of the Fleet say they need. They know. Let us give it to them.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just observed with a great deal of care what our majority whip told us about this bill not forcing any man to join a union, but if you will just flip her around, it does not protect him against having to join a union to work for his Government, and be subjected to the penalties of the bill. That is the answer to the speech of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. The amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma to make men their own free agents against having to join a union against his own will, should by all means be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIZLEY) there were—ayes 64, noes 185.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: At the end of section 6, page 12, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 7. No registrant requested or ordered to accept employment under the provisions of this act shall be required to join any religious, political, fraternal, or labor organization in order to comply with said order or request."

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska on the ground that the amendment is not germane and on the ground that the identical question has already been voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The Chair will state that the substance of the amendment is along the line of other amendments which have been considered by the Committee. The Chair holds the amendment is in order.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment if adopted would guarantee to the individual freedom of choice in joining or not joining a union if he volunteered or was ordered to accept employment under the provisions of this act. I have a profound respect for those patriotic unselfish individuals who are serving on our local draft boards. I received a telegram which I believe represents the sentiment of a great many of those boards which says: "This board is reticent in classying men into I–A when the alternative is a war plant job requiring union membership. Congress should eliminate such requirement for full support of the war effort." If in order to increase production, shorten the war, and lessen the number of casualties it is necessary to require that our citizens serve in war jobs, the men of America will gladly respond, but we have no right to compel them to join any organization in order to perform the work that they are ordered to do. If the law remains that these individuals sent into war jobs must join a union you will have done the unions a great injustice. You will have aroused public sentiment against them. You will have done nothing to protect the workingman. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 107, reported the same back to the House without amendment,

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHORT. Emphatically, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows: Mr. SHORT moves to recommit H. R. 1752 to the Committee on Military Affairs for further study.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 230, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—183

Adams	Gillie	Neely
Allen, Ill.	Graham	O'Brien, Mich.
Andersen, H. Carl	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
	Green	O'Konski
Andresen, August H.	Griffiths	Outland
	Gross	Patterson
Angell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Philbin
Arnold	Hagen	Phillips
Auchincloss	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pittenger
Bailey		Ploeser
Barrett, Wyo.	Halleck	Powell
Beall	Harless, Ariz.	Price, Ill.
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Rabaut
Bennett, Mo.	Havenner	Ramey
Biemiller	Healy	Rankin
Bishop	Hedrick	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Henry	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Boren	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Bradley, Mich.	Hinshaw	Rich
Brehm	Hoeven	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brumbaugh	Holifield	
Buck	Holmes, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.
Buffett	Holmes, Wash.	Rockwell
Bunker	Hook	Rodgers, Pa.
Butler	Horan	Sadowski
Byrnes, Wis.	Howell	Savage
Campbell	Hull	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Izac	Schwabe, Okla.
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Scrivner
Celler	Jennings	Shafer
Chenoweth	Jensen	Sharp
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ill.	Sheridan
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Short
Clason	Jones	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Jonkman	Simpson, Pa.
Coffee	Judd	Smith, Maine
Cole, Mo.	Kee	Smith, Ohio
Corbett	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Kelley, Pa.	Springer
Crosser	Kelly, Ill.	Starkey
Cunningham	Kinzer	Stefan
Curtis	Kirwan	Stevenson
Dondero	Knutson	Stockman
Doyle	Landis	Sumner, Ill.
Dworshak	Lane	Talbot
Ellis	Larcade	Talle
Ellsworth	Lemke	Taylor
Elsaesser	Lesinski	Tibbott
Elston	Lewis	Traynor
Engel, Mich.	Ludlow	Vorys, Ohio
Feighan	McConnell	Vursell
Fellows	McCowen	Wasielewski
Fenton	McGlinchey	Weichel
Flood	McGregor	Weiss
Fuller	McKenzie	Welch
Gardner	Madden	Wilson
Gavin	Mason	Wolcott
Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach	Morgan	Woodruff, Mich.
Gillespie	Murphy	
Gillette	Murray, Wis.	

NAYS—230

Abernethy	Forand	Mundt
Allen, La.	Gallagher	Murray, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Norton
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gathings	O'Brien, Ill.
	Geelan	O'Neal
Andrews, Ala.	Gibson	O'Toole
Andrews, N. Y.	Gifford	Pace
Arends	Goodwin	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	Patrick
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	Peterson, Fla.
Barden	Gossett	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Pfeifer
Barry	Granger	Pickett
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Plumley
Bates, Mass.	Gregory	Poage
Beckworth	Gwynne, Iowa	Price, Fla.
Bell	Hale	Priest
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	Quinn, N. Y.
Bland		Rabin
Bloom	Hancock	Rains
Bonner	Hand	Ramspeck
Boykin	Hare	Randolph
Bradley, Pa.	Harris	Rayfiel
Brooks	Hart	Resa
Brown, Ga.	Hartley	Richards
Bryson	Hays	Riley
Buckley	Hébert	Rivers
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Robertson, Va.
Burch	Hendricks	Robinson, Utah
Burgin	Herter	Roe, Md.
Byrne, N. Y.	Heselton	Roe, N. Y.
Camp	Hobbs	Rogers, Fla.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoch	Rogers, Mass.
Carlson	Hope	Rooney
Carnahan	Huber	Rowan
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jarman	Ryter
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Sasscer
Chelf	Johnson, Luther A.	Sheppard
Clark		Sikes
Clements	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Slaughter
Cochran		Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Snyder
Colmer	Kean	Somers, N. Y.
Combs	Keogh	Sparkman
Cooley	Kerr	Spence
Cooper	Kilburn	Stewart
Courtney	Kilday	Stigler
Cox	King	Sullivan
Cravens	Kopplemann	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	Kunkel	Sundstrom
D'Alesandro	Lanham	Taber
Daughton, Va.	Lea	Tarver
Davis	LeCompte	Thom
De Lacy	LeFevre	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney, James J.	Link	Thomas, Tex.
	Luce	Thomason
Delaney, John J.	Lyle	Tolan
	Lynch	Torrens
Dickstein	McCormack	Towe
Dingell	McDonough	Trimble
Dirksen	McGehee	Vinson
Dolliver	McMillan, S. C.	Voorhis, Calif.
Domengeaux	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Doughton, N. C.	Mahon	Walter
Douglas, Calif.	Maloney	Weaver
Douglas, Ill.	Manasco	West
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Whitten
Durham	Marcantonio	Whittington
Earthman	Martin, Iowa	Wickersham
Eberharter	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Elliott	May	Winstead
Engle, Calif.	Merrow	Wolverton, N. J.
Ervin	Michener	Wood
Fallon	Miller, Calif.	Woodhouse
Fernandez	Mills	Woodrum, Va.
Fisher	Monroney	Worley
Flannagan	Morrison	Zimmerman
Folger	Mott	

NOT VOTING—16

Cole, Kans.	LaFollette	Rogers, N. Y.
Dawson	Mansfield, Mont.	Sabath
Eaton		Satterfield
Heidinger	Murdock	White
Kearney	Norrell	Winter
Kefauver	Powers	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Heidinger for, with Mr. Sabath against.

General pairs:

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Rogers of New York with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. White with Mr. LaFollette.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 167, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—246

Abernethy	Flannagan	Norton
Adams	Folger	O'Brien, Ill.
Allen, La.	Forand	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Fuller	O'Neal
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gamble	O'Toole
	Gathings	Pace
Andrews, Ala.	Geelan	Patman
Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	Patrick
Angell	Gifford	Peterson, Fla.
Arends	Goodwin	Peterson, Ga.
Auchincloss	Gordon	Pfeifer
Baldwin, Md.	Gorski	Pickett
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gossett	Plumley
Barden	Granger	Poage
Barrett, Pa.	Grant, Ala.	Price, Fla.
Barry	Gregory	Priest
Bates, Ky.	Gwynne, Iowa	Quinn, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Hale	Rabin
Beckworth	Hall, Leonard W.	Rains
Bell		Ramspeck
Bennet, N. Y.	Hancock	Randolph
Bland	Hand	Rankin
Bloom	Hare	Rayfiel
Bonner	Harris	Resa
Boren	Hart	Richards
Boykin	Hartley	Riley
Bradley, Pa.	Hays	Rivers
Brooks	Healy	Rizley
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Robertson, Va.
Bryson	Heffernan	Robinson, Utah
Buckley	Hendricks	Roe, Md.
Bulwinkle	Herter	Roe, N. Y.
Burch	Heselton	Rogers, Fla.
Burgin	Hobbs	Rogers, Mass.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoeven	Rooney
Byrnes, Wis.	Holmes, Wash.	Rowan
Camp	Hope	Russell
Cannon, Fla.	Huber	Ryter
Carlson	Jackson	Sasscer
Carnahan	Jarman	Sharp
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Calif.	Sheppard
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Luther A.	Sikes
Chapman		Slaughter
Chelf	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Smith, Va.
Clark		Snyder
Clason	Johnson, Okla.	Somers, N. Y.
Clements	Judd	Sparkman
Cochran	Kean	Spence
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Stefan
Colmer	Kerr	Stewart
Combs	Kilburn	Stigler
Cooley	Kilday	Stockman
Cooper	Kopplemann	Sullivan
Courtney	Kunkel	Sumners, Tex.
Cox	Lanham	Sundstrom
Cravens	Lea	Taber
Cunningham	LeCompte	Talle
Curtis	LeFevre	Tarver
D'Alesandro	Link	Taylor
Daughton, Va.	Luce	Thom
Davis	Lyle	Thomas, N. J.
De Lacy	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney, James J.	McCormack	Thomason
	McGehee	Tolan
Delaney, John J.	McMillan, S. C.	Torrens
	McMillen, Ill.	Towe
Dickstein	Mahon	Trimble
Dingell	Maloney	Vinson
Dirksen	Manasco	Voorhis, Calif.
Dolliver	Mansfield, Tex.	Wadsworth
Domengeaux	Marcantonio	Walter
Doughton, N. C.	Martin, Iowa	Weaver
Douglas, Calif.	Martin, Mass.	West
Douglas, Ill.	May	Whitten
Drewry	Merrow	Whittington
Durham	Michener	Wickersham
Earthman	Miller, Calif.	Wigglesworth
Eberharter	Mills	Winstead
Elliott	Monroney	Wolverton, N. J.
Engle, Calif.	Morrison	Wood
Ervin	Mott	Woodhouse
Fallon	Mundt	Woodrum, Va.
Fernandez	Murphy	Worley
Fisher	Murray, Tenn.	Zimmerman

NAYS—167

Allen, Ill.	Arnold	Bennett, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bailey	Biemiller
	Barrett, Wyo.	Bishop
Andresen, August H.	Beall	Blackney
	Bender	Bolton

Bradley, Mich.	Halleck	O'Brien, Mich.
Brehm	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Brown, Ohio	Harness, Ind.	Outland
Brumbaugh	Havenner	Patterson
Buck	Hedrick	Philbin
Buffett	Henry	Phillips
Bunker	Hess	Pittenger
Butler	Hill	Ploeser
Campbell	Hinshaw	Powell
Canfield	Hoch	Price, Ill.
Cannon, Mo.	Hoffman	Rabaut
Celler	Holifield	Ramey
Chenoweth	Holmes, Mass.	Reece, Tenn.
Chiperfield	Hook	Reed, Ill.
Church	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Clevenger	Howell	Rees, Kans.
Coffee	Hull	Rich
Cole, Mo.	Izac	Robertson, N. Dak.
Corbett	Jenkins	Robsion, Ky.
Crawford	Jennings	Rockwell
Crosser	Jensen	Rodgers, Pa.
Curley	Johnson, Ill.	Sadowski
Dondero	Johnson, Ind.	Savage
Doyle	Jones	Schwabe, Mo.
Dworshak	Jonkman	Schwabe, Okla.
Ellis	Kee	Scrivner
Elsworth	Keefe	Shafer
Elsaesser	Kelley, Pa.	Sheridan
Elston	Kelly, Ill.	Short
Engel, Mich.	King	Simpson, Ill.
Feighan	Kinzer	Simpson, Pa.
Fellows	Kirwan	Smith, Maine
Fenton	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Flood	Landis	Smith, Wis.
Gallagher	Lane	Springer
Gardner	Larcade	Starkey
Gavin	Lemke	Stevenson
Gearhart	Lesinski	Sumner, Ill.
Gerlach	Lewis	Talbot
Gillespie	Ludlow	Tibbott
Gillette	McConnell	Traynor
Gillie	McCowen	Vorys, Ohio
Graham	McDonough	Vursell
Granahan	McGlinchey	Wasielewski
Grant, Ind.	McGregor	Weichel
Green	McKenzie	Weiss
Griffiths	Madden	Welch
Gross	Mason	Wilson
Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Hagen	Morgan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff, Mich.
	Neely	

NOT VOTING—16

Cole, Kans.	LaFollette	Rogers, N. Y.
Dawson	Mansfield, Mont.	Sabath
Eaton	Murdock	Satterfield
Heidinger	Norrell	White
Kearney	Powers	Winter
Kefauver		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Heidinger against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rogers of New York with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. White with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. GRANAHAN changed his vote from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing for tomorrow. I understand there are no special orders for tomorrow, and I intend to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I shall object to that request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, rather than let the gentleman have the privilege of objecting, I shall not submit the request. The purpose of my statement was to feel the gentleman out.

There is nothing on the program for Monday. On Tuesday the farm census bill will be considered. Following that the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill will be in order.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WALLACE-FOR-PRESIDENT CLUB

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, a telegram sent at 4:25 from my home city of Hartford, Conn., was received by me late this afternoon. It reads as follows:

In view of Senate action in trying to push Henry A. Wallace out of the political picture we the undersigned have formed a Wallace-for-President Club and are planning to extend the organization of such clubs throughout the State and Nation.

Martin Hogan, William Zeman, Joseph V. Cronin, John Banks, Daniel Howard, Rev. Alfred M. Lambert, Irving Atwood, J. B. O'Brien, James C. Egan, William Conroy, Harry Cooper, Patrick Ward, Henry Mitchell, Dr. Allen F. Jackson, Harold Conroy, Ben Abrams, George David, and others.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today a chart of the War Production Board showing production.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from ex-Senator Robert L. Owen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include some brief excerpts, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Courier-Journal of some days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMPBELL] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects. On one extension I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost will exceed the usual amount by $676, but I ask that it be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from the Ladies Home Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include a statement by the National Manufacturers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on rural phase-inverters by Lee M. Moore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EATON (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), for an indefinite time.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, for an indefinite time, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, February 2, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, February 2, 1945, to begin hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

156. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement to the effect that no reservations pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858), were made during the calendar year of 1944; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

157. A letter from the secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting the annual report of the directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

158. A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

159. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting a report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

160. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a report of the estimated number of pieces of matter mailed free of postage under the penalty privileges during the quarter ended September 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

161. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting tabulations submitted by the Commissioner of the General Land Office showing the withdrawals and restorations made under the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847; 16 U. S. C., sec. 471; 43 U. S. C., sec. 141 et seq.), for the period from January 1, 1944, through December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

162. A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the United States Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

163. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the government of the District of Columbia for year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

164. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a request for reintroduction of H. R. 7500, Seventy-seventh Congress, a bill to amend section 927 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, relating to insane criminals; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

165. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, a report of a committee was delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 689. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State; with amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1916) granting an increase of pension to Celia A. Chappelle, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 1920. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 1921. A bill to discharge registrants unlawfully inducted into the armed service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1922. A bill to repeal section 3 of the act approved April 13, 1938, as amended, relating to hops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1923. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of March 20, 1933, so as to eliminate financial inability to defray expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care as a prerequisite to obtaining such treatment or care in a Veterans' Administration facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1924. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, relating to eligibility for annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1925. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1926. A bill to repeal the use tax on motor vehicles and boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 1927. A bill to provide for the payment of grave and grave-marker allowances for veterans' burials; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1928. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1929. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 so as to authorize the termination under certain conditions of the payment of monthly family allowances to class A dependents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1930. A bill to provide for the making of loans to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the deduction of certain circulation expenditures, and expenditures in defense of or perfecting property rights or title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1932 (by request). A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1933 (by request). A bill to increase the compensation or pension for nurse or attendant for service-connected disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1934 (by request). A bill to establish effective dates of revisions of the schedule for rating disabilities, 1938, under Veterans' Regulation No. 3 (a), promulgated under the act of March 20, 1933, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1935 (by request). A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part 1, paragraph 1, to authorize service connection of certain disabilities on the basis of aggravation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1936 (by request). A bill to grant pension to World War No. 2 veterans and others entitled to war-service-connected rates under paragraph 1 of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended, at the same rates as granted World War No. 1 veterans for specified war-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1937 (by request). A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 10 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1938 (by request). A bill to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1939 (by request). A bill to increase the allowance for burial expenses of deceased veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1940. A bill to incorporate the United War Mothers of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1941. A bill to provide for recognition of active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol as veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1942. A bill to provide that all sums received by the United States from the liquidation of Government property be applied to the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1943. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1944 (by request). A bill to establish uniformity by increasing by 15 percent the special awards and allowances fixed by law for service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1945 (by request). A bill to recognize service in the land and naval forces performed on or after September 8, 1939, but prior to December 7, 1941, as service performed during the present war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1946. A bill relating to contracts between Members of Congress and agencies of the United States for housing facilities in and near the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1947. A bill to authorize an increase in the pay of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy while serving under reappointment for an additional term or terms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a document of the historical statement of the laws enacted and the regulations promulgated relating to veterans and providing for additional copies for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to terminate the effectiveness of the act of January 20, 1942, which established daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. Res. 118. Resolution providing additional compensation for two floor managers of telephones of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 1948. A bill for the relief of Drapery Hardware Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1949. A bill for the compensation of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of Harry Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1951. A bill for the relief of George H. Hines, Jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Joseph Brunette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Oscar S. Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1955. A bill for the relief of the Revere Sugar Refinery; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Annie M. Lannon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Frank Sable; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of L. A. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1959. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

44. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Jessie Lord, Grinnell, Iowa, and members of the First Friend's Church of Grinnell, Iowa, in opposition to compulsory peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

45. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of directors of the Alamo National Farm Loan Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to House bill 667 in its present form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

46. Also, petition of the American Water Works Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the upgrading of their industry in regulatory directives, to the position to which by reason of its vital functions, and in the public interest, public water supply service is entitled; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast given unto the chosen representatives of our beloved country the sacred and difficult task of serving their generation in these days of unparalleled tragedies, we pray that Thou wilt create within their souls a vivid sense of Thy presence and power.

Help us to have a clear understanding of the problems which confront the members of the human family. Give us wisdom that we may know how to counsel them in their perplexities. Make us strong and brave that we may be able to assuage their sorrows and anxieties. Fill us with sympathy and hope that we may bring courage to all who are in distress and despair.

Grant that our hearts may be leagued with Thine in an abiding comradeship. Make us sensitive and responsive to the guidance of Thy Spirit. May we seek to fulfill each appointed task in faith and in faithfulness. Hasten the day when the ideals of righteousness and peace which we recognize and cherish shall become the blessed realities in the life of humanity.

Hear us for the sake of the Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 626. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 63. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs;

S. 72. An act for the relief of Antonio Ruiz;

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper;

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs;

S. 184. An act to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage-record information to State unemployment-compensation agencies;

S. 213. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio;

S. 216. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.;

S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine;

S. 218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California;

S. 219. An act to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy;

S. 221. An act to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them

by the Government of the United States of Brazil;

S. 243. An act for the relief of Galen E. Walter;

S. 294. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes;

S. 311. An act for the relief of Philip Kleinman;

S. 312. An act for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards;

S 314. An act for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir;

S. 315. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S 317. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 335. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; and

S. 375. An act to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. National Housing Agency.

THE GEORGE BILL

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I use this means to respectfully call to the attention of the Speaker the bill which was passed by the Senate yesterday which has been messaged to the House. Originally it was a bill to separate the loaning agencies from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The attention of the Chair was diverted for a moment. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is covering a lot of territory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COCHRAN. Had this bill been passed by the Senate as it was reported by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate there would be absolutely no question as to what committee had jurisdiction. I understand there was a bill introduced in the House similar to the one that was introduced in the Senate and that bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee and properly so.

Anyone who understands the effect of the Senate amendment, now section 5 of the Senate bill, will fully realize the importance of the question involved. If what has occurred in the past can be taken as an indication of the attitude of those in charge of the corporations affected there will certainly be tremendous objection.

I am not, of course, Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the merits of section 5. I do not know of any Member of the House who has been more active in supporting the Comptroller General. Many, many times I have stated that public money, no matter how used, should be subject to an audit. I merely say this to give an indication of my feeling. The point that I am making is that taking the bill as a whole, section 5 is now the most important part of this legislation.

Let it be remembered the bill introduced in the House which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency did not contain the language I refer to now in section 5 of the Senate bill.

It was during the consideration of the bill in the Senate that section 5 was added. It is admitted as the bill now stands jurisdiction lies with two committees. Section 5 provides that the Comptroller General shall audit all corporations wholly owned by the Government. I do not think anyone can state offhand the number of those corporations but there are well over 50 of them. Now the question of the confirmation of Mr. Wallace does not enter into this bill at all as it comes to the House. It did in the Senate. Therefore, in my opinion, the most important part of this bill now is whether Government corporations should be audited by the Comptroller General, rather than the part divorcing loaning agencies from the Department of Commerce. I think it is well known that time and again I have urged that Government-owned corporations be audited by the Comptroller General. I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and no one can dispute that jurisdiction undoubtedly lies with that committee insofar as section 5 is concerned. If my contention is correct that the audit feature is the most important part of the bill, then it should be referred to the Committee on Expenditures.

My purpose in taking the floor is to urge the Speaker to give careful consideration to section 5 of the bill, and I express the hope that the Committee on Expenditures will not be bypassed, but that the bill will be referred to that committee.

I also want to call attention to the fact that the Senate bill originally was referred to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and not to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which considered the R. F. C. legislation. I appeal to the Speaker to give careful consideration to the arguments I have advanced. I insist the most important part of that bill as far as the House is concerned is section 5.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield if permitted by the Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have some amendments that I hope will be attached to this legislation. For instance, the alteration of section 1 of the War Manpower Act gives the President the power to shift agencies around. I believe that, under the present conditions, needs attention. Also the question of auditing, in which the gentleman is interested. Could the gentleman's committee handle both of those subjects?

Mr. COCHRAN. I know the Committee on Expenditures as constituted is fully able to handle this subject or any other that comes within its jurisdiction. We have many capable members on the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate how capable the members are, but the question is whether you could cancel that power of the President to shuffle the bureaus. Did that come from the gentleman's committee in the first place?

Mr. COCHRAN. It did not. That matters not. For instance, the original bill which was acted upon in the Senate yesterday came from the Committee on Commerce in the Senate, but the original loaning agencies legislation came from the Committee on Banking and Currency of that body. The reason, as expressed on the floor, was that there was more commerce involved than there was banking.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request that we take the bill up now for consideration by the House and not bother with any committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. I certainly will not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. The whole thing is out of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Speaker, who is in control, did not say I was out of order.

Mr. RANKIN. I did.

Mr. COCHRAN. It matters not to me what the gentleman says. The gentleman is not running the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I know I am not. I am not trying to do so.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman had listened to me at the outset, he would have heard me say that I was seeking the floor in order to bring the matter to the attention of the Speaker. I am attempting to state my reasons for making a parliamentary inquiry, which I will do if it is necessary to get an expression from the Chair. I am sure the Speaker fully understands my purpose and is in a position to answer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has had the floor to propound some questions to the Chair.

Mr. RANKIN. And I made the point of order that the gentleman did not propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not have to assume this is a parliamentary inquiry in order to answer the gentleman's questions. The gentleman from Missouri on yesterday raised this question and the Chair has considered the matter.

Two bills have been introduced by Members of the House relating to the

same subject of removing these loaning agencies from the Department of Commerce. Those bills have been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Of course, the Chair intends, after going over this matter, to refer this matter to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is up to the Committee on Banking and Currency to drop out any sections they desire or for the House to do it after the bill is reported to the House.

The Chair now refers the Senate bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. COCHRAN. I always abide by the decision of the Chair and that settles the matter so far as I am concerned.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of any other special orders for today I may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the address by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from O. J. Fox, president, Welfare Federation, Inc., of Oklahoma City, Okla., and also a copy of H. R. 1831.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been interested in simplifying the procedure of old-age assistance to where the recipients could receive an equalized pension and eliminate excessive rigid investigations.

On January 23 the entire eight Members of Congress from Oklahoma met and considered H. R. 605, which I introduced on January 3, and growing out of this meeting were two amendments. After rewriting the bill to include the two amendments, I reintroduced the bill on January 29 and it is now known as H. R. 1831.

Hon. O. J. Fox, president of the Welfare Federation, Inc., the old-age-pension organization of Oklahoma, met with us and discussed the proposed amendments at length and was in complete agreement with the provisions of this measure. At this point I wish to insert a letter I received from Mr. Fox dated January 31, 1945, which is as follows:

WELFARE FEDERATION, INC.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., January 31, 1945.

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEWART: I have been directed by the State executive board of the Welfare Federation, Inc., of Oklahoma, to write to you in regard to H. R. 1831, the old-age-pension bill which you introduced in the House of Representatives on January 29, 1945.

The State executive board and myself wish to compliment you and the entire Oklahoma delegation for your action in behalf of this legislation. We endorse the bill under the auspices of the Old-Age Pension Organization of Oklahoma and feel that this is timely legislation, inasmuch as it would be a great advantage to the older people of this Nation and a great relief to the manpower shortage now existing.

Your bill will pay all the old people the same amount throughout the Nation and it will also eliminate the case-worker system, making it possible for this great army of case workers and associated employees to accept war jobs and also making it permissible for thousands of elder people to accept part-time jobs without interfering with their old-age-assistance checks.

Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, introduced a companion bill, which is identical to H. R. 1831, in the Senate and this bill is numbered S. 436.

May we, therefore, urge you and the Congress to pass this legislation at the very earliest moment?

Your friend,

WELFARE FEDERATION, INC.,
O. J. FOX, *President.*

H. R. 1831, in brief, provides for an equalized pension to be received on the first of the month by each eligible old person. To be eligible for this pension, a person must be 65 years of age and a citizen of the United States. The only provisions to qualify for a pension under this measure are that a man and wife cannot earn more than $1,200 jointly per annum and a single beneficiary cannot earn more than $750, in addition to assistance. A married couple can own and possess up to $15,000 in capital assets and a single beneficiary up to $10,000. In addition to the pension with the above limitations, a burial fund of not less than $100 and not more than $150 is provided for each old person who dies while receiving this pension.

We feel that not only the old-age recipients but the businessmen are in agreement with this sound old-age pension program. The businessman can intelligently extend credit to a recipient when he knows that the recipient will receive a certain sum on the first of each month.

We believe it is universally understood that old-age pensions or assistance are here to stay and the elimination of all red tape is far more satisfactory because: First. It removes the fears of the aged of rigid investigations; second, it makes possible the expression of free thought as every American citizen should enjoy; third, it provides for a line of credit in a case of emergency such as illness or a death in the family; fourth, it gives the satisfaction of being able to earn a livelihood to supplement the pension to where a person can continue to live and enjoy life by the same high standards they did prior to becoming eligible for old-age assistance; fifth, aside from the great benefits derived under this law, it will aid very materially the manpower shortage by permitting old people to work and by freeing many case workers to enter war plants.

While this bill amends the social security law which is very voluminous, it is more or less understood by the entire citizenship to where all who read and study it will know it provides for an equalized old-age pension eliminating all red tape. It goes without saying that the passage of this measure will not strike from the rolls a single old person now receiving assistance. The bill is as follows:

H. R. 1831

A bill to equalize State old-age assistance payments and to provide burial allowances under title I of the Social Security Act

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury to any State under title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, unless the State plan for old-age assistance provides that the only limitations with respect to eligibility for old-age assistance are (1) an age requirement of not more than 65 years, (2) United States citizenship, (3) a residence requirement complying with the provisions of such title I, and (4) net income from sources other than old-age assistance, pensions, retirement pay, Government disability compensation, or similar payments for man and wife of $1,200 per annum or single beneficiary of $750 per annum, as reported in previous year's Federal income-tax report; and/or capital assets of more than $15,000 for man and wife, and/or $10,000 for single beneficiary, same to be appraised at its fair cash value. Such old-age-assistance payments within such State shall be equal in amount for every person eligible therefor, and shall be made by check to be received by every eligible person at his or her post-office address on the first day of each calendar month.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the word "and" before "(8)", and (2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "(9) provide for the payment of not less than $100 nor more than $150 for burial and funeral expenses (including preparation of the body) of each individual who dies while receiving old-age assistance under such plan; and (10) to provide that (A) any person claiming old-age assistance who is receiving any pension, retirement pay, Government disability compensation, or similar payments aggregating an amount equal to or greater than the amount of old-age assistance claimed by him shall not be entitled to any such old-age assistance; and (B) any person claiming old-age assistance who is receiving

any pension, retirement pay, Government disability compensation, or similar payments aggregating an amount less than the amount of old-age assistance claimed by him shall be entitled under this act to the amount by which such old-age assistance exceeds the aggregate amount of such pension, retirement pay, Government disability compensation, or similar payments."

(b) Section 6 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and money payments for the burial and funeral expenses of such individuals."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that Mr. JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania, is present and ready to take the oath of office.

Mr. FULTON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, throughout this entire country, and especially in the dairy regions all over the United States, men who are operating dairies are wondering what they are going to do with their herds. It looks as if they are going to have to sell them because you cannot use inexperienced men, either in the feeding or milking of the dairy herd. You must have experienced help.

The selective service in most of our States continues taking farm operators and farm laborers without regard to the Tydings amendment.

I shall include as a part of my remarks, and I hope you will read them, a resolution from the Denver Milk Producers, Inc., together with a letter that came with the resolution.

(The letter and resolution referred to follow:)

DENVER MILK PRODUCERS, INC.,
Denver, Colo., January 31, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM HILL,
Representative, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HILL: In connection with our telegrams regarding selective-service activities, I am attaching herewith a copy of the resolution passed at the State-wide dairy meeting held in Denver on Monday of this week.

I have discussed the situation with Lieutenant Colonel Mowry at the State selective service office and he informs me that while the Tydings amendment does exempt essential agricultural workers until satisfactory replacements can be secured, they cannot live up to the law because they have a letter from the Commander in Chief advising that the young men are needed more for armed services than for the production of food. For this reason they are going to have to draft the young men.

What few young men we have left on our dairy farms are the ones that are doing the milking and there are no replacements for them. The first sale we have now advertised as a direct result of the drafting of farm boys will be held next Tuesday, February 6, when 55 dairy cattle will be sold. The taking of this young man, Harry Williams by name, leaves a 240-acre irrigated farm to be operated by the father, who is past 60, and a girl, 12, and another one, 16. They expect to carry on and do what they can with the farm but must sell the herd.

Every day I get new calls from men who will sell their herds if the orders now in effect are carried out. Most of these boys have had their physicals and are waiting for reclassification now, so it is not yet too late to save a great many of our essential milkers. With a large number of sales and the agricultural shortage of farm help, it can mean only one thing, and that is the slaughter of a great number of our dairy cattle, and it will be years before they can be replaced.

I hope something can be done in Washington to get some different instructions out to our local boards as we are going to lose our young men unless something more is done.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,
DENVER MILK PRODUCERS, INC.,
W. C. MOORE, *Manager.*

Resolution passed at Colorado State-wide dairy meeting held at Shirley-Savoy Hotel in Denver, Colo., January 29, 1945

After giving due consideration to the need of young men to make up the armed forces of the United States and the fact that such young men between the ages of 18 and 26 who are still left on dairy farms are the only efficient milkers left, and further drafting of men in this age group will seriously reduce the supply of dairy products and must force the sale of dairy cattle for slaughter and further, dairy products now being produced do not meet the present needs of the armed forces, civilians, and our allies, and the extensive slaughter of dairy cattle will result in a shortage of dairy products for many years to come. Land may be left idle without the loss of the land but it takes years to replace a milk cow. Some producers, due to intensive patriotism, will not intercede in their own behalf. The Tydings amendment was passed not to protect agriculture but to insure the production of essential food to win the war and write the peace: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this State-wide meeting of producers and processors of dairy products in the State of Colorado demand that the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act be observed to the letter insofar as it pertains to milkers; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to President Roosevelt, Major General Hershey, Senators Johnson and Millikin, and the four United States Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I just made and to also extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the National Reclamation Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SERVICEMEN'S SOCIAL SECURITY ACT OF 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a bill I introduced to give certain benefits under the Social Security Act to widows and orphans of veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for the benefit of the veterans of World War No. 2, their widows, and children, a bill entitled "Servicemen's Social Security Act of 1945" which gives insurance credit to veterans of World War No. 2 under the old-age and survivors insurance provision of the Social Security Act. The benefits under the act are in addition to benefits from the United States Veterans Administration. This is a bill that has a great deal of merit and I trust it will pass unanimously. The bill is as follows:

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of that act for military service, by providing for adjustment of benefits received under such title in certain cases, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding the following:

"CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE

"SEC. 210. For the purposes of this title, each individual in the active military or naval service of the United States shall be deemed to have been paid wages of $160 for employment in and for any calendar month or any part thereof of active service after September 16, 1940, not counting for a calendar year, that part of any wages deemed to have been paid to him under this section which, when added to any other wages paid to him during such year, exceeds $3,000: *Provided, however*, That this provision shall not apply to such individuals who receive credit for such service under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, or the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, as may be provided in regulations of the Board after consultation with the Railroad Retirement Board and the Civil Service Commission.

"APPROPRIATIONS IN LIEU OF EMPLOYER'S AND EMPLOYEE'S TAX

"SEC. 211. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time to the trust fund amounts equal to the sum of (a) the product of all wages deemed to have been paid under section 210 multiplied by the current rate of the tax imposed on employees under the Federal Insurance Contributions

Act, as amended; and (b) the product of all such wages multiplied by the current rate of the tax imposed on employers under that act.

"DEATH BEFORE PASSAGE OF THE ACT

"SEC. 212. (a) Upon the filing of an application within such period as may be prescribed by the Board, benefits payable with respect to the death of any individual which are based upon wages deemed to have been paid under section 210 shall be payable to persons entitled thereto as of the date of the death of any such individual who died prior to the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Social Security Act of 1945.

"(b) In the case of any benefit to which an individual became entitled prior to the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Social Security Act of 1945, the amount of such benefit for any month may be recomputed to include wages credited under section 210 if such recomputation would increase the amount of the benefit payable to such individual.

"ADJUSTMENT OF DUPLICATE BENEFITS

"SEC. 213. (a) Where, for any month which occurs after the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Social Security Act of 1945—

"(1) A benefit under section 202 (a) and a Federal noncontributory benefit are payable to an individual for the same month by reason of his retirement, disability, or old age; or

"(2) A benefit under subsection (b) or (c) of section 202 and a Federal noncontributory benefit are payable to a wife or child for the same month by reason of the retirement, disability, or old age of the individual with respect to whose wages the benefit under this title is payable; or

"(3) A benefit under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 202 and a Federal noncontributory benefit are payable to a child, widow, or parent for the same month by reason of the death of the individual with respect to whose wages the benefit under this title is payable;

the benefit payable under this title for such month shall be adjusted in accordance with the following provisions of this section:

"(b) (1) If the benefit payable under this title is greater than the Federal noncontributory benefit, the benefit payable under this title shall be reduced by an amount equal to one-half the Federal noncontributory benefit.

"(2) If the benefit payable under this title is equal to or less than the Federal noncontributory benefit, the benefit payable under this title shall be reduced by one-half.

"(c) The adjustment under this section shall be made after any reduction or increase under section 203 except that no benefit or total of benefits under section 202, payable for a month with respect to an individual's wages, shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (d), (e), or (h) of section 203, be less than $10. The adjustment under this section shall be prior to any adjustment under section 204. Adjustments under this section shall not be affected by deductions from, or adjustments or other temporary modifications of, or delay in the payment of, any Federal noncontributory benefit.

"(d) If a Federal noncontributory benefit is payable on other than a monthly basis (including a benefit payable in a lump sum or on a commuted basis) adjustment of benefits under this section, in accordance with regulations of the Board, shall approximate as nearly as practicable the adjustments prescribed in subsection (b).

"(e) No adjustment under this section shall be made in any benefit to which an individual had become entitled before the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Social Security Act of 1945 which shall reduce such benefit to an amount less than the benefit payable before such date.

"FURNISHING OF INFORMATION

"SEC. 214. Any department or agency of the Federal Government shall, at the request of the Board, furnish such information with respect to individuals in the active military or naval service of the United States as may be necessary for the purposes of this title.

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 215. The term 'noncontributory benefit' means a cash benefit, allowance, annuity, or compensation (including payments under any workmen's compensation law) payable by reason of the past employment or services of any individual, under any law or plan of the United States, or any Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, creating a system of such payments to individuals (including payments made under any such law or plan by private insurance carriers), if with respect to such individual the benefit system is supported without direct and substantial contributions by wage earners."

NAME OF ACT

SEC. 2. This Act shall be known as the "Servicemen's Social Security Act of 1945."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a resolution and two statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an article by Miles Hollister, of Altoona, Pa., appearing in the March 1945 issue of the American magazine entitled "Careers for G. I. Joes."

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the article referred to will require one and one-fourth pages of the RECORD, the cost of which will be $65. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the cost I be permitted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein the article referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a resolution from my own town, and in the other to include some advice concerning assistance to the returned servicemen in our own county.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SELECTIVE SERVICE MEDAL

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the Members of the House that day before yesterday I introduced a bill authorizing the award in the name of the Congress by the Selective Service Board of a Selective Service Medal to be presented to each uncompensated civilian employee in the Selective Service System; in other words, the members of the selective service and appeal boards throughout the country. This will be an appropriate, suitable medal and certificate awarded to them for one of the most patriotic services in connection with this war.

I am also introducing today a bill to incorporate the veterans of World War No. 2 at their request. I will introduce on Monday a resolution which will direct the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to design and authorize a national military service medal for World War No. 2, an appropriate replica colored ribbon, and a similarly designed clasp, which may be worn by every honorably discharged serviceman of World War No. 2 and which could be pinned on rather than placed in the lapel buttonhole.

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend certain benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act to employees with not less than 5 years' service who are voluntarily separated from the service.

Under the existing civil-service law, an employee who has served for a total period of more than 5 years and before becoming eligible for retirement—that is, has served 30 years and is 60 years of age, or 15 years and is 62 years of age—becomes involuntarily separated from the service, is paid a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 62 years if he had

less than 30 years of service—and at 60 years of age otherwise—computed under whichever of the three plans of calculation will pay the largest annuity:

Plan 1. Thirty dollars for each year of service times years of service not exceeding 30, plus the amount in the retirement fund times the age factor for the age at the beginning of the annuity payments.

Plan 2. Average salary—5 consecutive years, not to exceed $1,600—times years of service—not to exceed 30—divided by 40.

Plan 3. Average salary—5 consecutive years—times the years of service—not to exceed 35—divided by 70.

Careful reading of the record discloses no good reason why the operation of plan 3, which is the more liberal treatment afforded higher-salaried employees, adopted under Public Law 411, Seventy-seventh Congress, and limited to voluntary separation should be limited to one group. It ought to apply whether separation is voluntary or involuntary.

A great deal of discrimination has grown up during the war period because of this provision and the law should be amended so that voluntary as well as involuntary separations from the service should be permitted to compute the retirement under the one of the three plans which will pay the largest annuity.

If this is not done, employees who have stood by the old-line agencies in their positions of responsibility for which their experience and training have made them irreplaceable, are discriminated against as compared with those employees who by resignation or reemployment or by transfer took other jobs, usually at higher salaries, especially in war agencies. These employees will at or before the termination of the war, as the need for their work diminishes, be involuntarily separated from their jobs and thus have the option of retiring under the annuity plan which pays them the largest annuity, whereas the employee who remained with the old-line agency has no such option under existing law.

It would seem advisable to correct this situation now. Many employees now in old-line agencies not yet at retirement age would be very pleased to resign their positions and make jobs for returning servicemen providing they could do so on the same basis of selecting the retirement plan giving them the highest annuity as is now afforded to those persons employed by the war agencies. Under such conditions no annuity would be paid to these individuals until they attained the age of 60 or 62, depending upon the years of service, and there would be none of the opprobrium attached to such a plan of creating jobs for war veterans as is attached to the plan currently being discussed of permitting Government employees to retire after 30 years of service regardless of age. Under this latter plan persons would be drawing large annuities from the Government at the age of perhaps 50 and holding another nongovernmental job from which they are simultaneously drawing income. This would cause much criticism. Voluntary retirement of persons who have the means to support themselves until they are 62 years of age could very well create an equivalent number of jobs without having any of the criticism which would be attached to this other plan.

I believe that after you have examined the bill and have become familiar with its objectives, you will agree that it is fair and equitable and ought to be passed.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have been placed on the Committee on Printing of the House, which committee has charge of the printing of the proceedings of the House of Representatives in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is supposed to be a true and correct proceeding of the things that transpire here on the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. From the standpoint of the reporters of debates of the House, it is absolutely correct, I believe, but when we get permission to revise and extend our remarks we delete many of the things that have been said here on the floor. Members sometimes try to find out what another Member said the day before. I looked for some of those remarks today in the RECORD, and they are not there. I believe that when a man stands on the floor of the House and makes a statement condemning the fight or work bill and calls it in terms most everything that he can conceivably think of as not being sound and sensible legislation and yet says that he is going to vote for it, that he should not be permitted to delete those remarks from the RECORD. I think they should remain in the RECORD of that day. I hope that the Members, when they make statements of that kind, ought to be honest enough with themselves to leave them in the RECORD so that the public can see just what happens here on the floor. We as Members of the House of Representatives should be recorded as we talk. If we make an error, correct it. I personally want my people to know how I talk, I want them to know just how I feel about legislation. I do not want to be forced to vote against my convictions by my party or by any group. If I do, I want the public to know it, and I will let them know it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a group of short resolutions dealing with educational post-war planning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1808) to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has this measure been considered in the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. FARRINGTON. This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Naval Affairs and was to have been taken up Monday on the Consent Calendar. However, inasmuch as consideration of the measures on that calendar has been postponed, at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I submitted the request that this measure be taken up today.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the urgency for its passage?

Mr. FARRINGTON. The construction of the power plant that will follow the enactment of this legislation is essential to the operation of the military establishment on the island of Oahu.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it a contribution to the war effort?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Very definitely.

Mr. VINSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman briefly explain what this bill is?

Mr. FARRINGTON. This bill grants an easement to the Hawaiian Electric Co. to enable it to draw salt water out of Pearl Harbor. The salt water will be returned after it has been used in generating electric power. The easement allows it also to run a pipe line into Pearl Harbor for the purpose of moving fuel oil into its plant. This is one of three plants that the company operates. This particular plant is adjacent to Pearl Harbor itself. The measure provides every possible safeguard to the public interest, and subjects the pipe lines and easements to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman consider this legislation vital? That is, it could not come up on Monday? The gentleman thinks it ought to come up today?

Mr. McCORMACK. The call of the Consent Calendar on Monday has been dispensed with. The gentleman has conferred with me and with the minority leader.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman thinks it is urgent?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes. He would have to wait 2 weeks before the bill could be considered on the Consent Calendar, and that would be quite

a delay. I think the urgency is enough to justify considering the bill at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman consulted both the majority and minority leaders?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is a good thing we stayed in session today. That is the only point I want to make.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has established plausibility.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am glad this is to be an American pipe line into Pearl Harbor at this time and not a Japanese pipe line.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the right is hereby granted to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., a Hawaiian corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate intake and discharge ditches and tunnels for the purpose of taking salt water from and discharging it into Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H., and to lay, maintain, and operate oil pipe lines from ship's moorings to the company's properties at Waiau, Ewa, said Oahu, in the area in Pearl Harbor between the southern boundaries of the company's presently owned properties at said Waiau as shown on the company's map W-1614, dated September 26, 1940, filed in the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, and the minus 20-foot contour line in Pearl Harbor, the said area being contained on the east by a line running from the easternmost point of the said southern boundaries, the coordinates of which point are one thousand six hundred and twenty-five and thirty-four one-hundredths feet south and six thousand nine hundred and forty-two one-hundredths feet east, referred to Government survey triangulation station Ewa Church, in a true southerly direction, and on the west by a line running from the westernmost point on said southern boundaries, the coordinates of which point are one thousand five hundred and eight and forty one-hundredths feet south and five thousand eight hundred and ninety-six and seventy one-hundredths feet east, referred to Government survey triangulation station Ewa Church, in a true southerly direction, subject to the restriction that such ditches, tunnels, and pipe lines shall be constructed, maintained, and operated in such manner as not to interfere with navigation or Government use of such area: *Provided*, That the location and plans of the ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines are submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Navy before construction is commenced: *And provided further*, That this grant is subject to the right of the Secretary of the Navy, from time to time, to require the company to relocate within said area at its own expense such tunnels, ditches, and pipe lines, and to alter and deepen such ditches and to alter and lower the level of tunnels and pipe lines when such is necessary in his judgment for the purpose of improving navigation or Government use of such area.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE FRANCIS J. SEIBERLING

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the passing of a former Member of this House who was a very distinguished gentleman. I refer to Hon. Francis J. Seiberling, of Akron, Ohio. He served in the Seventy-first and Seventy-second Congresses. Those who were here at that time will remember him as a very capable and kindly gentleman.

I want to say for him that his great position of worth and esteem in this life was not attained by reason of his work as a Congressman. He was one of the outstanding industrialists in the State of Ohio. He had done something which I presume is the ambition of every normal man, that is, to be a power in his own community. When I say a power I do not mean a political power nor a financial power, but a power in the hearts and minds of the people who knew him. He was loved best and thought of best by those who knew him best. When a person is respected by those who know him best he usually is worthy of respect. I am grieved to announce the passing of this very distinguished gentleman. He was a friend that I shall miss. When I chanced to be in Akron I called on him if I could do so. He was always gracious and courteous and continued to manifest a keen interest in national affairs and especially in the happenings in Congress. I hope that other Members of Congress who are here present will take this opportunity to speak a few words on the life and character of this splendid gentleman.

On behalf of the Ohio Congressmen now Members of this House, both Republican and Democratic, I extend to Mr. Seiberling's family our most profound sympathy.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, my acquaintance with Mr. Seiberling was not as a Member of this distinguished body. However, I knew him as a charitable man, and as a member of the board of trustees of Lincoln Memorial University at Cumberland Gap, Tenn. He was one of the men who helped to endow that university, which allowed the poor boys who were the residual legatees of Davy Crockett and Daniel Boone to secure an education. Mr. Seiberling gave not only his money but most of his time to educating and bringing out the character of these young people of that mountain area.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I regret, of course, as all who knew him do, the passing of Mr. Seiberling. I served with him two terms in the House. He was an unusual man. He was a man of wealth, a typical businessman who had made his mark as such. Yet in every respect he was a friend of mankind, who devoted his life to doing as much good as he could. He served well. He made his contribution to good government and human happiness. He had the respect and confidence of us all. The State of Ohio has lost a good man in the passing of Mr. Seiberling.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve here for two terms with Mr. Seiberling. I knew him well. We had many conversations together in our offices and in committee. He was a gentleman of the highest type, thinking of the things that were best for the country at large and for the State of Ohio and for his constituents. He was ever zealous in trying to do something for the unfortunates of this country who are unable to take care of themselves. I believe that Mr. Seiberling was one of the finest men I have ever known. It was a great pleasure to have the privilege of his association while he was in the House. We mourn his passing. We believe, and I know that I do, if we could follow in the footsteps of a man like Mr. Seiberling it would be a great honor and a great privilege. He served this Nation well. He will be missed by all. This country needs more men like Mr. Seiberling. He will be greatly missed. His good deeds will always live in the hearts of his people.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in common with all colleagues who were privileged to serve in this body with Mr. Seiberling some years back, I am made sad at the news of his passing. The world is better for Francis Seiberling having lived in it. The House is better for the services he rendered here. In his passing we have lost a fine American. I remember him particularly well because of his modesty and retiring nature. Only today did I learn that he had devoted a large part of his great wealth to promoting the welfare of the underprivileged. He was not one to talk about his good deeds. In common with all the Members of this House I hope that his spirit will find the rest that it so richly deserves.

FREEING OF AMERICAN PRISONERS FROM JAPANESE PRISON CAMPS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I express the sentiment of every Member of the House when I stand here in this 1 minute to say how deeply thrilled we all are over the heroic action of the group of Rangers on Luzon Island in freeing

American prisoners who had been held since the fall of the Philippines. I know it has been a great thrill for all of America. We can see the real meaning of liberation when it comes to the liberation of our own heroic men who have been held prisoners for so long. We believe that the might of America will march forward until complete liberation comes at a very early date. The day is not far distant when the Stars and Stripes will wave once more over Manila.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I understand, made some remarks a short time ago about a Member who had been active in attempting to amend the bill on yesterday, had voted in favor of the bill, and had explained why. I wonder if the gentleman had reference to me? Just on the chance that he did, I would like to say to him that last night when the debate was over I was simply so tired I felt I did not have the strength to go over my last speech. I, therefore, held that speech out of the RECORD last night. It will be in the RECORD today and it, of course, will be in the permanent RECORD. If the gentleman will look in the daily RECORD he will find where I was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks I made yesterday. I felt very deeply about this matter. Furthermore, I would like to point out to the gentleman that I stated over and over again in the course of the debate that I was in agreement with those people who had said that some sort of bill ought to be passed. To defeat everything would have been a great mistake. I believed that all the way through. For that reason all the more earnestly I tried to amend the bill into such shape as I believed it ought to be. That is the situation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I mentioned no name.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand the gentleman did not.

Mr. RICH. I was trying to keep the RECORD correct. I believe that is something that should be done. I feel the gentleman from California would like to see the permanent RECORD contain statements that are made on the floor.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have never made a speech in this House that did not go into the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] was talking about that colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] on the day before yesterday, which escaped the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. I mentioned no names.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am to follow the gentleman from Michigan. My remarks will be very short and I have some other matters to attend to. Would it be in order for me to ask the gentleman's consent to exchange places with him?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that can be done without my losing my place it is all right with me. I know that the gentleman has some other business that he would like to attend to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

BALLOTS FOR SOLDIER VOTING

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago the Members of Congress and the people of the country were bombarded with an organized demand for the passage of a law providing for a Federal ballot to be sent to our men overseas—a bobtailed ballot, with the names of no candidates printed on it.

As a member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, I led the fight against that measure, because it would have violated not only the Constitution of the United States but the constitution of every State in the Union.

After going through all the turmoil we did, we were compelled to accept an amendment to permit those States that desired to do so, to accept that Federal ballot. I understand that 10 States passed such a law and accepted the Federal or bobtailed ballot. Untold hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of propaganda was spread throughout the country and among the men in the armed forces of the Nation, in favor of that wholly new-order program known as the Federal ballot for election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. A representative of the War Department came before the committee and for days and days regaled us with a recitation of how much the men in the service, our boys overseas, were desirous of having this Federal or bobtailed ballot law passed, which would have prevented them from voting for Governor, or any other State or county officer. Those 10 States sent those ballots overseas through this Commission set up in the War Department, called the Federal Ballot Commission, along with the regular constitutional ballots used by other voters in those States.

After all this propaganda and all the money that was spent, the mountain labored and brought forth a mouse. The War Ballot Commission now reports to us that among the servicemen from those 10 States that ratified or recognized this bobtailed ballot, and they were all given an opportunity to vote it, only 2.2 percent of them did so. The rest of them who voted at all, 34.6 percent, preferred to vote the other constitutional ballot used by the folks at home, with the names of all the candidates for National, State, and county officers printed on it.

I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, at this time, because there is already beginning to creep in intimations that attempts will be made to amend this law and make this "bobtailed" ballot apply to the election of Congressmen next year.

Could you have a greater repudiation of an unconstitutional monstrosity than to have 97.8 percent of the servicemen decline to vote the ballot or to have anything to do with it? Are you going to permit these self-appointed revisers of constitutional government to come in and ram down the throats of Congress, and these servicemen, another "bobtailed" ballot for the elections in 1946, when the men themselves have almost unanimously expressed their disapproval of the one we passed last year, the Federal ballot sent to them by these 10 States that undertook to placate the advocates of this measure?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman will recall that the Worley amendment was proposed. I voted in favor of the State ballot against the Federal ballot, for which I received some little criticism in my district. I am wondering if the gentleman can say now that we were vindicated in our position by the result?

Mr. RANKIN. We were not only vindicated by the people at home, but we were vindicated by the men in the armed forces. We did not have the Stars and Stripes, dominated by this Ballot Commission, to spread our propaganda for the Constitution of the United States, for State governments and for the rights of the States; we had to depend on the hard-headed intelligence of the individual servicemen to decide which ballot they wanted; and with all that propaganda those servicemen came through, 97.8 percent of them declining to vote that "bobtailed" ballot.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman recall that during the campaign last year the C. I. O. and the P. A. C. charged that we were betraying the soldiers because we denied them the opportunity to vote? Do you recall that?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman asked them what they think about it now?

Mr. RANKIN. No; but as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities I probably will have some questions to ask them.

And I want to state one other thing. Those boys who are over there fighting and dying for this Republic, for constitutional government and the American way of life, will back the Committee on Un-American Activities just as strongly as they repudiated the "bobtailed" ballot.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wish the gentleman would tell that to his committee members. He does not have to walk over here and tell me. I am with him.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that, and the other Members will be, too, when the bonfire of public sentiment gets going all over this country.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I think the gentleman will be interested in an experience I had out at the Naval Hospital. One of the doctors out there asked me what happened to that Federal bobtailed ballot. He said that for 3 weeks last year they ceased to practice medicine and that they could not get in or out of that place until they had gone through a whole line with reference to the Federal ballot.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. It reminds me of the old fellow in Vermont who went down to New York and offered to sell a trainload of frogs to a hotel man so that he could have frog legs to serve his customers. The fellow made a trade with the hotel and then went back home. The hotel man did not hear from him so he called him over the telephone, but could not reach him. He then sent a man up to see him. He said to him, "I came up here to find out what you did with those frogs?" "Why," he said, "I found all that fuss was being made by three or four old frogs."

That is what was behind your bobtailed ballot proposition. Whenever we turn the sunlight of publicity on this organization known as the P. A. C. you may find that the only ones who were trying to speak for the great mass of American labor were just about three frogs—Hillman and the other two.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I would like to offer the gentleman for his committee some advertising that was put out by my opponent which stated that I opposed the right of the soldiers to vote in the campaign.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they said the same thing about me, but it had no effect.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi on the position he takes with reference to un-American activities. I am hoping that the committee which has been appointed by the House of Representatives to function will take the same stand and that every man who is doing anything that will undermine our Constitution and undermine our form of government will be publicized. I hope the members of the gentleman's committee will take the same attitude as he does because I believe that there are subversive activities going on in this country that will eventually overthrow it as sure as anything can possibly be unless the gentleman's committee does something to prohibit these activities.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there is no doubt in my mind but that there is a deep and well-laid plan on the part of these organized subversive elements to overthrow this Government, to destroy our constitutional form of government and our American way of life. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to give an inch. I am going to exert every effort possible to expose them as I did when they undertook through their subversive organization down here to smear and destroy one of the greatest generals in the American Army, General Patton. I knew what was going on. When I took this floor in defense of General Patton a year ago I knew that I was going to bring down on me all the condemnation of that little crowd that yells for war and then dodges the draft. When the boys began to come back here, wounded and disabled, who had fought under General Patton, they gave him the greatest recommendation I have ever heard a general given, which was that he never sends a man where he is not willing to go himself. I thank God that if I never did anything else, I helped to keep this smear bund of the so-called Anti-Defamation League, which the Dies committee said was a subversive organization, from detroying and humiliating General Patton, one of the greatest leaders that ever wore the uniform of this country.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. PATRICK. It will be a question, of course.

Mr. RANKIN. It will have to be short, because I have but little time remaining.

Mr. PATRICK. The committee, since it has been organized—even though some of us voted against it—can devote itself to saving America from un-American activities——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further, and I do not care to be interrupted. All of you gentlemen who voted against creating the Committee on Un-American Activities can take the floor and argue your position at any time you please, but not in my time.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman wishes to ask me a question. I will answer it if he makes it short and to the point.

Mr. PATRICK. Can this committee be depended upon to devote itself to the saving of America from un-American activities and not be trying to save America from America?

Mr. RANKIN. If it does, I am afraid the gentleman would not vote to extend it, because that is what the Dies committee did, and the gentleman from Alabama voted against extending it as a permanent committee of the House.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BAILEY. Is the State of Mississippi, the gentleman's home State, 1 of the 10 States that approved this bobtail ballot the gentleman was talking about?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I fail to understand the gentleman's argument.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course the gentleman fails to understand it. I suspected that when I saw the gentleman come in.

Mr. Speaker, when these boys overseas write back home, they say, "There are two things we want. We want to win this war and get home as quickly as possible, and we want to find the same home we left. We want to find," say these boys from overseas, "that great constitutional government, the greatest government ever created by the mind of man, that we left and that we are now fighting for. We want to find it still standing and not impaired, weakened, or destroyed, by subversive elements. When we come back, we want to see the American Flag flying above every public building in the United States and we want to find our laws and institutions fully protected.

"That is what we are fighting for. We are giving up our lives to save America and all her sacred institutions from destruction at the hands of our enemies abroad, and we expect you, our elected Representatives in Congress, to protect her against our enemies at home."

We must not fail them.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to unduly alarm the gentleman from Mississippi concerning any legislation that might be offered on the uniform Federal ballot, or whatever it might be called. I have read a report from the War Department, which shows that a very small percentage of the armed forces did vote the Federal ballot. May I say, however, that I am pleasantly surprised at the large number who were able to use the uniform ballot in face of the terrific restrictions which were imposed upon its use. I have never wanted the Congress to override any State law and, since most of the legislatures of the 48 States are now in session, it is the primary duty of the States to amend their voting laws so that the men from those States will have a full, free, and fair opportunity to vote. As you know, the original idea for the Federal ballot was to supplement State action, and I believe that with no Presidential election coming up this time perhaps the Congress can give objective and dispassionate consideration to the bill which will be introduced later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we can all join with the gentleman from Mississippi in the hope which he expressed that when the servicemen return they will still find here a constitutional government, but there will have

to be something more than that hope if those boys who come back are not to be disappointed. I, for one, am relying on the committee of which the gentleman is a member to do not only its share of the work but a part of the work which would otherwise fall upon the rest of us, for that committee will have extra help.

The purpose of the bill which we adopted yesterday was to get greater war production. That debate is over and gone, you might say, but the bill undoubtedly will come back in some different form from the other body. So I want to put into the RECORD, if I may, just a few statements showing that there is plenty of manpower available without drafting anyone.

Here is an excerpt from the February 1 South Bend Tribune:

WAR WIVES DARE COLD AS PICKETS

SOUTH BEND, IND., February 1.—A group of war wives, some accompanied by small children, today withstood freezing weather to picket headquarters of the C. I. O. United Automobile Workers, Local 5, in protest of the prospective laying off of servicemen's wives at the Studebaker Co.'s aviation division.

Throughout the day, in temperatures ranging as low as 10 above zero, a dozen women and one man paraded before the union's offices. Many of them carried placards accusing the union of discrimination against war wives for its plan to deprive them of the status previously given them by their husbands' service.

The women said the union some time ago set up an arrangement whereby wives and other close dependents of former Studebaker men now in service were credited with their husbands' seniority.

But last Friday the union voted that henceforth straight seniority would prevail in the event of lay-offs.

The Studebaker plant recently laid off about 1,400 employees as the result of cutbacks and more releases are expected.

That is to say, the wives of these men who are overseas, the wives who might find it necessary to work to support themselves and their children, were to step down the line and take a place at the end while the C. I. O. boys in the union stayed on. But now get this point on the argument that there is a manpower shortage:

The Studebaker plant recently laid off about 1,400 employees as the result of cutbacks and more releases are expected.

So while we were here debating that bill, and the argument was being made that men must be drafted for factory work, down in the Studebaker plant at South Bend, Ind., 1,400 workers were discharged because there was no work for them. And that is just one of the many examples which might be cited. Yet the Congress passed the bill drafting workers, and the Congress—the gentleman from Mississippi spoke about having a constitutional government when the boys came back—the Congress drafts men for work, and at the same time permits the administration, before they can go to work, to compel them through the orders of the War Labor Board, to join a union and pay a fee, or, by the security-of-membership clause, to resign from a union or continue to be a member and pay dues.

That is the first time I ever heard, and I do not believe you will ever find it in print anywhere in the history of mankind, of any country or any nation or any dictator, czar, or king requiring a man by what a deputy sheriff in our country called a "writ of grabation"—he went and brought a man into court and the judge said to him, "What did you have, a warrant?" He said, "No." The judge said, "What did you have? You could not have had a writ of replevin, because that does not apply to individuals. What did you have? How did you get him into court?" The officer said, "I had a writ of grabation." The judge said, "What is that? What did you do?" He said, "I reached down and got him" to pay a fee to comply with the law. I have always thought you paid if you violated the law. But that is what the Government is doing with these workers.

The administration permits the union, before a man or woman can go to work, or if he is a member of a union, to compel that man that we have ordered to work to join an organization or remain a member of that organization and pay a fee, before he can do the work the Government has ordered him to do. Is there not something screwy about that? You pick the man out of his home, you say, "Listen now, Brother, you go down to that factory gate and you go through there and go on your job or we are going to send you to jail or fine you so many dollars." The fellow starts down, and when he gets to the gate there is a picket collecting union dues, and he says, "You cannot go in here. You do not belong," or he says "You are back in your dues." The War Labor Board upholds the union and says, "You cannot go in there until you comply with union rules." The President of the United States upholds the union and says, "You cannot go in there until you have paid the C. I. O." If I were that fellow I would say, "All right, here I stand; now what are you going to do? Are you going to let me go to work or are you going to send me to jail?"

If the man balks and the union starts a riot, the President of the United States, instead of making the union be good, refrain from violence, from assault and battery, seizes the employer's business, takes it over and tries to operate it with men who are now in the Army.

When the Ward employees, who were satisfied with their jobs, went behind the counters and began to work and sell goods and would not pay to join a union, along came other union men—that is, men from other unions—who were employed in war plants, and wrecked the store. Then the President seized the plant. The President says, "Now, boys, you are in the Army. We are going to run this like we run the Army; now go to work." The first demand the union made was that the Government take out of the Ward company funds to pay for the back dues of some of the workers 13 months back dues. Now, think of that. I am wondering whether or not, when this bill becomes law, if it does, and the Army and Navy order those men to work, or whoever has the authority orders them to work, I am wondering whether you are going to make them pay dues and whether you are going to make them join a union. If you are, let us be fair about it and make an appropriation from the Federal Treasury directly to the union for the amount Sidney Hillman thinks he should have for his campaign fund. Why chase the devil around the stump? Why say to the men, who someone says have no work, "Now, you go to work and you pay that dollar before you go to work"? Then the union gets the dollar, and they take it over and deposit it in the campaign fund of the P. A. C., and they spend it to keep the administration in power. Why not play the game straight, and let the Federal Treasury pay into the union treasury such a sum as the P. A. C. or Sidney Hillman or those in charge of political activities in the administration can agree upon? Let us take a short cut and put the money directly into the fund which it is supposed to augment? Do not take it out of the pockets of those men who are ordered—who are forced to work in a particular plant. Why should the Government, through the power given it by the bill yesterday, force an A. F. of L. man to work in a factory where the C. I. O. has a closed-shop contract and compel the A. F. of L. man to join the C. I. O., pay initiation fees and dues, when the administration knows that he prefers the A. F. of L. and that the A. F. of L. can do all and more than the C. I. O.?

Here is another article dated January 17. I will not give the name of the union steward.

It says:

Union steward at the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. reclassified I-A by draft board for inciting a strike was complaining—

The steward claimed that the strike came 4 days after he had refused to work a night trick, the act alleged by the company to have set off the strike.

I worked 3 nights last week at the request of my foreman but refused to work Thursday night, as I was scheduled for the day shift.

Here is another one:

Army seizes railroad only 20 miles long.

That one was dated January 25 out in Utah. There are plenty of them.

Here is another one, dated January 26:

STRIKE OVER 10 WOMEN HALTS ROCKET OUTPUT

Five hundred male workers producing Navy gun mounts, rockets, and machine tools struck yesterday at the Goss Printing Press Co., 1535 South Paulina Street, because 10 women refused to quit their jobs in the plant to make place for men workers who had been laid off because of a change-over in production.

The 10 women were the only workers who remained on the job, after the walk-out, which was ordered by officials of district No. 8 of the International Association of Machinists (A. F. of L.). The strike was started at noon.

* * * * *

Several weeks ago the company laid off several hundred men and women because of the change-over in production. McDonald explained, "Our contract with the company provided only that women could be hired or retained for 1 year after the contract date in 1942. We told the women workers this at the meeting and we insisted that they leave the plant so some of the men workers

who had been discharged could be rehired in their stead."

Here is another one:

Nine hundred electrical workers involved.

That is January 29.

Here is one more from the Labor Department. Get this one:

LABOR DISPUTES COST EIGHT AND ONE-HALF MILLION MAN-DAYS IN YEAR—ONE-TENTH PERCENT LOSS

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 29.—The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated today that 5,000 strikes and lock-outs involving 2,100,000 workers occurred in 1944, but said total time lost was one-third less than in 1943. The eight and one half million man-days of idleness were termed 0.1 percent of available working time, compared with 0.15 percent in 1943, 0.05 in 1942, and 0.32 percent in 1941.

The estimated 280 strikes last December involved 55,000 workers and 380,000 man-days of idleness, equivalent to 0.05 percent of available working time.

The figures covered work stoppages caused by disputes connected with terms and conditions of employment, regardless of whether workers or employers initiated them.

Eight and one-half million man-days lost in 1944 because of strikes. Had those 8,500,000 days been worked, how many bombers, how many guns, how many tanks might have been produced? Let someone tell me. Yet the Congress turns around and drafts men to work.

Here is another one:

TOBIN'S UNION PUTS SENIORITY ABOVE WAR VETS

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters (A. F. of L.) will maintain existing seniority rules in the reemployment of war veterans who come back to their old jobs despite an interpretation of the Selective Service Act granting them superseniority rights.

This intention is expressed by Daniel Tobin, head of the union, in an article in the February issue of the International Teamster. Tobin took sides with the rival C. I. O. organization against Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey on the issue that an otherwise qualified veteran may return to his old job irrespective of his seniority, even though such reinstatement would require the discharge of a nonveteran with greater seniority.

MUST OBSERVE CONTRACTS

"The seniority clauses in our contracts must be observed," Tobin wrote after conceding that servicemen who were former members of I. B. T. unions could return to their old jobs and pledging the organization to do everything within its powers and under the law "to be helpful in finding employment for returning members."

"It must be understood, however, we have laws and a constitution which we are governed by and which we must observe," Tobin wrote.

"For instance, we cannot strike out all forms of initiation in order to admit to membership men in the service who were never members of our union. Nor can we place at the top of the list, in violation of our contracts with our employers, men who have been in service and who are just returning even though they were members of our union."

FEAR "PAPER PROTECTION"

Tobin's policy also conflicts with aims expressed by Daniel D. Carmell, attorney for the Illinois State Federation of Labor, who said the veteran would receive only valueless "paper protection" if seniority rules remained inflexible.

Tobin, who was chairman of the labor division of the National Democratic Party in the last compaign, attacked President Roosevelt's Chicago promise of 60,000,000 jobs in the post-war era. Compared with business stagnation at the close of World War No. 1, Tobin foresaw worse conditions after this war.

"We hope and trust there will be work enough to go around," he wrote, "but we are not living in dreams, nor are we going to be deluded by political promises made during campaigns."

What that amounts to is that while under the selective service law, according to Mr. Hershey a man coming back is to have his seniority and go back on his own job, Dan Tobin—and we passed a bill you will recall to prevent his racketeering in New York—Dan Tobin now says by his actions that he is not satisfied with taking that money out of your pocket and my pocket and out of those who are hauling food into the city of New York but he is going to put his union members ahead of those designated as being entitled to employment by the Selective Service Act, that is, those boys who come back after having served our country.

What Dan Tobin says in effect is this—the boys can go and fight to preserve America, American homes, and American jobs, while members of his union, who remain at home, drawing good wages, living with their families in comfortable homes will, when the boys come back, and as they come back—and they are coming back, thousands of them each month—those boys coming back, war veterans, capable of holding a job, of driving a truck, can just wait around for a job until the members of Dan's union have all had jobs. That is the position of Daniel J. Tobin.

And when you tell me that we must draft men in order to get workers in war plants, just read this one, which is just one of many:

C. I. O. UNION BALKS AT FASTER WAR WORK; 813 STRIKE—BUILDING OF AMBULANCES DELAYED IN DETROIT

DETROIT, MICH., January 20.—The Vernor plant of the Briggs Manufacturing Co., which makes parts for critically needed army ambulances and B-29 Super Fortresses, was closed today by a strike of 813 C. I. O. United Automobile workers over a demonstration by the company of how the workers could increase production.

Simultaneously, in another part of the city, 150 more C. I. O. members staged a howling 2-hour protest in the regional War Labor Board office against deduction of union strike fines from the pay of 572 employees of the United States Rubber Co. plant here.

POSITION OF UNION

Officials of Local 212, U. A. W.-C. I. O., said the Briggs strike was in protest against the company's failure to use union workers in the demonstration designed to show how to speed production of parts for ambulances.

A company statement said the demonstration showed that 2 important assemblies for the new ambulances could be produced at the rate of 16 in 8 hours by 2 men as compared with the existing rate of 14 in the same time by 3 men.

The company said only 177 of the striking workers are making ambulance parts. It said the remaining 636 are making B-29 parts and are striking in sympathy.

All except a few toolroom employees are affected by the strike.

That is just another illustration of how union officials limit production, and that policy of slow-downs has been followed for more than 2 years.

Many a man with blood relatives in the service has been denied the opportunity to do a full hour's, a full day's work.

Do not tell me that Dan Tobin is thinking first of those who are doing the fighting. Dan is thinking of himself.

Now, there is another way of handling the situation without drafting men for civilian jobs. Here is a news item:

Eight arrested for work slow-down in the city of Chicago.

There is a remedy to get men to work, if you want to get them to work. Here is a letter from a farmer who has a farm and who also works in the great Clark Equipment Co., which has factories producing war material in several cities in Michigan. This man says in his letter which just came in to me:

Five of us worked on one job last night on the 4 to 12 shift, and I could have done easy myself what we all done.

Here is a letter from a member of the American Legion post. He is speaking of the war manpower situation:

In the last 3 weeks I have contacted at least 100 men who told me they were unable to secure employment.

Things just do not make sense when you have so many men drawing unemployment insurance. I even left the factory myself, and in the plant where I plan to work they told me that they had about 300 more workers than they should have; yet there are advertisements in the local paper asking me to come there. The employment offices are just so full of manpower that it is really pitiful to talk about shortages.

I might go on indefinitely reading from letters from people in the District, union men and nonunion men, working in war plants who write me that they are not permitted to do an honest day's work. Sometime the fault is that of management. Sometimes it is the fault of the union which is following a policy of making the jobs last. Sometimes management does not want to produce more per day for fear the contract price per item might be cut down. Sometimes the union bosses do not wish to have the men produce more items per hour for fear the rate of pay per item will be reduced.

Now, for a few moments let me discuss the question of the drafting of farm workers. At the outset permit me to say that I am not criticizing the local boards. It is quite true that the law vests in them a certain measure of discretion, but so long as the war is on and so long as the President keeps reiterating the statement that he is the Commander in Chief, the local boards will be inclined to follow the President's recommendations as passed on down to them through General Hershey and the State selective service officials. The President is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy—of the armed forces. He is not Commander in Chief of the civilian population. As Commander in Chief in the areas outside of the combat zones he has no authority to ignore or set aside a law enacted by Congress. Yet that is just what he has attempted in this instance to do.

In common with other Members of Congress, shortly after January 3, I began to receive letters from farmers in the district complaining that their last farm worker was being drafted by the local boards.

Of course we all know—and it has been repeated time and again from the floor of the House and the Senate—everybody knows that there has been and is a shortage of farm labor; that while we have up to date had an abnormally large production, because of the extra effort put forth by the farmers and because of good growing seasons and fine harvesting weather, that condition will not continue indefinitely. As in the days of old, there will be fat years and lean years. Many of the older farm workers attracted by high wages have gone to war industries. Many of the farm boys have already been drafted.

We, as Members of Congress, assumed that the administration knew of these conditions and would use common sense and good judgment in dealing with the situation. We knew, too, that parents often complain without reason when their own flesh and blood is drafted. We knew that there were inequities and always would be when millions of men are drafted, but the complaints became so numerous and they showed so clearly that the administration if it continued would bring about a food shortage, that some of us began to inquire what had hit the local draft boards. They have tried to do a good job.

Then we learned that on January 3 General Hershey sent a telegram to all State directors of the Selective Service System, and that he quoted from a letter written him by Mr. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, as follows:

> You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age, the only remaining substantial source in this age group, is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation.

General Hershey, in his instructions to the State directors, also quoted from Mr. Byrnes' letter the following:

> The War Food Administration, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18 through 25-year-age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.
>
> As long as you comply with the Tydings amendment, that will be all there will be to it, and we can get along.

But that was not all that Mr. Hershey sent to the State selective-service directors. Further quoting from the letter of Mr. Byrnes, he wrote:

> I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through 25-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.
>
> The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture, like our other war industries, can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older-age groups.

That is only a part of Directive No. 288 sent out on the 3d day of January, 1945, by General Hershey.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

State director advice No. 288, issued January 3, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of registrants in agriculture, ages 18–25.

CONFIRMATION OF TELEGRAM TO ALL STATE DIRECTORS WITHIN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, DATED JANUARY 3, 1945

The following letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has been received by the Director of Selective Service:

"The Secretaries of War and Navy have advised me jointly that the calls from the Army and Navy to be met in the coming year will exhaust the eligibles in the 18- through 25-year age group at an early date. The Army and Navy believe it essential to the effective prosecution of the war to induct more men in this age group.

"You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation. You have further advised me that if this group is not available, you must call into the service occupationally deferred men in the next age group, 26 years and older, most of whom are fathers.

"The Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Krug, advises me that the loss of these men would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet critical war demands. Moreover, these older men would not meet the expressed needs of the Army and Navy.

"The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18- through 25-year-age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

"The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act does not give the agricultural worker absolute exemption from selective service. It was not so intended. In asking Congress to adopt this amendment, Senator TYDINGS said: 'All my amendment seeks to do is to provide that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food, and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated, and there is no replacement, he shall be deferred upon those facts until a replacement can be found.'

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture, like our other war industries, can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

"The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and boards of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all registrants ages 18 through 25 deferred in class II–C excluding those identified by the letters "F" or "L." In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–C, local boards will consider the President's findings that "The further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II–C excluding those identified with the letters "F" or "L" in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction physical examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class II–C registrants at the same time as they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction physical examination.

HERSHEY.

When Brig. Gen. Leroy Pearson, State selective-service director in Michigan, received that directive, he passed the substance of it along to the local selective-service boards, and I quote now from a statement issued on January 18, 1945, by A. D. Morley, county agricultural agent, who acts with the local Allegan County Draft Board. That statement is as follows:

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS AND SELECTIVE SERVICE

The State selective-service board representatives at a meeting in Kalamazoo on Wednesday, January 17, instructed all local selective-service boards to place in I–A and start processing all agricultural workers now in II–C who are under 26 years of age.

All other men in nonessential work up to 38 are also to be considered very soon. As soon as above groups have been processed the men 26–30 in less essential industries are to be processed.

The following quotations are taken from a directive by Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion to the Director of Selective Service.

"The Secretaries of War and Navy have advised me jointly that the calls from the Army and Navy to be met in the coming year will exhaust the eligibles in the 18- through 25-year age group at an early date. The Army and Navy believe it essential to the effective prosecution of the war to induct more men in this age group. You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation. You have further advised me that if this group is not available, you must call into the service occupationally deferred men in the next age group, 26 years and older, most of whom are fathers. The Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Krug, advises me that the loss of these men would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet critical war demands. Moreover, these older men would not meet the expressed needs of the Army and Navy. The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of the physically qualified men in this 18- through 25-year age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition."

There are 382 men in Allegan County in II–C under 30 years of age.

"The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act does not give the agricultural worker absolute exemption from selective service. It was not so intended. In asking Congress to adopt this amendment Senator Tydings said: 'All my amendment seeks to do is to provide that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food, and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated, and there is no replacement,

he shall be deferred upon those facts until a replacement can be found.'

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of existing conditions agriculture, like our other war industries, can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

"The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

The schedule of meetings listed in the papers last week giving locations of meetings at which II–C registrants would make out new questionnaires, in view of the above directive, has been canceled.

All registrants have the same right of local board hearings if requested within 10 days of the mailing of the I–A card.

In meeting with State selective-service officials it was evident that very few deferments in agriculture are to be granted.

A. D. MORLEY,
County Agricultural Agent.

On the 20th of January 1945, from Arthur A. Schupp, Farmers' and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association, I received the following wire:

SAGINAW, MICH., *January 20, 1945.*

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress:

Newspaper reports: "Orders were issued to local boards today by Brig. Gen. Leroy Pearson, State selective-service director, to place all qualified farm workers between 18 and 26 in class I–A." While above quotation applies to Michigan we assume same instructions issued in other States in this area. We object to such general reclassification of farm workers without due consideration of the critical nature of their work. County agents advise that young farmers are absolutely necessary in many cases for machinery operators and for heavy work. Further that every young farmer now inducted will remove 100 acres from production and seriously curtail food production. The present drastic procedure will affect the sugar program most adversely in this area. We urge that instead of general reclassification that each case be considered on its merits and that critical farm workers be deferred.

ARTHUR A. SCHUPP,
Farmers' and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association.

To which I made the following reply:

WASHINGTON, *D. C., January 20, 1945.*

Mr. ARTHUR A. SCHUPP,
Farmers, and Manufacturers' Beet Sugar Association, Saginaw, Mich.:

Neither Hershey nor Brig. Gen. Leroy Pearson has any authority to direct local boards to place farm workers 18 and 26 in class I–A unless they did not come under the Tydings amendment.

Before a committee of Congressmen Hershey admitted last week Tydings amendment still in force; it governs farm workers.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress.

But the complaints of farm workers being drafted without regard to the Tydings amendment continue to roll in—complaints not only from my district but from other districts. Consulting with other Members of Congress, I learned that they, too, had received similar complaints. You will recall how some 250 Congressmen met in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building and how General Hershey reluctantly finally admitted that his directive of the 3d of January last, might be misconstrued and promised to correct the misunderstanding. My information is that after meeting with that unofficial committee and after action taken by the House Committee on Agriculture, General Hershey promised to send out a wire reading as follows:

Questions of interpretation of State Directors' Advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, S. D. A. 288 did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State Directors Advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5K of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

But still the complaints rolled in. So on February 1 I sent the following wire and on the same day received a reply, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
February 1, 1945.

Brig. Gen. LEROY PEARSON,
Director, Michigan Selective Service Office, Lansing, Mich.:

Have you corrected the erroneous instructions sent to local boards to automatically place farm workers in I–A? Am advised that under it farm registrants entitled to deferment are being put into the Army?

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress.

LANSING, MICH.,
February 1, 1945.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress:

Reurtel 1st February. There have been no—repeat no—erroneous instructions sent to Michigan local boards regarding farm workers. Local boards have been furnished copy of directive of January 3 from Washington calling for review of agricultural deferments ages 18–25, and the order to send such men for physical examination. Our boards have also been advised that such directive and order do not change or modify Tydings amendment.

LEROY PEARSON,
State Director.

Now notwithstanding the wire of Brig. Gen. Leroy Pearson, we all know that erroneous instructions were sent out. In the first place the President of the United States, even though he be Commander in Chief, had no authority to tell General Hershey, State directors, nor the local boards "that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interests of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men."

When General Hershey quoted the President's statement from the letter of Mr. Byrnes to the State directors, the Allegan County agricultural agent who advises with the board was quoted in the Allegan Gazette as follows:

Review of all farm deferments, which was set by A. D. Morley, county agricultural agent and member of the war board, have been canceled because all farmers under 26 years of age are automatically in I–A and under latest instructions from National Selective Service, these men will be processed by Selective Service as rapidly as possible and placed in the military service.

That announcement was made this morning by Morley, who points out that it is useless for his office to spend 9 or 10 days reviewing farm deferments when those cases reviewed are automatically slated for military duty. Morley made his announcement following a meeting in Kalamazoo when officials of the State selective-service board issued instructions to all local draft boards to place in I–A and start processing all agriculture workers now in II–C who are under 26 years of age.

I sent a message to the local papers and to the draft board in which I stated:

Neither the President, Pearson, nor Hershey has any authority to call and induct farmers in disregard of Tydings amendment which provides that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated and there is no replacement he should be deferred until replacement can be found.

Naturally, the draft boards did not pay any attention to what I told them when they had before them the President's message, the directive of General Hershey and of Brig. Gen. Leroy Pearson. The local board interpreted the Tydings amendment as giving them the power to take any man into the service when the need arises for that individual. Other local boards followed the same course.

A Gladwin County Michigan newspaper carried the following announcement:

The Gladwin County Draft Board asks us to make clear to folks throughout the county that they have no choice now but to call up young men under 26 who are engaged in farm work for physical examination. The order calling up these young men is a Presidential directive and the local draft board has no authority whatsoever to defer any man in this age group.

As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] this morning said, they are cutting straight across and without authority of law.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to amplify what you will find in my extended remarks made on yesterday. Some of us wired the Governor of Michigan, as well as the Director of the Service, and this morning the director from Michigan has telephoned to General Hershey, and General Hershey has taken the matter up so that I think the Tydings amendment will be respected in Michigan. I have talked with Mr. Jones, the War Food Administrator, and Mr. Hershey this morning. I think after the prodding they have received from the gentleman from Michigan and others here, they are now going to admit the Tydings amendment is what it is.

I might say further I hold in my hand a letter signed yesterday by General Hershey, directed to our colleague, which

makes it clear that the Tydings amendment is to be enforced, and they intend nothing else—if they will only do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If they follow intent of Congress they will be doing something that they have not done heretofore.

Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan what has been done about this Major Luscombe, who has gone out over the State of Michigan telling the boards to disregard the directive of January 22, which authorized the local boards to consider the Tydings amendment?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Permit me to say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] that I hold in my hand a statement published in an Adrian paper, that being the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who yesterday, I understand, used the same statement before the House Committee on Agriculture, which tells something of the activities of the major. The statement which was published in Adrian on January 30 reads as follows:

THE ARMY NEEDS THEM—YOUNG FARMERS MUST GO, MAJOR SAYS

Young farmers in the 18 through 25 age group are destined for military service if they can pass physical requirements, Maj. Nick A. Luscombe, of the operations section of the Michigan State selective service, told a group of 100 businessmen, supervisors, draft board, and county war board members at the courthouse last night.

"This meeting has been called to discuss the status of II–C farmers," said Major Luscombe. "In the last 4 weeks Selective Service has had to change its thinking and go back to the original purpose of furnishing men for the armed services. We believed we had reached a peak with some 12,000,000 men in service, but the Germans threw a monkey wrench into things. Whereas our estimates were that 60,000 men a month from last July to next July would be sufficient, it now appears that this must be revised upward to some 160,000 to 180,000 men a month.

"Our casualties have been heavy, men are cracking in 15 days in the combat areas; the weather is a big factor, and our replacements must come from the younger men. Failure to meet our quotas would prolong the war for 2 or 3 months, maybe a year.

"I wish to state right here that this decision is not that of your local draft board, nor the State selective service, nor the national office, but higher up. The President of the United States, after conferring with his aides, advised General Hershey that further deferment of men 18 to 25 because of farm occupation is no longer needed and ordered a review of the men.

"The Tydings amendment is no more important than other sections of the Selective Service Act. We have been liberal for the last 6 months, and now the needs of the moment mean more stringent application of the act. Local boards must order for induction all men in II–C. They will review and consider the evidence in the files and classify men accordingly."

Judge M. E. Tripp, Prosecutor L. B. Kuney, and Judge G. Arthur Rathbun, as well as laymen, pointed out that, in their opinion, the various sections of the Selective Service Act and the Tydings and other amendments were in conflict.

THE PRESIDENT'S POWER

"However you construe the act," said Major Luscombe, "the fact remains that Congress has empowered the President of the United States to issue the directive he has."

It was pointed out that while II–C's have the right to appeal their cases, the appeal in the final analysis must go to the Presidential board which issued the directive. This, it was claimed by farmers, would be like appealing to the judge who has just sentenced you.

While the II–C has the right of appeal, the State selective-service board also has the right of appeal. Asked if they would appeal deferments made by the local draft board, Major Luscombe said, "I will say this, that they will consider an appeal in every case."

"In a nutshell, gentlemen," said Major Luscombe, "the Presidential board has decided that the 18 to 25 age group is no longer as essential to food production as it is to the Army. In Lenawee County there are approximately 328 men affected, and of these some will be rejected for failure to meet physical requirements. This would take a small percentage of the agricultural workers of the county, and I do not believe that food production would be seriously affected."

ADVISES W. F. A. PROTEST

"If you gentlemen believe otherwise and can prove that this is the case, I believe it is up to you to present your case to the War Food Administration and leave it to them to fight it out with the President."

A farmer in the rear of the room declared that by the time that could be accomplished the season would be fall, there would have been no crop, and the II–C might be a casualty.

"Drafting of some of these men is going to hurt, and hurt a great deal," said Major Luscombe. "It may hurt food production to a certain extent, but we need men in the Army more than in agriculture. It doesn't please us to know that in some individual cases there will be hardship, some cattle sold, some acres untilled; there may be the third or fourth boy of a family will be taken. There is a mission to be performed; and if by taking the II–C's we can shorten the war a single day, I believe the step well worth while."

To rate as a II–C, Major Luscombe said, a farm worker must now be actively and fully engaged in essential agricultural endeavor; the farm operation must be essential to the war effort; if a man is inducted and a large section of land would remain untilled, and if no replacement is available, then deferment will be granted only until a replacement can be found.

Note in particular the first, fourth, fifth, seventh, and the next to the last paragraphs. After that statement of Major Luscombe's, acting as the representative of Brigadier General Pearson, there was nothing practical left for the local boards to do—which the average citizen would be expected to do—other than draft all physically fit farm workers between the specified ages.

Apparently to this administration it makes no difference at all what the Congress does or fails to do; the President of the United States seems to be a law unto himself.

The President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, gives an order and in compliance with that order American men are denied their constitutional and legal rights. They are taken from the farms and without hearing they are put in the Army.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which I hope will receive consideration and which, if enacted, would require the commanding officer where those men are taken to discharge them upon proof they were illegally inducted, and I also provide in the bill for punishment of those who violate the law. I do not care how high up it hits for those who do unlawful acts.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The tragic part of all this is that General Hershey did send out a classification order on January 22, yet on January 29, 7 days afterward, this Major Luscombe appeared up in the district of our colleague and told the boards to disregard the directive of the 22d, to put these men into the service and to stop all deferment of agricultural workers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] whether he is going to include in his 1-minute address that account from his district in Michigan?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. I think I stated to the gentleman I was going to do that. I may say that by reason of this statement made to over 100 farmers, businessmen, and draft boards in my home county and as a result of the telegrams which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and myself sent to our Governor, our Governor has taken the matter up with the State director and in turn with General Hershey. I have assurance from the Governor's office and from General Hershey's office this morning that this man Luscombe, representing the Selective Service, had no right to make these statements which were made as to what they will do in reference to taking these boys.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that while we now have the assurance from General Hershey that hereafter the Tydings amendment will be at least considered in their actions, what is to be done with the thousands and thousands of boys who have been drafted, who are now in the service, and who were drafted in disregard of the Tydings amendment?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The purpose of the bill I introduced yesterday was to get them back. I may say to the gentleman that those farm boys who were drafted off the farms and put in the service are not going to milk any cows or turn any furrows or dig any potatoes or harvest any crops while they are in the Army. Some one may wake up some time and find out they want something for breakfast, they will still want it at noon and at night, if they keep on.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan and the other Members of the House, that, being conversant with what has been going on in Michigan, and I assume in other States as well, I sent the following telegram yesterday to the Governor:

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

HON. HARRY F. KELLY,
Governor, Lansing, Mich.:

May I remind you that the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act is still the

law of the land. Neither the wish nor directive of the President can alter this fact. Our boys on the fighting lines of the world and the people of this country need more food not less. I hope you will leave nothing undone to correct the situation which seems to be developing.

ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Member of Congress.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I have here a telegram also that shows the condition is the same in my State. I have received the following wire:

EDGERTON, OHIO,

Hon. CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. CLEVENGER: As far as the Tydings amendment is concerned it does not exist in Defiance County, Ohio, because the local draft board in spite of repeated warnings of the war board are indiscriminately drafting farmers with 20 or more essential food units to their credit. If Tydings amendment is law why this condition in Defiance County. The draft boards of our adjacent counties are following the spirit of the act. I think the whole draft situation should be investigated at once in Defiance County. The war board will welcome your effort.

GUY C. CAPE,
Past Member A. A. A. County Board.

Mr. MASON. What we need is impeachment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Do I understand the bill that the gentleman said he introduced yesterday will make enforceable a law that was previously passed by the Congress?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, if the bill that the gentleman has introduced is passed and is not enforced it will require another bill to make it enforceable?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; if the administration refuses to obey the law. If this bill passes I would ask the Attorney General to lay before the grand jury the facts, and if justified, have a trial by jury. I do not blame the local boards or the State director. If the State director, Major Luscombe, General Hershey, or the Commander in Chief even, violated the law of the land, I would try him just the same as I would a chicken thief, and if he was convicted he would take the punishment imposed by the law, because when we reach a time when there is no longer any respect for the law by those in the Executive Mansion or in authority, when the Commander in Chief can put out a directive or an order, or whatever you want to call it, taking men into the Army without authority, then I say it is time we begin at the top and go down instead of beginning at the bottom and working up. Otherwise all respect for law and order is at an end and the Government will fall apart.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, if the bill that the gentleman introduced becomes law, it will not be retroactive as to those who have already been taken in in violation of the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; it will, in effect as to men illegally put into the service. When any man is drafted in violation of the Tydings amendment and evidence is presented to the commanding officer, an investigation is made, and if he was put in without authority of law they send him back and start him on the road that the law has laid down. That is what should have been done. There is no excuse for the President doing this. The men who should be most careful in obeying the law are those who are charged with its enforcement and those who make the laws. The Congressmen are among those who should not violate the traffic regulations or any other law, no matter how trivial. We should set an example, and so should the executive department. And that includes the Chief Executive and the members of his household. What I seek to show here, and which is shown by the statements offered is that this major went in, and under his advice and under the advice of Brigadier General Pearson, our selective service man there in Michigan, those boys were just shanghaied, if you want to put it that way, off the farms and put into the armed service.

I have letters here and so have you to the effect that hundreds and thousands of acres of good productive land are going to be idle in the coming year unless some of those boys are permitted to return and some are left on the farms. I have one letter from two women, Sylvia and Susan Miles, each past 50, with a helpless mother 91 years of age, who are farming more than 150 acres of land. Those two women are farming that land and producing crops. They also last year bought 20 $100 bonds and 1 $50 bond. They are not writing for themselves; they are writing for a couple of neighbor boys who are farming several hundred acres of land. They say those young men cannot do the job all alone. They cannot feed all the township and the county, even with the rest of the women helping them; they just cannot do it. They have to have some younger fellows to do some of the hard work.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I want to fortify the gentleman's contention and position by reminding this House that this area that is being denuded of its men is the surplus food area where our beef, our pork, and our dairy products come from. It is the vital key production area right across the North Central States where 80 percent of this surplus food to feed the forces of the Army and the Navy comes from.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no doubt about that. The further point is this: In the districts where they are taking these workers off the farms, they have a surplus of labor in the factories within 10 or 15 miles of the farms.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] before the annual meeting of the Colorado State Mining Association in Denver on January 27 on the Bretton Woods proposal. I have taken this matter up with the Public Printer and am advised that it may run over the usual two pages, for which I am obtaining an estimate. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the cost, that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

DRAFTING FARM LABOR

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to enter into an argument with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] who has just addressed the House. As a matter of fact, I am very much in sympathy with many of the things he said with reference to the drafting of farm labor. However, I do believe there are two or three things we ought to keep very clearly in mind in considering this matter.

I come from an agricultural section. I am a believer in the Tydings amendment. I think that in the early stages of the war farm labor was pretty well stripped from the farms of this country. It was in view of that fact that the Tydings amendment was adopted.

However, there are two essentials in the Tydings amendment that we must keep in mind. The first is that the boy who is on the farm, who seeks deferment, must be engaged in essential farm work; and, second, there must not be a replacement for him. I think very often we overlook that requirement of irreplaceability.

There is another thing to keep in mind. Between the ages of 18 and 26, if I remember my figures correctly, there are 364,000 boys deferred on the farms, and, if I remember correctly, there are

only 40,000 within that age group deferred in industry. There are a good many people who have felt that perhaps an unduly large number were deferred on the farm. I do not think so, when we consider the extent to which the farms were stripped in the early part of this war. I do believe that General Hershey created considerable confusion by the directive that he first sent out.

There is one other thing that I think ought to be remembered, and particularly it ought to be remembered over the country and by our local draft boards. That is that under the law the draft board is the one to pass on the question of whether or not a man should be deferred. Regardless of the pressure that is sought to be placed on them by State directors or by Washington, the law lodges the authority in the local boards, and the local boards ought to exercise that authority. I believe that often our local boards forget those things.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. MICHENER, and Mr. PHILLIPS rose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be glad to yield if I can get more time, but there is something else I want to talk about.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The confusion was caused by the quotation from the President which was sent out to the local boards, wherein the President said that men were more essential in the armed forces than in agriculture, and it was said, therefore, the boards should disregard placing them in deferred status for agricultural work. That is what caused the confusion. That order went out on January 3 from General Hershey's office. On January 22 a group of us met with General Hershey and he sent out a clarification order which stated that the local boards had the sole responsibility of determining whether or not a registrant came under the Tydings amendment. Now we find that since the order of January 22 was sent out different orders have gone out from the Selective Service to disregard the order of January 22. The confusion still exists.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want the gentleman to understand me clearly that I am not condoning any of this confusion that has been brought about. What I am saying is that we ought to do all we can to convey to the country as a whole and to the local draft boards the fact that final responsibility does rest upon them regardless of what pressure may be sought to be placed upon them by our State systems or even out of Washington.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Supplementing what the gentleman from Minnesota has said, the real trouble has been, as far as Michigan, anyway, is concerned, a sort of reticence on the part of the Selective Service authorities in Washington to correct that apparent misinterpretation of the law by the Michigan selective-service director. The attitude has been so clear along that line that the thought is that the Michigan director has been acting under the direction, if not with the approval, of the Washington Director. Indeed, I have letters from members of local boards stating that they had been told they would be removed from office if they did not follow the order and draft all these boys, regardless of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Again I say that those local boards ought to remember that they have the final responsibility and ought not to be subject to the pressure the gentleman describes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman feel that much of the difficulty has come from widespread misunderstanding of the real powers and functions of the President as the Commander in Chief? He is in complete control of the troops. That is true; but people get to assuming, including members of local draft boards, that because he is the Commander in Chief of the Armies after Congress has raised them, therefore he also has the power to raise the armies. However, section 8 of article I of the Constitution clearly provides that the Congress shall have power to raise armies and to provide a navy. I think some effort ought to be made to get people to reread that section of the Constitution. The President commands the Army but Congress has the power to raise it, and only the Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not question the right of the President to give out exactly the statement that he gave out, that is in considering the essentiality as provided for in the Tydings amendment that relative essentiality might be regarded. That was perfectly all right for the President to give that message out. I do believe that General Hershey made a mistake in sending his message down the line to the local boards in such a way as to make the boards believe that this opinion expressed by the President was binding on the local boards. I think the great mistake perhaps comes in not keeping the local boards advised that theirs is the responsibility of passing on deferments. They should stand up for the rights that are vested in them as local boards.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wonder if the gentleman would not agree that while we can understand the problem that the local draft boards are up against, if the local board takes a position under the law and insists upon it, if anybody then tried to remove that local board I believe that just could not be done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think it can be done under the law either. I do not think they have the right to remove the local board regardless of the threats that may be made against the local boards. I believe the local boards should understand this.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Suppose the local board under its interpretation of the Tydings amendment goes ahead and drafts these boys who are clearly entitled to be exempt. Then what redress or relief has such a boy got after he is drafted?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am afraid there is none.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Then he is just hopeless?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Again, it is left up to that local board as to whether or not the boy shall be taken.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Can the local board be of assistance in getting him out if they have made a mistake?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Probably they could recommend a release, but once the man is inducted it becomes a matter of the individual being released by the armed services. The local board has no control over them after they are inducted.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Even though they may be wrong, once the man is inducted then their authority is exhausted?

Mr. SPARKMAN. When the man is inducted, then the local board is out of the picture. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think we have taken so much of the gentleman's time and in view of the fact that there are some questions that I would like to ask, I will wait until after the gentleman has concluded his speech and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are placing the responsibility on the local board. Now here is a member of the local board which met with the State board.

He writes:

> The State selective service board representatives at a meeting in Kalamazoo on Wednesday, January 17, instructed all local selective service boards to place in I–A and start processing all agricultural workers now in II–C, who are under 26 years of age.

Our people at home are loyal. All through the country they regard the Federal Government as the supreme Government. They follow directions and when the State man comes along and says the President told you to send these boys, they do not stop to read the letter, they do not pay any attention to the wire I send them, they shove them in.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know how the situation is going to be remedied if the local boards just do not uphold their rights.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But if the fellows at the top do not tell them, then what is the situation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it is for us to say in such a way that the country will understand, that nobody has the right to tell the local board to reclassify anybody or to draft anybody.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But that is just what the President did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But the power is lodged in the local board and the local board has to exercise that authority.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President sent that directive to the local boards and General Hershey sent it on down.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not agree with the gentleman in that respect. I think the President did say they ought to consider the matter of relative essentiality. I do not quarrel with him on that. I think we have a right to consider relative essentiality.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me briefly on that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield briefly to the gentleman, although I hoped the gentleman might be able to cover that in his time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Permit me at least to ask you if this is not the first time that the interpretation of essentiality was ever entered into. That was a new interpretation right then.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we are bound to consider relative essentiality. For instance when we had plenty of manpower we deferred them more liberally in industry; then when we started taking the fellows below the age of 26 we tightened up on deferments of men below 26. Then we loosened up on deferments for those above 26. I think we always have considered relative essentiality.

Now, I want to discuss very briefly what the gentleman from Michigan said regarding the legislation we passed yesterday, to the effect that we would draft labor under that law, if it becomes law, and force them to join the unions. I think that question has been debated sufficiently on the floor of the House. The statement has been made, if I recall correctly, by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], who handled the legislation, and it was made by various other members of our committee as well as other Members of the House in the course of the debate, that any such interpretation as that was not a proper interpretation regardless of what news columnists or commentators may have said in the newspapers and over the radio. That is not a correct interpretation.

There is no intention under the law to force a man to join a union by reason of his being deferred under the bill that this House passed yesterday. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to check that statement that I have just made.

Mr. MAY. I have already checked it, and it is absolutely correct. I would like, if the gentleman will yield to me, to supplement it by saying that in the course of the debate you will recall I took the position that in case of strikes or lock-outs there was no severance or breaking of the relation of employer and employee. In that connection, I cited a Federal case from the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. In addition to that, I made the flat statement that there was no purpose on the part of the Military Affairs Committee of the House to use it for an open shop or a closed shop in any instance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that we do a disservice when we get up here and try to give to the country as a whole that wrongful impression of the meaning of the legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hope that you and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] are absolutely right and that I am just as wrong as wrong can be. I hope so. But I am asking you this now: You have a closed shop and the man who has been employed in an open shop is assigned to work in the closed shop, how are you going to get him in there under the War Labor Board's directive, if he does not join the union, and how are you going to keep him there?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the only place in which the question would arise would be an absolutely closed shop.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Or maintenance of membership.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it would not. If I understand correctly maintenance of membership, he would not have to join. He is given the option, if I understand correctly the definition of maintenance of membership.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the legal interpretation but as a matter of fact it does not work that way.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, that is the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is like this draft law.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is the law. I think we ought to keep in mind very carefully the definition of a closed shop. I think I am correct in this statement that there is no closed shop in this country that exists except by voluntary agreement between the employer and the employees.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. No. The War Labor Board has ordered some closed shops.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not understand so. I may be wrong but I think the gentleman from Michigan is in error. I think the War Labor Board has taken the attitude that it would not force a closed shop.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As further evidence of showing what the House Military Affairs Committee actually decided and intended by the legislation, we wrote in it a provision known as the Martin amendment, which said that any man assigned to a plant would have a reasonable opportunity of making a choice of the plant in which he wanted to work.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. I was going to refer the gentleman to that provision in the bill. If a man who objects to belonging to a union should be referred to a closed ship, he would not have to accept employment there, but he could ask for referral to a shop where he would not be compelled to join a union.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under your statement then you will not get the manpower of these unemployed workers in any munitions plant where you have a closed shop.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, I do not agree with the gentleman because I think there are many people who would join a union. The gentleman is assuming that nobody would want to join a union. I am assuming that a reasonable number, perhaps the majority, would want to join a union.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But suppose you need the last 100 men, and they say "No," then your choice is to make them join the union.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, the gentleman is reducing it to an absurdity. We can get the last 100 men all right under the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you lived in Michigan you would know better than that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Suppose we reverse the situation and find a man who is a member of the union and his services are essential to the war effort, and he is assigned through the selective service to an open shop, and by accepting that, under the direction of the Government, he sacrifices his privileges in the union. If he should refuse, would he be fined or placed in jail?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not see that he would sacrifice his rights in the union.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The union will take his card from him.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Assuming that he would, although I think he could work in an open shop and maintain his membership in the union, but assuming that he would lose his union rights, he would have exactly the same option that the other man would have. That is, he could say, "I prefer to work in a union shop." Then he could be referred to one that has a closed shop or one with maintenance of membership.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Let us presume that that is his privilege and he continues to say "No, I do not want to work in this shop," and he moves from one shop to another shop. The time is lost and his efforts are lost.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He is not going to do that. He has a reasonable choice. The gentleman is talking now about details of administration.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assume that the local boards will perhaps on their forms have a question whereby it can be de-

termined whether the man insists upon a closed shop or an open shop; that is, upon a union shop or an open shop. That information will be on the card and I presume they will use that information in making their referral. However, it is a detail of administration.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Who will determine whether this man A or B is best qualified for the particular kind of work that is necessary in a particular plant for the war effort?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is shown on the card.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Who determines that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under the bill it would be the Selective Service. My own idea would be that they would call into consultation and receive advice and assistance from the United States Employment Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] will remain a moment because I should like information on this subject, particularly on one point which has not been discussed and which I think is perhaps the most important item in the whole discussion.

It is extremely important that there should be no further confusion on the subject about which we are talking. Certainly it is the desire of every Member of the House of Representatives who comes from a rural area that there should be no further confusion because the problem is not whether you can get farm boys to enlist or to serve but whether we can persuade enough farm boys to stay on the farms to take care of the crops. From the very beginning the record will show the good percentages of enlistment and of voluntary service as well as the drafting of the men from the farms.

It has been stated that 364,000 men are in this deferred class for agriculture between the ages of 18 and 25 and approximately 303,000 between the ages of 26 and 29. These are men who have been deferred under the terms of the Tydings amendment. The gentleman from Alabama, and the other Members, will please understand that we are only talking about men who come under the terms of the Tydings amendment. In the statement of Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator; in the statement of General Hershey, and in every other statement except one, recognition has been given to the Tydings amendment and that it is stated that the Tydings amendment is in effect.

The Tydings amendment stands, as the gentleman from Alabama will recall, on four legs, not on two. It must be, first, an essential form of agriculture; second, the worker must have continuous employment; third, the worker cannot be replaced; and fourth, the farm must not lie uncultivated. These 364,000 men were under the Tydings amendment until this January 3 directive came from the selective service. Now there has been brought into it, in addition to the statement from Mr. Krug and Mr. Jones, the statement from the President of the United States that there is an essential need for men in the armed service which is greater at the moment than the need for men in agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that rather than doing what was done, putting out a directive through General Hershey, bolstered by a statement of the President, the administration should have come to the Congress, given us the facts they had, and asked that consideration possibly be given to changing the Tydings amendment? In other words, come honestly through the front door and let the law stand or fall on its own merits.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That water is under the mill. I will agree with the gentleman completely, but that water is under the mill.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to put yourself in the place of a draft board which gets that sort of a directive. It is all very well for us to stand here and say that a draft board does not have to comply, or that the draft board should say, "This is the law and we will not follow that directive." Consider a draft board sitting in a rural area, compelled of necessity to send only farm boys or largely farm boys because that is all that are available, and finally receiving in the morning mail, or by telephone, or by wire, a directive saying that the President of the United States has now said it is no longer necessary to defer men for agriculture.

The unfortunate thing, may I say to the gentleman from Minnesota is not only the fact that it was sent out, but that since it has been sent out it has been extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get the Director of Selective Serivce to send a clarifying statement and to stand on that clarifying statement, to say that the Tydings amendment is still law.

All this furor, Mr. Speaker, is over only 300,000 men. All that the Director of Selective Service, who is a hired man, who has nothing to say, nothing to think of for himself, is told, is that he has to produce by a certain date, which is July of this year, 750,000 men. That is what he is told—900,000 actually, but he has 150,000 in his pocket now. So 750,000 is all that he has to worry about. There are 360,000 young men coming up in the January age group, so to speak. By previous experience we know that 180,000 of them will get into uniform. The others will be deferred for reasons of health, and for other reasons. He will get half of them. That is 180,000. On that same basis, between the 1st of February and the 1st of July, there will be another 240,000 coming up in the natural course of events. That means a total of 420,000 men.

So all of this talk, all of this furor, is only over the need for 330,000 men as a maximum.

The point I contend has not been discussed fully, is this matter of going back to the farms to take men. Here is a dairy in my district. The last milker is gone. Forty more milk cows have gone into the beefsteaks that we get in the restaurants. Here is a 400-acre farm in the Dakotas. That farm is closed. There is no argument about it. That is distinctly against the terms of the Tydings amendment.

Therefore, is it not right for us, Mr. Speaker, and the Congress of the United States, to say that that is not the only source for 300,000 men at the present time? There are 11,900,000 men and women who have been taken and kept in the armed services. There have been about 13,500,000 men drafted into the services. Enough of those have been released to leave a balance of 11,900,000; 7,225,482 are abroad at the present time. That leaves in uniform in the United States, perfectly physically capable men who want to serve, who either enlisted or were drafted to serve, 4,674,518 men.

Can we stand here today and say that out of 4,000,000 men physically capable, drafted, trained, ready to go, there are not 300,000 men who can be sent as replacements to the fighting armies in all the areas in which we are fighting? Many of you have sons in the service, many of you have friends in the camps, and you know exactly what I know, that there is available manpower in the camps today that is not used by the War Department and not used by the Navy Department more than all the number that we are talking about in these discussions over the need of drafting farm labor.

We also know—and it was admitted by General Hershey—that there are 2,000,000 civilian employees in the War Department today. There is available in the United States adequate manpower without even touching the factories which were under discussion yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I add to the gentleman's statistics the fact that the Department of Commerce has recently released a document which shows that approximately 4,000,000 people have left the farms of the United States since the commencement of the war. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has been one of the leaders in Congress in the effort to produce a sufficiency of food. He undoubtedly can confirm this statement as to the drifting away from the farms of much needed manpower.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Three and one-half million plus.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I further relate this occurrence which came to my attention yesterday: I was advised that a lady whose husband was killed in a defense plant last year had as her only assistant on the farm an 18-year-old son. That son now has been informed by the local draft board that

he must go into the service on the 15th of February. Two of the board members wanted the boy to stay on the farm, but the third, evidently one who dominates the board, argued that the word of the President superseded the Tydings amendment. That farm will be out of business, as this lady cannot do all of the farm work herself, and another sale will shortly add another farm to those closed out by a very short-sighted policy. Does not this boy have the right of appeal under the present law?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is a point I wanted to bring to your attention. When these men go to the draft boards and are put through this preinduction test and come back, they are told that the right of appeal is no longer theirs.

You say it is not possible. Of course, it is not possible. It is no more possible than the old story of the man who was in jail, and his lawyer said, "Why, they can't put you in jail for that." "But," he says, "here I am." That is exactly what the draft boards are doing today in many States. They are saying that the man does not have the right of appeal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I add with respect to the number of Government employees that out of the 3,400,000 civilian employees on the Government pay roll 400,000 are serving outside the United States.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We would not even have to pay transportation on them if the gentleman from Alabama will observe the figure.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman says the furor is over the 350,000. I think the furor is more over the violation of the Tydings amendment than over the number of men affected by it, the violation of the express law of the land and its being set aside by what appears to be a dictatorial power.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that all the men who have left the farm were drafted, or does he believe that some of them might have left the farm to get a reasonable wage?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not only "some of them." We have just as many people in agriculture who do things that hurt agriculture as you have in industry or anywhere else. A man goes down to the draft board and gets himself an IV-F status. He can go back on the farm and get the normal farm wage, which is all the farmer can afford to pay, just about four times what it was previous to the war, or he can walk over into one of the manufacturing plants and get up to $100 a week for about one-third of the work. Which do you think he is going to do? Had we put teenth in the draft law so the boards could say, "All right, you are deferred, stay on the farm; fine."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We are told that food will win the war and write the peace, and the farmers have been urged to produce in abundance. It seems to me one of the troubles we are up against is that those who made that statement and who are running the war do not recognize the production of food as an essential industry, just as essential, at least, as the manufacture of war materials.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not merely as an essential industry but one which they now classify, a subclassification of a classification, as "critically essential." I should like the gentleman, who knows a great deal more about this than I do and is an authority on it, to say just what he thinks of this business of nice productive agricultural seasons year after year, after year after year. Nature is working on the side of the Allies, and I hope she continues to do so, but how long does the gentleman think we are going to have these exceptional growing seasons?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We may not have them any more, but certainly on the dairy farms and the other farms we must have skilled manpower to produce the food. They passed a bill here yesterday to provide men for certain war industries, not agriculture but war industries, where the men will possibly be taken out of agriculture to be placed in these industries, causing a greater reduction in the production of food.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on William Penn, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer that it will entail an additional cost of $102.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 375. An act to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 6, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

166. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 616 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations, House Joint Resolution 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of the rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1962. A bill to incorporate the American Veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 1963. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey with a view to establishing a lock system for passage between Grand Traverse Bay on Lake Michigan, and Torch Lake, Antrim County, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH:

H. R. 1964. A bill to incorporate the American Veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 1965. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of run-away, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 1966. A bill to establish an American Mothers Memorial Commission to prepare plans and estimates of costs for the construction in the District of Columbia of a national memorial to the mothers of America; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1967. A bill providing for the promotion of certain substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1968. A bill to provide, in the case of certain Government employees dying after September 18, 1939, for payment for accumulated or accrued annual leave due at the time of death; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1969. A bill to extend certain benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act to employees with not less than 5 years' service who are voluntarily separated from the service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1970. A bill to amend title 11 of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of that act for military service by providing for adjustment of benefits received under such title in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1971. A bill relating to the amount which may be paid in connection with the settlement of accounts of deceased members of the armed forces without the appointment of a legal representative of the estate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1972. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1973. A bill to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to create a commission to prepare plans for the establishment of a school for the training of women for service as commissioned officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. R. 1974. A bill for the relief of Lindon A. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 1976. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1977. A bill for the relief of Edith M. Carney; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Jay H. McCleary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1980. A bill for the relief of Maj. Edward A. Zaj; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Cyriel Pequ, also known as Carl Smith; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1982. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr., Edward Gray, Jr., Bertha Mae Gray, Bertha Patmon, and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hamtramck, Wayne County, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Benjamin D. Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

47. Mr. WELCH presented California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7, relating to memorializing Congress to enact a seamen's bill of rights, which was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, in the darkness of our limited knowledge, we turn in our deep need to Thee whose dwelling place is light, without the shadow of our earth-born clouds. To all the phantoms of brutal hate which devastate our world worn and torn, we would close our eyes for this hallowed moment and still our souls in the calm assurance that at the heart of the universe goodness reigns. In that faith send us forth without fear or favor to do the right as Thou dost give us to see the right, firm in our conviction that these clouds are lies and that the blue sky is the truth.

In these fateful days for whose decisions the future will judge us, by Thine enabling might may we maintain our integrity unsullied by animosities, prejudices, or personal ambitions, regarding always public office as a sacred trust. As our frail hands have a part in the shaping of the world that is to be, give to us the vision, the wisdom, the courage that will make for both justice and lasting peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 1, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1752. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1808. An act to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 621) to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

RECONQUEST OF THE PHILIPPINES AND PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 10 minutes on the subject of the Philippine Islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? No objection is heard, and the Senator from Maryland will proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when the news came yesterday of the fall of Manila as the result of the brilliant campaign waged by General MacArthur and Admiral Halsey, nearly all the world sensed an emotion of great joy. These two men will go down in history as two of the greatest leaders on land and on sea and in the sky that military annals will ever record.

The Battle of the Philippines Sea, which brought about much of the destruction of the Japanese Fleet as the result of the skill, strategy, and tactics of Admiral Halsey and those under him, and the Battle of Leyte, where General MacArthur, by slowly advancing—when he could have gone more rapidly—decimated the bulk of the Japanese forces in the Philippines and made the conquest of Manila easy, will always live in the history of the world as two unusual and unmatched achievements.

It is not, however, to the military side of this matter that I wish to address myself today, but rather to the history of our relations with the Philippines ever since 1898.

About 11 years ago in this body, under the leadership of former Senator Hawes and the late Senator Bronson Cutting, a move was made to grant complete independence to the Philippines, and although that attempt did not meet with complete success, nevertheless, it laid the foundation for the legislation which followed soon after, which passed both branches of Congress, and which was signed by the President—the Filipino Independence Act. That act gave to the Filipinos a concrete promise of complete and absolute independence by July 4, 1946. It was accepted by the Filipino authorities; a new government was organized, and the Philippines and the Filipino people started on the road toward sure independence.

I think it was one of the most idealistic acts of any government in all the history of mankind. I think it was a just act, because our people do not want to hold sovereignty over any nation by conquest, and particularly when the people who are subject to that conquest do not wish to be so held.

There was great opposition to the Filipino Independence Act when it came up in this body. Many persons predicted that the Filipinos themselves would divide, that there would be civil war in the Philippines, that they could not

maintain a stable government, that the economic situation would be chaotic, and fear was injected into the argument to the extent that many persons who were inclined to support the proposition of Filipino independence voted against it.

Now, today, as we cast our vision over Europe and see other countries threatened with the loss of their territory, their liberty, and their nationality, we find many who did not favor independence for the Philippines speaking out loudly against the wrong of these threatened acts; we hear much in Congress and out of it to the effect that justice and fairness are not present in the dealings between the threatened countries and their purported aggressors. Yet when we had the same proposition here before this body only 11 years ago there were men here who did not see fit to give to the Philippines their independence, even though every President of the United States from William McKinley down to that date promised it formally to the people of the islands.

When we approached the question of Filipino independence we had before us more than the mere carrying out of an idealistic concept of international relations. We were confronted with the question whether or not we should keep the word of our own Government, whether or not the promises we had made should be fulfilled to the letter.

As the capital of Manila again comes under the American flag for a short period and the realization of Philippine independence is complete, we can all look back and say that in our dealings with a smaller and a weaker country we have not only kept our word but fulfilled the highest attribute of idealism and fairness and justice between nations of which human beings are capable.

It would be a fine thing if the pattern which we so realistically drew and adhered to in the case of the Philippines could be followed by the other nations of the earth with equal spirit as difficult international controversies arise in the future, for I believe that the spirit which motivated the Filipino Independence Act and all the transactions which have taken place from its enactment to this hour is the only spirit which will insure justice to the small nations of the world and lay the foundation for an abiding and lasting peace among peoples and nations.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a comment upon the point he has just been making?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. It was just within the past few weeks that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] and I were in northern Africa. We constantly heard comment as to the attitude of the United States, and the outstanding reason why the people in north Africa express confidence in the United States is not because of anything the United States is now saying but because of what the United States has been doing with regard to the Philippines. The people regard that conduct as a guarantee of the good faith of the United States, and they now rely upon it as a guide to our future policy.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. Cynics may scoff, reactionaries may frown, aggressors may be heedless of the example which our attitude toward the Philippines holds up to the entire world, but the United States can righteously be proud of this great adventure in international relationship, for out of it has come the finest comity between peoples, out of it has come the greatest achievement of realistic idealism that I know of on the face of the earth.

We ask nothing from the Filipinos except the opportunity to help them to be a free people, and they ask nothing of us except to have what has always been their right, the right to elect those who shall govern them, and to have their own institutions in accordance with their own wishes.

Would that Almighty Providence might endow other parliaments and legislatures with equal vision and equal impulses directed to such worthy ends, for if such were the case, in my humble judgment there would be laid a more lasting foundation for peace—because it would be built on absolute justice—than all the armies and navies and air forces in christendom could ever erect or maintain.

As we celebrate today the liberation of Manila, the capital of the Philippine Islands, I think those of us in the Congress who supported the ideal of Filipino independence can take a reasonable measure of humble pride in the great accomplishment which has borne fruit as a result of the Independence Act.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a moment I shall yield.

I should like to add that, owing to the unstinted and complete cooperation of the Filipino people with the American Army, Navy, and Nation in the trying hours through which we have passed, thousands of American boys are today alive, and will live, who would have had to expend more precious blood to achieve even a modicum of the success which so far has crowned our naval and military efforts.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not want this opportunity to pass without saying to the Senator from Maryland how much people generally approve his magnificent understanding of the Philippine problem, and his intelligent cooperation in the things which have come to pass between the American people and the Filipino people. The memory of the 90,000 Filipinos, under the leadership of Manuel Quezon, who fought side by side with General MacArthur's troops in the early days of the campaign, has fixed in all of us a determination to be mutually helpful as long as time shall last. I want the Senator from Maryland to know how heartily I approve and appreciate the intelligent help he has given, and the contributions he has made to the good feeling and good understanding between the American people and the Filipino people.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. One regret I have today is that one of the two great Filipino leaders who helped to work out this program is not alive to see the consummation of their dream. President Manuel Quezon was long a leader in the fight for Filipino independence, and unfortunately he was taken to the bosom of eternity not long ago, and did not have the chance to feast his mortal eyes on an independent Filipino government.

The other great leader in the struggle, the present President Osmeña of the Philippine Islands, fortunately is in Manila, where I believe soon the reins of government will be completely given over to him and his people, and thenceforth those pepole will be as free and as independent as are the people of the United States of America, owing allegiance only to their own country and their own flag. But I like to think—in fact, I know—they will always have an affection for the United States, its Government, and its people, which will be finer in its distillation than any mere allegiance of lip service which so many give to their own and to other governments.

So today, Mr. President, as the Philippines once more are under the American flag, for the most part, and Manila, the symbol of the Philippines, is in American hands, I think our country and our people can be justly proud that amidst all the contention, and bitterness, and jealousy, and narrow nationalism, and aggression, and greed, and suffering, and waste of wealth, we have given to the world, not an imaginary ideal, but something of justice that is built of reality. We have given to a great people the freedom for which we claim we all fight, and I am hopeful that that lesson will not be lost as the grim future of history's pages is written, when other nations, too, will be put to the test before the conscience and the tribunal of all mankind.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am interested in what the Senator has said about the pride we take in what this Nation has contributed to the freedom of the Philippines. So I go back in history to 1898, to events which the Senator will remember? When in the course of human events did any nation ever defeat a nation and act as we did after we defeated Spain. Instead of taking indemnity and the spoils of war, we drew a check on the Treasury of the United States and bought, for millions of dollars, the Philippine Archipelago. And having bought it in that way, we acted as a big brother to the Filipino people. We put them on their feet, restored them industrially, and aided them in many other ways, and now give them their freedom after having had temporary sovereignty over them. This is a great day for the Filipino people and the American Nation. We of our day have made a real contribution to the American tradition and have refuted any charge that our Nation has imperialistic designs.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has expressed my sentiments very well, and I am glad he brought out these facts of history. I am glad to say that at no time in all our supposed sovereignty, and real sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, have a majority of the American people,

or even the Members of Congress, wished to keep them longer than it would take us to discharge our obligations, and give to the Filipinos what was their due.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I might comment on the fact that we went into the Philippines with the very purpose of ultimately bringing about the independence which has been achieved. I myself was in the Philippines when I was a small boy, from 1900 to 1904. I lived for 2 years in the Malacanan Palace, which yesterday was taken over by American soldiers. I went with the commission which traveled throughout the Philippine Islands and set up some 25 different provincial governments, and which at that time gave to those people self-administration and local self-government. I remember for a number of years traveling up and down the very section over which MacArthur's forces have moved north to Dagupan and toward Baguio.

Certainly the spirit with which we went into those islands was very different from the spirit in which many nations today are moving into lands and attempting to set up governments. The American policy has been successful because it has been inspired from the very beginning by the theory of, the belief in, and the strong feeling for, democratic government looking toward education in self-government and the establishment of a complete self-governing commonwealth among a people who are after all better off in being independent than they would be as part of a nation many thousand miles away.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Ohio, and I want to say that his father was one of the great leaders in this whole movement and helped to lay the foundation for what has now been accomplished.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to join in everything that has been so eloquently said by the Senator from Maryland and by other Senators regarding the Filipinos, and I desire further to call the attention of the Senate at this time to the marvelous work, both in amount and in character, which was done by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who was the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs in 1934 when the bill of which he speaks was passed. It was no easy task; it was a gigantic task which the Senator from Maryland then undertook. He had opposition in his committee, especially at first, but he overcame the opposition. I happened to be a member of the committee at the time and recall what took place.

The Senator had opposition in the Senate itself, though it was not serious. He made out a splendid case, such a splendid case that I have sent for the RECORD of March 22, 1934, so that I might tell the Senate the result of the vote which was taken on that day, when the question to be determined was what we should do with the Philippines—whether we should fulfill the sacred promises which we had made, some of them having been made by the father of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, President Taft, and by a great many others who believed that the Philippines should be given their independence. The vote was 68 to 8 in the Senate in favor of granting Philippine independence. I think the bill was passed in the House by as large a majority as the Senate vote. By that vote Congress showed to the world that the American people have a different idea of dealing with nations after a war is concluded than some other countries have. We did not take over the Philippines, as we might have done, though we paid for the islands.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland deserves the thanks of this country and all the countries of the world for pursuing the idealistic course which he did, and I believe future developments will show that the Senator brought about great progress in the world's history by taking that course.

Mr. President, when I was in Tennessee last fall and learned that Douglas MacArthur had set foot on Leyte Island and was going to take back the Philippines, I sent him a telegram of congratulations. Incidentally the telegraph office did not want to take the message at first, because it was a telegram of congratulations. I think General MacArthur, perhaps more than anyone else in the Army, or anyone in other position, is entitled to the greatest credit for having retaken the Philippine Islands under the circumstances which surrounded his effort. I wish to take off my hat in praise to this great general of the armies who has managed that campaign so splendidly and so in accordance with the wishes and desires of the American people toward the people of the Philippines.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for all the complimentary things he has been good enough to say but, so far as his remarks apply to me, I will say that my part was a small one, and would not have been of any consequence at all except for the help of himself and many other Members of this body who felt that idealism could be practiced and in the end pay larger dividends than a selfish or a narrow policy.

LETTER FROM ACTING SECRETARY OF WAR IN APPRECIATION OF WORK OF OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, Members of the Senate will remember that on the 24th of January General Marshall and Admiral King gave to the Congress an off-the-record account of the military and naval situation at a meeting which was largely attended. The Vice President has received a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, regarding that occasion, which I ask to have read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 31, 1945.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I wish to take this opportunity to express for myself personally, and on behalf of General Marshall, our deep appreciation for the splendid work done by Mr. Wall Doxey, Mr. Leslie L. Biffle, Mr. Carl A. Loeffler, and the late Colonel Edwin A. Halsey, in connection with the recent appearance before the Congress of General Marshall and Admiral King on January 24.

I am well aware that arrangements of this nature are not easily made and the able assistance of the gentlemen I have mentioned went far toward making it a pleasant and successful meeting.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Acting Secretary of War.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM RESOURCES IN RELATION TO THE NATIONAL WELFARE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] as a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the Matter of Petroleum Resources in Relation to the National Welfare, authorized by Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, as continued by Senate Resolution 36, Seventy-ninth Congress, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Maloney.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FINAL ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS

A letter from the Secretary of State dated January 29, 1945, transmitting, pursuant to law, an amended certificate of final ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President chosen in Arizona in the election of November 7, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the Department of Justice for the quarter ending March 31, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

MATTER MAILED FREE OF POSTAGE UNDER PENALTY PRIVILEGE

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the estimated number of pieces of mail mailed free of postage under the penalty mail privilege during the quarter ended September 30, 1944, together with a tabulation showing the estimated number of pieces mailed, and the estimated cost to the Post Office Department of the handling of these mailings (by departments and agencies) for the quarter ended September 30, 1944, etc. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

RESERVATION FROM APPROPRIATION OF LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS—POWER AND RESERVOIR SITES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting pursuant to law, relative to reserves from all appropriation lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects for the calendar year 1944; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PATENTING OF LANDS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND MUNICIPALITIES FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the patenting to States, counties, and municipalities of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity,

for the calendar year 1944; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing withdrawals and restorations of public lands made during the year 1944 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

LEGISLATION ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

THE BALDWIN BROTHERS PAVING CO. *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of The Baldwin Brothers Paving Co. against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Director of Contract Settlement, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second quarterly progress report of the Office of Contract Settlement, entitled "War Contract Terminations and Settlements" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report (No. 9) of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, Public Law 98, Seventy-seventh Congress (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the United States Office of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the United States Public Health Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, tables of bankruptcy statistics with reference to bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated in the United States district courts during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the secretary of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMPARATIVE GENERAL BALANCE SHEET OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet for the company for the year 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of the company for the year 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., submitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the company for the calendar year 1944, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the year ended December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders for the year ended December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate monthly reports from the chairmen of certain Senate committees, made in response to Senate Resolution 319 (agreed to August 23, 1944), relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
February 1, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.
CHARLES A. MURRAY,
Executive Secretary.

WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE — FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Kurt Borchardt	6007 34th Pl. NW., Washington, D. C.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	$5,600
Ann Cheatham	4000 South Capitol St. SE., Washington, D. C.	do	2,000
Bertram M. Gross	613 South Quincy St., Arlington, Va.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Doris Phippen	40 Plattsburg Court NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,300

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (AA), U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	1,512

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	5305 41st St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$2,400
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,400
Yeoman (2d cl.) Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2134 R. St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	1,152
Yeoman (2d cl.) Loretto F. Jochman, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	1,152

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, 3d and Independence Ave. SW.	$3,200
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mt. Rainier, Md.	Navy Department, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,800
Rose Gerber	2513 14th St. NE., Washington, D. C.	do	2,000
Harald Lund	476 N St. SW., Washington, D. C.	do	6,200
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW.	5,600
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Veterans Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.	2,000
Ruth Morgenstein	3022 Rodman St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,600
Dolores Raschella	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW.	2,000
Renee Roth	1614 North Queen St., Arlington, Va.	Veterans Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.	2,900
Lt. Leslie Falk, Army of the United States, Medical Corps.	2804 Terrace Rd. SE., Washington, D. C.	Pentagon Building, U. S. Army	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.	U. S. Navy, 18th and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,000

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Joe L. Martinez (investigator)	208 Massachusetts Ave. NE.	U. S. Maritime Commission, Commerce Bldg., 14th St., between E St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	$3,800
Franklin N. Parks (investigator)	No. 106, 4021 Benton St. NW.	Office of Price Administration, 2d and D Sts. SW.	3,800
Brig. Gen. Frank E. Lowe	1316 New Hampshire Ave.	Finance office, Pentagon Bldg.	6,000
Col. Harry Vaughan	1609 Oakcrest Drive, Alexandria, Va.	do	4,000

JAS. M. MEAD, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis J. Meyerle	612 Bennington Drive, Silver Spring, Md.	Veterans Administration	$5,000

JAMES M. TUNNELL, *Chairman.*

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

FEBRUARY ?, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Virginia W. Boyce	3810 W St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.	$1,800
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,000
Hope C. Heslep	2 East Maple St., Alexandria, Va.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Joan P. Karasik	1919 19th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,800
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Fritzie P. Manuel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Manpower Commission Washington, D. C.	3,800
Darel McConkey	Rural Free Delivery, Box 1953, Alexandria, Va.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Herbert Schimmel	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	8,000
Marjorie J. Tillis	211 Delaware Ave. SW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,200

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum):

CARL A. HATCH, *Chairman.*
By W. H. MCMAINS, *Clerk.*

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

To: Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

From: Senator Pat MCCARRAN, chairman, Subcommittee to Investigate Administration and Use of Public Lands.

Those detailed from the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to assist with the work of the above subcommittee are:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF–12; basic salary, $5,000 per year.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF–5; basic salary, $2,000 per year.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY
PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN
SMALL BUSINESS,
January 1, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 I am tranmitting herewith a list of employees of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.
By DEWEY ANDERSON,
Executive Secretary.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

FEBRUARY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Brainard Cheney	3418 Highwood Drive SE., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	$6,500
Agnes E. Crivella	1408 Buchanan St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,700
Emerald G. Devitt	2425 27th St. South, Arlington, Va.	do	2,000
Elsie A. Digges	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C.	do	1,800
Harry J. Evans	3010 Gainsville St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	6,500
F. Preston Forbes	510 Four Mile Rd., Alexandria, Va.	Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Carol M. Fuller	2101 S St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,100
Scott K. Gray, Jr.	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Stella J. Groeper	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Kathleen Kimball	1701 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,000
Elizabeth P. Lucas	1730 North Quincy St., Arlington, Va.	do	1,800
John W. Nelson	1445 Ogden St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	5,600
Vernice M. O'Mullane	Alcott Hall, Washington, D. C.	do	1,620
Grace F. Purdy	230 Rhode Island Ave. NE., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,300
Martha G. Ray	1457 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,100
Arthur G. Silverman	719 D St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) George H. Soule	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Lillian Evelyn Spicer	1433 Decatur St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Frederick W. Steckman	4000 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C.	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.	5,000
Margie L. Strubel	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	1,800
Allen G. Thurman	201 East Shepherd St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Alfred J. Van Tassel	1622 Mount Eagle Pl., Alexandria, Va.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Olga Yelencsics	2400 13th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,100

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted at a general meeting of Branch 239, Workmen's Benefit Fund, Oakland, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to reduce the present age limit of 65 years to 60 years for eligibility to receive old-age pension; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of American Veterans of World War No. 2, Orlando, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation to incorporate the American Veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by a meeting of the Democratic caucus of the Wisconsin Legislature, favoring the confirmation of the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from Thomas P. Shirley, of New York City, remonstrating against confirmation of the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for continuation of the Children's Museum; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation granting relief from double income taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to cooperation among nations to curtail the production and traffic of opium

"Whereas the tragic evil of opium addiction is age-old, and the control of opium production has been attempted through various means for many years, presently by the Permanent Central Opium Board of the League of Nations, through which 66 countries and 99 colonies cooperate to control the international drug traffic, most of which countries still report to the board in spite of the war; and

"Whereas success in controlling the growth and production of opium necessarily depends upon the cooperation of the opium-growing countries; and

"Whereas the United States is in a position to exert pressure on some of the opium-producing countries because they are dependent on its lend-lease money and materials, and its men, in developing their railways, highways, and factories; and

"Whereas since our entry into the war, American fighting men are now in countries where opium is produced and freely available, and American merchant seamen daily touch port in opium-producing countries; and

"Whereas the peril to addiction is great among those of our men suffering from loneliness, discouragement, and the fatigue of war, and its use would destroy the fighting efficiency of these men, thereby constituting a real threat to our war effort; and

"Whereas an easy opportunity is now afforded for the smuggling of opium into the United States, thereby endangering our war efforts on the home front; and

"Whereas its use by criminals, who do not hesitate to kill under its influence, adds to the problems of law enforcement and to the peril of faithful law-enforcement officers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President to approach the governments of those opium-producing countries throughout the world upon which the United States can exert influence, urging upon them in the interest of protecting American citizens, and in the interest of world welfare, that they take immediate steps to limit opium growth and the production of opium and its derivatives to the amount actually required for strictly medicinal and scientific purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the office of the President of the United States and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to the commemoration of the centennial of the raising of the bear flag of the California Republic at Sonoma on June 14, 1846

"Whereas on June 14, 1946, California will celebrate the centennial of the 'raising of the bear flag of the California Republic' at Sonoma by a group of Californians whose declaration and prophecy was the freedom of California from Mexican rule and her sub-

sequent addition as a State in the Union; and

"Whereas it is the custom of the Federal Government to issue commemorative stamps signalizing and emphasizing the importance of historical events and the recognition thereof by the issuance by the United States Post Office Department of such commemorative stamps; and

"Whereas a group of patriotic citizens, headed by the Sonoma Parlor of Native Daughters of the Golden West and Sonoma Parlor Native Sons of the Golden West, with the cooperation of the leaders of both these organizations and in accord with the sentiments of many other civic and patriotic societies, have instituted a movement to secure the issuance of a commemorative bear-flag stamp as an outstanding feature of the centennial commemoration, making Sonoma the initial place of cancelation of said stamp: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That we join with the people and organizations mentioned herein and respectfully ask the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Postmaster General, and the Post Office Department that a commemorative stamp be issued in accordance with the commemorative centennial, to be known as the California bear-flag stamp, and in further token of the fact that many years ago the State of California adopted the bear flag as the official State flag of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, Members of the California delegation in Congress, and the Postmaster General."

FASCISM IN SPAIN — RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY MEETING AT MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, NEW YORK

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Dr. Karl Menninger, of Topeka, Kans., a letter signed by him and others, together with resolutions adopted at a meeting of 16,000 people at Madison Square Garden, New York, concerning fascism in Spain. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and resolutions printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENNINGER CLINIC,
Topeka, Kans., January 17, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The following friends and associates of mine join with me in endorsing the enclosed resolutions formulated at a meeting of 16,000 people at Madison Square Garden on January 2, the resolutions, circulated by the Nation Associates, concerning the attitude toward Fascist Spain.

Sincerely yours,

Karl Menninger, M. D.; Robert W. Worthington, M. D.; C. P. N. Elliott, M. D.; J. M. Stone; Robert P. Knight, M. D.; Mildred Law; M. L. Howard; E. M. Leitch, M. D.; Lucille Cairns; M. Fabian, M. D.; Helvi Boottis; W. L. Pious, M. D.; Hugh Dimont, M. D.; R. I. Meptik, M. D.; David Repeport, Ph. D.; Roy Schafer; Margaret Brenman, Ph. D.; Jerome W. Schneck, M. D.; Jerome A. Shiell, M. D.; Ruth A. Barnard, M. D.

At the moment when millions of American soldiers on the western front are personally experiencing what fascism means, when they are not only facing the powerful and ruthless Nazi war machine, but also witnessing the killing of American war prisoners in violation of all rules of civilized mankind, we, American citizens assembled at Madison Square Garden, have unanimously resolved to address to the President and to the people of the United States a supreme appeal for immediate action against one of the strongest supporters of fascism and one of the most vicious enemies of the American way of life and of American interests in the world today—Francisco Franco.

The story of Franco's support to the Fascist cause and of his past crimes against the United Nations is well known. We believe deeply that our continued cooperation with Franco foments distrust among the United Nations and that no diplomatic gesture would more greatly strengthen the relations between the United Nations—in particular between England and America on the one hand and Soviet Russia on the other—than an immediate break in diplomatic relations with Franco. Instead of having a vast spy system at the rear of our armies supplying the enemy with information and costing the lives of American soldiers and their Allies, the reestablishment of the Spanish Republic would convert that country into a land as secure and friendly, as hard-working, and hard fighting as America itself.

Therefore, we ask all Americans who believe in the democratic way of life to take a stand, at once, against one of the great criminals in the history of humanity. We ask them to write to the President, the Secretary of State, to their Senators and Congressmen, and to organize meetings and conferences for the purpose of implementing the following nonpartisan, democratic measures in regard to Spain:

1. The immediate severance by the Government of the United States of diplomatic relations with Franco. This will certainly lead to similar action by the governments of all other United Nations.

2. The complete stoppage of shipments of any kind to Franco. Whatever we send is helping the enemy.

3. The guaranty to the people of Spain themselves of complete freedom to establish their own democratic regime. The refusal to countenance the imposition of a royalist or similar puppet regime and support for the reestablishment of legal democratic institutions in Spain.

4. Financial and moral support to Republican Spanish forces both inside and outside Spain and admission of Republican Spain to the United Nations.

5. Freedom of movement and of communications for the democratic Spanish leaders in the various parts of the world.

In order to give this policy the maximum popular support in all the United Nations, we have unanimously resolved to create the Friends of the Spanish Republic and we invite all those who are fighting for the United Nations' ideals to join this committee whose only purpose is to bring about the aims outlined in these resolutions.

PROTEST AGAINST INCREASED GRAZING FEES ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN—RESOLUTION OF NEVADA ASSEMBLY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there has come from the legislature and the Governor of my State a resolution protesting against the threat by the Interior Department, and particularly the Grazing Service, to increase the fees for grazing on the open public domain. I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Nevada now is confronted with the question of whether the forage and stock-water values of her public range lands shall be taken, through increased grazing fees, for direct enrichment of the Federal Treasury or whether these natural resource values shall remain on hand to support her stock-raising land settlement (an economic operation of which is otherwise impossible) and the business, social, and tax structures of her local communities which are largely dependent upon the stock-raising industry; and

Whereas the Senate Committee on Public Lands of the Congress of the United States, through a subcommittee is now investigating the issues involved in a settlement of this problem, with hearings scheduled for various points where all interestes concerned may appear and testify: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada (the Senate concurring), That a committee be appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly of the State of Nevada and the President of the Senate of the State of Nevada consisting of one senator and one assemblyman to represent this legislative body at the hearing to be held on this subject at Ely, Nev., February 1-3, 1945, the necessary travel and subsistence expenses of said committee to be reimbursed from the general fund of the State of Nevada; be it further

Resolved, That the said committee shall present to the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee at the said hearing the stand of this legislative body as definitely opposed to the increased grazing fee policy being proposed by the Grazing Service, and insisting that the same is directly contrary to the intent of Congress in its enactment of the Taylor Act, to the effect that the said forage and water resource values should not be taken away from the local economies concerned for purposes of direct revenue to the Federal Treasury; be it further

Resolved, That our Governor, as chairman of our State range commission, hereby is urged to appear in behalf of Nevada interests as a whole at said subcommittee hearing in opposition to said increased grazing fee policy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent all Members of the Nevada congressional delegation, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands, and the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior.

DRAFTING OF DEFERRED FARM LABOR

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there have arisen throughout the country strong protests against removing farm hands from the farm, and especially boys or young men who have been engaged legitimately in agriculture. I have received a great many communications from my own State, which in reality is not an outstanding agricultural State. If Senators who represent important agricultural States have received proportionately half as many complaints as I have received, then they must indeed be overwhelmed with correspondence complaining of the removal of boys who are legitimately and honestly engaged in agriculture. To my mind it is one of the serious things that confronts this country today. It has been said that war is hell, but famine and war together will product a double hell. That is exactly what seems to me to be ahead of us if we remove all labor from the farms.

With that thought in mind, I addressed a letter on the 3d of February to Marvin

Jones, Administrator, War Food Administration, to a copy of which I have attached a number of communications from my own State which I thought were to the point. I ask that the copy of my letter together with the attached letters be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1945.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
Administrator, War Food Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JONES: Within the past few days I have received communications from three different sources in Nevada concerning alleged overestimation by the War Food Administration of the production of farm commodities in that State.

I am so impressed by the sincerity of these letters and the seriousness of the situation which they portray that I am sending copies of these communications to you with this letter.

If the situation in Nevada, as these letters reveal it, in any way approximates the situation nationally, it is my judgment this country is making a great mistake in taking agricultural workers off the land to meet draft quotas.

It is my firm belief that we must regard food as being as essential as ammunition. I have always felt that boys who are conscientiously doing farm work and have been deferred for that purpose should be kept on the farms. The older people and the youngsters among our farm population have been pitching in to do their share of farm work; but we cannot and must not rely entirely on adolescent youth, and the aged and infirm, for the food with which we are to win the victory and write the peace.

I respectfully request that you give the enclosed letters, and the situation which they indicate, your most careful consideration. I shall be most interested to know your conclusions after you have studied the matter.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

MINDEN, NEV., *January 21, 1945.*

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator from Nevada, Washington, D. C.:

Selective service order taking deferred farm labor spells disaster for already reduced production schedules for this area letter giving details and analysis of alarming discrepancy between W. F. A. estimates of 1945 production in Nevada and actual facts follows.

Wilbur Stodieck, manager, Minden Butter Manufacturing Co.; W. F. Dressler, State senator and president, Farmers Bank of Carson Valley; F. C. Reed, manager, Minden Milling Co.; S. F. Heise, vice chairman, East Fork Water Users Association; F. H. Settlemeyer, chairman, West Fork Water Users Association; Clarence Henningsen, president, Alpine Land & Reservoir Co.; D. W. Park, president, Pinenut Stock Growers Association; J. B. Dangberg, president, Nevada Range Sheep Owners Association; George C. Hussman, legislation and sheep and dairy operator.

MINDEN BUTTER CO., INC.,
Minden, Nev., January 22, 1945.

Hon. P. A. MCCARRAN,
Senator from Nevada, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A quick survey of the operations of our company in the last 2 years, in view of the recent threat to draft farm labor, brings to light the following facts: This plant, in September 1942, manufactured 42,617 pounds of butter. In September 1944, the total make of butter was 22,900 pounds. Compared with October 1942, we made 40,087 pounds of butter, and 20,028 pounds in October 1944. Nineteen hundred and forty-two was already a war year, yet our reduction in butter make was almost 50 percent. We admit that we have made some diversions from butterfat to whole milk to satisfy the call of the Reno Army Air Base, but we had less milk for civilian use during this time. There have also been some diversions from our cream supply through the use of whole milk in adjacent communities, but not nearly enough to account for the big reduction in the manufacture of butter here, and in those communities.

The main reason for our loss of production is the lack of competent labor on the farm. That is, men who will stay on the job, and our farmers are selling milk cows because they can't get labor. The further drafting of essential farm labor (young married farmers with children, who are farm owners and operators) will result in further reduction in production.

The Dairy Products Marketing Association, a Government war agency, admits that butter is now the scarcest food in the United States. Yet, we see further threats in the draft law of removing labor which is used to produce the supply of butter. Dairy and egg product processing plants are now No. 6 on the essential list, but that can't do us any good if we have nothing to process. We don't want to appear unpatriotic, but not to prevent further loss in farm food production on the scale it is going on here, could lose the war as easily as the lack of ammunition.

Enough on that subject. We also have a labor problem in our own plant. Local draft boards still tell us that we should train replacements for all men of draft age in our plant. At the beginning of the year, we had 15 regular employees. At the end of the year, 11 of these were still on the job. During the year, to replace the ones who left, and to carry on our activities, we had a total of 52 different employees, or a turn-over of 346 percent, which results from two things—the hiring of inexperienced labor which is not capable of doing the work, and the continued search for easy jobs at high wages, among those who are not of draft age and evidently feel no other responsibility.

I believe, in view of the facts shown, it is high time that we have a labor draft, and that we immediately stop drafting essential farm labor, as our story is repeated in other industries concerned with handling farm products. Western Nevada's butter industry is now in a very serious condition.

We know that you are busy, but we are also sure that you will appreciate the need for such a letter as this.

Very truly yours,

WILBUR H. STODIECK,
Manager.

MINDEN MILLING CO., INC.,
Minden, Nev., January 22, 1944.

Senator P. A. MCCARRAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: This is the only time that we have ever thought it necessary to write you regarding our local problems, but in this case deem it imperative that you be informed of our reactions to the action of selective service of drafting more men from our farms at this time. It appears to us that any further reduction in farm labor will very seriously affect the production of food in this State.

In estimating the production of food for this year we find a vast difference between the W. F. A. and our local agencies, especially so in our dairy industry. The W. F. A. has it 33 percent higher than we can possibly figure and we believe that the farmers report is more nearly correct, as their figures are compiled through the county farm bureau and our butter manufacturers. Still believing that the cow is the most efficient unit of food production and realizing that this type of farm labor is the hardest to obtain, we feel sure that more farm workers inducted will further reduce the flow of these very essential food products. As you know, the farmers in the dairy business are mostly small operators and have depended on members of their immediate families for the help needed, and as these members are withdrawn their production, of course, goes down. This has happened already in many cases.

The Minden Milling Co. mixes feeds for all kinds of livestock, and the following figures will give you some idea as to what is happening to this industry. These will be given in percentages and are, we believe, substantially correct. Beef cattle fed in 1944 are 50 percent of cattle fed in 1942. Hogs 1945 appear to be 40 percent lower than 1944. Egg production will be about the same and our sheep will, I believe, show some reduction when the thing is figured.

Our business territory is Carson, Smith, and Mason Valleys, and we hear the same story everywhere. If these conditions are general throughout the good old United States of America, we have a job to do and it will not be easy. Everything, we believe, should be done to protect the food producers of our country.

In closing we would like to say that all statements made in this letter are not guesses but are the result of a very close study of the real conditions in our State.

Thank you and, with personal regards, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

FRANK M. REED, *Manager.*

MINDEN, NEV., *January 25, 1945.*

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senator from Nevada, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: This is written in support of the telegram sent you on January 21, a copy of which is enclosed herewith.

The W. F. A.'s announced food production goals for Nevada for 1945 are based on figures for 1944 which are alarmingly above actual available food supplies and existing livestock numbers. If these errors made in Nevada are repeated in the 48 States, the Nation's food supply situation is serious now; if it deteriorates further through over-all planning based on a statistical oversupply leading to W. M. C. and selective-service directives to draft deferred farm workers between the ages of 18 and 30, it can become disastrous.

The findings of the W. F. A. committee of five which came to the State in December to make its survey preparatory to making food plans for 1945 corrected the figures of the local men, county representatives, to arrive at results for planning which are in error as follows:

Dairying: Actual numbers of cows on hand, 72 percent of statistical.

Hogs: Actual production in 1944, 60 percent of statistical.

Feed: Actual production in 1944 same as 1943 but no Government wheat available for 1945, making actual feed in relation to 1944 but 77 percent of statistical.

Cattle: Actual numbers for 1944, 85 to 95 percent of statistical.

Sheep: In fair agreement with actual numbers owing, in part, to importation of herders.

Thus W. F. A.'s base for planning for 1945 food production is 28 percent overestimated for dairying; 40 percent overestimated for hog production; 23 percent overestimated for livestock feeds, and 5 to 15 percent overestimated for cattle.

In the face of these figures and errors it is even more amazing to find that the W. F. A. recommends that hog production be decreased 25 percent and cattle production 3 percent. Production of feed and dairying are to be held at 100 percent, or at the imaginary 1944 level. W. F. A. comments:

"We undoubtedly can expect to have surpluses in some things as part of the price of plenty. We cannot gamble with vital food supplies; so the 1945 goals have been set on the risk side of too much."

When a manpower shortage overtakes us the W. F. A., having taken risks on the safe side, consents to the use of the deferred farm laborers.

It has been said that the figures used by the W. F. A. are supplied for the most part by the B. A. E. To the credit of the latter agency, it has always called attention to the fact that its figures are estimates. However, so mesmeric is the effect of compilations of figures that this danger sign goes unheeded. Now the B. A. E. is discovering verification of its estimated increases in the reflection of its own image and "statistical" cattle roam the western ranges in mirrored millions.

In order that you may have a picture of the situation where all figures are based on actual records, we will, at the risk of directing attention to an almost microscopic unit in the national picture, give you a tabular analysis of production in Douglas County and the immediately tributary areas from 1941 to date:

	1941	1942	1943	1944	Percentage decrease in 4 years
Dairying:	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	
Butterfat	514,865	467,703	336,647	256,486	50
Milk products	41,199	62,864	99,713	118,917	33
Total	566,064	530,567	435,713	375,403	

NOTE.—The figures given represent the condition in five counties, namely, Alpine and Mono, Calif., and Douglas, Ormsby, and Lyon, Nev. Ten dairies have been sold when the last or only son went into the service and 20 have reduced their output owing to sons having gone into the service or having been drafted. The present directive of Selective Service sends 9 men for preinduction medical examination and, if these men are finally taken—they are last and only sons—it will mean that 9 dairies will be closed and 50,000 fewer pounds of butterfat produced. Three more dairies will soon be sold from which only sons have gone in the past 5 months.

Hogs: Actual figures are not available, however, inasmuch as hog production is complementary to dairy production, the butterfat reduction represents but half the picture. For every dairy cow that goes out of production there will be two or three fewer 220-pound porkers produced. Shippers estimate a reduction of 40 percent in hog production here in the last year.

Feed	Winter 1942–43	Winter 1943–44	Winter 1944–45	Percent reduction in 3 seasons
	Carloads	*Carloads*	*Carloads*	
Beet pulp	12	8	3	
Cottoncake	6	2	1	
Corn	-------	3	2	
Commodity Credit wheat	28	28	0	
Total	46	41	6	87

NOTE.—These feed concentrates and Commodity Credit Corporation feed (Government) wheat represented 39 percent of all grain and concentrates fed to cattle and hogs in 1943–44. The reduction in available grain and concentrates is reflected in reduction in numbers of cattle fed this year. (Figures are for total number weighed for sale.)

Cattle:

1941	4,528
1942	5,500
1943	3,047
1944	3,867
Percent reduction in 4 years	15

NOTE.—The figures on cattle are the most deceptive of all for the following reasons:

1. Cattle men are always ready to admit an increase but always in the other fellow's territory. To correct this habit we obtained the enclosed analysis from Mr. Brennen.

2. Cattle are sold as calves, yearlings, and 2-year-olds; when an area, such as Douglas County, begins selling calves and short yearlings, sale figures mount as they did here in 1942 and decline sharply the next year, as they did in 1943. The percent decrease has therefore been computed on the basis of sales in 1944 rather than on the 1943 basis. However, numbers of cattle sold here in 1944 represent lighter cattle than in 1941 when we still sold fat cattle, instead of feeders.

3. Figures of total numbers for the State compiled by the B. A. E. show an increase of cattle population for each year since 1941. If instead we go back to their 1941 population figure which represents a period anterior to planning, we find a population of about 375,000 cattle. If this figure is subjected to a 5-percent decline for each of 3 years, we arrive at a cattle population figure of approximately 330,000 or 30,000 above estimates of those familiar with shipping over the same period of time and about 20 percent below the W. F. A.'s planning base.

The labor available for replacement of deferred men at this time must come from the source tapped for this purpose by the Farm Placement Bureau. In 1944 this agency paid the fares to Douglas County for 376 men. We got 176 of them; they came drunk, left drunk, and stayed on the average of 6 days each. If we make allowances for sobering up on the job, which was customary, Douglas County farmers got about 60 man-months out of these fellows, which gives the other farmers of the county 11 men for the 3 months of harvesting (we had 9 of them).

Finally, we believe W. F. A. food statistics are in alarming error on the side of optimism and we know that we are producing the limit with available labor, we therefore urge consideration of the effect of drafting deferred farm labor on the war effort.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

J. B. DANGBERG.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
Elko, Nev., January 23, 1945.

Mr. J. B. DANGBERG,
Minden, Nev.

DEAR MR. DANGBERG: In reply to your inquiry of January 19 and suplementary to my night letter of yesterday will say that getting accurate data on the livestock population trend especially any subdivision of a State is a difficult problem. When we have occasion to use such livestock population data we quote the Department of Agriculture B. A. E. estimates or census figures and then interested parties who feel they may be in error can adjust them if and as more accurate data becomes available. I take it that is just what you want to do.

Since wiring you round numbers indicating the Elko County cattle population trend I have obtained some more accurate information on the sample and also broken it down between the so-called average run of ranches running around 1,200 or less cattle and the large outfits in the group. While these individual figures are confidential I am at liberty to give you the totals and averages. These figures used are made up from exact counts and close estimate made by people familiar with or running the outfits. The group includes 16 outfits.

Fourteen of the ranches were of the smaller type which in round numbers had a total of 8,000 cattle on January 1, 1944, and 7,750 cattle on January 1, 1945, and showed a net decrease of 250 head, or 3.12 percent.

Of the two big outfits running approximately equal numbers, one made all the decrease. These two ranches had a round number total of 17,400 cattle on January 1, 1944, and 16,500 cattle on January 1, 1945, and showed a decrease of 900 head, or 5.17 percent.

The group total of this 16-ranch sample, with 14 of the smaller outfits and 2 large outfits had a ranch number total of 25,400 cattle on January 1, 1944, and 24,250 cattle on January 1, 1945, and showed a net decrease of 1,150 head or 4.52 percent.

Since the two big outfits included have such a marked influence on the average I think the 3-percent decrease is a safer and probably a more accurate figure to use. While this sample is small still when coupled with the various opinions of a good many cattlemen it leads me to believe that Elko County cattle numbers decreased in 1944 and that the decrease is at least 3 percent, and possibly a little more, but not to exceed 5 percent at the very outside.

With reference to your other question; all of the cattle which I know of in Elko County are native and none have been shipped in to feed. There are no beef cattle on feed in this area this year.

The decrease in cattle numbers in Elko County in 1944, supported by expressions among cattlemen that were in close touch with the outshipments, was mostly made up of cows, heifers, and weaner-age calves.

Trusting this information will be helpful and with kindest regards to yourself and Bill Taber, I am

Very sincerely yours,

C. A. BRENNEN.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 446. A bill to provide for the return of unabsorbed premiums for war damage insurance, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 447. A bill to reduce the rate of interest on loans secured by the United States Government life insurance to 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado) introduced Senate bill 448, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 449. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow the Silver Star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 450. A bill to amend section 1 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to permit joint action by common carriers subject to part I, II, III, or IV, respectively, in connection with procedures related to the establishment of rates and the taking of other action; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 451. A bill for the relief of Carl Baumann; and

S. 452. A bill for the relief of Phillip J. McCusker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 453. A bill making it unlawful for any person to change his residence from one State to another for the purpose of avoiding the payment of any judgment for support of minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 454. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 455. A bill for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 456. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 457. A bill to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Maj. L. J. H. Herwig, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate bill 459, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 460. A bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to provide for integrated water control and resource development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding region in the interest of the control and the prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment for veterans and war workers, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. BILBO):

S. 461. A bill authorizing the acquisition for park purposes of certain lands adjacent to Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 462: A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 463. A bill to amend section 927 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, relating to insane criminals; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 464. A bill to amend the Tenessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, with respect to the manner of the exercise of the power of condemnation by the Tennessee Valley Authority and to require the receipts of the Authority to be covered into the Treasury; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 465. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the qualifications of certain attorneys employed in the Office of Price Administration and with respect to the authority of the Administrator to bring suits for damages under such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 466. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 467. A bill for the relief of Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer; and

S. 468. A bill for the relief of the estate of James W. Taylor 3d; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 469. A bill to provide for financial control of Government corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 470. A bill for the relief of W. P. Richardson, as successor and assignee of W. P. Richardson & Co., of Tampa, Fla., a partnership composed of W. P. Richardson, George W. Hessler, and L. C. Park by reason of certain claims arising within the World War period; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Samuel F. Howard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution requesting the President to declare November 10, 1945, a day for the observance of the creation of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution providing for paying the expenses of returning certain nationals of the United States from the Philippine Islands to the continental United States; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself, I introduce a bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act.

The bill (S. 448) to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act, introduced by Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in connection with the bill just introduced by the Senator from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement describing the amendment to the law proposed in the bill which he has introduced, and setting forth the necessity for such legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At its fifty-fifth annual meeting on September 16, 1943, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, by resolution, declared in favor of the enactment into law of a bill to amend the Federal Power Act, a copy of which bill is attached to this memorandum. In the copy so attached, language which the bill would add to the Federal Power Act is underscored. That which would be struck out is shown as struck out.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Federal Power Act in such manner that a clear line of demarcation shall be established between electric utilities which Congress has designed to subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, in the respects provided by the act, and those which it has intended to leave subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the respective State regulatory commissions.

The first section of part II of the Federal Power Act, enacted in 1935, provides as follows:

"SEC. 201. (a) It is hereby declared that the business of transmitting and selling electric energy for ultimate distribution to the public is affected with a public interest, and that Federal regulation * * * of that part of such business which consists of the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce and the sale of such energy at wholesale in interstate commerce is necessary in the public interest, such Federal regulation, however, to extend only to those matters which are not subject to regulation by the States.

"(b) The provisions of this part shall apply to the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce and to the sale of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce * * * The Commission shall have jurisdiction over all facilities for such transmission or sale of electric energy, but shall not have jurisdiction * * * over facilities used in local distribution or only for the transmission of electric energy in intrastate commerce."

In its report upon the bill when it was in course of enactment (Rept. No. 621, 74th Cong., 1st sess.) the Senate committee said:

"Subsection (a) * * * declares the policy of Congress to extend that regulation to those matters which cannot be regulated by the States * * * but not to impair or diminish the power of any State commission. * * * The rate-making powers of the Commission are confined to those wholesale transactions which the Supreme Court held in *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Attleboro Steam and Electric Co.* (273 U. S. 83) to be beyond the reach of the States."

The House committee report (No. 1318, 74th Cong., 1st sess.) was substantially identical with respect to these matters.

It will be seen that the act in its opening paragraph designates (and declares affected with a public interest) that which Congress designed to subject to Federal regulation, which was "that part of such business" of transmitting and selling electric energy "which consists of the transmission of (such) electric energy in interstate commerce."

The prime purpose of the act (as made plain by what the Senate and House committee said in their respective reports) was to supplement State regulation by supplying Federal regulation with respect to "those wholesale transactions which the Supreme Court held * * * to be beyond the reach of the States." The Federal Power Commission, in sections 205 and 206 of the act, was given power to regulate "rates and charges made * * * for or in connection with the transmission or sale of an electric energy subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission." The "business of transmitting," as well as of selling, was designed to be subjected to regulation, insofar as such transmission was done for compensation for which a charge was made. No intent was indicated, however (either in the language of the act or in the reports or statements in either House) to give the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over intrastate electric utilities not engaged in the sale at wholesale of electric energy transmitted into another State or not engaged in interstate transmission as a "business" for compensation represented by charges.

Notwithstanding these facts, the Federal Power Commission, in the Jersey Central Power & Light Co. case, asserted jurisdiction over an electric utility, all of the property and business of which was wholly within the State of New Jersey.

THE FACTS OF THE JERSEY CENTRAL CASE

The Jersey Central case involved the legality of a purchase of stock of the Jersey Central Power & Light Co. by New Jersey Power & Light Co. The latter company was admittedly a public utility, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. The purchase had been made with the approval of the New Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissioners, but without obtaining approval of the Federal Power Commission. Such approval was necessary under the Federal Power Act if Jersey Central was a public utility subject to Federal Power Commission jurisdiction, and not otherwise. It,

therefore, became necessary to determine the question of the Commission's jurisdiction over Jersey Central.

The Federal Power Commission held Jersey Central subject to its jurisdiction upon the following facts:

Jersey Central is an electric utility operating in New Jersey. All of its physical property is within that State. It sells no electric energy at wholesale outside the State or to any other company within the State to be sold at wholesale in interstate commerce. It does not transmit energy as a business for compensation.

Jersey Central, however, has exchange arrangements with the Public Service Co. of New Jersey, under which either company may receive "emergency service" in the case of an emergency or may receive so-called economy-flow service from the other when the other can generate the same more cheaply than the receiving company. Under these exchange arrangements, power was occasionally exchanged. The Jersey Central had no control over electric energy after the same had passed from its lines.

It is also an undisputed fact that when electric systems are connected, there is some inevitable transmission of electric energy from one system to another of a momentary character, which is involuntary, in the sense that it is not planned for. This is designated as "slop-over" flow.

The system of Public Service Co. is connected with Staten Island Electric Co. in New York, and exchange arrangements exist between those two companies similar to those between Jersey Central and Public Service.

By reason of these exchange arrangements, it sometimes happens that electric energy generated by Jersey Central passes from its lines to the lines of Public Service at the same instant that electric energy passes from the lines of that system to the lines of the Staten Island company in New York. It thus results that some electric energy generated and transmitted by Jersey Central, and exchanged by it with Public Service, finds its way into New York, and is there consumed.

It is plain that such energy was not sold by the Jersey Central at wholesale in interstate commerce. It was sold—if the exchange transaction can be designated as a sale—to another New Jersey utility, to be used in the intrastate business of such other utility company. It is plain that such transmission was not made in the course of the business of tranmitting, for a compensation or charge, such as Congress designed to bring under regulation. Such transmission by Jersey Central was in local distribution incidental to the local business of Jersey Central. As such it was, in express terms, exempted from the application of the act by section 201 (b), consistently with the purpose declared in section 201 (a) to bring under Federal regulation only "those matters not subject to regulation by the States." Such exchange arrangements, incidental to local business, remain "subject to State regulation," even though affecting, or involving in some degree, interstate commerce in the absence of Federal legislation having a contrary purpose. This principle was recognized in the Attleboro case, and was acted upon by Congress, as has been shown.

In the Jersey Central case, however, it was held that it was the intent of the act to subject to Federal Power Commission regulation any company transmitting any electric energy which is generated in one State and consumed in another. Reliance was placed upon the definition in section 201 (c), which is as follows:

"(c) For the purpose of this part, electric energy shall be held to be transmitted in interstate commerce if transmitted from a State and consumed at any point outside thereof."

This definition was read by the Commission, by the court of appeals, and by the majority of the Supreme Court, in disregard of the provisions of section 201 (a) above set forth, which were designed to control the construction of the entire act.

The Commission held that any transmission of energy, generated in one State and consumed in another, even "slop-over" transmission, which unavoidably occurs between connected systems, renders the company over the lines of which such transmission occurs subject to Federal Power Commission jurisdiction. This holding was sustained by the Court of Appeals (129 Fed. 2d 183). In its opinion sustaining the Commission, the court of appeals said:

"We think that 'slop-over' or 'incidental' current is well described upon the brief of the petitioner, Jersey Power, as '* * * an electrical phenomenon which consists in an instantaneous, involuntary ebb and flow where there is a physical connection, otherwise unused, between two systems. Where such an unused connection exists the two systems are normally 'in balance.' When there is a sudden demand for more energy made on one of the systems, its generators are speeded up to meet the demand. There is a tendency, however, for the system on which the sudden demand is made, to draw on the system with which it is connected for the instantaneous period between the demand and the compensating generating speed-up. * * *' Since the systems of Jersey Central, Jersey Power, and Public Service are interconnected and are synchronized, not only with each other but also with other electrical transmission systems covering the southern part of New Jersey, the southeastern part of Pennsylvania, the northeastern part of Maryland, Delaware, and with the Staten Island company * * * and since these various electric utilities systems are interconnected, it is obvious that there will be some incidental slop-over current passing through the various system connections including the bus-bar at the Mechanic Street substation which comprise the connections between Jersey Central and Public Service on the one hand and Public Service and the Staten Island company on the other.

"Some part of the electricity passing from the Jersey Central system to the Public Service system moved in interstate commerce and reached the Staten Island Co. That electric energy was transmitted in interstate commerce within the meaning of section 201 (c) if the words of the subsection be applied literally. The facilities of Jersey Central were in fact employed for this transmission. * * * We do not think that it is important that the electricity which was transmitted is designated as emergency, economy-flow, incidental, or slop-over current. It is electricity which is transmitted from New Jersey to New York when circuits are closed" (129 Fed. 2d 183, 187, 195).

The Supreme Court, in an opinion by Justice Reed, on May 3, 1943, sustained the Circuit Court of Appeals, saying in part:

"The connection between Public Service and Staten Island is maintained primarily to guard the Staten Island distribution against breakdown. It is used for emergencies a few times per year on an average. Surplus energy is occasionally sold. The rest of the time the line is maintained 'in balance.' * * * Any oscillation of the balance, created by increased demand in New York or New Jersey, carries energy in one direction or in another to be consumed on one side or the other of the line between the States. This is called 'slop-over' energy.

"Petitioners concede that some energy generated by Jersey Central and sold and delivered by it to Public Service passes thereafter to New York.

"We think the definition in subsection (e) of 'public utility' covers Jersey Central, since that company owns and operates the transmission line to the Raritan and that line * * * is a facility under Commission jurisdiction by the terms of subsection (b). Subsection (b) declares that the provisions of this part apply 'to the transmission of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce.' * * * The determinative fact is the ownership of facilities used in transmission. Such use makes the owner or operator of such facilities a public utility under the act (e)."

Justice Roberts filed a dissenting opinion, concurred in by the Chief Justice and by Justice Frankfurter. In that opinion, Justice Roberts set forth the language of section 201 (a), hereinbefore quoted, and said:

"Language could not be plainer, nor more clearly exclude the present case. Congress desired to fill the gap left by the inability of the States to regulate certain forma of interstate transmission and sale. Congress made clear that it intended to go no further. The opinion of the court ignores this fundamental declaration of purpose and policy and reads as an independent mandate in vacuo the words of subsection (e). This I think is not a fair construction."

It seems plain that under the construction given to the Federal Power Act by the majority of the Supreme Court, every electric utility which is connected with another utility extending into another State (whether directly or through inter-connected systems) can be subjected to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. The result, accordingly, will be that practically all electric intrastate utilities will be subjected to Federal regulation, inasmuch as practically all are inter-connected, directly or indirectly, with interstate lines, and "slop-over" transmission of electric energy between connected systems is unavoidable.

It is believed that this was plainly not the purpose of Congress, when the statute was enacted, and that such unintended effect of the statute should be avoided by a corrective amendment.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE ATTACHED BILL

It is not intended by the attached bill to affect in any way the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission to regulate actual sales at wholesale in interstate commerce, wherever such sales may be made, or the jurisdiction of such Commission to regulate the charges for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce. The bill provides only that the exchange of energy, when settlement for any variation in delivery is made upon the basis of the cost of production, or of purchase, to the company receiving payment, shall not be held to be a transmission or sale subject to regulation under the act.

The bill also changes the definition of "public utility," in section 201 (e), so as to bring within the definition only those companies engaged in one or both of the activities which it was the purpose of the statute to bring under Federal regulation. It makes the jurisdiction of the Commission over a company depend upon what the company does, rather than upon the ownership of property.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1752. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1808. An act to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 19, to aid in maintaining agricultural production essential to the prosecution of the war, to clarify the application of existing law relating to

the utilization of agricultural workers, and for other purposes, introduced by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] for himself and several other Senators, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It provides for an investigation of certain phases of the farm-labor draft program. The Committee on Military Affairs has claimed jurisdiction of the resolution by letter to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the subject this morning, having also considered it at previous times, and decided that it would not resist the claim of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, because the Committee on Military Affairs is now in process of developing a bill which deals with and which must deal with that subject.

So, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am returning Senate Joint Resolution 19 to the Senate for reference, if the Senate sees fit to do so, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution and it will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] earlier today requested a change of reference of a joint resolution which had previously been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in Selective Service, issue of January 1945, be printed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Alabama.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Selective Service System has the job of furnishing 750,000 acceptable men to the land and naval forces before July 1, 1945. These men should be the best that can be made available as combat replacements. In recent months the armed forces have repeatedly stressed their extreme need for young men. The supply of men 18 through 29 and of the types essential to the successful prosecution of the war by the armed forces is most limited. It is evident that there are insufficient men below 26 years of age to meet the calls which will be placed upon the local boards.

The continued production of the munitions of war and of food must be maintained. This production can and must be maintained by the use of the least possible number of deferred men within the age group 18 through 29, and of the physical standards required by the armed forces.

The decision for each registrant must be made initially by his local board. The members of these local boards are most familiar with the Selective Training and Service Act; they know the regulations; they have detailed information of the part that each registrant has played in support of the war since Pearl Harbor. To a most unusual degree the local boards have the confidence of the people, the President, the Congress, and the judiciary.

Durig this month certain coordinated steps have been taken by the Government to aid in the procurement of suitable young men for the armed forces and to assist in the continued production of the munitions of war. Local Board Memorandum No. 115–I provides measures to reduce the withdrawal of men from war industries for reasons other than induction, as well as provisions which generally tighten the requirements for deferment in the older age groups, particularly 26 through 29.

In my letter of January 15 and the list accompanying it, I transmitted to the local and appeal boards the best information available as to the activities that are essential or critical and the priority of withdrawals of men in the 26 throgh 29 agre group from these activities. The number of men to be inducted from those now deferred in II–A or II–B in the 26 through 29 year age group will depend on the number that can be made available from those in the younger age group, 18 through 25, and those reaching 18 years each month.

In this younger-age group there can be some recovery of men for the armed forces from those who have been heretofore rejected for military service. There will be some now deferred in II–A or II–B who have completed the critical work for which they were deferred or for whom satisfactory replacements can be made available. The numbers in II–A or II–B below 26, however, are not substantial when the merchant marine deferments are deducted. The necessity for men to man the ships in our merchant marine is disputed by no one. If the measures provided in Local Board Memorandum No. 115–I effectively stabilize male labor in the older age groups it may be possible to gradually withdraw for induction physically acceptable young men from the merchant marine.

Regardless of these measures the necessity of finding all available men under 26 requires the most careful screening of all such men.

Many individuals believe that Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act (the Tydings amendment) creates an exemption for farmers, but, as you well know, the amendment prescribes the requirements that a man must meet for agricultural deferment and does not provide an exemption from military service. It vests in the local boards the duty of determining, in the case of each registrant, whether or not such registrant meets the requirements of law after a full consideration of all of the pertinent facts. These facts include the extent the registrant is engaged in agriculture, how essential in the war effort are the products of his efforts, how necessary is he to this production, and whether there is a replacement available.

The urgent present need for young men by the armed forces cannot fail to be a factor which the local boards must weigh in considering deferment from service. The act of which section 5 (k) is a part was passed, in the words of the act itself, because "the Congress hereby declares that it is imperative to increase and train the personnel of the armed forces of the United States."

The local boards are ever conscious that their primary job has always been to procure men of the right age and type for the land and naval forces. They have considered always that the fundamental policy of Congress was expressed in these words, "The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of military training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service."

The Congress originally delegated to the President the power to issue regulations to govern deferments; it later provided by the Tydings amendment the method to be used in determining whether or not a registrant should be given an agricultural deferment. Neither of these provisions change the fundamental purpose of the act, which was to provide men for the armed forces, or the basic principle of a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service.

State Director Advice No. 288 provided information which had been furnished by the Secretaries of War and Navy, by the Chairman of the War Production Board, and War Food Administrator. It includes a finding by the President that the need for all of the men now agriculturally deferred in II–C under 26 years of age is not as essential to the war effort as is the need for young men in the armed forces. It was stated that the President felt that in view of existing conditions, agriculture, like other war industries with few exceptions, can be carried on by those above 26.

The purpose of State Director Advice No. 288 was to provide the information as to the current urgent needs of the armed forces and the relative needs of agriculture to the local boards for their most serious consideration. It did not seem to me at that time necessary to indicate that there was no intention to annul, to change, or to ignore the provisions of the Tydings amendment, as State Director Advice No. 288 specifically stated: "The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

There was no intent I am sure on the part of the President, or the Director of Selective Service, to direct a classification in any particular case or any type of cases. The effort was to bring to each member of the Selective Service System full information concerning the present situation in the words of those primarily responsible for the prosecution of the war. The duty then rested on the local board to consider each case and decide which registrants still met the requirements of the law for agricultural deferment.

I am aware of the tremendous responsibilities which the necessities of war now place upon local board members. I am aware of the great fund of good judgment and fortitude which local board members have displayed for more than 4 years. I am reassured by the knowledge that when you have weighed all of the factors you will, pursuant to the provisions of the Tydings amendment, render your own judgment to defer or not to defer consistent with the needs today of the armed forces for young fighting men.

LOUIS B. HERSHEY,
Director of Selective Service.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and myself, I submit amendments intended to be proposed to Senate bill 36, to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, as amended. I ask that the amendments be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 10 minutes, in connection with the introduction of a bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, which I am not going to do in this particular case, let me say that I shall object to any further encroachment upon the morning hour by speeches longer than 5 minutes. The Senator from Ohio and other

Senators know how studiously I have for a long time tried to enforce the morning hour rule with respect to speeches longer than 5 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say to the Senator that I waited until apparently all proceedings in the morning hour had been concluded. So I felt I was not in any way interfering with the morning hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not objecting to the Senator's request, but in the future I shall still insist that we observe the morning hour, for the benefit of Senators who have come to the Chamber for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. However, my understanding is that now there is nothing more to be handled during the morning hour. That is why I have made the request at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Chair had not announced the conclusion of the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Ohio will withhold his request for a moment, we will conclude the morning hour, and then the Senator can proceed.

Mr. TAFT. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of concurrent and other resolutions is in order.

MARY Y. HALSEY

Mr. BYRD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 68), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the financial clerk of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mary Y. Halsey, widow of Edwin A. Halsey, late Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944—LETTER FROM ROBERT H. HINCKLEY

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in keeping with the law setting up the Office of Contract Settlement, the Director, Mr. Robert H. Hinckley, has sent his second report to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. When that report came I requested that he send with it a brief of the report which I might place in the RECORD so that Senators could have information concerning what has been accomplished to date. I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter from Director Hinckley be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1945.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: On your becoming chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, you asked me to outline for you what progress has been made toward accomplishing the objectives of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944. Accordingly, I enclose herewith copies of the reports which, as required by that act, I made to the Congress in October 1944 and in January 1945. These reports contain the salient facts that you seek. Some of them deserve particular emphasis.

Great strides were made in the last quarter of 1944. Canceled commitments of $4,200,000,000 were disposed of, a much larger volume than in any previous period. The backlog of terminated contracts pending settlement was reduced from its October high point of $14,300,000,000 to $11,600,000,000 at the end of the year. The available figures show, moreover, that the age of the pending backlog is being reduced and that cases are being settled more quickly. In the War Department, for instance, the average settling time has been brought down to 4.2 months.

This improvement in the volume of cases handled has not been achieved by careless methods. During November and December investigators chosen by this Office from among the partners and managers of leading accounting firms examined more than 500 actual settlements, selected by them at random from the files of the principal procurement offices throughout the country. Their unanimous opinion was that a careful settlement job was being done.

From all this we can conclude that we have turned the corner. A mechanism for contract settlement has been created that is gaining rapidly upon the current load. There is a growing confidence in its ability to meet the test of mass terminations when they come.

The present situation is the product of several factors. Among them are the accomplishments of the contracting agencies over the last 2 years, the needed expansions of legal authority conferred by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and the efforts of this office during the 6 months of its existence. Much has been done to bring about uniformity among the contracting agencies and to streamline their procedures. Standard termination clauses have been developed for contracts. Standard forms for the submission of contractors' claims are now in use. Uniform interim financing procedures have been established. Uniform principles have been promulgated to govern the negotiation of settlements. Uniform rules have been laid down for clearing contractors' plants of inventory and equipment within 60 days after request. The War and Navy Departments have adopted a joint regulation which unifies policies and procedures as between these two agencies over the whole field of contract settlement.

While a great deal has therefore been accomplished, much still remains to be done. Terminated cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts are the area in which least satisfactory progress was made during the past year. Though they represented only 30 percent of the value of all commitments terminated up to December 31, 1944, they are 47 percent of the December 31 backlog. A large part of this difficulty arose from uncertainties as to the legal situation, which have now been clarified. New procedures are under discussion which should permit far better progress to be made in clearing up the over-age backlog of these contracts.

The better and quicker handling of subcontract settlements is our most important problem. In the subcontractor group are the smaller firms who would be most damaged by delay in settlement. This office is convinced that subcontracts generally can be settled most quickly and fairly by the customers who place the orders. This presupposes, however, an acceptance of responsibility by American business generally for seeing to it that their suppliers get fair settlements and are paid promptly; and this responsibility is not yet being fully recognized or discharged. To meet this need we are putting further emphasis on training courses and other means of bringing home their responsibility to contractors, large and small.

New procedures are also being developed for special situations, including the limited use of the statutory authority to make direct settlement of subcontracts. But our greatest present need is not new procedures, but more experience and speed in using those we now have.

While the war lasts, the primary function of contract settlement is to clear the way for other war production. The existing mechanism has demonstrated its ability to do this job increasingly well. By doing it, we are learning how to handle the mass terminations which lie ahead. I feel an increasing confidence that the future job can be done quickly and fairly.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. HINCKLEY.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER AT BOGOTA, COLOMBIA

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator PEPPER on December 4, 1944, at Bogota, Colombia, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY OF MEXICO—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF MEXICO

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by His Excellency Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, on January 7, 1945, on the subject of the foreign policy of Mexico, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW—ADDRESS BY CHILEAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the development of international law, delivered by Dr. Marcial Mora, Chilean Ambassador to the United States, at the Inter-American Bar Association meeting at the Pan American Union, Washington, D. C., on January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER HARRY W. BASHORE

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, before the Nebraska Reclamation Association, Lincoln, Nebr., January 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN LEGION—ADDRESS BY EDWARD N. SCHEIBERLING

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relative to the policies, purposes, and activities of the American Legion, delivered by Edward N. Scheiberling, of Albany, N. Y., National Commander of the American Legion, at a dinner in his honor at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y., which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN SHIPPING IN THE POST-WAR ERA—ARTICLE BY FRANK J. TAYLOR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "American Shipping in the Post-War World," written by Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., which appears in the Appendix.]

FAMILY SIZED FARMS—EDITORIAL FROM SAN ANTONIO (TEX.) EVENING NEWS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "All the People Have a Stake in the Family Sized Farms," published in the San Antonio (Tex.) Evening News of January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

C. I. O.-NEW DEAL PACT SEALED—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK SUN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "C. I. O.-New Deal Pact Sealed," written by George Van Slyke and published in the New York Sun of January 23, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED OF CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATION—ARTICLE BY ROBERT B. DRESSER

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Need of Constitutional Limitation," by Robert B. Dresser, of Providence, R. I., which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF HENRY WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—NEWSPAPER AND OTHER COMMENTS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD newspaper editorials and other comment concerning the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLIGHT OF THE WHITE-COLLAR WORKER—LETTER FROM EDWIN H. CHEEVER

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Edwin H. Cheever, of Little Rock, Ark., containing a poem on the plight of the white-collar worker, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLAN FOR WORLD COOPERATION AND WORLD PEACE

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a plan for world cooperation and world peace prepared by John Pearson, of Hanover, N. H., which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT BY SIXTEEN NEW SENATORS ON FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials commenting on the letter addressed to the President of the United States by the 16 new Members of the Senate, on January 23, 1945, regarding the affirmative participation of the United States in foreign affairs, which appear in the Appendix.]

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine business hour is concluded. The Senator from Ohio is now recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color.

Last year the Republican Convention endorsed the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, but I do not wish to have this bill regarded as in any way a Republican bill. It is entirely my own personal suggestion as to the proper method by which that pledge should be carried out.

The bill establishes a Federal Commission of five with power to set up local commissions in all regions throughout the United States. The Commission is authorized to make comprehensive studies in each district to determine how discrimination in that district on grounds of race, creed, and color can best be eliminated and full employment provided for Negroes and all other minority groups. It is given full power to call witnesses and inquire into specific cases of discrimination, make recommendations, and take every step to secure community interest and cooperation and voluntary compliance by employers and labor unions.

In my opinion the establishment of this Commission is justified by the fact that Negroes do not have the opportunities for employment enjoyed by white men. In many places they are the last to be employed and the first to be laid off. Custom and prejudice interfere with improvement in their position. Substantial progress has been made during the war; and the temporary Fair Employment Practice Committee, though without legal authority, has contributed materially to that progress.

I feel, Mr. President, that the compulsory provisions of the bill heretofore introduced in the Senate will hinder progress toward solving the problem, rather than achieve it. Few realize how extensive these compulsory provisions are. They are modeled on the unfair labor practice provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, and give to anyone who is refused employment or dismissed from a job the right to bring an action against the employer, alleging some motive of discrimination because the applicant or employee is white, black, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Czech, Pole, or German. Such motives are always possible to allege, and the question is left for decision to a board which is bound by no rules of evidence, and practically not subject to court review. Since actions can be started by millions of individuals, rather than by labor unions, the act goes much further than the National Labor Relations Act in providing an almost complete regimentation of employers.

Abuses which come about under similar provisions of the National Labor Relations Act have led to demands by labor organizations themselves for its amendment. As I see it, the compulsory act, if duplicated in every State, as its proponents plan, will finally force every employer to choose his employees approximately in proportion to the division of races and religions in his district, because that will be his best defense to harassing suits. Race and religion will enter into every decision. Catholic institutions, for instance, will have to employ Protestants. The Methodist Book Concern—a concern in Cincinnati manufacturing books for Methodist institutions—will have to employ Catholics and Jews. White waiters and porters could insist upon doing most of the work in the Pullman sleepers and dining cars. In the long run this board would tell every employer how he must make up his labor force. The bill even includes national origin and ancestry, so that in a city like Cleveland, Ohio, employers could be sued by representatives of every nationality group, particularly if they do not have members of that nationality employed in the particular office or plant.

In my opinion any such compulsory measure will create more bad racial and religious feeling than any other method which can be pursued. I think it will do the colored race much more harm than good. Progress against discrimination must be made gradually and must be made by voluntary cooperation and education, with encouragement from a Federal board, like that I propose, and State governments and boards, and not by inviting thousands of law suits which will get beyond the control even of the Fair Employment Practice Commission itself. A voluntary commission can develop different kinds of plans to increase good colored employment in different cities, after studying the local conditions and the character of local industries. The method of solving the problem of Negro full employment in Cleveland may be entirely different from that which should be pursued in New York City or in Atlanta, Ga. No scientific study of the problem has yet been made, and that should be the first task of the boards I propose.

It is true that there may be a few recalcitrant employers but if local committees are set up and sound plans developed, I believe they will be a few indeed. If there are a few, perhaps they can be by-passed, and employment can be provided by other means. If the voluntary method fails to continue progress, the commission is given power to recommend compulsory legislation. I should not oppose it as a last resort. Even then, I doubt if the unfair labor practice approach is the proper method of dealing with the situation. For instance, when a comprehensive plan of employment has been made, and efforts at voluntary compliance have failed, the board might be given the right to apply to a court for general approval of the plan, and for a court order against an employer whose course of conduct interferes substantially with the success of the plan.

The bill which I am now introducing proposes a constructive approach to one of the most difficult problems we face. It is so fair that I believe the opponents themselves should be willing to withdraw their opposition.

The bill (S. 459) to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, introduced by Mr. TAFT, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DEATH SENTENCE BY ARMY COURT MARTIAL

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to have the attention of members of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Last evening one of the leading lawyers from my State called me on the long-distance telephone and stated that he was extremely disturbed by a news item which he had heard over radio station KOA at Denver, to the effect that a young man at Camp Roberts, California, had been sentenced to death by hanging because of his refusal to obey the orders of his superior officer. I told him that I had not seen anything in the newspapers about it, and that certainly there must be some mistake. My informant is a very reputable lawyer, and a high-type man. He said, "I am so disturbed about the matter that I shall be glad to make an investigation of it at my own personal

expense if you will try to check up on it."

I happened to pick up yesterday's Washington Post, and read the following item:

REFUSAL TO DRILL BRINGS DEATH EDICT

CAMP ROBERTS, CALIF., February 3.—Pvt. Henry P. Weber, 27, was sentenced to death by hanging today by an Army court-martial board for refusing to obey orders of his superior officer.

The incident leading to the court martial arose on January 11 when Weber refused to drill or join his squad, according to testimony at his trial. The court martial is subject to review at Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that an army court martial would sentence a man to be hanged because of the fact that he refused to drill. If that were to be done, between 16,000 and 18,000 Canadians would have to be hanged because of the fact that they refused to drill. Some of them apparently threw their arms overboard.

Mr. President, in my judgment American boys have responded to the call to arms better than have the boys of any of the British colonies or commonwealth of nations. If the report which came over the radio and was published in the Washington Post is true, I believe that the Committee on Military Affairs ought to investigate the matter immediately. Whoever sentenced that boy to hanging ought to be discharged from the Army. Anyone who would think of doing such a thing ought not to be in the Army. Unless I am assured by the Committee on Military Affairs that it will look into the matter and do something about it, I intend to submit a resolution providing for an investigation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Instead of having the responsible officers dismissed from the Army, why not send them to the front lines?

Mr. WHEELER. That would probably be a good idea, but if they have no more sense than to sentence a man to hanging for such an offense, I do not know what good they would do in the front lines.

FACILITIES OF THE LAW LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, last year a special committee of the American Bar Association, of which Hon. Harold M. Stephens, Associate Justice of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, was chairman, made a most interesting and informative report on the facilities of the law library section of the Library of Congress. This report is invaluable to Members of Congress and to the bench and bar of the United States, because of the increasing importance of our relations with our international neighbors.

I requested Mr. Eldon R. James, law librarian of the Library of Congress, to prepare a supplemental statement as to the facilities of the Library in the field of foreign law. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the special report of the committee of the American Bar Association and the supplemental statement of the law librarian.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ON THE FACILITIES OF THE LAW LIBRARY OF CONGRESS JUNE 15, 1944

The Special Committee on the Facilities of the Law Library of Congress has again the satisfaction to report the continued interest of the Congress of the United States in the activities and services of the Law Library of Congress. The support accorded to the Law Library by the Congress has made it possible to maintain the development of the collections, and the continuation of its services to Members of the Congress, to the Supreme Court of the United States, to the Government agencies and to members of the bench and bar during this difficult period of war and of establishment of military government in territories liberated from the control of the Axis Powers. The members of the American Bar Association are deeply interested in the activities of the Law Library of Congress, which they regard as the national law library, and your committee therefore expresses the hope that the support of the Law Library by the Congress will be continued.

The Law Library has received by purchase, copyright, gift, and exchange approximately 30,000 volumes and pamphlets, during the year, making the total number of volumes and pamphlets in the Law Library approximately 600,000. The number of readers in the Law Library of Congress will run well over 30,000 for the current year, and, as the attendance at Washington law schools is low at the present time, this number is composed almost entirely of members of the bar and of the staffs of Government agencies.

The Law Library in the Capitol, containing some 40,000 volumes, is housed in the room used by the Supreme Court of the United States until 1859 when the Court moved to the old Senate chamber immediately above. This is the room in which Marshall sat and where were rendered the great opinions which established the constitutional basis of the Nation. In this room also resounded the voices of the great leaders of the American bar during the period from 1815 to 1859. It is in a sense, therefore, an American legal shrine. Also from this room Samuel F. B. Morse, the inventor of the electro-magnetic telegraph, sent his famous message to Baltimore on May 24, 1844, "What hath God wrought." The collection in the Law Library in the Capitol is used almost exclusively by Members of Congress and every effort is made to keep it supplied with the latest legal publications. It is serviced by a staff of three competent persons.

During the past year the Law Library has been able to organize its collections in the new quarters assigned to it shortly before the death of the late law librarian, Dr. John T. Vance. The shortage of manpower which prevails in the Law Library, as well as elsewhere, has made it necessary to call upon members of the staff whose duties are not ordinarily concerned with the shifting of books to do much of the work, and by their efforts and without appreciable interruption of their other activities, the collections of the Law Library have now been placed in permanent positions and arranged so that it will be possible to service them with greater efficiency than was possible during the days when the collections were crowded together in a space which had long ago proved entirely inadequate. The reading room which had been established for foreign, Latin-American, and international law was equipped with suitable seating and shelving facilities.

Owing to war conditions, there has been a very heavy turn-over in the staff of the Law Library; it has lost, during the past year, 10 members of its staff of 27, 7 of whom went into military service. However, the staff, although suffering from the losses just mentioned, has kept up the regular services of the Law Library and deserves a great deal of credit for its wholehearted cooperation.

During the past year, in connection with a survey of the whole of the Library of Congress, the Civil Service Commission has made a survey of the various positions in the Law Library. In connection with this survey, it has been possible to make certain but minor changes in the organization of the Law Library. The survey has resulted, in many instances, in raising salaries to a point reasonably commensurate with the importance of the work done by members of the staff and this, together with the reorganization just mentioned, will, it is expected, enable the Law Library to perform its important work even more satisfactorily in the future than it has been able to do in the past. There are some instances in which salaries are still thought to be too low, considering the importance of the work done, but progress has been made toward placing salaries in the Law Library upon a basis more satisfactory than has been the case in the past. The survey by the Civil Service Commission, which has made possible the partial rectification of the salary situation, was planned several years ago but was not begun in the Law Library until within the last year.

The Law Library has been faced, during the fiscal year just ending, with a difficult situation so far as acquisitions are concerned. It receives a very considerable proportion of current American legal material by way of copyright deposits. Books and other materials received through copyright are, of course, of great importance, but the Law Library is a research library and needs to complete its collections through the acquisition of historical material, both Anglo-American and foreign. Offers of American material within the field of what might be called rare books, such as early session laws and compilations which are necessary to complete and round out its collections, have been very few. It is not clear why this should be so, but probably it is due to the fact that many of those who searched the country for law book dealers have been taken into the armed forces and this, with the difficulties arising out of the lessened facilities for transportation caused by gasoline rationing, has had its effect. A book seller acquires his stock, to a very large extent, by searching for it. If he cannot search for it, he does not get it, and, if he does not get it, he cannot offer it. However, a few interesting American items have been acquired during the past year.

The Law Library obtained an excellent copy of the 1710 revision of New York laws known as the Second Bradford, and the laws of New Jersey for the session beginning September 24, 1723, printed in Perth Amboy by William Bradford. A number of interesting laws of American Indian tribes were also acquired.

The Library has made every effort, not only through the usual channels, but also through the representative of the Library of Congress in London, to procure current English material. The quantity of this has, as a result of the war, been much reduced and it has, also, been extremely difficult to obtain the older English material not only because of the excessively high prices demanded, but also because catalogs and lists issued by English booksellers are few, due both to the shortage of manpower and the greatly increased local demands.

In addition to legal material issued in the British Isles the Law Library is making every effort to obtain the laws, regulations, treatises, etc., issued in the British Dominions and

throughout the whole of the British Commonwealth. It has been very difficult, amounting almost to an impossibility, to obtain any material from India. It is hoped, however, that within the coming year, arrangements may be developed to obtain more material from India than has been the case in the past for this has been greatly in demand because of the extension of the American war effort to the Asiatic mainland.

Mr. W. L. Friend, the head of the British section of the Law Library, has prepared an annotated guide to Anglo-American Legal Bibliographies. This work, dedicated to Dr. Vance, is now in press, and promises to be very useful to libraries, research students and members of the bar generally.

In the course of the past year the Law Library has lent assistance to the Joint Committee on Interchange of Patent Rights and Information with Great Britain for Mutual Aid in the Prosecution of World War II, of which the chairman of this special committee on the facilities of the Law Library of Congress is the American chairman and the representative of the Department of State.

Latin America has been ever since the coming of Dr. Vance, a very important field for the activities of the Law Library of Congress. Both through blanket orders placed to secure complete coverage of current legal publications, and through continuous checking of dealers' offers, library lists, etc., every effort is being made to keep complete and up-to-date collections of laws, codes, court decisions, legal treatises, and other pertinent legal material for each of the Latin-American republics. Efforts are constantly being made to fill in gaps in the collections, both through correspondence and through the utilization of the Library of Congress representatives in Latin America.

The staff of the Latin-American section of the Law Library is engaged not only in assisting readers who come to the Library but also in the translation into English of legislation and other Latin-American publications for the use of Members of the Congress and of its committees. Also the section has assisted in the preparation of guides to the law and legal literature of various Latin-American countries. The Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Mexico, which was begun by Dr. Vance and continued and completed by Mrs. Helen L. Clagett, the head of the Latin-American section, is now in press and it is hoped that it will be published early in the autumn. Mrs. Clagett has also published in the Tulane Law Review for March 1944, an article dealing with the sources of the commercial law of Mexico.

For the past 3 years the law librarian has supervised a project sponsored by the interdepartmental committee of the State Department on cooperation with the other American republics. This project had for its purpose the compilation of guides to the law and legal literature of nine of the Latin-American republics. In addition to the Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Mexico just mentioned, which Dr. Vance originally undertook to prepare under his own immediate direction, there are in press at the present time three other volumes of the series, one of which, the Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Colombia, was prepared by Phanor J. Eder, Esq., of New York, and Richard C. Backus, Esq., of Boston. Although the project will be brought to a conclusion at the end of the present fiscal year, some work will still remain to be done. This will be undertaken by the Latin-American section, in addition to its other work. The manuscripts of all of the guides contemplated, in addition to those now in the hands of the printer, therefore, will be completed within the coming year.

In view of the importance at the present time, and in the foreseeable future, of our relations with the Latin-American republics, and also of the completeness of the Law Library's collections in the field of Latin-American law, it would seem desirable to organize in the Law Library a center of Latin-American legal studies which might undertake the preparation of indexes to Latin-American legal periodicals and indexes to and translation of important Latin-American legislation. It would seem highly desirable; also, that Government agencies and members of the bar should have at their disposition accurate translation of important codes of Latin-American countries, and such translations could be undertaken by the center suggested if funds were made available for its establishment. A center, such as that suggested, would be of considerable importance to members of the bar and, also, to those American business interests which are engaged in extending their activities in the republics to the south of us.

The chief burden of war work in the Law Library has been borne by the foreign law section. Translations of important topics of foreign law have been made at the request of Government agencies, an instance of which is the translation by the foreign law section of the Courts Martial Laws of Soviet, Russia, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and Japan, and the Disciplinary Code of Soviet Russia, which was issued in multigraph. A revised edition is in preparation.

The staff of the Foreign Law Section also prepared a survey of the Italian codes in force on the eve of the Allied invasion of Italy, which appeared in the Library of Congress Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions, 1943, volume I, No. 2, page 44, and which was also reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 90, part 9, pages A1703–A1705. In addition to these, the Foreign Law Section has made investigations into the nationality laws of Imperial and Soviet Russia, Germany, Austria, France, and Switzerland; the requirements for the validity or marriage and the various aspects of divorce and separation as these appear in the laws of Yugoslavia (Croatia), the Netherlands, Finland, Poland, Germany under both pre-Hitler and Hitler decrees, and Switzerland; the right of aliens to inherit under the laws of Greece, Rumania, Bulgaria, Italy, and Denmark; the laws concerning workmen's compensation and the admittance of foreign insurance companies to do business in Egypt, the Belgian Congo, and the Italian possessions in Africa; the German laws, with translation, for the prosecution of war crimes, passed after the Versailles Treaty, together with many other important studies and reports. In addition, the Foreign Law Section assists those who come personally to do research work in the Law Library.

Every effort is made to obtain legal materials from all foreign countries, including enemy countries, and from any source which is available. Since it is not always possible to get this material in the original printed form, it is frequently obtained in the form of microfilms or photostats. In this way the Law Library has secured and is able to serve to readers and investigators the legislation of Germany practically complete up to January 1944. The Law Library has many of the fundamental legal publications relating to a number of the countries occupied by enemy powers, including decrees both by the local and by the occupational authorities, coming down practically to January of the present year.

The book markets of Europe, of course, will not be open until after the forces of the United Nations have established themselves upon the continent of Europe. There is, of course, a great deal of material which the law library has not been able to get during the war years, but preparations are being made to take advantage, at the earliest moment, of the resumption of trade when that time arrives.

Notwithstanding the paucity of offers, as compared with the pre-war years, a great deal of legal historical material from the countries of continental Europe has been acquired; for the law library is a research library as well as a working library of current material. The law library has been fortunate in securing during the past year the 1475 edition of the decisions of the great court of the Holy See known as the Rota Romana, which is probably the first printed work containing law reports. It has also secured the official prints containing the proceedings of the Hungarian Diets of 1715, 1723, 1729, and 1741 with the original authenticating signatures and seals of the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles VI, and of Maria Theresa, Empress of Austria and Queen of Hungary. The number of other important items within this field coming into the law library is too large to be included in this report.

To give some idea of the extent of the foreign law collections of the Law Library of Congress, the following rough estimate applying only to the larger countries, may be of interest: France, 20,000 volumes; Germany, 30,000 volumes; Russia, 10,000 volumes; Italy, 20,000 volumes; and Spain, 18,000 volumes.

The committee draws attention to a situation existing in the Library of Congress with regard to location and custody of legal publications which elsewhere are found in law libraries, but which are excluded from the Law Library of Congress by the classification schedules of the Library of Congress set up many years ago, which require that many important classes of lawbooks, instead of being placed in the Law Library, must be distributed throughout the general collections of the Library of Congress. Books an constitutional law, labor law, the law of taxation, international law, conflict of laws, insurance law, the law of domestic relations, military law, and naval law are not in the Law Library of Congress, unless they have been duplicated there by purchase. This extraordinary situation, in which material which can be used completely, effectively, and efficiently only in connection with books which are in the Law Library such as periodicals, reports, statutes, digests, and citators, is shelved and serviced in the general collections, would seem to require the consideration of the administration of the Library of Congress. It is hoped that steps may be taken to correct this situation and to establish the Law Library upon the basis contemplated by Congress when it directed many years ago that the lawbooks should be separated from the books in the general collections.

The Law Library of Congress, conceiving itself to be the National Law Library, has been able to continue its long-established services to members of the bench and bar throughout the country. These services consist of interlibrary loans in accordance with the regulations of the Library of Congress, the furnishing of legal bibliographical information, the answering of legal questions so far as they can be answered without giving legal opinions, and the making of photostats of important legal items. The Law Library is preparing a set of records and briefs in cases before the Supreme Court of the United States which will be lent on interlibrary loan to members of the bar throughout the country. Owing to the shortage of manpower resulting from the war, it has been difficult to arrange the duplicate records and briefs in the Law Library so that they may be used for the purpose of interlibrary loans, but this work has been progressing and the Law Library will be happy to respond to such requests whenever possible. Hon. Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, has arranged to allow the Law Library a second set, which will not be absolutely complete, but nearly so, of records and briefs in cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States during the October term, 1943, and succeeding terms.

These are arranged and may be lent on interlibrary loan.

The committee, during the year, made an interim report calling attention to the services which can be rendered to the bench and bar of the country by the Law Library, which was approved by the board of governors and sent to each of the facilities committees of the various State and local bar associations throughout the country. It is urged that facilities committees, where they do not already exist, be organized so that through them may be made known the services which the Law Library of Congress, our nationallaw library, can extend to members of the bench and the bar throughout the country. Such committees are also useful means for correspondence with bench and bar throughout the country on important matters affecting the Law Library and its services. They can also render valuable assistance to the Law Library itself, in aiding it in securing important uncopyrighted items issued locally which otherwise might never come to its attention. It is hoped that members of the bar and bench in whose localities valuable uncopyrighted material is published may bear in mind the desire of the Law Library of Congress to obtain this material, which will consist chiefly of memorials to deceased members of bench and bar and of reports to local bar associations, very often of great value and not elsewhere published. Any assistance which can be given by members of the bar to the Law Library of Congress in this regard will be appreciated and acknowledged.

HAROLD M. STEPHENS,
Chairman.
WALTER E. CRAIG.
CHARLES FAHY.
ROBERT S. GAST.
MARGUERITE RAWALT.

THE FOREIGN LAW SECTION OF THE LAW LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Translations of foreign laws into English are comparatively few in number. Such of them as do exist are in the Law Library of Congress. An attempt was made some years ago to translate into English the commercial laws of the countries of the world. This was a venture of an English publisher and, as it failed to secure support, it was discontinued after the publication of a few volumes and was never completed. In the field of commercial law, there is very little that has been translated. Here and there a commercial code has been translated but as there is no service by which these translations can be kept up to date, as each session of a legislature is likely to amend the commercial law, a translation made even a few years ago is today obsolete in many respects.

The civil codes of a few countries have been translated. The French Civil Code was translated into English, the latest translation being published in 1930, but no arrangements have been made to keep this translation up to date. The German Civil Code was translated into English but the latest translation was published in 1909. The German Commercial Code was translated into English in 1911 and no English translation has been issued since. There is a translation of the Japanese Civil Code published in 1934. The latest translation of the Japanese Commercial Code was published in 1941. The most recent translation of the Italian Civil Code is one which was made in the Law Library of Congress by members of one of the war agencies during the past year and has recently been issued as a restricted publication by the Army. The Italian Civil Code includes also the commercial code. There is as yet no translation into English of the Russian Codes except the criminal codes and a very old and at the present time obsolete translation of the civil code.

In Latin America there exist at the present time no translations of modern civil or commercial codes. Summarized versions of some of these codes or paraphrases of portions of codes may be found in scattered places. There have been recently, however, translations into English of particular items of commercial legislation, chiefly in Cuba and Mexico. However, in none of the countries of Latin America or of Europe have any of the codes of procedure been translated and in only a very few instances have there been any translations of penal codes. The latest translation of the German Penal Code was issued in 1919, in Johannesburg, South Africa. The Law Library is now working upon a modern translation of this code, including the penal legislation of the Nazi Government.

The amount of foreign legislation available to one who reads only English is very small. The Law Library in the Library of Congress, however, has a service by which this legislation, although it has not been translated into English, may be made available to governmental and other users. Its staff consists of a number of linguists, all of whom are familiar with the various legal systems which may be involved, and their services are always available to users of this material.

It has been proposed, in view of the very considerable interest in Latin America at the present time, that the Latin-American section of the Law Library be expanded so that it may make available to the Government and to others the most recent developments in Latin-American legislation, with translations of such portions as may be necessary. It is hoped, also, that should it be possible to expand the Latin-American section a systematic effort will be made to translate into English the codes of most importance to the Government and to American businessmen from all the Latin-American countries with a service which will enable these translations to be kept up to date.

The Law Library endeavors to keep up its collections of foreign legal material and it has for all of the countries of the world practically complete collections of current legislative material which was, before the war, received regularly, and which during the war has been received somewhat irregularly but in considerable quantities. This material includes the legislation of enemy countries coming down well into 1944.

Also the Law Library has complete collections of current court reports and an excellent working collection of treaties. A study of foreign law can therefore be made in the Law Library practically as well, if not better, than it can be made in the countries in which the material originated.

The Law Library is working upon the completion of a project which is a part of the State Department's program of Cooperation with Latin American Republics. This project consists of the preparation and publication of guides to the law and legal literature of various South American countries. Under this project, guides to the law and legal literature of the following countries have been issued: Colombia, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba. A Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Mexico is in press and it is hoped will be published early in the spring. Other guides are far advanced in preparation. In 1919 a Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile was issued and a supplement to this guide is involved in the project. Also the Law Library published, some years ago, guides to the law and legal literature of Germany and of France which, although not up to date, are still of value to anyone who wishes to know how the laws of those countries were published.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY—MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Consideration of a motion coming over from a previous day is in order.

The Chair lays before the Senate a motion entered on January 29, by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 17, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 17) continuing the authority for an investigation of the alcoholic beverage industry increasing the limit of expenditures.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, the pending motion was made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] at my request, because I was absent from the city of Washington on that date.

In 1943, a resolution was submitted in the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary calling for an investigation of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the United States. At that time the late much-beloved Senator Van Nuys of Indiana was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, and uanimously approved. It was then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and that committee reported the resolution allocating $10,000 for the investigation.

A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was appointed of which the late Senator Van Nuys was chairman. The work went forward under his chairmanship until his lamented death, and then the senior Senator from Nevada took over the chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary. He also took over the chairmanship of all the subcommittees of which his predecessor had been chairman.

We continued with the investigation of the liquor industry as long as the funds which had been allocated to the committee were available, and made two partial reports. We called for assistance from the Department of Justice, from the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and from the O. P. A. In each instance we received assistance by way of clerical or advisory help.

Mr. President, in the course of our investigation we discovered evidence to indicate that the law was being violated, that fraud was being perpetrated, that combinations in restraint of trade were being carried forward, and that all kinds of questionable activities were being engaged in by certain interests in the liquor industry. We found, for example, that powerful groups of the liquor industry were purchasing parts of the wine industry of the State of California, as well as of other States, to such an extent that those who were engaged in conducting vinyards in the State of California, and engaged in the wine industry, were complaining that control over practically all

the wine industry was about to pass into the control of the liquor distillers of America. We found a combination existing whereby those engaged in the distribution of liquor in America who asked for a good grade of liquor were provided with, say, 5 cases of bonded liquor if they would take 20 cases of rum and perhaps 20 cases of tequila or some other imported beverage. We continued our investigation as long as the money held out, with the intention of presenting to the Department of Justice the case which we had worked up so that they could proceed accordingly, and so that we could present to the Congress proposed legislation for the purpose of remedying the situation. I shall not disclose facts on the floor of the Senate which we discovered and ascertained through our investigation. I was engaged too long as a prosecuting attorney to disclose the facts associated with a given case.

Mr. President, what is the history of the resolution? The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary believed that it was his duty, under the facts which had been disclosed by his investigators, to resubmit the resolution to the new Congress. So the resolution was resubmitted asking for the authorization of an additional sum of $15,000 in order to pursue the investigation. The resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary, and was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. That committee has evidently seen fit not to report the resolution to the Senate. Instead of reporting it they have given, as we have read it, faint praise to the subcommittee which made the investigation by saying that we did our work so well that we worked ourselves out of a job, and that the investigation should not be continued. But, Mr. President, I present to the Senate the question, Shall the work of a standing committee of the Senate, which has twice voted a resolution for an investigation, be stopped by action of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

In regard to that question I may say that there is a precedent of the Senate to which I desire to invite attention. In 1939, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session—the quotation will be found at page 10915 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—former Senator Byrnes, who was then chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, presented the question now involved on the floor of the Senate: He said:

> Mr. President, I am merely reporting several resolutions; I am not asking for action, and I intend to make a statement with reference t. them.
>
> There are nine of the standing committees of the Senate which have reported resolutions for the investigation of various subjects. Those resolutions have been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for the purpose of determining how much money shall be made available out of the contingent fund of the Senate for the conduct of the investigations. The Committee to Audit and Control has authorized me to repor. these resolutions with a recommendation as to the amount which shall be expended in each case, should the Senate decide to authorize the investigations.
>
> The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate are of the opinion that when a standing committee votes unanimously, as in most of these cases, the committees have to conduct investigations, the Senate should have an opportunity to pass upon the question, and determine whether or not the investigation should be made.
>
> The amounts asked by the committees have not been recommended by the Committee to Audit and Control, except in one or two instances where the amounts requested were comparatively small. Members of the Committee to Audit and Control, in reporting the resolutions to the Senate to give to the Senate an opportunity to act on them, reserve their right, as individual Members of the Senate, to oppose the resolutions when they are brought before the Senate, should they see fit to do so. They merely determine to let the Senate have an opportunity to consider these measures.

I read the language of Senator BYRNES on that occasion because I think it outlines the proper course to pursue. I do not believe, after a standing committee such as the Judiciary Committee votes unanimously for an investigation and sends a resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate should set itself up as a superior committee, thwart the action of the other standing committee, and nullify any action it might take. If that can be done, then every standing committee of the Senate can be thwarted in its work by the action of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate by simply refusing to report the resolution adopted by the standing committee, thereby killing all action.

I have no criticism of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but I want the Senate of the United States now to say whether or not Senate Resolution 17 should be brought before the Senate and voted upon. In my judgment, it should be; in my judgment, the investigation should proceed. That is my judgment, and it is the judgment of my committee.

If the Senate feels that an investigation should not go forward, then it is for the Senate of the United States, not for the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to say so, otherwise no standing committee can adopt a resolution providing for an investigation and have any idea whether or not such resolution will be brought forward or have an opportunity to be acted upon by the Senate.

I submit the matter. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was not set up for the purpose of being a committee of final determination on matters of policy concerning which legislative committees adopt resolutions.

The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was set up along about 1807. It had only two or three members at that time. Later on it was set up under a rule of the Senate, rule XXXVI, if I recall aright. Today it is under rule XXV.

In the last Congress, as in previous Congresses, the Senate adopted a resolution providing that all resolutions should first be referred to the standing committee having jurisdiction of the subject before they went to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It was evidently the intendment of the Senate to see to it that standing committees should first pass on a resolution to ascertain whether or not the standing committee wanted to go forward with an investigation, and then if they did want to go forward, that they should submit the matter in the form of a resolution for reference to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. What for? In order to determine how much money should be allocated for the investigation.

If, on the other hand, the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate can simply say, "We will take the resolution and pigeonhole it; we will not tell you whether you can have any money at all, and you can stand wondering about what has gone on until we see fit, if ever, to report it, and we never will report it." If that be the case, then no standing committee can be assured of going forward in what it believes to be the proper work of the committee.

I submit the matter, in the hope that the resolution will by a vote of the Senate be brought back to the Senate and acted upon by the whole Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not want to appear to be technical or captious about a question of this kind, but, as a matter of precedent and parliamentary procedure, I am constrained to make a point of order against the consideration of the motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for the following reasons:

I should like to call to the attention of the Chair the fact that Senate Resolution 206 was submitted to the United States Senate on November 12, 1943, and was adopted on November 16 of the same year. The committee provided for by the resolution became active and continued in existence until the 31st day of January 1945. The committee continued for a month during the present Congress as a result of the action of the Senate on December 18, 1944, in adopting Senate resolution 356, which reads as follows:

> *Resolved*, That all resolutions heretofore agree authorizing standing or select committees to employ clerical assistance, hold hearings, and conduct investigations during the Seventy-eighth Congress hereby are continued in full force and effect until January 31, 1945.

Mr. President, there is no question about the life of this committee coming to an end on the 31st day of January 1945.

I believe it was on January 29 that a motion was made by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in behalf of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for failure

to report the resolution continuing the committee.

Mr. President, the suggestion and contention that I make is simply that any motion to discharge the committee made previous to January 31, 1945, had to be acted upon by the Senate of the United States before that time. I should like to have the Presiding Officer keep in mind that the entire Senate acted upon the resolution terminating all special committees on January 31, 1945, and that the action in connection with the motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate came about through the fact that the Judiciary Committee had before that time adopted a resolution to continue the committee which died on January 31, 1945.

I make this contention in all seriousness as a matter of parliamentary procedure. It is my studied opinion that the roots of a tree cannot be cut without affecting the limbs and leaves and every other portion thereof. What is true of Nature is true in parliamentary law. This seems axiomatic. I submit that it was absolutely necessary that the Senate as a whole should act upon the motion to discharge the committee previous to January 31, 1945. It was a mere motion, and it certainly did not extend the life of the committee.

I make this statement in the utmost good faith, Mr. President, because it seems to me that the Committee on the Judiciary is now in a position where it is compelled to start de novo proceedings, so to speak; in other words, it is necessary, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Illinois, for the Judiciary Committee to adopt a new resolution providing for the formation of a new committee to continue the study of the beverage-alcohol problem.

I make the point of order against the motion to discharge. I think the point of order is logical. It does not seem to me that a motion to discharge a committee can be sustained when the investigating committee in question dies under the unanimous agreement of the United States Senate adopted last December. I respectfully ask for a ruling.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire that before ruling the President pro tempore read the resolution which the Committee on the Judiciary seeks to have adopted. It reads as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 206, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to November 16, 1943 (relating to the investigation of the alcoholic-beverage industry), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased.

This is a resolution which was unanimously adopted by a standing committee and sent to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I contend that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, by merely holding the resolution beyond a certain date cannot destroy the action of the Judiciary Committee. The resolution is still pending before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate by reason of its failure to report it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, appreciating the difficulty which the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate finds in the discharge of its duties, I have a great deal of sympathy with the position stated by the Senator from Nevada. It seems to me that at the present time the rules leave the Senate in an anomalous position. A resolution is offered, referred to a standing committee, and is favorably reported by such committee, and then, if it carries and charge against the contingent fund of the Senate, it must under the rules, go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It seems to me that the duty of that committee is limited to deciding what will be a proper expenditure from the contingent fund of the Senate, and that it does not extend to the substantive question whether or not the investigation called for in the resolution should be made.

It might be that to reach that point the rule should be amended, but certainly I agree with the Senator from Nevada to this extent, that neither the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, nor any other committee, should have unlimited power over resolutions offered and approved by a standing committee, so that the Audit and Control Committee, as at present, could definitely say that an investigation should or should not be made, by holding a resolution in the committee.

It would seem to me that the better parliamentary practice would be for the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to report such a resolution to the Senate, stating whatever amount of money, however small, it might feel was justified under all the circumstances. Then, when the resolution came before the Senate, that amount of appropriation could be approved, or it could be amended, as the Senate saw fit. But at the present time—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from Illinois will not differ with this suggestion—the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, under the practice which has grown up, can control the fate of any resolution which may be offered by holding the resolution in the committee after it reaches it and not reporting it to the Senate. In such a case the only way to get the resolution before the Senate is to take some such step as that taken by the Senator from Nevada this morning, namely, to move the discharge of the Audit and Control Committee from the further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. President, this is a very awkward situation. I do sympathize with the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in the difficulties of the situation under which it labors. Yet I feel that the Senate owes it to itself to make the practice more precise so that a resolution can have consideration on its merits on the question whether or not the subject matter should be followed through, without any one committee having the power to impose a final veto upon the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make just one observation in connection with the point of order I have made. If the Chair overrules the point of order, it will establish a precedent for any special committee, notwithstanding the unanimous consent of the Senate to terminate it, to come before the Senate and make a motion to discharge any committee which might be holding up a resolution in which they are interested. The mere motion to discharge apparently will carry the jurisdiction of the committee over into the next session. That is the practical effect of what will happen if this motion shall be sustained. In other words, if such a practice were followed, we could never terminate a special committee. I submit that such a practice is not in accord with the best tenets and precepts of protective parliamentary procedure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair holds that Senate Resolution 206 came within the terms of the resolution known as the Lucas resolution (S. Res. 356) which was adopted on December 18, 1944, and which continued until January 31, 1945, all resolutions authorizing investigations. But inasmuch as prior to January 31, during the present session, a resolution was offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]:

That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 206, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to on November 16, 1943 (relating to the investigation of the alcoholic-beverage industry), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress—

The Chair holds it is in order at this time for the Senator to pass upon the motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution.

The Chair further thinks that while the resolution died and is now dead, if the Senate desires to reinstate the resolution, it can be done undoubtedly by discharging the committee and agreeing to the resolution. The Parliamentarian of the Senate endorses this view; and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the decision made by the Chair, to which the Senator from Illinois adheres but respectfully disagrees with, I desire to make a brief statement upon the motion to discharge, as well as upon a few pertinent facts leading up to the position now taken by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I think it is agreed that a motion to discharge a committee is seldom made. It is unusual for such a motion to be made. The committee's action was unanimous, with the exception of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], who was not present. The Senator wrote a letter in which he asked that the investigation be continued.

Mr. President, some motives at times have been ascribed in one way or another to the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as though the chairman were acting in rather an arbitrary and capricious manner. All that I have attempted to do since I have been

chairman of this very important committee is to have the committee investigate as carefully as we can the facts contained in reports that are before us, without any thought of dealing with the merits of the proposed legislation which might be involved in any resolution. Obviously we are compelled to delve into the facts if we are to arrive at an intelligent conclusion as to the amount of money that is necessary in order to make an investigation upon any subject matter. I congratulate the Judiciary Committee, under the able leadership of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], upon the work the committee did in connection with the investigation of the alcohol-beverage problem. But I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the original resolution, which reads:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the business practices and operations of the alcoholic-beverage industry in all its phases, including any matters relating to the production, importation, distribution, purchase, or sale of whisky, gin, rum, brandy, or other distilled spirits, or wine or malt beverages. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

Two reports have been made by the committee. The last was made on January 15, 1945, and it is an important report, Mr. President. It contains the following language:

There is no doubt that the committee operating under Senate Resolution 206 was responsible for securing the release of alcohol manufacturing facilities for the production of beverage alcohol during August of 1944 and during the present month of January 1945, and that these two "holidays" have materially increased supplies of potable liquor to the consuming public, and have been the largest single factor in combating the black market in liquor.

They say, among other things:

While it is undoubtedly true that certain interests both within and outside the liquor industry would be pleased to see this investigation abandoned, it is the view of your committee that the Senate, having committed itself to a full and complete investigation of the alcoholic-beverage industry in all its phases, and having expended public funds in the furtherance of such an investigation, should not back off now nor be satisfied with anything less than the accomplishment of the full and complete investigation originally authorized.

The Audit and Control Committee, in the analyzation of this resolution and the report, in trying to determine the amount of money which ought to be expended in connection with a complete and full examination and investigation of the alcohol industry throughout America, concluded that $10,000 is but a drop in the bucket if it is proposed to do what the investigating committee intends. The witnesses who came before us stated that they wanted to investigate monopoly in the liquor industry of America. I do not know anything about the monopolistic end of it, but perhaps that is not the business of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. However, it seems to me, and it seemed to the committee, that if there is a monopoly in the liquor industry of America the Department of Justice ought to investigate it. It has the power to do so. It has investigated monopolies of all kinds. I repeat that the only reason for the continuation of the subcommittee which was presented before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was the sole purpose of investigating the monopolistic tendencies of the liquor industry in America.

Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee has done a good job. It has made its report and it has recommended certain legislation, which is proper. The committee thought that in the interest of economy we should not grant any money at all for the further investigation of the liquor industry. It was the unanimous opinion of our committee that if the Committee on the Judiciary were to undertake the investigation of a monopoly which it contends exists in the liquor industry much more than $10,000 would be needed. At the very minimum, $100,000 would be needed.

With the meager testimony before the committee, it was the opinion of the committee that we should do nothing at all with the resolution, and so we passed it over. So far as the argument made by the able Senator from Nevada with respect to pigeonholing resolutions is concerned, let me say that ever since I have been a member of the committe, if the committee has not agreed to report a resolution, the resolution has remained with the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. That was the practice which was in vogue when I became a member of the committee. According to members of the committee who had been on the committee before I came to it, that was the long-established practice.

It is not important to me whether or not we keep the resolution in the committee or report it to the Senate. I do not care one way or the other about a thing of that kind. The committee thought it was following practice and precedent. I consulted the Parliamentarian as to whether or not it was necessary for the committee to report the resolution, and I was advised that it was not.

Let me remind the Senate that there has been some disagreement at times in the past as to the power of this committee. I am the last one to wish to usurp power. The senior Senator from Illinois does not want his committee to have any more power for his committee than the Senate wishes it to have. What we are attempting to do is to give to the Senate and the taxpayers of America fair value for the money involved. In my section of the country I used to wage a legal battle for 2 weeks over a $10,000 lawsuit. Here we sometimes toss around amounts of $5,000, $10,000, $15,000, and $20,000 as though they were no more than a few thin dimes. We complain about the executive branch of the Government spending money. And yet I wonder sometimes how well we protect our own funds.

Mr. President, long ago a very able and eminent Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Gallinger, was a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. He was a member of that committee for a long time. This is what he said when a point of order was raised in the Senate:

When the original resolution was offered, the Committee on Contingent Expenses satisfied themselves of the fact that the money would be forthcoming, if called for. It is true that that resolution was subsequently amended without dissent, and to that extent the Senator has a precedent for asking that we further amend it. But it does seem to me, Mr. President, considering what is the function of that committee, and its only function, that when we propose to expend more money, that committee ought to be given an opportunity to say whether or not it is a wise investment of the public funds; and for that reason it seems to me very clear that the point of order having been made the resolution ought to go to that committee, as it would if this was an original proposition.

I read that because it seems to me that as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and one who must approve each and every voucher for funds expended, it is advisable to attempt to ascertain whether or not the money is being spent wisely and in the public interest, as was pointed out by Senator Gallinger.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. I have no personal feeling about this matter one way or the other. The principal witness was the lawyer for the committee. Two Senators also testified, but the chief witness was the lawyer for the committee, who wanted to continue to investigate the liquor monopoly. If a proper and full investigation were made of the alleged monopoly, $100,000 or more would be required for such an investigation. If the Senate wishes to do that, if it wishes to discharge the committee, thereby reversing the action of one of the standing committees of the Senate, of course I shall bow to whatever decision may be made by my colleagues.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote on the motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from further consideration of Senate resolution 17. I wish to make my position clear.

I happen to be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Also I have recently been made a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I went along with the committee in the action which it took in connection with this resolution. I did so for an entirely difference reason than that which has been presented on the floor of the Senate today. I did so because I felt that if a motion to discharge would bring this question to the floor of the Senate, that is exactly where such resolutions should be considered, if committees are to continue to borrow help from various Government agencies to carry on investigations.

The man who is investigating the liquor industry of the country under this resolution is a borrowed employee of the Department of Justice. He is not on the pay roll of the Senate. If he owes alle-

giance to any agency, it is to the Department of Justice.

As a member of the committee, I do not propose to continue to vote to appropriate funds to help committees establish great retinues of personnel borrowed from other Government agencies, to promote certain legislation and interests in the United States Senate.

We have another resolution asking for $25,000 for a certain committee. That probably will be here today or tomorrow. The committee uses 17 persons borrowed from various departments. The practice which has grown up in the Senate of borrowing personnel from the Executive branch is a vicious one. It is my contention that if we wish to have an investigation of the liquor interests made under the broad scope of the resolution, the matter should be brought before the Senate, and the appropriation of a sufficient amount of money should be requested; because if we are to go into the investigation of a monopoly control, a personnel of more than one employee will be required. It will take 15 or probably 20 employees, and the investigation should be made in conjunction with the Department of Justice, or at least the committee and the Department should not overlap in their investigations.

If we wish to vote on a resolution such as I have indicated, to have the question brought before the Senate as it should be brought, and to provide the necessary help, that is one thing; but it is quite another thing to agree to a resolution creating a committee and authorizing the appropriation of $15,000 for the investigation, and then have the committee borrow 15 or 20 persons from various departments to conduct the investigation which it is desired to make.

Let me say that more than once in the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, I have observed that when persons coming from various departments were faced with the question of developing a view of the Senate, they brought in an entirely different view. I do not say it was done maliciously; but, after all, such persons represent the departments. That is not the way the committees should proceed to function.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are we to understand that the rule which has been applied in the present instance was applied so that borrowed help would not be used?

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the question of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, let me say that I myself think the committee in the case of this resolution did not take the same action it took on all other resolutions.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is why I wish to ask whether the same rule is applied to all resolutions.

Mr. WHERRY. But that does not alter the case. In some instances resolutions were continued until July 1, for no other reason than to enable the committees involved to come before the Senate and request appropriations, and then if the Senate felt that the investigation should be continued the Senate would act, instead of having the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate take action.

I am sorry the same procedure was not followed with reference to all the resolutions, but the fact that it was not used in the present case does not at all detract from the force of the argument I am making, because it is my contention that the other way is the hard way to do it. I think the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is wholly within his rights in submitting this matter to the Senate. In fact, I am glad he has submitted it, because it brings up the very serious position adopted by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, namely, that resolutions permitting the continuance of the practice of borrowing help should not be submitted. In many instances various groups in committees have proposed legislation which the Senator from Michigan knows as well as I do has caused considerable debate, and which would not have come to the Senate if it had been before a regular legislative committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to make my position clear, namely, that I am absolutely opposed to the borrowing of help from the departments, but I think the rule should be applied to all committees.

As I understand the matter, this is the only resolution which was not reported from the committee, so the procedure was applied solely in the case of this particular resolution. Some other committees have as many as 17 employees obtained from various departments; but no such rule was applied by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to the resolutions relating to other committees.

Mr. WHERRY. I may answer the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan by saying that the resolution relating to this committee involved only the matter of clerk hire; and we know, and the committee knows, and certainly the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary knows, that it is impossible to make the kind of investigation necessary unless it is the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary to borrow more help in order to make it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator know of any special committee which has been appointed by the Senate which has accomplished more with less money than has the committee whose continuation is now being considered by the Senate? It would seem that the valuable service rendered under the resolution is one of the reasons now given for discontinuing the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to answer the distinguished Senator by saying that I have no quarrel with the work of the committee. But those who came before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and asked for authorization of an appropriation of $10,000 said that the main object now would be to make a complete investigation into monopoly control. I submit to the distinguished Senator from Utah, for whom I have profound respect, that it is impossible to make an exhaustive investigation of the alcohol interests' monopoly control with an appropriation of $10,000 or $15,000, unless help is borrowed from some of the departments. I know that the Senator from Utah with his usual good judgment will agree with me when I make that statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can it not also be said with reference to other resolutions relative to investigating committees, which resolutions were reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, that in many cases if an examination had been made to ascertain whether such committees could do all the work they claimed they would do, it would have been found that they could not do the work with the amount of money to be allowed in the appropriation requested?

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the Senator from Michigan, Mr. President, let me say that most of the committees which presented testimony were committees which had not used large groups of personnel. Their resolutions were not so broad in scope. I know of one instance involving the continuation of a wool investigation committee, a committee which has been in existence for 10 years, and with only one Senator on the committee. That committee observes what happens in the wool market, and the committee itself stated that very little money was necessary in order to enable it to accomplish its purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask a question. I am not a member either of the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I do not understand that the action of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in respect to any of the other resolutions, or in respect to the resolution now under discission, was based on the question whether the committee concerned would borrow employees from various departments.

Mr. WHERRY. I admit that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me that the only question, under the rule, is whether the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate shall determine the amount of money which any other committee requests. Actually, it has a right to determine whether such committee shall be entitled to any money; if it can fix the amount of money at $5,000 or $10,000, it can fix it at nothing.

I do not think the committee is violating its obligation or going beyond its province if it decides that a certain committee is not entitled to the appropriation of any money.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is the last point I was about to make.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry.

Mr. WHERRY. Now that the Senator has made my point for me, I shall yield the floor, and——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. However, Mr. President, first I will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska referred to the committee to investigate the production, transportation, and marketing of wool. The Senator will recall that no clerk hire for that committee has been appropriated for at all.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The committee has been in existence for a long time. Occasionally it has held a hearing, with perhaps a little incidental expense, as a result of which it has requested the appropriation of a small amount of money.

Furthermore, since the Senator from Michigan has stated that the resolution under discussion is the only one which has been passed over, I should like to call his attention to the fact that we passed over the very controversial question of investigating the shortage of gasoline in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that while I have great sympathy——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me say that I am not familiar with the investigation. I should like to know the purpose of the investigation. I understand it is to determine whether there is a monopoly in the whisky business. Is the investigation to be made from the standpoint of the prices charged?

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, let me say that the resolution which brought into existence the particular committee under discussion was Resolution 206 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. It has already been read into the RECORD by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, but in its scope it applies to a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the business practices and operations of the alcoholic-beverage industry in all its phases, including any matters relating to the production, importation, distribution, purchase, or sale of whisky, gin, rum, brandy, or other distilled spirits, or wine or malt beverages.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That does not answer my question.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that under the resolution the committee can investigate almost anything in the world.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understood it was previously stated that the appropriation requested was for the purpose of enabling the committee to continue to pursue an investigation into the monopoly phase of that business. That matter does not go into the question of whether the committee has sufficient power to conduct the investigation covered by the resolution. However, I inquire what necessity there is for the resolution at this time, when there is strict limitation on the quantities which may be produced and the prices at which they may be sold. What good would it do to find that out so long as that condition prevails?

Mr. WHERRY. There is much merit in the question propounded by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. However, that question was not presented to the committee. Most of the testimony presented to the committee was to the effect that monopolistic control should be investigated, and it was contended that the committee could investigate it. I am in favor of an investigation of monopolistic control if sufficient funds for such investigation are provided, and a full and complete investigation is made. The committee wanted to go along with the witnesses so far as possible, but felt that it should pass solely on the appropriation, and the committee, in its wisdom, decided not to vote for an appropriation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If a monopoly exists, it would be in violation of the antitrust law.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does not the Department of Justice have jurisdiction over such matter?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. The Senator knows the answer to the question without asking it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote on the motion, but we all know that the investigation to which reference has been made grew out of the furor which was raised, particularly here in Washington, because of the scarcity of liquor. Two or 3 years ago the newspapers carried statements to the effect that certain brands of liquor were not available, and the question was asked, What has happened to all the liquor in the country?

We all knew that for 2 or 3 years no liquor had been manufactured because the distillers were making industrial alcohol for industrial purposes. Last summer a 30-day holiday was declared, and permission was given for certain supplies to be made in order to replenish present stocks. I understand that the report indicates that the work of the committee was responsible for the holiday. I do not know whether that is true, or whether the committee claims it to be true. At any rate, no liquor is now being manufactured. Regardless of anyone's attitude toward the question, I have been wondering for some time how long we should continue the investigation of the entire liquor business, which grew out of the fuss and feathers aroused in Washington 2 or 3 years ago over the scarcity of liquor. If we were to investigate the entire question of whether there has been a monopoly we should be busy for 2 or 3 years. Unless some legislation is recommended strengthening the monopoly laws I doubt the wisdom of continuing the investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I have already stated my position. I believe this to be a matter for the Senate to decide. I think the proper manner in which to consider all such resolutions is first to have a request of the Senate for the appropriation needed, setting forth the reasons for asking for the appropriation. The Senate can then vote upon the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 17.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Fulbright	Murdock
Bailey	George	Overton
Ball	Gerry	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Briggs	Hill	Saltonstall
Brooks	Hoey	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taylor
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	McMahon	Wherry
Cordon	Magnuson	White
Donnell	Maybank	Wiley
Downey	Mead	Willis
Eastland	Millikin	Wilson
Ellender	Mitchell	
Ferguson	Moore	

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the pending motion, under the precedents, will be placed on the calendar, but a motion is in order at any time to take it from the calendar.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I move that the Senate continue with this matter to its final determination at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Will the Senate discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 17?

Mr. LUCAS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question before the Senate. Is it on the motion to discharge the committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 17? Those in favor of discharging the committee will vote "yea" when their names are called.

Mr. TOBEY. And those opposed will vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer the pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and vote. I vote "nay." I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is unavoidably detained, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is detained on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—28

Austin	Ferguson	Millikin
Ball	George	Moore
Buck	Gurney	Murdock
Burton	Hawkes	Reed
Bushfield	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chandler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McCarran	Wiley
Donnell	McFarland	
Eastland	McKellar	

NAYS—43

Bailey	Connally	Johnston, S. C.
Bankhead	Cordon	Lucas
Barkley	Ellender	McClellan
Brewster	Fulbright	McMahon
Briggs	Gerry	Magnuson
Brooks	Hayden	Maybank
Butler	Hill	Mead
Byrd	Hoey	Mitchell
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Radcliffe	Taylor	Wherry
Robertson	Thomas, Utah	White
Russell	Tobey	Willis
Saltonstall	Tunnell	Wilson
Stewart	Tydings	
Taft	Wagner	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Bilbo	Langer	Scrugham
Bridges	Morse	Shipstead
Downey	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Glass	Murray	Vandenberg
Green	Myers	Walsh
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wheeler

So Mr. MCCARRAN'S motion was rejected; and the Senate refused to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 17.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, when the vote was taken earlier today I was absent, but I wish the RECORD to show that if present I would have voted "nay."

COMPENSATION OF TELEPHONE OPERATORS IN THE CAPITOL

During the consideration of Mr. LUCAS' point of order against Mr. MCCARRAN'S motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 17, the following occurred:

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], I wish to say that I do not desire, in what I am about to suggest, to displace the pending matter; as a matter of fact, I could not displace it. But it is not possible to have an investigation, and it will be pretty hard to have Congress function, if we do not keep the telephone system of the Capitol functioning. Under present circumstances the authorities are having a great deal of trouble in obtaining a sufficient number of operators to take care of the business of the Capitol, in this time of war. I have in my hand a bill which has passed the House, which would moderately raise the pay of our telephone operators, so as to alleviate the condition under which many are working with great difficulty. I am going to ask unanimous consent, without displacing the pending business, that the Senate consider this House bill, which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, and that it be passed, because it should have been passed the first of February. If we do not pass it, I am afraid we may not have very good telephone service, which is rather important in war time.

I ask unanimous consent, without displacing the business now pending before the Senate, that House bill 1427 be acted on immediately.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am very much in favor of the immediate passage of the bill which the Senator from Maryland presents. If there is to be no controversy over the bill, and no discussion, I shall have no objection.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall withdraw the bill if there is any objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1427) relating to the compensation of telephone operators of the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether the bill has been reported unanimously.

Mr. TYDINGS. This is a House bill, and has been reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It provides a very modest increase in the compensation of some telephone operators. That is all there is to it.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I find there is no printed report from the committee, and before we take action I should like to have the Senator make an explanation of the nature of the increase.

Mr. TYDINGS. The bill is a very short one. It simply provides that the chief operator shall be paid $3,000 per annum; the assistant chief operator $2,400 per annum, and others $1,800 per annum, with $200 per annum additional for the assistant chief operator, and in the case of those receiving $1,800, additional pay per annum of $240, $180, $150, $120, and $60 for different categories. In other words, that is the entire bill, and it provides a modest increase in salaries. I am advised that it is becoming more and more difficult to man the switchboards under the present low rate of salaries.

Mr. BURTON. Can the Senator state what the amount of the increase is?

Mr. TYDINGS. I stated it.

Mr. BURTON. I did not hear it.

Mr. TYDINGS. $240 per annum is the maximum and $60 is the minimum in the various categories.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator state the total increase?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not have the figures, but the House committee report would show the amount; $240 is the maximum and $60 the minimum, depending upon service, present pay, and so forth.

Mr. BURTON. How does that compare with present pay? I did not understand that point clearly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the bill, if passed, there will be an increase of $240 per annum in the case of those having more than 25 years of service; $180 additional in the case of those having more than 20 and not more than 25 years of service; $150 additional in the case of those having more than 15 and not more than 20 years of service; $120 additional in the case of those having more than 10 and not more than 15 years of service, and $60 additional in the case of those having more than 5 and not more than 10 years of service.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator now means that the employees are receiving $1,800 per annum, and those with long periods of service will receive additional pay?

Mr. TYDINGS. One thousand eight hundred dollars is not the standard all the way through, but for the purpose of the discussion $1,800 is substantially the annual salary.

Mr. BURTON. Is the committee satisfied that this increase will not set a precedent which will immediately bring about similar increases throughout the civil service?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think it will. The increase is long overdue. The committee was unanimous in its report. The bill has come to us as a result of what the authorities in the Capitol have had to deal with.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the increase be more than 15 percent in any one of the brackets?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did these individuals receive any increase together with other Federal employees last year or the year before?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think so.

Mr. ELLENDER. They were not included?

Mr. TYDINGS. They were overlooked, and it is becoming a little difficult to keep them on the job because they are receiving better offers elsewhere.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1427) relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. The necessary amounts to carry into effect the increases herein provided, from February 1 to June 30, 1945, hereby are authorized to be paid from the appropriations for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 29, Senate bill 298, to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 298) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the measure now before the Senate is commonly known as the Commodity Credit renewal bill. It has been before the Senate on a number of occasions heretofore, and I am sure that there is general familiarity by Senators with the Commodity Credit organization and with the program it has been administering.

I will say in the beginning that, so far as I know, there is no active opposition to the bill. It comes before the Senate with a unanimous report from the Committee on Banking and Currency. The committee held hearings on the bill for 2 full days and then went into executive session and discussed it frankly and freely; certain amendments were proposed, and some amendments were made to the bill.

It is confessedly—and it was so stated to the committee—a bill of the Department of Agriculture, of the administration, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 years, and providing necessary funds to continue the administration of the program.

Mr. President, the Commodity Credit Corporation, in my judgment is, for the farmers, the best organization to be found in the Government. It makes loans on basic commodities, and some loans on commodities which are nonbasic. It handles the support prices, to encourage and bring about adequate production of numerous items of food which would not be produced but for the encouragement and support given by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

When introduced, the bill increased from three billion to five billion dollars the capital authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make expenditures. After full discussion of and consultations about the subject, involving the testimony of the needs of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the programs which were in contemplation for the next year, and the war necessities, the committee decided to reduce the amount requested from five billion to four and a half billion dollars, which constitutes an increase of one and a half billion dollars in the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as it already had a $3,000,000,000 authorization.

Mr. President, I doubt if there would be any particular value in holding the Senate for a detailed discussion of the different items which are involved in the administration of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The list is long, and most Senators are familiar with the number of the activities. It is the judgment of the Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, and his assistants in the department, that in order to assure an adequate production of the food crops necessary during the war period, the items contained in the bill as reported by the committee are the minimum they would feel justified in relying on at this time.

Mr. President, the planting season is rapidly approaching, particularly in the southern areas of the country, and in the case of some crops which are early seasonal crops. The War Food Administrator is exceedingly anxious to know what his authority will be so that appropriate announcements may be made for the guidance and information of the farm producers. For that reason we have proceeded, with as much diligence as possible, in the preparation of the bill and in its consideration, and we are here now asking action by the Senate on the bill.

The only other item in the bill of real consequence is the question of subsidies. Senators may recall that on the passage of the price-control bill last year there was included in the measure an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] which provided a limitation upon subsidies and contained a provision that they should not be paid hereafter until the Congress had acted upon the specific subsidies which the department desired to use.

When the pending bill came from the department it contained a provision which eliminated, so far as the Commodity Credit Corporation was concerned, the limitation to which I have referred, and any other limitation upon the Commodity Credit Corporation in the matter of subsidies to be used in the production of crops. The subject was given full consideration, and as it dealt with an amendment which had been sponsored by the Senator from Ohio, and was finally worked out in an agreeable way, I shall ask the Senator from Ohio to make such explanation as he thinks advisable and as he desires to make regarding the settlement of that question, and the report made by the committee, which in effect amends his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Commodity Credit Corporation was formed for the purpose of buying and selling agricultural commodities and maintaining the loan price which was fixed by Congress. The operations of the Corporation for many years consisted of buying and selling. The Corporation would buy when prices began to go down and would sell when prices went up. During a period of a number of years in the maintenance of the price program the Corporation lost only about $200,000,000, spread over a very considerable number of years.

As we came into this war we inaugurated by statute a support-price program, and extended the support-price program to a great many commodities. I think there is no question that that is a very wise program, and it has resulted in a great increase of agricultural production, as Mr. Jones' figures show.

It seems to me to be obvious that in wartimes, just as we guarantee manufacturers a fair price if they manufacture war products, it is proper to guarantee farmers a fair price if they produce farm products. That program has extended to many different kinds of commodities, and I think it meets with very general approval.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has now about $2,000,000,000 invested in various kinds of agricultural products. It has about $1,000,000,000 of lending power left, and has asked Congress for $2,000,000,000 more. The committee

proposes that the Corporation be allowed one and a half billion dollars more, so that it will have two and a half billion dollars in addition to the $2,000,000,000 which it has now invested, to be used partly, at least, for the purpose of continuing the program of supporting prices.

The various commodities which are covered are barley, rye, corn, cotton, dairy products, eggs, fruits, hemp, oil seeds, tobacco, wheat, and wool. For instance the Corporation is buying the entire wool crop this year and reselling it, probably without any loss.

The only thing that concerns me about the program at all is this: Figures have been presented respecting the additional money the Corporation will need to hold a larger inventory at the end of 1945 than that which the Corporation has today. The figures which are perhaps most interesting are $331,000,000 for cotton and $371,000,000 for wheat. If we continue the program, and use that amount of money, it will result in the Commodity Credit Corporation owning or controlling, by loan, approximately 11 500,000 bales of cotton and some 400,000,000 bushels of wheat. I hope very much that that will not be necessary: I hope that those products will be sold before we come to the time when the support buying is expected to begin, and that this money we are granting will not be necessary to carry out the support program. But we have made a promise as to the support program. Congress has laid down the policy that in the case of these commodities, at least, and some other standard commodities, the loan value shall continue to be 90 percent for 2 years after the war, and it may well be that it will be necessary to use the amount of money requested to purchase that additional supply.

I only question where we are going if we continue indefinitely to increase the country's holdings of cotton and wheat, and I think after the war we must certainly have to consider some more drastic method of dealing with the surplus problem.

I feel, however, that the case is perfectly made for the amount that is asked for the purpose of the support-price program and for the additional inventory that may have to be held. We cut the amount requested by $500,000,000. I think Mr. Jones is satisfied that he could in all probability get through with that amount even if he is called upon to buy a great many commodities, and I think it is not likely that he will need quite what the bill proposes to give him.

After the war began and without further authority from Congress, the administration started the subsidy program. That program differs from the support-price program in the fact that the commodities in question are bought for the express purpose of taking a loss or paying a subsidy which will prevent an increase in the price to the consumer. That is the program about which there has been such great controversy in Congress during the past 2 years. Today, for instance, the Commodity Credit Corporation is making payments to dairy farmers on all the milk and butter they sell. The payments are being made now at the rate of about $450,000,000 a year. That is the largest subsidy the Commodity Credit Corporation pays. I think the meat subsidy of the R. F. C. is the only one that is larger.

Mr. President, we gradually drifted into that subsidy program. When at first it was criticized in Congress it probably involved on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation $250,000,000 a year. As I shall show the Senate, what we have allowed here is at the rate of $845,000,000 a year for the subsidy program.

The support-price program differs from the other program in that while it is used to support prices, instead of trying to sell the commodities at the same price at which they were bought so there is no loss, which was the former practice, it is now deliberately planned to sell at a loss, and to absorb the difference, so that the farmer can be paid more, and the consumer not be forced to pay increased prices. That is a part of the general program.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The subsidy is paid to the processor, the packer, and the miller. Can the Senator tell us the commodities which are involved?

Mr. TAFT. In the case of the Commodity Credit Corporation the subsidy in nearly all instances is paid to the producer. It differs from the R. F. C. subsidies, which are not before us today. The Commodity Credit Corporation subsidies, I might say, are listed in its report, and will be found on page 3 of the report. They cover fruits for processing, vegetables for processing, dry edible beans, soybeans, peanuts, sugar, dairy production, cheddar cheese, fluid milk, shortening, peanut butter, feed wheat, and one or two other minor products.

I think there can be no question that in all these cases the subsidy goes to the producer, or it goes to the consumer, to put it in another way, because every subsidy is for the purpose of paying more to the producer at the same time that it is sold to the consumer for less.

That program has gradually grown. I personally have previously expressed my opinion on the floor that I do not think on the scale on which it is indulged it is a sound program, but it has been set up, and I have always felt that our interest is to see that it is not arbitrarily increased. When this bill came to the committee, it allowed $2,000,000,000 more. So far as legal restrictions were concerned, the whole $3,000,000,000 could have been used for subsidies alone, instead of for the other program.

Last year, when we revised the Price Control and Stabilization Act, we inserted this provision:

> After June 30, 1945, neither the Price Administrator nor the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor any other Government corporation shall make any subsidy payments, or buy any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss and thereby subsidizing directly or indirectly the sale of commodities, unless the money required for such subsidies, or sale at a loss, has been appropriated by Congress for such purpose; and appropriations for such purpose are hereby authorized to be made.

Personally, I felt that appropriations for subsidies in the Commodity Credit Corporation and in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should have been put in the Budget by the President and should have been submitted as a part of the Budget message, since that was the law of Congress; but it was not done. Mr. Jones did not want to come to the Appropriations Committee. However, it is clear under this provision that no subsidies can be paid at all unless we expressly authorize them. Since my main interest was to see that there was a definite limit on the amount that could be paid for subsidies, I agreed that it could be done in this way, by authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation, without appropriations, to pay subsidies. So the bill provides that the particular provision of last year's law which I read shall be suspended, so far as the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation are concerned, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, provided that in this bill we now impose certain definite limitations on the subsidy program. Those limitations are set forth on page 3 of the bill.

The prior law does not go into effect until the 1st of July 1945. For the 6 months from July 1, 1945, to December 31, 1945, the Commodity Credit Corporation is limited to $250,000,000 for operations with respect to the dairy production payment program. That is slightly more than the present rates being paid to dairy farmers. It will be remembered that last year it was the position of all the dairy interests that we ought to allow the price of milk to the consumer to be raised, and that, if we were willing to increase the price of milk to the consumer by 2 cents a quart, we could save $500,000,000 a year. However, the administration has proceeded on the other program. I do not like to take the responsibility of forcing an increase in the price of milk. The stabilization program has worked reasonably well; and I feel that at this time we ought simply to say, "Go ahead, but do not increase the subsidy payments any further." That is the effect of this bill. Two hundred and fifty million dollars is allowed for the first 6 months of the fiscal year; and if the war continues after the 1st of next January, $250,000,000 more for the second 6 months of the fiscal year. So there is a total authorization of $500,000,000 for the year for dairy production payments.

For operations during the last 6 months of the calendar year 1945, $60,000,000 is permitted for noncrop programs. Those programs are described in the report. They cover the various payments which are made throughout the entire year.

There is a limitation of $225,000,000 with respect to 1945 crop programs. So, in case the war continues until July 1, 1946, the outside total authorization for the fiscal year 1946 is $845,000,000. Of the total increase of one and one-half billion dollars which we are granting by this bill, $845,000,000 may be used for subsidy payments, and that is all that

may be so used. The remainder must be used only for the ordinary buying and selling operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I may say at this time that I believe the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will come to Congress with a similar request. The request of the R. F. C. will probably be closer to $1,000,000,000. So the total subsidy program is likely to cost, and is now costing, at the rate of about $2,000,000,000 a year. I have never been entirely against subsidies. I believe that many subsidies should be paid. I think we should have been much better off if we had limited subsidies when they were approximately $500,000,000 a year, or even $1,000,000,000 a year. The difference of opinion as to what should be done was so great that the law which was finally enacted permitted a gradual increase in the program. I have always felt that we should freeze it and say to the Administration "If you want to pay more subsidies, you must obtain authorization from Congress," because subsidy payments are definite expenses of the Government. When they are paid, they are gone. There is no possibility under any circumstances of recouping them. They are just as much a war expenditure of the Government as are expenditures of the Army, the Navy, or any other war agency. I feel that the proper policy for Congress is to freeze subsidy payments about where they are. We have allowed a little leeway. I believe that the present program could be carried on for $750,000,000 or $800,000,000, instead of $845,000,000. We have allowed some leeway for minor increases. So the Administration is not absolutely tied hand and foot. But, in substance, the policy of the bill is to freeze the present scale of subsidy payments, unless the Congress at a later date should see fit to increase them. I believe that this is the best policy we can pursue at present, and I hope the bill may be passed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has just said that he did not know where we were going. I think it is all written down in the record of the transactions of 5,000 years ago. It was recorded in final form about 3,000 years ago. It is supposed to have been read by all the generations since, so I shall not repeat it. It will be found in the forty-seventh chapter of Genesis. That is where we are going. It is the story of Joseph, who, I think, was the Jesse Jones of that generation.

Mr. President, I rose merely to remark that Thomas Carlyle, the British philosopher and essayist, remarked, toward the close of the first fifty years of the nineteenth century, that the American people were peculiar, that they differed from all other peoples in one special respect, namely, that they really believed that they could postpone doomsday or bring in the millennium by act of Congress.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this is one of the most important bills relating to food supplies that will be presented at this session of Congress. There is practically unanimous support for the bill. The War Food Administrator requested it. All the farm organizations are together in support of it. The outstanding organizations of farmers have not always been in accord, but they are in full agreement in support of the pending bill. After full consideration, the committee unanimously reported it. I hope the bill will be passed without any dissenting votes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency was, in section 1, on page 1, line 6, after the word "term", to strike out "$5,000,000,000" and insert "$4,500,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, on page 2, line 7, after the word "as", to strike out "to increase the consumption of such commodity and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 16, to strike out—

SEC. 4. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation designed to support prices or obtain production of agricultural commodities, or to absorb abnormal costs in connection with the transportation of agricultural commodities and foods.

SEC. 4. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That the making of subsidy payments and the buying of commodities for resale at a loss, by the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the purpose of maintaining maximum prices established pursuant to provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended and supplemented, shall be limited as follows: Obligations for making such payments and absorbing such losses may be incurred and paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation (a) in such amounts as may be necessary (1) to complete operations with respect to 1944 and prior year crop programs and (2) to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal year noncrop programs; and (b) in amounts which do not involve subsidy payments or losses in excess of (1) $250,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to the dairy production payment program, (2) $60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program, and (3) $225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop program operations. Should hostilities in the present war extend beyond December 31, 1945, such dairy production payment program and other noncrop program operations involving such subsidy payments and losses may be continued on a basis which, taking into account seasonal variations in rates and production, will not involve such subsidy payments and losses in excess of $250,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy production payment program, or $60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program: *Provided, however*, That if hostilities cease before June 30, 1946, no additional obligations provided for in this sentence may be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such programs after the date on which hostilities cease.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio, who has discussed the bill. The $845,000,000 for subsidies is in effect an appropriation made by increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it seems to me. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is correct. The Commodity Credit Corporation perhaps would already have the $845,000,000, even if we were not to increase the borrowing power. We are increasing the borrowing power a billion and a half dollars, and the Corporation already has, according to its statement, about a billion dollars more. So the $845,000,000 could be obtained from the billion dollars the Corporation already has, even though the Congress did not appropriate the additional money. But in effect it is an appropriation of $845,000,000, because when it is used there is no possibility of getting it back.

Mr. BALL. If the Senator will further yield, let me inquire whether the Congress will not eventually have to appropriate directly out of the Treasury the funds necessary to make up whatever is paid out in subsidies during the war by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The Commodity Credit Corporation Act provides that on the 1st of every March, as I recall—and now we would change that to the 1st of July—an inventory shall be made of all the products, and a determination shall be made of how much the Corporation has impaired its capital by losses, and then Congress is practically forced by the law to appropriate the amount of money necessary to make up the losses. So ultimately there will be an appropriation of the $845,000,000 in order to prevent the capital of the Corporation from being impaired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that under the Taft amendment the appropriations are now authorized.

Mr. TAFT. The appropriations are already authorized under the former law, I believe. That has been the regular practice.

I may say that, although we do not yet have the complete figures, apparently during the past year or year and a half the subsidy program has actually cost the Commodity Credit Corporation $553,000,000, and no doubt we shall be asked to appropriate that sum of money next summer, as soon as the July 1 audit is made. The sum of money which we shall be asked to appropriate may be a larger one, of course. What we are now authorizing will not be finally appropriated for until the summer of 1946 or possibly 1947.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator. That is the point I wished to have discussed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 298) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the term "$3,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "$4,500,000,000."

SEC. 2. In the event the War Food Administrator determines that there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage in the stocks of any nonbasic perishable commodity owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Corporation may sell or cause to be sold such stocks of such commodity below the parity or comparable price therefor and the Corporation shall, insofar as practicable, make such sales, or cause them to made, in such manner as to prevent the depression of the farm price of the commodity.

SEC. 3. The provisions of subsection (c) of section 381 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 67) are suspended until the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date on which the President, by proclamation, or the Congress, by concurrent resolution, declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated.

SEC. 4. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That the making of subsidy payments and the buying of commodities for resale at a loss, by the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the purpose of maintaining maximum prices established pursuant to provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended and supplemented, shall be limited as follows: Obligations for making such payments and absorbing such losses may be incurred and paid by the Commodity credit Corporation (a) in such amounts as may be necessary (1) to complete operations with respect to 1944 and prior year crop programs and (2) to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal year noncrop programs; and (b) in amounts which do not involve subsidy payments or losses in excess of (1) $250,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to the dairy production payment program, (2) $60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program, and (3) $225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop program operations. Should hostilities in the present war extend beyond December 31, 1945, such dairy production payment program and other noncrop program operations involving such subsidy payments and losses may be continued on a basis which, taking into account seasonal variations in rates and production, will not involve such subsidy payments and losses in excess of $250,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy production payment program, or $60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program: *Provided, however*, That if hostilities cease before June 30, 1946, no additional obligations provided for in this sentence may be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such programs after the date on which hostilities cease.

SEC. 5. The first two sentences of section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"As of the 30th of June in each year and as soon as possible thereafter, beginning with June 30, 1945, an appraisal of all of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The value of assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower, and a report of any such appraisal shall be submitted to the President as soon as possible after it has been made."

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1945" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947."

MARINO BELLO

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as the result of the action the Senate has taken today, only one bill remains on the calendar. It is Senate bill 410, for the relief of Marino Bello. It is a private claim bill. In order that we may complete action on measures on the calendar, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may now proceed to the consideration of that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 410) for the relief of Marino Bello.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, which was, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,233" and insert "$2,333", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marino Bello, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $2,333, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for (1) compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, (2) reimbursement of medical expenses incurred by him because of such injuries, and (3) damage to his automobile, as a result of an accident which occurred when his automobile was struck by a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Aliso and Alameda Streets in Los Angeles, Calif., on January 29, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a midemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] today introduced a bill in his own behalf and in my behalf. In connection with the introduction of the bill, I desire to make a few brief remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for about 2 years I have been studying the operations and activities of Government corporations. As a new member of the Senate, I discovered that certain corporations of the Government were operating in the field of Government financing in ways unknown to Members of Congress. I felt that Congress should be informed of these activities. As a result, in February 1943, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, calling for an investigation of all Government financing agencies, including Government corporations in that field. The Byrd Committee subsequently made a comprehensive and enlightening study of these agencies.

My first interest in the general overall picture of Government corporations resulted from my trip to South America in the summer of 1943. It was then that I discovered a number of Government corporations which I, and I am sure a majority of Congress, never knew existed. Further, I discovered that certain corporations about which we knew were engaging in activities of which Congress was not aware. I say this not so much in criticism of the corporations as I do of Congress in failing to provide machinery for securing information concerning creatures of Government for which Congress should be responsible. I reported my findings in South America to the Byrd Committee.

I claim no credit for the subsequent splendid report made by the Byrd Committee in August 1944, on Government corporations. However, I do believe that that report gave Congress the first real picture of this fourth branch of Government which has grown so much like Topsy in the past several years.

On September 21 of last year, I spoke at length in this Chamber, setting forth the history and far-reaching effect of Government corporations. In order to avoid reiterating that statement, familiarity with which I believe is vital to a complete understanding of the present situation, I suggest that the Members of the Senate may wish to review it at their leisure.

Government corporations can be compared to any private business corporation. As a rule they are incorporated under State charters. They have a certain capital on which they operate. They are run by officers charged with duties similar to those of the officers of private corporations. Their capital comes from taxes collected from the people, thus making the people the stockholders. In corporations wholly owned by the Government, this is particularly true. Logically, we in Congress, elected by the people, can be considered the board of directors of these corporations. As the board of directors, our duty is to develop the policy of the corporations, review their activities, and generally guide their programs. To date we have, to some extent, failed in this responsibility.

Some Government corporations have engaged in questionable activities; some have pursued a sound course. But in either case Congress should act. We have a definite responsibility to the people as their board of directors. For

months I have received letters from, and have talked to, many responsible people who have recognized this failure. During the past several weeks the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I have conferred with representatives of the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department. The unanimous response was surprising. All these agencies agree that a definite need exists for Congress to set up a uniform structure in which Government corporations should operate.

As a result of many conferences, and without any consideration for recent political occurrences, a bill was drafted. I am happy to say that the three agencies, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I are in complete agreement as to the contents of this bill. Some of us feel that the bill does not go far enough, but we all feel that it establishes a basically sound policy for the organization and operation of Government corporations responsible to Congress and the people.

Very briefly, I wish to outline the provisions of the bill. The bill, when and if passed, will be called the Government Corporations Control Act. The bill covers both wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations. Such corporations as Commodity Credit, in which all stock is owned by the Government, comes in the first class. I may say in this connection that the bill which the Senate acted upon early in the day was handled in almost exactly the same manner that is provided for in the bill to which I am referring.

The second class, much smaller by comparison, contains the Federal land banks, the Federal home-loan banks, the Central Bank for Cooperatives, and the regional banks for cooperatives. In this group banks or individuals own part of the stock and the Federal Government the remainder. Under the proposed bill the wholly owned corporations would be required to submit a detailed budget program to the Bureau of the Budget at the beginning of each fiscal year and the President would submit these estimates to Congress in the annual Budget. Specific requirements are provided. These include estimates of administrative expenses, estimates of necessary borrowing by the corporation, estimates of the amount of capital funds to be returned to the Treasury during the fiscal year or the appropriations required to provide for the reissuance of authorized capital or the restoration of capital impairments. Congress may then approve or modify such estimates as it sees fit. The General Accounting Office is to audit the financial transactions of these corporations each year and submit such audit to Congress. No additional Government capital or paid-in surplus is to be subscribed or paid in to any of these corporations without specific authorization from Congress. The Director of the Budget, with the approval of the President, at any time he deems it to be in public interest, may recommend in the annual Budget that certain corporations be treated as Government agencies insofar as appropriations, expenditures, receipts, accounting, and other fiscal matters are concerned.

Mixed-ownership corporations are to be audited by the General Accounting Office, and reports are to be made annually to Congress similar to those required in the case of wholly owned corporations.

Other general provisions are included which support the above program.

May I stress that this bill in no way hinders the operation of Government corporations. Instead, it sets a definite pattern of operation for them and places them under the control of Congress, as any Government agency should be. Congress must accept its obligations in this matter. We have avoided it too long. If we fail in this and subsequent duties entrusted to us by the people, we fail the cause of representative government for which our sons are fighting and dying.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from the President's 1940 Budget message in which he apparently approves of exactly the form which we are suggesting in this bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I recognized the merit of constructive suggestions of this nature by recommending in my last Budget message a change in the method of financing the requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This recommendation provided for an annual appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Corporation, and contemplated that any surplus from operations or any impairment of capital resulting from losses be reflected as receipts or expenditures in the annual Budget. Under this method the Budget would be affected, not when the investment or loan is made, but in the fiscal year when the surplus or loss occurs.

Mr. BUTLER. The present bill provides this procedure.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, CARTER GLASS, for 1919, setting forth exactly the same views which are covered by this bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCORPORATED GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The subject of incorporated Government agencies is closely related in its importance to the Treasury to that of appropriation for revolving funds and reimbursable appropriations. This means of handling some large and unusual activities of the Government was necessary during the war, but, now that the emergency has passed, there can be no justification, generally speaking, for the creation of new Government-owned corporations or the continuation of those in existence except in unusual cases or for the purpose of winding up their affairs. At the least, such agencies should not be exempted from amenability in future to the accounting laws of the United States and the regulations of the Treasury made in pursuance to the statutes unless good and controlling reasons are given therefor. The particular advantage, which I should rather call menace in time of peace, accruing to Government functions so organized, is the freedom which they enjoy in the expenditure of public money without the legal restrictions that the Congress has imposed with respect to the usual transactions of the Government. If these activities were sustained by specific appropriations and were required to withdraw their funds from the Treasury in the manner prescribed for other Government establishments with the same accountability both as to disbursements and receipts, there would be little or no ground for the corporate form of organization.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the bill which has been introduced.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 469) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to provide for financial control of Government corporations

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Government Corporation Control Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to bring Government corporations and their transactions and operations under annual scrutiny by the Congress and provide current financial control thereof.

"TITLE I—WHOLLY-OWNED GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

"SEC. 101. As used in this act the term 'wholly-owned Government corporation' means Commodity Credit Corporation; Federal Intermediate Credit Banks; Production Credit Corporations; Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations; Farmers Home Corporation; Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Defense Plant Corporation; Defense Supplies Corporation; Metals Reserve Company; Rubber Reserve Company; War Damage Corporation; Federal National Mortgage Association; The RFC Mortgage Company; Disaster Loan Corporation; Inland Waterways Corporation; Warrior River Terminal Company; The Virgin Islands Company; Federal Prison Industries, Inc.; United States Spruce Production Corporation; Institute of Inter-American Affairs; Institute of Inter-American Transportation; Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc.; Inter-American Navigation Corporation; Prencinradio, Inc.; Cargoes, Inc.; Export-Import Bank of Washington; Petroleum Reserves Corporation; Rubber Development Corporation; United States Commercial Company; Smaller War Plants Corporation; Federal Public Housing Authority (or United States Housing Authority) and including public housing projects financed from appropriated funds and operations thereof; Defense Homes Corporation; Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; Home Owners' Loan Corporation; United States Housing Corporation; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Panama Railroad Company; Tennessee Valley Authority; Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.; any other corporation which is wholly-owned by the United States Government or by any agency thereof, including Government corporations.

"SEC. 102. Each wholly owned G[illegible]nment corporation shall cause to be prepared annually a budget program covering all operations for the ensuing fiscal year with comparisons with the current fiscal year and the last completed fiscal year. Such budget programs shall be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget at the time prescribed for the submission of the estimates of appropriations by the regular Government departments and establishments and shall be transmitted by the President to the Congress in the annual Budget; except that the first budget programs shall be submitted as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act.

"SEC. 103. The Bureau of the Budget, under such rules and regulations as the President may establish, is authorized and directed to prescribe the form and content of, and the manner in which such budget programs shall be prepared and presented; but all such budget programs shall contain specific estimates of administrative expenses and estimates of necessary borrowing by the corporation concerned, together with the estimates of the amount of Government capital funds which shall be returned to the Treasury during the fiscal year or the appropriations required to provide for the reissuance of authorized capital or the restoration of capital impairments. Such budget programs shall be considered and shall be included in the annual Budget in the same manner, as nearly as practicable, as are the estimates and other information submitted in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921. Budget programs so submitted to the Congress shall be considered and approved, modified or prohibited by it, in the same manner, as nearly as practicable, as appropriations are considered and made by Congress.

"The budget program may, whenever deemed necessary, include and set forth specifically requests for authorization to cover possible emergency or contingent operations in the ensuing year, but operations thereunder shall be initiated only after approval by the President and shall be reported to the Congress from time to time, but not later than the time for transmittal to the next annual Budget.

"SEC. 104. No wholly owned Government corporation shall transact any business in any fiscal year except such business as is authorized by act of Congress as a part of its budget program for such fiscal year, and no expenditures for administrative expenses in any fiscal year shall be made by any such corporation except in the amounts authorized and made available by Congress for such fiscal year. No funds so made available by the Congress for administrative expenses shall be obligated or expended unless and until an appropriation account shall have been established therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a covering warrant, and funds so made available shall be subject to apportionment by the Bureau of the Budget, and claims and accounts thereunder to adjustment and settlement by the General Accounting Office under title III of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921. This section shall take effect with respect to wholly owned Government corporations or groups of corporations at the earliest possible date following the enactment of this act, as determined by the President, but no later than July 1, 1946.

"SEC. 105. The financial transactions of wholly owned Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit begin with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of this act.

"SEC. 106. A report of each such audit for such fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the several corporations, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. The report shall also show how the budget program (herein provided) was executed and specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

"SEC. 107. No additional Government capital or paid-in surplus shall be subscribed or paid in to any wholly owned Government corporation except pursuant to specific appropriation therefor hereafter made.

"SEC. 108. Whenever it is deemed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the President to be practicable and in the public interest that any wholly owned Government corporation be treated with respect to its appropriations, expenditures, receipts, accounting, and other fiscal matters as if it were a Government agency other than a corporation, the Director shall include in connection with the budget program of such corporation in the Budget a recommendation to that effect. If the Congress approves such recommendation in connection with the budget program for any fiscal year, such corporation, with respect to subsequent fiscal years, shall be regarded as an establishment other than a corporation for the purposes of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and other provisions of law relating to appropriations, expenditures, receipts, accounts, and other fiscal matters, and shall not be subject to the provisions of this act other than this section. The corporate entity shall not be effected by this section.

"TITLE II—MIXED-OWNERSHIP GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

"SEC. 201. As used in this act the term 'mixed-ownership Government corporations' means (1) the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the Regional Banks for Cooperatives, (2) Federal land banks, and (3) Federal home loan banks. Any of such banks from which Government capital has been entirely withdrawn, and during the period such bank remains without Government capital, shall not be subject to the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 202. The financial transactions of mixed-ownership Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit shall begin with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of this act.

"SEC. 203. A report of each such audit for each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15, following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expenses; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of, and the use of Government capital by, each such corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital or lack of sufficient capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

"SEC. 204. (a) No additional Government capital or paid-in surplus shall be subscribed or paid in to any mixed-ownership Government corporation except pursuant to specific appropriation therefor hereafter made.

"(b) The President shall include in the annual Budget any recommendations he may wish to make as to the return of Government capital to the Treasury by any mixed-ownership corporation.

"TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 301. The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of wholly-owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations as provided in sections 105 and 202 of this act shall be borne out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized for the purpose.

"SEC. 302. The banking and checking accounts of all wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations shall be kept with the Treasurer of the United States, or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, with a Federal Reserve bank, or with a designated depositary or fiscal agent of the United States.

"SEC. 303. (a) All bonds, notes, debentures, and other similar obligations which are hereafter issued by any wholly owned or mixed-ownership Government corporation shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, shall bear such rates of interest, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, shall be issued in such manner and at such times and sold at such prices as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(b) Hereafter, no direct obligation of the United States, and no obligation guaranteed by the United States as to principal or interest, or both, which are held or owned by any wholly owned or mixed ownership Government corporation shall be sold, nor shall any such obligation be purchased by any such corporation without the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to exercise any of the functions vested in him by this section through any officer or employee of any agency whom he may designate for such purpose.

"SEC. 304. (a) No corporation shall be created hereafter by any officer or agency of the Federal Government or by any Government corporation, except by direct congressional action or pursuant to act of Congress specifically authorizing the creation of such corporation.

"(b) Any such corporation hereafter created shall be subject to the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 305. All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act, to the extent of such conflict, are hereby repealed."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Am I correct in understanding that the audit would be made by someone appointed by the administration?

Mr. BUTLER. It would be someone appointed by the Comptroller General.

Mr. LANGER. He would be appointed by the same administration that operated the corporations, would he not?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; but I believe that by leaving the selection to the Comptroller General we could obtain as much ability as we could by leaving it to any other Government official.

Mr. LANGER. Should we not try to provide some means of representation of the minority side in naming the auditors?

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that the bill has only been introduced today. I assume that it will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that he, or any other Member of the Senate, will be welcome to present any amendment or proposal which he sees fit to present.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can the Senator from Nebraska refresh my recollection with reference to the term of office of the Comptroller General?

Mr. BUTLER. I understand it is for 15 years.

Mr. AUSTIN. So that in order for him to be a member of an administration, the administration would have to last as long as the term of office of the Comptroller General.

Mr. BUTLER. That has not happened many times.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. DREWRY, and Mr. MOTT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law No. 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. KEOGH and Mr. BUCK members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy; that, pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Speaker had appointed Mr. SASSCER, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. PRICE of Florida, Mr. HESS, and Mr. KEEFE members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy; that, pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Speaker had appointed Mr. BLOOM and Mr. GRAHAM directors on the part of the House of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf; that, pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. KNUTSON a member of the Committee to Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures, to fill the existing vacancy thereon; that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law No. 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. FORAND and Mr. TALBOT members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy; and that, pursuant to the provisions of title 20, section 43, United States Code, the Speaker appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. COX, and Mr. REECE of Tennessee members on the part of the House of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

SURVEY OF THE DISTRIBUTION AND UTILIZATION OF HEALTH PERSONNEL, ETC.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendment, Senate Resolution 62, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 62) submitted by Mr. PEPPER on January 29, 1945, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment at the end of the resolution to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$15,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, as agreed to June 2, 1940 (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services) is hereby further continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Resolved further, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services) agreed to June 2, 1943, is hereby increased by $15,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] a question relative to the resolution. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I happen to serve with the distinguished Senator from Florida on the Committee on Education and Labor, and also on the subcommittee which has conducted the investigation into wartime health and education. There is no doubt in my mind that the Senator and his committee have done splendid work. I believe that if the committee should ask to be continued, I should be very reluctant to oppose its request. It is my fundamental belief that the appropriation for which a committee asks should be of sufficient size to provide all the necessary finances in connection with the employment of personnel of the committee.

With that preliminary remark, I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if the requested appropriation of $25,000 would cover all the expenses of the committee, including the employment of personnel.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, allow me to say to the Senator that the requested appropriation has been reduced by the committee to $15,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I ask the Senator from Florida if an appropriation of $15,000 would be sufficient to enable the committee to employ necessary personnel, or would the committee have to continue its functions with personnel borrowed from the executive departments of the Government?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that a similar question was raised by the Senator from Montana a few days ago with respect to the Small Business Committee. I agree with the statement which has been made that personnel employed by a standing committee should be paid for out of Senate funds. But, aside from the adequacy of the appropriation, one of the difficult questions involved is that pertaining to the type of personnel which we should like to employ. In the past we have been borrowing personnel. We had an appropriation of only $5,000 for the committee. All the personnel under the authority of the original resolution had to be borrowed from executive agencies. But, for example, a very able doctor from the Navy by the name of Dr. Truslaw has been working with our committee. He has worked in close cooperation with the Surgeon General of the Navy, Admiral McIntyre. I dare say that it would have been impossible for us to have employed a competent doctor with such relationship to the Navy who could have given his time and energy to our work. We have also had a man from the Public Health Service, who has been on loan from that Service. Of course he has been carrying on essentially the same type of work for the committee that he would have been carrying on for the Public Health Service, and I dare say we could not have obtained his services without borrowing him. We have also had a man from the Army Medical Corps, a very able man, whose services we probably would not have been able to obtain unless he had been borrowed. We have a man from an executive agency who is especially qualified to deal with health problems as they affect veterans. So generally speaking, our personnel has been borrowed from agencies that are engaged in the same type of study that we have been conducting.

I had in mind, in asking for the $25,000 appropriation in the first place, that we would try to make our personnel as nearly as possible the same as it now is; but the trouble is, as the able Senator knows, that the Senate becomes so readily frightened about ten or fifteen or twenty-five thousand dollars when we are considering such a thing as the health of the Nation.

We started this study because of the grave disclosures of the Selective Service System as to the number of men rejected from the selective service because of educational and physical deficiencies. If I may say so, the response of the medical profession, of the Army and Navy medi-

cal branches, of the public, and of the press has been very encouraging to the work of our committee.

We issued a report on January 4, which was commented upon very favorably in an editorial in the American Medical Association Journal. We have been working in contact with the Federal Security Agency, the medical profession, and the Veterans Administration and the medical branches of the Army and Navy, with the Public Health Service, and with various research agencies of the country. I think we have prepared and issued a report which has disclosed the need for the Nation making a more serious effort to solve the health problem. Now we are at the point of getting down to something specific. The able Senator, who is a very valued member of the committee, has been very helpful, and I am sure will be helpful in the future.

The subcommittee will consist of nine members, five Democrats and four Republicans. So far as I am concerned, I will say to the Senator I wish we did not have to borrow anybody, provided we could get the type of personnel we need, and, of course, the more the appropriation is reduced the more we will either have to curtail our work or resort to borrowing necessary personnel.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the Senator's answer is that his committee has to have borrowed help in addition to those who may be provided for by this appropriation?

Mr. PEPPER. There will undoubtedly have to be some borrowed help. It may not have to be full time, perhaps only part time, but we will have to have the help from other agencies to some extent. What I am hopeful of is that the staff director will be paid out of the appropriation. I shall ask our staff director to reexamine our personnel and make any reductions which possibly can be made consistent with efficiency and the duties of our committee. I will say to the Senator we want to curtail the borrowing and, as a member of the committee, I shall be glad to cooperate with him in curtailing borrowing as much as we possibly can.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the answer of the Senator from Florida that he is willing to curtail, and that he himself has expressed a desire to discontinue, the policy of borrowing in the future, I shall not object, as his committee is put in the same category as the Small Business Committee. I want to say to the Senator from Florida, who I know is reasonable, that there are on this committee at this time 15 borrowed personnel. To me the salaries paid are not so important, as is the fact that all the personnel should be working in the interest of the United States Senate. I do not condemn or criticize the work of any individuals; no doubt they have rendered meritorious service, but it is my feeling that when by a resolution $25,000 is asked for and the subcommittee knows that it is going to need a personnel of 15 or 20 to do the work of the committee, that set-up is really being provided under a subterfuge, whether we so acknowledge it or not, and it should be brought to the attention of Members of the Senate.

I shall be glad indeed to consider each one of the committees on its own merits and consider the appropriations and personnel needed. I think the Senator knows I feel that way. But the only way to stop the practice of borrowing personnel—and we have now 96 personnel borrowed from some 26 different Government agencies—is to establish and declare a policy in the United States Senate. Because of the suggestion of the Senator, I want him to know that I propose to submit a resolution in order to have the Senate determine the policy it shall pursue in the matter of borrowed help, and to require in the future that appropriations shall be provided contingent upon the fact that the legislative branch will not borrow help from the administrative branch of the Government.

The borrowed personnel may be very efficient, but I found out that the minute a man who is borrowed is discharged by the committee he loses his job with the agency with which he was connected. I am quite satisfied, and I believe the Senator will agree with me, that the necessary personnel can be taken care of as employees of the Senate, if we provide a proper appropriation, and if their work is needed and the investigation should go on.

Mr. PEPPER. I might say to the able Senator I agree to every word he has said; but if that policy is to be carried out, unless the work of the Senate committees is to be curtailed the Senate has got to quit becoming excited whether the amount appropriated is $5,000 or $6,600 or some such sum as that, and not look upon every committee as if it were trying to steal a few dollars from the Senate contingent fund. I thoroughly agree with the principle the Senator has enunciated, and I should like to see it adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not at all alarmed about five or ten or fifteen or twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars necessary for essential committee work—we just passed a bill providing for about four and a half billion dollars—but the thing I am alarmed about, as I said in connection with a prior resolution, Senate resolution 206, is that this practice which has grown up, should be changed. A resolution providing a small appropriation is passed, a committee is created, and then it starts to borrow help from various Government agencies. My position, as a member of the committee, is simply that in the future, if these appropriations are to be made, the committees which are created should stand on their own merits; they should come to the Senate and ask for appropriations, and then employ their help for the Senate of the United States and have them responsible to us as fact-finding investigators, so that we will have them work for us and definitely and solely responsible to the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I merely want to take this opportunity to say that I think the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and his subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor have rendered a very fine service to the Senate and the country in their work, in their hearings, and in their report on the question of the health of the people of the Nation. I think it would be most unfortunate if anything should now occur that would in any way handicap this committee or interfere with the fine work it is doing. I desire to commend the Senator from Florida and his subcommittee for the splendid contribution they are making, looking toward a solution of one of the most vital and one of the most challenging problems which confront us today, namely, the health of the people of the United States of America.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the able Senator from Alabama for what he has just said. I should like to trespass upon the time of the Senate to comment upon the fact that the American Medical Association carried our full report in its Journal, and, if I may do so without immodesty, to refer to two or three sentences in an editorial which I will read:

> The report reaches us just as the Journal goes to press. The time is too short for detailed consideration of the various aspects of this report. The report, in general, would seem to be a more scientific, carefully considered document than has heretofore been available as a result of previous hearings in this field.

I want the Senate to know that we are not out for socialized medicine; we are not out to break down any of the standards of the profession. We do not have any panacea. We are merely trying to find what we may properly do to bring a greater degree of health care to the people of this Nation, and we welcome the interest of Senators in our work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to make an observation in regard to what has already been said not only in respect to the borrowing of employees from the executive departments, but to emphasize what I have said heretofore in regard to the multiplicity of special investigating committees.

The only theory really upon which the Senate is supposed to authorize the creation of special investigating committees is that such a committee can investigate matters, for the purpose of recommending legislation, which cannot be done by a standing committee. I doubt whether in one case out of a hundred that theory is accurate or sound. In recent years we have had a good deal of experience in the creation of special committees. We have not authorized such special committees to report proposed legislation. They have a right, as the result of their investigations, to recommend legislation, and in the case of the George post-war committee it has not only recommended but has participated in the framing of legislation, but that legislation had to be referred to the appropriate standing committee of the Senate.

I am a member of the George committee, and, therefore, I can speak frankly. I think the committee has done a very

fine piece of work, but I would not, as a member of the committee, assert that it had done a better piece of work than the appropriate standing committee could have done if it had also gone into the same subject.

I know how easy it is for a Senator who thinks something should be investigated to offer a resolution and have it referred to a committee of which he is a member, or of which he is chairman, and I know that in such a committee the easiest course is the course of least resistance, and therefore the easiest thing to do is to get the resolution out of the committee and onto the floor of the Senate, where it goes automatically to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Then the pressure is put on the Committee to Audit and Control, by those interested in the resolution, to report it favorably. It is possible to multiply that situation ad infinitum and ad nauseam. We have not escaped the ad nauseam status sometimes in the history of the Senate in the recent past.

I recall when my good friend the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], now the minority leader, was not in that position, but the position was held by the late distinguished Senator from Oregon, Mr. McNary. Sometime before Senator McNary's untimely and unfortunate death he said to me on a number of occasions, "I think we are running these special investigating committees to seed." I agreed with him, but we took it out largely in talking to each other about it across the aisle, and we did not go very much further. But we were getting to the verge of bringing the matter before the Senate to determine whether or not we should not put the brakes on the creation of special committees, with the employment of special personnel paid out of the contingent fund, and we know that from time to time we have had requests for increase in the contingent fund of the Senate in order that we might pay such expenses.

For that reason I was glad when we discontinued all the special committees, effective on the 1st day of February, and I do not mind confessing that it was my hope that most of them would not be revived. Some of them have been, I do not know just how many. I was not able to be in the Senate at the time the revival took place. So much for that.

Many persons think we have more committees now than the Senate should have. Movements are on foot to revise, to streamline, to reform Congress, by cutting down the membership of committees. I do not know how that would work out either in the House or in the Senate, but certainly the question of the numerosity of committees is under wide discussion in our country, and we may be confronted by very intelligent proposals to reduce the number of committees. Whether that would mean an increase in their size in order that all Members of the Senate might find themselves on important committees is a matter to which we must give very careful consideration, because I do not think any committee should be so large that it becomes a town meeting in order that it may function.

We have a sufficient number of standing committees of importance, which have jurisdiction over every imaginable kind of legislation, so that upon our standing committees we do not have to superimpose special committees to go out and investigate something and then come back and ask a standing committee to do something about it. Therefore I think the time has come for us to put the brakes on the creation of special committees.

As to the employment of help from the departments, I know how that works out. Let us take the Committee on Agriculture, for instance. A Senator who is on that committee offers a resolution to investigate a question involving agriculture, and he has it referred to his committee, the committee reports it, and the Senate appropriates $5,000 or $10,000. He decides he needs fifteen or twenty employees from the Department of Agriculture, and so he goes to the Secretary of Agriculture and says, "I want these employees." The Secretary of Agriculture is human, he has legislation pending before the committee, or he may have, and what is he going to do? He is going to make the employees available.

Mr. President, either those employees are not needed where they are, or they are needed. If they are not needed, they should not be on the pay roll of the Department of Agriculture, or anywhere else. If they are needed there, they should be kept there.

I have been amazed, in the last 2 weeks, to find that committees with appropriations of fifteen or twenty thousand dollars are spending seventy-five, or eighty, or one-hundred thousand dollars through the transfer to Capitol Hill of employees who have been in the departments, under civil service, where they are supposed to be needed, and where the Civil Service Commission has been asked to certify them for employment. I do not like the word "fraud" or the word "deception," but the practice is a species of covering up the expenses of these investigations.

Mr. President, in what I say I am not referring particularly to the committee of which the Senator from Florida is chairman, and I concur in the congratulations which have been hurled in his direction, which I am sure were not unwelcome, for the fine work the Senator from Florida and his committee have done. My remarks are not aimed at that committee, or the Small Business Committee, but I think that on the whole it would be better for the Senate to use its own funds and employ the people it needs. I have just as much moral right to ask the Secretary of the Treasury to send a clerk or stenographer to my office in the Senate Office Building to help me out because I am short of employees as a committee has to ask the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, or any other department to send 3, or 4, or half a dozen, or 15, or 20 employees to the Capitol to help a committee which is a creature of ourselves in the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope we are reaching the tail end of this practice, and that we may at a very early date discontinue it altogether. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for his devotion. The chairmanship of that committee is a thankless job. Anyone who has the position of chairman of the Audit and Control Committee, and who must pass on these things and resist requests, has a thankless job. The Senator from Illinois knows that to be so. The Senator who preceded him as chairman, Justice Byrnes, who was chairman of the committee for a long time, knows it to be so. Other members of the committee know it to be so. It is a hard thing to stand up and say, "You are not entitled to this money and you ought not to have it." Certainly there is no pleasure in doing that. Such action comes only from a sense of duty done. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois on the perspicacity and the tenacity with which he has performed his duty in a most admirable way. Therefore, having said all I want to say on these two subjects, I hope the resolution of the Senator from Florida will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Chester L. Sumners, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice James O. Day, resigned.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edwin Jackson Kyle, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Guatemala;

Joseph F. McGurk, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic;

R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Panama;

Herman B. Baruch, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal; and

Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Sydney, Australia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the

clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTER GENERAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania, to be Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in connection with the confirmation of Mr. Walker's nomination to be Postmaster General, I desire to say that for the first time in history, I believe, the Post Office Department the past fiscal year has made a substantial profit. The exact amount is $37,768,028. The Department has produced that surplus despite franked mail and penalty mail, both of which are very large. It has also carried free mail to the soldiers, and all mail, so far as the Army and the Navy are concerned, is carried free. Other departments are required to pay postage. The Department has never been better or more successfully operated than it has been under Mr. Walker. He has made a most admirable executive. He has done his work in a cheerful, delightful, pleasing way, and, in my judgment, he is one of the best officers we have ever had in charge of that or any other department.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to ask him a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to be informed whether the figures showing these admirable gains take into account mail outside our borders. In other words, during the war has there been charged up to or has any responsibility been placed on the Post Office Department for transportation of mail beyond our borders?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; the Post Office Department has charge of all United States mail wherever it is carried.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I had an idea that the Navy and the Army had charge of the mail as soon as it reached the borders.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, the Senator means mail which applies solely to the Army and the Navy?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am inclined to think that what the Senator says is true about mail after it reaches the borders.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], I, as next ranking Republican member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, wish to join in what has been said about Mr. Walker by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I join in everything that the Senator has said concerning Frank Walker. In all my experience on committees of the Senate I do not know when we have had more real, genuine, true cooperation than we have had from the Post Office Department. Time and time again the First Assistant has come before the committee and produced any records we wanted. Mr. Walker has invited us to the Department. I sometimes think that Mr. Walker's attitude may be due to the fact that he lived for a time in the West, in the State of Montana. Living there, he became sort of democratic. Certainly Frank Walker has been most helpful, and has been intensely interested in cooperating with the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Blynn T. Shafer, of Ohio, to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service System, with salary at the rate of $5,600 per annum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Angus J. Gallagher, of Ohio, to be administrative officer in the Selective Service System, with salary at the rate of $6,500 per annum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Raymond H. Fleming, of Louisiana, to be State director of selective service for Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall ask that the nomination of Colonel Roosevelt, appearing on page 5 of the calendar, be passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if any of these nominations to be temporary brigadier generals are to go over I think they all ought to go over. It is my purpose——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield. I think we ought to dispose of all of them this afternoon.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no objection to the Senator's suggestion, but I was discussing a matter with the majority leader, Mr. President, at the time the motion to confirm was made. I am not aware at this moment exactly how far we have gone. I do, however, object to considering en bloc the entire list of nominations to be brigadier generals.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator object to the nominations in the Regular Army or simply those which are temporary nominations?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Simply those which are temporary, appearing on page 5 of the Executive Calendar. I have no objection to considering those en bloc, Mr. President, if the name of Elliott Roosevelt is left out of the list.

Mr. BARKLEY. The temporary list begins on page 3. I have no objection to the consideration of Mr. Roosevelt's nomination separately, if we can dispose of it this afternoon, but if his nomination is to be put over until the next executive session of the Senate I think all the nominations of temporary officers ought to go over and be acted on at the same time.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. But I think they ought to be acted on now. We have plenty of time now. I think any Senator who wishes to discuss the nominations in question will have plenty of time to do so this afternoon.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. While this name has been before the committee for some time I have had no opportunity to study the qualifications of the nominee nor have a number of other Senators upon this side of the aisle. Because of the considerable amount of mail I have received upon this subject in the past week, I think it is of sufficient importance to warrant enough time being afforded to enable us to look into the matter a little on our own behalf. I have nothing either for or against this young man, but I think Members of the Senate should have an opportunity to investigate the subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I have no quarrel with the Senator from South Dakota if he wants to investigate the matter further. The Committee on Military Affairs, as I understand, voted to report all these nominations unanimously upon the military records of the officers involved, without regard to any extraneous matter that might be discussed in letters or newspaper articles.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Even bulldogs?

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, there was no dissenting voice in the Committee on Military Affairs in connection with any of these nominations. The Committee on Military Affairs is in the midst of an investigation of the episode, which is no doubt on the Senator's mind, and concerning which he is receiving letters. I also have received letters, and am receiving letters on that subject, and I suppose we all have. Of course, I would welcome the Senator's individual investigation of that subject; but the Committee on Military Affairs is looking into it now to ascertan what happened.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If we should confirm the nomination today, and the committee should learn something afterward, it would be too late, would it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. If it were something that would shed any light upon his qualifications as a military officer, that might be true; but the Committee on Military Affairs, which is made up of some very alert Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, in spite of the fact that this matter was under investigation, and is now under investigation, voted to report the nomination on his military record, and on nothing else. I do not know what effect any new discovery as to the record would have upon any Senator's vote.

I should like to dispose of all these nominations today; but if there is to be any disposition to ask that one of them go over, I think they should all go over. I hope that none of them will go over.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The request which I am about to make seems agreeable to the Senator. I ask that all the nominations for temporary advancement be passed over for 1 week.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Why can we not dispose of them? Today is Monday. On this list are the names of officers who are in the combat zones, and who every day are risking their lives for their country. I do not know any reason why these nominations should be delayed for a whole week. Most of the officers whose names are on this list are, as I have suggested, in the overseas theaters of operations. Most of them are combat officers, who every day are subjected to great danger in leading their men in the fury of battle. I do not know why the Senate should wait a whole week to confirm this man's nomination. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs did not require a week to pass on it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no objection to the Senator's desire to act upon the nominations today, if one name is left off the list.

Mr. HILL. I will not agree to leave that name off the list. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs considered this one name, and considered the record of the nominee, Colonel Roosevelt, as that record was compiled and sent to the committee by the War Department. After reading the record of Colonel Roosevelt, and after considering it, the Committee on Military Affairs reported the nomination without a dissenting vote; and there was a good attendance in the committee at that time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I think there is no misunderstanding about the situation with respect to these nominations, and in particular the nomination which has been mentioned. There are Senators who will wish to make some further investigation, and I anticipate that a number of Senators may wish to say something about this nomination. I am not one of those Senators.

Reference has been made to the Committee on Military Affairs and its investigation. I have great respect for the Committee on Military Affairs; but I wish to invite the attention of all Senators to the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs is not the Senate of the United States, and that every Member of this body has a right to express his views and has the right to a fair opportunity to express them. When an effort is made to confirm nominations en bloc——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. At the moment I am yielding to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to have the Senator yield to me.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky has yielded to me, I should like to proceed for a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor, and has yielded to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was saying that while I have great respect for the Committee on Military Affairs, it is not the Senate of the United States; and every other Member of this body has an equal right with members of the Military Affairs Committee to an opportunity to vote on each and every one of these nominations if he so desires.

I do not like the situation which has developed. So far as I personally am concerned, I am perfectly willing to see all these nominations confirmed at this time; but other Senators disagree with me. They desire an opportunity to be heard; and I suggest, with all respect, that we shall not make progress on this nomination or other nominations if an effort is made to interfere with what I think is the right of Senators to be heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, so far as I am concerned, I do not object to any other Senator being heard, and I have not heard of any Senator on either side of the aisle who is objecting to any Senator being heard. Senators who wish to be heard can be heard this afternoon. The request has been made that this particular nomination go over for a week, and that if it cannot go over by itself, all the nominations go over for a week. The Senate will be in session on Thursday. We shall not have much legislation before us at that time, unless the Committee on Military Affairs reports the manpower bill; and even if it should do so, it could only report it on that day, and the bill could not be taken up on Thursday except by unanimous consent. So we shall have all day Thursday to discuss these nominations, if the Senate wishes to do so.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine can point out a single thing which has been done irregularly by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, then his remarks are justified; but if he cannot point out any irregularity, his remarks are very much out of order.

This is not the first time in the Senate when a request has been made to confirm Army nominations en bloc. I have heard such a request every time Army nominations have come up. To imagine that any Senator has in any way tried to foreclose the remarks of another Senator, or to assume that any member of the Committee on Military Affairs has decided that the committee is the Senate of the United States, is going just a little too far.

Mr. President, the request for confirmation of these nominations en bloc was made by me instead of by the majority leader because the majority leader was engaged in conversation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish the Senator to understand that I was engaged in a very important conference at the moment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I understand; but I wish to point out that everything has been done regularly. For any Senator to assume that he has not had an opportunity to investigate these nominations, after the committee considered them and reported them in the regular way, is unjustified. Nothing irregular has been done; and I will say not only to the Senator from Maine, but to every other Senator present, that so long as I am chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs nothing irregular will be done. Nothing contrary to the rules of the Senate, or out of the ordinary way in which the Senate has carried on for many years, will be done. I think I ought to say that in justice to the committee, after what has been said.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I want the very distinguished and able Senator from Utah to understand that in my request there was no reflection of any kind whatsoever made upon either the chairman of that important committee or upon any of the members of the committee. I know of nothing having been done irregularly. I did not charge anything of that kind. I was simply making a request of the majority leader that this one name be not included in the consideration en bloc of the nominations of brigadier generals. I hope the distinguished Senator from Utah will not think that my objection is any reflection at all upon either him personally or upon the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order to consider any listed nominations en bloc it is necessary to have unanimous consent. Otherwise, each name is read separately and each nomination is subject to separate action by the Senate. We all understand that.

But it has been the custom here from time immemorial to consider en bloc what are regarded as routine nominations. The Committee on Military Affairs evidently considers all these nominations as routine nominations, because the nominations started through military channels long before any episode or incident which weighs heavily upon the Senator's mind had taken place or before we had ever heard of it or, I have no doubt, before anyone involved in the nomination ever thought about such an episode. These nominations do not come to the Senate overnight. They are recommended by the officers in the field, and they come through the General Staff. That process was in operation long before the happening of an episode which the Senator has in mind.

So I am sure the Committee on Military Affairs took that situation into consideration in determining its action in reporting all the nominations here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota moving that all the nominations for brigadier general go over for 1 week.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire why the Senator moves that they go over for 1 week. The

Senate will be in session on Thursday of this week.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is very true, Mr. President; but it was a personal request of my own. I hesitated to bring the basis for the request into the discussion. A member of my family passed away last evening. I am leaving tomorrow for the funeral in Ohio. I shall not be back until Saturday. That was the reason for my motion. I did not like to make my request as a personal one, because it is wholly personal. Otherwise, I could be ready on Thursday, just as well as not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Could not the Senator make such observations as he wishes to make even today, before leaving?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I can make the observations which I myself have in mind, but other Senators have come to me this afternoon saying that they wish to say something about the nominations and that they are not ready and would not be ready to do so today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a further word about the situation. As the Senator from Utah has said, it is true that the practice has grown up—and it has been followed in this Chamber for a long time—of moving the confirmation of nominations en bloc. But within my experience, I have known of no instance when, upon the objection of a single Senator, a nomination included in the list would not be singled out, and when an opportunity to discuss that nomination would not be afforded. I think that should be done now.

I speak not as one who is opposed to any nomination on the list, but as one who expects to vote for all the nominations which are on the list. However, let me repeat for emphasis that if a Senator wishes to discuss one of the nominations, I think he should have ample opportunity to do so, and I believe that a motion looking to the consideration of the nominations all together, en bloc, ought not be pressed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that a motion to consider nominations en bloc is a routine matter, and that if any Senator objects the nominations must be considered separately. However, the motion of the Senator from South Dakota is still the pending question. That motion is that all the nominations for brigadier general go over for 1 week.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. I call for a division.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order to——

The VICE PRESIDENT. A division is requested.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the personal request of the Senator from South Dakota, I shall not object. I think it is unfortunate that consideration of the nominations must go over for a week because of the Senator's necessary absence. But on the other hand, I suppose the war will go on, and these officers will continue to fight, just the same.

Therefore, in order that there may be no controversy about the matter, I myself ask unanimous consent that all the temporary nominations for brigadier general go over until next Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, so that I may say a word, let me say that as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I came to the Senate today prepared to answer any questions about Elliott Roosevelt's military record and prepared to answer any questions about what the committee did in regard to his nomination. I had no opportunity at all to consider the request that certain nominations go over.

So far, no explanation has been made why it is proper to object to withdrawing a single nomination from the list of nominations for promotions in the War Department. The reason is that the withdrawal of one such nomination upsets the seniority record of all the officers involved. It has been the custom in the Army, since almost the beginning of our history, to have promotions follow in the order in which the recommendations are made, unless objection is interposed. Accordingly, our hesitancy to postpone action on one nomination in the list is due merely to a desire to preserve the military custom, whether good or bad. Time and time again we have tried to break the custom, but we have not succeeded in doing so, because it is one of long standing.

The Committee on Military Affairs has, in its room, a complete record which any Senator may see. Just this morning the chairman of the committee announced to the entire Senate that he had briefed a report by that committee to the Senate so that all Senators could be informed, although, of course, the law requires that the nominations be first submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs, before they are considered by the Senate. Such procedure is not followed because of any action on my part. It is the procedure of the Senate. As I have stated, the records are in the committee room.

Let me say also about the promotions which are coming up that the reason why the Committee on Military Affairs deemed that it is a part of its duty to expedite the promotion of such officers as rapidly as it can is that at the beginning of the war most of the promotions were of men who were on this side of the ocean, men who had demonstrated real worth as officers qualified to train soldiers. However, today, inasmuch as various theaters of war are in operation, most of our officers and men are in combat areas. The promotions which now come along are very definitely promotions coming from the fronts. Practically every one of them occurs as a result of valued and heroic service.

The Committee on Military Affairs, therefore, changed its custom in order to meet the new situation. The committee has attempted to consider the nominations on the first day when they came before the committee, and to consider them in full committee, without referring them to subcommittees.

Therefore, Mr. President, I can say that everything has been done regularly. Everything is set forth in the record for the Senate to see. Every record is made. We have gone so far as to request the War Department to check the nominations and to let us know what nominations are of men in the combatant service and what nominations are of men stationed in the United States, so that we can keep track of that matter.

I repeat to the Senate that the promotions which will be submitted in the next several months undoubtedly will be promotions for service in the field, promotions which have been earned as the result of military action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

Consideration of nominations for appointment in the Regular Army is now in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thought all the Army nominations had been passed upon. The other Army nominations came ahead of the ones we have last been considering.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They came first on the list, but they were not passed upon, because request was made that all Army nominations be agreed to en bloc, and objection was made to the request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations for appointment in the Regular Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Regular Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

All nominations of temporary brigadier generals were asked to be put over. What disposition does the Senate desire to make with the nominations of major generals on the temporary list?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose we should confirm the nominations of major generals. I ask that the nominations of major generals on the temporary list be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BURTON. I invite attention to the fact that the confirmation of the nominations of lieutenant generals was not included. Was it intended to include them?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, confirmation of the nominations of lieutenant generals will be included

and, without objection, their nominations are confirmed en bloc.

CHESTER L. SUMNERS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, earlier in the day the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously reported the nomination of Chester L. Sumners to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi. I am familiar with the rule requiring that a nomination lie over before the Senate votes upon it. The reason for the rule is a good one, but no rule is so sacred that an exception cannot be made to it.

Since the 1st of January there has been a vacancy in the office of the United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi. No one there has authority to O. K. pay rolls, and I have been asked to urge upon the Senate an early confirmation of the nomination. I ask that an exception to the rule be made, and that the Senate now proceed to the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester L. Sumners to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, when was the nomination reported to the Senate?

Mr. BILBO. It was reported unanimously today.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, Mr. President, the rule which we are asked to suspend is a perfectly sound rule.

Mr. BILBO. I admit that it is.

Mr. WHITE. But if the Senator is justified in assuring us that the matter is of an emergency nature, I have no disposition to object.

Mr. BILBO. I assure the Senator that it is of an emergency nature, and I have been urged to seek early confirmation of the nomination by the Senate. I have been informed that no one is present in authority to O. K. pay rolls for the employees of the northern district.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BILBO. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 8, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 5, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Felix Cole, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, consul general and first secretary of Legation at Monrovia, Liberia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5, 1945:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Frank C. Walker to be Postmaster General.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Blynn T. Shafer to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service System.

Angus J. Gallagher to be Administrative Officer in the Selective Service System.

Brig. Gen. Raymond H. Fleming to be State director of selective service for Louisiana.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Chester L. Sumners to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Victor Bradley Vare, Jr., to be a first lieutenant, Medical Corps, with rank from August 26, 1944.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lt. Col. James Breakenridge Clearwater, to the Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lt. Clinton Fort Matthews, to the Signal Corps.

Second Lt. Robert McNeely Peden, to the Infantry.

Second Lt. Weston Fisher Maughan, to the Air Corps.

Capt. Charles Pearce Bellican, to the Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lt. John Baker, to the Corps of Engineers.

Lt. Col. James Stevenson Rodwell, to the Infantry.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Carl Smith Doney, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Fay Brink Prickett, Field Artillery, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Calvin DeWitt, Jr., Cavalry, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Lucien Samuel Spicer Berry, Cavalry, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Victor William Beck Wales, Cavalry, with rank from December 1, 1944.

William Earl Chambers, Infantry, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Joseph Merit Tully, Cavalry, with rank from December 1, 1944.

James deBarth Walbach, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Warner William Carr, Adjutant General's Department, subject to examination required by law, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Hugh Mitchell, Signal Corps, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Robert LeGrow Walsh, Air Corps, subject to examination required by law, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Richard Mar Levy, Adjutant General's Department, with rank from December 1, 1944.

Charles Francis Shook, Medical Corps.

Clarence Constantin Olson, Dental Corps.

Perry Orlando Wilcox, Chaplains, subject to examination required by law.

Thomas Lyle Martin, Infantry, with rank from December 1, 1944.

George Sidney Andrew, Cavalry, with rank from January 1, 1945.

Roland Paget Shugg, Field Artillery, with rank from January 1, 1945.

Rafael Larrosa Garcia, Philippine Scouts, subject to examination required by law, with rank from January 1, 1945.

Ellicott Hewes Freeland, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from January 1, 1945.

Spencer Albert Townsend, Cavalry, with rank from January 1, 1945.

Richard Clarke Birmingham, Infantry, with rank from January 1, 1945.

James Cornelius Ruddell, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from January 1, 1945.

Joseph Hamilton Grant, Infantry, with rank from January 1, 1945.

To be lieutenant colonel

Stanley William Matthews, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.

To be captain

Richard William Jungfer, Jr., Chaplains.

Paul Victor Kiehl, Medical Corps.

To be first lieutenants

Kenneth Bradley Johnson, Pharmacy Corps.

Ralph Bassett Martin, Corps of Engineers, with rank from January 1, 1945.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be a major general

Leif John Sverdrup

To be lieutenant generals

William Hood Simpson
Albert Coady Wedemeyer
Leonard Townsend Gerow

To be major generals

Anthony Clement McAuliffe
David Myron Schlatter
Clarence Lynn Sturdevant
George Dunbar Pence
Alexander Russell Bolling
Clarence Howard Kells
Robert Wilson Hasbrouck
Elmer Edward Adler
Paul Wilkins Kendall
Philip Edward Brown
Frank Augustus Keating
Lester Johnson Whitlock
William Gaulbert Weaver
Arthur McKinley Harper
Otto Paul Weyland
William Caldwell Dunckel
George Price Hays
Vernon Evans
William Ord Ryan
Edmund Walton Hill
Victor Emile Bertrandias

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, in this day of liberation, we rejoice that Thou art our rock and our fortress, our deliverer, and our strength, in whom we will trust. It is God that girdeth us with strength and maketh our way perfect. Grant us the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have us do that the spirit of wisdom may save us from all false choices, that in Thy straight path we may not stumble. Thou knowest that we are in the midst of most urgent problems, and we pray Thee to support us in all our wise endeavors. Only by the test of our blessed Redeemer does life stand or is justified.

Thou who art more than dream or heart can tell, come to us in the love and wisdom which will help us to the solution of complicated and perplexed questions, and clarify our purposes and ambitions. Keep us from that deterrent

which is so often couched in the unwillingness of the human heart. Thou who art the joy of loving hearts, may we feel the burden of human anguish and misery and envisage that day when all men will be enriched with that glow of courage which comes to the sons of God. Possess us with that stalwart truth that the greatest country is that land which spends the least and gives the most. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 2, 1945, was read and approved.

FRANK J. SIEGFRIED

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 119) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Frank J. Siegfried, husband of Virginia Siegfried, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Virginia Siegfried.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 49, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints, as a member of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission to fill an existing vacancy thereon, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter to the President of the United States from the newly elected Democratic Members of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therein some articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 1984, Rept. No. 54) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive offices, boards, and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts reserved all points of order on the bill.

PLANNING FOR A BETTER WORLD

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a number of letters which I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Christianity is facing its greatest challenge in the nearly 2,000 years of its history. If a better world is to come out of the ashes of the present conflict, the forces of Christianity must be a leading factor in building that better world. How are those forces preparing to meet the challenge?

With these thoughts in mind, I wrote to 100 of the leading churchmen of the United States, clergymen and laymen, Protestants and Catholics, asking them two questions.

First. What plan would you suggest to mobilize the mighty power and strength of Christian influence to assist in bringing about lasting world peace?

Second. Would you consider it advisable for leaders of all religious denominations to ask for a conference with Secretary of State Stettinius in order to bring about a better coordination and implementation of the forces that desire permanent world peace, based on justice?

I have received answers to nearly all of the letters; and while these replies reveal keen alertness to Christian duty and responsibility in the world's supreme crisis, they display an utter lack of coordination which must be overcome before Christianity as a whole can bring the full play of its saving grace to the amelioration of the existing deplorable condition of mankind.

Catholics are more united and cohesive than are the Protestants in respect to this matter. Last November the archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church of the United States got together and made a statement on the coming peace which may be construed as representing Catholic thought. Among Protestant groups there appears to be no interdenominational agreement or understanding. The Pattern for Peace, issued simultaneously by leaders of the Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic faiths on October 7, 1943, has had widespread notice. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has advanced substantive proposals but perhaps the nearest approach to an interdenominational understanding among Protestant groups was reached at a conference held in Cleveland earlier this month.

On the broad general principle of employing Christian influences to the utmost in fashioning a better world there is complete unity in the answers I have received, the common purpose being well expressed by Rev. Carleton W. Atwater, an outstanding minister of the Baptists, who wrote:

> So many of us who are Christian leaders have believed that there were principles of religion involved in this war, and I do hope that the leaders of all denominations will have an opportunity of a conference with Secretary of State Stettinius and be allowed to express what seems to be the purpose and hope of the religious people of our country regarding world peace.

While complete unity of purpose and hopes is manifest among our religious leaders, there is no resemblance of unity as to procedure.

This lack of agreement amounting to a chaotic situation as regards Christian cooperation for world peace, has caused me to change my mind in regard to the advisability of a meeting of religious leaders with Secretary of State Stettinius at this time. Instead, I accept as a wise suggestion the advice of Archbishop Curley who said in a letter to me dated January 2:

> If the leaders of religious denominations are going to ask for a meeting with Secretary Stettinius they should first get together among themselves and plan a statement to be made to the Secretary of State.

That, I think, is an excellent idea. It is obvious that the religious leaders of America are not prepared now to meet with Secretary Stettinius. The first step should be a conference of such leaders among themselves to reach certain bases of common agreement and to prepare definite recommendations on which all denominations can stand. To this conference Jewish leaders should also be invited, for Judaism is a fine philosophy, splendidly humanitarian in its scope and purpose. This conference, if held, should embrace in its personnel all religious leaders of America. It would be an excellent start, I think, toward mobilizing the mighty power and strength of Christian influence to assist in bringing about lasting world peace.

If and when the religious leaders of America are ready to talk to Secretary Stettinius in regard to plans for world peace they will find in him a gracious and willing coadjutor. I am in a position to say—it is not guesswork with me—that Mr. Stettinius would be most gratified if he could be an instrument in helping to establish the future of the world on the foundation of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. He knows that is the only foundation on which the future can be made secure against recurring wars, with their deluges of blood and tears. His bent of mind already has been demonstrated in respect to Greece and Poland. Shrewd and practical as he is, he has the Christian's viewpoint with tremendous capacity to back it up.

The present World War must be the last one, else humanity is doomed. We who profess to be Christians must be

alerted and must do our part while praying to the Father of us all for guidance and direction. Longfellow, in his beautiful poem, Hiawatha, written so many years ago, struck a chord that is vibrant today with meaning when he wrote:

Every human heart is human,
That in even savage bosoms
There are longings, yearnings, strivings
For the good they comprehend not,
That the feeble hands and helpless,
Groping blindly in the darkness,
Touch God's right hand in that darkness
And are lifted up and strengthened.

There are millions of inarticulate sorrowing people in this poor, stricken world today who are wishing in their heart of hearts that the world could get in touch with God's right hand.

The Supreme Architect who created the universe can build a better world of the future if we will get into harmony with His plans. He gave us His pattern in the Sermon on the Mount. The Atlantic Charter is a reflection, feeble enough, perhaps, but nevertheless clear, of His pattern. Let us as Americans never cease to fight for it and for all other righteous measures that are necessary to rescue humanity from the blood and mire of power politics and place the peace of the world on a secure and lasting basis. I feel that if the letters I have received from distinguished religious leaders will contribute even in a small degree toward that end my symposium will not have been in vain.

By unanimous consent of the House I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the letter I sent to church men and some of the replies I have received:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 28, 1944.

DEAR ———: After all of the suffering and travail the world has gone through no peace will be acceptable except a peace of the ages, and, in my opinion, there can be no peace of the ages that is not founded on principles of Christian faith.

The principles of Christianity are eternal and apply to all human kind. They are as applicable to non-Christians as to Christians. Those principles, wisely applied, can be made the common denominator of a world peace settlement that will last throughout the ages.

The Atlantic Charter harmonizes very well with Christian principles in that it provides for no territorial aggrandizement; no territorial changes that do not accord with the wishes of the people concerned; the right of all people to choose their own form of government and the restoration of self-government to those deprived of it; the enjoyment by all states—victors and vanquished—of access to trade and raw materials; economic collaboration between all nations; freedom from war, from fear, from want of all peoples; freedom of the seas, etc.

Secretary of State Stettinius in his recent statements in reference to Greece and Poland has shown a courageous adherence to moral principles in international relations without which any peace that may be established will be founded on shifting sands.

This war will be followed either by a Christian peace or by the greatest saturnalia of grab politics the world has ever known, based on the pagan idea that "he may take who has the power and he may keep who can." Since America has voluntarily assumed a leading part in this war to save and perpetuate humanitarian ideals, the Christians of America could not, if they would, escape their responsibility of leadership in this dark and fateful hour.

Speaking at Constitution Hall the other night, Secretary Stettinius dwelt on the peace to come and declared as one of the main objectives of his foreign policy, "Establishment at the earliest possible moment of a United Nations organization capable of building and maintaining the peace—by force if necessary—for generations to come."

We are at the cross-roads. We either go forward toward the goal of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man or we sink into the world's darkest night of paganism. Humbly, very humbly, let me suggest that if ever there was a time when Christians should hear the "alert" call and rally to the salvation of the world, now is that time.

I am writing to ask you two questions:

1. What plan would you suggest to mobilize the mighty power and strength of Christian influence to assist in bringing about lasting world peace?

2. Would you consider it advisable for leaders of all religious denominations to ask for a conference with Secretary of State Stettinius in order to bring about a better coordination and implementation of the forces that desire permanent world peace, based on justice?

As a citizen and as a representative of citizens in the Congress of the United States, I am keenly anxious to do my part toward the creation of a new world order where wars will be banned and nations will live on terms of mutual respect and friendly cooperation one with another.

So motivated, I have taken the liberty to write letters identical with this to a number of leaders of religious thought and purpose. I would greatly appreciate your answer.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

ARCHBISHOP CURLEY

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE,
Baltimore, Md., January 2, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 28.

Last November the archbishops and bishops of the United States made a statement on the coming peace, which was received splendidly by the press of the Nation, Catholic and non-Catholic.

A copy of that statement, I am sure, can be gotten from the Very Reverend Monsignor Howard J. Carroll, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 5, D. C.

The chairman of the executive board of the bishops is the Most Reverend Edward Mooney, D. D., archbishop of Detroit, whose address is 1880 Wellesley Drive, Detroit, Mich.

I would suggest that you read carefully the copy of the bishops' pronouncement in this matter. It will tell you exactly where we stand on the question of future peace, and then we might give consideration to No. 2 of your letter. If the leaders of religious denominations are going to ask for a meeting with Secretary Stettinius, they should first get together among themselves and plan a statement to be made to the Secretary of State.

Every good wish for the new year.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL J. CURLEY,
Archbishop of Baltimore and Washington.

BISHOP G. BROMLEY OXNAM, PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

JANUARY 10, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have read your important letter of December 28 with great care.

My own judgment is that it would be much wiser for Secretary of State Stettinius to have a series of conferences with the great denominations rather than a single conference. I know this would take a great deal of his time. However, when we meet as a conference of many denominations, the number representing each denomination is, of course, limited. It is the great denominational body that knows how to carry a message to the local parish, and it is in the local parish that real public opinion is formed. If Mr. Stettinius could receive, let us say, 8 or 10 of the major denominations, it would mean that the representation instead of being 2 or 3 from each denomination, would probably be 20. These leaders so reached would be in a position to mold the opinion of the denomination itself. For instance, in the case of the Methodist Church, you may recall that the entire council of bishops spent a week in Washington a year ago, preparatory to our crusade for a new world order. This crusade had remarkable effect, I believe. I am taking the liberty of sending you herewith a copy of the report. We are now about to mobilize the entire church through the 578 districts of the church in support of Dumbarton Oaks. I shall send you a copy of the 16-page booklet we are using for this mobilization.

If it is impossible for Mr. Stettinius to give the time, of course the meeting of the denominations in one conference would be very wise

I am the new president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and we are naturally eager that all of the churches move. You are, no doubt, familiar with the great Cleveland conference, which will consider the whole question of international relationships. Three hundred delegates will be present from all of the churches. I think it will be one of the most significant gatherings the church has had. This will be held the 16th to the 19th of January.

With kindest regards, believe me,

Ever sincerely yours,

G. BROMLEY OXNAM.

ARCHBISHOP OF CHICAGO

ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO,
January 3, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Congressman, Eleventh District Indiana,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I thank you for your letter. It is indeed a great consolation to all who are longing and working for a good, lasting peace to know that you are determined to do your utmost for a peace within the framework of Christian ethics.

In a statement issued by the Catholic bishops in November, our plea for a good peace was voiced. We have done much and are doing everything in our power to this end. It seems to me that in our country public opinion very definitely is demanding the sort of peace which is in your mind. Our citizens are ready to sanction the participation by our Government in a sound international organization which will recognize the juridic parity of rights in the family of nations, maintain peace, and promote cooperation among the nations. If, however, they discover that power politics, spheres of influence in which puppet nations are gathered like satellites around big powerful nations, and the balance of power policy dominate in the family of nations, they will feel compelled to defend their own interests in a rigid isolationism. We are praying that our country will stand uncompromisingly for a good peace in justice and charity.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL A. STRITCH,
Archbishop of Chicago.

PRESIDENT ROBERT M. HOPKINS, OF THE UNITED CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY

THE UNITED CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 2, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: First of all as I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of December 28, let me express my great delight that we are represented from Indianapolis by so excellent a man as yourself in the House of Representatives at Washington. I could not ask for a finer presentation of my own basic convictions on this subject of world peace than you have so clearly set forth in this communication. I am proud to have you serve as my Representative.

I think without doubt in answer to your questions, we should mobilize the strength of Christianity, and for that matter, both Protestant and Roman Catholic Christianity, and Judaism as well, in bringing about a lasting world peace. I was glad to sign the statement of basic principles which were acceptable to Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religious leaders, because I felt that statement would have effect among all three religious bodies.

I would say further that these efforts should be multiplied by all Christians and advanced in every good way, and frankly we are seeking in the United Christian Missionary Society to work to that end.

In answer to both your first question and your second question, I would say that the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in North America, which represents the Disciples of Christ and other religious bodies within this country, is the best way of securing the leadership to confer with Secretary of State Stettinius and others upon these matters.

You may know that there is to be held in Cleveland in January a very representative gathering of religious leaders that will give itself over to the study of the issues involved in this problem. This is being headed up by the Honorable Mr. Dulles, who is chairman of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council charged with this responsibility. I would hope very much that growing out of the Cleveland Conference, the churches cooperating would have not only a representative utterance, but a very wise utterance to make to our own governmental leaders and others who are concerned with this basic problem.

Personally, may I say that I heartily endorse the recent utterances of Secretary of State Stettinius in reference to Greece and Poland and similar European situations.

As you say, this is the time when we must be very aggressive if we are to secure following this war a peace that will be both just and durable.

Thank you again for your own good letter and for its evidence that you are alert to the situation which is most critical. It shall welcome any further communications that you may have to give us that will help us as church leaders working to that end.

Yours cordially,

ROBERT M. HOPKINS.

ARCHBISHOP OF NEW ORLEANS

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW ORLEANS,
New Orleans, La., January 6, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: It is gratifying to know your mind regarding the necessity of basing the peace and post-war world order on the principles of our Christian faith. In this you may be confident of the appreciation and approval of all Christian forces in our own country as well as in the countries of the Allied Nations.

Replying specifically to your questions may I state the following:

1. "The mighty power and strength of Christian influence" can best be mobilized by the efforts of individuals and groups to evaluate, understand, and support with enthusiasm the leadership of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, who has enunciated repeatedly and clearly the principles upon which a Christian peace must be based. National and international leaders, like our own President, who have given expression to their adherence to Christian principles and ideals, should be upheld and given evidence of encouragement.

2. I doubt whether it would be practical to convoke, under the authority of Secretary of State Stettinius, a conference of leaders of all religious denominations for the purpose of coordinating and implementing "the forces that desire permanent world peace, based on justice." However, it would undoubtedly be helpful if Secretary Stettinius were to solicit formal expressions from various religious groups along the lines indicated. In fact, most religious bodies have already expressed themselves very definitely and constructively. The statement made on November 19 by the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference on behalf of the hierarchy of the United States of America is still fresh in our memories and its text has been incorporated into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

3. Undoubtedly a most constructive and effective means toward the end would be courageous expressions from representative men, like yourself, who are charged with responsibility and enjoy great prestige because of their office.

Thanking you for this opportunity to voice my opinion, and assuring you of my best wishes for the realization of your ideals, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOS. F. RUMMEL,
Archbishop of New Orleans.

PRESIDENT OF DEPAUW UNIVERSITY

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY,
Greencastle, Ind., January 2, 1945.

Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have your letter of December 28. I stand strongly back of the idealism of the Atlantic Charter. I am afraid the nations are getting away from it. A short time ago the President, himself, indicated that it was merely a memorandum agreed to informally by Mr. Churchill and himself.

It might serve a useful purpose for the leaders of all religious denominations, Catholic, Jew, and Protestant to hold a conference with Secretary of State Stettinius.

We all appreciate your leadership in the cause of peace and the religious motivation which is back of it.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE E. WILDMAN.

BISHOP ANGUS DUN

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 19, 1945.*

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am sorry to be tardy in answering your communication of December 28, on the subject of the relationship of the churches to the vexed problem of a world peace. Naturally I have the fullest sympathy with your concern.

As a general policy, I am strongly convinced that in a matter of this sort it is best to work through the existing channels, rather than to set up new informal gatherings of religious leaders. The Federal Council of Churches is the most representative organization of the non-Roman churches, and the Roman church is, of course, officially represented through its headquarters organization here, in Washington.

The State Department and Mr. Stettinius in particular already have called several conferences with religious leaders and representatives of other public groups, and I think there is every indication that they stand ready to give the fullest opportunity for the exchange of views.

On the matter of official representation of churches at any peace conferences of representatives of States, I have very considerable doubts, for reasons which I think are obvious. To speak in a rather summary fashion of a vast problem, I think we must recognize that while Christians of many church affiliations have basic common convictions, they differ about as much as any others when it comes to the application of principles to highly complex and stubbornly real situations, such as the right borders for Poland or what government would represent the will of the people of Greece.

The subject is not one on which I can claim any experienced knowledge, but if I could be of the least help to you in your very genuine concern, I would, of course, be glad to talk with you.

Cordially yours,

ANGUS DUN.

BISHOP BAXTER

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Portland, Oreg., January 8, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am deeply appreciative of your letter of December 28 and the indication of the interest you have in a post-war plan which will guarantee a lasting peace.

You ask concerning the relation of the church to this. I wonder if you know that a year ago the Methodist Council of Bishops organized the Crusade for a New World Order which was started by a series of public meetings attended by over 200,000 people. We are now in the beginning of a 4-year program across the church with five emphases, and the first of these is the continuation of this crusade. Therefore I think you will find that the Methodist Church will be expressing itself in helpful and constructive fashion.

Certainly any conversations which might be arranged with the Secretary of State to express the point of view of church people would be helpful.

Since you come from Indiana, I am sure that you must know the resident bishop of the Indianapolis area, Titus Lowe. I spoke in his area a year ago on this subject that you discuss and know his keen interest in the whole matter. Would you not wish to sit down with him in discussion of the keen Methodist interest in post-war plans?

Cordially yours,

BRUCE R. BAXTER.

BISHOP MOORE

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Dallas, Tex., January 8, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I received your letter of December 28, 1944, which was evidently sent to other churchmen. You ask two important and difficult questions: 1. What plan would I suggest to mobilize the mighty power and strength of Christian influence to assist in bringing about lasting world peace. 2. Should church leaders meet Secretary Stettinius and seek coordination of the forces that desire permanent peace.

To the first I would say that in my opinion it is evident we will get a political peace. Russia has made that clear and the other nations are just as self-seeking including our own. We think and talk in terms of markets, oil, trade, bases, and we want a peace that will benefit us. Britain wants open ways and her points of vantage. China has her wants.

So it goes. The Church of England goes along with its Government. The Roman Catholic Church talks peace but thinks of restoration of her devastated areas in Italy, Poland, Spain, Rumania, and Bavaria. Lutheranism in Germany is in a sad plight and is divided from Lutheranism in Scandinavia. Protestantism in the United States has not less than 350 denominations and sects. The Greek Church is now making fair weather with Russia. Mobilization of the views of the Christian churches is not a possibility.

A lasting world peace is what all the peoples of the United Nations now want. Whether or not they will want it if the terms of the peace treaty seem against their political desires is another question.

No one can write a peace treaty until the state of Europe and Asia that the war makes and leaves is known. We have talked too much about post-war and most of it is guess work. The war would be nearer a close if we had talked mid-war and post-war less.

Are the churches helpless? No. They are effective now so far as they emphasize that which Christ Jesus emphasized. But they will not get far on political plans. Let the church be the church and its influence will be great.

2. Leaders meet with Stettinius? No. At least not yet. Churchmen are not well enough informed as to the diplomatic status. It is evident the State Department has not yet found its sure footing. We need not hurry.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN M. MOORE.

DR. DENNIS, PRESIDENT OF EARLHAM COLLEGE

EARLHAM COLLEGE,

Richmond, Ind., January 22, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,

House of Representatives.

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I received and read with the greatest attention and appreciation your letter of December 28 in regard to the all-important subject of world peace. I would have answered you sooner except that it was my intention in connection with attendance upon the meeting of the Association of American Colleges at Atlantic City a few days ago to have stopped over for a day in Washington, when I hoped to have the opportunity to call upon you personally. * * *

Turning to the tremendously important subject of your letter, permit me once more to say how glad I am that you represent in part the people of Indiana in Congress, and I am convinced that no one more truly represents the sentiments of the great majority of the people of Indiana on the subject of peace than you. Irrespective of party, I believe that the majority of the people of Indiana stand behind the proposals for world organization for peace tentatively embodied in the Dumbarton Oaks plan and hope that these proposals will be developed as much as practicable in accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and in accordance with the spirit of the Christian religion. Occasional voices of reaction and vengeance do not, I am confident, represent the people of Indiana.

* * * * *

I agree with you that we ought all to do everything in our power to "mobilize Christian influence on behalf of lasting peace." It is difficult to say how this can best be done except as we act as individuals. As an individual I am working and speaking constantly on this subject and propose to continue to do so. My next engagement to speak on this subject is before the Rotary Club of Indianapolis January 30, where I am to speak on the topic, "Dumbarton Oaks and Beyond."

Responding to your second question, I should think that it might be a very useful thing for the leaders of all denominations to ask for a meeting with Secretary Stettinius to manifest their interest in world peace and to hold up his hands. I am not sure just what steps in this direction were taken at the recent meeting of the Federal Council of Churches, of which G. Bromley Oxnam, formerly president of DePauw, now Methodist Bishop of Massachusetts, is president, and John Foster Dulles is an important member of the committee which deals with matters of this character, but I know that they adopted certain recommendations as respects Dumbarton Oaks and doubtless appointed a committee to take these resolutions to the Secretary of State. You are, I am sure, familiar with the statement of the Catholic bishops, a most important statement, and I doubt not that the Jews have made some similar pronouncement, although I do not have it in mind at the moment. It may well be, however, that there ought to be one general meeting with the Secretary of State, at which the leadership of the Protestants, the Catholics, and the Jews should all be present. I should suppose that such a meeting, if held, would need to be carefully planned in advance and that the leaders should present a carefully thought out address to the Secretary of State, which should be realistic as well as idealistic. As the President says, perfectionists as well as reactionaries can damage the cause.

In my judgment, we ought to go forward with the determination to achieve as much that is good as is practicable and to accept even half a loaf rather than to get no bread. Further, we ought to remember that the world is not good enough to form a superstate at this time, even in the impossible event that Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill should suddenly be converted to the idea that the time was ripe for a superstate. But we must be determined to make a modest advance on the road to peace. As Senator Lodge used to say (and I am not arguing as to whether or how far he fell short of his ideals)—

"May the victors when they come,
When the forts of folly fall,
Find our bodies at the wall."

But I agree with you that now is the time for the forces of righteousness to bestir themselves in behalf of peace, and I am personally at your service if there is any small thing which I can do to help.

With the kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. DENNIS.

REV. EDWARD L. DAY

CHRISTIAN CHURCH UNION OF INDIANAPOLIS,

Indianapolis, Ind., January 5, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In re your communication of December 28, I was much interested in your statements regarding the incorporation of the principles of Christianity in the solution of the war problems and the ensuing peace and, of course, want whatever solution which is arrived at to be permeated and dominated by the teachings and spirit of our common and holy religion. I can heartily approve of what I interpret is in your mind and purpose all the way.

However, as to the method to be pursued in attain this, I am not so sure. There is a great deal of confusion here among our Christian forces. Nearly all of the leading communions of Protestant and evangelical Christianity have expressed themselves about this from time to time. I am somewhat familiar with the conclusions of the Federal Council of Churches and their attempts to get them before governmental leadership. I think these conclusions fairly represent my own communion, the Disciples. However, neither I nor anyone else can speak authoritively for our group. Anyone or group of us can speak only for ourselves.

Answering your questions specifically, as to the first: Anything beyond the wide publicity that is already being given through not only the Christian press but as it is echoed in the secular press as well, I could not say. What is needed today, above everything else, is a more virile Christianity in individual, daily living. Quoting Dr. Austin Kennedy DeBlois, from his book of a few years ago, entitled "The Church of Today and Tomorrow": "The greatest need of our modern churches is a revitalization of primary interests and purposes; a recrudescence of the ancient fidelities; the rebirth of an unconquerable faith in God and the divine realities; a complete spiritual renewal." If the church had been the church, if it had not lost its spiritual power, there would not have been the First or Second World Wars. The great Gladstone said in answer to a question by a constituent one time as to what he considered the greatest problems of that hour: "There is but one problem at this hour. That problem involves the building of the mind of God in the hearts of men." That has been the problem of the ages and is the problem now.

That kind of Christianity will make Christ-filled men, men who will live and apply their Christianity to life's problems. That will send men to Congress and other places of leadership who will speak and act like Christians on the problems before us today. Pardon me, but I believe that is what you are trying to do.

I believe there are indications of awakening in our beloved America as well as in other lands today. An indication that many are beginning to be willing to try something that has never been tried as it ought to have been—that is, to put brotherliness, justice, mercy, love before envy, covetousness, greed, and hatred. "Let there be no strife between thy herdsmen and my herdsmen, for we be brethren," and "Blessed are the meek, the merciful, the peacemakers, they that hunger and thirst after righteousness."

As to going before the Secretary of State upon the part of Christian leadership—if it is in the spirit of Christ, yes. But not to go as a bloc, or with any political motive. On the other hand, I would consider it good politics upon the part of any political leadership to heed and act upon an appeal from such a source.

Pray pardon my long, rambling setting what comes into my mind upon paper. I feel that I have not, and cannot, give you the answer you want and need. But may your tribe increase. May there be enough Christian-minded men in Congress to have the courage of their Christian convictions to see that a just and righteous peace is accomplished.

I am

Most sincerely,

E. L. DAY.

EDITOR OF THE CHURCHMAN

THE CHURCHMAN,

New York, January 11, 1945.

Mr. LOUIS LUDLOW,

Committee on Appropriations,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: In answer to your recent letter concerning bringing to bear the Christian leadership of the country on setting up a post-war peace. It seems to me that your second suggestion is of great value. The conference of Christian leaders with the Secretary of State ought, I should think, to have more influence than any other method which could be used.

You are well aware, of course, that church groups throughout the country are discussing the matter, as are such journals in the religious field as the Churchman.

With cordial good wishes and appreciation of the leadership you are displaying in this matter, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

GUY EMERY SHIPLER,

Editor.

SISTER CATHERINE THERESE

LADYWOOD SCHOOL,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 12, 1944.
Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: In answer to your letter of December 28, I am writing a few thoughts here, although I well realize the enormous import of your two questions. All who think are in agreement with the conclusion that plans for preserving peace used heretofore will not accomplish that end now. What were they? Force, political combinations, alliances, ententes, balance of power, even treaties. A nation is made up of individuals, and their combined thoughts, emotions, ambitions, ideals, ethics are projected into the nation as a whole. The thought that history repeats itself is founded on the fact that, given a set a conditions human beings will react in the same. Unless, and here is the big if, unless the individuals who make up a nation have formed habits of thought opposed to the plans listed above.

It seems to me that we already have in the Ten Commandments the mighty power about which you speak. You remember that Christ was asked about them and He compressed them into two—"Love the Lord Thy God, and your neighbor as yourself. In this is the whole law," He said. No Christianity strong enough to reach the hearts of men, and to direct human conduct can be built on any other foundation. Why? The Founder of Christianity said it, and He knew. What plan would I suggest? With so much of the world far from Christian ideals in education, sociology, economics, I am afraid I would throw up my hands and say "Go back to the Ten Commandments, else civilization is doomed. We are not wiser than Christ."

I wonder if you recall that the word "peace" was so often on Christ's lips. Peace be with you; My peace I give you, not as the world giveth (force, combinations, etc.), do I give; to the Disciples, when you enter a house say, peace be to this house; peace, be still, to the angry waters. He knew what a world needed, even if the world did not. Senator VANDENBERG the other day could go no further than force, the old plan, to keep world peace. We have not progressed far in our civilization. And so, I would say that the mighty power and strength of Christianity for bringing about lasting peace must be built on the Ten Commandments and on Christ's summary of them, else its foundation is the sand about which He told a story.

Now for your second question, the meeting of Christian leaders with the Secretary of State. I believe it would be a fine idea. An exchange of thoughts among great men at any time is powerful. And if the ideas refer to the mighty force of our Christian heritage, there is no telling what the result could be. In any discussion, the first thing to determine is the definition of the terms under discussion. Here, it would be peace, justice. If the definitions are agreed upon a plan should not be far afield. Peace begins in the human mind, and justice, in our attitude toward human beings. Punishment of the guilty involves justice, but so does discrimination between guilt and innocence. It would have to be objective, eliminating emotions that are a bar to justice. Justice is a word that takes in a large amount of territory, and, unfortunately, each individual and nation may confuse justice with selfishness. What I want is confused with what I may have by the scales of justice. Those two things are not synonyms.

I believe that the road of the world back to the powerful but simple tenets of Christianity, as the Master left them, is long, because it has gone so far on the wrong road. But the Master also said: "I am with you all days * * *." If He is with us, what matters who is against us? But we have to be very sure He is with us. Some years ago a Catholic bishop said: "Before involving God in an event try to find out just how much God has to do with it." Some will say that this war is a punishment. That may be, but if it is, then we are the originators of the punishment. We punished ourselves by making the inevitable possible by our foolishness.

You are definitely right in adding the Fatherhood of God to the brotherhood of man. Both stand or fall together. The thoughts here are, of course, built on my position as a Catholic teacher. They represent what I really think. If I have not answered to your satisfaction you are free to make further inquiry.

Very sincerely yours,
Sister CATHERINE THERESE.

DR. CARLETON W. ATWATER

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Indianapolis, January 15, 1945.
Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: * * * So many reports have come out of Washington regarding the peace proposals that many of us are in considerable confusion. However, if all of the Representatives would take such matters as seriously as you evidently are doing, I am sure that a true, just, and durable peace would be established.

I do like the attitude of Secretary of State Stettinius and some of the statements that he has made. I do hope that there can be established some type of cooperation between the nations embodying some of the same ideas as were found in the League of Nations. I would suggest that you follow very carefully the proceedings of the conference on a just and durable peace which is being held in Cleveland this week. So many of us who are Christian leaders have believed that there were principles of religion involved in this war, and I do hope that the leaders of all denominations will have an opportunity of a conference with the Secretary of State Stettinius and be allowed to express what seems to be the purpose and hope of the religious people of our country regarding world peace.

* * * * *

Thanking you for your letter of inquiry, and trusting that everything will go well with you through the coming year in the great responsibilities that rest upon you, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
CARLETON W. ATWATER.

ARCHBISHOP CANTWELL

LOYOLA HIGH SCHOOL,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 11, 1945.
Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: His Excellency, Archbishop Cantwell, has requested me, as the chairman of the Archdiocesan Peace Committee, to indicate our mind with regard to the proposal in your valued letter of December 28. It seems that if the papal peace proposals are substantially incorporated in the peace plan we may confidently look forward to a truly just and lasting peace. You may be interested to know that we began last September the task of molding public opinion along those lines. The first step was to acquaint our people with the peace program. This was done in a series of six sermons on successive Sundays. I am sending you a copy of the outlines. We are now preparing to follow this with a plan of providing speakers for various organizations or study clubs desiring to become more familiar with the specific proposals. We are using as our text the volume A World to Reconstruct, by Gonella-Bouscaren. Explanatory pamphlets are also being consulted.

With regard to your second question, it does not seem clear that we are adequately prepared for an intelligent conference with the Secretary of State until such time as we have a well-molded public opinion.

I hope and pray that your earnest efforts and those of others with like high motives will bear the greatly desired fruit of a lasting peace.

Sincerely yours,
Rev. E. J. ZEMAN, S. J.,
Chairman of the Archdiocesan Committee on the Papal Peace Proposals.

BISHOP PEELE

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
SOUTHEASTERN JURISDICTION,
Richmond, Va., January 12, 1945.
The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: In answer to your letter of December 28, I would say that the Methodist Church has been and is greatly interested in the matter of a durable and permanent peace. So much so that a crusade for a new world order, under the leadership of Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y., has been actively engaged in for over 12 months.

If you have not done so, I would request that you write Bishop Oxnam, and you will receive from him definite information as to the plans of the Methodist Church concerning this most important matter.

Cordially yours,
W. W. PEELE.

EDITOR OF WORLD CALL, INTERNATIONAL MAGAZINE OF DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

INDIANAPOLIS, IND, *January 17, 1945.*
The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter of December 28 came while I was out of the city. I have read it with much appreciation and share your concern over the peace which is to follow the war.

With respect to your two questions, I would answer as follows:

1. I think that we already have made an excellent beginning toward mobilizing the influence of the churches back of the movement for a durable peace. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has been operating for several years through a commission on a just and durable peace. I has held several significant conferences of a Nation-wide scope. Such a conference with 400 representatives from various protestant churches is being held in Cleveland January 16–19. The headquarters of this commission may be found at the offices of the Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. I suggest that you ask the commission, of which Dr. Luman J. Shafer is executive secretary, to send you material concerning its work

2. In answer to your second question I should say that the leaders of this interdenominational commission have been in frequent contact with the State Department I think that it is well to emphasize the need for further and more frequent conference

As an expression of some of my own views in this field, I am enclosing a copy of a pamphlet written by me on A Just and Durable Peace. You will note that at the close of this pamphlet I quote from the Six Pillars of Peace issued by the Commission of the Federal Council. This statement more than any other with which I am familiar represents the best thinking of the protestant churches today.

Enclosed also is a leaflet on the Churches and the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals.

I was present at the meeting in Pittsburgh on November 28 in which this resolution was

adopted. You will note that its attitude is helpful and constructive. You will be interested in knowing that Mr. John Foster Dulles, chairman of our commission, spoke with considerable force in support of this resolution.

I want to express my personal appreciation for your attitude toward the question of a just and durable peace. I was glad to note that you voted against the continuing of the Dies committee. In my opinion the attitude of mind of which that committee and its activities are expressions constitutes a threat to the spiritual unity required if America is to take its place in a decent world order.

Sincerely yours,
GEO. WALKER BUCKNER, Jr.

ARCHBISHOP LUCEY

CHANCERY OFFICE,
San Antonio, Tex., January 5, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Eleventh District Indiana,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LUDLOW: Thank you for your very fine letter of December 28. We have a national headquarters in Washington, known as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW. In the various departments of the conference there is one known as the Social Action Department and within that department there is an organization known as the Catholic Association for International Peace. Rev. Raymond McGowan is the executive secretary but you will not be able to see him for a few weeks as he is here in San Antonio at the present moment. The assistant executive secretary, Miss Catherine Schaefer, is in the office every day and you might contact her.

Greetings.

Most Rev. ROBERT E. LUCEY, D. D.,
Archbishop of San Antonio.

MRS. C. O. NEASE

INDIANA WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN
MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 9, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I feel honored that you have asked me, as a religious worker, to voice my opinion upon plans involving world peace. I am of the opinion that more people, both church and nonchurch people, are thinking seriously upon this question than ever before in the history of our Nation. What I have to answer to your two important questions is partly my own convictions and partly the conviction of many church members with whom I work. I say this to give you encouragement for the steps you have taken and the further steps I feel sure you will take in behalf of this important issue.

I am suggesting that if at all possible (and it should be made possible) a conference be held of all outstanding organizational leaders of Protestant groups as well as leaders of the Federal Council of Churches and National Council of Churchwomen. The purpose of this conference should be to get a concerted action upon the issues involved so that influence will be brought to bear upon the representatives at the peace table.

Second. With the findings of that first conference prepared, then it seems it would be advisable to ask for a conference with Secretary of State Stettinius. A representative committee appointed by the first conference should be the interpreters of the findings to Secretary Stettinius and those working with him.

Because you have taken time out of your busy life to write letters seeking advice and help gives to us who answer the confidence that our letters will be read. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,
MRS. C. O. NEASE.

EDITOR EMORY STEVENS BUCKE

ZIONS HERALD,
Boston, Mass., January 2, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have your interesting letter of December 28 in which you have asked for opinions in the matter of planning for world peace, based on justice. I agree with the first part of your letter essentially and am in hopes that Secretary Stettinius will be strengthened rather than weakened by his recent choice of assistants. I am not too optimistic about good international-mindedness at the present writing, but in editorial fairness, I am hoping that this will be of value and that these men will be able to cooperate in leading our Nation in this exceedingly vital matter.

I am enclosing a copy of an editorial which I recently wrote regarding the address of Mr. Stettinius on the Polish situation. Perhaps you will be interested in reading this.

In answer to your first question, I feel that the church people ought to be thoroughly mobilized as church people, in building up a tremendous sentiment for world peace and in expressing complete opposition to any type of isolationism. I think that the church people must be educated in these matters for churchmen in this country represent the middle classes for the most part, and are not too alert on these subjects. Careful courses of study have been presented and more must be worked out to meet this end.

In regard to question No. 2, I most certainly think that we should have a conference of all religious denominations and that such a conference ought to represent numerically the various denominations in our Nation. I think that in no way should it be allowed to prejudice people against world peace, because of the possibility of its appearing to be dominated by any one denomination. All religious groups should be fairly represented. Naturally, committees would have to work out much of the details of any united effort on the part of churchmen to further the cause of an international organization as a general hope for world peace.

* * * * *

Very truly yours,
EMORY STEVENS BUCKE.

VICAR GENERAL RAYMOND R. NOLL

ARCHDIOCESE OF INDIANAPOLIS,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 11, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Member of Congress.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am pleased to send the following answers to your two questions:

1. The Pattern for Peace, issued simultaneously by leaders of the Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic faiths October 7, 1943. It is in the records of Congress and I am sure you are familiar with it.

2. At the end of this question "and charity'" should be added to "justice" for divergent interests will have varied and contradictory definitions of justice in concrete cases. Also, conference should not exclude approach to other leaders, such as the competent committees of Congress. Religious leaders should be agreed upon the plan they present. These leaders should be not mainly clergymen. Above all, every Member of Congress who believes in God and in a supernatural destiny of man should incessantly and courageously insist that the makers of the peace begin their first conference with an humble prayer to God.

Your letter, Mr. LUDLOW, is an excellent presentation of the fundamental principles upon which the permanent peace must be based. Your reelection last November in spite of the general trend in Indiana should add power to your voice in the Halls of Congress.

Very sincerely yours,
RAYMOND R. NOLL.

BISHOP HERBERT WELCH

METHODIST COMMITTEE FOR
OVERSEAS RELIEF,
New York, N. Y., January 3, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: In answer to your communication of December 28, may I say that I am in heartiest sympathy with using all the influence of the church in favor of some plan for world organization. In the Methodist Church, as you may know, we have an organized effort under the title, "Crusade for a New World Order," through which we are seeking to rally our people to study and act. While there may be some question as to the wisdom of the church making any official pronouncement on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, there can be no doubt that an insistence on the American ideals and constructive criticism of the proposals, insofar as they do not measure up to those ideals, is a genuine and important service.

With regard to your other question, I am not sure whether it would be best to seek to bring together for such an interview with the Department of State, leaders of all the various denominations, or to have representatives of the Federal Council of Churches, which includes so many of the separate groups. I think that anything which would encourage Mr. Stettinius and also impress him with the depth of Christian sentiment on this matter would be useful.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
HERBERT WELCH.

ARTHUR R. BAXTER

THE KEYLESS LOCK CO.,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 3, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have your very splendid letter of December 28, and as usual you are taking the splendid Christian view of the world peace. I do not differ with you one iota in the objectives we have in mind, but we are miles apart on how to accomplish it. I am sorry for this because I would rather be on your side. I feel that I belong there.

Feeling as I do, however, I must answer your two questions as follows:

1. My opinion is that there will be no lasting world peace during our time, at least, except through military might on the part of America. Therefore, I advocate complete armament and continuous preparation for instant war as the best and only present guaranty of peace.

2. I would not advocate a meeting of religious denominations at this time, as I think it would only muddy the water.

This is very sordid but I have thought deeply about this matter and have come to these conclusions.

When we are in position to prevent war by force, then will be the time to take up all of those finer aspects of civilization which you have always represented. Our only enemy for the next generation is Russia, and the only consideration having any weight with them is force.

Wishing you the best year you have ever had in Congress, I beg to remain

Very sincerely yours,
ARTHUR R. BAXTER.

REV. GEORGE ARTHUR FRANTZ

THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Indianapolis, January 24, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I should have answered your fine letter long before this. The Federal Council of Churches with much help from Mr. John Foster Dulles has already been working on the problem of how to mobilize the Christian forces for world peace. If you care to see the literature which they have available, I am sure they will be glad to send you copies. The council's address is, Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

Our own church has been holding conferences all across the country for ministers and laymen on world order. These conferences are still being held and will be until we have covered the Nation. As to your second question, it would seem to me to be a good plan to bring the leaders of all the churches together with Mr. Stettinius. This would possibly be done best through the committee which the Federal Council already has working.

I am not sure that I have added anything to what you already know, but I can assure you that the churches share your concern and are grateful for your willingness to help. It is always a pleasure to me to see you in the congregation and I hope you will be back in Indianapolis again soon.

Yours cordially,

GEORGE ARTHUR FRANTZ.

BISHOP WADE

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Detroit, Mich., January 4, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR BROTHER LUDLOW: Your letter of December 28 has been received and read with interest and appreciation.

In reply to your two questions I would say first that I do not know of any better plan than the one outlined by that which we term the Delaware conference and now sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

In answer to the second question, my answer is an unqualified affirmative.

Permit me to thank you for your very marked and helpful interest in this as well as other good causes.

Most cordially yours,

RAYMOND J. WADE.

REV. SUMNER L. MARTIN

ROBERTS PARK METHODIST CHURCH,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 4, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I greatly appreciate your letter which indicates that you are aware of a spiritual leadership in these troubled times. In answer to your first question I would ask the president of the Federation of Churches to appoint a committee to work with the Secretary of State to bring about a lasting peace.

I would suggest to him that it might be wise to call a national meeting of all denominations, perhaps in St. Louis, which would have this theme as the basis for its consideration.

I am grateful for your friendship and Christian leadership.

Yours most sincerely,

SUMNER L. MARTIN.

DR. F. D. KERSHNER, BUTLER UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF RELIGION

SCHOOL OF RELIGION, BUTLER UNIVERSITY,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 3, 1945.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This is to express my hearty endorsement of your communication of December 28 and my thorough-going approval of the suggestion which it contains. Replying specifically to your inquiries I may say: first, it would be a fine thing if the Christian sentiment could be mobilized in a great mass meeting or series of mass meetings representing the Christian ideals of the Nation. If such meetings are not feasible representatives of the World Council of Churches as well as of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America could speak for the Protestants and even for the Greek Orthodox Churches. The Roman Catholic Church could be represented by the National Catholic Welfare Council or some other appropriate spokesman.

I think that the suggestion for a conference of church leaders with Secretary of State Stettinius is excellent and I cordially approve the proposal.

Very sincerely,

F. D. KERSHNER.

REV. H. J. KUIPER

CHRISTIAN REFORMED PUBLISHING HOUSE,
Grand Rapids, Mich., January 5, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I think it is very encouraging that our representatives in Congress try to apply the principles of Christianity to national and international affairs. Thank you for your kind letter.

In reply to your two questions I could send you a long letter; but let me make my answer as brief as possible. First, what plan would I suggest to mobilize the mighty power and strength of Christian influence to help in bringing about lasting world peace? I have no plan at all. We should not expect durable world peace as long as human nature is what it is. I believe in the plan of Dumbarton Oaks because I'm hopeful that such an agency as a league of nations, or whatever name one may give it, may prevent some wars; but let no one imagine that wars will cease before Christ returns. I believe we should stress military preparedness much more than we have done. Pacifism is responsible for the present World War and the evil philosophy which is behind pacifism, namely, the doctrine of inevitable human progress. If England and America had not yielded to the wiles of the Pacifists, Hitler would never have dared to start this war.

If I were to be included among leaders of religious denominations, who would confer with Secretary of State Stettinius, I would stress what I have written in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

H. J. KUIPER.

ALVAH J. RUCKER

INDIANAPOLIS, *January 4, 1945.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Member of Congress, care of
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I appreciate your letter as to Mr. Stettinius's views, which I greatly favor.

The method, however, of a convention of religious leaders does not intrigue me very much. If there could be a meeting of religious people in distinction to the professionally religious the same would have great appeal and would be listened to, even by the Russians.

I hope you are well, and I congratulate you on your reelection and the noble spirit of your letter. I am,

Very cordially yours,

ALVAH J. RUCKER.

WILL H. HAYS

MOTION PICTURE PRODUCERS & DISTRIBUTORS OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N. Y., January 3, 1945

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Member, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LOUIS: Your letter of December 28 just reaches me, and I am glad to hear from you.

Of course, the subject matter is the most important thing which has to be accomplished—next to winning the war. No one could be engaged in as vital a matter either in thought or action. I have given much consideration to it, and at an early date when in Washington I will get in touch with you.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes always, and congratulations again, I am,

Sincerely your friend,

WILL H. HAYS.

HARVEY B. HARTSOCK

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 5, 1945.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Member of Congress, Eleventh District
Indiana, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Answering your questions of December 28, 1944:

1. I suggest that all Christians, by their representatives, unite in a written program in which not only all Christians, but all people who believe in a creator and His natural laws which pervade and control every phase of life, as well as all matter, can ultimately join and cooperate. (All people recognize the laws of physics, mathematics, chemistry, etc. They have been slow to recognize the laws of the mind and spirit and society, which are just as omnipotent and omnipresent.) When such a simple and all-attractive program is prepared and sponsored by a sufficient number of people, it should be presented, through our Government, to the peace conference.

2. Yes; but not until they have agreed upon the above-mentioned program. Until then, they will only waste their own time, effort, and money, and the time and effort of the Secretary of State.

Further comment: It is Christ's teachings, not the religion about Jesus, which will save the world. They should not be advanced in an effort to make others adopt our religion, but as part of a sound, simple, and unlimited plan to teach all peoples the truth which will make them free. Chemistry, geography, engineering, etc., need no religion to spread them; neither do the natural laws of any other phase of life. Everyone is equally subject to all these laws and should be equally free to live and profit by them.

But we cannot forsake force to keep the peace until people recognize the natural laws sufficiently to build and maintain public opinion strong enough to obtain the observance of those laws without the use of force.

Therefore, any plan for peace should include (1) a method of preserving peace by force until (2) education of all peoples to recognize and obey natural laws, and (3) the equalization of opportunities for all people to work out and enjoy their own status in life, make world-wide public opinion and interrelations strong enough to preserve peace as the only sensible plan of life for any people.

Let us cease trying to proselyte and seek unselfishly and impartially to educate all peoples to recognize all truth.

Very truly yours,

HARVEY B. HARTSOCK.

DR. LOGAN HALL

MERIDIAN STREET METHODIST CHURCH,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 4, 1945.
The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROTHER LUDLOW: In reply to your letter asking suggestions for coordination of Christian forces with the coming peace, may I say that the sentiment of the Methodist Church is crystalized in the Committee on World Order of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ. John Foster Dulles is the keynoter for the group, and you are undoubtedly aware of his position.

Early in the year there is to be a conference on peace and order at Cleveland, Ohio, which will, without doubt, sum up the thinking of Methodism. I would suggest that the findings of this significant conference might be used as a summation of the thinking of my particular group.

* * * * *

Fraternally yours,

LOGAN HALL.

BISHOP OF PENNSYLVANIA

BETHLEHEM, PA., *January 23, 1945.*
The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Through some misunderstanding your letter of December 28 was mislaid, for which I am sorry, for I appreciate your writing me on a subject of such great interest. As a member of the group representing the Christian Churches meeting recently in Cleveland, I hope that our recommendation that the churches support the Dumbarton Oaks plan as a step in the right direction will be of help to the cause. As you probably know, we then went on to outline ways in which we felt that the proposals could be improved, but made it clear that we regarded the present proposals of sufficient value to endorse them as a first step.

As a member of the executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches, I am sure that there is the utmost willingness on the part of the Christian Churches of America to give their support to any constructive program which holds out hope of maintaining a just and durable peace after the war, even while vigorously supporting efforts of our armed forces to secure a decisive and early victory.

With kindest regards.

Faithfully,

FRANK W. STERRETT.

DR. JEAN MILNER

SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 30, 1945.
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Pardon my delay in answering your letter of December 28th of which I am deeply appreciative.

In answering your questions I would say that I think the most effective thing that can be done would be for Secretary of State Stettinius to give formal audience to the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Mr. John Foster Dulles is chairman of that commission.

We here in Indiana are deeply appreciative of you, of your long years of service and your deep sincerity regarding the building of a warless world.

With best wishes always, I am, as ever,

Sincerely,

JEAN S. MILNER.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF OREGON

ARCHDIOCESE OF PORTLAND IN OREGON,
Portland, Oreg.
The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: With regard to the inquiry contained in your letter of December 28, 1944, for which I thank you, I venture to make the following answers, taking the second question first:

2. Question. Would you consider it advisable for leaders of all religious denominations to ask for a conference with Secretary of State Stettinius in order to bring about a better coordination and implementation of the forces that desire permanent world peace, based on justice?

Answer. Definitely yes.

1. Question. What plan would you suggest to mobilize the mighty power and strength of Christian influence to assist in bringing about lasting peace?

Answer. It occurs to me that the abovementioned conference might well become a semipermanent institution for the purpose of exchanging information on matters of peace and peace settlement.

(a) On the part of the State Department; acquainting the religious leaders with difficulties, practical aspects, and probable consequences of a given situation.

(b) On the part of the religious leaders; acquainting the State Department with existing resentments, protestations; bringing to the attention of the State Department the desires of the articulate part of Christian public opinion.

(c) On the part of both; cooperation in determining what policies Christian public opinion could or could not support; cooperation in determining ways and means and practical extent of application of such principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

It seems to me that such cooperation as outlined above could be very helpful, both in counteracting the formation of a sterile perfectionism with regard to a given political situation and also in concentrating the forces of Christian public opinion upon what is actually possible as well as restraining demands for what is, momentarily at least, unattainable. The Christian influence in world affairs can become felt only as it is freed from any reason for charging that it is constantly preaching the impossible. That acceptance of minimum principles is possible is shown by the matter in which Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic leaders endorsed the Pattern for Peace.

May I, in closing, commend both your objective and your manner of approach to this very vital issue.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD D. HOWARD,
Archbishop of Portland in Oregon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the half hour granted me under special order today may be carried over to February 13, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMITTING THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION AND UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION TO PAY THE TAX IMPOSED UNDER SECTION 1410 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1429) to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a short explanation of the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 1429 has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It was introduced and considered at the request of Admiral Land, Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, and is designed to overcome an administrative problem in that agency during the war period.

The War Shipping Administration is required by law to pay the employers' tax of 1 percent on the pay roll of seamen in its employ for old-age benefits under the Social Security Act. Existing law requires that the War Shipping Administration pay such tax only on the first $3,000 of wages paid to a seaman during a year, but in order for the Administration to observe this limitation it would be necessary to establish a large and expensive bookkeeping division here in Washington. Admiral Land believes, and the committee agrees, that it is more practical and economical, during the war period, to permit him to pay the 1 percent tax on amounts above $3,000, and not make claim for refund, than to establish the expensive bookkeeping division, which would otherwise be necessary, when not only manpower but also business machines are difficult to secure.

Under the bill there would be an estimated net saving of $50,000 to $100,000 per year.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina has covered the situation very clearly.

Law enacted in 1943 placed service of seamen in the employ of the War Shipping Administration within covered employment of Social Security Act for purpose of old age survivors' insurance.

Benefits are financed by equal taxes on the employer and employee. The taxes are based on the employee's wages up to $3,000 and not in excess of $3,000 received in any 1 year.

Administration of old-age and survivors' insurance necessitates maintaining a continuous wage record under a separate account number for each employee until he is eligible for benefits. Every 3 months employers report the amount of each employee's wages, with his account number, to the Bureau of Internal

Revenue, when they pay the employer's and employee's taxes. The Bureau forwards these reports to the Social Security Board, where each employee's wages are recorded to his account.

This bill, H. R. 1429, is to overcome an administrative difficulty relating to the War Shipping Administration which has no means to determine when a seaman in its employ has reached the $3,000 limit with respect to employment in a particular calendar year.

Vessels are operated through designated agents referred to as general agents. He selects the crew for each vessel and its supplies. He pays off the crew at the end of the voyage after making tax deductions. Men he hires are not his employees; they are employees of the War Shipping Administration.

This bill, H. R. 1429, eliminates the application of the $3,000 limitation as to taxable wages. It may lead to overpayment of taxes by the Shipping Administration, but will in no way adversely affect the benefits of the employees.

To operate a central wage record unit to enforce the $3,000 wage limitation would cost $150,000 to $200,000.

The estimated additional taxes which, under the bill, the War Shipping Administration might have to pay in wages in excess of $3,000 would probably not exceed $100,000—a saving of $50,000.

Calculating machinery is not available to set up a central wage unit to keep the records to insure the enforcement of the $3,000 limitation.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. A special division would have to be set up by the Government and the Government would lose about $60,000 per annum.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I can appreciate the difficulty which the Maritime Commission may be having in collecting their tax. Does the Ways and Means Committee ever think of the difficulties they have placed on manufacturers and business people of this country not only in collecting that tax but taxes they are forcing the employer to collect today? I want to say that as an employer of labor, the duties that are imposed upon manufacturing concerns today by the new tax laws are most difficult, and they are supposed to be so exact. With the labor shortages in many establishments in this country, I hope the Ways and Means Committee will find some way of simplifying the duties which are being imposed upon the business people of this country. It will be necessary to do that if you expect the business people to continue in business.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that at the time we consider the next tax bill we will be pleased to have the gentleman appear before our committee. There are obvious difficulties.

Mr. RICH. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. But that is in no way involved in the present bill.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, but this gives me an opportunity to call the attention of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of that committee to the matter. I have the greatest respect for the chairman of that committee and I hope that that committee in the future will try to find some way of giving relief to the people of this country that we are forcing to collect the greatest amount of taxes that has ever been collected. They have a problem now to face.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We are all having that problem, I may say to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 1426 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, and their agents or persons acting on their behalf or for their account, may, for convenience of administration, make payments of the tax imposed under section 1410 without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1), but they shall not be required to obtain a refund of the tax paid under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code on that part of the remuneration of seamen in their employ not included in wages by reason of section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code."

(b) The amendments made by this act shall be effective as if made by section 1 (b) (1) of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes", approved March 24, 1943 (Public Law 17, 78th Cong.; 57 Stat. 45).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION—1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 120, Rept. No. 56), which was referred to the House Calendar and order to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 85) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered on tomorrow, I may have permission to address the House for one-half hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a colloquy I had with Bob Evans, C. B. S. reporter, over WFBL at Syracuse recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SCARCITY OF FOODSTUFFS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a man operating a cooperative creamery, also a resolution adopted by the board of that creamery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we who buy our groceries in Washington have reasons to know there are shortages in many foodstuffs essential to our well-being. One of the most valuable food products we have is butter, and anyone within the sound of my voice who has had occasion to do the family marketing knows how difficult it is to find a pound, half pound, or even a quarter of a pound of butter for sale. I assume one can buy all the butter and other scarce foods he desires if he wishes to contact the black market. I do not indulge in that reprehensible practice myself. Consequently we do not always have butter in our household.

Whenever conditions in this life are not what they should be, there usually are reasons why such conditions prevail. This definitely is true of the butter situation, which I assume is much the same throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, in the town of Remus, Mich., one of the thriving little localities in my congressional district, the Remus Cooperative Creamery Co. has

for many years been doing a very splendid business, thereby contributing to the welfare of the community and the country. On Saturday last I received a letter from the manager of this creamery company, Mr. Ted Baumann, and in this letter he discusses the conditions which exist in that part of Michigan. I again assume the same conditions prevail elsewhere in the State and the Nation. Mr. Baumann discusses this question in a way most illuminating, and, I believe, points directly to the things which are responsible for the prevailing shortage of butter. Mr. Baumann's letter is so lucid and covers the whole question so completely that each Member of this House should have an opportunity to see for himself what the present situation is and what it demands.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing Mr. Baumann's letter, together with a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the stockholders of this splendid company. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Baumann has put his finger squarely upon the things that must be done if we wish to return to a normal production of this very important food commodity, and thus relieve the present unfortunate situation.

REMUS COOPERATIVE CREAMERY CO.,
Remus, Mich., January 31, 1945.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: Under present conditions with the price of whole milk, sold for manufacturing purposes, bringing the farmers who are able to sell whole milk, a high premium over that received by farmers who are selling cream for manufacturing butter, we find ourselves making 25 percent less butter than a few years ago and our very existence jeopardized.

This discrepancy in the price has brought on a condition, whereby the average consumer cannot find butter unless he knows or has a friend in the retail butter business or patronizes the black market.

It is, also, causing a glut on the market of certain manufactured products which is unnecessary and uncalled for. Indirectly it is discouraging farmers from raising hogs, thereby causing a shortage of meat products.

It is creating a serious condition that may well cause serious loss to the dairy industr for many years after this war is won, because butter is the balance wheel of the industry, and, as such, must not be completely destroyed. It has forced many creameries to close their doors, thereby depriving those who have no other outlet for their product a market for their cream. It is causing those who have no available market for their whole milk a serious financial loss.

With the foregoing conditions handicapping many of our 3,000 patrons—at one time we were serving 4,000 farmer patrons—as well as causing serious handicaps to the creamery, action was taken at our annual stockholders meeting and a resolution was passed which is designed to increase the price of butterfat sold to creameries for manufacturing butter, and to equalize the dairy feed subsidy paid to the producers of butterfat for butter manufacturing, so that the relationship between prices received by farmers who sell cream to creameries and that received by farmers who are able to sell whole milk will be more nearly equal.

I am forwarding a copy of the resolution passed and ask your cooperation in securing an adjustment in the price of butter, which will encourage a higher production of butterfat and thus relieve the serious shortage of butter which in turn will ease the shortage of fats for our war effort.

Cordially yours,
REMUS CO-OPERATIVE CREAMERY CO.,
TED BAUMANN, *Manager.*

Whereas butter production in the creameries of the country is decreasing to an alarming extent; and

Whereas this appears to be due to a price differential established by the War Food Administration and Office of Price Administration which favors production of processed milk in the form of powdered, condensed, and evaporated milk by establishing a price to the producer for his whole milk which encourages the sale of whole milk and discourages the sale of cream to creameries on a butterfat basis; and

Whereas the feed subsidy to milk producers is based on 100 pounds of raw milk irrespective of its butterfat content, while producers who separate milk and sell the cream to the creamery receive their subsidy on the basis of butterfat content which at the present time places a premium on sale of whole milk and discriminates against the average producer who sells cream; and

Whereas the present tendency of producers to discontinue the sale of cream to creameries and to sell instead to processors of whole milk is a factor in decreasing pork production since there is therefore less skim milk available as food for pigs and hogs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Remus Cooperative Creamery Co. protest the present ceilings and subsidies and request the War Food Administration and Office of Price Administration to make a new study of conditions referred to in these resolutions, and to so adjust ceiling and subsidies that the discrimination against butterfat production for butter production be eliminated and dairy farmers encouraged to produce cream for sale to creameries, with the object of removing the factors contributing to the butter shortage and encouraging production of an increased supply of butter for the consumer; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the War Food Administration and to the Office of Price Administration, to Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Congressman ROY O. WOODRUFF, Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD, Congressman ALBERT J. ENGEL, and Congressman FRED BRADLEY.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to read to the House a telegram which I have received from the commissioner of agriculture of my State who wires me as follows:

Am being contacted daily through mail, telephone, and personal calls by desperate farmers who are losing essential workers. Much confusion here regarding Tydings amendment. General Hershey quoted as stating that it is still effective. Selective service appears to disregard it. There are no replacements for the few young men still remaining on farms. They are working diligently for long hours. With assistance of favorable weather farms have produced abundantly. Regardless of what happens, they will continue to produce to the limit of their endurance. If these young men are taken, production must drop.

CARL R. SMITH,
Commissioner, Maine
Department of Agriculture.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the House very kindly granted me permission to speak on tomorrow after the pending special orders. It has been suggested by the majority leader that I change my request to either today, tomorrow, or Wednesday in order to conform with previous commitments already entered into.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for 30 minutes either today, tomorrow, or next day.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders on either today, tomorrow, or Wednesday I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a resolution adopted by the National Retail Dry Goods Association in January and in the other to include an article on the subject of old-age assistance and social security.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter dealing with the question of farm boys.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

STATES' RIGHTS VERSUS C. I. O.-P. A. C.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement made by the President of the United States in 1930, when he was Governor of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, while he was Governor of New York State, in 1930, Franklin Delano Roosevelt lucidly and almost prophetically explained the reasons which are now causing State legislators to memorialize Congress to protect the independence of the States:

Now, to bring about government by obligarchy masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously

preserved and fought for whenever they seem in danger.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT.

Has Mr. Roosevelt forgotten all of his promises of 1930–32? Why? Oh, why?

Unless we as citizens of this country remember that the States have certain rights and that the people in those States have certain rights, we will be taken over by the C. I. O.-P. A. C., and if you permit the C. I. O.-P. A. C. to take hold of this Government in the way that they are doing at present, by action of the New Deal through Executive orders and bureaucrats it is going to be a sad day for American liberty and American independence. Wake up people of the United States and watch for all un-American moves by P. A. C. and other radical groups or you will have to clear all with Sidney. The New Deal does its clearing through him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Advertiser Review.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Missouri Farmers Association on T. V. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a news article and my comments thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of Lincoln and his wife.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two speeches—one by myself and one by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

W. P. B. NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR CONFUSION IN SHUT-DOWN OF WAR PLANTS IN DETROIT AREA BECAUSE OF NATURAL-GAS SITUATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point relative to 100 war plants being shut down in the Detroit area because of the gas shortage brought on by diversion of gas to Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening of last week the House passed and sent to the Senate the so-called work-or-jail bill, which would bring every man between 18 and 45 years of age into some phase of the war effort.

At 4 that afternoon the War Production Board here in Washington issued an order to curtail the supply of natural gas. Among the areas affected was Detroit, the arsenal of democracy, in which there are more than 100 war plants. Telegrams were sent to the Pan Handle Pipe Line at 5 p. m., which supplies its subsidiary, the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. in Detroit. The Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. went to sleep at the switch; in fact, they slept on the order all night, instead of making it public on its receipt. The next morning, that is, Friday morning, February 2, they began to curtail some of the consumers around 10 a. m., and later in the day other consumers and in the afternoon notified the war plants. As a result a dozen or more plants were made idle and approximately 50,000 workers were sent home. If the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. had made the order public upon its receipt, the confusion could have been averted because if the residential sections and other users had known about it, they could have curtailed the use of gas and thereby materially assisted in preventing the reduction of the pressure.

The Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. and certain of the newspapers have made it appear that the shut-down in Detroit was caused entirely by the bungling of orders from the War Production Board here in Washington. That is not the case. According to information given to me by Mr. Alexander Macomber, Director of the Gas Division, Office of War Utilities, War Production Board, if the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. had taken immediate action on the order telegraphed from Washington much of the confusion could have been averted. In fact, it is altogether probable that there would have been sufficient gas for the war plants to operate during the 6 or 8 hours that the gas was cut off, and untold thousands of man-hours in our war effort would not have been wasted.

Incidentally, the shortage of gas in the Detroit area was not caused altogether by the use of natural gas in that area but by diversion of a large quantity of gas to Ohio in order to take care of a very critical situation in that State, and just as soon as the emergency is over the gas will again be made available to the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. It is significant that almost simultaneously with diversion of gas to Ohio the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. issued a statement to the effect that the emergency emphasized the importance of the consummation of their plan for building an independent $70,000,000 pipe line.

This new pipe line is of vital interest to consumers of natural gas in the Detroit area, and the Common Council of the City of Detroit on February 2 ordered that a public hearing be held on February 9 to disclose "the true reasons behind the movement." This action of the common council was taken after its corporation counsel pointed out that "in view of the evidence surrounding the introduction of natural gas to this area, the matter of the proposed new pipe line is of great importance to the city and the rate payers."

My Detroit office telephoned me this morning to inform me that an early edition of the Detroit papers carried this headline "Utility giants to move for city gas control; $70,000,000 pipe-line plan to be aired."

In other words, the giant utilities corporations are taking advantage of the present emergency to put over their $70,000,000 pipe-line plan.

For some time I have been making an exhaustive study of the natural-gas situation in the Detroit area and the exorbitant rates paid by the rate payers there in comparison to what is paid in other areas. As a result, I am convinced that the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act have been violated, and I have brought this matter to the attention of the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I also introduced in the House of Representatives in the last Congress and again in this Congress a resolution asking investigation of these matters. My resolution of this Congress, numbered House Resolution 18, is now pending before the Committee on Rules. If this resolution is approved by the committee and the House, it would authorize the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to go into the whole matter. I shall have more to say about the natural-gas situation in the Detroit and neighboring areas at a later date, as well as my resolution, House Resolution 18 of this Congress.

PHILIPPINES VICTORY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are thrilled today with the accomplishments of General MacArthur and our brave soldiers in the Philippines. I think we would be derelict if we did not take some official notice of what they have done there, especially within the last 24 hours. They have now retaken

Manila, as General MacArthur told them we would do. He told them he was coming back.

I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to send to General MacArthur and his brave men a telegram of congratulations to let them know that we are not overlooking the great things they are doing to save this great Republic against the most vicious enemy the white man's civilization has ever known.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a dramatic statement appearing in the Washington Post of this morning made by Father Dugan, who was one of the prisoners recently rescued on the island of Luzon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post entitled "Peril to Education."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after "facilities", insert "including housing for civilian employees."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "$1,500,549,500" and insert "$1,500,539,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the House passed the bill with the total amount incorrectly shown as $1,500,549,500. The correct total is shown in the Senate amendment, $1,500,539,500. This is merely a mathematical error.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is another amendment having to do with housing, however.

Mr. VINSON. Yes. The break-down of the amount carried in the House bill shows a provision for miscellaneous structures and facilities of $41,265,000. I am advised by Admiral Moreell, of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, that he wants the language of the bill to read "including housing for civilian employees," and these words were inserted in the Senate. The reason is that there may be certain instances where it will be necessary to construct some houses for civilian employees of the Navy Department when the National Housing Agency cannot do it. These projects are usually small emergency projects of vital importance to the Navy. At this time he has no specific projects of that character in mind, but instead of coming back later with a request for a specific authorization for such projects, he asks for it now.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman's committee previously had jurisdiction over housing?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. This is all for naval work. This is in navy yards and naval establishments. It concerns nothing but naval activities.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman spoke of a change in figures. I call the attention of the gentleman to the statement of February 1 of the Federal Treasury, showing that we are now $233,776,000,000 in debt. The gentleman has asked for a general order for housing although there is nothing specific for which they want to use this housing.

We ought to be careful not to grant anybody any power to build more houses unless we know they are absolutely necessary for this reason. There are several places in Indiana where 4,000 to 5,000 houses have been built and only 10 percent of them are rented. There are a number of instances of that kind. We could have a list of them published in the RECORD, but you all know about them. An enormous waste of money has been indulged in by this Government in the last 3 or 4 years in building housing projects. I think this is a dangerous provision to put in this bill.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that every item in this bill has been verified by Admiral King as necessary in the prosecution of the war. It is absolutely essential in certain areas to carry on the war activity to have housing for civilian personnel where none are available for them. If the gentleman wants to aid in the prosecution of the war so that we can ultimately reduce the great debt to which the gentleman has referred, then I hope he will not interpose any objection to anything that will help bring about a speedy termination of the war and which is necessary in carrying out projects of this kind.

Mr. RICH. Since this refers to the Navy, I am not going to object, but if it had to do with the Army I would object.

Mr. VINSON. I am grateful to the gentleman but his efforts toward economy should be just as strict against the Navy as against the Army.

Mr. RICH. I do not know of any instances where the Navy has wasted money in this way but I do know of a lot of instances where the Army has done so.

Mr. VINSON. We are trying to do a good job. There will be no waste in this item.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this measure give the Navy Department authority to construct housing within the continental limits of the United States?

Mr. VINSON. For the information of the House, may I read a memorandum from Admiral Moreell:

In the hearings before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs on the public works authorization bill, H. R. 626, the Department recommended two amendments.

The first amendment was the correction of an addition, the total figure being wrong by $10,000.

The second amendment inserted under the title "Miscellaneous" the following words: "including housing for civilian employees."

The reason for this second amendment was that from time to time there arises a need for constructing housing for civilian employees of the Navy Department when the National Housing Agency does not have funds to finance such construction. These projects are usually small emergency projects of vital importance to the Navy.

Some time ago when one such project arose, the Judge Advocate General of the Navy ruled that we could not expend public-works funds for such housing when it is not located on a naval station, although we can expend public works funds for such housing "on station" when the housing is constructed as a part of a larger development such, for example, as an ammunition depot or hospital.

In order to remove any doubt as to the legality of taking care of such emergency cases, the Department decided to request the insertion into the public works authorization bill of authority to construct housing for civilian employees. It is not contemplated that this authority will be resorted to except in an emergency and when the National Housing Agency does not have funds to take care of the situation.

That gives the complete justification for this amendment to the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, this gives the Navy Department the authority to construct houses for civilians in this country?

Mr. VINSON. I would say yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman has stated that all of the funds mentioned in this bill have already been accounted for by particularizing the items; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct; with this limitation: Under the bill, these items can be varied up or down or absolutely wiped out completely and new items substituted in their place if it is necessary in the prosecution of the war. In other words, to put it before the House in this manner, the $1,500,000,000 is almost a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So that the Navy can use it for almost any construction it wants to including houses, in all of the ports in this country if they think it is necessary?

Mr. VINSON. If they think it is necessary in the prosecution of the war. If Admiral King thinks he needs an ammunition depot or hospital they should be built, and he is asking for that authority.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Could not the Navy Department go to one of the housing authorities we have already established and ask them and do you not think the housing authorities would give the Navy Department priority for immediate construction of whatever housing was necessary?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has heard the admiral's statement. If it does not appear to the gentleman to be sound, of course, he has the right to object to it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether or not there is any breakdown to indicate housing deficiencies that presently exist which give rise to this request?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; it is broken down under "Miscellaneous structures and facilities." It is broken down that way to the amount of $41,265,000. Under that broad language in all probability the houses could be constructed, but to clarify it and make it positive it includes, "Including houses for civilian employees." Now, if you were construing the words "Miscellaneous structures and facilities, $41,265,000" under a liberal interpretation, you would readily conclude that houses for civilian employees could be constructed. It is not an increase in the amount of money at all. It does not increase it by 10 cents.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman I have not studied it sufficiently to be able to advise him as to whether or not I would be able to come to that conclusion. But I do want to understand it. Did the hearings before the gentleman's committee break down that $47,000,000 item to indicate a field of possible public housing that might be engaged in under this appropriation?

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. KEEFE. How far do they expect to go in this field?

Mr. VINSON. I would not say it is not broken down that way. But it was broken down to show what they had in mind when the bill was presented with reference to "Miscellaneous structures and facilities." They may be changed tomorrow.

Mr. KEEFE. Just so that we can understand it, then, we must rely on the good faith of the Navy Department in the expenditure of these funds on this particular item as being wholly necessary for the war effort?

Mr. VINSON. Before any of the projects are started by the Navy Department, they are required to clear each item through the committee so that we keep a close check on what is being done.

Mr. KEEFE. Because we are giving them what appears, under the gentleman's statement, carte blanche authority to spend up to $1,500,000,000 if they so determine for public housing; is that not true?

Mr. VINSON. No; they would not do that. As I said before, we scrutinize every item before they undertake construction. To date we in the committee have passed on a total of 3,000 items to see that they are essential for the war effort.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, they would not do it, but they could, according to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. VINSON. Well, the emergency does not justify that.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not assume that they would do it.

Mr. VINSON. Of course not.

Mr. KEEFE. But they could spend whatever amount the Navy decided ought to be spent for public housing, adjacent to Navy structures or establishments, for civilian employees?

Mr. VINSON. That is, for those who are engaged in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. KEEFE. Who handles that housing, the Navy Department?

Mr. VINSON. The Navy Department.

Mr. KEEFE. Are there any such projects now in the country which the Navy has built out of these funds; that is, public housing projects?

Mr. VINSON. My recollection is that at Norfolk they have a project known as the Ben Moreell project. If my recollection is correct, that was built by the Navy.

Mr. KEEFE. How are those projects handled as to rentals and so forth?

Mr. VINSON. They are rented out, and up to date I think they are showing a substantial return.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the chairman would tell us whether or not facilities are included in this housing?

Mr. VINSON. I am sure in all constructions which the Navy makes out of these funds certain facilities such as ice boxes and refrigerators and gas stoves and things of that kind would be included, but I would not imagine that beds and bureaus or dressers would be included.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am afraid the term "facilities" will include sewer systems and everything else.

Mr. VINSON. I imagine it includes sewer systems; that is a facility in the construction. It also includes land.

Mr. McGREGOR. As I understood the gentleman's statement this whole appropriation or authorization could be used for the construction of houses, sewer systems, and even include school houses?

Mr. VINSON. As I said, in presenting the bill, when it was first before the House, it is an authorization for $1,500,000,000. The broad latitude given to the Navy Department almost makes it a lump sum appropriation subject, however, to clearance through the committee. Nevertheless, we itemized each of these items and unless some unforeseen emergency arises, the funds will be used as indicated by the bill—so much for fleet training facilities and so forth.

Mr. McGREGOR. How much for housing?

Mr. VINSON. In the total amount, "Miscellaneous construction and facilities," nothing was said about housing.

Mr. McGREGOR. But they might use the entire allocation?

Mr. VINSON. Of course they might, but of course, they are sensible men like the gentleman who is asking the question. They would not do it. We still maintain our check on how the Navy Department is using the appropriation for public-works projects.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that they might use this entire authorization for the construction of houses, sewers, and other facilities, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 626, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. VINSON, Mr. DREWRY, and Mr. MOTT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is rather anomalous and not so very well known, that the State Department is the only branch of our Government that need not render a report to Congress. Every other department is compelled to render at least annually reports to us. That failure to render a report to Congress has caused rather strange repercussions in our history. There has developed because thereof a condition that our foreign affairs, for example, are a dark, murky, backstairs business, and that the sign "no admission" confronts not only Members of Congress but the public in general. There has developed an aura of secrecy about the State Department's activities that now bodes ill. That secrecy stemmed from Alexander Hamilton, who you may remember insisted that treaty ratifications should be by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. He looked upon the Senate as a sort of privy council; that they would act in secrecy; that treaties were secret affairs. We know also that the Senate in its few sessions met and deliberated in secrecy, and there were no public sessions, but all of that has gone over the dam, thank goodness. We know that a stunning blow was struck at secrecy by Wilson when he spoke of "open covenants openly arrived at." Many blows have been struck since at this so-called secrecy, but more, indeed, are necessary. For example, we have no questioning hour in this Chamber as they have in the House of Commons in Great Britain, and as required by the bill offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. We should have a questioning hour. That would break down the wall of secrecy. We are unable to discover policies, the rationale

of policies, and the results of policies inaugurated by the State Department. We are confronted with a fait accompli. We have little choice. Good or bad, we must accept the situation. But before announcement of the results, the accomplished facts, all we can do in this Chamber is to guess and speculate, and at times raise doubts. We are compelled to get information from the grapevine, from enterprising commentators and columnists. We have no choice but to rely upon rumor and surmise and guesses, and unfortunately, distortions. We are not in the know. We ought to be in the know. The system, not the men who run the system, is at fault, and we in the Congress are not blameless in that regard, because of our complacency, because of our indifference, because of our allowing such a system to endure so long.

We are to blame because we permit, as it were, the functioning of a creaking, weather-beaten, one-horse shay, whereas we should have a modern streamlined automobile. We often come to conclusions that may be unsound, even unfair, but what can we do as Representatives? We hit in the dark in the hope that the State Department will unfold; we raise a fuss in the hope of getting some enlightenment; we ring the bell, pound the door, sound the alarm, wake up the whole State Department in order to get sometimes a few facts. Then, too, often in strict traditional manner, facts are told us, but they are often old facts, already known. What we are told are likely words emanating from the moth-eaten holes of an old parlor sofa. We do not get the real low-down, and that is what we are entitled to.

We in the United States are no longer infants so far as foreign affairs are concerned. We have outgrown our diapers and even our rompers. We must be told the facts of life of foreign affairs. We shall not take merely the assurance of our Department of State; we shall not be mere little cocker spaniels wanting to be petted, and then be nice doggies. We must and we will know. And, Mr. Speaker, what I say here is in no way offered in personal affront or personal criticism of Mr. Stettinius or his assistant, Mr. Grew. They are very estimable gentlemen. They are endeavoring to do a good job. There are many others in the Department, distinguished administrators, splendid servants of you and me and the rest of the people of the United States, and I refer to men like Archibald MacLeish, Nelson Rockefeller, and the distinguished head of the Visa Division, Howard K. Travers. I cannot mention them all. I want to praise them, but at the same time I denounce the system. Mine is only a criticism of the system that we have allowed to develop.

We must remove the barnacles of some of the silly precedents of secrecy and drain off the bilge water of dark and murky protocols of extreme conservatisms; otherwise our ship of state is headed for reefs and rocks. Remember, unless we get rid of some of the flotsam and jetsam of outworn conventions, Russia's Foreign Office, realistic, alert, keen, with a determination to get what it wants when it wants it, come hell or high water, will beat our State Department in the international race.

Take, for example, the punishment of the Axis war criminals. We bungled woefully the last time. None of the criminals, none of the Huns after the First World War were brought to the bar of justice. You may remember how Kaiser Wilhelm was permitted to suffer a convenient exile as the Squire of Doorn, chopping wood. But the same pattern of bungling and ineptitude is being woven again. Shall we fail to punish the Huns the second time? The Lord forbid. Oh, I recognize the same old diplomatic squeamishness, the same old tender regard for diplomatic niceties on the part of the United War Crimes Commission, with no remonstrance from our own State Department.

Take the Herbert C. Pell incident. He has been compelled to resign as our representative at London on the War Crimes Commission, although he did a good, courageous job and may be punished because of his integrity of purpose. He may be punished because of that very courage, that very intrepidity that is his. The Department offered a rather lame excuse, when there was a squawk on the part of the public concerning Pell's forced resignation, the lame excuse that we in this House failed to appropriate $30,000 for the maintenance of our representative in London at the War Crimes Commission.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said that his committee would have gladly recommended the appropriation had they been told by the State Department that the appropriation had been necessary; but the Appropriations Committee was led to believe there were ample funds and therefore there was no need for any additional appropriation.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished and able gentleman from New York, chairman of the all-important Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BLOOM. Would the gentleman mind putting in the history at this time with reference to what really happened to the $30,000, which was put in by the Senate and taken out at the request of the House? I say the House is to blame for the $30,000 not being appropriated.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his statement, but I may say, countering what he said, that the House naturally was working in the dark. The House was not properly informed and if it had been properly informed perhaps a different result would have occurred.

Mr. BLOOM. A representative of the State Department appeared before the Appropriations Committee and explained the purpose of the $30,000, but it was not allowed to remain in the appropriation.

Mr. CELLER. Was that not before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate? We did not pass upon it at all. Certainly if the State Department had made known its wishes, we would not have gainsaid it in the important matter. But it did not make us aware of the need—the real need. However, the gentleman is perfectly at liberty to make any statement he wishes concerning the situation.

I respect his judgment. There are some who hope that the Russians will get to Berlin first. The Russians, it is said, know what they want when they want it. Soviet Russia refuses to line up, for example, with the United Nations War Crimes Commission, and rightly so. They will deal with war criminals in their own inimitable way, having established an investigatory and administrative body of their own.

The United Nations War Crimes Commission has been meeting for several years, but apparently has gotten nowhere. Its machinery has been stalled by a lot of nonsensical legalistic mumbo-jumbo. It has labored and not even brought forth a mouse.

Our State Department may or may not be culpable. It has, as far as is known, done little, however, to speed up the procedure of the United Nations War Crimes Commission. I suspect it shares the views of the British Foreign Office which wants apparently little or no action on the part of the United War Crimes Commission.

The chairman of that Commission, Sir Cecil Hurst, wrote three letters to the British Foreign Office. The first, written last May, asked for the extension of the Commission's power to try the Nazis for crimes against their own nationals; that is, for crimes against the Jews particularly. The reply came 4 months later from Anthony Eden, British Foreign Secretary which, in common parlance, said, "No soap." I suppose Anthony Eden would have the Gestapo act as judge and jury to try the foul offenders of the laws of humanity.

The chairman of the War Crimes Commission wrote a second letter asking for international courts to try the Axis jackals like Hitler, Himmler, Quisling, and the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. Anthony Eden took 3 months to answer that one, and again it was "no soap." This apparently would mean that Hitler and his gang cannot be tried by judicial processes, and reveals the possibility that whatever punishment is meted out to these officers and officials may only be imposed, shall we say, as the result of caprices of political leaders of the United Nations. They could decree that the criminals be shot or hanged or, as in the case of the Kaiser, as I said before, sentenced to a comfortable exile. Or it might be that Herr Hitler and Herr Himmler and company will receive the Napoleon treatment. Napoleon was permitted to live in luxury in exile on the island of Elba. Such tender treatment for Hitler, the murderer of millions, would be fitting, would it not? I am sure you want in that regard an "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

The excuse given by Mr. Eden for the delay in answering the letters is that there is no central body in the United Nations to which such problems can be forwarded, and that the British Foreign Office is the most convenient channel. It took a long while for Mr. Eden to come to such a watered conclusion, and all the while, though I hesitate and regret to

state this, we got very little comfort from our State Department. It took the Pell incident, however, to force it out of its lethargy.

The third letter to the British Foreign Office was very properly a letter of resignation. Sir Cecil Hurst was so thoroughly disgusted with the attitude of the British Foreign Office that he resigned.

It is, therefore, on good ground that Russia resolutely refuses to join the Commission and snubs its conclusions. While the United States War Crimes Commission has been talking and strictly following diplomatic protocols, the Russians have been for more than a year conducting trials and executions. The SS guardsmen and members of the Gestapo have been hung for mass murder, and military officers have been shot for using civilians as spearheads against advancing enemy troops. Concentration camp officers have been hung for building crematoria for the ruthless burning of innocent people. Russia refuses to postpone the trials until after the war is won. They would dare punish the Herrenvolk murderers now. To indicate her seriousness of purpose Russia appointed as chairman of her Commission on War Guilt a trade-union leader. Among its members are a brain surgeon, a historian, a distinguished writer, and a woman airplane pilot. No single diplomat is found on the Russian Commission for the punishing of war criminals. That is most significant. They know diplomats are too bound by the past. They want no one hog-tied. When it comes to these Nazi monstrous war crimes—wholly unprecedented—precedents avail as naught.

Mr. BLOOM. May I state to the gentleman that he ought to bring out the fact that the War Crimes Commission today is functioning, but functioning under the military. It is costing the Government just as much to conduct this Commission; that is, the expenses of it, but the fact is that they wanted to get rid of Herbert Pell. Herbert Pell, as I understand, was willing to work for $1 a year. The office today is in the hands of the military, and what they are doing over there nobody knows.

Mr. CELLER. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman's observations. Some of this mumbo-jumbo of the United Nations War Crimes Commission stems from its reluctance to set up international courts for the trial of Axis criminals.

How else can crimes which have no geographical frontiers be tried? How else can crimes be tried that have been committed in more than one country? Which country will have jurisdiction? Who will have jurisdiction in cases where crimes against nationals of one country were committed in another, as happened in mass deportations? Is Germany to have jurisdiction of crimes against her own nationals, such as the crimes against minority populations, Catholics, Jews, and even Protestants? That is what happened last time with tragic results.

In all this our own Government through our State Department is playing a rather feeble part. Herbert Pell, our representative on the Commission, has disagreed with the English point of view, but he has not been able to dominate the proceedings. Yes, as I said before, he has expressed himself in a courageous manner. But why was he given the gate? Of course, his views must have displeased some of those in the British Foreign Office, and they have likely demanded his return to this country.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. This is exceedingly important to the Congress of the United States. Has the gentleman determined the position of our popular and able Secretary of State on this very sincere matter?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know what Mr. Stettinius' personal views are. I have great confidence in him.

Mr. PATRICK. But does not the gentleman believe his views are exceedingly important, considering the post he occupies?

Mr. CELLER. I do. I hate to think he does not know what is going on around and about him. It may be that the proper picture is not properly presented to him. It may be that my feeble remarks here this afternoon may needle even Mr. Stettinius into action that would win our approval. I do not know. The head of the State Department has an immense job and he cannot know everything that is going on around and about him. I hope the gentleman's question and my reply and what has been said here this afternoon will be helpful in the situation.

The expression of American sentiment in regard to trial and punishment of Axis war criminals must be made more articulate in London. We want these war criminals tried expeditiously and punished without any squeamishness, without any tender regard for legal precision and niceties. Pell can help in that regard. This is a war without precedent. The atrocities committed by the Axis beasts outrival the acts of Atilla the Hun and Genghis Khan. We have never witnessed before anything as horrendous. Therefore, new laws must be applied, new remedies discovered. To raise the question that punishment imposed through new law might be in the nature of an ex post facto law is too silly for words.

It would be tragic to repeat the international wink of the eye into which the trial and punishment of war criminals resolved itself after the First World War. Two and a half years of bargaining, legal pettifogging, and wire pulling among the royal families of Europe resulted in the trials being held by the German high court at Leipzig. It would be farcical did we not feel its horrible repercussions today. A list of 900 culprits was whittled down to 12. Yes, of the 900, 12 only were tried. Six were acquitted. Two naval lieutenants received 4-year sentences and the other 4 received sentences of 6 months in jail. The 2 naval lieutenants who had been sentenced to 4 years in jail contrived to escape. That was the sum and substance of the attempt at international justice—6 months in jail for 4 underling culprits.

It shall never happen again. The American people will not remain complacent. Less than a month ago the Nazis disarmed and captured American soldiers. Many were murdered in cold blood. Such savagery on the part of officials is now well known. Those guilty must be hunted down and punished.

General MacArthur has reentered Manila, but you remember when he left Manila he declared Manila an open city. However, the Japs disregarded the fact that he had made that declaration, and their airplanes flying low machine-gunned thousands of innocent men, women, and children, despite their knowledge that they were flagrantly violating the laws of nations and the Geneva Conventions. Those Jap beasts must be punished. Those beasts will not be punished if we continue our present process of legal coddling and nursing. I believe our State Department must revise its entire thinking on the subject. The public want action, definite, positive action, and they want Pell returned because they like his forthrightness. Pell should, indeed, be reinstated.

I repeat what I have said and will continue to say it in all kindliness. I speak more in sorrow than in anger.

In order to remedy this situation I have this day offered a joint resolution requesting the President to create a commission to operate with the United Nations War Crimes Commission, or any other agency of the United Nations, in the preparation of definite plans for the punishment of war criminals.

The consideration and passage of this joint resolution by the Congress will be a definite expression of the American people that it wants action, and quick action, in the running down and the punishing of these Axis brutes.

I have faith in Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Grew and most of their staff, but, unfortunately, they now place me and many others in a position where I cannot refrain from offering criticism. They have, in fact, made it most difficult for my unfortunate brethren in Europe who are victims of the continuous persecution and mass murder under Hitler to have realized their dream of a homeland in Palestine.

Be it remembered that President Roosevelt and his recent political opponent, Governor Dewey, as well as some 400 Senators and Representatives, all pledged aid in the creation of a national homeland for Jews in Palestine and also pledged that the United States would use its good offices to abrogate the infamous Malcolm MacDonald white paper that slams with a bang the gates of Palestine against Jewish immigration. Both Democratic and Republican platforms called for the same laudable effort.

Are we to understand that the State Department is now sabotaging the setting up of this homeland and that it is seeking the prevention of the ordinary developing of Palestine by reasonable periodic inflow of Jews fleeing the Nazi scourge. Charges are made in some quarters that the State Department in its consistent retarding attitude toward Palestine is exhibiting a rather uncomprehending policy, that it is unduly

swayed by the British Colonial Office which waves the alleged flag of Arab unrest.

Another upsetting act of the State Department—again I say this respectfully—is its recent appointment of Mr. Wallace Murray, formerly head of its Near East Division, to be our Ambassador to Iran. This is the same Mr. Murray who for years in his official capacity went out of his way to discourage the development of Palestine as a national homeland for the Jews and to defer its utilization as a haven for refugee Jews. Undoubtedly, Mr. Murray in Iran will cooperate with much enthusiasm with Arab opponents in Palestine, just as he has been in the past few years their most alert friend in Government service in the United States.

This is the same Mr. Murray who had the temerity to tell me personally that the aforesaid MacDonald white paper, excluding Jewish immigration into Palestine save by the will of an Arab majority was not a violation of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, despite the fact that this treaty specifically states there could be no discrimination as to immigration into Palestine on the grounds of race or religion.

In addition to Mr. Murray, the Department now is contemplating the appointment of Col. Harold Hoskins as Director of American Economic Operations and Minister to Middle East to succeed Dean James M. Landis, of Harvard Law School who resigned because he could not stomach the flagrant disregard by Britain of fundamental human rights in the Middle East.

This is the same Harold Hoskins who as a long-time champion for the Arabs only last spring circulated among Senators an alleged confidential and restricted report which he himself wrote forecasting dire disaster for additional homeless and persecuted Jews who found asylum from Hitler in Palestine. Hoskins circulated this erroneous report, I am informed, among Senators by and with the consent of the State Department. I hope I am misinformed. The Department should offer a disclaimer if my information is false.

He was born in Beirut and has lived many years in the Levant. He has taken on too much of the color of his Arab surroundings. He would, as successor to Landis, be compelled to settle many delicate questions involving Arab and Jew. He is an avowed Arabphile. Jews could not possibly obtain a square deal from such a one as he.

All this, despite the fact that since the beginning of the war, Palestine, through the loyalty of its Jewish population was the foremost source of supplies for General Montgomery's harrassed troops at a time when the German General Rommel had pushed the Allies back almost to the waters of the Suez. During all this period, the Arabs of the Middle East were watching which way to jump.

Meanwhile, many of the Arabs in high authority were stooges of the Germans. Today, Palestine is continuing to make everything from marmalade to munitions for us and our allies, and is cooperating more energetically with our war effort in the Middle East. In addition, the united population of Palestine has entered into the war effort, either as soldiers or factory workers.

Colonel Hoskins has never raised his voice or a finger to help the Jews. On the contrary, he has been most disparaging of the Jews in Palestine. To whom is he persona grata? Under no circumstances should he be sent to the Middle East. His appointment will be the source of greatest friction. His machinations with the Arabs will develop greatest hostility among the Jews. His intense Arab bias and his well-known hostility to Palestine as a national homeland for the Jews should make the State Department hesitate and bethink itself before appointing him.

Of course, the Arabs will welcome him as an excellent counterpart to Mr. Murray in Iran.

The Department has given the Jews a solar plexus blow with its demand for deferment of consideration of the Palestine resolution. It gave the Jews a left to the jaw with the Murray appointment. Now, it would follow up with another blow by the selection of Hoskins.

I am quite sure that President Roosevelt is unaware of the implications attendant upon such an appointment. Surely the President who has so long been devoted to Palestine as a Jewish national homeland would not permit, if he knew it, the designation of a man like Hoskins as successor to Jim Landis.

Assuredly, the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in particular and the Senate in general should carefully scrutinize this appointment of Hoskins as well as that of Murray.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article from the Hartford Courant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE HOUSING SITUATION IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I regret as much as anybody here that it is necessary to consume time of the Seventy-ninth Congress discussing the subject that I have to discuss this afternoon. That is, housing conditions in Washington as affecting Congressmen and their staffs.

A personal experience brought this about. I lived at a hotel in the city of Washington for 5 years. I sought at the beginning of this Congress to obtain the same quarters which in 1941 and 1942 I had occupied for $125 per month. Now, I was asked to pay $250 a month for these same quarters, with a little cut off of one corner.

That obtains all over the city of Washington, I later found. That exists, notwithstanding the rule that rents were to have been frozen at the 1941 figure. The people who occupy those quarters I had are paying $250 a month, and the authorities are doing nothing about it. I discussed it with the authorities, and they inferentially admitted it is true. That is no more serious in the case of Congressmen than anybody else, except for the fact that the Congressmen are here to represent the people over the country. They are expected to get to work at the people's business on arrival.

H. R. 68 is a resolution introduced by me on the 9th of January, this session, asking authorization for a study of housing shortage and rent-control violations in the District of Columbia. The purpose of the resolution was to determine the facts and to make way for needed legislation as relating to Congressmen, Senators, and their help. Two informal and unofficial meetings followed which sprang out of the situation itself, almost of their own accord, and an abundance of facts brought to light from those meetings, and from the need shown it has caused me to obtain the privilege of speaking for 10 minutes.

House Joint Resolution 59 is a joint resolution introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], on January 6, this session, asking that the National Housing Administration be given authorization to cause to be constructed as expeditiously as possible within a reasonable distance from the Capitol, two apartment buildings providing suitable quarters which will be available to Members of Congress. My name has become connected with this and I have had applications from about 50 Senators and Congressmen, thinking that I was already in position to offer them some help. These range from a Congressman from West Virginia before the first meeting to the chairman of a committee, a gentleman from Texas, who wishes an apartment of two rooms. It came just a few moments ago.

It is my individual belief that this bill should include secretarial help also. All this should have been attended to incidentally years ago.

We expect much help from the Republicans on this bill because they tell us they expect to come here in considerable numbers 2 years hence. How are they going to find places to live?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I notice in the press that a certain real-estate building firm here has made a proposal to the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, I read that. I regret they picked out that isolated instance. I do not know why a representative of the press selected that particular firm, because at least 25 have approached us. However, the press selected one building firm. Why they ignored others I do not know.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The point I wanted to bring out is that there seems to be a little sympathetic consideration shown by the real-estate interests here to try to do something for the Congressmen.

Mr. PATRICK. True. The real-estate interests here seem eager to do right

about this. The other day we had merely a little informal meeting which one paper set out as a regular meeting—last Friday it was. We did not expect to have that meeting but one paper carried that as our meeting date so we tried to accommodate those that came. The press carried that meeting, one paper in particular, the Scripps-Howard paper, the News—and the News reporter was there at the meeting; carried it as a major meeting. But, as I said, the reporter was there and heard us state that it was not. Despite that fact the reporter sent out the story I have stated.

Under present law Members of Congress may not rent property owned by the Federal Government. If it is necessary for this principle to remain the law some way should be provided for mere Congressmen and their help to find homes on property not owned by the Government. All doors should not be closed in their faces. It does not serve the interests of the country as a whole or specially affected districts in particular to elect lawmakers to come to Washington only to have them spend weeks and weeks running around hunting a place to live.

There are 31 Congressmen and Senators in Washington right now trying to secure living quarters, and a greater number of secretaries, clerks, and other employees in a similar fix. Certainly the people of the United States who elect their Representatives to come to the Capital should expect the situation to be such that their Representatives can promptly get to work.

Surely there was never more work cast before them. What could more tend toward skimpy or unfruitful legislation than to have one come to Washington to do his district's work and his country's work and be forced to spend his days—and nights, incidentally—looking for a place for his wife and children to lay their heads at night?

Congressmen in the House are elected every 2 years. New Members come in fresh from the people and bring to this body the newest public thought. It is these new Members who are so hard hit. Instead of having a chance to bring forward what new they may have to offer their energies must be devoted to looking for quarters. One Congressman said to me, "Even the pigeons in Washington seem to find places to roost at night."

The Sabath bill stipulates a cost not to exceed $3,000,000. Also, the Sabath bill places the management, care, and maintenance of the proposed two apartments under the Architect of the Capitol. Today at 3 p. m. we meet at 413 Old House Office Building to begin the draft of a new bill supplanting H. R. 59. It appears probable that the management, care, and maintenance clause will be changed since it may better serve to have persons removed from Government employment handle this part of the housing service.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am quite sure that gentleman has already pointed out, but if he has not I hope he will make it absolutely clear and certain to the American people that Members of Congress will pay for their quarters, that this project will be self-liquidating and not 1 cent will come from the taxpayers.

Mr. PATRICK. That is absolutely true and I thank the gentleman for that timely contribution. I have not mentioned that, but I will do so later.

The purpose to be sought is merely adequate housing for Congressmen, Senators, and their staffs. This will run from a bachelor Congressman to Senators with large families, from one or two rooms to four rooms, and possibly a five-room apartment or two. It is also suggested that page boys should also be provided for since they are away from home and temporarily orphaned for several hours each day. The rooms should be simple in type and should rent for from $60 to $125 per month with a few necessarily running into a slightly higher figure, and they should be paid for just as anybody else would pay for similar places of abode.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I would like to ask the genleman in connection with the last sentence stated there, does his bill contemplate having a uniform group of apartments or would they vary in size and number of rooms?

Mr. PATRICK. They would, and that is the reason I made that statement.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. So far as I am personally concerned, that is not a problem which affects me because I own my own home, but I want the gentleman to know it is a splendid idea.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are three or four other special orders that have already been granted. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I shall not—it seems to me that the gentleman should not make the request, in view of the fact there are three or four other Members here waiting. However, I will leave it to his good judgment, and I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it may be necessary to ask for a special committee so as to have hearings. This will be known only after those of us now drafting the Sabath bill substitute shall have done all we can to bring it to form. Meanwhile, the response has been far beyond that expected, not only from the lawmakers and their help but from people all over the District of Columbia. I will have more to report to this body following our 3 o'clock meeting this afternoon, and I invite the gentlemen who have asked questions to join us and help draft a bill, Republicans and Democrats alike.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was on objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a round-table discussion on American Forum of the Air program last Tuesday night, in which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and myself participated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the president of the Farm Bureau of Michigan to the man at the head of the selective-service activities in that State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ARMS FOR THE MEN OF FRANCE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, France seeks arms for her fighting men. This is a matter of more than casual interest to the people of the United States. It is of paramount interest, for each new French division in the field helps to reduce the strain on American manpower. During the occupation France was stripped of military material by the Germans. Consequently, she must look to her allies for the muscles and sinews of war. She has hundreds of thousands of men available for service, but to this date the Allied High Command has authorized arms and equipment for but few new French divisions.

The French Consultative Assembly in recent session passed a resolution urging its government to mobilize all available manpower for the fighting forces, underlining what is the chief preoccupation of all Frenchmen today—that France would be represented at full strength on the battlefield. The military outlook is changing rapidly, but who can say that there is not still time for the French to develop and exert their military potentialities to an extent that will make them an important factor in the final issue.

The French Government, eager to take a larger military and industrial role in the war, has emphasized that they must import 6,000,000 tons of supplies in the first 6 months of 1945 to enable the French people to play their full part in the final drive against the Germans. In the utilization of shipping it is to me significant that it requires less shipping to provide arms and equipment for the French than to send across the Atlantic the equivalent number of fresh American troops. It follows that the American manpower thus replaced by French troops can be used more efficiently at home for increased war production. I would also like to point out that the French tell me their mills are not in use, but that the machinery is in working condition, and that they have the trained manpower—many, many thousands of them now idle—with which to manufacture uniforms and other equipment for the French and for the allies of France if textiles and other materials are provided. This information I have emphasized again and again to our officials and am glad to note that an agreement has been reached in the past few days whereby American raw materials are to be shipped to France for processing. I regret to say that it is my understanding that the quantities involved are not large, but the step taken is a significant and a proper one.

The French First Army, now fighting on the western front, is not a large force, yet it contains the greater part of the French forces now available for combat service. The sterling qualities and the achievements of this force will not be questioned. The French Government has informed Washington and London that it is now ready to double the number of French divisions in the west, and they have asked for the necessary military equipment. One class of Frenchmen, the class of 1943, or men born in 1923, has been called up for induction in January and early February. Another class is scheduled to be called in the spring or summer. Each of these classes, I am informed, comprises about 200,000 men.

France is now providing material assistance to the Allies under great difficulties. In view of her limited facilities, it will not be easy for a wide-scale training program to be undertaken, but if she is left to her own resources to rearm, she cannot do so until long and costly months have passed, months that would seem doubly long as we wait for victory and doubly costly as we scan the mounting list of American casualties.

I shall comment briefly on the conditions within France. As a base for Allied operations, France is furnishing not only military but economic assistance to our people. Seventy-five thousand French civilians—the equivalent of five normal divisions—are working for the United States Army communications zone, it is said.

In addition to the men now on the job, more than 100,000 French civilians have registered with the United States Army for work.

Our officials pay high tribute to the skill and willingness of this voluntary labor force. They perform every type of military task from stevedoring to typing. The workers are paid by the French Government.

There have been few significant work stoppages, in spite of the hardships which laborers have faced in many cases.

I have been informed that France is giving more than she is receiving on lease-lend. Her coal mines are producing most of the coal for Allied supply routes in the west, and her own people are living in unheated buildings.

It is well to consider the French report on the effects of liberation and of German occupation. On the transportation system the damage was so great and the demands of the military are increasing to such an extent that the country is again virtually divided into two zones, with insufficient transport to move any goods for civilians from north to south or vice versa.

In addition to the total destruction of 200,000 buildings and serious damage to 800,000 more, the report states that only about half of France's 16,000 locomotives can be used or repaired, and that half of her rolling stock has disappeared, and the other half is badly worn. Only about 125,000 of France's pre-war total of one and one-half million trucks were left in the Nation by the Germans, and most of these are 10 to 12 years old. Out of 19 large freight yards on the French railway system, all but 4 were knocked out in the preliberation bombings and many of the key bridges were destroyed.

Obviously, there are difficulties in the way of material participation by the French, but let us consider the whole story. France has manpower, hundreds of thousands of fresh youths eager for revenge for long years of occupation. She has that great reserve of young men of 18 to 24 who came into manhood under the German yoke and who clamor for the right to wear their country's uniform in battle. She has trained men by the hundreds of thousands who were a part of the old French Army and who can be recalled to the colors. She has officers who carried on the fight when and where they could, and who are ready to train a new army. She has the underground whose members gave the Germans no rest throughout their occupation. France has greater reserves of unused manpower than any other Allied Nation today.

There are those who have said that the difficulties of training and equipping the French are too great for it to be undertaken on a large scale. For each of these, I have heard other authorities say that these difficulties are but little greater than those of training and equipping Americans and transporting them across an ocean. There are those who will point to the language difficulties in coordination of command, and of the technical training problems which go with modern equipment. On the fighting fronts in this war there are now Americans, Brazilians, British, Czechs, Poles, Russians, Belgians, Dutch, French, Chinese, and still others. They have gotten along very well. The technical phases of training are always slow, regardless of nationality.

Official spokesmen tell us that replacements are needed instead of armies. It is difficult to comprehend an inference that new armies will not add greater weight to the forces against Germany and hasten her collapse. I believe that we are capable, not only of providing replacements for our own armies, but that we can also arm the men of France. The end of the war may not be so near but that they will be needed.

We Americans are not in the habit of allowing difficulties to stop us. France today offers a great source, the only great source, of willing manpower which is not being utilized to full advantage for the Allied cause. I do not think that people of America will take kindly to the philosophy that we must send more American youths to the front because it is too difficult to train and equip the French. France, our friend and our ally on many an historic field, begs for a chance to place its legions at the side of our own fighting men.

I say again—I emphasize this fact—a million fighting French are waiting to take their places on the front lines beside the men of America. Their presence on the front will lighten the load of our own people. The sanction of American officialdom plus the ingenuity of American enterprise can place them there. It is too great a challenge to ignore.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE DOLLAR-A-YEAR PROBLEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, recognizing as I do the genuine service which some dollar-a-year men have rendered to our country in this war period, I am nonetheless convinced that this system is wrong in principle, and have therefore reintroduced my bill to forbid the employment by the Government of policy-making officials on a dollar-a-year basis. Unfortunately, there are some examples of men who have taken Government jobs on a dollar-a-year basis only to quit them in the very middle of the war, and who apparently have gained private advantages as a result of their opportunity to guide Government policy.

One of the best war programs that the War Production Board has carried on has been the war production drive through which the formation of labor-management production committees has been sponsored in some 5,000 critical industrial plants. Joint labor and management committees have been set up and have over and over again proven their great value. This work ought to be continued and yet in announcing his retirement from the War Production Board as of January 1, 1945, Mr. T. K. Quinn, then still the head of the war production drive, announced in letters dated December 15 that the war production drive would soon terminate its activities and would be disbanded. But I have here a copy of the Labor and Management News, official publication of the W. P. B., for January 13, in which appears the following message from Mr. Krug:

MESSAGE TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES

Current developments in the European theater of war have proved the need for the

utmost effort in producing critical war materials.

To the more than 5,000 labor-management production committees, as well as to the War Production Board, these urgent needs present a challenge that must, and I know will, be met.

Most committees have done a splendid job of unifying the efforts of workers and management to meet or exceed production schedules. Almost unbelievable records have been established by many committees in developing new production methods and techniques through worker suggestions; in improving attendance and reducing labor turn-over; in improving quality and reducing rejects; in improving health and reducing accident rates; in short, in performing all of the various functions for which they were established.

It is my earnest wish that the work of the labor-management production committees be continued and where possible expanded, to insure the greatest possible use of manpower and machine production capacity. I urge that every committee review its program and accomplishments to determine and put into effect any further programs to expand or improve its work. This is particularly essential in critical plants now behind schedule, or threatened with falling behind schedules.

I also recommend the most serious consideration be given by management and labor to the establishment of labor-management production committees in critical war plants where they do not now exist.

In the same sense that labor-management production committees have a responsibility to the war production program, we in the War Production Board recognize our responsibility to the committees. The consulting services of both the Washington and regional field staffs of the War Production Drive Division are available to the committees, and will be available as long as critical production urgencies exist.

Let us continue to work together.

J. A. KRUG,
Chairman, W. P. B.

The fact that Mr. Quinn was wrong in making his announcement, and the further fact that the decision has just been made and publicly announced that the war-production drive will continue as long as problems of critical production remain, are only some of the points I wish to make in this speech. I have never met Mr. Quinn personally, nor do I have any animus against him, but certain facts regarding his activities on the War Production Board have been brought to my attention and I cannot refrain from using them as an example of the evils to which the dollar-a-year system is subject.

The war-production drive was established in March 1942 by Donald M. Nelson, then Chairman of the War Production Board. Its first director was Michael W. Straus, now Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, who was borrowed from the Interior Department by the War Production Board in March 1942 to organize the drive and the labor-management committee function. After 8 or 9 months, when the drive was well organized, Mr. Straus returned to the Interior Department and was succeeded as Director by Mr. William Marshall, a vice president of the Westinghouse Electric Co. Mr. Quinn did not come on the scene until the middle of 1943, when Mr. Marshall found it necessary to devote his full time to his work in Pittsburgh.

Prior to the time that Mr. Quinn had any connection with the war-production drive, the war-production-drive headquarters had worked out a full program of committee aids and services and of procedures for establishing and operating the committees. Although all this material and information is available from the War Production Board to whomever asks for it, nevertheless, this program and these procedures are now being sold privately in a manual being offered by the T. K. Quinn Co. Before Mr. Quinn joined the war-production drive as a dollar-a-year director of this work, the war-production drive had worked out an individual awards plan which it had established through the medium of the joint labor-management committees and which it was operating in several thousands of war plants. The individual awards plan was a system by which war workers were honored for suggestions that improved production. The suggestions plan had been set forth in booklets published by the war-production drive under the imprint of the War Production Board, and the War Production Board through the operation of the system had made hundreds of awards to individual war workers throughout the Nation. The war-production drive had employed Mr. Wheeler Beckett to make a survey of the use of music in war plants to combat fatigue and thereby to increase production, and had published a pamphlet making the results of this study available to the labor-management committees that were being served. The war-production drive had published incentive material, such as posters, streamers, stickers, placards, leaflets, and so forth, that had proved of great worth. The war-production drive had developed safety programs, health programs, plant feeding programs, and various methods of attacking production bottlenecks through the cooperation of labor and management in the war plants and had published and circulated many memoranda, booklets, leaflets, and other publications describing these techniques for the benefit of the committees in the war plants through which it operated. All this material is public property that can be and, I understand, is being made available on request by the War Production Board.

I cite this record simply to show that, prior to the connection of Mr. Quinn with the war production drive, its program was fully developed and operating. It is that program and the techniques developed mainly by his predecessors, and wholly by Government employees through the expenditure of Government funds, that Mr. Quinn now appears to be attempting to exploit privately.

Shortly after Mr. Quinn received his appointment as director general of the war production drive the Quinn Co. soon developed a keen interest in the business of serving labor-management committees and charging for their services. Various members of the staff of the war production drive were approached to join the staff of the Quinn Co., and at least one of them did. Records that could be of value to the Quinn Co. were apparently scanned and copied.

On September 16 the weekly newspaper of the war production drive carried, under the director general's column, which was always prominently signed by Mr. T. K. Quinn, an item headed "Coming—the Labor and Management Committee Manual," in which was forecast the publication of a manual describing the operations of committees jointly organized by labor and management for the promotion of production and good industrial relations. The write-up forecast that the manual would sell for about $6 per copy and that it might be published by the Government. It added that if the War Production Board's budget would not permit publication by the Government the book probably would be privately printed. Considerable work in the preparation of manuscript, assembling of illustrations, and the lay-out of the book was done prior to the time that the decision was finally made that the War Production Board would not publish the book, at least not in the particular form proposed.

Here is the exact language of that director general's column:

COMING—THE LABOR AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MANUAL

We commend to you the Original—Labor and Management Committee Manual, now on its way to the printers.

It will be a big loose-leaf job in 8½-by-11-inch size pages with a 3-inch binder. New pages may be added from time to time and old ones replaced.

The manual includes the substance of the experience and technique developed over many years, particularly the past 3 war years, in close to 5,000 factories, mills, mines, and shipyards, together with collected and related papers and articles from hundreds of contributors.

In well over 100,000 words and more than 200 cuts and illustrations, the manual summarizes and brings up to date the whole labor-management committee program.

Each of 14 large sections is a newly written treatment of all the known committee organizations, functions, methods, and results.

The section on suggestion systems alone is the best and most comprehensive yet produced; so are the sections on absenteeism, production problems, etc.

This manual will serve as an authoritative reference and informational working guide for industrial managers, union and nonunion labor representatives, professional men, schools, teachers, foremen, and committee and subcommittee members.

Labor and Management Committees After the War is the subject of the last section of the manual, which includes statements from over a hundred plant representatives expressing the post-war intentions and plans of their committees.

The first section of the manual begins with definitions, followed by a review of the development of committee objectives, plans, and accomplishments during the past 25 years. There are charts showing the progress made, the number and types of industries represented, and all interesting and relevant data.

How to Organize and Operate a Committee and Subcommittee is treated originally and pictorially for practical day to day use in section 2.

Other sections cover comprehensively all of the committee activities and subjects—safety, turn-over, transportation, tool and material conservation, nutrition, education and training, recruitment, publicity, publications, morale, case histories, etc.

The cost of the manual is now estimated at about $6 per copy, including the binder, depending on the number printed. If our

budget permits we may be able to present each committee with a copy. More likely, however, we shall have it printed at private expense and sold at approximate cost.

Please send in your order now to guide our quantity commitment to the printer. Send it to: M. E. Walsh, Administrative Division, War Production Drive, W. P. B., Municipal Center Building, Washington, D. C.

Kindly indicate the number you require, assuming a charge of $6 per copy. Where 10 or more copies are ordered we should expect the price per copy to be less than $5.

T. K. QUINN.

This manual was not printed by the Government, but was printed privately and is now being offered at $5 per copy to the public under the title "The Original Labor-Management Committee Manual," by the T. K. Quinn Co. While the Quinn Co. says in its advertisements that the manual is not a profit-making venture, the material that is printed in the manual was made possible by the expenditure of public funds, and some of the manuscript actually was prepared by Government employees. Furthermore, the manual is being offered exclusively by the T. K. Quinn Co., which is in the business of hiring its services to industry for the promotion of good industrial relations. That certainly sounds like a profit-making operation.

This is a remarkable example of disposition of nonsurplus Government property.

There are two other interesting items connected with the publication of this manual. One of them is that several weeks before the manual appeared, Mr. Quinn had printed at the Government Printing Office a flyer advertising the manual for insertion in the Labor-Management News. This flyer was not inserted in the News, however, because someone in the War Production Board had sense enough to sequester and suppress all copies of the flyer.

The other interesting item is that, in his letter soliciting all of the Government-sponsored committees and dated December 15, Mr. Quinn, on the stationery of his private firm, announced his coming retirement from the War Production Board on January 1, 1945, and announced that the War Production Drive Section of the War Production Board would soon terminate its activities and would be disbanded with victory in Europe. This announcement made by Mr. Quinn on his private stationery in a letter in which he referred to himself as a public official had at that time not been made by the War Production Board. On the contrary, the decision has been made, and publicly announced, that the War Production Drive will continue as long as any problems of critical production remain. His contrary announcement, however, obviously served Mr. Quinn's interests since it seems that he hopes to have the T. K. Quinn Co. succeed to the War Production Board in the matter of serving the joint labor-management committees. I should like to read in full the letter that Mr. Quinn sent, and the advertisement it enclosed of the manual. I have photostatic copies here. I also have a copy of the item that appeared in the Labor-Management News. I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in full at this point in the RECORD:

T. K. QUINN CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR —: You and I exchanged some correspondence a few months ago on the subject of your Labor and Management Production Committee.

I have resigned my position as Director-General of the War Production Drive-W. P. B. in Washington, effective January 1, 1945. The work is about completed, and the Division will be discontinued when the war in Europe is over.

However, the continuation and further development of Labor and Management Committees is more vital than ever in future industrial relations.

I commend to you the new, comprehensive Labor and Management Committee Manual, announced in the L-M News from Washington a few weeks ago. Because of Government-budget limitations, I am publishing the Manual at my own expense on a nonprofit basis.

It is an authoritative 8½- by 11-inch volume of replaceable pages in a practical black binder, with over 110,000 words and more than 200 cuts and illustrations. The origin, growth, activities, organization, experience, technique, and accomplishments of the more than 5,000 committees are fully covered for every-day reference and guidance.

Sincerely yours,

T. K. QUINN.

Fill in, tear off at this line and mail to receive your copy.

T. K. QUINN CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y.:

Please send me ——— copies of the new, authentic, and complete Labor and Management Committee Manual.

( ) Enclosed check for $5 (per copy) includes mailing cost.

( ) Please send bill.

Mail to:

As to the advertisement which I am informed was enclosed with Mr. Quinn's letter, it would be impractical to try to insert it in the RECORD. I have a copy of it here in my hand, however. The advertisement contains this language:

Experience! Technique! Know how! Five thousand labor and management committees in 3 war years have developed experience and technique of lasting value and use in industrial and human relations. Now recorded in the new authoritative Labor and Management Committee Manual to be published before the end of 1944. Priced at $5, including mailing cost.

And then follows a summary of the 14 sections included in this booklet and thereafter there is an order blank space with the words "order now," in large letters beside it. The order blank reads as follows:

T. K. Quinn Co., Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. Please send me ——— copies of the Labor and Management Committee Manual. I understand that you will bill me at a price not to exceed $5 per copy.

This will be enough to make clear the nature of the advertisement. It is perfectly plain that the advertisement sent out by Mr. Quinn while he was still an official of the War Production Board urged people to order from the T. K. Quinn Co., Mr. Quinn's private business, a manual on labor and management committees, the material for which had been gathered by a Government agency, but which was going to be sold by a private company. I do not think I need to say any more on this particular point. The facts speak for themselves.

Note particularly that the letter was dated on December 15, 1944, was actually delivered within a few days after that, and that in it Mr. Quinn states:

I have resigned my position as Director-General of the War Production Drive-W. P. B. in Washington, effective January 1, 1945. The work is about completed, and the division will be discontinued when the war in Europe is over.

Here is a public official announcing in a letter of his own private company the prospective discontinuance of a Government function, with which he is officially connected.

Mr. Quinn said in the next paragraph:

However, the continuation and further development of labor and management committees is more vital than ever in future industrial relations.

Here the T. K. Quinn Co. sets itself up to continue the activity that Mr. Quinn says the Government is about to discontinue.

I commend to you the new comprehensive Labor and Management Committee Manual, announced in the L-M News from Washington a few weeks ago. Because of Government Budget limitations, I am publishing the manual at my own expense on a nonprofit basis.

Note Mr. Quinn's specific reference to the announcement in the L-M News, the publication of the War Production Board that I mentioned earlier, that is printed and circulated free weekly to the committee members of the labor-management committees in industrial plants that are sponsored by the Government. While Mr. Quinn states he is publishing the manual on a nonprofit basis, we have only his word for that. He is using the book obviously as a means of establishing his company as an industrial relations counselor with the industries that the Government heretofore has been serving. So much for Mr. Quinn's activities.

The sponsorship by the Government of joint labor-management committees has proved beneficial and should be continued. Leaders in labor and management and Government have on several occasions endorsed the war production drive. Literally thousands of testimonials have been given voluntarily by those connected with the labor-management committees or plants in which these committees operate to the effect that the drive and the joint labor-management committees have increased production and improved industrial relations. National and international labor organizations meeting in recent months have indicated that they believe that such participation with management as is obtained through these joint labor-management production committees is valuable and desirable and should be continued. I understand that many industrialists are of the same opinion.

Frankly, it is impossible to gage accurately in percentage points the increased production that resulted from the operation of the war production drive. Many plant operators credited amazing results to the joint labor-man-

agement committees. A very high percentage thought that production was improved. A very high percentage of the participants from the labor side thought that working conditions had been improved and the record is clear that good industrial relations were promoted.

The question is, Shall the Government continue to sponsor joint labor-management committees in industry for the purpose of promoting good industrial relations, improving working conditions, and increasing production?

Canada and Great Britain are continuing these activities and have announced that they will continue them in peace. There are many in the United States who believe that the war-production drive should be reorganized and transferred to the Labor Department, in order that this work that it has successfully begun may be continued. That particular question, I respectfully urge, should be placed before the proper committees of the Congress for investigation and determination of a policy. This is the type of decision that should not be left to retiring dollar-a-year men who are prepared to take up as a private business what they so gallantly lay aside as public officials.

In revealing the activities of Mr. Quinn, I do not wish to reflect in any way upon the many upright and loyal employees of the Government who have been connected with the war-production drive, nor upon those who are now connected with the drive. They are, I am certain, as shocked and as embarrassed by what Mr. Quinn has done as am I.

I do hope, however, that some good may come of this. The Congress should investigate through its appropriate committees and establish a policy on the matter of continuing the encouragement by the Government of labor-management cooperation at the plant level throughout industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have made this speech not because I wanted to say something in criticism of an individual but because these facts have been brought to my attention and because I believe they ought to be set forth in the hope that things like this will not happen any more. It seems to me that when an individual takes a position, especially a policy-making position with the Government as a dollar-a-year man, the work he does there is sacred to the public interest and ought not to be a means of getting him started in a private enterprise thereafter. I feel, furthermore, very earnestly that these committees where labor and management have been brought together in joint effort to improve production have been of importance and of such great value that no individual person ought to announce their discontinuance; and I am glad to know that they are not going to be discontinued. They have been of value in other countries besides our own, and, in my judgment, they will continue to be of value.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from California, I am sure, will recall that following the last war we had some very unfortunate experiences with dollar-a-year men.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do. That is one of the main reasons why in the early days of this war I introduced this bill forbidding the employment of dollar-a-year men and providing that anyone employed by the Government be paid a salary commensurate with his worth and not be put on a dollar-a-year basis. In announcing that policy I am not attacking any individual or any individual's work for the Government. If we need their services, I think we should pay them what they are worth; but I do not think it is right that they should be placed in position to profit personally by their work for the Government.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have a number of officials on the public pay roll who write articles for magazines, such as Mr. Hopkins does. He is now publishing a series of articles in the American Magazine and I understand he gets $7,500 for each of them. Much of the material in them came to him as the result of his service in the Government.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know what we can do about things like that. Many people write articles. Many Congressmen do so. I happen to have written a couple of books and I certainly drew upon the results of my work and those books came in part out of my experience as a Congressman. I will say to the gentleman, however, that I never made money like that out of my books.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am satisfied the gentleman from California does not have a ghost writer because I know that he wrote them himself; but I am a little suspicious about Mr. Ickes and some of the others not having ghost writers and getting good money for them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman for what he has said and I assure him that I have never brought material to this House or set it out in magazines or books that I did not write myself.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sure of that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order entered on my behalf for tomorrow and Wednesday be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR—WE WANT TO KNOW

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for our winning the war is not debatable. It is a task that 130,000,000 Americans have set their hands and minds to and the job must be done as speedily and decisively as possible. In order to win the war America has been transformed into a vast factory for the production of everything that is needed by our fighting forces. Twelve million men have been inducted into the various services and are now in uniform. Of this huge number between seven and eight million have already been sent across.

Notwithstanding this stupendous drain on our manpower there is a continual call for more, and yet more, men to serve as replacements, or in new fighting units. America has not been at all backward in her war effort. In addition to training, arming, and transporting this vast force we have also had to equip and sustain with supplies the armies of our cobelligerents. To date the war effort has cost us nearly $200,000,000,000 and the figure will probably mount to three hundred billions or more before peace returns.

The war effort has fallen harder upon the American farmer than on any other one group. Three weeks ago the Minnesota State director of Selective Service stated that we are scraping the bottom of the bin as it applies to the farm labor situation.

All over the land our farms have been stripped of help until today the farms are being carried on largely by the very young and the old. I know of one instance where the draft took four boys, all that there were, from one farm, leaving the aged parents to carry on.

For a year or more there has been a constant succession of farm sales all over America, sales that were made necessary because of the shortage of farm labor. Let me call to your attention a sale bill announcing an auction on a Minnesota farm. It was held on last Wednesday, at which time the owner was obliged to dispose of the accumulation of years of hard toil because of having been called to the military service.

Mr. Speaker, the situation has become so critical that farmers are holding meetings to protest over the manner in which the supply of farm labor is being depleted. On Tuesday of last week a monster meeting was held at Albany, Minn. In describing the gathering my correspondent writes me that several hundred farmers were unable to gain admittance into the large school auditorium as every available foot of standing room in the hall, on the stage, and in the balcony was occupied. At this meeting a resolution, signed by 1,000 farmers, was adopted, which I desire to incorporate in my remarks at this point:

PETITION

We, the undersigned petitioners, gathered at a county-wide meeting of farmers in Stearns County at Albany, Minn., on this 30th day of January 1945, at 2 p. m., hereby request that the selective-service officials, the Congress of the United States of America, and other Federal officials give immediate consideration to the serious threat to the farmer and dairy farmer caused by a critical manpower shortage as a result of:

The continual drafting of essential men from farms for military service. In many instances, leaving the father alone to operate a large dairy farm, which results in his being forced to have a public sale and putting the farm out of producing vital products which are needed to feed our soldiers and our allies.

We earnestly call your attention to the fact that agriculture of the diversified type, carried on in this community, will be largely

forced out of production if any more manpower is taken from this county.

It is suggested by the undersigned petitioners that consideration be given to the possibility of securing military help and assistance from the men of our liberated countries, such as France and Belgium, also from China, India, etc.

It is further suggested that if an inductee has 2 years in service, and particularly foreign service, he should be given a release, or to say the very least, an extended furlough.

It is also further suggested that the law, known as the Tydings amendment be followed and adhered to by the selective-service agencies, so long as it remains the law of the land.

Again, may I say that this petition was signed by 1,000 farmers present at the meeting.

There are a number of things that the people out in our part of the country cannot understand. They would like to know why the tens of thousands of surplus and idle workers in the Government, many of them young men, are not inducted. They want to know why it should be necessary to continue sending men to the battle fronts of Europe where there are already available in the liberated countries eight to ten million young men capable of bearing arms.

They want to know why we do not draw upon the inexhaustible reservoirs of manpower in China and in India to do the fighting in the far Pacific.

Let me read from the auction bill that I hold in my hands:

Having been drafted into the military service, I will sell at public auction on my farm, known as the C. B. Stroschein place—

Then it goes on and describes the location—

the following described property on Wednesday, January 31: All the horses. Forty-three head of dairy cows, nearly all of them either giving milk now or due to freshen before spring. All the implements. All the household goods, the feed, and a silo nearly full of silage.

Then it goes on and says—

For sale or for rent: This modern rural electrified farm with running water, 160 acres, will also be offered for sale or will be rented.

Those of you who come from agricultural regions know that nearly all farms are rented in the fall, subject to immediate possession or possession on March 1 of the following year. You know that it is practically impossible to find a tenant for a farm in the middle of the winter, and the only salvation that this man has is to be able to find a buyer, and buyers are not plentiful in view of the farm-labor shortage.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing one of the great farm States of the Union. My desk is filled nearly every morning with correspondence similar in character to that which the gentleman has described here.

I wonder if the gentleman could tell us why it is that we seem unable to get the draft boards to enforce the Tydings amendment in the several States.

Mr. KNUTSON. One reason is that it has been intimated to the draft boards that they should disregard it. We all know that the Tydings amendment is the law of the land, and no one, not even the President of the United States, has the right to set aside a law enacted by the Congress for the protection of our people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I supplement what my colleague has so well said in regard to the Tydings amendment? When the Congress passed the Tydings amendment it was the clear intent that the local draft boards should pass upon the essentiality of any draft registrant, subject to appeal, and if the board decided that such registrant was essential to a farming operation, then he should be placed in Class II–C and given deferment.

There has been some confusion as the result of a directive sent out by General Hershey's office on January 3. In that directive General Hershey quoted the President of the United States as follows:

The President has found deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for such young men.

The President has sought to place a different interpretation upon the Tydings amendment than what was intended by Congress and, therefore, the conflict has been brought about and the local boards in many instances are following the Commander in Chief, who has tried by his language and his opinion to set aside the intent of Congress with reference to the Tydings amendment. I wanted to bring that in because we had a meeting with General Hershey in our Committee on Agriculture this morning. We know what the trouble is. There is very little that Congress can do about it. A case may go to the courts of the country to get an interpretation as to the intent of Congress, but for the present the President has held, and General Hershey is carrying out his order, that farm boys who have heretofore been deferred for agricultural purposes in the age group of 18 to 25 are more necessary in the armed forces than they are in producing food for the war effort.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has well stated the case.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. Does not the gentleman feel that under the statement just made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] elements in our administration are deliberately usurping the powers of the draft boards and using the statement of the President, who probably made an offhand statement with no knowledge of the facts, to defeat the very purpose of the Tydings amendment?

Mr. KNUTSON. I have no sympathy with these attempts to gloss over everything the President does that is not popular. All through the campaign we heard him referring to himself as the Commander in Chief with the all-seeing eye, who knew everything that was going on, even to the fall of a sparrow.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] the President merely expressed the thought that these farm boys are more needed in the armed services than they are on the farm. Certainly there was no directive issued by the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I will not argue with the gentleman because it does not matter. Certainly the President, by directive, has no power to override the express statute of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. My dear sir, he has not even stopped at overriding the Constitution.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I agree that he has demonstrated that on many occasions. After this selective service law was on the statute books of the land and after we had had experience with it, it was learned that we must keep certain young men on the farms of the country, and the Congress passed the Tydings amendment with the objective of producing a maximum of food in this country, all in the interest of winning the war. I say that under the circumstances the President by directive cannot legally change that law.

Mr. KNUTSON. The President has set himself up as a court. He assumes to interpret the law as expressed in the Tydings amendment.

Mr. HOOK and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN rose.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the defense wishes to get in a word.

Mr. HOOK. I was just wondering, when the gentleman referred to the fall of the sparrow, whether he was referring to Mr. Dewey.

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I was not. I was referring to the depth to which constitutional government in America has fallen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman was not referring, either, to that dog that came down out of the sky?

Mr. KNUTSON. Let us not bring in any extraneous matter now, because it is a very important subject on which I am speaking. My only purpose in taking the floor is in the hope that what I may have to say and what other Members may have to say upon the subject this afternoon may bring a little ray of light to the President and to those who are charged with the administration of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has correctly stated this matter is of too great importance to have a political discussion injected in it. I think our trouble is that the administration

failed to recognize that food is essential to win the war. They stated they must have food to win the war and write the peace, and they urged the farmers to produce in abundance, but they have not designated agriculture as an essential war industry. We did that in Congress through the Tydings amendment. Nor does the administration recognize that in order to produce that abundance of food it takes an abundance of skilled manpower. I think our whole trouble is that the administration fails to recognize that, and until they do we are going to have this difficulty which confronts the farmers today.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman inform us by name which person in the administration gave any orders to the draft board to avoid the Tydings amendment?

Mr. KNUTSON. The President of the United States did. Does that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. HOOK. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. KNUTSON. He merely thinks?

Mr. HOOK. I think the gentleman is mistaken if he says the President gave any order to the draft boards that they should avoid the Tydings amendment. He never made any such statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my colleague who is very well acquainted with that particular phase of the matter. I thank the gentleman for having brought it up because I had not intended to refer to it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I call the attention of the gentleman to State Directive Advice No. 288, dated January 3, 1945, in which General Hershey quotes the President as saying, after he had reported certain facts to the President:

> I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agriculture is not as essential to the best interests of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.
>
> The President feels in view of existing conditions agriculture like our other war industries can with few exceptions be carried on by those in older-age groups.

That is quoting directly from that order in which the President in fact states that men who have heretofore been deferred for agricultural reasons as being essential are more essential in war industries than they are in agriculture.

Mr. HOOK. That is not a directive to avoid the Tydings amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Although my time is short and I do not know whether I can get more time, I cannot refuse to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to call the attention of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] to the statement in Friday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I inserted, quoting Mr. Luscombe, of the Selective Service in Michigan, to the effect that the local boards should pay no attention to the Tydings amendment. I might say to the gentleman that General Hershey was before the Committee on Agriculture this morning. That committee was kind enough to ask me to come to the hearing this morning. I think there is no question at all about that order having gone to local boards from some source. It is just a question of whether or not they have the right to make the order.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot yield any further because my time is very limited. I feel that I have been fair in yielding to the gentleman.

Several weeks ago 100 or more Members of the House held a meeting in the caucus room of the old House Office Building. Among others we heard Major General Hershey, Director of Selective Service. We demanded to know why the spirit of the so-called Tydings amendment, which provides that "every registrant found to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained," was not being lived up to in the drafting of farm labor. General Hershey subsequently sent telegraphic instructions to all draft boards advising that the Tydings amendment was still the law of the land and must be observed. Just what effect this has had in easing the situation I have not been advised.

I believe that where a farm laborer is called in the draft without being replaced by a suitable replacement, the farmer can go into the Federal courts and secure a temporary restraining order that would postpone the induction until the spirit and plain phraseology of the Tydings amendment had been fully and fairly met.

All will agree that food is just about as necessary to winning the war as are planes, tanks, and guns. Was not it Napoleon who said that an army cannot travel on an empty belly? America cannot continue to produce all the food needed for our war effort without enough labor on our farms to do the necessary work.

Another thing that I would like to touch upon before closing is the policy being followed by this administration of sending vast quantities of farm equipment, such as tractors, plows, discs, drills, milking machines, and so forth, to the allied countries when such equipment is urgently needed at home and should be distributed among our own farmers to replace in part the labor that has been taken from our farms.

To say the least, the whole thing has been badly bungled.

We are about to take a farm census, and I, for one, believe that it is badly needed. We should also take a census of our war plants to ascertain just how much truth there is in the charges frequently made that nearly all such plants keep a reservoir of surplus labor in reserve. Of course, under the cost-plus plan, on which this war is being fought, the expense of keeping reservoirs of idle labor on hand is deductible from income-tax returns, hence it does not cost the employer anything to play safe. It is Uncle Sam who pays.

Because of bungling, mismanagement and perhaps worse, this war is costing the American people anywhere from 25 to 40 percent more than it should. There would be no labor shortage were it not for the shameful practices of waste in manpower to be found in many war plants. Let me read to you a letter written to a draft board in Minnesota, which will give you an idea of what is going on all over the land. Again, let me say that we should have a survey of the manpower situation in all war plants and this survey should be made immediately. The letter follows:

> DEAR SIR: I received my reclassification card yesterday and was very much surprised to be placed in I-A.
>
> I did not notify you of my change of positions as I resigned the first part of December and at that time thought it was O. K. to change to a position in which I am able to really contribute toward the war effort, without asking permission from the draft board. My previous position on the west coast was as chief clerk and accountant in a war plant. All the 6½ months that I was employed there, it seemed to me as wasted time. I drew big wages for doing nothing. There were four people in our department and I am sure I could have handled all the work alone most of the time. The Government is paying for all ships built and therefore is also paying wages drawn by people employed in all shipyards and it seems to me that it is a waste of money to be paying wages to a lot of people who are not needed as there is not enough work for all. For example, when we wanted a desk moved in our office, we could not move it ourselves but called in three men from the yard and they would move it for us, maybe move it 20 feet, two men would have to be along to see that his men would do the job right. The same was true with fixing electric fans or anything else; it would take two or three men to do any kind of job which, if you or I would have to pay for the work, we would have one man do it and get it done better than they got it done in the shipyards, or we would do it ourselves. You are a good and successful businessman and I am sure you understand why these conditions exist when you consider that all these plants operate under the cost-plus basis. Now, I could not see how I could be very essential under these conditions and was sure that I really was not contributing toward the war effort.
>
> When the bank requested my services, I knew if I accepted, I would really contribute toward the war effort. I am saving the Government money and really doing essential work. Having an executive position with 14 employees under my jurisdiction and the full responsibility for handling all ration banking and War Savings bond sales made me believe I was really doing something worth while for my country.
>
> You probably remember last spring my former employer saw you regarding my classification and you informed him that my position was classed essential. My present position here is even more important.

I pass these observations along in the hope that the administration, which is also in control of the Congress, will speedily do something to relieve an intolerable and dangerous situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD her remarks, and that there may be included

therein a statement by the Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. William E. Warne.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield 5 minutes of his time to me at this time?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to continue along the line of the gentleman from Minnesota in order to answer a question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is going to stay here I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

THE PHILIPPINE CAMPAIGN OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks Americans have been watching the unfolding of the masterful strategy of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a strategy which culminated in the liberation of Manila. When word of that great victory came to us over the air every one of us, I am sure, had feelings not only of joy, but pride in the magnificent courage of the Americans and Filipinos who made that victory possible fighting under the command of General MacArthur. Our hearts were filled with the pride we have always felt in the great soldiers of our country.

Americans of all political faiths have gloried in the fact that Robert E. Lee was one of the world's great generals; that his campaigns have been standard studies for every military school in Europe. Our children have been taught of the great strategy of Andrew Jackson at the battle of New Orleans which numbered him among the world's great. We have had particular pride in the fact that George Washington showed the military genius that set him apart among the generals of the world. It is my humble belief that when the moving pen of history has written, the name of Douglas MacArthur will be found on one of the brightest pages of that book. He will be recognized as one of the great strategists of all time.

By outwitting and confusing the Japanese command he seized Manila with a minimum loss of life and without the usual destruction and demolition which has accompanied the liberation of other cities in this war, thus saving not only lives but countless millions of dollars for the American people who have pledged themselves to a program of rehabilitation in the Philippines.

In the Sunday issue of the Washington Star, under date of February 4, there appeared an article by Brig Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, in which he graphically described the great part that has been taken by the Filipino guerrillas, the Filipino underground, if you please, in the brilliant victory our forces today are reaping. General ROMULO has the rare ability to set forth facts in a glowing picture.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks made at this time the article by General ROMULO which appeared yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

THE FILIPINOS KEPT THE FAITH—AMERICAN POLICY OF FRIENDLY DEVELOPMENT PAYS DIVIDENDS IN FOILING JAPS

(By Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States)

Back in the fall of 1942, about 6 months after the surrender of Corregidor, a little group of loyal Filipinos, working in a relay, pedaled furiously on a jacked-up bicycle to spin a generator stolen from the Japanese invaders.

From this generator all hopes and faith of the Filipino people poured into a set of storage batteries which soon thereafter were to power a makeshift short-wave radio set whose weak and wavering signals were beamed to America in an effort to arrange a rendezvous.

For 3 hours the patriots pumped without pause, except to change pedalers, after which the broadcast started. In 15 minutes the batteries were exhausted, but a War Department monitor picked up the signals before that brief period had ended.

That first weak signal came from the patriots on Panay Island, a particularly appropriate island for its name was borne by the first American ship sunk by the Japs, the river gunboat *Panay*, which was attacked by planes during Nipponese action against the Chinese along the Yangtze River long before Pearl Harbor.

SUBMARINE WAS SENT

The message was relayed to Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Australia, and a submarine was immediately sent to the Philippines to get in touch with the Filipino patriots.

This simple beginning was the forerunner of a vast communication system which was destined to bring General MacArthur reports every 24 hours on the situation within the island and to reduce to almost unbelievably low figures the casualties suffered in establishing a foothold in the islands and expanding that foothold into a firm base which now dominates the entire archipelago.

To understand the situation in the Philippines, it is necessary to go back to that fatal spring of 1942 when the Japs overran the islands.

The Filipinos were completely cut off from the rest of the world. They had no news save what came from Japanese sources. They had no radios of sufficient power to pick up foreign broadcasts. The only information they were able to obtain by air was the exceedingly doubtful information broadcast by the Japanese-controlled Manila radio.

They knew that the Americans had been driven from the islands and they were constantly informed by the Japs of additional defeats which Tokyo claimed to have administered to American forces. Nothing but discouragement was offered so far as any aid from the United States was concerned, and the future was dark indeed.

SHUNNED JAPANESE OVERTURES

But the Filipinos, unlike the peoples of the other Pacific islands seized by the invaders, were not to be influenced by the false friendship and ingratiation of the invaders. Back of them was the record of years of American cooperation which had built up the islands' economy, expanded its educational system, and inaugurated the program for final independence. Back of them were many years of unexploited friendship and understanding.

Back of them, also, was General MacArthur's promise, "I will return."

So the Filipinos were determined to resist. With few exceptions, there was no collaboration, and even among a few who apparently played the Japanese game were some who secretly were associated with the patriots and thus proved invaluable in increasing the effectiveness of the communications system by means of which General MacArthur was kept informed of the exact military situation throughout the islands.

For instance, the wife of a mining engineer, Yay Panlilio, who had been educated at Denver University, became a news commentator on the Manila radio under Japanese supervision. For a time Yay was thought to have sold out to the Japs, but suddenly it was realized that her broadcasts were conveying vital military information to the American forces. Each day her comment was recorded and studied and the results were exceedingly useful. Unfortunately the Japs also became aware that all was not as it appeared on the surface and Yay was arrested and placed in a prison noted for its torture chamber. With the aid of undisclosed patriots, she escaped and joined the guerrilla movement.

RESISTANCE SPREAD RAPIDLY

Resistance to the Japs spread rapidly after the first contact with the outside world through the submarine General MacArthur sent in response to that 1942 appeal from Panay. A few carefully selected Filipino and American officers landed from the submarine and traveled throughout the islands investigating, advising, and organizing.

The resistance movement took two forms, the civilian underground and the guerrillas. The former spied and hampered in the cities. The latter struck and killed from the hills.

Completely without arms at the outset, the guerrillas manufactured crude guns from pipe and knives from the metal slots of venetian blinds. With these weapons they attacked small isolated bands of Japanese troops and after slaying the enemy gathered up their arms and ammunition to turn them back against the Japs in bolder and more important attacks.

The guerrillas of necessity operated from the hills and in small outlying villages, but as their activities grew and their material increased they gradually pressed the invaders back to the cities.

And all the while the fear mounted in the hearts of the enemy. With each successful foray that fear was accentuated until now on Cebu, for instance, the Japs seldom move far away from their main concentrations and then only in large numbers. At night they remain within stockades which tower 18 feet into the air. Shorter walls had proved no protection against the Filipinos, who, with the cunning which grows under necessity, had often scaled the walls to kill a few more of the enemy and then slip back into that hinterland the Japs have learned to shun.

More and more supplies have been seized from the enemy and have been obtained from external sources until now the guerrillas are in a position to bring powerful forces into play when they are required. This was demonstrated when the landing came at Leyte. The Japs, moving down to the beaches to resist the invasion, were caught between the guns of the warships standing offshore and the artillery and machine guns of the guerrillas who attacked from inland. The result was complete disaster for the Japs. It was especially gratifying to the Filipinos to take part in that particular action just as it was gratifying to the Americans, for there, caught between the patriots and our American com-

rades, was that infamous Sixteenth Japanese Division which tortured our sick and wounded in the march of horror from Bataan to a prison camp nearly 100 miles to the north.

Less spectacular and, for safety's sake, less publicized has been the work of the underground in gathering the information which has aided the military in striking the Japs where they least have expected it and have been least able to resist.

From one end of the archipelago to the other the underground has kept watch. Not a Japanese ship has arrived or sailed, not a plane has taken off and not a group of enemy soldiers has moved but that the movement has been observed and the information forwarded to central points from which it has been relayed to General MacArthur.

PRIMITIVE SIGNALS USED

By fire signals, by bird calls, even by church bells, the information has been passed on. In some cases, vital facts have been transmitted by bamboo drums which are audible for only about 2 miles. Yet, some place short of the maximum distance the signals will carry, a listener has waited, picked up the message, and relayed it by the same means to the next listening post.

As the underground and guerrilla movements grew and increased in importance, General MacArthur sent members of his staff to Camp Cooke and Camp Beale in California where two Filipino regiments were being trained. A careful selection of commissioned and noncommissioned officers was made and these men were landed by submarine to aid in training the guerrillas for their attacks and to coordinate the work of the underground and the fighting forces.

They taught members of the underground who were impressed as laborers to build airfields, for instance, how to plant mines and grenades so that when enemy planes landed they were wrecked by the explosions and the landing strips were temporarily put out of commission. They were instructed in the techniques of mining and destroying bridges. They expanded the system of mobile radio equipment so that the enemy found it difficult to locate the transmitters which kept General MacArthur in touch with the situation.

FOURTH OF POPULATION AIDS

The developments on the island of Luzon perhaps best illustrate the effectiveness of the combined underground and guerrilla movements. Luzon has a population of 8,000,000. Of this population at least 2,000,000 are actively engaged in one or the other of the resistance movements.

General MacArthur's magnificent strategy, which has followed by sea the Russian system by land of striking where the enemy is not prepared and circling around behind strong points to isolate them, has paid dividends in tremendous accomplishment with minimum of loss. The Filipinos will never forget what has been done by the American Navy and the American Army. They will never forget, also, what their own patriots have accomplished to make these victories more easily obtained than if there had not been that cooperation from within.

After the securing of Leyte and Samar Islands, General MacArthur ordered the landing on Mindoro and shortly thereafter the invasion and securing of Marinduque, a small island between Mindoro and Luzon.

The enemy had perhaps expected that Cebu and Panay might have been next objectives or Mindanao to the south, and was therefore not ready to defend Mindoro and Marinduque. The underground knew of the conditions and the guerrillas were ready to strike at the appropriate moment, so the landings came on Mindoro and Marinduque.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIVE THOUSAND JAPS IN LUZON

Immediately Lieutenant General Yamashita, the Japanese commander in the Philippines, faced a serious problem. He had some 165,000 troops on Luzon, by no means an oversupply if the next thrust should be from Marinduque to Luzon. He did not foresee the bold stroke by which General MacArthur was to take his huge invasion convoy west of Luzon for a landing in Lingayen Bay, where the Japanese themselves found their best point of entry. Instead he moved the greater part of his troops southward.

This movement was observed by the underground and the information given to General MacArthur. Acting upon the advice, the American convoy struck at Lingayen Bay, and by the thousands American troops with tremendous supplies and weapons moved ashore without the loss of a man. A foothold was obtained, which was quickly expanded into occupation of important areas controlling the path to Manila.

The movement inland and southward was expedited by information to the landing commanders as to which roads were guarded, which were open to a quick advance.

Steadily the Americans moved forward to capture of important Clark Field, as wonder grew at the lack of resistance. But the underground knew why there was so little opposition. The Japs were out of position. Everything which could be done to hamper the efforts of Yamashita to move northward was done. Bridges were destroyed, roads blocked, supply lines harassed by the guerrillas, and most important, information was gathered concerning the direction and strength of Japanese troop movements.

Further north, where the Japanese waited in vain for help, the enemy fled to the hills as the Americans moved inland. The exact date when they will meet their fate is not known, but the nature of that fate is in no doubt. Where those who surround and outnumber also have complete knowledge of every move taken and contemplated, morale suffers. That of the Japanese throughout the Philippines now sags badly.

When the history of the war is finally written a bright page will be devoted to the Filipino underground and guerrilla movement. That page will be bright because of all nations holding territory in the Pacific and in Asia the United States stands out alone in the intelligent treatment of native populations. Unexploited, aided, and guided to self-rule by the United States, the Filipinos kept the faith throughout the dark months which followed Bataan. They knew their friends would be back, and they never wavered in their loyal efforts to hasten the return.

Mr. BELL. I believe that as time goes on General ROMULO will take his place in history as one of those who helped make possible the liberation of the Philippines. His voice and pen have played their part in keeping the fires of patriotism burning brightly in Filipino hearts. It is my belief that he has preached the doctrines of true liberty and democracy, the kind of democracy which our forefathers gave us in America. He has done it with an understanding which many people on this continent might emulate. I believe his work not only has been helpful to the Philippines but also has had its part in the permanent cementing of a strong bond of friendship between the people of America and the people over there in the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain newspaper articles and letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the confusion which has arisen over the drafting of agricultural workers, in my judgment, can be laid to the directive of General Hershey issued on the 3d day of January 1945, No. 288. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] inquired of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] where there was any reason to charge the drafting of these men to the President. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] will read Directive No. 288—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 761—sent out by General Hershey he will find there quoted the statements of Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Jones, and in the statement signed by General Hershey quoting Mr. Byrnes, it is stated:

> I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 to 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interests of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

There is where the trouble started, and you cannot get away from it. The fact is that after that order went out the local draft boards throughout the country, acting on it, as the President must have expected they would, began to ignore the Tydings amendment. They began to put men who were in II–C directly over into I–A, and to send them into the Army without any review as to whether they fell under the Tydings amendment and should be deferred. When they did that they disregarded their duty.

In my judgment, they are not to be criticized, because the idea that the Commander in Chief can do no wrong, make no mistake, has been stressed so often and so strongly by some papers, by Members of Congress, by almost every columnist, that as a practical matter the local draft boards had no choice.

I know what has happened and so do you. A local draft board which deferred these agricultural workers would have been charged, just as you and I have been charged during past months, with being disloyal, with aiding the enemy, with exempting men who were not entitled to be exempted, with refusing to support the war effort. Who is there in a local community who wants to stand up to that kind of criticism from the daily press, from the administration and the administration spokesmen?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. What the gentleman says is absolutely correct. I can cite one instance where a draft board back in Minnesota did try to live up to the spirit of the Tydings amendment. What happened? A regular Army captain was sent in there to run the affairs of that draft board and the members of the board became mere figureheads.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that on January 22 General Hershey appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture for the purpose of discussing the confusion which had followed the issuance of directive No. 288 and that at the suggestion of the House Committee on Agriculture General Hershey issued a clarifying amendment in which he definitely stated that it was not the purpose of directive No. 288 to annul or to modify the Tydings amendment. I think that General Hershey did everything possible to clarify any misunderstanding which had arisen after the issuance of directive No. 288. I may say further that the House Committee on Agriculture has just finished a session this morning with General Hershey in which this matter was discussed. He still maintains that it was not and has not been his purpose to circumvent either directly or indirectly any of the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

May I say further that there is some difference of opinion regarding the meaning of the Tydings amendment. I think General Hershey has honestly endeavored to interpret that act of the Congress. I agree with the gentleman that there has been some confusion and that many boys have been deprived of deferment which I think should have been granted.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Before that late interpretation by General Hershey, was not a great deal of damage already done?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. In my section of the country they rushed the boys right in.

Mr. COOLEY. I have felt all along that the local boards have not given adequate attention to the Tydings amendment, and I think that many boys have been inducted that should have been deferred. But I do say this for General Hershey, the minute he was advised by the Members of the House that there was confusion prevalent in the country, he made an honest effort to clear up the situation.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not want to yield just here any further; I will a little later.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to make a correction.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now; a little later, because I want to answer the gentleman here about General Hershey.

It is quite true, as we all know, that some 200 or more Congressmen met over in the old House caucus room and had this matter up with General Hershey. We all know that subsequently the Committee on Agriculture had General Hershey in before it, and we know that as the result of those two meetings he did agree to make some sort of a correction. You will find that correction on page 762 of the RECORD of February 2.

I heard the general this morning over before the Committee on Agriculture, the meeting to which the gentleman referred, and if I ever saw or listened to a sorry spectacle and exhibition on the part of a responsible officer, it was that one this morning. General Hershey just would not agree to correct the wrong impression created by 288 and do it now.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] called the attention of General Hershey in no uncertain terms to the fact that under the Tydings amendment it was the duty of the local board to determine whether or not the registrants in that class were essential to agriculture.

What the President did in his statement, which was embodied in Order 288, was to declare that those men were essential, not to the agricultural effort, not to the production of food, but were essential to the war effort, and therefore they should be lifted out of agriculture and put into the ranks of the Army and the Navy. There is where the trouble began, because some local boards, following that Directive 288, put II–C's into I–A and sent them off without a review.

After that order was put out and after the complaints had been made, this Major Luscombe went over to the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]—he put it in the RECORD, and I put it in the RECORD on last Friday at page 761—and told the members of the draft board, the supervisors and the others who were there, flat out, that, regardless of the Tydings amendment, the local draft board should put those men into I–A. That is not the only instance, either.

Here is another one. Our local agent from Allegan County, Mr. Morley, put out a statement after that in which he said:

> The State selective-service board representatives at a meeting in Kalamazoo on Wednesday, January 17, instructed all local selective-service boards to place in I-A and start processing all agricultural workers now in II–C who are under 26 years of age.

Mr. A. D. Morley quoted from the directive by Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion to the Director of Selective Service much of what was written in Directive 288 sent out by General Hershey, and then Mr. Morley gave his understanding of what he had been told at the meeting in Kalamazoo in this paragraph:

> The schedule of meetings listed in the papers last week giving locations of meetings at which II–C registrants would make out new questionnaires, in view of the above directive, has been canceled.

Note, he told the people interested that, in view of the above directive, that is, 288 which was passed down, all of these meetings for review where registrants should have had their day in court, would be canceled. What do you think about that? That shows the impression created by General Hershey's directive No. 288, and to this day he has never completely wiped it out.

That misconstruction was called, not this particular one about Allegan County but the one about the meeting held over at Adrian in the other district, and others, to General Hershey's attention this morning, and what did he do? He ducked and he dodged around, first, by saying that he did not know whether Major Luscombe has made those remarks. He had had plenty of time to learn whether he had made them.

Some of the members of that committee asked him about that. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] asked him and said, "What have you done to learn whether Major Luscombe was correctly quoted?" Well, he had called someone—at least I think he said he had. Listen; he did not have any difficulty in getting that order out on January 3. When he learned that these officers were disobeying those instructions or violating the law by forcing those men into the service, why did he not call them up? Why did he not ascertain the fact? I will tell you why he did not call them up. He wanted to put those agricultural workers into the Army and the Navy. That is the only reason I can see. He has telephones and telegraph wires. You remember this woman down in the O. P. A. in Miami who sent a 2,500-word wire through at Government expense. Surely General Hershey can wire instructions out. And he can get orders out by wire.

When he was asked about it, he kept ducking and he never did, so long as I was there, say that he would clarify it.

It would not take General Hershey 10 minutes nor more than 50 words to give instructions to these local boards to disregard all previous directives and orders, and comply with the law, including the Tydings amendment.

When he put out this directive, this correction, here is what he put out. I have it before me. It is on page 762 of the RECORD. He says:

> Questions of interpretation of State directors' advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

Then he said that directive did not change or modify in any way the Tydings amendment.

> The opinions and findings contained in State Directors' Advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

They were not any such thing. Those directions in there were for the purpose of telling the local boards to stick those boys into I–A, that is what they were for, and everybody so understood it and General Hershey knows it.

Then he went on:

> Notify all local boards immediately.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to relieve General Hershey of some of the responsibility for the ambiguity which the gentleman seems to read into that clarifying directive.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not read it in. That directive standing alone is clear enough if there had been no previous one; if his subordinates had let it stand.

Mr. COOLEY. I say that for this reason. He was summoned before the House Committee on Agriculture, and after a long discussion of the matter and after the committee members had impressed upon him the necessity for the

issuance of a clarifying directive, we appointed a subcommittee that sat around the table with General Hershey and prepared that directive, and it was prepared in our committee room. If any ambiguity still exists, the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, should share its part of the responsibility. I do not think General Hershey has ducked or tried to dodge anything.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He certainly did this morning before that committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will poll that committee, he will find out that is the opinion of about three-fourths of its members.

Mr. COOLEY. It certainly is not my opinion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That might be, but I heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] express a contrary opinion very logically and very forcibly.

If General Hershey wanted to clear up this matter, all he needed to do this morning was to tell the committee that he would wire all State directors to wire all local boards to defer all registrants the local boards in their judgment believed came under the Tydings amendment; and if he wanted to be fair about it, he would leave out the statement that the board members must be "absolutely sure" that they did fall within the exception before deferring them.

That "absolutely sure" was and is a limitation upon the Tydings amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman says General Hershey wanted to draft these farm boys. Why did he want to? The gentleman is aware that General Hershey takes orders from his superiors, is he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I assume he does.

Mr. SHORT. Is he not? He has to take orders from his superiors, does he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, everybody knows that.

Mr. SHORT. I am just wondering how the rural farm population voted last November, and if that could have had anything to do with it. The order was issued by the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some people say I am unduly suspicious, so I shall not express any opinion on that.

I heard that same argument that was made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] over there before the Committee on Agriculture, and that is all right, so far as it goes. If that was all there was to it, I would say that your subcommittee did share equal responsibility, and that correction which you sent out is not so bad. That is all right in a way. I am not complaining principally about that—do not misunderstand me. Here is what I am complaining about in connection with that: My complaint is that in spite of that, when these objections or complaints continued to roll in, these officers—I heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] this morning, and if I am not correct, he sits here and can correct me if I am in error—over in the Agricultural Committee say that when Major Luscombe went back to Adrian, after he had made the misstatements as to the meaning of 288, he merely reiterated—did I hear correctly?—the statements he had made before.

Mr. MICHENER. Reiterate means to repeat. He did not say "repeat." He came back purportedly to straighten out the mistake that he had made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, and what did you say he told them?

Mr. MICHENER. He left leaving with them the impression that he was right the first time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right; he did not reiterate, he did not repeat, he did not change their minds, he just strengthened their recollection and opinion of what they heard him say the President wanted them to do. That is the way it is. It would not take General Hershey more than 10 minutes and 50 words to straighten this out if he wanted to. But you could not get out of him this morning a single statement that he would do it.

Mr. COOLEY. Did he not tell the committee he had been unable to obtain full information regarding that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. And why should it take him so long? And how many boys are being sent into the Army because of the erroneous statements that have been made while he waits for a report? And what about Major Luscombe? Why did he not call Major Luscombe and say, Did you in substance say this or that?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not doubt that he would do that if he were requested to do so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He has been asked by more than 200 Congressmen to correct the situation. Why does he not do it on his own initiative? Why does he not stop sending all these farm boys into the Army. They are going away by the thousands. Farms will be vacated and the land left uncultivated. Yet General Hershey has not the initiative, at least he has not exhibited it. I think he is under orders from above, that they intend to get these men from the farms no matter what the law may be.

The fact is he has not yet, although from the 29th up to the present time, the days have rolled by and he has not yet, according to his statement this morning ascertained whether Major Luscombe was correctly quoted or not, or whether the officials who came down from the State board to Kalamazoo to the third and fourth districts instructed those officials to put those boys in.

Saturday morning I had another phone call from my district. Two boards are examining these boys in accordance with the law and the corrected instructions. According to the instructions of the agriculture subcommittee they are giving hearings. Another board in the same county is still relying upon General Hershey's statement to the State directors which the State director sent down to the local boards and are still shoving the II–C boys straight into the service without any screening and without any application of that act.

I want to show you that General Hershey had not the slightest intention of giving anybody an opportunity to comply with the Tydings amendment; that is a fair and square opportunity. Why do I say that? Here is his letter or a part of his letter written on February 1 to Mr. Wolcott, as put into the RECORD by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] on February 3 after this trouble arose.

> We have, however, directed the review of all classifications of agriculturally deferred registrants between the ages of 18 and 25, inclusive—

Now listen to this—

> to make absolutely sure that they fully meet the requirements of the Tydings amendment, i. e.—

Then he goes on with the Tydings amendment. Now where does General Hershey get authority to say that before a man in II–C can be further deferred the board must be absolutely sure that he comes within the requirements of the Tydings amendment?

A man accused of a crime must be shown to be guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, but these men who make application for deferment are not criminals. They are just seeking to take advantage of the provisions of the law which we enacted. If General Hershey wanted to be fair about the matter, if he had those two words, absolutely sure, in his system and he had to use them in some directive then why did he not say to the boards, "you must excuse these men in II–C unless you are absolutely sure that they are not necessary on the farm," and follow on through in the same way on the other requirements as to exemption?

Do you see the point? Why did he not turn it around? Oh, no, he adds the additional restriction. He requires the board to find that the board is absolutely sure they are necessary, and so forth, on the farm.

In an ordinary civil case all a jury needs to do in order to render a decision for a claimant is to find by a preponderance of the evidence that the claim is just. Even in a criminal case, unless the jury is satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, they must acquit him.

But for the agricultural worker General Hershey, by his letter to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], makes the road long and rocky and hard to travel. He goes beyond any rule as to the weight of evidence in either civil or criminal cases and requires a registrant to produce evidence which will make the board absolutely sure that he should be deferred.

Now you know that requirement is almost impossible of fulfillment. Yet he goes over before the Committee on Agriculture and he does not correct that unjustifiable requirement. He made a bad matter worse when he inserted that "absolutely sure."

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not think we ought to be so severe with General Hershey. After all he is an Army officer whose duty it is to obey orders. He is

merely obeying orders from the Commander in Chief. Why does not the gentleman criticize the Commander in Chief for bringing about the situation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I have been accused of disliking the President and some of his policies, and there is a little truth in that. I do not mean as to dislike of him, but as to some of his policies. I have nothing personal against General Hershey but I do not like to see him amend a law. The gentleman says he is a good officer. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. The first duty of an officer to to obey his orders. All right. The Commander in Chief has no authority to write law. Congress writes the law. If General Hershey is a good officer he should obey the law and he should not get confused about where the order comes from.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman forgets that we have a different Commander in Chief now.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, is it not the first duty of every officer to support the Constitution of the United States? That duty takes precedence even over his duty and responsibility to the Commander in Chief of the Army, does it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to that I would not want to counsel any private or officer or anybody else to disobey any order that was handed down, because his relatives might find he had been shot before we could get around to getting relief from anyone in authority. But I do say that neither General Hershey nor the Commander in Chief has any authority to issue any orders under this Selective Service Act which are contrary to the terms of the act itself. Neither General Hershey nor the President has any authority to change a word or a punctuation mark.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the order to which the gentleman referred was not a mandatory order at all. It could only be construed as advisory. But assuming further that the gentleman's position is correct, does not the gentleman think that in the bill which we passed last week we have sufficiently cleared that matter up?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean the work-or-fight bill?

Mr. BROOKS. I refer to rewriting the Tydings amendment in the work-or-fight bill. Not only in that particular place, one subsection, but all through the bill we clearly indicate that agriculture is most essential as an occupation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that be true, no one knows what is going to come back from the other end of the Capitol. If you read the papers you will see where they are on again and off again, as to the terms of that bill. Answering the first part of the gentleman's argument, that the local boards have that authority, that is true. But what is a local board going to do when it gets directives from Washington. The ordinary men in a small town are fine men, brought up to regard government as supreme; looking up to the President as the top man who will do no wrong. I mean, of course, in years gone by they felt that way, and they still have it hanging over them. Then down comes this order. The gentleman knows very well that if the local boards would defer these men they would be accused by columnists, the big papers, the Washington Post, as being Nazi, as being supporters of Hitler, and a dozen other things that hurt. PM, the Daily Worker, and all the rest of the yellow sheets. You know what would happen.

Now aside from a Congressman who has enough fortitude to take such abuse and get along, there is no one that likes it. I do not know any reason why the average citizen should be compelled to take that kind of abuse.

Mr. BROOKS. Fortunately or unfortunately, the Washington Post does not reach the areas that I am most conversant with.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You should thank the good Lord for that.

Mr. BROOKS. But I will say that I know draft boards that are staffed with the most competent attorneys; they are members of the draft boards, and they know the law and they would not hesitate at all to follow the law regardless of an advisory directive.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; that may well be, but nevertheless all too many boards are frightened by orders, rules, directives from Washington. First one administrative agency, then another, kicks our citizens around, interferes with their business, compels them to get priorities, rations their food and their clothing, until actually in this country the average citizen, the average businessman, is afraid to turn around in the daytime, to go to sleep at night, because he is not sure that he has not violated some rule from Washington.

The practical result of this directive was to frighten many of the local boards into improperly placing IV–C's into I–A.

The local folks back in my district have confidence enough in me to reelect me, but when it comes to taking my statement that the President has no power to change the law they just throw that statement out the window. It does not make any more difference to them than the breeze from the lake. When Directive 288 came out, two out of three boards began putting the farm workers in the service. You know very well thousands of them have gone. There is not a Congressman from an agricultural district who has not had this same experience.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The gentleman was present during the discussion in our committee this morning. I call his attention to the fact that the so-called Tydings amendment was born right in that committee when they began literally to gut the farms up in my district, that Tydings amendment was passed putting agricultural labor in a separate class; and it has been observed for the last 2 years until now; but outside of the gentleman from North Carolina, was there any meeting of minds between General Hershey and the committee this morning,

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not see anything to indicate it.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I was thinking the same myself. So something happened in January of this year that has upset the procedure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What happened was the issuance of Order 288 and the directive of General Hershey where he continues to hold to the theory that these men must be taken. This activity on his part and on the part of the President and Mr. Byrnes is typical of the attitude of this administration in trying all too often to find ways to avoid and disregard the expressed will of the Congress and follow their own conclusions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter I have from the chairman of the draft board in Gladwin County, Mich., and my response thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Gladwin County (Mich.) Draft Board issued a statement through the local newspaper, the Gladwin Record, in connection with the deferment of farm labor, reading as follows:

> The Gladwin County Draft Board asks us to make clear to folks throughout the county that they have no choice now but to call up young men under 26 who are engaged in farm work for physical examination. The order calling up these young men is a Presidential directive and the local draft board has no authority whatsoever to defer any man in this age group.

Thereupon I issued a statement to the newspapers of my congressional district covering the subject fully, and as a result thereof the chairman of the local draft board No. 1, Gladwin County, Mr. George E. Carvey, wrote me as follows on the letterhead of the Selective Service System, bearing of the stamp of his board, located at 243 West Cedar Avenue, Gladwin, Mich.:

JANUARY 25, 1945.

Representative ROY WOODRUFF,
Tenth Michigan District Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In an article written by you in the Bay City Times, Wednesday, January 24, you say we have a misconception of General Hershey's order.

We did put in the paper that all farm boys under 26 years of age would go for preinduction examination, and we had no choice in the matter, but we did not say they would all go into the armed forces.

If you will look in memorandum M-937, dated January 4, 1945, to all local boards and boards of appeal and read paragraph 4 of this memorandum, you will see where it says they will all go down for a preinduction examination.

This local board most likely understands the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act as well, if not better, than you do.

You keep on playing your politics to get a few extra farm votes, and we will keep on

calling them according to the regulations sent to us by national and State headquarters.

Sincerely yours,

LOCAL BOARD NO. 1, GLADWIN COUNTY,
GEORGE E. CARVEY, *Chairman.*

On January 27, I wrote Mr. Carvey as follows:

Mr. GEORGE E. CARVEY,
Chairman, Local Board No. 1,
Gladwin County, Gladwin, Mich.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of January 25, relative to an article written by me for the Bay City Times, Wednesday, January 24.

In my article I quoted the statement you put into the Gladwin Record, and I quoted it accurately. Nothing I said in my news release was in any way critical of you or any of the members of your board. I was attempting to be helpful to you.

You might be interested to know that, upon learning of General Hershey's instructions, which were based upon the President's statement as repeated by Byrnes, some 250 of us Members of the House of Representatives formed an unofficial committee—about evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats—and called Major General Hershey to a conference in the Old House Office caucus room. The general was unable satisfactorily to explain the President's position, or the legality of the instructions, and he finally agreed to notify all State directors that his previous order was erroneous, and to instruct them to comply with the provisions of the Tydings amendment, and defer every farm worker who was found to be necessary and regularly engaged in the production of food, or whose work was essential to the war effort, so long as he remained so engaged or until a satisfactory replacement could be found.

The last sentence in your statement was as follows: "The order calling up these young men is a Presidential directive, and the local draft board has no authority whatsoever to defer any man in this age group." That sentence clearly indicates that, notwithstanding your statement to the contrary, you were not familiar with the Tydings amendment, and further that you were not familiar with the fact that even a Presidential directive cannot set aside that particular provision of the law. If any man in the age group specified cannot be deferred, it must be clear to anyone that he must be inducted. It must, therefore, be evident to you that your tsatement was the result of lack of information.

So, as a matter of fact, my dear sir, you were not properly informed about this matter, as the subsequent action of General Pearson clearly discloses. You were simply misled, as have been so many others throughout the country.

Yours very truly,

ROY O. WOODRUFF.

I have heard nothing further from Mr. Carvey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OFFICIAL INSPECTION TRIP OF EUROPEAN THEATERS OF WAR WITH HOUSE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to now give a report on my recent inspection of the European battle fronts, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Since the war this committee has formed and passed much of the legislation enlarging the Army, providing for its organization, for its supply, its munition and war machines, all in close cooperation with the military leaders of the Nation.

Most of this inspection tour was taken up with conferences with Army personnel, who because they are at the front, have had no opportunity to tell our committee of the needs and of the weaknesses which have shown up in our equipment, supplies, and munitions. Of course, this information, vital as it is to our committee in further carrying out our work of backing our armies to the limit, cannot be released, but must be kept for the use of the committee.

However, we did see and learn many things that can be told, matters in which I was very much interested and which I believe will be of interest to you also.

On November 23, 1944, the committee left from the National Airport, at Washington, D. C. After stop-offs in Bermuda and the Azores we reached London, where we had our first taste of war. Several robot bombs fell in London the night the committee arrived and the next day the Members were shown the still raging fires and the scattered debris—all that remained of homes and shops. Workers were still probing the ruins, looking for bodies of the dead at the time our party visited this scene of brutality.

After one day in London we went to Liverpool where we inspected the port facilities through which a great deal of the supplies for our Army has moved. We also paid a visit to the hospital ship *Chateau Thierry,* which was sailing for America with its cargo of wounded and sick soldiers. We visited a hospital for the treatment of mild psychiatric cases, and the most interesting experience at Liverpool was a visit to the giant rehabilitation center where we watched rehabilitated soldiers teaching disabled soldiers to overcome their handicaps. Here soldiers are taught how to use stiffened ankles, knees, legs and elbows, how to learn once again to walk, to write, and to shoot a gun. We were told that a vast majority of these patients recover sufficiently to return to the front lines and to active combat duty.

The last day we were in England, the committee was privileged to witness a bombing mission take-off for operations over Germany. An oil refinery was the specific target for this mission, and 1,400 bombers participated. After the bombers had gone, General Doolittle, who is in command, took our committee to the fighter field, and we saw our fighters leave the ground within about 1 hour after the bombers had gone. About 800 fighters were included in this operation. The briefing of the pilots and the crew of the bombers was at the early morning hour of 4 a. m., and it was intensely interesting to hear them discuss the mission from the standpoint of the difficulties of the terrain, enemy opposition, weather conditions over the target, and many other things of interest to each member of the committee. We were still at the field when the bombers returned, and we were sorry indeed to observe that four of our big craft did not come back. Captain Rooney, of New York, was pilot of the lead bomber, but Lt. Marshall M. Payne, a Mississippian, was the second in command and was to take over in the event anything happened to the lead plane.

It was during this hasty swing around England that I gained a high respect for the English men and women and the part they have played and are playing in this war. I know that we have all heard rumors about the English letting us fight this war while they sit at home and benefit from lend-lease, but when you go into town after town and village after village, one realizes that England is really in this war. The terrific damage that has been wrought by more than 5 years of war also helps one to realize what England has suffered. But the realization comes when one sees middle-aged, gray-haired women driving big unlighted trucks along the narrow, winding country lanes through dense fog.

The committee, on November 30, flew to Cherbourg, France, where our first contact with France was made. The city of Cherbourg, which was once a magnificent port city, was in ruins. We spent some time visiting the scene of the D-day operations on the Normandy coast, where our troops landed first, and from there we observed the progress of our forces throughout the Cherbourg Peninsula. The Germans thought they had completed total wreckage of the Cherbourg Harbor and made it impossible for the Americans to use them when they surrendered. Ships were sunk close together to block the harbor, and at first it was necessary for all our supply ships, whether loaded with men or supplies, to stop several yards out at sea. The men and supplies were then transferred to ducks and ferried ashore. This was slow but our engineers quickly put the harbor into use. Instead of wasting time attempting to blast out or remove the wrecked ships, they built platforms on them and thus made them into more or less stationary piers onto which our large ships could unload. But once unloaded, there were no railroads to move the badly needed men and supplies to the front. They had to be loaded into trucks and hauled to the front over badly wrecked highways. All this consumed millions of gallons of gasoline which had to be brought from America.

At Cherbourg we were shown the graves of hundreds of our boys and men who were killed in the invasion. We found these cemeteries, and all other cemeteries which we visited on our trip, extremely well kept. The graves were carefully marked, and we were advised that the bodies were also carefully identified. We were also told that each member of our armed forces who gave his life for our country had been reverently interred and the proper rites conducted. We were told that many native families had taken the grave of a certain soldier and kept this grave in good condition.

From Cherbourg we went to Le Havre, France, where we made an inspection of the water front. Here we observed the German strong points and pill boxes. We saw numerous ships which had been sunk in the harbor in such locations as would give our forces the most trouble. We saw the expert work of the engineers

as they erected bridges over the sunken ships and as they provided temporary port facilities. At Le Havre we were told that in 1 heavy invasion bombardment 6,000 French were killed and only 60 Germans.

We went from Le Havre to Paris and spent the entire day of December 2 at our Allied headquarters as guests of Gen. John C. H. Lee, commanding general of the communications zone. Here we received highly confidential reports from every branch of the Army. In my opinion, we were given a true picture of the entire situation. It was interesting for me to talk personally with General Lee, whose father is buried at Okolona, Miss., and who, of course, was interested in having the latest news from our State.

We went from Paris to Rheims and were met by General Thrasher and made visits to certain supply installations in the vicinity, among which was a warehouse containing a large stock of captured German medical supplies. We went from Rheims to Namur, Belgium, where advanced section installations were visited, including a field hospital at Leige. This field hospital was only a group of tents and each tent was a separate ward with its own nurses. Once inside the tents we found the men warm and comfortable enough, although their surroundings were crude when compared with the shiny tile floors of the modern hospital back at home. Here the floors were rough-cut boards, but they kept out the wind and mud. Heat came from a big stove in each tent. Every effort was being made to see that the patients, the sick and the wounded, were kept warm and comfortable. Here we saw men delivered less than 4 hours after they were wounded on the battle fields. I want the folks back home to know that our soldiers are being given the best medical care it is possible to give them under battle conditions. Too much praise cannot be given the doctors and nurses. But it is really the unarmed corpsman who is the real hero of this Army. General Eisenhower, himself, praised these enlisted men highly and said he was recommending the award of a distinctive badge with an increase in pay for battalion medical personnel. We promised him that our committee would act promptly to draft such a bill. We plan to get it before the House just as soon as possible.

On December 5 the committee went via automobile to the headquarters of Gen. Omar Bradley where we met with the General and his staff. General Bradley personally briefed the committee on the tactical situation, and made no efforts to conceal the fact that the part of the line where the Germans broke through a week later for their offensive was lightly held. The explanation which General Bradley gave sounded reasonable.

From General Bradley's headquarters we proceeded to Verdun and were met there by General Lewis, Commanding Eagle Rear. It was here, as you no doubt recall, that 750,000 men lost their lives during the First World War.

Operating from Verdun, we visited the headquarters of Gen. George S. Patton. The members of our committee were favorably impressed with General Patton. It was our observation that when General Eisenhower wants a certain job done, he calls on General Patton who always delivers. General Patton is like the broken runner on a football team. He can carry the ball where others, less prone to take a chance, would be stopped.

It was at Metz that the committee got a first-hand view of battle. Several forts in the vicinity were still holding out against the Third Army. Two of these forts, however, gave up the day we were at Metz.

Any idea that we might have had that our forces are coddling enemy prisoners was dispelled in Belgium, northern France, and during a visit to another big prison camp. I can truthfully say that I did not see in these camps one instance of coddling prisoners. They were earning every bite they get to eat. We are not mistreating them but they are having to work and work hard. I saw prisoners cutting up discarded auto tires and patching the heels and toes of the prisoners' boots. Others were busy moving supplies. They are working at useful work.

The committee visited General Eisenhower's headquarters on Sunday, December 10. General Eisenhower briefed the committee on conditions at the front and then answered any questions that were asked of him. Most of these questions dealt with lacks and shortages. We stayed with the General for dinner and further discussed the war situation and conditions back at home. We were all highly impressed with General Eisenhower's ability to carry forward the tremendous task which he has before him.

After arriving in Italy on December 12 we made an inspection of the Italian war front, the harbor where we noted very fine work which had been done by Army engineers in rebuilding wrecked docks. One point of great interest to me was, while in Rome, when I had the opportunity to enter Mussolini's former office and to look out onto the balcony where Il Duce made his most famous speech. While in Rome we visited the Vatican and had a most interesting visit with Pope Pius XII. We also visited the United States Army Rest Center in Rome where the battle-fatigued soldiers from the front are sent for rest and relaxation.

It was in Florence that the committee met Gen. Mark Clark, commanding general of the Fifth Army, and members of his staff. General Clark appeared confident, but not overly so. He knows his business and has worked miracles with the little that he has had to work with. It is terrifying to see some of the obstacles the Fifth Army has overcome in its drive up Italy. These obstacles, in the form of mountains, swift rivers, lack of roads, and lack of manpower and materials, dwarf those our Army has run up against in eastern Europe. General Clark has the affection and respect of all his men from the lowest to the highest ranking officers. These men seem to adore him, and it was common when riding along with the general to pass privates who would salute smartly and then say, "That's General Clark." As we drove on the general would always remark, "Those are great guys."

General Clark took us on a personally conducted visit to the front lines in Italy. While there we had a taste of the rough life of the combat soldier who treads through mud, shivers in the cold, and eats K-rations. This visit convinced us in a small way what our boys are going through. We were weighted down with warm, heavy clothing, but even then the cold got the best of us. Practically every member of the committee showed up with "Roman throat" within 48 hours. The Roman throat is the name our soldiers have given a severe cold accompanied by a sore throat because the combination is so prevalent in the bitter weather in which they are fighting.

Brief visits to Amendola and Bari ended our inspection trip, with short stops at Casablanca, the Azores, and Bermuda.

I learned much from my trip. The first thing I learned is that we should stop complaining about Britain's part in the war and start admiring the British for what they have done. I do not agree to all England does and has done. I have made my complaints and expect to continue to do so at the proper time and place. My brief first-hand glimpse of the situation convinced me, however, that America and England must stick together in the long years that lie ahead. It is to our interest to help keep the British Empire a going proposition. If the British Empire disintegrates, it will be only a matter of time until we find ourselves in a dangerous position.

There are criticisms of our Army, but these criticisms are far outweighed by admiration for the unbelievable job that has been done. One cannot appreciate what has been accomplished until it is seen first-hand.

There is no dodging the fact that our Army is critically in need of additional heavy equipment above a 90-millimeter gun. Our casualties are mounting by the thousands each day. Therefore, it is necessary for every individual in America to make the greatest contribution possible to the war effort.

Our medical men are doing a wonderful job, but there is a serious shortage of whole blood and nurses. This should be easy to correct.

Treatment of the enlisted men in the rear area can stand improvement. They should be given more recreational facilities. Too much credit cannot be given nor can too much be done for the enlisted foot soldier who is performing miracles.

Steps should be taken to dissipate the feeling of resentment that the ground soldier has built up toward the airmen. This is due to better living conditions afforded the airman, his regular tours of duty, and his opportunity to get back home for a visit. Certainly no advantages should be taken from the airman, who has likewise accomplished miracles, but instead a plan must be worked out to give the ground soldier similar advantages.

And above all we should realize that we have a real war on our hands, one that we must keep fighting every day

at our greatest strength if we are to win it.

There is plenty of blame for everyone for the present critical situation. The Army guessed wrong. Business was overly anxious to start producing for civilian markets again. Workers were too hasty in leaving their war jobs for jobs they thought had a better future.

And Congress cannot escape its share of the blame. We, in Congress, were too ready to start talking about reconversion and post-war plans.

Our soldiers are doing an unbelievably good job. It is up to us here on the home front, in the home, in the factory, on the farm, and in Congress to attempt to live up to their example.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address on war mothers and permanent peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DRAFTING FARM LABOR

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Just to keep the record straight, permit me to call the attention of the House to the fact that General Hershey, in an effort to clarify the situation which appeared to be very much confused following the issuance of Directive 288, issued a clarifying directive. That directive was prepared in the committee room of the House Committee on Agriculture after a long discussion between the members and General Hershey regarding the confusion which had arisen following the issuance of Directive 288.

It is easy for a Member of Congress to stand on the floor of the House and deride, ridicule, and criticize a member of the executive branch of the Government. I, for one, believe that General Hershey has acted with great impartiality and has shown outstanding ability in the discharge of the very arduous duties of his high office. Certainly he has not been able to make everything crystal-clear to all of the thousands of people who are administering the Selective Service Act; certainly, hundreds and perhaps thousands of farm boys have been drafted who should have been deferred; but I believe in fixing responsibility upon those who should be charged with responsibility. By the Selective Service Act we charged the local draft boards with full responsibility in the administration of that law.

We did that as a part of the proper processes of democracy, believing that the local draft boards would be familiar with the local situations and could, therefore, render more righteous judgments concerning eligibility for deferment than could some person sitting here in Washington or in some State headquarters.

I know in my home county many, many boys who have gone into the armed services leaving widowed mothers at home with farm machinery stowed away for the duration, with no one to care for the farming operations. I know of one case, to which I called the general's attention this morning, where a young man whose father was at the point of death, with no one at home to look after a four-horse farm, was drafted by his local board and inducted into the Army. When the facts were brought to the attention of the War Department, he was immediately released, and he came home to care for the farm and his father, only to be picked up again by the local draft board and reinducted. He is today a member of the armed forces, the farm is idle, and his father is helpless and badly in need of assistance.

I know there are hardship cases, and they exist throughout the length and breadth of this country, but I am not willing to charge General Hershey with that responsibility. It is primarily the responsibility of the local board.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think it would help if General Hershey would wire these local boards, telling them that notwithstanding any directive which they may have received either from him or from the State director or agents out of the State selective service, they should discharge their duty under the law and use their own judgment as to these deferments?

Mr. COOLEY. I think General Hershey has done exactly that. Here is the reason I make that statement. When he appeared before the committee, we wrote that clarifying directive ourselves, subject to his approval, and in that it was emphasized that Directive 288 did not have for its purpose the altering or the changing or the modifying of the Tydings amendment. If it were addressed to intelligent people, and I know the State directors are intelligent, there should not have been any further misunderstanding.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that was all there had been to it, all well and good, but that was followed by these fellows who came out from the State offices and told them to disregard the Tydings amendment. Then it was followed by the further directive on February 1 of General Hershey himself in which he told them that they must be absolutely sure.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that perhaps somebody from the State office has been guilty of misconduct, probably resulting from misunderstanding, but I do not believe General Hershey should be charged with malfeasance. I do not believe that we should blame him for everything that has happened. I could even say to the gentleman from Michigan, and I have proof which I submitted to General Hershey last July, that the boards in eastern North Carolina were called together and a man from the State office, I think he was a major, told all of the selective-service boards there assembled that if they did not fill their quotas, their resignations would be requested and they would get men who would fill the quotas. I called that to General Hershey's attention and told him I thought that was an unwarranted intimidation and coercion of the local boards. He did not agree with that major, neither did the State director agree, but here was a major without any authority from anyone who made that statement. It was made in the presence of the county agent from my county and other people as well. I called the selective-service board in my town and the answer was that it would be very difficult for a boy under 26 years to get a farm deferment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hope the gentleman does not believe or does not think I am trying to criticize or am criticizing General Hershey personally. I never saw him until he came before the committee in the House caucus room. I have not had any criticism of him personally at all. It is only of his official acts.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sure of that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is part of the job. Nobody denies that.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sure the gentleman has no personal animosity against General Hershey. But I will say this about him: I do not know of a man connected with the executive branch of the Government who is more pleasant to deal with or who tries to have a more sympathetic understanding with the problems that are brought to his attention. I know nothing about him or his background or his politics, and I do not care, but I do respect the manner in which he conducts the duties of his office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. Does not the gentleman think that perhaps some criticism is due to a misunderstanding because of some deferred men who stated to the draft boards that they were engaged in farming and were living on farms but were merely farming night and morning and then had jobs in town to which they drove their cars great distances and were classified as farmers and that some times, therefore, the folks deferred were not acting in good faith?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is right. I think the very purpose of this order was to screen more closely those boys who had been deferred in the hope that some additional manpower could be obtained for the armed forces.

I would say the real misunderstanding has resulted on account of the difference in the interpretations of the Tydings amendment. Every man engaged in agriculture is not entited to a deferment. Every man that is continually engaged in agriculture and necessary to agriculture

is not entitled to deferment. If so, every man on the farm would be deferred. It is only those who are engaged in the kind of agriculture that is essential to the war effort.

I am sure the gentleman knows, and I certainly know, of many farmers who are producing but a bare subsistence. They are not making a contribution to the war effort and are certainly not entitled to deferment.

I say the responsibility is with the local boards, and General Hershey agrees to that. He makes no effort to take away from the local boards their sound discretionary powers to defer those whom they think are eligible for deferment and induct those whom they think are not eligible for deferment. The word "essentiality" or phrase "essential to the war effort" used in the Tydings amendment means just what it says. Some people try to construe that to mean essential to agriculture. I assume everybody engaged in agriculture is essential to some particular type of agriculture, but the significant thing is whether or not that particular kind of agriculture is making a contribution to the war effort.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] knows, I do not always agree with the administration but I certainly do not feel that the administration should be criticized for everything down the line.

Let us see. There might be something behind this, and far behind, going back before the Tydings amendment. When the Selective Service Act went into effect, as I understand, the different Governors of the States appointed the local boards. It just so happens there were 26 Republican Governors. In the great Midwest throughout the farm States, including the State of Michigan, Republican Governors named the draft boards, and they named the State officers of the local boards.

Shortly after the setting up of the Selective Service System I investigated the composition of the local draft boards in my own State. In the entire State of Michigan I found that there was just one Democratic local draft board member, and he did not last long. Every draft board official in that State, as far as I could discover, were Republicans. I can not imagine that the Republican Governors of the other States in the Midwest Farm Belt acted very differently.

I am just wondering whether those local boards are not just hiding behind the unfortunate statement that was made by General Hershey when Order 288 was issued. I think we ought to look into that just a little bit further. When we are criticizing the administration we ought to also think about criticizing those who were charged with the administration of the Selective Service Act, and those who were charged with the administration of that act were the local boards appointed by the Governors. The Governors of the great Midwest farming States appointed the local boards. The local boards are responsible, and nobody ever expected the local boards to violate the law.

I think that covers the situation in pretty good shape.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know whether the gentleman was listening to what I said.

Mr. HOOK. Yes; I listened very attentively.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My point was that Directive 288, which came down on January 3, gave the local boards the rule and the guide which they have since followed.

Mr. HOOK. It is my contention it gave the local boards that were appointed by Republican Governors something to hide behind.

SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the other day when we were discussing the bill, H. R. 1752, I called the attention of the House to bulletins issued by the Treasury Department on the sale and offer for sale of surplus commodities the Government now is offering to the public. I have with me today two additional bulletins issued since that time. The material contained in these bulletins indicates to me that there is a tremendous quantity of materials being offered to the public that I think with a little investigation and ingenuity on the part of the appropriate departments could be used very advantageously in the war effort rather than be sold at auction or on informal bid where in many instances they are sold for practically nothing.

To emphasize that point, let me call your attention to a recent offer. The story appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, yesterday. The Navy was offering to the public life rafts which are no longer needed, according to the Navy, some 1,900 of them, for 50 cents apiece. The Maritime Commission, realizing that they were worth more than 50 cents apiece, stepped in and said to the Navy, "We will take them over and sell them for $50 apiece." They did, and the difference between 50 cents and $50 was realized to the Treasury of the United States.

Another instance was cited in an editorial appearing in the Washington Post this morning. The editorial stated that—quote:

> It is a shock to public confidence to hear that a dealer bought at auction for $31 a Government-owned searchlight that was promptly resold to another Government agency for $235.

Another witness confessed at a hearing that was being held by the Senate War Investigating Committee, and this is mentioned in the same editorial "that eight ship strainers from the Government were bought for $3.25 apiece and sold to a ship repair firm working for the Government for $12."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial in full at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This editorial reads as follows:

SURPLUS SCANDALS

Under the chairmanship of Senator MEAD the Special War Investigating Committee is adding fresh laurels to those it won when Vice President TRUMAN was its head. The current probe into the affairs of an auctioneering firm known as Surplus Liquidators, Inc., highlights the need of improved safeguards to protect the public investment in billions of dollars of Government property that eventually will be classified as surplus materials. The recent setting up of a Surplus Property Board to formulate disposal policies and exercise supervision over agencies doing the actual work of disposal is only a first step. The agencies delegated to handle surpluses will have to be put on the alert to prevent the Government from being gypped by sharp and unscrupulous private dealers.

The unsavory details brought out by the inquiry into the affairs of Surplus Liquidators, Inc., certainly suggest a deplorable lack of competence and vigilance in administering the disposal program. It is a shock to public confidence to hear that a dealer bought at auction for $31 a Government-owned searchlight that was promptly resold to another Government agency for $235. Another witness confessed to buying eight ship strainers from the Government for $3.25 each and selling them to a ship repair firm working for the Government for $12.

These and other instances of petty though outrageous profiteering at Government expense as well as evidence indicating that Surplus Liquidators, Inc., had made good use of friends with political influence to secure auction contracts are not in themselves significant. Abuses of such kind inevitably occur whenever opportunity is afforded the greedy and unscrupulous to benefit at public expense. The moral pointed by the disclosure of irregularities is plain. It is that we need immediate reforms in the Government's procurement and disposal practices. The Mead committee recently stressed the importance of improving procurement methods and further centralizing control of the procurement function. While recognizing that it is impossible to achieve a completely centralized system of procurement, the committee declares that "a great deal more could be done in centralizing control of procurement between the departments and between branches within the War Department and bureaus within the Navy Department, and more could be done toward centralizing procurement as between the War and Navy Departments."

However, elimination of the loose procurement practices will not prevent tremendous surpluses from developing as a result of conditions beyond anyone's control. In fact, the Mead committee points out that "huge amounts of a great variety of supplies have been accumulated which the armed services already know that they will not need." With the disposal problem already pressing and grave abuses currently being uncovered, Rudolph Halley, chief counsel for the Mead committee, properly emphasizes the need for strong and efficient investigating staffs in all Government disposal agencies to spot trouble and prevent scandals from develop-

ing. That is the only way to keep out the "bootleg element" that has already begun to prey upon the rich spoils that are piling up in Government warehouses as the war is prolonged.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize further the need of more careful investigation of the sale of the surplus commodities that I have been told amount to some $15,000,000,000. I understand that under an act previously passed by the Congress none of this property can be sold that exceeds $5,000,000 in value without action of this House. I think that amount ought to be decreased. We should have control over the sale of materials that cost less than $5,000,000, because evidently, according to the editorial appearing this morning's Post, considerable scandal has already been revealed in connection with the Surplus Liquidators, Inc., which shows that they are disposing of large quantities of these materials which in many instances are being sold back to Government departments when the Federal Government owned them before they were offered for auction.

I am going to offer an amendment to the Surplus Commodities Act that has been passed by the Congress which will provide that the veterans of this war be given certificates of credit whereby they can obtain quantities of surplus commodities as a priority before the public has an opportunity to bid on them. I think the men who are now fighting are entitled to the opportunity to obtain some of the surplus commodities that may be beneficial to them in establishing a business or in rehabilitating themselves in whatever work they may want to perform when they return from the war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article entitled "Arms for Russia" by Ernest Lindley. It is important, I think, that the Russian people know how much we have done in the matter of supplying their country with arms.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted (at the request of Mr. VINSON) to Messrs. IZAC, SASSCER, RIVERS, HÉBERT, MADDEN, HAVENNER, DE LACY, BIEMILLER, MOTT, COLE of New York, BATES of Massachusetts, HESS, ANDERSON of California, GRANT of Indiana, TOWE, ELLIOTT, and PIÑERO on account of official business for the Naval Affairs Committee in connection with an inspection of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 (Elk Hills).

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 63. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 72. An act for the relief of Antonio Ruiz; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 184. An act to amend the Social Security Act by authorizing the furnishing of wage-record information to State unemployment-compensation agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 243. An act for the relief of Galen E. Walter; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 294. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War No. 2, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 311. An act for the relief of Philip Kleinman; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 312. An act for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 314. An act for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 315. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 317. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 335. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 6, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold an organization meeting at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 7, 1945.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXVI, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

167. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on record proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

168. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 29, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the lower Mississippi River, with a view to determining whether additional flood protection should be provided for the St. Johns Levee District, Mo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on November 16, 1943; to the Committee on Flood Control.

169. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, which the War Department recommends be enacted into law; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 119. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses to Frank J. Siegfried, husband of Virginia Siegfried, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rep. No. 53). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 1984. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and

sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 338. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat; with amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 120. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 57. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 1985. A bill providing for a service medal, ribbon, and clasp for honorable service in the armed forces of the United States during World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1986. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to suppress and extirpate contagious, infectious, and communicable diseases of dogs and other carnivorous animals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1987. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the Intracoastal Waterway between Carrabelle and St. Marks, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1988. A bill providing for the examination and survey of a proposed waterway from Tallahassee to the St. Marks River, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1989. A bill to provide for the examination and survey of the Choctawhatchee River, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1990. A bill authorizing the dredging of the boat basin at the mouth of the Apalachicola River at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 1991. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the Intracoastal Waterway between Carrabelle and St. Marks, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1992. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska, in trust for the Roman Catholic Church; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 1993. A bill to amend section 3404 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1994. A bill to completely restore the Federal Loan Agency as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, as it was prior to February 24, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JAMES J. DELANEY:

H. R. 1995. A bill to extend for 1 year the time for filing applications for the payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 1996. A bill to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 1997. A bill to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOCH:

H. R. 1998. A bill to establish a Chiropody (Podiatry) Corps in the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1999. A bill to establish a joint committee to select a suitable medal or award to be bestowed upon members of selective service local boards; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McKENZIE:

H. R. 2000. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution requesting the President to appoint a commission to cooperate with the United Nations War Crimes Commission, or any other agency or agencies of the United Nations, in the preparation of definite plans for the punishment of war criminals of the Axis countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 121. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the utilization of manpower in the critical labor areas of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States by commending the State Department and those engeged in repatriation work and urging continuance of such efforts that every American now held by the Japanese Government be returned to the United States; to the Committe on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Lanham Act to provide that temporary war housing, and particularly housing which violates minimum safety requirements or the building regulations of the community in which it is situated, should be removed as soon as practicable after the recognized cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon legislation to recognize national responsibility by providing financial aid during the period of reconversion to those communities which have been forced, because of the war effort, to carry an abnormal war burden, so that they may be enabled to rehabilitate municipal facilities and services to the same level of adequacy as before the war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider the advisability of returning the Employment Service to the administration and control of the State of California at the earliest date compatible with the effective prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States by a resolution urging that the United States should take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine should be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2001. A bill for the relief of Betty Ellen Edwards; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2002. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wyzynski; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2003. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Stewart Martin, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2004. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Wilder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 2005. A bill for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2006. A bill for the relief of Boyd B. Black; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2007. A bill for the relief of Hattie Bowers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 2008. A bill for the relief of the village of Cold Spring, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 2009. A bill for the relief of Walton R. Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2010. A bill for the relief of J. H. Westfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri:

H. R. 2011. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. Earl Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

48. By Mr. BLAND: Petition from Sgt. Henry M. Burch, Jr., national commander, American Veterans of World War No. 2, Orlando, Fla., for incorporation of that organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. S. A. Sperry and 37 other citizens of Cleveland Ohio, urging enactment of a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

50. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution memorializing the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States with relation to the cancelation of certain Federal income taxes due the Government by persons in the armed forces of the United States of America previous to their induction into said service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

51. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of L. A. Woods, State superintendent, department of education, Austin, Tex., and Texas school executives and teacher trainers, urging the 18-year-old boys be given a year's training before battle service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

52. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Henry Schmidt, Newton, Iowa, and other members of St. John's Women's Guild in opposition to peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

53. By the SPEAKER: Petition of 13 signers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to permanent exclusion of all Japanese, loyal as well as disloyal, from this country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

54. Also, petition of the American Veterans Alliance of Jersey City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the consideration of proper treaties and international agreements which will protect and preserve inviolate the rights of Poland and its citizenry, to a proper determination of its boundaries and territorial limitations to the end that justice may prevail and a true and lasting peace eventuate from the present hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

55. Also, petition of the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favorable commendation of President Roosevelt's appointment of Hon. Henry A. Wallace and approving the principle and purpose of the full-employment bill of Senator MURRAY and colleagues; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

56. Also, petition of John W. L. Hicks, of Detroit, Mich., contesting the election of GEORGE A. DONDERO, Congressman from the Seventeenth Congressional District of Michigan; to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art our everlasting Father, in the simplicity of faith, we pray that hearing, we may hear, that seeing, we may understand. Mid adverse opinions and convictions, dear Lord, we make the quest for that power which transforms differences into the spirit of oneness and which dissolves the dilemmas of misunderstanding. We would live with the sense of eternity in our hearts, standing before our fellows with an incontestable assurance in the reality of God.

Incline Thine ear, O Lord, and teach us that the tidal wave of clean, pure living can lift our Nation to the highest plane as a liberator of the world. Let the sublime virtues of honor and justice prevail throughout our land, broadening the sweep of contentment and brotherhood to the remotest section; may they break the bounds with that chivalrous spirit that dares to do right. O God, we pray for a release of this prostrate earth, grizzled with despair; O let there come a new life that shall fulfill Thy divine decree. Pity it, hold Thou its hand, bless it with the message of our Saviour—"Ye shall find rest to your souls." Grant that Thy sacrifice shall make us humble, Thy sympathy make us social, and Thy love make us benevolent. In the name of Him who is the light of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 298. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; and

S. 410. An act for the relief of Marino Bello.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1427. An act relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

MESSAGE TO GENERAL MACARTHUR

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of the House on yesterday, February 5, 1945, the Chair sent the following message to General MacArthur:

At the suggestion of the House of Representatives, unanimously expressed, I send to you and the valiant officers and men who serve with you our grateful thanks for the courage and effectiveness in bringing freedom to the Philippines and further glory to American arms.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker.

CALLING OF PRIVATE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Private Calendar today may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN PAY OF CAPITOL TELEPHONE OPERATORS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Senate passed an amendment to the bill H. R. 1427, relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange, recently passed by the House. The Senate amendment provides merely that the amount necessary to carry into effect the increases for the telephone operators be paid out of the authorized appropriation for officers and employees of the House. I have conferred with the Members of the Committee on Accounts, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to take this bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 2. The necessary amounts to carry into effect the increases herein provided from February 1 to June 30, 1945, hereby are authorized to be paid from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1945."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include a message from the State Legislature of Nevada, with a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Franklin Chronicle, of Franklin, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in three instances and include therein two editorials and a feature article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. I wish to ask the Chair how it is that if a Member on this side asks for a minute in which to address the House he is permitted to insert 300 words or less, but that when some Members on the other side of the aisle make similar requests they are permitted to put in 7½ pages, or some 8,000 words? How does the discrimination come about?

The SPEAKER. There is no discrimination because there was no legislative program on yesterday and anyone had the right to extend his remarks "at this point" in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. I am glad to hear that.

The SPEAKER. There is no discrimination; that has been the custom for several years. The gentleman will learn it now if he does not already know it from previous rulings of the Chair.

Mr. RICH. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. In this instance the matter inserted in the RECORD covers 7⅓ pages. I have always understood the rule to be that if the matter inserted exceeded 2 pages an estimate of cost must be secured from the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. It is the duty of the Public Printer to return it with an estimate, if an estimate has not been secured, and then permission of the House may be granted notwithstanding the estimate. But if the matter is the Member's own words the Member can put in just as much as he pleases. When it comes to inserting extraneous matter, such as a speech prepared by somebody else, or articles from newspapers, periodicals, and so forth, matter not the Member's own words, it may not exceed 2 pages without an estimate of cost being submitted and the request again acted on.

Mr. RICH. But in this instance it is not the Member's own words.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not intend to express an opinion on it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain letters.

PRIVILEGES OF MEMBERS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it was not, nor is it my desire, nor am I trying to challenge the Speaker or any other Member of the House, but as a member of the Printing Committee of the House I have a certain duty to perform. I want to perform that duty impartially to every Member of this House. I do not want to have any favorites of any kind, on the Republican or Democratic side of the aisle. I asked the questions I did for the purpose of trying to get a satisfactory reply or rule in reference to some of these insertions in the RECORD.

My duty is to try to cut down and keep to a minimum the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I want to do that honestly and fairly. I hope the membership of the House will not think I am trying to point to any one Member, but from now on I give warning that if I am on that committee I am going to perform my duty. Whenever the House does not want me on that committee, I will resign if asked by my Republican leader, or if somebody else wants the job they may have it if they will perform their duty on the committee. It is a thankless job.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. All of the Members highly commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any other Member for doing their duty. The question is, What is one's duty? As a Member of the House, not as majority leader, I would like to have the gentleman insert in the RECORD for my benefit—and I am sure all other Members would like it, too—the gentleman's conception of what his duty is in censoring the remarks of other Members, and what his duty is as a member of the Printing Committee, because I assume the gentleman feels he has got a duty in censoring the remarks of other Members. I would like to know what my distinguished friend's concept of his duty is.

Mr. RICH. Rule 10 promulgated by the Joint Committee on Printing provides that any one requesting permission to insert extraneous matter in excess of two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD must obtain an estimate in writing from the Public Printer, and at the time permission is requested must announce the cost of publishing the insertion before it may be printed in the RECORD. This was not done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All Members know that they may exercise their privilege at any time to object to insertion of remarks in the RECORD.

INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY STABILIZATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand copy of a report released on February 1 by the American Bankers Association dealing with the Bretton Woods proposal for an international currency stabilization and an international bank. In the February issue of the American Banker Mr. Morgenthau states that if certain advice were listened to, it would kill the program, and added further that this advice would not be followed. He is referring to this report.

Since when has the Secretary of the Treasury received authority to determine what kind of legislation this Congress is going to enact on such matters as international currency stabilization and the international bank? I suggest that all Members of the House get a copy of this report and read it very carefully because it will stimulate their thought with respect to those two proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the report which has been so bitterly attacked by Secretary Morgenthau is based upon the studies of the committee on Federal fiscal policy of the Association of Reserve City Bankers, of the advisory committee on special activities and the economic policy commission of the American Bankers Association and of the study committee on post-war problems of the Bankers Association for foreign trade. It has been approved by the administrative committee of the American Bankers Association. The report is highly constructive and in the interests of the American people.

Upon what authority does the Secretary speak when he says—in speaking of the report—"that their advice will not be taken." After all, I had understood from the Secretary that he was going to let the Congress decide what would be in the text of the agreements as when and if approved.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PRIVILEGES OF MEMBERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question nor has there been for a long time as to what we could do under the 1-minute ruling. I have had manuscripts sent back to me covering a 1-minute speech if it exceeded 300 words for printing in the Appendix. That has been the rule. But one Member of the majority has had his own speeches printed when they exceeded 500 words. Yet yesterday, under that 1-minute rule, we find printed 7 pages. I do not complain about either the insertion or the rule. I do not care how many pages Members put in, but I intend to insist if I can that we all have the same privilege and be governed in the same way. The only point I make is that the rule apply to all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

TREATY WITH MEXICO

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of California traveled 3,000 miles back here to Washington to testify before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in opposition to the proposed treaty with Mexico which affects the future of California very vitally. He testified at length before that committee, at the conclusion of which time he was simply thanked by the committee for his statement. He was not asked one single question, nor was any comment made upon the testimony he gave.

Mr. Speaker, speaking, I feel confident, for the California delegation in the House I think I may say that we therefore assume that the committee must have agreed with everything Governor Warren said for otherwise certainly they would have accorded him the courtesy of asking questions in order to draw out his viewpoint and to express any disagreement that they might have had with him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The question has been raised by two Members, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] about certain matter that was inserted in the RECORD on yesterday, by another Member. The contention has been made that it was in violation of the rules of the House.

May I ask the Speaker if it would not be the proper procedure, if any Member feels that the rule has been violated, for him to make a point of order against the insertion, and if his point of order is sustained, then to move to strike the matter from the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. That could be done. Let the Chair explain the whole situation.

In the first place, the 1-minute rule was adopted in order that no Member could proceed for more than 1 minute prior to the business of the day on any day when there was a legislative program. The Chair has instructed the official reporters that if such a 1-minute speech and whatever extension is made of it amounts to more than 300 words, it must appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

As to the matter on yesterday, when a Member asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, whether or not he addresses the House in connection therewith and whether or not there is a legislative program for that day, if the extraneous matter covers more than two pages it is the duty of the Public Printer under regulation promulgated by the Joint Committee on Printing to return it, unless the Member, having first obtained an estimate of the cost from the Public Printer and included that estimate in his request, has obtained the unanimous consent of the House that the whole extension may be included in the RECORD. The Chair has tried to enforce the 300-word rule, and intends to, but he does not have any way of looking into what goes to the Printing Office in the extension of remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. A further parliamentary inquiry, if the Chair will bear with me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The point I wanted to bring out was that each Member has his remedy against any violation of the rules in that he may make a point of order against extraneous matter that has been inserted in violation of the rules, and if that point of order is sustained, then he may move to strike it from the RECORD. That would be much more in keeping with proper procedure than speaking about it on the floor and not doing anything in connection therewith.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. If the Chair will permit.

Mr. RICH. I am not trying to have this taken out of the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I commend him for his alertness. But I am pointing out the proper procedure in such cases.

Mr. RICH. I am only interested that if we have rules in the House, those rules should be carried out. I was not trying to censor the Speaker of the House, but I know this, that if I did do so I would be carried clear from here down the Potomac to Chesapeake Bay so far that I would never get back.

The SPEAKER. There are 434 other Members of the House besides the occupant of the chair who have a duty to perform.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include about a 100-word article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 120, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered, as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Anderson, Calif.	Elliott	Hartley
Baldwin, N. Y.	Elsaesser	Havenner
Bolton	Engel, Mich.	Healy
Bradley, Mich.	Fernandez	Heidinger
Buckley	Gardner	Hess
Cannon, Fla.	Gavin	Hinshaw
Chapman	Gearhart	Holifield
Chelf	Geelan	Holmes, Mass.
Clason	Gibson	Izac
Cole, N. Y.	Granahan	Jenkins
Dawson	Grant, Ind.	Johnson, Calif.
De Lacy	Green	Johnson,
Dingell	Hand	Lyndon B.
Doyle	Harless, Ariz.	Kearney
Durham	Harness, Ind.	Kee
Eaton	Hart	King
Kirwan	Mott	Shafer
LaFollette	Norton	Sharp
Lea	O'Brien, Mich.	Sheridan
Lemke	Outland	Somers, N. Y.
Luce	Phillips	Stockman
Lyle	Powers	Thomas, N. J.
McGehee	Price, Fla.	Torrens
McGlinchey	Price, Ill.	Towe
Madden	Rees, Kans.	Weaver
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.	White
Morgan	Sasscer	Winter
Morrison	Satterfield	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 120 makes in order House Joint Resolution 85 to appropriate $6,784,000 for the continuation or completion of the agricultural census.

Very briefly the history of this act is that in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1944 the sum of $650,000 was appropriated for the preliminary work or preliminary survey in anticipation of this census.

Thereafter, in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act of 1945, the sum of $7,250,000 was appropriated which at that time was thought to be sufficient. Since that time, however, it has developed that the cost of taking this agricultural census is going to be materially more than could have been reasonably anticipated at the time the work was planned. This census is being taken, as it has been every 5 years since 1925, under a general act of this Congress providing that such census shall be taken every 5 years.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman not in error when he says this census is to be taken every 5 years? The act under which it is taken provides that it shall be taken every 10 years and that the first census shall be taken in the year 1935.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I meant to say 10 years.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I thought the gentleman would like to be corrected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is in error. The first census was taken in 1925.

Mr. KEEFE. I am speaking about the enabling legislation which the gentleman referred to in his speech.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but I was here during the Coolidge administration. This census was first provided for in 1919 and the first census under it was taken in 1925, and the law provided for it to be taken every 10 years thereafter.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I will say to the gentleman that every 10 years this agricultural census is taken in connection with the regular decennial census; in addition a further census is taken at the 5-year intervals occurring between the decennial census. Be that as it may, and the Committee on Appropriations

can go into details when the bill comes up under the rule, the fact remains that the cost of taking this census is higher this year than it has ever been before, due to the fact that persons who ordinarily would be glad to accept employment of this sort, as enumerators, are making substantially more in defense industry and other places. It was estimated, based on previous experience, that it would cost 50 to 60 cents per tract, that is, per farm, to carry out this enumeration. It now develops that it will cost something like 90 cents per tract.

It is the position of the Committee on Appropriations that this information is necessary, particularly with the end of the war in sight, due to the fact that conditions are entirely different than they were in 1940, when the census was last taken, and this information as to the number of farms, the amount of equipment thereon, and the livestock available is necessary to plan intelligently for our agricultural future.

That, briefly, I think, covers the situation, which will be explained in more detail by the committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Can the gentleman tell us what the cost was in 1925?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I do not have that information. The Committee on Appropriations can supply the gentleman with this data.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The total request this year is for how much?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. This joint resolution is for $6,784,000. Heretofore there has been appropriated the sum of $7,250,000, plus $650,000 which was originally agreed upon.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am curious to know whether this is not just a part of this national planning scheme. Is not this a part of what we might call the Gosplan, the same as Russia has?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I may say to the gentleman that other speakers from the Committee on Appropriations who will follow me will be far better qualified to answer that question than am I.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The observation was made in the Committee on Rules that the Census Bureau is acting under a statute that is mandatory, and until that statute is repealed there is nothing the Congress con do but make the appropriation to enable the Bureau to do the job, which makes this joint resolution necessary. That is the justification for the measure.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. It is well to observe that a great demand for this appropriation is coming from the business and commercial world. Not only do the farmers need it but business all over the country wants it. It is not a New Deal proposition.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. That is the information the committee received.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman will inform the House the number of man-hours that will be required to take the census.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I do not have that information, but I assume someone from the Committee on Appropriations will have it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In the event this joint resolution is passed, does the gentleman have any idea where we can get the people to take the census?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. The gentleman is equally well qualified to pass upon that question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual rule in that under the general rules of the House the Committee on Appropriations is privileged as far as general appropriations are concerned, but this is not a general appropriation bill, it is a specific appropriation measure providing an appropriation for $6,784,000. Therefore, it must be considered under a rule. This rule grants 2 hours of general debate, and then the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) will be read under the 5-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does this appropriation carry out the work that is being administered by a man by the name of Capt?

Mr. MICHENER. I am not advised as to that. I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALTER. Is this additional appropriation necessary because of the incompetency of Mr. Capt?

Mr. MICHENER. Members of the Committee on Appropriations, I feel sure, can give the gentleman such information as will satisfy him.

The law authorizing the taking of the agricultural census was passed in 1925, at a time when there was an abundance of manpower and when the country was at peace, with no prospect of war. Since that time we have passed through a depression and at the moment we are in the greatest war in all history. The economy of the country when this law was enacted is in no way comparable with present-day conditions. Then there was no Agricultural Adjustment Agency. There were no regional, State, county, and township committees, investigators, administrators, and what-have-you going among the farmers measuring their fields, keeping accounts as to their production, and supervising their activities. In those days, about the only direct contact the farmer had with the Federal Government was his local postmaster and his rural letter carrier. It undoubtedly was advisable at that time to make a general survey of farm acreage and farm possibilities in order to guide future agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with complete farm regulation and regimentation, with rationing and priorities, it would seem that all of these many agencies, boards, and bureaus have adequate information as to just what the farmer has accomplished during the last year.

When this law was enacted in 1925, the farmer was not required to keep books. Few of them were required to pay a Federal income tax and they were not required to submit to the visitations of the myriad inquisitors who now beset their path at every turn. And mark you, this is all because of laws enacted by the Congress and Executive orders issued by the President, the bureaus, and the other agencies. I sometimes wonder that the farmer is as patient as he is, with the handicaps under which he operates today. Historically an independent businessman, running his own project, sowing when he thought wise, reaping when he thought advisable, and marketing when and where his good judgment dictated, he was truly the master of his own financial destiny. This is all changed now.

The manpower shortage in this country is so desperate that within the last few days the House passed a work-or-fight bill. We are now drafting men for military service, and shortly we will be drafting them for service on the home front. Choice of occupation no longer exists when any manpower draft law is in effect. It is going to use manpower to take this agricultural census. It is going to take gasoline. It is going to take tires. It is going to take automobiles. Do not forget that visiting the farmer is only the beginning. Then the various blanks and forms and reports must channel up through county administrators, State administrators, regional administrators, and Washington bureaus. These reports will finally be placed in the archives in the Census Bureau. Oh, Mr. Speaker, in these circumstances this is not the time or the place to appropriate $6,784,000 of the people's money on such a useless and unnecessary project.

I am not condemning the taking of the census in ordinary times, when the data collected is valuable and ofttimes necessary. When this war is over, when peacetime economy approaches, and when there will be more people than there are jobs, the taking of an agricultural census may be helpful. It is inconceivable to me that there is any justification for such action now.

I am wondering how many of you have seen the questionnaire which the census enumerator is to use in his contact with the individual farmer. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has one of the forms here for your inspection. There we see page after page, questions running into the hundreds, important questions, unimportant questions, going all the way from the hired man's domes-

tic connections to the spiritual approach of the farmer being interviewed. Oh, yes; the facts must be fully explained concerning each member of the family. We have heard much complaint about complicated income-tax returns. Well, the most complex and baffling income-tax return ever conceived in the Bureau of Internal Revenue is a kindergarten primer compared with this proposed questionnaire. These enumerators will surely require much instruction and study and must be people of unusual ability along this line before they can hope to assemble intelligent reports from the information furnished by the respective farmers. For my part, I believe the farmer has troubles enough right now. I believe he is compelled to make too many reports already. I shall accordingly vote against spending more than $6,000,000 of his money as in this bill provided.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. If the gentleman from Ohio appears a little unusual this morning, it may be because of the fact that within the last few hours he has become a grandfather for the first time, and, believe it or not, it is twins, and boys at that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that since November I have given careful study as to how we might be able to oust the New Deal. I have come to the determination we need more Republicans in the United States, and the Brown family is doing its part toward that desirable end.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 120 makes in order an appropriation of some six and one half million dollars in additional funds to conduct the 1945 census of agriculture. I gravely question the necessity of this work in time of war. This body has twice passed upon this particular issue, once when it was before the House on a direct vote, and the second time when the matter came back from the Senate as an amendment and the House again rejected the appropriation. The statement has been made here that the law is mandatory. There is some question as to whether any mandatory statute can be enacted which will require the Congress to make such an appropriation. There is some question as to whether the Congress is under a mandatory requirement to make an appropriation for any particular purpose except as the Constitution of the United States may require. This census of agriculture will be made at a time, if the bill becomes law, when we are discussing seriously, and when this House has voted, I might say over my protest, to conscript men between the ages of 18 and 45 for war work. If we can judge by the past, the reports made as the result of this survey will not be available or usable until 2 or 3, or even 4 or 5 years from now. There is always a great delay between the taking of this census and the publication of the figures therefrom, which if they might be of any particular benefit certainly would not be of great worth after the war is over, because conditions surrounding agricultural production will change entirely the moment victory comes in Europe or in the Pacific. Therefore I will not support this rule because the House has twice passed upon this question. However, if the rule is adopted I want to urge every Member of this body to listen carefully to the debate as the members of the Committee on Appropriations, who are fully familiar with all of the details of this legislation, develop it. I urge every Member to follow the discussion closely and then vote his own judgment and his own conscience, because I believe that this appropriation cannot be justified at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICH. While we are at war, should we send men out to take a census when the farmers need those men on the farm to raise crops? What are they going to say about such a procedure as this?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think this is entirely unnecessary, and will interfere with the production of food and with the efforts of the men on the farm who are already overworked.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I was going to ask the same question, as to whether this would not involve the use of considerable manpower at a time when we are told there is a great shortage of manpower?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I know the department has come into agricultural counties, as in my own section of southern Ohio, as the gentleman is aware, and set up large staffs which could be better occupied if they would go to work on the farms instead of farming the farmers. I hope the House will give this matter its very careful attention and in the end substantiate the action which the House has taken twice before, by rejecting this legislation.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I intended to make these short remarks under the 1-minute rule; but inasmuch as there are more than 300 words and the question has been raised, I ask at this time to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to call to the attention of the House a very significant thing that is now in progress and is worthy of our attention and commendation. Last week my office was called on the telephone, and I was invited to attend a dinner downtown by the A. A. A. in the interest of the rehabilitation of soldiers. Of course, the A. A. A. to me meant the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. However, when I arrived at the hotel I was astonished to learn that this A. A. A. was the American Automobile Association.

As you well know, the American Automobile Association has for years, in cooperation with the National Safety Council, been giving of its time and money primarily in sponsoring safety projects and safety driving on the highways of America. The very significant and commendable thing is the fact that this businessmen's organization is spearheading a program in cooperation with the Army and Navy in the rehabilitation of our maimed and wounded men to make it possible for them to become automobile drivers and safe drivers on our highways.

This association proposed to the Surgeon General that men convalescing in the various veterans' hospitals be sent to Washington to be trained in the art of driving automobiles and then return to their various stations to teach others. The automobile association would furnish the necessary instructors, the course of study, and the equipment, and the Army was to furnish housing facilities at Walter Reed Hospital during the instruction course.

The course has now been completed for the first group. The dinner to which I referred was the graduating exercises at which certificates of graduation were issued to bear witness that the holder of said certificate was a competent and safe driver and recommended for a driver's license. Up to this point there is not anything so very unusual until we take a look at the men. There were some 25 men in this graduating class. Some had lost 1 leg, some both legs were gone. One has an arm missing and others with serious disabilities. These were the men who were to be sent back to their various stations to teach other men, such as they, to become safe automobile drivers.

I especially want to call to your attention four of these men, none of whom are from my district or State, but are returning to a large hospital located in my district to become instructors. We have Lieutenant Romiti, from Oregon, who had the misfortune of losing a leg. Sergeant Saunders, from California, who lost his arm and also had a badly mangled leg. Sergeant Molyneux, from Idaho, and Joe Miller, a civilian from Montana. I must tell you something about Joe. He had the misfortune of losing both legs early in his youth. After Pearl Harbor he wrote the President of the United States and told him he wanted to go to war. Yes, he could have been classified in IV–F. By the direction of the President he was assigned to duty as an instructor in mechanics at which he is an expert, and he is now an automobile driver instructor.

When I mingled with these men, listened to their conversation and gay spirits I was unaware of their condition until told. The last thing on earth these men want is sympathy, the last thing they want is an automobile built for their special benefit. All they want and need is a good old standard-shift stock automobile with some gas in it and they are ready to drive in all kinds of traffic and on all the highways.

This demonstration was a real inspiration to me to see what the medical profession has accomplished in this war not only in the field of medicine but in surgery and plastic surgery. It even outstrips our great production program about which we boast, and when I see what has been done I stand in awe and reverence to this branch of the armed services. When one contemplates the

great sacrifice that these young men have already made and the long, determined hours they have spent to be rehabilitated and in rehabilitating themselves, it makes one want to hide his face in shame at the trifling things about which we sometimes complain. These men have given part of their bodies in their fight for freedom, but in spite of this they have retained their indomitable will to be normal, useful citizens. Not only that, they are willing to lend their efforts and radiate this magnificent spirit to others like themselves, that they, too, will persevere and become useful citizens. They have emerged from a world wrought with sorrow, blood, and tears to bring to light once more the dignity and greatness of men and the glory of God—yes; moving us one step closer to the realization of the answer to a question that was asked long, long ago, and has been ringing in our ears down through the centuries, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is a scheme designed to sabotage the work-or-fight bill passed last week; in other words, it is being brought in here for a declaration by the House of Representatives that we can put people to work at something that is not necessary and desirable at this time and at the same time say to the country that we are going to lock them up if they do not work. I said it was not necessary; I will go into that in a minute.

There is no requirement of law that this be done. There is authority for it, but that authority becomes a requirement only when the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives and the Senate pass a bill providing funds so that the job can be done. We all ought to understand that and know what the picture is. Not an item of information will be gathered that is not already in the possession of our county agents and our A. A. A. committeemen. In other words, this is another demonstration of the desire to duplicate and create confounding activities in the Government.

Last January 14—and I have it in front of me—there was a release by the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, giving a résumé of practically the information that is proposed to be gathered here. It is perfectly ridiculous for us at this time to do such a thing as to provide a total of almost $15,000,000 for this operation. Six hundred and fifty thousand dollars was provided in the first appropriation. That was followed by $7,250,000 and now they want a little better than $6,800,000—a total of nearly $15,000,000. On the basis of last report only $254,000 had been spent. They have been having all sorts of difficulty in getting help.

At the time we held our hearings letters were presented by a lot of people who wanted more money for this operation. In one of these letters the statement, among others, was made that they could make a lot more money picking cotton without spending money for gasoline or using their precious tires. Why should we be spending our precious tires and our gasoline that is rationed for cutting such capers and sabotaging the work-or-fight bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Whoever wrote that letter evidently never saw a cotton stalk. You do not pick cotton in February, March, or April.

Mr. TABER. It was the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] who cited this letter in the hearings and it appears on page 18 thereof. I read this right from the hearings and it is a statement from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]. If the gentleman means to direct his indictment at the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], why, that would be a quarrel he would have with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] and not with me. I cannot make any such statement about the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Since the gentleman has mentioned my name, why does he not read into the RECORD what was said?

Mr. TABER. Yes. I will read the exact quotation:

> Many tell me that they can make a lot more picking cotton and without spending money for gasoline or using the precious tires.

That is the exact quotation, and I have read it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is part of it.

Mr. TABER. It is the quotation to which I was referring. If the gentleman wants to read any more of it he will be able to get plenty of time to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that this is a direct competitive proposition from a labor standpoint with the war effort and is direct competition with the labor that is required for war activities, because it is proposed to carry on with that labor.

Mr. Speaker, I have been over this situation with a great many people. I have heard from my farmers and farm organizations. They have called me on the telephone because they were disturbed that such a thing as this could be indulged in at this time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] makes the point of order a quorum is not present. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No 11]

Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	Luce
Baldwin, N. Y.	Geelan	Lyle
Barden	Gibson	McGlinchey
Barrett, Pa.	Gifford	Madden
Bates, Ky.	Granahan	May
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ind.	Miller, Calif.
Biemiller	Green	Morgan
Bradley, Mich.	Gregory	Morrison
Bradley, Pa.	Hand	Mott
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Mich.
Butler	Harness, Ind.	Outland
Byrne, N. Y.	Hart	Patterson
Canfield	Hartley	Pfeifer
Carlson	Havenner	Phillips
Chelf	Healy	Plumley
Clements	Hébert	Powers
Cole, Kans.	Heidinger	Rees, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Sasscer
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	Satterfield
De Lacy	Hope	Scrivner
Delaney, John J.	Izac	Shafer
Dickstein	Jenkins	Sheridan
Dingell	Jensen	Somers, N. Y.
Douglas, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.	Stockman
Doyle	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	Kearney	Torrens
Elliott	Kee	Towe
Elsaesser	Kefauver	Vursell
Engle, Calif.	Kilday	Welch
Fernandez	King	White
Gardner	Kirwan	Winter
Gavin	LaFollette	Wolcott
	Lea	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and twenty-nine Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. BONNER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] may proceed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when the roll call interrupted, this is a direct attempt to sabotage the labor market and to sabotage the work-or-fight bill we passed last week. It is absolutely unnecessary. The information that is desirable is already available. It is not mandatory unless the Congress decides to make the appropriation for it. The estimate presently before the Congress involves practically $15,000,000. It is an increase of almost 75 percent over the cost of the last previous farm census. It will be of almost no value because of the very erratic conditions upon farms, very unusual conditions, conditions where certain types of livestock have been built up to a tremendous figure and other types cut down; conditions where the production of farms has shifted in such way that it is absolutely impossible to base any operation or calculation upon the results of this census.

What we should do here is to stop this operation and stop it now. On the basis of last accounts only about $254,000 have actually been paid out. I presume more has been paid out since the first of January. On the other hand, there has not been anything like the $7,900,000 that has heretofore been appropriated spent and we could stop this thing before any more of that money is wasted and before we provide another practically $7,000,000 to waste.

This census proposition has been upon an entirely false basis. We have built

up duplicating activities in the agricultural committeemen and in the county agricultural agents where they have practically all the information current in my country, and if the Census Department and the Department of Agriculture would coordinate the information that is already available there would be absolutely no necessity whatever for such a thing as this census.

I called attention a little while ago to a release from the Department of Agriculture and the Census Bureau which indicate that they have practically everything they are asking for now available at the present time. This release was issued right in the middle of preparation for hearings upon this bill.

I am hoping that after the House has debated this bill it will refuse to waste $6,800,000 for this purpose and will refuse to join in an effort to sabotage the work-or-fight bill. It is about time that we begin to wake up and realize that we are in the war instead of fooling around and wasting money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In my district, the Eighth Michigan, the farmers are in virtual revolt over losing their sons to the military forces, thereby cutting the production of foodstuffs. I cannot imagine anything that would more incite them at the present time than to start having solicitors going through the communities with all this talk about shortage of manpower, with the loss of their boys to the military forces, the cutting of the production of food, and call of Mr. Jones, War Food Administrator, for additional food, and these solicitors getting up information that is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. TABER. And absolutely preventing people from being employed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKENZIE].

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, in taking a census we are taking stock of our national assets. The gentleman who just preceded me seemed to think that is not necessary. I wonder if the gentleman deems it unnecessary for his bank to make a periodical audit and report to its stockholders and its depositors in order that they may know how it is being run. I wonder if that same gentleman would say that the big business institutions of this country should operate without taking stock of themselves and finding out where they are. The same thing may be said of merchants and certainly it is true of the farmers. The farmers should take stock and we should take stock of our national farm situation in order that we may know what stock piles we have, where our shortages exist, if they do exist, and where we have a surplus.

Mr. Speaker, this same gentleman and others on his side are the very ones who have criticized the fact that there was a shortage in our stock piles of rubber and tin and many other critical materials needed for this war. They are the ones who said that if we had had the information we would not have been caught in this particular short position. It is good business, Mr. Speaker. Any sensible man recognizes the necessity of taking stock at regular intervals. How else is he going to know where he stands and what he needs?

I have heard many of my learned colleagues get up and say that we had an oversupply of this and an oversupply of that. They said that we had a certain number of cattle on the range. They said that we had a certain amount of dairy products. I want to know where they got their information. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if that information is correct. They quoted figures as facts. Where did they get them? I want to know just exactly how many farms we have in my own district. I would like to know how many thousands of acres have gone out of production and the various reasons why they have gone out of production. It may have been due to shortage of manpower. It may have been due to shortage of equipment. It may have been due to any one of a thousand different things.

I want to know why there is a shortage of bacon. I want to know why there is a shortage of butter. Have any of you been able to buy those things for your table recently? I want to know what has become of the beef. I want to know, if it is on the farm, why it has not reached the processor. I want to know why it is not on the shelves of the merchants. Is it a black-market proposition? I think it is time that we should find out exactly where we are and what we have. Common sense, Mr. Speaker, dictates that we should have this census, and that it should be made available to the people of this Nation just as soon as possible. Common sense, Mr. Speaker, demands that we find out what we have. How are we going to meet our commitments, if these commitments are now being made by the Big Three to feed the world, if we do not know what we have to feed the world on? How are we going to make our plans for the post-war period? How are we going to know how many men we can reemploy on the farms if we do not know what the farms need?

Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous for anybody to get up here and talk about the spending of a mere $15,000,000 for the purpose of getting this vital information when we are spending billions of dollars blindly and not looking back.

I urge the Members to give very serious consideration to the necessity of this information. If the bank needs its audit, if the railroads and big industries need their financial reports, if the storekeeper needs to take stock of his merchandise, if the Army needs to inventory its equipment, stock piles, and manpower, then the Nation needs this agricultural census to determine its food resources and potentialities.

I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this resolution which the rule would make in order for the House to consider has some background which I would like to discuss first.

In 1929, when the basic law was established that authorized the taking of this census I will say it was a good law. The farmers of the country ought to have a census of all of their products so that they know where they stand. But since the law was passed in 1929 a new administration came upon the scene and it established the A. A. A.; since the war it established the War Food Administration; to find out about the manpower on the farms they created State and county boards in each and every State and county, respectively, for the 48 States and the three-thousand-odd counties of the United States. What is the work of the A. A. A.? The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, in the first place, was supposed to be an agency that would cut down production. A. A. A. committeemen were the local agents of the ever-normal granary. The war emptied the granary and took away their jobs. Farm surpluses were eliminated. The Army, Lend-Lease and other war commitments of the Government left A. A. A. committeemen without a reason for existence. However, bureaucracy rose to the occasion with a new enterprise for the local patronage. Someone conceived the idea that these A. A. A. committeemen could be the local messengers and agents of the Agriculture Department to increase production on the farms for war purposes.

How can the A. A. A. committeemen increase the production on the farms unless they know every year just how much livestock, how much food and fiber is to be raised on the farms? That precisely has been the job of the A. A. A. committeemen since the war began.

How many A. A. A. committeemen are there? In my county, in a typical midwestern district, there are 77 A. A. A. committeemen in each county. There are three county committeemen and three alternates on the pay roll annually, by the year in each county. There are three township commiteemen and three alternates in each township of my district. What is their job? Their job is to make a survey on forms furnished by the Department of Agriculture to give to the War Food Administration, to the O. P. A., and to the Department of Agriculture the very things this census proposes to do. The basic law for this appropriation contemplated the necessity of a census every 10 years. Why in the name of conscience should we have an agricultural census this year prepared by the Census Bureau in view of the conditions I have described, unless this Congress means to tell the people, on the eve of passing a work-or-fight bill carrying the penalty of a prison sentence or a fine, that it envisions the day when there will be three men asking questions to one man farming?

The consideration of this question today is above politics. It is a question of conserving the manpower of which the Army and the Navy says we are deficient.

What was the condition in the calendar year of 1944, when the regular Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, appropriation bill came before the House? The subcommittee on Department of Commerce appropriations recognized the shortage of manpower then, and we cut this agriculture census provision out of that supply bill. Why? I repeat, because the A. A. A. committeemen, the War Food Administration, and the O. P. A. have the information by the quarter every year.

Did you notice, when Chester Davis resigned in the middle of the year 1944 from the War Food Administration, what he told the President? "I think I will resign now," he said in effect, "because the food and fiber program for 1945 should be put into effect promptly." The war-food program for 1945 was envisioned and consummated and was on the books for the war effort long before the beginning of 1945, and you who are interested in and know about the mechanics of the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration know that to be true. The letter of Chester Davis confirms it.

The subcommittee on Commerce Department appropriations eliminated that item from the bill. The Senate put it in to the tune of $7,500,000. When it came back in a conference report I attempted to cut out the duplication. The cost of the A. A. A. committeemen to collect this information quarterly is about $26,000,000 a year, so I said, "If we are going to have a census of agriculture in 1945, when we have all of these other duplicating war agencies, then let us write an amendment, a prohibition, on this bill, and let the Department of Commerce take the census and prohibit all other agencies from spending any money for the same purpose.

What happened to it? The gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that the amendment went beyond the authority of the subcommittee considering appropriations for the Department of Commerce. Today we are past that stage of eliminating the A. A. A., the W. F. A., and other war agencies from spending money on a farm census.

The A. A. A. committeemen are spending $26,000,000 annually to collect that information. The next best thing we can do now to conserve and save manpower is to cut out this appropriation for this farm census here and now, because the A. A. A. committeemen do it every year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the burden of the argument of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, as well as others who have spoken in opposition to this legislation, is that it is not needed because it is charged that the A. A. A. can do that job. If that were actually true, despite the fact that Congress has heretofore appropriated over seven and a quarter million dollars to take this census as required by law, much of which has been obligated, then their point might be well taken, even though such alleged argument comes pitifully late. That might have been valid argument in 1943, when Congress appropriated $650,000 to start this agricultural census. But now, the charge that the A. A. A. can do the job, I say, comes mighty late. But is it true? What are the facts? The record discloses that the Department of Agriculture says it needs it. That is also what the Secretary of Agriculture says. That is what Hon. Marvin Jones, the Food Administrator, tells us. Is it reasonable that both would insist that this census be taken if they had that information or had the facilities for securing this particular information? Does that sound plausible? If Judge Marvin Jones had that information, those of you who have served with him in the House of Representatives and know that he is an able, conscientious, and fearless public servant, must know that he would not under any circumstances urge the passage of the pending bill. Again, the opposition in their desperation have repeatedly stated the law requires that the census be taken only every 10 years. To which law do they refer? Surely they know that there are at least two laws on the statute books governing the taking of the census. One is section 201, and the other is section 216 of the code, enacted the same year of 1929, which incidentally was under a Republican administration, a year that some of our Republican brethren would like to forget. One of those census laws handed us in 1929 called for a complete census of business, agriculture, and commerce, beginning in 1930. The other law, both of which were mandatory, provided for an agricultural census alone, the same to begin in 1935.

So, just to keep the record straight, let us not say the law, when, in fact, there are two laws on the statute books with reference to the taking of the census. They are plain and mandatory.

Now, if we have cleared that up and rubbed the cobwebs out of our thinking about the law, I want to answer, if I may, some of the rather unusual statements of our esteemed friend from New York, who is violently opposing the pending bill. Let me say that I was surprised and shocked at the opening statement of the gentleman from New York to the effect that the real purpose of this legislation is to sabotage the work-or-fight bill. Frankly, I am amazed and somewhat chagrined that the gentleman from New York would make such an absurd and groundless statement. Heretofore I have heard the gentleman make many wild and radical statements during our services together in the House. We all realize that he often makes strong statements in an effort to carry his point, but to question the patriotism of those backing this bill will not enlarge his stature or enhance his standing on either side of this aisle. I know the gentleman does not mean to leave that unfortunate statement in the RECORD. I know the gentleman does not in his heart mean to tell this House that the real purpose of those who have sponsored this legislation is to sabotage the work-or-fight program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is the result.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield at this time unless the gentleman desires to back up on his unfortunate statement or explain what he really means.

Mr. TABER. That is the result.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then the gentleman desires to stand by that statement?

Mr. TABER. Why, certainly. It is the result and it is the fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not care to yield further to the gentleman, who, when he cools off, will no doubt correct that statement. The gentleman surely is too fine and big to stand on a statement impugning the motives and questioning the patriotism of those who happen to disagree with him. Of course, I might add that it comes with poor grace for the gentleman to be appealing here to men on his side of this Chamber to stand by the work-or-fight bill. Maybe the gentleman has forgotten that practically all the opposition to that measure came from gentlemen on the Republican side of this Chamber.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; I do not yield, unless the gentleman has repented and desires to apologize for his rash statement a few moments ago.

Mr. TABER. I voted for that bill and I spoke on it. The gentleman can find out just where I stood on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will take the gentleman's word for it without looking up the record. I do not question his motives in opposing this bill, although I have a sneaking suspicion that petty partisan politics is the main propelling factor.

Mr. Speaker, again I was surprised and disappointed that the same gentleman read one sentence into the RECORD from a letter I placed in the RECORD, written by a census supervisor in Oklahoma. It is obvious from the one or two sentences read that he would leave the impression that I am opposed to this legislation or that the author of the letter in question was opposed to finishing the job they have begun. The opposite, of course, is true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The letter made the point clear that he could not secure capable enumerators at the low cost of 51 cents per family being paid by the Census Bureau in Oklahoma; that additional funds must be forthcoming if the job is to be completed. That letter was strong and convincing evidence favoring the passage of this bill to finish the job. Frankly, I am surprised that the gentleman should pick out one or two isolated sentences.

Now, I do not care to answer the argument that this bill will sabotage the war effort or it will have that result, further than to say that the gentleman making

that charge knows that all enumerators and others in connection with this program must be cleared through the United States Employment Service. Most of the enumerators thus far appointed are farm women. May I add that when the Congress appropriated $650,000 to start this work back in 1943, there was no serious opposition from the gentleman from New York. His opposition was very mild last fall when over $7,000,000 was appropriated for the same purpose.

Many of the gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber were willing to carry out the mandate of the law early last fall after the provision was written into the law that enumerators could not be appointed until after the election. That provision seemed fair enough and was not objected to by Democratic Members of Congress. We know, of course, of the great disappointment of the gentleman from New York and many of his colleagues. Let us be honest about this whole matter. Is there anyone here who thinks that a single Member on the Republican side of this aisle would have raised his voice against it had their side won? It is not our fault that they guessed wrong. But, honest injun, is it good sportsmanship to come here at this late hour and rant and rave and question the motives of those of us who are still supporting this legislation and want to see the job finished? That is all there is to it now. This Government has a moral obligation that it cannot repudiate or ignore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time, and I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there was a fight made against the original appropriation of $650,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mighty weak.

Mr. TABER. Mighty weak, but enough to carry the opposition through to success in the House. It was only put in after it went to the Senate, and then the conference was opposed. Then there was an item in the Census bill for this matter and it went out in the House. The conference, after it was put back in the Senate, was opposed. There was nothing in the nature of politics raised except by the proponents of the bill. We do not have to resort to politics on this. The facts of the situation are that there is no justification for the expenditure and that is the reason why I am opposed to it, as I have been to countless other useless and vicious measures that were brought in here.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think if the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] had kept a little closer in touch with this crop report in 1943 he would not have allowed the State of Virginia to get over a million dollars worth of free hay, when his State really had a drought and did not get any of the free hay.

Mr. TABER. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What will it cost to take this census?

Mr. TABER. The total cost will be practically $15,000,000 as against $9,000,000 the last time it was taken, because it is handled in such a way and at such a time, in competition with the war effort.

Mr. RICH. Do you think anyone on the Democratic side can tell us where we will get the $15,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I would not ask them that question. They print it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I have a question that does not particularly have to do with this controversy. If this agricultural census is taken and all of this information becomes available to the Department of the Census, will it be possible for the Congress, its individual members or the Committees of Congress, to get the information that may be wanted from time to time, from the Department of the Census, or is it necessary that the information be cleared through the various departments or bureaus of the Government who themselves seek to transmit information from the Census Department to us?

Mr. TABER. I could not answer that question, but I imagine that is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I notice on the form there is a heading which reads that this information will be confidential during the war.

Mr. TABER. Confidential only as to individuals; not as to gross results.

Mr. HALLECK. My inquiry is this: I cannot see any reason why the Congress or its committees should not have access to the information the Department of the Census could give us from this census or any other census rather than the Congress being required, as I understand the Congress is required, to go through other departments of the Government to the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. TABER. That should be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat amusing to hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] advance the rather novel theory that had he been permitted to attach a limitation to the appropriation for the farm census carried in the Department of Commerce appropriation bill which was out of order because it would have applied only to the agriculture appropriation bill, this issue would not have arisen; in other words, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], in violation of the rules of the House had been permitted to handicap the statistics gathering activities of the Department of Agriculture by attaching to a bill totally foreign to the Department of Agriculture which carried no funds therefor a restriction which was not permissible under the rules of the House, applying only to the Department of Agriculture funds, this issue according to him, would not have arisen.

Now, let me talk to you Democrats, because we are going to get few if any Republican votes, let me talk to you Democrats about what the issue here is. These gentlemen on the Republican side who artfully say they want you to examine the issues here in the light of the facts and arrive at a judgment dictated by conscience, are camouflaging. On the Appropriations Committee not a single one of them supported this appropriation, and in my judgment there will not be a single one of them who will vote for this bill on passage. They are simply trying to mislead a few of the Democrats in the hope that if your votes were added to theirs they would be sufficient to defeat the passage of the measure.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time.

They say it is not necessary to secure this information; yet last year they were perfectly willing to have the farm census and to appropriate in excess of $7,000,000—almost $8,000,000—for the purpose of beginning the job provided there might be attached to the appropriation the condition that the enumerators should not be appointed until after the 1st of January when they confidently anticipated they would be appointed under Republican administration and not under Democratic administration. After it was ascertained by the election held on November 7 that their hopes in that connection were not justified, their opposition to further appropriations became intense, and on account of the absence of a few of our Democratic Members from Washington they were able to defeat the making of the necessary deficiency appropriation during the latter part of the last Congress and to that extent to handicap the work so that it now hangs suspended in midair with about half of it done and the rest of it contracted for, and with the determination here on their part to stop it. If that is done all that has been spent will in reality be a total waste and accomplish nothing of benefit to the farmers. That is purely a question of political patronage. That is one reason for the opposition, but there is another: Mr. Speaker, this farm census will demonstrate the fact that the farm program of this administration has resulted in placing American agriculture in the best status it has occupied in 40 years.

The statistics which will be collected when this program is carried through will demonstrate that not all of the wailings with regard to the condition of agriculture in the country are justified but that the farm program as at present and for several years carried on has been of greater benefit to the American farmer than anything else which has been undertaken in his behalf, as I have said, in the last 40 years. Under these circumstances, I do not see why any man on

this—the Democratic—side of the aisle should lend his support to the unanimous efforts of the ladies and gentlemen on the other side to hamstring this thing which has already been undertaken.

They say it should not have been undertaken. Perhaps that is true. I think it should have been undertaken. The War Food Administration needs this statistical information to be developed by this census. At least it say it does. The fact it has some estimates as to the agricultural resources of the country is not indicative of its having sufficient information on that subject. We saw in the papers a day or so ago an estimate by the Bureau of the Census as to the population of the United States, an estimate of 138,000,000-plus. That does not mean that the Bureau of the Census has taken a new population census. It means that from the best sources of information available it now makes that estimate of the population of the United States. Will anybody say that on that account there should not be a population census taken in 1950 to determine adequately and definitely just what the population of the country is, or shall be continue to rely upon the general estimates of the Bureau of the Census?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the distinguished advocate of economy from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In reference to the census the gentleman is talking about, if 1950 were today during a war period, the gentleman would not want to go out and take a census now when it is necessary for the manpower of this Nation to do the things that are going to be essential in order to win the war. The gentleman should not.

Mr. TARVER. At least I would not go halfway through the census, provide for taking a census as did the Seventy-eighth Congress, make more than half the money available, and then after getting it halfway through, if disappointed by the result of a national election, which I had hoped would give my party patronage control, undertake to stop it on that account. That is exactly what is happening here today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 198, nays 160, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—198

Abernethy	Bailey	Bonner
Allen, Ill.	Baldwin, Md.	Boykin
Allen, La.	Barry	Brooks
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bates, Ky.	Brown, Ga.
	Beckworth	Bryson
Andrews, Ala.	Bell	Bulwinkle
Angell	Bland	Bunker
Arnold	Bloom	Burch
Burgin	Jackson	Rabaut
Byrne, N. Y.	Jarman	Rabin
Camp	Johnson, Luther A.	Rains
Cannon, Fla.		Ramspeck
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Okla.	Randolph
Carnahan	Kefauver	Rankin
Chapman	Kelley, Pa.	Rayfiel
Clark	Keogh	Resa
Clements	Kerr	Richards
Coffee	King	Riley
Colmer	Kirwan	Robertson, Va.
Cooley	Knutson	Robinson, Utah
Cooper	Kopplemann	Roe, Md.
Courtney	Lane	Roe, N. Y.
Cox	Lanham	Rogers, Fla.
Cravens	Larcade	Rogers, N. Y.
D'Alesandro	Lea	Rooney
Daughton, Va.	Lesinski	Rowan
Davis	Link	Russell
Dawson	Ludlow	Ryter
Delaney, James J.	McCormack	Sabath
	McGehee	Sadowski
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Savage
Doughton, N. C.	McMillan, S. C.	Sheppard
Douglas, Calif.	Mahon	Sikes
Douglas, Ill.	Maloney	Simpson, Ill.
Doyle	Manasco	Slaughter
Drewry	Mansfield, Mont.	Smith, Va.
Durham		Snyder
Earthman	Mansfield, Tex.	Sparkman
Eberharter	Marcantonio	Spence
Engle, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Starkey
Ervin	Mills	Stewart
Fallon	Monroney	Stigler
Feighan	Morgan	Sullivan
Fisher	Mundt	Sumners, Tex.
Flannagan	Murdock	Tarver
Flood	Murphy	Thom
Folger	Murray, Tenn.	Thomas, Tex.
Forand	Neely	Thomason
Gallagher	Norrell	Tolan
Gathings	Norton	Traynor
Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.	Trimble
Gorski	O'Brien, Mich.	Vinson
Gossett	O'Toole	Voorhis, Calif.
Granger	Outland	Wasielewski
Grant, Ala.	Pace	Weaver
Hare	Patman	Weiss
Harless, Ariz.	Patrick	West
Harris	Patterson	Whitten
Hays	Peterson, Fla.	Whittington
Healy	Peterson, Ga.	Wickersham
Hedrick	Philbin	Winstead
Heffernan	Pickett	Wood
Hendricks	Poage	Woodhouse
Hobbs	Powell	Woodrum, Va.
Hoch	Price, Fla.	Worley
Holifield	Price, Ill.	Zimmerman
Hook	Priest	
Huber	Quinn, N. Y.	

NAYS—160

Adams	Elsaesser	Johnson, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl	Elston	Johnson, Ind.
	Engel, Mich.	Jones
Andrews, N. Y.	Fellows	Jonkman
Arends	Fenton	Judd
Auchincloss	Fuller	Kean
Barrett, Wyo.	Fulton	Keefe
Beall	Gamble	Kelly, Ill.
Bender	Gearhart	Kilburn
Bennet, N. Y.	Gerlach	Kinzer
Bennett, Mo.	Gifford	Kunkel
Bishop	Gillespie	Landis
Blackney	Gillette	LeCompte
Bolton	Gillie	LeFevre
Brehm	Goodwin	Lemke
Brown, Ohio	Graham	Lewis
Brumbaugh	Griffiths	McConnell
Buck	Gross	McCowen
Buffett	Gwinn, N. Y.	McDonough
Butler	Gwynne, Iowa	McGregor
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagen	McMillen, Ill.
Campbell	Hale	Martin, Iowa
Carlson	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Martin, Mass.
Case, N. J.		Mason
Case, S. Dak.	Hall, Leonard W.	Merrow
Chenoweth		Michener
Chiperfield	Halleck	Miller, Nebr.
Church	Hancock	Murray, Wis.
Clason	Henry	O'Hara
Clevenger	Herter	O'Konski
Cochran	Heselton	O'Neal
Cole, Kans.	Hill	Phillips
Cole, Mo.	Hinshaw	Pittenger
Corbett	Hoeven	Ploeser
Crawford	Hoffman	Plumley
Cunningham	Holmes, Wash.	Ramey
Curtis	Hope	Reece, Tenn.
Dirksen	Horan	Reed, Ill.
Dolliver	Howell	Reed, N. Y.
Dondero	Hull	Rich
Dworshak	Jennings	Rizley
Ellis	Jensen	Robertson, N. Dak.
Ellsworth	Johnson, Calif.	
Robsion, Ky.	Smith, Ohio	Vorys, Ohio
Rockwell	Smith, Wis.	Vursell
Rodgers, Pa.	Springer	Wadsworth
Rogers, Mass.	Stefan	Walter
Schwabe, Mo.	Stevenson	Weichel
Schwabe, Okla.	Sumner, Ill.	Welch
Scrivner	Sundstrom	Wigglesworth
Shafer	Taber	Wolcott
Sharp	Talbot	Wolfenden, Pa.
Short	Talle	Wolverton, N. J.
Simpson, Pa.	Taylor	Woodruff, Mich.
Smith, Maine	Tibbott	

NOT VOTING—72

Anderson, Calif.	Elliott	Kilday
Andresen, August H.	Fernandez	LaFollette
	Gardner	Luce
Baldwin N. Y.	Gavin	Lyle
Barden	Geelan	Lynch
Barrett, Pa.	Gibson	McGlinchey
Bates, Mass.	Granahan	Madden
Biemiller	Grant, Ind.	May
Boren	Green	Morrison
Bradley, Mich.	Gregory	Mott
Bradley, Pa.	Hand	Pfeifer
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Powers
Canfield	Hart	Rees, Kans.
Celler	Hartley	Rivers
Chelf	Havenner	Sasscer
Cole, N. Y.	Hébert	Satterfield
Combs	Heidinger	Sheridan
Crosser	Hess	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	Stockman
De Lacy	Izac	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney, John J.	Jenkins	Torrens
	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Towe
Dickstein		White
Dingell	Kearney	Wilson
Eaton	Kee	Winter

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mr. Fernandez for, with Mr. Hess against.
Mr. Chelf for, with Mr. Hartley against.

General pairs:

Mr. Gardner with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Hand.
Mr. De Lacy with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. John J. Delaney with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. May with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX changed his vote from nay to yea.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 85,

making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture, with Mr. MURPHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be notified when I have consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, let us talk sense about this resolution providing for an agricultural census.

Substantially all the facts this census seeks to obtain are already available from the different governmental departments which have had to obtain and assemble such information as a basis for their work toward winning the war. So why spend the taxpayers' money wastefully to make work for a group who might much better be employed on the farms where they are urgently needed rather than working at obtaining information already obtained heretofore and made available.

The information which the departments have obtained is available and accessible now and is being used. The information which this proposed census would undertake to accumulate would not be of any value until it had been screened and codified which would take at least 6 months. That is the answer to the question as to when it would be available for use in connection with the war effort.

These are the facts. To my mind they are the answer to the question of the necessity for the immediate making of this census.

I am not opposed to the making of an agricultural census as such, but I am opposed to its having to be made now when its present uselessness is so apparent.

If we were not at war that would be a different matter. If the questions asked were within the law, which they are not, that would be another. But the fact remains that the fundamental and necessary information sought to be obtained by this census is now readily accessible and available, and is being used.

Moreover, as I have said, any information sought to be obtained under the present plan would not be available for some 6 months. It would be useless so far as its value to the present war effort is concerned. In short, the agricultural census would be a delayed duplication.

This census so to be taken involves an expenditure of an awful lot of money which must necessarily come out of the pocket of the taxpayers. It is one of those things which could be properly postponed. I am in favor of such postponement. I am against the resolution.

Such a census as is contemplated would be only a duplication of effort to no good purpose and to serve no worthwhile end presently. No farmer needs it as much as he does the dollar which would have to come out of his pocket to pay for a job for somebody who might better be working on his farm than serving as a census enumerator.

The time to stop wasteful, useless expenditures of the taxpayers' money is now. I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the pending resolution provides money to complete the agricultural census of 1945.

The issue presented by the resolution is clear and unmistakable. It resolves itself into two very simple questions: first, shall we obey the mandate of the law? Second, shall we finish the job?

Some question was raised in the debate on the rule as to whether the statute is mandatory. In response to that may I quote from section 16 of 13 United States Code, 216:

> There shall be made in the year 1935, and once every 10 years thereafter, a census of agriculture and livestock.

Not "there may be," but "there shall be."

And again:

> The schedule embodied in this census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census. Such census shall be taken as of the first day of January.

In each instance the language of the statute is not permissive; it is not optional, it is not a mere authorization; it is a mandate, a specific directive. That is the law of the land and that law has been in force since 1925. The first question before us today is, whether we shall comply with the law.

The second question is whether we will finish the job.

In compliance with this law, Congress has made two appropriations for the purpose of starting the work—one of $650,000, carried in the First Supplemental National Defense Act, approved December 23, 1943, and the second of $7,250,000, carried in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, approved June 23, 1944.

With this money the work on the agricultural census has been started, with the understanding that additional money would be provided when needed. Offices have been rented, equipment has been installed, schools of instruction have been held and supervisors are now recruiting enumerators to visit every farm in America in the next 2 months. Approximately $4,000,000 of the original appropriations has been spent and the $6,784,000 carried in this bill is the amount required to complete the job. Unless this money is provided all that has been invested up to this time is a total loss. It is as if we had appropriated money to build a house and now refuse money to put a roof on the house.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that provision in the organic law passed in 1925, to which the gentleman referred, was passed by a Republican-controlled Congress.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; it was passed by a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and signed by a Republican President, so that there can be no partisanship involved in this proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that Secretary Jardine, a Republican Secretary of Agriculture, specifically and enthusiastically approved and supported the law in question that Republican Members of this House are so frantically attempting to defeat?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Every Secretary of Agriculture since the enactment of the law, regardless of party, has approved and endorsed the law, and insisted upon its comprehensive administration.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Amplifying further, has it occurred to the gentleman that the conditions today are entirely different from those existing at that time when there was no manpower shortage? It was just the reverse of what it is today. We did not have these A. A. A. agencies and we did not have other agencies taking the census and preparing the data, and we were not in a war when every individual's energy is needed in an all-out war effort.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, the advisability or the expediency of taking the census is not really germane to this question. That has been previously and authoritatively determined too often to require its discussion here. But in response to the suggestions of the gentleman from Michigan, may I say that never before in the history of the country has it been so important that we take a farm census as at this time. Agricultural conditions have been completely dislocated and disorganized by the war. Farm conditions are so different and have changed so materially under the impact of the war that it is particularly necessary that we take this census in order to have information which we can effectively secure in no other way. It is especially important at this time in order to plan for the postwar period. Everybody agrees, and every business organization in the country insists, that we begin planning for post-war economy. It is impossible to make plans either for agriculture or industry without an accurate knowledge of the agricultural situation. This bill provides for the acquisition of that knowledge.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the observation about the war made by the gentleman from Michigan, I do not know of any activity that plays a

more important part in the war than agriculture.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. General Marshall corroborates what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said. He tells us that food is as essential as gun powder in winning the war.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am sure that the gentleman is aware of the fact that recently this House renewed the Post-War Policy and Planning Committee.

One of the subcommittees of that committee set up by this House is charged with the responsibility of trying to work out a post-war program for agriculture. May I ask the gentleman from Missouri, who is a farmer himself, and who has given the problems of agriculture great study, if any committee can wisely undertake and effectively carry out that job unless we have some facts in connection with the disturbed agricultural situation we are now facing in the midst of this war?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No plan for either the immediate or the long-distance future can be made without an accurate knowledge of our agricultural assets and activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I shall take 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think what the gentleman says is absolutely true. That is the reason I voted for the rule and why I am going to vote for the appropriation. But what I cannot understand is that if agriculture is as important as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts says it is, why has it not been declared an essential industry by the President in connection with the matter of drafting labor? I would be interested to hear from the distinguished gentleman later. Perhaps he can explain that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Speaking for myself, and without a farm in my district, I think that during my 17 years in this Congress I have had a pretty good voting record on behalf of the farmers of the country. I take a lot of pride in my record.

Mr. KNUTSON. We appreciate what the gentleman has done, but what I asked the gentleman was, Why has not agriculture been declared an essential industry?

Mr. McCORMACK. Agriculture, ab initio, from the beginning, is an essential industry.

Mr. KNUTSON. Tell that to the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am telling it to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I already know it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I observe that agriculture is essential to the war effort by virtue of the fact that both Houses of Congress have heretofore adopted the Tydings amendment. It is not necessary for the President or anyone else to declare that agriculture is essential.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Minnesota is usually on sound ground, and he is on sound ground in supporting this rule and the joint resolution. As to his comment, on the labor situation, that does not apply as labor is not a factor. The labor employed in the taking of the census is not engaged in either farm production or the war program during the two months the enumerators are in the field.

So far as farm labor is concerned, the Tydings amendment, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] well says, is still in effect.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is aware of the fact, is he not, that one of the contentions that has been made repeatedly by the gentleman and many others is that many farms throughout the country have been abandoned because of inability to get manpower or because of machinery shortages, and so on, and that in planning for the post-war period it ought to be very essential to know and understand the acreage that has gone out of production? Does not the gentleman believe it is essential that we know the acreage that was in production and that has gone out of production in the last 2 years due to the impact of the war and otherwise?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is part of the data we expect to secure through this census.

Mr. KEEFE. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in the very material which is put out by the Census Bureau there is a specific instruction that farms abandoned or idle in both 1944 and 1945 are not to be enumerated on this schedule. Can the gentleman tell us why the enumerators are not permitted to enumerate the farms that have been abandoned, and so give us that information?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For the reason that the total acreage has long been established. When we have enumerated those which are under cultivation it is a simple matter to determine the number that are not under cultivation.

In response to the question the gentleman has raised, let me say again, and permit me to emphasize it, that the question of the contribution of labor to the war is not involved. No man is accepted for this work who is not cleared by the War Manpower Commission. That was brought out in the testimony and that is the practice that has invariably been followed.

As a matter of fact, most of the enumerators who have been accepted up to this time have been women who are not engaged in industrial occupations or have been farmers who are in winter quarters the first 2 months of the year. In January and February there are practically no farm duties except the farm chores. The enumerators follow their own time schedules. They are not paid by the day and are not paid mileage. It is piecework. They have so many farms to visit and 2 months in which to visit them. They attend to the chores at home and devote such part of the day as they wish to enumeration. The work of the census will not take a single man away from war work. It will not subtract from the farm a single unit of manpower which could be used or is needed in the operation of the farm. So we may discard once for all the question which has been emphasized so strongly in the debate in opposition to the rule.

In response to the suggestion that the department already has the information to be compiled by the census and there is no need for a census, permit me to cite letters which I have here from the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator. They came unsolicited.

The Secretary of Agriculture writes:

In agriculture as in any business activity it is necessary to have a periodic inventory to show where we are and it is especially important in time of war. Production in agriculture as you know in recent years has broken all previous records of production despite difficulties in getting labor, machinery, and fertilizer. A census of agriculture at this time would give information about production in 1944 and will provide a benchmark for many other programs that will be necessary in reconversion.

And may I have the attention of those who have insisted that we have other means of securing this information. The Secretary of Agriculture says further:

The Department of Agriculture currently collects a large body of statistics about agriculture but these cannot replace the statistics supplied by a census. In fact the census figures provide the basis for backing up the Department's estimates.

Here is his letter in full:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 29, 1945.

DEAR MR. CANNON: I understand that House Joint Resolution 85, providing for additional appropriations for the census of agriculture, is under consideration. I hope that the Congress will enact this resolution.

In agriculture, as in any business activity, it is necessary to have a periodic inventory to show where we are, and this is especially important in times of rapid change. Agriculture, as you know, in recent years has broken all previous records for production despite the difficulties of getting labor, machinery, and fertilizers. A census of agriculture at this time, with information about production in 1944, will provide a bench mark for many of the programs that will be necessary for reconversion.

The Department of Agriculture currently collects a large body of statistics about agriculture, but these cannot replace the statistics supplied by a census. In fact, the census figures provide a basis for trueing up the Department's estimates. In addition, they provide figures for townships and counties, whereas many of the current estimates which the Department prepares are of necessity only for States and the Nation.

There has been close collaboration between technicians of the Department of Agriculture and those of the Bureau of the Census with a view to avoiding duplication and thus reducing cost and also with a view to providing for the maximum usefulness of the in-

formation to be collected by the census. There has been continuous consultation between the technicians and the representatives of action agencies within the Department of Agriculture to find how the needs of these agencies could best be met. Now that field work on the census has begun, the field staffs of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, the Extension Service, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are cooperating with the field staff of the Bureau of the Census.

The provision of a more accurate benchmark for post-war planning activities is one of the vital services which the 1945 census of agriculture can and should render. Recent hearings conducted by congressional committees well illustrate the need for such information. In the course of the hearings on the future of cotton, it was apparent that if the most urgent questions are to be answered, information is needed on the amount of cotton grown in low- and high-producing areas and on small and large farms, from those which grow less than one bale up to those which grow as many as 500 bales. It is necessary also to have information on the extent to which alternative crops have been developed in areas which formerly produced cotton, on the speed with which mechanization is proceeding, and on the incomes and welfare of farmers growing cotton. Testifying recently before a Senate Committee on farm housing, I pointed out how the farm-housing problem relates to the whole agricultural problem. Much of the information which I presented to the committee was based on the 1940 census and it would have been helpful if we could have brought it up-to-date with the 1945 census. In my testimony before the House Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, I had occasion to outline some of the policies and problems of agriculture in the post-war period. If we are to deal adequately with those and with the questions raised in the report of that committee, we need to have information on the incomes of farm families, on the extent to which farmers work part-time off the farm, the number of old farm operators who may be expected to retire and make way for younger operators, the growth of mechanization, as well as on the increased production of crops and livestock. These few instances illustrate how, in my opinion, the census of agriculture at this time should and can help in supplying the information which is needed in dealing adequately with the agricultural problems that lie ahead.

The action agencies in the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration need much of the information which the census can provide. For example, the Farm Credit Administration needs to have county data on property values, on production, on farm incomes, on mortgage debt, on farmers' investment in equipment, on the age and tenure of the operators and on the extent of part-time employment of farm operators. The Rural Electrification Administration needs information on the coverage of all electric service in rural areas and the economic feasibility of extending the service to areas not now covered. The Forest Service needs information on the extent of farm forest resources and the amount of forest products taken from the farm for home use and for sale. The Extension Service, especially the county agents, need a large amount of information by townships and counties to assist the farmers whom they are serving. Other illustrations might be given, but these will indicate something of the range of data which our action agencies need and hope to get from the census of agriculture. If the Census were to get all of the information requested by the action agencies, the schedule would need to be very much longer than it is now.

Through the close cooperation between the staffs of the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Agriculture in all phases of the planning of the 1945 census, full account has been taken of the information already being collected in the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration. The census goes to every farm in every township and county in the United States. With such information as a background, we can and do collect a large amount of current information from a sample of the farmers on the basis of which we prepare national and State estimates. Local groups of farmers need these figures but they need also to have information about their own localities.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

Permit me to read also from a letter by Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, than whom I am certain no man has to a greater degree the confidence of both sides of the House due to his long service in this body and his complete knowledge of the agricultural situation through his long chairmanship of the Committee on Agriculture. In his letter just received he says:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
February 2, 1945.

DEAR CLARENCE: It has been brought to my attention that House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture is now under consideration. While it is possible that this data may not be assembled in time to be of special advantage to the operations of the War Food Administration, we think it is proper to call your attention to the following facts.

Agricultural statistics heretofore gathered have been indispensable in planning and administering wartime agricultural programs.

Since the beginning of the war in Europe we have asked the farmers of the country to make many changes in their practices. We have asked for and received large increases in the production of such crops as soybeans, peanuts, and flax because they were needed for carrying on the war. The production of many other crops and of livestock and livestock products was increased at the request of the Federal Government. Some new crops, such as hemp, were grown.

When the special needs of wartime have been met farmers will face many problems of reconversion. I believe that the Federal Government is obligated to have the necessary facts and programs ready to help farmers make the shift to a peacetime production pattern. As I understand it, the 1945 census of agriculture would provide much of the factual data which will be needed in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

In this connection, let me quote also from a statement by Secretary W. M. Jardine, Secretary of Agriculture under President Hoover, in support of the 5-year farm census. Secretary Jardine said in a statement dated February 25, 1928, and addressed to the chairman of the House Census Committee:

The agricultural census is so important to our work and to the work of other agricultural agencies, not to speak of its extensive utilization by innumerable manufacturing and commercial interests, that I feel justified in emphasizing the point of view expressed * * * in the accompanying memorandum.

The memorandum referred to presents the portion of Secretary Jardine's recommendation on the bill providing for the quinquennial census of agriculture:

It might appear to the uninitiated that we are giving undue emphasis to unimportant considerations. Only those who are continually employing these statistics realize how vital and important they are not only to the agricultural interests of the Nation but to a large proportion of the other business interests.

In addition to the direct use which the farmer makes of the census statistics, he also benefits indirectly through the use made of these materials by the various agencies which are working in his interest. From time immemorial farmers have been at a disadvantage because of inadequate knowledge of what to produce, when to produce it, and when and where to sell their product. A great many manufacturing and commercial agencies are well equipped with such information. They are not jumping in the dark as the farmer is compelled to do. He has the uncertainty not only as to how much he himself will produce as affected by weather and other conditions, but also as to what his competitors, the other farmers in this and other countries, are doing or are going to do. It is not too much to say that whatever can be done toward stabilizing agriculture will depend absolutely on having adequate statistical data concerning the factors of agricultural production, the acreage planted or to be planted, the volume of production and the disposition of the products.

The agricultural census is the most important single statistical document for agriculture. It provides an inventory or cross section every 5 or 10 years of the productive resources and current status of the agricultural industry. It, therefore, provides the basic data for research work in agricultural economics and for extension work.

While the census comes only every 5 years, formerly only every 10 years, it constitutes the basis for an adequate system of annual statistics and monthly crop and livestock estimates. It would, of course, be more desirable to have an annual census, but this would probably be too expensive. Therefore we have developed the system of supplementing the information in the census by annual estimates which have as their point of departure the data enumerated in the census of agriculture. In order to keep these estimates from getting out of line it is necessary to check them back every five years to an actual enumeration. Otherwise the errors in estimating crop acreage or numbers of livestock would be carried forward and exaggerated in the annual estimates, resulting in a cumulative percentage of error. In other words, the census and the annual estimates are interdependent and both are necessary.

The agricultural census provides the most important body of economic information concerning the economic life of the Nation. It is more important than the manufacturing census because it is much more detailed and because the products of agriculture constitute the materials of manufacture and trade.

Statisticians realize that the fluctuations in agricultural production exert a most powerful influence on the variations in the business cycle and affect almost every current of economic life. The census is, therefore, of tremendous significance for the business man. It provides cotton manufacturers, cereal merchants and millers, and other processors with information concerning the raw materials employed in their business. Mail-order house and other commercial agencies are vitally interested in the buying power of farmers in various sections of the country and are anxious to know the amount of product which the farmer has produced and

the price he is receiving for it in various areas. Railroads need to know how much is to be produced, or is likely to be produced, so that they can make their arrangements to haul the product to market. Bankers find that the success or failure of crops in the various parts of the country has tremendous influence on the volume of credit required, the amount of reserves to be kept, and the general condition of the money market; and other credit agencies lending to farmers are vitally concerned with such information.

Sometimes the statement is made that speculators are the only people who profit by the agricultural information in the census, as well as by the information put out by the division of crop and livestock estimates of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. There is no greater mistake than this. Almost every line of legitimate business is concerned with these materials. However, even in the case of speculation it is in the interest both of the farmer and of other classes of business that speculation shall be as intelligent as possible. Insofar as speculation is intelligent it makes for prices justified by conditions of supply and demand, present and prospective. Insomuch as it is unintelligent it results in erratic markets and market conditions.

While it is true that these agricultural statistics are not directly used by the majority of individual farmers, it is possible for the research and extension agencies to organize the statistical information from this and other sources in such a manner as to throw a great deal of light on the outlook for the various lines of agricultural production and to take this information to the individual farmer. The work is only in its infancy, but it represents a line of development which agricultural leaders for a half century or more have recognized as essential if the farmer's business is to be placed on a plane of intelligent action in any manner comparable with that enjoyed by other lines of business.

The interpretation of the highly complex data concerning production and marketing conditions and outlook is a job of great technical difficulty, wholly beyond the range and abilities of the individual farmer. Existing technical agencies are trying to translate these facts into their actual significance and bearing on the farmer's business, so that he will not continue to be at a disadvantage as compared with other classes of producers. It is desirable not only to interpret the outlook but also to aid the farmer to determine the relationship of the existing outlook to the proper readjustments called for in the type of farming which he pursues. This implies a knowledge of the systems of farming in the various parts of the country, and the agricultural census is the most important source of information along this line.

Some people have the impression that these statistics and the interpretation made of them, as well as the technical activities of the Department of Agriculture, only injure the farmer by helping to increase his production. It is desirable to correct the impression that because we have the surplus problem it is not worth while to help the farmer improve his productiveness. Every kind of improvement which helps the farmer lower his cost of production, either by better technical methods or by more effective adjustment of his plans to market conditions, enables him to compete to better advantage with producers in other countries and increase his chance of making a profit. If the resulting production is excessive, the remedy is to reduce the acreage and amount of labor employed in agriculture, but not to decrease the efficiency of the individual farmer on the land. Both the Nation as a whole and the farmer as a producer are vitally interested in bringing the level of efficiency of agriculture up to the highest point possible; and accurate statistics, of which the census of agriculture is the essential foundation, will be of the utmost importance in contributing to this result.

Going a little farther back in order to include every administration in the last half century, we have a strong statement to the same effect by Secretary James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture from 1897 to 1913 under Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and Taft, in support of a census of agriculture at 5-year intervals.

In testifying before the House Census Committee on a bill providing for a 5-year census of agriculture, which was first taken in 1925 during the Coolidge administration, Secretary Wilson said:

> There is no reason given for the midway census of manufactures that does not apply with much greater force to agricultural products. * * * Before there was a permanent Census Bureau provided for, the Department of Agriculture had been for many years in the habit of making estimates of these products. But the time between decennial censuses is too long, because the increase of production in one class of products and the decrease or possible standstill in production of another might have a very great influence on the producer and the dealer in the United States. The benefit that would come to the Department of Agriculture would be that instead of having once in 10 years a reliable basis for estimating, we should have it once in 5 years. * * * The reason why I should like to see the average census taken every 5 years is that we could then make more intelligent annual esitmates and be less likely to report wide of the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be notified at the expiration of 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as to the very pertinent statements which have been made and reiterated, and will no doubt continue to be emphasized, that we already have this information or that it can be secured through the A. A. A., or through the Extension Service or other agency, let me say it is impossible to use the A. A. A. for such purpose, for the reason that they have only statistics relating to the farms which are under the A. A. A. program. Many farms throughout the United States have not conformed to the A. A. A. program, and we would have no data on them. Furthermore, even those which have participated in the A. A. A. program have information available only on certain crops. They have nothing on livestock; they have nothing on fruit; they have nothing on vegetables; they have nothing on hay; they have nothing on many crops, many items of production that we must understand in order to plan for the future.

Furthermore, all employees of the A. A. A. are on a per diem basis. If the A. A. A. were to do the job it would take more money to have the A. A. A. secure this information than it would for the Bureau of Census to compile it.

The suggestion that the county agents take the census is out of the question. The State extension services are not equipped or staffed to take a census. As a matter of fact the county agents are already overworked and would not have time to employ or supervise the enumeration. If they were to take the census they would have to employ as many enumerators at as high salaries, and would have to do over the work already done by the Census Bureau.

Furthermore, it is not along their line of endeavor. The census should should be by an impartial agency, not by some agency handling an action program, and which is interested in selling its program to the country. The Census Bureau is adequately equipped. That is their business. We might as well expect our barber to service our automobiles or ask the plumber to shave us as to ask the Extension Service or the A. A. A. or the O. P. A. to take a census.

If further evidence to this effect is required it is supplied by the following letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

> UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
> OF AGRICULTURE,
> BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
> *February 5, 1945.*
>
> The question of having the field staff of the Department of Agriculture take the census is one that has been frequently discussed. If it were the intent of Congress to have that done, suitable arrangements could be worked out. Under the present arrangements, however, the field staff of the agricultural agencies has clearly specified functions and the funds from which they are paid are limited both in amount and in the purposes for which they can be used, and their work is limited to these.
>
> As I understand it, the major part of the costs is that which results from the actual collection of schedules in the field. This cost would be altered very little if persons other than the enumerators now being employed were to be used. In nearly every agricultural county there are three groups of people who work closely with Federal agricultural agencies; the A. A. A. committeemen, the volunteer neighborhood and community leaders working with the Extension Service, and the volunteer crop reporters who supply much of the current statistical information to the Department. No one of these groups is large enough to take over the job of enumeration.
>
> Agricultural Adjustment Agency committeemen are paid a per diem when actually performing work for the A. A. A. If they were to be appointed as census enumerators, obviously they would need to be paid for the time required to do that job. The neighborhood and community leaders assisting the Extension Service are volunteers, so are the crop reporters. They do not receive pay for the services they render. If the responsibility for collecting the census schedules were to be given to either of these groups, funds would have to be made available to pay them.
>
> My information is that in actual practice a good many persons who have had service with the A. A. A., the Extension Service, or as crop reporters are actually on your staff as census enumerators.
>
> Any proposal that county, State, or regional workers of the Department could fill the supervisory jobs assumes that most of them could be taken away from their present work for a period of 4 to 6 months. No doubt there are some individuals who can render such assistance, but the number of such people is too limited to provide the supervisory staff which you need. As you know, members of the field staff of the Department are cooperating with the Census organization in many ways and the possibility of releasing staff members to assist with the job of census taking has been rather fully explored.
>
> We need the census data as bench mark statistics to keep our own estimates in line. Many of our current estimates provide an

adequate basis for State, regional, and national figures, but for most county figures it is still necessary to go to the Census. The farther we get away from the last census, the less satisfactory are the county figures which are available.

The need for figures for counties and townships is an ever-present one. Local groups of all kinds are constantly in need of figures for their own counties. As planning groups get more deeply into the problems of agricultural adjustments when wartime crops are no longer so urgently needed, there will be an even greater demand for county figures of all kinds, and especially on the production of such wartime crops as soybeans, peanuts, flax, etc.

In many of our studies of adjustments and of the effects of proposed programs, it is necessary for us to be able to combine counties into some regional units. These may be type-of-farming areas, they may be land-use adjustment areas, watersheds, or other regions, including only some portions of States. Unless we have the county data so that the figures for the appropriate counties can be combined, it would be necessary to make many highly unsatisfactory estimates for such areas.

I need not point out to you very many uses by farmers, farmers' organizations, marketing agencies, sales organizations, radios, newspapers, advertisers, and others for the figures for counties and smaller areas which are supplied by the Census. I am sure you must have many more requests from such groups for these materials than we have.

Sincerely yours,

H. R. TOLLEY, *Chief.*

Perhaps the most convincing statement on the subject is an excerpt from the report released January 14, 1945, by the Bureau of the Census, and quoted by my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who cited the report as proof that we already have data on hand which renders a further inquiry for agricultural information, by the Bureau of the Census, or other agency, unnecessary.

Here is a paragraph from the report to which he refers which he evidently overlooks:

> Because of sampling errors, relatively small numbers for either date (1940 and 1944) and small changes between the two dates, which were indicated by the accompanying estimates, are not trustworthy.

The various agencies of the Department of Agriculture which issue estimates on farm production, resources, activities, and conditions, make the best guess they can but cannot be expected to even approach accuracy without the quinquennial count by the Bureau of the Census on every farm in the Nation to serve as bench marks.

Who, Mr. Chairman, can plan the future of the Nation without adequate information? Must we drop back into the abyss into which agriculture and the country plunged after the last war? Or shall we adopt some measures which will aid in preventing a recurrence of that catastrophe? We must have accurate and dependable data to guide us, and it can be secured only through the official census provided for in the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, every business, industrial, labor-economic, and labor organization in America is requesting this census. The agricultural press is especially unanimous in its endorsement of this bill.

The following letters are typical:

CAPPER PUBLICATIONS,
January 8, 1944.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that there is a possibility of a 1945 census of agriculture with particular reference to its population and housing. We would like to go on record as believing that this would be of very great value to the Nation.

Never in our experience have we found the interdependence of agriculture and industry so much in the consciousness of all those who are responsible for management and policies in American business.

It is supremely important that basic information on the whole agricultural situation be kept as up to date as possible and a 1945 agricultural census of any and all phases of its tremendous ramifications, would be of very real value at this time.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP ZACH,
Director of Advertising,
Capper Publications, Inc.

CAPPER-HARMAN-SLOCUM, INC.,
February 11, 1944.

On January 10, we wrote to you, expressing our wish that the 1945 census of agriculture be made as originally planned, and although we have had no word on anything that may have developed, we hope that this may be done.

Under normal conditions we could get along reasonably well as publishers of three farm papers with a minimum of data on agriculture, but the more critical the situation, the more necessary this data becomes and agriculture in general has never faced before a situation so critical as it faces now.

We have done our part, we believe, reasonably well in the reduction of the use of paper, both in our publications and in our other operations, where we have reduced this use to a minimum, eliminating many things that we have done regularly in the past—requiring the use of paper.

Very truly,

CAPPER-HARMAN-SLOCUM, INC.,
NEFF LAING, *General Manager.*

AMERICAN POULTRY JOURNAL,
January 28, 1945.

I would like to add a hearty voice of approval to your attitude that a 1945 census is needed especially because it is an abnormal year. We have the 1940 census for a normal pre-war picture and when this war is over we will want the 1945 census for the abnormal conditions.

It is my sincere belief that if there is any substance to the argument that we must plan for the post-war period, an agricultural census of the war period will be essential to that planning.

Being a taxpayer, right in the midst of figuring my income tax, I am not too enthusiastic about increasing Government expenditures but I believe firmly that there are certain functions that the Government needs to carry on even at times such as these when the war is a drain on the Treasury. Taking the census, in my opinion, is a governmental function that should not be curtailed. The money spent on that is well spent.

Sincerely yours,

AMERICAN POULTRY JOURNAL,
L. M. KLEVAY.

AGRICULTURAL PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION.
February 3, 1944.

This letter comes to you on behalf of the 34 farm publication members of this association, these publications having a combined circulation of 11,750,000.

The publishers of these farm papers, meeting here in Chicago, January 26, were agreed that a 1945 census of agriculture will be of tremendous value to a very great number of people in this industry. It was pointed out particularly that essential facts brought together next year will give us an opportunity to make comparisons with conditions in 1940, in pre-war times, and then with post-war conditions in 1950.

It was the unanimous feeling of our member publishers that the bringing together of agricultural statistics in 1945 is a matter of sufficient importance that this office was instructed to write you, urging that everything be done to bring about that end and offering to cooperate in every possible way.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD BURLINGHAM.

(The Washington Farmer, the Idaho Farmer, the Oregon Farmer, California Cultivator, the Montana Farmer, the Utah Farmer, Arizona Farmer)

ASSOCIATED FARM PAPERS,
January 28, 1944.

My publishers represented in this letterhead; and I hope that there is definitely to be a 1945 general census. I write you because we have heard some rumors to the effect that this census may be postponed to the 1950 date.

Such a postponement would be particularly lamentable. It would put us in the position of being pretty much in the dark in a 10-year period during which we have engaged in a world cataclysm and the resultant changes and distortions of our normal, if there is such a thing, procedures.

The word "normal" suggests to me the abnormality prevailing now and the fact that a census in 1945 would have the profound position in history of having examined our population precisely under these abnormal conditions.

A 1945 general census would then give us in the years to come a yardstick in our history to look back on. You know, we shall want to look back in 1950 at this period—1940–45—with the yearning to know a lot about it. Only if a general census in 1945 is available will we be able to do so.

Sincerely yours,

FRED O. TOOF,
National Advertising Manager.

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER,
February 1, 1944.

We have learned with great satisfaction that there are tentative plans for a 1945 census of agriculture and we are writing to express our very earnest hope that these tentative plans will become definite soon.

We have found each census of agriculture of increasing value to our sales department, to our editors, and to our advertisers. And we feel that there is an even greater need for a census of agriculture in 1945 than there has been for the very helpful ones of the past. The war's effects upon farm buying power, upon the availability of and the market for manufactured goods, upon farming practices, etc., seem to make a 1945 census of agriculture a necessity in order to provide up-to-date information on the farm market—information that is urgently needed by the farm press, by business, and by all agencies who serve agriculture and who are served by it.

Sincerely yours,

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER,
FOWLER DUGGER,
Advertising Manager.

FARM JOURNAL AND FARMER'S WIFE,
March 3, 1944.

Thank you for your letter of February 29 and for the information with reference to frozen foods. This is most helpful.

As you suggest, I shall also contact the War Food Administration for the information they have.

Incidentally, I thought you might be interested in a copy of a letter which I am

writing to the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee and to our own Senators and Representatives in Congress, urging them to insert in H. R. 4024 provision for the taking of a 1945 census of agriculture. I feel this information is very basic, particularly during these times, and I hope that the Congress will deny the Budget Bureau's proposal that this census be eliminated and will instead make the necessary funds available.

Again many thanks for your fine cooperation in connection with the frozen-foods figures and for the many courtesies you folks have extended to us in the past. You're doing a great job.

Cordially yours,

H. F. E. JEUNET,
Research and Sales Promotion Manager.

THE FARMER,
St. Paul, Minn., January 7, 1944.

We understand that there is some question about making a 1945 census of agriculture because of the very abnormal conditions prevailing during wartime.

The same question was raised in early 1934 about the then forthcoming census of agriculture for 1935 because of the devastation and havoc wrought by the drouth which would make conditions subnormal at the census period. The census proved to be a very interesting analysis of the changes that had taken place especially in the utilization of land under adverse conditions.

The 1945 census should reveal a very interesting comparison with the decennial census of 1940. The 1940 figures show pre-war conditions while the 1945 figures would give us data on agricultural production under all-out war conditions. Such a comparison may prove to be of great historical importance sometime in the future, besides the value of it in determining changes for increased war production, if we are still at war, or for the basis of post-war planning when hostilities cease.

We also believe that it would be inadvisable to break the census cycles. That might be an unfortunate precedent and certainly would throw the data out of balance through the inability of showing developments or changes between agricultural periods.

It is our considered opinion that a 1945 agricultural census should be conducted regardless of the present abnormal conditions or the unusual difficulties you naturally will face in conducting the census at this time.

Sincerely yours,

THE FARMER,
HORACE C. KLEIN.

THE PRAIRIE FARMER,
January 28, 1944.

I am writing to urge that your Bureau go through with a 1945 census of agriculture. It seems to me it is important in these times to have the proper information and figures as a guide to farm conditions during the war.

A 1945 census would be very valuable to compare with 1940 and again in 1950.

We sincerely hope that your Bureau will be able to carry through in 1945.

Very truly yours,

J. E. EDWARDS,
Advertising Manager.

THE ARIZONA FARMER,
February 14, 1944.

I would like to add my own recommendation to those made to you by other publishers that there is a vital need for a 1945 general farm census.

Conditions are changing so rapidly in the farm field that the 1940 figures bear little resemblance to operations nowadays. At least ours do not.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE H. POWELL,
Manager.

THE FARMER-STOCKMAN,
January 31, 1944.

Because of the vital light it will throw on a rapidly changing picture, will you please use your full influence at the right sources to see that a 1945 census is taken?

Such a census would be of tremendous benefits to the farming communities of this country. Daily the import of this grows upon us as we come in contact with those who are producing our food, feed, and fiber for victory.

Thank you for your help in this direction.

Yours very truly,

THE FARMER-STOCKMAN,
DEWEY H. NEAL,
Advertising Manager.

(The Washington Farmer, the Oregon Farmer, the Idaho Farmer)

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FARM TRIO,
February 26, 1944.

Thank you for the information in your letter of February 21 in which you outline the situation as regards the 1945 agricultural census, and the likelihood that it may not be taken because of the lack of an appropriation to pay for the work.

Our publications here in Spokane make extensive use of the data secured in the periodic farm censuses; and we sincerely hope that the money will still be appropriated to finance the 1945 census.

Your good cooperation in supplying us with needed statistics from time to time is keenly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FARM TRIO,
RALPH E. DYAR, *Promotion Director.*

THE WESTERN FARM LIFE,
January 13, 1944.

It is our understanding that consideration is now being given to the possibility of conducting a 1945 census of agriculture. Both our editorial department and our advertising department use such information extensively and we would just like to go on record as favoring, in fact needing the material such as the census would contain, if it is possible to conduct one under wartime conditions.

We sincerely appreciate the problems you will be faced with in collecting and handling this data under present-day conditions and we trust it will be possible for this service to be continued.

Very truly yours,

THE WESTERN FARM LIFE,
E. M. MCKIM,
Advertising Manager.

THE SPOKESMAN-REVIEW,
January 21, 1944.

The question came up the other day as to whether there will be in 1945 a census of agriculture, a census of distribution.

These would be of great value to the Cowles publications and we'd appreciate any advance notice you can give us as to the plans of the Census Bureau regarding same. Thanking you for any information you can give at this time, we are

Very truly yours,

RALPH E. DYAR,
Promotion Director, Cowles Publications.

THE NEBRASKA FARMER,
February 11, 1944.

We sincerely hope that the 1945 agricultural census will be taken as usual next year. We understand that there is some possibility that this census may be deferred because of the war and, we believe, such deferment would be a mistake.

So many changes have occurred as a result of the war that it has been quite impossible to visualize agricultural conditions accurately. Also, there will be a readjustment after the war, which will make another change. We believe that an agricultural census in 1945 is even more important than in normal times.

Very sincerely yours,

GLENN BUCK,
Associate Publisher.

THE MONTANA FARMER,
February 3, 1944.

We have been somewhat concerned over reports that there is some question about carrying out the regular census of 1945. We hope these reports are erroneous and that it will be possible for your department to make the usual 5-year census survey next year. We make very extensive use of statistical material developed by the census and a gap in this program would very seriously interfere with the issuance of statistical reports which we make to an extensive list of advertisers and other institutions.

We hope it will be possible for you to send us assurance that the 1945 census will be carried out in accordance with the regular schedule.

Yours very truly,

LESTER COLE, *Editor.*

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO.,
February 29, 1944.

We have just learned that there is some question as to whether or not a 1945 middecennial agricultural census is going to be taken. From the attached copy of a letter addressed to Senator CARTER GLASS you will notice that we are urging that an appropriation should be made for the taking of this census.

At the same time we are calling this to the attention of the Farm Equipment Institute, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., and suggesting that all members of the institute should write a similar appeal to Senator GLASS. If there is anything else we can do to stress the importance of this census to the Senator, please advise us and we will attempt to use our influence accordingly.

Very truly yours,

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO.,
By J. M. STRASSER,
Supervisor, Market Analysis and Consumer Research.

FARM EQUIPMENT INSTITUTE,
March 6, 1944.

Thank you very much for your letter of the 4th, enclosing copies of chapters III and IV of the Agriculture Handbook.

In the second paragraph of your letter you referred to the list of farm machinery studies which were made for Government agencies. If copies of these are available, we would like very much to obtain them.

You will also refer to tabulations made for individuals or firms. It is possible that we would like to have some studies made for us on certain points, and would appreciate your indicating the basis on which such studies may be made; that is, whether this is a per diem charge, and if so, how much.

By the way, it has been reported that there is a possibility that the 1945 census of agriculture may be passed up. Do you think this is likely to be the case or do you feel that census will be made as usual?

In view of the exceptional record made by agriculture during the war period and the need of pertinent information as a guide for the post-war period, it would seem most desirable to have the middecennial census taken as usual.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT A. JONES.

THE CLEVELAND TRACTOR CO.,
March 10, 1944.

This letter is being written with regard to the article on page 20 of the March 1, 1944,

issue of Sales Management—Agricultural Census in 1945.

We are in complete accord with Mr. Philip Salisbury and certainly feel that it is vital that we have a census of the machinery and other equipment on farms in order to judge more accurately the replacement markets in the post-war period as well as all of the agricultural statistics on crops and livestock by counties. In other words, we too protest vigorously in dispensing with the census.

We sincerely trust that it will be made available to those of us to whom it is of vital importance.

Sincerely,

THE CLEVELAND TRACTOR CO.,
L. D. OGLE, *Assistant Sales Manager, Agricultural Division.*

Mr. Chairman, every other group of trade publication in the country is as unanimously in favor of this bill. I ask the gentlemen who have today opposed the bill to cite a single reputable national organization of any character opposing it. I ask them to cite a single editorial in any newspaper in the United States opposing this bill. I ask them to submit here an authentic statement from any prominent businessman, from any public official, from any economist, engineer or author of national prominence, opposing this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is no opposition to this bill anywhere in the United States except on this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 5 additional minutes.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps at the outset I ought to observe—and I think your own observation will coincide—that a rather distressing attitude has grown up in Congress. The word "million" does not mean anything any more; we have just knocked out the M and supplanted it with a B and we have thought so long and earnestly in terms of billions that it becomes rather difficult for us, I suppose, to orient our thinking to a little bill that involves $6,750,000. But as we go along, Mr. Chairman, we have got to reorient our thinking. A million dollars is still a lot of money out in my country; I think it is still a lot of money in every section of the country. Perhaps we ought to sit at the feet of Dr. Einstein and develop some practical ideas of relativity. When I think of the six-and-three-quarters-odd millions involved here I think in terms of the entire tax take by the Federal Government in the form of income tax from thirty or forty thousand American families. This helps me get my feet on the ground. The amount of money involved here will probably be the equivalent of the total income tax that is squeezed out of the 35,000 families in the city of Peoria, Ill.; and since it is almost an incidental function it takes on some new significance for me. That is not quite the whole story.

Originally there was supplied in the First Supplemental Defense Appropriation bill $650,000, obviously to initiate this census program. After a while we added $7,200,000. When the census people got into the field and found they could not get enumerators for an average of 89 cents a schedule; which plus overtime would be about $1.02 per schedule, they came back for this deficiency that is before us today. There thus will be expended on this agricultural census something like $14,750,000. That is a lot of money for a census in only one field of American endeavor. That is the proposition before us.

Let us look at the status of this activity for a moment. They tell us that something like $2,000,000 has been obligated. This may be right, and it yet may not be exactly right, but let us assume for all practical purposes that $2,000,000 has been allocated. Then the argument has been advanced that since the law makes it mandatory, since the statute says an agricultural census shall be taken and since area officers have been sent out and some enumerators have been recruited, therefore, ipse dixit we must proceed with this matter. I do not follow that line of reasoning at all. The fact of the matter is that the law does not say when this must be done. It says that a quinquennial census shall be taken; it does not provide a specific date. We can take it in the latter part of 1945 as well as in the first part of 1945. We can devise ways whereby we can save a little money and still get the information desired.

At the very outset perhaps we should be clear as to what the law really does provide. The authority for an agricultural census is found in title 13, section 216 of the 1940 Code and provides that "there shall be in the year 1935 and once every 10 years thereafter a census of agriculture and livestock which shall show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of the principal crops and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country."

There you will find the whole mandate in the law. It should be remembered, however, that since Congress enacted the law providing for a census Congress can expressly repeal or can make it inoperative by refusing to provide the funds. I believe that fact is implied in any statute which the Congress might enact. The very fact that the law is quite specific on the items to be surveyed in such a census would indicate that Congress was endeavoring to apply a limitation.

The law does not say a lot of other things that we find in the proposed census. For instance, in the schedule I have, there is a question whether the operator lives on the farm, whether the operator began to operate this farm and so forth. What difference does it make so long as war food is being produced? How many days did the operator work off the farm during 1944 and did he work for pay? Is that essential at this time? They say here that emphasis has got to be placed on the production of food as a munition of war. They also ask the method of rental at a time like this when we are engaged in a war, when we are in a critical period. What difference does it make how a farmer rents, whether it be for cash or on shares? Give the number of stock and machinery owned by the landlord. That is very important, but does it affect the production of war food and the formulation of these programs that they say are before us in fabricating a program for next year? What are the number of occupied and unoccupied dwellings on the farm? Is that so essential? Does the farm have electricity? Does it have running water? Does it have a radio? Does it have a telephone? Well, I could take the last census and answer that because I know how priorities have been handled by the War Production Board. I can tell them from the last census pretty nearly how many telephones there are on the farms of the country right now.

There are questions also about machinery and about tractors, how many boys and girls under 14, how many men and women and boys and girls over 14. You could take the figures of 1940, minus the mortalities, which are all recorded down here, and the Census Bureau could tell you pretty well.

The point I am trying to make is that in the justification for this census the Census Bureau sets forth in its testimony before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies that the information to be obtained in this census "is essential for planning war and post-war programs involving the determination of food allotments, the development of food distribution programs, the formulation of price policies, the mobilization of manpower for agriculture, and similar programs."

It is doubtful, therefore, whether a good deal of the information which is required in the forms which have already been prepared has any direct bearing upon the objectives cited to the committee.

Let it be emphatically understood that if a census of this nature is to be taken at this time I have no objection whatsoever to obtaining information on the items now carried in these schedules, but the point must not be overlooked that we are in war. We are constantly spending borrowed funds and it is so eminently proper for the Congress to determine the necessity and the advisability of the census at this time.

I am not one of those who believe that thrift is synonymous with hoarding because there are times when the best kind of thrift is to spend money, nor do I believe that in order to achieve economy there must be an indiscriminate lop-off of Federal functions. I do mean to say, however, that a proper perception of thrift requires prudence in expenditure and that there should be an endeavor to secure value for whatever money is appropriated. It, therefore, behooves us to look at this in a practical and prudent way.

The Census Bureau is going rather far afield in this matter. I contend that as we examine the whole proposition before us we could let this thing lay a little while and see whether or not the people in the Department of Agriculture can ascertain and gather together the essential information upon which to predicate a war food program. We could do that now. Then we could obtain the other data at some later time. I say we can do it now because I think we have the manpower in the various Federal agencies to

produce the data which may be essential.

I went back to the agricultural appropriation bill to see just what we do have and I discovered some very interesting things. These are the statements that were given to us on the agricultural appropriation bill for 1945 by the departmental authorities themselves. We had all of them before us, including the Secretary of Agriculture.

We have today 4,050 full-time people in the A. A. A. In addition to that, we have 9,093 county committeemen who operate on a per diem basis. We have 104,700 community committeemen scattered all over the country. In addition to that, the Farm Security Administration has 9,514 people for whom we have appropriated funds and who are presently on the pay roll. Then, to make it even more complete, we have a statistical agency—and it is a good agency—in the Department of Agriculture, called the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. How many people has it on the pay roll? It has 769. Now, by the very simple process of addition, draw a line and what have you? You have 127,000 people identified with agriculture and with the action programs of the Federal Government in every county, in every one of the 3,105 counties of the United States.

Is there anyone here and now who would say that we have got to spend this amount of money to get the information that the statute calls for, namely, the value and number of livestock, the acreage and principal crops and the total acreage? That is what is asked for.

Mr. Chairman, I think I can establish to your satisfaction that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has done a pretty fair job in this field. Every month you get this little document that is known as the Agricultural Situation, gotten out by the Department of Agriculture. This one is dated January 1945.

This issue consists of 25 pages. It contains commodity reviews, tables showing parity prices, a very extensive article on 1945 agricultural goals for commodities and livestock, a general survey of the food situation, a number of articles dealing with the various agricultural sections of the country.

In it you will find estimates on hogs and cattle, on farm labor and poultry, on fruit and soybeans, on food and feed grains, and a host of other material, all of which has been brought down to date by means of spot checks throughout the country.

Most of this information is developed in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Give ear for a moment as I read you from it under the subdivision "Poultry and Eggs" on page 20, an article prepared by Mr. T. S. Thorfinnson of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

> The number of hens and pullets in the Plains States on January 1, 1944, was 63.6 million, or 57 percent higher than the average for the 5-year period 1937–41.

Where did they get that figure? They tell you exactly how many chickens there are in the country. They make spot checks from time to time, and I think those would be useful and serve our purpose in devising the war-food program that lies immediately ahead. You can examine this and it will give you the figures not for 1940 but for January 1, 1944, and subsequent dates as to how much poultry there is, how many sheep, lambs, hogs, cattle, mules, colts, and bushels of grain of all kinds in storage, under seal, on the farms, in the elevators, and everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It occurs to me from that information we ought to be pretty careful before we go ahead and spend the remaining $12,750,000. They say you must go ahead. Must you? We put in ten or twelve million dollars to harness the tides of Passamaquoddy but we did not go ahead. We put $5,000,000 in the Florida Ship Canal, and they still have a lot of bridges scattered along the excavations which were made. But we did not go ahead. We stopped it. We had the C. C. C. tooled up in every section of the country, camps everywhere, at an annual cost of $250,000,000, and the Congress said, "It shall not go further," and it stopped.

There is an implication in every statute that is enacted, even though it is mandatory, to proceed with the work only if the funds are made available, and it remains then the function and the power of the lawmaking branch, the guardian of the purse of the country, to determine whether we shall go ahead.

My suggestion is this: I will not quarrel with any mandate of the statute but I will say, let us today by record vote say to Mr. Capt, Director of the Census Bureau, that he talk with Mr. Wickard and with Mr. Jones, War Food Administrator, and see whether or not within the framework and the personnel in these departments the essential information cannot be gotten with a moderate amount of cost. In that way we can still save some money for the taxpayers. Do not forget that the sum represented in this deficiency is the equivalent of the income taxes paid by more than 30,000 American families and if we add to it the funds already appropriated but not expended it will probably be sixty or seventy thousand families.

When all is said and done, the proponents for this bill have not established that it is necessary at this time nor have they met the contention that the essential information as provided by the statute as the basis for our war-food production programs can be obtained more expeditiously and more economically through the personnel and the authority which already lodges in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in his argument against the rule a short while ago raised a very pertinent question. He indicated that if he had the justification for this legislation, he would support it. I think he is right in taking this position. We should always have ample justification before enacting any legislation. Therefore, in the very few minutes allotted to me I shall attempt to enumerate a few of the justifications announced when the law was enacted in 1925, providing that this census be taken every 10 years. The first argument made in support of the legislation was that it would enable those engaged in agriculture to better regulate their production program so as to meet or comport more nearly with the demand for crops and livestock. That was primarily for the benefit of the farmer. If it were good for him in 1925, if it were good for him in 1935, why should not the farmer want similar information in 1945 or 1946?

Another argument was that this information is necessary or essential every 5 years to enable the transportation facilities of the country to make arrangements so that wherever there is a surplus production it may be transported to those sections, areas, and markets where it is in demand. Without this information the transportation companies cannot properly facilitate, expedite, and economize on the distribution of farm crops.

Another argument was that such legislation was essential in order for those engaged in distribution of farm crops could operate most efficiently. People who are engaged in the distribution of farm crops, such as wholesale merchants, people who buy large supplies and distribute them, are anxious to get information as to total production and number of livestock, poultry, and so forth, from time to time in order that they may deal fairly and at the same time insure the farmer a fair and reasonable price for his product and then sell in the best markets. If that were a justification in 1925, when the law was enacted, and in 1935, when the census was taken, why should it not be a justification in 1945, when there is greater disruption and uncertainty as to acreage and agricultural production than at any time in our history?

Another justification for the legislation in 1925 was to prevent and obviate undue speculation in farm crops. There had been built up in this country private reporting agencies. It was to their interest to disseminate information throughout the country that there had been an unprecedented increase in the production of wheat, for example, designed primarily to depress the market.

On the other hand, some other agency would issue a statement that it had obtained information that the wheat crop was seriously damaged and there would be underproduction and they would, therefore, expect an increase in the price. It was to stop or prevent undue speculation in farm crops that this legislation was enacted in 1925, and you can mark my word that if this or similar legislation is not enacted you may expect a similar situation to arise regardless whether the war ends this year or not. All the reasons and other justifications that existed for passing the law in 1925 exist today just as much as at that time, and my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was here at that time and supported the legislation, and my very high regard for him convinces me he will not think hard of me for calling

his attention to these justifications for this legislation.

To my mind, the greatest reason for passing this measure at this time is that we are in a war. We have been told that various foods, such as bread, meat coming from slaughtered cattle, hogs, poultry, including eggs, milk, butter, and so forth, are all needed to go into a balanced ration for our men in the armed forces. Suppose you, Mr. Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, had charge of distributing food to our armed forces in every nook and corner of this world, to see that every man on the front line was supplied with a sufficient amount of food, a sufficient amount of meat, of bread, and other things that would enable him to go into battle as a strong man; what would you want to know? The first question you would ask would be, "How much breadstuffs is available in this country, and how much was produced last year? I want to know down to the actual pound how much beef is marketable, how much pork is marketable, and how much milk and how much butter is marketable, how many chickens and eggs are available. I want to know where these food products are, because I want to get hold of them to distribute them to the young men who are fighting the greatest battle of all time."

Without this information we cannot logically expect that sustained momentum necessary in any offensive war effort.

We are told that without this information it would be impossible for those charged with the duty and responsibility of planning and providing the necessary food and clothing requirements of each man in the armed forces would be unable to expeditiously assemble such requirement unless they know where every available item mentioned could be obtained and properly processed for distribution to the various theaters of war. When there is doubt, uncertainty, or delay in the prosecution of this part of the war program it will certainly be reflected in a failure to sustain a regular or increasing momentum by the Army or Navy. Military experts have said time and time again within the last 3 years that the most important factor in a successful drive by an army is sustained and continuous momentum, and that this is impossible without sufficient available supplies of every kind and description for every minute of the hour and every hour of the day. Our military leaders would not dream of making a drive against the enemy without first knowing the available supply of planes, tanks, guns, munitions, men, and so forth, and it is absurd to say or even think they would not necessarily have to have similar information with reference to food and clothing, and I do not know of any agency in the Government that has been definitely authorized by law and charged with the responsibility of ascertaining and providing this information except that provided for in the Bureau of the Census. I know it has been said here that other agencies may be collecting this information already. I am not prepared to admit it, but if they are, certainly somebody has made an appropriation to duplicate the efforts and responsibilities of the Bureau of the Census and, speaking for myself, I would like to know if this is true. If it can be shown that any other such agency is furnishing or is prepared to furnish the information more accurately and more efficiently than the Bureau of the Census, then there would be no justification for continuing this Bureau at all. Others have said we could call on the triple A to gather this information, saying it has organizations and agencies sufficient to secure the information. That may be correct, but they will not be able to do it for nothing and those who advanced the theory have not indicated they would be able to do it any cheaper than the Bureau of the Census. They have also said that the Extension Department could do the same work through county agents. I am not prepared to deny that, but if they undertook it they would certainly have to have more men, more women, and more money, and nobody has undertaken to say that it could be done through that department or agency any cheaper than through the Bureau of the Census. I yield to no man present a greater desire to economize on these activities, and I am glad to place my record for economy against that of any other Member, but I am definitely convinced that the information gathered would or should contribute to increased efficiency in the prosecution of our war program, and from my observation and experience I believe it can be done with less money by the Bureau of the Census than by any other agency of the Government, and I am therefore supporting this resolution. I am satisfied from the information furnished that our armed forces have been reasonably well supplied with food and clothing, although there have been complaints from individual sections.

I do not know why there should be a scarcity at any place. I am quite sure it is not because the Congress has refused or failed to make the necessary appropriations and if it has been due to the failure of those in charge of securing and distributing food supplies and if their failure has been due to the lack of available information as to where food supplies are available and the program of prosecuting the war has been delayed by reason of such failure, I am prepared to discharge what I consider my responsibility to soldiers on the front lines by providing this information. I know that $7,000,000 is a pretty large sum of money to ask the taxpayers for, but it represents only one-tenth of the 1 percent of the money refunded to the large taxpayers of the country in 1943 and the burden transferred to men and women with low incomes and I want to emphasize the fact that it was done largely by those who are now howling economy at the expense of our war effort. I may be mistaken in my position, but I have no apologies to offer in my effort to use every legitimate and available means to see that our men in the armed forces are supplied with the necessary food requirements because I would not be able to look one in the face upon his return and have him say that he and his comrades could have saved thousands or hundreds of thousands of lives by terminating the war earlier if they had been promptly and regularly furnished at all times with an ample supply of food and clothing so essential in winning this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes also to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rather regret that the question of politics on this issue has been raised. I am opposed to this appropriation on the ground that it is unnecessary. It is a waste of money and a burden on the taxpayers. I do not attribute to the Republicans a greater interest in economy than that possessed by the Democrats, and I do not like for my Democratic associates to bring up the question of politics. I trust that they will in this case, show their real interest in economy. Let us decide this thing on the question of what is right and what is wrong. We hear a great deal these days about the strengthening of Congress. We have appointed committees to study problems of its reorganization.

Some are submitting reports on wasteful spending. I agree that those studies should be made. But all this, gentlemen, will be of no avail, unless Congress rededicates itself to the policy of strict economy and dares to confine the activities of the Federal Government to absolutely essential work demanding that Government agencies spend wisely and carefully and spend only such money as will do the job. We cannot, Mr. Chairman, much longer ignore the mounting colossal public debt. We have to be liberal as to war expenditures but we should determine now that every other type of spending will be authorized only if we cannot carry on without it, and then only for the minimum amount which will do the job properly. It is hardly necessary to state that our public debt is a burden that can only be carried and paid by the American people through self-denial, suffering, and labor for years to come. We can make the future burden lighter if we save now where we can. After the war is over; and, of course, gentlemen, that day will come; and the stimulus of the war is no longer in the hearts of the American people, they will face the stern reality that a large part of their possessions and their energies and their would-be savings must be given to our Government to pay the public debt. They will say to us, "Why did you not save a dollar wherever you could? Although you thought you were getting gifts for us, in all truth you were loading us and our children with debt caused by lavish and unnecessary expenditures."

Our nonwar spending has gone up as well as war spending. We are spending today billions of dollars more on nonwar activities than we did before the war, and for years before it. In all frankness, Mr. Chairman, the reason I

am opposing this appropriation is that it is in the class of nonessential spending and an inexcusable waste of Government funds. Mr. Chairman, how long will we permit this sort of thing to go on in Congress?

Let us look at this bill. This authorization to take the 5-year census no doubt was good when it was first made because we then had no other agency taking the census. We had nothing else of the same kind, and we needed that kind of information. We passed a law back in 1924, or thereabouts, and we started the first census in 1925. We only authorized three things to be done. The law says we shall take the acreage of farm land; second, the acreage of the principal crop; and, third, the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country. Mr. Chairman, that is all the authority we have. We did take the census in 1925, 1930, 1935, and 1940. But, Mr. Chairman, a war came on. After the last war was over I was sent to a school to study first aid at the front. That was after the war was over. Somebody had forgotten to countermand the order and the school went on. It was to teach first aid at the front. The need for the school was over, yet the school went on. It is very much like that now, Mr. Chairman.

This census was not stopped by any committee in the House, because no one in the House has given much attention to it. We have other agencies that are doing the same thing right now. We do not direct how the census shall be taken, and yet with this effort, always to build up a Government bureau, they have set up their plan how to do it, and they want hundreds of supervisors and 27,000 enumerators going out over the country to take it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I will yield after I have finished. I really do not have time now. They want 27,000 enumerators. Where are they coming from? They are coming off the farms. That is the testimony. Most of them will come off the farms, 27,000 people, yet we have heard about the shortage of farm labor.

In addition every one of them will have to travel in his automobile over every county in the United States, and cover every farm in the United States; certainly a waste of gasoline and of manpower. And all of it to do what? To find out how many acres, what the crops are, and how many cattle there are.

If you will go into your county you will find where the county agent has a list of every farm and he has a map and it shows every head of cattle on it and every crop. Now, when are we going to stop this foolish spending?

In addition to this amount of $15,000,000 for the census, we have furnished to the War Manpower Commission, to the War Food Administration, to the O. P. A., and others, millions of dollars to get this same type of information. It has been necessary for this administration to regulate the diet and the food of every family in America; to say when they could eat meat and when they could not. It makes me think there is not much to stabilization, to O. P. A. prices, and all that has gone on to make the food go around. Can we have any confidence in the War Food Administration if their information is no good? Will sending 27,000 people around over the country give us the information so that we can correct this program? I say as a member of the Democratic Party I feel very badly to think the Democrats will stand here and say that our information is no good and that our rationing program is based on a lot of hooey. I do not believe it. I know we have given millions of dollars to these people to find out how many farms there are, what their crops were, and how many cattle they have on their farms today.

On the question of money and saving money, the total amount required for this is something over $15,000,000. That is the total of what they have had and what they are asking in this bill, $6,784,000. That is a total of $15,000,000. I do not care what others may say, the testimony is that they have obligated only about $2,000,000 to date. They have possible other obligations that they do not know of accurately, but not in excess of $2,000,000 more. So, of the $15,000,000 the total obligation, even after paying the supervisors, those who are on the rolls now, and taking care of these undetermined obligations it leaves from $11,000,000 to $13,000,000 that has not yet been spent.

Now, if we stop this at this time we definitely stop what they ask for in this bill, $6,784,000. If we stop this census it will save a total of from $11,000,000 to $13,000,000. If we defeat this bill, they can, with the money that they now have available by previous appropriation take a census, and probably a better one under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I will now take 2 additional minutes.

If they would stop all of it we would have from $11,000,000 to $13,000,000. If they go on with it, by such funds as they now have, we certainly can save $6,784,000.

Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat, I see no reason for either side to consider this a political matter. It is good common sense, ordinary simple business to try to save our taxpayers a little of the burden they face for the next 20 or 40 years.

Not only on this bill but on every item that comes before us we are going to have to rededicate ourselves to making an effort to save a dollar wherever we can save it. To stop this appropriation will do no harm, because we are spending millions to get the same information. I trust that on both sides of the aisle Members will consider that we have a burden to face in the future which demands that we now exercise our self-control, and cease to think of appropriations bringing services to our districts. Vote against this appropriation. Nobody will be hurt and we will have started in the right direction toward practical economy which, in my opinion, is practical patriotism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as a farmer myself I want to discuss the proposed farm census. The futility of the thing is evident on all sides. During December past the time had come for us in our township to put on the regular tuberculosis test of our cattle as well as the Bangs disease test. This was definitely in the public interest in that it had to do with the safeguarding of public health through protecting the milk, and it had to do with the welfare of our livestock. That was handled by a local committee of which I was chairman. It was absolutely impossible to get anyone in the township—and every farmer was involved—to provide a car and a driver to drive the veterinary over the township. No one felt at liberty to take the necessary time, or had the necessary gasoline or good tires for the job. We had to go outside of the township to find one. We finally found a woman in an adjoining town. This difficulty is going to be universal. We have all the information right now we need to know about these things. It will serve no useful purpose. The information we have is sufficient. The War Food Administration, Marvin Jones, declares there is a scarcity of food of all kinds. That is all we need to know to realize that we have got to step up production on all the farms in all classes of products from one end of this land to the other.

What good purpose would it serve to go out and count the apple trees right here in the Virginias and southern Pennsylvania, one of the heaviest apple producing areas in the Nation when we know that there has recently been shipped right into these areas a million and one-half bushels of apples from Canada? That is all the evidence I would need to know that every effort should be made to produce more apples right here.

They tell me this is going to take around 30,000 enumerators. This means 30,000 automobiles with a driver burning gas and using tires. I took the census, myself, back in the twenties. If a census enumerator contacts 8 farms a day he has done a pretty good job. That means 30,000 men taking the census occupying the time of 30,000 other men every day it is in operation. That is just 60,000 man-hours a day as long as it lasts, 60,000 man-hours lost to production. I do not know what the reaction of the farmer will be when the census enumerators take up his time or what the reaction of the census enumerator will be when he tries to contact the farmer two or three times and then finds he cannot get the information he wants. The census enumerators may not get all the information they want and they may find that the farmer has other more important things to do in the war interest.

Calling this matter up again at this time just shows the determination on the part of the administration—and it is typical—to not let one thing go by that may mean votes whether it interferes with winning the war or not, or whether

it would save money. So long as it will get a few votes they have got to put it through.

I have received some letters from people in rural districts where they do some earnest thinking about this thing, as to how this is going to react upon these people in this time of war and when the public debt is rising so rapidly; and I just wonder whether your enumerators will be welcome. I am just wondering whether in the public interest and whether to satisfy your own sense of obligation to the people you had not better vote against this worthless expenditure of money. Marvin Jones and the rest of the men who know about food and those who ration food admit there is a scarcity of it.

These people who will go out and spend this time and take up the farmer's time in gathering this information should be doing something in the war effort during this time. Every rural mail carrier puts into the mail box of every farmer every month a card for him to return. The farmers are returning nearly all of them. He has to tell how much livestock he has, how many he sold last month, how many calves were born, how many lambs, how many sows were bred, how many chickens he ate, the number of eggs he produced, and so forth and so forth. They are continually gathering all this information and it does not serve any useful purpose for a census at this time. It is a vote-getting, money-spending scheme that will interfere with the successful winning of the war and this bill should therefore be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania makes a very strong case for his concluding statement that the taking of this agricultural census is a money-spending, vote-getting scheme. The history of it shows that this originated in a Republican Congress in 1925 and it was provided then that this agricultural census shall be taken every 5 years. The questions being asked today are 300 fewer than were asked in the first census. I do not think you can make a case for saying this is another New Deal extravagance because it was not an idea of the New Deal at all. It was an organic, basic law that was passed and I think it was a wise law.

Now, with reference to the need for this, I do not know how badly it is needed and I do not believe any man on the floor of this House is as well qualified to say how badly it is needed as is the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the War Food Administration. They both have made very strong statements in favor of the taking of an agricultural census at this time.

We have heard here time and again very impressive statements that the impact of this war upon agriculture has had a devastating effect, that the whole success of the war is threatened by a break-down of agricultural production because of the manpower situation. Another thing we have been hearing is that although there has been a congressional statement of agriculture being an essential industry and that selective-service boards should defer young men on the farms within certain categories, yet time and again that is not being done, that the farms are being denuded, they do not have the labor, they do not have the machinery, they do not have the equipment, they are being starved of everything that they need to carry on. Very shortly we are going to be called on to consider agriculture in the post-war era. Then you will want to know what happened to agriculture. What did it do? How many of the farms had to shut down because of no labor, how many of them did not have sufficient farm machinery? And a thousand other pertinent questions that I do not believe any agency of the Government has at the present time.

The gentleman from Illinois and my dearly beloved friend from Kentucky have stated that other agencies in the Government are getting this information and why should they not do it?

I know both of those gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations so well that I know if any other agency of the Government for which we had appropriated funds to do a specific job would start out taking an agricultural census, my two friends would very properly and immediately be on their feet saying, "We did not appropriate this money for you to take this census; not only that, but the law says that the Census Bureau should take it."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. How can the War Food Administration tell us how much food each individual should have if they do not know the number of cattle or the amount of crops on the farms?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think the War Food Administration has accurate, last-minute, up-to-date information on that at the present time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Are they guessing at it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think some of it has been a guess. Some has been based on partial reports.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is a terrible indictment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They can answer for themselves, but they say they do not have that information. If the information is needed, $14,000,000 is not a great sum of money to spend if it is really going to help agriculture. In the time that I have been in this House I have opened up the Public Treasury, as the rest of you have, and have poured out literally millions and millions of dollars in an effort to try to help agriculture.

Let us just go a step further. Are we not in this sort of a situation? It is just like the fellow who starts out to build a house. He draws his plans. He makes his contract. He gets the house half completed, and then he sits down and says, "Well, I believe I was a fool to build this house; not only that, but I am not building the right kind of a house." Which way would I be the biggest fool? To let the half-built house stand there as a monument to my lack of intelligence and foresight, or to try to finish the job?

We started out on this agricultural census the very way that it has always been conducted, the very same machinery, the very same procedure, the very same technique, and the very same set of questions, except in a few instances. Money was appropriated to take it, and the question came up whether the enumerators should be appointed before or after the election. Very properly we waited to appoint them until after the election, because it should not get mixed up in an election. The further question came up as to what time of the year the census should be taken, and very properly we provided that it be taken at a time of the year when the farmer would be less busy and less engaged.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have passed the point of talking about whether or not we ought to take the census. We have an investment of anywhere from two and a half to four or five million dollars in this census. The machinery has been set up under the Director of the Census under our mandate. He has appointed supervisors. He has established quarters. He has had forms printed, and in many instances has engaged enumerators.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who said this was a vote-getting scheme, recalls that we have provided that these enumerators and supervisors would not be appointed until after January 1. If it had been a vote-getting scheme, we might well have done it before election, but the Republicans at that time thought they would carry the House, so they wanted it put over until after January 1.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman that it was on the 23d of June that I, as a Member of the Congress, made the point of order at that time preventing this census being taken before January 1. I have no political interest in it personally, because to me it should not be undertaken at this time. We get much more information today than any census will ever give on information that is necessary for the war. I would not apply that to general information, but so far as the war is concerned, the War Food Administration and the Crop Reporting Service are giving us more information every month than this census will ever give.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I say to the gentleman that the War Food Administration and the Crop Reporting Service are giving us such information as they get and such information as they have. It is based on reports. But they tell us that they need a census now to bring the thing up to date and to tie it up with present conditions.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, down in my district people are struggling under a crushing weight of taxation. I know it has been recently said that there is nothing in the statement of John Marshall that the power to tax is the power to destroy, but people who are being shorn and skinned by taxation down where I live are tired of this continual spending of money that we do not have for things we do not need and can do without.

I own and operate a farm. I grow cattle, hogs, and sheep for sale. If I thought this count of the farm animals of the country and the individuals on the farm would add one runt pig to one litter of pigs or make a twin out of a single bull calf anywhere in this country, there might be some excuse for this needless expenditure of money.

What is the practical result of it? A man is out on the farm at work, and a census enumerator, who ought to be at work, takes a farmer from between the plow handles or away from some other task and asks him how many cattle and how many hogs and how many sheep there are on that farm, and undertakes to find out how much corn and wheat and oats were raised last year.

I think we will all agree that there are agencies that have a reasonable idea of what the food resources of the country are today, what they have on the farms, and what was produced last year, and what will likely be produced next year.

What will this cost? Six million seven hundred and eighty-four thousand dollars. We have gotten to the point now that a dollar in this country is looked upon as chaff which the wind bloweth away. Let us translate this sum into farm animals. This sum that it is proposed to appropriate for this needless expenditure represents 67,840 steers at $100 apiece, or 678,400 lambs at $10 apiece.

It is said we ought to vote for it, or at least we are estopped from voting against it, because some 20 years ago a Republican Congress authorized a farm census. That was in peacetime and this is in wartime. That was when we were not broke and this is at a time when we approach that period in our fiscal history when the debt of this country will be equivalent to every dollar's worth of property in it.

People get up here and talk about economy and then honor the economy to which they render lip service more in the breach than in the observance, because every time they get a chance to spend millions of the people's money they vote it out of the taxpayer's pocket to some bureaucrat. This expenditure of $6,784,000 will not increase production.

I can give you one suggestion as to how we can help the farmer: Stop stripping the farms of farm labor. You cannot take a boy from town and make a farm hand out of him overnight. He just does not know how to do farm work.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand, this would make Government officials out of some 27,000 farmers.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes. Fellows who ought to be at work, ought to be tilling the soil, and ought to be engaged in the work of producing a crop which we badly need. We need food now.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would not this be the result, that these fellows would have a draft classification which would prevent them either from going to war or going into essential industry?

Mr. JENNINGS. They would be deferred from the armed services, or in the event this work-or-jail bill becomes a law, from being put into some useful form of employment.

The very unusual argument was made here a moment ago by my astute friend from Georgia that you ought to vote for this bill, because the Republicans are against it. We Republicans are opposed to wasting the people's money.

I am glad to stand here in favor of economy and to vote against this waste of this large sum of money.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that the various A. A. A. committees throughout the Nation have in their possession information to a large degree identical with that sought in an agricultural census. I cannot see why the Bureau of the Census does not utilize this established set-up to secure the answers to the numerous questions contained in the enumerators' workbook we have exhibited here today.

On page 24 of the hearings you will note that we have a total of 9,093 county committeemen and 104,700 township committeemen, all bona fide farmers and all having a good knowledge of the general conditions on the farms of their neighbors. For years this great organization, which I have always supported personally, has accumulated vast information relative to acreage, crops produced, and like problems.

Here, in this resolution, we are being asked for $6,784,000 for the purpose of taking an agricultural census, in addition to nearly $8,000,000 appropriated last year for the same job. Let us remember first that the previous Census of this nature cost only about $9,000,000 and ask ourselves the question, "Why, in time of war, should it be necessary to spend $15,000,000 to do that same job?"

We can also well ask ourselves, Can we justify the usage of 28,000 people at this time for 2 or 3 months in work that could well be done after the war has been won and there is need to furnish jobs for returning servicemen?

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the bill as drawn, or one very similar to it, will be passed by the House, as the majority in control have decreed its passage. May I express the hope that some compromise may be effected and thereby save the taxpayers of America millions of dollars and still get a satisfactory job done?

Millions of dollars can be saved, Members of this House, if the Bureau of the Census will only work through our great A. A. A. organizations to secure this information needed. Why cannot our county A. A. A. committees mail out to the farmers in each county these blanks and request each farmer to take a few hours in the evening to fill these out and return to the county committee? The various township committeemen could call personally on the very small percentage of farmers who would not forward in such blank, properly filled out, and aid them, their close neighbors, to do so.

Can you see any good reason why millions of dollars could not be saved by this method rather than to have 28,000 enumerators scurrying around in their cars from farm to farm, bothering the farmers at their work, using gasoline and precious tires? I know the $8 or $10 per day these enumerators would earn looks very attractive to many. To these men and women, however, I would say that the saving of four or five millions of dollars to the taxpayers should also be an incentive.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think this entire project should be put off until the war is over. However, also frankly speaking, it is evident that only a middle-of-the-road compromise has any chance whatever of being agreed to by the majority of the Members of this House.

With that in mind, I am intending to offer an amendment to the bill at the proper time to reduce this appropriation by several millions of dollars. It is my sincere belief that if the Bureau of the Census will cooperate with the A. A. A., and will also eliminate the items in its questionnaire which can serve no good purpose in the winning of the war, this census job can be done very quickly and accurately. The farmers of America are ready to do their part in this and we need not pay an average of $1.02 for each return to an enumerator who could better be doing something worth while in producing food. We on the farm will be glad to fill out these blanks and mail them in. It is not necessary for any man or woman to waste gasoline and tires coming to the farms, 6,000,000 of these farms by the way.

Our rural carriers will bring the blanks to the farms and take them away again after a few days when the farmer has had the opportunity in the evening to check into his records and answer the questions as well as he can.

Two additional girls in each county committee office, or about 6,000 in the Nation, can well do the work, and do it better, than can 28,000 men and women trying to travel the snow-filled roads of February and March, wasting gasoline, tires, money, and taking up the time of farmers who today are so shorthanded in labor that they are fast becoming despondent as to their ability to produce the food which must be produced.

I hope that the House will see fit to accept my amendment to the bill. It is a compromise, it will get this job done, yet will save manpower and millions of dollars.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I open my remarks today with the old saying, "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

In 1940 the Republican platform read:

> The Republican Party will put into effect such governmental policies, temporary and permanent, as will establish and maintain an

equitable balance between labor, industry, and agriculture.

Those words are the official pledge to the Nation by the Republican Party.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] who just left the floor—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 7347, September 23, 1942—said in this House:

Did you ever stop to think that food is just as necessary to the winning of this war as is almost anything, except manpower, that you can mention, tanks, guns, planes, or munitions? Have you momentarily paused and thought of what may come to our beloved Nation in a few years time if too much farm labor is stripped from the farms, if experienced farmers continue to be taken in the draft. * * * We have plenty of food today How about tomorrow?

H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think that was a very good prophecy, was it not?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, I do not know. We still have food.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] said:

When famine strikes home next winter—

He was speaking in June 1943—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6225—all this bugaboo went on to frighten the public and the Congress into a shivering fear, "You are going to have a famine." That is what they told us back in 1943. We have got something of the same problem hovering over this House again this afternoon. This is what he said:

When famine strikes home next winter in New York City and other large consuming areas. * * * It will then be a question of getting food at any price, if it can be secured at all. Within 6 months most legitimate food dealers will be out of business because of inability to secure supplies from food processors. * * * There is a question in my mind if they will be able to get enough supplies to take care of the requirements of our armed forces, to say nothing of lend-lease commitments.

Do you remember that quotation in the House?

Our dear friend, my personal friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] on October 6, 1942—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A3592—spoke across the aisle and stated:

I urge an immediate survey, to be completed by January 1, a kind of census of all the time-saving machinery on United States farms.

My friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on February 24, 1943—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1270—rose in this House as he does with all his vigor and vim and said:

Now, on machinery, why can there not be made a recheck on the inventories on machinery * * * in the hope that there can be an increase in the quotas on various types of machines that are necessary to till the soil?

Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said again on February 24, 1943—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1263:

I think it is eminently fair to conclude that there has been no comprehensive food program, and that the Department of Agriculture and other officials charged with this responsibility have not been seeing in the future and determining the needs of this country.

And now to recall further statements made in the Congress on subjects intimate to the agricultural census, I quote the following extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Accurate information and figures are a critical necessity. At present figures put out by the Government are notoriously inaccurate (THOMAS A. JENKINS, Republican, Ohio, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, p. A2752, 78th Cong., 1st sess., June 2, 1943, from his address Food Is Our Most Serious Problem.)

Mr. Speaker, the whole problem of farm production and the need of food supply should be examined realistically and practically, and that right now all factors and all matters should be worked out so there may be a better understanding on this extremely important problem. (EDWARD H. REES, Republican, Kansas, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8375, Oct. 19, 1942.)

Mr. Speaker, I think that all Members of the House will agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that the Congress should do everything in its power to prevent the dilemma, indeed the catastrophe, that faced agriculture following the last war. (DEWEY SHORT, Republican, Missouri, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9613, Dec. 16, 1944.)

Food production is not a day-by-day process. It requires advance planning. (RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, Republican, Indiana, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2202, Mar. 18, 1943.)

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] cites many statistics relating to farm incomes, production, values, and so forth—statistics available from the Census Bureau.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] thanks him for the wealth of information and pays his respects for giving so much careful study to the farm problem.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] replies:

I thank the gentleman for that, but so far as I am concerned I cannot take any personal credit for it, because the information is all down in these departments, and has been there, and this great committee that is here today is the one who has been granting appropriations to produce that information year after year. The only credit that I can take, is that I have had enough interest to get the facts, because as Members know, when we have the facts, it is easy to know how to vote. (REID F. MURRAY, Republican, Wisconsin, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1436, Feb. 8, 1944.)

The farmers of America must be provided with sufficient farm machinery and parts for repair if they are to produce the foods so badly needed for our fighting forces. * * * It is the responsibility of Congress to do everything possible to assist agriculture. (A. L. MILLER, Republican, Nebraska, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 614, Feb. 4, 1943.)

So, Mr. Chairman, today we are asked to look into the future to find out what is necessary, what farm needs really are, what shortages and what surpluses exist, so industry will be able to prepare to supply its necessities immediately in the post-war program for the betterment and comfort of those who have struggled along with inferior implements as well as to eliminate the antiques of drudgery for the veteran upon his return. Yet, Mr. Chairman, when in an orderly fashion we seek to take these steps we are confronted with the accusation, "politics."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I believe the last speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, really gave us more to think about than some of us realize. I believe many of us are familiar with agriculture. I have been astonished to notice how those who are so anxious to have this census, with one or two exceptions, all come from States that do not produce enough food to even feed themselves. I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] brought out the real purpose of this census. Anyone who is familiar with the situation knows that our Bureau of Agricultural Economics and our Agricultural Adjustment Administration have more information on agriculture than this census will ever develop. By the time the information obtained from this census is available it will be entirely obsolete as far as its contribution to the war is concerned. Anyone familiar with agriculture at the present time knows that all these Government agencies have information at the end of every month telling exactly the number of pounds of milk produced in every State in the Union, the number of eggs and other agricultural products that are produced in this country every month. That is a set-up that has developed since 1925.

I do say this, that I believe the business interests, as our good friend from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] said, are the ones who are interested in this bill. I believe what they want to know is how many millions or billions of dollars the farmer has accumulated in this time when he has been pictured as rolling in so much unaccustomed wealth. I think they want to know just exactly how much wool has been grown so they can get out their shears to clip it as soon as the war is over. I do not believe there is any doubt as to that or as to the fact that from the businessman's standpoint there is some merit to it. But as far as agricultural information is concerned there is not a living soul who can stand on this floor and say that we are justified at this time in spending these great amounts of money for information that does not help win this war; and no man yet has told us where this information is going to help win this war in any way. As a matter of fact it is going to keep us from winning the war by just the extent it ties up manpower, uses gas, and consumes tires. If the bill cannot be defeated and the item eliminated entirely, I sincerely hope the amount can be cut down. The first census cost $4,000,000 plus. That was in 1925. In 1935 the cost was five million and some thousands. Why all at once during wartime, does it blossom out to a $15,000,000 figure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With the gentleman's permission may I not say to my very

distinguished friend from Michigan that he reminds me of the fellow who was marshaled to speak for the character of the accused and said he is a good eater. There was just about as much germaneness to the things he said as there was in the illustration I gave. The fact of the matter is that all this information is available through the War Food Administration and there are literally thousands of people down here available for assembling that information. In addition thereto the War Production Board and the other instrumentalities of the Government have acquired that information once and they do not have to acquire it a second time.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I should like to remind the gentleman from Illinois that he ought to be very discreet in his praise of anything that has been done because he might be praising something that happened under the Democratic administration.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan whether he is addressing me or the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Illinois just made a reference to me and I replied. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I make no excuse for saying that this is interesting to industry.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. And I do not believe the gentleman from Wisconsin wishes to take the position that people in the rural districts are not interested in industry as it affects the farmer whether it be iceboxes, plows, or machinery. Somebody has to have the facts if you want to properly prepare to take care of the people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would suggest that our friend from Michigan read the statute that was put on the books in 1924 or 1925 which circumscribes the area within which an agricultural census may be taken. It provides specifically for acreage of principal crops, acreage, value and number of livestock. That is what it provides for and all of these other things are extraneous matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Illinois I would say there is no limit put upon what may be inquired about.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the gentleman read the language.

Mr. RABAUT. It is right here in the book.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Read it to the Committee. They would like to have it, and it is the best evidence, you know.

Mr. RABAUT. I will insert in today's proceedings section 205, title 13, chapter IV, United States Code, for the gentleman's edification.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. The original statute creating the Department of Agriculture, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, gives the Secretary power at his discretion at any time to collect the information provided for in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, there should be no misunderstanding as to the law under which we are presently operating. It is available for anyone's inspection and will be found in section 216 of title 13 of the United States Code. Let me read it to you now so that the Members will have it today when they perhaps will vote upon the pending resolution.

> There shall be in the year 1935 and once every 10 years thereafter a census of agriculture and livestock which shall show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of the principal crops, and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country. The schedule employed in this census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census. Such census shall be taken as of the first day of January and relate to the crop year.

I am now quoting the exact language from section 216 of title 13, United States Code.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct——

Mr. KEEFE. I am surprised to have that admission from the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is usually correct.

Mr. KEEFE. I accept the compliment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certain inquiries are specifically designated in the statute but the questions to be asked in the census are not limited to the designated subjects. The statute provides that the schedule of questions employed in the census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census and every Director of the Census and every Secretary of Agriculture under every President since the agricultural census was instituted has held the statute to authorize questions on related subjects supplying data required to give a full picture of the agricultural situation. No Director and no Secretary under any President has ever interpreted any provision of the statute as a limitation. And that interpretation has been approved by every succeeding Congress providing funds for the census.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman want to ask a question or does he want to make a speech? He has plenty of time to make a speech in his own time. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further.

Mr. Chairman, I read the statute to the members of the committee, and I am just as able as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri to place an interpretation upon the plain English that appears therein.

May I say that the administrative interpretation that has been put on this statute by the New Deal makes it as broad as the wind, and administratively they contend that under this limited language they can go out and ask any questions under the sun and fail to ask any questions that they do not want to ask that might get them information that the people of this country ought to have.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield to the gentleman from Michigan, because he cannot contribute anything more on this particular question.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield. I am utterly amazed by the argument made by the gentleman from Michigan. I want to talk to you people over on the Democratic side——

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, am I going to be permitted to occupy this floor or not? The gentleman from Michigan knows the rules of this House; and if he does not, he ought to. The gentleman from Wisconsin has the floor, and he intends to occupy the floor in his own time.

Let us get down to brass tacks on this proposition for just a minute. You say that Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, wants this bill passed. You say that other agencies of government want this bill passed. I have read the hearings before the Deficiency Committee, and the only person who testified was Mr. Capt, Director of the Census. If you had information in the form of letters or something else, you did not submit it for the benefit of the members so that we could read it in the hearings. You did not subject either Marvin Jones or the Secretary of Agriculture to cross-examination. Let me ask you this. When you say that Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, must have the information in this census, are you not making a confession to the people of this country that you will live to regret? Marvin Jones, as War Food Administrator, and the agencies in the Department of Agriculture have been making crop allocations for a number of years. They have been telling the people of this country what to grow and what not to grow. Based upon the same information, the O. P. A. has been placing restrictions upon the diets of the people of this country, limitations upon price and supply, upon the theory that they have available the information as to the amount of food supplies that are available.

I recently wrote to Marvin Jones and said, "Will you please tell me the basis upon which you are making your allocations of milk subsidy payments to the farmers of this country? What is the reason that you are paying 60 cents a hundred to the farmers in Wisconsin and 90 cents a hundred to the farmers in other sections of the country?" You should have seen the maze and mass of information that Marvin Jones came back with and the amount of statistical

information that he had available to give me that answer. He could tell me the production of milk in every single county in the United States. He could tell me the number of milch cows in the United States. He could tell every pound of milk produced and where and how it was consumed or processed. He could tell me the number of chickens on every farm and the number of dozen eggs that have been produced on every farm in the United States.

They claim to have that information and they have it currently available, as you all know. Operating in conjunction with the triple A program, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Extension Service, and the crop-reporting agencies of the various States, that information is not 5 years old. Do you mean to say that Mr. Bowles has issued his orders rationing food and fixing prices on information that is not accurate?

Do you mean to tell me that the W. P. B. when they made their allocations of steel for the manufacture of farm implements and machinery did not know what the available supply of farm machinery was? Are you confessing as Democrats that your whole war program has been based upon misinformation?

I am glad that my friend from Kentucky, a distinguished Democrat, had the courage to stand here in the well of this House and tell you Democrats the truth, but you will not believe it, and why? Because you know that you have the votes to pass this or any other bill. You are going to pass this bill, I am certain of that, because you are going to vote for it en masse. You are going to vote for it as Democrats, you are going to vote for it because you have been told that this is a Democratic matter. Well, you vote for it. All I want to do is let the people of this country know that although my good chairman in his first talk to the members of the Committee on Appropriations impressed upon us the necessity for economy and for refusing to appropriate a single dollar that was not necessary for the war effort, on the very first test in meeting that admonition from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations we are going to vote to squander $14,500,000 to take a farm census in order to put some 30,000 more on the pay roll and interfere with the prosecution of the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if you have read the hearings you will find the whole long list of telegrams and excerpts from letters. How many of you have read those? How many of you have read these hearings? If you will read the hearings, what will it demonstrate? It will demonstrate, if it demonstrates anything at all, that they are having a terrible job not only to get the supervisory personnel but to get enumerators to do this work. There is letter after letter recorded in which the people who are solicited to become enumerators say they will not take the job for the money that is offered. What is the implication from that. The implication is that they are busy or they have jobs already that will pay them more money than you want to offer them under this census program.

The other thing that shows up in these statements is this: Letter after letter comes in, such as the letter put in from the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], in which it appears that a large number of the people who are doing this job are not Democrats, they are Republicans. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] told the committee that the man in charge in his area is a Republican, a fine man. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] said the man down in his area is a Republican. So it is all over the country. Republicans are being asked to do this job.

I suppose the only conclusion you can draw from that is there are no more Democrats who might possibly be available to do this job. The reason for this is obvious. You have 3,500,000 of them on the pay roll now and there are no more Democrats to fill these jobs. I do not feel that is exactly the situation, however. But, Members of this Congress, you are going to have a terrible job getting this information. Let me show you something. Let us get down to the real facts of this thing. Here is a newspaper published in my district. What does it say? It says:

> Urge farmers prepare data in advance for census takers.

That is a Democratic paper too. What did they do? Why, they could not get census enumerators. They are not able to get the people to go out and take the census.

So what do they do? This article says that the Director is sending this form out in the mail to the farmers and asking them to fill it out and send it back to headquarters. So you are going to have that farmer fill this form out and you are going to get that type of information. What is the farmer going to do? He will get this bulletin from headquarters and supply the information that the census enumerator will finally use in filling out the census return. The farmer will tell how many cows there are on his farm. That may make some difference to him as between the number that are on the farm and what is shown on the assessor's rolls, do you not see? Does anybody check to see how many cows are there? Does anybody check to see how many chickens are there? Does anybody check to find out how many dozen eggs were collected or how many dozen eggs were sold? Does anybody check to see how much milk was sold on that farm? Can anybody check to determine how much food was consumed on the farm? You talk about accurate information. Why, it is ridiculous. It cannot be anything more than the barest kind of an estimate made up of a lot of guesses that have been slapped together to call it a farm census.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, let me say further, you are going to pass this bill. You are going to pass this just as you are going to pass a lot of other bills in this session of Congress. So far as we on the Republican side are concerned, we want to see the issue made clear. You and your spokesman have told the people of this country that you are solidly behind the war; that you intend to devote every dollar of the resources of this country and all its energy to the war effort. Now you are kicking 30,000 people out of their jobs on the farms where they are producing food and you are sending them out on the highways and byways, burning gasoline and using up tires to take the census. You are going to spend $15,000,000 to do it. When you have the census, then what have you got? Oh, I know it is easy to hook everything onto the war effort. I listened to the speech of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], who tried to hook this onto the war effort so that the taking of this census would appear to help the boys over on the battle front. Why, Mr. Chairman, this material will not be available for 6 or 8 months. If you read the hearings, Mr. Capt says they perhaps will not conclude the enumeration until June, and it will take another 6 months to compile it. Why, it is perfectly ridiculous to talk about getting information between now and June that will be of assistance in telling the farmers in the northern half of the country what they should plant for crops to remedy food deficiencies in the growing crop year of 1945.

It seems to me it is perfectly absurd. Now, you take the responsibility. You are running this show. Your leadership has brought this bill out here. We licked this bill twice. When they asked for $5,500,000, it was defeated by a roll-call vote and you told us at that time, "Wait until January when our new men get in here and we will pass it." Now, it is January, and you are here with your added strength. You are not asking for $5,500,000. Now, you are here asking for $6,784,000. Well, I congratulate you. I congratulate you upon your power. I am telling you right now, my friends on the Democratic side, and most of you are my friends and I have some very dear friends over here that I think the world of, you have got that responsibility. Now you face the people of this country in view of what you said last week, when you said that the manpower situation was so critical that you had to pass a law to conscript labor in this country, to regiment them under a draft. Then you tell the people the very next week, the same leadership, the same control, "We are going to take 30,000 men and put them to work on this silly business of taking a census in wartimes." A census that may have been thoroughly advisable in 1925, or 1930, cannot be justified under conditions as you described them last week when you voted for this manpower conscription bill. I say to you gentlemen, you go ahead and send out the word to the Nation. Oh, yes. You talk about economy. Yes, we do not intend to spend the people's money foolishly. Here you are going to throw away $14,000,000 of the taxpayers' money on

this futile thing. Why not say to the people, "We intend to do what we said." Why not send a word of hope and encouragement back to the people of this country that Congress is determined to get behind the war effort, and not to expend a single manpower hour or a single dollar that is not essential and necessary for the prosecution of the war?

I am convinced that no effective showing can be made that the expending of this money will contribute one iota to the war effort. I am further convinced that to utilize critical manpower in this manner would make a mockery of the arguments presented last week in connection with the labor-conscription bill. I am convinced that when the public know the truth of this situation and see the utter recklessness with which public funds are being thrown about in utter disregard of the necessity of the war effort and the bankrupt condition of the Treasury, they will call to account those who vote for this expenditure.

Some two million dollars of the appropriation has already been spent, and another two million may be necessary to wind up this fiasco. For me, I would rather lose the entire $4,000,000 than to continue this unnecessary program and squander $14,684,000 plus such additional sums as may be found necessary before the job is completed. If these were normal times, there might be some reason in the arguments of the proponents of this legislation. The country is at war, and we must give up many things which might otherwise be considered necessary in order that we might carry on most effectively with the war effort. My conscience will not permit me to vote to squander public funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] quoted from chapter IV, title 13, section 216. In order to put the other wheel on his cart, and give the whole story to the Congress so it will keep him in proper seat, I ask at this point to put section 205 in the RECORD.

Section 205. Duties of supervisors, enumerators, and other employees:

Each supervisor shall perform such duties as may be imposed upon him by the Director of the Census in the enforcement of this chapter, and the duties thus imposed shall be performed in any and all particulars in accordance with the orders and instructions of the Director of the Census; that each enumerator or other employee detailed to serve as enumerator shall be charged with the collection in his subdivision of the facts and statistics called for on the population and agricultural schedules, and such other schedules as the Director of the Census may determine shall be used by him in connection with the census. It shall be the duty of each enumerator to visit personally each dwelling house in his subdivision, and each family therein, and each individual living out of a family in any place of abode, and by inquiry made of the head of each family, or of the member thereof deemed most competent and trustworthy, or of such individual living out of a family, to obtain each and every item of information and all particulars required for the census; and in case no person shall be found at the usual place of abode of such family, or individual living out of a family, competent to answer the inquiries, then it shall be lawful for the census employee to obtain the required information as nearly as may be practicable from the family or families or person or persons living nearest to such place of abode who may be competent to answer such inquiries (June 18, 1929, ch. 28, sec. 5, 46 Stat. 22).

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, of course that request must be made in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is to place a certain section of the law pertaining to this bill in the RECORD?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be required to renew that request in the House.

Mr. RABAUT. I will make the request in the House, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just preceded me, my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], for whom I have great respect, has challenged the Democratic Party to pass this bill. I am sorry this has resolved itself into a political matter, but as far as I am concerned, and I think as far as every other Democratic Member in this House is concerned, we are willing to accept the challenge and pass this bill when we get an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. Chairman, I have been taught all my life to respect the law of this country. Maybe my training has been peculiar in that respect, but in 1925 and 1930, the Republican Party in the Congress that was then functioning in this Nation spent $14,000,000 to take this very kind of census we are now discussing.

To show you how valuable it was, the first census was compiled in two octavo volumes and is available now for the people of this country and will always be available for them to go to and see what were the needs of the farmer and what were the needs of the business life of this Nation at that time. When the second census was taken 5 years after and that by the Republican Party, it comprised 11 volumes of valuable information with respect to the farm life of this country and also the industrial life of this country as was ever collected. It is now available and will be as long as this Nation stands.

This is the law of the land. Men whom we can depend upon have come before our committees and come from the various divisions of this Government and told us that this census was necessary. As far as I am concerned I am willing to take the advice of these men. I live in a great farming area and know something about the farm industry of this country of ours.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield briefly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. What right has this body here today, unless we repeal that law, to take action in violation of the specific terms of that act which states that we shall do this thing?

Mr. KERR. It is wrong; the gentleman knows it and every other man in this House knows it. This is a sacred law of this land and it involves the right of 30,000,000 farmers in this country who are as valuable citizens as we have and who will always contribute much to the welfare of this country and to its history. This census involves knowledge obtained from them and is most important to the industry of this country.

Yes; if the Republican Party wants to make a political issue of this matter, if they want to challenge the Democrats to pass this measure, I insist. Let us accept the challenge and pass it and abide by the law and confirm the law and make the law useful as the men who wrote it and as the men who know something about it demand that it should be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time and the remainder of all time for general debate to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the committee has just indicated, we now come to the close of general debate on this bill. I shall not attempt to answer all the charges that have been made but I shall mention a few statements or charges that have been repeatedly made by all of those, if I remember correctly, who have opposed the bill.

Charge No. 1 is that the A. A. A. can do this job. Is it not quite significant that so many laudatory remarks should come here today about the A. A. A. from the Republican side of this House? I am glad these gentlemen have finally decided that the A. A. A. after all is such an efficient organization. Some of us did not fully realize how efficient it was until I heard these laudatory speeches today. The reply, however, again is that if the A. A. A. had this information certainly it has not passed it on to the Secretary of Agriculture, because, despite what the gentleman from Wisconsin, my esteemed friend, has said, let me once again remind the House that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for this information and urged the passage of the pending bill.

The fact that the War Food Administrator, Mr. Marvin Jones, has written a letter in which he has asked specifically for the information, is the best answer to the argument that he now has all that information. Much has been said about the information on which the Food Administrator has made his decisions and issued directives. For many years I have had a high regard for Marvin Jones, the Food Administrator. Now to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] say the Food Administrator knows the number of cows and chickens owned by every farmer in America is certainly a high compliment to him. Of course no one pretends to say that the War Food Administrator or the Department of Agriculture knows every calf, every chicken, every duck on every farm in the country. But no doubt they can make and have made reasonably accurate estimates. The Food Administrator says he wants the full facts and if there was ever a time we should have the facts rather

than an estimate it is now. Charge No. 2 is that the passage of this bill proposes a waste of manpower. You have heard that over and over again. Somebody said there will be 27,000 farmers taken out of production to do this work. Yet, let me again remind you the record discloses that every enumerator must be cleared through the United States Employment Service, so that oft-repeated charge, like the rest falls by the wayside. The record also discloses that for the most part the actual enumeration is being made by elderly farm women. A few disabled war veterans and older men have been employed.

Again they say the agricultural census is not needed. Oh, it was greatly needed back in 1925 and again in 1930. A Republican Secretary of Agriculture appointed by the great engineer testified it was needed. But now with America in a war that will decide civilization for centuries to come and with the growing realization that the slogan "food will win the war" is becoming more and more important, we are suddenly told that this vital information the Food Administrator and Secretary of Agriculture both say is essential is not actually needed.

The gentleman from Illinois, the very eloquent orator and clever debater, Mr. DIRKSEN, departed somewhat from the usual opposition. You will remember he did not say that this census is unnecessary, and I challenge the RECORD on that score. Oh, he said there were a lot of foolish questions being asked in these schedules by the Census Bureau. I hold in my hand these books they talk about containing all of the questions. They say there are some foolish questions in here. That may be true. He read some of those questions into the RECORD. There were originally many more questions when his party took the census. I have here a list of the new questions being asked this year. These were not asked by our Republican brethren. There are only six of them in this book and none are among those placed in this RECORD by the gentleman from Illinois. Three hundred and eight questions asked back under "Hoover, hell, and hard times" have been eliminated. Ninety-five questions have been eliminated in the other book I hold here. The six new questions are important and sensible. They refer mostly to the dairying industry, milking machines, poultry, eggs, and electric power being used on the various farms. Does anyone object to that information? Does anyone say that information would not be helpful not only in winning the war, but also in the post-war program to follow? If petty partisan politics is not the primary factor behind this stubborn Republican opposition, then I must confess, I am at a loss to know what is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the amount named in the appropriation contained in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, for preparing for, taking, compiling, and publishing the quinquennial Census of Agriculture of the United States is hereby increased by $6,784,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURPHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. J. Res. 85) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the course of debate today and include certain data referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include certain extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post by Drew Pearson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today be permitted to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think consideration of this bill should be postponed until we vote on the bill now before the House. I do not think you ought to come in here at this time of the day, with all the pressure that has been put on the Members of the House, and attempt to bring that measure up when we are right on the verge of voting on a bill that has been debated all day long. I hope the gentleman will withdraw it, because I cannot agree to its consideration at this time. I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 20 minutes.

TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF WAR VETERANS SUFFERING FROM NERVOUS AND MENTAL DISORDERS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two columns by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House today what I believe to be one of our most pressing problems.

Simply and broadly stated it is this: The treatment and rehabilitation of war veterans who are suffering from nervous and mental disorders.

An immediate concern of the Congress, as I view it, is to find a way for specialized training of from 10,000 to 20,000 medical graduates in the field of neuropsychiatric treatment, and to provide reasonable assurances that an adequate number of men so trained shall go into veterans' hospitals for a definite and specified length of time.

I do not propose today to attempt to give all the answers to this very broad subject. I shall introduce some legislation a little later on dealing with a proposed training program and some other phases of the problem.

The Congress has taken some very commendable steps to provide for rehabilitation and readjustment of veterans in the G. I. bill of rights. That is a broad charter providing many avenues for physical, financial, and educational readjustments. That bill, along with other legislation, provides for hospitalization in a rather liberal way, as it should. But neither the Veterans Administration nor any other agency of Government today is able to cope with this growing problem of the psychiatric case.

A competently trained and skilled psychiatrist cannot be made overnight. A graduate of a reputable medical school who has the natural aptitude for special work with nerve or mental cases usually must spend from 3 to 5 years beyond an internship before he is considered adequately trained for treatment of such cases.

A great majority of those properly trained today are now in the armed forces. There are less than 4,000 members of American Psychiatric Association, all told. No one desires to take any of these men from the armed forces, where they are unquestionably needed badly.

But so far as I know there is at this time no plan or proposal that would give any degree of assurance that the services of any appreciable number of these psychiatrists now serving in the Army and Navy Medical Corps might be retained for veterans' hospitals when the war is over. Many of them, no doubt, will desire to return to private practice. For, mind you, the impact of war has created many neuropsychiatric cases in the civilian population, and many veterans will be discharged without being hospitalized, no doubt, who will be suffering from some nervous or mental disorder.

Already there have been discharged from the armed services between 130,000 and 140,000 men because of neurotic maladjustments. There will be many more, and still others will develop when those who appear normal at the time of their discharge return to civilian life.

These men will be scattered in communities all across the country. And let me say here, Mr. Speaker, that in the end, regardless of what Congress or Government may do, much of the success of rehabilitating these men will depend upon how conscious the community becomes of its responsibility and of how successfully it meets and discharges that responsibility.

It is encouraging in this respect to note that many communities and States are showing an active interest in this matter. And in this connection I call the attention of the House to a series of columns written recently by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes. I regard him as one of the very able newspapermen writing on public problems today. I am including two columns by Mr. Stokes in my remarks.

Looking broadly at this matter, we cannot overemphasize the importance of community responsibility in the task of rehabilitating men whose nervous systems have been wounded by war. I think it is highly important that we realize that a mental or nervous disorder is nothing more or less than a wound that can, with proper treatment, be healed just as surely as an injury left by a bullet to an arm or leg.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman is rendering a very splendid service in bringing this problem to the attention of the House. I join with him in commending Mr. Stokes on the excellent statements he has been making. I, too, feel that it is well for the country to be made aware of the severity of this problem. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree that the Federal Government, without evading its responsibilities, still needs the aid of the States and all of the facilities they have in this work of rehabilitation. The gentleman has referred to the importance of community services, and it seems to me that all of the Federal officers would welcome the aid of the State agencies in those services he is emphasizing.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, and I agree fully. Granting that we may arrive at a workable plan for training and obtaining the services of a sufficient number of psychiatrists to take care of the needs in the hospitals, it still will be necessary for a great deal of community work to be done. Above all, it seems to me, it will be extremely important that the community develop the proper attitude toward the reabsorption of these neuropsychiatric cases into community life.

That will call for the very closest cooperation among all agencies in a community with interests in the problem, and I believe calls for particularly well defined programs of cooperation among local, State, national public health services, with local and State medical, social, and psychiatric groups.

Perhaps there is not a great deal the Congress can do insofar as the community phase of this problem is concerned.

But it is very clearly the responsibility of Congress to see to it that adequate provision is made for treatment of these veterans in the veterans' hospitals.

The Veterans Administration is not prepared at the present time to begin to cope with the matter properly. I doubt if we have begun to realize fully the tremendous amount of detail imposed upon the Veterans Administration in the G. I. bill of rights. Presently the Administration is handicapped seriously by personnel problems. Many of these will no doubt clear up in most of the activities when the war is over. But whether the Veterans Administration shall be able to give the neuropsychiatric treatment that must be given as the number of such patients increases will depend primarily upon whether the Congress takes the necessary steps to augment facilities and to assure a sufficient number of adequately trained and skilled men in the medical service to the job.

I do not know, nor does the Veterans Administration or the Public Health Service know, today how many men will be required. All who have looked into the matter at all know that many more will be required than are available today, even if we were able to use all those now serving in the Army and Navy Medical Corps. I have received estimates that range from 10,000 to 18,000.

In order to help meet the great need for nurses the Congress enacted the Bolton bill, which provided for the Nurse Cadet Corps.

In order to meet the need for psychiatrists, I believe the Congress must enact legislation to provide for the beginning at an early date of a special training program for medical graduates and physicians whose services then may be obtained for a specified length of time in our veterans hospitals. I shall introduce legislation very shortly in an effort to bring the matter before the House for action, and at an early date I expect to discuss the detailed provisions of that proposal.

One of the difficulties we face in the beginning of such a program immediately is an acute shortage of teachers who are qualified in this field. Most of those who might be utilized are in the service of their country. It may develop that it will be necessary first to train some teachers. But whatever is necessary it must be done.

Not so long ago a close friend of mine who was a junior officer in the Army developed a nervous condition that was rather serious. He entered a veterans' hospital and after a number of months he had made but little, if any, progress. This was not the fault of the hospital insofar as lack of attention was concerned. That hospital simply did not have anything like an adequate staff.

Finally, a skilled psychiatrist took hold of this young man's case, and within a remarkably short time he was out of the hospital and well on his way to complete recovery and readjustment.

What happened in the case of this young lieutenant can happen to thousands of others, and we must not allow any condition to exist that will prevent those needing such treatment from receiving it while yet there is time for a complete healing of these mental wounds.

In addition to a program of training, I believe the Congress should pass legislation to establish in the Veterans Administration a commissioned service. I have, with the assistance of the legislative counsel, and others, drawn such a bill. When I have completed a few technical revisions, I expect to introduce that bill, also. I shall not at this time go into a full discussion of the reasons for such legislation, but hope to do so very shortly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious, of course, that a subject as broad as this one can only be touched upon in the time I have today. I have tried simply to emphasize in the first place that the rehabilitation of war veterans suffering from nervous or mental troubles is one of our most serious problems growing out of the war.

In the second place, to point out that there is now and will continue to be a dangerous shortage of trained psychiatrists to give proper treatment unless steps are taken quickly to train others, and that even then there will be a gap that must be bridged by community effort.

I have referred to two bills which I shall introduce. I do not suggest even that these bills will furnish the full answer. I stand ready to lead or to follow in whatever action may be practical in removing our present shortcomings in the treatment of neuropsychiatric cases among war veterans. The number already is large and it is growing.

Medical science and skilled surgery are effecting nothing short of miracles in the treatment of physical injuries suffered in combat today. Our appreciation for their achievements is unmeasurable. And the same miraculous results can be attained in this delicate field of mental illness among war veterans if there is sufficient alertness to the psychiatric phases of our rehabilitation program, and if this alertness prompts the Congress, the Veterans Administration, the Public Health Service, and all other agencies of Government that share the responsibility, to take hold of it with an aggressive determination to see that the facilities and the personnel are provided and utilized.

Let us firmly resolve here in the House of Representatives that we shall do all that is possible legislatively to provide these facilities and this personnel. Until we have done so we are leaving a tragically dangerous gap in our veterans' program unbridged.

NEUROPSYCHIATRIC CASES POST-WAR PROBLEM

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—One of the most serious problems growing out of the war—and it is becoming apparent now—is the treatment, care, and rehabilitation of servicemen who are maladjusted, what is known technically as neuropsychiatric cases.

Already around 130,000 have been discharged for disabilities of this nature. The number will grow. It might be pointed out that some 1,200,000 civilians were rejected for military service, because of neuropsychiatric disabilities, 30 percent of all those turned down on medical grounds.

Yet, the Government is not adequately prepared to cope with this problem in the opinion of experts in the field. Nor is the public awake to it, they say. In the last analysis, it will become a community problem and responsibility, for a community program will be essential as well as an integrated Government program. The soldier must be fitted back into community life.

Many shortcomings are pointed out in a survey of the problem.

There is an acute shortage of psychiatrists to work with the expected large number of cases. The American Psychiatric Association has 3,400 members, about all the psychiatrists there are, outside of perhaps 500 others not members of the association. To add some quickly the Army is rushing classes through a 90-day course, which does not produce fully trained psychiatrists, but helps to some small extent.

A way must be found to train more psychiatrists, many more.

A basic shortcoming in the mechanics of an effective program is the lack of a coordinating agency among the various Government bureaus which have to do with veterans. This results in the usual conflicts and inability to act when there is no ultimate responsible authority to work out a program and get action.

This reacts upon the development of local community plans and projects. Although a number of communities are organizing themselves, they are handicapped by the lack of a single agency here to which they can come for information, advice, and a pattern. Men of standing in the psychiatric field who are working here in one or another agency find themselves enmeshed in the bureaucratic tangle, unable to move directly to do the things that ought to be done.

The Veterans Administration, itself, is not sufficiently alert, and gives too little emphasis to the medical and psychiatric phases of the rehabilitation program. That is the testimony all around. It is hidebound in its approach, too routine, too timid. It lacks the aggressiveness and imagination needed to take hold.

Treatment of neuropsychiatric cases is impeded by a shortage of out-patient facilities. In many cases the veteran has to go long distances for treatment. When he gets there, he often has to wait and wait, for doctors are overburdened with the paper work essential in the Government. Recently the Army has begun to give treatment to some men in the Army, itself.

One of the major needs in meeting the neuropsychiatric problem, in the view of those experienced with it, is to educate the public to the reception and reabsorption of the veteran back into normal life. There is need to educate the employer to utilize the neuropsychiatric who, in many cases, is more efficient in certain types of jobs than persons considered well. Likewise, families need enlightenment in the handling of men who are maladjusted.

Only a vague and sketchy beginning has been made in this sort of education.

Another shortcoming is the isolation of many veterans' hospitals that were built after the last war. New facilities, it is urged, shou'd be in or near big communities, because experienced consultants are available there and because the veteran should become a part of community life, and not isolated in an institution, for obvious reasons.

What is being proposed to meet some of these problems will be discussed in a subsequent column.

PSYCHIATRY FOR VETS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The manifold affairs of the war veteran, sick and well, are the concern of a number of Government agencies.

There is the Veterans Administration created after the last war, solid, permanent and highly bureaucratic; the Federal Security Administration with its State rehabilitation offices; the United States Employment Service having to do with jobs; the United States Bureau of Education; Selective Service; the United States Public Health Service; and the War Department and Navy Department.

There are also outside organizations, such as the various veterans' associations, and the American Red Cross.

This is as it should be, for the veteran's problem is many-sided. The Government interest is specific as well as broad, as is that of the public. But, as with other problems and interests that come within the purview of Government, this can create confusion, so that the main objective often gets lost.

Those who are experienced with the Government veteran set-up say that what is most needed now is some coordinating agency over all these various agencies. This is emphasized particularly by those concerned with a problem that is now beginning to demand attention.

This is the treatment and restoring of the neuropsychiatrics, the veterans who have become maladjusted, troubled with nervous or mental disorders, which have been discussed in two previous articles. Their number is large and still growing.

Because of the varied interests of the veteran it has been suggested that an over-all investigation should be conducted, perhaps by a commission representative of the Government, including Congress, and the private agencies.

Such an inquiry not only could consider this matter of co-ordination, but could go into the numerous phases of the particular problem with which this and two previous articles have been concerned, the neuropsychiatric. To be effective, such an investigation should be made soon.

It could go into a major need, the providing of more psychiatrists to take hold of this problem. It could also consider numerous other suggestions.

One is that in order to furnish more outpatient facilities there be created mobile psychiatric units to visit small towns and rural areas where treatment could not be given locally.

Another is that there be a physical, psychological, and vocational appraisal of those in the service prior to their discharge, immediately upon cessation of hostilities, with the record to be furnished to rehabilitation agencies properly restricted, of course, to protect the veteran. The theory is that this would cover all servicemen, and might save time and trouble later, as well as being preventative in nature.

An inquiry into the neuropsychiatric problem also would serve the very useful purpose of broadening public understanding, of removing phobias about it. It yields to the proper treatment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I am very happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understood the gentleman to say he was introducing a bill for a commissioned corps in the Veterans Administration.

Mr. PRIEST. I have drawn such a bill and am making some revisions in it and plan to introduce it just as soon as I have completed those technical revisions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted to know that. I have already introduced a bill and I hope we can get the House to go along with something in connection with this matter.

Mr. PRIEST. I am delighted to know that the gentlewoman has introduced such a bill. I did not know that. Certainly I will get a copy of it and read it immediately. I would like to have time to discuss more in detail, and perhaps we shall be able to do so shortly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a very fine and illuminating statement. I am delighted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I am very happy to yield to my majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made a very powerful and constructive contribution to a human activity and responsibility on the part of the Government and our people that is near and dear and close to the hearts of us all. The gentleman from Tennessee always makes constructive contributions, but on this occasion he has made a most powerfully constructive one.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank my distinguished leader.

THE SOLID-FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks and include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 weeks there has been, and, as a matter of fact, there continues to be, a solid-fuel shortage, including anthracite coal, throughout the market area. I desire to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of Members of this House that the anthracite-coal industry, and more especially the mine workers, are in no way responsible for this shortage. The fault has resulted from a combination of difficulties, including exceptionally bad weather conditions, excessive snowfalls, and low temperatures, far below normal. The resulting embargo on railroad traffic, with a shortage of rolling stock, prevented sufficient cars being delivered to the mines to be loaded with coal. I wish to emphasize that the fault was one of transportation, and not of production, and definitely not the fault of mine labor nor of mine management.

In my district, which embraces the entire county of Luzerne, in the very heart of the anthracite-coal fields, over 50,000 men and women are in the armed forces of this country. The great majority of these are the sons and daughters of the men who toil in the hard-coal mines in that area. There is no more patriotic or hard-working group of men in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would develop this subject at much greater length, but, in my limited time this afternoon, that, of course, is impossible.

When, however, the current fuel shortage made it clear that the emergency existed and when the message was received from the 6 Governors of the New England States urgently requesting more coal, these hard coal miners gladly heeded the requests of the Government authorities that they work on Saturday, their day off, to help relieve this fuel shortage, and, Mr. Speaker, 65,000 of them did so work and worked for straight time, not for time and one-half, and did not ask for the time and one-half to which they were entitled.

This exhibition of loyalty and patriotism and desire to cooperate with the Government during this emergency was participated in wholeheartedly by all of the leaders from the top down, as well as the members of the United Mine Workers of America; and it was this same spirit which last year produced 4,000,000, tons more than ever, of anthracite coal, with 7,000 less men to do the work.

Amplifying what I have just said, especially as evidence of the response of the mine workers, I call your attention to the following newspaper articles:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader-Evening News of February 3, 1945]

CHURCH IS CLOSED BY LACK OF COAL; 35,000 MINERS AT COLLIERIES TODAY—10,000 IDLE EARLIER DUE TO EMBARGO, LOSE EXTRA PAY BUT REPORT TO RELIEVE FUEL SHORTAGE

Heeding the request of Government authorities that they work today to help relieve the fuel shortage which is still in the critical stage, an estimated 35,000 mine workers in District 1 reported for work today.

Producers contacted in a local survey this morning stated that the manpower situation was normal for Saturday when, ordinarily, some of the workers are absent.

Earlier in the week there was a supposition that those miners who lost a day earlier in the week as a result of the embargo placed upon coal shipments might not work today. The opinion prevailed that these men, not having worked five consecutive days leading up to today, would sacrifice time and half pay today and therefore would not work. Union spokesmen, as late as yesterday, predicted that the men would work on a straight time basis today inasmuch as the loss of a day's work earlier in the week resulted from a national emergency which they recognized. It is estimated that less than 10,000 men in the entire district are sacrificing extra pay today because of the earlier interruption in work.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of February 4, 1945]

SIXTY-FIVE THOUSAND MINERS WORK ON DAY OFF—OVERTIME PAY IS GIVEN UP IN EMERGENCY—DIG 150,000 TONS OF COAL TO OFFSET SHORTAGE

Sixty-five thousand of the State's 77,200 anthracite miners dug coal on their normal day off yesterday in response to the Government's plea to help combat the critical fuel shortage.

PRODUCE 150,000 TONS

They produced approximately 150,000 tons of coal, said Owen E. Williams, regional Solid Fuels Administration representative, at Wilkes-Barre.

The news was welcomed here by the Retail Coal Dealers' Association of Philadelphia, which said the off-day output would push the 200 dealers here slightly ahead of their current day-to-day basis of supplies.

Coupled with the reports from the hard-coal belt was somewhat more moderate weather than that which created the fuel crisis.

RAIN, SNOW FORECAST

After dipping to a low of 18° at 8 a. m., the temperature rose to 30° at 4 p. m. The Weather Bureau forecast a high today of 33°, with increasing cloudiness. Mixed snow and rain, originally predicted for today, may arrive tomorrow because a storm is moving up from the Gulf States more slowly than was anticipated.

Effect of the weather on pedestrians was shown by a check of hospitals which reported more than 1,100 persons were treated for injuries from falls on icy streets in the last 17 days. The snow and ice have been continually on the ground for 4 weeks today.

Thousands of the miners who worked yesterday received only straight time because for them it was not a sixth consecutive workday. Their mines were closed for 1 day earlier in the week, due to the first rail embargo on nonmilitary shipments.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania on his remarks in reference to the coal problem of the East at the present time. I am sure that, as soon as the situation is such that cars can be provided, an ample supply of coal will be furnished.

May I say to the Members of the House that they have just heard the remarks of a distinguished and able Member of this House, and I am sure in the days to come the people of northeastern Pennsylvania may well be proud of the achievements of their new advocate.

VETERANS' HONORABLE DISCHARGE BUTTON

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the following announcement issued this morning by the War Department Bureau of Public Relations. I quote:

Representatives of the Army, Navy, and Veterans Administration, following a thorough study, have decided to retain the present design of the discharge button which is given all honorably discharged veterans of the present war.

As some Members of the House are aware, there has been some public criticism of this insignia. It has been said that it is not easily recognized, that the public does not know for what it stands, and that former service men and women, who have served their country well, have been made the object of embarrassing and humiliating remarks. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] had something to say on the subject in this Chamber less than a week ago.

As a recently discharged veteran, I can attest that the public is not well informed on the discharge button. However, that is less the fault of the emblem itself than of the public-relations branches of our armed services. They, and perhaps the Office of War Information, should have made it their business long ago to so publicize this button that it would be known and honored by everyone.

I have been gratified to learn that recently a prominent Chicago newspaper, the Herald-American, has undertaken an aggressive campaign to secure public recognition of the veteran's honorable discharge button. The design was featured in gold on page 1, with the legend, "They have served."

This campaign has since been taken up by other newspapers in the Hearst chain, and the current issue of Reader's Digest devotes half a page to the same subject. If newspapers and magazines generally

would devote themselves to this worthy effort, I am certain that the morale of our returning service men and women would be greatly enhanced.

At the same time I would like to suggest to the Secretary of War his earnest consideration of a proposal to permit the use of this insignia on service flags. Every home and every factory, office, store, or place of business from which men and women have gone out to serve their country is permitted to display the familiar blue star on a white and red background. If the man or woman is killed, the blue star is supplanted by a gold star. But if they have served and been honorably discharged, there is no way of indicating this fact on the service flag.

I urge the War Department to so amend its regulations as to make this possible. Now that there is no longer any question about the design of the emblem and its significance is being given such widespread publicity, this additional step would overcome the last barrier to its complete acceptance by the public.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GREGORY (at the request of Mr. CHAPMAN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 410. An act for the relief of Marino Bello; to the Committee on Claims.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, February 7, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold an organization meeting at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 7, 1945.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Lands at 10:30 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, February 7, 1945, to consider H. R. 1719 and for organization purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

170. A letter from the executive director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, transmitting the Proceedings of the Twenty-sixth Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held at Chicago, Ill., September 18–20, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 43); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

171. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

172. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

173. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

174. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of November 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

175. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $389,000 (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

176. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $37,250 (H. Doc. No. 45); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

177. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations of the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 (H. Doc. No. 46); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

178. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $6,310,000, and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

179. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $291,979,881.04, and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

180 A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Price Administration in the amount of $6,790,000 (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

181. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 50); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

182. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation amounting to $8,707,400, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 51); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

183. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Housing Agency for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $90,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 52); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

184. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $23,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 53); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

185. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor in the amount of $13,098,000 for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

186. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations in the amount of $1,140,500, together with provisions affecting an existing appropriation, for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

187. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriations for the Department of Justice, involving decreases amounting to $135,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for the fiscal year 1946 (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

188. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year 1946 (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

189. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1946, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year, amounting to $337,000 (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

190. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $14,500 and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation, both in the form of amendments to the Budget for the fiscal year 1946, for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

191. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $405,000 for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for improvement of existing river and harbor works, to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

192. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

193. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the judiciary amounting to $387,600, in the form of amendments to the Budget for the fiscal year 1946 (H. Doc. No. 62); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

194. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Manpower Commission of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $5,567,400 (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

195. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $29,750,000 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1946, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

196. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriations, totaling $3,297,000, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

197. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1945 and prior fiscal years for the Department of the Interior in the amount of $424,282.89, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations and proposed authorization for the expenditure of Indian tribal funds (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

198. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Veterans Administration amounting to $246,775,000 for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2012. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the financing of certain aeronautical developments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2013. A bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 2014. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2015. A bill establishing a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of disease or injury existing within 5 years after discharge from service in the armed forces during the present war; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2016. A bill granting to veterans certain benefits and priorities in connection with the acquisition by them of surplus property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2017. A bill to amend the Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944, granting to veterans certain benefits and priorities in connection with the acquisition by them of surplus property; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2018. A bill to carry out obligations of the United States under article 27 of the Geneva Convention relating to compensation for certain injuries to interned workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2019. A bill to make it a criminal offense for certain escaped convicts to travel from one State to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2020. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2021. A bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 2022. A bill to aid in preventing inflation, to stabilize rents of commercial property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2023. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2024. A bill providing for classification of clerks in third-class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 2025. A bill to increase allowances for clerk hire in post offices of the third-class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to reaffirm the necessity of the Tydings amendment in our war effort, and creating a congressional committee to investigate the necessity of agricultural deferments; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate additional and adequate funds annually for the maintenance and operation of the San Joaquin experimental range; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2026. A bill for the relief of the York Products, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2027. A bill for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 2028. A bill for the relief of John Visnovec, Rose Visnovec, and Helen Visnovec; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2029. A bill for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

57. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Senate Memorial No. 2 of the seventeenth legislature, State of New Mexico, to the Congress of the United States of America relating to the purchase of Indian-owned lands in Santa Fe and Rio Arriba Counties; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

58. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Workmen's Benefit Fund of America, San Francisco, Calif., branch 102, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the reduction of the present age limit of 65 down to 60 years of age to be eligible to receive the old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God and Father, Thou hast been merciful unto us; surely Thou wilt hear and bless us when we pray. We would bow before the majesty of Thy infinity, and in the name of our Master we humbly claim our portion of that triumphant life which He blesses and bestows. Be pleased to accept our thanksgiving and interpret our prayer according to Thine own wisdom, giving us those things which Thou knowest we need, rather than those which in error we desire. Across the broken waves of the sea of life comes the timeless assurance: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Thou who hast been exalted to be an example, rooted in the vast relations of our being is the conviction that we are debtors to our fellow men and must add to the moral and spiritual wealth of our country. As the tyranny of bigotry is hurling its evil image across the face of humanity, enable us to stand square up to our obligations and keep clear the divine perspective in our conduct until the pagan usurpers are fleeing to the hills and gullies, falling in the smoke of stifling battle. In the memory of our hallowed dead, we echo the words of our great Commander: "God speed the day." In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. FOGARTY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, known as the George bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

NOEL COWARD

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I notice by the press that Noel Coward is again expected in this country. Walter Winchell says "he is coming on important business." I hope it is not the kind of business that will bring more slurs upon our fighting men, the kind of business that will take additional millions of dollars out of this country for more of Noel Coward's writings on "mournful little boys."

In my statement to the House on November 14, 1944, I suggested that Mr. Coward stay out of this country for at least the duration of this war. I have communicated my sentiments to the Department of State. However, if Mr. Coward does have legitimate business that requires his coming to the United States, the American consul and the Department of State should make absolutely sure of this before granting him a temporary visa.

It is Noel Coward's duty upon his visit to the United States to apologize to the widows and children of our fighting men and to those "little boys" from Brooklyn, Texas, Arizona, and other parts of these United States. It is these "little boys" who are fighting and dying to save Mr. Coward and others like him whose sole contribution during this crisis is rather questionable literature criticizing our fighting boys, as, for example, "I was less impressed by some of the mournful little Brooklyn boys living there in tears amidst the alien corn with nothing worse than a bullet wound in the leg or a fractured arm." It is these same "mournful little boys" who are receiving Congressional Medals, Medals of Valor, and Purple Hearts for their valiant fighting in defense of their country and in defense of the principles in which they believe, while Mr. Coward is traveling around the world on "important business."

I sincerely hope Mr. Coward will make an apology to the American public for his slurs upon our fighting men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a press release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Sons of Italy at Lynn, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extracts from an address delivered by Col. E. W. Garbisch, district engineer of the Corps of Engineers in command of the New York district, at a meeting of the New York Highway Chapter, Associated General Contractors of America, at Albany, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Charles M. Armstrong, of the State Education Department of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in the first an excerpt from the Spencer Leader, and in the second a letter from the mayor of the city of Brockton, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of observations concerning current problems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make today on the independent offices appropriation bill and include certain tables, a brief newspaper article, and some excerpts from the committee report and hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by me before the Women's National Republican Club on security and freedom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS and Mr. SHAFER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RECORD OF THE F. B. I.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I shall make on the independent offices appropriation bill and include extracts from the hearings and the report and some clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 22, 1945, after the reading of the Journal, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article and a radio talk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a press statement regarding the reorganization of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am informed, but I hope incorrectly, that the American Dental Association has rendered a report to the advisory committee of the Committee on Education providing what is known as a numerus clausus—religious clause—for entrance into the various dental colleges. This should be a subject for the deliberations and investigations of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. The American Dental Association has the temerity to seek grants in aid from our Government, a democracy, in one breath and in the other breath seeks to smite our Bill of Rights, the very keystone of our democracy, by providing for religious tests for entrance into dental colleges. That is indeed un-American and should be investigated by the so-called Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Veterans of Foreign Wars approving the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am getting tired of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] raising the Jewish question in the House, and then jumping on every man who says anything about it.

Why attack the American Dental Association? That organization has done what it had a right to do. I wonder if the gentleman knew that 90 percent of the doctors who get on the civil-service roll are Jews, and 60 percent of the doctors we are compelled to accept in our veterans hospitals are Jews.

Remember that the white gentiles of this country have some rights.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Anderson, Calif.	Geelan	May
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Morrison
Barden	Grant, Ind.	Mott
Bates, Mass.	Green	O'Toole
Biemiller	Hancock	Pfeifer
Boren	Hand	Powers
Bradley, Pa.	Harness, Ind.	Rains
Buckley	Havenner	Reed, Ill.
Chelf	Hébert	Rees, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Heidinger	Rivers
Colmer	Hess	Sasscer
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	Satterfield
De Lacy	Izac	Sheridan
Delaney, John J.	Jenkins	Smith, Va.
	Kelley, Pa.	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Kilday	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	Kirwan	Towe
Elliott	LaFollette	White
Elsaesser	Lyle	Winter
Fernandez	McGehee	
Gardner	McGlinchey	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 369 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, with Mr. MURPHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose last night the joint resolution had been read, and it is now under consideration under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolving clause be stricken out.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we are here today determining whether we have a sense of responsibility to the people back home who sent us here, determining whether we are going to hire 27,000 people who ought to be devoting themselves to the war effort but who will be gathering statistics and that sort of thing, information which is already available so far as they are of any value. The cost of this item over all will be nearly $15,000,000. Last week we passed a bill requiring people to work or fight. Now we are asked to pass a bill to take people out of work which is classed as essential industry and put them to work at something which we do not need, involving a waste of Federal funds. Is the House going to be false to its responsibility? Is it going to say to the people back home that we do not appreciate the responsibility which was entrusted to us in this time of war when there are all sorts of labor shortages and when there is a demand that we build up the armed forces and take people out of industrial activities? For my part there has never been a clearer proposition. There has already been spent, insofar as we have a report of it, $254,000. Perhaps $2,000,000 more has been obligated—I do not know. We might better pass that up than make a mistake in passing this bill which provides nothing of real value to the country but wastes money and interferes with the manpower and production in our country. I hope that the House will meet its responsibility and turn this proposition down completely and vote for this motion.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to say to the gentleman I read very carefully the debate on yesterday, and I do not want this moment to pass without paying a great tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky. You cannot read a speech like that or hear remarks like that and not be convinced of what our duty is at this hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, this question was exhaustively debated yesterday. Every phase of it was discussed in debate that consumed most of the afternoon. There is no necessity for again threshing it over this morning. Every business, commercial, labor, industrial, and agricultural organization in the country favors the bill. There has not been a single editorial in any newspaper or other

periodical in the country against it. There has been no criticism of it by any competent national authority. As I said yesterday, Mr. Chairman, there is no opposition to this bill anywhere in the United States except on this floor.

In view of this situation, may I call the attention of the House this morning to the fact that we are now waiting to take up in the House the first of the annual supply bills, the independent offices appropriation bill. We would like to get through with as much of the general debate today as possible. My good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for whose aggressive and militant statesmanship I have the warmest admiration, said frankly on the floor yesterday that this bill would be passed; that Members on that side understand that enactment of the bill is inevitable. That being true, I trust the House will bear with me today if from time to time I move to close debate in order to expedite consideration to get an early vote, and proceed with the consideration of the general appropriation bill now waiting to be called up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 105; noes 131.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 153, noes 177.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 1, line 7, after the word "by", strike out "$6,784,000" and insert "$2,500,000"

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted, the Bureau of the Census will have available for the taking of the census the sum of $10,145,725. The 1940 census cost $9,671,840. Thus there would be nearly $475,000 more under this proposal of mine than was expended in 1940.

I realize that approximately $2,500,000 has been expended to date and it is because of that amount already having been used, that many Members think the work should be completed. The fact remains, also, that many of us, myself included, feel that this entire proposition should be delayed until after the war.

It is evident that the majority now in control of the House are bound and determined to see this bill passed, war or no war. Assuming that to be the case, I am hopeful that there are a sufficient number of members on the majority side of the House who will join with the minority in accepting a compromise which will do the job and yet save millions of dollars to the taxpayers.

Yesterday, I brought out that we already have much information, concerning practically every farm in the Nation, gathered by the A. A. A. committeemen, nearly 110,000 of them, in every county of our land. The assembling of this information has been accomplished at a cost of a good many millions of dollars.

Just why should it be necessary for the Bureau of the Census to pay enumerators an average of $1.02 for each farm schedule? Why cannot this be done through the A. A. A., for not over 40 cents per farm? A saving of 60 percent in the field would mean a saving of practically the amount my amendment seeks to cut out of this bill, a little over $4,000,000. Other savings could be made by the elimination of irrelevant questions.

The rural carrier comes to practically every farm home in America. Why cannot this carrier bring the necessary blanks to be filled out to the farmer, instead of having this tremendous travel duplicated by a huge number of enumerators? The farmer could in his own time secure the facts from his own records, and is certainly able to do so without an enumerator at his elbow.

Cannot the various A. A. A.'s mail these out to the farmers in their counties? The addresses of all farmers in the county are on file, the county committee has much of the information as to acreage already for every farm in the county. My home A. A. A. committee knows exactly what has been produced on my farm for a good many years past. Why in the name of common sense does not the Bureau of the Census use this fund of information?

It would require 2 additional clerks in each of the approximate 3,000 county committees to do the necessary work in mailing out, tabulating, and checking the incoming returns from the farmers. These 6,000 clerks could do the work far more efficiently than could the 28,000 enumerators, and can send in the returns to national headquarters without a host of supervisors and State set-ups being required.

I know there would be a few farmers who would not report immediately, but in these isolated cases the local township committeeman could drive over to this neighbor of his and secure the necessary information.

A year ago I protested in this House as to the wasteful methods used and still being used, in the payment of the so-called dairy feed subsidy allowances. Rather than allow my local creamery to add the few cents per pound of butterfat to my cream check each month, and then have that creamery reimbursed by the Government, individual payments are calculated, individual checks are made out, thousands of tons of paper and hundreds of thousands of hours of manpower are wasted every month.

Members of this House, I offer this amendment in all sincerity. We can save manpower, we can save millions of dollars, and yet secure an accurate farm census.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the preliminary statement made this morning, I now move to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Missouri will not do that. I was recognized on this bill last night.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My motion applies only to the pending amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we are supposed to have debate on both sides of the question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I heard the gentleman's statement and my understanding is that he said he would make that motion on any amendment that was a frivolous amendment. May I ask the distinguished chairman if he regards as frivolous an amendment which goes directly to the bill and merely proposes a change in the amount, but a very substantial change, approximating $4,000,000?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have not intimated at any time that the amendment is frivolous. I consider it a perfecting amendment and a well-considered amendment. My only purpose in making the motion is to expedite consideration. As I explained in the beginning, we have another bill ahead of us which we hope to take up today. Does the gentleman desire 5 additional minutes?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not on this amendment alone; no.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No one on this side desires to debate the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; they do.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With, I trust, the concurrence of both sides of the House, Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's motion is not debatable.

Mr. RANKIN. Then we will have to vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to close debate on the pending amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to the opponents of this measure for just a moment. I think you are making a serious mistake, and I am going to tell you why.

I am on the Committee on the Census. As I said, I was on that committee when the first agricultural census was taken. It is more important today than it has ever been in the history of this country. Since 1935 farm life in America has changed more than it had in 50 years prior to that time. Since 1935 we have built more than 450,000 miles of rural power lines and have electrified more than a million farm homes.

In 1935 I put the statistics in the RECORD to show that only one farm home out of 10 in America was electrified, whereas 9 out of 10 in Germany, Japan, France, Italy, and the Scandinavian countries had electricity at that time, and that Holland and Switzerland had their farms practically 100 percent electrified.

The farmers want this information. The farmers in your districts are interested in this information because when this war is over we expect to spend $1,000,000,000 electrifying the farm homes that do not now enjoy the use of electricity. The ones who do not have electricity are anxious to get it.

The idea that you can have the rural letter carriers get this information is most ridiculous. How long do you think it would take the rural carrier to make his rounds if he had to take one of these questionnaires and submit it to everybody on his route?

I hope you will not make a partisan issue of this matter. Electricity is nonpartisan. It serves them all alike. It is the greatest servant mankind has ever known and the only one the man or woman of ordinary means can afford. We want to see it supplied to every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We like to follow the gentleman, we just love him, but we cannot go along with everything he has.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that 58 percent of the farm homes in Michigan are without electricity today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But our farmers can read and write.

Mr. RANKIN. If your farmers can read in the dark, what could they do if they had lights?

I notice, with all deference, that the very men who have spoken the loudest against this proposed legislation voted in 1938 against my amendment to provide the first $100,000,000 to electrify the farm homes in your States and mine. I hope you will not vote against this measure, but will let it go through, in order that we may acquire this information for every congressional district in the United States, because it is vital and it is necessary; and the amount expended will be well spent, in view of the fact that we expect, when this war is over, to spend at least $1,000,000,000 electrifying the rest of the farm homes of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, has all time expired on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee closed debate on the pending amendment and it must necessarily be put to a vote.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Chair permitted the gentleman from Mississippi to interrupt at that point, and it seems to me the gentleman from Nebraska should have the same right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has made no motion.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Is it right that after one Member has an opportunity to speak 5 minutes on that side on the pending motion and then the Chairman recognizes the chairman of the committee to ask for a vote on the amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, all debate on this amendment has been closed. They can offer amendments, but they cannot debate them.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered a new motion, an amendment to the amendment. Is that right?

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have not heard the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$1."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this country is at war and if the Members of Congress do not know it, they will know it pretty soon. It will not only be a war against Germany and Japan but there will be a war in this country of ours to get rid of the New Deal, and get rid of it very quickly. We want a square deal—one that will keep America safe. I want to say here that I resent the work of this Committee today in trying to stifle the Members of the House in the discussion of this bill. In my judgment it is a ridiculous bill to bring before the House of Representatives at this time. In my business or in any other sound sensible business back home we have things to do while we are in this war, and we do the essential things, we do the necessary things, we do the things that are important and vital to the winning of this war and in the production of goods and material to that end. But here in Congress where we are supposed to set the example, you come in here with a ridiculous bill such as this and ask the people of this country today to take a census, when you have all the facts which this census will bring to light at the present time in the Agriculture Department. All the facts are available at the present time, and if the Members of Congress do not know those facts, they should know them because they are available. Now, I do not want to chastise the Congress, but I am absolutely disgusted with the proceedings of yesterday and today on this little bill providing for, what someone said yesterday, was a mere $15,000,000. I want to tell you that back home where I come from 10 pennies make a dime and 10 dimes make a dollar. You have this country so involved in national debt that the country is going to be ruined. This national debt did not all come about because of the war. You started in 1933 with a per capita debt of $155.93. Before the war started the per capita debt was $325.66, after you started to spend, spend, spend, and elect, elect, elect. Now you have raised the debt to $1,486 per person in the United States. That is a serious situation. Yet you come in today and say $15,000,000 is a little item. You are going to wreck this Nation if you do not turn the tables and get down to brass tacks and common sense. It is serious. You can call yourselves a Democratic Administration or New Deal or whatever you want to, but unless you use some common sense it is going to wreck the Nation. I am a Republican and glad of it. But if my party came in with a bill such as this, at this time while at war, I would tell them to take a back seat. I would not vote for it. I absolutely would not do it. I cannot see for the life of me why you have to force this down the throats of the men here in Congress. If this joint resolution becomes law, it will be evidence of the complete loss of every scintilla of good common sense in the expenditure of Government funds, which already represent a huge burden on the taxpayers of the country. The taxes that you have imposed on the people of this country are going to wreck this Nation. Perhaps the New Deal Members want to vote on this but I can sense that they are forced to vote for it. You are going to vote on it but you are going to be held responsible. If you think that the C. I. O. and the P. A. C. are going to pull you through, wait until the people wake up. When the people of America find that they have reached the limit of taxation, the limit of burdensome laws, the limit of reports, and the limits on census. I look for an awakening of the responsibilities of the American people in order that they save themselves from a financial wreck and from the ills of the laws passed by the New Deal.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the political and New Deal hysteria which seemed to be present on my left yesterday would subside overnight. This is not a political question and I am sorry to see politics brought into a question that vitally affects the farmers of America.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not yield. I only have 5 minutes. I say it is not a political question.

Mr. TABER. Why do you bring it in?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. This law was enacted by a Republican Congress back in 1924. I think that Congress acted wisely. We might just as well be honest with one another and face the facts. Under Republican administrations in 1925 and 1930 the personnel was more or less selected from among Republicans, just as the postmasters were selected. Under the Democratic administrations in 1935 and 1940 the majority of the personnel was selected from Democrats. We all realize this. Then why can we not take a common-sense view? We have talked about everything except the necessity for this farm survey. It is necessary. If it was necessary in 1925, 1930, 1935, and 1940, it is certainly necessary now; even more so, because we will need this data in working out post-war agriculture. Post-war agriculture will be one of the most difficult problems this Congress or any other Congress ever tackled and we should have all the information possible to obtain, to guide us in correctly solving the problem.

Another thing, it is attempted to drag a red herring across the trail by saying we are interfering with manpower. You know and I know that under the provisions of the law everyone who engages in the census work will have to be cleared by the United States Employment Service. The determination will be made by that service as to whether or not the applicant is necessary to the war effort. If the applicant is found necessary to some other branch of the war effort a clearance slip will not be issued. You know and I know as a practical proposition, the personnel that has been selected has come from among school teachers, from the aged and from those whom the United States Employment Service has certified are not necessary to the war effort.

I appeal to you in the name of the farmers, and they are back of this legislation; I appeal to you in the name of the farm leaders and they are back of this legislation; I appeal to you in the name of the Secretary of Agriculture, and our old colleague, Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, who are also behind this bill to enact this law, and give those in charge of agriculture the necessary data.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 90, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just to put in the RECORD at this point that I could not help but notice the fact that not a single Democrat in this House saw fit to support my amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I felt for a moment that I would not be ruled out I would propose an amendment today to take this money being appropriated for the agricultural census and use it to relieve some of the hard-pressed farmers and city dwellers in up-State New York from the snow and cold. There is an emergency up there. People are suffering from lack of fuel; the farmers are suffering from lack of ability to dig themselves out of their barnyards; yet here today we are quibbling over $15,000,000 for an agricultural census, which money will not be spent until the snow is all melted. I hate to think of the floods that will swell the rivers of New York and Pennsylvania and ruin so much fertile land and so many good people. I think it is a crime that we do not apply our energies to approving a relief program for those hard-pressed people in the Northeastern States, because they need help and need it badly.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does not the gentleman believe that this army of workers should have the benefit of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act? He will recall that the conscript labor bill which the gentleman and I opposed last week, contained such a provision?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I answer the gentleman by saying that it is a tragedy such a bill is proposed now when all over the farming country in up-State New York, Pennsylvania, and New England there is definite lack of farm help and they are not able even to carry on the process of dairying. I suppose some Member will rise and say that one does not plant crops in February, March, and April. My answer to that is that dairying is an all-year-round industry. How if we take men off the farm to participate in this agricultural census are they going to tend cows, feed the stock, and get milk to market? How are they going to make up that lost time and energy producing food for victory?

For the life of me I cannot see the necessity of such an asinine proposal, particularly in view of the fact that they are so short of men to work on the farms to say nothing of having enough to take an agricultural census. I for one want to go on record as being strongly opposed to the passage of such a resolution at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is not this bill a good bit like the New Deal and the cows the gentleman is talking about? They are milking somebody all the time?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Let me state to the gentleman that I received a letter from a farmer in my district the other day in which he said: "How in God's name am I going to be able to prepare this agricultural census data with one hand and milk a cow with the other?"

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has heard about this 60,000,000 job program. Maybe this is not waiting until the war is over to get these jobs going.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not as much concerned in this matter with where we are going to get the money to conduct this census, as to where we are going to get the people to work on it. I asked that question on the floor yesterday, where are we going to get the people to do this work, and I was refused an intelligent answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Most of them are working already. A great many of them are at work now. The question is, Will we pay them for the work they have already done?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Get a few of them up there where I come from to work on the farms so that they can produce milk, so that they can produce food for victory. They will do more to aid the war effort by developing calluses on their hands from manual labor than by pushing a pencil.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Will this increase the number in General Patton's army?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not think so.

Something will have to be done in order to get adequate farm labor. I am against the pending resolution. I want to have this money appropriated for other than worth-while projects, and I want to see concern on the part of Washington for my snowbound and fuelless district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending resolution and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 128, noes 90.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 161, noes 117.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: After line 7, insert the following:

"No one shall be exempted or deferred under the Selective Service Act, or relieved from the assignment to essential industry or to agriculture under any law of Congress, by reason of being employed in preparing for, taking, compiling, or publishing the Quinquennial Census of Agriculture in the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 89, noes 144.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURPHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture, pursuant to House Resolution 120, reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. TABER. I am opposed to the joint resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: After line 7 insert:

"No one shall be exempted or deferred under the Selective Service Act, or relieved from the assignment to essential industry or to agriculture under any law of Congress, by reason of being employed in preparing for, taking, compiling, or publishing the quinquennial census of agriculture in the United States."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a point of order against the motion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the point of order comes too late. On the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, the previous question has been ordered. This is not a general appropriation bill. It is simply a joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the motion is not germane to the joint resolution and is, therefore, not in order. It introduces matter which is entirely foreign to the joint resolution pending before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must hold that this is not a general appropriation bill and the limitation does not apply. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that it is not germane to the joint resolution. It introduces a subject entirely foreign to the purpose of the joint resolution itself.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to ask the gentleman. Does this joint resolution make appropriation for the hiring of people?

Mr. TABER. It does.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think it does.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether or not this limitation, which would be in force if the motion to recommit were adopted, would be applicable to the funds already appropriated in previous appropriation bills, or only to those carried in the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER. This limitation would go to funds under this resolution.

Mr. TARVER. Therefore, the funds appropriated in previous appropriation bills would not be affected thereby?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not think so. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion to recommit, and the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 193, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—179

Adams	Canfield	Fisher
Allen, Ill.	Carlson	Fuller
Andersen, H. Carl	Case, N. J.	Fulton
Andresen, August H.	Case, S. Dak.	Gamble
Andrews, N. Y.	Chenoweth	Gavin
Angell	Chiperfield	Gearhart
Arends	Church	Gerlach
Arnold	Clason	Gifford
Auchincloss	Clevenger	Gillespie
Barrett, Wyo.	Cochran	Gillette
Barry	Cole, Kans.	Gillie
Beall	Cole, Mo.	Goodwin
Bender	Corbett	Graham
Bennet, N. Y.	Crawford	Griffiths
Bennett, Mo.	Cunningham	Gross
Bishop	Curtis	Gwinn, N. Y.
Blackney	Delaney, James J.	Gwynne, Iowa
Bolton	Dirksen	Hagen
Bradley, Mich.	Dolliver	Hale
Brehm	Dondero	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Brown, Ohio	Dworshak	Hall, Leonard W.
Brumbaugh	Ellis	Halleck
Buck	Ellsworth	Hancock
Buffett	Elsaesser	Hartley
Butler	Elston	Henry
Byrnes, Wis.	Engel, Mich.	Herter
Campbell	Fellows	Heselton
	Fenton	
Hill	McDonough	Schwabe, Okla.
Hinshaw	McGregor	Scrivner
Hoeven	McMillen, Ill.	Shafer
Hoffman	Martin, Iowa	Sharp
Holmes, Wash.	Martin, Mass.	Short
Hope	Mason	Simpson, Ill.
Horan	Merrow	Simpson, Pa.
Howell	Michener	Smith, Maine
Hull	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Ohio
Jennings	Mundt	Smith, Wis.
Jensen	Murray, Wis.	Springer
Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara	Stefan
Johnson, Ill.	O'Konski	Stevenson
Johnson, Ind.	O'Neal	Stockman
Jones	Phillips	Sumner, Ill.
Jonkman	Pittenger	Sundstrom
Judd	Ploeser	Taber
Kean	Plumley	Talle
Kearney	Poage	Taylor
Keefe	Ramey	Tibbott
Kelly, Ill.	Rayfiel	Vorys, Ohio
Kilburn	Reece, Tenn.	Vursell
Kinzer	Reed, Ill.	Wadsworth
Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	Walter
Kunkel	Rich	Weichel
Landis	Rizley	Welch
LeCompte	Robertson, N. Dak.	Wigglesworth
LeFevre	Robsion, Ky.	Wilson
Lemke	Rockwell	Wolcott
Lewis	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Luce	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
McConnell	Schwabe, Mo.	Woodruff, Mich.
McCowen		

NAYS—193

Abernethy	Granahan	Patrick
Allen, La.	Granger	Patterson
Anderson, N. Mex.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Fla.
Andrews, Ala.	Green	Peterson, Ga.
Baldwin, Md.	Gregory	Pickett
Barrett, Pa.	Hare	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Harless, Ariz.	Price, Fla.
Beckworth	Harris	Price, Ill.
Bell	Hart	Priest
Bland	Hays	Quinn, N. Y.
Bloom	Healy	Rabaut
Bonner	Hedrick	Rabin
Boykin	Heffernan	Rains
Bradley, Pa.	Hendricks	Ramspeck
Brooks	Hobbs	Randolph
Brown, Ga.	Holifield	Rankin
Bryson	Hook	Resa
Bulwinkle	Huber	Richards
Bunker	Jackson	Riley
Burch	Jarman	Robertson, Va.
Burgin	Johnson, Luther A.	Robinson, Utah
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Roe, Md.
Camp	Johnson, Okla.	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.	Kefauver	Rogers, N. Y.
Carnahan	Keogh	Rooney
Celler	Kerr	Rowan
Chapman	King	Russell
Clark	Kirwan	Ryter
Clements	Kopplemann	Sabath
Coffee	Lane	Sadowski
Combs	Lanham	Savage
Cooley	Larcade	Sheppard
Cooper	Lea	Sikes
Courtney	Lesinski	Slaughter
Cravens	Link	Snyder
D'Alesandro	Ludlow	Sparkman
Daughton, Va.	Lynch	Spence
Davis	McCormack	Starkey
Dawson	McGehee	Stewart
Dickstein	McKenzie	Stigler
Domengeaux	McMillan, S. C.	Sullivan
Doughton, N. C.	Mahon	Sumners, Tex.
Douglas, Calif.	Maloney	Tarver
Douglas, Ill.	Manasco	Thom
Doyle	Mansfield, Mont.	Thomas, Tex.
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomason
Durham	Marcantonio	Tolan
Earthman	Miller, Calif.	Torrens
Eberharter	Mills	Traynor
Engle, Calif.	Monroney	Trimble
Ervin	Morgan	Vinson
Fallon	Murdock	Voorhis, Calif.
Feighan	Murphy	Wasielewski
Flannagan	Murray, Tenn.	Weaver
Flood	Neely	West
Fogarty	Norrell	Whitten
Folger	Norton	Whittington
Forand	O'Brien, Ill.	Wickersham
Gallagher	O'Brien, Mich.	Winstead
Gathings	Outland	Wood
Gibson	Pace	Woodhouse
Gordon	Patman	Woodrum, Va.
Gorski		Worley
Gossett		Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—59

Anderson, Calif.	Fernandez	May
Bailey	Gardner	Morrison
Baldwin, N. Y.	Geelan	Mott
Barden	Grant, Ind.	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Hand	Pfeifer
Biemiller	Harness, Ind.	Philbin
Boren	Havenner	Powers
Buckley	Hébert	Rees, Kans.
Chelf	Heidinger	Rivers
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Sasscer
Colmer	Hoch	Satterfield
Cox	Holmes, Mass.	Sheridan
Crosser	Izac	Smith, Va.
Curley	Jenkins	Somers, N. Y.
De Lacy	Kelley, Pa.	Talbot
Delaney, John J.	Kilday	Thomas, N. J.
	LaFollette	Towe
Dingell	Lyle	Weiss
Eaton	McGlinchey	White
Elliott	Madden	Winter

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Chelf against.

Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Fernandez against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Madden against.

Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Rees of Kansas for, with Mr. John J. Delaney against.

Mr. Talbot for, with Mr. Hoch against.

Mr. Winter for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

General pairs:

Mr. Gardner with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Biemiller with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Mott.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 198, nays 171, answered "present" 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—198

Abernethy	Byrne, N. Y.	Douglas, Ill.
Allen, La.	Camp	Doyle
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cannon, Fla.	Drewry
	Cannon, Mo.	Durham
Andrews, Ala.	Carnahan	Earthman
Bailey	Celler	Eberharter
Baldwin, Md.	Chapman	Engle, Calif.
Barrett, Pa.	Clark	Ervin
Bates, Ky.	Clements	Fallon
Beckworth	Coffee	Feighan
Bell	Combs	Fisher
Bland	Cooley	Flannagan
Bloom	Cooper	Flood
Bonner	Courtney	Folger
Boykin	Cravens	Forand
Bradley, Pa.	D'Alesandro	Gallagher
Brooks	Daughton, Va.	Gathings
Brown, Ga.	Davis	Gibson
Bryson	Dawson	Gordon
Bulwinkle	Dickstein	Gorski
Bunker	Domengeaux	Gossett
Burch	Doughton, N. C.	Granahan
Burgin	Douglas, Calif.	Granger
Grant, Ala.	Manasco	Rogers, Fla.
Green	Mansfield, Mont.	Rogers, N. Y.
Gregory		Rooney
Hare	Mansfield, Tex.	Rowan
Harless, Ariz.	Marcantonio	Russell
Harris	Miller, Calif.	Ryter
Hart	Mills	Sabath
Hays	Monroney	Sadowski
Healy	Morgan	Savage
Hedrick	Murdock	Sheppard
Heffernan	Murphy	Sikes
Hendricks	Murray, Tenn.	Slaughter
Hobbs	Neely	Snyder
Holifield	Norrell	Sparkman
Hook	Norton	Spence
Huber	O'Brien, Ill.	Starkey
Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.	Stewart
Jarman	Outland	Stigler
Johnson, Luther A.	Pace	Sullivan
	Patman	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Patrick	Tarver
	Patterson	Thom
Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Fla.	Thomas, Tex.
Kee	Peterson, Ga.	Thomason
Kefauver	Philbin	Tolan
Keogh	Pickett	Torrens
Kerr	Poage	Traynor
King	Powell	Trimble
Kirwan	Price, Fla.	Vinson
Knutson	Price, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Kopplemann	Priest	Wasielewski
Lane	Quinn, N. Y.	Weaver
Lanham	Rabaut	West
Larcade	Rabin	Whitten
Lea	Rains	Whittington
Lesinski	Ramspeck	Wickersham
Link	Randolph	Winstead
Ludlow	Rankin	Wolverton, N. J.
Lynch	Resa	Wood
McCormack	Richards	Woodhouse
McGehee	Riley	Woodrum, Va.
McKenzie	Robertson, Va.	Worley
McMillan, S. C.	Robinson, Utah	Zimmerman
Mahon	Roe, Md.	
Maloney	Roe, N. Y.	

NAYS—171

Adams	Fuller	Lewis
Allen, Ill.	Fulton	Luce
Andersen, H. Carl	Gamble	McConnell
	Gavin	McCowen
Andresen, August H.	Gearhart	McDonough
	Gerlach	McGregor
Andrews, N. Y.	Gifford	McMillen, Ill.
Angell	Gillespie	Martin, Iowa
Arends	Gillette	Martin, Mass.
Auchincloss	Gillie	Mason
Barrett, Wyo.	Goodwin	Merrow
Barry	Graham	Michener
Beall	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Bender	Gross	Mundt
Bennet, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Murray, Wis.
Bennett, Mo.	Gwynne, Iowa	O'Hara
Bishop	Hagen	O'Konski
Blackney	Hale	O'Neal
Bolton	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.		Pittenger
Brehm	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Brown, Ohio		Plumley
Brumbaugh	Halleck	Ramey
Buck	Hancock	Rayfiel
Buffett	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Butler	Henry	Reed, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Herter	Reed, N. Y.
Campbell	Heselton	Rich
Canfield	Hill	Rizley
Carlson	Hinshaw	Robertson, N. Dak.
Case, N. J.	Hoeven	
Case, S. Dak.	Hoffman	Robsion, Ky.
Chiperfield	Holmes, Wash.	Rockwell
Church	Hope	Rodgers, Pa.
Clason	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Clevenger	Hull	Schwabe, Mo.
Cochran	Jennings	Schwabe, Okla.
Cole, Kans.	Jensen	Scrivner
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Shafer
Corbett	Johnson, Ill.	Sharp
Cunningham	Johnson, Ind.	Short
Curtis	Jones	Simpson, Ill.
Delaney, James J.	Jonkman	Simpson, Pa.
	Judd	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kean	Smith, Ohio
Dolliver	Kearney	Smith, Wis.
Dondero	Keefe	Springer
Dworshak	Kelly, Ill.	Stefan
Ellis	Kilburn	Stevenson
Ellsworth	Kinzer	Stockman
Elsaesser	Kunkel	Sumner, Ill.
Elston	Landis	Sundstrom
Engel, Mich.	LeCompte	Taber
Fellows	LeFevre	Talle
Fenton	Lemke	Taylor
Tibbott	Walter	Wilson
Vorys, Ohio	Welchel	Wolcott
Vursell	Welch	Wolfenden, Pa.
Wadsworth	Wigglesworth	Woodruff, Mich.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Chenoweth

NOT VOTING—61

Anderson, Calif.	Fernandez	Madden
Arnold	Fogarty	May
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gardner	Morrison
Barden	Geelan	Mott
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ind.	O'Toole
Biemiller	Hand	Pfeifer
Boren	Harness, Ind.	Powers
Buckley	Havenner	Rees, Kans.
Chelf	Hébert	Rivers
Cole, N. Y.	Heidinger	Sasscer
Colmer	Hess	Satterfield
Cox	Hoch	Sheridan
Crawford	Holmes, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Crosser	Horan	Somers, N. Y.
Curley	Izac	Talbot
De Lacy	Jenkins	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney, John J.	Kelley, Pa.	Towe
	Kilday	Weiss
Dingell	LaFollette	White
Eaton	Lyle	Winter
Elliott	McGlinchey	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Fernandez for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Mr. Chelf for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Izac for, with Mr. Grant of Indiana against.

Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.

Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Harness against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Mr. John J. Delaney for, with Mr. Rees of Kansas against.

Mr. Hoch for, with Mr. Talbot against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Winter against.

Mr. Somers of New York for, with Mr. Hess against.

General pairs:

Mr. Gardner with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Biemiller with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. May with Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Mott.

Mr. Crosser with Mr. Horan.

Mr. NORRELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. FERNANDEZ. Were he present he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, events will prove that the Democratic leadership in the House out-smarted themselves when they censored all debate on this bill a little while ago and prevented my explaining my amendment to

the agricultural census bill. This amendment merely provided that no one should be exempted or deferred under the selective-service laws or from assignment to essential war work or agricultural work under any laws of Congress by reason of being employed in the agricultural census. The same amendment was used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in his motion to recommit. If the majority had not arbitrarily shut off debate, they would have learned what this amendment provided, and it is inconceivable that it would have been defeated. Even under the steam-roller tactics which were used, this provision was only kept out of the bill on motion to recommit by a straight Democratic majority of 15 votes. The result is that 194 Democrats have said by their record votes that they felt this agricultural census was more important than fighting or than working in essential war work.

Of course, we know that these jobs are intended mainly for broken-down political hacks, but this vote making the job an impregnable pill box against war work may change things. The United States Employment Service may well say that the majority of this House considered this census as a war measure by insisting upon its passage at this time, and that by their vote on my amendment they classed this census as even more essential than the draft or work in war industries or in agriculture itself. Draft boards, looking at this vote, may say to the able-bodied young farmer who has secured an appointment as an enumerator: "Go ahead and count cows and hogs. You need not fight. You need not farm. You need not help make munitions. It is true that the Government already knows how many cows and hogs there are around here; it is outrageous to keep you out of the war or war work for the purpose of recounting them, but a majority in Congress has spoken, and we have no choice."

If the Democratic majority had permitted themselves the chance to find out what was involved in this amendment, at least enough of them to have changed the result would have voted for my amendment to show the intent of Congress that working and fighting in the war effort was more essential than taking this census. The defeat of my amendment in the Committee of the Whole without discussion or debate resulted in bringing it up in the motion or recommit without explanation or discussion, and the blind followers of their party machine now find themselves on record for hog recounting as more important than hog raising, for cow recounting as more important than making munitions, for sheep recounting as more important than fighting Japs and Germans. The only explanation of those who voted against this amendment will be "We didn't know what we were doing," and the reason they did not know was because they voted to keep themselves from knowing by arbitrarily shutting off debate. All of which shows that parliamentary censorship, like other forms of political censorship, sometimes hurts those who might have listened as well as those who might have talked.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAYLOR] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been informed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] that this bill will not take much time and on that understanding has recognized him to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. If that should prove not to be the case, the Chair will ask the gentleman from Virginia to withdraw his request.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the bill been reported?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Chair understands the bill has been reported with amendments. The Chair is recognizing the gentleman from Virginia on the theory that this bill is going to take very little time, as was stated by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to ask the gentleman if it is not very important that this bill be passed at once in order to further the war food production effort inasmuch as many farmers are awaiting the passage of this bill in order to determine whether they will put in war crops.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is true.

That is the reason the bill was rushed through the Senate and that is the reason I am anxious to get it through the House.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. After a full and complete hearing, it was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Agriculture.

The provisions of the bill are simple and easily understood. Under the present law if wheat, cotton, and peanut farm allotments are not used for 3 years, they are lost. Many wheat and cotton farmers at the request of the War Food Administrator have diverted their acreages to vital war crops. Then, too, many cotton, wheat, and peanut growers have been called to the service and hence are unable to plant. The bill simply preserves the rights of these farmers during the emergency.

For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the farm program, let me go into the matter a little more in detail.

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938, farm acreage allotments were established based upon the past production history of each individual farm. With respect to wheat and cotton the act provides that if a farmer fails to plant such crops for a period of 3 years in succession, he thereby loses his farm acreage allotment. Having lost his farm acreage allotment by failure to produce for 3 succeeding years, the only way the farmer can get back into the production of wheat and cotton is to come in as a new grower, which means that his farm acreage allotment would be greatly reduced. In the case of cotton only 2 percent of the State acreage allotment is apportioned to new growers, and in the case of wheat only 3 percent of the county allotment is apportioned to new growers. This means, of course, that a farmer who loses farm acreage allotment, and later desires to come back under the farm program, comes back with his farm acreage allotment greatly reduced.

During the past 2 years many growers of wheat and cotton, at the request of the War Food Administrator, have used their entire acreages previously planted to wheat and cotton for the production of vital war crops. While most of these farmers desire to continue to cooperate in the war food program, they hesitate to go along further, knowing that if they do they will lose their old farm-acreage allotments, and after the emergency, in order to reestablish their farm-acreage allotments they will have to come back under the farm program as new growers. This means that their patriotic response to the request of the War Food Administrator would be penalized by a reduction of their farm acreage allotments. It is simply asking too much of the cotton and wheat growers to go along further with the War Food Administrator unless their farm acreages are protected. So much for the wheat and cotton farmers who are left at home. How about the wheat and cotton farmers who have been called into the service? Why, the farmers who have been called into the service and for this reason are unable to plant for 3 successive years, would also lose their farm-acreage allotments. Now all the bill does is to protect the acreage allotments of these two classes of farmers—those who have responded to the war effort by diverting their acreages to vital war crops and those who have been called into the service—until after the emergency.

With respect to peanuts the same 3-year limitation applies. However, peanuts are a vital war crop, and no encouragement should be given the peanut grower to change to other crops. While this is true, the peanut farmer who has been called to the service, and who thereby stands to lose his farm-acreage allotment, should be protected. Hence, the bill only protects the acreage allotment of the peanut grower who has been called into the service.

Planting season is close at hand, and for this reason it is imperative that this legislation be passed at once. If the legislation is not passed, many cotton,

wheat, and peanut growers who have been called into the service will lose their farm-acreage allotments, and many cotton and wheat growers—patriotic farmers who desire to cooperate with the War Food Administrator—will be forced to discontinue their cooperation and go back to the production of wheat and cotton in order to protect their farm-acreage allotments.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this matter has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I recognize it is necessary to pass this bill promptly. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. As he knows, I offered an amendment in committee which would permit farmers to plant corn for ensilage purposes outside of the regular corn acreage allotment. Corn is not covered in this bill. Therefore, my amendment would not be germane at this time. But due to the need for farmers to raise their own fodder, I want to ask the chairman of our committee if he will not permit the consideration of such legislation and help us bring it out on the floor of the House.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I will say to the gentleman we will do that as soon as we can get to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in establishing acreage allotments under subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations prescribed by him, may provide that for any crop year (beginning with the crop year 1945) during the present emergency any farm, with respect to which a cotton or wheat allotment was established for the 1942 crop, shall be regarded as a farm on which cotton or wheat, as the case may be, was planted, if the Secretary determines that, because of the production of war crops designated by him on such farm, or because the owner or operator was serving in the armed forces of the United States, the cotton or wheat production history of the farm for such year is not representative of the normal history of the farm.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "cotton", strike out the word "or."

On page 2, line 3, after the word "wheat", insert the words "or peanut."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "cotton", strike out the word "or."

One page 2, line 5, after the word "wheat", insert "or peanuts."

On page 2, line 5, after the word "be", strike out the word "was" and insert the word "were."

Line 6, after the word "planted", insert the words "and grown."

Line 6, after the word "that", insert the words "with respect to cotton or wheat."

Line 8, after the word "or", insert the words "with respect to cotton, wheat, or peanuts."

Line 11, before the word "wheat", strike out the word "or."

Line 11, after the word "wheat" insert the words "or peanut."

On line 13 insert the words:

"The Secretary may also provide with respect to any such farm that the past acreage of peanuts shall be adjusted upward to the extent that the acreage used for growing peanuts on such farm in such year is below the normal history of the farm."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton, wheat, and peanuts."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein two speeches, one by a former Senator from Oklahoma, Hon. Robert L. Owen, and another by former Senator Gore, on the occasion of the eighty-ninth birthday of Senator Owen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a statement by the American Labor Party on the matter of the policy of the United States Government in Europe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances, and in the first to include a speech by Senator VANDENBERG, and in the second an editorial thereon, which I ask to follow immediately after the speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include correspondence on the War Manpower's division between critical and essential industries, and in the other to include a very fine article on the rehabilitation of soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday upon the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders I may be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984), making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself, and continue through the afternoon. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the bill comes to the House with a unanimous report from the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations. I know of no controversial features in the bill, but there are a number of Members who desire to speak. It will be the intention to remain in session today as long as gentlemen are willing to remain, and to have some debate tomorrow and conclude the debate in time to finish the bill tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1984, the independent offices appropriations bill, 1946, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first of the major appropriation bills of this session of the Congress. I am very glad to say that it comes to the House with the unanimous report of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations. If there is any controversial feature in it I do not know about it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not want the chairman to proceed under the illusion that there may not be some amendments offered to the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understand that; but when I say "controversial features" I mean no fundamental difference of opinion. Some amendments may be offered and points of order presented, but generally speaking the committee was in agreement.

The Budget estimate for this bill was $3,295,000,000; the committee recommends $3,218,000,000, or a reduction of $76,281,000. The bill as it comes to us is $5,321,000,000 under what the bill carried last year, but the major portion of the cut is occasioned by the fact that the bill carries no funds for ship construction for the Maritime Commission, merely providing that funds heretofore appropriated shall be available for administrative expenses. The total ultimate financial situation on the bill is that it carries approximately $1,444,956,000 more this year than last for comparable items, aside from overtime, which is contained in the 1945 appropriation. This is more than accounted for by increases in the civil-service retirement and disability fund and in the Veterans Administration which latter subject I propose to discuss somewhat in detail with the Committee later on in my remarks because I believe it is a matter in which the Congress will be interested. Also, I am sure the public is interested in what we are doing for the veterans and the colossal sums we are committing the Government to expend in their interest.

A very full and complete report accompanies the bill. The report has been available for several days and is available to members of the committee. It discusses the various and sundry agencies provided for in this bill, some 39 or 40 of them, most of them the old-line standard agenices of the Government. Almost in every instance there have been reasonable cuts in the appropriations, and the committee has, with few exceptions, refused to authorize new personnel or expansions in these old-line agencies unless there was some reason shown that it directly contributed to the war effort. The best comment we can make is that about 85 percent of the functions of these independent establishments are now directly traceable to the war effort.

WAR OVERTIME COMPENSATION

This bill does not carry any funds for wartime overtime compensation. I believe this should be mentioned because there may be some concern about the matter by some of the employees. The organic act providing for the payment of war overtime terminates on June 30, 1945. It is of course generally anticipated that this act will be renewed. So far it has not been renewed. If it is, supplemental appropriations will come in for all these agencies carrying such additional amounts as the new overtime legislation may authorize.

PENALTY MAIL

We carry in this bill funds for penalty mail. You will recall that Congress provided by organic law that departments should not use franked mail but should pay postage and get appropriations allotted for it in the hope and for the purpose of having a deterrent effect in unnecessary use of the mails. The committee rather arbitrarily made a 10 percent cut in the amounts for penalty mail with the hope that it would be notice to the departments and would have some deterring effect.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

There are quite a number of general legislative provisions in the bill. They are set out under title II of the bill and they are specifically stated on pages 3 and 4 of the report. The committee did that because we are in hearty sympathy with the idea that the Appropriations Committee should not bring substantive legislation in here on appropriation bills. In each of these instances we felt that while this may be technically a change of fundamental law, yet it is in the interest of uniformity and by the carrying of one section in the first appropriation bill it is unnecessary to carry it in each one of the other bills. I will not go over all of them. For instance section 201 (a) provides that funds available for expenses of travel of employees shall be available also for expenses of travel performed by them including expenses of transportation of their immediate families in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President on transfer from one official station to another for permanent duty. We are already doing that in some agencies. In order to get uniformity and to prevent the necessity of repeating that in each bill, we put one section in here that applies to all agencies. It is subject to a point of order and if any gentleman objects to that procedure he can certainly strike it out of the bill. I would now like to refer to several of the agencies for which funds are provided in the bill.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

In considering the estimates for the Bureau of the Budget the amounts for "Salaries and expenses" and for "National defense activities" were combined to present a more accurate picture of the appropriations requested for 1946. As presented to the Congress the estimates propose the transfer of approximately $265,000 from national defense to the regular appropriation item. The following tabulation gives the basis for the 1946 estimate for both regular and national defense items:

Total appropriations, 1945	$2,879,800
Less overtime compensation	314,750
Net appropriations, 1945	2,565,050
Less savings in 1945	92,433
Obligations for 1945	2,472,617
Increase in obligations	417,483
Estimate for 1946	2,890,100

In recommending an appropriation of $2,672,557 for the combined regular and national defense items for salaries and expenses, we have effected a reduction of $217,543 in the amount proposed in the estimates. The increase of approximately $200,000 over 1945 obligations will be available for the establishment of additional field offices, for the management-improvement program, the administrative office, and to bring the staff level up to that provided by current-year funds.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

For this activity we have recommended a total of $5,005,400 which is a reduction of $201,600 under the Budget estimate and $495,072 less than the current appropriation, with overtime compensation excluded from the comparison. A net reduction of $1,225,914 in the current appropriation for national defense is largely offset by a proposed increase in the estimates of $928,142 for regular activities. We have allowed an increase of $726,542 in the regular appropriation to meet the upsurge of work which is anticipated during the next fiscal year, the increase to be used primarily in the regulatory and licensing field. Testimony presented to the committee was to the effect that a tremendous increase in standard and FM broadcast applications is anticipated; that applications for new television stations are increasing; and that facsimile broadcasting, international broadcasting, and experimental and relay broadcasting are subjects which will require immediate consideration at the conclusion of the war. The proposed increase in funds for regular activities will enable the Commission to utilize a considerable portion of the trained personnel no longer required under the national defense appropriation.

PUBLIC WORKS ADVANCE PLANNING

Title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 is to encourage States and other non-Federal agencies to make advance plans for public works by providing loans or advances to aid in financing the preparation of such plans without commitment on the part of the Federal Government to supply funds for the construction cost of such projects. You will recall that provision of the Reconversion Act which we passed some time last fall, and which authorized large appropriations by the Federal Government to States as loans with the understanding that if and when the States actually constructed the project it would pay back to the Federal Government the amount that the Federal Government had loaned for advance planning.

The committee is very cognizant of the necessity and the desirability for some post-war advance planning, so that when the reconversion period comes and it becomes necessary to put men to work we will not find ourselves in the position we found ourselves some time ago when we had to, suddenly and on the spur of the moment, make work and when we had to inaugurate a program that came in for criticism, some of which was justified.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder why this fund is necessary to help the States.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will answer that if the gentleman will permit me later.

Mr. JENSEN. The States are much better fixed than the Federal Government. They have post-war planning committees.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman anticipated me a little bit. Of course, the Congress has authorized this and we are a little late now in talking about whether it is necessary, not too late, however. The Congress has passed the organic law providing for this

advance of funds. In categorical answer to the gentleman, I do not think it is necessary to do that, and for that reason, notwithstanding the fact that the Budget estimate was for $75,000,000 to be advanced to the States and for $2,680,000 for administrative expenses, the committee only made a token appropriation of $5,000,000 with 4-percent limitation for expenses, believing that would bring the matter up for consideration and discussion.

There is something of a fundamental question involved in this so far as I am concerned, and I speak for just a moment personally and perhaps a little collaterally. I believe that we ought to try to discourage rather than encourage the parade of the States to the depleted Federal Treasury. I have said that time and again, not only on the floor of this House but to my own people. I believe one of the most serious problems that Government in America today has to face, local governments and State governments, is that they are too prone to look to Washington for relief on everything.

Here is an instance of it. Without any demand, practically, the Federal Government fixes up a nice little hunk of pie and holds it up and invites the States to come up and help themselves. Personally I do not see the necessity for it. Practically every State in the Union has a post-war planning board and commission. They have one in my State. It is busily and intelligently at work. If they need any money out of the Federal Treasury I have never heard of it. I do not believe they need it, and I do not think they should have it.

An article in the Washington Post under date of February 4, which under leave to extend I shall insert in the RECORD, states that there are 42 legislatures that are preparing to spend $2,000,000,000 on post-war projects. I shall include that article in my remarks. I shall not take the time now to read it.

SURVEY SHOWS 42 STATE LEGISLATURES PREPARED TO SPEND TWO BILLION ON OWN POST-WAR PROJECTS

State governments have earmarked $1,025,758,000 for post-war projects and have additional plans under consideration to increase the total outlay to $2,000,000,000 or more.

A survey by the Associated Press, conducted with 42 legislatures in session, showed that the lawmakers are devoting considerable thought to proposals to construct buildings, roads, and airports, to aid war veterans, and to help the jobless during the post-war reconversion period.

Most of the States are in good financial shape. Revenue is flowing in and the big normal outlet—new public structures and highways—is obstructed by labor and material shortages.

State surpluses and reserve funds now aggregate $1,134,023,000 and further accumulations of $337,000,000 will pile up in the near future. With $1,025,758,000 already set aside for post-war spending, governors and planning groups have recommended programs involving $788,200,000 more and nonblueprinted ideas for various undertakings approximate $4,000,000,000.

FUNDS INCREASING

Purposes for which the definitely committed capital will be used include office and school buildings, hospitals, airports, irrigation, and parks. The prime favorite is highway construction. Some States will draw on savings to pay off bonded debts or to cushion the fiscal let-down when fighting ceases.

New York has $163,000,000 salted away and aims to put an expected one hundred and fifty million treasury surplus in the same reconstruction kitty. Pennsylvania has a surplus of $170,958,000—of which $48,870,000 is tagged for liquidation of bonded debt and the balance for post-war work. California figures on a peace construction fund of $139,735,000 by June 30 and has an untouched $25,000,000 war-catastrophe cache. Illinois has a $116,000,000 melon and it's growing $2,000,000 a month.

But State budgets in the main are on the upward trend and a few are at record high levels.

Many legislators are pondering plans to assist the men who are battling for victory. There is talk of soldier bonuses in several States.

Other proposals in that field include $2,500 property tax exemptions in Arizona and Iowa; preference in buying State lands in Oklahoma, Colorado, and Arizona; readjustment loans or relief or rehabilitation funds in California, Nebraska, North Dakota, Georgia, and Utah; enlargement of State hospital facilities in Illinois and Massachusetts; creation or extension of veterans' service offices in Colorado, Kansas, Texas, West Virginia, and Utah; expansion or reorganization of schools to accommodate ex-service students in Kansas and Montana.

Just a few days ago the distinguished Governor of Illinois, in his inaugural address, pointed out that Illinois had a post-war planning commission busily at work. I shall also insert this article in the RECORD under leave to extend. It is as follows:

POST-WAR PLANNING

In a broad sense each of the problems we are discussing today is a part of post-war planning for Illinois. This means that the coordination of the plans of each division of the State's activities into a unified program is essential. That task has been undertaken in a thorough, fact-finding manner by the Illinois Post-War Planning Commission, and, as I have pointed out, its comprehensive report to the general assembly and to me is now in preparation. It will be the subject of a later detailed message to you on our post-war program.

A principal section of that report will deal with public works programs considered both from the point of view of need and from the opportunity to provide employment for large numbers of citizens during the period of industrial transition to peacetime production. The commission has inquired carefully into public works projects of both the State government and all local governments. The various branches of State government have listed specific projects which, exclusive of highways, would total more than a quarter of a billion dollars. Obviously all these projects cannot be undertaken at once. To assist in an orderly selection of the most essential needs I appointed an advisory priorities committee of members of the general assembly and representatives of the executive department who have held hearings in cooperation with the commission staff. They examined all proposals and made recommendations for the consideration of the whole commission. This work will enable us to submit to you soon a program of major State improvements chosen on a basis of urgent need, and particularly concerning public health and safety upon which work should be started in the next biennium.

Public works, however, is only one phase of our post-war program. In the last analysis, the prosperity of all the elements in the State depends upon the prosperity of the agriculture, the business, and the workers of Illinois. The commission quite properly is consulting with leaders of agriculture, industry, and labor in determining both immediate and long-range needs, and how the State may cooperate with the leaders of free enterprise in solving them.

With the assistance of experts at the University of Illinois and other institutions, it is making an extensive analysis of the natural, man-made, and human resources of Illinois and of the opportunities for their future development. I am satisfied the general assembly will wish to continue this important commission and to provide additional facilities for its work during the next biennium.

May I say this, that when this estimate of 75 million to be loaned to the States for planning came to the committee, the Federal Works Agency brought in a break-down of their personnel, starting out with a Commissioner at $10,000; an assistant commissioner engineer at $8,000; a chief counsel at $6,500; director of research, $6,500; director of control division, $6,500; director of engineer division at $6,500; director of planning at $6,500; statistician at $5,600, and on down the line until you almost lose your voice and surely lose your patience, a total of 117 departmental positions at an annual pay roll of $358,840. That is not all, because they asked for 445 employees in the field at an annual pay roll of $1,374,440 merely to administer the act of advancing funds to the States, because the States are supposed to do the planning.

The only possible effect of that would be to put a large army of high pressure salesmen in the field to tell every little community and every little town in the State to point the way up to Washington, that there might be a big hand-out in Washington and say, "Now, what do you need? We are happy to fix it up and ready to get your plans drawn up for your airport, your hospital, your stadium and everything else, and we will all go up and see the Congressmen and the Senators, and after they loan us the money to draw the plans they certainly will not refuse a hand-out to build the project."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, if they considered the $75,000,000 requested by the Federal Works Agency unreasonably high, or if the committee thinks the appropriation of $5,000,000 unreasonably low?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; possibly. It is merely a token appropriation. I am quite in sympathy with what I understand to be the uniform opinion, and I say "uniform" because I do not think Mr. COLMER's Committee on Post-War Planning has yet taken formal action. But I understand uniformly they think if something of this kind is done—and perhaps it should be done on a more modest basis—that it ought to be on a matched basis with the States.

If it were done in that form, certainly if the State of Virginia or the State of West Virginia or some other State should put up half the money to make plans

they would have more interest in seeing that the money was not dissipated.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have listened carefully to what the gentleman has had to say. It seems to me that the philosophy that lies behind this proposal and that was behind the action of Congress when it passed title V of the Reconversion Act was a little different from the one the gentleman has discussed. It is perfectly true, of course, that the State treasuries are in much better shape than is the Federal Treasury, but the reason Congress proposed to make these grants for planning was twofold: First, to be sure that if public works were necessary they would be properly and well-planned public works, that they would be the kind of thing that would be able to justify itself in the light of the improvements and facilities accomplished, and that they would not be things started up on the spur of the moment and fly-by-night projects. We felt that by giving some inducement to the States to go ahead and make careful and detailed plans we might make certain that when, as, and if public works become needed they will be as worth while as possible.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does not the gentleman from California, who is one of the most thoughtful and studious colleagues we have in the House, think that if we are going to do this at all the offer ought not to be made to the States but to the localities and the municipalities in the localities? The States have money to do the State planning and they will do the State planning. It is the small communities that, if they need help at all, would need it under an act of this kind. It seems to me the fundamental idea behind it is very good, but the approach to it is very bad and very dangerous, and lets us in for a whole lot of trouble if we go ahead with it without thought.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As far as my own State is concerned—and this may be a typical California comment—I think our State has done the best job of planning that has been done by any State I have knowledge of in this field. But what I am concerned with is that this job should be done with reasonable uniformity throughout the country. It is not going to be fair for some parts of the country to do the job well and then have to pay the bill for the parts that do not do it well. I still feel that the element of an inducement to the localities and the States to do this job right is a sound investment. I might add that in my view the careful planning of these works carries with it no obligation as to when they should be started. That must be decided on other grounds.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. California figures on a peace-construction fund of $139,735,000, by June 30, and has an untouched $25,000,000 "war catastrophe" cache already.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Answering the argument of the gentleman from California as to the uniformity of planning and that it may be properly supervised, it is my opinion, first, that the gentleman from Virginia has taken a very sound position. I am satisfied that the States are not only better off financially to do this planning but they know better what they want than would be the case if they had supervision from Washington. Second, there is enough progressive spirit among the communities of this Nation to know what they want, and they are capable of planning in their municipalities without the encouragement or the interruption of some visionaries, and there would be some visionaries, who would be employed here to help them plan from Washington.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman from Virginia perhaps misunderstood the question of the gentleman from West Virginia when he said "Yes" to the question of whether or not this $5,000,000 was an unreasonably low figure. Was it not the opinion of the committee that this $5,000,000 was adequate at the time, and that if a real and genuine need could be demonstrated in the future more money could certainly be provided by Congress? However, no adequate need was shown at this time to satisfy the committee.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes. I thank the gentleman for that clarification. The gentleman, who is a distinguished member of the subcommittee which heard this testimony, will remember that under questioning the agency said that so far there had been no request whatever from any State for funds under this program, that they had had some correspondence, some inquiries, but they were very vague and indefinite about what they needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, we are up against the same old story here. The gentleman, as well as others, says on the floor of this House, "Well, we will just ask for $5,000,000. Then if we need more we can appropriate more." We know that is the thing that has happened in every instance where we start appropropriating for some new department, bureau, or commission. In a few years it becomes a great big thing which costs billions of dollars in many instances. So I hope that this will be knocked out. I am sure almost every State planning committee will be against it. I hope it will be knocked out and stopped and killed right in its tracks before it gets started and gets to the point where it will indeed cost billions of dollars.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Just a few hours ago we were told we had created a sacred obligation, that the Congress of the United States was given a mandate by reason of the passage of an act to take an agricultural census every few years and that therefore we should take that census now and vote the necessary money. That was the argument advanced. Just a few months ago you voted for a reconversion bill and I voted for it. It contained an authorization for $70,000,000, loans for post-war planning. If the act which you passed to take the agricultural census was a mandate, what was this? It certainly is also a mandate. I understand that provision came as a result of the activities of the so-called George committee and Colmer committee, both being post-war planning committees. The gentleman said a moment ago that the Public Works Administration stated they have no requests. I will tell the gentleman that within the last 2 weeks the mayor of St. Louis, together with his staff, was here in conference with the Public Works Administration wanting to know whether or not it was the purpose to carry out the provisions of the Reconversion Act and whether the city of St. Louis could borrow some money which would enable them to prepare plans and specifications for the expenditure of some $50,000,000 for public works. They assured the Public Works Administration that the money would be repaid. Remember this provides for a loan, it is not a grant.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is a loan, if they ultimately build a project.

Mr. COCHRAN. It provides for a loan.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; there is a lot of difference in the type of contract it involves.

Mr. COCHRAN. I spent some hours reading the hearings on this subject. I think I got the viewpoint of the members of the committee. I know you went into it in great detail. I could read between the lines, that in back of the whole thing, and I do not blame you, but in back of it all imbedded in your minds, and very properly so, was the number of personnel that they wanted to set up, not only in the city of Washington, but throughout the entire United States. They wanted a regional office in many places.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman think that is necessary?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not. I think if a responsible community can submit a proposal to a board, say of 6, 8, or 10 members, including engineers, that that board would be able to determine whether it was a worth-while project, whether it came within the meaning of this act and a loan should be made to that community or county for the purpose of drawing the plans and specifications pending, as you might say, a bond issue.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

DIRKSEN], but may I say that I am very anxious to devote a good deal of the time to the Veterans Administration item and I would appreciate it if the gentleman would let me get to it as soon as possible.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but to make sure that the RECORD will disclose all the facts here, may I say that the gentleman is right about this. When we went into this thing, it was made very clear that if money is advanced to project these plans and the project is not constructed, the money is definitely lost.

What the committee had in mind, of course, was to prevent the setting up of a high-pressure program, ofttimes pressuring small communities to build things that as a matter of fact the people did not want.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman relative to the pressure groups. The hearings show that was brought out. The gentleman knows my view here with reference to grants to States. I think I have gone further than a great majority of the Members in the House in opposing grants. The gentleman knows that the time to have stopped this proposal was on that reconversion bill. We had no business including that in the law if we are going to permit a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives to say to the Congress as a whole, "We are not going to give you any money, even if you did provide for it by law." That is exactly what happened in the supplemental appropriation bill, because you had a request then for an appropriation and it was turned down. Then the Bureau of the Budget came in with this request and it is turned down again. So therefore your Committee on Appropriations is overriding the will of the Congress. That is just exactly what is happening when you deny an appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I think the gentleman is laboring that point a little bit. That is just exactly what the committee has not done. It did not turn down the appropriation, although I think I can say the committee was almost unanimous in its opinion that no appropriation should be made. But we did feel that, Congress having passed the law, we ought to put in at least a token appropriation, bring the matter back, and I am specifically singling this item out to talk about so that the Congress can say what it wants to do. Instead of overruling the will of the Congress we simply come back and call your attention to this and say to you, "Did you mean you wanted to do this? If you do you can offer an amendment to increase the amount recommended in the bill."

Mr. COCHRAN. And we would have a fine chance of passing it with the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and their associates on the committee opposing it. But I wonder, was there not a little thought in the minds of some members of the committee that when you brought this in at $5,000,000, the Senate might increase it to $50,000,000, and then you would compromise somewhere between $5,000,000 and $50,000,000? I might be wrong, but I will await with interest the action of the Senate.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If that sort of thing happened, you would save $25,000,000, and that is not a bad thought.

Mr. COCHRAN. But I do not believe the Congress of the United States should say this should be done and then a committee of Congress should say, "We are not going to do what the Congress said should be done," especially when it is a post-war project.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will say very frankly, we doubt very much that States whose treasuries are virtually bulging with money—and that is hardly an exaggeration—are in need of this assistance. The treasuries of the States of this country are almost without exception in fine condition, and the Federal Treasury is busted.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is right as far as their financial condition is concerned, and you know where they got part of it. They got part of it by the Federal Government paying a sales and use tax for munitions of war. The bill I introduced to prevent this, which 23 members of the Ways and Means Committee approved, never could clear the Rules Committee. As a result of that, you will find by investigation that your Government has been paying to the States—and California was probably the biggest beneficiary—a sales and use tax for the privilege of making munitions of war to defend the States of the Nation. The amount paid to some of the States was staggering.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Just because of the question involved, I think it should be pointed out that the reconversion bill did not carry that specific authority. Second, neither did the reconversion bill say that this shall be done. It merely was an authorization and, like all authorizations, is subject to limitation if limiting amendments are adopted.

Mr. MAHON. There was nothing in the reconversion bill as to what time the money should be made available or how much.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. If Federal funds are appropriated to match State funds in any project will the same regulations and requirements prevail as prevailed in the old P. W. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is no matching of funds; it is an outright loan. This is not for construction, it is merely for planning. There is no construction fund at all in the money carried here.

I would like to refer to two or three additional agencies before discussing the items for the Veterans Administration.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Aside from a reduction of $4,500 in the estimate for penalty mail, the committee has approved the total Budget estimate of $33,885,000 for the expenses of operating the General Accounting Office during the fiscal year 1946. The total basic increase recommended for the fiscal year 1946, amounting to $1,690,253, provides for increases of $1,039,978 for salaries, and $655,275 for miscellaneous expenses. The committee is advised that during the fiscal year 1944 the General Accounting Office recovered $39,978,928.74 as a result of its work and that collections so far during the fiscal year 1945 indicate that approximately $70,000,000 of erroneous payments will be recovered. In view of this direct saving and the salutary effect of the audit upon the spending agencies, which cannot be estimated in specific amounts, we were of the opinion that approval of the appropriation recommended is fully justified.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The research activities of this Committee have been expanded to meet the needs of the Army and the Navy into practically every field involving an aeronautical object. At the present time the work of the Committee is 100 percent devoted to projects of direct interest to the Army and Navy during the war. The Committee has three laboratories under its direct jurisdiction—one at Langley Field, Va., another at Moffett Field, Calif., and a third, an aircraft engine research laboratory, at Cleveland, Ohio.

Aside from a reduction of $607 in the item for penalty mail, we have approved the entire estimate totaling $26,015,000. The estimate of $26,000,000 for salaries and expenses, which is a basic increase of $3,051,994 over the 1945 appropriation, will permit the employment on a full-year basis of all personnel including that provided for on a part-year basis during the fiscal year 1945, and provides personnel necessary to staff the new construction installations heretofore provided. An indication of the high regard in which this agency is held by the Army and Navy is set forth on page 89 of the printed hearings wherein it is stated that the Army and Navy have turned over their own personnel to serve in the laboratories of this agency.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

In connection with this activity we considered and approved a change in the appropriation language heretofore governing the expenditure of funds for this activity. In the past, congressional appropriations have been made available for two distinct purposes: First, to provide funds necessary for development and construction activities which may not be financed from proceeds under the terms of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and, second, to supplement proceeds where such proceeds have not been sufficient to finance the activities referred to in section 26 of the act. The amounts appropriated for section 26 purposes to supplement proceeds were required primarily for the construction of power facilities to keep pace with the rapid growth in the power requirements in the area. While there were substantial cash surpluses from power sales above all costs of operations, these

surpluses were insufficient to provide all the funds needed in the construction of power facilities.

During this period of heavy construction, when appropriated funds were being made available for both construction and operating purposes, the annual appropriation acts have included a provision consolidating appropriations and receipts into a single fund on the books of the Treasury, known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund. This single-fund arrangement was included in order to simplify budget and accounting procedures during the period when receipts and appropriated funds were being used for the same purposes.

Circumstances will be substantially different in 1946. The Budget for 1946 shows that estimated proceeds from revenue-producing activities in that year will exceed estimated fund requirements for the activities to be financed out of proceeds under the terms of section 26 by $10,016,000. This estimated surplus of proceeds is reserved for payment to the general fund of the Treasury, as required by section 26. The appropriation recommended for 1946 is therefore limited to funds required for activities not financed by receipts, including major construction projects, the manufacture and distribution of phosphatic fertilizers, and so forth.

Because of these circumstances, the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, with the permission of the Bureau of the Budget and the approval of the Comptroller General—see page 383 of the hearings—recommended that the single-fund provision be discontinued beginning with the fiscal year 1946.

Under the proposed change in language, deposits and disbursements of funds would be handled as follows:

First. Appropriated funds placed in a fiscal year appropriation account subject to withdrawal in the usual manner.

Second. Receipts deposited, as received, in a collection account with the Treasurer of the United States.

Third. Disbursements made only from the appropriation account.

Fourth. Appropriation account reimbursed monthly from the collection account for expenditures during the month for activities which are to be financed out of proceeds in accordance with the provisions of section 26.

Fifth. Balances in the collection account, after all settlements for the fiscal year, would be paid into the general fund of the Treasury within 6 months after the close of the fiscal year.

We were in accord with the proposed change and have included the language in the bill which will put the plan into effect.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The bill includes no additional funds or contractual authority for the construction of ships or facilities. Appropriations totaling $15,741,010,000 toward the ship-construction fund have been heretofore provided and contractual authority for ships and facilities totaling $16,926,650,000 has been granted. It is estimated that funds and contract authorizations now available will be adequate for the program as presently agreed upon by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In fact, after providing $2,759,300,000 for obligations during the fiscal year 1946 for the anticipated requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for ship construction beyond the current program, it is estimated that, of the contractual authority already available, $1,167,350,000 will remain unobligated at the close of that fiscal year. The entire estimated cash balance in the construction fund at the close of the fiscal year 1945 will be $3,941,484,924, and it is estimated that the cash balance as of June 30, 1946, will be $1,629,650,000.

Since the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Maritime Commission, to the close of December 1944, has delivered 4,561 newly constructed ships to the Army, the Navy, the War Shipping Administration, to private operators—operations under control of the War Shipping Administration during the war period—and under the defense-aid program, in addition to 1,215 small barges and powerboats. As of December 31, 1944, there were 1,072 vessels under various stages of construction. Early in January 1945 the Commission awarded contracts for the construction of 226 additional dry-cargo vessels and tankers to be delivered in the second half of the calendar year 1945. Altogether, there are now scheduled for delivery, during the calendar year 1945, about 1,300 vessels, exclusive of any that may be completed under awards yet to be made.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Now, Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the Members, I wish to turn to the item for the Veterans Administration. The total carried for the Veterans Administration is $2,707,119,250, which is, by far, the largest item in the bill and is some indication of what the Government is doing and what commitments we are making to look after our soldiers. Let me say in the beginning that I think I reflect the sentiments of the Members of the House as well as the sentiments of the American people when I say that the best is none too good when reasonably, intelligently, and logically used for these men who are in the war, and I am not going to be staggered by the colossal and stupendous figures that we have in the bill, provided it is being intelligently used and provided the veterans are getting the benefit of it. We are fortunate in this country in having in charge of veterans' affairs a man whom I believe to be the finest administrator ever to hold public office, General Hines. He is not only interested in the veterans but he is interested as a citizen in the United States, and he is interested in the Federal Treasury.

Here is an over-all break-down of this $2,707,000,000, and I have other charts here which will go into it a little more in detail.

CHART NO. 1

Veterans Administration, estimate all appropriations, fiscal year 1946

Appropriation title:	*Appropriation*
Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services	$227,675,000
Printing and binding	780,000
Penalty-mail costs	614,250
Pensions and compensations	$1,080,150,000
Readjustment benefits	295,000,000
Military and naval insurance	18,000,000
Adjusted service and dependent pay	----------
Adjusted compensation payments	----------
National service life insurance	1,000,000,000
Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief	400,000
Hospital and domiciliary facilities	84,500,000
Total, Veterans Administration	2,707,119,250

Two hundred and twenty-seven million six hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars is carried for administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services. Under the item "Hospital expenses" are included hospitalization, nurses, physicians, transportation of veterans to and from a veterans' hospital or veterans' facility; burial expenses, flags, and things of that type are carried under this item.

Salaries and expenses: Let me say here that you will be interested to know that out of every dollar we appropriate in this bill for the veterans more than 96 cents goes directly to the veteran or his dependents in direct benefits; less than 4 percent goes for really administrative expenses.

Printing and binding: This, of course, includes the voluminous forms and documents the Veterans Administration has to send out.

Cost of handling penalty mail, $614,000: That is under the new penalty mail law that we passed.

Army and Navy pensions, $1,080,150,000. That includes, of course, World War No. 1, as well as World War No. 2. We have presently on the rolls 350,000 veterans of World War No. 2, and 50,000 of their dependents. They are already on the rolls drawing pensions because of World War No. 2.

Two hundred and ninety-five million dollars is readjustment benefits, which means the unemployment compensation which the States administer and which we pay.

Eighteen million dollars is military and naval insurance. That is the old war-risk insurance.

For national life insurance, $1,000,000,000 is carried in this act. The United States Government operates for the benefit of the veterans a life-insurance company that from the standpoint of the amount of money involved, the number of policyholders, and the potential liability is greater than all of the life-insurance companies in the country combined in one.

The interesting thing about this is that we have over 16,000,000 policyholders. You will probably ask, how can you have more than 16,000,000 policyholders when there are not that many men in the armed services? The answer to that is that some of them have two or three policies. Some started out with one policy, getting a $5,000 policy and later obtaining another policy. That life insurance fund is set up on an actuarial basis

which is self-sustaining except for the war hazard. That is to say, if every one of the policyholders in the national life insurance would live out a normal life there would be no potential liability whatsoever on the Federal Government. It is only the war hazard that comes out of the public treasury. Of course, unfortunately for us, our war hazards are going to be heavy, much heavier than many of us would like to see.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would not the gentleman like to have the veteran of this war receive the benefits of insurance that would pay him dividends in his lifetime, if totally and permanently disabled? That happened in the First World War. In this war it is only the beneficiaries of the veteran who get insurance premiums after the veteran's death. The veteran himself has no direct benefit.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that is a matter of broad general policy that Congress could well consider. The figures I have given here show that we have gone overboard pretty heavy in the matter of financial commitments and perhaps there is a limit to where we ought to go and how far we can go with national solvency.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems rather hard that the veteran himself shall have no immediate and direct benefit.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Undoubtedly that is going to have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. That insurance is not compulsory; is it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not compulsory; no.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. It seems to me that might well be made compulsory because I have run across death cases where there was no insurance involved and that seems to happen in cases where the need is the greatest.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know how far you can go in making it compulsory and forcing a soldier to take out insurance that he does not want to take out. I may say, however, there are very few of them who have not taken out this insurance.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In reference to the fifth item on the gentleman's chart, readjustment benefits, does that include all benefits under the G. I. bill, educational and all, including unemployment payments and loans?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman mentioned only unemployment. My impression was that it included all of them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will have a chart on that a little later.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not true that the Army and Navy pensions are presumed to be an allowance that the Government makes by way of compensation to the veteran and his dependents?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And that the insurance is merely to provide an optional privilege for the veteran who might otherwise be unable to purchase insurance?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct in that.

Hospital and domiciliary facilities, $84,500,000. That is all the expense for construction of the veterans' hospitals, and I have a chart on that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman satisfied with the number of hospitals and beds that are available today? I know in testimony given this morning before the Military Affairs Committee the Navy said it would have to have more nurses and others because the veterans' hospitals are not ready.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think we are being pressed. The number of casualties that are returning are pressing the program, but I think it is well in hand. General Hines tells us it is reasonably well in hand. Of course, they have some difficulty with nurses. I have a chart on the hospitals that I will display in a few moments.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So far as NP cases are concerned, the Army and Navy hospitals are not equipped with NP wards and the Veterans Administration is not ready.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is one of the hard spots.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is one of the serious points.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This chart shows a break-down of the $227,000,000, the first item on the chart. As I say, that includes all of the expenses of the central office in Washington, also the office in New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are 94 hospitals now in operation. Thirty-eight are regional office activities and 11 for domiciliary activities. There are 8 additional hospitals to become available in 1946 and 200 contact offices. This is a break-down of the personnel, showing a total provided in 1946 of 73,811 people, the number of beds in operation in veterans' hospitals 104,286, average daily patient load 90,000, average daily patient load other than Government hospitals, civil, State hospitals, and State homes, 10,000; number and cost of rations, the average cost of rations being about 45 cents, and I may say that compares very favorably with the Army and Navy, both from the standpoint of the excellency of the rations and the cost of the rations. Vocational rehabilitation and training, estimated, 32,664; at the end of 1946, 63,000. Estimated loans, 1946, 600,000. Cost of processing those loans, $19,800,000. Readjustment treatment allowance, 371,000; cost, $5,943,000.

CHART NO. 2

Salaries and expenses, Veterans Administration	$227,675,000

This appropriation provides for operation of Veterans Administration consisting of: Central office, Washington, D. C., and branch office, New York City; 28 regional, area, and insular offices and supply depots; 94 hospitals now in operation, of which 38 have regional office activities and 11 have domiciliary activities; 8 additional hospitals to be available in 1946; 200 contact units and branch offices.

Personnel (man-years) required:	
Departmental service	16,147.4
Field service	57,664
Total	73,811.4
Average beds in operation, Veterans Administration hospitals	104,286
Average daily patient load	90,172
Average daily patient load, other Government, civil, and State hospitals and State homes	10,841
Number and cost of ration, at 45 cents	$37,340,506
Vocational rehabilitation:	
Estimated average in training	32,664
Estimated in training end of 1946	63,235
Loans:	
Estimated loans in 1946	600,000
Cost of processing loans by other Government agencies	$19,800,000
Readjustment allowance:	
Estimated number to receive benefits	371,772
Reimbursing States for administrative expense	$5,943,500

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does that mean that the loans amount to $600,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; 600,000 is the number, and the cost of processing them is $19,800,000.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. As to the eight additional hospitals to be made available in 1946, are those entirely new hospitals constructed for the veterans or by the Veterans Administration?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. Does the gentleman have any figure as to the total number of beds?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have a chart, which I will show in just a few minutes, giving that information.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Have any of those hospitals been taken over from the Army?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There are some hospitals that the Veterans' Administration has taken over from the Army, but they are carried now as Veterans' Administration hospitals in here.

Mrs. BOLTON. I wondered if the gentleman knew whether they intended to take them over.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They intend to do that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know, as a matter of fact, that two have been taken over.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I know it is the intention to utilize them wherever they can.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Are you authorizing an appropriation for the additional nurses needed? Do you allow for the 2,000 nurses needed at once, another 1,000 by the 1st of July, and another 3,000 by the end of the year? Are you appropriating for those additional nurses if you can get them?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The appropriations for them are carried in here.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Which item is that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Under the item covering personnel. I was told by General Hines that the recruitments were picking up a great deal. Possibly the suggestion of drafting nurses may have influenced some to apply. I think General Hines appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He has not testified before the committee yet.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think it should be said that nurse recruitment is picking up because of the threat of being drafted. It is picking up because for the first time in many, many months they are being made aware that they are really needed. The rate of nurse recruitment in the United States kept absolutely parallel with the rate of growth in size of the armed forces until the Army announced a little over a year ago that it did not need so many nurses, cut back its goal from 50,000 to 40,000. Then, of course, recuitment leveled off at 42,000. After such a psychological let-down associated with good reports from all battle fronts, and predictions of early defeat of Germany, reconversion, and so forth, it takes a little time to change the psychology. Volunteering has enormously increased in the last few weeks when the need became obviously urgent and the volunteering has only begun. I do not like to have it left that this group of devoted women, who already have volunteered at a far higher rate than any other group of women—or, for that matter, of men, excepting doctors, I believe—can be gotten to take care of our wounded men only by the threat of being drafted.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sure of that.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I add this to the gentleman's statement, that this is also the first time there has been any possibility of having a proper, adequate recruitment drive.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The fact is that we are getting nurses now and we were not getting them before, whatever the cause.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say, if the gentleman will yield further, that we are not getting our nurses fast enough. I think the figures given before the Committee on Military Affairs will demonstrate that.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It has been called to my attention that part of the shortage of nurses is due to the fact that the Army does not take nurses unless they have been trained in a certain sized hospital, and I wonder if that is true. It has been called to my attention that a number of nurses who wanted to volunteer for that service have been turned down because they were trained in hospitals of small size. I just wonder what truth there is to that statement, because I have some pretty direct information that many nurses who have volunteered were not taken in because they were trained in small hospitals, not coming up to a certain size.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I think the Army and perhaps the other armed forces require that nurses shall be trained in hospitals that have a regular average of as many as 50 patients per day. I believe they have made a mistake in that regard, and I have strongly urged that the policy be modified.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is the very point I wanted to find out about. I think it is something that should be looked into, because some of our small hospitals are very efficient and can train nurses just as well as the large hospitals.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am glad to have that in the RECORD. Of course, I cannot tell about that.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. The percentage of nurses who have been rejected because of being trained in small hospitals originally is less than 2 percent of the total number, according to the testimony before the committee the other day. In addition, the Army accepts nurses whose training has been in smaller hospitals provided they have had some experience in larger hospitals where they have had opportunity to learn administration and the responsibilities that are thrust upon them when they go into the armed services.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentlewoman for that contribution.

Mr. MAHON. May I say that from the standpoint of developing initiative, in the smaller hospitals where they do not have the equipment that some of the larger ones have, the nurses have probably received as good training for the work required in this war as the nurses who have had everything they might wish in the better-equipped hospitals in the cities. Of course, I do not discount the necessity for well-trained nurses.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Might it not be worth adding that one reason there has not been as good recruitment among the nurses as we suddenly desire when we have a lot of unexpected casualties is that nurses know the armed services until very recently had not been willing to accept all sorts of well-qualified nurses who volunteered. Naturally they concluded the need could not be too great. Some of the armed forces would not accept colored girls. Some would not accept Japanese girls. Some would not accept or keep married nurses. Now they are suddenly taking in medical WAC's and giving them a fly-by-night course, when they had been refusing a lot of graduate nurses from schools which give excellent training and experience. Therefore, there is blame all the way around. I dislike the tendency to think that we must always resort to compulsion whenever we run into a jam, instead of just speeding up and improving the system that already has given such magnificent results. Out of an estimated total available pool of only about 157,000 eligible nurses, more than 42,000 volunteered up to the time they were told they were not needed. In contrast the WAC's have not been able to get more than about 85,000 WAC's out of a total available pool of at least 20,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

May I direct your attention to this chart:

Veterans' Administration estimate appropriation Army and Navy pensions fiscal year 1946

Wars and regular establishment	Estimated number on roll June 30, 1946	Appropriations, fiscal year 1946
1. Yellow fever roll of honor	7	$10,500
2. War of 1812	1	240
3. Mexican War	42	27,360
4. Indian wars	3,918	2,439,496
5. Civil War	21,896	10,723,830
6. Spanish-American War	194,923	147,566,287
7. Regular Establishment	54,961	22,821,645
8. World War No. 1		
Living veterans:		
Service-connected	329,307	178,808,310
Non-service-connected	90,124	56,663,413
Emergency officers	2,436	4,070,448
Deceased veterans:		
Service-connected	83,437	50,618,000
Non-service-connected	27,514	13,127,520
Total, World War No. 1	532,818	303,287,691

Veterans' Administration estimate appropriations Army and Navy pensions fiscal year 1946—Continued

Wars and regular establishment	Estimated number on roll June 30, 1946	Appropriations, fiscal year 1946
9. World War 2:		
Living veterans:		
Service-connected	993,841	$424,415,719
Increase pension payments (Public Law 16)		24,149,626
Deceased veterans:		
Service-connected	158,624	121,930,606
Total, World War No. 2	1,152,465	570,495,951
10. Retired officers, Army of United States (other than regulars)	13,790	22,777,000
Grand total	1,974,821	1,080,150,000

You will notice we still have one veteran, or a dependent of a veteran of the War of 1812. There are 42 receiving Mexican War pensions.

One of the interesting things about this chart is that we will have 993,000 service-connected cases from World War No. 2 on June 30, 1946.

The total amount is $1,080,150,000, as I pointed out a while ago.

This chart—No. 4—shows the estimated appropriation for readjustment benefits carried under this bill. Title II, subsistence allowance and tuition fees and supplies shows a total of $180,000,000. This is under the educational feature of the G. I. bill.

Title III shows the interest we are going to pay on the loans made to veterans, and that is estimated to amount to $11,250,000. Guaranteed losses are estimated at $7,000,000. There is a total of $18,000,000 under that.

The readjustment allowance under title V, which is the unemployment compensation, amounts to $96,000,000.

The chart I have just referred to is inserted at this point:

CHART No. 4

Veterans' Administration estimate appropriation readjustment benefits (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944) fiscal year 1946

Benefits:	Appropriation
1. Education:	
Subsistence allowance	$123,775,740
Tuition, fees, and supplies	56,261,700
Total, education	[1] 180,037,440
2. Loans:	
Interest	11,250,000
Guaranteed losses	7,052,560
Total, loans	[2] 18,302,560
3. Readjustment allowances	[3] 96,660,000
Total estimate or appropriation	295,000,000

[1] Based upon an estimated average of 187,539 in training. It is estimated that 336,504 veterans will be receiving this benefit on June 30, 1946.

[2] Based upon the payment of the first year's interest on loans for an estimated 225,000 veterans and estimated losses on loans during 1946.

[3] Based upon an estimated average of 92,943 veterans on the rolls.

It is estimated that 371,772 veterans will receive this benefit in 1946.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to know why the figure of only 336,000 is taken as an estimate of the number of veterans who are likely to be receiving educational training at the end of 1946. I should think it might be many times that number. I earnestly hope it will.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is an estimate made by the Veterans' Administration. I will say to the gentleman they have been uncanny in their ability to estimate future requirements.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree as to that and have great respect for their estimates.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wanted to know on what basis that figure was arrived at.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have no idea what formula was used in arriving at that figure.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I think that is largely based on the prediction that the war will still be on. There have not been anywhere near as many veterans seeking these educational benefits thus far as was anticipated because the men being discharged now have a good opportunity to work patriotically in the war effort. When the war is over in Europe and when full employment is not so urgently needed, there will be a sudden boom in men seeking education.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering whether the gentleman could tell us whether the estimates were based on the assumption that the war will still be in progress at the end of 1946.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The estimates are based on the assumption that the war will still be in progress during the fiscal year 1946.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Might I suggest to the gentleman, referring to the other chart, that the number of service-connected casualties in this war is estimated to be three times the total number in World War No. 1 by the end of 1946. That is something that certainly should sober every American.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; that is the number estimated to be on the rolls June 30, 1946.

This is another statement with reference to national life insurance:

CHART No. 5

Veterans' Administration

National service life insurance	$1,000,000,000
As of Dec. 31, 1944:	
Approved applications	16,482,072
Amount of insurance	$125,593,605,000
Average value per policy	$7,620.01
Average amount of insurance by lives	$9,146.21
Claims allowed	118,075

There are 16,000,000 approved applications. I think there are an additional 1,100,000 since this chart was made up. The total amount of insurance is $125,000,000,000. The average value per policy is $7,000. The average amount of insurance by lives is $9,000. There have already been 118,000 claims allowed under the National Life Insurance Act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Can the gentleman state the number of applications of policies in effect in relation to the number of men? Possibly it should be noted that the testimony shows that as of October 31 there were a little over 16,000,000 applications and over 13,000,000 lives covered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; there are over 13,000,000 lives covered. That shows that it is pretty generally accepted and that advantage is taken of this opportunity.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. I believe the gentleman stated the average was $7,000,000 per policy. Did he not mean $7,000 per policy?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Seven thousand dollars per policy is what I meant to say. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

This is chart No. 6 which shows the situation in reference to hospital beds.

CHART No. 6

Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary beds to be available upon completion of projects for which funds are available or included in 1946 Budget estimates, November 1, 1944

Item	Hospital					Domiciliary	Grand total
	Tuberculosis	Psychotic	Other neuropsychiatric	General	Total		
Veterans Administration facilities:							
1. In operation	7,625	41,172	2,894	22,985	74,676	14,753	89,429
2. Under construction	354	12,168	----------	155	12,677	−1,689	10,988
3. Not under construction funds available	100	5,887	----------	2,409	8,396	3,500	11,896
4. Funds in 1946 Budget	3,400	2,700	----------	8,000	14,100	----------	14,100
Total	11,479	61,927	2,894	33,549	109,849	16,564	126,413
Other Government hospitals:							
5. Allocated to Veterans' Administration	----------	90	----------	4,338	4,428	----------	4,428
Grand total	11,479	62,017	2,894	37,887	114,277	16,564	130,841

The Veterans' Administration facilities total 74,676 hospital beds in operation. And there are 14,000 domiciliary beds, or a grand total of 89,429. There are under construction, which will come in and which are provided for in this bill, another 10,000. We lose 1,600 domiciliary beds because they are turned into hospital beds. But we get a gross increase of 10,988.

Under "Construction funds available" are funds carried in the deficiency bill, which has just been passed, for another 11,000 beds. We carried 14,000 beds in the 1936 bill, making a total of 126,413 available beds at the end of the fiscal year 1936, including domiciliary beds, just of the Veterans' Administration beds.

Then there is another 4,000 in other Government hospitals, such as Public Health hospitals, and beds that are being utilized in Army and Navy hospitals; or a grand total provided for of 130,841.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. What is the estimate of the Bureau as to whether that figure of 126,413 beds at the end of 1946 will be sufficient to take care of the load?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, there is an unpredictable element in that, but they feel that that situation is pretty well in hand. They are being pressed. The casualties have been terrific, many more than had been anticipated.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Nearly a million service connected from this war already.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, not all of those are in hospitals.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. But hospital facilities are available to them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. General Hines is being given the funds when he and the Hospitalization Board think they are necessary. They are using them just as fast as they can get construction, and I think the situation is well in hand.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I would like to know where we stood before the war with reference to hospital beds as compared with the 126,000 that will be available at the end of 1946.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman means before the declaration of war?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. On November 30, 1941, there were 61,845 hospital beds in operation and 1,262 under construction.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. That is, when we reach the 126,000, the gentleman thinks that will be double?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. How much does this bill carry for hospital construction?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Eighty-four million five hundred thousand dollars is carried in this bill for hospital construction.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman feel that the most important single kind of construction of any sort in the United States is the construction of these hospitals for veterans?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think so.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is not anything else that should come before it.

Is the gentleman satisfied that this work is being pressed just as fast as it can be pressed? I mean the construction of the hospitals.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I wish I could say I am satisfied, but, reluctantly, I must say I am not and the veterans are not. I am always told at the Veterans' Administration that the reason for failure to construct more beds quickly is that they cannot get the men and materials; but the G. I. bill which we passed provides that next to the Army and Navy, first priority should go to the Veterans' Administration. There are many Minnesota veterans now that have to be sent to hospitals in other States. We do not have the facilities to take care of our own casualties. I do not know whether we had more than other States or not. Our boys were among the very first to go overseas. But it is most distressing to the people of Minnesota to have their boys sent to Wisconsin or North Dakota or Chicago because there are not enough beds in our State available for our own men.

May I say further that, in my judgment, the most acute need is for beds for neuropsychiatric patients in general hospitals. Many men suffering with battle fatigue are dismissed from Army hospitals as early as possible. Doubtless, that is a good thing to get the boy back into normal life and try to get readjusted before he lies around too long, brooding and worrying and becomes chronic. But some are not quite able to make the adjustment, and need careful psychiatric handling or they go from border line to psychotic rather than to normal; then they have to be sent to a neuropsychiatric hospital and are unfortunately branded by the ignorant as insane. When they come out, people do not like to employ them. They cannot get a job. People say, "He is a nut." So the thing of greatest urgency is not more neuropsychiatric hospitals but more neuropsychiatric beds in the general hospitals, where these border-line cases can go when their very sanity and their whole future hangs in the balance. They do not need to be confined. They may be ambulatory cases but they need a place where they can have counsel; can go in and discuss their problems with a psychiatrist; perhaps have a short period of observation during a period of excitement till they quiet down. This is the greatest single need the Veterans' Administration needs to meet—I believe the most urgent need. If handled well, it will save billions of dollars later, not to mention the useful lives.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. General Hines gave his opinion that the program was entirely safe, in the absence of unusually large transfer from the Army.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Will the deficiency appropriation for additional hospitals increase this total of beds available?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, yes. This is just for funds that have already been provided. Anything provided in the future will be in addition to this.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Can the gentleman tell us how much there will be?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. I do not know whether the Budget has sent up an estimate or not. I know the Veterans' Administration has presented their requirements to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. I may be speaking out of turn, but it is my understanding there will be a deficiency item for further hospital construction. However, I am confident if General Hines thinks it is needed he will ask for it, and if he asks for it he will get it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Speaking of the difference of 41,000 beds, is that the difference between the operations at the present time and what is expected to come in 1946?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. MILLER of California. Do those 41,000 beds represent additional beds in hospitals now built or in hospitals to be built?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Some of each.

Mr. MILLER of California. What proportion?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman will find a table on page 157 of the hearings that will give him that information.

I have consumed 1 hour; I do not want to consume more time. I thank the Committee.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include in the RECORD several short articles relative to the natural-gas situation in the Detroit area.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to get that permission in the House. In the Committee the gentleman may get permission only to extend his own remarks.

Mr. LESINSKI. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask for that permission.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries, in addition to permanent appropriations amounting to $2,707,000,000, authorizations for expenditures amounting to $61,100,000, and direct appropriations amounting to $3,218,000,000.

The table in the committee report prepared by the Bureau of the Budget comparing authorizations and direct appropriations for the fiscal year 1945 with recommendations for the fiscal year 1946 is deceptive and misleading in that it indicates reductions all along the line to a total of $5,321,000,000.

Examination will show that various nonrecurring items of expenditure are included in the table; that nothing is included for overtime in the fiscal year 1946; and that the fact that the Maritime Commission asks for no additional construction funds results, in itself, in a reduction of $6,766,000,000, or more than the total reduction indicated by the Bureau of the Budget.

Taking out nonrecurring items and correcting for overtime, there is an actual increase in comparable items of about $1,526,000,000, instead of the indicated reduction of $5,321,000,000.

Of the 32 items approved by the Budget, as I count them, 22 reflect increases, and 10 reflect decreases. Of the 10 items showing over-all decreases, 3 reflect increases in appropriations for normal activities as distinguished from national defense activities.

In those cases where agencies have had appropriations for both normal activities and national defense activities, there is an evident tendency to shift funds from the latter to the former with a view to retention of their staffs.

It also appears from testimony before the Appropriations Committee that the Bureau of the Budget has done little or nothing to bring about a real reduction in the use of penalty mail. With but few exceptions, the estimates of the departments and agencies appear to have been accepted in full.

The reductions recommended by your committee amount to $346,611 in authorizations for expenditure and $76,281,221 in direct appropriations.

A number of amendments will be offered at the appropriate time.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

In appearing before your committee, Mr. Chairman, the Comptroller General of the United States made some very challenging statements. I urge all Members of the House to read his testimony.

Among other things, the Comptroller General stated in substance:

That Congress has no idea how appropriated funds are spent, even in the General Accounting Office;

That the war situation has been taken advantage of both to ease and to lift proper restrictions on matters entirely unrelated to the war effort;

That it is axiomatic that the confidence of a citizenship in its Government traditionally rests upon how its funds are expended and checked;

That all funds should be audited by a nonpartisan, independent agency of the Government, subject only to the Congress itself;

That in rendering decisions to the heads of departments and disbursing or certifying officers the Comptroller General acts as the agent of the Congress to see that appropriations are expended in accordance with the intention of the Congress, as expressed in appropriation acts and other pertinent statutes;

That he likes to think of the General Accounting Office as the institution of the Congress in fiscal matters, free from the executive branch of the Government, with the Comptroller General and his assistants as the agents of the Congress; and

That the General Accounting Office is the last bulwark there is in the Government today to aid the Congress impartially and to protect the taxpayers.

Under the law, Mr. Chairman, the Comptroller General is required to investigate all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds and to make to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session a report in writing of the work of the General Accounting Office containing recommendations concerning legislation he may deem necessary to facilitate the prompt and accurate rendition and settlement of accounts, and concerning such other matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds, as he may think advisable.

The Comptroller General is also required to make recommendations to the Congress in such regular reports or in special reports at any time when the Congress is in session, looking to greater economy and efficiency in public expenditure.

He is also required to report to the Congress every expenditure or contract made by any department or establishment in any year in violation of law.

It does not appear from the record that all reports which should or could have been made to the Congress have, in fact, been made, or that charges have been raised or items collected in cases where reports have been made to the Congress.

I am amazed, however, to find that, in the fiscal year 1944, 184 reports were made by the Comptroller General to the Congress or to committees of the Congress.

A table listing these reports will be found in the hearings at page 1128. I doubt if any Member of Congress has seen more than a few of them. The Comptroller General complains of a lack of action in respect to them. Steps must be taken and taken immediately to meet this situation.

COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS

Among other things, the Comptroller General refers to the matter of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. He states, in substance, that the country is, in his opinion, at the mercy of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contractor who is writing his own ticket and getting what he writes. A statement furnished for the record in this connection shows:

Total number of exceptions	79,108
Total amount of exceptions	$3,333,660,923.56
Total amount of collections	48,324,550.37

The Comptroller General also refers to the matter of the final settlement of war contracts, indicating that, under existing legislation and Executive orders contracting agencies have been authorized to make final settlements to determine what documents shall be submitted to the General Accounting Office, and, in fact, to oust the General Accounting Office of all jurisdiction except in cases of fraud.

The Comptroller General states that, in certain fields, such as passenger and freight charges, no audit whatsoever is made by the administrative agencies.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

The Comptroller General also refers to Government corporations, listing 36 of those corporations as not being subject to audit by the General Accounting Office, and stating that he has no data or records whatsoever as to their nonadministrative expenditures.

The committee will have in mind the fact that the Byrd committee has made a special report on this subject—Senate Document 227, August 1, 1944.

That report shows 55 Government corporations with 697 offices and 67,912 employees. It indicates that these corporations have assets of $20,400,000,000, liabilities of $16,300,000,000, a borrowing power of $33,200,000,000; outstanding obligations guaranteed by the Government amounting to $12,600,000,000; and investments in securities of the Treasury and other Government agencies of $1,700,000,000.

The report states that these Government corporations are competing with private enterprise, that they are largely exempt from taxation, and that they are subject to no effective Government control.

It further appears that many of these corporations have been chartered under the laws of the several States; that they hold no Federal charters; that nevertheless they perform Federal functions, and in effect, pledge the credit of the United States by and through the issuance of their guaranteed notes, bonds, and debentures.

The magnitude of Government corporations—

The report states—

particularly of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Commodity Credit Corporation, is now so great as to rival Government proper.

It is high time, Mr. Chairman, that Congress took this all-important matter in hand. Immediate steps should be taken to assure proper over-all control by the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury; to assure proper auditing by the Comptroller General; and to consider whether existing borrowing authorities should not be canceled;

whether existing power of investment in obligations of the Treasury and other Government agencies should not be terminated; and whether Government corporations should not be strictly limited to those operating under properly recorded charters granted directly by the Congress.

BUDGET BUREAU TABLES

In connection with the general picture painted by the Comptroller General, attention is invited to two tables furnished by the Bureau of the Budget, one dealing with unobligated contract authorizations, unobligated balances, and revolving funds; the other dealing with the total national indebtedness in terms of direct obligations, guaranteed or contingent obligations, and unliquidated obligations incurred against contract authorizations or appropriations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the tables at this point:

TABLE I.—*Unobligated balances of appropriations and contract authorizations as of Nov. 30, 1944*

[000 omitted]

Department or establishment	Contract authorizations	Revolving fund appropriations	Other appropriations	
			Available	Not available [1]
Legislative branch			$18,906	$21,749
The judiciary			8,478	875
Executive Office of the President:				
The White House			446	85
Bureau of the Budget			1,869	331
Office for Emergency Management:				
Committee on Fair Employment Practices			329	
Division of Central Administrative Services			1,365	1,320
Miscellaneous accounts			276	45,436
Foreign Economic Administration			15,910	11,752
National War Labor Board			8,242	119
Office of Alien Property Custodian				
Office of Civilian Defense			464	5,170
Office of Defense Transportation			15,618	214
Office of Economic Stabilization			76	35
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	$8,177			2,228
Office of Scientific Research and Development			70,969	5,510
Office of War Information			41,418	1,319
Office of War Mobilization			531	1
War Manpower Commission			47,810	8,683
War Production Board			38,849	13,612
War Shipping Administration		$1,291,733	284,587	1,792
Committee for Congested Production Areas			83	1
Committee for Education of Men Demobilized From Armed Forces			3	
Liaison Office for Personnel Management			3	
National Resources Planning Board				35
Office of Censorship			18,894	1,995
Office of Price Administration			102,179	8,641
Office of Strategic Services			41,870	644
Petroleum Administration for War			3,887	256
War Refugee Board			449	
Appropriations to the President:				
Emergency funds for the President (unallocated)			61,590	5,005
Defense aid (lend-lease) (unallocated)	516,000		1,871,615	
Foreign War Relief				
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation			427,684	
Independent establishments:				
American Battle Monuments Commission			25	9
American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas			30	
Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel				8
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation			3	
Civil Service Commission			11,429	1,167
Employees' Compensation Commission			10,268	956
Federal Communications Commission			3,812	244
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: Federal credit unions			39	
Federal Power Commission			1,633	248
Federal Trade Commission			1,247	208
Foreign Service Pay Adjustment			261	241
General Accounting Office			25,189	2,489
Great Lakes Exposition			2	
Greater Texas and Pan-American Exposition			87	
Interstate Commerce Commission			5,633	1,352
National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics			15,234	751
National Archives			537	20
National Banking Emergency Act			16	
National Capital Housing Authority		388	17	152
National Capital Park and Planning Commission			1,130	
National Labor Relations Board			2,254	93
National Mediation Board			406	53
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion			423	
Railroad Retirement Board			79,642	368
Securities and Exchange Commission			2,805	148
Selective Service System			38,234	5,238
Smithsonian Institution			1,132	80
Tariff Commission			563	49
The Tax Court of the United States			355	59
Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission			15	
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission			20	
Temporary National Economic Committee			1	
Tennessee Valley Authority		25,026		
Texas Centennial Commission			12	
U. S. Maritime Commission	1,208,169	4,485,771	61,362	
Veterans' Administration		454	802,716	165,695
Federal Security Agency			304,872	59,828
Federal Works Agency	312,973	1,467	9,008	110,166
National Housing Agency		42,009	54,394	1,175
Department of Agriculture	11,473	75,455	1,122,988	130,360
Department of Commerce		52	90,091	33,272
Department of the Interior	11,650		210,519	16,155
Department of Justice			81,669	6,606
Department of Labor			31,071	433
Navy Department	13,947,515	218,579	9,490,463	2,311,554
Post Office Department:				
Payable from general fund			11,249	571
Payable from postal revenues			639,108	43,548
Department of State			40,226	1,333
Treasury Department	84,000	67,289	2,220,244	86,256
Interest on the Public Debt			2,633,652	
War Department		534,786	37,718,852	1,578
Panama Canal			33,010	
Total, general and special, and postal accounts	16,099,957	6,473,009	58,842,392	3,120,295

[1] Represents unobligated balances of expired appropriations, which are no longer available for obligation.

TABLE II.—*National indebtedness*

Direct public debt (as of Dec. 31, 1944):		
Interest-bearing debt	$228,891,263,312.84	
Matured debt on which interest has ceased	185,900,520.26	
Debt bearing no interest	1,553,069,876.26	
Total gross public debt		230,630,233,709.36
Contingent liabilities of United States (as of Dec. 31, 1944):		
Obligations guaranteed by the United States (net)	1,513,997,139.36	
Obligations issued on credit of United States:		
Tennessee Valley Authority bonds	6,300,000.00	
Funds due depositors by Postal Savings System	2,206,694,367.00	
Federal Reserve notes (face amount)	[1] 20,821,761,306.26	
		24,548,752,812.62
Unliquidated obligations incurred against appropriations and contract authorizations	[1] 67,057,064,000.00	
		322,236,050,522.98

[1] As of Nov. 30, 1944; not available for Dec. 31, 1944.

It will be noted that table 1 reflects a total of $84,535,000,000 in terms of unobligated contract authorizations, unobligated appropriations, and revolving funds subject to the control of departments and agencies and not subject to the control of the Congress.

It will also be noted that table 2 shows direct obligations of $230,630,000,000; guaranteed or contingent obligations of $24,548,000,000; and unliquidated obligations incurred against contract authorizations and appropriations of $67,057,000,000; or a total of $322,236,000,000. The latter figure is exclusive of any contingent liability on account of insured obligations in other fields, which the Bureau of the Budget is apparently unable to furnish at this time.

ADEQUATE STAFF FOR CONGRESS

I agree, Mr. Chairman, with the Comptroller General that the confidence of the citizenship in its Government rests, in the long run, on how its funds are expended and checked.

The matters mentioned, and others referred to by the Comptroller General, call for positive and prompt action by the Congress with a view to bringing order out of the fiscal chaos under this administration, which can wreck our national economy.

The Congress cannot expect from the Bureau of the Budget the type of assistance which is imperative. The Bureau of the Budget does not consider itself primarily responsible to the Congress. It reflects the views of the President. It declines to reflect them when so instructed by him, as evidenced by the experience of the House Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission.

When informed by the House Civil Service Committee on April 14, 1943, that the committee was interested in some organization that was not influenced by the executive departments, but directly responsible to the Congress, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget replied:

I would think that would either have to be a new organization of some sort or possibly tied in with a revision and clarification of the functions of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In my judgment, the gentleman is making one of the most constructive suggestions that has been made concerning our governmental reorganization today. It occurs to me that in connection with the consideration of this bill, the bill should include the suggestion that has been made for a bill growing out of the Byrd-Butler recommendations. I am wondering if the gentleman thinks, in view of the fact that there are some legislative provisions in this bill, that tomorrow during the amendment stage of this bill, we should raise the question for consideration by offering the provisions of that bill, to provide for the financial control of Government corporations, as a part of the legislative provisions offered under the general provisions of this bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not familiar with the details of that bill but I am wholeheartedly in favor of steps at the earliest possible moment to bring Government corporations under proper supervision by the Congress.

With the enormous expansion, Mr. Chairman, of the executive branch of the Government, with little or no expansion in the legislative branch of the Government, it is, in my judgment, almost impossible for the Congress properly to perform its fundamental duties in respect to the appropriation and expenditure of public funds.

Additional and competent expert staff is imperatively needed. The expenditure of from $200,000 to $300,000 a year in this connection could save hundreds of millions of dollars, in my judgment, and perhaps our American form of government.

Arrangements for the prompt consideration of all reports and recommendations of the Comptroller General are also vital—perhaps by the circulation of all reports and recommendations to all Members of the Congress; perhaps by the creation of a special committee.

I cannot recommend too strongly the immediate consideration of these matters by those charged with the formulation of recommendations for the reorganization of the Congress, with a view to the proper control of the purse strings of the Nation.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Among the agencies of which the Comptroller General has been most critical in recent years, Mr. Chairman, are the United States Maritime Commission and its twin, created by Executive order, the War Shipping Administration, for which appropriations are made in another bill.

The Commission requests $28,500,000 for expenses of administration, as compared with $32,500,000 in the present fiscal year. The committee recommends $28,300,000.

No request is made for additional construction funds, there being sufficient funds available at this time due to curtailment in program and the changeover from the Liberty to the Victory type of construction.

As a matter of fact, the record indicates that, in the absence of further request for ships by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commission will have on hand as of June 30, 1946, unobligated contract authorizations, and unexpended funds, amounting to $2,800,000,000. It would appear that part or all of this sum might well be canceled or returned to the Treasury.

The Commission presents its program of construction as follows:

Contracts and awards to June 30, 1944, 4,473 ships at $11,296,000,000.

Contracts and awards to November 30, 1944, 63 ships at $77,739,000.

Contracts and awards to December 31, 1945, 354—new—at $1,000,000,000.

Contracts and awards after calendar year 1945, — ships at $2,759,000,000; total, including other items, $15,311,000,000.

The Commission estimates that 50,000,000 tons of shipping will be on hand at the end of 1945. Peacetime needs of this country prior to the war amounted to about 11,000,000 tons. It is apparently contemplated, if pending legislation is enacted into law providing for the restoration of shipping to our allies on a 1939 basis by sales at pre-war prices less depreciation, with credit to noncitizens, that a total of 12,000,000 tons will be required. Admiral Land would place in reserve at a cost of from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 a year, from 1,000 to 2,000 ships, or from 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 tons. This would still leave a balance of from 7,000,000 to 17,000,000 tons on our hands.

Despite this fact, the Commission indicates a desire to construct from 6 to 10 passenger vessels for peacetime use at a cost of some $250,000,000. It states that these ships will not be built during the calendar year 1945. It would appear that no peacetime construction should be initiated in the absence of express approval by the Congress.

PURCHASE PRICES, CHARTER RATES, INSURANCE

The Comptroller General has been very critical of purchase prices, charter rates, and insurance values paid and allowed in this general field. These matters fall under the jurisdiction of War Shipping Administration rather than that of the Maritime Commission at this time. In view of the close connection between the two agencies, however, the following facts may be mentioned for the record:

The Comptroller General has indicated that excessive prices have been paid for vessels purchased and requisitioned. No general report to Congress has been made by him on this subject. Five special reports have been made, all of which have been highly critical in character.

Figures received from the Maritime Commission and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of January 27 and February 4, 1944, show 69 vessels, 20 years old or over, bought for $26,300,000, or about 7 times their book value.

The committee will have in mind the advisory board of three judges which rendered an opinion in regard to the applicable law about a year ago. The Comptroller General reports, in substance, that it is difficult to interpret this opinion; that he does not consider himself bound by it; that certain purchase prices paid since the opinion have been proper, in his judgment; that others have been set aside and are now under consideration.

The Comptroller General has indicated that, in his judgment, many excessive charter rates have been paid. No general report has been made by him to the Congress in this connection.

The figures referred to, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of January 27 and February 4, 1944, show 758 vessels, 20 years old or more, having a book value of $37,900,000, with charter earnings in a period of 18 months estimated at $199,700,000.

Figures included with reference to the Red Sea charters, which the committee will recall, show 81 vessels with a book value of $8,200,000 earning profits on 91 voyages to the Red Sea area of $26,800,000. No recoveries have been realized except from 2 of the 19 companies concerned.

The Comptroller General has indicated that excessive war-risk insurance values have been paid, in his judgment. No general report has been made by him to the Congress in this connection.

Figures inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 4, 1944, show 690 vessels, 20 years old or more, with book values totaling $34,500,000, on which war-risk insurance had been effected in the total of $477,300,000, or at about 1,400 percent of the book value.

The steamships *Effingham, Manhattan, Washington,* and *Santa Lucia* would appear to be specific examples of overpayments on war-risk insurance.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a further table received from the General Accounting Office in this connection:

Historical and financial data of vessels owned and operated as at Dec. 31, 1941

Vessel name	Dead-weight tons	Year built	Construction cost	Year sold by United States	Amount paid Government	Admiral Land's estimated value for operation Dec. 31, 1938	Owner's financial statement, Dec. 31, 1941				Insurance by U. S. Maritime Commission on time charters for premium purpose
							Date acquired	Cost-plus betterments	Reserve for depreciation	Net book valuation	
Alabaman	10,380	1921	$2,139,856.45	1922	$300,000.00	$117,443.00	1936	$291,873.24	$152,430.36	$139,442.88	$830,400.00
Alaskan	10,350	1918	3,032,133.92	1928	275,000.00	89,943.00	1928	525,707.59	454,425.66	71,281.93	879,750.00
American	9,500	1916	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1925	422,934.87	422,933.87	1.00	
Arizonian	11,600	1920	1,747,406.87	1920	506,369.46	97,506.00	1929	317,119.90	223,299.50	93,820.40	870,000.00
Arkansan	10,380	1921	2,123,450.57	1928	300,000.00	117,326.00	1936	314,106.48	173,320.68	140,785.80	
Carolinian	10,380	1921	2,128,625.68	1922	300,000.00	117,326.00	1936	313,661.37	167,175.10	146,486.27	830,400.00
Coloradan	10,700	1920	1,519,034.99	1917	175,000.00	109,948.00	1936	446,430.43	352,968.38	93,462.05	802,500.00
Columbian	9,500	1913	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1925	421,033.68	419,555.95	1,477.73	807,500.00
Dakotan	10,175	1912	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1912	701,999.31	699,352.59	2,646.72	864,875.00
Floridian	10,380	1921	2,096,095.36	1922	300,000.00	117,342.00	1936	327,079.91	185,010.08	142,069.83	830,400.00
Georgian	11,600	1920	1,731,788.00	1920	506,369.46	97,674.00	1936	528,874.19	427,693.29	101,180.90	870,000.00
Hawaiian	9,500	1919	2,407,223.07	1928	1,862,000.00	81,627.00	1925	416,056.54	368,648.39	47,408.15	807,500.00
Honolulan	10,970	1921	1,999,633.68	1928	112,237.50	125,643.00	1937	84,893.72	39,656.79	45,236.93	877,600.00
Illinoian	10,700	1918	2,585,478.37	1928	175,000.00	108,539.00	1936	447,055.06	392,469.04	54,586.02	802,500.00
Iowan	10,175	1914	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1914	766,160.32	764,813.78	1,346.54	864,875.00
Kansan	9,560	1918	1,163,781.67	1928	1,136,064.01	81,660.00	1925	424,018.14	386,995.26	37,022.88	807,500.00
Kentuckian	9,925	1910	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1910	606,738.44	602,374.57	4,363.87	843,625.00
Mexican	13,825	1907	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1907	893,222.51	889,620.51	3,602.00	1,106,000.00
Minnesotan	10,175	1912	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1912	691,767.65	686,890.64	4,877.01	864,875.00
Montanan	9,500	1917	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1925	413,817.64	405,313.65	8,503.99	807,500.00
Nebraskan	11,992	1912	713,600.00	1928	539,881.99	110,199.00	1927	391,670.51	386,394.41	5,276.10	1,019,320.00
Nevadan	10,085	1912	616,000.00	1928	463,903.74	79,380.00	1927	325,993.31	322,536.21	3,457.10	806,800.00
Ohioan	9,417	1920	1,955,151.46	1928	96,524.25	101,916.00	1936	76,503.55	55,858.05	20,645.50	
Oklahoman	8,584	1920	1,824,730.64	1928	87,986.00	92,358.00	1936	78,629.42	46,512.82	32,116.60	
Oregonian	9,500	1917	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1925	427,247.06	424,265.82	2,981.24	807,500.00
Panaman	10,175	1913	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1913	750,290.21	746,996.19	3,294.02	864,875.00
Pennsylvanian	10,175	1913	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1913	748,448.41	747,956.83	491.58	864,875.00
Puerto Rican	9,400	1919	1,943,437.02	1928	96,534.50	101,882.00	1937	60,692.43	34,385.12	26,307.31	753,600.00
Texan	13,950	1902	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1902	883,971.37	877,535.72	6,435.65	1,116,000.00
Utahan	10,300	1919	2,063,460.08	1928	101,987.50	117,898.00	1937	73,877.78	41,494.83	32,382.95	824,000.00
Virginian	12,250	1903	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1903	957,369.56	952,755.92	4,613.64	1,041,250.00
Washingtonian	10,700	1919	1,533,827.01	1928	175,000.00	110,954.00	1936	469,557.10	370,143.87	99,413.23	
Total								14,598,801.70	13,221,783.88	1,377,017.82	23,466,020.00

[1] Data unavailable.

It may be pointed out that the record indicates that, in many cases the payments made to shipowners go into one or more statutory reserve funds which are free from income taxes provided the funds are ultimately used in the purchase of new vessels. The Maritime Commission reports a total in the capital reserve and special reserve funds of $130,700,000 as compared with $80,700,000 a year ago.

On January 12, 1943, the Comproller General reported 27 investigations pending in respect to purchase prices, charter hire, and insurance. To date, only five reports on those matters have been submitted to the Congress.

VESSELS TRADED IN AGAINST NEW CONSTRUCTION

The matter of trading in obsolete vessels for credit against new construction, under section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, is a matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, the Comptroller General has indicated that there have been various cases, in his judgment, where excessive credits have been allowed including credits in excess of the value at which ships traded in could have been acquired under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act.

The Commission has furnished certain tables covering trade-in transactions. Those tables are incomplete in that the original construction costs are not shown. Under the circumstances, I am inserting data from other tables supplied by the Comptroller General in respect to vessel trade-ins:

Schedule of obsolete Great Lakes ore carriers traded in under section 510, Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, showing amount of credit allowed for each vessel

Vessel	Date of construction	Age (years)	Dead weight (tons)	Gross tons carrying capacity	Original cost (approximate)	Allowance at $63.75 per gross ton carrying capacity	Excess allowance over cost
Capt. Thomas Wilson	1900	43	7,000	7,404	$305,184.79	$472,005.00	$166,820.21
A. W. Osborne	1897	46	6,200	6,538	226,062.76	416,798.00	190,735.24
Maritana	1892	51	3,900	3,907	150,000.00	249,071.25	99,071.25
Mariposa	1892	51	4,300	3,862	150,000.00	246,202.50	96,202.50
Alexander McDougall	1898	45	7,000	7,240	225,000.00	461,550.00	236,550.00
Munising	1902	41	6,300	6,913	230,000.00	440,703.75	210,703.75
Cadillac	1902	41	6,300	6,675	230,000.00	420,531.25	190,531.25
Negaunee	1902	41	6,300	6,700	230,000.00	427,125.00	197,125.00
Colonel	1901	42	5,800	6,245	180,000.00	398,118.75	218,118.75
Yosemite	1901	42	5,800	6,152	200,000.00	392,190.00	192,190.00
Wilburt L. Smith	1903	40	6,300	6,749	250,000.00	430,248.75	180,248.75
George B. Leonard	1903	40	6,300	6,646	250,000.00	423,682.50	173,682.50
B. Lyman Smith	1903	40	6,300	6,774	250,000.00	431,842.50	181,842.50
William Nottingham	1902	41	6,300	6,708	250,000.00	427,635.00	177,635.00
Monroe C. Smith	1903	40	6,300	6,722	250,000.00	428,527.50	178,527.50
Cetus	1903	40	6,900	7,327	139,487.07	467,096.25	327,609.18
Corvus	1903	40	6,900	7,057	139,790.41	449,883.75	310,093.34
Cygnus	1903	40	6,900	7,326	139,501.17	467,032.50	327,531.33
Pegasus	1902	41	6,800	7,254	153,218.81	462,442.50	309,233.69
Saturn	1901	42	6,800	7,009	211,302.08	446,823.75	235,521.67
Taurus	1903	40	6,800	7,236	139,498.76	461,295.00	321,796.24
Vega	1906	37	7,000	7,076	211,302.08	451,095.00	239,791.92
Amazon	1897	46	5,700	5,827	229,362.21	371,471.25	142,109.04
S. B. Coolidge	1897	46	6,000	5,684	236,661.45	362,355.00	125,693.55
Clarence A. Black	1898	45	6,800	6,776	250,000.00	431,970.00	181,970.00
Zenith City	1895	48	5,700	5,856	240,000.00	373,320.00	133,320.00
Robert Fulton	1896	47	5,900	5,856	245,000.00	373,320.00	128,320.00
Queen City	1896	47	6,000	6,224	245,000.00	396,780.00	151,780.00
Rensselaer	1900	43	7,500	7,189	324,000.00	458,298.75	134,298.75
Herman C. Strom	1903	40	6,900	6,733	280,000.00	429,228.75	149,228.75
Penticost Mitchell	1903	40	6,800	6,618	255,000.00	421,897.50	166,897.50
Richard J. Reiss	1901	42	7,500	7,869	250,000.00	501,648.75	251,649.75
A. B. Uhrig	1893	50	4,900	5,101	120,000.00	325,188.75	205,188.75
Johnstown (ex Lehigh)	1905	38	10,350	10,734	395,000.00	658,173.81	263,173.81
Sancon	1906	37	11,391	11,391	396,000.00	698,458.91	302,458.91
Cornwall (ex Steelton)	1907	36	9,800	9,943	325,000.00	609,672.28	284,672.28
Total			239,741	247,321	8,301,371.59	15,683,684.25	7,382,312.66

Schedule of obsolete vessels traded under Sec. 510, Merchant Marine Act, 1936

Vessel	Date of construction	Type	Dead weight	Construction cost	Purchased by owner		At time of trade-in			Trade-in allowance—sec. 510		Excess allowance			Operating valuations, Dec. 31, 1938
					Year	Cost-plus betterments	Book valuation	Residual value—General Order 24	Scrap value	Average per dead-weight ton	Amount	Over book value	Over residual value—General Order 24	Over scrap value	
President Jackson	1921	Passenger	14,123	$5,616,420.09	1926	$932,874.73	$236,260.86	$236,260.86	$159,127.97	35.37	500,000	$263,739.14	$263,739.14	$340,872.03	$231,292
President Jefferson	1920	do	14,174	7,202,170.91	1926	941,526.16	249,725.80	249,725.80	180,054.27		500,000	250,274.20	250,274.20	319,945.73	232,126
President Grant	1921	do	14,119	6,365,118.88	1926	945,692.94	243,765.97	243,765.97	140,410.50		500,000	255,234.03	255,234.03	359,589.50	231,228
President McKinley	1921	do	14,127	6,906,426.59	1926	946,194.05	308,318.57	308,318.57	172,660.86		500,000	191,681.43	191,681.43	327,339.14	231,358
Total			56,543	26,090,136.47		3,766,287.88	1,038,071.20	1,038,071.20	652,253.60	35.37	2,000,000	961,928.80	961,928.80	1,347,746.40	926,004
Lafayette	1919	General cargo	11,240	1,768,163.16	1932	178,301.55	62,326.83	44,200.00	34,780.00	72.73	675,000	613,673.17	631,800.00	641,220.00	103,324
Arizpa	1920	do	8,804	[1] 529,223.33	1931	118,401.53	26,101.48	38,230.00	29,165.00		686,900	660,798.52	648,670.00	657,735.00	91,168
Kofresi	1919	do	7,990	1,419,693.63	1931	380,447.55	92,598.67	35,492.00	31,616.00		686,700	594,001.33	651,208.00	655,084.00	82,733
West Kyska	1918	do	8,480	2,006,807.48	1931	108,329.64	24,742.75	50,170.00	31,560.00		560,000	535,257.25	509,830.00	528,440.00	93,096
Gateway City	1920	do	8,804	1,428,627.24	1931	112,959.46	23,545.46	35,715.00	29,165.00		686,900	663,354.54	651,185.00	657,735.00	91,084
Panama City	1920	do	7,667	1,660,776.73	1925	136,456.82	33,383.43	56,240.00	31,000.00	66.97	548,000	514,616.57	491,760.00	517,000.00	81,258
Pan Gulf	1918	do	8,594	2,249,620.43	1929	215,139.12	69,066.88	41,519.00	26,300.00		541,000	471,933.12	499,481.00	514,700.00	93,884
Total			61,588	12,062,912.00		1,250,035.67	331,865.50	301,566.00	213,586.00	71.20	4,385,500	4,053,634.50	4,083,934.00	4,171,914.00	636,547
Pan Carolina	1919	Tanker	13,800	1,948,056.46	1936	480,489.21	190,529.37	48,701.00	43,575.00	75.00	949,370	758,840.63	900,669.00	905,795.00	197,098
William Penn	1921	do	14,000	2,927,066.76	1940	609,643.63	335,305.58	73,177.00	47,900.00		1,105,325	770,019.42	1,032,148.00	1,057,425.00	[1]
Chiloil	1920	do	7,925	1,932,071.25	1935	174,000.00	174,000.00	48,302.00	31,459.00		624,347	450,347.00	576,045.00	592,888.00	132,770
Dilworth	1919	do	10,671	2,211,350.59	1929	602,763.43	96,714.11	56,183.00	37,000.00	73.95	806,000	709,285.89	749,817.00	769,000.00	178,915
Chas. Kurz	1918	do	9,300	2,665,035.12	1927	47,590.66	96,714.11	66,626.00	34,000.00		653,000	556,285.89	586,374.00	619,000.00	145,544
Chilbar	1919	do	7,900	2,195,369.70	1927	416,534.00	96,714.11	54,884.00	29,000.00		602,000	505,285.89	547,116.00	573,000.00	127,742
Antietam	1919	do	10,910	2,179,030.56	1923	460,710.00	172,501.83	54,474.00	37,000.00	77.15	776,000	603,498.17	721,526.00	739,000.00	177,061
Baldbutte	1919	do	9,862	1,906,596.42	1929	515,051.00	153,802.93	47,664.00	36,000.00		716,000	562,197.07	668,336.00	680,000.00	159,868
Baldhill	1919	do	9,860	1,959,395.86	1925	516,051.00	109,595.21	48,985.00	36,000.00		716,000	606,404.79	667,015.00	680,000.00	162,865
Danne Daike	1919	do	6,350	1,858,444.89	1926	210,000.00	43,261.39	46,461.00	23,000.00		474,000	430,738.61	427,539.00	451,000.00	109,457
Paco	1920	do	7,900	1,360,131.63	1926	336,909.00	62,593.24	34,033.00	29,000.00		653,000	590,406.76	618,967.00	624,000.00	131,704
Thermo	1920	do	6,710	[1]	1929	277,500.00	73,535.99	33,550.00	25,000.00		540,000	466,464.01	506,450.00	515,000.00	[1]
Beta	1917	do	9,280	2,743,891.00	1925	45,920.50	179,874.52	68,500.00	31,274.00	70.71	670,000	490,125.48	601,500.00	638,726.00	143,868
Elwood	1918	do	11,250	[1]	1935	350,000.00	131,187.15	56,250.00	36,461.00		690,000	558,812.85	633,750.00	653,539.00	[1]
Olney	1920	do	10,710	2,631,250.34	1928	347,903.15	143,852.15	65,781.00	32,138.00		849,000	705,147.85	783,219.00	816,862.00	185,238
Acme	1916	do	10,670	950,687.90	1916	954,069.12	762.36	21,838.00	48,000.00	62.00	661,540	660,777.64	639,702.00	613,540.00	[1]
Birkenhead	1921	do	10,698	2,026,424.06	1931	2,026,424.06	3,980.75	50,660.00	36,000.00		663,276	659,295.25	612,616.00	627,276.00	[1]
Gargoyle	1921	do	10,630	2,014,437.41	1931	2,014,437.41	1,630.37	48,628.00	36,000.00		659,060	657,429.63	610,432.00	623,060.00	[1]
Liebre	1921	do	11,077	2,029,042.37	1928	2,001,793.26	29,944.15	50,360.00	36,000.00		686,774	656,829.85	636,414.00	650,774.00	[1]
Standard Arrow	1916	do	13,380	873,531.93	1916	878,262.91	1,185.89	50,726.00	37,000.00		829,560	828,374.11	778,834.00	792,560.00	[1]
Vacum	1920	do	10,680	1,946,146.99	1931	1,946,146.99	3,365.40	23,767.00	37,000.00		662,160	658,794.60	638,393.00	625,160.00	[1]
Mojave	1920	do	11,305	2,050,449.09	1926	483,760.95	4,892.91	51,261.00	36,000.00	61.00	689,605	684,712.09	638,344.00	653,605.00	[1]
Argon	1920	do	10,790	1,807,812.13	1920	1,811,464.41	14,412.21	45,195.00	37,000.00		658,190	643,777.79	612,995.00	621,190.00	[1]
Paulsboro	1916	do	10,647	1,364,644.75	1931	1,364,644.75	39,905.79	35,116.00	37,000.00		649,467	609,560.21	614,351.00	612,467.00	[1]
Tejon	1920	do	10,687	2,648,235.86	1926	520,812.37	5,159.48	66,204.00	35,000.00		651,907	646,747.52	585,703.00	616,907.00	[1]
Shenandoah	1919	do	9,980	2,342,328.21	1920	1,837,500.00	97,251.09	56,931.00	35,400.00	63.00	693,740	596,488.91	636,809.00	658,340.00	[1]
Idaho	1919	do	10,020	2,277,251.17	1920	1,837,500.00	139,196.65	58,558.00	35,400.00		672,640	533,443.35	614,082.00	637,240.00	[1]
Virginia	1917	do	9,830	871,170.61	1929	864,323.39	----------	21,060.00	35,400.00		566,100	566,100.00	545,040.00	530,700.00	[1]
Pennsylvania	1917	do	9,830	842,511.30	1929	905,213.42	----------	21,780.00	35,400.00		566,100	566,100.00	544,320.00	530,700.00	[1]
C. A. Canfield	1913	do	10,320	566,349.72	1935	398,985.12	128,266.18	14,159.00	[2] 33,000.00	58.12	304,000	175,733.82	289,841.00	271,000.00	[1]
Edward L. Doheny	1913	do	10,440	650,740.49	1935	403,624.48	155,253.81	16,268.00	[2] 35,000.00		315,240	159,386.19	298,972.00	280,240.00	[2]
Glenpool	1913	do	8,370	409,361.61	1935	64,820.46	180,212.15	10,234.00	[2] 31,000.00		224,470	44,257.85	214,236.00	193,470.00	[2]
F. O. Barstow	1917	do	15,955	962,267.38	1935	223,583.52	58,240.48	24,057.00	55,000.00		753,970	695,729.52	729,913.00	698,970.00	[1]
Frederic R. Kellogg	1917	do	11,050	1,201,846.23	1935	246,272.79	36,164.95	30,046.00	35,000.00		593,340	557,175.05	563,294.00	558,340.00	[1]
R. G. Stewart	1917	do	[3] 13,640	911,343.14	1935	750,685.14	155,524.73	22,784.00	46,000.00		624,770	469,245.27	601,986.00	578,770.00	[1]
George W. Barnes	1918	do	9,750	1,255,791.15	1935	376,948.15	389,743.17	31,395.00	36,000.00		575,650	185,906.83	544,255.00	539,650.00	[1]
Wm. G. Warden[4]	1917	do	15,955	959,542.53	1935	217,852.61	51,020.53	23,989.00	55,000.00		725,000	673,979.47	701,011.00	670,000.00	[1]
S. B. Hunt	1919	do	11,205	2,536,813.82	1919	339,472.95	50,687.26	64,670.00	36,000.00		735,340	684,652.74	670,670.00	699,340.00	[1]
Vistula	1920	do	13,725	465,760.53	1935	516,248.09	87,158.53	11,644.00	[2] 44,000.00		969,230	882,071.47	957,586.00	925,230.00	[1]
E. T. Bedford	1921	do	15,655	2,650,542.29	1921	846,437.50	349,101.66	66,264.00	57,000.00		1,127,890	778,788.34	1,061,626.00	1,070,890.00	[1]
Walter Jennings	1921	do	16,075	2,655,564.20	1921	685,772.33	250,038.02	66,389.00	54,000.00		1,150,200	900,161.98	1,083,811.00	1,096,200.00	[1]
Christy Payne	1921	do	12,475	2,338,153.40	1935	320,143.63	166,770.76	58,454.00	43,000.00		910,220	743,449.24	851,766.00	867,220.00	[1]
Chester O. Swain	1921	do	12,450	2,337,993.59	1935	350,621.10	39,148.28	58,450.00	43,000.00		908,380	869,231.72	849,930.00	865,380.00	[1]
Thomas H. Wheeler	1921	do	10,450	1,933,622.29	1921	389,357.84	32,998.41	48,341.00	35,000.00		793,170	760,171.59	744,829.00	758,170.00	[1]
Total			484,167	74,448,056.73		30,968,274.40	4,532,798.66	1,952,799.00	1,663,407.00	63.93	30,845,031	26,312,232.34	28,892,232.00	29,181,624.00	[1]
Number of vessels															
Passenger 4			56,543	26,090,136.47		3,766,287.88	1,038,071.20	1,038,071.20	652,253.60		2,000,000	961,928.80	961,928.80	1,347,746.40	[1]
General cargo 7			61,588	12,062,912.00		1,250,035.67	331,865.50	301,566.00	213,586.00		4,385,500	4,053,634.50	4,083,934.00	4,171,914.00	[1]
Tanker 44			484,167	74,448,056.73		30,968,274.40	4,532,798.66	1,952,799.00	1,663,407.00		30,845,031	26,312,232.34	28,892,232.00	29,181,624.00	[1]
Total			602,298	112,601,105.20		35,984,597.95	5,902,735.36	3,292,436.20	2,529,246.60		37,230,531	31,327,795.64	33,938,094.80	34,701,284.40	[1]

[1] Unknown.

[2] Foreign built.

[3] Charter hire paid on 14,560.

[4] Substituted for E. G. Seubert (lost).

It will be noted, among other things, that 36 vessels, from 36 to 51 years of age, were accepted as trade-ins for a credit of about 190 percent of their original cost, and that other vessels appear to have been accepted for credits amounting to several hundred times the book value of the vessels at the time of the trade-ins.

An expert, testifying before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on June 6, 1944, stated that credits had been allowed on 8 ships amounting, in his opinion, to 100 times their market value.

OTHER MATTERS

The record indicates the termination of the concrete-ship program involving the construction of 104 ships at a cost to the taxpayers of $167,000,000, a program undertaken against the best judgment of Admiral Land, initiated, it is said, at the suggestion of Harry Hopkins. The record also indicates the purchase from Canada of 100 ships at a cost to the taxpayers of $164,000,000. The reason for the payment of any purchase price for ships to be used in the common war effort has never been satisfactorily explained.

No additional expenditure by the Maritime Commission is contemplated at this time for facilities. Total expenditure to date for facilities is given as $588,000,000. Detailed information as to investments in facilities by the Federal Government and shipbuilders and the earnings of the latter has not been furnished.

Irregularities in connection with the Rheem Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I., and East Coast Shipyards, Bayonne, N. J., have been dealt with recently in reports by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which were highly critical of the Commission.

The sale of the Avondale Marine Ways, Inc., representing a Federal investment of $563,000, is understood to be in process with Commission approval for approximately $93,000.

The criticism by the General Accounting Office in respect to the disposal of the San Jacinto, Tex., shipyard, said to involve the sale of assets costing $2,500,000 for some $200,000, is taken exception to by Admiral Land. The matter is said to be under further investigation by the General Accounting Office.

The Comptroller General has also been properly critical of hotel bills and travel expenses paid by shipbuilders for Maritime Commission officials and employees, and of sponsors' gifts to wives and relatives of officials of the Maritime Commission and other high Government officials, such gifts having been said to cost from $135 to several thousand dollars each. Neither the General Accounting Office nor the Commission have furnished detailed information requested in this connection. Both irregularities are said to be under control.

The Commission has done magnificent work, Mr. Chairman, in the construction field. I have often paid tribute to all concerned in our ship construction.

It is to be regretted that the same cannot be said of the work of the Commission in the matter of handling public funds.

I renew the suggestion that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee or a select committee make a thoroughgoing investigation of the work of the Commission in the financial field, reporting at the earliest possible date to the Congress and to the people in this connection.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Commission has requested $5,207,000 as compared with $5,500,000 appropriated for the present fiscal year. The request represents an over-all reduction of $293,472; but it also reflects an increase in the normal activities as distinguished from national defense activities of $928,142, and an over-all increase as compared with the fiscal year 1941, prior to the war, of about $500,000. The committee has reduced the request for normal activities by $201,000.

The Commission appears with two new Commissioners, Chairman Porter and Commissioner Jett.

Chairman Porter, formerly publicity director for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, formerly Deputy Administrator for the rent-control program of the Office of Price Administration, formerly Washington counsel for 5 years for the Columbia Broadcasting System, formerly publicity director for the Democratic National Committee in 1944, takes the place of Chairman James Lawrence Fly, who resigned during the course of the investigation of the Commission by a House select committee.

Commissioner Jett, formerly Chief Engineer of the Commission, has taken the position formerly occupied by Commissioner Craven, the ablest member of the Commission as formerly constituted, who publicly declined renomination.

There is one vacancy on the Commission, no successor having been appointed to fill the position of Commissioner Payne whose renomination was sent to the Senate one day and withdrawn the following day without explanation.

The record outlines anticipated developments in frequency modulation, television, facsimile, and international broadcasting. Attention is particularly invited to plans for licenses for the exclusive use of educational institutions. The part which the United States Office of Education plans to play in this program is important and should be clarified and closely examined.

Congress reduced the Commission's appropriation for the Radio Intelligence Division for the fiscal year 1945 by a million dollars, and the appropriation for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service by just under $500,000. The Commission suggests further reductions this year in the respective amounts of $416,611 and $180,061. These reductions are particularly interesting in view of the protests and pressure brought to bear against the cuts a year ago.

The record indicates further condonation of illegal operations by a licensee known to the Commission for from 2 to 3 years, in the case of Station WGST.

The record indicates no definitive action in respect to concealed ownership reported to the Appropriations Committee by the Commission 2 years ago in respect to Station WOKO.

The record indicates postponement until after election of hearings on the recommended revocation of licenses of the Kennedy stations in West Virginia on the basis of false statements and concealed ownership.

The record raises the question if the Commission has not completely ignored both tax evasion and false statements under oath by Commission licensees.

Tables furnished by the Commission show that the transfer of stations or the control of stations for values far in excess of physical values and trafficking in Government franchises with Commission approval still continues.

Among other transactions of this character may be mentioned the following:

Original cost:	*Sales price approved by F.C.C.*
$418,313	$8,000,000
$37,363	575,000
$56,996	500,000
$79,454	987,500
$181,045	620,000
$12,649	400,000
$12,019	106,000
$52,585	487,410
$34,118	275,000
$20,908	250,000

It will be noted that sales are indicated at 12, 15, 19, and even 32 times the original cost to the seller.

In this connection I include at this point the following excerpt from a recent newspaper article:

THERE'S A BULL MARKET IN RADIO STATIONS

The bull market in radio stations hit a new peak last week with the sale by Hearst Radio, Inc., of Station WINS, in New York, to the Crosley Corporation, of Cincinnati, for approximately $1,700,000, highest price ever paid for an individual radio station. (The transaction is subject to customary Federal Communications Commission approval.)

In 1944, 160 radio stations changed hands, more than 3 times the number of license transfers (45) the previous year. And 33 of them brought more than $100,000, many of them much more.

It may be added that figures furnished the Appropriations Committee by the Commission as to station costs do not agree with figures furnished by the Commission to the select committee investigating the Commission only a few weeks ago.

I shall not speak at greater length in respect to the Commission at this time, inasmuch as my views have been fully set forth as additional minority views in the report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission under date of January 2, 1945.

In my judgment, that investigation made clear the imperative need for immediate improvement in standards of administration and for remedial legislation. As I stated at that time, both are essential to impartial and efficient regulation and to equality of opportunity and freedom of speech over the radio, one of the greatest factors in the Nation today in terms of the preservation or destruction of our American way of life.

The investigation by the select committee served to take the Radio Intelligence Division of the Commission out of the military and naval field, in accordance with the wishes of the Joint Chiefs

of Staff, who stated that the Commission "had endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence."

The investigation served to disclose, and, I hope, to eliminate, certain abuses of the Commission's licensing powers, condonation of illegality, actions based on political considerations, misrepresentation to the Congress, unlawful solicitation of support for appropriations, and falsification of records.

It served to bring about important changes in personnel.

It served to produce annual savings of between two and three million dollars.

It was impossible, however, in view of the obstruction encountered by the select committee, to conduct anything approaching a thoroughgoing investigation. Many important matters, including alleged abuses by the Commission of its licensing powers in respect to many radio stations, were not considered. An abundance of evidence collected by the committee's staff was not heard. Some of it is sensational. Only by continuing the investigation can the work undertaken under the instructions from the last Congress be carried to a proper conclusion.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Commission requests $17,048,000, as compared with the appropriation for the present fiscal year of $18,345,000. The request reflects an over-all decrease, but an increase for normal activities, as distinguished from national defense activities, of $1,342,000. Your committee recommends a cut of $503,480.

Included in the request of the Commission are two items calling for a personnel of 110 at a cost of $366,157 for the work improvement and better personnel management programs. These items have been reduced by your committee by 50 percent.

Included in the work contemplated are job-construction programs, job-methods programs, job-relations programs, and employee counseling in personal as well as official matters.

The general idea seems to be that the Civil Service Commission teachers shall teach supervisors throughout the Government how to teach their employees.

The apparent basis for the work is an assumption by the Commission, to quote Commissioner Flemming, that "supervisors spend most of their time behind a desk reviewing papers, and too little time out working with those they are called upon to supervise."

The matter has gone to such a point that the General Accounting Office reports for that agency alone, job-instruction training for 588; job-methods training for 729; job-relations training for 404; and 39,959 transactions—about 3 per employee—in administering a program comprising health, welfare, safety, and counseling employees on personal problems supposed to affect their official relations.

The House Committee on the Civil Service, in its report dated December 16, 1944, is complimentary neither to employee counseling nor to those acting as counselors.

That report states that the committee has been deluged by employee complaints resenting the type of assistance offered them. Many of the counselors are said to be drawn from the field of social work. Assistance is apparently often psychiatric in character. Hang-overs are said to be diagnosed as some form of neurosis. The employee who visits his Congressman is said to find that he has a persecution complex.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point excerpts from the Civil Service Committee report referred to.

EMPLOYEE COUNSELING

Members of the Congress and this committee are deluged by employee complaints, who resent the type of assistance offered by the employee counseling program in the Government. The following is an excerpt from the job description of a CAF-12 counselor:

"* * * provides for competent psychiatric assistance to employees requiring this type of aid; conducts continuing studies of working conditions with a view to making recommendations for improvements from the standpoint of health, morals, and productivity; submits recommendations to supervisory officials regarding the handling of vocational maladjustments by recommending transfers, change of hours, and other modifications calculated to improve morale."

Of 30 counselors ranging in grade from CAF-9 to CAF-12, the majority have been drawn from colleges or social work. Usually these persons have university training showing courses in social work or consultant and welfare work, personnel and counseling, or psychiatry and teaching.

The committee observes a tendency on the part of employees with real grievances to generally avoid contact with employee counselors. With rare exceptions the position of the employee counselor in the Federal structure is innocuous. It is not established that this expanding and expensive program has resulted in an appreciable improvement in employee-employer relations. There is basis for the feeling on the part of many employees that the most simple grievance, when reported to the employee counselor, may be translated into a major problem.

The employee who took a few days out for no good reason except plain cussedness may find that he has a psychosis. Hang-overs, resulting from a series of nights out, are authoritatively diagnosed as some form of neurosis. A complainant who visits his Congressman is amazed by the discovery that the counselor's report reveals a persecution complex.

The influence of this type of counselor is infecting administrative and supervisory attitudes. In several agencies it is noted that supervisors were inclined to label aggressive or complainant employees with psychiatric terms detrimental to the employee and the implications of which were unappreciated by the supervisor.

Experience in dealing with gainfully employed persons is seldom the main qualification for employee counselors.

If the theory of teaching teachers how to teach is sound, Mr. Chairman, why not set up a brand new agency to teach the civil service teachers how to teach the teachers how to teach? This can go on almost indefinitely, providing unlimited opportunity for additional jobs and increased spending.

I suggest that the real solution of this problem is the appointment of competent agency heads and competent supervisors in the first place.

The Commission explains in some detail its present procedure for investigations. It reports that during the period from July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1944, 1,160 cases have been rated ineligible because of lack of loyalty. In contrast to this figure the Commission reports no less than 117,300 names in its Bar and Flag Files, including persons against whom derogatory matters have been reported, who are now in the employ of some agency or for some other reason not under the present jurisdiction of the Commission.

Two thousand nine hundred and eighty-one investigations in respect to O. W. I. personnel remain uncompleted. One hundred and twenty-eight persons in that agency have been rated ineligible for lack of loyalty. One hundred and eleven have been denied appointments.

Instructions to regional directors, in reference to loyalty investigations, discussed at some length a year ago, remain unchanged. The number of anticipated investigations for the fiscal year 1946 amounts to only 29,670, and reflects a steady decrease as compared with investigations made during the fiscal years 1944 and 1945.

Information requested of the Commission as to the percentage of requests by agencies for upward reclassification which have been disapproved by the Commission during the past fiscal year, and as to the number of full grade promotions which have been approved by the Commission during that period, have not been furnished.

In November, last, the total personnel on the Federal pay roll amounted to 2,876,000. The Commission expects that 2,750,000 persons will remain on the rolls throughout the fiscal year 1946.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The National Housing Agency represents an attempted consolidation of 18 agencies in the housing field. There was chaos in this field before the consolidation. There still appears to be great duplication of effort, and a great excess in overhead.

The Agency includes the Federal Public Housing Authority, in the construction field; the Federal Housing Administration, in the mortgage insurance field; the Home Loan Bank System, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, in the credit, insurance, and salvage fields. Over the last three mentioned, we find the Home Loan Bank Administrator, all having not only departmental forces but field offices, travel, and other obligations.

On top of this structure comes the Office of the National Housing Administrator, with a departmental personnel of 308 and a field force, including 7 regional offices, at $655,000, and 35 war housing centers at $320,000, or a total of almost a million dollars.

The organization of the Administrator's office appears to be excessive. It is financed largely with funds from the Lanham Act, and should be dealt with in connection with the appropriation of those funds.

The set-up referred to reflects all the evils mentioned in connection with Government corporations. We find authority to issue obligations to the extent of $5,350,000,000, in addition to four indefi-

nite authorizations. We find outstanding obligations amounting to $1,800,000,000, investments in Treasury and other agency obligations of $376,000,000, and annual receipts amounting to $568,000,000, of which $566,000,000 is retained by the agency, beyond the control of the Congress.

The Administrator gives the total Federal investment and contingent liabilities in the housing program as $13,804,000,000. A table breaking this total down will be found at page 727 of the hearings.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which requests $5,687,000, as compared with $7,811,000 for the current fiscal year, shows initial advances of $3,276,000,000 reduced to $1,220,000,000; properties held reduced from 192,000 to 6,571; and indicates a total loss to date of $106,880,000.

The Federal Housing Administration, which requests $10,558,000, as compared with $9,030,000 for the current fiscal year, bases its request largely on an anticipated increase in title II work. The record indicates a loss to date under title I of $26,000,000, and a further anticipated loss of $11,700,000, or a total loss of $37,700,000.

The Federal Public Housing Authority requests $2,350,000 as compared with $2,492,000 for the current fiscal year, based on continuation of its present work in the war-housing field and on the reactivation of 9,000 United States Housing Authority units. The record indicates that there is little or no probability of recovering any substantial part of the $130,000,000 invested in the P. W. A. housing projects.

The record also indicates that the Administration is attempting to drum up post-war activity by circularizing local housing authorities, mayors of cities, and others.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

The Federal Works Agency is another example of attempted consolidation. It includes the Public Buildings Administration, the Public Roads Administration, the Communities Facilities Division financed with funds from the Lanham Acts, and it contemplates a Public Works Advance Planning Division if funds are made available under this bill. Each is a complete organization.

Over these agencies we find the office of the Administrator, which requests $337,600, as compared with $293,202 for the current fiscal year.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $250,000.

I am frank to state that I question the necessity for these funds. No satisfactory statement has been furnished as to the functions of this office. In my judgment it might well be eliminated.

The committee has allowed the request of the Public Buildings Administration, less $1,000,000. It has allowed the request of the Public Roads Administration in full. It recommends an appropriation of $5,000,000 for public works defense planning, and $150,000 for public works in the Virgin Islands.

The last two items might well be deferred.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The committee has approved a request of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a change in language affecting the handling of its funds.

The procedure under the new plan as indicated in the committee report will be as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

1. Appropriated funds placed in a fiscal year appropriation account subject to withdrawal in the usual manner.

2. Receipts deposited, as received, in a collection account with the Treasurer of the United States.

3. Disbursements made only from the appropriation account.

4. Appropriation account reimbursed monthly from the collection account for expenditures during the month for activities which are to be financed out of proceeds in accordance with the provisions of section 26.

5. Balances in the collection account, after all settlements for the fiscal year, would be paid into the general fund of the Treasury within 6 months after the close of the fiscal year.

Statements by Mr. Lilienthal and by the Comptroller General in this connection will be found at pages 381 and 383 of the committee hearings.

It appears to the committee that the suggested change is a step in the right direction.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

I cannot conclude without a word in respect to the Veterans' Admnistration.

The Administration requests an appropriation of $2,707,000,000, as compared with $1,250,000,000 for the present fiscal year. This is an increase of almost 120 percent due, generally speaking, to casualties, insurance, and the provisions of the G. I. bill for the veterans of World War No. 2.

The principal increases will be found in the table in the hearings, at page 162.

They include Army and Navy pensions, $521,800,000; national service life insurance, $500,000,000; readjustment benefits, $295,000,000; hospital and domiciliary facilities, $66,700,000; salaries and expenses, $83,400,000.

The increases in Army and Navy pensions is the result of additional World War No. 2 veterans now on the rolls, and five new pieces of legislation. A supplemental appropriation will probably be necessary.

The national service life-insurance increase reflects insurance on 13,500,000 lives, amounting to $123,100,000,000. A supplemental appropriation may be necessary.

Readjustment benefits include $180,000,000 for education—books, tuition, and subsistence allowance, $50 to $75 per month; $18,000,000 for loans—interest and losses—guaranty up to 50 percent of $2,000 loans and interest for the first year; and $96,000,000 for readjustment allowances—$20 a week for 52 weeks.

Under hospital and domiciliary facilities we find as of October 31, last, 75,000 patients and 89,429 beds, a margin of about 20 percent. There are now under construction 10,998 beds and funds for further construction of 11,896 beds. Provision is made in this bill for 14,100 beds, and there are anticipated in other Government hospitals, 4,000 beds. This gives a total of 130,000 beds against an eventual need of 300,000 beds, of which 100,000 are to be provided by the Army and Navy.

The Administrator considers the situation safe, in the absence of an unusually large transfer of patients from the Army to veterans' hospitals.

Attention is invited to the very comprehensive justification furnished by General Hines, and to his interesting discussion of the special medical and educational advisory groups, and of the overall plans for vocational rehabilitation and education. The best interests of the veterans of the Nation are in good hands.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the recent crisis in the ranks of the Belgian Government calls attention to the situation which has arisen in liberated Belgium and which requires immediate steps. Unlike Russia, which saw fit to make the proper distinction between the Nazis and their victims, the Belgian Government apparently lumps together all people born in Germany and seeks to impose on German-Jewish refugees the status of alien enemies.

Whenever the Russian Government concluded an armistice agreement with the defeated Axis satellites, it wrote into the terms the provision that Jews and other refugees from the Nazi terror who may be found within the territories liberated by the Allied armies, shall be immediately restored to their freedom and be allowed to live in peace.

Belgium seemingly reverses the process and wishes to keep the refugees from the Nazis in concentration camps while the erstwhile collaborationists with the Nazi regime are enjoying all the freedom and living on the fat of the land.

Belgium is the one country in Europe which not only did not do anything for the war effort, but harbored the greatest number of pro-Nazis when it was profitable to be a pro-Nazi. It did not come to the assistance of France when France was bleeding and clamoring for help. It hid behind a neutrality which helped the Germans and which was broken only when the Germans saw fit to overrun Belgium as they did in 1914. But unlike 1914, when its heroic King Albert stood forth like a rock and would not yield to force, his weak successor was only worried about his own safety and surrendered at the first possible moment.

During the time that the patriots of France were fighting in the mountains of Savoy and the patriots of Greece and Yugoslavia were dying, the Belgian patriots were living in comfort in London and New York, drawing good salaries for propaganda activities, and it is the common knowledge in Washington that the Belgian Government was spending more than any other government-in-exile, and in fact, more than many a government at war, for so-called propaganda.

American soldiers who have been fighting for the liberation of Belgium did not do so to bring about a reactionary regime in that country. We all sympathize with

the plight of the Belgian people, and most of us remember the German atrocities of 1914 and the fact that American generosity restored to Belgium many works of art which the Germans had so ruthlessly appropriated in Belgium during the First World War.

King Albert of Belgium, the ruler of that country during the First World War, was a heroic figure to which Americans always looked up with admiration. It would not be fair to the successors of the Belgian fighters in the war of 1914 if their government were to exhibit tendencies which are usually associated with the Nazi monster.

Let us hope that the occupation of Belgium by the Germans did not turn the character of its people from friends of democracy to enemies of democracy.

In making these remarks, I am aware of the fact that Belgium has had a fine national history in the 115 years of its independence and that the Constitution of Belgium guarantees to its citizens all the rights which we usually associate with our own Bill of Rights.

It is therefore most disappointing to the friends of Belgium that at a time when, after years of oppression, a new regime is instituted, this regime does not follow constitutional patterns but is trying to copy Nazi models.

I hope that the German occupation of Belgium did not extinguish its innate sense of justice and that the Belgian Government will see its way clear to treat refugees from the Nazis as fellow sufferers and not as Germans.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon, the following announcement was made at the White House:

The President of the United States of America, the Premier of the Soviet Union, and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, accompanied by their Chiefs of Staff, the three foreign secretaries, and other advisors, are now meeting in the Black Sea area.

Their purpose is to concert plans for completing the defeat of the common enemy and for building, with their allies, firm foundations for a lasting peace. Meetings are proceeding continuously.

The conference began with military discussions. The present situation on all the European fronts has been reviewed and the fullest information interchanged. There is complete agreement for joint military operations in the final phase of the war against Nazi Germany. The military staffs of the three Governments are now engaged in working out jointly the detailed plans.

Discussions of problems involved in establishing a secure peace have also begun. These discussions will cover joint plans for the occupation and control of Germany, the political and economic problems of liberated Europe, and proposals for the earliest possible establishment of a permanent international organization to maintain peace. A communique will be issued at the conclusion of the conference.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure this information will be received by the people of America with great satisfaction and consolation, and I am sure the prayers of all American citizens will follow the discussions and conclusions of this momentous conference.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]

CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, every Member of the House and every American join in the expression of the gentleman from Virginia with respect to the deliberations now going on in the conference in the Black Sea area. Our prayers are also with those boys who are launching the new offensive which was announced in the papers today.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts with respect to the need for better governmental control of Government-owned corporations and other agencies which are operating in corporate fashion today financed by the Government, is a speech which deserves wide consideration throughout the country. In that connection, the proposal which has recently been made to provide for financial control of such Government corporations by bringing them under the principles, at least, of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 deserves consideration as a means of accomplishing the goal suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I do not expect at this late hour this afternoon to go into that proposal in detail, but when we return to the House I shall ask permission to include as part of my remarks the text of the so-called Byrd-Butler bill which has been proposed in the other body of the Congress and which I intend to offer in the House so that it may be available as a House bill also.

The matter referred to follows:

A bill to provide for financial control of Government corporations

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Government Corporation Control Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to bring Government corporations and their transactions and operations under annual scrutiny by the Congress and provide current financial control thereof.

TITLE I—WHOLLY OWNED GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

SEC. 101. As used in the act the term "wholly owned Government corporation" means the Commodity Credit Corporation; Federal intermediate credit banks; production credit corporations; regional agricultural credit corporations; Farmers Home Corporation; Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation; Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Defense Plant Corporation; Defense Supplies Corporation; Metals Reserve Company; Rubber Reserve Company; War Damage Corporation; Federal National Mortgage Association; The RFC Mortgage Company; Disaster Loan Corporation; Inland Waterways Corporation; Warrior River Terminal Company; The Virgin Islands Company; Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated; United States Spruce Production Corporation; Institute of Inter-American Affairs; Institute of Inter-American Transportation; Inter-American Educational Foundation, Incorporated; Inter-American Navigation Corporation; Prencinradio, Incorporated; Cargoes, Incorporated; Export-Import Bank of Washington; Petroleum Reserves Corporation; Rubber Development Corporation; United States Commercial Company; Smaller War Plants Corporation; Federal Public Housing Authority (or United States Housing Authority) and including public housing projects financed from appropriated funds and operations thereof; Defense Homes Corporation; Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; Home Owners' Loan Corporation; United States Housing Corporation; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Panama Railroad Company; Tennessee Valley Authority; Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Incorporated; and any other corporation which is wholly owned by the United States Government or by any agency thereof, including Government corporations.

SEC. 102. Each wholly owned Government corporation shall cause to be prepared annually a budget program covering all operations for the ensuing fiscal year with comparisons with the current fiscal year and the last completed fiscal year. Such budget programs shall be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget at the time prescribed for the submission of the estimates of appropriations by the regular Government departments and establishments and shall be transmitted by the President to the Congress in the annual Budget; except that the first budget programs shall be submitted as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 103. The Bureau of the Budget, under such rules and regulations as the President may establish, is authorized and directed to prescribe the form and content of, and the manner in which such budget programs shall be prepared and presented; but all such budget programs shall contain specific estimates of administrative expenses and estimates of necessary borrowing by the corporation concerned, together with the estimates of the amount of Government capital funds which shall be returned to the Treasury during the fiscal year or the appropriations required to provide for the reissuance of authorized capital or the restoration of capital impairments. Such budget programs shall be considered and shall be included in the annual Budget in the same manner, as nearly as practicable, as are the estimates and other information submitted in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921. Budget programs so submitted to the Congress shall be considered and approved, modified, or prohibited by it, in the same manner, as nearly as practicable, as appropriations are considered and made by Congress.

The budget program may, whenever deemed necessary, include and set forth specifically, requests for authorization to cover possible emergency or contingent operations in the ensuing year, but operations thereunder shall be initiated only after approval by the President and shall be reported to the Congress from time to time but not later than the time for transmittal of the next annual Budget.

SEC. 104. No wholly owned Government corporation shall transact any business in any fiscal year except such business as is authorized by act of Congress as a part of its budget program for such fiscal year, and no expenditures for administrative expenses in any fiscal year shall be made by any such corporation except in the amounts authorized and made available by Congress for such fiscal year. No funds so made available by the Congress for administrative expenses shall be obligated or expended unless and until an appropriation account shall have been established therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a covering warrant, and funds so made available shall be subject to apportionment by the Bureau of the Budget, and claims and accounts thereunder to adjustment and settlement by the General Accounting Office under title III of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921. This section shall take effect with respect to wholly owned Government corporations or groups of corporations at the earliest possible date following the enactment of this act, as de-

termined by the President, but no later than July 1, 1946.

SEC. 105. The financial transactions of wholly owned Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit shall begin with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of this act.

SEC. 106. A report of each such audit for each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the several corporations, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. The report shall also show how the budget program (herein provided) was executed and specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 107. No additional Government capital or paid-in surplus shall be subscribed or paid in to any wholly owned Government corporation except pursuant to specific appropriation therefor hereafter made.

SEC. 108. Whenever it is deemed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the President, to be practicable and in the public interest that any wholly owned Government corporation be treated with respect to its appropriations, expenditures, receipts, accounting, and other fiscal matters as if it were a Government agency other than a corporation, the Director shall include in connection with the budget program of such corporation in the Budget a recommendation to that effect. If the Congress approves such recommendation in connection with the budget program for any fiscal year, such corporation, with respect to subsequent fiscal years, shall be regarded as an establishment other than a corporation for the purposes of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and other provisions of law relating to appropriations, expenditures, receipts, accounts, and other fiscal matters, and shall not be subject to the provisions of this act other than this section. The corporate entity shall not be affected by this section.

TITLE II—MIXED OWNERSHIP GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

SEC. 201. As used in this act the term "mixed-ownership Government corporations" means (1) the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (2) Federal land banks, and (3) Federal home-loan banks. Any of such banks from which Government capital has been entirely withdrawn, and during the period such bank remains without Government capital, shall not be subject to the provisions of this title.

SEC. 202. The financial transactions of mixed-ownership Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit shall begin with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of this act.

SEC. 203. A report of each such audit for each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15, following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of, and the use of Government capital by, each such corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital or lack of sufficient capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 204. (a) No additional Government capital or paid-in surplus shall be subscribed or paid in to any mixed ownership Government corporation except pursuant to specific appropriation therefor hereafter made.

(b) The President shall include in the annual Budget any recommendations he may wish to make as to the return of Government capital to the Treasury by any mixed-ownership corporation.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of wholly owned and mixed ownership Government corporations as provided in sections 105 and 202 of this act shall be borne out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized for the purpose.

SEC. 302. The banking or checking accounts of all wholly owned and mixed ownership Government corporations shall be kept with the Treasurer of the United States, or, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, with a Federal Reserve bank, or with a designated depositary or fiscal agent of the United States.

SEC. 303. (a) All bonds, notes, debentures, and other similar obligations which are hereafter issued by any wholly owned or mixed ownership Government corporation shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, shall bear such rates of interest, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, shall be issued in such manner and at such times and sold at such prices as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) Hereafter no direct obligation of the United States, and no obligation guaranteed by the United States as to principal or interest, or both, which are held or owned by any wholly owned or mixed ownership Government corporation shall be sold, nor shall any such obligation be purchased by any such corporation without the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to exercise any of the functions vested in him by this section through any officer or employee of any agency whom he may designate for such purpose.

SEC. 304. (a) No corporation shall be created hereafter by any officer or agency of the Federal Government or by any Government corporation, except by direct congressional action or pursuant to act of Congress specifically authorizing the creation of such corporation.

(b) Any such corporation hereafter created shall be subject to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 305. All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act, to the extent of such conflict, are hereby repealed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has truly said our prayers are with the "big three" and all of those who are at the conference at the present time to bring about as speedily as possible an end to this horrible war and an adequate future peace.

Mr. Chairman, in tonight's Star is to be found word that Great Britain would include France in conferences on Europe's borders. I hope that the United States and the President will see fit to include France not only in the border conferences but in more of the discussions, and make it the "big four" rather than the "big three." I have long favored taking France into the council as the House well knows.

Mr. Chairman, on February 2, 1901, the Congress passed the Army Reconstruction Act, a part of which established the Army Nurse Corps. How the corps has grown from 100 members to its present strength of 42,000 shows a record of splendid and interesting history and service.

On February 2, the Army Nurse Corps celebrated its forty-fourth anniversary. Its present size is 42,000, but General Kirk has estimated the ceiling for nurses should be 60,000, in order to care for the present and anticipated load of our casualties. General Kirk has stated that in the past year the increase in casualties has been 270 percent. I heard him make that statement some days ago before the Military Affairs Committee. I believe the figures today would indicate a great deal larger increase.

Nobody wants to draft any group of persons. Nobody wants to draft women. Nobody wants to draft nurses. We wish the Army Nurse Corps many, many happy returns of the day. Certainly their work from the beginning has been amazing. I watched them through the First World War—their unselfishness, their tirelessness, their valor, their integrity. I have watched them in this

World War. They are performing miracles.

I would like to include as a part of my remarks a description of a little nurse 4 feet 11 inches tall, whose home is in Lowell, Mass., in my district. She is considered one of the best shock nurses that the Army has. When you read the story about her, you will know that no reward can pay for the happiness she must have knowing what her service has done for so many. When anyone has watched those boys in the shock wards, those soldiers who are given blood that brings them back almost from death to life, they know the importance of having the best and most highly trained and experienced nurses to care for our wounded, and the necessity for having enough nurses. The experienced use of penicillin, the use of blood plasma, and the use of whole blood means the saving of life. The immediate and careful care of an experienced, highly trained nurse, in some of the horrible face burns, means that a man may be saved from very bad mutilation. That is why I have come to the conclusion that we must draft nurses—a rare commodity, as rare as some of our national resources that cannot be replaced—in order to get enough nurses promptly. I may say every minute counts, and it is just that. We must draft them in order to try to save the lives of the men which the Congress of the United States drafted to fight the war for us. This precious care must be used wisely and where it will do the most good. The nurses would have gone into the service in greater number if they had realized the need. But the plain fact is there is an acute shortage of nurses in the armed services and in the Veterans' Administration. Today they do not realize the need and I am afraid they have not been adequately told of that need. So in order to secure them, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we must draft them. It would be better for the civilian population also, the civilian hospitals. If we could have a selective service for nurses in order that an orderly withdrawal of nurses from hospitals and from communities be provided for, that the needs of public health be maintained, and that nurses in charge of training be not taken. Those not taken, if selective services goes through, should be given some kind of badge to show that they wanted to serve but were kept out because of essential need.

I extend at this point in amplification of my remarks and of my earlier reference to Helena Naylor the article written of her by Catherine Coyne in the Boston Herald of February 6; and following that I set forth the statement of Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General of the Army, concerning the needs of Army nursing:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of February 6, 1945]

LOWELL NURSE'S HYMN TUNES TRANSFUSE HOPE IN WOUNDED—PINT-SIZE HELENA NAYLOR RATES HIGH WITH FRONT-LINE SURGERY

(By Catherine Coyne)

WITH THE THIRD ARMY, February 5.—The boy from Salt Lake City was slowly coming out of shock. His blond hair, cut so short his mother probably would have wept at sight of it, was caked with blood—but that didn't matter. What mattered was that the blood a tiny, humming nurse had given now was coursing through his veins. Soon he would be strong enough for surgery to repair a bad chest wound. He recognized and hummed the tune Rock of Ages. He tried to smile, then whispered:

"Do you know any other hymn tunes?"

The sparrowlike nurse replied, "Sure, I know hundreds of them."

He whispered, "Even that one starting 'Send the light, the gospel light?"

Lt. Helena Naylor, one of the best shock nurses in the Army, according to surgeons with whom she works, sang that hymn for him. He relaxed, letting it send him back in memory to his boyhood days as choir singer in a Mormon church. It seemed to give him as much strength as the blood gift from an anonymous American at home.

As he was wheeled toward the operating room, he asked shyly, "Will you pray for me?"

Shorty Naylor is used to that question, asked with a shyness verging on shame by men who wouldn't want that cheerful, efficient, 95-pound nurse to know they were frightened. Her promise is always given sincerely with the confident reminder, "God does answer prayers."

FROM LOWELL

The surgical team calls this former Lowell girl its unique evangelist in the midst of war-bred callousness to life, suffering, and death. But she is no holier-than-thou killjoy. Daughter of Fred Naylor, Sunday school superintendent at Richmond, Maine, she is a practicing Christian who is at same time a superb nurse, expert in her difficult specialty. To doctors and nurses she is a good sport. To everyone she is a mite of cheer standing 4 feet 11, though she pleads to be recognized as around 5 feet.

Helena's pleasant looking with oval smiling face framed by soft brown hair and she's always humming or singing her hymns. Everyone dreams of going home to stay, but she dreams of going home to train at Wheaton College, Illinois, to become a medical missionary.

Her dreams are in conflict though, for she is struggling to make up her mind about marrying Lt. James Wohlgemuth, of Pittsburgh, 6-foot signal officer, now in England.

"Perhaps I'll marry Jim," she said, "and do church work, though I've always dreamed of being a missionary in the Belgian Congo. Right now, it doesn't matter because there's so much to do before I make my decision."

HER SKILL LAUDED

Maj. Samuel Karlin, of Portland, and Maj. Lawrence Pratt, of Detroit, rated her one of the finest shock nurses they'd encountered. Men come from battlefield to her shock ward—just now the poolroom of roadside cafe—nearly dead, and there she struggles to fan faint sparks of life into the glowing embers, so that surgeons can do their life-saving work. As she cleans mud from eyes, ears, and noses, and as she wipes blood from faces, she hums softly.

As men begin to look human again, they try to smile at the tiny nurse. Many a man has gasped gratefully "It's good to hear a woman hum soft like that."

"Most of them don't know the score," she commented, "but I think many get new confidence from my humming, because it's something very different from battle."

Surgeons said they frequently assigned to her care difficult post-surgical cases when the shock ward was not crowded.

"She has a knack with these men," said Major Karlin, "and men seem to sense that and appreciate it. She's proved herself a fine nurse."

HAD PARIS "SPREE"

She's the sort who can take a good ribbing, but she knows how to give the same in return. Right now she's being teased about a 48-hour pass spent in Paris where she surprised everyone by spending $100 and visiting the Folies Bergere. What she likes best to remember about Paris, however, was bed and bath. She slept 12 hours in a soft bed.

"It had hemstitched sheets—actually hemstitched—and a flowered puff," she said. "It was the first real bed I'd slept in in months and it was heaven. All we nurses raved over the joy of eating off china dishes in a pleasant dining room instead of out of mess kits that we had to wash before and afterwards. Just the pleasure of that hot bath that took me more than an hour and those 12 hours in bed was worth being bounced unmercifully on that 11-hour truck ride to Paris and the 11-hour return trip."

Of the Folies she would only say, "It's Paris so I went with the others." She neither approved nor disapproved of it, much to the amusement of the surgical team.

"My funniest experience," she said, "was going into a fancy bar in Paris with my gang and asking for lemonade. They thought I was crazy. I just sat at the bar and gabbed with the others and had a swell time." Most of the $100 was spent on perfume to be sent home as gifts.

WERE IN BASTOGNE

Before coming here, the surgical team worked 3 days in Bastogne, but got out when shelling made the beleaguered town too hot for surgery. Prior to that they worked in an old schoolhouse. Classrooms became wards and blackboards became arenas of competition for amateur artists and writers. Between suggestively drawn pin-up girls and caustic parodies chalked on board, Shorty Naylor wrote scriptural verses and homely mottoes like "Only one life, 'twill soon be past, only what's done for Christ will last," and "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in time of need."

"She's a big help to me," said Major Pratt, "but she's a joy to chaplains because she knows hundreds of hymns, not only how to sing them but also how to play them with grace on the ricketiest of organs or pianos. She's a great little woman, sincere and honest; but what's important from my point of view is, she's a great nurse who has saved many a soldier's life."

Her sister Beulah is a freshman at the Gordon College of Theology and Missions.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. NORMAN T. KIRK, SURGEON GENERAL OF THE ARMY

General KIRK. Mr. Chairman and members of the House Military Affairs Committee, for the record, my name is Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, United States Army. I am Surgeon General of the Army.

In that capacity I am responsible for providing adequate medical and nursing care for the personnel of the United States Army. My action in favoring the application of selective-service principles to the procurement of nurses at this time is based on but few and simple facts. We are now receiving in our Army hospitals in this country, from foreign theaters, between thirty and thirty-two thousand patients each month, as compared with 8,500 patients monthly for the first half of 1944. This represents an increase of 270 percent.

Approximately 15,000 patients leave hospitals each month, either to return to duty or to be separated from the service.

Now, this applies just to our general hospital chain that has to do with overseas patients. The patient load is being increased in hospitals and doubles the number of those released. Since May our nursing personnel has increased only 2,000, but our patients requiring nursing care have increased from 260,000 to 450,000. The increasing number of battle casualties, added to those requiring hospitalization because of sickness and disease, has greatly enlarged the demand for nurses.

It is to meet this demand that I am now in favor of the application of selective service to fill immediately the shortage in the supply of nurses.

The American soldiers are entitled to, and are receiving, and will receive, the best medical care that we are capable of giving.

Adequate nursing is one of the most important of all factors in the proper care and recovery of the sick in the Army, and of those who have been wounded in battle.

The importance of nursing, in making sick and injured men well, cannot be overestimated. The Army nurse is doing one of the truly great jobs of this war. With supreme loyalty and a high devotion to duty, some 42,000 American women are now in the Army Nurse Corps, as a result of voluntary service.

Many others have volunteered, but have been unable to meet physical or other requirements necessary for those who are to engage in this skilled, strenuous and mobile military duty.

In my opinion, the Army must have an approximate total of 60,000 nurses at this time in order to furnish presently needed nursing service to our soldiers. At the present time, the Army hospitals in this country are understaffed with nurses because of the large number of nurses used to fill the minimum overseas requirements. Over 60 percent of all Army nurses are now assigned to overseas units.

The requirement of 60,000 nurses is based upon a minimum of 1 nurse to 12 beds in overseas operations, and 1 nurse to 15 beds in the zone of the interior, which is necessary to provide minimum adequate nursing care.

Actually, in the zone of the interior, there is only 1 nurse to 25 beds, in general hospitals, and additional nurses are needed in overseas duty to assure the 1 to 12 ratio. Many nurses have served in foreign theaters for a long period of time and should have a period of rest from their strenuous service. Practically speaking, it may be fairly stated that all hospital beds are filled.

With an immediate minimum need for 60,000 nurses in the Army the question arises as to how to obtain them. It is my opinion that this number can be secured only through extending selective-service legislation to include nurses. One significant advantage of such legislation would be the registration of all qualified nurses in this country, so that there would be a complete record of the number of nurses, of the places where they are employed, and their possible availability for service in the armed forces.

At the present time there is no accurate source of information of many factors needed in respect to the nurse population in this country. Registration of nurses will provide information which has not been available, and which is necessary for a proper distribution of the limited supply of nurses between the armed forces and civilian use.

Selection of nurses through induction should assure an equalization, throughout the country, in the drain upon nursing population. Furthermore, that will make the way free and clear to many women who are qualified nurses, but who have hesitated to volunteer because of the conflicting needs at home and in the armed forces.

I am in accord with the provision, in the proposed legislation, permitting the continuance of selection of nurses upon a voluntary basis. It is possible that with the enactment of this bill, and the registration of nurses, a large proportion of those needed may be obtained upon a voluntary basis.

Without such a law, it is believed there will be a real difficulty, if not impossibility, in filling the nursing needs for the armed forces.

The experiences of the past year afford a clear indication that something more than purely voluntary methods is required. On the 28th of April 1944 there were 40,000 nurses in the Army Nurse Corps. At that time a program was commenced by the Army to secure an additional 10,000 nurses by the end of the year. Notwithstanding the fact that there were many nurses in this country qualified for Army service, and that between April and the end of the year there were 27,000 new nurses graduated from nursing schools, the Army's net increase was only slightly over 2,000 nurses. That is from April to December.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1984, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1946, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in revising my remarks made early this afternoon I may include the text of a bill proposed to provide for budgetary control of Government corporations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Daily News today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of the remarks I just made a part of the statement of Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General of the Army, in regard to the need for the 60,000 ceiling for nurses in the armed forces and also an article by Catherine Coyne describing the care given by Lt. Helena Naylor to the shock cases in the Third Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein a copy of the Tydings amendment, the directive of January 3, known as Directive No. 288, issued by General Hershey; the supplemental directive issued by General Hershey on January 22, and a signed editorial by General Hershey appearing in Selective Service, a Selective Service System publication; and certain excerpts from the testimony of General Hershey before the House Committee on Agriculture on February 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

FARM-LABOR SITUATION

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the farm-labor situation has been brought about, in my opinion, by the Selective Service placing an erroneous construction upon the Tydings amendment.

The Tydings amendment, which is subsection (k) of section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act, reads:

(k) Every registrant found by a Selective Service local board, subject to appear in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his Selective Service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

This amendment has been construed by the Congress and, in my opinion correctly construed, as meaning that the local Selective Service boards, subject, of course, to appeal, shall determine—and this is the only determination under the amendment the local boards can make—if a registrant is "necessary to or regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort." If the local board determines that the registrant measures up to this yardstick laid down by Congress, then it becomes the duty of the local board to defer such registrant "from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

The amendment is clear and unambiguous and I do not believe is susceptible to any other interpretation.

However, on January 3, 1945, General Hershey issued Directive No. 288, the effect of which, in my opinion, was to annul and set aside the Tydings amendment. This directive is as follows:

FIRST DIRECTIVE

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

State director advice (No. 288).
Issued January 3, 1945.
Subject: Reclassification of registrants in agriculture, ages 18–25.

CONFIRMATION OF TELEGRAM TO ALL STATE DIRECTORS WITHIN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, DATED JANUARY 3, 1945

The following letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has been received by the Director of Selective Service:

"The Secretaries of War and Navy have advised me jointly that the calls from the Army and Navy to be met in the coming year will exhaust the eligibles in the 18- through 25-year age group at an early date. The Army and Navy believe it essential to the effective prosecution of the war to induct more men in this age group.

"You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation. You have further

advised me that if this group is not available, you must call into the service occupationally deferred men in the next age group, 26 years and older, most of whom are fathers.

"The Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Krug, advises me that the loss of these men would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet critical war demands. Moreover, these older men would not meet the expressed needs of the Army and Navy.

"The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18 through 25 year age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

"The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act does not give the agricultural worker absolute exemption from selective service. It was not so intended. In asking Congress to adopt this amendment Senator TYDINGS said: 'All my amendment seeks to do is to provide that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food, and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated, and there is no replacement, he shall be deferred upon those facts until a replacement can be found.'

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture like our other war industries can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

"The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and boards of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all registrants ages 18 through 25 deferred in class II–C excluding those identified by the letters F or L. In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–C, local boards will consider the President's finding that "the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II–C excluding those identified with the letters F or L in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction physical examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class II–C registrants at the same time as they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction physical examination.

HERSHEY.

On January 22 General Hershey appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture, and this meeting resulted in an agreement being reached between General Hershey and the committee upon the wording of a supplemental or clarifying amendment, which the committee thought cleared up the situation, and which the committee further thought placed upon the Tydings amendment the construction I have given. This supplemental or clarifying directive is short and is as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECTIVE

Questions of interpretation of State Directors Advice No. 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State Directors Advice No. 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State Directors Advice No. 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant, whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

From later developments I am afraid that the supplemental or clarifying directive of January 22, so far as clearing up the situation, is not worth the paper upon which it is written. The directive of January 22 was issued to clear up any misunderstanding caused by Directive No. 288 issued on January 3, and had not General Hershey subsequently issued a statement contradictory to the directive of January 22 and confirmatory of the directive of January 3, I believe would have cleared up the whole matter. In the selective service a publication gotten out by the Selective Service System, of January 1945, published subsequent to the directive of January 22, appears a signed editorial by General Hershey which, in my opinion, sets aside and annuls the directive of January 22 and confirms the directive of January 3. The editorial is as follows:

The Selective Service System has the job of furnishing 750,000 acceptable men to the land and naval forces before July 1, 1945. These men should be the best that can be made available as combat replacements. In recent months the armed forces have repeatedly stressed their extreme need for young men. The supply of men 18 through 29 and of the types essential to the successful prosecution of the war by the armed forces is most limited. It is evident that there are insufficient men below 26 years of age to meet the calls which will be placed upon the local boards.

The continued production of the munitions of war and of food must be maintained. This production can and must be maintained by the use of the least possible number of deferred men within the age group 18 through 29, and of the physical standards required by the armed forces.

The decision for each registrant must be made initially by his local board. The members of these local boards are most familiar with the Selective Training and Service Act; they know the regulations; they have detailed information of the part that each registrant has played in support of the war since Pearl Harbor. To a most unusual degree the local boards have the confidence of the people, the President, the Congress, and the judiciary.

During this month certain coordinated steps have been taken by the Government to aid in the procurement of suitable young men for the armed forces and to assist in the continued production of the munitions of war. Local board memorandum No. 115–I provides measures to reduce the withdrawal of men from war industries for reasons other than induction, as well as provisions which generally tighten the requirements for deferment in the older age groups, particularly 26 through 29.

In my letter of January 15 and the list accompanying it, I transmitted to the local and appeal boards the best information available as to the activities that are essential or critical and the priority of withdrawals of men in the 26 through 29 age group from these activities. The number of men to be inducted from those now deferred in II–A or II–B in the 26 through 29 year age group will depend on the number that can be made available from those in the younger age group, 18 through 25, and those reaching 18 years each month.

In this younger age group there can be some recovery of men for the armed forces from those who have been heretofore rejected for military service. There will be some now deferred in II–A or II–B who have completed the critical work for which they were deferred or for whom satisfactory replacements can be made available. The numbers in II–A or II–B below 26, however, are not substantial when the merchant marine deferments are deducted. The necessity for men to man the ships in our merchant marine is disputed by no one. If the measures provided in local board memorandum No. 115–I effectively stabilize male labor in the older age groups it may be possible to gradually withdraw for induction physically acceptable young men from the merchant marine.

Regardless of these measures the necessity of finding all available men under 26 requires the most careful screening of all such men.

Many individuals believe that section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act (the Tydings amendment) creates an exemption for farmers, but, as you well know, the amendment prescribes the requirements that a man must meet for agricultural deferment and does not provide an exemption from military service. It vests in the local boards the duty of determining, in the case of each registrant, whether or not such registrant meets the requirements of law after a full consideration of all of the pertinent facts. These facts include the extent the registrant is engaged in agriculture, how essential in the war effort are the products of his efforts, how necessary is he to this production, and whether there is a replacement available.

The urgent present need for young men by the armed forces cannot fail to be a factor which the local boards must weigh in considering deferment from service. The act of which section 5 (k) is a part was passed in the words of the act itself because "the Congress hereby declares that it is imperative to increase and train the personnel of the armed forces of the United States."

The local boards are ever conscious that their primary job has always been to procure men of the right age and type for the land and naval forces. They have considered always that the fundamental policy of Congress was expressed in these words, "The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of military training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service."

The Congress originally delegated to the President the power to issue regulations to govern deferments; it later provided by the Tydings amendment the method to be used in determining whether or not a registrant should be given an agricultural deferment. Neither of these provisions change the fundamental purpose of the act, which was to provide men for the armed forces, or the basic principle of a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service.

State Directors Advice No. 288 provided information which had been furnished by the

Secretaries of War and Navy, by the Chairman of the War Production Board and War Food Administrator. It includes a finding by the President that the need for all of the men now agriculturally deferred in II–C under 26 years of age is not as essential to the war effort as is the need for young men in the armed forces. It was stated that the President felt that in view of existing conditions, agriculture, like other war industries with few exceptions, can be carried on by those above 26.

The purpose of State Directors Advice No. 288 was to provide the information as to the current urgent needs of the armed forces and the relative needs of agriculture to the local boards for their most serious consideration. It did not seem to me at that time necessary to indicate that there was no intention to annul, to change, or to ignore the provisions of the Tydings amendment, as State Directors Advice No. 288 specifically stated: "The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

There was no intent, I am sure, on the part of the President, or the Director of Selective Service, to direct a classification in any particular case or any type of cases. The effort was to bring to each member of the Selective Service System full information concerning the present situation in the words of those primarily responsible for the prosecution of the war. The duty then rested on the local board to consider each case and decide which registrants still met the requirements of the law for agricultural deferment.

I am aware of the tremendous responsibilities which the necessities of war now place upon local board members. I am aware of the great fund of good judgment and fortitude which local board members have displayed for more than 4 years. I am reassured by the knowledge that when you have weighed all of the factors you will, pursuant to the provisions of the Tydings amendment, render your own judgment to defer or not to defer consistent with the needs today of the armed forces for young fighting men.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director of Selective Service.

On February 5, the House Committee on Agriculture again went into the matter of deferring farm labor with General Hershey. At this meeting the real issue between the Congress and Selective Service, for the first time, was developed and brought to a focus. At long last we know exactly what the issue is. It is this: Selective Service has written into the Tydings amendment comparative essentiality; that is, it has construed the Tydings amendment as placing upon the local boards the determination as to whether the farm registrants between 18 and 25 years of age are more essential to the armed forces than they are to the farm, and vice versa. There can now be no question about this as is shown by the following excerpt from the testimony of General Hershey before the House Committee on Agriculture on February 5, 1945:

EXCERPT FROM GENERAL HERSHEY'S TESTIMONY

The CHAIRMAN. Let me see if I cannot state the situation between Selective Service and the Congress. As I understand you, General Hershey, you think the question of relative essentiality enters in the Tydings amendment?

General HERSHEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You do?

General HERSHEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, if you entertain that opinion, you have evidently instructed the State directors to instruct their local draft boards that when a farm boy appears and is examined, that they should determine whether that boy is more essential to the farm than he is to the Army, rather than determine whether or not that boy is essential to the farm; is that right?

General HERSHEY. Well, if the two telegrams and the editorial add up to that, the answer is yes. I have not instructed either the local boards nor the State directors anything any more than what we have here on the board.

The CHAIRMAN. General Hershey, I just wanted to get at the issue.

General HERSHEY. Well, I think that is a fair interpretation of what we have said in these two.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

General HERSHEY. I think so, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That the local boards shall take into consideration the relative essentiality of the boys?

General HERSHEY. That is right; the needs for the men in the forces.

The CHAIRMAN. And to determine whether he is more essential to the Army than to the farm, and vice versa?

General HERSHEY. I think that is fair.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not agree with the committee that the only determination to be made by the local board, under the Tydings amendment, is to find out whether or not the boy is essential to the farm?

General HERSHEY. Well, you embarrass me a little by saying that I must disagree with the committee in order to state my views, but I do disagree. I believe that if the local board had, I do not care who it was, outside of ministers and the people that have been exempted, I believe that if the local board got to the place where there was nobody left to raise this force, I do not believe that the power of deferment—deferment is only a stay, exemption is another matter, but I do not believe deferment, under any circumstances, would prevail if the last man had to go. Is that what——

The CHAIRMAN. No; I just want to get the issues clear. As I understand it, the issue is this: The Congress believes that under the Tydings amendment, the determination for the local board to make is whether or not the boy is essential to the farm. Under your interpretation, it is a question as to the relative needs of the farm and the Army.

General HERSHEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that the local board should determine, when they examine a farm inductee, whether or not he is more essential to the farm than he is to the Army, or whether or not he is more essential to the Army than he is to the farm?

General HERSHEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

Moreover, I am of the opinion that the Selective Service has already made the determination that the farm boys between the ages of 18 and 25 are more essential to the armed forces than they are to the farms. That this determination was made without permitting the local boards to function under the Tydings amendment, and that unless congressional action is taken, and immediately taken, the local boards will induct all such boys found physically fit into the armed forces. The evidence before the House Committee on Agriculture seemingly confirms this opinion.

THE ISSUE

Let me draw the issue.

Simply stated the issue is this: The Congress is of the opinion that the Tydings amendment is clear and unambiguous, and places upon the local draft boards only one determination, and that determination in the language of the amendment is to find out if the registrant is "necessary to or regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort." Selective Service has, in construing the Tydings amendment read into the amendment a new element, namely, comparative essentiality, and thus placed upon the local boards the duty to determine whether the registrant is more essential to the armed forces than he is to the farm, or whether the registrant is more essential to the farm than he is to the armed forces. This, in my opinion, is an unwarranted construction and a construction that the Congress never contemplated would be placed upon the amendment.

THE REMEDY

The House Committee on Agriculture has gone as far as it can. It has succeeded in developing the issue. It is now up to the Military Affairs Committee to work out the remedy. As a remedy I respectfully suggest that the May bill, H. R. 1752, be amended as follows:

After (7) page 5, line 21 and 22 of the May bill, which reads:

"'(7) Nothing in this subsection shall affect in any manner any of the provisions of subsection (k)' the following be added:

"'In carrying out the provisions of subsection (k) the local selective service board, in classifying the registrant, shall base its findings solely on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation or endeavor including service in the land or naval forces of the United States.'"

The adoption of this amendment would clear up the matter and force the Selective Service to construe the Tydings amendment as the Congress intended it should be construed.

If we have reached the point where farm boys between the ages of 18 and 25, regardless of their essentiality to the war food effort, are more essential to the armed forces, then the Congress should be so advised. If this is found to be true I am sure the Congress would immediately take appropriate action. However, the Tydings amendment is still the law of the land and until amended or repealed should be respected and observed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not use the special order I had for today. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] was so kind as to give me 5 minutes during general debate on the appropriation bill.

I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, February 14, I may address the House for 30 minutes following the business of the day and any special orders already entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from

Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] is recognized for 25 minutes.

REVISION OF COST-PLUS CONTRACT SYSTEM

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon I introduced H. R. 2030, a bill to replace the present cost-plus and other systems of contracting for public construction by a system of negotiated lump-sum contracts. In essence, this bill is the same as H. R. 4352, which I introduced during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, except that it contains several minor clarifying amendments.

During the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Committees of Judiciary, Naval Affairs, and Military Affairs carried on exhaustive investigations of the high cost of war production and brought to bare not only the tremendous waste of manpower and material, but also the exorbitant profits made by some contractors in the manufacture and construction of war materials and facilities. As a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I had an opportunity to get first-hand information on this subject matter when your committee considered the problem of the renegotiation of war contracts. The abusive practices of some of the contractors and subcontractors were alarming.

Neither H. R. 4352 nor the bill I have introduced today is likely to be found perfect. However, it is my personal hope that the Committee on the Judiciary, to which the measure has been referred, with its broad learning and experience, will perfect and amend this legislation in such a manner as to make it applicable to all forms of contracts. The bill in its present form is applicable to construction work, but I am confident that it can be broadened to cover other fields of contract service.

There has been an erroneous impression in the minds of some people that Uncle Sam is a sucker, that the Federal Government should be scalped at every turn, that because of our Government's great wealth, it should be obliged to pay far more for the performance of services to it than should a private citizen or corporation. Because it lacks a check on excessive costs and waste of manpower and material, the cost-plus contracts have been grossly unfair to our Government.

Let us examine some of the methods of contracting now employed by the various Government awarding authorities. Generally speaking, these methods may be classified as, first, the competitive bid system; second, the several different forms of cost-plus systems. Both have been thoroughly discredited.

The long-established method of buying goods and services by the Federal Government consists of advertising for bids, to be received and opened at a specified time, and then awarding the contract to the lowest responsible bidder. The responsibility of a contractor, according to the practice, is established by the filing of a performance bond with the bid, and/or a certified check. The Federal Government, I am informed, requires a performance bond from a surety company. The bond becomes a part of the contract when executed, and the contractor's responsibility is thus considered established. The record shows, however, that a bond is not necessarily a guaranty of responsibility because bonding companies have all too frequently been called upon to complete contracts which contractors have abandoned for lack of financial ability or have been removed for persistent faulty work or materials, or failed to meet a required time schedule.

Discussing the subject of the competitive-bidding system, Mr. William Haber, in his chapter "Building construction" in How Collective Bargaining Works, a text book used by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, on page 194, states:

> Prospective owners rarely ask for bids from only one construction firm, but from several general contractors, who, in turn, may ask for bids from several subcontractors for each trade.
>
> The process is full of pitfalls. Most subcontractors have few records and have wholly inadequate cost-accounting systems. Estimates are submitted to the general contractor, who adds the bids for all trades together, includes an item for his own profit and overhead, and hands the total to the owner. Since the owner usually awards the job to the lowest bidder, subcontractors are under great pressure to make low bids. In addition, the practice of bid shopping, or putting pressure on the low bidder to get still lower bids, intensifies the downward drive and leads to many evils—inaccurate estimates, shoddy quality, and disregard of labor standards—which in the end may adversely affect the construction worker.

The evils that grow out of competitive bidding as described above most certainly have had an adverse affect upon the type of work realized under this system by the awarding authorities. Many authorities might be cited to substantiate the conclusion that the present competitive system of contracting leads to collusive bidding and price fixing; leads to various unsavory trades practices and evils which result in bid peddling, chiseling, price cutting, inferior work, impeded progress, litigation, bankruptcy, economic waste, and overcharging on changes and extras and other kinds of unpardonable profiteering.

The bill I have introduced this morning seeks to determine responsibility in a more practical way. It requires all intending bidders to file a completed questionnaire drawn in the form to elicit reasonably accurate information as to the bidder's experience and skill as a contractor, as to his integrity, ability to cooperate, to reach the objective of the contract, as to his administrative and organizational ability, his financial strength and dependability. The completed questionnaire, if favorable, with appended references, supplies the awarding authority and the ratifying committee with facts by far more important to the successful conclusion of a contract than any relatively small difference between the low bid and the higher bid.

It is reasonable to assume that there is just as much difference in skill, integrity, adaptability, and cooperative ability in a score of contractors for a given piece of construction as there is likely to be found in an equal number of bankers for a financial project, or lawyers for litigation or counsel, or generals in the conduct of a war, or architects for the design of buildings, or engineers for the design and building of great bridges, tunnels, or subways. In the conduct of such projects, the banker, lawyer, general architect, or engineer is selected not according to the lowest bid but in accordance with those qualities, unquestionably real and important, but elusive of arithmetical calculation.

It is proposed in the legislation I am introducing that the qualities recognized as highly essential to the best performance of Government contracts are to be obtained by a selective method. The Government is entitled to the best that is available at the lowest equitable cost. The lowest bidder with a performance bond is all too frequently selected in the vain delusion that the bond provides all those qualities not to be measured by figures, but which are absolutely essential to the best performance.

H. R. 2030 provides that a contractor is selected by the awarding authority cooperating with the ratifying committee, and all three, working together, negotiate a lump sum figure for the work indicated, upon which a fixed fee is calculated. When these three parties in interest have agreed on the estimate of the cost, the objectives of all three are merged into one, and that objective is the best possible solution of the problem posed by the project.

The evils of the cost-plus system of contracting bare their ugly head at every turn, particularly today, when a serious manpower shortage exists in our war production effort and the astronomical size of our national debt seems to be skyrocketing to infinity. Under the cost-plus plan, the contractor is at least mildly indifferent to the total cost, not perhaps consciously, but because that is the way human nature works. The same indifference to costs applies to labor in greater or lesser degree. To prove this, the Government need only to examine into its own experience.

Briefly stated, the evils of the cost-plus system are as follows: First, the working force under this system of contracting consciously or unconsciously feels that the cost-plus contract is a legitimate reason for extending the man hours; second, the field organization, consisting of clerks, stenographers, bookkeepers, engineers, stockkeepers, timekeepers, and so forth, is overmanned; third, there is a great hoarding of labor, especially skilled labor; fourth, frequently, overmanning results on orders from the officer in charge; fifth, tendency to use less efficient men, reserving the best and most efficient for lump sum contracts; sixth, voluminous amount of red tape and paper work; seventh, lack of incentive for management to save on labor; eighth, lack of incentive for management to buy close; ninth, extravagant over-ordering and waste of materials; tenth, if cost-plus work is carried on in a plant concurrently with a lump sum contract, there is at least the risk that labor and materials that should be charged to the lump sum contracts are charged to the cost-plus job.

Under the negotiated lump-sum contract, when the awarding authority, the ratifying committee, and the contractor all have a common objective, the resulting operation is certain to be better and more equitable than that produced by any other method hitherto devised, since it is based on the normal reaction of human nature. The provisions in this bill requiring agreement among the awarding authority, the ratifying committee, and the contractor, before a contract is executed, thereby reducing to the minimum proportions the necessity for renegotiation after completion, in accordance with the Renegotiation Act as amended. The amendments to the Renegotiation Act recommended by the Under Secretaries of War and Navy provide a reduction in the total number of contracts subject to renegotiation, of excusing all contractors from renegotiation whose annual war business amounted to less than $500,000.

This amendment would reduce the estimated number of cases to be renegotiated from 85,000 to 20,000, thus permitting 65,000 contractors to go free of any examination for excessive profits. This amounts to a wholesale surrender of principle to expediency. The task of renegotiation, reckoned in competent manpower, is administratively impossible within any reasonable length of time. Renegotiation destroys confidence; this bill would restore confidence. Renegotiation lessens enthusiasm for Government work; the negotiated lump-sum contract would increase it. Renegotiation consumes the time of officials, of both Government and contractor, that should be given to construction problems; the adoption of the negotiated lump-sum contract system would end this waste of time.

The recovery by renegotiation of excessive profits is essential; but even more important to the winning of the war is the prevention of such profits before they accrue by proper control of prices. This latter is the primary responsibility of the procurement and awarding agencies. The prevention of excessive profits by the control of prices is far more effective than the subsequent recovery of profits because it avoids all the subsequent administrative work. Renegotiation is an administrative sin, because it amounts to a confession on the part of the procurement and awarding agencies in the first instance awarding contracts which subsequently require reexamination and repricing after completion of the work called for in contracts. There may be some few instances in which it may be difficult to determine the cost of producing a new item in advance. However, under the triple check of the negotiated lump-sum-contract system, this could be corrected before final payment is made. Renegotiation not only costs the Government large sums of money for clerical and accounting services, but it imposes on the contractor the cost of much time and effort to compile and supply the data required by the renegotiation official. This time and effort must be supplied by executives whose attention is thereby diverted from their normal duties as well as by the capable rank and file, whose customary duties must meanwhile be suspended from activities important to the winning of the war. The negotiated lump-sum-contract system would definitely eliminate these extra preoccupations made necessary by renegotiation.

It is not my purpose to discuss exhaustively the negotiated lump-sum system of contracting, as proposed in the bill introduced by me, but briefly to sketch its advantages over the existing systems of contracting now used by the various Government awarding agencies. The system of contracting proposed in the bill introduced by me provides a triple check of cost: First, there is an estimate of the cost of the work to be done before a general contractor is selected; second, a check and approval of the contract and the subcontracts must be made by the ratifying committee before the work is begun; third, the ratifying committee makes a complete audit of the books of the contractors and subcontractors before final payment.

A central construction contract ratifying committee is established under this bill, which would have jurisdiction over all contracts entered into by any and all Government awarding authorities. In this way a more uniform system of contract letting is established and takes the matter out of the hands of whimsical individuals. A uniform centralized system of contracting would eliminate a flagrant bit of inefficiency and confusion which today causes one awarding authority to sell for little or nothing as surplus a commodity which another agency repurchases through speculators at fabulous prices. The ratifying committee is to consist of three members who are qualified engineers or architects. The ratifying committee shall have the power to disapprove any contract that does not comply with the existing law and the provisions of this act, and shall have available to it all the records in connection with all contracts that are negotiated by any and all Government agencies. No contract can be consummated without its approval. It shall also have the power to adjust any and all differences arising between the awarding authority and the contractor or between the contractor and subcontractor. The centralization of the ratification of all contracts should greatly aid in avoiding the conflicts and confusion that often occur under the present system of letting Government contracts.

Mr. Speaker, the plan I submit is not a perfect one. I am not wedded to any particular part of it. However, I believe it points to the right direction and should be developed to that end. I trust that these suggestions may be incorporated into the law of the land as quickly as possible, for it is, in my opinion, a long step toward accelerating the day of victory and at the same time holding and cutting down the cost of waging the war.

The text of H. R. 2030 is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to save the Government time and money in connection with highway building, and other construction, to provide for a simplified, practical contracting procedure in place of the various contracting methods now employed by Government awarding authorities; to protect the Government from profiteering; to substitute a simplified system of auditing and adjustment of fees for the formal process of renegotiation of various construction contracts, or as an aid to such process, and to remove the causes of unfair trade practices in public construction, all construction contracts entered into after the enactment of this act, by any department, bureau, or agency of the Government, including Government owned or controlled corporations (hereinafter referred to as the "awarding authority"), shall be on the negotiated basis hereinafter described, any law or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding.

SEC. 2. The procedure to be followed in letting contracts on the negotiated basis shall be as follows:

(a) The awarding authority shall make available questionnaires prepared by the Construction Contract Ratifying Committee (established by section 3) to contractors by advertisement or invitation, and determine from the answers to such questionnaires, together with such supplementary investigations as the awarding authority and the Construction Contract Ratifying Committee may wish to make, the general contractor best fitted to undertake the work. The awarding authority, in connection with such questionnaires, shall also make available to contractors a statement, prepared by it in collaboration with the ratifying committee, setting forth the nature of the work to be performed, its location, the time within which such work is to be started and completed, and an estimate of all costs of labor, material, and fees.

(b) The general contractor, when selected, will select the subcontractors (subject to the approval of the awarding authority) in the same manner as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The awarding authority shall negotiate with the general contractor a lump-sum fee for his services. The general contractor shall then proceed to negotiate contracts with each subcontractor, specifying a lump sum for the work to be performed, including all elements of cost and the fee for his services. Each contract shall be subject to approval in all respects by the ratifying committee. If the general contractor has been accustomed to perform carpenter work, masonry, concreting, or any other specialty work with his own forces, he shall negotiate for it on a lump-sum basis, just as though such work were being sublet to another contractor.

(d) In order that the total commitment of the Government may be determined in advance, no contract or subcontract shall be operative until the ratifying committee has been furnished with all contracts and subcontracts covering the work in question and until it has approved the aggregate amount involved in such contracts and subcontracts.

(e) Any extra work done by a subcontractor or by the general contractor with his own forces shall be negotiated for in advance on a lump-sum basis in the same manner as prescribed for in the original contract.

(f) The fees of the various contractors shall be determined by the importance of the work, the skill required to properly execute the contract, and the time estimated to be necessary to complete the work.

(g) The contractor's fee shall include the cost of the services rendered by his central office for estimating, purchasing, expediting, accounting, financing, and general supervision.

(h) Before final payment is made on any of the work, the books of the contractor and of each subcontractor shall be audited by the ratifying committee to determine the true over-all cost of the work; and the total compensation, including that made on extra work, shall not exceed the sum agreed upon negotiation. When the job is completed and certified by the awarding authority, an auditor shall be appointed by the ratifying committee to determine whether profits in excess of those agreed upon have been made by the contractor. The cost of such audit shall be

borne by the contractor. Final payment to the contractor to be made within 30 days after the audit has been submitted to and approved by the ratifying committee. If upon such audit it should be found that compensation in excess of the agreed amount has been paid, the excess shall promptly be repaid to the Government; and if any evidence of fraud should be discovered, the awarding authority shall pursue the remedies provided by law.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established an Independent Construction Contract Ratifying Committee, which shall consist of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each member shall be a qualified engineer or architect, and no member shal be financially interested in any company or firm with which the awarding authority has had any business. Each member shall serve for a term of 6 years. A member of the ratifying committee shall become permanently ineligible to serve, if any company or firm in which he is financially interested is an applicant for or a recipient of either a contract from the awarding authority or a subcontract from its contractor. The President shall designate one of the members as chairman. The compensation of each member of the committee shall be $8,500 per year. In addition, each is to be paid travel and subsistence expense while actually engaged in work of the ratifying committee outside of Washington, D. C.

(b) The powers and duties of the ratifying committee with respect to contracts negotiated by the awarding authority shall be as follows:

(1) To disapprove any contract that does not comply with the existing law and the provisions of this act. In order to facilitate the ratifying committee's task in this respect, the awarding authority shall submit to the ratifying committee in addition to the proposed contract a detailed memorandum of its reasons for arriving at its final choice of a contractor or subcontractor, the replies to the questionnaire by those who filled it out, and any protests which may have been filed with the awarding authority by dissatisfied contractors or subcontractors. No contract between the awarding authority and a contractor shall become effective without the written approval of a majority of the ratifying committee.

(2) To adjust any differences between the awarding authority and the contractor, or between the contractor and any subcontractor, and to make final determination of the allowable profit of the contractor or any subcontractor if any dispute arises as to the proper amount.

SEC. 4. No construction or road-building contract shall hereafter be entered into on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis of a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost basis.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that I may include as a part of my remarks the text of H. R. 2030.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PUNISHMENT OF WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the subject of punishment of war criminals has recently come very much to the fore, and I regret to say that it has disclosed a rather gloomy picture. It has often been stated, and with a great deal of logic, that the failure of the Allies in the last war to exact punishment against the war criminals paved the way to the present war.

The atrocities and horrors which Germany and her allies have committed in this war surpass, beyond all proportion, what they did before, yet it seems that they have not been gruesome enough to shake some quarters in the British Government and in our own Government.

Having plunged the whole world into a war which already has cost some 20,000,000 casualties, if not more; the shooting of hostages; the deliberate eradication of cities; the diabolical mass murder of some 4,000,000 Hebrew men, women, and children in especially constructed death factories; the cannibalistic practice of using human corpses for fertilizing purposes and for the manufacture of goods; having committed all this horror, which our minds are not really capable of grasping, the hesitancy shown in regard to the punishment of those guilty of it is indeed perplexing if not shocking.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, this hesitancy exists, and this hesitancy now aims to liquidate even the limited measures which have been undertaken in this line. Last week, the Department of State announced that the Honorable Herbert C. Pell, our representative on the United Nations War Crimes Commission in London, will not return to the Commission.

Mr. Pell has publicly declared that he suspects he was removed because he believes that the Axis should be punished for crimes committed against Hebrew people in the same manner as they ought to be punished for crimes committed against other United Nations. In other words, all Mr. Pell advocates is that we consider Germany's murder of close to 4,000,000 Hebrew people in Europe as a war crime. As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is beyond my comprehension, but it seems that some high Government officials have their doubts, they are not sure, and therefore are unwilling to state that this wanton deed is a crime, a crime against God and man in peace as in war. I can hardly think, Mr. Speaker, of a stand which is more violently in opposition to the traditions and sentiments of America as such a cruel, unjust, and legally frustrated point of view. I personally hope that Mr. Pell is wrong and that these were not the reasons for the State Department's removing him. It is conceivable that though Mr. Pell is a veteran diplomat and has done, under the circumstances, a most creditable job in London, his superiors in the State Department do not think so or may have some administrative reasons for his removal. While I would regret this very much, this, of course, will be an entirely different question, one which will involve the prerogatives of judgment and decision of the Secretary of State. But it is a fact, quite apart from the Pell ouster, that the State Department has not announced a clear policy on this issue. It is a fact that for months it has been urged from many quarters that a clear statement be issued in this regard. The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, a body which is naturally deeply concerned with this issue, has repeatedly pointed out not only the importance but the urgency of the matter. The committee claims, and it seems to me perfectly true and logical, that our failure to date to act and to make known to the German barbarians and their satellites that we consider the mass murder of Hebrews as brutal a crime as the mass murder of Czechs or Poles or Englishmen, and that due punishment will be coming for all atrocities without any exceptions, is largely responsible for Germany's continued mass murder, even at the present stage of the war, when she knows she is defeated and is merely fighting a delaying action.

It is sound to assume that the Germans will not continue to murder Hebrews right up to the very minute of the armistice. They will stop sometime before that. I firmly believe that if we adopt a clear and determined stand on this issue immediately the mass murder will stop now.

I wish to emphasize that I have been referring all along to "Hebrews," not to "Jews," for these two terms are not synonymous. Crimes committed against United Nations nationals of Jewish religion are of course part of the crimes against the United Nations and will be punished as such. It is only those crimes committed against Hebrews—people now referred to as stateless Jews, German Jews, or Hungarian Jews—which are not being considered as war crimes at all, since the Hebrew Nation is not recognized as one of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, these people are neither stateless nor are they Germans nor Hungarians; they are Hebrews. It is as such that they have been murdered and their extermination sought, and it is only through our recognition of them as such that they can be saved. It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that something drastic be done to alleviate the continued, age-old suffering of these people. We all hope that out of the victory of this war this problem, too, will be solved with boldness and imagination.

But meanwhile thousands of Hebrews are being daily massacred and we have no right to delay for a single day any effort that we can make to attempt to save them. Least of all have we the right to delay in making a clear statement of policy on this issue.

For many months the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation has urged upon the governments of the United Nations, including our own, the following proposals:

1. That the governments of the United Nations concerned issue a joint declaration proclaiming that crimes committed against Hebrews in Europe, irrespective of the territory on which the crime was committed or the citizenship or lack of citizenship of the victim at the time of death, be considered a war crime and punished as such.

2. That the governments of the United Nations concerned instruct their representatives on the War Crimes Commission to see to it that the above-mentioned declaration is put into effect.

3. That representatives of the Hebrew people be given membership on the War Crimes Commission and that temporarily, until such time as a Hebrew national sovereignty be reestablished, the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation be authorized to constitute the Hebrew representation on the War Crimes Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support these proposals. I am sure that the great majority of the Members of this House do so equally. I was pleased and heartened by the statement made by Mr. Grew, the Acting Secretary of State, in which he acknowledged and welcomed the great public interest and concern in this most important problem, but this is not enough. It only proves the justification of the above-mentioned proposals which I want to urge, as forcefully as I know how, be acted upon by the Department of State without any additional delay. What less, Mr. Speaker, can we do for a martyred people who have been so fiendishly ravaged in this war?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am very grateful to the gentleman for that statement. I, too, am a little disturbed why Mr. Pell was removed. I think he was an able statesman, and I believe that he expressed the thought that proper punishment, as laid down by the President, should be meted out to the people who are responsible for these atrocities. I think one of the reasons for his removal was his unwillingness to go into that question. I think he was a capable man and should have been left where he was. I am worried why the State Department has removed him, and I hope and trust the gentleman will follow through.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I also call to the gentleman's attention the fact that not only were 4,500,000 Hebrews or persons of Jewish blood in Belgium, Poland, and Holland, people who were nationals of those countries, killed in cold blood, but many Catholics and Protestants were killed also, running into the hundreds of thousands.

Mr. LANE. The gentleman is right.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. So the scope of the question is much larger than what the gentleman expressed, dealing only with Hebrews.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Atlanta Journal of Atlanta, Ga.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LAFOLLETTE (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for an additional 30 days, on account of necessary and official business.

To Mr. HAND (at the request of Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. BYRNE of New York), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1427. An act relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, February 8, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2023. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1525. A bill relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 375. An act to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 2030. A bill to replace the present cost-plus and other systems of contracting for public construction by a system of negotiated lump-sum contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2031. A bill to permit the naturalization of native-born Filipinos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2032. A bill authorizing general shoreline investigations at Federal expense, and to repeal an act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States, approved June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 2033 (by request). A bill authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 2034. A bill to make more uniform a trial on the issue of compensation in cases of condemnation of property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2035. A bill making more uniform trial of the issue of compensation in cases of condemnation of property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 2036. A bill to provide for award of the Order of the Purple Heart and authorizing an award to civilians wounded by enemy action; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2037. A bill amending Public Law 322, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 501, first session (H. R. 5750); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 2038. A bill to establish a United States Naval Academy in the Puget Sound area of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2039. A bill to extend the time for filing applications for payment of World War adjusted-service certificates to January 1, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2040. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2041. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for the establishment of a uniform classification and uniform scale of class rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 2042. A bill to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees in the field service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 2043. A bill to provide for the extension of patents whenever the use of the same is prevented by war or other causes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2044. A bill to establish a United States commission for the promotion of physical fitness and making an appropriation for such commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2045. A bill to establish a United States commission for the promotion of physical fitness and making an appropriation for such commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2046. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2047. A bill to provide that the widows and orphans and dependent parents of deceased World War veterans who were suffering with permanent total combat-incurred disabilities shall, regardless of the cause of death, be entitled to the rates of pension which would be payable to them if the veteran had been killed in action in such service; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2048. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on

the Gila reclamation project, Arizona, to the University of Arizona; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2049. A bill to prohibit cancelation or reduction of old-age assistance allowances or unemployment insurance otherwise payable to one receiving an allotment or allowance under Public Law 625, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 23, 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2050. A bill to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2051. A bill to provide for financial control of Government corporations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2052. A bill to amend Public Law No. 300, Seventy-eighth Congress, May 11, 1944, to include aggravation of an existing injury or disease in determination of service connection of disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to provide for the admission to the United States of aliens who are religious or racial refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Res. 122. Resolution to inquire into the administration of the national selective service law in the State of Michigan and elsewhere; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 123. Resolution for lend-lease aid to Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2053. A bill granting a pension to Rachel Melvina Ann Campbell Frum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2054. A bill for the relief of Rastus L. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2055. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2056 (by request). A bill for the relief of Universal Steamship Co. for losses sustained due to the interruption of a voyage of the American schooner *Ninetta M. Porcella* by reason of a Presidential proclamation, effective September 28, 1917, forbidding sailing vessels from entering the war zone; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 2057 (by request). A bill for the relief of S. H. Brown and M. Brown, also known as the Universal Steamship Co., a Georgia corporation, to cover the loss of their bark *Brown Brothers*, destroyed by a German raider during the World War; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2058. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Fontenot; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2059. A bill for the relief of the Allied Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2060. A bill for the relief of D. W. Key; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2061. A bill for the relief of M. L. Waller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of Dave Topper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2063. A bill for the relief of Peter Paul Bacic, Charles C. Cox, H. Forest Haugh, and Luther M. Durst; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 2064. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Dorocke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2065. A bill for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as in reverence we hallow Thy name, so may we hallow our own as we keep our honor bright, our hearts pure, our ideals untarnished, and our devotion to the Nation's weal high and true. In a day of threat and tragedy, as we hurl the might of physical force against entrenched paganism with all its callous cruelty and glaring injustice, save us from the disguises and pretenses of our own hearts which make us unworthy to wear the white plume of the gallant knighthood of Thy eternal purpose for human brotherhood. Turn upon our ruling passions the light of Thy holiness, that we may not deceive ourselves and, in a day of stupendous world needs, seek our own petty ends in spite of noble profession.

In the midst of losses and dread and longing for loved ones in danger and far away, we would close the door for this quiet moment upon the wild world without and find Thee anew within, until thought grows reverent again, the waiting tasks are glorified, and a faith in the ultimate decency of the world because of the God behind the shadows transfigures all common things into shining sacraments of love. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 5, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1427) relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1429) to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1427) relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LETTERS OF APPRECIATION FROM MRS. EDWIN A. HALSEY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate letters of appreciation from Mrs. Edwin A. Halsey, which were read, as follows:

To the United States Senate:

Please be assured of my deep appreciation for the beautiful flowers and the sympathy expressed by the Senate in the loss of my husband, who counted you his friends. My son joins me in thanking each of you.

MRS. EDWIN A. HALSEY.

To All the Employees of the Senate:

Our thanks and deepest appreciation for the lovely flowers and for your sympathy.

MRS. HALSEY.
LT. EDWIN A. HALSEY.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BOLITHA J. LAWS TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 16, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Bolitha J. Laws, of the District of Columbia, to be chief justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Edward C. Eicher, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee to Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures, to fill existing vacancies thereon, the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] as members of the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, to fill existing vacancies caused, respectively, by the expiration of the terms of service of the Senator from Missouri, Mr. Clark, and the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Nye.

VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, the Chair appoints the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

DIRECTOR OF COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of the act of June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 360), the Chair reappoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] as a director of the Columbia Hospital for Women.

DIRECTOR OF COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair reappoints the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] as a director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 20, ch. 3, sec. 431), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the Senate, to fill two existing vancancies, namely, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as a member on the part of the Senate of the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise Committee, created by Public Resolution 124, approved June 22, 1938, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation as a Member of the Senate of the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 616 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

RECREATIONAL RESOURCES OF THE DENISON DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT, TEXAS AND OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Park Service on recreational resources of the Denison Dam and Reservoir project, Texas and Oklahoma (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

SEPTEMBER 1944 REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, pursuant to a Senate resolution, the nineteenth monthly report of the National War Labor Board, covering the month of September 1944 (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments of the Government and an agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY A COMMITTEE WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a monthly report of the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations relative to persons employed who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS

FEBRUARY 5, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John F. Feeney	1425 Rhode Island Ave. NW	General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C	$6,400
Harold E. Merrick	906 Aspen St. NW	do	4,800
Thomas J. Scott	1210 24th St. SE	Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C	4,800
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave	District of Columbia Government	3,500

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Acting Chairman.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Two joint resolutions of the legislature of California; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the prompt removal of temporary war housing which violates local building regulations and relative to the timing and method of such removal and consultation with local legislative bodies to determine the need for retaining any such housing

"Whereas loss of life and property has resulted from fire in federally financed temporary war housing some of which has been constructed in violation of building regulations and minimum safety requirements of the community in which it is situated; and

"Whereas there will continue to be danger to life and property so long as such faulty housing remains available for occupancy; and

"Whereas the city councils or other governing boards of local commmunities are, by their very position, in possession of facts which should determine which temporary housing continues to be needed in the public interest; and

"Whereas present Federal law provides for disposal of war housing with consideration to its full market value notwithstanding the fact that faulty housing does not, in fact, have true value as private housing; and

"Whereas present law provides that removal of war housing shall be accomplished not later than 2 years after the President declares that the war emergency has ceased to exist, although in fact an armistice truce following the defeat of the enemy may occur considerably in advance of such a declaration: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Lanham Act to provide that temporary war housing, and particularly housing which violates minimum safety requirements or the building regulations of the community in which it is situated, should be removed as soon as practicable after the recognized cessation of hostilities; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That all such temporary war housing be removed as soon after organized hostilities cease as practicable with due consideration to the need for more adequate housing under private ownership and the public interest, and after consultation with the city council or other governing board of the respective local communities as to such housing which is still needed in the

interest of the orderly demobilization of the war effort; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California."

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to consider early return to this State of the administration and control assumed by the Federal Government as part of a Nation-wide wartime employment program

"Whereas the State of California with an enormously expanded labor force faces severe unemployment after the war, and consequences therefrom which may endanger its economic and social stability; and

"Whereas it is imperative the State of California be prepared with a complete and comprehensive work program, unemployment-insurance program, and relief program in order to minimize and temper the severity and magnitude of post-war unemployment; and

"Whereas the successful and effective operation by this State of the aforementioned programs for avoiding high unemployment and mitigating the evils of temporary unemployment requires a well-developed and efficient employment service whose administration is coordinated with the various other State programs and State agencies; and

"Whereas the public employment service operated by the State of California through its department of employment was assumed as of January 1, 1942, by the United States Employment Service as a part of a Nation-wide wartime employment program; and

"Whereas it is indispensable that the employment service be returned and reestablished under State administration and control well in advance of the termination of war contracts and the occurrence of the impact of mass unemployment which will come with war contract cancelations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to consider the advisability of returning the employment service to the administration and control of the State of California at the earliest date compatible with the effective prosecution of the war; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide financial assistance following the cessation of hostilities and during the period of reconversion to normal peacetime operation to those communities which have suffered deterioration of facilities owing to the impact of war industry and war-increased population

"Whereas, ever since the United States began to meet the needs of the present war, many communities in California have suffered an influx of war industry, military installation, and war-borne population which have swamped public facilities and enormously increased the burden of providing municipal services; and

"Whereas, in the face of the inability of those communities to pay the full cost of such enormously increased demands upon their facilities and services, the Federal Government has recognized national responsibility for these burdens by providing more than a billion dollars for housing, sewers, schools, hospitals, and other community facilities during the period of the war; and

"Whereas, after the cessation of hostilities those communities will find it necessary further to restore their facilities and services which have deteriorated or become inadequate as a result of wartime demands upon them; and

"Whereas increased wartime population will remain in many of those communities after the war, thus continuing the disproportionate burden upon municipal services; and

"Whereas such communities do not have financial resources sufficient to meet in full these burdens: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to consider and act upon legislation to recognize national responsibility by providing financial aid during the period of reconversion to those communities which have been forced, because of the war effort, to carry an abnormal war burden, so that they may be enabled to rehabilitate municipal facilities and services to the same level of adequacy as before the war; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution memorializing the Senate of the United States not to advise nor consent to a proposed treaty with Mexico, signed February 3, 1944, relating to the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and the Rio Grande

"Whereas there was signed on February 3, 1944, a treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, relating to the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and the Rio Grande and said proposed treaty was thereafter submitted to the United States Senate for its advice and consent with a protocol, signed November 14, 1944, and the matter of said proposed treaty has been set for hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, commencing January 22, 1945; and

"Whereas the Legislature of California did on June 8, 1944, by its joint resolution, being chapter 10 of resolutions of its fourth extra session held in the year 1944, memorialize the Senate of the United States not to advise nor consent to said proposed treaty and therein placed its objection upon a single ground, to wit, that said proposed treaty would violate a solemn compact entered into by reciprocal legislation between the United States of America and the State of California; and

"Whereas this legislature does hereby in all things reaffirm the joint resolution above mentioned, but desires to place of record more fully before the United States Senate its views in opposition to said proposed treaty; and

"Whereas said proposed treaty is destructive of and dangerous to the welfare of the State of California and of the United States and said protocol does not remove the defects of said treaty: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Senate of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested and urged not to advise nor consent to the proposed treaty, for the following reasons:

"1. The treaty is cast in unusual, vague, and uncertain terms and grants to a Federal commission the power to interpret and settle finally the meaning of such terms, free from correction by the Congress or the courts. Such extreme delegation of power is un-American and contrary to our institution of government by laws, not men;

"2. It would set up in the basins of three important international rivers, constituting a large fraction of the territory of the United States, a supergovernment consisting of one Mexican commissioner and one American commissioner, having hitherto unheard-of breadth of power, amenable to no control but that of the Secretary of State and beyond the control of the Congress;

"3. It would, so far as the Colorado River is concerned, create such dictatorial authority on a perpetual basis, when no authority is needed, or will be needed for many years to come, if ever. If and when any Federal administration on the Colorado River is needed, it should be created by domestic legislation at the time when the conditions causing the need are known, not by a perpetual treaty;

"4. It would invade the constitutional jurisdiction of the States and federalize waters and irrigation and power works which belong to the States and State agencies;

"5. It would give the two commissioners power to enter into, carry out, and enforce further agreements, with the approval of the Secretary of State and the Minister of Foreign Relations of Mexico, without the consent of Congress;

"6. It would nullify the reservation attached by the United States Senate to the inter-American Arbitration Treaty of 1929, requiring the approval of the Senate of questions to be arbitrated, by enabling the commission to settle all disputes and to formulate the special agreements defining such questions;

"7. It would give to Mexico without any consideration in return for it, a guaranteed first right to more than twice her just share of Colorado River water and this largess would cast a cloud on all water rights on the river vested in the people of the United States;

"8. It would guarantee to Mexico a fixed amount from the surface flow of the river, without regard to the fluctuations of the available supply, which is wrong in principle, and, on the other hand, it would totally disregard the underground flow of the river, which Mexico would develop and use, although that is a part of the waters of the river and should be so treated;

"9. It would donate to Mexico rights in water conservation works in the United States, which must be paid for by American water and power users and which are necessary to make available the water to be delivered to Mexico, and would therefore subsidize water users in Mexico at the expense, not of the United States, but of the citizens of particular communities in the United States;

"10. It would permit Mexico to share in revenues from power development on the All-American Canal, which by Federal law and contract belong to local public agencies in California;

"11. It would require the building by Mexico within 5 years of a main diversion structure or dam across the Colorado River, which structure is not now necessary and which would create a flood and drainage menace to communities in the United States;

"12. It would violate the solemn promise of Congress that war veterans should have the preferred right to settle public lands below Boulder Dam and irrigate them with the waters conserved by that dam;

"13. It would violate contracts for delivery of water and power from the Boulder Canyon project, made by the United States with its own States and communities, entered

into by the latter in absolute reliance upon the good faith and integrity of the United States and upon which contracts the States and communities have expended and committed themselves to expend hundreds of millions of dollars of the public funds of their taxpayers. If the treaty were ratified, the United States would thereby voluntarily disable itself from performing its own contracts with its own people, in order to make a free gift to a foreign country of one of the most precious natural resources of the State of California and of the entire Southwest; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the Assembly of California is directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to each Member of the United States Senate and to each Representative of California in the Congress."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to exchange of United States and Japanese nationals

"Whereas the State Department of the United States Government and the Japanese Government have been negotiating for the further exchange of nationals of the two nations interned in the two countries; and

"Whereas the people of this country will be most happy to welcome the return of as many as possible of our citizens who have been held by the Japanese since the outbreak of hostilities; and

"Whereas the State Department has declared its desire to insure the speedy execution of any exchange to which the Japanese Government's agreement can be obtained: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California jointly*, That the State Department and those engaged in this work of repatriation be heartily commended for their efforts in this matter, and that the President and the State Department are hereby urged and memorialized to continue their efforts to the end that every American now held by the Japanese Government be returned to the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"*To Whom It May Concern:*

"This is to certify that the Senate of the State of California on January 25, 1945, adopted the following:

"'Senate Resolution 36

"'Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the United States; and

"'Whereas such training will result in building up the physical and mental health of young Americans in an atmosphere faithful to the democratic institutions of the country and equip large numbers of our citizens in the fundamentals of military service so that they may rapidly respond to any future needs for the defense of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled are hereby petitioned and urged to enact a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the country; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from this State.'"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"*To Whom It May Concern:*

"This is to certify that the Senate of the State of California on January 16, 1945, adopted the following:

"'Senate Resolution 26

"'Whereas there has existed for many years a serious health and economic problem arising out of the failure to control the disposition of ships' garbage; and

"'Whereas the unrestricted dumping of ships' garbage in the harbors and ports of this State and off the shores of this State has resulted in the introduction of serious pest infestations which have caused great damage to agriculture and livestock in this country; and

"'Whereas such unregulated practice may directly affect the health of the people of this country by the introduction of diseases common to other parts of the world; and

"'Whereas it is proper that the Department of Agriculture be authorized by Congress to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by enforcing laws adequate to control such practice; and

"'Whereas it is proper that the Congress enact stringent laws adequate to remove this menace to the health and economic welfare of this country: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation to control and regulate the disposition of ships' garbage in the harbors and ports of this country and off the shores of this country; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of California.'"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

"Whereas the Nazi persecution and wholesale slaughter of Jews in Europe have outraged the conscience of the civilized world and have vastly aggravated the tragedy of the Jewish problem there; and

"Whereas at the end of the present war large numbers of European Jews will find themselves in desperate need for a new home where they can rebuild their lives in dignity and security; and

"Whereas after World War No. 1, Great Britain had accepted at the instance of the Allied and Associated Powers the mandate for Palestine and had undertaken 'to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine,' an undertaking subsequently approved by 52 nations, including the United States; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922; and

"Whereas the Democratic and the Republican Parties in their national conventions of 1944 adopted platforms in favor of the reestablishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and

"Whereas the President of the United States on October 15, 1944, expressed his approval of this aim which he stated to be 'in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms": Be it therefore

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa* (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That we of the State of Iowa express our profound sympathy with the millions of innocent victims of the enemy's ruthless extermination policy, and that we demand just punishment of all those who perpetrated these horrible crimes against humanity; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United States should take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine should be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution should be forwarded to the President, the Secretary of State, the Senate, and the House of Representatives of the United States of America."

Resolutions adopted by a meeting of the National Board of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in Washington, D. C., relating to the proposed draft of nurses and pending national service legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the California Progressives, Los Angeles, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory military training in peacetime; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Arkansas; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States on the post-war Military Establishment and the status of the National Guard

"Whereas the States, as well as the National Government, are vitally interested and will be affected by the post-war military policy and by the character, composition, and size of the Military Establishment of the United States; and

"Whereas the National Guard units, and the Organized Reserves of the States and Territories have performed brilliantly in World War No. 2 and have completely justified the vision and wisdom of the Congress in making them a first-line component of the Army of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Arkansas* (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That the Congress is respectfully urged to retain the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves in the post-war military organization of the Army of the United States along the lines laid down in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, and especially the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 relating to the status of the National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of the Nation; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we fully subscribe to and endorse the position taken by the Secretary of War as to the future status of the National Guard as announced on November 23, 1944, to the effect that the National Guard units have played a vital roll in the mobilization of our present Army and have made a brilliant fighting record and that they should be counted on as a bulwark of our future national security as a reserve component of the Army.

"We also endorse the statement of Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, set forth in War Department Circular No. 347, August 25, 1944, to the effect that the post-war Military Establishment should consist of a regular army, no larger than necessary for normal peacetime requirements, to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from the civilian components of the Army; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That in formulating post-war military policies and determining the form and character of the Military Establishment, men of all components of the Army, who are or who have been serving with the armed forces in times of war, be given full opportunity to be heard and to express their views on these important matters.

"Adopted by senate January 30, 1945.

"Adopted by the house January 31, 1945."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Baltimore (Md.) Retail Druggists Association, protesting against the enactment of legislation pertaining to the socialization of medicine; to the Committee on Education and Labor;

Resolutions adopted by the Harford County (Md.) Pomona Grange, Bel Air, Md., favoring discontinuance of the automobile use tax; to the Committee on Finance; and

Resolutions adopted by the Harford County (Md.) Pomona Grange, Bel Air, Md., favoring the adoption of standard time and the discontinuance of daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the Legislature of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 36

"Resolution memorializing the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States with relation to the cancelation of certain Federal income taxes due the Government by persons in the armed forces of the United States of America previous to their induction into said service

"Whereas members of the armed forces, who have been engaged in service in World War No. 2 and honorably discharged from such service, should not have to return to civilian life after such discharge to face adjustment to their future, saddled by a debt of Federal income tax which they were unable to pay off previous to their induction into such service: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America, be, and they hereby are, earnestly requested to take such measures and promote such legislation as will provide for the cancelation of 1 year's Federal income taxes due the Government by any member of the armed forces which he or she was unable to pay previous to his or her induction into service in World War No. 2: *Provided, however*, Such person has been honorably discharged from such service and is returning to civilian life after such discharge: *And provided further*, That any such person desiring to be relieved from the payment of such income taxes, shall make application to the officer authorized to receive any such tax and, if such officer shall be satisfied from the proof submitted that such person was actually in such service, he shall make out in duplicate a certificate to that effect, which certificate shall show the amount of such income tax unpaid at the time of the induction of such person into the armed services. One copy shall be given to the taxpayer and the other retained by the collecting officer as evidence that such person is entitled to a credit in his accounts for the amount of such unpaid Federal income tax so canceled; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America."

SENATOR FROM INDIANA—RESOLUTION OF INDIANA DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present a resolution of the Democratic Committee of the State of Indiana addressed to the Committee on Privileges and Elections but which, it seems to me, should be presented to the Senate and then printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I ask that that disposition be made of it.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas at the last general election held throughout the United States and in the State of Indiana, widespread fraud and illegality were practised by certain Republican officials and party workers in the State of Indiana to prevent voting by Democratic and independent voters; and

Whereas because of the formulation and carrying out of a criminal conspiracy to hinder, delay and prevent the registration of legally qualified Democratic and independent voters, thousands thereof were prevented from voting in the State of Indiana at such election; and

Whereas because of the formulation and carrying out of this criminal conspiracy Democratic candidates for public office, including the Democratic candidate for United States Senator from the State of Indiana, were defeated; and

Whereas there exists persistent rumors of illegal expenditures in connection with the nomination and election of Homer Capehart who is now occupying the position of junior United States Senator from the State of Indiana; and

Whereas the maintenance of democratic government requires honest elections and the protection of the right to the franchise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Democratic State Committee of the State of Indiana meeting in a regularly called session, That we do hereby request the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the United States Senate to continue the investigation that was begun in this State by the Committee on Campaign Expenditures of the United States Senate and that the Committee on Privileges and Elections do prosecute such investigation with vigor to the end that all facts concerning the illegality that occurred in connection with such election throughout the State of Indiana be fully ascertained; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Honorable THEODORE F. GREEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Campaign Expenditures and of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections of the United States Senate.

Adopted by the Democratic State Committee of Indiana in regular meeting this 31st day of January 1945.

FRED F. BAYS,
Chairman.

Attest:

CHARLES E. SKILLEN,
Secretary.

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—PETITIONS OF MEMBERS OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference petitions of members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island in favor of the confirmation of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce and against the enactment of the so-called George bill.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
SENATE CHAMBER,
January 30, 1945.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: We, the undersigned Democratic members of the Rhode Island State Senate do hereby respectfully request you, as United States Senator from said State, to cast your vote in favor of the confirmation of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce and further that you vote against passage of the George bill.

William G. Troy, Ambrose P. McCrary, David Harris, Raymond A. McCabe, Joseph Pezzullo, Alfred Richard, James J. Brady, George Beaucage, Dr. John H. Finn, Terrence E. Duffy, Daniel G. Coggeshall, George E. Conley, Frank S. Gambato, Dominic Piandro, J. E. Frances, Canler B. Barr, William J. Smith, Leo F. Gilmore, David H. Boylan, Joseph P. Rosquies.

To the Honorable PETER G. GERRY and the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, UNITED STATES SENATORS FROM RHODE ISLAND IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

We, the undersigned, Democratic members of the Rhode Island House of Representatives, heartily endorsing Henry A. Wallace for Secretary of Commerce, respectfully request that you vote in favor of his confirmation and against the passage of the George bill:

Harry F. Currim; James H. Kiernan; Alfred U. Menard; Herman D. Ferrara; Edward F. Burns; James J. Horgan 2d; John J. Wrenn; Julio F. Roche; Nelson F. Duphiney; Charles L. Walsh; Robert M. Watt; Ira T. Williams; Samuel Azzinaro; Charles Rand; Rolland H. Chapdelaine; Alphonse G. LeBlanc; William D. McWeeney; Robert A. Shea; Sonner Siegal; Gladys M. Brightman; Samuel C. Ragan; H. T. Powers; William R. Conway; Emile Beaudom; Francis X. Affelin, Sr.; Harold A. Duxbury; Gerard D. Fiore; Patrick B. McCoughley; John Archambault; William J. Landi; Hugh C. King; Morgan E. Pease; Joseph Robert; Michael Sepe; Arthur E. Magee; Thomas L. Etheridge; Henry L. Russell; Arthur L. Desmarais; James J. McGrath; August P. LaFrance; Daniel J. O'Connell, Jr.; Jos. O. Laurence; Henry Alfred; Samuel J. Johnston; Henry J. Theroux; Vincent P. Nugent; Edgar J. Sullins, Jr.; Robert A. Caldwell; Walter J. Mathews; Joseph F. McVay; William J. Murray.

FEDERAL GASOLINE AND CAR STAMP TAX—RESOLUTION OF PHELPS COUNTY (NEBR.) PETROLEUM INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution with related letter adopted by the Phelps County Petroleum Industries Committee of Phelps County, Nebr., relating to the Federal gasoline tax and the car stamp tax.

There being no objection, the resolution and the accompanying letter were

referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HASTINGS, NEBR., *December 16, 1944.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Pawnee City, Nebr.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: A few nights ago the petroleum dealers of Phelps County met for the purpose of organizing the Phelps County Petroleum Industries Committee. At this meeting a resolution was passed concerning the Federal gasoline tax and the car stamp tax. I am enclosing a copy of this resolution in order that you may know of our desires and give us your help in repealing of these burdensome taxes.

Respectfully,

PHELPS COUNTY PETROLEUM INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE,
E. B. JOHNSON, *Secretary.*

(Enclosure)

Resolution Opposing Federal Gasoline Tax and Auto Stamp Tax

Whereas the 1½ cents per gallon Federal tax on gasoline was enacted as a temporary tax; and

Whereas this tax is being assessed against a commodity used by many in the pursuit of a living, thus placing an additional burden upon those who must burn gasoline; and

Whereas the farmers who burn huge amounts in the tilling of the soil and harvesting of crops, thus overtaxing those persons whom the Government seeks to help; and

Whereas the taxation of gasoline has previously been rightfully considered the privilege of the States and this double taxation makes the motorist the most heavily taxed person: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Phelps County Petroleum Industries Committee lend whatever support possible to the repeal of the Federal tax on gasoline and the car stamp tax.

CONDITIONS AFFECTING CORN INDUSTRY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also present a resolution adopted by the Republican City Community Farm Bureau unit of Republican City, Nebr., with a related letter, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. The resolution has to do with corn that is on the ground because of the failure to get boxcars to move the corn, as it should be moved to market at this time.

There being no objection, the resolution and related letter were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN CITY, NEBR., *January 27, 1945.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the fact that Harlan County, Nebr., has produced the largest corn crop in its history and cribbing not being available for this huge corn crop, it is necessary for farmers to store corn in makeshift corn cribs and on the ground. The present rate of grain car rationing will not permit normal rate of shelling and movement of corn before spring rains and work starts.

With these facts in mind, the farmers and their wives of the Republican City Community Farm Bureau unit made the enclosed corn survey, and submit the enclosed resolution for your immediate consideration.

Very truly,

Mrs. JOHN SINDT,
Secretary.

(Enclosure)

Since there are thousands of bushels of corn on the ground as indicated by the attached survey as completed in a regular community farm bureau unit meeting here in Republican City on January 26, 1945, and since present grain car rationing will not permit a normal rate of shelling and an orderly movement of corn to market, and since this corn should and must be moved before spring rains to prevent an enormous loss due to spoilage, be it therefore resolved that the undersigned farm bureau members petition our United States Senators to continue their efforts to relieve the situation by presenting the facts before the national officials of the Office of Defense Transportation in Washington, D. C. Signed this 26th day of January 1945.

R. L. Haskins, Jack D. Payne, C. C. Hawley, John Hinds, Kenneth J. Payne, Mrs. C. C. Hawley, Mrs. Peter Rolland, Mrs. Bob Crow, Mrs. R. L. Haskins, Mrs. Orly Stolts, Mrs. George Clark, Frank Kriley, H. H. Guest, Mrs. Clemens Seyler, Mrs. H. H. Guest, Orly Stolts, G. L. Clark, L. L. Kammerer, John R. Lethem, Clemens Seyler, Byron Miller, C. R. Waggoner, Hal Miller, R. G. Crow, Lloyd H. Crow, Peter Rolland, Lloyd Whitney, Earl L. Kriley, Merle W. Payne, Mrs. Eva Kriley, Mrs. John Lethem, Mrs. Lloyd Crow, Mrs. Hal Miller, Mrs. Erma Kammerer, Flora Sindt.

Corn-on-the-ground survey, Republican City Farm Bureau community unit

Name	Address	In cribs	On ground	Produced	Sold
		Bushels	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
C. C. Hamly	Republican City		600	2,800	2,000
John Smith	do		2,000	4,000	
K. T. Payne	do		1,500	2,300	800
Clemens Seyler	do	1,600	2,000	7,500	
John R. Lithum	do		3,500	6,000	2,000
L. L. Kainmenn	do		4,500	7,000	2,280
G. L. Clark	do		1,400	1,400	
Orly Stolts	do			9,000	9,000
Hal Miller	do	3,100	6,000	9,100	
Lloyd H. Crow	do	200	2,000	5,700	3,500
Peter Rolland	do	1,300		4,000	
H. H. Guest	do		2,000	2,500	4,000
Frank Krilz	do		3,000		
Ray Haskins	do	2,500	2,000	8,500	
Total		8,700	30,500	69,800	23,580

REVISION OF THE TAX LAWS

Mr. TUNNELL. I present a resolution adopted by the Delaware Feed Dealers' Association protesting against certain taxes, particularly those against cooperatives, which I should like to have referred to the Finance Committee and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the exemptions enjoyed under our Federal revenue laws of Government corporations and farmer cooperatives are unfair and inequitable, when private business corporations, concerns, and individuals with whom these tax-free groups in business compete are paying the heaviest tax load ever experienced; and

Whereas the continuance of this tax favoritism to said Government corporations and farm cooperatives produces such a competitive advantage that the future existence and growth of taxpaying private corporations, business, and individuals is threatened thereby; and

Whereas our Government is losing huge tax revenues by reason of the exemption granted to said corporations and farm cooperatives, which revenue is greatly needed for the prosecution of the war and the proper functioning of our Government service; and

Whereas there are certain other privileges that are enjoyed by Government corporations and farmer cooperatives, such as easy credit, exemption from antitrust laws, and preference in Government purchases of various commodities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Delaware Feed Dealers' Association in session at Seaford, Del., on February 1, 1945, That we go on record as strongly urging Congress to revise its present revenue laws so as to require the said Government corporations and farm cooperatives in competition with taxpaying private businesses to pay excess-profits and Federal income taxes on a similar basis as all other businesses, thus restoring the old constitutional concept of tax equality; be it further

Resolved, That Congress revise its present laws of granting special privileges to Government corporations and farmer cooperatives in competition with private business; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be placed in the hands of each of the Congressmen and Senators of the State of Delaware.

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF DELAWARE

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I also present a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion of Delaware which I should like to have referred to the Military Affairs Committee and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in the short space of 25 years our Nation has been forced into two world conflicts, each time being compelled to take up arms without being prepared, and each time men have died because of that unpreparedness; and

Whereas World War No. 1 taught us as members of the American Legion that war's cost in blood and money is proportionate to the Nation's degree of preparedness, and realizing that preparedness can be secured only through national military training or the less American method of maintaining a large standing Army; and

Whereas we regard adequate national defense as necessary regardless of what kind of an international organization for the preservation of peace which our Nation may join; and

Whereas we believe that the only effective basis for a sound and continuing national military and naval policy is the training of

every able-bodied young man to defend his country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Delaware, in meeting assembled this 30th day of January 1945, does hereby declare its unqualified support of H. R. 515 and S. 188, referred to as the National Military Training Act of 1945, now pending in both Houses of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and that this committee does hereby respectfully petition its Representatives in Congress to use their influence in behalf of and to vote for the above-mentioned bills; and be it further

Resolved, That the department adjutant be and is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution to United States Senators TUNNELL and BUCK and to Representative PHILIP A. TRAYNOR.

Attested by:

INKERMAN BAILEY,
Adjutant, the American Legion,
Department of Delaware.

DRAFT OF NURSES—LETTER FROM THE CONNECTICUT HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a letter addressed to me by the Connecticut Hospital Association, under date of January 23, on the subject of the drafting of nurses.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONNECTICUT HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Middletown, Conn., January 23, 1945.

Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON,
Member of Congress,
Senator from Connecticut,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you kindly register with the proper congressional committee the opposition of the Connecticut Hospital Association to any recruitment program for nurses which will be detrimental to the hospitalization of civilian and war workers.

We are in hearty accord that those in the armed forces should get the very best of nursing care, and recent reports from congressional committees and doctors returning from service have not indicated any nursing shortage.

Any suggested draft of nurses must include the allocation of all nurses to the practice of their profession as well as filling the requirements of the armed forces, if not, the civilian hospitals will be badly crippled. In the hospitals, essential supervisors, head nurses, key technicians, and instructors must be permitted to remain in order that the training program for student nurses, trained attendants, and proper supervision of Red Cross nurse aides be maintained.

If additional nursing personnel is needed, recruitment from those who are not practicing their profession but are working in positions other than nursing in industry should be undertaken; secondly, the larger private nursing groups and the overstaffed war industrial groups could easily fill the demands of the 20,000 additional nurses requested. In the publicity given to the present nursing shortage no mention is made concerning the enrollment of the graduate cadet nursing group up to 100 percent of their respective classes.

In some sections of our State, nurses in industry are acting as drivers for cars, as social-service investigators, and others released from wartime industry are in the lines each week drawing their weekly unemployment check and not registering for any type of nursing service.

We, therefore, urge a stronger appeal to those in the general nursing field, before any regulatory provisions are established that may cripple the present restricted nursing service in the general hospitals serving the war industry area of Connecticut. The hospital facilities to the wives and children of our veterans in the service must not be imperiled if their morale is to be maintained.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM B. SWEENEY, *President,*
The Connecticut Hospital Association.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. McMAHON also presented resolutions adopted by the Polish-American Congress, District of Connecticut, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Whereas, recent events on the military fronts in central Europe indicate that the present war in that sector of the world is fast approaching a climax; and

Whereas many of the countries small and large whose lands had been taken and whose people had been enslaved by the totalitarian bestial lust for conquest and power are now fast coming under the jurisdiction of the Allied forces and the people therein are being liberated; and

Whereas most of these countries have been at all times an integral part of the Allied cause whose people for centuries have stood for the principles of justice and liberty, and

Whereas among these nations is Poland who first exposed the treachery of totalitarianism and which even facing utter extinction fought alone against the forces of the enemies of justice and freedom at a sacrifice unparalleled heretofore, being true to all of her promises to her allies and respecting every treaty and covenant made with them, never having at any time conducted a war of aggression; and

Whereas one of our allies, Russia, has indicated a desire to annex certain portions of Poland and other small countries and to impose her will and influence upon the government of Poland and these other little countries; and

Whereas this conduct on the part of our ally, Russia, does not comply with the original principles of the Allied cause when Poland was invaded and the countries of Great Britain and France found those acts of aggression cause for a declaration of war upon aggressor, Germany; and

Whereas the present attitude of our ally, Russia, does not square with the principles of the "four freedoms" and the enunciations set forth in the Atlantic Charter which served as an inspiration for the whole civilized world and which caused our own boys to most willingly undertake all hardships and make sacrifices for the fulfillment of the promises to the world made thereby; and

Whereas the fortunes of war have caused most of these little nations to be reoccupied by the military forces under the command of our ally, Russia, which participated in the original act of aggression upon Poland but which later was compelled to join the Allied cause for its own security, but at present seeks legal approval of that portion of the original aggression that she undertook; and

Whereas certain groups and individuals acting in their own individual interests only are disseminating propaganda of misapprehension by various propaganda machines: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Polish-American Congress for the District of Connecticut, acting herein as a district member of the Polish-American Congress of America, consisting of church societies and organizations, civic, welfare, social, veteran, educational, beneficial, political, fraternal, clubs, and societies of Americans of Polish descent, do hereby go on record urging that the coming peace be based on justice. That the principles of the "four freedoms" and the enunciations of the Atlantic Charter should be put into operation. We desire to go on record as commending the refusal of our Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, to place any approval for the surrender of any territory of Poland to Russia as urged recently by Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain. We further urge that our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, in the coming meeting which is to take place with Prime Minister Churchill of England and Marshal Stalin of Russia, to most forcefully insist and demand collaboration for the bringing about of a peace based on justice seeking to forever demilitarize those who have been guilty previously in causing wars creating bloodshed and to refuse to recognize any unilateral creation of boundaries originated since the beginning of the present conflict. We still further urge and request that if the present conflict is not over in Europe at the time of the said meeting that the matter of boundaries and questions of government be postponed for deliberations after the military phase of the war is completed. We do further condemn any instrumentalities that seek to influence public opinion by sowing seeds of misapprehension thereby causing injustice to Poland and other freedom loving nations by exposing them to the dangers of an imposed sphere of influence against their will; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, to our Senator and to our Members of Congress.

Attested to by:

JOSEPH KOZAKIEWICZ,
Secretary.
LUCIEN MACIORA,
President.

POST-WAR PLANNING COMMITTEE, STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE, DICKINSON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Post-war Planning Committee of the State College at Dickinson, N. Dak., on January 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Dickinson, N. Dak., January 29, 1945.

Whereas the proposed compulsory military training program will likely involve emphasis on physical fitness, mathematics, and the natural sciences; and

Whereas academic training is of special significance in modern warfare; and

Whereas the colleges are well adapted to provide this type of training; and

Whereas the administrative machinery and equipment is already at hand; and

Whereas the colleges have had signal success with Army and Navy training programs during the course of the war; and

Whereas a special 1-year program including vocational and industrial training could easily be devised to meet the requirements of compulsory military training; and

Whereas it would be economy to use existing institutions: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Post-war Planning Committee of the State Teachers College at Dickinson, N. Dak., That any program for compulsory military training should make provision for the college student or prospective college student to get the major part of his training in a collegiate institution; and

Whereas permanent collegiate institutions are well distributed throughout the country; and

Whereas they could be easily staffed with the necessary military personnel; and

Whereas the college equipment and housing could be expanded to meet the needs of the trainees more economically than to maintain separate institutions for military training; and

Whereas training at collegiate institutions would be more in keeping with American tradition: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That collegiate institutions should be considered as possible training grounds for all those who are required to complete a year of military training.

POST-WAR PLANNING COMMITTEE.
R. L. LOKKEN, *Chairman*.
E. S. HATCH.
L. G. PULVER.
A. C. SELKE.
I. I. GRINDSTUEN.

RESOLUTIONS OF WILLIAMS COUNTY (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION CONVENTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred certain resolutions together with a letter received from the Williams County Farmers Union.

There being no objection, the resolutions were appropriately referred, and the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAMS COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Williston, N. Dak., January 27, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: We are enclosing herewith resolutions which were unanimously adopted by the delegates and members present at the Williams County Farmers Union convention held at Williston, N. Dak., January 20, 1945. Your favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

S. A. FORSETH,
Secretary.

By SALNI HELLER.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolution 7

We urge an incentive payment of $15 per acre for each acre of flax seeded, so as to bring up the income as to that of other crops.

To the Committee on Education and Labor:

Resolution 11

We believe it is the duty of our National Government to supervise and maintain our schools, so that all children, both rich and poor, will secure an education.

We feel that a national law should be passed where provisions for means and standards for our schools are adopted for all schools.

We feel that schools of higher learning should be open to all students who can make the grade at Government expense.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolution 6

Whereas a resolution proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution to limit the taxation of incomes to 25 percent; Whereas the appeal is made on the basis of protection to the low-income group, but in reality it is a benefit to the wealthy;

Whereas this amendment has passed in 16 different legislatures, and if they can muster two-thirds majority of the legislatures it will force the Congress to repeal the income-tax law, which destroys the principle of levying taxes according to ability to pay: Therefore,

We, the members of the Williams County Farmers Union, urge our legislature to be on the alert for such a proposal and reject it.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolution 1

We, the members of the Williams County Farmers Union, in session January 20, 1945, held in the Williston Armory, ask that the stepped-up demands of the armed forces not take our boys in such numbers from the farms so that it will curtail our production of food for our armed forces and civilian use.

Resolution 3

We, the members of the Williams County Farmers Union, urge Members of Congress to postpone action on the post-war military conscription bill until after the peace settlement.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 210. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis," approved June 16, 1938; with an amendment (Rept. No. 34);

S. 211. A bill for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 35);

S. 212. A bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 36);

S. 214. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 37); and

S. 215. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 38).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 290. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 39).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 374. A bill to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce"; with an amendment (Rept. No. 40).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 41).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Rules:

S. Res. 52. Resolution giving a retirement privilege to certain Senate restaurant employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 43).

By Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. BYRD), from the Committee on Rules:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; with amendments (Rept. No. 42), and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 472. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the deduction of certain circulation expenditures, and expenditures in defense of or perfecting property rights or title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 473. A bill relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 474. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Frederick Alden;

S. 475. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Bullshows and Horse Bullshows;

S. 476. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Rose Bearcloud;

S. 477. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Ruth Morning;

S. 478. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to LeRoy Milliken;

S. 479. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Martha Long Neck Little Light a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 480. A bill to authorize the sale of the allotment of Henry Keiser, on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

S. 481. A bill authorizing the issuance of patents in fee to the heirs of Lucky Horse Singer and Ambrose Singer;

S. 482. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph J. Pickett a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 483. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John J. Akers a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 484. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in Valley County, Mont.;

S. 485. A bill authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any tribe or band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; and

S. 486. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Fort Peck project, Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 487. A bill to extend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 relating to education and training, to children of persons whose death results from service in the armed forces; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHEELER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 488. A bill to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 489. A bill for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 490 (by request). A bill to further amend the act approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 864), entitled "An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 491. A bill for the relief of John H. Gradwell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 492. A bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce;

S. 493. A bill to carry out obligations of the United States under article 27 of the Geneva Convention relating to compensation for certain injuries to interned workers, and for other purposes;

S. 494 (by request). A bill relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens;

S. 495 (by request). A bill to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath; and

S. 496 (by request). A bill to make it a criminal offense for certain escaped convicts to travel from one State to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HATCH (by request) introduced Senate bill 497, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 498. A bill for the relief of W. C. Wornhoff and Josephine Wornhoff; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for certain exclusions from gross income for income-tax purposes in the case of persons who serve in the armed forces in time of war; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 500. To amend title II of the act entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1175), in order to give credit for active duty performed by enlisted men subsequent to transfer to the Fleet Reserve, in computing their retainer or retired pay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 501. A bill for the relief of the Catholic Chancery Office, Inc., to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 502. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic metals and minerals and petroleum and petroleum products, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. ELLENDER introduced Senate bill 503, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 504. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Cosby and Skipwith's report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 South, range 3 East, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 505. A bill to authorize the naturalization and the admission into the United States under a quota of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Stanley E. Hubbard; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 507, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution requesting the President to declare November 10, 1945, a day for the observance of the creation of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution providing for recognition of the services rendered voluntarily and without compensation in the operation of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 28 (by request). A joint resolution providing that certain provisions of law shall not be applicable to persons appointed to the Advisory Board under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PURCHASE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR HOME AND OTHER SITES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, by request I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and in connection with the bill I ask that a letter from the Secretary of the Interior may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 497) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), introduced by Mr. HATCH (by request) was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The letter presented by Mr. HATCH in connection with the bill is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington D. C., January 4, 1945.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609).

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to amend the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609, 43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), in order to remove the existing prohibition against the application of that act to the public domain in Alaska. In addition, it would sanction the lease to or the purchase by the employees of this Department, stationed in Alaska, of small tracts of land in that Territory for personal use only. It would also correct a typographical error in the present law.

In its present form, the act of June 1, 1938, supra, has been a satisfactory vehicle for making available in the United States small tracts of land not in excess of 5 acres for home, camp, convalescent, recreational, and business sites. Until recently there would seem to have been no need for the extension of this legislation to the Territory of Alaska. In view, however, of the very possible changed conditions in the Territory after the termination of the present conflict, it may be that a small-tract program will fill an essential need for making land in Alaska available to the expected influx of people, especially veterans of the present conflict. Improved transportation methods may open wider travel horizons so that people in the United States may wish to acquire vacation homes or camps in the Territory. Furthermore, as the population of Alaska increases, there will be many people who will desire homes with small gardens in areas suburban to existing centers of population, but who will not need to acquire large tracts of land under the existing homestead or other public-land laws. It would seem advisable, therefore, to extend the operation of this beneficial legislation to the Territory of Alaska to anticipate these demands.

Another purpose of the proposed amendment is to permit employees of this Department, stationed in Alaska, to acquire a home site or camp site under this act, notwithstanding their connection with this Department. It is a sound policy not to allow employees of this Department to acquire an interest in resources and lands administered by it. I can see no objection, however, to allowing a Government employee in Alaska, where there is little privately owned land except in the few cities and towns, to acquire a small tract of land of a few acres for his own use on the same terms as the general public.

I have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

COST OF FARM LABOR—PARITY PRICES FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference. The bill relates to the present farm parity formula. The bill, if enacted, would change the present farm parity formula in two particulars. The first provision would modernize the base period in that it would change the base period from 1909 to 1914 to the years 1919 to 1929, the most recent period in farming when the country has had an era of, I might say, natural activity. Since 1929 we have had depression and war, and the farming occupation has been managed and controlled by legislation so the era has not been a natural one.

The second provision proposes to direct the Department of Agriculture to consider farm labor in making up the farm parity formula.

The third provision of the bill is that it shall not become effective until 3 months after the termination of the war.

Mr. President, the bill is introduced in order that we may have time to study the whole problem, and I hope we may work out a satisfactory amendment and have the proposed legislation passed by the Congress and ready for operation when the war is over.

I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD in full at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 507) to provide for a new base period, and for considering increases in the cost of farm labor, in determining parity prices for agricultural commodities, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of determining and publishing parity prices as provided by law in the case of agricultural commodities, the base period shall be the period July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1929 (base period for tobacco), in lieu of the period

heretofore fixed by law; and the parity prices determined and published for agricultural commodities shall also reflect the cost of all farm labor (on the basis of the national average and including hired workers, farm operators, and members of families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), as contrasted with the cost of all farm labor during the base period: *Provided*, That this act shall not take effect until 90 days after the termination of the war between the Allied and Axis Powers.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement with respect to the Future Farmers of America.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

During the present week the national officers of the Future Farmers of America have visited Washington. The Future Farmers of America is the national organization of farm boys studying vocational agriculture in our public high schools. This agricultural-education program administered by the Agricultural Education Service of the United States Office of Education is made available through the National Vocational Education Acts. There are at the present time more than 200,000 active members in 6,500 local chapters in the continental United States, the Territory of Hawaii, and the island of Puerto Rico. The organization, which these boys serve as officers, has rendered outstanding service to our country during these war years. By working together, members of the F. F. A. collected 62,000,000 pounds of scrap, purchased more than $8,000,000 worth of War bonds, produced tremendous quantities of food for victory, repaired 245,000 farm machines in the school-farm shops, processed more than 2,000,000 cans of food in food-conservation centers, and performed other essential wartime activities. The organization is proud of the fact that approximately 150,000 members are serving in the armed forces of their country.

The major objectives of the Future Farmers of America are to develop agricultural leadership, cooperation, citizenship, improved farming, and patriotism. Members of the organization are striving to live up to their challenging motto, "Learning to do. Doing to learn. Earning to live. Living to serve."

I am pleased that the national president, Oliver H. Kinzie, is from my State of Oklahoma. The national first vice president is Sigvald J. Sandberg, of Minnesota. The national second vice president is David B. Jameson, of Pennsylvania. The national third vice president is Merrill J. Hallam, of Utah. The national fourth vice president is Tom Vaughan, of Tennessee. The national student secretary is George C. Fry, of Maryland.

Oliver H. Kinzie was elected national president at the national convention of the Future Farmers of America at Kansas City, Mo., last October. His record of achievement is typical of that of many of the other national officers present and the entire membership of the Future Farmers of America. He studied vocational agriculture in the Cushing, Okla., High School for 4 years. During his membership in the Future Farmers of America he has served in many positions of leadership in the organization. These include secretary, vice president, and president of the Cushing, Okla., chapter and vice president of the Oklahoma State Future Farmers of America Association prior to his election as national president. Oliver is active in church work, public speaking, and leadership in his home community.

During his 4 years in vocational agriculture, Oliver developed an outstanding supervised-farming program. He has total assets of more than $5,000 earned principally from his supervised-farming program. From a small beginning Oliver has grown into the business of dairy farming. He has 23 head of registered Jersey cattle, 26 head of registered Duroc hogs, and 2 beef cattle. Last year he produced 56 acres of oats and 20 acres of grain sorghums. He holds a substantial partnership interest in a complete outfit of farming equipment.

Boys like these, who are studying to become scientific farmers and leaders of rural America, are helping to build a new and better day for farming and rural life.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1429) to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DEFERMENT OF FARM WORKERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments relating to the deferment of farm labor and ask unanimous consent that I may address myself briefly to the subject matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a great many of us have recently been concerned over the action of the Selective Service System in dealing with an act of Congress having to do with the deferment of essential farm workers for whom there were no replacements to carry on farm work. That act, known as the Tydings amendment, was passed by Congress formally in 1942, as I recall. It was passed unanimously by the Senate and by the House of Representatives, and was signed by the President.

The act itself is a very brief statement of policy on the part of the Congress, and I should like to read it so that every Senator may be familiar with it for the purpose of this discussion. The act reads:

Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

Mr. President, that means, in the plainest language that could be used, that if a man is regularly employed in an agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort he cannot be drafted until a replacement is found for him. That that was the intent was ably brought out by some 20 or 30 Senators who took part in the debate and who favored the amendment, and I do not believe clearer language could be employed to convey such an intent. However, I am shocked to learn that that act of Congress is to be set aside by executive edict—not by the President, but by one in charge of one of the departments.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will allow me first to read the order, then I will yield to him.

Mr. REED. I was going to suggest to the Senator from Maryland that before he reads the printed statement issued by the Selective Service System I should like to call his attention to a directive issued by General Hershey, of the Selective Service, on January 3 preceding the document which the Senator has in his hand.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be delighted to have the Senator do so.

Mr. REED. On January 3 of this year General Hershey addressed to all State directors a letter, the concluding language of which is as follows:

In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II–C, local boards will consider the President's finding—

I call the attention of the Senator from Maryland to that particularly—

will consider the President's finding that—

Now I read what General Hershey quotes as the President's finding—

further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men.

Does the Senator from Maryland find in the language of the Tydings amendment anywhere a direction or authority or permission or requirement of the local draft board to give consideration to the need of the Army for men?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Kansas and all other Senators know that the head of the Selective Service System cannot do anything except in accordance with the acts of Congress. He cannot on his own motion draft anybody for the military service. He can only draft those within age limits and restrictions fixed by the Congress. He has no more authority to draft a man for the military service than I have, unless he is given the authority by law. Therefore my answer to the Senator is that what he has just read, contravening as it does the act of Congress, is worthless, and the fact that a Government official occupies a high position does not make his action any more valid than if he were a mere justice of the peace.

I should like to say for General Hershey—and I have had numerous dealings with him—that I have found him to be a very able man, who, until this recent action, it seemed to me was trying to stay within the acts of Congress and to perform at the same time a very arduous and difficult task, namely to supply men for our armed forces. That is the reason I feel all the more shocked that in this sweeping order, a part of which the Senator from Kansas read,

and the remainder of which I shall shortly read, the whole amendment known as the Tydings amendment has been completely brushed aside insofar as what General Hershey said is concerned. Actually the Tydings amendment is just as valid and effective today as it was the day it was signed. No man coming within the provisions of the Tydings amendment can be drafted for any service until Congress changes the policy it adopted at the time it enacted that amendment, and the Tydings amendment provides that if a man is regularly employed in an essential agricultural endeavor he cannot be taken for any other service unless a replacement for him shall first be found.

Mr. President, following what the Senator from Kansas just read, I wish to say that I hold in my hand a pamphlet known as Selective Service, on the second page of which appears a supposed editorial, which is nothing more nor less, as it is published by the Selective Service System, than an instruction to the draft boards of the country. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be published in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Selective Service System has the job of furnishing 750,000 acceptable men to the land and naval forces before July 1, 1945. These men should be the best that can be made available as combat replacements. In recent months the armed forces have repeatedly stressed their extreme need for young men. The supply of men 18 through 29 and of the types essential to the successful prosecution of the war by the armed forces is most limited. It is evident that there are insufficient men below 26 years of age to meet the calls which will be placed upon the local boards.

The continued production of the munitions of war and of food must be maintained. This production can and must be maintained by the use of the least possible number of deferred men within the age group 18 through 29, and of the physical standards required by the armed forces.

The decision for each registrant must be made initially by his local board. The members of these local boards are most familiar with the Selective Training and Service Act; they know the regulations; they have detailed information of the part that each registrant has played in support of the war since Pearl Harbor. To a most unusual degree the local boards have the confidence of the people, the President, the Congress, and the judiciary.

During this month certain coordinated steps have been taken by the Government to aid in the procurement of suitable young men for the armed forces and to assist in the continued production of the munitions of war. Local board memorandum No. 115–I provides measures to reduce the withdrawal of men from war industries for reasons other than induction, as well as provisions which generally tighten the requirements for deferment in the older age groups, particularly 26 through 29.

In my letter of January 15 and the list accompanying it, I transmitted to the local and appeal boards the best information available as to the activities that are essential or critical and the priority of withdrawals of men in the 26 through 29 age group from these activities. The number of men to be inducted from those now deferred in II–A or II–B in the 26 through 29 year age group will depend on the number that can be made available from those in the younger age group, 18 through 25, and those reaching 18 years each month.

In this younger age group there can be some recovery of men for the armed forces from those who have been heretofore rejected for military service. There will be some now deferred in II–A or II–B who have completed the critical work for which they were deferred or for whom satisfactory replacements can be made available. The numbers in II–A or II–B below 26, however, are not substantial when the merchant marine deferments are deducted. The necessity for men to man the ships in our merchant marine is disputed by no one. If the measures provided in local board memorandum No. 115–I effectively stabilize male labor in the older age groups, it may be possible to gradually withdraw for induction physically acceptable young men from the merchant marine.

Regardless of these measures the necessity of finding all available men under 26 requires the most careful screening of all such men.

Many individuals believe that section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act (the Tydings amendment) creates an exemption for farmers, but, as you well know, the amendment prescribes the requirements that a man must meet for agricultural deferment and does not provide an exemption from military service. It vests in the local boards the duty of determining, in the case of each registrant, whether or not such registrant meets the requirements of law after a full consideration of all of the pertinent facts. These facts include the extent the registrant is engaged in agriculture, how essential in the war effort are the products of his efforts, how necessary is he to this production, and whether there is a replacement available.

The urgent present need for young men by the armed forces cannot fail to be a factor which the local boards must weigh in considering deferment from service. The act of which section 5 (k) is a part was passed, in the words of the act itself, because "the Congress hereby declares that it is imperative to increase and train the personnel of the armed forces of the United States."

The local boards are ever conscious that their primary job has always been to procure men of the right age and type for the land and naval forces. They have considered always that the fundamental policy of Congress was expressed in these words, "The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of military training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective, compulsory military training and service."

The Congress originally delegated to the President the power to issue regulations to govern deferments; it later provided by the Tydings amendment the method to be used in determining whether or not a registrant should be given an agricultural deferment. Neither of these provisions change the fundamental purpose of the act, which was to provide men for the armed forces, or the basic principle of a fair and just system of selective, compulsory military training and service.

State director advice No. 288 provided information which had been furnished by the Secretaries of War and Navy, by the Chairman of the War Production Board, and War Food Administrator. It includes a finding by the President that the need for all of the men now agriculturally deferred in II–C under 26 years of age is not as essential to the war effort as is the need for young men in the armed forces. It was stated that the President felt that in view of existing conditions, agriculture, like other war industries with few exceptions, can be carried on by those above 26.

The purpose of State director advice No. 288 was to provide the information as to the current urgent needs of the armed forces and the relative needs of agriculture to the local boards for their most serious consideration. It did not seem to me at that time necessary to indicate that there was no intention to annul, to change, or to ignore the provisions of the Tydings amendment, as State director advice No. 288 specifically stated: "The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

There was no intent, I am sure, on the part of the President, or the Director of Selective Service, to direct a classification in any particular case or any type of cases. The effort was to bring to each member of the Selective Service System full information concerning the present situation in the words of those primarily responsible for the prosecution of the war. The duty then rested on the local board to consider each case and decide which registrants still met the requirements of the law for agricultural deferment.

I am aware of the tremendous responsibilities which the necessities of war now place upon local board members. I am aware of the great fund of good judgment and fortitude which local board members have displayed for more than 4 years. I am reassured by the knowledge that when you have weighed all of the factors you will, pursuant to the provisions of the Tydings amendment, render your own judgment to defer or not to defer consistent with the needs today of the armed forces for young fighting men.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director of Selective Service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it will be found that the third, the fifth, the seventh, and the ninth paragraphs, particularly, of the editorial in effect say, "It does not make any difference whether a man is employed on a farm in an essential agricultural endeavor, and whether or not no replacement for him is available; if the draft board wants to draft him I say, 'Go to it.'"

That is exactly what the language means.

Mr. President, I do not believe Congress is going to stand for that sort of interpretation of its clear and express purpose in this matter, not only because of the merits of the legislation itself, inherent, in my opinion, in its wording and in the circumstances which now confront the country, but because the Congress will not be worth its salt unless it shall see to it that its acts are respected by those in executive position who are called upon to administer and enforce them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REED. To reinforce what the Senator has said, though it really needs no reinforcement, I hesitate to refer to the Constitution of the United States in the presence of so many distinguished lawyers, but in the Constitution I find only this language in regard to the Army:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to raise and support armies.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. President, we can simplify this situation in a few sentences without oversimplifying it. We all know that in this Government the Congress defines policy. It declares war; it supports and maintains armies, and so forth, and so on.

There is another branch to execute the policies promulgated by the Congress. In the instant case the language of the so-called Tydings amendment is clear beyond any possibility other than deliberate misinterpretation, no matter what expediency or the exigency of the moment may indicate to be wise to some officers of the Government. In other words, if Congress wants to modify or rephrase or restate its position as to essential agricultural workers for whom there is no replacement in the community, Congress can do so, but no one else, not even the President of the United States, can do so until Congress acts. I do not think anyone will challenge the accuracy of that statement. In this instance Congress has definitely spoken.

The draft boards of the country are confused. For nearly 3 years they have been carrying out the program as outlined by Congress. While there may have been some inequalities or injustices here and there, we all know and must admit that in the main the so-called Tydings amendment has been as reasonably and fairly interpreted as has any other act passed by Congress during the course of this war. Now we have a total striking down of that amendment, not by us, not even by the President of the United States, but by the head of the Selective Service System. I know that the pressure on General Hershey to provide men is tremendous and I sympathize with him. The way to obtain a change in anything we may have done so as to accommodate the country to the situation is by a new policy of the Congress; but so long as the policy of the Congress remains unchanged it must be interpreted as it has been interpreted up to now.

When the amendment was under consideration, in order to prevent any evasion of military service, a number of us, Democrats and Republicans, met with General Hershey for several days in the office of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and there we worked out with General Hershey a program under which an essential farm worker not only had to be employed but he had to produce a minimum number of units in order to show that he was regularly employed and essential to the war effort. If he did not produce the required number of units, then, even though he were regularly employed, he could be drafted. We went as far as we could go. Subsequent to that time the unit system was revised and modernized in the light of experience; but now, even though a man may milk 40 cows twice a day, feed them, and take care of them, and although he may now be deferred because he is doing that work, even though there is no replacement for him in the community, General Heshey says "draft him anyway."

What is to become of the man's dairy herd? It will be totally worthless. There is no provision to compensate him. If this policy were carried out willy nilly—and the editorial seems to indicate that it is the wish to carry it out—it would wreck American agriculture, and a shortage of food would ensue. Every Senator who comes from a farming State knows that statement to be true.

The Tydings amendment has not excused millions of men from the armed services. The number deferred has been very modest indeed—far more so than I expected. Why? Because, in addition to consideration by the local draft boards, there is consideration in the farming counties by the farm boards, food boards, or whatever they may be called. They first investigate the case as practical farmers to see whether or not a man is essential, to ascertain whether or not he is producing the minimum number of units, and whether or not there is a replacement for him in the community.

I am hopeful that before the compulsory service bill comes before the Senate for consideration the Selective Service System will see fit to interpret this amendment exactly as it was written by the Congress. If it is not so interpreted, they may find that they have opened up a Pandora's box, for legislation will undoubtedly be introduced in this body to make certain that the farmer is not stripped of his essential labor. I serve notice, not in a threatening manner, that when that bill comes before the Senate, if there is not a change in attitude, if there is not a desire to carry out the law enacted by Congress, I have on my desk an amendment which I think will cure the situation, and which I shall offer with reluctance as a last resort.

Senators have come to me with amendments proposing to defer all agricultural workers from now on because the farms have already been stripped of labor to a considerable extent, and there is considerable support for an amendment of that kind. In my judgment, that would be a mistake. I believe that all men whom the Army and Navy need and who can possibly be spared from the farms should be permitted to go into the armed forces. No man should be permitted to remain on the farm if his services there can possibly be dispensed with. That was the intention of the so-called Tydings amendment .

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that if he has any idea that General Hershey is going to give effect to the Tydings amendment I believe he is sadly mistaken. Last week I submitted a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, providing for an inquiry into this matter. Question arose as to the jurisdiction of committees. Last Saturday a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry met. I am not a member of that committee. General Hershey was present, and I discussed with him the document which the Senator holds in his hand, of which I have a copy. General Hershey made it clear that he had no intention of carrying out the Tydings amendment by the deferment of essential farm workers until they can be replaced.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Maryland——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me interrupt to point out to the Senator that the Tydings amendment was enacted by Congress subsequent to the enactment of the Selective Service Act. As it postdates the passage of that act, it takes precedence over anything in the act which is in conflict with it. So anything that may have been done before Congress formally went on record with regard to the deferment of essential farm labor cannot be set up as a means of evasion. Such a policy is not good law or good sense.

Mr. REED. As the Senator has indicated, there are half a dozen places in the so-called editorial to which I called General Hershey's attention. I discussed them with him. I am sure that the Senator from Maryland is familiar with the portions of the editorial to which I refer. I hope he will discuss briefly some of the statements which General Hershey has made, which are intended to be controlling upon the local selective service boards.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate at this unusual hour to discuss this question at length. The only reason I do so at all is that this matter is coming to a head. It has far-reaching ramifications, and time is of the essence. To illustrate, let me read a paragraph from the editorial:

> The urgent present need for young men by the armed forces cannot fail to be a factor which the local boards must weigh in considering deferment from service. The act of which section 5 (k) is a part was passed in the words of the act itself because "the Congress hereby declares that it is imperative to increase and train the personnel of the armed forces of the United States."

There an attempt is being made by a disingenuous approach to this whole matter to make it appear that, because the Congress said, in enacting the draft law, that we needed a large army, even though the Tydings amendment was adopted subsequently, the original declaration still stands regardless of any qualification written into the law by the Tydings amendment.

Mr. President, let me sum up the situation. The Congress is watching. Shortly there will come before the Senate for consideration a measure having to do with compulsory service in work of various kinds. I do not know what form that measure will take. Perhaps it will not come before us at all. If it does not, a rider will be offered as an amendment to some other bill. Shortly there will be legislation much more drastic, in my judgment, than any amendment which I might offer, because those engaged in agriculture are reaching the conclusion, rather reluctantly, that the Tydings amendment is to be disregarded, even though Congress has not changed its policy, and that men are to be taken willy-nilly, without regard to the declared purposes of Congress.

I am hopeful that within the next week we may have such clarifying interpretation by the Selective Service System that there will be no need for further clarification. Otherwise, some of us will attempt to clarify the situation in Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has not the Congress some method of control over an officer such as General Hershey, whereby we can prevent boys who should not be taken from being taken, before a new bill is enacted into law?

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe we can find a way to take care of the situation. I believe in giving everyone a chance. Certainly we do not want anything that Congress has not said we shall have. In my humble judgment we are entitled to what Congress has said we shall have; and if we do not get it, we will certainly find means to get it. I say that not in the sense of making a threat, but because I believe the Congress of the United States owes it to itself to demand complete respect for its own acts.

It is just as wrong to violate one law of the Congress as it is to violate any other law. The necessities of war do not excuse violation of the law. When Congress has had time to consider a question, and has defined a policy, that policy is the law of the land. So far as I know, we have not yet reached the point where edicts can set aside the law of the land.

Mr. LANGER. In my State farmers are renting their farms or abandoning them, because farm labor is being taken. That situation also prevails in eastern Montana. My mail contains many letters from farmers saying that they simply cannot continue farming unless the boys are left on the farm.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I apologize for the time I have taken, but I feel justified because of the importance of this question. I send to the desk the two amendments to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 36) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. TYDINGS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF AGRICULTURAL DEFERMENTS—THE SO-CALLED TYDINGS AMENDMENT

Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WHERRY) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in order that there may be no further misinterpretation of the will and the desire of the Congress in enacting subsection K, section 305, title 50, United States Code, commonly known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, Congress reaffirms the necessity to our war effort of said subsection K and again expresses its will and desire that the local selective-service board, in classifying the registrant, observe subsection K, and concern itself solely with the registrant's essentiality to an agricultural occupation or endeavor, and to the question of whether or not a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

That a joint congressional committee of six be appointed, three to be selected by the chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the Senate and three by the chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the House, to determine who is responsible for the wholesale induction of essential farmers and farm workers where no replacements are available, in violation of the Tydings amendment, and to determine the effect of such induction upon agricultural production and upon the war effort, and to return its findings to the Congress at the earliest possible date.

ELECTION OF LESLIE L. BIFFLE AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to offer a resolution which I suppose is a privileged matter. Before I offer it I desire to make a brief statement.

We in the Senate understand the value of loyal service to the Senate and to the country by those who serve in offices to which they are not elected by the people, those who never or rarely ever get their names in the newspapers because of anything they have said or done. Yet the wheels of legislation could not turn and the intelligent consideration of legislation would be impossible if it were not for these public servants of ours who year after year and even decade after decade serve in the humbler walks, as we might say, who walk in the shadows where the sun of publicity never beats. We had an instance of that the other day when we lost our great Secretary of the Senate, Colonel Halsey, who had served the Senate for 48 years, rising from page to the secretaryship. We have an example of it here in persons like John Crockett, who has been here for so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, and I hope that will continue to be the case for a long time. We have an example of it in Carl Loeffler, on the other side of the aisle, who I think has been here since 1889. That means 56 years of continuous service in the Senate.

We have another example of that in the personality of the man who for a number of years has been the secretary of the majority. I do not like to indulge in extravagant praise, and I am not ordinarily given to the use of hyperbolical language, but I believe I am well within the truth when I say that I think Members on both sides of the aisle will agree that never within our recollection has there been a more efficient, loyal, alert, intelligent servant of the Senate than Mr. Leslie Biffle, who has been here a long time. He came to Washington years ago as secretary to a Member of the House of Representatives. Subsequently, he became secretary to one or more Senators from Arkansas. Thereafter he was superintendent of the folding room for a number of years. Since 1933 he has been the secretary to the majority of the Senate. A few days ago he was elected Acting Secretary of the Senate, because there had to be a Secretary at once, so that the ordinary routine of the Senate might be carried on through the Secretary's office.

I have been directed by the unanimous vote of the majority conference to present his name for election as Secretary of the Senate. I offer his name not only with pleasure and satisfaction; I offer it as a matter of great pride. He has made the job he has held here almost indispensable, as he had made himself; for if I may say so, he has become one of the most indispensable, if not the most indispensable, of all persons within the entire service of the Senate, especially to the majority and to the majority leader. I am sure the minority leader and the minority Members of the Senate will also join in the statement that no more courteous, efficient, loyal, devoted, or intelligent man has served the Senate of the United States within the recollection of any of us here. It gives me great pleasure to send to the desk a resolution providing for his election as Secretary of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Kentucky will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was read, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to its consideration, as follows:

Resolved, That Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, no resolution could have been submitted by a Member on the majority side of the Senate which could give greater satisfaction to those of us upon the minority side, and which would have more complete approval, than does the pending resolution. I shall not state how long I have known the Senate of the United States. I am sure I do not look that old, and no one would believe me if I stated the number of years. But during the entire span of time in which as a boy, a young man, and later as a Member of the Congress, I watched the Senate and the other House of Congress, no man ever served more faithfully, more efficiently, and with greater effectiveness, than has Mr. Biffle in the various capacities which he has filled under the present majority. I express my great personal admiration for him, and my great respect for the manner in which he has met his obligations. But beyond all that, I express a deep sense of obligation for the consideration shown me and for the many kindnesses which have moved from him to me. If I may do so, I wish to second the suggestion of the majority leader and express the hope that the selection of Mr. Biffle may be the unanimous choice of the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that I endorse all the statements which he has made with regard to Leslie Biffle; but Leslie Biffle is so darned smart, and has served the Democrats so well in getting them into the Chamber on close roll-call votes, that it has made me somewhat hesitant in voting for him as Secretary of the Senate. However, I have overcome my hesitancy and hope that there will be no dissenting vote against him, because he is all that the Senator from Kentucky has stated.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I have been a Member of the United States Senate a little more than 2 years. Therefore I do not have knowledge of all the services which have been rendered by Mr. Biffle, but I should feel remiss in my duty today if I did not state that ever since I became a Member of the Senate Leslie Biffle has been as courteous and considerate to me, as one sitting on this

side of the aisle, as he has been to Members sitting on the other side of the aisle.

I should like also to state that we in the Senate are peculiarly fortunate in that the majority party has seen fit to select Mr. Biffle to be Secretary of the Senate. We are fortunate in having a man like him to replace so promptly the able, efficient, and patriotic American, the late Col. Edwin A. Halsey, who served so faithfully and well as Secretary of the Senate for a period of 12 years. We know that death is no more mysterious than birth; we know that a thousand years are as a day when they shall have passed, and that things must change as we move along the highway of life. I think it is to the credit of the Democratic Party and the entire Senate to have trained a man like Mr. Biffle so that the important duties and responsibilities of the office of Secretary of the Senate can now be reposed in the custody of such a fine and able American citizen, who, I am sure, will render distinguished service to this body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was unanimously agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Biffle will present himself at the desk and take the oath of office.

Mr. Leslie L. Biffle advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 70) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, as Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 71) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, as Secretary of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF COURT MARTIAL OF PVT. HENRY P. WEBER

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution asking that the Committee on Military Affairs or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, make a full and complete investigation in respect to the court-martial proceedings at Camp Roberts, Calif., in the case of Pvt. Henry P. Weber.

Let me say that since I made a statement regarding this matter on the floor of the Senate on Monday last suggesting an investigation of this case, letters have been coming in from many sections of the United States and Canada.

All those who telegraphed or wrote were shocked because of the heavy sentence imposed on this boy. Many felt that he never should have been in the Army, but rather should have been in a camp for conscientious objectors.

The fact that the sentence was reduced to life imprisonment at hard labor does not excuse in any way the action of the court martial in the case, especially when the fact is considered that many of the soldiers who were engaged in the black market in France were merely given comparatively short prison terms. I think it will be generally agreed that the act of a soldier in dealing in the black market, thereby jeopardizing the health and happiness of his fellow servicemen, is far more serious than the act of this one lone private who refused to drill because of his deep conviction that he could not kill, but who had aided his country by working in the Kaiser shipyards and who, upon being taken into the Army, had asked assignment to a medical unit so he would not have to kill.

Let me say that I am not at all opposed to disciplining soldiers who violate the rules of the Army, but certainly to sentence a man to be hanged or to life imprisonment under the circumstances surrounding the case of Private Weber is wrong, and the matter should be thoroughly investigated by the Military Affairs Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution (S. Res. 72) was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the court-martial proceedings at Camp Roberts, Calif., in the case of Pvt. Henry P. Weber, with a view to ascertaining whether the sentence imposed pursuant to such proceedings was reasonable and proper, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SUPERVISION OVER GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation in order to determine whether the General Accounting Office, under its present organization, can properly carry out the functions, as an agency of the Congress, of maintaining constant supervision over expenditures in the executive agencies of the Government and of reporting, at least once each month and more often if required, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to the questions hereinafter specified; and the said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make from time to time full and complete studies and investigations in order to determine (a) whether funds appropriated to the various governmental departments and agencies are being properly and economically expended; (b) whether there are duplications of services and efforts by such departments and agencies and, if so, means for eliminating such duplication; (c) whether services of such departments and agencies can be reorganized so as to increase efficiency; (d) whether agencies interested with the recapture of large sums of money have properly functioned, and whether such sums due the Government have been recaptured; and (e) whether contracts entered into by the various agencies of the Government have been in compliance with existing law. The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time at the earliest practicable dates the results of its studies, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of these investigations, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PAN-AMERICAN HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. CONNALLY (for Mr. ANDREWS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 74), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Pan American Highway Congress has, from time to time, by resolution called to the attention of the governments of the American republics the need for a study of the pan-American highway system, with a view to the extension and connection of the trunk highways of each country, including, where needful and practicable, connection by oceangoing ferries; and

Whereas the potential benefits of such extensions and the interconnection of the highway systems of the American republics, including the island republics, appear to merit thorough study: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or a subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a study of all questions which the said committee may consider as germane to the proposal to connect the highway systems of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Panama Canal Zone with existing or proposed highways of other American republics by means of oceangoing ferries. The study hereby authorized shall include, but shall not be necessarily limited to (1) the development of a comprehensive plan, including the location of road and ferry routes and termini considered by the committee as needful or desirable to effectuate an over-all, connected,

inter-American highway system; (2) the respective views of the interested governments with regard to such a plan, and the extent to which each of such governments would cooperate in its execution and operation; (3) estimates of the cost of surveys, construction, maintenance, and operation of roads, ferries, and ferry termini, and estimates of revenues reasonably to be anticipated from the operation of the ferries proposed; (4) a study of the questions of design, construction, financing, ownership, control, and operation of ferries and ferry termini proposed; (5) contributions of the plan to the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere, the growth of amity between the American republics, and the development of hemispherical solidarity; (6) the benefits from the plan which would accrue to trade and industry; and (7) the cultural and educational benefits reasonably to be anticipated.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the study hereby authorized, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to designate and request one member of each of the following-named standing committees of the Senate to act as adviser to the Committee on Foreign Relations or a subcommittee thereof; viz: The Committees on Commerce, Finance, Immigration, Manufactures, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Post Offices and Post Roads, Territories and Insular Affairs.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the study hereby authorized, the Committee on Foreign Relations, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof is authorized (1) to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stencgraphic services to report hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words; (2) to employ and fix the compensation of such counsel, experts, and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in carrying out the purposes of this resolution; (3) to request the use of services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 4. On or before December 31, 1945, the Committee on Foreign Relations shall make a report to the Senate of its findings as a result of the study authorized and directed hereby, together with its recommendations, including recommendations, if any, as to the nature and form of any legislation deemed by the committee to be advisable in the premises.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee, or any duly appointed subcommittee, incurred pursuant to the authority granted in section 3 hereof, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate.

MANPOWER AND OTHER NEEDS AT THE BATTLE FRONTS—EDITORIAL FROM STARS AND STRIPES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to read an editorial which appeared in the Paris edition of Stars and Stripes, published on February 7, 1945. The thoughts are those of the men in our front lines. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I hope we will act without delay to aid them by passing the necessary legislation. They are offering their lives. All of us at home must assist to the limit of our ability. The editorial reads as follows:

Sure the news is good. No doubt about it. "West wall cracked again," reads one headline. "Soviets cross Oder," says another; "Half of Manila liberated by United States forces," reads a third.

To many readers here and at home the war must seem on ice. That's exactly where it is—ice that's thick in some places, thin in others. Nothing but a film in the middle and still open water most of the way.

Happy optimism is one sure way to delay the day when the ice will be crossed, when we reach the other side to victory.

Victory depends on blood, not ice; that's why for our money the really good news in the paper was the squib on the manpower bill. "It would tell our fighting men," said Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, "that they will get the weapons and supplies that they must have and the men."

You can say that again, Mr. Patterson. This war won't be won by good news, by optimism, by headlines, by wishful thinking.

Take it from the writer of this editorial, Mr. Patterson, he's fought in the mud and the blood of the Ruhr; what the front needs is men and more men, weapons and more weapons; supplies and more supplies; everything and all that American manpower and industry can feed it. Everything and all.

They call the proposed manpower law the May bill. That name ought to be changed. There can't be any may about it. "Must" is the word.

COAL-MINE PRODUCTION IN 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the almost miraculous production record of American industry, for which both management and labor share the credit, has been an outstanding achievement in this war and one to which the whole world has paid tribute. Both our allies and our enemies are aware that the tremendous weight of American arms, munitions, shipping, planes, foodstuffs, and so forth, has been a decisive factor. These vast quantities of supplies together with the valor of our fighting men are recognized by the entire world as having made a contribution to victory that has earned for this Nation the right to take a place inferior to none in the councils of the world.

Occupying a foremost place in the great American production record is the vital coal industry which has exceeded all previous records of tonnage mined with fewer coal miners and in spite of grave obstacles caused by bureaucratic fumbling. Coal is the basic fuel for all of our war industries and without plenty of it production could not possibly be maintained or increased.

I take special pride in citing the record of the miners of my own State of Montana, who in 1944 produced an estimated 4,700,000 tons. This figure is a Bureau of Mines preliminary estimate and it is likely the final total will show 100,000 tons more for 1944, or upward of 4,800,000 tons. This would be almost 1,000,000 tons more in 1944 than was mined in Montana in 1942.

The man-day per-capita production of Montana miners for all classes of mining is the highest of any State in the Union, averaging 11.85 tons per man per day in bituminous coal mines. Such is the official average reported by the Bureau of Mines for the year 1942. The combined average for both bituminous and lignite is 11.57 tons per man per day.

During 1944, Montana lost a considerable number of miners. What is more, shipment of higher-quality coals on subsidized freight rates by the Government to Seattle territory of approximately 3,000,000 tons shut off possible increased markets for Montana coal. The subsidized freight rate averages from $18 to $20 a ton.

This excellent record of the Montana miners is representative of that of all coal miners everywhere in the Nation, who toiled unremittantly through 1944 to supply this fuel in greater quantities than ever before produced in any single year, for our home industries and our allies. This was achieved despite the serious drains of manpower of the mines, through Selective Service and other industries, which left the working forces in bituminous and anthracite mines more than 100,000 below pre-war years. Official figures show that even with reduced number of miners, there was produced in 1944, 684,500,000 tons of anthracite and bituminous coal—more than the combined production of the rest of the world. Bituminous totaled 620,000,000 tons, an increase of 31,000,000 tons over 1943. Anthracite totaled 64,500,000 tons, an increase of 4,000,000 tons over 1943. Once again in 1944 coal miners sacrificed their vacation period and worked the extra hours required of them, sometimes in exceedingly dangerous conditions due to absence of safety devices and proper ventilation. Illustrating the hazards of the industry, there were 934 miners killed in the first 9 months of the year.

Not only have the miners served the Nation well in producing coal, but from their ranks have come thousands of our most heroic fighting men. On the service flag of the United Mine Workers of America there are 2,345 gold stars, indicating men lost while in action, and there are 130,136 serving in the American forces. The United Mine Workers and their membership have also purchased a total of $170,617,330 in United States and Canadian War bonds. Contributions to the war relief agencies aggregate $3,603,293. Both these figures have been increased considerably in recent months and the total will range several thousand above the figure cited.

This accomplishment of the American coal miners came about despite malign interferences with free collective bargaining in the industry and efforts to

deny mine workers just wage demands by chaining them to a formula that has kept their wages frozen, although living costs have risen outrageously in mining communities. Fortunately, the leadership of the United Mine Workers of America was able to preserve collective bargaining against the assaults of those who lacked understanding of the fact that the institution of free collective bargaining is the basis for the fruitful production effort that has been achieved.

Throughout the year there has been a flood of press releases and statements from Government and coal operators and political sources designed to create confusion in the public mind and to obscure the great record that American coal miners have made in this war.

It is to their everlasting credit that the miners have gone ahead disregarding the petty attacks on their organization and on their record, to produce the coal in sufficient quantities not only to supply our own needs but also to ship large amounts abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Much-Maligned American Coal Miners Break All Production Records in 1944," from the United Mine Workers' Journal, volume LVI, No. 1. The article contains an authoritative analysis of the subject to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUCH-MALIGNED AMERICAN COAL MINERS BREAK ALL PRODUCTION RECORDS IN 1944

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Official figures released by the Department of the Interior, on coal production, may be at variance with the totals of 1944 coal production used in this summary, but the fact is that it is many months following the close of the calendar year before correct totals are available. These belated totals invariably add from two to five million additional tons to the totals reported by the Department at the year end.)

American coal miners, and the coal industry as a whole, despite the shenanigans of certain managements, can look their fellow Americans in the eye in the midst of all the claims and counterclaims of manpower shortages, production delays, misdirected efforts, and countless other accusations which have flared of late in official circles as regards alleged shortages of munitions' supplies, and take a bow.

Four hundred seventy-nine thousand bituminous and anthracite miners, responding to the Nation's demand for increased coal production on the home front, and to supply the ever-increasing but undisclosed demands of our allies, literally tore the cover off the ball to establish an all-time production record of 684,500,000 tons in 1944—20,000,000 tons more coal than Government authorities were willing to admit at the start of the year as being obtainable with the decreased manpower available. Such an achievement is something for the boys over there and the war effort at home which the industry has every right to feel proud of and boast about. The industry faced many difficulties and hazards to life and property in the repair and maintenance of old and defective equipment to achieve the result.

There were not quite as many directives and press releases relating to coal issued by the combined Government agencies and operators' associations as there were millions of tons of coal produced, but, looking over the shelf-laden stacks of words, sermons, statistical summaries, and public appeals in this office and without an official count, we judge that it was a close race.

Despite all the directives and, in certain instances, failure of management to function through the medium of joint mine production committees, machinery shortages, lack of repair parts, dwindled manpower, decreased transportation facilities for miners, confused distribution, delayed action, and stalling tactics by Government agencies—purposely planned to avoid validating negotiated wage agreements—lawsuits by some operators to circumvent the law of the land providing "portal to portal" payments, American coal miners patriotically set about to do the job plainly necessary to keep the wheels of American industry and transportation delivering in ever-increasing quantities the implements of war needed to speed victory.

Although the story has been told over and over again, too few people in the United States seem to recognize that without coal—and plenty of it—the war-production effort could not be maintained, to say nothing of being increased month after month.

American coal miners produced in 1944 a total of 684,500,000 tons of anthracite and bituminous coal—more than the combined production of the rest of the world. Bituminous production totaled 620,000,000 tons, an increase of 31,000,000 tons over 1943. Anthracite production totaled 64,500,000 tons, an increase of 4,000,000 tons over 1943. The over-all increase of 35,000,000 tons approximates 5.1 percent.

The 1944 production records were achieved despite a decrease in manpower during the year due to permanent and partial disabilities, retirements, enlistments in the military services, and other causes, of approximately 30,000 men and an increase in the average age of miners employed of 13 years from 32 to 45 years. Demonstrating their loyalty to the Nation's war effort, 15,000 miners over the social-security retirement age of 65, many between the ages of 70 and 80, remained on the job, while others returned to the mines from retirement to take up any available task which could be assigned to them to meet needed coal requirements.

The efficiency of the production efforts of American coal miners in 1944 stands out all the more remarkable when compared with the previous record high established in 1918 during World War No. 1.

In 1918, 613,000 bituminous coal miners produced 579,500,000 tons of coal, while 147,000 anthracite coal miners produced 99,000,000 tons—a total production of 678,500,000 tons by 760,000 miners.

In 1944, 72,000 anthracite miners and 407,000 bituminous miners—a total of 479,000—produced, on a basis of 281,000 fewer men employed, 6,000,000 tons more coal than were produced in 1918, a reduction in manpower of approximately 37 percent—all of which tells the story of why Americans enjoy the cheapest coal produced in the world.

In 1944, as in 1943, coal miners sacrificed their vacation periods, worked holidays in bad air and under dangerous conditions, in some cases where companies flatly refused to install safety devices and improved ventilation, and in others where companies could not obtain the machinery and devices to comply with the safety recommendations of Federal and State mine inspectors.

Coal-mine fatalities for 1944 are not available except for the number killed, which total 934 for the first 9 months, of which 810 deaths were in bituminous and 124 in anthracite. Both fatal and nonfatal accidents have been increasing since 1940, with 61,089 recorded for 1940 and 78,064 for 1943.

All the while the miners were slugging and digging the record 1944 coal production, hardly a week passed that coal associations did not indulge in their favorite pastime of giving out news releases attacking miners for absenteeism. These figures usually included the sick, disabled on compensation, worn-out old men who cannot take it every day, men forced to lay off and take their children to nearby communities for medical care for lack of mine-community doctors, and those absent for many other reasons who should not, in all fairness to American coal miners, be included in honest absenteeism accounting.

Topping all the publicity show and resorting to full-time competition of using the coal industry to get all possible individual news space for personal play, the Solid Fuels Administration seldom let a day pass without grinding out some release containing refigured calculations of an estimated, growing coal shortage. All this was indulged in face of the fact that during many months of 1944 thousands of miners were forced to work short-time because, in the scheme of preferential buying, the coals they mined were snubbed by purchasers and the operators for whom they worked were forced to curtail running-time for lack of orders.

Some of the publicity about "the growing coal shortage," unless understood fully by the trade, would lead one to believe that the coal miners were very negligent and should be blamed for mining inferior coals. In other words, all miners had to do to mine the kind and size of coal that the preferential buyers wanted was simply to follow the course of one in a garden—pick the big tomatoes and pass up the little ones—or exercise the same selectivity in loading coal that the grower does when grading oranges or any other fruit. In fact, we believe the result of these releases which came with such frequency induced many consumers to think that they would be foolish to take whatever was offered them at the time; let it go to the other fellow and they would get the cream of the crop later on.

STORAGE STOCKS HAVE GROWN SINCE WAR BEGAN

Bituminous-coal stocks as of December 1 totaled 65,000,000 tons. Storage stocks of coal are 15,000,000 tons higher now than they were when we entered the war. We believe that, at a minimum, stocks are 7,000,000 tons higher than reported. We don't trust voluntary war estimates of stocks on hand by consumers.

The ability of the American coal industry to supply every need and build up reserve stocks—while every other country in the world has exhibited such a miserable failure in meeting its coal requirements—is but another demonstration of the efficiency of American coal miners.

Early cold December weather which brought rains that flooded mines and snowdrifts that stopped all transportation, closed mines in Pennsylvania, southern West Virginia, and elsewhere for 4 to 5 days, resulting in a production loss of 4,000,000 tons. Many consumers who had postponed adequate storage became anxious buyers, willing to discard their preferential specifications and accept the kind of coals which they refused to buy when many mines were operating on curtailed running time. Such consumers have now rushed and increased spot buying, but there is, however, no over-all coal shortage now, nor will there be one in the immediate months to come.

Lake shipments of coal in 1944 established a new record, in keeping with production, totaling 54,000,000 tons—an increase of 8,300,000 tons over 1943.

Both anthracite and bituminous shipments to New England registered increases, while nearly 3,000,000 tons of coal were shipped from the Midwest territory to the Washington-Oregon region, which constitutes one of the most uneconomic and unlooked-for developments in coal distribution connected with the war effort.

Little publicity is given to shipments of coal to our allies. Just who gets the coal, in whose vessels it is shipped, what the terms are, who pays for it—if anybody—whether on lend-lease or otherwise, constitutes one of

those bureaucratic war-suppressed confidences which the coal industry, and especially the coal miner, is not supposed to know about.

Another partial news black-out, although referred to occasionally, is the constant decrease in transportation facilities available for coal miners to get to and from their work. Then we have mine explosions, which not only take the lives of men but decrease coal production sometimes as high as 5,000 tons a day for months, or maybe a whole year, which are played down; also floods, snowstorms, and influenza epidemics.

All of these important factors in employment and production receive but scant publicity, while the results are played up in the monthly charts of absenteeism and weekly production figures.

Although American coal production in 1944 totals more than all the rest of the world combined, the job of fueling our allies and liberated countries and increased shipping, together with meeting the expanded domestic and manufacturing needs of the United States, as a result of diverting oil and gas, constitutes a load that will eventually "break the camel's back," even though our bureaucratic statesmen in their good-will travels and conferences do not take such a factual result into consideration when they offer our last shirt as convincing proof of America's all-out war effort.

During the course of the past 3 years, international officials of the U. M. W. A. have met and talked with representatives of the coal industry and Government officials representing various nations allied with our war effort. In every case, these representatives have persisted in their inquiry:

"How do you get American coal miners to do the job they are doing?"

In each instance, the representatives of our Allied Nations have confessed their inability to overcome a lag in coal production in their own countries. They have been free to assert that, regardless of all the compulsory efforts taken—conscription, draft threats, arbitrated and enforced wage rates—increased production has not resulted. These men read the statistics of American coal production. Many have visited American coal mines. They witness mechanized development, strip-pit operations, and hand-loading mines and they marvel even at the high rate of production in hand-loading mines. Yet, somehow or other, in the planned economy of their nations, with compulsory arbitration and all the other bulwarks to force workers to produce in a regimented economy, they have become so baffled in their viewpoints that they simply cannot understand how, through the simple operation of a collective-bargaining wage agreement, free from the policing and direction of production by Government agencies, such continuity of operation and production results can possibly be attained.

All of which is another way of saying that wherever free collective bargaining has prevailed in American industry on a Nation-wide basis, such as in the coal industry, the most fruitful productive efforts have followed.

The leadership of the U. M. W. A. had a difficult time in 1943 and on into 1944 in championing the maintenance of free collective bargaining in the American coal industry, the sacrificing of which would have resulted in a far different coal-production story for 1944. It was a hard road for the U. M. W. A. to maintain the present collective-bargaining status in the face of the Government's determination to deny miners just wage demands and shove them about from agency to agency when the preservation of free collective bargaining in the industry meant the salvation of the American war-production effort.

The Government took over nearly all coal mines on several occasions; took over others from time to time. Yet the belief of mine workers in their union, their solidarity in acceptance of the fundamental principle of free collective bargaining, finally resulted in the negotiation of a national wage agreement on a collective-bargaining basis for the coal industry as a whole. This enabled the coal industry to continue with such freedoms as are basically essential to maintain high productive efficiency.

It is generally admitted that American coal miners have been the most maligned of all American workingmen by politicians, the press, and radio. The following appraisal by the S. F. A. of the problems faced and results obtained, culled from a year-end press release, confirms the outstanding 1944 performance of American coal miners:

"The biggest factor in the fuel problem is the lack of manpower and equipment for increasing production as rapidly as requirements have arisen. The coal mines have lost 1 out of every 5 men employed in peace time. And the average age of the coal miner is now 45, 13 years older than before the war.

"To help counteract these conditions, mine working hours have been increased 37 percent. Thousands of inexperienced, physically inferior, or aged men have been recruited for mine work. Many of these are men who had been retired because of age, including a large number now 70 to 80 or more years old. The advanced age of the average coal miner is an important factor, in view of the arduous, dangerous work involved in mining. But despite their handicaps, the preponderance of the coal miners are digging more coal per man each day than at any time in history, and the remainder are also giving a good account of themselves.

"Wherever manpower and materials permitted, mine capacity has been expanded, particularly in the higher-grade coals, for which the need is most acute."

AMERICA'S PLACE IN THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America's Place in the Peace," delivered by him at a civic dinner in Detroit, Mich., on February 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAYING FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "Paying for Public Education," delivered by him in the New York Times Forum on January 23, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RED MASS AT CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY—SERMON BY BISHOP HUNT OF UTAH

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the sermon delivered by the Most Reverend Duane G. Hunt, Bishop of Salt Lake City, Utah, at the Red Mass at the Catholic University on February 4, 1945, and also a brief description of the mass, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE—PORTION OF NINTH ANNUAL REPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the Ninth Annual Report of the Social Security Board having to do with the question of medical care insurance, which appears in the Appendix.]

A. M. ETTESVOLD, TYPICAL MIDWESTERN FARMER

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the record of a survey to determine the most typical midwestern farmer which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN DOLLAR AND THE BRETTON WOODS PLAN—ADDRESS BY DR. E. W. KEMMERER

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The American Dollar and the Bretton Woods Plan," by Dr. E. W. Kemmerer, professor emeritous of international finance, Princeton University, and president of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

CERTIFY LABOR LEADERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE RAILROAD WORKERS JOURNAL

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Certify Labor Leaders," from the January-February 1945 issue of the Railroad Workers Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANPOWER IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two telegrams from Palmer Hoyt, editor of the Portland Oregonian, and an editorial entitled "The Coercion Bill," from the Portland Oregonian of February 4, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

SCHOOL-LUNCH AND MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal assistance in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch and milk programs, and for other purposes. In connection with the introduction of the bill, I desire to say a few words at this time.

All groups concerned with the welfare of children—doctors, educators, nutritionists, child-care agencies, and the leaders of parent groups—have long pointed to the urgent need for an organized program to provide well-planned lunches at school. Many thousands of children, especially those attending the schools from poorer homes, have always had an insufficient supply of food—insufficient in quantity and in essential nutritional elements, or both, causing malnutrition with its dire effects upon mind and body.

At the hearings on school-lunch legislation, held by a Senate committee last May, Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, pointed out that surveys of the situation almost invariably have shown that malnutrition in this country, despite its wealth, is not only widespread, but serious. This, he emphasized, has resulted in retarded growth of children, in increased susceptibility to disease, in retardation of the mental development, and in the production of an adult population much less healthy than we reasonably should expect. He reported that in the opinion of the medical staff of the Selective Service one-half of all men rejected for the draft were rejected because of poor nutrition in childhood, which resulted in lack of physical development and other defects.

I quote a brief extract from Dr. Parran's statement:

The best way of correcting this situation, at least in part, is to make a well-balanced school lunch available to all. That would insure for 5 days of the week, during a school year, at least one good meal a day. Such a

school lunch will have far-reaching influence on the nutritional habits of the child in later life. * * * Probably no experiment the Federal Government could make would have a greater, more beneficial influence on the future health of this country.

Mr. President, educators have frequently pointed to the loss of public money entailed when children stay out of school because they are too ill or listless to go to school or when they are too hungry or undernourished to benefit fully from the education provided. Everywhere teachers testify that not only are children in better health when they can get a good, hot lunch at noon at school but they progress better in their studies; they get more out of their education, and their conduct is improved. This testimony is enthusiastically supported by both parents and welfare workers.

The point naturally arises as to why Federal help to provide good noon meals for all children at school should be pressed now when the Government is plagued with a multiplicity of problems growing out of the war. There are several urgent reasons for this. In the first place, the Federal Government is already involved in the school-lunch program. Instead of proceeding directly to help the schools to supply this important school service, as England and many other progressive nations have done, our Government began to aid school lunches indirectly, first, through seeking worth-while employment for unemployed women; second, through seeking outlets for surplus farm commodities; and third, through making the school lunch an important part of its farm-market price-support program.

As a result of these several Government operations the schools have for several years been motivated to install school-lunch equipment, to provide lunchroom facilities, and to employ school-lunch workers. If the help these schools are receiving from the Federal Government were to be discontinued, many of them would now find it most difficult to carry on. This would result in a serious set-back.

Moreover, many of the school districts, either to secure better educational services or to adjust to war conditions, have consolidated with others, have abandoned small schools, or have changed school bus routes. These consolidations and changes have resulted in children going greater distances to school and in having to spend longer hours away from home. Such children usually leave home early and hurriedly; they often leave without breakfast. Obviously, they cannot go home to eat at noon. Since many of these reorganizations were made because, with Government help, lunches had become available at school, the need for continuing Federal assistance to this program seems clear.

Added to the needs already pointed out for continuing Federal support to school lunches, it should be borne in mind that certain demands for school-lunch programs have grown directly out of the war. Many mothers are now employed in the war industries, and they leave home early in the morning and return late at night, or they work on shifts thus making it difficult or impossible for them to provide well-planned morning and evening meals. They also find it difficult to plan and prepare properly balanced or adequate lunches for their children to take to school. Transportation, shopping, rationing problems have all greatly complicated the processes of providing adequately for the food needs of children. As a result there must be a growing dependence upon school-lunch programs which will give all children an opportunity at the noon hour to buy good lunches at cost, or which will provide part-free or all-free meals to those who are unable fully to pay the cost. To fail to help the schools to provide and maintain school lunches would be disastrous, especially during this critical wartime.

Mr. President, another very important justification for furnishing lunches at school is the fact that opportunities are thereby afforded to provide much needed instruction in nutrition and applied economics. The school lunch, properly directed, becomes an activity through which children learn some of the most important lessons of life; namely, the production, conservation, purchase, preparation, serving, and consuming of foods. But to accomplish these purposes the school lunch must become an integrated part of the entire school program. It must be managed by technically trained supervisors who have the ability not only to put the funds provided to most effective use but to help all the children to secure from the school-lunch program maximum benefits both nutritionally and educationally.

While school lunches were begun in some of the schools of the United States more than 30 years ago, this development has until recently shown a very slow growth. The recent progress in this field is to a large degree due to the various types of assistance given to school lunches by the Federal Government. Yet even today only about one school in three provides this important school service; and only about half of those now providing school lunches receive financial assistance from the Government.

Moreover, it cannot be said with accuracy that the schools which now serve noon lunches, with the aid of the Federal Government, are located in the communities where the children most need lunches at school. The available facts indicate that the installation of most of the school-lunch programs has been achieved as a result of a combination of factors other than need—factors such as the availability of school lunchrooms and equipment, or the funds to procure these facilities. School-lunch programs have been put into effect through the leadership and vision of school officials, socially minded parents, and public service organizations; they have developed where State legislators and other leaders have been far-seeing enough to provide essential appropriations and enabling acts to help organize and maintain school lunches. There is much evidence that aid for school lunches which has come from the Federal Treasury has given great impetus to this development in nearly all the States and has achieved much good. When viewed from the standpoint of the unfulfilled need for this service, it becomes clear that the Government should not only continue and increase its help to school lunches, but that the time has come to enact sound and permanent legislation to the end that all children, and especially those most in need of it, shall be assured of the benefits of this important school service. To be sure, this service always has been, and it should continue to be, largely self-supporting; but well-considered Federal assistance to this program can accomplish far-reaching results in promoting the health and physical fitness of children.

Extensive hearings were conducted last May on the whole question of what constitutes sound Federal legislation to aid school-lunch programs. These hearings resulted in much helpful testimony. Practically all persons appearing before the committee agreed that the excellent results brought about by affording financial aid to school-lunch programs not only justified but made the continuation of such assistance imperative. They were almost unanimous in urging that this type of Government aid be retained, systematized, and made permanent. Many helpful ideas for improving this aid program were suggested. These have now been studied and evaluated. To effect the desired improvements in school-lunch legislation I am now prepared to propose a plan, the high lights of which may be briefly described as follows:

First. The bill I introduce is basically a merger of the outstanding features of S. 1824 and S. 1820, two of the school-lunch bills introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and is receiving wide public support.

Second. It is a "two title" bill. Title I assigns to U. S. D. A. the administration of an initial sum of $65,000,000, increasing to $100,000,000, for aiding school lunches through the distribution of surplus foods, or cash in lieu thereof; title II assigns to the Office of Education $15,000,000 for aiding school lunches through the distribution of funds for the development, administration, and supervision of school lunches, for the training and employing of technical personnel, and for other critical needs.

Third. Apportionment to the States of both sums is to be made according to an objective formula based on the ratio which the number of children 5 to 17, inclusive, bears to the number of adults 20 to 64, inclusive.

Fourth. Title I is to be administered according to agreements made between the Secretary of Agriculture and the State departments of education, and title II is to be administered according to plans made by State education departments with the guidance and approval of the Commissioner of Education. The basic features to be included in the agreements and plans are stipulated in the law.

Fifth. Both titles are designed to make Federal aid to school lunches permanent.

Sixth. The Federal funds used by the States under both titles are to be matched by State or local funds on a differential basis determined by economic ability.

Seventh. Title I provides that $500,000 of the funds appropriated shall be used by the Department of Agriculture for administration and audits. Title II also provides that $200,000 be appropriated to the Office of Education for the purpose of administering and promoting school-lunch and nutrition programs and for auditing the funds spent under this title.

Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that the committee to which the bill will be referred will consider it at once, and report it back to the Senate within a short time.

The bill (S. 503) to provide Federal assistance in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school lunch and milk programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED DRAFTING OF LABOR

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, during the debate this morning concerning the Tydings amendment reference was made to the confusion in the consideration of the manpower problem. This confusion is not new. It can be traced, in a large degree, to the failure of the administration to inform the people adequately of its definite program.

In 1940—for political purposes—the people of America were told that they were not going to be taken into the war, while the administration secretly had drawn up the plans for an army of 11,000,000 men.

Again in 1944, just before the election, by the control of the agencies of propaganda and the organization set up for that purpose, the people were led to believe that all was well. Victory was a matter of hours, and production was at its height in munitions of war and food. Rationing restrictions were drastically relaxed. In fact, there was not the slightest intimation that we were short of men, of materials of war, labor, or food, or essential supplies for the home front.

The President, himself, speaking of the glowing picture of our successes stated at Philadelphia on October 27, 1944:

> Never before in history have the soldiers and sailors of any nation gone into battle so thoroughly trained, so thoroughly equipped, so well fed, and so thoroughly supported as the American soldiers and sailors fighting together in Europe, Asia, and the Pacific.
>
> It all means planning and terms of precisely how many men will be needed and how many ships * * * and how much equipment and what types of equipment, down to the last cartridge, and it has meant getting them all to the right place at the right moment.

But suddenly, when the election was over, it became known that we had been falling short in our production—ration points were canceled without an hour's notice—and then it was revealed that there was a shortage of food, and that even shells had been rationed to our troops at the front line. Now comes the demand that we pass another law stepping further and faster toward complete regimentation of the civilian population of our country—and this at the very hour when MacArthur has retaken Manila and the American and Russian forces are closing in on Berlin.

The very fact that we are considering, at the request of the President, backed up by letters and statements from the heads of our armed forces, a bill designed to draft the labor of the United States for the prosecution of the war, is a terrible indictment against the leadership of our country. The very fact that 7,000,000 men have been sent out of the country to the battle fronts of the world, and more than 4,000,000 in addition are in the various services at home, and there is a lack of civilian production to sustain and maintain them, is proof of the failure of the present administration to give intelligent, inspirational leadership to our free people.

Just think of it. Our Government conscripted the men of the Nation, taking 11,000,000 sons, brothers, husbands, and sweethearts, hurling many of them into the jaws of the machines of war in the hands of vicious enemies and failed to provide sufficient leadership to attract full cooperation of the trained womanhood of our country to bind the wounds of our gallant wounded men. It is an indictment which speaks more eloquently than words of the failure of the national leadership of our beloved land.

There are many people who have believed from the beginning that the present administration, coming into power as it did in the depth of a depression, in the midst of a real emergency, launched its march to unprecedented centralization of power by creating further emergencies, situations, and crises under which Congress is always put in a bad light if it does not yield to the request of the President. He has always astutely developed his demands for more power as being in the best interest of the people. The demand for a draft-labor law is another demand for power.

All of us have great admiration, faith, and confidence in the leaders of our naval and military forces, but we must never lose sight of the fact that the founders of our country, fresh from the tyranny of military abuses, feared that some day an oversized military establishment under the control of a central government would destroy the liberties of the people. Strong leaders throughout history have used vast military forces and military regulations to promote their own ambitions and the liberties of the people were lost. That is why the raising and maintaining of the Army and Navy was placed in the hands of Congress by the Constitution.

The people, through their representatives in Congress, in the march of human liberty under our form of government provided in the thirteenth amendment to our Constitution that—

> Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

The problem confronting us today is production—and the question is, How can production for war be accelerated to meet the demands of our fighting men and our home front?

More than a year ago, on October 1, 1943, when there was a previous demand for a labor draft law, I presented a resolution in the Senate to create a committee to study the entire manpower problem so we could keep a constant check on labor shortages, labor hoarding, and slow-down practices in production plants. That resolution died in committee without even a hearing. Now comes the War Department and Navy Department, under the direction of the President, demanding a work-or-jail law.

On the other hand, the responsible leaders of labor, individual employers, the Association of Employers and Manufacturers, and major farm organizations, who together are responsible for our miracle of production, all warn us that such a law will retard production rather than increase it.

The fact that General Marshall and Admiral King have added their voices in the demand for such a work-or-jail law, does not impress me. They are professional men, trained in the art of strict military and naval tactics and discipline, but they are not experts on assembly lines and the art of labor and management cooperation which is so necessary to maximum production.

In fact, they are, in a measure, to blame for the overconfidence on the part of our civilian population. Under the guise of military and naval security they have helped play down our real reverses and losses, and under the guise of morale have played up the successes of our forces.

During the months of September and October they did not tell us that they were short of ammunition and that shells were being rationed. As the heads of the Army and Navy, they are responsible in part for the failure to utilize fully the vast manpower already in the armed forces. They are responsible for vast overproduction of the billions of dollars' worth of surplus goods now being sold back to the public at a loss.

I yield to no man in my willingness to take any steps necessary to provide the fullest possible support of our fighting men. On the Appropriations and other committees, I have voted for the requests made by our armed forces almost without question, believing that, in that field, they were experts.

But this is a different matter. I join them in their demand for whatever production is necessary, but I have never felt that intimidated, forced, or slave labor, ever could or would equal the production of our free American people.

I believe that the leaders of American labor and American industry will cooperate with a patriotic fervor if they are given an honest picture of a genuine manpower and production shortage.

Merely to place more power in the hands of those who either cannot, or will not, outline a definite program, increases confusion.

To shout that we "draft men to die" why not "draft men to work" does not answer our problem. The problem is to get more production to sustain our gallant men who fight for a free country. Of course we can draft men to work

but our industrial and labor authorities tell us that this will not improve our production. Certainly it is another step toward wiping out freedom in the land for which our men are fighting.

I always have believed, and now believe, that every able-bodied man should be either at the fighting front or where he can render the greatest possible service to those who are. I seriously doubt whether drafting labor will answer our perplexing problems.

THE DRAFTING OF DEFERRED FARM LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief observation or two with respect to the Selective Service System of the United States as it applies to the Tydings amendment. There has been much discussion upon the floor of the Senate today concerning the failure of certain State directors of the Selective Service System strictly to construe and apply the Tydings amendment so as to defer agricultural workers.

I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which consulted with General Hershey last Friday in the office of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. At that time I took occasion to call the director of selective service of Illinois to ascertain from him whether or not they were now applying the intent of Congress as expressed in the Tydings amendment with respect to the deferment of agricultural workers, and he advised me that they were. I requested that he write me in respect to the matter, and I have a letter from the deputy State director, which I shall now read:

ILLINOIS STATE HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Springfield, Ill., February 2, 1945.

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: Colonel Armstrong is in Chicago today, and after I told him of your telephone call, he instructed me to write you and enclose pertinent and current memoranda and releases regarding farm deferments. I am, therefore, enclosing copies of the official memoranda and publicity releases which Colonel Armstrong has issued in recent months in reference to farm-deferment matters.

Illinois State headquarters and our local and appeal boards have always gained from directives received from the Director of Selective Service in Washington the definite impression that the provisions of the Tydings Act must be followed. Because of this understanding, local and appeal boards in this State have been generally most careful in determining whether or not farm registrants were necessary to the agricultural production on their respective farms.

After Pearl Harbor, Colonel Armstrong increased the membership of each Illinois local board from three to five members. To make certain that agricultural production would be fully protected, he insisted that local boards in all agricultural areas—those outside of metropolitan Chicago—each have two bona fide farmers as members—real dirt farmers who fully understood the labor requirements in their respective communities.

Colonel Armstrong also developed a farm questionnaire which is filled out by each farm registrant and his employer to show the number of war units each farm supported. This questionnaire, through the cooperation of the Illinois State Departments of Agriculture and Finance, has been furnished each year to the selective-service local boards in this State without any cost to the System. The form is revised annually, and I am enclosing a copy of such form for your information. It provides the local board with specific information which—along with any other information received (from U. S. D. A. War Board, etc.) plus the board's personal knowledge of each case—permits the local board to determine quite efficiently whether or not an individual farm registrant is necessary to agricultural production. If, after consideration of all written evidence in a registrant's file, the local board determines that such registrant is necessary to agricultural production, then the local board, in strict accordance with the Tydings Act, grants deferment to such registrant unless or until a replacement for such registrant is available. Incidentally, Illinois was the first State in the country to develop and use its own farm questionnaire.

For the State director:

VICTOR A. KLEBER,
Colonel, Specialist, Deputy State Director.

Mr. President, that letter was dated February 2 and it is current with respect to how the boards in Illinois are now construing the Tydings amendment. I do not know what the situation is in other States. I do not know what the State directors of Selective Service have done in connection with the interpretation of any telegram or directive that General Hershey has recently issued, but as of February 2 this year, insofar as the State of Illinois is concerned, the director of Selective Service and the draft boards throughout my State are following the Tydings amendment, just as they have always done since it became the law. And that is, of course, the way it should be.

Mr. President, I wish to make one further statement. Insofar as Illinois is concerned, there are at the present time some 33,000 farm boys between the ages of 18 and 26 who have been deferred under the Tydings amendment and who are now performing the agricultural work for our State. I have not received half a dozen letters from Illinois with respect to the proper interpretation of the Tydings amendment, notwithstanding any directives, telegrams, or additional rules or interpretations by General Hershey. I think I should add that to what has already been said here today.

MARY Y. HALSEY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 68 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 68), submitted by Mr. BYRD on February 5, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the financial clerk of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mary Y. Halsey, widow of Edwin A. Halsey, late Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 12, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8, 1945:

Col. David R. Nimmer to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 20th day of January 1945.

Col. William W. Rogers to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 20th day of January 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Ely E. Palmer, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

Joseph F. McGurk, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic

Edwin Jackson Kyle, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala.

R. Henry Norweb, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

Herman B. Baruch, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Lena M. Morrell, Florence.

COLORADO

Ruby H. Schroeder, Gypsum.
Edward Termer, Sugar City.

CONNECTICUT

John J. Shea, Colchester.

FLORIDA

George C. G. Hopkins, St. Augustine.

IDAHO

William Clay Peebles, Nampa.

ILLINOIS

Roy M. Hart, Fairmount.
George T. Hobkirk, Williamsville.

INDIANA

Esther Wolford, Linton.

IOWA

William F. Hulburd, Dow City.
Walter H. Peters, Ireton.
Florence Goss, Lawler.
Jeneva G. Parker, McIntire

MAINE

Loretta M. Dwyer, Great Works.
Clara A. Lewis, Litchfield.
Everett E. Clarke, Long Island.
Maud R. Tyus, New Harbor.
Walter W. Anderson, New Sweden.
Clarence T. Carll, Waterboro.
Mary W. Dingley, West Farmington.

MARYLAND

May B. Bolt, Eckhart Mines.
Ruth V. Hoshall, Parkton.

MISSOURI

James H. Powell, Elsberry.
Imogene Johnson, Galt.
Ethel I. McRaven, Glencoe.
Oren G. Gamel, Half Way.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Gould S. Richmond, Orford.

NEW MEXICO

Dolores Romero, Roy.

NEW YORK

Elliott McClung, Campbell Hall.
Charles Riccardi, Glasco.
Naomi C. S. Garritt, Cragsmoor.
Mildred E. Kraack, Lake Huntington.
C. Everett Scott, Morristown.
Patrick K. Fleming, Plattekill.
Mabel J. Bigelow, Richville.
Belle Ernes, Selden.
Katherine C. Slattery, Trudeau.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clyde B. Shaw, Carthage.

OHIO

Richard Brooks, Bradford.
John W. Martin, Cadiz.
Josephine A. Ginnan, Jacksonville.
Vera E. Schaller, Jenera.
Elizabeth C. Brown, North Madison.
Alta O. Sharp, Pleasant Plain.
Flora W. Brown, Smithville.

OREGON

Lloyd W. Lewis, Nyssa.

VERMONT

Frank H. Duffy, Jr., Rutland.

VIRGINIA

Manie R. Rodeffer, Keswick.

WASHINGTON

Doris M. Stock, Allyn.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, Thou art infinitely high above our thoughts, yet Thou dwellest amidst Thine own and wilt accept our poor tributes. Open our hearts and minds for the contemplation and reception of Thy goodness; let Thy holy spirit be granted unto each of us. Wherever there is perplexity or sorrow, may it be no vain thing to call on the name of the Lord: "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee."

Heavenly Father, we pray that the public mind may not be confused or cumbered with fear but meet all crises with calmness which is the secret of strength. Grant that by faith we may empower our wills and vitalize our spirits, and thus be made strong for the valley, the shadow, and the hill. As we cannot be cup bearers to the king, O may we beautify the commonplace road of life, giving a cup of cold water in Thy name. Thus may our light shine on the dark, heavy paths of the tired wayfarers in life's throng and press. We need one another here; the poor, the bent, and the broken are threading their way through the dense and indifferent crowds; inspire us to heed the words:

"He who has a thousand friends has not one to spare;
He who has a single enemy will meet him everywhere."

In the holy name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBER

Mr. HENRY J. LATHAM, Member-elect from the Third District of New York, presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an editorial by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the American Dental Association since 1917. Speaking for that association, through our president-elect, Dr. Sterling V. Mead, as well as the Council on Dental Education, I wish to inform the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that there is no foundation to the rumor which he reported on the floor of the House yesterday wherein he stated that it had been advocated by the Council on Dental Education that religious affiliations should be taken into consideration as a qualification for entering a college of dentistry.

There has never been any racial or religious discrimination advocated by the A. D. A. or the Council on Dental Education. The members of the dental profession constitute one of the most democratic organizations in America, and I regret that the gentleman from New York saw fit to express a mere rumor without ascertaining the facts, especially since the facts were so readily obtainable.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement made by a member of a local draft board in submitting his resignation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DR. E. B. FRED, NEW PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and pending that motion——

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 16]

Adams	Gardner	Madden
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ind.	Mansfield, Mont
Baldwin, Md.	Green	May
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.
Barden	Hand	Mott
Barry	Harless, Ariz.	Mundt
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	Norton
Blemiller	Havenner	O'Hara
Bolton	Hébert	O'Toole
Boren	Heffernan	Patterson
Buckley	Heidinger	Peterson, Ga.
Bulwinkle	Hess	Pfeifer
Carlson	Hoch	Phillips
Cole, N. Y.	Holmes, Mass.	Powell
Colmer	Izac	Powers
Cooley	Jenkins	Quinn, N. Y.
Curley	Johnson, Calif.	Randolph
Dawson	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rayfiel
De Lacy	Keefe	Rees, Kans.
Delaney, John J.	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Dingell	Kelly, Ill.	Roe, N. Y.
Domengeaux	Keogh	Sasscer
Durham	Kilday	Satterfield
Eaton	King	Sheridan
Elliott	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Ellsworth	LaFollette	Talle
Engle, Calif.	Landis	Thomas, N. J.
Ervin	LeCompte	Thomason
Fallon	Luce	Towe
Fenton	Lyle	Traynor
Fernandez	McDonough	Weiss
Fisher	McGlinchey	West
Fogarty	McGregor	White
Fulton	McMillen, Ill.	Winter

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. So many Members who were not on the floor at the proper time have come to the Chair to ask that they be allowed to submit requests to extend remarks that the Chair will now recognize Members to submit unanimous-consent requests to extend remarks or correct the RECORD.

Hereafter, when there is a legislative program, Members on the floor at the beginning of the session will have an opportunity to submit such requests, but after the roll is called and the House is ready to go into the Committee of the Whole no Member will be recognized for any purpose.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include an article which appeared in a recent issue of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a reprint from the Boston Traveler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by H. A. Morgan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include an article entitled "Heroic Polish Boy Scouts Keep Their Movement Alive," and to include also a resolution adopted by the Polish people of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial, certain statements, and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial from the New York Times regarding the rescue of incarcerated individuals in the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution unanimously adopted by the Oklahoma State Legislature commending the Commander in Chief and incidentally the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the life of Mrs. Ruth Hanna Simms, a former Member of this House, and to include therein certain editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the

Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill shall be concluded not later than 2 o'clock, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1984, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congress faces three matters of major interest, first, winning the war; second, winning the peace; and third, employment in the post-war era. The statement I want to make deals only in a collateral way with the bill now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation Resources sent to all Members of Congress yesterday its last printed hearings. These hearings constitute the only full report of seven Federal agencies dealing with conservation matters and they also include the reports of 42 State game departments.

Through this medium each Federal agency ascertains what the other Federal agencies are doing, as a means of coordinating their activities; what the State game departments are doing; and State game departments learn of and check on the Federal activities in their respective States.

In addition to outlining the general trend of the national conservation program, the 500 pages of these hearings contain something of interest for every congressional district. There is not a congressional district in the Nation in which the sportsmen and conservationists are not interested in this program.

I hope each Member of the House will take time to examine the copy of the hearings which has been sent to him, because the program involves employment projects after the war as well as a contribution that we can make to the physical rehabilitation of those who have suffered for us on far-flung fighting fronts.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a few observations with reference to a provision in this bill appearing on page 18 and having to do with public works advance planning. It makes an appropriation, and the language begins as follows:

Toward accomplishing the provisions of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, $5,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

I fear that there is a great deal of misunderstanding with reference to the subject matter of this provision. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was a pioneer in the consideration of post-war planning and, in order to gather factual information, began hearings on this subject, irrespective of any bill, in November 1943. The hearings continued for 2 or 3 months and many witnesses prominent in various fields of American activity testified. It was recommended by quite a number of these witnesses—and, incidentally, I might mention Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and Mr. Henry Kaiser, the eminent shipbuilder—that, in order to avoid another W. P. A. after this war and afford employment upon a more practical basis, some provision should be made to make loans when necessary to cities or other political subdivisions to stimulate them to get their plans ready for construction of the projects that they would undertake when the war is over absolutely at their own expense and without any Federal contribution or grant. The purpose of this suggestion was to make it more certain that when the time came when such work could be done it could be started promptly. It is not difficult to understand that this would in very large measure obviate unemployment.

I believe that the cities and States, which are in much better financial condition than the Federal Government, should carry on at their own expense the projects which are not essentially Federal in character, but it does seem necessary that their programs should be ready in plans at the appropriate time. Many cities have programs in prospect, but a very small percentage of them have their plans in readiness. To the extent that it is necessary to impress upon them the importance of such plans, it seems feasible to offer loans for the completion of their planning. The mere offer might have good effect in speeding such preparation. And I repeat that such advances should be loans, and I think the law so contemplates, to be repaid as a part of the cost of the projects. Proper administration would forestall such loans in cases in which there was not a reasonable prospect that the projects would be completed. If some such step is not taken, I fear that most of the cities and States will continue to rely upon the Federal Government to carry on the local public works which are no essential part of Federal activity.

The Budget estimate which the President has submitted to the Congress calls for $75,000,000 for this purpose, exclusive of administrative expenses. I may say in this regard that I think administrative expenses should be reduced to the minimum necessary. I believe the Federal Works Agency could administer this policy without any considerable increase of personnel. This bill appropriates $5,000,000. There is a very great discrepancy between $5,000,000 and $75,000,000. Personally, I do not know what amount is necessary and will not at present offer any amendment, but I do think that further serious study should be given to the matter of loans where necessary to assure getting these programs of projects ready. It will save the taxpayers of this country many millions of dollars by establishing in advance the obligation and responsibility of the States and cities and poltical subdivisions in financing their own local projects.

Let us learn from our experience after the First World War. What was the situation then? There were no such plans available, and resort was had to the W. P. A., which required no plans, and my recollection is—and someone can correct me if I mis-state the fact—that the original appropriation for that purpose lacked just a little of being $5,000,000,000. The cities and States were not ready to give any employment and had no plans perfected. It took almost 18 months to get 100,000 people employed in W. P. A., and some of that money was devoted to the raking of leaves and to other things of no permanent value.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. The purpose of the authorization in the act referred to in this provision of this bill is to obviate a repetition of any such impractical policy as that, and to make sure that the cities and States and political subdivisions will be ready to carry on at their own expense when the war is over their needed projects and thereby afford profitable employment. A few cities have their plans, most of them do not, and surely we should see to it that their responsibility is properly recognized and provision made for its discharge.

I do not believe this subject has been sufficiently explored by the Committee on Appropriations. I do not think the purpose is properly understood. Our past history forces upon our attention a realization of the problem. The proposal as originally made and as incorporated in existing law is, as I understand, not for the Federal Government to furnish the money for these local projects, but simply for the Government to take appropriate steps to give assurance that the cities and other political subdivisions will do what is necessary to get their plans ready for execution.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does the gentleman see any reason why this work should be undertaken by the Federal Government when the States and localities themselves can do the job without Federal assistance?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not think the Federal Government should make any unnecessary loans, but I do believe that proper action to convince the States and localities that it is their obligation to have plans ready will aid materially in preventing a recurrence of the W. P. A. and the expenditure of very vast sums of

Federal money when the States and the cities are in much better financial condition than the Federal Government itself. If we are to have a sound economy, they must learn in some way sooner or later that they will have to bear the cost of their own local projects and improvements.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman is correct in his statement. The purpose sought to be accomplished by providing plans is to prevent a W. P. A., which does not require any plans and which will be the only source to which we can turn for general employment if no plans are available.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right, and a W. P. A. would be at the expense of the Federal Government, which means all the taxpayers in the country.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that the gentleman's experience is similar to that of the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. We considered the question and went into it rather thoroughly and heard some of the biggest men in the country on the subject. As I recall, it was pointed out that many cities and local communities have projects in mind but only about 2 percent of the plans are ready.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds submitted to the gentleman's committee, which was headed by our distinguished friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] similar information, giving it the advantage of the data our committee had acquired through extensive hearings.

I do not know how much ought to be appropriated, but there is a great discrepancy between the estimate of $75,000,000 and the appropriation of $5,000,000. I am suggesting that a study be made promptly and seriously as to just what should be done to save the Federal Treasury in this regard.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: How long a time elapsed between the other war and the depression which called for the W. P. A. appropriation?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not recall just what the dates were.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There were many years which elapsed.

Mr. LANHAM. But I do recall very definitely that the failure to have any planning or any projects that could be carried out as a post-war program led to the W. P. A., and it cost billions and billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, and much of it was spent for things of no lasting value whatever. Let us obviate that and let us study this question promptly and make proper provision, whatever that provision may be. This bill is in accord with the stipulations of existing law. Let the States and the cities bear the brunt of their own local expenses, but let them have their plans and their programs ready when the war is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make the observation that the United States Army engineers, under the established custom, will pay one-half of the expenses of making plans for municipalities, as I understand it. I think that is the intent of this legislation—to extend this practice. I do want to remind you gentlemen who declare that our State and municipal treasuries are bulging with funds while the Federal Treasury is so badly off that those funds are largely, if not sometimes wholly, invested in United States bonds—that is, Government debt. Our banks today have invested about 75 percent or 80 percent of their entire assets in that Government's debt. What a situation? Think that over. If our Government Treasury is in such a condition as you state, have our banks and our municipalities made a bad investment?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. As I understand the premise of the talk of the gentleman from Texas, it was that enterprise is going to cease to function in this Nation after the war is over and that the only hope of the Nation is to have Government public works.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to bring out the fact that the banks and municipalities have invested much or all their money in the debt of the Government which some here today declared to be badly off. Perhaps we should be worried about it. I know, of course, it is no worry to some people who have adopted the theory, as I have reminded you so often, "We owe it to ourselves, so what of it?"

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. We are spending so much money in this country on dead horses. That is the trouble with so many of our municipalities and other political subdivisions, and it is becoming the trouble of the Federal Government. The income is being absorbed by paying for dead horses. Is that not what the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. GIFFORD. Perhaps my municipality bought bonds with their surplus money which they depend upon for post-war activities. Our banks own 75 to 80 percent of the Government's debt. I do not like such a situation. Do not talk to me about our municipalities bursting with money; they are bursting with Government debt.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. RICH. I could not get the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] to answer my question, but I would like to know whether the spending of this $5,000,000 is going to be any duplication at all of the work of the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust I may supply the answer to my genial friend from Pennsylvania before these rather rambling remarks are concluded.

Mr. Chairman, I might begin by saying that the bill before us is the first of the fourth. By that I mean the first regular appropriation bill of the fourth term. It is an important bill. When bills of this magnitude come before the House they deserve our attention not only with respect to the immediate bill but with respect to the whole fiscal picture which confronts the country and confronts the world. It is to that matter that I want to address some time this afternoon.

However, I do want to pay testimony to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on independent offices the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. He has been so eminently fair and tolerant; he has been so genuinely good and decent in all the deliberations on this bill. And so, speaking for the members on the minority, we take off our hats to the chairman of the subcommittee for the fine treatment we have received. He has always indicated rare ability in piloting a difficult bill across the floor of the House, and it is testimony, I think, to his capacity, to his background, and his experience as a legislator.

At the same time I want to offer a tribute to the very diligent and earnest clerk of this committee, Mr. William Duvall. For years I have been in close association with many of the clerks on the Committee on Appropriations. They do such a tremendous amount of work. Night after night you will find them burning the proverbial midnight oil for the purpose of digging out these little legislative difficulties that sometimes pop into the provisos on appropriation bills. They labor long and earnestly, and they are among the most skilled and devoted public servants we have. I do not see Bill Duvall on the floor at the moment, but I do want to say to him and for him that he has rendered an outstanding service to this committee, and we are genuinely appreciative and grateful.

Let me then start with the general observation that we are in the Lincoln season. In a little while we are going to observe the birth anniversary of the Great Emancipator. I have more than casual interest in him because I represent three of the counties that he represented when he was a Member of this Congress in 1847. We live in that country and we are steeped in that lore. It serves a useful purpose to go back now and then and to dig out something that is timely and appropriate to the problems and the occasions of today. It runs in my mind that Lincoln once sent a little note to some farmer out in Illinois in which he was addressing himself to the problems

that were on the national threshold in his day. He said, "If we could but know where we are and whither we are tending, we should know the better what to do."

That is a priceless sort of thing. If we can but know where we are and whither we are tending, the direction we are taking, we shall know the better what to do. Like so many mariners who have been tossed up on the restless sea, it becomes necessary now and then to take a shot at Polaris, or at the Southern Cross, for the purpose of ascertaining our latitude and longitude to get a better sense of direction.

I think I can illustrate it further by a story that appeared in Reader's Digest some months ago. It was a story about a lady who had gotten aboard one of the double-decker busses in New York on Park Avenue. She went up to the only available seat on the top deck and when comfortably and safely ensconced she unfurled a huge colored map of China done in gold and red and green and blue like maps usually are and began to study it very intently. After a while the bus stopped to pick up another passenger. Unfortunately, it happened to be a man who before coming aboard had looked too long and lovingly upon the flowing bowl. So he clambered up the stairs and took a seat right opposite this lady. After a while his dull perceptibilities finally encompassed the fact that here was a map and evidently he may have thought it was a road map, because when he could ultimately manage it he suddenly stared at her and said: "Lady, are you sure you are on the right bus?" And so we have got to be sure we are on the right bus and going in the right direction. And I propose after a little while to touch only a few of the fiscal high lights that are suggested by the bill that is before us, in the hope of better pointing our direction.

In the pending bill we are appropriating $3,200,000,000. That is an awful lot of money—$3,200,000,000—but it is only a circumstance compared with what we find in the President's Budget message when he indicates that for the fiscal year 1946, which begins on July 1, 1945, our over-all expenditures will be $87,000,000,000. I like to phrase it in another way—it sounds more emphatic and it frightens me more: Instead of $37,000,000,000 I like to say eighty-seven thousand million. That is beyond the comprehension of any finite mind; it is simply inconceivable to comprehend. It will be for 1 year only, but it gives point to the fact that since we have been in this conflict we have expended or will expend four hundred and fifty thousand million for war alone, four hundred and fifty thousand million for the purpose of humbling an enemy in the far areas of the world and for the purpose of restoring peace to this turbulent and distressed world. What we could do with four hundred and fifty thousand million! And as I contemplate it in connection, of course, with the loss of precious young lives, it is to me the greatest incentive in all the world that this time the Big Three who are meeting in the Black Sea area must not fail to find the answer for this insane kind of brutality that we call war. We cannot stand the impact of another expenditure like that a generation hence. Maybe it is vain now to talk about it, and perhaps the damage may have been done, but at least here in the lawmaking branch it deserves our best thinking and our best courage as we wrestle with this problem of war in the hope that we can still reorient our fiscal situation and salvage something for this country and for the other countries of the world.

Do not forget, Mr. Chairman, we are going to borrow forty thousand million in this fiscal year. The revenues are not sufficient to stretch, so we have got to tell somebody down here in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving to work the printing presses overtime, to get out the bottles of red and green and blue and gold ink and start running off these pieces of paper we call bonds and debentures and Treasury notes. Those will be sold to the people. Those will be sold in the form of war bonds and direct obligations of Government.

With each additional bond issue, the public debt increases. We know, of course, that in time of war, money which is one of the sinews of war must be raised. When revenues are insufficient, the Government must borrow.

The purpose is, of course, to keep our housekeeping in order and borrow the necessary money so that we can strike a balance upon the books of the Nation when the next fiscal year has been closed. The books of Government are always nicely in balance for the revenues plus the borrowings must always equal the expenditures. But the borrowings must one day be repaid.

Our receipts are going to drop somewhat. This is important not only to economists and tax experts but to every taxpayer. This year our revenue will be approximately forty-seven and three-fourth billion dollars, but the President indicates that in the fiscal year 1946 it will drop to forty-one and one-third billion dollars. We will be losing substantially six and one-half billion dollars in revenue in the next fiscal year and perhaps that will be one of those phenomena that will continue from year to year. It is going to plague us plenty before we finally peg our income in the post-war period at a certain level and are able to say that we can muster and command the necessary revenue to develop a balanced budget, and then look forward with courage and hope into the future.

The President indicated also in his Budget message that the national debt, the public debt, on June 30, 1946, will be two hundred and ninety-two thousand million dollars. I like that term "public debt" because it gives everybody a share in it. The babies that are being born now will have their part in the public debt; the octogenarians and the people who have reached fruitful years all have a share in this debt. I suppose if one bothers with arithmetic he would find the per capita will be perhaps $2,000. So if you take a family consisting of a man, wife, and two children, which makes a total of four, their share of the public debt will be $8,000. It is so difficult to dramatize, yet, in my judgment, it is the most important domestic item that is before the country at the present time as we prepare to give some orientation to this tremendous load that we are going to carry for the very good reason that it is going to make a lot of difference in the world whether a free functioning, private enterprise system is going to endure in the United States.

Now, then, there are lots of debt theories. I like to consider some of the wizards of money and magicians of our monetary system who say, "Well, what difference does it make how big the debt really is?" Take, for instance, a very accomplished economist like Steuart Chase. He says, "Never talk about debt. You must call it an investment." He has a very felicitous explanation or illustration. He says, "Debt and income are but opposite sides of the same shield. You hold it up like that, it is debt, but turn it around and it is income." If you spin out that theory sufficiently, why, I suppose it would not make any difference how big your debt is except that your money will be no good, the incentive for business and for the generation of revenue and the preservation of opportunities for the millions of young men who will come back will go aglimmering, and then we will be on a basis of State management which has been very adequately called State socialism.

That is why this debt business is so important at the present time. I worry under the spell of my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], when day after day he belabors us with his admonition, "Where are you going to get the money?" I worry about that. Sometimes I feel a good deal like the lady who went to the Governor of Tennessee and said: "Governor, I would like to get my husband out of prison." The Governor said, "What is he in there for?" She said, "For stealing a ham." The Governor said, "Has he been a good husband?" "No." "Do you have a family?" "Yes; we have a family of nine children." "Does he support you and take care of you?" "No, Governor, he is just no good." "What is he in prison for?" "He is in there for stealing a ham." The Governor than asked, "Why do you want to get him out of prison if he is no good?" She replied, "Governor, to be frank with you, we are out of ham again." I am just alarmed that one of these days we may be out of ham. We may run out of money, we may run out of confidence which is, after all, the basic foundation for a money structure and then, of course, our problems will become difficult indeed.

Maybe you missed that line in the President's Budget message, but to me it is extremely significant when he said:

> The management of the public debt is bound to have a profound influence on our economy for a long time to come.

"The management of the public debt should have a profound influence." What kind of a management? Will we be called upon finally to divorce ourselves of what few powers remain in the legislative basket and delegate broader and broader authority over the economy of the country to the point where the fiscal wreck will one day be complete? What does the distinguished Chief Executive

mean when he says, "The management of the public debt?" It has not been clarified.

But there is an implication here that disturbs me a great deal, so it is time for us to bethink ourselves and to cudgel our best thoughts on this whole problem and ventilate those thoughts very freely here, because I think it adds to the residual confidence of the country and to these enterprises who are also looking forward to the days to come for them to invest money out of which there shall stem jobs for the rugged hands of rugged young soldiers returned; that they may be inspired by the confidence to go ahead and build this country even to a higher and to a more prosperous level. How else shall 60,000,000 jobs be developed if that number is needed? There are some problems. There are going to be continual justifiable, and defensible expenditures. You cannot escape it. That was so clearly delineated by the chairman on the Veterans Administration appropriation on yesterday. I got out a little statement on this matter the other day, and as I think of this veteran's picture I go back to the Revelations of St. John the Divine—you know that old patriarch, who sat on the Isle of Patmos, and there probably with a quill laboriously wrote the Apocalypse. You remember his prophecy about the Four Horsemen; pestilence, famine, disease, and death that shall ride over the world and conquer the dominions, and leave destruction and agony and death in their wake. Then finally the seal shall be closed again and the Four Horsemen shall disappear.

The Scripture says nothing, however, about the Fifth Horseman, but the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse is just as surely there and he rides and rides and rides long after the war has come to an end. The proof is so apparent.

Two years ago General Hines told us in the committee that the peak load of neuropsychiatric cases of those veterans of the First World War, in whom that slender and brittle cord of memory that binds the present to the past and the present to the future has snapped—and they are the veterans for whom the armistice bells will never ring and the armistice whistles will never blow—he said it would be 1947 before we reached the peak of those mental cases of the last World War. That is 29 years after the the deums were sung in the churches and we got the glad tidings on the western front that the world's greatest conflict up to that time had come to an end.

Think of it. There is the creeping, progressive, continuing disintegration of war as it moves on and on and on through the years and keeps affixing its destructive stamp to the mentalities and the bodies of the youth of the Nation.

Look at the picture that is presented to us now—373,000 veterans, not of World War No. 1 but of World War No. 2, who are already on the compensation rolls as service-connected disability cases. What is the estimate for June 30, 1946? Hold your breath. General Hines estimates are good and they are always verified by the facts at the end of the estimated period. General Hines said, "We estimate that on June 30, 1946, the number of compensable cases on the rolls will be 993,000." That is just short of a million, and it is only beginning. So there is going to be an outlay for the veterans, a justifiable outlay, expressing the tangible gratitude of the people of this country to the young men of this generation who have become soldiers at the battle stations of freedom. We owe it to them, and let there be no niggardliness about it as we approach that responsibility as lawmakers. I impress it upon your attention, however, because it must be taken into account as a continuing expenditure in the years ahead.

It is estimated that the number of veterans' hospital beds in the future to take care of them will be 300,000, and the over-all staff of the Veterans' Administration, the nurses, the attendants, the doctors, the orderlies, and all those who minister to the wants of those who freely gave of their talents and their energies and, yes, their lives for this country, will be 100,000 people. It is an empire in itself. New hospitals must be built. Other hospitals must be taken over from the Army and Navy. All these must be maintained and we dare assume that these costs will mount and continue for many years to come. It becomes a fiscal item to be considered in our future fiscal policy.

So as you contemplate in this bill $2,700,000,000 for veterans, you must realize that it will grow infinitely larger as the years go on. In 1940 the whole expenditure for the Veterans Administration was only $561,000,000. In the fiscal year 1946, only a matter of 6 years later, the amount jumps from $561,000,000 to $2,707,000,000. I point that out to you for the very good reason that if we undertake to strike some balanced fiscal picture in the future for the purpose of reaching that elusive hope of a balanced budget, we have to take into account these increased expenditures.

In this fiscal year, how much will the interest on the public debt be, that public debt that belongs to you and me and everybody and in which we shall all have an equal share? The interest for the 1946 fiscal year will be $4,500,000,000. It will grow greater as time goes on. Fortunately, the interest rate has been kept down. In 1941 the going Federal rate of interest was about 2.9 percent plus. Then in October of 1944 I think it was reduced to perhaps 1.97 percent. So the interest rate by means of our monetary and Federal reserve efforts has gone down, but the debt has steadily gone up. The amount for interest, for the privilege of borrowing money from our people, will be $4,500,000,000 each year. It also will grow as expenditures grow beyond our revenues.

Why, it is more than the over-all cost of government in 1933, much greater than the cost of government. As I think back comparatively to these astronomical sums and to what we must do to maintain fiscal solidarity in the future, I go back again to this war expenditure of $450,000,000,000. It is 20 times the direct cost to this country of World War No. 1. It is 2½ times the war cost to all the Allied Nations that were engaged in World War No. 1. If we had all this money and if we were spending on a 1933 level, we could run the Government of the United States for 112 years and not collect 1 penny of taxes from the people of this country. It affords a comparative idea of the vast sums in which and with which we deal.

In the preparation of any Annual Budget in the future therefore, we shall continue to deal in staggering figures. In addition to increasing outlays for our veterans; in addition to the growing cost of carrying the public debt; there will be other items which are suggested by the bill before us.

An effort may be made when this bill is read for amendment to increase the amount allowed by the committee for advance planning of public works. Much interest in and solicitude for our future economic stability has been expressed on this floor in the last few days. Thoughts run to huge public-works programs as a stabilizing force. These are already being programmed in the Federal, State, and local fields. There will be grants and loans. But whatever they are, they represent expenditure which must be raised by taxes or borrowings. The war constantly directs our thoughts to future security. We shall not make the mistake again of letting the Nation's defenses lapse. In a feverish world, our hope and trust must be placed in a defensive force on land, sea, and in the air that will assure security and peace. These of course will cost money for maintenance and constant modernization. Expenditures for this purpose will far exceed the amounts which were devoted to this purpose in prewar days. And such additional sums must be reckoned as we consider annual budgets and the problem of debt in the future.

I know that there is wide anxiety as to whether or not we shall be able to find that combination of vision, talent, and courage in financial leaders in government in the days ahead who can pilot the Nation through these shoals and still preserve the essential freedoms.

More important than all else, the forgotten man is getting rather concerned about this. You probably have had experiences similar to my own during the winter recess. Many people would come to me and ask, "Do you think these bonds we buy will maintain their value?" My answer was invariably that they would. If the bonds are no good, then nothing is any good. But how often one heard that question, not in high financial circles but coming from the minds and hearts of the common man—the forgotten man—the fellow who has a little mortgage on his home, the chap who has a job, the chap who religiously buys War bonds because he thinks it is his patriotic duty, the man who has surrendered his son to go forth to war. He is getting a little concerned about it because, after all, the value of what is accumulated in the form of worldly goods in this country is going to depend after all upon what the fiscal operations and fiscal integrity of the National Government will be. He finds it difficult to comprehend these figures. Of course, as he comes within the orbit of the Federal tax collector, it does make him more tax conscious. You see, at one time there were so few who

paid Federal income taxes. The last estimate from the Treasury is that there will be 44,000,000 citizens of this country who will make their peace with the Bureau of Internal Revenue each year. So as the tax collector knocks upon the door and by implication hands him a little statement that says, "This is what you owe your Federal Government," it makes him a good deal more tax conscious, and also debt conscious.

As we think of taxes and as we think of debt, let us not forget this, just as a rule of common sense; debt is a difficult business for a democracy. In a country where all power is lodged in one man, it is very easy to manage debt because all he has to do is to call in the president or the chairman of the central bank and say, "Now, this is what you will do." So management of debt and of the monetary system of the country which is on a totalitarian basis is very easy. But for a democracy it is not so easy for several reasons. In the first place, we recoil from taxes. Have we not had many illustrations here in Congress? I assume I have voted on at least a dozen revenue measures since I have been a Member of this body. Somehow or other we recoil from taxes, because of one of those natural impulses of humankind. It is so easy, of course, when you have not got the money and you are spending money, that you borrow. That is why the very first line in this appropriation bill constitutes one of those felicitous fictions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, that is why you have one of these hypothetical fictions:

> There is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

Note that it says, "not otherwise appropriated."

But there is no money in the Treasury For a long time there has been a deficit. That is to say, if you try to cast up a figure and draw a line and strike up a balance sheet there definitely is no money.

We must borrow $40,000,000,000 in this fiscal year of 1946. So I say debt is a difficult problem for a democracy, because we do not like taxes. We find it so easy to go in debt and borrow. And, of course, we cannot repudiate. When you start thinking about this problem, we so often hear people idly say, "Oh, one fine day there will be repudiation." There will never be any repudiation with my vote. I say that to you right now. When you repudiate the solemn debts of this country, you repudiate yourself and you repudiate every God-fearing citizen in the land. That is what happens. Repudiation is something more than financial repudiation. Repudiation is moral obliquity. It is unthinkable to understand these easy, happy phrases that flow from the tongues of people about repudiation; to think that ever in the history of this great Republic there should be repudiation. I do not think we are going to pursue that course. This Nation has too much character for that.

There is one other observation I want to make in that direction. Has it ever occurred to you that debt is speculation on growth? A young man borrows money to go to college. For what purpose? Well, to increase his social horizon, of course, but also for the purpose of earning more money. There is growth in his soul. He is a growth creature.

A man buys a house and he pays so much down and then there is a mortgage on it. It satisfies his desire for anchorage on a bit of this earth's surface that he can call home, because he is looking into the future. He is anticipating a family. He expects growth in the country. Cities go into debt. They issue bonds and borrow money to install sewer systems, to lay out paving and other public projects. It is speculation on growth. If growth should ever level off in cities, counties, States, and the Nation, but the level of debt continue to increase, can anyone deny that it constitutes a truly dangerous condition? So we cannot be unmindful of the fact that there has been a leveling off of population. The trend has been down since 1850. When you go back to your offices, get out the abridgement of the 1940 census. Right in the front of it you will find the percentage factor by which the population grows in a decade. Also the exact number. How many more people we had in 1860 than in 1850; and then the percentage of increase. You will find that since 1850 it has been dropping from about 32 percent in a decade to 14 percent. And so it goes on down. As we move along in this debt structure, let us not forget there is a factor operating against us. It is that static or diminishing factor of population growth when considered by percentages.

So I bring it to your attention only to marshal your interest in appropriations because it is tremendously important. But all this leads up to something that I really was going to say to you. Out of burdensome debt there may come management of your country. We surrender a great many things in wartime. We have got to do it. We have got to surrender a measure of our economic freedom. I had no great taste for the work-fight bill that was here the other day. I felt the military imperative made it necessary to hold up the hands of our military leaders in time of war. But in time of peace it is a different thing.

I wonder whether or not there has been an acceleration of this leadership and management idea away back before the war began; whether it is registered in the thought processes and lives and customs of the people to the point where when peace comes again and people resume the ways of contentment and happiness, we can divest them of that thinking and once more put our feet on the pathway of the tradition that we always associate with living in this Republic.

As you analyze the speeches that have been made on this floor from time to time, we say we have got to do something to stop the march of totalitarianism in our country.

Can it be that there has actually been a change in the essential substance of government in this Nation already and that because of closeness to it, we have inadequately discerned and appreciated that it was taking place. Can it be that, ever since 1933, we have quietly but surely embraced the leadership principle without ever being too fully aware of it and that already it has become an accomplished fact?

I shall never forget the speech made by Majority Leader Joseph Byrns on this floor on the 11th day of March in 1933. We were considering the so-called Economy Act which delegated broad powers to the President. That great Tennessean made quite an impression that day as he exhorted the House to enact that first bill of the new administration. On that occasion he appealed to his party in behalf of the new President and said.

> Do not mistake it, this is his bill. It has come from his hand. This is not a time to look for defects. It is time to get behind our great leader and to show him and be guided by his judgment rather than our own in this critical period.

Here was an interesting use of the pronoun. Here was the very foundation of personal government. It has grown with the years and perhaps we are maintaining a vigilance against a change in government which has already happened.

We are like Elijah; we are watching for a cloud. You remember how Elijah sent his servant saying: "Go look at the horizon; see what is there." The servant came back and said: "Elijah, I do not see anything." "Go back and look again." "I see nothing." "Go back and take another look." He came back and said: "I see a little cloud arising out of the sea no larger than a man's hand." And it was the cloud of prophecy of that ancient day. And so we are doing that; we are watching the horizon for a cloud of prophecy for the restoration of all those things that were a part of a three-branch government each articulating in its own sphere and enjoying the maximum confidence of the people. I wonder if the cloud has come and gone.

Now we are getting to the thing I really want to tell you, because up to this time it has been really preliminary. I want you to take a look at the hearings. You do not have to do it now, but just mark this: Look at page 119 of these hearings when you have time, under the appropriation for the Federal Register under the Department of Archives. You know what the Federal Register is. When the administrative rulings and orders and proclamations and Executive decrees became so numerous that they became virtually the bible by which people lived and moved and had their being, we had to devise a way of acquainting the country with them. So in 1935 we authorized the publication of the Federal Register. The law provides that every order of legal effect and general applicability must be published there. It is fair, therefore, to assume that the administrative orders by which the Government moves, the administrative orders under which the people live, are published in that document. How many have been published? The hearings will provide

the answer. From 1941—and I am starting long after the Register got under way—from 1941 to 1946—and the fiscal year 1946 is estimated—182,170 administrative orders of legal effect and general applicability were submitted to the Federal Register. Of that number 178,828 were published.

What are these thousands and hundreds of thousands of orders? These are the orders of the O. P. A. to tell at what price a house dress must be sold by the dry-goods store in your town; these are the orders from the Office of Defense Transportation to tell whether you in the produce business can buy a new truck because your old truck is antiquated and worn out; these are the orders that tell a factory owner by the recommendation of the War Production Board how much coal he as an industrial consumer can have; these are the orders from the Interstate Commerce Commission mandating railroads what they can or cannot do under existing law; these are the orders that deal with peanuts, and wheat, and hogs, and beef prices, with life insurance, and the brokerage business, and areas of production, and car purchases, and everything that touches the people of the country. One hundred and eighty-two thousand in 6 years. When the Federal Register and the codes up to date have been compiled, there will be 90,000 pages of administrative orders. Do you need anything additional from me to indicate the trend of things in this country and in what direction we are moving? How did we get that way?

The Federal Register presents a cold and realistic picture of what has happened in the land. It is like a direction finder. It reveals so clearly our progress toward administrative government and administrative law.

It is not a phenomenon of war. War merely increased the tempo. Our progress toward administrative government was rapid long before the war. It began in 1933. The vast number of orders and regulations which were issued long before the war, carrying their own penalties, is a matter of record. War but speeded the process.

The beginning of the fourth term is an appropriate time to review the matter. The depression was such a splendid instrument for bringing about change. It seemed so easy then to take over all economic power, make it palatable by means of persuasive publicity, develop broad political support for the program, substitute Government enterprise for private enterprise, make debt alluring or at least divest it of its terrors, and then undertake the complete management of Government from the top. How simple it seems. And how effectively it has been done.

Moreover, there has been a strange vitality about this trend toward administrative absolutism. Remember when Bruce Barton came to Congress on a platform to repeal a law a day. Not a single law was repealed during his tenure here. That is not a reflection on Bruce Barton. Rather, it reflects the bigness and complexity of Government. More than that, it indicates the force and power of the trend toward complete administrative rule.

Is it not a rather amazing thing that the so-called proviso that we wrote in the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933 to issue billions in greenbacks is still the law of the land? It has not been repealed. None of those things against which we fought have been repealed. It is still unlawful for one to have more than a hundred dollars of gold in his or her possession. All those things we did when Government captured economic power, long before the war began.

How, you may ask, can Government depart from the ancient faith and make it palatable. It is easy enough. I recall when Edward Taylor was chairman of the Appropriations Committee that a report was obtained from the Budget Bureau showing the number of persons doing all manner of publicity work in the various agencies of Government. It totaled about 34,000, full time and part time. This great host, equal to three Army divisions, was preparing news releases, lecture material, radio scripts, and what not to support the action programs of the Government in all fields. This host labored well and effectively. They did sell the new programs to the people through the medium of the press, the magazine, and the radio. The best proof of their workmanship lies in the fact that anyone who decried Government policy as unsound, dangerous to our fiscal well-being, and certain to lead toward disaster was shouted down as a Tory and a reactionary. Thus was economic power taken over, made palatable, and made to have political sex appeal to substantial groups.

That is the same technique that was used even long ago. Is the technique any different from the days of Emperor Augustus? Is it any different from the technique used in the days of Diocletian, who instituted the first O. P. A. probably 1,900 years ago and which for all practical purposes was intended to be a permanent one? He went much further than Mr. Bowles. Mr. Bowles gets out his schedules and orders on mimeographed paper. Diocletian had the price tables chiseled in stone where all the world in succeeding generations could see them. The technique of those days is no different than it is now; first, the capture of economic power and making it palatable to swing large segments of people in line so that they like it. As an illustration, there is the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Farm Security Administration, all those things for farmers, some good, some perhaps not so good.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In reference to the A. A. A., does the gentleman think the farmers of this country would sell out their freedom and subscribe to this philosophy unless they were paid for it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am only indicating what I see here as a perspective picture which we have to have in mind as we think of the future.

So here is this capture of economic power, here is this continuous drive to make it palatable, here is the bringing of great quantities of our people into line because it is so easy, it is so palatable, and it looks so good. Then you must put those who have other ideas about this thing, shall I say "in bad repute," or perhaps a better statement would be, to impair their credibility as witnesses for the existing system; to put the tarred stick on them, if necessary to smear them a little bit. How many businessmen have tried to hold on to the great American tradition, and were promptly confronted with the charge that they were economic royalists; they were corporals of disaster, and sergeants of despair. Remember how this technique was so effectively utilized year in and year out, to make personal government palatable; to marshal the support that was so indispensable every 4 years so that the program might go on to its ultimate fruition; to discredit the protest of any substantial group or agencies in the land who might possibly stop this trend and impair its efficiency as it moved on down—to what? To the greater and greater centralization of power, the impairment of the sovereignty of the States and of the localities of the country, and to make management, to make personalized government, complete, not in wartime when we naturally expect to surrender much of our economic freedom in the interest of speedy and complete victory but in the post-war days that lie ahead.

One cannot examine the oft-expressed opinions of that school of economists who might best be defined in the President's own phrase as somewhat "left of center" with respect to debt and the management of debt without somehow feeling that here is the instrument which has been shaped to their use in bringing about a completely managed economy in the post-war period.

On every hand, one can detect the deep notes of concern and anxiety about the future. The common man and the uncommon man if there be such a creature, the farmer and the laborer, the home owner and taxpayer, the businessman and enterpriser, the retailer and the industrialist are freely expressing their concern about the future. The efforts of labor and agriculture and business to secure from Congress such legislation as will safeguard wages and prices and values are after all nothing more than expressions of concern on the part of these economic groups that something is liable to happen in the readjustment period and they want to be protected.

When anxiety is so widespread over the future, it is not too difficult to persuade many folks that unless the whole complex business which we call our economy is entrusted to strong guidance and direction, it may all go to pot. After all, the dark deflationary days of 1933 are only 12 years behind us and people have good memories. With such a background of concern, it is easy to command attention by saying, "Leave it to us. Leave the management of debt and the whole economy in our hands. We will know what to do."

That rings persuasively. Let us assume that there will be some dislocation in the post-war period. Let us assume that we recede from high national-income levels and we have some unemployment to contend with. Think not that the readjustment is going to be so easy. It never was. The thing we overlook, when we have it all so nicely put by standards of arithmetic, is after all the moral factor. If I remember correctly, there is written in Revelation that story about the dead who lay under the altar of the earth, and whose voices ascended to righteous Providence and say, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell in the earth."

Oh, we are going to have to make our peace for our own sins of omission and commission; whether social or economic, does not make any difference. The whole economic fabric has been distorted. We dip down into the human fabric of the world and take 50,000,000 people and throw them into the pile of human wreckage. They are these dead, yes. We always forget that moral factor. I think it frightens us as we go along with all of the groups in the country clamoring to maintain present levels. What is it? It is a bad conscience. They are afraid there is going to be dislocation. So bad conscience now impels them to take hold and sort of dig in at these higher levels that now obtain, knowing that when the war is over and the transition begins, then must be both moral and economic expiation. So I say to you, the adjustment is not going so easy. And when dislocation comes with its handmaiden of despair and distress, there will come those eloquent and persuasive economic prophets to preach their magic dispensation and say, "The forces of dislocation may destroy the Nation. It cannot survive the shock with such a burden of debt unless—yes, unless complete economic power is entrusted to strong hands." What then?

For years, many well-meaning and altruistic men have been going over the country preaching the gospel of greater centralization, more control, more direction by Government, more spending and more debt. Mr. Wallace is one of these. He is an amiable and affable person. He has so freely expressed his beliefs from the platform and by the printed word, I have read much of what he has written. I picked up a little booklet the other day that he wrote in 1934, in which booklet he says:

> The social controls are here to stay and to grow on a national and a world scale.

That is what Mr. Wallace wrote in 1934, and he has not relinquished that philosophy insofar as this humble mind knows.

I think of a learned educator by the name of Dr. Lynd standing before 2,500 educators at Columbia University, standing before people whose life's business it is to fashion the direction of the thinking of our youngsters, and there before those people he said:

> To preserve the technological advances there must be a centralized, planned national economy.

I think of Stuart Chase, whose economic theories are so beautiful and persuasive until he gets around to the point where the question is asked about finances, and when you ask Mr. Chase, "Where are you going to get the money?" his theories show up much like the point in the story that came up from Texas when one of the candidates who was running down there promised everybody $30 a month. He would go around with his orchestra playing these hill-billy tunes. After a while somebody in the audience who at least had done a good deal of fiscal housekeeping in his time and could make his budget balance, even though it was meager, said, "Mr. Candidate, how are you going to get the money?" The candidate turned to the orchestra and he said, "Boys, play him another tune." Yes, play them another tune. If one solution of a problem fails, try another and appropriate additional billions. If a W. P. A. fails to meet our job problem, try a bigger W. P. A. If modest borrowing is good, heavy borrowing is better. If a little debt is good, more debt is better. Never call it debt. Call it investment for income. If this theory is sound, then one must agree that a person can drink himself sober. Yet this is the philosophy which seems to be catching on from the persuasive pens of economists like Mr. Chase.

Then I think of Rex Tugwell, our Governor down in Puerto Rico, one of the most engaging personalities I ever met. I used to go down and visit with him when he was Under Secretary of Agriculture. You will not find a more facile conversationalist or a more intriguing personality. In Los Angeles he made that celebrated speech a few years ago in which he said: "There must be disciplined democracy."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think of Doctor Hanson, adviser to the Federal Reserve Board, one of whose favorite phrases is "bold social engineering." S. E.—that is the new degree which youngsters may look forward to—social engineering. There are many others who accent the same general theme today. Debt, discipline, control. These are the miracle words of today. There must be mass direction for the common good. There must be management. The individual counts for naught.

Put those forces together and they are so relentless and so determined. Give them a national debt estimated now at $292,000,000,000, and it may be more, and let them frighten enough timid people that this the job of managing a huge debt and controlling every aspect of our economy must be entrusted to them or we shall surely go to pot and then what? This condition when fused with another period of distress will make administrative absolutism complete.

I end where I began. I suggest you read pages 119 and 120 of the hearings—182,000 administrative orders from 1941 to 1946. If the trend continues, then what? Then instead of fussing as we have been that something must be done to preserve all the basic values and traditions of our Republic we may very well say that unlike Elijah we watched and we missed the cloud; it is already gone down. Then our achievement in state socialism will be complete.

Let us think pretty carefully about these appropriation bills that come along, because in them is the seed of the preservation of our country in the days that lie ahead of us.

Now, any questions?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman referred to Stuart Chase. I want to quote him directly:

> Great nations do not go bankrupt in the way a person or a business does, because the debt they owe is to themselves. If the price level is kept under control, the public debt can be a great reservoir for public investment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The great financier who is now the leader of our country in 1932 promised the American people that in a short time he would balance the Budget. Then they decided to spend and spend and spend, and now we find we have gotten into our present situation. Does the gentleman believe the words he used in his Budget message, "the management of the public debt," meant anything other than that they would so manipulate the debt that, owing this debt to ourselves, as he said, it would eventually amount to nothing? Does the gentleman believe that when he referred to the management of the public debt he had in mind that eventually the debt would be wiped out by his manipulations?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Permit me one final observation. Now and then one encounters the name of a great philosopher. One such was Oswald Spengler. You remember he wrote that rather difficult tome called "The Decline of Western Civilization." You know the theme that he pursues. He takes all the civilizations of the world, the Chinese, the Greek-Roman Classic, the Egyptian, and others, and divides them up into periods. He shows the precultural period and how long it lasted, and then the duration of the culture is divided into spring, summer, fall, and winter. He shows the rise and decline of each one of these cultures, and there is an amazing cycle of consistency about it, because the spring season of every culture was about the same number of years, and likewise the summer season, the autumn season, and then the decline. Then he measures the development of western civilization, including us, for the purpose of predicting that there will be a decline in western civilization and that the ultimate end is what? His word is imperialism—amazing thing. We dare then ask today, Are we on the way to fulfillment of that

prophecy? Spengler says it is inevitable. History may incline that way but it does not impel. Salvation still lies in our own souls, our own efforts.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There was another great social philosopher named Thomas Jefferson, and he foresaw with uncanny clarity the very things the gentleman has discussed so well for us today. He stated his philosophy in one inspired sentence:

> I am for a government that is rigorously simple and frugal and not one that multiplies offices to make partisans and by every device increases the public debt under the guise of being a public benefit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I first want to say a word of appreciation for the splendid and clear manner in which the chairman of this committee presented the statement on this bill. However, I was a little disappointed at the manner in which the committee has handled that part of the bill which has to do with advance planning of public works. You will recall that when we passed the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act in September of 1944, there was provision in that act for the planning of public works. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has said, his committee went into the fact-finding field. There is a special committee of which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is chairman, and a subcommittee, of which I am chairman, which has to do with public works. We have gone very carefully into the field of public-works planning, because we feel very definitely, although our report has not been completed, that we should not have a W. P. A. in this country. Both the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and I feel that instead of loans or advances, we ought to have grants on a matching basis. However, the law provides for loans and advances. If we are only going to the extent of $5,000,000 for an appropriation for the planning of these public works, then truly it is only a token appropriation and we must look forward in the future to some real development so that the planning of public works might go on.

I do not maintain that the planning of public works, or the construction of public works will by itself quiet any great economic unrest which might result from the cessation of the war, but it will have a powerful influence and this Congress should determine whether or not we are going to have advances or loans for public works or whether we are going to have grants-in-aid. The present bill provides that where loans or advances have been made for post-war planning and those plans go into construction, that the loan must be paid. If the plans do not go into actual construction, then the loan must not be paid back. It has been intimated that by reason of the latter provision perhaps the bureaus are going to go out or will go out and try to dig up trade, as it were, amongst the various communities, urging them to start their planning even though there is no prospect of going into actual construction later. However, I think it can be fairly said that the Federal Works Agency is giving careful consideration to all these plans as they are submitted.

Further, I desire to state that actually there is present now a case where the city of St. Louis needs funds for post-war planning. They have authorized a bond issue for the construction of public works. They cannot issue those bonds until their plans and specifications are ready.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] has expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. They cannot get those plants and specifications because they do not have the money. The bonds have not been sold.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of course, the gentleman is talking about my city now. As I stated yesterday, after members of the committee had said that no applications had been made for funds to be used for preparing plans and specifications, within the past 2 or 3 weeks the mayor of the city of St. Louis, together with his engineers, called in person upon General Fleming, and appealed for financial assistance so that our city can be ready to spend this money in the event it is necessary at the termination of the war. The gentleman is absolutely correct. They cannot proceed until plans and specifications are ready. The bond issue has already been passed. We cannot change it. However, we were led to believe by the Reconversion Act that the Government was going to loan—not grant—we are not looking for a hand-out—but we need a loan to complete the plans and specifications.

Mr. LYNCH. I am sure there are other instances in addition to that of the city of St. Louis where the money is needed for this planning.

As I said, under the present law it is now a question of advances alone. $5,000,000 will not in any way take up the slack that exists in connection with the need for money for post-war planning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the Members to the case of Pvt. Henry Weber, of Vancouver, Wash., sentenced to death by a court martial at Camp Roberts, Calif., the reason being, as far as I can ascertain, a refusal to drill for conscientious reasons. I note in this morning's newspaper that the death sentence has been commuted to life imprisonment at hard labor with all pay and family allowances cut off.

Private Weber is a conscientious objector against war and the killing of his fellow men. No one can question the sincerity of his feelings when we can plainly see that he has faced the death penalty because of his beliefs. Private Weber's draft board knew that he was a conscientious objector when they inducted him. The Army knew he was a conscientious objector since the records show that he has already served one 6-month term at hard labor for refusal to bear arms. Why was he discriminated against and kept in a combatant unit when the records plainly showed his firm convictions against such service, and the fact that on several occasions he had requested transfer to a noncombatant unit?

Not only is Private Weber made a victim of this discrimination but his wife and 2-year-old son, cut off from his Regular Army allotment by the action of the court martial, must now make their way in the world as best they can.

I believe that the Military Affairs Committee of the House should make a complete investigation of this affair before it becomes a blot upon the record of our armed forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. TRAYNOR].

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the remarks made today by the gentleman from Ohio concerning the American Dental Association and the entrance of Jewish boys into dental colleges. During my 50 years in the practice of dentistry and my membership in the American Dental Association I have never known the American Dental Association to pass a resolution dictating to dental colleges the personality of dental students of any race or religious beliefs to be denied courses in their chosen professions.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to the item in this bill of $5,000,000 for lending to States and municipalities for the making of plans to provide employment during the post-war period. I hold in my hand a copy of the report composed of 102 pages by the Iowa Post-War Rehabilitation Commission presenting detailed recommendations to the Governor of Iowa and the fifty-first general assembly in January 1945. It is a most comprehensive and notable report. This commission is composed of 25 leading citizens of the State of Iowa who gave much of their time to the study of this problem. The chairman of the commission is Mr. Don L. Berry, of Indianola, Iowa, and the secretary is Bar Keshlear, of Shenandoah, Iowa. In this report they say:

> If a liberal-spending program for public works is inaugurated, either by the State or Nation, which cannot be slowed down or suspended when private enterprise calls for the available men and materials, such

a program will contribute toward an inflationary spiral and a subsequent collapse which may make the troubles of the thirties seem by comparison like a mild summer breeze.

Your commission believes the Fiftieth General Assembly was wise in calling for a program financed mainly from within the State itself for several reasons. In the first place, the Federal Government is deeply in debt and without considerable assets, the inevitable aftermath of war, for which no criticism is here implied. Local governments are in better condition and able to finance their own projeects.

Secondly, the tax or bond dollar will buy more if expended near to where it is raised, rather than by sending it to Washington to be allocated back. Experience has demonstrated that such dollars lose most of their manhood during their visit to Washington and return home looking like victims of pernicious anemia.

On the next page of their report they make the following statement:

It is the opinion of your commission that post-war stability would be greatly strengthened if the Government would finally announce that the era of Federal generosity to local projects is past. We recommend that the Iowa General Assembly memorialize Congress to this effect. From the best information we can gather, a great many communities, instead of going ahead and making plans for projects that can be used to stabilize employment after the war, are sitting back waiting to learn how much help the Government will give them.

They say further:

It is the opinion of this commission that the legislature should take such action as will empower cities, counties, and school districts to levy a tax sufficient to defray the expense of planning improvements in advance of final financing, and to permit them to borrow in advance of the anticipated proceeds of such levy in order that planning activities may proceed immediately.

One would think, listening to some of the debate on the floor this afternoon, that the Federal Government had a monopoly on all planning ability for the things that will be needed after this war.

I want to remind the Members of this House who are inclined to feel that way that we still have brains out in the States and just as good architects, just as good planners, if not better, as you can possibly get out of Washington, D. C. I hope this $5,000,000 item in question will be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, as the reading of this bill proceeds, there will be one item hardly any notice will be taken of and it is for this reason that I call attention to it now.

It will be recalled that a few years ago an effort was made to bring the Members of Congress and members of the Cabinet under the Federal Retirement Act. All the newspapers of the country carried articles to the effect that the Congress was voting itself a pension. I challenged that statement at the time based upon my own service and I showed that if I received all the benefits of the Retirement Act it would cost me, according to the Civil Service Retirement Division, around $8,900 and from that time on I would be required to pay $41 a month as long as I was a Member of the Congress.

There are many people who feel that Government employees take care of their own retirement. That is exactly what I want to call attention to. I feel that the Government, just like any private employer, should contribute toward a retirement fund or a pension plan or the Social Security Act, as they do. However, in this bill you will find an appropriation of $245,000,000 of the taxpayers' money which is put into the retirement fund. That is an increase over the current appropriation, which was $194,500,000. The increase is due to the fact that a large number of new Government employees have joined the retirement fund and, as they make their private contribution toward the retirement fund, under the law the Government likewise adds a certain amount. The Government employee today is contributing 5 percent of his salary toward the retirement fund. I just wanted to show that the fund is not self-sustaining.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have the figures presently at hand, but I shall put them in the RECORD, showing that we are appropriating at the present time something like $500,000 a year to pay the salaries of retired members of the judiciary, and those individuals do not contribute a nickel toward their own retirement. We are also appropriating almost a hundred million dollars a year to pay the retired pay of officers and noncommissioned men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, not one of whom contributes 5 cents toward that fund. The taxpayers pay the bill every year without any contribution from anyone. If that is fair, it seems to me that we should be able to work out some kind of an amendment to the present Retirement Act whereby the Members of the Congress and the members of the Cabinet will have an opportunity if they so desire to join the Retirement Act providing that they meet all of the requirements of that act that every other Government employee and official meets. There should be no objection to that. The Chairmen of the Tariff Commission, the Communications Commission, and every other commission come under the Retirement Act, if they desire to join, but Cabinet officers cannot nor can Members of the Congress.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the figures that were given relative to the Veterans' Administration. We regret the necessity that calls for the enormous increase, but we are very glad that this Nation is able and prepared to take care of the veterans of this war. Three years ago, as I recall, the over-all appropriation for the Veterans' Administration was something like $900,000,000; somewhat less than one billion. In the appropriation bill today the figure is $2,700,000,000.

The United States has a record of taking better care of the defenders who bare their breasts to the enemy, who keep the enemy from invading the shores of our country and putting down the enemies abroad, than any other nation, I believe, and we are not going to fail in our obligations to the veterans now fighting on three continents for our Republic.

The last time I talked with General Hines he anticipated it was going to be necessary to have a great many more veterans' hospitals. I can see that that must be true with the number of casualties that are reported daily from overseas from all theaters of war. This forenoon I was in the Casualty Division of the Adjutant General's Office. The reports of casualties come in by the thousands every day; not once in a while, but every day. They showed me where some time reports come into the Casualty Division at the rate of 5,000 in 1 batch. Those casualties, of course, include different degrees of injuries, missing in action, and deaths from various causes.

It may be of interest to Members of Congress to learn that the Casualty Division sends, on the average, more than 4,500 notification telegrams per day. It has from 900 to 1,000 telephone inquiries daily, and if you become vexed because it seems to take more time to answer one of your personal inquiries than seems necessary let me say that it would pay you to make a trip down to the Munitions Building and let one of the officers there show you their set-up and explain how each case is handled. It is a marvel to me that they can furnish us with information as quickly as they do, especially when one learns that whereas a year ago congressional inquiries averaged 54 a day, now there are on the average 243 inquiries each day from Members of Congress. The Casualty Division is open 7 days a week, and in order to keep up with the work there are 3 shifts of employees. Something like 2,300 civilians and around 80 officers are required in this division of The Adjutant General's office alone.

Each report is checked so carefully that while during the last war mistakes averaged approximately 6 percent, up to the present time during this war errors have averaged only three-tenths of 1 percent, including reports coming to us from our own people and from the enemy as well. Out of the whole number of casualties there are a great many soldiers suffering from injuries who will have to be taken care of for a good many months and some who will have to have hospital care for a good long while after the war is over.

I am glad to say that the Appropriation Committe has been generous and has undertaken to anticipate the needs of the Veterans Administration even before the end of the war is in sight.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. A measure has been passed in another body, S. 294, providing that the taxpayers of this country shall give to the veterans of our Allied Nations in this war, at our expense, each and every benefit we are giving to our own veterans, and that these other countries at some future date to be agreed upon shall repay to our Government such sums as we disburse

for that purpose; in other words, it is proposed that we lend-lease veterans' benefits. I am wondering if the gentleman thinks we can meet the obligation we have to our own veterans in this country if we adopt any legislation of that character.

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I say to the gentleman that our obligation is first to our own defenders. I do not know what it is going to cost to administer the veterans' affairs in the years to come, including pensions, disability benefits, hospitalization, and so forth, but I can visualize that it might go to $5,000,000,000 annually, and the total budget of the Federal Government not many years ago was less than that figure. I do not know how we can carry out the provisions of the bill to which the gentleman refers. Our first obligation is to our own boys, obviously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, who knows more about veterans' affairs than anyone else in the House, I think.

Mr. RANKIN. There are two things I should like to say to the gentleman. In the first place, the Army and Navy have built some very splendid hospitals that are being used now, and it is our hope that when the war is over some of them at least may be transferred to the Veterans' Administration.

With reference to what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] said a moment ago, I think you will find that the bill to which he refers is merely a reciprocal proposition, that we are to provide the same facilities for the disabled men from other countries who are in the United States that they provide for ours in their countries. There are really more of our disabled men in their countries than there are of their disabled men in our country, so I do not think there is as much danger in the bill as the gentleman from Missouri seems to apprehend.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have not seen this bill. It applies for the present and not for the post-war years? It applies to the period before we get our boys home?

Mr. RANKIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is another proposition entirely from what I understood the question of the gentleman from Missouri to be. We want to do whatever is necessary to insure that our boys will be taken care of abroad the same as at home.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Charity begins at home.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Charity, of course, begins at home, but we want our boys to be taken care of when they are overseas in a foreign country.

Mr. RANKIN. But if we have disabled men in Canada, and Canada has disabled men in the United States, there is no reason why a reciprocal agreement should not be worked out for them to help take care of ours and for us to help take care of theirs.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We want our boys taken care of wherever they are.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree that we want to take care of ours first and bring them home as quickly as possible, but where this reciprocal agreement can be worked out to the benefit of all concerned without imposing an unnecessary burden on the United States, of course we are in favor of it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Of course, we will see that our boys have the care that they so richly deserve. They are the saviors of our country and in fact the defenders of liberty throughout the entire world.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

NEEDED: REINTERPRETATION OF G. I. BILL TO ASSURE VETERANS TUITION PAYMENTS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, it has just been revealed that 350 veterans now studying in private trade schools have been seriously affected by a new interpretation of the G. I. bill of rights by the Veterans' Administration. In New York City a small delegation of 15 soldiers now studying at a photography school have been informed that the Veterans' Administration is not planning to pay their full tuition.

The school tuition fees are $410, together with an additional $90 for supplies. The school curriculum calls for a 4-month course, and veterans honorably discharged from the services with more than 90 days of service are permitted $500 a year for educational purposes, together with a regular monthly stipend for maintenance during this scholastic training.

Under the new ruling, the Veterans' Administration has interpreted the law to require the soldier to attend school for at least 30 weeks of every year in order to receive the full credit of $500 provided by the act. If the course is shorter in duration, the veteran becomes entitled under this view to only one-thirtieth of the $500 annual amount, or $16.67 for each week of schooling, in addition to the maintenance sums.

The Veterans' Administration had already approved the applications of some 350 veterans before issuance of the new interpretation. Included in this number are many who are disabled and who now face the prospect of owing their training schools as much as $200 each. At the New York photography school its director pointed out that 12 students had already completed their training and that some 50 others are now attending classes. No funds at all have yet been paid for this training.

It should be pointed out that this new ruling has not had congressional authorization, but that it has been handed down by Veterans' Administration officials upon advice of counsel. To declare that this decision is a breach of faith with those who have relied upon the popular understanding of the G. I. measure does not solve the problem. It must be reconsidered and clarified by Congress so that every soldier who has served 90 days becomes eligible for a training course of his own choosing up to the $500 figure, provided that the course is offered by a regularly approved educational or trade-school institution.

In this bill we provide over $2,707,000,000 for the Veterans' Bureau. The item here discussed is a relatively small amount. It involves a mere $500, but it is most important to those affected. I trust that it will receive the immediate attention of the Veterans' Administration. I share the views of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, about General Hines and his administration. I think they are doing a remarkable job, but I think they have misinterpreted the law in this regard. This is the time to bring this to their attention. I trust this injustice will be corrected.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to comment upon one phase of the manpower situation which has not been commented on, at least as far as this bill is concerned. We heard a great deal during the debate on the recent manpower bill about the shortages of manpower in certain industries manufacturing war material. But nothing was said about the surplus of manpower in other industries making and manufacturing war materials which are no longer required. An illustration in point is found in this bill when we come to the appropriation for the United States Maritime construction fund. The report of the committee shows that the United States Maritime Commission was given an appropriation for its construction fund for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, the sum of $6,766,000,000.

That record further shows that there is no money in the present appropriation bill for construction.

Reading the committee report we find the following language:

> It is estimated that funds and contract authorizations now available will be adequate for the program as presently agreed upon by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In fact, after providing $2,759,300,000 for obligations during the fiscal year 1946, for the anticipated requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for ship construction beyond the current program, it is estimated that, of the contractual authority already available, $1,167,350,000 will remain unobligated at the close of that fiscal year.

That is the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Continuing the report reads:

> The entire estimated cash balance in the construction fund at the close of the fiscal year 1945 will be $3,941,484,924, and it is estimated that the cash balance as of June 30, 1946, will be $1,629,650,000.

In other words, they will spend approximately $2,300,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. The 1945 appropriation was for $6,476,000,000. This reduction in funds means a reduction of manpower.

On page 563 of the hearings, Admiral Land testifying on January 15, 1945, we find the following:

We have dropped down from about 750,000 to about 585,000, and if we can hold the men and hold their morale, as we have been able to do—and when I say we, I do not mean Washington; I am talking about the industry—I think we can meet the program as outlined in the first quarter of 1945.

They had already dropped on January 15, 1945, 165,000 workers from the rolls in the Maritime Commission alone.

A little farther down in the same quotation he said:

We announce in advance that we are going to slip on our schedule, and very properly so, and very willingly so, in order to gear in with the program for the second half of the calendar year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Let me continue the quotation:

You can easily understand when you remember that we are doing 9,000,000 tons on schedule the first half of the calendar year (1945) and only four or five the second half, that you will have to slope it down.

Talking about the construction program, Admiral Land states that they are going to produce 9,000,000 tons of shipping with 585,000 men during the first 6 months of 1945 and they expect to cut construction down to from four to five million tons during the second half of the calendar year 1945. From this testimony we can anticipate that the present reduction from 750,000 to 585,000 will probably go down to approximately three or four hundred thousand men. We can expect a reduction of from 250,000 to 350,000 men in this one construction field alone.

This is only one illustration of many where we will find a reduction of manpower in plants producing items of war material where we have an adequate supply or where we have a surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

For salaries and expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia; contract stenographic reporting services; supplies and equipment, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, garage rentals; traveling expenses; newspapers not to exceed $500, foreign postage; not to exceed $4,500 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); and witness fees and mileage in accordance with section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act; $1,897,833: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein for the Federal Trade Commission shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 17, line 8, strike out "$1,897,833" and insert "$1,832,833."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I may say that this is the first amendment of four which I intended to offer at points in the bill to reduce amounts. It happened that when the bill was being marked up after our hearings were concluded I was on the funeral escort committee to Montana for our late colleague, Mr. O'Connor, and was not present when the bill was being marked up, so some of the notes I have made about possible reductions or revisions in the bill I did not have a chance to offer.

With this amendment as with the others, they are not crippling amendments. They are offered in a sincere effort to save a little money, to do something about this problem of decreasing deficits and debts about which there has been a good deal of talk.

With respect to the Federal Trade Commission, my amendment proposes a reduction of $65,000 and that $65,000 is directed to the request for $100,000 for new general economic investigations proposed by the Federal Trade Commission. Last year they had $35,900 for this purpose. My amendment proposing a reduction of $65,000 will leave them substantially the same money they had this year for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings the Federal Trade Commission proposed $100,000 to permit it to make investigations in seven broad fields as follows: First. Production and distribution policies and practices of large companies and their effect upon small business; second, survey of mergers; third, cost of production and cost of distribution on a number of things; fourth, lumber and other building materials, costs, prices, and profits; fifth, wholesale bread-baking industry; sixth, present degree of concentration in industry and of industrial prices and policies and their effect on trade and commerce; and, seventh, a survey of trade-association activities.

These are broad general investigations, independent of and in addition to the specific tasks which the Federal Trade Commission carries on as a matter of course. In connection with a couple of them let me tell you what happened in the committee. I asked them about the bread-baking industry. They had made a study of that last year, but wanted to go further. I asked them if they had anything to do with the regulation of the O. P. A. last year for the elimination of the use of slicing machines in bakeries. They stated: "Well, we recommended against that." Then I said, "Evidently the O. P. A. did not follow your recommendation. And if that fact were true, "I asked them, "What good does it do to make these particular investigations when the O. P. A. is operating and is functioning?" They had to admit that if the O. P. A. did not follow their suggestions, there was not very much they could do about it.

I asked them also with reference to the proposed investigation into the production and distribution policies and practices of large companies and their effect upon small business, a laudable objective, perhaps, but meaningless if they cannot do anything about it. I pointed out that under the present set-up the O. P. A. prescribes the regulations as to retail distribution, grades, prices, and so forth. I refer to the hearing on page 242 of the hearings where I asked them:

Is there anything you can do about these practices if they are ordered by the O. P. A.?

Mr. England answered:

I would prefer for the chairman to answer that if he will.

Then Mr. Ferguson answered:

I think, Congressman CASE, as I said a moment ago, the Commission, under section 6 of its act, could conduct an investigation of that kind, provided it had the funds and the personnel to do it.

Then I asked:

What I was getting at was your power to investigate the effect of the O. P. A. ceilings.

Mr. FERGUSON. We cannot investigate the O. P. A. If it is done at all, I think a committee of Congress will have to investigate O. P. A. and not the Federal Trade Commission.

So they are asking $100,000 to go into fields where they can have little if any effect when they make their recommendations. It is true they can make some general recommendations. It is true they can make findings, but they are not going to be effective if another Government agency can ignore them.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the splendid statement made by the gentleman. I would like to have information on this point. Of course, the O. P. A. is a temporary war agency. The Federal Trade Commission is a permanent agency of the Government, designed and intended to help and improve business practices.

Why would it not be helpful for the Federal Trade Commission to have available the necessary information, especially for the reconversion and post-war period, as to the effect of business practices of large business institutions on small businesses? Why would it not be helpful for us to have that information for the post-war period? Certainly, the O. P. A. is only temporary.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that. May I say this to the gentleman that when this agency was before the subcommittee, when the O. P. A. was established, when we were first going into the whole field of price control during the war, I asked them if they were equipped to make price studies. I asked them to place in the record, and they did place in the record, a statement showing the price-control activities in which they engaged during World War No. 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was my feeling that we ought not to abandon the experience and the facilities of the Federal Trade Commission in favor of setting up a new temporary agency, but we were confronted with the fact that by the policies of the administration the O. P. A. was set up.

The investigation that the Federal Trade Commission proposes to make now would be based on temporary data. It would be based on artificial conditions set up by the O. P. A. It is my thought that it will be valuable to the Federal Trade Commission to investigate these practices when normal conditions return. My amendment leaves them $35,000 for these broad investigations, the level of this year, and they still have $1,832,000 for carrying on their normal activities. But this idea of going out into some new field is valueless if they are not going to be able to do anything about conditions they find, and if the conditions they investigate are temporary conditions set up by O. P. A. regulations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If I remember correctly, I saw in the paper the other day where the Federal Trade Commission had found that this stuff that Drew Pearson is advertising over the radio called Serutan was a fake. Of course, the Federal Trade Commission cannot go out and prosecute Drew Pearson for this fraud. That is a matter for the Department of Justice.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Federal Trade Commission can and does institute complaints and orders to cease and desist.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; but prosecutions are left to the Department of Justice. So if the Federal Trade Commission in its diligence does what the Congress authorized it to do, I submit that you are not going to cure the delinquency of other agencies of the Government by cutting down the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not believe that the gentleman from South Dakota remembers what this Congress did by resolution—as I recall—by Senator WHEELER in the Senate and by Mr. Warren in the House. We provided that the Federal Trade Commission should make these very investigations named in the hearings. On top of that——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I must decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COCHRAN. We gave them $300,000 to do the job, and they made the report in part. There are many volumes. I have some in my office you can see if you desire.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I trust the members of the committee who have been talking about economy will do something about it and vote for my amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission is $1,897,000. Of course, to cut $65,000 off of this appropriation is not an extremely serious matter so far as dollars are concerned. But I want to submit to the committee, in view of the statement in the hearings which the gentleman from South Dakota himself has read, that there is no reason whatever why the action of this committee should be overruled and an additional cut placed on it. The committee has already cut $50,000 off of the appropriation of the Federal Trade Commission. We did that because in most of these old-line agencies, like the Federal Trade Commission and the Tariff Commission, and other agencies, we tried to hold them down especially where any increase in their appropriations would call for additional manpower.

Now just look for a moment, if you will, at one of these seven categories in which the Federal Trade Commission stated they might operate if they were given this $100,000; and $100,000 for a fiscal year in the broad field of general investigations, of course, is a mere pittance. Let me call your attention to one subject which they propose to investigate, for instance, and see if it is important:

> Cost of production, costs of distribution, and prices of farm implements, tractors, motor vehicles, household appliances, and household furniture and furnishings.

And another:

> Lumber and other building materials, costs, prices, and profits. The building industry affords an enormous market for postwar labor, which market will tend to be larger if material costs are kept at a low level. A general study of production and distribution costs and profits of sample selections of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers would disclose whether costly and uneconomic practices are being engaged in.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Are not all of those things, farm machinery, lumber, and so forth, under price ceilings of the O. P. A. today?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Maybe they are under the price ceilings of the O. P. A., but everyone here knows that the O. P. A. is a temporary agency, just as pointed out by the gentleman from Tennessee, and its life is fixed by the duration of the war. If the war is over, O. P. A. ceases. We all hope it will be over soon. Then the only investigative agency we will have is the Federal Trade Commission, which is operating under mandates of Congress. To take $65,000 off their appropriation, it seems to me, is a little bit more than a pat on the wrist; it is a sort of a slap in the face. If they are not doing any good and they are not a useful agency, we do not want their investigations and we ought not to appropriate anything for them. We ought not to appropriate even $35,000 if these broad general investigations are no good. Why throw away $35,000? Why give them $35,000 and take the $65,000 away from them?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is what they had this year, $35,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that these facts are being assembled for the postwar period principally to safeguard the consumer in the field of agricultural implements, and the small businessman?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think so. It is not a large operation, and it is an operation they are eminently qualified to do. They are doing a good job on it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope very much the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 62, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read, as follows:

> Public works advance planning: Toward accomplishing the provisions of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, $5,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 4 percent shall be available for administrative expenses necessary therefor, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1946, including salary for not to exceed one position at $10,000 per annum; personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; purchase and exchange of lawbooks and books of reference; purchase (not exceeding 5) and repair, maintenance, and operation of passenger automobiles; and travel expenses (not to exceed $10,000): *Provided*, That the Federal Works Administrator may delegate to the principal administrative officer of this activity the authority to make appointments of personnel hereunder.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph on the ground it contains legislation in an appropriation bill. I invite the attention of the Chairman particularly to the language in lines 14 and 15, page 18, which says:

> to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

And also to the language beginning in line 24 saying:

> *Provided*, That the Federal Works Administrator may delegate to the principal administrative officer of this activity the authority to make appointments of personnel hereunder.

I direct the point of order to the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 18, line 12, insert:

"Public works advance planning: Toward accomplishing the provisions of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, $5,000,000, of which not to exceed 4 percent shall be available for administrative expenses necessary therefor, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1946, including salary for not to exceed one position at $10,000 per annum; personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; purchase and exchange of lawbooks and books of reference; purchase (not exceeding 5) and repair, maintenance, and operation of passenger automobiles; and travel expenses (not to exceed $10,000)."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against certain language in the amendment just offered reading, "to be immediately available," and call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the bill is an appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. I direct this point of order merely against the language, "to be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered conforms to the point of order which the gentleman made to the paragraph originally. The language in line 17, "to be immediately available," had not been complained of by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] makes a point of order against the language indicated by the gentleman from Virginia, "to be immediately available." Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from South Dakota, Is the language to which he makes a point of order found in the printed bill after "$5,000,000", in line 14?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the language against which I make a point of order is found in line 17 of the printed bill. They are the words "to be made available" in lines 17 and 18.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the point of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota is well taken. This is a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending—not beginning, but ending—June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. I cannot see where it violates any rule of the House to make this immediately available.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, that means the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, which means beginning July 1, next.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it says, "ending June 30, 1946." Now, if this money is to be expended between now and that time, I cannot see where those words "to be immediately available" violate any rule of the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. How could you end a year without beginning the year? Therefore it begins on July 1 and ends on the last day of June.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is right; but that still does not make this language subject to a point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was just going to make the observation that I thought the precedents on this type of language were sufficiently clear that it was not necessary to look them up at this time. But the language "to be made available or to remain available until expended" has recurrently been held to be legislation on an appropriation bill, where an appropriation bill was under a title making it specific for a given fiscal year. My purpose in making the point of order is because it seems to me, with the manpower situation as it is, this particular activity could just as well start after June 30 as to start before that time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The Chair is ready to rule. In volume 7, Cannon's Precedents, section 1120, the Chair finds the following language:

Under the modern practice the provision that an appropriation shall be immediately available is not subject to a point of order.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized on his amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, of course, the amendment in substance is the language carried in the original bill, with the exception of that stricken out, "to be immediately available and remain available until expended."

As I stated in presenting the bill to the House yesterday, the Committee on Appropriations felt there was some question about this program for Federal participation in making money available as loans to States for advance planning, but inasmuch as the authorization was carried in the War Mobilization Act and it was substantive law, we felt we should bring the item to the House for consideration. Therefore, we made what is tantamount to a token appropriation. I believe this amount should be carried in the bill, and we should be guided in the future by what experience shows us. If there are applications for these funds and they are needed, it will be very easy to add to the appropriation. I do not think we should strike out entirely all appropriations for this item. On the other hand, I do not think we should enlarge the appropriation at this time.

Therefore, I hope the action of the committee in making an initial appropriation of $5,000,000 for the next fiscal year will be sustained by the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] may be confused by reason of the point of order that was made and sustained by the Chair, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], which is now before the House. It is my understanding that under the rules, if the gentleman from West Virginia desires to increase the amount over $5,000,000, he is now at liberty to offer his amendment for the amount he desires to insert in preference to the $5,000,000. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Answering the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is now pending. An amendment to change the amount would be in order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland rise?

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to strike out the entire paragraph under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had sent that amendment to the desk before the paragraph was stricken on a point of order. The situation is different at this time. If the gentleman desires to oppose the amendment which the committee has offered, he will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, we all thoroughly enjoyed the masterful explanation of this bill by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia yesterday. I was greatly impressed by his statement that the request for this particular item originally was for $75,000,000, but that the committee allowed $5,000,000. Had the request been for six or seven million and the committee had authorized five million, one would not be suspicious, but when a request comes in for seventy-five million and the committee in its wisdom recommends but five, then, in my opinion, we should look into it.

Every State in the Union is planning for post-war work. How this post-war work is handled is going to be one of the most important things facing this Congress and facing this Nation. I believe we should encourage the States and cities to stand on their own legs, not come to Washington and depend on Washington's financing all their projects. I come from a little State that is known as the Free State, a State which still believes in home rule and State's rights, and not too much centralized Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have to pass this appropriation to insure that the Federal Government is going to help after the war ends. We already have a road program, a rivers and harbors program, and in this bill a marvelous program for the education of the boys in the armed service, to put them in business, to help them buy homes and to help them in every way we can. So I say we should stop and think before we make this initial appropriation to go

into the field of advance planning for the Nation after this war has ended just to be sure that we do not have any more W. P. A., just to be sure that we do not repeat the mistakes we made during the depression following World War No. 1.

So I hope my amendment to strike out this whole clause will be adopted and that we will let the States and cities proceed with their own planning. Let them stand alone, let them get out of the habit of calling on Washington to help them on any and all occasions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman's amendment proposes to strike out the entire paragraph.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The point of order which was sustained by the Chair struck out the paragraph. In other words the gentleman is urging us to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. I want to strike out the whole paragraph.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That will do the same thing.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. I thank the gentleman. That is what I wish to urge then.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY to the amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virinsert in lieu thereof "$25,000,000"; strike out "4 per centum" and insert "2 per centum."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I hold no brief for the Federal Works Agency which the committee hearings and the Budget recommendations show asked for a total of $77,800,000. I do believe, however, that the paltry sum of $5,000,000 approved by the Committee on Appropriations comes dangerously near to sabotaging the entire post-war unemployment program. This program has legislative approval under title 5 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

I want to compliment the distinguished and able gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] on his very fine statement, also the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] who spoke in support of this program.

It is not a Federal gift as some would have you believe, it is not even a Federal grant; it is a loan, and the Federal Treasury will be reimbursed for all advances to cover engineering costs out of State, county, and municipal funds on all projects that are completed.

I have scanned the program as submitted by the Federal Works Agency and I find the backlog of the proposed post-war projects for 1,480 governmental units is on the dollar-and-cents basis in excess of $11,000,000,000. Of this $11,000,000,000 program, plans and specifications have been completed on less than $1,000,000,000, leaving approximately $10,000,000,000 on which plans and surveys must still be prepared.

On the basis of 5 percent for engineering costs, the estimate of the Federal Works Agency as submitted for the overall project was not so far out of line. The five million approved by the committee for this item will provide engineering fees or costs on only $100,000,000 of construction, which happens to be the approximate amount of the backlog of projects in my home State of West Virginia.

I fear those who are proceeding on the assumption that there will be no post-war unemployment are living in a fool's paradise. Private industry will not be able to absorb all of the employables. There is sure to be a period of months or even years when industrial concerns now engaged in war work will be retooling and reconverting to peacetime production. It is essential that a post-war program of public buildings, highways, and other improvements be ready to go into action should this unemployment situation develop.

I am sure no Member of this Congress desires to return to the P. W. A. and the W. P. A. and like agencies, and I am equally sure that this Congress is not interested in any cost-plus contracts. The only way to avoid all of this is to have plans and specifications ready for immediate advertisement so that they can be let to private contractors.

Again, I submit that the sum of $5,000,000 is wholly inadequate. If the $75,000,000 is unreasonably high, then the $5,000,000 set by the committee is unreasonably low and I trust, therefore, it will be the pleasure of this committee to accept my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia to the amendment.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman preceding the gentleman from Texas made the remark that this is a loan and that the money would be paid back provided the projects are completed. Is that a true statement? It will not be paid back unless the project is completed.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will turn to page 977 of the hearings he will find a copy of the law on the subject which does authorize an appropriation of Federal money to be lent or to be advanced to the States for the purposes of planning.

The Committee on Appropriations, which brings in this bill, is certainly not opposed to post-war plans. All of us know a great deal of work is being done along that line. We are all familiar with the Flood Control Act. Many millions of dollars are planned to be spent on work along that line, including soil conservation, which is essential, regardless of the unemployment or employment situation when this war is over. We are all familiar with the public-roads program which is being planned and which is essential. We are also familiar with the fact that we must be on the alert and not overlook having adequate plans for employment when this war is over.

The organic law does not state how much money may be appropriated for the purpose of post-war planning. The Budget picked out of the blue the figure of $75,000,000. They would like to have that amount appropriated by this committee. But it was not shown that requests had been made for loans or advances by the States for this money, and there was no adequate reason shown at this time why the $75,000,000 should be appropriated. They did bring down for us justifications containing many pages of jobs, one at $10,000, some at $8,000, some at $6,500; numerous jobs to be filled in carrying out this program.

Mind you, this appropriation is merely for the purpose of trying to stimulate the States to make plans for post-war projects. As has been pointed out so well by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], most of the legislatures of the country are now in session, 42 of them, I believe. The States are pretty well fixed financially, and there is a keen interest in the States as regards planning. Let us give the States whose legislatures are now in session a chance to rise and meet their own needs, and then a little later in the session—as we expect to be here for some time—if it develops that we need more than $5,000,000, why we can appropriate it, but let us give the States the right of way to plan their own projects.

It seems clear to me that this initial appropriation of $5,000,000 should give us a start, and let us ascertain whether or not it might be necessary to appropriate $75,000,000 or $100,000,000 or any other sum in the future for this kind of program. I submit no one can read the hearings and find why $75,000,000 should be appropriated at this time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wanted to ask the gentleman whether, so far as this list of jobs is concerned, the committee has not taken care of that problem in the text of the bill, regardless of whether amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia is adopted or not. The language that the committee has brought before us and the language of the Woodrum amendment would prevent any such number of jobs as the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that on as important a

matter as this is we at least ought to have fairly extended debate.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as I look over the House, I think everyone who is on his feet is opposed to the amendment, and I am wondering what the necessity for prolonged debate is.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to making it 30 minutes if it is going to cover the Members now standing and give them each 3 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what I was thinking of, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICH. If that is the case, I will not yield any further, Mr. Chairman. If they are going to cut me down to 3 minutes, I must object.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia wish to submit a further request?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I realize that I take up time on the floor. I am sent here for that purpose, and I expect to do it. But when they try to cut me down to 3 minutes it just does not seem fair. All of us are sent here with the duty of trying to save this Nation; save it from the New Deal policies. I do not think it is a question of appropriations any more; it is a question of our being the saviors of the Nation. If this Congress is not going to do it, nobody will do it, because we are in terrible straits. The Nation is in financial peril, all on account of the New Deal administration.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman is not speaking to the question. He is making a political speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. RICH. When the gentleman from Virginia says $5,000,000 is a paltry sum, then I wonder where we are heading for. Five million dollars to me is a terribly large amount of money. To New Dealers it is a paltry sum.

For 12 years you have been carrying on with the idea that to spend, spend, spend is the wise and sane thing for the American people to do, and especially this Government, until you have this Nation in the most critical condition it has ever been in in all its history. Notwithstanding the fact that you have got us into this war, you are still continuing to try to wreck us by spending. The very things the boys are fighting for in Europe are going to be lost here unless this Congress saves them. The President will not; he has proven that beyond all doubt. He will wreck the Nation in extravagance.

I say to you from the best judgment I possess that unless you stop this squandering of public funds you are not going to be able to do anything less than keep the printing presses going until you repudiate all the things we have ever undertaken. All the things that have been built up in this Nation of ours by men who have always considered that work, earn, and save should be the policy we should pursue are going to be lost, and there will be no opportunity in this land for anyone. That is a serious situation. It certainly behooves everyone in the Nation and especially every Member of Congress to try to preserve, if they possibly can, the last vestige of American liberty.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I am attempting to get an answer to my question, which I think was pertinent. Now, I believe in preparing and having plans and am not opposed to the committee request of $5,000,000, however——

Mr. RICH. I think it was very pertinent, too.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman from West Virginia made the remark that the money would not be considered a loan to the State, and would not be repaid to the Federal Government unless the projects were completed. Those are his exact words. In other words, the dreamers and visionaries could spend this money to draw plans for building a Tower of Babel or a bridge across the Atlantic Ocean, or engage in any other scheme of planning just to use the money and make plans, knowing the money would never be repaid, because the plans would not be accepted as practical by the State.

Mr. RICH. I will have to leave that up to them to answer, but I think they are up to all kinds of cockeyed schemes in planning for the future and the spending of money. They did it for 10 years in the past. We have been trying to secure money from the people of this Nation by taxing, taxing, taxing until their backs are about broken now. Now they are after the States to start the operation. They are trying to get this idea over to the States that they will let them do it now. I always wanted the States to do the spending. That is the right thing to do, and it always was the right thing to do. I have always been in favor of States' rights. We should have done that a long time ago. But instead of that the Chief Executive of the United States and a great many of the New Dealers have thought they knew everything and they knew where to get the money, and they have been getting it as long as the people in this country had resources, but they have about cleaned up everybody, and they think that within the next year they will have them all cleaned up. Then they want to go back to the States. It seems to me that is the object of this legislation.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a healthy question?

Mr. RICH. I yield for a healthy question. I would like to get a half a dozen of them at least.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I just want to remind my friend from Pennsylvania and my friend the gentleman from Ohio that unfortunately we get partisan every once in a while.

Mr. RICH. This is not being partisan. You would not accuse me of being partisan.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; but every once in a while someone will get up and say, "This is just another New Deal stunt." This was written into the organic law by the Congress with practically no opposition from anybody. If it is a cockeyed stunt, it is what was done in the Congress.

Mr. RICH. When was that written in? The New Deal had the majority, so they are responsible.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In the war mobilization and reconversion bill those words were written.

Mr. RICH. You mean you fellows voted for that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know where my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania was at that time. Where was he?

Mr. RICH. I was not voting for that. I was not in Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place may I point out that if, once this war has finally been won, we should have the good judgment to maintain our national wealth production at the same level we have achieved for the war we could cut taxes in half and still raise $22,000,000,000 per year of tax revenue. The financial problem of the Nation depends primarily and basically upon whether or not we maintain a high enough wealth production, a high enough level of business activity, so that with reasonable tax rates we can raise revenues necessary to not only finance the needs of the Government but to retire an admittedly staggering debt.

Mr. Chairman, I remember when we considered the contract termination bill I was on one of the committees which discussed that bill. I remember we were told by witness after witness and it was stated on the floor of the House that although there were billions of dollars involved and although by the passage of that bill, an admittedly very liberal measure toward war contractors, billions of dollars, literally billions of dollars, not millions, but billions of dollars, might be lost, it would be a small price to pay to get prompt reconversion back to peacetime production. I remember also when the bill was passed to end renegotiation of war contracts—and I regret to remind the House that renegotiation of war contracts will come to an end on June 30 of this year in the absence of other action by this Congress—similar arguments were made. The one item in the reconversion bill which had to do directly with employment of the people is the item that is here before us, an item which aims not at public-roads construction with Federal subsidies, not at rivers and harbors projects financed in whole by the Federal Government, but an item to encourage the actual blueprinting and careful preparation of worth-while plans for public projects by whom? Not by the Federal Government but by the States

and localities. Why? In order that we may not have a W. P. A. In order that we might encourage such a good program of public-works planning by the States and the cities, counties, and municipalities of this Nation as to hope that when, as, and if it became important to conduct public works those communities would be ready promptly with worthwhile projects.

This is a guaranty against a W. P. A. Indeed, I think it would be sound policy on the part of the Federal Government to pass legislation in the form of a policy declaration, at least to the effect that Federal public works, like roads, to take a difficult example, where not actually necessary to the economy of the country, should be delayed until such time as needed for employment purposes. But this is different. The time to encourage the making of these plans, if you are going to do it at all, is at the earliest possible time. I am susceptible to the argument advanced by the committee, that there has not been presented to the Public Works Administration any great number of requests for these loans. I think, under those circumstances, the committee was probably justified in cutting down the amount the Budget asked for. I think they are severe. I think perhaps the compromise proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia might be the most reasonable. But certainly I think it would be a terrible blunder on the part of the House to cut out this item completely. I think it would be bad policy and a bad precedent for us to establish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the proposals already advanced in this discussion are indicative that there is no unanimity of opinion on what should be done and how much should be allocated. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ROE] would strike out all of the money. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] thinks it should be $25,000,000. The Public Works officials who advanced this matter to the committee think it should be about $75,000,000. The subcommittee believes it ought to be $5,000,000.

Manifestly, we, as members of the subcommittee, do not arrogate to ourselves omniscience in the matter; but on the basis of all the testimony that you have and all the testimony that you absorb from men who are before you, you try to do a reasonable job. I think we try to follow the old Confucian line of "sweet reasonableness in the face of all circumstances." That is the reason we placed it at $5,000,000.

Here are some of the supporting reasons for it: First, let me say to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who is so distressed about what may happen in the post-war period, that they told us in the committee that $2,400,000,000 worth of road projects are well beyond the design stage. That is a lot of money for highways. Thereby you start cushioning the shock of readjustment.

Second, the Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds was before us. They are going to lay the whole program of Federal buildings before the Buildings and Grounds Committee at an early date, calling for the construction of Federal buildings in every congressional district in the country. That will, in addition, cushion the shock. Now, the Federal Works authorities are frank to say to us in support of the $75,000,000 that these works programs are in the "idea" stage. That is the language that was used in the justification. Now, shall we undertake to give them $75,000,000 to unduly encourage communities around the country that have some of these projects in the "idea" stage and, against their better judgment, get them, on the basis of advance planning money, to undertake programs that they do not want? If the money is advanced and the project is not built, the money is lost. It will be sunk in engineering work and blueprint paper, and all that sort of thing, but it will be irretrievably lost to the Federal Treasury. Why not pursue a reasonable course, as indicated by the committee? We have no intention of striking it all out, but why not develop an experience factor, and after a while, Congress being in session continuously, they can come back and lay before us some experience tables and say, "Here is what we have ascertained in the field. Here is the way the first $5,000,000 was used. On that basis, we feel justified in asking for additional money."

That looks like a reasonable way to proceed. I hope, therefore, the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia for $25,000,000 will be defeated, and that the committee's position to provide $5,000,000 as a start, an experimental test fund, will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is recognized for 3¾ minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment. I am in favor of it because I do not like grants, and I have voted against just as many outright grants to the States and municipalities as any Member of this House, I do not care who he may be.

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the hearings on this. I know what scared the committee, and I think I know what justified the commitee in their action and kept them from making a more favorable recommendation; that was the breakdown submitted to the committee by the Federal Works Administration in connection with the administration of this money; that is what scared the committee. As I recall it, they wanted over a hundred-odd employees in the District of Columbia and four hundred-some-odd throughout the country. That, in my opinion, hurt the Federal Works Administration more than anything else. The gentleman from Illinois asked us to set up an experimental fund of $5,000,000. This money will not be available until July. By that time there will be requests far in excess of $5,000,000. I know what the request of my own city, St. Louis, was, because it was presented by the mayor and his engineers. Our trouble is that while we have been authorized a bond issue, as I understand it, we cannot sell the bonds until the plans and specifications are ready. We do not want this money to be given to the city of St. Louis. We want to borrow the money. We are going to complete the public works, because the bond issue has been approved by the people.

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. COCHRAN. I mentioned the gentleman; I will yield to him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman makes the best argument in support of the committee's position after all, because the city of St. Louis floated an issue of $63,000,000 in bonds. Bond houses will not buy the bonds on the basis of plans. The gentleman's city probably has the best credit of any large municipality in the United States.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How amazing then that a city so amply able to finance its plans should be stymied simply because it needs a little more money to make plans.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is held up for the reason I stated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the Federal Government lends us the money to prepare plans and specifications we will pay it back; the city agrees to pay it back. Nobody wants this as a grant.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the gentleman's city has no difficulty whatever in getting all the funds it needs.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; it does. We are governed by a charter, and also whether we have the necessary cash available.

I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia is extremely reasonable. Cut down on the administrative expenditures if you desire; you can do that as much as you please; but give us an opportunity to borrow money, not receive it as a grant, so we can go ahead and get ready if the time comes when we may need it in the event of unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] or any one else on either the right or left side of the aisle, tell the Nation where the money is to come from to finance all the proposed plans for post-war employment, except by financing a goodly portion of it with the Government printing press? If you cannot answer this question, then you admit that the political exigencies of the situation demand that we blindly proceed with planned spending until the Nation

is plunged into wild and uncontrollable inflation, ultimately wrecking the whole structure upon which all sound employment rests.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, most Members of the House are rather worried about our national housekeeping, and the terminal we may finally arrive at, maybe in a year or 2 years from now, maybe not that long, and finding our country financially insolvent.

Sometimes we are charged with being perhaps political. Most of us when we vote for economy vote to try to save this Government of free enterprise and opportunity for the boys who are making such a great sacrifice. So far as concerns the amendment asking for $25,000,000 and encouraging the people to plan, I fear there are those in this House who have not sufficient confidence in the progressive spirit of the American people to trust them. There is no question but we in Illinois have more plans than we can consummate; therefore, we do not have to borrow any money in order to encourage us to plan for our people, our returned soldiers, and the improvement of our State.

I do not think we should try to encourage people along this line at the expense of the National Government. We have had too much of that during the last few years. I have even seen a campaign waged by a Senator who said, "I can get more money from Washington than my opponent because I go along with the administration." We have had too much paternalism and the people have been encouraged too much to bring all of their problems to Washington. It is going to ultimately wreck this country unless that is stopped.

The committee may have the right answer. They may be putting out a fire in the woods to burn leaves in order to keep a greater fire in the form of an extension of the W. P. A. from enveloping the entire country after this war is over. I would not oppose vigorously the $5,000,000 if we could stop at that, but I certainly oppose unqualifiedly the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia for $25,000,000. I have faith in the courage and in the progressive spirit of the people of the States and the various communities to plan. They are planning State-wide projects all over the Nation and they do not need the encouragement of several millions of dollars to get them to overplan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I dislike, on such matters as this, to take a position in opposition to the distinguished members of the Committee on Appropriations on my side of the aisle. Perhaps the reason I do so is because I have an engineering viewpoint rather than a strictly legal viewpoint or some other viewpoint that might prevail in the minds of others. I know that my own State government, as such, has no need for these funds and probably would not consider making any application. That, however, is not generally true in the case of county and city governments, because during these trying times most of them have endeavored to reduce their tax rates to the point where they are barely getting along, what with increased salaries. That has come about also because after all the Federal tax rates have necessarily increased, and our local governments have tried to cooperate by lowering taxes and cutting expenditures to a minimum.

Some cities and some counties are in much better condition than others. Some are in very poor condition. I have to look upon this sort of a thing as being very much in line with conservatism in thinking, a conservatism that arises from the fact that cities, counties, and States, when they engage in public-works projects, do it through private contractors as a rule, although sometimes they engage in construction themselves. I also look upon this from the standpoint that it takes from 12 to 18 months to draft engineering plans. They cannot be begun, of course, until after next July 1, because the funds will not be available until then, and it means it will be July 1, 1946, or July 1, 1947, or later before these plans can possibly be ready. No one knows how long this war is going to last. No one knows when we may need a sudden large amount of employment necessary to take up a sudden slack.

I think that this is very cheap insurance for the future, and I say so with all due respect to my colleagues on the Republican side of the committee. I note that the funds are limited to 4 percent for administration. The balance of the funds will not be used unless the States and municipalities call for them and then, as has been explained, if the projects are entered into, the funds are repaid to the Federal Government. I think it is very good insurance. It comes at the right time, because we do not know what the future may bring in either the length or the shortness of the war.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman called attention to the fact that the cities and counties have tried to cut down their tax rates.

Mr. HINSHAW. They really have.

Mr. MASON. What good does it do when the Federal Government has been increasing its tax rates by leaps and bounds and have more than taken up what the cities and counties and States have tried to do in the way of saving taxes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint but we do have a war on that is very expensive, and necessarily the Federal Government is spending a large amount of money for that purpose. I am in hearty accord with the principle of reduction in unimportant expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I really do not know whether it would be wise for us to vote in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia, but whether that amendment carries or not, I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia calling for $5,000,000 will carry. That amount is actually necessary and should be voted.

My colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] says that nothing is needed in Illinois. Surely not, because in Illinois, due to the sales tax that we adopted during the trying Hoover days to keep the people from starvation, we have been collecting a great deal of money which, however, has not been spent for the purpose for which it was originally intended, and now, though the need does not exist, is still being collected and the public is being mulcted on 3 percent of the necessaries of life, while millions of dollars have been expended for political purposes by the present Republican Governor in his recent reelection campaign; there still remains $138,000,000 of these moneys in the State treasury, which I repeat has and is now being taken daily out of the pockets of the consumers.

And now a word about my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I want to call attention to the hue and cry that we hear day in and day out from the gentleman.

Of course, he was not here when we passed the reconversion bill in 1944. I presume he was home counting his profits and making more millions. I do not know whether you know it or not, but he is one of the richest manufacturers and businessmen in the State of Pennsylvania. I have nothing against him. More power to him, as long as he makes the money honestly. But I know the attitude of all these big manufacturers and all these rich people when it it comes to appropriating a few thousand dollars or a few million dollars for the general good of the country. They feel that they will have to pay a little larger income tax or that there will not be an immediate reduction in the income tax, and they object and find fault. They oppose, fight, and vote against such needed funds. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has restated at least half a dozen times the fear that there will be repudiation of our values because of the increased debt of the country. I say to him and to the country that there will be no repudiation while this administration is in power. The gentleman is judging this administration and the New Deal by the old Republican Hoover administration, when there was indirect repudiation to the extent in many instances up to 85 percent of the value of the assets, bonds and securities held by the public, as you may not recall that in 1932, or before this despised New Deal came into power, everything we possessed was worth only about 15 cents on the dollar, and nearly every bank, insurance company, and businessman and manufacturer was broke and, if not broke, was on the verge of bankruptcy. That, I repeat, cannot and will not happen under this administration. We will continue to provide employment, and there will be prosperity for all.

When we legislate, we do not legislate in the interest of the Democrats; we legislate in the interest of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes. We are giving everything else away; we might just as well give a little time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate on the amendment has been fixed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a report from an outstanding institution giving the number of billion-dollar corporations, the number of billions they have made in the last few years, and a list of those poor unfortunates who are earning above $75,000 a year—more than the President of the United States. They are not my figures—they are figures that have been given to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to get permission in the House to place that in the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with my request and the unanimous consent which I have obtained, instead of including all of the figures, I shall give a few totals and excerpts of the figures given in a report issued by the Minneapolis Investors Association—a Republican investors' group—of Minneapolis, Minn. On page 5 of their report there is a list of 40 billion-dollar corporations in the United States having assets of $88,000,000,000. On page 4, a table is shown giving the increase of national income from 1932 approximating $40,000,000,000, which rose in the year 1942 to $147,927,000,000. Compare this amount with the national income in 1920 under a Democratic administration when it was $75,000,000,000, and the following year—1921—when, under a Republican administration, it was $60,000,000,000—a drop of $15,000,000,000, and to prove to the gentleman from Pennsylvania how the insurance companies have progressed, this report shows that in 1933, due to the great "Hoover prosperity" when suicides were occurring daily, the assets of the insurance companies in this country amounted to $20,000,000,000. Within 10 years—namely 1943—they have increased to $47,000,000,000.

A comparison of the benefits paid out to policyholders amounted to over $3,000,000,000 in 1933 with a lesser number of policyholders, and in 1943 with more policyholders the benefits paid out amounted to $2,365,000—$700,000,000 less than in 1933.

Mr. Chairman, these figures clearly show the prosperity of the Nation under the New Deal administration of President Roosevelt. The few figures which I have quoted should relieve the anxiety of the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to the future and should reassure him that there will be no repudiation of our debts because, with the tremendous income, we will be able to repay our debts within a short number of years and redeem all our outstanding bonds or obligations.

Mr. Chairman, if a compilation was made of all of the commercial and savings deposits in our banks I am sure it would reach the tremendous sum of $100,000,000,000, and that is not taking into consideration the billions of dollars which are locked up in safe-deposit vaults, nor is it necessary for me to point out that we own nearly 75 percent of all the gold in the world.

From time to time I receive, and presume most of you Members likewise receive, communications from so-called institutes, which are nothing more than industrial combinations, or from their officers, agents, or lawyers, who, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, complain, and with crocodile tears express fear as to the future under the New Deal, but on examination you will find that they are the officers or representatives of these $40,000,000,000 corporations which I have mentioned who are drawing salaries and bonuses ranging from $75,000 up to $450,000 a year—a sum six times greater than the salary received by the President of our country. These salaries do not include the tremendous dividends and interests which these representatives derive from the stocks owned in their respective corporations.

Mr. Chairman, in the near future I shall insert a list of those persons receiving salaries in excess of $75,000. The names of 676 of these poor, underpaid, and overworked officials of these corporations make up this list who find fault with this administration. I shall also include an insertion covering a list of corporations who have increased their assets over $40,000,000,000 in the last few years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I realize fully the force of the argument of those who see in this proposal an opportunity to get away from a repetition of W. P. A. If I thought this proposal would have that result I would gladly vote for either of the proposed sums and for many times either sum proposed. In my judgment, however, this proposal will not have that happy result, but will, on the contrary, open up just one more avenue for the demand for Federal hand-outs of the people's money.

I am going to vote against both amendments, and I take that position because of the fact that in my judgment no action is necessary at this time.

The only real basis for this proposal, as I see it, is the fact that some State legislatures have not placed upon the statute books of their respective States the necessary authority to localities to issue bonds for the purpose of paying planning costs. They all have the authority in respect to construction. If they had it in respect to planning there would be no need for this proposal whatever. Almost every State legislature is now in session. It is a simple matter to enact the necessary legislation.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the record indicates that over $3,547,000 of post-war projects have been already planned. I hold in my hand a newspaper article dated February 2 indicating that the National City Bank of New York stated on the previous day that the end of the war threatens to let loose the greatest concentrated spending in history by States and municipalities. It adds that the States as a whole will have accumulated surpluses of more than $2,000,000,000 and have been planning on how to spend it. It states further that a survey by the Federal Works Agency shows some $13,000,000,000 of post-war public projects planned or in the process of planning.

The record also indicates that from 6 to 12 months is all that is required to complete the shelf of post-war projects which those advocating this proposal have in mind. With the war still in process, with the depression following the war probably some years away, it seems to me that the Congress is fully justified in postponing this whole matter for further consideration at some future time. I shall vote accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there are three simple propositions here.

The first question you ought to ask in your own mind is whether or not this will interfere with the war effort. On that I merely want to submit one thing. This plan is supposed to put engineers at work drawing plans. Less than 2 weeks ago on a train I met an old friend who is now a representative of the Republic Airplane Corporation. He said he was out to scour the country to find 37 engineers to put to work on the draftsman's board designing airplane plans right now. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we do not have the engineers and they will not be available until the war is over.

In the second place: Is this thing needed now? I am not opposed to the expenditure of money for the proper planning of public works. But on the question of whether it is needed now or not, remember this: Our W. P. A. era did not come until we had a boom for 10 years after the World War. Why do the proponents of starting this plan now believe everything is going into a tailspin when peace comes? Already we have over $1,000,000,000 authorized in various ways for public roads. We soon will have over $1,000,000,000 programmed in rivers and harbors work. We have nearly $2,000,000,000 authorized for flood control work and going into the plans stage now. Anyone who is at all familiar with the private housing industry knows they expect the biggest boom in private housing after this war that we have ever had. There is no great rush about this proposition before us. It should have the further study which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] mentioned.

Then the third question you should ask yourself is: What is this proposition going to lead to? Do not deceive yourselves. You can talk about loaning this money but the community which is not able to finance the planning of its public works is not going to be able to finance the building of such public works. The gentleman from Virginia yesterday stated the case very well against the whole proposition at this time and against the amendment which he has had to offer in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee. He said yesterday:

I believe one of the most serious problems that confronts government in America today

is that local governments and State governments are too prone to look to Washington for relief on everything. Here is an instance of it.

That is what the gentleman said speaking about this proposition. He said further:

Without any demand, practically, the Federal Government picks up a nice little hunk o' pie and holds it up and invites the States to come in and help themselves.

The statement presented to the committee by the Federal Works Agency for this proposition has this sentence in it:

In a word, the purpose of these funds is not to promote what might be called planning at large but to promote advance planning necessary to the actual construction of the specific work to promote—

Note the words. In other words "to prime the pump" that siphons "money from the Federal Treasury."

And you cannot get away from it. Let us not deceive ourselves. In the long run you will be giving this money to the States and to the local communities. You can call it a loan if you will today, but they will come back and expect the money to construct the projects by grants or by loans and grants.

The gentleman from Virginia yesterday put in the RECORD a statement which you all should read. It is a clipping from Sunday's paper which had attracted the attention of many of us. It reports that the Associated Press has made a survey of 42 States and has found that the State governments already have earmarked over $1,725,000,000 for post-war projects.

Mr. Chairman, this thing is not needed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a moment to state the parliamentary situation.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] made a point of order against the language included in the second paragraph on page 18. The point of order was sustained. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] then offered an amendment which reestablishes the amount of $5,000,000. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] offered an amendment to increase that to $25,000,000. When my time expires we will vote, and the vote will first come upon the amount of $25,000,000, the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia; and, second, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] to retain the amount of $5,000,000.

I am going to vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia, but I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. I am not opposed to post-war planning. I believe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] will agree with me that the bill presented to this House and passed, to establish a post-war planning committee, was the bill which I introduced, with very few changes. But I do not want to go about it in the way the P. W. A. wishes. They came here and asked for $77,680,000. Of that amount they were going to use $2,680,000 for administrative purposes. They were going to have a personnel of 562, if I remember correctly. This $5,000,000 is enough to start with. The truth of the matter is, I am willing to give them $77,000,000 later if I see it is needed. But we suggested to them that they start their work with the $5,000,000, and lay down a pattern. Then if they later need more money they can come before the Deficiency Subcommittee, or they can come back before our committee. If we are urging $25,000,000, or $77,000,000, as an emergency measure, then we are assuming this war will be over, because in the hearings on page 998 we asked Mr. Field the question how long it would take to prepare these plans, and he said it would take from 6 months to a year. I do not believe we are going to need these plans before that time. With $5,000,000 in the next year they can lay a pattern for us, and we can see what they plan. We can give them the money necessary at that time, and I am going to vote for the $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

All time has expired on the pending amendment and amendments thereto.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOM) there were—ayes 36, noes 94.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 114, noes 76.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Virgin Islands public works: To enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by, and in accordance with the provisions of, the act of December 20, 1944 (Public Law 510), $150,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 19, after line 2, strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, when I was here 2 years ago I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations. At that time the Virgin Islands were under the supervision of the Interior Department, and I presume still are. Moneys were appropriated to the Interior Department for the Virgin Islands. Moneys were appropriated for a W. P. A. in the Virgin Islands. Mr. Ickes, now Secretary of the Interior, held the same office at that time. He, together with some others of his henchmen, conceived the idea of going to the Virgin Islands and buying sugar plantations, buying some worn-down rum plants. He bought those rum plants and built them up, improved them, set the Government up in a corporation so that every individual in the United States is now a stockholder in the Virgin Islands rum manufacturing business.

I have always been opposed to the Government getting into business in competition with private enterprise. I am opposed to the Government's getting into the rum business in competition with private enterprise. I want to see this principle carried out in the future. Get the Government out of all business.

This appropriation is for the purpose of buying Government machinery of other departments. I have no doubt it is machinery owned by the Interior Department or by the Navy. If we appropriate this money in the Independent Offices bill they will spend the money and give the equipment to the Interior Department. That will give Mr. Ickes just that much more opportunity to expand the rum plant in the Virgin Islands. Do you want to take part in such a proposition? Do you think it is a good thing to give them $150,000 to buy this machinery from another branch of the Government? I do not believe in it. I am against this section of the bill. We know not what the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, will do with this machinery, and I want to know that we will not improve the rum business owned by this Government.

This should be stricken out until such time as we know what Mr. Ickes and the people in the Virgin Islands want to do with this money. It is not a good thing to have it in this bill at the present time, and certainly it is not necessary.

Mr. Chairman, let me state another thing. If this equipment is owned by another branch of the Government, we ought to be careful now what we do with excess machinery, excess inventories of all kinds so far as supplies are concerned. The Government is beginning to dispose of this equipment to various agencies and at public sales, yet we find that we are buying the same materials at the same time from private corporations in this country for the Army, the Navy, and other departments of the Government. We should have a department of government established, and all the matériel, machinery, and so forth owned by the Government should be turned over to that department when it becomes surplus in any branch. It should be a clearing house and not be turned over to private enterprise so that they can make a profit out of it. We are not doing what we should as Members when we permit the Government to proceed as it is proceeding at the present time in disposing of surplus materials. You do not do things in a good business way.

Mr. Chairman, Members who are interested in the efficient operation of the Government should keep it out of private hands. Here is a good chance to do that. Here is a chance for Members to keep the Government out of the rum business. Here is a chance to get started in sound government, because that is what this money will be used for before the machinery is worn out, I believe—bigger Government-owned rum plants. Let us stop it here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. Chairman, by Public Law 510 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, an act was passed for the benefit of the government, municipalities and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands and for their internal improvement, islands that we are responsible for, islands from which last year we recovered into the Public Treasury more than $28,000,000 in receipts. In this act 29 projects were specifically set forth stating the purpose of the improvement and the amount which it was estimated the project would cost.

Section 2 of the act provided that not to exceed 5 percent of the funds therein authorized should be available for the purpose of making studies, investigations, plans, and specifications, and so forth. The Budget estimate, based on that organic law which we passed in the last session of Congress, was $535,000, which the committee reduced to $150,000. Fifty thousand dollars of that is provided to enable the Federal Works Administration to acquire machinery that is already over there, that is owned by other agencies, in order to obviate the necessity of getting new machinery and sending it over there later.

As to the $50,000 item it is merely a bookkeeping transaction because they simply buy the machinery from the other agencies and the money is covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. RICH. What other agencies?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understand it is the Navy.

Mr. RICH. I want to say that the gentleman is in error when he states that the Virgin Islands turns any money back into the Federal Treasury over and above their expenses. The Virgin Islands have not turned anything back to the Federal Treasury since we have had them. They have always been a liability and as far as getting any credit over and above expenses we have not done so. But that is not the ground on which I oppose this appropriation. I am opposing it because I think we ought to teach those people to be self-supporting and we are not doing it by the way we are handling the Virgin Islands.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The basic law which authorized this more than $10,000,000 of internal improvements was for the very purpose the gentleman is talking about, to give them internal improvements, such as sanitation, a water supply, schools, hospitals, and so forth that are badly needed over there and that our people after investigating found out that they did need very badly if we are to give them a minimum of the needs they require as citizens and for which we are responsible.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania overlooks the enormous revenue that our Treasury Department gets from the rum which is produced in the Virgin Islands and shipped to this country. I think it would just about be equal to or probably exceed the amount of money we spend down there.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It amounted to more than $28,000,000 last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

For carrying into effect the provisions of the Public Buildings Acts, as provided in section 6 of the act of May 30, 1908 (31 U. S. C. 683), and for the repair, preservation, and upkeep of all completed public buildings under the control of the Federal Works Agency, the mechanical equipment and the grounds thereof, and sites acquired for buildings, and for the operation of certain completed and occupied buildings under the control of the Federal Works Agency, including furniture and repairs thereof, but exclusive, with respect to operation, of buildings of the United States Coast Guard, of hospitals, quarantine stations, and other Public Health Service buildings, mints, bullion depositories, and assay offices, and buildings operated by the Treasury and Post Office Departments in the District of Columbia:

General administrative expenses: For architectural, engineering, mechanical, administrative, clerical, and other personal services; traveling expenses, printing and binding (not to exceed $32,000), advertising, testing instruments, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and such other contingencies, articles, services, equipment, or supplies as the Commissioner of Public Buildings may deem necessary in connection with any of the work of the Public Buildings Administration; ground rent of the Federal buildings at Salamanca, New York, and Columbus, Mississippi, for which payment may be made in advance, $1,347,890, of which not to exceed $639,650 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $522,700 for personal services in the field: *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriations shall not be available for the cost of surveys, plaster models, progress photographs, test pits and borings, or mill and shop inspections, but the cost thereof shall be construed to be chargeable against the construction appropriations of the respective projects to which they relate.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee a question. May I ask if this section contains the item to pay for the numerous guards, doorkeepers, time-consumers, receptionists, and stopper-uppers that you meet as you go into practically all of the Federal buildings these days? I have been unable to determine just which item in this bill provides for their salaries, but this section does contain a provision for their uniforms, the cleaning and the pressing thereof. Does this section include their salaries?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The appropriation to which the gentleman is addressing himself is for general administrative expenses. It does not contain the guard personnel.

Mr. POAGE. Where do we find that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. At the bottom of page 21, salaries and expenses, public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia. That is the next section.

Mr. POAGE. That is the $26,000,000 item. Of course, I cannot offer an amendment as long as I do not know how much we are spending for this purpose and I do not know that I will ever care to offer one, but I do want to ask the gentleman this question: Just what benefits do we derive from all these guards? If the gentleman knows, I would like to also ask how much we pay for this extra guarding. What benefit do we get by reason of having to go through this investigation every time we attend business in any of these Federal buildings? How does the practice of having 8 or 10 people meet you and having to produce your birth certificate or your bank book or show your finger prints and having someone determine that you are there and that you are a person in being and that you want to see somebody, regardless of what you want to see them about or why, or who you are, or where you come from—how does this help win the war? You are admitted, of course; nobody is kept out but it simply delays everybody who has business with a Government agency. Anybody who wants to go in, whether to plant a bomb or steal or commit robbery or arson can, of course, get in. But as for everybody who comes here at considerable expense from great distances, the time consumed will run into a substantial item. When you add up the total amount of time so lost it will run into thousands of years of wasted time. If there is some connection between this wasted time and the winning of the war that is one thing, but if it is simply to spend public money and the time of citizens that is another thing.

I would like to have the gentleman give us an explanation of just what good is accomplished by this expenditure. In the early days of the war I understood it was supposed to have a psychological effect; that it put the fear of the war into everybody, and it made everbody realize that there was a war going on. I do not think we have to spend money to do that any longer. I do not mean that we should not have somebody available in a building to throw out somebody who became violent, but when you take 15 or 20 or 30 buildings and close all of the doors except 1 so that people have to walk a block or two to get to the right door although he will probably walk past guards at every door; when you have a group of guards and of record makers at the one door where you can get in and all that these employees do is to waste your time and their time, it does seem to me that it is an utter waste of Government money and of Government time and certainly

it is a waste of the manpower of the Nation. It is not so much that anybody objects to having to answer questions and fill out forms as that it is a useless waste of time. If we do not have some purpose in mind and some good result we are going to get from it, why do it?

I do not mean that the committee cannot explain, but I mean that up until this moment nobody has ever explained to me what good it does. I should just like to have the committee take a little time and tell us what good is accomplished by having you sign in and sign out and getting a card and a b-dge and a guard and a guide each and every time you go in a building. I can conceive that there must be a guide in the Pentagon Building, else we would become lost and waste time, but in the ordinary building where the ordinary country boy can find his way around, I do not see why we should not send in the country boy just as well as the smooth representative of the Axis Powers. There never was a man sent over here from Berlin that did not have sense enough to get by those guards. If we are doing any good let us keep them, but if we are doing some good by having them I think the Congress and the Nation would be interested in knowing what it is.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand that the gentleman is irritated if he has to sign in and sign out. For that specific purpose the Public Buildings Administration has issued to the gentleman a very attractive little badge that he may put on the lapel of his coat, including his picture and his name. The gentleman, with that badge on his coat, can walk in or out of any Government building in Washington, including the Army and Navy Departments, and all they will do is salute him and say, "Good morning, Congressman," and he will not be stopped a moment so far as he is concerned.

As far as the boy from the country is concerned, for security reasons it would be impossible to open many of the Government establishments. Perhaps it would not apply to all of them, but in many of them it would be impossible to turn the public loose to roam at large all over that building looking for anything they pleased, particularly, during wartime. In the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission, in all of these agencies that have large dealings with contractors and representatives and business agents, it is not only for security but it is for the convenience of people coming there looking for persons that they are met by a receptionist and asked, "Who is it you wish to see?" Oftentimes they do not know whom they wish to see. They naturally do not know whom they wish to see. They go there and information is obtained from them. They are given a card and, if they have a briefcase, they are required either to check it or have it searched. Then they are given a card and a guide and they get in and out, if they have business. It not only is convenient for them but it protects the officials of the Government from having a long line of people standing around taking up their time all day long.

I am quite willing to admit that the thing is overdone to some extent in certain agencies. The Public Buildings Administration admitted in our hearings that perhaps now, with the war having reached the stage it has, these very severe restrictions could be relaxed in some agencies to some extent. But there are many other agencies where, for security reasons, they cannot be relaxed. For instance, the question was asked, Why is it necessary down at the Department of Commerce to have all this? The Maritime Commission is in the Department of Commerce Building, and in the records of the Maritime Commission are records of all the sailings of convoy vessels going out of this country. Merely to state that shows why it is necessary to know, as far as it is humanly possible, who it is that is going in and out of there. The fact that you have these restrictions is a restraining force on many people who do not have legitimate business with those agencies.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all printing and binding for the General Accounting Office, including monthly and annual editions of selected decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States, $235,000.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN: After the last paragraph under the heading "General Accounting Office" on page 32 insert the following:

"Investigations for, and detail of assistants to, committees of Congress: In order to enable the Comptroller General, as authorized in section 312 (b) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to make investigations and reports ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures, and to furnish, through assistants from his office, to such committees, at their request, any aid or information so requested, including the employment, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, of necessary personnel for such purposes, and including salaries, contingent expenses, and necessary travel, $67,980."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment as the result of a unanimous vote of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Congress authorized, in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the Comptroller General to do just exactly what this amendment provides. But the Congress has never given the money to the Comptroller General to do the job. I think the testimony of Mr. Warren, the Comptroller General, before this subcommittee is a direct challenge to the Congress because he says we just do not know what becomes of the money we appropriate.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was set up by the consolidation of about 14 committees. I have been a member of it ever since it was established. I was the chairman for nearly 10 years. It has very wide jurisdiction. The committee can investigate any expenditures at any time it desires, and can require any Government officials to come before the committee and bring books and records in response to the committee's request. Unfortunately, the Congress has seen fit to pass many resolutions setting up select and special committees and in doing so it has taken away from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments the jurisdiction that Congress gave to the committee at the time it was created. This committee as now constituted can do a good job and save millions of dollars if it has a proper investigating force. This amendment provides for just that. We have confidence in the Comptroller General and know he will cooperate with us. We do not ask for this money but want it given to the Comptroller General.

Without fear of contradiction I can say the Committee on Expenditures is the poorest staffed committee in the House of Representatives.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to say I have just conferred, since the gentleman handed me the text of his amendment, with gentlemen on the minority side, and the gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. In view of that, Mr. Chairman, I will not take up further the time of the Committee and I ask for a vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For the record, I think it should be made clear that this amendment does not limit the use of the funds to any single committee, but makes it available for any committee of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman's amendment is good and should be adopted.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman. I cannot see how anyone can oppose it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I just wanted to ask the gentleman this question, whether or not the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, deemed this amount provided by the gentleman's amendment was sufficient?

Mr. COCHRAN. About 2 years ago the Comptroller General appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, at my request, and conferred with the ranking members of that committee as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who has been interested for several years. He said he would be willing to do the job if Congress wanted him to do it. I think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. COOLEY. Did he think this money provided by the gentleman's amendment would be sufficient to do the job?

Mr. COCHRAN. It is his figure.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. As I understand it, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is endeavoring by this amendment, and through existing law, to accomplish the same purpose that I have had in view in a measure which I have had before the Congress for 3 years, to create an office of fiscal investigators as an agency of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the purpose of it. The gentleman from Texas is to be commended for his untiring efforts to bring this about. I have always appreciated his assistance.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the committee.

Mr. JUDD. I do not like to inflict myself upon the committee, but I was appointed to this Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. When I studied what its function and jurisdiction was, it appears that it already had jurisdiction to do a great many things for which we have set up special investigating committees and for which we have spent a great deal of money. Every week a Member gets a letter from a constituent asking why so and so gets a private airplane to go here or there, or what is done with this money or that money. With this set-up we can find out why it was done. I think it is a very forward step.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in hope this amendment will be agreed to. First, because our committees need all the help they can get. Second, because for a long time we have failed to use one of the most effective tools within the hands of the Congress. In the British House of Commons, one of the most important committees of the Parliament is the committee the duties of which are equivalent to those of our Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Strangely enough that committee seems to have fallen into disuse as an investigating agency, in the United States House of Representatives. It has the widest jurisdiction. It has plenary powers. All that is necessary is for us to use them. Complaint has been made of members of the committee that it is without sufficient staff to discharge its duties. This amendment will remedy that need. There is from time to time complaint in the press of the country that there should be more investigations by our congressional committees. Perhaps the criticism is in some respects well founded. Either we have neglected this committee or the committee has neglected its duties.

If we exercise the power lodged in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments it will be unnecessary for us to provide money for so many special investigations carried on by so many special committees under special rules and special authority from the House. By implementing this committee specifically established for the purpose, by providing additional staff through the G. A. O. and thus placing in its hands the power to carry out the purpose for which it was constituted we should answer much of the criticism on this score in the press and render unnecessary many expenditures for special investigators by other committees not originally designed for that purpose.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would not such a committee in the House properly equipped, be very similar if not parallel to the Mead Committee in the Senate, the ex-Truman committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would do precisely the same work and would make unnecessary all such special committees and special expenditures.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood the gentleman from Missouri to say that in the British Parliament this was a permanent standing committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; one of the oldest institutions of the English Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Such a standing committee would make many of these special committees unnecessary. For instance, a permanent standing committee on the investigation of these expenditures in the various departments should save this country untold millions of dollars.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have such a committee but unfortunately, for some reason I have never been able to understand, we do not use it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman knows, if he heard the amendment read, that this is no appropriation for the Committee on Expenditures; it is an appropriation for the Comptroller General, setting up in the General Accounting Office under the Budget and Accounting Act an investigating division to serve the Congress of the United States, his committee as well as the committee of which I am a member. The gentleman has received $100,000 for his committee. This committee is not asking for a cent. The amendment asks it be given the Comptroller General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I again yield to my colleague from Missouri to complete his inquiry.

Mr. COCHRAN. Our committee is not asking for money, nor is it asking for any additional help at this time; it is asking that the Comptroller General be given the money he says he can use in making investigations for committees of the Congress. That is what we propose to do, let the Comptroller General make them for the Committee on Expenditures.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And, as will be noted from a reading of the amendment, it also provides that the Comptroller General shall use this fund—not on his own initiative—but for investigations upon the request and report of committees of the House; and the gentleman's committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, is the committee on which the duty of conducting the investigations devolves. It is also the committee which has complained that it was without means of conducting investigations. It is the committee on which the rules place the responsibility of investigation. No other standing committee of the House is clothed with that wide and specific authority. This amendment applies to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as to no other committee of the House.

So far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, it has maintained for the last 2 years, under special authorization of the House, a system of investigation much better adapted to its purposes than could be supplied under this amendment. Under this provision the General Accounting Office will immediately employ additional personnel. That additional personnel will be there day after day, year after year, drawing salaries whether there are any investigations to be made or not. And do not get the idea that there will be a general rush on the part of congressional committees to make use of this personnel. Various Members of the House have over the last 2 years given statements to the press and delivered speeches on the floor of the House urging large and expensive staffs to conduct investigations. I have made it a practice to go personally to all of them, or address them here in debate and ask what they wanted to investigate and assure them that if it is anything the Committee on Appropriations could investigate for them through our research staff, I would be glad to take it up for them with the committee. And in every instance they have said they had nothing to investigate.

So, after the novelty of the new toy wears off, the new staff down at the General Accounting Office will have little to do if it has to wait for reports from House committees as provided in the pending amendment. But whether there are investigations or not they will be on the pay roll cooling their heels. Under the system employed by the Committee on Appropriations we do not call a man until he is needed and we release him as soon as the job is done. We pay him the same salary he receives under civil service, and there is no incentive for him to unduly prolong the job.

Another material advantage the system employed by the Committee on Appropriations has over the service proposed in the amendment, is that it provides men specially qualified for the job

in hand. Many special investigations require specially trained men, such as engineers, scientists, physicians, detectives, lawyers, accountants, and so forth. We can supply scientists and physicians from the Federal Bureau of Standards and United States Health Service, and there are none better anywhere in the country. We can supply operatives from F. B. I. and the Secret Service of the Treasury Department. Where in the United States or in the world can you find men who are as well qualified? We get exactly the man we need for the work. If you are limited, as you are under this amendment, to the General Accounting Office, you get an auditor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman made that statement on the floor once before and I immediately contacted the General Accounting Office and I found out that the gentleman did not know what he was talking about. They have all types of men in the General Accounting Office capable of making any kind of investigation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have repeatedly applied to the General Accounting Office and all we ever got from them was bookkeepers.

My good friend says I do not know what I am talking about. He does not know what he is talking about when he says I have received $100,000. A fund of $100,000 was made available but we did not take it. We accepted and used less than $25,000 a year and for that sum—the smallest sum ever spent by a congressional committee in major investigations in the last 50 years—we secured all the pertinent information asked by anybody, either in or out of the committee, and saved millions of dollars to the United States Treasury, as has been frequently referred to on this floor.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If a Member of Congress talks across the District line on the telephone he has to pay for it. It has been rumored around the Capitol, and especially over in the other body, that a certain individual spent a thousand dollars down there in the departments in 1 day telephoning. If the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments were adequately staffed with investigators, it could require the various departments to submit detailed statements with reference to every dollar spent and what the money was spent for. I submit that it would save this country probably hundreds of millions of dollars a year and I think it would be well worth while to provide such a committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I heartily concur in what the gentleman from Mississippi has said. The British Empire considers its committee on executive expenditures as one of the most indispensable adjuncts of government. Only the ablest members of the House of Commons may aspire to membership on the committee. Membership on the committee is one of the special prerogatives of the minority—or as they term it—"His Majesty's opposition." If our similar committee was properly staffed, as the gentleman from Mississippi suggests, other authorizations to special committees and other appropriations for investigations would be unnecessary.

And may I add that such investigations would serve a useful purpose not only in uncovering maladministration, waste, and inefficiency, or misdirection of funds, but would also serve to disprove many of the wild and disturbing rumors constantly current in Washington and throughout the country. It frequently happens in our investigations we prove alarming rumors of graft and misappropriation to be entirely without foundation. The welfare of the country and the cause of good government is served by disproving many of the disquieting rumors that shake the confidence of the people in their officials and their Government.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman frfom Missouri has again expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read, as follows:

For necessary salaries and expenses of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, including contracts for personal services in the making of special investigations and reports; traveling expenses of members and employees, including the cost of a compartment or such other accommodation as may be authorized by the Chairman for security when authorized personnel are required to transport secret documents or hand baggage containing highly technical and valuable equipment; periodicals and books of reference; equipment, maintenance, and operation of the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory, the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, and the aircraft engine research laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio; purchase and maintenance of cafeteria equipment; maintenance and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; not to exceed $286,871 for personal services in the District of Columbia, including one Director of Aeronautical Research at not to exceed $10,000 per annum; not to exceed $5,468 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); and not to exceed $2,500 for temporary employment of consultants, at not to exceed $50 per diem, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; in all, $25,999,393.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Page 38, line 1, after "equipment", insert "maintenance and operation of aircraft including aircraft borrowed from the Army and the Navy."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, later in the bill, under general provisions, there is a provision that no agency may purchase, maintain, or operate aircraft unless it is specifically authorized in its appropriation. The National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics is directly concerned with experiments and research on airplanes. They have many of their own planes. They frequently have planes of the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard and, of course, it is necessary for them to have the right to maintain and repair those airplanes.

I ask for a vote on the amendment, unless there is some opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for costs of penalty mail of the National Housing Agency as required by the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364), $241,905, said sum to be derived by transfer from the funds of the constituent units of said Agency available for administrative expenses as follows: Office of the Administrator, $6,075; Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, $124,410; Federal Housing Administration, $49,500; and Federal Public Housing Authority, $61,920.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the chairman of the committee what economy, if any, has actually been accomplished in this matter of charging the departments for their mail? Has that resulted in any decline of the use of the mails by the various departments?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I say to the gentleman that it is a little early to be able to form any definite conclusion on that. Our committee debated that question and we had investigators go into all of the agencies provided for in this bill to check the telephone, the telegraph, and the mailing situation. I could not answer affirmatively that something has been accomplished. I hope something has been accomplished. I will say that we did, however, make an arbitrary 10 percent cut in the amount estimated for penalty mail in the hope that that, at least, would cut some of it down. There will have to be more experience, I think, until we can ascertain definitely.

Mr. THOM. How long has the plan been in operation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Since January 1 of this year.

The Clerk read as follows:

Annual contributions: For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1410), $7,600,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1945: *Provided*, That except for payments required on contracts entered into prior to April 18, 1940, no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment to any public housing agency for expenditure in connection with any low-rent housing project, unless the public housing agency shall have adopted regu-

lations prohibiting as a tenant of any such project by rental or occupancy any person other than a citizen of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 49, line 9, strike out "$7,600,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment merely proposes to strike $600,000 from the item for annual contributions to public housing agencies. This amendment is offered because consistently since 1940, the amount we have appropriated for contributions has been in excess of the amount that has been needed. I have here a table that was given the committee, and I call your attention to these facts:

For 1941, the Agency asked $15,000,000, and we appropriated $10,000,000. They had a surplus even out of the $10,000,000.

Next year, 1942, the agency asked for $10,000,000, and we appropriated $8,000,000, and still they had a surplus.

For next year, 1943, the agency asked for $17,000,000, and we appropriated only $13,000,000, and still they had a surplus.

For the next year, 1944, the agency asked for $6,000,000 and we appropriated $5,750,000, and they still carried over a surplus.

Last year this agency asked for $10,000,000 and we appropriated $9,500,000, and now there is $2,030,000 being carried over, so that $2,030,000 will be in addition to the $7,600,000 here proposed to be appropriated.

I am sure on the basis of the record that we can strike out the $600,000, and if experience means anything they will have a surplus at the end of this year. We should continue to hold this appropriation down so that there will be an incentive to save as much in it as possible.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this would merely be a bookkeeping matter whether we left the money in or took it out. The fund carried in this bill is the amount that the Federal Government has to pay as a subsidy on these low-cost housing projects. Whatever the bookkeeping shows we owe on it we have to pay. If the bookkeeping does not show that we owe it; of course, it goes back into the Treasury.

It may be that because of full occupancy there will not be such a need for reimbursement or for the Federal Government to pay these funds. If not, they go into the Treasury. In any event, the Authority ought not to have a deficiency. It ought to have enough funds to meet the Government's obligations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In previous years has not the gentleman thought there was a little moral encouragement to the agency to conserve some of its funds if we did not appropriate all it requested?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not see how they can conserve it. It is a matter over which the Agency does not have very much control. They audit the books of these housing authorities which have control of these low-cost housing projects, and if the books show that the Government owes money, they have to pay it. The Agency does not have very much control over it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think they did testify that the reason they had been accumulating these funds is that if the local housing project is quite successful they do not have so much to pay. The thing is not automatic. They do have some discretion.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This amount, $7,600,000, is the best estimate the Agency could give us. I hope very much the Committee will support the Appropriations Committee's judgment on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For all salaries and expenses necessary for continuing preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of Hawaii and other lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory, including assistants, and making necessary observations in high altitudes; and for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts; including personal services in the District of Columbia; traveling expenses; not to exceed $4,536 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); printing and binding, not exceeding $88,500, of which not to exceed $12,000 shall be available for printing the report of the American Historical Association; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; not exceeding $5,500 for preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; and not exceeding $6,500 for purchase of books, pamphlets, and periodicals, $1,065,160.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against certain language on page 50, lines 18 and 19, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution," as follows:

And other lands under the jurisdiction and protection of the United States.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including the continued construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky.; and construction of South Holston Dam and Watauga Dam; and the acquisition of necessary land, the clearing of such land, relocation of highways, and the construction or purchase of transmission lines and other facilities, and all other necessary works authorized by such act, and for printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, periodicals, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles, rents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, not to exceed $20,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364), and all necessary salaries and expenses connected with the organization, operation, and investigations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for examination of estimates of appropriations and activities in the field, $9,648,000, together with the unexpended balance on June 30, 1945, in the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945," to remain available until June 30, 1946, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia on page 54, line 2, after the words "(Public Law 364)" insert "not to exceed $15,000 for maintenance and operation of aircraft."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is an instance where the Tennessee Valley Authority, because of their far-flung activities, have one passenger-carrying plane which they use for the purpose of carrying official personnel, engineers, inspectors, and so forth, across their properties and when they are called to Washington on official business. In addition to that, they have six small planes which they use in insecticide dusting in connection with malaria-control operations. This language is merely to provide funds for that purpose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the chairman think the Tennessee Valley Authority should use these airplanes for the purpose of picking up editorial writers around the country and taking them down into the Tennessee Valley Authority to show them the operations there?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not. I remember the discussions in committee on that. Mr. Lilienthal, as I recall, said on one occasion when he was coming back to the Tennessee Valley properties some distinguished magazine writer or editorial writer who wanted to visit the properties was permitted to ride on the plane back there with him. I think that was the only instance disclosed during the hearings.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the only instance which he found it convenient to recall. The questions which you are asked in committee were prompted by the fact that even as far away as Montana the story is current there that leaders of certain farm organizations or editors of newspapers were invited to go down there at the expense of the T. V. A. on a sort of junket trip to

look things over. I concede that the T. V. A. has need for the proper use of airplane craft. I am not going to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but I do think there ought to be some understanding as to how they will use the airplanes and gas as far as going around the country and picking up people to bring them down there to show them the T. V. A.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I agree with the gentleman that the use of planes ought to be strictly for official purposes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is more than gratifying to me, after 20 years of struggle for the creation and development of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to find that there is no more criticism of this activity than what has been lodged against it by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Just about 12 years ago now, Senator Norris, of Nebraska, and I introduced a bill, which finally became the law, to create the Tennessee Valley Authority. It has resulted in the greatest development of ancient or modern times. No other development in all time compares with it. It is now virtually completed.

I have prepared and introduced a bill, H. R. 1824, to carry this policy to the entire Nation by creating regional authorities to cover every watershed in the country. It comprises the greatest program of post-war development that has yet been proposed.

The year I came to Congress the American people used only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity all told. During the year 1944 they used 220,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or five and one-half times as much. I predict that within 10 years after this war closes we will be using a half trillion kilowatt-hours, and long before the turn of the century it will require a trillion kilowatt-hours a year to meet our requirements.

Today in this country 230,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of hydroelectric power are running to waste every year that rolls around in our navigable streams and their tributaries, which this measure I have introduced would develop. It would take 115,000,000 tons of coal every year to generate that amount of electricity. Imagine 115,000,000 tons of coal running to waste down these streams every year and you will have an idea what this waste amounts to.

At the rate we are going, in 100 years from today our coal supply will be so nearly exhausted that the American people at that time will be literally scratching for fuel. The chances are that our oil and gas supplies will have been exhausted long before that time, unless we develop our water power and conserve fuel.

We are clamoring for some kind of a program for the employment of the returning servicemen when the war closes, a program that will give them useful employment, that will be inspiring and not have a deadening effect upon their morale. Nothing we could do would contribute more to that end than to develop all the waterpower in the Nation, control the floods on every stream, and at the same time provide navigation wherever that is possible. That is what is provided for in my bill. It will pay for itself in less than 50 years through the sale of power, just as the Tennessee Valley Authority will pay for itself in less than 40 years, including every dollar that has been spent on power production, flood control, navigation, reforestation, and soil conservation. Every dollar that has been spent by the Tennessee Valley Authority will be paid back through the sale of power in less than 40 years.

Yet, 12 years ago when Senator Norris and I were making this fight, the private power interests were buying power at Muscle Shoals wholesale at 2 mills per kilowatt hour, and selling it to our residential consumers at an average of 10 cents a kilowatt hour. Today we are buying it from the T. V. A. at an average of 4½ mills per kilowatt hour wholesale, or more than twice as much as the power companies were paying for it at that time, but instead of charging the individual consumer, the householder, 10 cents per kilowatt hour, they are being charged an average of 1.9 cents per kilowatt hour.

You are not going to get those boys who come back from the war to move out on a farm where there are no conveniences and live in the dark and mud. They are going to demand some of the comforts and conveniences of life. By the passage of the bill to which I refer, we can do for every section of the United States just what we have done for the Tennessee Valley area, and what we have done for the great Columbia River Valley. We can develop all the waterpower in the Nation and make it possible for a man to live on any hillside, with all the comforts and conveniences he can get in the city, without the noise and the city taxes. In addition to that, we can save hundreds of millions of dollars in damages that are now being wrought by floods every year, to say nothing of the human lives that are being swept away. We can provide a system of inland transportation that will not only meet our needs in time of peace but will help to protect our country in time of war.

It is the greatest program of its kind that has ever been submitted, and I hope the Members will all assist me in getting it enacted into law at the earliest possible moment, so as to provide our country with the greatest program of internal improvement the world has ever known.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 54, line 10: strike out the period and insert "*Provided*, That no part of the funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority may be expended for the transportation of visitors to the Tennessee Valley Authority other than representatives of the Government on official business."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman showed me this amendment and I may say that officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority have given us assurance that the funds are not used for that purpose, anyway.

If the language of the amendment turns out to be restrictive, I would want to say to the gentleman that in conference we would expect to straighten it out.

So far as I am concerned, I have discussed the matter with the members of the committee and I have no objection to it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Virginia, and also to the gentleman from South Dakota, that I hope the amendment is defeated. We are at war today and we have a large number of Allied countries that are in this war with us. They are constantly sending their visitors over here to look over the Tennessee Valley Authority, and this amendment would preclude them from riding in one of the T. V. A. planes. I think if the gentleman is going to offer an amendment of that kind it certainly ought not to be so restrictive as to prevent those men from riding in these planes, the only ones they can get down there, the planes owned by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me say in the first place that the amendment does not prevent travel within the Valley, it is merely travel to the Valley. In the second place, people who come here as guests of the United States Government come under funds that are provided to the State Department for their entertainment. They can be taken care of.

The reason for offering this amendment is, as I said earlier in the afternoon, that reports are recurrent through many States that groups of editors and leaders of various groups have been invited to go down at the expense of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I brought that out during the hearings. Mr. Lilienthal told us that he did not know of any incident where that was true; but it certainly is not helping the Tennessee Valley Authority in the minds of the people in the various valleys in which the gentleman is interested to have groups of people think that certain people are invited down there to go on junkets and to use aviation gasoline during war when they cannot even get gasoline to go to a hospital.

Mr. Lilienthal said he recalled only one instance in which a private person was transported by the Authority and that was in the case of an editorial writer for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. He said the Tennessee Valley Administration wanted to be perfectly frank,

open, and aboveboard on this proposition with the public but they wanted the public to learn more about the Tennessee Valley Authority and he would welcome an expression of congressional thought on this matter.

At the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia I purposely drew the amendment so they would not be restricted from transporting official representatives of the Government. I do not believe, however, that this Congress wants the funds of the Tennessee Valley Authority used to bring people from great distances into the Valley, certain selected persons, and incur all the ill-will that creates.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As one member of the Appropriations Committee who has carried the flag for the Tennessee Valley Authority and has applauded its work in every particular, I wholeheartedly agree with what the gentleman says; and as far as I am concerned I do not see anything in this amendment to which the Tennessee Valley Authority should object. If, of course, it turns out to be restrictive of any legal operation I would use my efforts to try to have it corrected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the gentleman's interpretation of his amendment would be such that if a Tennessee Valley Authority plane should be in Washington on an official trip and one of these officials from a foreign government or someone else should be here who wanted to visit the T. V. A. that the gentleman's amendment would preclude him from traveling on that plane which is going back to Knoxville anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is what I am complaining about.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I very much doubt that it would because of the fact the individual would be an official visitor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Suppose it were a newspaper editor?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, it would—to the Valley; and it would prevent them from carrying any White House dogs, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In the first place I wish to ask the gentleman from South Dakota a question. Has the gentleman ever been down through the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; I have. I was a member of the phosphate-investigating committee. We went down and had a view of the operations.

Mr. RANKIN. How long ago?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was in 1938.

Mr. RANKIN. That was 7 years ago. I wonder if the gentleman went through any of those great dams and saw what this great development really means. I wonder if he realizes now what it all means. Not only has the T. V. A. controlled the floods on that stream, but it has reduced flood crests on the Mississippi by two or two and a half feet. It has provided a navigation channel something like 700 miles long, and is now generating about 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, or 50 times as much as the State of South Dakota now uses.

This amendment is unnecessary. I think it is petty. To be perfectly frank, I have never seen any outfit connected with this Government that was more careful about conserving Government money than the Tennessee Valley Authority. I know Mr. Lilienthal as well as any man in this House and I know Mr. Pope and Dr. Morgan and the other men connected with the T. V. A. It is one Government institution that you cannot call on the telephone and reverse the charges unless they are assured in advance that it is T. V. A. business.

Adopting this amendment would simply preclude them from letting any one else ride in a T. V. A. plane. We have men visit the T. V. A. from all over the world, and we welcome them. I wish more of you Members would go down there and see what has really been accomplished. I wish more people would come there from South Dakota to look over the greatest development of all time. They might get some information that would help them develop their sections of the country.

I would be willing for them to ride in this T. V. A. plane while there, in order to let them know what such development means.

To adopt this amendment and deny men who come from foreign countries the opportunity to see this development is ridiculous. Nor should we preclude them because they happen to be newsmen. Their people may read newspapers at home; that is the way they get information from all over the world. Some of them come here from Russia, from England, from France, and from other countries. If you adopt this amendment, and this plane is going from here to the Tennessee Valley, they would be precluded from getting on that plane. They would have to take a train, if one is available, and get there a day or two later when probably the man they wanted to see has returned to Washington or has gone elsewhere.

I hope the gentleman from South Dakota will withdraw the amendment, because it is petty and unnecessary.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. May I say that I have recently returned from a visit to England and one subject that seemed to be of more interest than anything else over there to members of Parliament, newspaper people, and others was the Tennessee Valley Authority. I should dislike very much to see any amendment added to this bill which would prevent the transportation of interesterd people coming from other countries down there to see this development. We should be proud of the Tennessee Valley Authority and glad to support it.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from California that the greatest single development of its kind in all the world, outside of the Tennessee Valley, Boulder Dam, or Grand Coulee, is the Dnieprostroy Dam in Russia. That dam was built by Colonel Cooper, who built the Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals. Men from Russia came here to look over the work of Colonel Cooper before they invited him to come to Russia to build the greatest power dam in all Russia. It was the greatest in the world at the time it was finished, but Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee both surpass it now.

People every day, from every section of the world, look over the Tennessee Valley for information. It is worth any man's trip to walk from here to Knoxville to get to go through those T. V. A. dams. It is worth a trip to California, or Nevada, to get to go through the Boulder Dam, yet I dare say there are not 20 Members of Congress outside of the ones from that area who have ever seen it. It is literally an education in itself. Go to Bonneville or Grand Coulee, go and see those great dams and then you will realize how rediculous it is when you hear these attacks made on those projects on the floor of this House. They are century-enduring monuments to the genius of this generation.

I have gone through this fight for many years, and I have not been sectional about it either. I prevented the restricting of Grand Coulee to a low dam, because I realized that to the people living in that section it meant benefits they had never dreamed of until this program was started. That development on the Columbia River from Grand Coulee to Bonneville will make that great northwestern country one of the richest sections of the world.

I want to see this program carried out everywhere else in the country and I do not want to see amendments such as this adopted that will preclude people throughout the United States from seeing such facilities. Nor do I want to see people who come here from Allied Countries prevented from seeing those facilities, which might aid them in promoting similar developments at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment conclude in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that some portions of the observations of our good friend from Mississippi were wholly uncalled for.

We have fallen into a habit here of referring, in a disparaging way, to things with which we do not agree. I frankly resent any statement that would reflect on the gentleman from South Dakota and represent to this Congress and to the

country that it was a petty amendment. The gentleman from South Dakota has been extremely tolerant and generous with the T. V. A. If the gentleman from Mississippi had directed those remarks to me, there might be some cause for it. I probably was one of its most vigorous antagonists on this floor for years.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman's record in that respect was so bad that I just decided to leave him out of the controversy. The RECORD shows that on the last 18 votes on the power question he voted against me, which included western water-power development, rural electrification, and the T. V. A. Every time the gentleman from Illinois has voted wrong. If his views had prevailed we would have had no T. V. A., no R. E. A., and no development on the Columbia River.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi does not have to gratuitously advise me of my record. The Congress and the country know that year after year, for 12 years, I have battled the T. V. A. from this floor. I think it has had a very salutary effect. I consider Mr. Lilienthal one of my good friends; in fact, he was one of my neighbors. He was born in my district. I value his respect as he does mine, and having seen him develop as I have seen for a number of years, I pay public tribute to Mr. Lilienthal and the Tennessee Valley Authority by stating in the RECORD that they have done a splendid job. But I think the gentleman from Mississippi goes too far afield in reflecting upon the gentleman from South Dakota and referring to the amendment as petty.

I have watched the services of the gentleman from South Dakota. He is one of the most diligent, one of the ablest, and one of the most earnest Members of this House. The amendment was contrived on the basis of representations made to the committee and in response to inquiries that were directed to the officials of T. V. A., and comes here in the best of grace for the purpose not only of protecting the public purse but also of affording an additional measure of protection to the T. V. A. So, it was well presented, in the best of spirit, and I think the gentleman from South Dakota is entitled, at least, to have it said in his behalf that there is nothing petty about that amendment. It is in the public interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no inclination to prolong debate on this matter. Frankly, I am not really concerned about this amendment. I wish very much that it had not been offered, but I am assured by the gentleman from Virginia, as the Committee has been, that if this language is thought to be unduly restrictive he will work to rewrite it in such a way that it will not be restrictive. I have great confidence in what the conferees, including the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from South Dakota, as well as the other conferees, will do. However, I think there may be a great misunderstanding as to the use of this plane, particularly for carrying passengers into the area, and the uses generally to which it is put. There is only one passenger-carrying plane owned by the T. V. A., and I suppose no one familiar with the region in which it operates would question the wisdom and the economy of having that plane.

As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, it only restricts carrying people from points outside of the region into the region. I think his amendment goes too far, because I think certainly if these officials from other governments are in Washington, as often they have been, and request to see that area, if the plane is here and is going back to Knoxville with some empty seats, they ought to be available for the use of such persons.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman know what kind and type of plane this one is?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe it is a Lockheed.

Mr. HINSHAW. A Lockheed 12 or 18?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a Lockheed 12.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would assume that the cost per mile of operating that plane, if it is a Lockheed 12, would be in the neighborhood of 45 cents.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Douglas DC–3 operates at about 67 cents a mile.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to have that information from the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. About the only place they go outside of the Tennessee Valley is when they come here to Washington on official business, and the only people they would take out would be the ones going from here back to the valley. I submit that one additional passenger would add very little to the cost of the trip.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The very fact that the fund that is provided for this purpose in this appropriation is only $15,000 indicates that it is not used very extensively, but I want to give you just this one little statement of fact. I knew there had been some controversy regarding this in connection with the hearings, and I asked the Tennessee Valley Authority to give me a statement as to the extent to which this plane is used for carrying passengers outside of their own organization. The statement furnished me by the Tennessee Valley Authority said, in substance, that since July 1, 1943, over 18 months, the T. V. A. plane has carried visitors on a total of 48 occasions. Most of these have been officials of other Government agencies engaged in work of joint interest, or they have been foreign visitors. On 24 of these occasions visitors occupied seats on scheduled trips, seats which would otherwise have been vacant.

I think we are making a mountain out of a mole hill regarding this whole thing, because the plane has not been used to any great extent, and I believe everyone that is familiar with the use it has been put to lauds the T. V. A. on the very fine, very helpful, and very economical manner in which it has used the plane.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. How many passengers have been carried on the plane during the past 18 months?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know. I do not know what the capacity of the plane is. Perhaps the gentleman from Virginia can tell us.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is a 12-passenger plane.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then if a full load was carried each time, and I think that would be a rather harsh assumption, it would be less than 600 persons, including the T. V. A. officials and other Government officials and all others who rode on it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The cost per annum is about $15,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The amount is limited in this appropriation to $15,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will yield further, does he think the Director of the T. V. A. should use that airplane for traveling to other parts of the United States to make speeches?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think if he goes out as a Government official, wherever he goes he has a right to use that plane. Oftentimes he can use it more economically than he could use the train.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why can he not use the air lines?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We do not limit the officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. When a similar item was put into their appropriation on this same bill not a single person took the floor and objected to the use of their planes or attempted to restrict it in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired on the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Not to exceed $28,290,000 of the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, shall be available during the fiscal year 1946 for administrative expenses of the United States Maritime Commission, including personal services at the seat of government; printing and binding; lawbooks and books of reference; periodicals and newspapers (not to exceed $6,500); teletype services; purchase (not to exceed three), maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; compensation as authorized by the act of August 4, 1939, for officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, detailed to the Commission; not to exceed $90,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); and not to exceed $325,000 for the employment by contract or

otherwise of persons, firms, or corporations for the performance of legal and other special services, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the civil-service and classification laws.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to propound a question to the chairman of the subcommittee and to direct his attention to the statement which appears in the report with reference to the United States Maritime Commission. I quote:

As of December 31, 1944, there were 1,072 vessels under various stages of construction. Early in January 1945, the Commission awarded contracts for the construction of 226 additional dry-cargo vessels and tankers to be delivered in the second half of the calendar year 1945. Altogether, there are now scheduled for delivery, during the calendar year 1945, about 1,300 vessels, exclusive of any that may be completed under awards yet to be made.

The question I want to address to the Chairman is this. It has been pointed out that we now have approximately 50,000,000 tons of shipping, or more than four times the peacetime requirements of our Nation. The newspapers are already full of articles indicating that one of the critical problems facing our country is how to dispose of this surplus shipping, to sell it at prewar prices, sacrifice prices, or to give it away to some of our allies.

I wonder if the committee has given any consideration to the advisability of streamlining the construction of shipping of dry cargo classification. We had a bill last week which pointed out the critical manpower situation. We understand that the crucial need of the country today and of the War Department is ammunition. Yet here we find the construction program of the Maritime Commission continuing unabated. Does not the gentleman think it is time to examine and scrutinize closely that shipbuilding program to determine whether there is any need at the present time for staggering that production?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is time to examine it. I will say to the gentleman it has been examined by the committee. We are stepping up production of ammunition and certain other critical items for the war. Of course, they are no good unless they are transported to other countries. Certainly there is no shortage now of shipping tonnage. There will be a surplus if and when the war is over.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Many of these ships will not be built until late in this calendar year. Certainly they cannot be used until they are completed.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Every appropriation that this Congress makes, every plan that the Congress makes, is on the theory that the war on both fronts is going to continue through this calendar year. We asked Admiral Land that very question. I will state to the gentleman that every ship that is being laid down now is laid down only on the certificate and at the specific direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that it is necessary.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Certainly, with the critical manpower shortage, it would appear that those men should be employed elsewhere than in shipyards.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I agree with the gentleman. But that is the decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That is the reason the program goes ahead.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time this Congress and the Committee on Appropriations took cognizance of the fact that these aircraft owned by the various departments of Government, and I refer not only to the Department presently under consideration but to all the departments, including the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Forestry Service, the Army and the Navy, and others should be used exclusively for the public business of the Government and in nowise for private purposes. I have known of several occasions where it was very doubtful indeed whether the trip that was made in a particular Government airplane was made for purposes other than the personal business of the person who was using the airplane. I believe that the committee would do well to place the same restrictions upon the use of aircraft that we have placed upon the use of Government automobiles. The committee is very strict in the application of this regulation with respect to automobiles. I wonder if the committee does not think it would likewise be important to place similar restrictions upon the use of Government aircraft, especially in view of the fact that the minimum cost per mile for the operation of these aircraft, that is the smaller ones, is around 45 cents per mile and runs from there on up to a dollar and a dollar and a half a mile. Very frequently I have stopped at airports on trips that I was making to and from my home on the commercial air lines and have found military transport aircraft assigned to the use of some general in the Army going from place to place with only one or two passengers on board. The airplane might have been operated by the Air Transport Command, or else from the field that was under the jurisdiction of that particular general. And at the same time there were a great many military personnel awaiting commercial air transportation who should have been transported in that same aircraft. I think it is about time that Government aircraft be used as economically as though they were commercial aircraft and should not be used for frivolous purposes. I do not accuse any particular department of the Government or person except to say that that practice has come to my notice. Likewise, I believe the Air Transport Command should allow the use of all of its empty places by traveling military personnel when they are going in the same direction, instead of shoving them over on the commercial air lines.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen many military transport aircraft idle at airports, indicating a considerable available surplus, when the commercial air lines have been forced to deplane military personnel and others because of higher priority military travelers. Either the Air Transport Command should carry these people or the surplus planes made available to the commercial air lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. Where appropriations in this act are expendable for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the amount of $50: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are herein provided.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO CORRECT ABUSES IN ARMY HANDLING OF THE C. A. A. WAR TRAINING SERVICE PROGRAM

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, perhaps no other branch of our armed forces has ever been the subject of such controversy as the War Training Service of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Born as the result of a shotgun wedding between the Army Air Forces and the C. A. A., it was tenderly reared until its parents went their separate ways and then, an unwanted child, it was denied its birthright and its members came to know themselves as the "orphans of the air."

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, when the full import of our plight dawned upon us, the President called for planes in staggering quantities. The Nation's genius responded to the call. But there also had to be pilots, hundreds of thousands of them, both combat and noncombat, to fly these planes. The Army Air Forces had perhaps 2,500 pilots, a woefully inadequate number, on December 7, 1941. Immediately the armed forces called upon the C. A. A. for help, and help came in the form of thousands of skilled civilian pilots. They came from the air lines, from the airports, from hundreds of private flying schools, and from private lives to give their Nation the benefit of their flying skill.

Yet these were not enough. Many more pilots had to be trained, and while the A. A. F. undertook to handle most of the training of its combat pilots, the C. A. A. was asked to train some 14,000 men for non-combat-flying work, recruiting its men from the ranks of those not qualified for combat flying. Thus the Civil Pilot Training Program, later named the War Training Service, came into existence as an adjunct to the Army's training program. Its men were told that they would train without pay for approximately 10 months, at the end of which, if successful, they would be commissioned as second lieutenants, rated as flight officer, or retained in a reserve status as instructors or air-line copilots.

Almost from the very beginning this program had difficulties. It soon bogged down for lack of planes and training facilities, and its men sat idle for as long as 7 months between training programs. This resulted in untold hardship and humiliation for many of them, which was only slightly mitigated by congressional action granting them pay which amounted to about $25 per month.

In the meantime the training program of the Air Forces was moving ahead of schedule, and it became apparent that the Air Force could do without many of the men in the W. T. S. A reduction was in order, and was easily achieved since the hardships of the men had driven many of them to the point of desperation and they had to find a way out. After this reduction, those left were called to active duty upon the promise that their training would be continued. Yet the process of reduction continued, until on January 15, 1944, the War Training Service ceased to exist.

Early in the course of the W. T. S., its members became convinced that they were an unwanted group. Yet they had volunteered at their country's urgent request, and those who could stuck with it to the bitter end. Nowhere did they find recognition, honor, the self-respect of a soldier who is serving his nation in his best capacity. Approximately 20 percent were eventually discharged, a still smaller percentage are in training as aviation cadets or glider pilots. The great majority are in a variety of assignments in the Air Force, without hope of ever realizing the dream of flying with the Army Air Force. Each can point to some technicality upon which he was informed that he can have no redress. Yet each can point to personal losses of money, pride in self and Government, faith in self and his country, that mount up in the aggregate to produce a situation which, from the standpoint of morale alone, seriously affects our war effort. The following history is a typical one. It has its own unique aspects, as do all the others, but the theme is representative of all:

The worst thing that W. T. S. has done to me has been the chain of events which has left my morale and self-respect at a lifetime low. If it had been planned carefully, it couldn't have done a better job. If it wasn't planned that way, then the most remarkable set of coincidental circumstances has managed to achieve that result.

I left an easy, sure, good job—bank teller—in September 1942, with flags waving and a thousand people applauding, to enlist in the service, which wouldn't have drafted me for perhaps 12 to 24 months later, to fly gliders, so the administrator at the local college stated. After about 2 weeks of training we were told that the glider program had closed. The confusion and uncertainty started early, but that liaison, A. T. C., service pilot and flight instructor positions needed men badly. So, as all records will show, I elected A. T. C. as my goal. I persisted in this choice every time an opportunity to make a choice was given. I successfully completed primary, secondary, cross-country, and part of the Link instrument course, was first paid 10 months after having started, meanwhile paying my own way, then was activated in August 1943. It was with great pride that I first donned the real uniform of the Army, and with greater pride still that I was returned to flying status. I was sent again to a Link instrument course, by now, however, it appeared more and more certain that instructing was the only end we could be sure of. This successfully completed, I was shipped to ------ for the final course, secondary instructor. On the very day of my last flight, the first blow fell—the program was discontinued—and I had the graduation certificate from that school in my hand, along with a graduation dance program and a graduation dinner place card—a jolly affair, you can be sure. We had shipping orders to Brooks Field and almost certain officerships for Tuesday, and this was Sunday. Instead we were shipped, about a week later, to Sheppard Field for reclassification.

Since the Army didn't know what to do with about 800 men, with $10,000 each worth of aeronautical training fresh in their minds, we were sent through a second basic training—the same movies again, the same lectures again, the same drill instruction and field maneuvers again—we'd only been having this same stuff 16 months straight at this point. And just incidentally, our pay had been cut about thirty-two or thirty-three dollars a month—through no failure or fault of our own. Well, finally reclassification day came—I had been a banker's man for 10 years—and had intensive aeronautical training, with good grades, for 16 months—so the major assured me I could go to clerks school—men were needed there—but would I please indicate a second choice (of his choosing), armament school. Trusting his assurance of the clerk school, I agreed, and was promptly sent to armament school at Lowry Field, Denver, Colo., with a delay en route. How did I explain all this to the people who had so proudly seen me off 18 months before—how did I explain that I hadn't failed somewhere or goofed-up some place—how did I explain to my employers that so far I hadn't contributed a damn thing toward the famous war effort—why was I always "schooling"—I did the best I could to explain a nasty mess that I had gotten into in good faith, and which I'd done my part in the "contract" but the other party—the Government—hadn't. After armament school came gunnery—both of which I hated—both of which none of my training, civilian or Army, none of my training, inclination, or aptitude was directed toward gunnery work. Finally, I've been chosen to be an instructor in this gunnery school, and I did everything I could think of to escape it—a far cry from flight instructor or glider pilot.

When the discharge offer was made I was just starting school here, as student, and I refused because I felt if I did my "duty"—completed my duty—I'd certainly get a decent break some place along the line—maybe the Harness bill would go through and my efforts would not be in vain—and I could return to my civilian occupation, post-war, without having to tell the long sordid story that seemed so untrue; but no, it didn't happen that way. So I've started on a reconsideration of that discharge offer, which is almost certainly doomed to failure, because the almighty Army doesn't like for individuals to change their minds, though the Army allows no investigation of its changes. But my state of mind at this point is such that I'm really no good to the Army—and I'm well aware that I'm not much good to myself. It will take a lot of civilian living to make me forget the injustice done to me and thousands of my buddies and the millions of taxpayers who footed the economic side of this venture—ill-fated, shall we say?

I can't possibly express in a letter the chagrin, embarrassment, "loss of face," and loss of self-respect and pride, of self and Government, that we all have suffered. The financial loss, the loss of comforts of home, the things we all gave up are much too numerous to record in one letter.

My home address, since I gave up a home to fly for our country, is ————————. Apart from that—far apart—I am—

It is true that griping is a normal symptom in the Army. It happens everywhere and is regarded as a healthy sign. But it is likewise true that the causes of the average "gripe" are forgotten almost as soon as they are removed. Men of normal judgment usually regard the hardships of military life, in retrospect, as a matter of course. This should be particularly true of men whose patriotism impelled them to go through considerable difficulty to arrange their private affairs so that they could voluntarily enlist at the time when their country so sorely needed them. Something must be wrong when the same men are now sorry that they did it. Actually, this regret amounts to bitterness, even in those who, because they have been given the opportunity to repair their broken fortunes in a civilian capacity, have nothing more to ask for themselves. The following letter is an expression from one of such men:

I am one of the more fortunate ones, being now back in civilian life and after being a participant in such a muddled-up outfit and being treated like the scum of the earth, I'm damned glad of it. I was willing and eager to serve my country when I heard those desperate appeals, and envisioned the great things I could do, as described in a C. A. A. circular. Be a ferry pilot, a glider pilot, an air-line copilot, etc. What "bunk" that turned out to be (16–p).

* * * Even as late as our cross-country program at ————, we were told upon arrival that new arrangements had been made for us, and, if we got through, we would become lieutenants in the Air Transport Command. If you cannot even believe printed circulars and officers of the A. A. F., who in the h—— can you believe?

* * * Incidentally, I begged the authorities to let me even fly a glider, but no; I was 11 months too old. But I wasn't too old when they thought they needed men in that category.

I regret my inability to adequately express my opinion of the whole stinking mess, but you may rest assured that if there is ever a like offer made me, I won't be so gullible. Is it the Air Force's policy to make men so disgusted they don't give a hoot whether they die or not? If so, they sure were making great headway when I left the Army (57–p).

The official history of the War Training Service is a matter of record. In every hearing ever held and recorded, it was this official history that was heard and acted upon. The real story, gathered from the experiences of the men involved, shows that the official version is at best a glossing over of unpleasant facts, and at worst, in certain respects, utterly false.

It is the purpose of this report to outline, step by step, the process by which the War Training Service was reduced from 12,335 men, and what happened to those men. The figures are official.

PROCESS OF REDUCTION OF THE C. A. A.-W. T. S.

Phase 1: Twelve thousand three hundred and thirty-five E. R. C. trainees reduced to 7,374 by S. 1697 and letter of May 29, 1943.

(a) Four thousand nine hundred and sixty-one disposed of to discharge, assignment to active duty as ground personnel, or assignment to aviation cadet training.

Phase 2: Seven thousand three hundred and seventy-four trainees called to active duty and reduced to 5,251.

(a) One thousand and forty-nine qualified for aviation cadet training.

(b) Nine hundred and sixty-eight assigned to technical training.

(c) Seventy discharged for physical reasons.

(d) Thirty-six disposed of as a result of miscellaneous causes.

Phase 3: Five thousand two hundred and fifty-one reduced to 4,687.

(a) Five hundred and fifty-four eliminated during training.

(b) Ten graduated.

Phase 4: Four thousand six hundred and eighty-seven reduced to 0.

(a) One thousand five hundred and twenty-nine have applied and been found qualified for aviation cadet training or glider pilot training.

(b) Cne transferred to A. T. C. for service pilot training.

(c) Thirty-five discharged, died, or hospitalized.

(d) Three thousand one hundred and twenty-two specialists and technical school students offered discharge.

During the early summer of 1943 the W. T. S. program had bogged down, and trainees were waiting in their homes for months on end, expecting each succeeding day to receive the call to further training—calls which, when they came, were urgent and immediate. The resultant hardships have often been discussed, but very little was ever done about them. The bill which finally granted some pay gave only $50 per month, retroactive to December 15, 1942, for the time spent in training plus 2 months of lay-over time. This made an average of about $25 per month, which was far from adequate, considering that the men had to live as civilians between training periods. Following are a few representative experiences. They show that even while undergoing great losses, some men, who still had money, were spending their own money to improve their training, which they were assured the Army would use.

I had a hard time getting a release from my job, working for an oil refinery, because it was an essential industry. After I quit my job my wife had to go to work to support ourselves and our child, while I went to school.

I took my primary flight training at ———, and I finished it in February 1943. After finishing primary I was told that it would be a little while before I took secondary. Seven months went by in which I didn't hear a thing from the C. A. A. about the program. During this time because of the uncertainty of the length of time before I could be called back into the program, I was unable to get employment anywhere, except for a few days work now and then. My wife had to keep her job to support the three of us, and we had to move out of our new home and rent it to keep from losing it. Just after we moved our daughter became ill and had to go to the hospital for an operation. She never recovered, she died in the hospital without ever regaining consciousness. That left my wife with all those big expenses on her shoulders and I must say it went bad with her.

Many months later this same man was grounded in the glider program and disqualified because of a sinus condition. Yet he is denied a discharge because he was accepted for the glider program. In the words of the War Department, he had "applied and been found qualified for glider pilot training."

I volunteered in November of 1942, fully 8 months to a year before I would have been drafted. I sold my business in advance of enlisting, and during my training as a reserve spent upward of $2,000 in keeping up a home and myself while away from home in these flying programs. I also bought time, about $500 worth, between primary and secondary, which consisted of a 4-month wait. During this 4-month wait, and another 2 months after secondary, I still paid the bills without any part of an income (14–p).

I had primary and secondary at ———. This was completed in February 1943. Then we were told to go home and wait until we were called for cross-country training. And wait is what we did—until August. Because of my liking to fly, and also because I didn't want to forget what I had learned, I had about 50 hours' flight time during this 6 months' waiting period.

Then when the Army decided to activate us, I was really pleased for I knew we were going to really get what had been promised us—besides being paid while we were training (33–p).

In order to start the training we made an assumption that it would continue right on until finished—then to be kept from continuation of training in the middle of the program, and not knowing when you would be recalled, made a bad situation insofar as obtaining work and living quarters.

* * * We were given the choice of resigning before the Army took over or to go into the other branches of the Air Corps—and again as in my case, and in many others, opportunities to be commissioned in other branches of the service were passed up, in order to continue flying (37–p).

There were 4,961 who could not weather it through. They had to get out, and they took their losses and had no further recourse than to chalk them up to experience. When the official letter of May 29, 1943, offered the choice of discharge, call to active duty in an enlisted capacity, opportunity to qualify for aviation cadets, or continuation of status as W. T. S. trainee, these 4,961 got out. Their losses were never made good, nor were the losses of the 7,374 who remained. Nor, apparently, have their hardships ever entered into any discussion as a factor calling for consideration in the disposition or treatment of the men. On the contrary:

When we were offered a discharge from the Reserves in July of 1943, we did not suppose that a failure in W. T. S., or the failure of W. T. S. itself, would so disastrously penalize us who chose to stay in it (58–p).

The 7,374 men believed that with call to active duty they would at last start getting somewhere, that the raw deal was over. But the raw deal was only biding its time. Immediately after activation, 2,123 men were eliminated from the W. T. S. These were men who, on Form S–1697, had elected to remain in W. T. S. General Arnold, in his statement of March 22, 1944, said, "1,049 went into aviation cadet training." No explanation is made of the means used to put these 1,049 men into aviation cadet training—also known as air-crew training—nor what happened to them after they were taken in. It is not likely that the following statement, made by one of those men, is altogether unique:

After I was called to active duty in July 1943, I was sent to an Air Force basic training center in North Carolina. There I was told that there was an excess of men in the program and some had to be eliminated. The first elimination came after the physical exam. I was given the regular cadet exam without waivers. They knew well enough that many of the men were in W. T. S. because they had passed the less rigid W. T. S. exam, but still we were eliminated.

When I was eliminated from W. T. S. I knew any hope of piloting Army aircraft was gone. The air bug was still with me, so I applied for air crew, my present status (6–p).

Again referring to General Arnold's statement, "968 went into air force technical training." Since all of these men had previously elected to remain in W. T. S., it is logical to assume that these men went into technical training after being eliminated from W. T. S. against their wishes. It is also logical to assume that the majority, if not 100 percent, of these eliminations from W. T. S. were on the basis of failure to pass the class 2 physical, known as the Army 64. Yet when General Arnold made the statement, "968 went into Air Force technical training," it was accepted as reasonable and fair. That it was not fair can be readily ascertained by scrutiny of the conditions under which W. T. S. men elected to remain in training, as set forth in the famous letter of May 29, 1943, accompanying form No. S–1697 upon which the trainees made the choices by which they were bound:

c. If you desire to remain in the C. A. A. War Training Service program you may elect to do so subject to the condition that on July 1, 1943, the following steps will necessarily be taken and will apply to you as well as to all other men in training or awaiting assignment to training.

1. All reservists remaining in training will be given a class 2–64 physical examination on W. D. A. G. O. Form 64 by an Army flight surgeon. All those failing to meet the requirements of this examination will be removed from training and will, at that time, be allowed to elect call to active duty in an enlisted status or discharge from the Enlisted Reserve Corps.

The ink was hardly dry on the trainees' signatures when the men were called to active duty and all conditions excepting the one about their having to pass the 64 physical were apparently forgotten. At any rate, the discharges consisted of those totally unfit for military service; those failing the 64 physical only were reclassified and assigned to various other forms of training. No one in the entire program, on the basis of information in our hands, has ever been offered the discharge option so clearly set forth in the letter of May 29, 1943, as one of the conditions promised upon failure to meet the requirements of the 64 physical examination.

While it is an established truism—among officers who were never washed out, who made the grade and therefore think that anyone with ability can do likewise because they did—that all washouts consider their elimination unfair, the thoughts of the latter deserve to be considered:

When I was washed out in Greensboro the major told me that my eyes were too bad for

flying, and in the next minute he said I could be a combat gunner. Too bad eyes for noncombat flying but good enough for combat gunnery. Certainly sounded mixed up to me. But they made it very plain that they didn't want us and out we went (60–p).

I sure wish I could get a discharge. I'd grab it so fast their heads would swim (23–p).

On the 11th of August 1943, I was inducted (or activated) in the Army at Camp Beauregard, La., and given a complete physical examination by the Army surgeons at Camp Livingston, La., which qualified me for further military flying. I was then shipped to Keesler Field, Miss., and placed in a squadron of W. T. S. men awaiting orders. We were given another physical examination and I was disqualified, along with about 50 percent of the squadron, due to a slight impairment of my eyes, which condition had persisted at the time of my original examination when I was accepted into W. T. S. And as you know, one of the requirements in order to enlist in the W. T. S. was to be rejected by the Regular Army Air Forces if you were 27 years of age or younger.

After having been disqualified at Keesler Field, Miss., I was transferred to a training squadron for the purpose of taking basic training, and have been kicking around in the Air Service Command doing nothing at all for which I was originally trained, in fact doing nothing that is of any help to the war effort. I feel that I could have done a great deal more if I hadn't believed that the W. T. S. was something our Government needed and intended to see through.

All W. T. S. boys have endured the long hours of ground-school training along with the flight training with the hope that at the end we would have a part in training cadets or other Government flying. We accepted the hardship of long hours, the confusion and waiting, not knowing where we stood from day to day, the low pay and lowly place, upon the promise that at the end we would have something to show for it. Now that all commissions and ratings have been filled, we are unable to find a place that would give us a small part in a mighty struggle (11–p).

These are men who were assured that if they failed the "64" physical they could elect a discharge.

Along with the 1,049 who went into the aviation cadet training, and 968 who went to air force technical training, 70 were discharged for physical disability, and 36 were disposed of as result of miscellaneous causes, including hospitalization. In just what respect hospitalization came to be a reason for elimination has never been officially explained, but it is evident that none of the 36 reappeared in W. T. S. training. Neither has any further light been shed upon the nature of the miscellaneous causes. Perhaps the latter include the following case:

After completing cross-country training, I was called to active duty and reported to Jefferson Barracks, Mo., where I was told that I would be returned to the enlisted status of a Reserve and would become a civilian instructor of primary flight training and could be retained for 2 years after the war ended.

Now this was entirely opposite to what I was told when I enlisted. I was led to believe all along—this was at the time I enlisted and during primary and secondary—that I would not have to become an instructor and that I would become a pilot on transport planes.

It is only natural that one tries to obtain the goal that he sets out to gain.

When the above information was given I could readily see we were an unwanted group. So I asked for a release from W. T. S. and applied for the Service Command, which was granted me immediately because of the amount or number of Government flying hours that I had on heavy ships.

I had passed the Form 64 physical, and all written tests that were required and had qualified to continue with W. T. S. training. But, as I stated previously, I asked for my release and applied for the Service Command.

My service record shows the date that I was classified for the Service Command.

Shortly after this I had to take a routine physical, known as Form 63, which is a very simple physical, and was rejected because of a temporary injury to my left knee. It was swollen and was very minor. It was so minor that within the week following the examination I was admitted to the hospital and was X-rayed for pneumonia, and the medical officers considered the knee condition so slight they would not even X-ray it while I was in the X-ray room. For that reason I was not allowed to continue on a flying status. This was in October 1943, and to this date this knee has never swollen and I have not been given any consideration to get back on a flying status.

None of the things that were promised me ever came true, and the idea that was given me as to how I could serve my country has turned out to be entirely false (12–p).

Again we quote from General Arnold's statement of March 22, 1944:

Altogether there was a total of about 13,000 in these various groups of people that we were using that were semimilitary and had the C. A. A. brand on them in some way or another.

Now, then, I think you should know that we have given every one of those people a chance to qualify in some way or another in the Army Air Forces.

It cannot be denied that "in some way or another" covers considerable ground.

The number of men retained in training in W. T. S. after the various eliminations following call to active duty is 5,251. Of this number, 10 graduated and 554 were eliminated during training. Again official history has inferred, and all investigations have taken it for granted, that all eliminations were utterly fair, and that wash-outs have only themselves to blame. Again we hear from the individuals concerned:

When we were sent to Brooks Field, Tex., we soon learned that there was little chance of making the course since there was by this time no need for instructors. Around 50 percent of the boys were eliminated for various causes. The elimination rides were a farce, in my opinion, since there were too many good pilots to fall out because of these checks. It is also my opinion, along with many others, that this was just another way of getting us out of the picture with the least amount of trouble. I was among those eliminated on January 13, 1944. This was just 2 days before the course was discontinued. Those who stayed in those 2 days are now in civilian life, for which I am very glad.

All of the W. T. S. boys endured the long hours of ground-school training along with the flight training, upon the promises of the C. A. A. and hope that at the end we would have a part in the training of cadets or in some kind of flying. We accepted the hardships of the long hours, no pay, and a lowly place upon the promises of something at the end. When it was all over we got nothing but a chance to start again in the Army after all the good places were filled. That would not be so bad if we were doing any good for the Army but we are not and it looks as if many of us will just be kept in the Army to fill up space for the duration. How many men of my age do you think the Army will send overseas at this stage of the game? Frankly, I feel that my efforts would do much more for our country if I were released from the Army and sent home to relieve the home front (53–p).

After completing his Link instrument training he was sent to an A. A. F.-W. T. S. detachment at ————, to take an instructor course. On January 13, 1944, when he lacked 2 days completing his instructor course, word was spread by the grapevine that W. T. S. was being folded, so 10 of the W. T. S. students were given check rides and 10 were eliminated, my husband being among the unfortunate 10. The next day it rained, so the rest of the class was spared the so-called check rides, and on the next day, January 15, official word was received to cease all operations. The C. A. A. inspector who checked my husband out told him that under normal conditions he would not have been eliminated.

So, inasmuch as the directive concerning the discharge specifies that in order to be eligible for discharge the applicant must have been an active trainee on January 15, 1944, my husband is not eligible. This in spite of the fact that others who completed only the fourth course (Link instrument) are eligible and have been discharged, whereas my husband, who completed 4 courses and would have completed 5 in 2 more days had the training continued in its normal manner, is not eligible. This, to me, is very unfair (17–p).

The person referred to is not the same as in 53–p. As a matter of fact, they even refer to two different training detachments.

One man was unwilling to assume the stigma of failure, however undeserved. His statement clearly illustrates conditions as they were in the last stages of the W. T. S., and certainly must raise some question as to the utter fairness of the eliminations:

During the Link instrument course I asked to be relieved from aviation-student status because I was reliably informed that men who were in classes ahead of me were being washed out at the rate of 95 percent in their final check rides and that the program was closing. Taking all this into consideration, and the fact that there was no chance of any commission, I thought it was best to try and advance myself in some other branch of the service and get a rating there, as I needed money badly after using all my savings for the support of my family during the previous training periods, when I had received no income (10–p).

The figures speak for themselves—554 eliminated, 10 graduated.

The following letter gives an example of a man who complained about his treatment, and what was done about it:

The first of October I was sent to ——— for my secondary course. The first 10 days we were there we didn't get near a plane. We were put to work improving the grounds of the ——— Airport. Conditions there were anything but what we expected. We slept in bunks with boards for springs. The heater for the barracks in which we lived was out in the open. That sounds rather foolish, but it was actually outside the building and in the open. We flew in N3Ns, a Navy ship with open cockpit. We were never issued flying clothes and had only our general G. I. issue. If you don't think it was miserable flying at

7 a. m. in November in an open cockpit, with only ground clothes on and so many of them that you had no freedom of movement, I'll tell you it was. That field was not properly set up to give us the training we were supposed to get.

On November 18, after 18 hours of what was to be a 40-hour course, I was washed out. My marks averaged 74 percent for flying and I was not the lowest rated student in my class, but I was the oldest. I protested, to no avail and wrote to the W. T. S. Coordinator at ———. It got me nothing. In my class of 50 the only wash-outs were men over 35 years of age, and I know we old men weren't the worst flyers in that group by any means. But out we went, the old 20 percent racket.

Since then I have been in radio and radar schools. I have passed the board for appointment to O. C. S., but just this month a new ruling has disqualified me because of a new age limit.

I'm too old to fly, too old to be given an opportunity to become an officer, but not too old to be sent overseas. I'm awaiting shipment to an overseas replacement depot. I haven't been home since July 1943. I'd be ashamed to have people back there know that in 16 months' time all I could get to be is a corporal.

Nothing this Army could do short of commissioning me or giving me a discharge would ever make me feel I have been anything but a fool for sticking and wanting to see it through (9–p).

On January 15, 1944, there were 4,687 War Training Service trainees who as yet had not been eliminated. On that day the War Training Service program ceased to exist. No one as yet seems to know why. Various reasons have been advanced; when they fail, others are advanced, until finally one is found that seems to fill the bill.

At first it was stated that the A. A. F. had no need for the men as pilots, yet:

At the same time they were telling us they didn't need flyers, they were recruiting WASPS (27–P).

When the above reason was brought under scrutiny, the following statement—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 20, 1944: statement from the War Department—was advanced, and for a time it was accepted:

The WASP program to utilize women pilots for noncombat flying assignments has been found to be militarily sound and necessary. Men released by the termination of the C. A. A.–W. T. S. program can be used for services for which women are not suited, whereas women pilots are qualified for certain flying duties which they can discharge as competently as men.

Eventually, in the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee on June 8, 9, and 10, 1944, the above statement was questioned. It was pointed out that hundreds of W. T. S. men were at Truax Field, Madison, Wis., taking radio mechanic training for which women must be suitable since there were WAC's taking the same training, and the students received instruction from many women instructors.

In defense of the condition, the representative of the Army Air Forces declared that none of the former W. T. S. trainees stationed at Truax Field had more than 125 hours of flying time. This statement was not one of fact, yet apparently it was accepted as a good reason why these men should have been moved out of flying in order to let in women with very little training.

Whatever the true reasons may be, not one member of the W. T. S. today feels that the discontinuation of the program was justified in the light of existing conditions.

In judging the military necessity of the discontinuation of the W. T. S. program two important points must be considered.

First. If it was true, as was at first claimed, that the A. A. F. had no use for these men as noncombat pilots, for which they were trained at great expense, then it is likewise true that they had no use for women in the same capacity—yet the need for noncombat pilots was stressed in order to build up the WASPS program—after the W. T. S. program was discontinued.

Second. It could not be true that the W. T. S. program was discontinued because the men "were needed in capacities for which women are not suited." because immediately after discontinuation, the Army had not the slighest idea what to do with the men. Their disposition was a problem that took months to solve. Finally a large share of them were placed in categories for which women are just as suitable as men, if not more so.

This can lead to only one conclusion: That the existence of W. T. S., this pool of trained noncombat pilots, stood in the way of another group, and events have shown that that group was the WASPS.

It would seem that the 4,687 men who were in the program when it was discontinued would be given every consideration in view of the hard road they had traveled for their country. Indeed the official history of their disposition would indicate that they did receive such consideration. Again the statements of the men involved shed new light on the subject:

I then (after discontinuation of W. T. S.) went to Greensboro, N. C., for reclassification and each classification I applied for was refused me because it was not open to W. T. S. men. I was sent from there to Madison, Wis., where I was going to be classified when I arrived. I was told that I was then in radio school and could not be classified for anything else. The classification officer at Truax Field, Madison, Wis., decided that because of my previous experience I should be in Washington working on reconversion of contracts. But when he applied for the transfer so that I might be commissioned, he was told that I could not be separated from the W. T. S. group. I was at Truax Field when we were offered discharges. I was discharged from Fort Dix, N. J., where I was told that we were not eligible for mustering-out pay because we had applied for discharges. Subsequently this has been straightened out (43–p).

Reference is again made to General Arnold's statement of March 22, 1944:

In going through the manpower available to the Air Forces and determining how we can make use of it we have endeavored wherever we can to put square pegs into square holes and round pegs in round holes. And the success that our units have had in the four corners of the world indicate that we have done fairly well along that line.

Another W. T. S. man, now discharged, states:

One of the things that bothered me tremendously was the continued "swell deals" we W. T. S. men were going to be given after being grounded Most of my time after January 16 (when flying was stopped) was in my opinion the most useless period of all time. I could go on and on, but if I do, it would be only repeating what thousands of former W. T. S. men are saying, "Why did I do it?" (36–p).

The following statement is interesting in view of the fact that one of the original promises under which the men enlisted specified that men eliminated from advanced courses might become control-tower operators:

I had 215 hours' flying time and nearly 850 hours' ground school. * * * I received a Bachelor of Science degree in business administration in college, and I was in the insurance business 8 years, so I was classified as a radio mechanic and sent to Truax Field. * * * The next day after being discharged I went to the regional office of the C. A. A. where I made application for airport traffic controller. On September 25, 1944, I went to work in the control tower here in ——— as a trainee. On November 9, I took my examination for my control tower operator's certificate which I passed with an average of 93 (38–p).

This, then, was the beginning of phase 4, the final reduction of W. T. S. personnel. Approximately 300 men were assigned as "specialists" of one form or another. This included such things as photography, cartography, cryptography, military police, and so forth. Some 2,800 men were assigned to technical schools, such as radio mechanics' school. Eventually a large percentage of these were discharged. Many refused because they still had faith that they would be given a decent "break" eventually; others refused because they saw no object in being discharged just to be drafted again; while still others took advantage of the discharge merely in order to have a furlough—a visit home which in one case was as short as 4 days.

Most of the men who accepted discharges did so in the conviction that they could be of much more service to the Nation and themselves in a civilian capacity, and because the pushing around from pillar to post which rewarded them for their patriotism in volunteering had so disgusted them with military life and opportunity that they were only too glad to get out.

But the Army had another so-called opportunity for those men who were under 31 years of age. The latter were urged to apply for aviation cadet training and glider pilot training. According, to official figures, 1,529 of them were found qualified for these 2 categories, and for that reason they were not offered discharges.

The long list of authentic statements which we will show here is only a small portion of the number that have been received from the men who accepted this opportunity.

With absolutely no delay I made application and by May 14 I was in Texas. I completed the glider maintenance course offered there as well as the ordeal of extensive basic ground training. Before the close of August I was eliminated for the usual reason of flying deficiency which seemed to be offered when a surplus was had in any of the classes.

* * * I am confident that had I pursued other lines my lot would have been a great deal more satisfactory. Through all the bouncing around from field to field when not under the C. A. A. the constant browbeating by individuals who have tried to do as little as they possibly could has become unbearable. I as well as several hundred more W. T. S. boys find ourselves in the most disagreeable circumstances imaginable and this will continue until we are discharged or a satisfactory rating is granted (54–p).

We went back to Greensboro, N. C., again, and took more basic training while waiting. We waited there about 2 months and then I signed up in the glider program. This was another program that ended in a commission. But somehow C. A. A. flying does not satisfy the Army and I was eliminated after flying 17 hours. I have had 200 hours of flying under C. A. A. instructors and yet the Army said I couldn't fly PT–19's in a primary program. So went my chances of a commission for the second time (1–p).

From an aviation cadet who has not yet been eliminated:

Here at ———, there is quite a representation of W. T. S. "left," that is a good many have been washed out. The percentage of W–O's is terrific, it has taken its toll all around (35–p).

From another still in training:

The wash-out rate here as everywhere else is pretty high. Several W. T. S. boys got the "purple shaft" here too and are either in radio school or somewhere else by now. I found out it's wiser to try and keep your experience in the W. T. S. a secret (33–p).

All you have to be is lucky in this outfit and not too hot. I never could fly worth a d— but I am struggling through this place and I think I have it whipped.

* * * Quite a few of our boys have washed out in other schools. They sure did go to work on them and got rid of a vast number. From rumors I know of a couple of dozen, but I would rather not mention their names because they might be sensitive about it (29–p).

I was in the instructors phase of the W. T. S. at the time it closed and then went in as a glider pilot. I almost finished this course, when I was eliminated because of an over-abundance of pilots, by the means of which I am sure you are familiar, and now I am in training as an engineer-gunner (2–p).

I went through the glider maintenance course, primary flight course, and almost finished advanced flight training here at ———, and within 2 days of graduating I was grounded because I had a little sinus trouble. I have now been disqualified for further flying or training and also for overseas duty. In the eyes of the Army, I am now in the same category as a recruit, after having gone to school for 2 years, and having approximately $20,000 spent on me for my training.

I think that I should be just as eligible for a discharge as the other W. T. S. men who did not take glider training in the first place. I am sure I could do more for my country at my job at the oil refinery than just being a yardbird in the Army (27–p).

The day the discharges were announced and applications were passed out, I received orders to ship to Sheppard Field, Tex., for gliders. I spoke to Major ———, asking him to take me off the shipping list so I could accept my discharge. No dice.

Upon my arrival at Sheppard I again requested the opportunity to apply for my discharge. Our commanding officer called us together and issued a direct order that we were out in the cold and had to sign our applications "I am not qualified."

After sweating gliders out for 3 months we began flying. My ears began plugging up and I had difficulty hearing. I reported to the flight surgeon and after having my ears blown out and cleaned I was given a hearing test. The results of those tests I was eliminated from gliders and future air crew training because of a hearing deficiency. The results at Sheppard Field showed that I had 10/20 and 12/20 hearing in my respective ears. Upon my preliminary 64 examination at Keesler a month before shipment my examination revealed that I had 20/20 hearing in both ears.

Since that time I have appealed to the officers of both Sheppard and Keesler Fields requesting an opportunity for my discharge. In all cases the answer is "No."

Specifically, I've never had an opportunity for my discharge. I believe if Keesler Field had not been so lax in their 64 physical examination, I would have been disqualified for gliders, which I should have been, and allowed to take my discharge.

Many of us feel that the Army just railroaded us to gliders so we would be unable to take advantage of our discharge.

It may be interesting to note that on one of the inspection tours by officials from Randolph Field, one of the officers remarked that "we were the bottom of the barrel," referring to us, the W. T. S. men at gliders (3–p).

The following story is another example of "You, too, can wear a pair of silver wings"—W. T. S. style:

I am writing as one who knows the futility of having been a W. T. S. trainee. For me the story began in the fall of 1941, when I still had illusions about doing my bit, and ambitions to do that bit in a capacity which the armed services needed and in which I was very much interested. In the fall of 1941 I tried to become an aviation cadet, but was rejected for cadet training because of a slightly weak left eye. Having been rejected for cadet training here in the States, but still wanting to fly, I took the necessary steps to go to Canada for training with the Royal Canadian Air Force. I was accepted and all ready to leave for Toronto when the attack on Pearl Harbor halted (temporarily, I thought) the subscription of any more men to Canada from the United States, pending legislative decisions as to the future policy in that respect. It wasn't until June of 1942 that the Ottawa Conference definitely froze all men here in the United States and also my aspirations to become a combat pilot. During the wait for definite word from the Canadian bureau, I had gone to work in Florida at a civilian contract school engaged in training aviation cadets. This position as flight dispatcher I took because I wanted to learn as much about flying as possible before starting to fly myself.

In July of 1942 I learned of the full-time program being started by the Civil Aeronautics Administration to train flight instructors and transport pilots for the United States Army Air Forces. In view of the turn of events, this was exactly what I was hoping for; since combat flying was out of my grasp. The plan as outlined by the C. A. A. was to train us over an approximate 12-month period, at the end of which those whose capabilities were exceptional were to be given twin-engine training for transport duty, though during the entire training, we were to receive no remuneration other than food and lodging. After passing the rigid mental and physical examinations and enlisting in the Air Corps Reserve in ———, I very enthusiastically started ground school and flight training. I completed the primary and secondary courses in ——— by January of 1943. Here, however, there occurred the first indication of things to come, for it seemed that the facilities were limited for conducting the next course—cross-country. Consequently, we trainees were sent to our respective homes to await further assignment. After waiting over 4 months, I was ordered to report to ———, for cross country. I had just completed this course when we were again sent to our respective homes, because the Army had started activating all W. T. S. men. Just prior to our activation, appropriations had been granted to pay us $50 per month, retroactive to December 1942, but not for over 2 months of any of the time we were idle and waiting for assignment. I was activated at Jefferson Barracks, St. Louis, Mo., in August of 1943, and after several weeks of basic training, was shipped to ——— for the Link instrument course. From there I went to ——— in November for the secondary instructor's course. I had just received my last hour of flight time in that course, when the Army closed the programs on January 15, 1944. From ———, I was shipped to Jefferson Barracks once more for reclassification. Being too old, by this time, for cadet training, I chose the only other alternative which would still permit me to fly as a pilot, glider training.

From Jefferson Barracks we shipped to Sheppard Field, Tex., in March. There we received a 2-months' course in glider maintenance plus another 2-month course of flight ground school and 40 hours of flight time in Fairchild PT–19's. In the middle of July, after completing our training at Sheppard Field, we were sent to South Plains Army Air Field, Lubbock, Tex., for advanced glider training. At Lubbock we received 1 month's ground school, and the second month in learning to fly cargo gliders. It was just after the start of the second month's training that I fell victim to the Army's well-oiled, ridiculous wash-out machine. I was eliminated from the glider program for so-called flying deficiency by the faculty board at a cut and dried hearing which was the biggest farce that I have ever witnessed, let alone appear in it in one of the leading roles. * * * The Army's line of reasoning seems to be that to graduate a class intact is bad policy and might result in criticism from higher authority. To say that their methods of acquiring a respectable wash-out quota are damnably unjust would be putting it mildly.

Now I find myself here at ——— with a commercial pilot's license, 250 hours of Government-supervised flight instruction, and many more hours of ground schooling successfully completed, waiting to be sent to an already overcrowded radio mechanics' school. In the meantime, my duties are humble, to say the least, for I am engaged in cleaning latrines, guard duty, and pulling K. P.

That is my "story"; and while I've dwelled upon it for too long, perhaps, it is still only a rather rapid sketch, and I have omitted many of the lurid details. Naturally, I am bitter, for, after spending 2 years and many thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money in training me to be a pilot, I am still a buck private, and the Army ignores that training, and I am to be sent to learn how to repair radios. One of these days it would not be surprising to find myself being sent to the Army's school for cooks and bakers (26–P).

In the meantime, the glider program had reached the saturation point, and again began the indiscriminate eliminations characteristic of Brooks and Randolph. Unfortunately, I am among the hundreds of "potential glider pilots" caught in the web, and almost before I realized it I found myself out by reason of that well-known phrase, "flying deficiency." I didn't get the ax until I had completed the PT–19 course and was eliminated on the strength of that one-flight test which was to determine whether or not I was fit to graduate that phase and go on to actual glider-flight training. Having once been in the glider program, I found myself ineligible for a discharge which was offered to other W. T. S. men.

I was allowed to select radio technical school and assured I would be sent there. On the day of my shipment I found myself on the way to Keesler Field and mechanic school instead. Try as I might to have my classification changed, I was threatened with shipment to a labor battalion overseas, despite my qualifications, if I made any further attempt to change my classification for radio school as they promised, the discharge being out of the question (4–p).

The following is a person who spent approximately $500 of his own money buying flying time between courses:

After 5 weeks of armor, I was offered a chance to take glider-pilot training, and was sent to Sheppard Field, Tex. This consisted of 4 weeks of advanced basic training, 6 weeks of glider maintenance school, and 6 weeks of flying and ground school. In my third week of flying, I was grounded by the flight surgeon, and also disqualified for overseas duty.

I was then transferred to the basic training section of the field for reclassification. After being classified for bomb maintenance, and my papers being sent to headquarters in Denver for approval, there was a change which, of course, pertained to my status—this being that anyone disqualified for overseas duty will not be sent through a technical school.

I have been shipped to Maxwell Field, Ala., as a casual, to do with as you see fit. I have no Army classification number, not having been through a technical school (14–p).

I am a former W. T. S. man or trainee, and am officially in the glider program. However, I am to be eliminated within the next few weeks by virtue of being disqualified on a 64 physical at this station. The disqualification is due to a very small spot on my chest which existed many years previous to my enlistment, and X-ray films show that the size of the spot is practically the same, now as when I first took a 64 at Sheppard Field, Tex., in September 1943 and in May 1944 at Chenute Field, Ill., at the time my application for gliders was forwarded (7–p).

The following is dated December 1, 1944, and is from an aviation cadet:

It seems we don't have much to look forward to, * * * They have started the old washing machine to rolling here, and we have been told that there will be plenty of faces missing before graduation (63–p).

The latest developments are such that even the hardiest are getting the desire to get out and be done with it. The following is dated December 4, 1944:

I am a part of the W. T. S. residue; in short, I have been eliminated from the glider program. After 7 months—long, hot, blistering, dusty Texas months—of working, being on the ball, and sweating it out, I have been washed clean as the barracks floor on a Friday night.

I know, "you told me so." So did old Pete Jester, Dave, and the rest of the boys. But it was spring, remember? And I wanted to fly, fly, fly!

Now I'm finished. No one realizes more than I, that I should have remained at dear old ———, where every day is like Sunday on the farm.

Now for the first time I want out so bad that it hurts. There are about 40 of us here pending disposition, which is to be gunnery school and nothing else (62–p).

Another letter dated December 4, 1944:

I am the wife of a W. T. S. man who very unfortunately selected glider training when the former program was terminated. My husband was eliminated from gliders only 3 days prior to graduation after a gruelling 7 months' course.

Under a new ruling all E. R. C. men physically qualified have only career gunnery school available to them.

During the 28 months my husband has been in the Army, this is the fourth crushing blow he has been dealt. First it was W. T. S. closing after he had 16 months of training. Second, discharges granted to those fortunate enough not to choose gliders. Third, being eliminated 3 days before graduation. Fourth, gunnery school, the only course available to him.

What makes it all the more difficult to bear is that he needn't ever have had to enlist in the first place, as due to his civilian job, he was exempted for the duration. He is an engineer for a plastic company doing vital war work. But his first ambition was to fly for the Army Air Corps—and this is his reward (64–p).

One person, who applied for career gunnery after discontinuation of the W. T. S. who refused discharge, has this to say:

There has been no attempt on the part of the Army to use our W. T. S. training, which, mind you, was received under Army auspices, while, since the W. T. S. was discontinued, jobs which were promised us when we enlisted have been filled by personnel certainly not more competent than us or subjected to better training than we were, or better prepared for the jobs involved had we been permitted to complete our course.

It is unfair, after enlisting for a flying job as advertised in recruiting propaganda, to not actually have a chance to qualify, while the jobs are filled from other personnel sources (41–p).

Another, who has been discharged and is serving the Nation in a vital industry, writes:

When the Army took over they decided they could only use us in the capacity of instructors—instead of ferry pilots or other branches of the Air Corps—but as instructors they could use 7,000. This decision was made sometime during June 1943.

In January 1944 the program is terminated because, as they told us, there were too many pilots on hand. Even if the figures on attrition were less than estimates, or if for any reason estimates were incorrect, it's hard to believe they could be that far off.

When the program was finally closed down—we were willing to continue flying, irrespective of being commissioned—and we were also willing to go anywhere and take all the worst assignments that were available.

At the same time that our program was closed down on the one hand, the Army was sponsoring the expansion of the women's flying (WASPS) on the other. With 4,200 men finished in training or nearly so, this was hard to understand (37–p).

For some reason a number of W. T. S. trainees had not as yet been called to active duty by January 15, 1944. Yet their story parallels that of the men included in the official figures, and their plight is in some respects worse, since they are denied the discharge option and still have no chance to fly. The statement of one such man is as follows:

I completed secondary February 22, 1943, and waited until May 10, 1943, before being called to —— for cross country. About 10 days after completing cross country there I was called back to the same place for the elementary instructor's course, which I completed and received my commercial and instructor's license on August 25, 1943. From there I went to —— for secondary instructor. On September 5, 1943, I passed the Army "64" and on the 10th began the program, finishing October 27, 1943. On November 12, 1943, I reported to Brooks Field, Tex., for the Army instructor's course, and was at Randolph Field, Tex., January 14, 1944, when the cadet program was slashed.

Upon returning home in January I received a notice that I could no longer be kept in reserve and had the choice of a discharge from the reserve or active duty in the Air Corps. Thinking the Army wanted me as a pilot, I chose active duty. The reason I thought this was because in every course we were told we were "officer material," and during secondary and cross country we were asked to fill out forms on which we could mark our choice of instructor, transport, or service pilot. Even when I went to the induction center I was classified as "enlisted service pilot." Since that time, March 14, 1944, I've been a buck private in the Air Corps. No more am I considered "officer material," nor have I been afforded my choice of jobs as flight instructor, transport or service pilot, as I was while taking W. T. S. courses.

To date I have 346 hours, of which 155 are dual, and on September 26, 1944, took the C. A. A. physical to keep my commercial instructor's rating valid.

Now I feel that all this training and the money spent on me has been completely wasted by the Army, and I'm sure all the other W. T. S. men feel the same way. We know we could be doing invaluable work as pilots if only given the chance.

Being married, as I am, and in the Army as a buck private is bad enough, but to have our promises broken and to be kicked around as we have been is really rubbing it in.

If there is any way in which you can help us in our situation, you will have the heartfelt thanks of hundreds of men who volunteered to help their country, agreed to take their training without pay, did exactly as they were told, and were figuratively given a slap in the face for their trouble (13–p).

Last summer, when the Army decided to pass out discharges, quite a few fellows I know turned theirs down because their draft boards informed them they would soon be right back in again. A number who did accept discharges have since been drafted or soon will be. Then there were many who, through no fault of their own, were not actually in a program on January 15, therefore declared ineligible for discharge according to the stipulation made by the Army. There are also several hundred men who, by the manipulation of W. T. S., were still in the enlisted Reserve Corps; these were definitely refused discharges. I know, because I'm one of them.

I'm telling you this because the Army seems to seek every loophole possible, and unless this bill is passed to include every W. T. S. man in service, regardless of where he was or what he was doing on January 15, 1944, or any other date they may choose, they will find some way to avoid giving us the break we really deserve. In other words, we've learned not to trust the Army, and we know that nothing but a bill void of any loopholes will do us any good (24–p).

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, we owe something to these thousands of patriotic boys of America. They have been pushed around aplenty. The least we can do is pass legislation to correct the chain of abuses and wrongs administered to them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we are approaching title 2 of the bill, which contains several general provisions. Customarily an appropriation bill is read by paragraphs, and points of order must be made at the conclusion

of a paragraph rather than at the conclusion of a section. I happen to notice that title 2 is prepared a little differently than the ordinary appropriation bill, in that each of the paragraphs is labeled with a parenthesized letter, indicating that it might be interpreted as a subparagraph. Some of us desire to make points of order against certain parts of the title or section 201, but not against the entire section. Consequently the question is whether or not a point of order must be made at the conclusion of the reading of each subparagraph, or should we wait until the entire section has been read?

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair would say that title 2 will be read by paragraphs, and points of order would be in order following the reading of each paragraph.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to answer some of the criticism that has been directed at the Veterans' Administration by insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

An attack was inserted by a Member the other day upon the Veterans' Administration facility at Mount Alto. Mount Alto is a diagnostic center. It is always crowded. It always has been, because so many wounded or sick veterans want to come to Washington. When they go to Mount Alto to be examined, many of them want to stay there, when as a matter of fact the best thing for them would be to go to other veteran hospitals, because of the fact that this is a diagnostic center, and other cases are usually waiting their turn.

The Veterans' Administration has a terrible responsibility and it is doing the best job possible. I daresay it is doing the best job of any organization of its kind in any country in the world. I ask you gentlemen who are getting this information from outside critics who want to jump on the Veterans' Administration, to first investigate. If you will go to the bottom of those criticisms you will find that they are not well founded. The Veterans' Administration is doing the very best job it possibly can under the circumstances, and I hope all Members of the House will join in helping continue that splendid service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi. The Veterans' Administration has rendered an unusually constructive and effective service. No human agency is perfect; but the Veterans' Administration, under General Hines, and his associates, has rendered an outstanding service to the veterans of past wars. The wonderful experience for the past 25 years equips them to render the maximum of service to the veterans of this war.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am glad the gentleman from Mississippi, the able chairman of the Veterans' Committee, has taken the floor at this time to clear out some of the cobwebs that have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the avowed purpose of reflecting on General Hines and the Veterans' Administration. As a member of the Appropriations Committee and being for several years a member of the subcommittee having jurisdiction over the Veterans' Administration, I a mfamiliar with the Veterans' Administration and its far-reaching functions which are growing in magnitude daily. Year after year I have seen General Hines appear before that committee. He always knows personally what it is all about. He does not have to bring a whole army of aides along to flank him on every side and to ask them what the answer is when a member asks for information, as is the case with so many others heads of departments and agencies of Government. I know that Members familiar with the general's work agree that he is doing an outstanding job with what Congress has given him. Of course, Mount Alto Hospital is overcrowded. It is by no means the only hospital in the country that is crowded to the overflowing. But that is not the fault of General Hines. He has repeatedly warned our committee to expect crowded conditions. As Members know, the Congress has made a lot of funds available for hospital facilities, but considerably more are desperately needed and I feel certain that we will not stint in making additional funds available for additional veterans' hospitals and also for enlarging our present hospitals.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I was one of those who inserted matter in the RECORD. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I have nothing but praise for the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman, and will say to him that I was not referring to him at all. I do believe, however, that a great deal of this criticism is unjustified and ought to cease.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to state that while I do believe the Veterans' Administration has done some extremely fine work I also feel that it could be improved upon in some of its services. I believe we should have more hospital beds; we should have a medical corps. We need nurses very badly and I believe it would be extremely helpful if more and more people could be interested in the whole hospital program, the whole program for the care of the men; in fact, I know every Member here is interested in doing constructive work for the veterans and also in improving the services now given the veterans by the Veterans' Administration.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

(c) Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the fiscal year 1946 shall be available for expenses of travel of new appointees and of transportation of their immediate families in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, and expenses of transportation of household goods and personal effects in accordance with the act of October 10, 1940 (5 U. S. C. 73c–1), from the places of their actual residence at the time of appointment to places of employment outside continental United States, and for such expenses on return of civilian officers and employees from their posts of duty outside continental United States to the places of their actual residence at time of assignment to duty outside the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against subparagraph (c) on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may state in this connection that the only reason I made the point of order to this paragraph and not to the previous paragraph is because subparagraph (b) is limited to transfer where permanent duty is involved. Subparagraph (c) is not so limited, and it seems to me would make possible foreign travel, or travel from a foreign country to the United States on rather temporary assignments and require the Government to pay the transportation of household goods and the transportation of families as well for temporary as for permanent appointments.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made against subparagraph (c) on page 65 is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

(d) Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the fiscal year 1946 shall be available for reimbursement, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile (unless otherwise permitted by law), of employees or others rendering service to the Government for use by them of privately owned automobiles for transportation on official business within the limits of their official stations or places of service.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order. It is legislation, but, Mr. Chairman, it was placed in the bill for the purpose of uniformity. This provision is carried in practically every appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts against subparagraph (c), page 65, is sustained.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he can inform us what the program will be for tomorrow and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The House will meet tomorrow. Unanimous consent will be asked tomorrow for the consideration of the insurance bill reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary. There is no other business scheduled for tomorrow.

If unanimous consent is granted—and I hope personally it will be, but that is only an expression of my personal desire—the bill will automatically pass.

It is understood, of course, that the bill will not be debated and whatever discussion is had in connection with the bill when the unanimous-consent request is made will be under reservation of objection. I make that statement so the Members will understand that a unanimous-consent request will be propounded and that the bill will not, therefore, be debated, except in connection with such discussion as might take place under a reservation of any Member to object.

I am going to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday.

On Monday there will be no business.

On Tuesday the civil functions appropriation bill will be called up for consideration. It is my understanding there is no controversy in that bill. If any should develop, and the necessity for a roll call should arise, an agreement has been had that the roll call will not take place until Wednesday. As I stated, my understanding is that the bill has been unanimously reported by the committee and contains no controversial items.

If a rule is reported by the Rules Committee, the so-called George bill will come up for consideration on Wednesday of next week, after which the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be considered, if a rule is reported by the Rules Committee on that bill. Following those bills, a rivers and harbors bill will be considered, if a rule is reported. We are hopeful that we may bring up that bill for consideration next week.

As I stated, on Wednesday the George bill, reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, will be considered by the House if a rule comes out of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the majority leader contemplate asking unanimous consent for dipensing with Calendar Wednesday business next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I intended to make the ordinary unanimous-consent request prior to next Wednesday that I usually make every week.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman notify me when he intends to make that request?

Mr. McCORMACK. Any Member making that request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, no matter what side the Member may sit on, will be considered and the gentleman from Massachusetts would not under any conditions propound any request until he gives notice to any Member desiring to be present at such time. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will be notified.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. I make the same request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the previous gentleman made, if the gentleman from Massachusetts intends to ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business. I desire to be notified because I shall object.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is an awful lot of interest in next Wednesday. It may be that this interest is so clear, so evident, and so pronounced that my intelligence will dictate that I not ask to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business.

Mr. SPENCE. I may say to the gentleman I have a very great interest in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

(e) During the fiscal year 1946 the head of the department or establishment concerned may delegate to such officials as he may designate his authority to authorize payment of expenses of travel and of transportation of household goods and immediate families of civilian officers and employees on change of official station.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph, particularly the words "may designate", that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, I believe it is a matter that ought to be covered by general legislation.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

(f) Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the fiscal year 1946 available for expenses of travel shall be available, when specifically authorized by the head of the department or establishment concerned or by such officials as he may designate for the purpose; for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation concerned is made.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph on the same ground as applied to the previous paragraph.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Page 66, line 6, insert:

"(f) Appropriations contained in this act, available for expenses of travel shall be available when specifically authorized by the head of the activity or establishment concerned for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation concerned is made."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment, pending which I should like to ask the gentleman from Virginia a question.

Would the gentleman have any objection to putting in the amendment which he has offered a provision limiting that to attendance at meetings in the United States? Many times we have had questions come up, at which times there has been a good deal of discussion about sending delegates to Mexico or some other place for a conference.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Some of these departments, notably the State Department, have occasion to attend meetings held beyond the continental limits of the United States. This language is carried in several bills.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that in the State Department you have a clear-cut case. The reason for raising the question is this: That a year or two ago there was a conference on Indian education held in Mexico City, and there was a great deal of stir in connection with the Department of the Interior appropriation bill against sending delegates to Mexico City on that particular occasion. I think the purpose is desirable. In many cases delegates should be authorized to attend.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not want to agree to that restriction, not knowing what effect it might have.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman want to leave the door wide open?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not, but this is the same authority that those departments have had all the time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not each department.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Every department in this bill has had it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do I understand that the amendment which the gentleman from Virginia has offered would make the entire appropriation of any agency available for the purpose of attendance at meetings?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The funds appropriated for travel are the only funds that could be obligated for this purpose.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is no limit as to the amount that could be expended at any conference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The limitation is the amount for travel. As the gentleman knows, a break-down of that is always furnished to the committee and is placed in our files, so I do not think there is any opportunity for abuse there.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the amendment that the gentleman has offered is limited to the agencies enumerated in this bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration

the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk have authority to correct the paragraph and section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 626) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 71):

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, as Secretary of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Justice.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. United States Tariff Commission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permited to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain correspondence which I recently received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THOMAS ALVA EDISON DAY

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I state that I have no knowledge this resolution was to be called up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who are interested in this resolution, to clear it with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will yield to me to explain this, may I state that this resolution was reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary, as I understand it, unanimously, either Tuesday of this week or Wednesday. Since Sunday, February 11, is the anniversary of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison, I have spoken to Members on my side, and I have spoken to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who said he had cleared the matter on your side. A similar bill was introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress and in the Seventy-eighth Congress and was passed by the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not have to explain the resolution to me because I am a great admirer of the late Thomas Alva Edison. I had not been informed that the resolution had been reported out of committee. Has it been reported out of committee?

Mr. SUNDSTROM. It had been reported out unanimously 2 days ago, as I understand it. It was a unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary as well as of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I can verify what the gentleman from New Jersey says. The Committee on the Judiciary was not organized until very late in January, as the gentleman from Massachusetts recalls, and we did not have very much time before February 11 in which to consider this bill. We considered it as promptly as possible. This is the first opportunity the gentleman from New Jersey had to bring it to the floor. It is in line with what we have done for several years past. The late Thomas Alva Edison was a constituent of the gentleman from New Jersey, and out of consideration for the gentleman as well as respect for that late great American, we think this is the proper thing to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman in his admiration and respect for that great American, Thomas Alva Edison. I was inquiring to see if the normal, natural, and proper processes of the House of Representatives had been complied with. I had no knowledge of this matter and I wanted to be sure it had been reported out of committee. Being informed now that it has been reported out of committee, I welcome the passage of this resolution. I asked for that information both for myself and for the record. I am not insisting that I personally be consulted but in order that the usual technicalities will be complied with, I think it might be well that when a bill is reported out of committee to be taken up by unanimous consent the Member interested would consult not only with the minority leader but with the majority leader and thereafter to advise the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has always been very fair in his attitude. If he was not consulted, I assure him it was an oversight. I was under the impression that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] had consulted him before we consulted the Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is quite probable the gentleman from Pennsylvania did, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has forgotten it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the Chair was not fully informed about this, because the Committee on the Judiciary has filed no report on the bill. This is the last time that will happen.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 76

Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day

Resolved, etc., That the 11th day of February of each year is hereby designated as Thomas Alva Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of the great inventor,

and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about Mr. Henry Wallace. I want to speak about a mild-mannered, modest, earnest, unquestionably sincere man, who is perhaps too forthrightly honest for everybody to understand him, and concerning whom it might be said "God protect me from my friends, I can take care of my enemies myself." Yet this gentleman seems to have gotten the Congress of the United States, or shall I say certain Members of it, into one of the most terrific dithers I have ever observed during my period of service here. Before I proceed I would like to make clear that there are no political implications either past, present, or future to be drawn from my remarks. I was delegate to the Democratic Convention in 1940, and as such I voted for the nomination, not of Mr. Wallace, but of the then Speaker, Mr. Bankhead, for Vice President. I did it for two reasons which I felt were good and sufficient; first, because I had a very profound affection for Speaker Bankhead and wanted to do him that honor; second, because I believed the party convention needed an element of independence in it. I was not a delegate to the convention in 1944, nor have any remarks any reference to any future convention. So what I have to say about Mr. Wallace today is said from the purely dispassionate and disinterested point of view of a person who merely likes to see fair play in American politics, and likes to see true worth recognized where it exists.

My speech mainly is in the nature of advice to the enemies of Mr. Wallace. I would like to remind those people that the people of this Nation cannot help wondering why all the hue and cry has been raised. The louder it becomes the more they suspect that Mr. Wallace may be all right. The American people have an inherent sense of fairness. If they think someone is being unfairly treated they have a way of rallying to his cause.

The nomination of Mr. Wallace comes before the Senate certainly in such fashion as to leave Mr. Wallace standing squarely upon his two feet. I would like to point out the fact that Mr. Wallace was not the author of the letter which the President wrote to Mr. Jesse Jones. The Congress might conceivably keep Mr. Wallace from filling any official position in the Government, and this might well be the very best thing that could happen to Mr. Wallace, personally. It would hurt those who opposed him very much indeed, it seems to me. It would relieve him of any immediate responsibilities and leave him in a position where he need only inform the American people of the principles for which he stands.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will.

Mr. OUTLAND. I compliment the gentleman on bringing this matter up at this particular time. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago that he was not quite certain the reasons for all the hue and cry that has been raised against Mr. Wallace. Would the gentleman suggest that Mr. Wallace's stand against cartels might have been one reason for it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much, but as usual when I make a speech, my colleague from the Eleventh District in California anticipates the main point of the speech and asks me a question which takes all the wind out of the remainder of the speech.

Mr. OUTLAND. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate it nonetheless.

It seems that Mr. Wallace has committed a lot of crimes, and done some terrible things in his career, and I wanted to speak about what some of those things were, because obviously there must be something terribly wrong with Mr. Wallace or Members of Congress would not be suggesting that we repeal the war powers of the President and change the whole war program around in order to try to "fence in" this gentleman, in case he is confirmed as Secretary of Commerce.

Of course, the first crime was the little pigs.

We have been hearing about those pigs now for a good many years. The trouble was that Mr. Wallace followed the then prevalent, and may I say the still prevalent in many quarters, conservative scarcity philosophy. I do not think it was right to slaughter the pigs, at least not unless and until there was a worthwhile program so that every bit of the meat could be used to feed hungry mouths. I believe that Mr. Wallace himself felt that it was not the right thing to do. But I want to emphasize the fact that with the welfare of the farmers uppermost in his mind he had three alternatives. The first, and the one he immediately rejected, was to let the farmers go bankrupt. That was the first thing he could do. The second thing was to reduce the supply of farm products. The third thing that he could do was to increase the demand for farm products by increasing the buying power of the people. Now that first alternative was to be ruled out; he was not going to let the farmers go bankrupt. He knew, furthermore, that he could not get support for a genuine program for distribution to the people who needed additional buying power. So the only alternative available to him at that time was to reduce supplies. And that is what he did. He could not see the farmers go broke; he, no doubt, thought it was a bad method, but he chose that alternative. And at the time he had the support of farm organizations and leaders.

But let me point out that Mr. Wallace brought forth his real proposal when he advocated that, instead of letting this food go to waste, we should have a program that would increase the buying power of the people and enable them to consume these very products. And so he was the champion of the school-lunch program in which we say we are not going to destroy farm products where we have a surplus over and above available purchasing power, but we will buy those products from our farmers and channel them into the stomachs of the children and people of the country where needed.

The second great crime of Mr. Wallace was that he suggested that the children of this Nation, and perhaps of other nations, too, should have milk to drink. Now, obviously it was a terrible thing for Mr. Wallace to say, because it immediately branded him as a terrible, radical sort of individual. I cannot quite understand what was wrong with it. For today every important farm organization in the whole country is saying that the key to the solution of the agricultural problem is precisely that; namely, to increase the demand for agricultural products and to keep it high enough so that it will be in line with the unfailing abundant supply of such products. In good times and bad our farmers maintain their production. Therefore we must make it possible that there be purchasing power in the hands of those who need them to consume these farm products. Full employment is the best way to do this. But it can also be done in part by the school-lunch program and the stamp plan that was tried out, instead of letting these farm products go to waste and our farmers go without a market. These programs were the proposals of Mr. Wallace.

I should like to quote briefly from the report of the Association of Land Grant Colleges made in August 1944:

> Aside from full urban employment, two measures will improve the domestic market for farm products and at the same time enhance the general welfare. One is education work to promote good nutrition. The other is subsidies, in one or more forms, to promote food consumption by low-income families.

And so, from the standpoint of the welfare of the American farmers, the welfare of the consumers of this country, and in fact all the world, what is wrong with saying as Mr. Wallace did, that as long as a superabundance of milk is produced it should be gotten to the people who need it, not only to provide the outlet but to use the food produced?

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman's first point dealt with the so-called slaughtering of the little pigs which has been blamed on Mr. Wallace but does the gentleman believe there is anything worse in that economy which has emphasized the law of supply and demand than the traditional tariff policy of the Republican Party?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree and I can give the gentleman additional

examples. It is no different than the policy followed by every single great industrial concern, especially in those fields where anything approaching a monopoly exists. For the very purpose of monopoly is to cut down, control, and restrict supplies, not, it is true, by slaughtering little pigs, but by restricting the production of oil, steel, aluminum, and all other commodities that a monopoly controls, all for the purpose of creating a shortage so they can control the price of their commodity.

Mr. OUTLAND. They have restricted production.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly. So this brings me to my next point, and that is that Mr. Wallace made two or three speeches against monopoly, and the worst of it was that it seemed he meant business about the matter.

He pointed out that we cannot have economic freedom or a chance for small business as long as monopoly exists and he said he was against monopoly and intended to do what he could about the matter. Well, this is very bad, as anyone will find out who does the same thing. In fact, I have had something to say against the oil monopoly, the financial monopoly and other kinds of monopolies and during my last campaign I may say I discovered that anyone who does that is asking for trouble in American political life.

Nonetheless, I cannot get the idea out of my head that Mr. Wallace's position against monopoly is the traditional American position. Certainly it was the position of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt. Certainly if the Congress proposes to give more than lip service to the cause of small business it will be compelled to agree with Mr. Wallace's position on this matter. I may say that I think the enforcement of our antitrust laws during the past few years has been a great undertaking and one that should have been started long ago and one that must be pressed with increasing vigor.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I notice the gentleman forgot to mention George Washington as being an antimonopolist. Does the gentleman recall that George Washington wanted to hang the monopolist on a gallows five times higher than the one created by Haman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much for adding the Father of our Country to my list.

Although the press resolutely suppressed it, Mr. Wallace had a good deal to say about incentive taxation; that is, a tax program calculated to induce constructive investment in employment-giving enterprises. Somehow or other his advocacy of incentive taxation did not seem to fit with all colors of the picture that had been painted of Henry Wallace, so they left that out of the news items.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that he also advocated fairer freight rates for the South and West so that industry might be spread out? It ill becomes some of his opponents from the South at this time to fail to take that into consideration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; but I would like to point out to the gentleman that Mr. Wallace is not without friends in the southern part of this country. I thank the gentleman for his observation because the very next point I was going to make is that Mr. Wallace's position upon freight rates is a position against one of the most powerful forces making for monopoly, namely, "Pittsburgh plus," and all that phrase means that we have had in this Nation for years.

Mr. Wallace, however, did not stop here. He had the temerity to actually propose to the Senate committee that we should have a program of equalizing credit opportunities of little business with big business. He seems to believe that the present situation wherein huge monopolistic enterprise can secure credit at 1½ or 2 percent, whereas small business must pay 6 or 7 percent, is wrong, and he indicated certain steps might be taken to correct this, such as a guaranty by the Government of private bank loans made to small business. I am compelled to say that it looks to me like that is a proposal very much in accord with the fundamental principles of American life.

Mr. Wallace has also advocated a broad international policy and has been the outstanding advocate of a policy of friendliness with the Latin-American republics. If this be a crime, then I must only say that it has certainly borne good fruit during this terrible war period, because I should hate to think what the opposite policy would have done to us had we been compelled to confront Germany and Japan on the battlefields of the world and at the same time to have had an unfriendly attitude to deal with in the Latin-American republics.

I am only getting started on this, however, for the worst things about Mr. Wallace are yet to come.

I have here a copy of the Washington Post for Sunday, February 4, in which appears an article about his appearance before the Senate committee. Here we find that Mr. Wallace's behavior was something terrible. It appears he did not sit properly in the witness chair; that his hair was not properly brushed; and that he actually chuckled and laughed at certain points during the questioning by the Senate committee. The article does not say so, but I have a horrible suspicion that another thing he did was to speak straight out about the things in which he believed and tell the exact truth as to where he stood.

The George bill as passed by the Senate recommends itself as being right in principle. The only wrong, it seems to me, was committed when the Congress permitted Mr. Jones to have both the job as Secretary of Commerce and also the job as Federal Loan Administrator, which I believed to be a job too big for any one man. Because it is right in principle, I shall support the George bill.

The only thing is, it should have been passed long ago. For if it is wrong for one man to have both of these jobs, it is wrong for another one to have them both.

We find, however, that some of the bitter-end opponents of Mr. Wallace are not satisfied with the George bill. They want to pass a special law to say that as long as Mr. Wallace is Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Commerce shall have nothing to do with the Export-Import Bank. They also want to amend the war powers of the President, to repeal one of the basic statutes under which the war has been conducted, for the private and special benefit of Mr. Wallace. I say "for the private and special benefit of Mr. Wallace" deliberately because all this sort of thing can hurt no one but Mr. Wallace's enemies. The more responsibility that is removed from his shoulders the better really for him personally so far as the future is concerned, and the more foolish Congress makes itself look in this matter. The people of the country are going to wonder just what manner of man this Henry Wallace must be that he has grown so great as to cause the whole Congress to turn itself inside out and alter the entire program of the war just on account of him. They will begin to suspect that he must have a good deal "on the ball."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

I should like to respectfully suggest to the gentlemen who are so exercised about this matter that the most clear-cut thing they might do would be to just pass a constitutional amendment which would say something to the effect that no one whose initials were H. A. W. or perhaps no one by the name of Wallace should be eligible to hold a Cabinet position in the United States Government. Perhaps, however, it would be more to the point to say in such a constitutional amendment that nobody who really means it when he says that there should be a policy on the part of our Government to assure jobs so far as humanly possible in private industry, for American citizens, notably American returning soldiers after the war, should hold a Cabinet post. For it is those jobs or the absence of them that are going to determine who will stand and who will fall in the postwar period.

It is, of course, true that all of us are in favor of enough jobs to keep our people employed, but the difference is that some say we must have enough jobs to have full employment provided it can be done without disturbing any vested interests, whereas others say that there must be enough jobs to keep our people employed and put a period after that statement.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of people are beginning to wonder whether this tremendous excitement over an essentially retiring modest public servant does not indicate that he represents them against interests which are too powerful to come out openly and give their real reasons for opposition.

I have here a telegram from a very fine small businessman that resides in my district. This is what he says:

As owner and general manager of small manufacturing firm with national distribution am greatly alarmed at strength of forces who would deny our country the benefit of the wisdom and experience of Henry Wallace as head of our Department of Commerce.

I have other letters, too, from all kinds of folks about this matter. They do not all agree with Mr. Wallace, of course. Probably none of us here in the House this afternoon agrees with Mr. Wallace in everything that he said or everything that he has done, but we do know, I think, that here we have an example of a man who was so forthrightly honest that he went before a great national convention and made a speech expressing his views, whether you agree with him or not, that perhaps cost him the nomination for the second highest office of his party in the Government.

When you find a man ready to do things like that, I think you have to respect him, and I think you have to know that an appointment of a man of that kind to a Cabinet position in the National Government is certainly not going to do this Nation any harm, but on the contrary will probably do it great good in the long run.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does the gentleman believe that the same forces that are raising so much of a rumpus against Henry Wallace today have a great deal in common with the same forces that a few years ago were raising the same rumpus against the man who is the President of the United States, but who now do not dare to raise their voices against the President?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is undoubtedly right about that.

I have two concerns about this. One is that I believe Mr. Wallace to be a devoted and earnest public servant, as I said. I believe he has the qualities I have indicated.

The other concern is that I do not like to see us here in Congress act in a manner that seems to me not to be altogether dignified. I think the George bill should pass the House as it passed the Senate, but I think attempts to festoon it with all sorts of far-reaching amendments are very ill-advised. I believe they will not hurt Mr. Wallace a single bit, but, if adopted, I think they would make the House look rather ridiculous.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. We are everlastingly hearing about Henry Wallace's slaughtering little pigs. I think the gentleman has well answered that, although he did not refer to the fact that some of the very farm leaders who have lately been criticizing that most questionable policy even in a period of drought and depression are the very men who urged it upon Henry Wallace at the time he was Secretary of Agriculture.

May I also ask the gentleman this. Have we not often overlooked Mr. Wallace's advocacy of the ever-normal granary, which implies an economy of abundance on the one hand, and on the other hand have not his foes overemphasized what looked like his act toward an economy of scarcity for which they said he stood?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that is very true. Nor have I mentioned Mr. Wallace's excellent administration of the great Agriculture Department over which he presided as Secretary for 8 years. I thank the gentleman from Arizona very much.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 1973) to express the intent of Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], is recognized for 40 minutes.

ATLANTIC CHARTER WAS SIGNED BY ROOSEVELT AND CHURCHILL, ACCORDING TO WHITE HOUSE RELEASE AUGUST 14, 1941—A PROMISE TO SMALL NATIONS—AN IDEAL TO FIGHT FOR

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, so that the RECORD may reflect events as they occurred in connection with the so-called Atlantic Charter, I am submitting forth herein pertinent material assembled for me by the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress.

[White House Release of August 14, 1941]

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES, KNOWN AS THE ATLANTIC CHARTER, BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM, AUGUST 14, 1941

Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial, or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

(Release to the press from the White House, August 14, 1941, as printed in State Department Executive Agreement Series 236.)

On the same day, Mr. Speaker, the British Library of Information in New York City issued a similar release, the language being identical. About the same time the Office of War Information had printed millions of copies of this alleged document and broadcast them throughout the country. Up until December 1942 in excess of one thousand million copies had been printed.

The White House also issued another release for the press on August 14, 1941, in which it said:

The following statement signed by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, is released for information of the press.

At the end of the release it is indicated that the President and the Prime Minister signed the statement. Copy is inserted at this point:

[White House release of August 14, 1941]

The following statement signed by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain is released for the information of the press:

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

"They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high ranking officers of their military, naval, and air services.

"The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lease-Lend Act, for the armed forces of the United States and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression has been further examined.

"Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

"The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite Government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

"They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

"Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

"Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

"Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

"Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

"Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

"Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

"(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
"(Signed) WINSTON S. CHURCHILL."

The White House again on August 21, 1941, issued a confidential release dealing with the coming message of the President to the Congress. The release was signed by Stephen Early, secretary to the President. And, again, this White House release indicates that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill signed the Atlantic Charter statement. The verbatim release follows at this point:

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS AUGUST 21, 1941

AUGUST 21, 1941.

Confidential: To be held in strict confidence and no portion, synopsis, or intimation to be published or given out until the reading of the President's message has begun in the Senate or the House of Representatives. Extreme care must therefore be exercised to avoid premature publication.

STEPHEN EARLY,
Secretary to the President.

To the Congress of the United States:

Over a week ago I held several important conferences at sea with the British Prime Minister. Because of the factor of safety to British, Canadian, and American ships and their personnel no prior announcement of these meetings could properly be made.

At the close, a public statement by the Prime Minister and the President was made. I quote it for the information of the Congress and for the record:

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

"They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high-ranking officers of their military, naval, and air services.

"The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lend-Lease Act, for the armed forces of the United States and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression has been further examined.

"Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

"The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

"They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

"Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

"Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

"Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

"Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

"Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

"Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

"(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
"(Signed) WINSTON S. CHURCHILL."

The Congress and the President having heretofore determined through the Lend-Lease Act on the national policy of American aid to the democracies which east and west are waging war against dictatorships, the military and naval conversations at these meetings made clear gains in furthering the effectiveness of this aid.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister and I are arranging for conferences with the Soviet Union to aid it in its defense against the attack made by the principal aggressor of the modern world—Germany.

Finally, the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal which is worth while for our type of civilization to seek. It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with nazi-ism, or to agree to a world peace which would give to nazi-ism domination over large numbers of conquered nations. Inevitably such a peace would be a gift to nazi-ism to take breath—armed breath—for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia to the American hemisphere itself.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government.

It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the declaration of principles includes, of necessity, the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information. No society of the world organized under the announced principles could survive without these freedoms, which are a part of the whole freedom for which we strive.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 21, 1941.*

Mr. Speaker, 1 year after the Atlantic Charter statement was issued, volume 7 of the Department of State Bulletin of August 15, 1942, page 697, reported an anniversary message from the President to the Prime Minister, as follows:

[Vol. 7, Department of State Bulletin of August 15, 1942]

THE WAR

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

(Released to the press by the White House August 14)

The President sent the following message to Prime Minister Churchill, of Great Britain, on the occasion of the first anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter:

"A year ago today you and I, as representatives of two free nations, set down and subscribed to a declaration of principles com-

mon to our peoples. We based, and continue to base, our hopes for a better future for the world on the realization of these principles. This declaration is known as the Atlantic Charter.

"A year ago today the nations resisting a common, barbaric foe were units or small groups, fighting for their existence.

"Now, these nations and groups of nations in all the continents of the earth have united. They have formed a great union of humanity, dedicated to the realization of that common program of purposes and principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter, through world-wide victory over their common enemies. Their faith in life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and in the preservation of human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, has been given form and substance and power through a great gathering of peoples now known as the United Nations.

"Freedom and independence are today in jeopardy—the world over. If the forces of conquest are not successfully resisted and defeated there will be no freedom and no independence and no opportunity for freedom for any nation.

"It is, therefore, to the single and supreme objective of defeating the Axis forces of aggression that the United Nations have pledged all their resources and efforts.

"When victory comes, we shall stand shoulder to shoulder in seeking to nourish the great ideals for which we fight. It is a worth-while battle. It will be so recognized through all the ages, even amid the unfortunate peoples who follow false gods today.

"We reaffirm our principles. They will bring us to a happier world."

Attention is called to the caption of the article and the word "signing." Further, to the first line in the message:

A year ago today you and I, as representatives of two free nations, set down and subscribed to a declaration of principles common to our peoples.

You will note the word "subscribed," and this is the language of the President. How, Mr. President, can you now say that there was no formal execution of the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. Speaker, I continue with the record as revealed by Government departments and agencies.

The Office of War Information, on August 13, 1942, issued an advance release—OWI–238—in connection with the first anniversary of the Atlantic Charter. I call attention to the first sentence and paragraph of that release:

One year ago, August 14, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill announced that they had signed a common statement of aims and principles for the kind of peace freemen can make.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the complete content of the release referred to:

[Advance release, O. W. I. 238, of August 13, 1942]

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION.

Advance release: The following background release for use in connection with the first anniversary of the Atlantic Charter is for publication Thursday morning, August 13:

One year ago, August 14, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill announced that they had signed a common statement of aims and principles for the kind of peace free men can make.

That statement became known as the Atlantic Charter. It was adopted in the United Nations declaration signed in the White House on New Year's Day, 1942, by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill for the United States and Great Britain, by Ambassador Litvinov for Russia, and by Foreign Minister Soong for China. On the following day representatives of 22 other countries signed the declaration, and the number of United Nations rose to 28 when Mexico and the Philippines adhered to the declaration June 14.

The Atlantic Charter's economic objectives have been formally made the basis of the lend-lease agreements concluded with our allies, and all 21 American republics adhered to the principles of the Charter at the Rio de Janeiro Conference last January.

The Charter has thus become the central statement on the kind of peace that the United States and United Nations are now fighting for the chance to build. It is a world-wide charter, as its text plainly states. It applies to all the world's peoples, to those who live on the Pacific and Indian Oceans as well as to those who live on the Atlantic. It is called the Atlantic Charter because it was signed aboard a battleship on the north Atlantic during last summer's meeting of the President and Prime Minister.

Incidentally, the name of the battleship where these principles of a free men's peace were laid down was the *Prince of Wales*. That battleship was sunk 4 months later off Singapore, fighting to her death against the Japanese wing of the Axis drive to conquer the world for tyranny.

The Charter has eight points. Their purpose is establishment of the kind of peace that will—

1. Afford to all nations the means to live in peace and safety within their own borders.

2. Assure to all people the opportunity to choose their own government and to "live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

This purpose is stated in points three and six of the charter. The charter's other points implement this purpose: No seizures of other people's lands (one); no territorial changes except by choice of the people concerned (two); restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those forcibly deprived of them (three); equal access for all peoples to the trade and raw materials of the world (four); international action toward securing for all a higher standard of living, improved labor standards, and social security (five); freedom of the seas for all men (seven); disarmament of the aggressors followed up by the setting up of a permanent system of international security that can keep the world at peace (eight).

President Roosevelt, Vice President Wallace, Secretary of State Hull, and other high United States Government officials have elaborated and interpreted in various public statements both the Atlantic Charter and the closely related "four freedoms" of the President—"freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear everywhere in the world."

They have said that while, first of all, this is a war to the death against those who would enslave the world to military tyranny, it is more than that. After winning, the United Nations do not intend to permit again the kind of world that bred fascism and gave tyrants their chance to kill and conquer and enslave in the first place.

"This time," President Roosevelt has said, "we are determined not only to win the war but also to maintain the security of the peace which will follow."

Vice President Wallace put it this way: "We failed in our job after World War No. 1. We did not know how to go about it to build an enduring world-wide peace. We did not have the nerve to follow through. * * * But by our very errors we have learned much, and after this war we shall be in a position to utilize our knowledge to build a world which is economically, politically, and, I hope, spiritually sound."

The Atlantic Charter provides the signposts for building that kind of peace. But Secretary Hull warned on July 22:

"Neither victory nor any form of post-war settlement will of itself create a millennium. Rather, we shall be offered an opportunity * * * we must be resolved not alone to proclaim the blessings and benefits which we all alike desire for humanity, but to find the mechanisms by which they may be most fully and most speedily attained and be most effectively safeguarded."

Putting the principles of the Atlantic Charter to work will be a long, hard pull, the Secretary said. It will depend both on individual men and women working together within nations and on nations working together throughout the world.

As he and other United States leaders have declared, the first requirement will be that the United Nations continue united when the war is won. They will face the task of disarming the aggressor nations and policing the world while a permanent system of security is being worked out.

"It is plain," said Secretary Hull, "that some international agency must be created which can—by force if necessary—keep the peace among the nations in the future. There must be international cooperative action to set up the mechanism which can thus insure peace. * * * Participation by all nations in such measures would be for each its contribution toward its own future security and safety from outside attack."

The United Nations would be the nucleus of such an organization.

The Atlantic Charter also recognizes that the security of no people can be complete unless all peoples have the means to a healthy economic life. Hunger breeds war. When the fighting ends, the United Nations will be faced with enormous tasks of reconstruction, feeding millions who have starved, rebuilding what has been destroyed. They will be called upon for such economic action as will release the full flow of the world's productive resources into peacetime channels.

One year later, O. W. I. issued another advance release (OWI–2314) on the second anniversary of the Atlantic Charter. The first sentence is as follows:

On the second anniversary of the Atlantic Charter, the Office of War Information today reviewed cooperative efforts made by the United Nations to implement the pact, the terms of which were first announced to the world by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941.

Attention is called to the use of the term "pact." In its ordinary sense this means a signed agreement, and it seems reasonable to conclude that O. W. I. so understood it.

It hardly seems necessary, Mr. Speaker, to set out additional references to the common belief that the Atlantic Charter principles were actually subscribed to by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. I conclude, however, with the submission of one further bit of evidence in support of that proposition. I refer to page 1 of a pamphlet issued by the United States Government Printing Office, known as Executive Agreement Series 236, authorized by the Department of State and entitled "Cooperative War Effort. Declaration by United Nations, Washington, January 1, 1942, and Declaration Known as the Atlantic Charter, August 14, 1941":

DECLARATION BY UNITED NATIONS

A JOINT DECLARATION BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND, THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, CHINA, AUSTRALIA, BELGIUM, CANADA, COSTA RICA, CUBA, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EL SALVADOR, GREECE, GUATEMALA, HAITI, HONDURAS, INDIA, LUXEMBOURG, NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, NICARAGUA, NORWAY, PANAMA, POLAND, SOUTH AFRICA, YUGOSLAVIA

The Governments signatory hereto,

Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter.

Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world, declare:

(1) Each Government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

(2) Each Government pledges itself to cooperate with the Governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

The foregoing declaration may be adhered to by other nations which are, or which may be, rendering material assistance and contributions in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism.

Done at Washington, January 1, 1942.

The United States of America, by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, by Winston S. Churchill.

On behalf of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Maxim Litvinoff, Ambassador.

National Government of the Republic of China. Tse Vung Soong, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

It appears from the evidence here presented, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this country had a right to understand that the President and the Prime Minister actually subscribed to the declaration of principles known as the Atlantic Charter. Therefore, when on December 20, 1944, the President, at his press conference announced that the Charter "is not a formal document" the people of this country were shocked. There was a considerable let-down at home, and in many of the small nations throughout the world. In the face of previous White House statements that it was a formal document we can but reach one conclusion, namely, that someone has been very careless with the truth at the White House.

My purpose, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House on this subject was twofold. First, to indicate for the RECORD, official White House statements related to the Atlantic Charter and the signing thereof and certain governmental agency releases which seem to verify that fact. That record is now clear. Secondly, it was to point out that the aforesaid declaration of principles carried the hopes, the aspirations of millions of people throughout the world, whether or not the document was formerly signed. True, it was idealistic in character, but that does not detract from its objective. Today there is great concern in this country, and throughout the world that Russia, Great Britain, and the United States are about to scuttle the principles of the Atlantic Charter and disregard the rights of Poland and many other small European nations. It appears that we may be headed for some kind of agreement in which power politics will be used to avoid the rights of those nations. If this happens we will have laid the basis for the next war. Principles are involved in this whole problem and there must be no temporizing; equity and justice must prevail as against expediency and force. That is what we are fighting for all over the world.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE PURPLE HEART

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter and a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked to find that the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the medal of military merit originally created August 7, 1782, by Gen. George Washington, and awarded to military personnel "for unusual gallantry and singularly meritorious acts of extraordinary fidelity and essential service," has been distributed with such reckless abandon in this war that dogs and blues singers are receiving it. This is all the more to be deplored because Executive orders relating to the award do not authorize such abuse. These orders would seem to limit distribution of the Purple Heart to those serving with the armed forces and injured by enemy action in combat. Some 70,000 awards of the Purple Heart were made before Pearl Harbor. It is conservatively estimated that more than 1,000,000 will be awarded to our wounded soldiers, sailors, marines, and Coast Guard men in this war. It is an insult to them and a disparagement of their sacrifice that the medal should be awarded under circumstances to which I shall refer in more detail. I approach this problem in the spirit of General Washington's order of August 7, 1782, which, after creating the Purple Heart, said:

> Should any who are not entitled to these honors have the insolence to assume the badges of them they shall be severely punished. On the other hand it is expected those gallant men who are thus designated will on all occasions be treated with particular confidence and consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the present trouble seems to have arisen as a result of lax interpretation and application of the language in Executive orders which permit the Secretaries of War and Navy to award the Purple Heart in the name of the President, to those serving in any capacity with the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and who are wounded. The two words, "any capacity", have been construed to include war correspondents and Red Cross people also serving in a war theater and injured by enemy action. Just recently the phrase, "any capacity," has apparently been construed to include civilians in or near war theaters entertaining troops and injured by an act of God or by negligence of some other civilian. As to whether it will be extended to Members of Congress who caught colds and had teeth pulled while visiting the fighting fronts, I do not know, but such would be a logical extension of current policy. So far as I am able to find, no official in Washington has abused the authority given to the Secretaries of War and Navy in distribution of the Purple Heart. However, various commanders overseas have been permitted to issue it with unhappy effect in some cases.

Jane Froman, the blues singer, has been awarded the Military Order of the Purple Heart. This civilian was injured when her Clipper plane crashed off Lisbon while she was touring Army camps abroad. No enemy action was involved. The question, therefore, naturally arises, Is anyone who is injured en route to or returning from cheering up a friend in the service entitled to the Military Order of the Purple Heart for valor? Heretofore, military service has been in an honored class by itself. But, some elements in this country have been advocating that civilians be accorded the same medical treatment in veterans' hospitals as war veterans. Appropriately enough, the picture of Jane Froman and announcement of her getting the Purple Heart first appeared in the C. I. O. News of January 15. I hold that picture and newspaper in my hand. It might be pointed out here that those in Congress who voted for the work or jail bill succumbed to this trend to reverse historic American policy for that bill included a provision giving well-paid war factory workers included under its terms the same protection given service men and women by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

WHY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE MISSOURI MULE AND CARRIER PIGEONS?

The award of the Purple Heart to a civilian blues singer not injured by enemy action is not the first abuse of its kind. In 1943 the heroes who legally wear the Purple Heart were astounded to read press dispatches from Sicily and to see pictures illustrating the ceremony at which a dog was awarded the Military Order of the Purple Heart. This dog's name was Chips. He was a war dog and performed an act of heroism. The article about his decoration was written by Hal Boyle, an Associated Press writer. We all admire the dog, but we fail to find anything in the law of the land or in Executive orders authorizing that a dog be placed on the same level with a human and given the same military decorations. If we are going to do that, I know some Missouri mules I want to see decorated. I have in my hand a large file of correspondence about this incident, including letters from soldiers who are now refusing to wear their Purple Heart awards because of obvious reasons.

Promiscuous distribution of some medals in this war has tended to cheapen them, and many servicemen no longer hold them in high regard. One G. I. told me that it was a standing joke that each first-aid kit contained a Purple Heart and that you could get one if you cut your hand opening a K-ration. I doubt these stories, but they serve to illustrate the mental attitude being developed by carelessly made awards.

A CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTION

Any service man or woman wounded by enemy action is certainly entitled to the Purple Heart. Anyone serving with the armed forces and wounded by enemy action is entitled to some distinctive recognition. Their patriotism has been put to the test and found sufficient. It does no good to criticize unless you have a constructive remedy or suggestion. I think that it would help to clarify the situation and make easier the proper administration of the business of awarding the Purple Heart, if the law of the land could be changed slightly. To prevent the further cheapening of this historic award by abuse in its distribution, I have prepared and introduced a bill, H. R. 2036, which has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I shall include it as a part of these remarks. In brief, it limits the award of the Purple Heart, as properly intended, to those members of the armed forces of the United States injured by enemy action. It authorizes the Secretaries of War and Navy to create an appropriate but entirely different award for those civilians who are wounded by enemy action while serving with our armed forces. It provides for recall of those Purple Hearts awarded contrary to the provisions of orders creating it. It also provides for posthumous awards of this decoration in proper cases.

WHAT DO AMERICA'S WAR HEROES, THE WOUNDED AND DECORATED VETERANS, SAY?

The national veterans organization known as the Military Order of the Purple Heart and representing the heroes who have been wounded in action and decorated with the Purple Heart, wrote me as follows on February 6, 1945:

THE MILITARY ORDER OF
THE PURPLE HEART,
National Service Department,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1945.

Hon. MARION T. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BENNETT: The motivating reason for your valued interest displayed in maintaining the Purple Heart decoration, the oldest military decoration in the United States—and with one exception the oldest in the world, in the high respect intended by its creator Gen. George Washington on August 7, 1782 is highly appreciated by our organization.

In connection with this, we respectfully invite attention to the seemingly disrepute and cheapening of this decoration during World War II, and in particular during the past 2 years, when the Purple Heart medal in our humble opinion has been awarded contrary to the intent of any general order, Executive order or public law.

Your familiarity with and objection to adverse criticism and even ridicule offered by many, both non-recipient and recipient of the decoration, in that much publicity through the public press, influential magazines and periodicals in awarding the Purple Heart medal not only to persons not members of the armed forces but in fact even awarded to dogs, are appreciated by us.

Your willingness and desire to correct this very apparent erroneous method of awarding the Purple Heart by introducing and furthering H. R. 2036 in the House of Representatives are highly appreciated by every recipient of the Purple Heart.

Respectfully,
THE MILITARY ORDER OF
THE PURPLE HEART,
FRANK HALEY,
National Service Director.

I appreciate this approval by a veterans' organization which is not only militant in protection of the rights of its own honored membership, but which has always stood forthrightly for Americanism as it was handed down by George Washington and the other founding fathers of this Republic. In my work as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives I know of the great service rendered to the Nation and to the servicemen, veterans and their dependents, by this organization through its able officers and national legislative representative.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's debt to the wearers of the Purple Heart is indeed great. I hope that in all fairness H. R. 2036 will receive prompt and favorable consideration. For the information of those who may be interested there follows a copy of this bill:

H. R. 2036

A bill to provide for award of the Order of the Purple Heart and authorizing an award to civilians wounded by enemy action

Be it enacted, etc., That Executive Order 9277, of December 3, 1942, general order 186, of January 21, 1943, and any and all other executive orders relating to the award of the Military Order of the Purple Heart are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The Purple Heart established by General George Washington, at Newburgh, N. Y., August 7, 1782, during the War of the Revolution, and revived out of respect to his memory and military achievements by Executive orders herein cited, is hereby authorized to be awarded by the Secretaries of War and Navy, in the name of the President, to any officer or enlisted man who, as a member of the armed services of the United States, is wounded in action against an enemy of the United States, or as a result of an enemy instrumentality of war, provided such wound necessitates hospitalization and treatment by medical officers and is received under honorable circumstances.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized and directed to award the Purple Heart posthumously, in the name of the President of the United States, to any persons who, while serving as hereinbefore set out in section 2 with the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, since December 6, 1941, are killed in action or who die as a direct result of wounds received in action or by an instrumentality of an enemy of the United States. The Purple Heart awarded under such circumstances shall be forwarded to the next of kin of any person entitled to said posthumous award.

SEC. 4. From the date of enactment of this Act no Purple Heart shall be awarded to any person not a member of the armed forces of the United States except in the case of honorably discharged veterans injured by enemy action during their active service and who did not receive said award at the time, although entitled thereto under Executive orders or public law then existing.

SEC. 5. Civilians serving with the armed forces and wounded by enemy action shall be entitled to an appropriate but entirely different award hereby authorized to be created by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and awarded in the name of the President.

SEC. 6. Awards of the Order of the Purple Heart heretofore made to civilians not injured by enemy action or serving with the armed forces of the United States, or deemed by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, to have been otherwise awarded in violation of the terms of the Executive orders relating to the Purple Heart, shall be recalled.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized to promulgate such regulations as they may deem appropriate to effectuate the purposes hereof. The regulations shall, so far as practicable, be of uniform application.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain figures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial by the Montana State Legislature touching on the life of the late Honorable James F. O'Connor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order for next Tuesday be extended from 30 to 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUTS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this week one of the great agencies for youth in America is celebrating the thirty-fifth anniversary of its organization. I refer to the Boy Scouts of America. Many years ago, I myself was a member of a Boy Scout troop, led by an Arkansas farmer, and I still maintain an active relationship both nationally and locally.

A year ago I remarked to this body concerning the outstanding service that had been rendered by the Boy Scouts of America in Food for Freedom. Recently I participated in a conference here in Washington, between officials of the Boy Scouts of America and representatives of Government agencies, to develop further Scouting relationships.

To me, one of the significant things about this occasion was the fact that these representatives of the Boy Scouts of America came to Washington, not to secure something for themselves, but to offer their service, to develop ways in which service could be most effectively rendered.

We reviewed briefly some of the extraordinary things that have been done by the Boy Scouts of America to help speed the day of victory. Some of the Government administrative officials reported what Scouts have accomplished. Reference was made to the 120,000 tons of waste paper collected during 2 months alone to help prevent a serious crisis. The War Food Administration reported that Scouts had collected almost the entire national goal of milkweed pods, the floss to be used for making 1,000,000 life jackets. The Director of the Field Service, War Finance Staff of the Treasury Department, described the Scouts' cooperation in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth War Loans, in which it has been estimated that they were responsible for the sale of some $8,000,000,000 worth of War bonds and stamps. The Director of the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information reported that the Boy Scouts distributed more than 103,000,000,000 pieces of Government literature.

Naturally, I was extremely interested in the report from the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, which stated that the contribution of the Boy Scouts during 1944 had been a real factor in feeding not only this Nation, but our Allies. A conservative estimate would show that 184,000 Boy Scouts had their own victory gardens, and that 126,000 worked on farms to help solve the problem of farm labor.

Mr. Albert Goss, master of our National Grange, stated:

I am a strong believer in self-help in youth movements. In these days when everybody is demanding special privileges and Government help, it is heartening to find such wholesome movements as scouting holding the line for building character interests, and the kind of patriotism that means sacrifice, if necessary, but always loyal service. I wish every boy in America could have such training.

Several of the representatives of Government agencies expressed a bit of surprise to find how much Scouts are doing for other agencies. But to those of us who are familiar with the Scout program, the surprise was not so great, because we are well aware of the value of organized boyhood. It is fundamental to a Scout that he should do his duty to his country. Boy Scouts want to do everything possible to help the country, and these various Scout services which the boys have carried on so effectively during the war years have also covered the period of the organization's greatest growth. Its membership is nearly 2,000,000. We may look forward confidently to greater service from the Boy Scouts in 1945.

Perhaps most of us are inclined to think of this agency as one which does something for boys. The record of their war service shows that it is also an agency which makes it possible for boys to do things for their country. As a result of this meeting, certain definite areas of service were developed, one of which will be soon inaugurated, another campaign for scrap paper which is sponsored by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and which gets under way officially March 1.

It is estimated on the basis of membership records that one man in every four of our armed forces has had some Scout training. They are helping to win the war on our battlefronts. Here at home, their younger brothers, nearly 2,000,000 of them, are also helping to win the war on the home front by practical and effective service.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEEFE (at the request of Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin) for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1427. An act relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 9, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Friday, February 9, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 11 a. m., Tuesday, February 13, 1945, for organization purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a meeting on Tuesday, February 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on House Joint Resolution 59.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, February 14, 1945, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia. The hearing will be held in room 362 (caucus room), Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing beginning at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, February 14, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 97) to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (with respect to certain patent matters). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1425, to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

199. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 304. A bill to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations; without amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCKENZIE: Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads. H. R. 744. A bill authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. S. 35. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 64. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; without amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 697. A bill relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Re-

ferred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1973. A bill to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; with amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1719. A bill to confirm the claim of Charles Gaudet; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 2066. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to locate, establish, construct, equip, and operate a hospital for the insane of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2067. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2068. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2069. A bill relating to the discharge of members of the War Training Service who were assigned to cadet schools or glider schools and who did not qualify for flying service through physical defects or to other causes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2070. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who have participated in the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 2071. A bill to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service, to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 2072. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic minerals and metals and petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 2073. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 2074. A bill to provide pension at the rate of $50 per month for veterans of World War No. 1 and all campaigns and expeditions engaged in prior to December 7, 1941, for which a campaign medal was given, and who have reached the age of 60 years or more; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2075. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act of June 7, 1924, section 202, paragraph 7, and all the amendments subsequent thereto; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2076. A bill to amend the Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944 so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain individuals discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2077. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic minerals and metals and petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 2078. A bill extending the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to provisional, probationary, or temporary officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served during the First World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2079. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic minerals and metals and petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2080. A bill to establish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2081. A bill to permit the use of live decoys in the taking of ducks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2082. A bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Res. 124. Resolution to create a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the production of aircraft and accidents resulting therefrom; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. Res. 125. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the official conduct of Albert W. Johnson and Albert L. Watson, district judges of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 126. Resolution to provide for expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 125; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2083. A bill for the relief of W. C. Liddell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2084. A bill for the relief of Emil Kraske; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2085. A bill to authorize the payment of adjusted compensation benefits to Sarah Ann Grugan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 2086. A bill for the relief of Presly Holliday, quartermaster sergeant, Quartermaster Corps, on the retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of George H. Kibbey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Danks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 2090. A bill for the relief of Sam J. Hash; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2092. A bill for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2093. A bill for the relief of J. P. Kerr and Robert P. Kerr; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our Father Almighty, with childhood love we would claim the promises which Thou hast vouchsafed unto all who humbly approach Thee. In the confidence of our divine Intercessor, resting upon the eternal efficacy of that sacrifice for our sins, we pray to be delivered from ourselves and implant within us the spirit of the lowly Nazarene. Set us free from the bonds of self-will and wavering faith and breathe Thy life, Thy peace and joy into all hearts.

Remember all parts of our land; wherever there are hateful dissensions and grasping selfishness may the truth of the Gospel, the love of Christ, and the power of God be among them. Be very merciful to our President; preserve his health and strength through these most arduous days as he gives himself to the high aims and lofty purposes of a free world. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I received from Mr. Joseph F. Clark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE GOTHAM GRANGERS—ANENT CEILINGS ON LIVE CATTLE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include a number of newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, during past weeks we have listened to Members from Gotham loudly demanding ceilings on live cattle, which these experts claimed would give them more and cheaper beef. Those of us who protested this foolish move were not heeded. We have a fixed price on dressed carcasses, a ceiling price on live cattle, the feeder caught between two squeezes, and his return for fed animals unpredictable.

Here we include the editorial comment from the January issue of the National Grange Monthly, and a report from the February 7 issue of the Chicago Tribune, indicating the largest run in many years and the lightest average weight in a like period in history. The prospect for good beef and much of it does not look too good, does it?

[From the National Grange Monthly of January 1945]

LIVESTOCK CEILINGS

Farmers and livestock men have vigorously opposed every attempt to put ceilings on live animals because they realize that ceilings will further reduce our meat supply. The reason is simple, but the O. P. A. has refused to recognize it and has yielded to pressure of city consumer groups who do not know what they are doing. A large portion of America's beef supply is raised in the open country and fattened in the feed lot. A 900-pound steer slaughtered direct from the range might dress out 400 pounds, while if put in the feed lot could be made to dress out 600 pounds. The additional 200 pounds is practically all meat, and the whole 600 pounds is a much higher quality meat than the 400 pounds before fattening.

No infallible method of grading cattle has ever been devised so that it will reflect accurately what is under the hide. The only type of grading which has ever worked has been through the eye of the buyer, who risks his dollars and bases his judgment on how much the critter will dress out. A good feeder who develops top-quality beef will get the highest price in an uncontrolled market, but prices may vary according to individual lots by 5 cents, 10 cents, 20 cents, $1, $2, or $3 or more a hundred. No system of grading livestock has ever been devised which will reflect these differences. Ceilings must be limited to not more than four or five grades, and no feeder can afford to fatten beyond the grade he will receive. The result will be less fattening and less meat.

On New Year's Day some 30 or 40 livestock feeders, from all sections of the country, gathered in the office of Judge Vinson to explain to him why they could not afford to feed out cattle under livestock ceilings as proposed. They presented conclusive evidence to show that while the numbers of livestock slaughtered may have gone up, the amount of meat yielded has gone down and feeders are being forced out of business daily. The new ceiling proposals would result in a wholesale reduction in meat supply. With the biggest corn crop on record, we could easily have an increased supply of beef, but if the practice of placing ceilings on livestock goes into effect, the supply will be curtailed.

On the other hand, if the ceiling is placed on the carcass, rather than on the live animal, feeders will get paid for what they actually produce and can afford to fatten beef if the ceilings are placed at a remunerative figure. The War Food Administration has consistently opposed the unsound practice of placing ceilings on live animals because they know the business, and know what the result will be. Because he is supposed to know the business, the law requires that permission of the War Food Administrator be obtained before a ceiling is placed on a farm product. Being unable to get permission of the War Food Administrator, the matter was placed before Judge Vinson, either by the O. P. A. or by a group of reformers—or possibly by both—and he overruled the War Food Administrator and issued a directive ordering an 18-cent top ceiling on livestock.

Many times in these columns we have predicted what was going to happen to the supply and price of beef and pork. These predictions have all come true. It took no special divining powers to make the predictions. They were made merely by recognizing the effect of economic law on known factors. These economic principles have been frequently ignored and they are being ignored now. The result will be less meat and poorer quality and more trouble with black markets. The public will get less meat and pay more for it.

[From the Chicago Tribune of February 7, 1945]

NEW PRICE LID BRINGS BIG RUN IN LIGHT CATTLE—PRICES END STEADY TO LOWER

Selling of cattle increased throughout the country yesterday as more farmers sent short-fed steers and heifers to market earlier than they had planned. The Chicago stock yards received 13,000 head, the largest Tuesday run since January 1942, and the second heaviest February Tuesday in 18 years. The 2-day total of 28,100 this week was the largest for a February Monday and Tuesday since 1927.

Cattle traders attributed the heavy marketing mainly to new price regulations which became effective January 29. With an overall ceiling of $18 per hundred pounds, it discouraged feeding steers to prime condition and encouraged farmers to sell their cattle at lighter than normal weights.

AVERAGE WEIGHT AT LOW

The selling was not considered a liquidation, although average weights of cattle butchered were the lowest on record for February.

Cattle feeders were attracted to the Chicago market by the relatively high prices offered for medium to near-good stock. Broad demand held this class steady, although declines of as much as 25 cents occurred in Good to Choice grades. No Prime offerings arrived. The best available brought $17. Most steers sold from $13.50 to $16.25. Steady prices were paid for heifers, beef cows, canners, cutters, bulls, and calves.

LAMBS CLIMB TO PEAK

Hog supplies were larger than on Monday, but remained abnormally low. The 18,000 head total was the smallest for a Tuesday since December 26. The 2-day total this week was the second smallest since October 1943, when hog ceilings were established, and 63 percent smaller than a year ago. All except some inferior light hogs and pigs brought ceiling prices.

Lambs rose 25 cents to the highest price level since last May and within 40 to 50 cents of the peak since 1929. The top was up 25 cents to $16.65 and compared with a 16-year high of $17.10, established last spring.

MEAT OUTPUT FALLS

Meat production in federally inspected plants last week was estimated by the War Food Administration yesterday at 288,000,000 pounds, a drop of 7 percent from the preceding week's total of 310,000,000 pounds. Output a year ago was 433,000,000 pounds. Cattle slaughter for the week was up 6,000 head from the preceding week, but calf, sheep and lamb, and hog slaughter all decreased.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "What Our Men Overseas Are Thinking," by Maj. William H. Burnham, appearing in a publication by the Connecticut Reemployment Commission entitled "Reemployment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

KATHLEEN SEXTON HOLMES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I noted in the papers that the Ingalls shipyard, of Decatur, Ala., will soon launch one of our C-2 cargo ships, which is larger than our Liberty ships, and this vessel will be named the *Kathleen Holmes*. I am sure there still lingers in the memory of each of the membership of both branches of the Congress a most pleasant recollection of the talented and pleasing personality of Kathleen Sexton Holmes.

Kathleen Sexton Holmes was one of the most beloved of the Washington journalists and her untimely death a short time ago was a shock to each of us. But her work, her wonderful character, and the things she did in life still live on.

I am indeed glad that the Maritime Commission recognized the infallible characteristics of Kathleen Sexton Holmes and are commemorating her memory by the naming of one of our ships in her honor. I am sure that this ship, inanimate as it is, will carry on in its course of activity, just as Kathleen Sexton Holmes carried on in the different sphere, human activity.

CHURCH CONFERENCES DURING WARTIME

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have been reliably informed that the Office of Defense Transportation in Scranton, Pa., has refused the Wyoming Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church to have their annual meeting on April 11, without permission of the Office of Defense Transportation in Washington. It seems to me there is no body of people in the country who travel less than the ministers. It is necessary for them to have their annual meeting. If they are not permitted to have the annual meeting the churches of this country are going to be retarded in the work they are doing. It is necessary for the church organization to function by meetings of their ministers, priests, laymen, or any of the designated people of authority if they maintain their church organizations as they should be operated. I care not whether it is a convention of Catholics

or Jews or Protestants, religion has been one of the predominant things for which this country has been noted since its formation. Freedom of religion. When the time comes that we prohibit these religious organizations from meeting, it is a pretty bad thing for the country. That is what Hitler did. I do hope the O. D. T. permits these religious bodies to meet in annual session. We can stop much more travel before we stop the churches from assemblage.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein an address delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, at the annual Lincoln Day dinner held in Washington last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therewith an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., at the Lincoln Day dinner in Washington last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the legislative business, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the South Carolina General Assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, the care and rehabilitation of disabled veterans of the present war gives me great concern. I have contacted the Veterans Administration in regard to their post-war program for my State of Nevada and the program as outlined to me over the signature of high officials of that department is disappointing. The additional hospital beds that would be provided are little more than sufficient to care for pre-war necessity. In my opinion, the Nevada veterans have traveled to neighboring States for medical attention too long.

I would like to be on record that in my considered opinion the program of the Veterans Administration for the care and rehabilitation of the disabled veterans of the present war as outlined in the appropriations bill is too conservative. By this statement, I do not mean to cast any reflection on the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House. On the contrary, it is to be commended.

The record shows that our treatment of veterans of World War No. 1 has not been too just nor too outstanding. In their anxiety to get to their homes, many of those men mustered out at the end of the last war failed to report ailments caused by the war. These very ailments in later years proved serious and medical attention and hospitalization was imperative. But in some instances it was almost necessary to get an act of Congress or a decision of the Supreme Court to get these ailing ex-soldiers to needed attention in veterans' hospitals. The hospitals were crowded and to my personal knowledge, some doctors were arrogant and lazy. These conditions existed even up until 1941. They must be changed and must not be permitted to digress from the high standard which our country needs and must have.

The casualties of this war are now 3 to 1 as compared to World War No. 1 and the conflict is not yet over. The advancement of medical science and new improved methods of caring for the wounded make it imperative that we have suitable conditions available in all parts of the Nation.

The veterans of World War No. 2 are entitled to complete rehabilitation in mind, body, and spirit. No man wants to live out the remainder of his days physically impaired or in mental stress. It was mentioned in this House that the Veterans Administration operates with great concern of the Federal Treasury. If so, it is the first department I have found that is in such a frame of mind and the one that should have the least concern over the Nation's finances. This agency is dealing in the lives of American men and women.

The Federal Board of Hospitalization and the Veterans Administration have adopted a very short-sighted view. It is said they will come back to Congress for more money later and, without a doubt, get it. Why are they so lax in formulating their program? These men are entitled to hospitalization in their own home surroundings—at least in the environs of their own States. They deserve to be near their friends and families. The Army and Navy are planning to take over resorts and hotels for wounded soldiers while the Veterans Administration plods along saving the taxpayers' money.

As for my part, I would like to have less economy in this department, particularly with regard to hospitalization. These men went away boys with light hearts and merry faces. They have offered their lives on the battlefields; they have tasted the horror of hell. They will return serious and sober and aged.

The veterans' hospitals need some attention and investigation. Modern scientific methods should be installed in many of these clinics. Investigation of these hospitals would doubtless show the need of many improvements.

Congress must keep faith with our fighting men and women. I propose to continue to lift my voice in the battle of the veterans and their wounded comrades.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address recently delivered by Mr. George Maurice Morris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects, and to include therewith certain other material in each instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address recently made by Vice Admiral Ben Moreell. I have made inquiry, and I am informed it will require 1⅔ pages. If that is in excess of the rule, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CHURCH, LODGE, AND LEGION MEETINGS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Dr. J. Rice Williams, former grand master of the Masonic Lodge of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, again I find myself in agreement with my distinguished friend of the loyal opposition the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I think it is an outrage to bar a church, lodge, or legion meeting under the pretense of aiding the war effort. One of these meetings will not injure the war effort any more than would a crowded picture show in Washington or a prize fight in Madison Square Garden, New York.

I received a letter from Dr. J. Rice Williams, the former grand master of the Masonic Lodge in Mississippi, complaining that they have been forbidden to hold the annual meeting of the Masonic Grand Lodge. A similar protest has come in concerning a legion meeting.

Dr. Williams points out that such an order of the O. D. T. is in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

As I said, you can have all the picture shows you want, you can have all these meetings here in Washington and other large cities, but when it comes to the Methodist Church, the Catholic Church, the Baptist Church, the Presbyterian Church, or any other church, or the Masonic Lodge, or the American Legion, meeting in a convention, then they come along and forbid it, in my opinion, in utter violation of the Constitution of the United States. If they do not change that order, Congress ought to do something about it.

Dr. Williams' letter, to which I referred, reads as follows:

GRAND LODGE OF MISSISSIPPI,
FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS,
Houston, Miss., January 31, 1945.

Mr. JOHN RANKIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Permit me to protest the recent ban on conventions to over 50 persons.

I also protest the manner of its interpretation. The O. D. T. seems to put the burden of proof on the people applying for a permit to meet to show that the meeting will benefit the war effort, whereas, in all good conscience, they should only be required to show that the meeting will not interfere with the war effort.

There would not be so much interference if the ban only applied to national conventions. It seems strange that the Congress should dip down into a State and limit the size of a convention in that State, wholly within the State.

Conforming to this unconstitutional ban, our Masonic grand lodge cannot meet as usual. Just a skeleton meeting that would just about as well not be held.

Article I of the amendments to the Constitution says that Congress shall make no law abridging the right of the people peaceably to assemble. There are no exceptions to it, such as a war measure, nor any other kind of exception. This article guarantees to the people the absolute right to assemble peaceably.

I protest against any infringement of the Constitution of the United States. If we lose the Constitution, we have nothing solid on which to rely. We shall have fought a war with the slogan "the American way" and then adopted the way of the dictator.

It is law and order, based on the Constitution, or it is chaos.

Your friend,

J. RICE WILLIAMS.

These church, lodge, and Legion members are loyal Americans, and I am sure they can be counted on to aid the war effort in every possible way, but they resent having their constitutional rights infringed, when doing so will not aid the war effort in any way. I hope this order is rescinded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CHURCH CONFERENCES DURING WARTIME

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is complaining about. He is kicking about the barring of these meetings of the churches in conventions; but he has been asking for it—not that particular thing, but he has been asking for a long, long time here to have the folks down at the other end of the Avenue run this Government, granting more and more power to the Executive. Now, at last, the gentleman is awake and beginning to be aware of how far the shackles which are destroying the liberties of the people have been forged upon us. Now, when they are getting into full swing and are limiting gatherings of the church folk, he objects to the way they are doing it and to the extent of it. I think he should be more consistent and not complain about it, or vote with us where we try to limit the power which is destroying us. You are now getting the typical New Deal directive over into the churches, and what can you expect when you have Earl Browder, who belongs to a party that does not believe in religion, does not believe in having churches at all—what can you expect when you find him in the same political bed with your President and your administration?

Mr. BULWINKLE rose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is getting just what he might have anticipated when he voted for New Deal legislation. He does not like it, but he will continue to get it so long as he supports this administration. We cannot convert and save him if he will not repent and cease sinning by voting with the administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to get into this discussion between the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Michigan, but I do want to call the attention of the membership of this House to the serious situation that exists in transportation at the present time. Something over 200,000 freight and coal cars are held up on account of the weather in the North, Northwest, and Northeast. Let me say further that it may be necessary even to take off passenger trains on the main lines because the time is here when we must make use of our entire transportation system to get supplies to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and to supply civilian needs; and we must not permit in the slightest our efforts to diminish. Our first endeavor, our first thought, must be to win complete victories in Europe and in the Pacific. May I not say that Colonel Johnson has a hard job and is doing it well. We must support him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1861, there was born in Wayne County, then Virginia, now a part of West Virginia, one of the finest Americans anyone who has ever served with him in this body will know of. Today, according to the information I have received, is his eighty-fourth birthday anniversary. He is one of the most lovable, one of the sweetest and noblest characters I have ever met, and I know all my colleagues present and those former colleagues now living who have served with him will agree with me in that statement about this distinguished Member of the House who was born 84 years ago today.

I know that all of my colleagues join with me in not only congratulating him but in conveying to him our very best wishes for many more years of fruitful service in this distinguished body, to his people and to his country. We all hope that God will endow him with a continuance of the fine mind he has and that he will be able to carry on the great work in the future that he has so effectively in the past. I speak the sentiments and feelings of all the Members of the House when I extend to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, our hearty congratulations.

INTENT OF CONGRESS IN RE REGULATION OF INSURANCE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H. R. 1973, and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I recognize the importance of immediate action upon an insurance bill of some type. It had been my hope and the hope of a great many Members on the majority side, and I am sure on the minority side, that the Senate bill, S. 340, introduced by Senator McCARRAN and Senator FERGUSON, which had received unanimous support in the Senate, would be reported out. In accordance with that agreement the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I went to see the Speaker on yesterday with reference to the possibility of bringing up this bill today by unanimous consent. At that time it was my understanding that there was only one minor amendment to the Senate bill, namely, that several words were to be added after the word "agreement" and that there was a correction in the date; otherwise the Senate bill would be reported exactly as passed by the Senate. May I ask the gentleman if this bill he is reporting conforms to that agreement?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1973 is the bill S. 340 as amended by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Of the House?

Mr. WALTER. Of the House. In effect, it is the bill that was agreed upon by representatives of the insurance companies, the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and the insurance commissioners of the several States. As the bill S. 340 passed the Senate, it was not in ac-

cordance with that understanding and agreement. The bill that the House Judiciary Committee reports is in accordance with the agreement that I have just mentioned.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I was wondering though if it is in accordance with the agreement that the gentleman and I had when we were in the Speaker's office yesterday at which time we discussed what was to be reported under this unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. We were in there before the Judiciary Committee met in the afternoon. As I understood it there were only to be two minor amendments, one adding some words suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] following the word "agreement." You are reporting out the House bill and the word "agreement" does not even appear in the House bill.

Mr. WALTER. I think I made it pretty clear to the gentleman from New Mexico that the Attorney General, in his testimony on yesterday before the Committee on the Judiciary, agreed that with the word "agreement" in the bill, which was done as an amendment on the floor of the Senate, it might very seriously affect the agreement entered into by many of the small mutual companies with respect to the prorating of losses and the division of profits, and the Attorney General, after that was called to his attention, agreed that that language ought to be changed.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I talked to the Attorney General this morning, and that is not his understanding.

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman will look at the testimony of the Attorney General, he will find that I have stated very nearly exactly what he said.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I am extremely anxious that a bill be passed. I think that I have explained to him and to others that my contacts with the insurance executives and my activity as president of an insurance company, though small it may be, convinces me that it is essential that some action be taken, but it is impossible to bring up a bill in the nature of H. R. 1973 without opportunity for House debate. It should not be brought up by unanimous consent, whereas the Senate bill 340, to my mind, is satisfactory, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. I might say to the gentleman that S. 340, as it passed the Senate, was not in accordance with the agreement entered into between the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the insurance commissioners and insurance executives.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I would challenge that statement to this degree, that the gentleman from Michigan, Senator FERGUSON, whose attitude in this matter has been completely fair all the way through, had it pointed out to him that there was some possibility of a misunderstanding, and it was requested of him on the floor that he propose an amendment to clarify that. He did propose an amendment to clarify it, and it is that language that was stricken out of the House bill.

Mr. WALTER. If that language is important, it certainly seems to me that the Senator from Michigan could make his position very clear in the event the bill goes to conference, and if the language is important, then I will say to the gentleman from New Mexico that the bill certainly should go to conference.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Let me say just this, that if we will here today concur in the Senate bill, the Senate will adopt the minor amendments suggested by the House Committee on the Judiciary, and we will never need a conference.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I think in all justice to the Attorney General I should state that the Attorney General indicated to me only 10 minutes ago that the bill as brought to the House does not meet with the agreement originally made, and that he is opposed to it. Furthermore, I am informed that a number of members of the Committee on the Judiciary are going to offer amendments which will be considerably damaging, and for that reason I shall object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I join in the objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot take the gentleman from New Mexico off his feet by objecting at this time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask whether or not the bill that is now proposed to be called was changed yesterday at the request of the Attorney General from the form which the subcommittee prepared and recommended from the full Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am not a member of the committee and I cannot answer that. It certainly was not changed at the request of the Attorney General, because he is opposed to the form of the House bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Similar legislation was opposed by about 50 Members of the House last year.

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. About 50.

Mr. WALTER. Not similar legislation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Furthermore, in view of the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that the Attorney General has informed him that this bill does not comply with the agreement that had been reached, I do not see why we should take up this legislation by unanimous consent. It is too important and there is too much involved, and if nobody else objects to its present consideration, I shall.

Mr. CELLER. I did object.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I want to explain to the gentleman from New York that everyone here recognizes the situation that is going to confront the several State departments of insurance. They depend upon payments from insurance companies of premium taxes for their maintenance. Those companies are not going to pay, in my opinion, in the absence of legislation by this House. If it is held that insurance is interstate commerce, then a foreign company is not going to pay a premium tax imposed by an individual State, because that is a burden on interstate commerce. It is to correct that situation that all parties tried to get together on compromise legislation. In the Senate it was proposed jointly by Members from the two sides of the aisle; it is satisfactory legislation to all concerned, and it is satisfactory to the Association of Insurance Commissioners, who are meeting today at St. Louis because of the extreme urgency of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago I spent 44 days going through 47 defense plants. I spent 2 weeks going through the General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler plants in the Detroit area, where the big automobile industry is centered. The speed with which they converted the automobile industry from peace to war production was one of the miracles of the war. Today I received a press release from General Motors, one of the big three producers, which is very interesting. Since the beginning of the defense program in 1940 General Motors has produced more than 140,000,000 shells and shell casings, more than 180,000 cannon, more than 1,000,000 .30- and .50-caliber machine guns, more than 2,400,000 carbines, more than 180,000 airplane engines, more than 9,000 complete bombers and fighter planes, more than 31,000 tanks, tank destroyers, and armored cars, and more than 740,000 trucks, including amphibious "ducks."

These are only a few of the 3,600 items they produced.

Mr. Speaker, this miracle of production was made possible by thousands of loyal, patriotic men and women who worked in these plants. Men and women who are just as patriotic and just as anxious to win the war as are Members of this House of Representatives. Thousands of these workers have sons in the service, serving in every theater of war. Many of them have lost sons. Many of these workers drove miles to and from work over icy roads in subzero weather. I went through some of these plants in midwinter. I found some of the workers in the Detroit area living in trailer wagons without adequate heating facilities, with outside toilets in a temperature of 15° to 20° below zero. This miracle of production was brought about by free labor, by men who went to and from work voluntarily under the most trying conditions. It was not brought about by workers chained to machines. We did

not need any compulsory manpower or labor laws then and we do not need such laws now.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I have received from the Chairman of the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STOP PAMPERING PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of War says that the Army is not pampering prisoners of war. I have great respect for the Secretary. I am reluctant to differ with him. But I do not believe Mr. Stimson has seen the things that my people have seen. They see the prison camps day after day. They see the prisoners day after day. They see in the newspapers frequent accounts of the good food, cigarettes, and candies enjoyed by German prisoners of war. Elaborate menus are printed, many of them showing meat point requirements higher than those available to American citizens. And in the minds of our people there is a growing resentment. They know how Americans who have been captured fare by contrast. They know that there are many of our own people right here at home who do not fare as well as these enemies of our country.

Their resentment does not stop at the good food and the camp comforts provided for the Germans. They are concerned by what they consider soft treatment, lax administration, and lack of effort to curb the nazi-ism which flourishes in prisoner-of-war camps.

Their resentment is well founded. The Army's handling of prisoners of war is one of its weakest points. However, in fairness let us not forget that the Army is only carrying out instructions. Policies on questions such as this are decided higher up. The Secretary of War says that our Government is simply adhering to the rules of the Geneva Conference. Actually our Government has leaned over backwards in interpreting the regulations of the Geneva Conference in the light most favorable to the prisoners, despite the fact that no other nation gives a hang for the Geneva Conference.

As an indication of this, it is well known that Americans in German prisoner-of-war camps would barely subsist if it were not for Red Cross food packages which our country sends to them regularly.

I realize that prisoners of war should have fair treatment. Simple justice requires it. And not to be overlooked is the fact that the Germans hold 100,000 of our people. We do not want to expose these American soldiers to recriminations. But we do want common-sense handling of prisoners of war.

It is common sense to realize that our experience with German prisoners of war is a foretaste of what we shall meet in dealing with a defeated Germany. Here is an opportunity to show that we can be firm and just, but at the same time to make it clear that we do not propose to put up with another generation of world-conquering Junkers. I fear that one result of our prisoner-of-war policies thus far has been to convince our enemies that we are soft, to encourage our prisoners to take advantage of the situation, and to strengthen the belief of our enemies that they can have another try at world conquest as soon as they can ready themselves. It is time to consider what we are doing. If we bungle this job here at home, where every facility favors us, how shall we expect to fare better in Germany after the firing ceases?

Of far-reaching importance is the question of reeducation of prisoners of war, and there, too, we have fallen down badly. It is painful to contrast the attitude of the German and American Governments toward each other's prisoners of war. Americans in German prisoner-of-war camps are systematically propagandized. Nothing reaches them concerning current events which is not strongly slanted to the German viewpoint.

Most of the news turns out to be Nazi propaganda in all its poisonous forms. Home-front weaknesses are played up. Dissension between the allies is emphasized. No effort is overlooked to convince American prisoners of war that their country is engaged in a futile struggle and that they are the chief victims. Theirs is a long-range objective. They are looking to the next generation, and they are seeking to plant the seeds of doubt and bitterness toward the Allied cause wherever they can.

Yet our Army seems frightened at the very idea of doing anything to dampen the fanatical nazi-ism of German prisoners in our care, despite the fact that there is not a word in the Geneva Convention which forbids propagandizing prisoners.

There is definitely the danger that national socialism will survive the defeat of the German armed forces. The reeducation of German prisoners of war and their utilization in a larger program of education within post-war Germany becomes in consequence an important task for the Allies. No one questions the fact that the Russians are indoctrinating prisoners of war with their own theories of government. From those prisoners and from other nationals under Russian control they are setting up provisional governments which will be expected to operate in every country which falls under the Russian sphere of influence. The British are increasingly aware of the importance of this work and their plans are progressing for the expansion of activities in the reeducation of prisoners of war. We, with probably half a million German prisoners of war under our direct supervision, are doing practically nothing along these lines.

Of the importance of the place that can be occupied within post-war Germany by friendly prisoners of war there can be no question. The prisoner of war who knows and appreciates Americanism is one of our best entrees to the German people. In a reasonable time it is presumed that he will be returning to his own country to take part in public and business life there. He can assist the Allies in the establishment of good governments. He can be of unparalleled service in assisting our people in setting up a systematic educational program there. So it should be obvious that a general program of reeducation in the prisoner-of-war camps can result in a great contribution to the democratic reconstruction of Germany. It naturally follows that experience gained by our own people in carrying on this educational program in prisoner-of-war camps will be of much value in developing effective educational programs for use within Germany after the cessation of hostilities. The success of this program appears to hinge on a prompt and adequate expansion of existing operations. The people in the War Department who are seeking means and authorization to do this work should receive far greater encouragement.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand the gentleman to say we might indoctrinate German prisoners of war without violation of the Geneva Convention?

Mr. SIKES. That is definitely true of all types of voluntary indoctrination or propagandizing. Forcible indoctrination is prohibited. I do not consider that we would seek to forcibly indoctrinate our prisoners.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to thank the gentleman for his timely presentation. It is a matter to which I have been giving considerable thought myself, and I am glad to have it so forcibly brought before us. I, too, have had occasion to wonder whether our treatment has not been lax with these enemies. I have been inclined, in my thinking of such prisoners, to emphasize that we must take steps to get all Axis prisoners out of this country and back where they belong at the earliest possible moment that peace will permit. However, it may be that the gentleman has struck upon a thing that is far more important. That is, that when they go back they go not as Nazi fanatics and teachers but as exponents and missionaries of democracy.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, because this House

knows how carefully and thoroughly he studies out these important questions.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am glad the gentleman has brought this matter to the attention of the country. I know of a prison camp in the Midwest which is supplied with every luxury—innerspring beds, the newest type of Frigidaire, and the finest food. At the same time I know of a hospital which has been trying to get a priority on a new Frigidaire and has been unable to get it.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address recently made by George J. Chryssikos, at naturalization proceedings in the Court of Common Pleas in Jersey City, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two short newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

SECRETARY MORGENTHAU, THE BANKERS, AND BRETTON WOODS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, upon two or more occasions, certain committees of the House have been called together to listen to presentations from Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and Mr. White on the so-called proposal for the stabilization of international currencies and the creation of an international credit bank. Upon those occasions, I was in attendance, and I received the distinct impression that the Congress would be given an opportunity to pass on those proposals before they were put into operation. Two or three days ago the American Bankers Association issued a formal report with respect to the recommendation of the Bretton Woods Conference held last summer. From the statement attributed to the Secretary by the press, I came to the conclusion that the Secretary of the Treasury is unwilling for Congress to proceed to take action, and that he takes the position that what he and Mr. White and others have recommended is what shall be adopted regardless of what Congress thinks about the matter.

At his press conference of February 5 Secretary Morgenthau publicly spanked the banks because they suggested a modification of the Bretton Woods program evolved largely by the American and British Treasuries. That spanking is unfortunate, because no group is better qualified to appraise the Bretton Woods proposals—which will soon be placed formally before the Congress—and no group has more patriotically cooperated with the Treasury in war finance, foreign-funds control, and similar matters.

If, as Mr. Morgenthau claims, the bankers who were selected by the American Bankers Association, the Association of Reserve City Bankers, and the Bankers Association for Foreign Trade to study and report on the Bretton Woods program, do not speak for the members of those organizations, then by the same token a Congressman does not speak for his constituents.

Mr. Morgenthau would condemn the report of the bankers' committees to their memberships on the grounds that they did not first poll their members. Imagine polling 15,000 bankers on a conference document which fills 85 printed pages with its articles, sections, and subsections. Naturally, the bankers had to delegate the job of analysis to committees, which have now made their report to all the bankers.

Imagine what it would be like if we Members of Congress had to send out and poll our districts before we spoke on any matter of public interest.

Did Mr. Morgenthau and Mr. Harry White speak the solid viewpoint of 138,000,000 Americans when they negotiated the Keynes-White program in 1943–44 and when they dealt with 43 other governments at Bretton Woods? Had they first polled our people?

Although Mr. Morgenthau regards the three bankers' committees who produced the report on the Bretton Woods program as not representative of banking as a whole, in the very same breath he states that the Pennsylvania Bankers Association approves the Bretton Woods program. I would ask the Secretary whether that State association was polled on the question, or whether its report favorable to the Bretton Woods Keynes-White program was not also the work of just a committee?

The Treasury seems to regard the work of the Bretton Woods Conference as beyond improvement. Is it possible that all the best brains and wisdom of this country were on the American delegation at Bretton Woods and that it spoke the last word on the subject? I would call attention to the fact that our delegation at Bretton Woods was instructed in advance by President Roosevelt not to consider any other plan than the one worked out by our Treasury and other Government experts. In other words, no alternative plans were even taken up at Bretton Woods.

Note, too, that the Bretton Woods program was, as Lord Keynes clearly informed the delegates, entirely ad referendum to the 44 governments. Lord Keynes said:

> We do not even recommend our governments to adopt the result. We merely submit it for what it is worth to the attention of the governments and the legislators concerned.

No country is committed to the program. None has yet accepted it.

Mr. Morgenthau accuses the banks of selfishness, of not looking beyond their own business interests in this matter. It seems that they are wicked international bankers one day and narrow isolationists the next. Imagine, if you can, the National City Bank of New York, with its 39 foreign branches abroad and its correspondents all over the world, as isolationist.

Does the Treasury consider itself or its economists the sole repository of practical international experience and of patriotism? With such a view I, for one, disagree.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Wednesday, after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and special orders already entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONVENTIONS AND CONFERENCES DURING WARTIME

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRICE-CONTROL AND STABILIZATION PROGRAM IN JEOPARDY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how long we can continue to criticize and censure the O. P. A. and the stabilization program and continue to have the confidence of the people in that program? If we continue day by day to point out the exceptional cases which are bad and which are subject to criticism, and never say a word in behalf of the whole stabilization program it is possible the time will come when the American people will say it is not worth while and just throw it overboard.

This morning I heard two or three Members criticize the O. D. T.—Office of Defense Transportation—for canceling conventions. I do not know what the facts are. Certainly I would be opposed to any discrimination against any religious organization, and you would, too; that is not a debatable question. I do not know whether it is necessary to suspend conventions or not; I do not have all the facts; therefore, I cannot pass on it. We have delegated power to run this war to other people who are supposed to get the facts, and I am not going to dispute them until I have the same information they have and then come to a different conclusion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. In just a moment. I do know that if I were to state here the enormous quantity of gasoline that is being used on the fighting fronts today, February 9, 1945, it would be startling and astounding to the people of America. It is just an inconceivable amount. I believe it is more important to use gasoline there than it is over here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No one can disagree with that statement. No one would criticize those in authority for imposing these restrictions were it not for the fact others tell us day after day about certain activities of other departments that we know are not necessary. That is the thing about it.

Mr. PATMAN. Things like that ought to be pointed out to the O. D. T. and ask them to make corrections. I am opposed to any kind of discriminations, I join the gentleman in that, but every day to be jumping on various agencies that are trying to hold the line and never saying a word on behalf of them will lead the people to come to the conclusion it is not worth while, perhaps that we ought to scuttle all these control programs and let inflation run wild.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman realize that when I make a complaint, for example, and other Members make complaints, we are only voicing complaints that are handed to us by people who know. For instance, there comes one to me where 4,200 men have been discharged and another 3,000 out on the west coast have been discharged, yet the contractors hire another group to take the places of these people. We do not voice these complaints because we imagine them or think about them. Somebody tells us about them and kicks.

Mr. PATMAN. Sometimes the people who tell us are not informed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; they are.

Mr. PATMAN. It is up to the Congress to be informed, and it is up to the Members of the Congress to be informed before they speak. If a Member gets up here and says, "I have received complaints from 4,000 people," well, of course, that is all right, but I think Members of Congress are expected to find out what the facts are, and I do not think that all of us always do that. Sometimes we are prone to criticize and censure without knowing all the facts. We should determine what the facts are, and that is what I object to. If there is plenty of gasoline to be used for all kinds of conventions, let them have conventions. If they have sufficient rubber for cars to go to conventions, all right. But I do not know what the over-all picture is, I do not know what the demands are on the 55 battle fronts of the world, and I am not going to do anything that will jeopardize the war effort to carry on something here that is not absolutely essential.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is right about that; but when people you know at home—for example, when Mr. Jones writes me, and I know Mr. Jones to be reliable, and he tells me something, do you not think it is our duty to call that to the attention of the department down here, and then when the department will not pay any attention to it, speak about it here?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; and I would ask for an investigation; even an impeachment might be considered in certain extreme cases if the facts should warrant. So you have a remedy without condemning something we are not fully informed about. I think the facts should be determined first. So far as transportation is concerned, I know that you cannot get coal in certain areas. They have blackouts, and all places of amusement and other nonessential places are closed because they cannot get coal. There are not sufficient cars to ship the coal. The same applies to oil. There is a tremendous transportation problem involved right now. I do not know how serious it is. I am certainly not going to condemn, criticize, and censure those who are trying to carry on this war effort and those who are trying to divide up the services and commodities equally among the people unless I know the facts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, another statement was made about the veterans and the O. P. A. being in the position of refusing veterans the right to certain supplies and equipment to go into business. Well, naturally, I deplore the necessity for that and you do too. We are all in favor of the veterans getting everything in the world they can to help them. We voted for the G. I. bill of rights. At the same time, the veterans are more interested in holding the price line and having stabilization than any other one group in America, much more so. What will happen to the widows and children of these poor men who have made the supreme sacrifice if we do not hold the line and keep stabilization going. Therefore, the veterans and their dependents have more at stake in this control and stabilization program than any other one class or group in America. If they want to ask exceptions to the rules, that might have a tendency to break that down.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURLEY. I think that there is a general disposition to find fault with the various agencies of the Government, not as a whole, but about their delay in arriving at a conclusion on some of these questions. For example, I have a veteran in my district who 7 weeks ago was discharged from the service and opened a bakery. He had saved up $1,500. He equipped a bakery, and then found that he could not get 100 pounds of sugar to run the bakery. I have been fighting with the Bureau for 3 weeks on that matter, and they say they cannot make an exception in the case of a veteran, even though he is a wounded veteran, and even though he put his life savings into that business, because he was not in the bakery business in 1942.

Mr. PATMAN. That is a very appealing case, Governor.

Mr. CURLEY. He was out fighting for his country in 1942.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; sure.

Mr. CURLEY. And he could not be here.

Mr. PATMAN. Sure; that is right.

Mr. CURLEY. They tell me there are 43,000 cases of veterans seeking priority. They expect to clear this matter up in 2 weeks.

Mr. PATMAN. If you open the door and say that every disabled veteran should have a right to get all the sugar he wanted, as much as we would like to, I do not know what the effect would be. You know the over-all picture. You know that sugar is scarcer today than it has ever been. The price of sugar has been held down to 7 cents a pound and less during this war with controls, and during the other war without controls it went to 35 and 50 cents a pound. So somebody has been doing some good on price control and stabilization.

Furthermore, speaking about these priorities, that is something that has to be handled very discreetly. Naturally you would say, if you had the authority, "Give each disabled veteran all the sugar he wants."

Mr. CURLEY. Certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. "Let him go in business." I suppose 1,000, 10,000, or maybe 500,000 others could well ask for the same privilege, but what is going to happen to your sugar supply? These veterans, as I have said, are more interested, as a group, in holding prices stabilized like we have had than any other one group in America. They are all interested, too, in a stable economy and fair distribution of scarce supplies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose we break this price line and things go up on articles like second-hand cars, for instance. Before prices were fixed, there is a case where a Ford or Plymouth or Chevrolet that had been run 100,000 miles was being sold for three times as much as it cost when it was new. That is just an example of what will happen if there are no controls. So we have got to have controls, and day by day when we stand here and condemn and criticize and censure everybody who has anything to do with it, I just wonder how long the American people can take it without losing complete confidence and saying, "Let us have the kind of inflation that they have in China."

ITALIAN FOOD SITUATION

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this morning's New York Times a statement by the Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Joseph C. Grew, in which he states:

> In line with the statement of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on September 26, 1944, the Allies are assisting Italy in every way practicable consistent with the prosecution of the war and the needs of the liberated countries to meet our present difficult situation.

I regret exceedingly that I am constrained to disagree with the statement of the Acting Secretary. May I call the attention of the House to a situation which has developed since the month of October which completely belies this statement of the Acting Secretary. I need not describe the conditions that exist in Italy. I refer you to an article written by Archbishop Spellman which appeared in Collier's magazine 3 weeks ago. The conditions in Italy are horrible. Children are dying from lack of food. Disease is rampant, and there is a feeling of discouragement among the Italian people particularly because they have nothing to eat. When I say "nothing," in many, many of the small towns in Italy that word is literally correct.

The President has tried to the best of his ability to keep the pledge that he made together with Prime Minister Churchill last September, referred to by Acting Secretary Grew. In October the President of the United States, by letter to the War Department, directed that the daily ration of bread be increased from 200 to 300 grams a day.

A survey was made by our military authorities, and a report of that survey now exists in the War Department. That survey demonstrates, first, that the food for the 300-gram daily bread ration was available, and that the shipping was available. Here it is February 9, and the President's directive has not been carried out. Why? The Allied Commission—and may I say inferentially that except in matters strictly military, on the Allied Commission there is today no American of authority comparable to that of any British representative on that Allied Commission in Italy—blocked the carrying out of the President's request and gave the following as the excuse. It stated that when we were ready to agree to make the same allocation of 300 grams of bread per day for the unliberated parts of Italy, then it would permit the distribution of the 300 grams of bread per day for the liberated parts of Italy.

Personally, I think that is an alibi. That is in keeping with what has been the policy of the Allied Commission, to reduce the people of Italy to the status of colonials.

The Italian people are participating in this war. Three hundred thousand Italian partisans are today fighting the enemy behind the German lines. Two hundred and fifty thousand Italians have been killed in the resistance movement against the Nazis. General Alexander has stated that the resistance movement in Italy has been more effective in fighting the enemy than any other resistance movement in Europe. The Italian people are trying to do everything to carry on warfare against the common enemy, but they are being prevented by the Allied Commission. The Allied Commission hinders Italy's every effort to fight the Nazis.

For instance, Italy has been attempting to raise an army. Under the terms of the armistice the Italian Army was restricted to 11,000. The Government of Italy has time and again sought permission to raise an Army so that it can throw a strong army into the fight against the Nazis. The Allied Commission has denied Italy this right.

I do not want to indulge in surmises and suppositions. I do not know what future plans the Allied Commission may have for Italy, but I do say that when the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the heroic and splendid fighting army we have in Italy, states that it is in our interest as well as the interest of the Italian people that the daily bread ration be increased from 200 grams to 300, and when that request of the President is supported by a survey made by the War Department to the effect that the food is available and the shipping is available, we, the United States, should see to it that that directive of the President is carried out, irrespective of what the designs or the excuses or the alibis of the Allied Commission in Italy may be. Such unilateral action on our part, the increase and distribution of the bread rations, will not injure our relations with Great Britain. Such action in the long run will strengthen the alliance.

I repeat, remember that on that Allied Commission there is no American of comparable authority with that of the British except in strictly military matters.

What I have told you about this four slices of bread for the people of Italy I have said on my responsibility as a Member of Congress. I state the following: First. That the President did direct an increase of daily bread rations from 200 grams to 300 grams by letter to the War Department during the month of October. Second. That the military authorities found that the shipping and the food were available. Third. That the Allied Commission has blocked it. On January 26, 1945, I wrote to Secretary of War Stimson on this subject. I placed a copy of the letter in the RECORD. To date, I have received no answer.

You know what 300 grams of bread represents. It represents four slices of bread. It may seem of no consequence to some of us, but remember that bread is the major portion of the Italian diet. Children are dying now because of the lack of bread. Read Archbishop Spellman's article on conditions in Italy. In the light of those conditions and in the light of the courageous struggle of 300,000 Italian partisans in warfare against the common enemy, in the light of the directive of the President of the United States, a promise incidentally which was made by American representatives in Italy, to the Italian people last September and October, that the bread ration would be increased from 200 grams to 300 grams, in the light of the Allied Commission arbitrarily blocking this directive of President Roosevelt, it is time that these facts be given to the American people. I do not want to arouse anti-British feeling, because I believe that the success of this war and the success of the peace are dependent entirely upon the grand coalition which now exists. I do not want to see that coalition disrupted. I hope this problem, like many other problems, will be solved within the structure of this coalition. We in America must have equal authority in a country where American boys are fighting and dying, particularly with regard to the problem of feeding the population in that country and the protection of the democratic rights of its people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield now to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When we voted for and supported the U. N. R. R. A., we contemplated there would be no power politics used in connection with the distribution of that food to the people in those countries.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But this does not involve U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. From what the gentleman has said, however, it would appear that the President or those in charge of our policy are letting the British Government dictate what we shall do in furnishing people in Italy with food.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In this particular case the Allied Commission is in control of the situation and on that commission we have no American of authority comparable to that of any British member. Please remember I am not referring to military matters. But may I correct the gentleman by saying that this particular item of bread rations for Italy is not a matter under the jurisdiction of U. N. R. R. A.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to say in this connection I have introduced a resolution which would express the sense of the Congress that Italy be recognized as an ally and that we extend lend-lease aid to Italy. This resolution is in the interest of saving American lives as well as giving aid to the people of Italy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the gentleman has said correctly that there are always British officers in Italy over our own officers. In order for our own American generals there to promote one of his own men in his service, the matter has to go through five British officers.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is correct as to authority in the Allied Commission.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would also like to state that I was in Florence and visited with Brig. Gen. Edgar E. Hume, the head of the United States military command, in a building where they were feeding and caring for a good many little Italian orphans. They were being cared for very well. The children were very sweet and very appealing and very attractive and very happy. There was so much tragedy and suffering it was a pleasure to hear children laugh. Italians are being employed to care for the children.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for an additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, much more of that sort of work ought to be done. It was pitiful to see long queues of people who had come in from the suburbs of Florence at 6 o'clock in the morning in the cold, hoping to buy even just a few grapes. They waited in line sometimes for hours. It is today true that the people in many parts of Italy are practically starving and the children are very much undernourished in even larger areas. Also, I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that if this country could spare only a few tools, comparatively few hand tools, which the Italian people could use in making various commodities they could then earn money and be more or less self-supporting. They thus could purchase the food and other necessities for themselves when they are available. They do not have the money to purchase anything. The Italian people are wonderful with their hands and very clever at making things, as you know. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York wholeheartedly in his wish to help the Italians.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND BANKING

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this opportunity to pay high tribute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. He is a prodigious worker. His understanding of public finance and banking is amazing. I have sat next to him on committee for years. I have leaned heavily upon him. He is so thorough in his studies of finance legislation. When he advises us, we should listen to him. I desire to join with him in his request that we consider the report of the American Bankers Association. They are the people who know banking and finance. The gentleman from Michigan resented Mr. Morgenthau's attempt to belittle their opinions. The bankers seemingly have always been under fire from the demagogic fringe. However, they are people who have been extremely loyal these last few years. They have protected Mr. Morgenthau in many critical periods when vast sums had to be raised by bond purchases. They have always responded. They deserve great praise rather than sneers.

I have studied, I think diligently, matters of public finance during the last dozen years. I have collected much material on the Bretton Woods proposal, in an endeavor to understand it, with the hope that I could support it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] warns us to consider it carefully and to give thoughtful study to the criticisms of the Nation's bankers, whose real business is public finance. I had a suggestion presented to me. It was to the effect that I could hardly expect to understand public finance unless I had taken a requisite course in astronomy. I wonder if Mr. Morgenthau could claim that he has had that requisite course? Else how could he comprehend billions and billions and billions?

I rose because I feel so strongly that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] should receive the commendation that he deserves. I regretted to leave the Banking and Currency Committee and the association with its members. Especially shall I miss my adviser the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], who sat next to me on that committee. I hope that when the Bretton Woods proposed legislation comes to us you will listen to his advice, as I consider that such advice would be most valuable and helpful.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The constituents of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] appreciate his work. They have increased his majority every time.

Mr. GIFFORD. He has shown courage at all times. It is indeed pleasing to have a constituency which will support a Representative who dares vote his honest opinion. I fear there is some little evidence otherwise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

FOOD PROBLEMS OF THE ITALIAN PEOPLE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in connection with the food problems of the Italian people. I tried to get the floor to ask him a question. The question I wanted to ask is this: Has not this Congress done its full duty in the way of appropriations and in the way of legislation and in every other possible way to help not only the hungry people in Italy but the hungry people in other countries in Europe who are similarly afflicted and situated. I could dwell on that at some length. I do not like the impression to go out from this House that this Congress has not been a forward-looking Congress, the same as its predecessor, in connection with all of these world problems.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I am just as much concerned as the gentleman from New York himself about the distressing conditions that he has set forth, dealing with lack of food, lack of medicine, and other things for the Italian people. Everything that he has said about this situation is applicable to the people of other war-torn countries, and, I repeat, Congress has passed all legislation requested to enable our administrative and other Government agencies to tender aid on behalf of the United States in connection with conditions such as the gentleman has pictured to us. It seems to me that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] has correctly pointed out that those in charge of the policy of the United States are the ones who are responsible for letting the British Government dictate what we should do in the way of furnishing food, medicine, and relief to starving children and other unfortunates in Europe.

I think the American people ought to know from the administrative officials of our Government more about developments of this kind. The administrative officials ought to tell the American people why they are following a policy of letting little children starve, of permitting lack of food and other help, after Congress, without regard to politics or partisanship, has passed necessary legislation giving power to the President of the United States to properly function and furnishing him with funds with which to carry on this humanitarian work. Of course, he has undoubtedly assigned the working details to understudies, and it would be interesting to know what sort of an alibi they are willing to present in connection with this discussion.

So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to sit idly by and permit the impression to go out to the American people that Congress is to blame for the mistakes of those who are in control of the foreign policy of our Government.

It is not out of place to call attention to the fact that there is a food shortage in countries like Belgium, the Netherlands, France, Greece, and Yugoslavia, where their people in many instances face starvation. They, too, have appealed for relief. Congress has acted in behalf of all peoples, but I repeat that the matter of carrying out any relief program rests upon the executive branch of our Government and the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL COUNTRIES

I want to comment on this global conference that is going on between Mr. Stalin, Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Roosevelt at this very moment.

This momentous session of these world leaders now being conducted somewhere at a port on the Black Sea should give attention to the small countries of the world that are directly concerned in connection with any policies shaped at the

meeting now taking place. The story of Finland has been discussed on past occasions on the floor of this House. So have the tragic developments that concern the people of Greece. The Members of this Congress know how the people of Poland feel about this subject.

We can well refresh our memory and remind ourselves of the day that the lend-lease bill passed the Congress of the United States. It was no mere accident. Its passage and the benefits that followed to the Allies were eagerly sought by the Allies. The fate of governments in the Old World was hanging in the balance. The Axis Powers stood to conquer, unless the resources of the United States of America were used for support of the Allies, so that they could wage war against those governments which were bent on their destruction.

In discussing this matter on other occasions, I have said that when the lend-lease bill was passed, that was the time to have a clear understanding with those countries that benefited from lend-lease as to the problems of the smaller nations. We were in a position then—and I hope the time is not yet passed—to insist that the rights of these little countries be respected, and that they be permitted to reestablish their governments in order that their people might live their own lives in their own way. This position is just a matter of simple justice and all of this talk about the four freedoms and our humanitarian position, is more or less meaningless unless our representative at the conference now in session translates the talk into something definite and positive. I hope this will be done and that Congress may be advised that the United States of America not only respects the rights of smaller nations but insists that they be treated fairly and justly.

PAYMENT OF OUR SOLDIERS ABROAD IN FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include as part of my remarks a letter from Mr. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, regarding our currency abroad.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous protests—especially from our soldiers while I was overseas in Europe in September and October—regarding the effect of the currency situation insofar as it related to our own soldiers and their pay. Many of our soldiers in France, Italy, and Belgium find that on account of being paid in French and Italian currency instead of United States dollars they are very much handicapped in making their purchases. This letter explains why the Treasury does not do something to relieve the situation. It is a very distressing one for our armed forces.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington February 8, 1945.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This is in reply to your letter of January 12 to Major General Ulio with regard to your inquiry concerning the method by which United States troops in Italy are paid, which has been referred to the Treasury Department for answer.

United States troops, no matter where located, are paid the full amount approved by Congress in United States dollars or the equivalent thereof in legal tender local currency, based on official exchange rates. Facilities have been made available pursuant to law and regulations to permit United States troops to make allotments from their pay to dependents, to pay premiums on their insurance policies, to make personal remittances to the United States, to make deposits in American banking institutions, and to purchase War bonds. All of these transactions are effected entirely in dollars wherever the soldier may be stationed and the soldier is free to dispose of all or any part of his pay in this manner. American troops in France receive any balance of pay retained for local expenditures in French francs at the official rate of exchange of 49.5663 francs to the dollar, while American troops in Italy receive any balance of pay in Italian lire at the official rate of exchange of 100 lire to the dollar. The rate of exchange for the French franc was selected by the French authorities and accepted by the Allied authorities prior to D-day. The rate of exchange for the Italian lira was established by the Allied authorities prior to the invasion of Sicily.

Any local currencies received as pay by Army personnel are freely changeable into dollars through Army finance facilities at the same rate of exchange at which the soldier's pay was computed whenever a soldier wishes to remit money to the United States or leaves the theater. Reports received by the War Department show that United States military personnel in Europe are retaining only a small proportion of their pay for local expenditures.

The impact of the war on the liberated countries together with the previous occupation by the enemy has resulted in a general shortage of most commodities with resulting upward pressure on price ceilings and high prices of uncontrolled commodities. Prices, moreover, vary markedly from place to place due to the shortage of civilian transportation and distribution facilities which has accentuated the over-all shortages of goods by preventing equitable distribution throughout the country. As a result of these conditions, which are temporary in character, black markets have developed both in commodities and in United States currency.

Efforts have been made by the United States Army to encourage the soldiers to send as much money out of their pay back to the United States as possible. So far as actual spending by American military personnel through civilian channels is concerned, our soldiers are affected mainly by the high prices of luxury goods since all subsistence requirements are furnished by the Army and since they can obtain a wide range of convenience and semiluxury articles through Army post exchanges at American prices as well as many free services through the American Red Cross and special services. It is believed that the measures taken by the United States Army minimize the adverse effects of spending by United States troops and at the same time give careful consideration to the needs of American military personnel in the area.

I sincerely trust that you will find the foregoing a satisfactory answer to your inquiry.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

CANCELATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order of 20 minutes for next Monday. Because I shall be absent from the city on that date, I ask unanimous consent that this order be canceled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered for that date, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. SUNDSTROM), for 1 week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned to meet on Monday, February 12, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 11 a. m., Tuesday, February 13, 1945, for organization purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a meeting on Tuesday, February 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m. on House Joint Resolution 59.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, February 14, 1945, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia. The hearing will be held in room 362 (caucus room), Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing beginning at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, February 14, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 97) to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (with respect to certain patent matters). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the postwar ship disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

200. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 1, during the calendar year 1943, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 314. An act for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir; with amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 234. A bill for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills; without amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 242. A bill for the relief of Ruben M. Herren; without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 245. A bill for the relief of the board of trustees, Summerville Consolidated School District, Chattanooga County, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 257. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 432. A bill to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of date November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., St. Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 791. A bill for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate; with amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 844. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 845. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 853. A bill for the relief of David Cowan; with amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 901. A bill for the relief of John H. Bonney, the legal guardian of Daniel R. Bonney, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of Blanche E. Broad; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 934. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Winfred Alexander; with amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 946. A bill for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor); with amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1036. A bill for the relief of the Stiers Bros. Construction Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1157. A bill for the relief of Barbara Healy; with amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1239. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1324. A bill for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1353. A bill for the relief of J. P. Harris; with amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1360. A bill for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Louis T. Klauder; with amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Edith M. Powell; with amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of the Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. H. 1550. A bill for the relief of E. Sullivan; with amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1561. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio; without amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1676. A bill for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of S. I. Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1753. A bill for the relief of Harry Tansey; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 2094. A bill to make veterans of the present war eligible to occupy certain national defense housing; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2095. A bill to regulate employment of conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2096. A bill to authorize renewal of trade-mark registrations pursuant to request made within certain periods after expiry of registration; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2097. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2098. A bill to provide financial credit for national defense in time of war without incurring public debt, to regulate the volume of such credit, to prevent post-war depression, and to provide for orderly transition from a war economy to a peace economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2099. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2100. A bill to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution requesting the President to recognize Italy as an ally, and to extend lend-lease aid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 2101. A bill for the relief of Evelyn DeNunzio, Mrs. Mary Capodanno, and the legal guardian of Vincent Capodanno; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY:

H. R. 2102. A bill for the relief of Harry Goldstein; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2103. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mallardi; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 2104. A bill for the relief of the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis*

during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2105. A bill for the relief of the California State Compensation Insurance Fund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2106. A bill granting a pension to Bettie Dick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2107. A bill for the relief of Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2108. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Chesser; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

59. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Petition of Edna Bondurant and 21 other citizens of Torrington, Fort Laramie, and Yoder, Wyo., urging support of the Pace bill, H. R. 752, and also requesting that conscription in any form be opposed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

60. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Ruth Asplin and 26 other citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of H. R. 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

61. By the SPEAKER: Petition of delegates assembled at the forty-fifth national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the lax regulations for conscientious objectors, requesting more stringent regulations or the introduction of a bill in the Congress of the United States to compel conscientious objectors to perform hard manual labor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

62. Also, petition of the Rockford Chapter of the Order of Ahepa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the Government of the United States of America to act as mediator and to actively participate in the solution of the urgent problems of Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God above all, yet in all, our way is veiled in night; with Thee alone is day. Out of the dense darkness and above the raging storm we lift our prayer. In spite of our selfish schemes which have been too often blind to the welfare of the common man at home and abroad, Thou hast entrusted to our hands and to those who march with us in freedom's cause the keys of the future. As the unworthy agents of Thy resistless will, our eyes are seeing written Thy righteous sentence against the tyranny which blasphemes Thy holy name and the fulfillment of the ancient word: "Who so diggeth a pit shall fall in it; and he that rolleth a stone it will return upon him."

In this grand yet awful time we are solemnly conscious that the light of each new day is bringing decisions of destiny which will mold the future, determining the shape of things to come for myriads of the sons of men and of generations unborn.

"O Christ of God! O Son of Man!
Awake us from our dreams
Of ancient good and partial truth
To trust tomorrow's gleams."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

H. R. 1984. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day; and

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture.

DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish now to give notice, in order that no Senator may think I am aiming at him, that I shall object to any speeches beyond the 5-minute limitation during the morning hour.

AWARD OF BRONZE STAR MEDAL AND CITATION TO LIEUTENANT CHAVEZ

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a communication which came this morning from Alfonso Mirabal, of Albuquerque, N. Mex. He enclosed a clipping which appeared in the Washington Star on February 10. I am certain that all Members of the Senate will be glad to learn that the son of the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], our colleague, has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal for gallantry in action on the island of Guam last July 22. The Marine Corps citation reads as follows:

By cool and capable direction and personal leadership, Lieutenant Chavez and his platoon completely annihilated an attacking enemy force three times superior in manpower and weapons.

His conduct, leadership, and courage throughout were outstanding and in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service.

I know that all our colleagues will be glad to hear of the outstanding exploit of bravery on the part of the son of the Senator from New Mexico.

NOTICE OF ADDRESSES BY SENATORS TUNNELL AND BURTON ON THEIR VISIT TO MEDITERRANEAN AND MIDDLE EAST AREAS

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, it is the hope of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and myself that when the Senate convenes on Thursday we may make some remarks in regard to our visit to the Mediterranean and Middle East areas. I make the announcement today that we expect to make the report when we can obtain the floor on next Thursday.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Francis Maloney, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] as a member of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, created by Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, as further extended by Senate Resolution 28, Seventy-ninth Congress.

VISITOR TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

VISITOR TO THE MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

POST-WAR REHABILITATION—BRETTON WOODS MONETARY PROPOSALS (H. DOC. NO. 70)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my Budget message of January 9, I called attention to the need for immediate action on the Bretton Woods proposals for an international monetary fund and an international bank for reconstruction and development. It is my purpose in this message to indicate the importance of these international organizations in our plans for a peaceful and prosperous world.

As we dedicate our total efforts to the task of winning this war we must never lose sight of the fact that victory is not

only an end in itself but, in a large sense, victory offers us the means of achieving the goal of lasting peace and a better way of life. Victory does not insure the achievement of these larger goals—it merely offers us the opportunity—the chance—to seek their attainment. Whether we will have the courage and vision to avail ourselves of this tremendous opportunity—purchased at so great a cost—is yet to be determined. On our shoulders rests the heavy responsibility for making this momentous decision. I have said before, and I repeat again: This generation has a rendezvous with destiny.

If we are to measure up to the task of peace with the same stature as we have measured up to the task of war, we must see that the institutions of peace rest firmly on the solid foundations of international political and economic cooperation. The cornerstone for international political cooperation is the Dumbarton Oaks proposal for a permanent United Nations. International political relations will be friendly and constructive, however, only if solutions are found to the difficult economic problems we face today. The cornerstone for international economic cooperation is the Bretton Woods proposal for an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

These proposals for an International Fund and International Bank are concrete evidence that the economic objectives of the United States agree with those of the United Nations. They illustrate our unity of purpose and interest in the economic field. What we need and what they need correspond—expanded production, employment, exchange, and consumption—in other words, more goods produced, more jobs, more trade, and a higher standard of living for us all. To the people of the United States this means real peacetime employment for those who will be returning from the war and for those at home whose wartime work has ended. It also means orders and profits to our industries and fair prices to our farmers. We shall need prosperous markets in the world to insure our own prosperity, and we shall need the goods the world can sell us. For all these purposes, as well as for a peace that will endure, we need the partnership of the United Nations.

The first problem in time which we must cope with is that of saving life, and getting resources and people back into production. In many of the liberated countries economic life has all but stopped. Transportation systems are in ruins and therefore coal and raw materials cannot be brought to factories. Many factories themselves are shattered, power plants smashed, transmission systems broken, bridges blown up or bombed, ports clogged with sunken wrecks, and great rich areas of farm land inundated by the sea. People are tired and sick and hungry. But they are eager to go to work again, and to create again with their own hands and under their own leaders the necessary physical basis of their lives.

Emergency relief is under way behind the armies under the authority of local governments, backed up first by the Allied military command and after that by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Our participation in the U. N. R. R. A. has been approved by Congress. But neither U. N. R. R. A. nor the armies are designed for the construction or reconstruction of large-scale public works or factories or power plants or transportation systems. That job must be done otherwise, and it must be started soon.

The main job of restoration is not one of relief. It is one of reconstruction which must largely be done by local people and their governments. They will provide the labor, the local money, and most of the materials. The same is true for all the many plans for the improvement of transportation, agriculture, industry, and housing, that are essential to the development of the economically backward areas of the world. But some of the things required for all these projects, both of reconstruction and development, will have to come from overseas. It is at this point that our highly developed economy can play a role important to the rest of the world and very profitable to the United States. Inquiries for numerous materials, and for all kinds of equipment and machinery in connection with such projects are already being directed to our industries, and many more will come. This business will be welcome just as soon as the more urgent production for the war itself ends.

The main problem will be for these countries to obtain the means of payment. In the long run we can be paid for what we sell abroad chiefly in goods and services. But at the moment many of the countries who want to be our customers are prostrate. Other countries have devoted their economies so completely to the war that they do not have the resources for reconstruction and development. Unless a means of financing is found, such countries will be unable to restore their economies and, in desperation, will be forced to carry forward and intensify existing systems of discriminatory trade practices, restrictive exchange controls, competitive depreciation of currencies, and other forms of economic warfare. That would destroy all our good hopes. We must move promptly to prevent its happening, and we must move on several fronts, including finance and trade.

The United States should act promptly upon the plan for the international bank, which will make or guarantee sound loans for the foreign currency requirements of important reconstruction and development projects in member countries. One of its most important functions will be to facilitate and make secure wide private participation in such loans. The articles of agreement constituting the charter of the bank have been worked out with great care by an international conference of experts and give adequate protection to all interests. I recommend to the Congress that we accept the plan, subscribe the capital allotted to us, and participate wholeheartedly in the bank's work.

This measure, with others I shall later suggest, should go far to take care of our part of the lending requirements of the post-war years. They should help the countries concerned to get production started, to get over the first crisis of disorganization and fear, to begin the work of reconstruction and development; and they should help our farmers and our industries to get over the crisis of reconversion by making a large volume of export business possible in the post-war years. As confidence returns private investors will participate more and more in foreign lending and investment without any Government assistance. But to get over the first crisis, in the situation that confronts us, loans and guaranties by agencies of government will be essential.

We all know, however, that a prosperous world economy must be built on more than foreign investment. Exchange rates must be stabilized, and the channels of trade opened up throughout the world. A large foreign trade after victory will generate production and therefore wealth. It will also make possible the servicing of foreign investments.

Almost no one in the modern world produces what he eats and wears and lives in. It is only by the division of labor among people and among geographic areas with all their varied resources, and by the increased all-around production which specialization makes possible, that any modern country can sustain its present population. It is through exchange and trade that efficient production in large units becomes possible. To expand the trading circle, to make it richer, more competitive, more varied, is a fundamental contribution to everybody's wealth and welfare.

It is time for the United States to take the lead in establishing the principle of economic cooperation as the foundation for expanded world trade. We propose to do this, not by setting up a supergovernment, but by international negotiation and agreement, directed to the improvement of the monetary institutions of the world and of the laws that govern trade. We have done a good deal in those directions in the last 10 years under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and through the stabilization fund operated by our Treasury. But our present enemies were powerful in those years too, and they devoted all their efforts not to international collaboration, but to autarchy, and economic warfare. When victory is won we must be ready to go forward rapidly on a wide front. We all know very well that this will be a long and complicated business.

A good start has been made. The United Nations Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods has taken a long step forward on a matter of great practical importance to us all. The conference submitted a plan to create an international monetary fund which will put an end to monetary chaos. The fund is a financial institution to preserve stability and order in the exchange rates between different moneys. It does not create a single money for the world; neither we nor anyone else is ready to do that. There will still be a different money in each country, but with the fund in operation the value of each currency in international trade will remain comparatively stable. Changes in the value of

foreign currencies will be made only after careful consideration by the fund of the factors involved. Furthermore, and equally important, the fund agreement establishes a code of agreed principles for the conduct of exchange and currency affairs. In a nutshell, the fund agreement spells the difference between a world caught again in the maelstrom of panic and economic warfare culminating in war—as in the 1930's—or a world in which the members strive for a better life through mutual trust, cooperation, and assistance. The choice is ours.

I, therefore, recommend prompt action by the Congress to provide the subscription of the United States to the international monetary fund, and the legislation necessary for our membership in the fund.

The International Fund and Bank together represent one of the most sound and useful proposals for international collaboration now before us. On the other hand, I do not want to leave with you the impression that these proposals for the fund and bank are perfect in every detail. It may well be that the experience of future years will show us how they can be improved. I do wish to make it clear, however, that these articles of agreement are the product of the best minds that 44 nations could muster. These men, who represented nations from all parts of the globe, nations in all stages of economic development, nations with different political and economic philosophies, have reached an accord which is presented to you for your consideration and approval. It would be a tragedy if differences of opinion or minor details should lead us to sacrifice the basic agreement achieved on the major problems.

Nor do I want to leave with you the impression that the fund and the bank are all that we will need to solve the economic problems which will face the United Nations when the war is over. There are other problems which we will be called upon to solve. It is my expectation that other proposals will shortly be ready to submit to you for your consideration. These will include the establishment of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, broadening and strengthening of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, international agreement for the reduction of trade barriers, the control of cartels and the orderly marketing of world surpluses of certain ccmmodities, a revision of the Export-Import Bank, and an international oil agreement, as well as proposals in the field of civil aviation, shipping, and radio and wire communications. It will also be necessary, of course, to repeal the Johnson Act.

In this message I have recommended for your consideration the immediate adoption of the Bretton Woods Agreements and suggested other measures which will have to be dealt with in the near future. They are all parts of a consistent whole. That whole is our hope for a secure and fruitful world, a world in which plain people in all countries can work at tasks which they do well, exchange in peace the products of their labor, and work out their several destinies in security and peace; a world in which governments, as their major contribution to the common welfare are highly and effectively resolved to work together in practical affairs, and to guide all their actions by the knowledge that any policy or act that has effects abroad must be considered in the light of those effects.

The point in history at which we stand is full of promise and of danger. The world will either move toward unity and widely shared prosperity or it will move apart into necessarily competing economic blocs. We have a chance, we citizens of the United States, to use our influence in favor of a more united and cooperating world. Whether we do so will determine, as far as it is in our power, the kind of lives our grandchildren can live.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 12, 1945.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Senate that the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and I, who were delegates to the Bretton Woods Conference, have been for some time working with our legislative counsel to draft the proposed legislation, and I understand it will be ready to be introduced on Thursday of this week. In the House, Representative SPENCE and Representative WOLCOTT, who were also delegates to the conference, have been working with the House legislative counsel, and we probably will agree by Thursday upon a bill to be introduced.

Mr. President, I notice that the Chair referred the President's message to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was done upon the recommendation of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction over legislation dealing with this question, I think the message should be referred to that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that unanimous consent be asked for change of reference.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the message will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, and branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service for the period of December 1, 1944 to January 31, 1945, with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

COSTS, CANCELATIONS, AND MISCELLANEOUS DATA, INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of costs, cancellations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects, for the fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD AND THE CITY OF NEW YORK RELATING TO FOREIGN TRADE ZONE NO. 1

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Foreign Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, and the report of the city of New York covering operations of Foreign Trade Zone No. 1, during the calendar year 1943 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

NOVEMBER 1944 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of November 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, pursuant to a Senate resolution, the twentieth monthly report of the Board covering the month of October 1944 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Archives Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to appropriate additional and adequate funds annually for the maintenance and operation of the San Joaquin Experimental Range

"Whereas the present appropriation for the San Joaquin Experimental Range in the county of Madera, State of California, is inadequate to properly carry on the necessary experimental work on range use and improvement; and

"Whereas the present work is being conducted by the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture largely through the employment of conscientious objectors who will not be available after the war: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate additional and adequate funds annually for the maintenance of the San Joaquin Experimental Range; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Resolution 36

"Resolution memorializing Congress relative to the control of ships' garbage

"Whereas there has existed for many years a serious health and economic problem arising out of the failure to control the disposition of ships' garbage; and

"Whereas the unrestricted dumping of ships' garbage in the harbors and ports of this State and off the shores of this State has resulted in the introduction of serious pest infestations which have caused great damage to agriculture and livestock in this country; and

"Whereas such unregulated practice may directly affect the health of the people of this country by the introduction of diseases common to other parts of the world; and

"Whereas it is proper that the Department of Agriculture be authorized by Congress to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by enforcing laws adequate to control such practice; and

"Whereas it is proper that the Congress enact stringent laws adequate to remove this menace to the health and economic welfare of this country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation to control and regulate the disposition of ships' garbage in the harbors and ports of this country and off the shores of this country; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of California."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Resolution 87

"Resolution relating to universal military training

"Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the United States; and

"Whereas such training will result in building up the physical and mental health of young Americans in an atmosphere faithful to the democratic institutions of the country and equip large numbers of our citizens in the fundamentals of military service so that they may rapidly respond to any future needs for the defense of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled are hereby petitioned and urged to enact a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the country; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chief clerk to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from this State."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Claims:

"House Resolution 84

"Resolution relative to memoralizing Congress to enact House bill 5553 and House bill 5599 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and bills amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto applicable to California boat-building concerns

"Whereas subsequent to the outbreak of the war a number of California boat-building concerns, upon request of the United States Navy, undertook the construction of buoy boats, the contract price being set by the Navy; and

"Whereas the figure set by the Navy was too low to enable these concerns to perform these contracts without sustaining substantial losses, but regardless of their early realization of this eventuality, such concerns made no attempt to escape from their contractual responsibilities but proceeded with the building of the boats, completed their contracts to the entire satisfaction of the Navy, and sustained substantial losses thereby; and

"Whereas it appears that the Navy, under existing laws, is powerless to reimburse such concerns for their losses, notwithstanding the merits of the situation; and

"Whereas, at the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, House bill 5553 and House bill 5599 were introduced to provide relief to certain of these concerns for the actual loss incurred by each of them in the performance of its contract with the Navy for the construction of buoy boats, House bill 5553 providing for reimbursement of the Harbor Boat Works, of San Diego, Calif., in the amount of $41,156.57, and House bill 5599 providing for reimbursement of the San Pedro Boat Works, of San Pedro, Calif., in the amount of $160,850.13, which bills are now pending before Congress; and

"Whereas the members of the Assembly of the State of California believe that in equity and fairness these and all similar claims of California boat-building concerns should receive favorable consideration by Congress and provision be made in adequate satisfaction thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact House bill 5553 and House bill 5599 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and bills amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto applicable to California boat-building concerns which have sustained losses by reason of their faithful and satisfactory performance of contracts under the United States Navy's buoy-boat program; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives from California."

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution by Logge Riunite, No. 889, Order of Sons of Italy in America, of Lynn, Mass., favoring the extension of aid, through the lend-lease program, to the population of liberated Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to empower our country to become a member of a world security organization

"Whereas our county is at present engaged in a mighty struggle to maintain its peaceful way of life and its democratic institutions; and

"Whereas in this great struggle the men and women of our country are engaged in battle on far-flung battlefields, in every corner of this earth; and

"Whereas many thousands of lives of our youths are being sacrificed, and many bodies maimed as the price which they pay for the preservation of the great ideals of our democracy; and

"Whereas it is our hope that their sacrifices shall not have been in vain, but shall be productive of a society that shall regard world peace as a primary and elementary state in human intercourse; and

"Whereas it is our opinion that world peace as a constant and lasting ideal of social conduct can only be attained by international cooperation of all peaceful nations, and that the dedication of our country to the organization of a strong world security organization to enforce peace by the use of arms if necessary will best attain this ideal, without in any manner compromising the sovereignty of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That it registers and declares its views that the Congress of the United States should empower our country to become a member of a world security organization, the aim of which shall be to give the world lasting peace, and that our participation in such an organization be made effective by our pledge of aid in force, in concert with other members of this organization, to the effective operation of such world security organization; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house and that copies thereof be sent to the President of the United States, the chairmen of the Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress from the State of Maryland.

"By the house of delegates, January 24, 1945."

THE TREATY-MAKING POWER—RESOLUTION OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGISLATURE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD, under the rule, a concurrent resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law an amendment relative to the treaty making powers of the President of the United States. I do this in behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself.

The concurrent resolution of the legislature of New Hampshire was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law an amendment relative to treaty making powers of the President of the United States.

That whereas a bill (H. Res. 16, 79th Cong.) has been introduced in the Congress of the United States proposing that the Constitution of the United States shall be amended so that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members in each House concur; and

Whereas the enactment of such a resolution and its submission to the several States for ratification would provide for and promote the chances of this Nation joining a world organization to preserve the peace and to insure our successful participation in building a peaceful society: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives, the senate concurring, hereby urge the Congress of the United States to immediately enact the before-mentioned resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of the legislative branches of the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, United States Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Congressman CHESTER E. MERROW, and Congressman SHERMAN ADAMS requesting them to do all in their power to secure the passage of the said resolution.

Passed January 31, 1945.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and a copy thereof referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency—a letter and statement issued by Mr. Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, dealing with Senate bill 298, which recently was passed by the Senate, and with House bill 1450. In his statement Mr. Holman points out that all the interests of the dairy industry are not protected under those bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD, and will be referred as requested.

The letter and statement are as follows:

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1945.

Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of a statement by me filed in connection with the House Banking and Currency Committee hearing record on H. R. 1450.

Since this statement was prepared, the Senate has passed S. 298 as amended by the Senate committee, and the House commmittee has ordered to be reported H. R. 2023, which is H. R. 1450 as amended by the committee.

In my statement I expressed preference for the Senate provisions with respect to limitations on production subsidies and noncrop program subsidies, but pointed out that the Senate limitation should be increased by $68,000,000.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. W. HOLMAN,
Secretary.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES W. HOLMAN, SECRETARY, THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, now in its twenty-ninth year, has 71 members, each of which is a bona fide farmer-owned and controlled dairy cooperative. A number of these members have numerous subaffiliated associations. The total membership strength consists of over 300,000 farm families residing in 44 States. These farm families own the organizations which in turn are affiliated with the national federation.

In discussing certain provisions of H. R. 1450, let me make it clear that our people continue to be unalterably opposed to governmental subsidies with respect to great agricultural commodities, such as milk and its products, in lieu of fair prices as a means of providing the farm income necessary to promote the production of food and fibres needed in the prosecution of this war. We are now forced to proceed on the assumption that subsidization has become the established principle and policy of both the administration and the Congress with respect to dairy farm income. It will be recalled that at no time has the administration receded from its insistence upon the use of subsidies and the Congress has acted only to prohibit subsidies except when it has expressly authorized them.

I will, therefore, deal with this bill realistically in the light of legislative history.

1. We approve enlarging the credit of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $1,500,000,000, as provided for in the bill.

2. We oppose section 2 of the bill, which, insofar as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned, makes an exception of its operations in relation to section 21 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 which forbade any Government agency to sell certain farm commodities in its possession at less than 90 percent of parity or the current market price, whichever might be the higher.

The exception provided for in section 2 of H. R. 1450 would be particularly dangerous to the welfare of dairy farmers since throwing on the domestic market a relatively small amount of dairy products at any time below current prices would have a disastrous effect upon price returns and in some instances the shake-down in price which might be caused by such action would be irreparable. The fact that section 2 provides a minimum price of parity mitigates only slightly the injury as compared with the 90 percent of parity provided for the Steagall commodities. Should dairy products be dumped upon the market by the Commodity Credit Corporation at parity, the drop in price would be 28 percent on milk and 23 percent on butterfat, with butter, cheese, evaporated milk, and the dried milks taking comparable price drops.

In this connection, may I point out that much of the butter and evaporated milk in Government hands carries private brands upon the individual packages. The sale of deteriorated products upon the open market at prices under those customarily obtained for high-quality products would injure the good will developed in the public mind for these products and in some cases would bring the makers of these products subject to prosecution by the inspection authorities of the Federal Government. I need only recall that some months ago we faced a similar situation when it was proposed that 20,000,000 pounds of branded butter which had deteriorated in Government hands be offered to the public. This unwise move fortunately was checked by the combined efforts of the dairy industry. Had it not been checked not only would the butter have been subject to seizure and prosecution by the regular Federal investigators but in many cases O. P. A. enforcement authorities would have started suits against the innocent butter manufacturers. We, therefore, ask that this section be eliminated. If the committee finds it necessary to make some modifications of the McKellar-La Follette prohibition in section 21 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, we urge that protection be afforded to dairy products by adding at the end of section 2 of this bill the following language: *Provided,* That milk and its products shall not be sold at less than the prevailing market prices."

Such language is important because from time to time the Commodity Credit Corporation, its subsidiaries or related agencies have made loans running into millions of dollars on dairy products. In 1938 when the Corporation was supporting butter prices at only 76 percent of parity, the amount of butter which they controlled, if translated into current prices would approximate $50,000,000. We anticipate that in the surplus-production period of this year, which is only 60 days away, the Corporation will find it necessary to take off the market huge quantities of evaporated milk and dry milk. Possession of those commodities, unless moved into foreign channels, will at once become a downward price-making factor with regard to all manufactured dairy products on the domestic market. I need only recall that under conditions of free competition before the Congress wisely placed a fairly adequate tariff upon nearly all dairy products, the arrival of one shipload of butter from a foreign country would often cause a break in the farm price of butterfat as much as 5 percent a pound for 5 to 6 days.

3. We oppose section 4 of the bill which nullifies the force and effect of the Taft amendment to section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944 with respect to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation "designed to support prices or obtain production of agricultural commodities, or to absorb abnormal costs in connection with the transportation of agricultural commodities and foods." This plainly exempts the operations of the Corporation with respect to the use of subsidies in that the Corporation will not have to obtain the necessary funds from the Congress for specific purposes. In lieu of that section we urge the adoption of section 4 of S. 298 as reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency modified somewhat as to the amounts allowable for subsidies to obtain dairy production based upon a careful study by our organization of the amount necessary to maintain during the next fiscal year the same rate of payments which prevailed on the average during the last 9 months of 1944 together with a compensatory additional payment to producers of separated cream in order to rectify certain inequalities which have prevailed in the Government's production-payment program to obtain dairy production. Below is a text of section 4 of the Senate bill as it is proposed to be modified by us:

"SEC. 4. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946: *Provided,* That the making of subsidy payments and the buying of commodities for resale at a loss, by the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the purpose of maintaining maximum prices established pursuant to provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended and supplemented, shall be limited as follows: Obligations for making such payments and absorbing such losses may be incurred and paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation (a) in such amounts as may be necessary (1) to complete operations with respect to 1944 and prior year crop programs and (2) to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal year noncrop programs; and (b) in amounts which do not involve subsidy payments or losses in excess of (1) [$250,000,000] *$274,000,000* for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to the dairy production payment program, (2) $60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program, and (3) $225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop program operations. Should hostilities in the present war extend beyond December 31, 1945, such dairy production payment program and other noncrop program operations involving such subsidy payments and losses may be continued on a basis which, taking into account seasonal variations in rates and production, will not involve such subsidy payments and losses in excess of [$250,000,000] *$294,000,000* for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy production payment program, or $60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program: *Provided, however,* That if hostilities cease before June 30, 1946, no additional obligations provided for in this sentence may be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such programs after the date on which hostilities cease."

The committee will note that we have suggested an increase of $68,000,000 over the Senate committee bill, making a total of $568,000,000 which we believe is absolutely essential to obtain adequate dairy production. In arriving at this figure, we have calculated the cost on the basis of the 1945 goal of 120,582,000,000 pounds of milk. If we are not to receive this amount of money in the

form of increased prices, we believe that it is necessary to continue milk payments at the annual rates in effect since last May. We believe it impossible to encourage milk production by equalizing milk and butterfat payments by juggling downward the payments on whole milk. That method is equivalent to "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

We have calculated the cost of dairy production payments for the year ending June 30, 1946, as follows: Milk payments, 71,100,000,000 pounds at 58.5 cents per hundred $416,000,000; butterfat payments, 1,145,000,000 pounds at 13.28 cents per pound, $152,000,000; total $568,000,000.

In the calendar year 1944 a total of $385,000,000 was expended for dairy production payments. The difference between $568,000,000 and $385,000,000 is made up of several elements, as follows:

1. In 1944, many producers did not collect the payment for which they were eligible. The milk payment uncollected on about 5,660,000,000 pounds of milk was	$28,900,000
The butterfat payment uncollected on about 402,000,000 pounds of butterfat was	29,400,000
2. If 1945–46 production equals the 1945 production goal, sales of whole milk will be 1,600,000,000 pounds larger than in 1944, increasing the milk payment by	9,400,000
3. Payment rates during January through April 1944 were were below the rates in effect since May 1, 1944. The increase, on an annual average basis, was 6.8 cents per hundredweight for milk and 1.01 cents per pound for butterfat for a total cost of	58,800,000
4. Butterfat rates should be increased to remove discrimination. The proposed butterfat rate will average 4.93 cents per pound higher than the current rate for a total cost of	56,500,000
Total of additional costs in 1945–46 over amounts paid in 1944	183,000,000
Total amounts paid in 1944	385,000,000
Total costs in 1945–46	568,000,000

4. We have no objection to extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to June 30, 1947, as this Corporation is absolutely vital to the welfare of agriculture in war and depression periods. It seems to us quite likely that before the war is over the Corporation will again have to go to Congress for further extension of its credit which would give an opportunity for the Congress to reappraise its work and pass any amendatory legislation which might seem desirable at that time.

FEBRUARY 6, 1945.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 491. A bill for the relief of John H. Gradwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 44).

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 105. A bill to amend Public Law 603 (77th Cong., 2d sess., ch. 404), which is entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes"; with amendments (Rept. No. 45).

PROGRESS REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (REPT. NO. 47)

Mr. MURRAY, from the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, submitted a progress report relating to the record and outlook of the so-called Senate Small Business Committee, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE PRODUCTION, ETC., OF FUELS IN AREAS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 60, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 60) submitted by Mr. REED on January 29, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942 (authorizing an investigation concerning the production, transportation, and use of fuels in certain areas west of the Mississippi River), and continued by Senate Resolution 61, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 4, 1943, is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, to July 1, 1945.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 508. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 509. A bill for the relief of Henry E. Fullhart; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 510, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 511. A bill to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 512. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur R. Brooks; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 513. A bill for the relief of Carroll Jesseman; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 514 (by request). A bill for the relief of the Baldwin Bros. Paving Co.; and

S. 515 (by request). A bill for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 516. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 517. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. B. Pedron and Mr. and Mrs. Jess Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 518. A bill to provide for the issuance of permits for the use of live decoys in the taking of ducks; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 519. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Straka; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 520. A bill relating to the national service life insurance of Merrill H. Johnston; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 521. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 522. A bill for the relief of W. J. King; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 523. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Jefferson County, Ala.; and

S. 524. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 525. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States Naval Training Center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 526. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 527. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 528. A bill for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. CHANDLER introduced Senate bill 529, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 530 (by request). A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes; and

S. 531 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to provide for audits by the Comptroller General of expenditures by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration from funds contributed by the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution which provides for the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act. The committee has decided upon the time for the extension which is December 31, 1946. The committee has also decided that hearings upon the resolution will begin on February 27.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REDUCTION IN RESERVE RATIO AND PLEDGING OF GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Mr. WAGNER. I introduce a bill for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that the bill itself may be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with a statement explanatory of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and without objection the bill will be printed in the RECORD, together with the statement presented by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 510) to amend sections 11 (c) and 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WAGNER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by changing the first sentence of such paragraph to read as follows:

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation: *Provided, however*, That when the Federal Reserve agent holds gold certificates as collateral for Federal Reserve notes issued to the bank such gold certificates shall be counted as part of the reserve which such bank is required to maintain against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(b) The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by striking therefrom the words "40 percent" reserve hereinbefore required" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "25 percent reserve hereinbefore required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To suspend for a period not exceeding 30 days, and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days, any reserve requirements specified in this act: *Provided*, That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further*, That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 25 percent, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 percent per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 20 percent, and when said reserve falls below 20 percent, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ percent per annum upon each 2½ percent or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 20 percent. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

SEC. 2. The second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Any Federal Reserve bank may make application to the local Federal Reserve agent for such amount of the Federal Reserve notes hereinbefore provided for as it may require. Such application shall be accompanied with a tender to the local Federal Reserve agent of collateral in amount equal to the sum of the Federal Reserve notes thus applied for and issued pursuant to such application. The collateral security thus offered shall be notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or acceptances acquired under the provisions of section 13 of this act, or bills of exchange endorsed by a member bank of any Federal Reserve district and purchased under the provisions of section 14 of this act, or bankers' acceptances purchased under the provisions of said section 14, or gold certificates, or direct obligations of the United States. In no event shall such collateral security be less than the amount of Federal Reserve notes applied for. The Federal Reserve agent shall each day notify the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of all issues and withdrawals of Federal Reserve notes to and by the Federal Reserve bank to which he is accredited. The said Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may at any time call upon a Federal Reserve bank for additional security to protect the Federal Reserve notes issued to it."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WAGNER is, as follows:

REDUCTION IN RESERVE RATIO AND RENEWAL OF AUTHORITY TO PLEDGE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS AS COLLATERAL FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

The bill introduced herewith would accomplish the following purposes: (1) Extend indefinitely the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to pledge United States Government securities against Federal Reserve notes issued by the Federal Reserve agents (existing authority expires June 30, 1945); and (2) reduce the requirements of reserves to be held by Federal Reserve banks from their present level of 40 percent in gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes in circulation and 35 percent in gold certificates or lawful money against deposits, to a uniform minimum of 25 percent in gold certificates against combined note and deposit liabilities.

The need for reducing the high reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks was mentioned by the President in his Budget message transmitted to the Congress on January 3, 1945.

PLEDGING OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SECURITIES AGAINST FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

This power was first granted to the Federal Reserve Board in February 1932 at a time when our gold stock was low and the supply of paper eligible as collateral small. The power was granted for the purpose of enabling the Federal Reserve banks to engage in open market operations which were necessary at that time in order to help banks get out of debt and to establish conditions in the money market favorable to the recovery of business which was at the depth of depression. The power was renewed from time to time; unless action is taken it will expire on June 30, 1945.

In conditions prevailing today, with Federal Reserve notes outstanding in an amount of $21,700,000,000 and deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks in an amount of sixteen and four-tenths billion, the extension of the power to pledge United States Government is imperative. Without it, the Federal Reserve banks would be obliged to sell a large-enough volume of Government securities to make it necessary for banks to borrow as much as $10,000,000,000 from the Federal Reserve banks at this time and possibly as much as fifteen billions by the end of the year. The manner in which this would work is that the banks would sell the securities in the open market; payment for them would take out an equivalent amount of funds from the market and member banks would have to borrow this amount from the Federal Reserve banks in order to replenish their reserves. The promissory notes of member banks at the Reserve would be eligible under the law as collateral for Federal Reserve notes. By this process member-bank promissory notes secured by United States Government obligations would be substituted for such obligations themselves as collateral held by the Federal Reserve agents against outstanding Federal Reserve notes. No public interest would be served, but in the process the market for United States Government war obligations would be disrupted at a time when the Treasury must still raise vast sums to finance the war. It is clear that this must not occur and that, therefore, the power to pledge Government securities against Federal Reserve notes must be continued.

There is nothing to be gained in placing a time limit on the extension of this authority, since it is impossible to foresee at present when, if ever, conditions will be such as to make it consistent with the public interest to revert to the provision of law, enacted nearly 30 years ago, which limited collateral against Federal Reserve notes to gold certificates, commercial paper, and member-bank collateral notes.

REDUCTION OF RESERVE RATIO

Conditions arising out of the war have caused the reserve ratio of Federal Reserve banks to decline from 91 percent at the end of 1941; soon after our entry into the war, to 49 percent at the end of 1944. If developments continue at the rate of recent months, the ratio will fall almost to the legal minimum by the end of the present calendar year. If gold export or currency withdrawals, or both, should be greater than in 1944, the legal minimum will be reached sooner. The following table shows the factors in the situation, together with hypothetical projections through 1945 based on probable trends of currency, deposit, and gold movements.

[In billions of dollars]

Federal Reserve bank	Dec. 31, 1941	Dec. 31, 1944	Projections	
			June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1945
Reserves	20.8	18.7	18.2	17.7
Deposits	14.7	16.4	17.4	18.4
Federal Reserve notes outstanding	8.2	21.7	23.7	26.7
Liabilities requiring reserves	22.9	38.1	41.1	45.1
	Per cent	*Per cent*	*Per cent*	*Per cent*
Reserve ratio	90.8	49.0	44.3	39.2

It will be seen that the decline in the reserve ratio has been due to a reduction in Federal Reserve bank reserves and to increases in Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities. Reduction of reserves has reflected the fact that most of this country's exports have been on lend-lease, while our imports have been on a cash basis. Countries that have sold commodities to the United States have not been able to buy goods here, on account of war restrictions, and have either withdrawn or earmarked gold against the time when goods will once more be available for sale.

Growth of Federal Reserve note circulation has been a part of the general expansion of currency which has accompanied war activity in every country in the world. Expansion of both notes and deposits has

reflected growth of Government war expenditures, enlargement of national money income, and advancement of pay rolls and trade at higher prices. So long as the Federal Reserve banks continue to do their part, as they surely must, to assist the Treasury in Government financing and in maintaining stable conditions in the market for United States Government securities, these banks must not be restricted by an arbitrary reserve ratio.

There are several ways to meet the situation, all of which have been carefully considered. One way would be to issue Federal Reserve bank notes, which require no reserves, in place of Federal Reserve notes; another way would be suspension of reserve requirements by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, which is authorized by law, and a third way would be a reduction of reserve requirements by the Congress. Other devices, such as issuance of currency by the Treasury, or reduction of member bank reserve requirements, have been reviewed and found to be inadequate or inappropriate. Reduction of the ratio by law, which is proposed in the bill, is the most clear-cut method, as well as the most consistent with the responsibility of the Congress to regulate the country's monetary policy.

Issue of Federal Reserve bank notes in their present form was authorized by the Emergency Banking Act of March 1933, and the authority will expire when the President declares that the emergency is over. The need for the lower ratio may continue beyond that date. Furthermore, the difference between Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank notes give rise to misunderstanding, and it would be simpler and less confusing to the public if Federal Reserve currency were all of one kind. It would be best at a time like this to have a Federal Reserve ratio that indicated to the Congress and to the people the amount of gold certificates held by the Reserve banks against their total deposit and note liabilities of all kinds.

The authority in section 11 (c) of the Federal Reserve Act to suspend reserve requirements does not appear to be the best method of meeting the situation, because the power was not designed for a situation like the present which is of indefinite duration. Suspension must be for a period not to exceed 30 days, renewable at intervals of 15 days. It also requires a penalty in the form of a progressive interest rate, to be determined by the Board, and added to the the discount rate of the Federal Reserve banks. At a time like the present, when discount rate charges must fit into the general rate policy adopted for war financing, this would not be the best procedure.

Consequently the bill provides for a direct reduction of the minimum ratio. Such an action would be entirely consistent with the changes in conditions which have occurred since the ratio was first established by the Congress. The original purposes of the ratio were (1) to assure adequate resources for the Reserve banks to meet demands for gold or lawful money by depositors and note holders, (2) to limit the expansion of Federal Reserve bank credit, and (3) to assure the public that there was at least 40 percent in gold back of the Federal Reserve notes which were then being introduced for the first time.

The first purpose is no longer compelling since gold redemption is now not permitted for domestic use, and gold can be exported only under license. While the country's aggregate gold reserves are ample to meet any conceivable foreign demand, a reserve ratio high enough to meet possible demands for both domestic and foreign use is no longer appropriate under present conditions. The second purpose—limitation of Federal Reserve bank expansion—is not relevant at a time when expansion by the Reserve banks is essential to the needs of war finance. Thirdly, confidence in Federal Reserve notes is well established, and whether the amount of gold back of the notes is 40 percent or 25 percent makes no practical difference.

War conditions have caused all belligerents to reduce or abolish central bank reserve requirements.

A reduction to 25 percent is proposed because it would be sufficient for all foreseeable contingencies. It would enable the Reserve banks to meet such additional demands for currency by the public and for reserve balances by member banks as are likely to occur. The currency supply and the bank deposit structure could nearly double before the legal minimum would be reached.

The bill provides for elimination of the distinction made in the present law between reserves required against notes and against deposits both as to percentage and as to composition of the reserves. Since the two liabilities are interconvertible at the option of the owners, the same requirements should apply to both. The provision in the bill that legal reserves should consist only of gold certificates would also eliminate controversy as to what constitutes lawful money and whether the Federal Reserve banks could, if so minded, use their own notes (Federal Reserve notes or Federal Reserve bank notes) as reserves against their own deposits.

A clean-cut uniform requirement of gold certificate reserves of 25 percent against both notes and deposits appears to be the best solution of the problem.

In conformity with the proposed reduction of the ratio to 25 percent the bill decreases proportionately the levels of the ratio at which the imposition of the different penalty rates provided in the law when reserves are suspended would be prescribed.

INCOME-TAX RELIEF FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES SERVING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which I ask to have appropriately referred. In connection with the introduction of the bill, I desire to make a brief statement.

The purpose of this bill is to provide that persons who serve in the armed forces outside of the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska during the present war will be relieved from paying the Federal income tax on the service pay received by them for service outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska. The bill amends section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code. This provision in existing law now provides that in the case of compensation received by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces during the present war, or by a citizen or resident of the United States who is a member of the military or naval forces of the other United Nations, for active service in such forces during the present war, there shall be excluded from the gross income of such person for income-tax purposes so much of such compensation for any taxable year as does not exceed $1,500.

This bill will exclude from gross income for income-tax purposes all of such compensation for any month during which more than 15 days of such service is performed outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and it will exclude so much of such compensation for any other month as does not exceed $125. The purpose of the latter provision relating to the exclusion of not to exceed $125 for any other month is to preserve, in the case of service within the continental limits of the United States, the benefit of the provision in existing law which provides for the exclusion of so much of the compensation for any year as does not exceed $1 500.

Section 2 of the bill makes it retroactive, so that its benefits will apply with respect to any taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 1942.

Mr. President, I wish to have the Committee on Finance carefully study the bill. There may be other suggestions or amendments which can be incorporated into the bill, but its purpose is explicit in trying to relieve the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Forces, and others who, while overseas, serve the United States during the war, from payment of income taxes—taxes which, I believe, they will not be able to pay anyway, and sooner or later we shall be faced with the loss of the income taxes which the Treasury may count upon collecting.

The bill (S. 529) to provide that compensation for service in the armed forces outside of the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska during the present war shall be excluded from income for income-tax purposes, introduced by Mr. CHANDLER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1984. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO GENERAL MACARTHUR AND HIS MEN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a few days ago the House of Representatives very appropriately directed that the thanks of the House be sent to Gen. Douglas MacArthur for his marvelous, heroic, and gallant exploits in the Philippines.

Now that Manila is about to be completely occupied by American troops, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses its thanks and gratitude to Gen. Douglas MacArthur and his gallant men for their glorious victory in liberating the Philippines and retaking Manila, its historic capital.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate the substance of this resolution to General MacArthur in the Philippines.

ANALYSIS OF FACTORS PERTINENT TO THE VOLUME OF POST-WAR FOREIGN TRADE—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT

Mr. BREWSTER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 76), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the date for submission by the United States Tariff Commission of final reports called for by Senate Resolution 341 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to December 8, 1944 (relating to the analysis of factors pertinent to the volume of our post-war foreign trade), is hereby extended to April 28, 1945.

Mr. GEORGE. The consideration of the resolution will not result in any debate. It is merely to extend the time in which the Tariff Commission may file a report under Senate Resolution 371 of the last Congress. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 76 submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE—CEILING PRICES ON HOGS AND CATTLE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an editorial in the Daily Drovers Telegram, Kansas City, Mo., of February 5, dealing with the meat shortage, which may become a meat famine before next fall.

As far back as 2 years ago cattlemen and some of us in the Congress more or less familiar with the livestock industry pointed out that O. P. A. policies then being initiated threatened to reduce meat production rather than stimulate it. Our position was sustained by the War Food Administration itself, especially in regard to the ceilings on live animals, particularly on cattle.

The Drovers Telegram editorial points out that these O. P. A. policies are bearing fruit. From the Department of Agriculture comes information that by next summer the meat shortage will be acute. There also is in sight a shortage of fats. Farmers were producing plenty of hogs to provide pork and lard. The O. P. A. shut off production with price ceilings that made hog production unprofitable. Now it has done the same thing, with probably the same result, by its action in fixing ceiling prices on cattle. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COSTLY MISTAKE

The difficult road that lies ahead for this country is not made easier by bungling and experiments by the Washington boys in charge of price and crop control. Sometimes we wonder if they fully realize the danger involved in tinkering with food supplies at such a time as this, while the Nation is straining itself to the utmost to win the gigantic struggle of a global war.

People get jittery over lesser things than a food shortage, and when they come face to face with such a meat shortage so critical that they cannot find what their family needs it would not take much spark to start trouble in the market places of the big cities.

Farmers have much to be thankful for in that they do not have to depend on the local retail butcher shop for much, if any, of their meat. It is a long and perilous trip for the pork chop in these times from the farm feedlots to the city dining room. The armed services get first choice in legitimate trade channels, and rightly so. However, before them come the black-market operators, and their "take" has become tremendous even under O. P. A. surveillance. So great has the illegal trade in meat become that it is doubtful to some that such operators can be carried on without the knowledge of at least some O. P. A. investigators.

Government experts who have their hands on the controls of the Nation's meat production are just now beginning to recognize the dangerous shortage of two vital war products—pork and fats—a scarcity which was forecast by farm and trade leaders as long ago as almost 2 years. The turning point in pork and lard production on farms dates directly to the establishment of a ceiling on live hogs on October 4, 1943.

When this ceiling was announced in September of that year we made bold to predict then in this column that "Time will prove this ceiling a costly mistake." How costly it has proved even to the inexperienced youngsters in the O. P. A. should certainly realize by now, and how much more it will cost us all before this war ends only time will tell.

Production of pork and lard was pushed rapidly to the highest tonnage in the history of the Nation soon after we went to war. Behind this great drive to make plentiful these two vital war materials worked a patriotic farm population certain that food would help win the war and write the peace.

Then the O. P. A. stepped in with its ridiculous price ceilings for live hogs, a move that was entirely unnecessary in view of the abundance of proof that live hog prices were being held in check by ceilings on meat in wholesale and retail channels.

The psychological effect on the raiser of hogs was disastrous. Pig raising dipped as soon as the country was definitely assured a hog ceiling. Both the spring and fall crops in 1943 were records, the total for the year being 121,706,000 pigs, compared with 104,559,000 in 1942. The ceiling news came out after many sows had already farrowed fall pigs. However, from then on sow herds were reduced so that in the spring of 1944 the pig crop fell to 55,428,000, compared with 74,034,000 in 1943, while the 1944 fall crop was reduced to 31,325,000, compared with 47,672,000 in the fall of 1943. Breeding intentions for the spring of 1945 point to a further reduction. Farmers plan to keep 8,522,000 sows, according to a Federal survey, a reduction of 7 percent compared with 1944 and 30 percent decline from 1943. Sow herds are smaller than in 12 of the last 21 years for a spring season.

What has to happen in this country to convince the O. P. A. that it is a mistake to impose ceiling prices on live animals?

INSTRUCTIONS RELATIVE TO MILITARY PLANNING FOR THE POST-WAR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD paragraph III of War Department Circular No. 347, dated August 25, 1944, issued by order of the Secretary of War, and signed by G. C. Marshall, Chief of Staff. It gives instructions relative to the military policy to be followed in all military planning for the post-war Military Establishment.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

III. MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

1. PRELIMINARY ASSUMPTIONS

(a) It is assumed that for some time after the defeat of the Axis Powers the United States will maintain such temporary military forces, in cooperation with its allies, as may be necessary in order to lay the foundations for a peaceful world order. The plans for a permanent peace establishment, referred to in this circular, relate to a later period when the future world order can be envisaged.

(b) It is also assumed, for purposes of planning, that the Congress will enact (as the essential foundation of an effective national military organization) that every able-bodied young American shall be trained to defend his country, and that for a reasonable period after his training (unless he volunteers for service in the Regular Establishment of the armed forces) he shall be incorporated in a reserve, all or any necessary part of which shall be subject to active military duty in the event of an emergency requiring reenforcement of the Regular Army.

2. TYPES OF MILITARY ORGANIZATION

There are two types of military organization through which the manpower of a nation may be developed.

(a) (1) One of these is the standing Army type. In this type the men of the Nation are drawn into the Army to serve in the lower grades. The function of the common citizen is ordinarily to be a private soldier or, at most, a noncommissioned officer in war. Reserve officers are drawn from the better-educated classes but are generally employed in the lower grades and in subordinate capacities. Under this system leadership in war and the control of military preparations and policy in peacetime are concentrated largely and necessarily in a special class or caste of professional soldiers.

(2) This is the system of Germany and Japan. It produces highly efficient armies. But it is open to serious political objections. In a nation maintaining sych a system, inteligent opinion as to military policy, and the international political policy associated therewith, is concentrated in a special class. Under such a system the people themselves are competent to exert only a limited intelligent influence on the issues of war and peace. Under such a system only the brawn of a people is prepared for war, there being no adequate provision for developing the latent military leadership and genius of the people as a whole. It therefore has no place among the institutions of a modern democratic state based upon the conception of government by the people.

(b) (1) The second type of military institution through which the national manpower can be developed is based upon the conception of a professional peace establishment—no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements—to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from a citizen army reserve, effectively organized for this purpose in time of peace; with full opportunity for competent citizen soldiers to acquire practical experience through temporary active service and to rise by successive steps to any rank for which they can definitely qualify; and with specific facilities for such practical experience, qualification, and advancement definitely organized as essential and predominating characteristics of the peace establishment.

(2) An army of this type has, among others, the following advantages:

(a) First. While, as in all effective military systems, the efficiency of this system depends primarily upon expert professional control, its leadership is not exclusively concentrated in a professional soldier class. All citizen soldiers after their initial training are encouraged to develop their capacity for leadership to such an extent as may be consistent with their abilities, their tastes, and their civil obligations.

(b) Second. As a great majority of the leaders of the war army are included in the civil population in time of peace, an intelligent and widespread public opinion is provided as the basis for the determination of all public questions relating to military affairs.

(c) Third. As with a properly organized citizen army reserve, no officers or men need be maintained in the Regular Army to perform duties which can be performed effectively and in time by reserve officers and reservists, the dimensions and cost of the peace establishment, under such a system are necessarily reduced to a determinable minimum.

(d) And, finally, as all our great wars have been fought in the main by citizen armies, the proposal for an organized citizen army reserve in time of peace is merely a proposal for perfecting a traditional national institution to meet modern requirements which no longer permit extemporization after the outbreak of war. This is the type of army which President Washington proposed to the First Congress as one of the essential foundations of the new American Republic. This is the type of army which, in the absence of effective peacetime organization, had to extemporize to meet our needs in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

(3) Details of military organization change with changes in weapons, modes of transportation, and international relations. But the type of our military institutions was determined in the beginning by the form of our Government and has not changed since Washington's administration. It will therefore be made the basis for all plans for a post-war peace establishment.

THE NEED FOR A SPIRITUAL REVIVAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Need for a Spiritual Revival," delivered by Senator LANGER on February 9, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTOLERANCE—ADDRESS BY ERIC A. JOHNSTON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Intolerance, delivered by Eric A. Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, before the Writers' War Board, New York City, on January 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BEN DEAN, PRESIDENT OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Ben Dean, president of Kiwanis International, to the Kiwanis Club of New York City, November 15, 1945, and with introductory remarks by Senator FERGUSON, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. R. C. CRAWFORD AT MEETING OF NEBRASKA STATE RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Brig. Gen. R. C. Crawford, U. S. A., division engineer, Missouri River division, at Nebraska State Reclamation Association meeting, Lincoln, Nebr., January 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LT. COL. S. G. NEFF AT NEBRASKA STATE RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION MEETING

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Lt. Col. S. G. Neff, C. E. district engineer, Kansas City district, at Nebraska State Reclamation Association meeting. Lincoln, Nebr., January 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LT. COL. DELBERT B. FREEMAN AT NEBRASKA STATE RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION MEETING

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Lt. Col. Delbert B. Freeman at the first annual meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, Lincoln, Nebr., January 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORALITY OF PUBLIC SERVANTS—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Morality of Public Servants," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the Rotary Club of New York City, October 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS—EDITORIAL IN THE STARS AND STRIPES

[Br. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial dealing with the Board of Veterans' Appeals, published in the Stars and Stripes of February 1, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPPOSITION OF RAILROADS TO WATER TRANSPORTATION — LETTER FROM WENDELL P. DODGE

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Wendell Philips Dodge, editor, the Marine News of New York City, relating to the opposition of the railroads to water transportation, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF RAILROADS TO THE GERMAN WAR EFFORT—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "When Berlin Falls," by Frank C. Waldrop, published in the Washington Times-Herald for February 3, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL THROUGH THE WHOLESALER

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Surplus Property Disposal Through the Wholesaler," published in the Underwear and Hosiery Review of January 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAPE OF EUROPA—ARTICLE BY FRANCIS HENRY TAYLOR

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Rape of Europa," by Francis Henry Taylor, published in the Atlantic Monthly for January 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

GERMANY'S PLACE IN A POST-WAR WORLD—ARTICLE BY EUGENE A. COX

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Germany's Place in a Post-war World," by Eugene A. Cox, published in the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune of January 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR WHITE FROM BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, at an earlier session of the Senate—I do not have before me the exact date—the Vice President was good enough to designate me as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. I did not know that the designation was to be made. I find it impossible to accept the burden of that appointment, and I therefore submit my resignation and ask to be relieved from that service. I may say that I have talked with the Vice President, and at an early date I shall submit a recommendation for an appointment, for his consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it may be that I had something to do with the appointment of the Senator from Maine to that position. For many years it has been customary for the majority leader and the minority leader to serve as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. My predecessor, Senator Robinson, served on the Board, as did the Senator's predecessor, Senator McNary. It has been looked upon as a custom which was entirely appropriate. I have no desire to persuade the Senator against his will to serve; but if the Senator insists on resigning from the Board of Regents, it will break the continuity of that custom. I merely express the hope that he will reconsider his decision, unless he feels compelled to pursue the course he has indicated.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to express to the majority leader my deep appreciation of the comment he has made on my resignation. I am very grateful to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Maine will be excused from service on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded. Under the rule, the calendar is in order on Monday, unless the call of the calendar is dispensed with by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to make such a request, because I wish to have the calendar called and considered under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator that two Senators desire to speak. Of course, under the rule, when the calendar is called, they will be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Only a few minutes will be required to dispose of the calendar, and there will be plenty of time following the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to call the calendar.

CONVEYANCE OF LIGHTHOUSE PROPERTY IN MANITOWOC, WIS.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 210) to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938, which has been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the numerals "1938", to strike out "(ch. 472, 52 Stat. 756)" and insert "ch. 472 (52 Stat. 756)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 16, 1938, ch. 472 (52 Stat. 756), entitled "An

act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.", is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENSIGN FREDERICK MATTHEWS McCORD

The bill (S. 211) for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $187.90, to Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of a fire in officers' quarters, Ferry Inn Annex, at United States Naval Base No. 2, on December 14, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST IN FIRE AT ASTORIA, OREG.

The bill (S. 215) to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $780; as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY DESTROYED BY EXPLOSION AT YORKTOWN, VA.

The bill (S. 214) to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $2,000, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to pay claims, including those of naval and civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment, for privately owned property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST IN HURRICANE AT PARRIS ISLAND, S. C.

The bill (S. 212) to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,333.33, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, Lt. Col. Frank P. Snow, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any provision violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

PERPETUAL EASEMENT TO ORANGE & ROCKLAND ELECTRIC CO.

The bill (S. 290) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co., its successors, and/or assigns, for transmission-line purposes, a 150-foot perpetual easement over, across, in, and upon the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

PUNISHMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION OF STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 374) to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce," which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "navigation", to insert "of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2, subsection (a), of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act (41 Stat. 324; 18 U. S. C. 408) is amended by adding the following new language at the end thereof: "and the term 'aircraft' means any contrivance now known or hereafter invented, used, or designed for navigation of or for flight in the air."

SEC. 2. Sections 3, 4, and 5 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act are amended by adding, after the words "motor vehicle" wherever they appear therein, the words "or aircraft."

SEC. 3. The title of the act of October 29, 1919, is amended to read "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles or aircraft in interstate or foreign commerce."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERPETUAL EASEMENT TO DUKE POWER CO. IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 222) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs whether the right-of-way proposed in the pending bill is merely a substitute right-of-way for one which has heretofore existed?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That was so in the case covered by Senate bill 290, granting an easement at West Point.

Mr. WHITE. In that instance there was simply a substitute right-of-way.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. I believe this bill involves a similar situation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It involves practically the same situation. The bill provides for no expenditure by the Government. It is all for the advantage of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to grant to the Duke Power Co., its successors and/or assigns, for transmission-line purposes, a 180-foot perpetual easement over, across, in, and upon Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGE FOR CERTAIN SENATE RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES

The resolution (S. Res. 52) providing retirement privileges for certain Senate Restaurant employees was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the resolution must be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate,

inasmuch as it creates a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate. The Chair hopes that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], chairman of the committee, will find it expedient to take early action thereon.

That concludes the calendar.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish merely to advise the Senate that following the address of the Senator from Arizona and that of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] it will be my purpose to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the executive calendar.

TREATMENT OF GERMAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall consume only a few minutes of the time of the Senate.

Today I received a letter from a personal friend of mine who is an outstanding judge in the State of Arizona, Hon. Howard C. Speakman. I wish to read an excerpt from his letter for the information of the Senate.

There is one matter over which the Senate has no control which is creating considerable comment, and that is the German prisoner situation in this country. You probably read of the numerous escapes. In fact, they are not escapes, the Germans just walk off from the job. They roam the neighborhoods, steal from people in the vicinity, pilfer houses where there is no one at home. They seem to do it at will. I presume you read of their displaying the Nazi swastika in Chandler as a truckload of prisoners drove through the town. Upon being stopped by the constable he was prevented from searching them by the guards. People are sore and disgusted, especially men who have sons overseas; when armed guards stand with rifles and prevent red-blooded American people from searching the damned Nazis to take from them a swastika, I think the War Department deserves condemnation. The Army now insists that no civilian accost a prisoner for any matter whatsoever. The Army is lucky there hasn't been half of them killed. They say that this kind treatment is given the Nazis because Germany has lived up to the Geneva Conference. I guess they failed to see the pictures of dead American boys in the snow in Germany, after being killed immediately after capture.

Mr. President, I have also received from Mr. Arthur Morton a letter on this subject. Enclosed with it is a news article in regard to the flying of the swastika flag. The letter reads as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *February 8, 1945.*

The Honorable ERNEST W. McFARLAND,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I enclose cutting from the Arizona Republic that should be of interest. From what I hear it is time that P. O. W. at Papago Park Camp were made to realize that they are prisoners. Again when escaped prisoners are caught with bacon and cigarettes. That does not go down good. We do not object to going without bacon and cigarettes when the armed forces need it. But do not consider that American citizens should have to do without so that German or Japanese P. O. W. can have same.

The Secretary of War stated that the P. O. W. were not being pampered, but were being strictly treated according to the Geneva Convention rules.

Let someone investigate some of the camps who is not connected with the armed forces. Congress can do it.

I trust that you will receive this. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR MORTON.

The news article mentioned in the letter appeared in the Arizona Republic for Thursday, February 8, 1945. It reads as follows:

TRUCK FLIES SWASTIKA FLAG

CHANDLER, February 7.—A Nazi swastika flag flying from a truck carrying German prisoners of war through here at 9:35 a. m. today still was under investigation tonight, when an aviation cadet from Williams Field reported seeing the same flag again flying from the truck on the return trip about 5 o'clock this afternoon.

The truck, taking the prisoners from a camp near Mesa to cotton fields near Goodyear, was traveling near the southern limits of this community this morning when the German flag was seen.

Roy Wolf, city marshal, said he was one of the first to see the flag which had been concealed by the time he reached the truck. He said he started to search the prisoners but was stopped by an Army captain.

Capt. Walter Young, public relations officer at Papago Park German prisoner camp, said the Army officer was fulfilling his duty in advising the city marshal not to search the prisoner.

"A civilian certainly has the privilege to call such a situation to the attention of the Army, but it is the Army's duty to handle the matter," he said.

Mr. Wolf said he called the matter to the attention of an Army guard who conducted a halfway investigation but could not find the swastika emblem.

Citizens and law enforcement officers in this city were further incensed tonight when the cadet reported seeing the flag flying from the truck as it passed through here on the return trip to the prison camp.

I also received a resolution relative to this matter from the Phoenix Central Labor Council, of Phoenix, Ariz. The resolution, which is signed by Mr. W. J. Eden, president, reads as follows:

PHOENIX CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL,
Phoenix, Ariz.

Whereas on December 24, 1944, 25 German prisoners of war escaped from Papago Park Prisoner of War Camp, Phoenix, Ariz.; and

Whereas the newspapers reported that Col. William A. Holden, camp commander, said a 200-foot tunnel bored through rock was the means through which the prisoners escaped; and

Whereas delegates to the Phoenix Central Labor Council, who worked on the construction of the camp and are familiar with hard rock mining and the formation in the area of the camp, branded this statement as fantastic and highly improbable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Phoenix Central Labor Council respectfully and formally requests that an investigation by a proper congressional committee be made and a credible report of the affair be given to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, all of Phoenix, Ariz., with a request that they concur in the resolution and notify Arizona's congressional delegation of their action.

W. J. EDEN,
President.

Adopted January 16, 1945.

Mr. President, in connection with the same matter I am also in receipt of a telegram from the Chandler Rotary Club, Mr. Virgil Shute, president. The telegram reads as follows:

CHANDLER, ARIZ., *February 11, 1945.*

Senator E. W. McFARLAND,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly urge that investigation definitely be pursued to a conclusion as to the method by Army authorities charged with supervision of German prisoners in this locality and particularly at Papago Park flying a Nazi flag on our highways and being allowed on our streets unguarded is something we cannot reconcile with the Malmedy massacre. Very respectfully.

CHANDLER ROTARY CLUB,
VIRGIL SHUTE,
President.

Another telegram in connection with the same matter is from Mr. A. S. Brayman and Commander R. C. Muse, post adjutant of Matthew Juan Post, No. 35, of the American Legion, at Chandler, Ariz. Their telegram reads as follows:

CHANDLER, ARIZ., *February 7, 1945.*

Senator E. W. McFARLAND,
Washington, D. C.:

A private truck loaded with German prisoners of war drove through Chandler today flying a German flag held by one of the prisoners. The truck was stopped by our local police officers and a deputy sheriff. Not knowing the proper procedure they called an Army captain from the prison camp. Instead of being helpful in this particular instance as would seem to become an officer of the United States Army he was insulting to the civilian officers for having stopped the truck, advising them that he could "pick them up if he so desired."

Only recently a truck load of German prisoners was parked on the main street of Chandler while the guard went into the barber shop for service and the prisoners were allowed to run the street unattended.

We have already taken affidavits from eight reputable citizens corroborating these statements and we respectfully urge you to take immediate steps toward the end that a congressional investigation will be held to determine if the citizens of this community and also of other communities must submit to such incredible incidents.

A. S. BRAYMAN,
Commander.
R. C. MUSE,
Post Adjutant, Matthew Juan Post, No. 35, The American Legion, Chandler, Ariz.

Mr. President, I do not like to criticize the Army for the manner in which it conducts the prisoner-of-war camps. I am reluctant to criticize, because I believe the Army in general is doing a good job. On the other hand, I believe that the people of my State have a right to be indignant when prisoners of war being transported in an Army truck are allowed to carry the swastika on the truck. We know what would happen to an American in a foreign country if he were to raise the United States flag while he was a prisoner of war. He would be struck down the minute he raised the flag.

Mr. President, I have called these matters to the attention of the Mead committee. However, I now feel that probably the proper committee to which they should be referred is the Committee on Military Affairs. I am now requesting that the Committee on Military Affairs

make a careful investigation of these incidents.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let me ask the Senator from Arizona whether the facts he has mentioned have been presented to the proper authorities in the War Department.

Mr. McFARLAND. They have been; but the people of Arizona are not satisfied with an investigation on the part of the War Department. They know when they see a swastika flag flying from a truck. I do not care if it is denied by Army officials.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in reply to the remarks of the Senator from Arizona, who has requested that the Committee on Military Affairs undertake an investigation of inquiry concerning these incidents, I should like to say that if the incidents are as stated, not only should an inquiry be made, but a reform should be instituted instantly in regard to the conduct of the prisoners; and I, for one, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, will do the very best I can to see that such a thing shall never again occur within the confines of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Utah. I am sure that the Military Affairs Committee will give the matter careful consideration. I certainly appreciate the attitude of its chairman.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be glad to do what I can.

EXTENSION OF SUBSIDY PAYMENTS FOR STRATEGIC METALS, ETC.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on February 8, 1945, I introduced Senate bill 502 to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic metals, and minerals and petroleum and petroleum products.

At the present time most domestic nonferrous-mining operations are faced with such excessive costs of operation that ceiling prices no longer yield sufficient revenue to permit their continued operation. With the withdrawal of producer-subsidy support our strategic and critical mineral and metal industry would be faced with immediate collapse. The blow to the war effort would be incalculable.

Under the last paragraph of section 2 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Act of 1944, no subsidies may be paid after June 30, 1945, without a specific appropriation from the Congress. In general, the thought behind this amendment was a worthy one, and I, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, certainly have no objection to Congress being apprised of the amounts necessary to effectuate the producer-subsidy program and being given full information as to how the money is to be spent.

The bill to which I have referred was introduced by me in behalf of myself and several of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 502) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any corporation created by it pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, with respect to strategic and critical minerals and metals, or petroleum and petroleum products, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. With respect to such operations the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, such corporations may pay subsidies and incur losses not in excess of $450,000,000 in the aggregate.

CONSTRUCTION WORK AT PEARL HARBOR

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, I report back favorably, without amendment the bill (H. R. 1808) to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H., and I submit a report (No. 46) thereon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill just reported by me. It has been approved by the Navy Department, and proper restrictions have been made in the bill providing that no construction may be performed without approval of the Navy Department. Plans for construction would have to be submitted to the Navy Department, and the Navy Department would have control over the pipe lines when constructed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1808) to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1808) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AND SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and section 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat, which were, on page 2, line 2, to strike out "or wheat" and insert "wheat, or peanut"; on page 2, lines 3 and 4, to strike out "or wheat," and insert "wheat, or peanuts,"; on page 2, line 4, to strike out "was" and insert "were"; on page 2, line 4, to strike out "planted," and insert "planted and grown,"; on page 2, line 5, after "that", to insert "with respect to cotton or wheat,"; on page 2, line 6, after "or" where it appears the first time, to insert "with respect to cotton, wheat, or peanuts."; on page 2, line 8, to strike out "or wheat" and insert "wheat, or peanut"; on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

The Secretary may also provide with respect to any such farm that the past acreage of peanuts shall be adjusted upward to the extent that the acreage used for growing peanuts on such farm in such year is below the normal history of the farm.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton, wheat, and peanuts."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to be heard before the motion is acted on. I wish to ask the Senator some questions. Does this bill deal with the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; it deals with allotments for wheat, cotton, and peanuts. Under the law, where farmers do not produce the acreage allotted for 3 years, they lose the allotments.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It deals only with allotments?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is all.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, food is not only essential to the men in the fighting fronts, but is equally essential to the civilian population engaged in production, as well as people generally, whether in time of peace or war. The present demand for food exceeds that in any other period in our history. Notwithstanding the enormous production, which has broken all records in recent years, we are now short of certain items of food.

The farm population now is the lowest in 50 years. It has declined 4,748,000 in the past 4 years, beginning in 1941. Perhaps one-third of those leaving the farms have been inducted into the armed forces. The other two-thirds represent persons leaving the farms for work in war industries at much higher wages than any possible earnings in farm operation.

Farm population during each of the past 4 years was as follows:

	Farm population	Decrease in farm population
1941	29,988,000	281,000
1942	29,048,000	940,000
1943	26,659,000	2,389,000
1944	25,521,000	1,138,000
Decrease since 1940		4,748,000

The reason, and the only reason, that a diminishing farm population has been able to meet, measurably, the demand for food is that for 5 consecutive years weather conditions have been materially

above the average in favoring large farm production. The weather may affect farm production as much as 10 percent between average years and the average production of the past 5 years. Weather conditions may affect farm production as much as 20 percent as between good years and years of extreme drought or extreme wet weather. Under the law of averages, the country is due for poorer than normal weather conditions in any of the years immediately following. If, from a weather standpoint in 1945, we should have only an average production year the present stringency in food, confined to a few commodities, will be extended to affect many commodities. If we should encounter a year of severely bad weather, either too wet or too dry, the country might, and probably would, face a food shortage such as it has never known. We may have difficulty in feeding our own people, much less supplying the needs of lend-lease and the requirements of peoples in liberated countries.

The Constitution devolves exclusively upon the Congress the power to "raise and support armies." The Congress passed the Selective Service Act. It also enacted the Tydings amendment, which is just as definitely a part of the substantive law as the remainder of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. President, I shall read the Tydings amendment. I hope the distinguished Senator from Maryland will listen. He presented the matter so ably last week that it is hardly necessary for me to refer to it. I do so only to supplement what he said, and to reinforce what I shall say from here on.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was very glad the other day to have the able support of the distinguished Senator from Kansas in attempting to enforce and uphold the action of Congress. Since then, and particularly this morning, I have received hundreds of letters from organizations and individual farmers from all over America stating that the so-called Tydings amendment is being disregarded in clear-cut cases. I have in my pocket many letters from the State of Ohio which I am turning over to the Senators from Ohio. They show that the Tydings amendment is being completely disregarded, even in cases in which men clearly come within the purview of the amendment.

Let me add that in my own State of Maryland, so far as I know, abuses of the Tydings amendment are almost nonexistent, because in Maryland we have what is called a county war board in each county. If the county war board certifies that a man is regularly employed in an essential agricultural endeavor, and there is no replacement for him, the local draft board handles the matter, as it should. It is a shame that the law is not being uniformly followed all over the country.

Mr. President, there is an amendment on the desk which I have drafted with the help of the able Senator from Kansas, and which I hope to offer to the bill which is now being framed when it comes before the Senate. If the amendment is adopted I believe that no loophole will then exist by which the law can deliberately be violated.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Maryland is fortunate in living in a State where the selective-service authorities observe the law.

I happen to come from a State that is not so fortunate in that respect, and I expect in the next 10 minutes to cite some specific instances such as those to which the Senator from Maryland has referred, showing a complete disregard for the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield further to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to presume to tell other Senators how to deal with this matter, but, in the best of spirit and in order to be helpful, I suggest that Senators, who have received complaints which seem to be bona fide immediately telegraph their State draft boards and if possible the county draft board affected by the instant case, and the agricultural organizations as well, telling them that there is no authority to draft a man who is regularly employed in an essential agricultural endeavor and for whom there is no replacement available; that that is the law of the Congress, and anybody in that category who is taken from the farm is taken from it in violation of the supreme law of the land.

Mr. REED. I agree entirely with the statement of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Let me say that I found it necessary in my State to telegraph the United States district attorney to see that the State draft board does not put pressure upon the local draft boards in order to compel them to violate the law. At least in some respects that has helped; but I have some letters this morning which I will read later, and not now trespass further upon the Senator's time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield further?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is just as illegal to violate the act of Congress by enforcing it beyond its limitation as it is to excuse a man who clearly should not be excused. The degree, however, may be different, but the violation is just as great when the act of Congress is exceeded as when it is evaded.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that he and I have had numerous conferences with those in charge of this matter. We have had the language used in the directive read to us time and again, and each time we have been assured that there was not any intent to violate the Tydings amendment, but nevertheless boys are being taken from the farms. No Senator on this floor, I am sure, has any objection to making a resurvey of the men in that class. There may be instances where they should not be longer deferred, and no one has any objection to that, but we certainly want the Tydings amendment carried out in spirit as well as in letter.

Mr. REED. I agree entirely with the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me to enable me to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Maryland?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland if it is not true that the recent directive issued by General Hershey, of the Selective Service, rather authorizes the local draft boards to make a determination as to whether or not the particular type of agriculture in which the registrant is engaged is essential to the war effort? If that be true, is it not that which has caused the confusion throughout the various counties and States of the Union? I mean that there is now devolved upon the local draft boards of the counties of Nebraska the determination as to whether the particular line of agriculture in which a registrant is engaged is essential to the war effort or whether it is not, and if the local board determines it is, then, of course, the registrant is deferred. If the local board determines it is not, then automatically he goes into I–A and is called up for physical examination. Am I correct in that?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot answer the Senator "Yes" or "No" without making a few remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to make a further observation, if the Senator from Kansas will permit me, because I think that is the crux of this matter. We have the directives, but the draft boards are still taking farm boys under the theory that the act does not defer them if they are not engaged in essential agriculture that is now needed in the war effort.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator that after the so-called Tydings amendment was adopted some six or eight Senators, mainly from States which are overwhelmingly agricultural, met on several days with General Hershey, and on some occasions, with Governor McNutt, under whom General Hershey operates in a way, and as a result of those conferences General Hershey suggested that the draft boards ought to have a yardstick so that a man who merely stayed on a farm and really did not do much work would not be excused, but would only be excused if he performed a certain number of what are called units. Thus if a man milked so many cows a day and cared for them, or planted so many acres of crops, or did any one of a number of things or parts of them, altogether making a unit with which to bring him up to the essential standard, then he would be excused. That was adopted. Subsequent to that

there was another meeting, some months afterward, when it was found that in some instances the units were fixed a little too high and in other cases a little too low, so, in the light of experience, a new unit system was adopted which required a man to perform a minimum number of units in order to be entitled to deferment. That did not mean he had to do only that many, but if he did not do that many he could not be deferred. That system was promulgated by a directive which was sent to the different draft boards under whom the Tydings amendment was administered.

The trouble with the situation today is that, while the unit system has not been changed the Selective Service head has not issued any instructions as to what is essential and what is not essential. So we have such a situation that a man in the State of Nebraska may be deferred while another man engaged in similar work in the State of Kansas may not be deferred, and in the State of Kansas a man may be deferred while another man in the State of Nebraska doing the identical work may be drafted. That is the result of what seems to be the studied confusion that has been generated and infused into this whole movement.

Therefore, I again suggest to Senators having complaints from their States that they telegraph their State draft board as to the facts, and also the local draft board, where possible, and that the county agricultural organizations be asked to investigate these cases, for men who are clearly within the limits of the Tydings amendment are not subject to be drafted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me say for the information of the Senator from Maryland and also the Senator from Nebraska that I have been telegraphing to the Governor of my State. The reason I have communicated with the Governor is because of the language of section 603.11 of the selective-service regulations, which reads:

> The governor of each State shall have charge of the administration of the selective-service law in his State.

To me that does not mean that the Governor can reverse the Selective Service Act or set aside an order, but it means that the Governor at least is clothed with some responsibility and some authority, and it is the duty of the Governors of the States where the Tydings amendment is not being observed, I think, to take up the matter with the Selective Service Administration. I want to refer to General Hershey pretty soon, because I have talked to him in company with a committee from the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator's idea of taking it up with the Governor is a good one, but I would also take it up with the other agencies I have suggested, because it is the kind of problem that cannot be taken up with enough people who have power to correct it, and to take it up with one only, in my opinion, will not get results, for the reason that these boards do not operate all over the State, and quite often the Governor does not know that in such and such a county John Brown has been illegally drafted.

Mr. REED. But if I may remind the Senator from Maryland, the State director of Selective Service is, I think in most cases, appointed on the recommendation of the governor, so that the governor, after all, is the main channel through which we may speak to a selective service board headed by a nominee of the governor.

Mr. President, I am about to read the Tydings amendment, but before doing so, let me say that the Congress passed the Selective Service Act, and also adopted the Tydings amendment, which is just as definitely a part of the substantive law as the Selective Service Act in and of itself. The Tydings amendment reads:

> Every registrant found by a selective service local board * * * to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

There is no power anywhere in the Executive arm of the Government to repeal an act of Congress. Neither the President, Justice Byrnes, General Hershey, nor any other officer can lawfully modify, suspend, or repeal an act of Congress. They are attempting to do so in this instance.

The Selective Service Administration has grossly mishandled the farm labor situation. It apparently does not class food among the essential commodities. It has violated deliberately the law enacted by Congress.

The Selective Service Administrator, under pressure from Justice Byrnes and President Roosevelt, put out a directive on January 3, 1945, which was a virtual instruction to the local Selective Service boards to disregard the Tydings amendment. Since that time committees of both Houses of Congress have discussed the matter with General Hershey. I was present when a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had a discussion with General Hershey, about a week ago Saturday, as I recall.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to interrupt the excellent argument the Senator from Kansas is making, but I told him a moment ago that I had here about 30 complaints which had come in from Ohio alone. I wonder if the Senator would defer his argument long enough to enable me to read just one case in which deferment has been denied, so that Senators who may not be as familiar with this situation as others can see the kind of thing that is happening.

Mr. REED. I am very happy to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. This reads:

> Herman Henry, Rural Route No. 2, Sunbury, Ohio. Physical examination Saturday, January 27, 1945.

In 1944 this man operated a 186-acre dairy farm on a 50–50 basis. He produced about 500 pounds of milk per day, 90,587 pounds during 1944. It was grade A milk, 500 pounds a day, 90,587 pounds in 1944 of grade A milk.

He raised 1,000 bushels of corn over and above the amount required to fill two large silos. He raised 900 bushels of oats, 40 tons of hay, fattened 24 hogs.

> Now feeding 25 shoats averaging 75 pounds per head.
>
> Will have 25 cows in full production.
>
> Mr. Henry's half interest in the livestock and a full line of modern machinery and equipment which will have to be sold at public auction if he is called to the Army. He raised the above-mentioned crops with the assistance of only his wife.

Let me repeat what he was producing:

Five hundred pounds of milk a day, 90,000 pounds for the year; 1,000 bushels of corn; 900 bushels of oats; 40 tons of hay; fattened 24 hogs; has 25 shoats; and is taking care of 25 cows a day, milking them daily.

> The farm is owned jointly by William W. Blayney, Delaware, Ohio, and his 83-year-old mother. Mr. Blayney is unable to operate the farm due to a physical handicap caused by infantile paralysis.
>
> Mr. Henry intends to increase both acreage and number of cows if not called to the Army.

It is obvious that in this case the man in question is engaged, beyond peradventure of a doubt, in an essential agricultural endeavor. He is away above the requirements of the unit system, and he has only his wife to help him. If there is no replacement for him in the community, that entire farm will lie idle, and all the food he has been producing will have to be lost. He is typical of the men who are being taken.

Let me say, in furtherance of my contention, that we read in the newspapers that by the middle of summer beef will practically disappear from the market. We have now from the Philippines an appeal for food and medical supplies, to consider which the Committee on Philippine Rehabilitation will meet in a few days. There will be devastation in Europe after the fall of Germany, which is imminent, and which I hope will occur sometime in the not too distant future. In many cases the people in European countries have not had time to get ready for spring planting so that they may have a harvest, and unless we are wise enough to look ahead into the future, this situation may cause a great deal of unrest and many difficult problems throughout the whole world, which a little bit of food might conceivably alleviate, and in some cases eliminate. So the question is not one of trying to do more, in its broader aspect, than to win the war and to win the peace.

Mr. President, I ask that the complaints I have received, one of which I have read, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, with the consent of the Senator from Kansas, so that those who read the RECORD may understand what is involved.

Mr. REED. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL OHIO COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS, INC.,
January 23, 1945.

Mr. JOHN A. HAAS,
Attorney, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAAS: At our advisory council meeting held a few days ago we were explaining the efforts that you were putting forth in Washington to keep the supply of milk available for Government as well as civilian demands. The group was very much interested and express their appreciation to Mr. Holman and yourself. It was suggested that those officials with whom you are discussing the manpower problems as it affects the milk situation and dairy farmers might be in a better position to realize the seriousness of the situation on dairy farms if they had before them for their consideration individual cases.

We are therefore enclosing herewith a few of the cases of members of our association which we feel might serve this purpose, and if you think they have any merit please feel free to use them as you think best.

We can certify that the statements contained in these letters are facts regarding conditions on these farms, and you can see how very seriously the amount of milk that will be shipped from these farms will be affected unless the order regarding the help on these farms is modified.

These are only a few of the cases that came to our attention and we are certain that thousands of like cases could be presented if they are needed. We want you to know that we appreciate the effort and interest you are making in the welfare of dairymen throughout the country.

We are looking forward to a battle royal as we fight for a Federal order in the Columbus market. We wish that Mr. Holman or yourself, or both, could be present to witness this struggle.

Thanking you for your continued cooperation, we remain,

Very sincerely yours,
J. R. BRIDENSTINE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

HERMAN HENRY, RURAL ROUTE 2, SUNBURY, OHIO

Physical examination Saturday, January 27, 1945.

1944: Operates 186-acre dairy farm on 50--50 basis; produces about 500 pounds milk per day; 90,587 pounds during 1944 (grade A milk); 1,000 bushels corn over and above the amount required to fill two large silos; 900 bushels oats; 40 tons hay; fattened 24 hogs; now feeding 25 shoats that average 75 pounds per head; will have 25 cows in full production.

Mr. Henry owns half interest in the livestock and full line of modern machinery and equipment which will have to be sold at public auction if he is called to the Army. He raised the above-mentioned crops with the assistance of only his wife.

The farm is owned jointly by William W. Blayney, Delaware, Ohio, and his 83-year-old mother. Mr. Blayney is unable to operate the farm due to a physical handicap caused by infantile paralysis.

Mr. Henry intends to increase both acreage and number of cows if not called to the Army.

CARL G. ROGERS, RURAL ROUTE 2, WESTERVILLE, OHIO

Age 23; was in II–C but has not been reclassified; has had physical.

Farming 190 acres; milking 18 cows; 4 heifers to be fresh in next 30 days; 14 head young cattle; feed off about 65 head of hogs each year; keep 5 brood sows; 40 acres corn; 15 acres soybeans; 30 acres wheat; 30 acres hay.

Intend to increase in 1945 if left on farm.

Father is almost blind, one eye removed. He will have to quit if son is taken.

WALTER WILSON, WEST JEFFERSON, OHIO

Age 25; married, 1 child; class I–A.

1944: 200-acre farm; 15 cows, 200 pounds per day, 15 other cattle; sows 14; hogs 70, 100 sold; sheep 25; corn, 60 acres; wheat and oats, 35 acres; soybeans, 10 acres; alfalfa, 28 acres.

1945: Cows, 16; corn, 70 acres; wheat, 16 acres; oats, 23 acres; soybeans, 12 acres; alfalfa, 20 acres.

If he goes to the Army everything will have to be sold.

HAROLD B. GULICK, ORIENT, OHIO

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing you in regard to my son, Harold B. Gulick, who has been called for his physical examination to be inducted in the Army. I am a milk producer and without him would be unable to continue. We have 240 acres, milk 28 cows besides a number of yearling heifers. We also make enough alfalfa hay for dairy herd. Do truck farming and general farming and custom work with corn picker and combine. We will not be able to get anyone to take his place, as the farm help is all gone.

Owing to the Tydings amendment requiring the deferment of essential agricultural workers, we feel he should be deferred.

The chairman of the local board of Pickaway County is D. D. Dowden, Selective Service Board, Courthouse, Circleville, Ohio.

Respectfully yours,
GUY B. GULICK.

DORANCE RAY GROVE, GALENA, OHIO

Age 20, class IV–F.

Farm: 210 acres; intend to rent 60 acres more if son is not inducted.

1944: 62 acres corn, 15 acres beans, 20 acres wheat, 21 acres hay.

Milking 22 cows, 6 to 12 heifers; fattened 80 head hogs.

LEWIS BURNS, MILFORD CENTER, OHIO

Age 29, married and 1 child 5 years old.

Farm 223 acres; 7 years farm for self.

1944: 180,000 pounds of milk in Columbus market; cows, 20; hogs, 14 sows—sold 200 head; sheep, 50—lambs 60 head; corn, 64 acres; wheat, 34 acres, oats, 17 acres; soybeans, 30 acres; alfalfa, 15 acres.

1945: Same as in 1944. Nobody to take over this farm.

CARROLL DEAN, BLACKLICK, OHIO

Age 22, married June 1943; no children; class II–C until February 1, 1945.

To Whom It May Concern:

Writing in regard to Carroll Dean, my only help. Why do I need him? Because he was born and raised on this farm and he knows every phase of this particular farm. He is my partner, he can supervise as well as work. He is interested in making a go of it.

We have a dairy herd of 40 cattle, 23 cows, year round work; raise from 50 to 60 hogs for market, keeping 5 brood sows. Raised 400 chicks and keep flock for laying.

Last year we raised 70 acres corn; 65 acres soybeans; 16 acres oats; 32 acres wheat; 16 acres alfalfa; 53 acres clover hay. We combined 135 acres wheat; 146 acres soybeans; filled 2 silos and shredded 1,500 shocks corn (custom work).

We expect to do as well, and better if possible this year if we can keep on. If boy goes the dairy will be the first to go.

One cannot do this work alone—it meant long days for both—and inexperienced help has proved almost total loss. Our farms in this community are very much in need of young men. Have had a dairy on this farm since 1914.

Yours truly.

CLARENCE E. DEAN,
Blacklick, Ohio.

ADAM CARFAGNA, R. F. D. 1, JOHNSTOWN, OHIO

Age 18; class I–A.

Farm owned by father, 165 acres; 13 years experience on the farm. I do operate the farm by myself. My father, 47 years old, is unable to do heavy manual labor for he has a doctor's certificate to keep away from farm work. Have 15 milk cows, 18 T. a year, will have more in the future; 4 brood sows; 25 small pigs; 1 sow yet to farrow. I have 3 beef cattle for I am just starting it. Crop acreage is as follows: Corn, 40 acres; soybeans, 60 acres; wheat, 24 acres; and also about 3 acres of garden vegetables.

ADAM CARFAGNA,
R. F. D. 1, Plain Township,
Johnstown, Franklin County, Ohio.

MERRILL N. GEYER

Age 21; class II–A; reclassed about 30 days ago; class I–A not called.

Helper on dairy farm of 306 acres and 40 cows. Have 2 sons on farm and 2 in Army. Operated this farm for 17 years. For the months of November and December shipped 56,000 pounds of milk to the Columbus market.

1944: 120 tons of milk; hogs, 150 sold; sheep, 50 sold; corn, 85 acres; alfalfa, 35 acres; oats, 22 acres; wheat, 30 acres; soybeans, 35 acres; barley, 12 acres.

Dad 61 and not well, cannot handle this farm in 1945 if Merrill is drafted. Boy left on farm 27 years old.

1945: Increase cows from 40 to 50 head; increase sheep from 50 to 60 head; alfalfa, 35 acres; soybeans, 40 acres; wheat, 50 acres; corn, 75 acres; barley, 12 acres; oats, 30 acres.

CARY C. MARTIN

To Whom It May Concern:

According to your views expressed in the past I know that you are against the induction of essential farm workers, and I wish to call a case to your attention in the hope that you may be in position to offer some assistance.

Cary C. Martin, a dairy farmer operating at Croton, Ohio, Licking County, has been a member of the milk association for years and due to a back injury, is dependent upon the help of a son, Jack E. Martin, age 23—class I–A—to operate the farm. Other help is not available and if Jack is inducted it will be necessary for this farmer to sell his herd and go out of business.

An appeal was made to the local board No. 3 at Granville, Ohio. He was deferred for 6 months. Then this was canceled and he was placed in I–A again within a month. Mr. Martin then appealed to the State board and it was turned down.

Any assistance you can offer in this matter will be appreciated because if they continue to induct the young farmers in this district it will seriously curtail dairy and food production.

Farm 115 acres: 17 dairy cows, average 5,000 pounds of milk per month; 5 heifers; 4 steers; 1 bull; 5 brood sows and pigs; 1 team of horses; 28 acres of wheat; 14 acres of soybeans; 24 acres of corn; and 22 acres of hay.

DON RIEBEL, WEST JEFFERSON, OHIO

Age 26; class II–C; called for physical examination at once; married, son 4 years old.

Owns farm 111 acres; farms 75 acres outside.

1944: Corn, 44 acres; wheat, 20 acres; soybeans, 93 acres; clover, 20 acres; hogs, 10 sows; 225 hogs sold.

Milk: Sold cream until 6 months ago; sold milk last 6 months, 20,000 pounds.

Cows, 9; heifers, 2; calves, —.

1945: Increase in milk. If he goes milk production will stop because farm will not be farmed.

HERBERT C. GUGEL, UNION COUNTY

Age 22; class I–A; called January 27, 1945.

1944: 400-acre farm; cows, 20, 180,000 pounds milk; heifers, 14; hogs, 120; wheat, 70 acres; soybeans, 50 acres; oats, 15 acres; corn, 60 acres.

1945: About the same as 1944.

LEWIS NICOL, R. F. D. 2, MARYSVILLE, OHIO

To Whom It May Concern:

I am farming 140 acres of land; have 10 cows and 12 heifers; had 48 acres of corn in 1944, 20 acres of wheat, 12 acres of oats; raise about 120 hogs per year. I have three sons in service overseas. My other son goes for examination January 27. I will have to sell my cows and cut down on my other farming in 1945 if my fourth son goes into service.

LEWIS NICOL.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Maryland will follow me for about 2 minutes, because I intend to read into the RECORD a report of a county war board estimating the effect of the present policy upon production. It is the only county estimate and report that has been made, so far as I know. I shall reach it in about a minute and a half.

Now I wish to return to the consideration of General Hershey. I have been with committees which conferred with General Hershey. He first blows hot and then blows cold. He is about as easy to keep located as a bar of wet soap in a bathtub. He finally comes down to the untenable position that the local draft boards should go beyond the Tydings amendment and attempt to determine, not the need for men on the farms but the need of men for induction into the armed services. General Hershey made that plain and gave that interpretation to a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at a time when I was present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I call to the attention of the Senator from Kansas, and of the country, the fact that the Tydings amendment, at the time it was adopted, had the approval of the Army, the Navy, and the Selective Service System, and if there is anything wrong with it they should tell us and let us rewrite it. They should not attempt to repeal it by flat, without authority.

Mr. REED. Under the Tydings amendment the sole and exclusive function of the local draft boards is to determine whether or not men are essential to agricultural production and, if they are, whether replacement is available. If they are essential to farm production they cannot be lawfully taken from the farm unless replacement can be found. Neither the President nor Justice Byrnes nor General Hershey followed that very plain intention and admonition of the law.

In the last month I have been deluged with complaints from Kansas of plain disregard of the Tydings amendment. Members of Congress from other farm States have had a similar experience. Perhaps the clearest statement of the effect of disregard of the Tydings amendment was made by the Ness County, Kansas, U. S. D. A.—that is, United States Department of Agriculture—War Board. Ness County is among the average good wheat and livestock producing counties of western Kansas. The U. S. D. A. War Board, in a meeting on February 3, analyzed the effect of inducting agricultural workers without regard to the Tydings amendment. This is the analysis of the situation which that county is immediately facing:

The farm plans of 32 agricultural registrants who have left or will leave sometime soon for preinduction physical examination were summarized by the county war board. There would be 26,500 acres of land, 335 milk cows, 2,450 other cattle, 330 hogs (many of which are brood sows), 6,700 laying hens affected by the induction of these 32 registrants. On 12 of the farms the registrant is the only laborer who is able to do regular heavy farm work. On several other farms the father can do only a limited amount of work. The average age of the 27 fathers is about 57 years. Twenty-three are 50 years or older. Nine are 60 years or over. The first results of permanent labor shortage on farms is to reduce the production of livestock and livestock products. This results in a shift of cropland from feed crops to wheat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there may be inserted the complete report of the minutes of the meeting of the Ness County U. S. D. A. War Board. It is easily the most comprehensive report I have seen from any source and comes from the official war board of a county which is protesting against these conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The minutes referred to are as follows:

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE NESS COUNTY U. S. D. A. WAR BOARD

Date: Saturday, February 3, 1945.

Place: Courthouse, A. A. A. office, Ness City, Kans.

Members present: Keith Dannefer, S. C. S.; E. E. Pember, F. C. A.; O. J. Weir, key banker; George Anspaugh, A. A. A.; W. E. Stone, V. A.; John W. Livingston, extension.

Purpose of meeting was explained by George Anspaugh: To discuss present situation in regard to the latest calls for 38 men and its effect on agriculture.

The farm plans of 32 agricultural registrants who have left or will leave some time soon for preinduction physical examinations were summarized by the county war board. There would be 26,500 acres of land, 335 milk cows, 2,450 other cattle, 330 hogs (many of which are brood sows), 6,700 laying hens affected by the induction of these 32 registrants. On 12 of the farms the registrant is the only laborer who is able to do regular heavy farm work. On several other farms the father can do only a limited amount of work. The average age of the 27 fathers is about 57 years; 23 are 50 years old or older, 9 are 60 years or over.

The first results of permanent labor shortage on farms is to reduce the production of livestock and livestock products. This results in a shift of cropland from feed crops to wheat. The result of farm labor shortages is not reflected in number of acres cultivated until total farm production has been reduced very materially and the labor problem is too large to be met. Satisfactory laborers to replace farm boys are not obtainable. Out of 100 transient laborers at wheat harvest time not over 10 can be classed as satisfactory for that type of work.

Many acres of wheat and barley were not harvested in this county which would have been saved had sufficient labor been available. Thousands of bushels of sorghum grain and forage were left in the fields because harvest labor was not available. Thousands of tons of forage are now standing in the fields because the farmers have been unable to haul it in and stack it.

The War Board agrees that agricultural production has been and will continue to be more seriously reduced if the present rate of induction of agricultural labor is continued in Ness County.

Mr. W. E. Stone moved that the following appeal be sent to the local selective service board:

"To the Ness County Draft Board:

"Owing to the acute agricultural situation in Ness County resulting from the induction of so many farm boys from II–C classification into the service, the county war board called a meeting for the evening of February 3, 1945, for the purpose of petitioning the county draft board from any further inductions until the present national labor draft is disposed of by Congress. The Ness County war board believes that some provision will be made in this labor draft for agricultural workers and that the Ness County draft board will have ample authority for delaying induction in their copy of Selective Service Bulletin from State headquarters dated January 16, 1945. We quote from this bulletin, 'Article 5: Local boards are again advised that calls placed for men are not to be a factor in determining whether or not a registrant is or is not to be deferred' and in article 6: 'Local boards who are especially conservative in granting II–C deferments are not to paralyze production by taking from agriculture those for whom a satisfactory replacement is not available.' We most respectfully submit this petition to the local draft board."

The case of Fred Leroy Amstutz was discussed by the board. It was moved that Fred Leroy Amstutz is in the group of less essential farm workers.

It was decided that copies of the minutes of this meeting be sent to Senator Reed, Governor Schoeppel, Senator Capper, and Representative Hope, as well as the State war board.

Motion was made by Mr. Keith Dannefer to adjourn. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE ANSPAUGH,
Chairman, Ness County
U. S. D. A. War Board.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this example can be repeated indefinitely in farm counties not only in Kansas but in other farm States from which the men intended to be deferred under the Tydings amendment are being inducted into military service. The effect of the present policy upon food production is going to be very substantial and far-reaching.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] read a letter which is very effective. I wish to read a letter of a little different type. At Welda, Kans., a small town in Anderson County, there lives a woman who had four sons. Three of them went into the armed services. Two

of them are dead. One was killed in action, the other died in a hospital. The third son now is in the South Pacific. Her fourth son is engaged in agriculture as the only helper on a 2,000-acre farm. In that case there is involved not only the need for food production, there is involved the question of common humanity and decency which ought to prevent anyone from trying to take the fourth son of a woman who has already lost two sons in the war. I read her letter, as follows:

WELDA, KANS., *January 26, 1945.*

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing you in regard to my youngest son, Kenneth Eugene Hartman, who this day got notice from the local Board No. 1 of Garnett, Kans., for Kenneth Eugene Hartman to come to Garnett at 5:30 a. m. the 12th day of February to start service.

He is our last son at home, and I'm writing you because I think he should be kept out of service. I had three sons in service. I have lost two. Otto Lee Hartman died in service September 11, 1943, at Forney General Hospital, at Palm Springs, Calif., and my second son, Lloyd Ivan Hartman, was killed in action on Leyte Island, October 28, 1944, and my third son, Lawrence Hartman, is stationed in New Guinea. My youngest son, Kenneth, has been deferred to Mr. M. S. Brecheisen since March 1943 until January 1945. Mr. Brecheisen is one of the biggest farmers in this county. He has over 2,000 acres of land, and my son is the only man he has and he cannot get any other help. I think I have had more than my share of grief already.

Yours truly,

Mrs. GRACE HARTMAN.

Mr. President, out of some hundreds of letters and telegrams which have come to me not only from Kansas but from all over the country, I have picked out 8 or 10, and ask unanimous consent they may be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I feel very deeply upon this subject. I have a son, two sons-in-law, and two grandsons in the armed forces. There is no man in this body who has any greater direct personal interest in the armed forces than I have. I have a son in France now. I have a son-in-law on Saipan. I have a grandson at Lowry Field, near Denver. I denounce with all the force at my command the maladministration and the misinterpretation of the law which was written by the Congress. The directive which General Hershey issued on January 3 contained a quotation from President Roosevelt intended to have the effect upon the local draft boards that it has had. That was an abuse of the law, an abuse of authority, an abuse of power, and it should not have happened.

EXHIBIT A

BAZINE, KANS., *January 22, 1945.*

Hon. Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the time I wrote you on January 6, I had just had an interview with our local draft board in regard to my son's classification, and they definitely informed me that all registrants in the 18- to 26-year olds would be reclassified and put in I–A. Therefore, I appealed to you for assistance, and on January 10 he received his I–A classification from the draft board. I immediately filed an appeal to the State board of appeal, which contains exactly the same information as my affidavit that I sent you, except that in addition it contained an affidavit of two of my neighbors certifying that they were familiar with our farming operations and the facts as set out and stated were true. On January 20 my son received from the draft board his notice to appear on January 29 for his preinduction physical examination. I was advised by the local selective-service attorney to file my appeal to the State board with the local draft office. Is this the correct procedure? Or should I have sent it direct to the State board? For some reason or other the decision of the local board is hardly ever changed by the State board. So I am wondering if it was the right procedure to file an appeal through the local board.

Thanking you very kindly for the interest you have given my case, I remain,

Sincerely,

JOHN B. SCHABEN.

MAHASKA, KANS., *January 25, 1945.*

SENATOR REED.

DEAR SIR: I have been wondering who to write to. I feel that you may be able to help out some way. My trouble is this—the drafting of boys off the farms. We have three boys, the oldest, Louis, is 23. He has been in England in service almost 2 years. Francis is 18 and is in service at Camp Hood for only a few more weeks, then he will be ready for service. George is 21. He is at home and has been in II–C ever since he registered until 2 weeks ago he was put in I–A.

Their father is in Kansas City taking treatments since November 4, for bovine or animal T. B. When he does come home he will not be able to work. Now we had farmed 560 acres, 400 acres is ours and 160 acres is Louis', the boy in England. Their father always took care of the stock while he was able, but now it's all for George to see after, with the help of his sister, 16 years old. At present we have 28 cows, 16 yearlings besides the little calves that are coming. We have always done quite a lot of milking. We have 8 brood sows, 52 little pigs now from 6. We sold some of the cows and stockers, 30 head in all when Francis left last October, also sold 63 hogs because George could not feed them out with feed to haul, corn to husk. He still has about 50 acres to husk. He just can't get any help. With the help of the daughter and myself we try to get the work done. I can't do much as I have low blood pressure. Age 56. It seems when the boy is doing the work of three he is needed at home.

George was going to buy a tractor, lister and cultivator at some of the farm sales as he has the farm rented, but he doesn't know what to do, if he will be here to farm or not. He has 45 acres of alfalfa to cut, 60 acres of wheat, besides the oats and flax and corn that he will plant.

When we got his card I–A we went to Washington to see the draft board. The lady said that nothing can be done that all boys between 18–26 will have to go to Leavenworth, just that much nearer to the Army.

It seems that George doing the work of two already in the Army is doing his part, and furthermore the land will just be idle if he goes for everyone has all they can take care of. They still say that each State has its quota of feed to raise. I am sure they can't if the farmers are taken into the service.

If you care to check up with the draft board at Washington, Washington County, Kans., you may get more information there because George has filled out the farm papers there. I just don't know how many acres of each, corn, oats, flax, and sorgo he wants to put in.

If there is anything else that I have not mentioned that might be of help, please let me know.

Yours truly,

Mrs. PAUL J. NUTSCH.

NESS CITY, KANS., *January 26, 1945.*

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I write you in regard to the draft law. I have a son, Richard M., who registered September 1943, was classified II–C and told he would remain in that class as long as he remained on the farm. Now they have put him in I–A.

Here is a small summary of my farm work: 1,080-acre farm; 720 acres in cultivation; milk 25 cows; 45 other cattle, 10 hogs, and 500 hens; raise feed for this stock; have 450 acres of wheat.

I am 63 years old and ruptured on both sides. My wife, two small girls, and a boy in school comprise my family.

Is the Tydings amendment still in effect?

The draft board says they are helpless to do anything. If this is the will of Congress, I will have to let the cows go dry, as I cannot carry on. If you could send the draft board a line to back them up on this deferment, it would be appreciated, but it will have to be done at once.

It looks as if they are trying to get all of the farm boys before spring work begins. He has to report for physical February 12, and it will be awfully hard for the boy, one girl, and myself to care for everything while he is gone.

Yours truly,

L. B. BURDITT.

GRINNELL, KANS., *January 31, 1945.*

Senator REED: I have read the papers and listened to radio news and all indications were that we could keep our farm boys home according to Tydings amendment but my son, LeRoy Anthony, leaves February 8, for induction.

I have a 720-acre farm of which 500 acres is farm land and milk 12 to 18 cows and keep 60 to 80 head of cattle the year around. I still have corn to pick and 60 acres of sorgo and feed to stack which I cannot do myself, as I have 35 percent disability from World War No. 1 (bronchitis) and I cannot work in dirt or dust, so if my second boy goes in the service I will be forced to sell all cattle and milk cows and quit. I have a debt of $6,000 on my farm yet.

I have one son in service for 2 years and 7 months. I wrote General McLean and gave him all information and told him the whole thing and he refers it right back to the local board with my letter and tells them to go according to the Tydings amendment, but all they did was send the notice for induction. They are not leaving any, but this summer there will be a lot of this country's farm land out of production. I have 200 acres that will be out as I will not be able to do it.

I was sick in bed most of last week and about half the time I am down in bed and I must have my son to keep going or quit. So, if the higher officials can do anything it must be done at once. They should either do something or at least quit telling the people what they could do. It looks to me mostly what they do in Topeka is pass the buck.

Hoping for results. My son is registered in Sheridan County. Hoxie. Please act at once.

Sincerely yours,

ED WAGONER.

NESS CITY, KANS, *January 22, 1945.*

HON. CLYDE REED.

DEAR SIR: I just heard over the news that you had recommended to Governor Andrew Schoeppel of Kansas to go slow in drafting farm boys for service in our armed forces.

I heartily approve your stand on this issue. I have three boys in service now and I only have one boy old enough to help or rather do our farm work. He is 23 in March. I have one other child 12 years old, and we farm 2,280 acres all told, wheat, feed, and spring crops. I am 57 years of age and in poor shape to carry on. I was in the hospital 10 weeks with a leg that still swells up and causes me considerable pain, and to lose the fourth boy I would be almost helpless on the place.

I have talked to the draft board and they say under present ruling they can't see any way out of taking him in the service. I told them to go slow on taking all the boys off the farms as the Government will regret it later on as it will seriously hurt agriculture and cut production immensely.

I have one boy, a doctor flight surgeon with the Twenty-first Pursuit Squadron, a Jap prisoner captured on Bataan Peninsula 3 years ago; another son, a bombardier, shot down over the oil fields of Romania, he is a German prisoner at Stalag Luft III in Germany; and the third son is a Navy pilot going to Japan in a short time now.

I think I have done my part in this war without losing the last son old enough to help me out. Hired help is not available, and if they were they are no account when it comes to repairing machinery, etc. I have 5 tractors, 4 combines, and have 250 head of cattle on the place now.

If there is anything Congress can do I would be thankful. Andrew Schoeppel is a personal friend of mine but his hands are tied by Government orders so please Senator help us out in the unfair deal. I will be thankful to you and to your associates in Congress if you make them go by the Tydings amendment.

Thanking you in advance, I remain yours,

W. A. BRENNER.

MORROWVILLE, KANS., *February 1, 1945.*

Senator REED,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are asking for your help in getting our son, Lawrence William Mathieson, deferred as my husband is totally and permanently disabled as the result of an accident on September 6, 1943. He was in the hospital almost a year, can't get around only on crutches. He has a stiff hip so can't ride machinery or get down to milk or chore any. He doesn't have any use of his left foot at all.

We have been farming 440 acres, also have 47 head of cattle including 19 milk cows which we have to milk by hand, besides hogs and poultry to take care of. He is our only child and all the help I have since my husband's accident. The draft board here doesn't seem to pay any attention to the Tydings amendment.

The land will have to lay idle if our son has to go for I can't keep things going alone. The draft board has put him in I-A and notified him to go for physical examination on February 6. Please help us quick before they put him in the Army. Hope to hear from you soon. Thanking you for any favor.

Mrs. WILLIAM MATHIESON.

FOWLER, KANS., *February 1, 1945.*

Senator CLYDE REED,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We received the telegram today concerning my son, Dale Reese. I will give you the facts to the best of my ability.

They sent this boy to Leavenworth without a classification about a month after he was 18 years old, telling us they would classify him in II-C after he got back, but when he got back they gave him a I-A classification with a deferment until August 1, and then told us they would give him a II-C classification. About 10 days before the deferment ended the boy and I met with the board to see what we could get done, as he was all the help I had and I am not able to work. They claimed then it was out of their power to grant any II-C classifications to anyone, but that if we would appeal the case to the State they would help all they could, as they thought he should have that classification.

We appealed and when they sent it in, everyone of the board here had voted to keep him in I-A. So, of course, the State turned it down, but gave him another deferment until December 30. With this appeal went a doctor's certificate asking this boy be left so I could go away for treatment. One member of the board lives here in Fowler and knows my situation. He told me to have the boy make out a new work sheet and they would send it to the war board for their approval, for at that time, besides taking care of our own 128 head, the boy was looking after 235 head of cattle we were pasturing. He said that they would reclassify him then. We found out later they never did send this work sheet to the war board. They claimed they wrote to Topeka to see if they could get him deferred and the boy went over one day to see if they had heard from it and the clerk jumped up and told him they would give him until the 29th of January and he was going and to get it out of his head if he thought he was going to get another classification or deferment.

So the 29th of January they sent him to the Army. I'm asking for an investigation in this case. There is no help anywhere that can even be hired. I am not able to do any work at all, with over 1,100 acres of growing wheat; 320 acres belongs to the boy. This wheat should be cut but will it be? I also have about 10,000 bushels of wheat to haul to market. Do you think I got a fair and honest deal? I know I did not. Is there anything that can be done?

Respectfully,

W. R. REESE.

SHARON, KANS., *January 23, 1945.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am wiring you in regard to a young man working for me on the ranch due to be inducted in the armed forces February 1, 1945. His name is Harvey L. Mathews; has been in my employ for some 3 years or longer; has three brothers in armed forces. No relative of mine, but capable farm hand I need very much if we continue with this outfit. We own and control 3,500 acres. Have at present time over 550 cattle, also are grain feeding over 100 cattle for market. We are at present time two men short and working very long hours. Sometimes it is 9 o'clock at night before we get in for supper, and if we are reduced down more in manpower looks like we are about done for, for I am past 55 years old and a cripple to boot; also the other and only man I have beside this young Mathews is a cripple, having been mashed under a tractor about 2 years ago. We also have lots of things that take some of my time, as you know there have to be a handful of papers made out for every little transaction. This alone takes some of my time away from the farm work. If you know any way of me getting this fellow to stay on the ranch at work, I would appreciate it. But I do not want to leave you with the impression that I am the only one about to shut out. There are many more.

Yours truly,

W. A. MCREYNOLDS.

KINSLEY, KANS., *January 23, 1945.*

Senator CLYDE M. REED,

Washington, D. C.

SENATOR REED: We have written Governor Schoeppel in Topeka in regard to drafting of farm workers in our county. The draft board here does not abide by the Tydings amendment.

We have two sons in the service. The second son was taken last year just a few weeks before harvest and now they have placed the third son in I-A. He is 18 years old. My health does not permit me to do all the heavy farm work and we have no one else to take his place.

Two farm workers from one family ought to be our share and leave us one to help at home, instead of sending them all to England. We have more than enough farm work to get one deferred.

If something is not done soon, this county will have no young men for the farms left, with spring and summer work not far away.

Thanking you for any help you can give us,

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. CARL HERRMANN.

HOLLENBURG, KANS., *January 31, 1945.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: We are farming in Washington County on farm land that is productive. We are operating under the governmental program; there are 335 acres in cropland; 80 acres are in pasture; we had 125 acres in corn during the 1944 season; the land on the river bottom produced 80 bushels of corn to the acre; we have 78 cattle; there are 18 milk cows; our calf production will be about 35 head for the 1945 season. In addition to the home pasture we pasture 35 head in the pasture of a neighbor at so much per head for the season. We have a good supply of hogs—about 40 head; of that number 14 are brood sows.

As my husband is mentally incompetent and physically unable to do manual work, the operation of the farming falls on my hands and those of two sons. One of these sons, Maurice Cumro, order No. 11,178, Washington County, has been ordered to Leavenworth for a physical examination, even though his work sheet was not placed before the board nor given a hearing after the classification was changed from II-C to I-A. This procedure is irregular and does not allow us an opportunity of having the case properly reviewed by the board. As our son is engaged in a very essential industry, vital to the winning of the conflict, and having three sons in the service, two of them being on foreign soil, Europe, we desire to protest the action of the Washington County board, inasmuch as they have not properly handled the case.

Our sons are producers, as you can see by all of the things mentioned herein. He is essential to the cause; should he be compelled to go our operations would be handicapped and most likely reduced very much, as one son cannot handle the project. We have farmed all of our lifetime; were brought up and raised on the farm. Our sons know only farming. They have been striving to produce maximum yields in food and in meat.

May we have your assistance in the matter of a proper handling of the case, which you can see was not handled as it should have been by the local board?

With sincerest thanks for your aid,

Respectfully,

Mrs. MARGARET CUMRO.

Senator REED:

I was advised by one member of the War Board to write you about this. He does not want his name mentioned. He is of the opinion that the board is not handling the matter quite right.

I was told that a committee of folks are in Topeka today to see about the matter and to ascertain what can be done.

This member of the Board said that the draft board is not complying with the Tydings amendment—to leave essential farmers on the farm.

The county appeal agent, Mr. Andy Bokelman, told us that out of forty-odd appeals he filed, all of the forty-odd were refused. So

he is resigning, as appeals are all overruled by the draft board.

Mr. Leslie Cain, of the Federal land bank office at Washington, Kans., informed me that he is certain that our son's work sheet had never been placed before the Board. Mr. Cain is a member of the War Board. In his opinion, as he expressed it, he considered Maurice an essential farmer. All the boys the draft board is now taking are badly needed on the farms.

On our farm there are over 50 acres in alfalfa. You know one man cannot handle 50 acres of alfalfa and put it up by himself.

Maurice aids me in managing the affairs.

As we do not have a tractor the farming is done with horse power.

BELPRE, KANS., *January 20, 1945.*

CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: I am writing to you in regard to the draft board of Pawnee County, Kans.

I am a farmer and live here in Pawnee County. I have 740 acres of wheat which I planted in the fall of 1944. I also have 5 milk cows in production now and another to freshen soon. I have 20 head of stock cows and calves also. I have chickens on my farm too.

Now the draft board classifies me as a nonfarmer and places me in I–A and is sending me to Leavenworth for a preinduction physical on February 5, 1945.

In the year of 1944 I produced on my farm and sold 1,769½ dozen eggs, 874 pounds of live chickens, 4 head of steers, 9,735 pounds of pork, and 11,769 bushels of wheat. I also milked my cows, on which I do not have a complete record.

Does this in any way show that I'm not a farmer? When I have to go to the Army I will be forced to sell my farm equipment and all my cattle, and move my family to town.

How are they going to feed the Armies of the United States and the civilian population when they take the real farmers into the Army?

I started farming for myself in the fall of 1937 and took my first crop off in the summer of 1938.

I am 27 years of age and will be 28 on May 5, 1945. Why take men with a family while they let young fellows live with dad and still be deferred as essential farm workers? This just isn't clear to me. Is it the Government or the local draft boards that make the draft laws?

Please let me know your views in regard to the new draft laws and the requirements it takes to make a farmer. I am,

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND FRANCIS.

SYLVIA, KANS., *January 26, 1945.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad that you are taking an interest in the agriculture of Kansas. We farmers are having considerable difficulty with board No. 3, of Reno County, Kans. They are taking our help away from us unjustly.

Recently, over my protest, my son, Viril Donald Moeckel, was drafted into the Army, over every protest and ground for deferment that I had. We are engaged in farming, and I cannot do the farming that he and I did together, because I cannot get the help. Jointly we farmed 620 acres, 320 acres in wheat, 130 acres in maize, hay, and feed crops, and 78 in pasture. We milked 16 head of cows and had 15 head of stock cattle. My son milked 10 head of these cows, and I milked the rest. Last summer he operated a 12-foot combine and tractor by himself, cutting about 40 acres a day by himself. He is married and has 2 children, the oldest of which is 2 years old.

I am a man 51 years of age and in poor health. My wife is in poor health, too. Since the induction of my son into the Army we cannot do the farming we did. It seems to me that the best interest of this country would be to let these men who are established in farming remain on the farms.

I will appreciate anything that you can do in this case, as I believe the conduct of board No. 3, in Reno County, Kans., deserves an investigation.

Here is the situation in regard to the board. A few months ago all of the members of this board resigned because they would not draft the farm help, and a new board has been appointed which in my judgment is not serving the best interest of this country.

Yours truly,

HERMAN MOECKEL.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to a statement contained in a letter which I have received from a member of a draft board in my State, as follows:

The order we got from Washington was, according to the President's findings, that—

"Further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through-25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for more young men."

Mr. President, it seems to me there is in that order indication to the local boards to disregard the Tydings amendment passed by Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The letter also states that the State draft board is bringing pressure to bear upon the local draft boards to induce them to violate the law.

Mr. President, I have here, out of hundreds of letters, two letters which are, I think, a little more than of the ordinary type. These letters are from officials of farm organizations which have held meetings to discuss the agricultural program for next spring.

I have a letter signed by the president of the Farm Bureau of Martin County, the county seat of which is Fairmont. That is one of the richest farming communities in Minnesota. It is near the Iowa line. He says:

FAIRMONT, MINN., *February 2, 1945.*

Senator SHIPSTEAD,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR SENATOR SHIPSTEAD: We, a large group of farm bureau members, gathered tonight to plan for the coming spring and summer, on food growing and production. * * *

Since our own Government has not recognized farming as essential, hundreds of boys so drastically needed have been ruthlessly drafted here in Martin County. Ninety-nine men have been called for physicals in February; 53 of these are farm boys and in many cases the last help on the farm. Now we farmers cannot rely on replacement help. We must have our help who are willing to work long hours if weather requires. We must have good experienced help to operate power machinery. Last year many a good tractor and other machinery was ruined beyond repair because of unskilled labor. We will not use war prisoners. We cannot always be a guard over such and will not subject wives to insults as some were subjected last year. Prisoners can be used where there are guards over them for day work, but not steady. If farmers are not assured of their help it will mean a cut in production, as not many anticipate right now with spring staring us in the face. Right now when we are all working for a full production comes this way of appreciating our unlimited efforts in the past 4 years. We have worked beyond our strength in the face of many drawbacks by weather, shortage of machinery, severe shortage of labor. Yet now, when every soldier on furlough says, for the sake of all, produce food. We will enclose just the sales listed the past week in just one of our county papers. You will see what is happening. We have written the State board many pleading letters explaining everything. We don't want anyone to think we want anyone deferred who can be spared. But on the other hand if one good experienced young man would be frozen on each 240- or 300-acre farm for the duration, then afterward he would go for training. If this is asking too much of Congress we will have to close out. We are willing to go all out for food production. But the past month with its hundreds of sales will make a big dent in meat and poultry production. It simply can't be done if they take our help.

Last week 18 herds of an average of 15 milch cows were shipped to market—will that help produce butter? Also approximately 350 brood sows due to farrow in April have been shipped to market. Short feed lot cattle are being sold now. This will be felt next summer when there will be no good fed cattle on markets. Our seed-corn agents have reported that many farmers have canceled their seed-corn orders. They will seed the land down and lay idle. There's nothing else to do. Farmers regret they are forced to do this. But if we are to be given no consideration as to our help there is no other way out. Too late Congress will see their terrible mistake. Factories, breweries, and every other business is recognized as to have experienced help. Will you help put farming back to an essential industry? We hope you will and we assure you this act of yours will not be forgotten. God grant you will get a hearing and cooperation in Congress.

We will have to know if we keep our help at least one good experienced man who is on said 240- or 300-acre farm or if we will be compelled to sell out. They say the Tydings amendment is still law. But they fail to say what they really mean by that, and we cannot farm by groping in the dark. Auctions are booked ahead for a month. So stock will have to be shipped. It is high time to sidetrack a few less important things in Washington and know if we keep up food production. Failure of that will not help speed victory. We hope you can do something for us members of Jackson, Martin, Blue Earth, Watonwan, and Cottonwood Counties are represented at this meeting. Also 8 auctioneers telling of an astounding number of farm sales; more than can be held. This is an earnest appeal to put farming back as an essential industry. It was shocking to hear that it had been removed from the essential list. Almost unbelievable. We are waiting anxiously to hear what we will do. Farm or not farm. Trusting you can help us and again our sincerest thanks for what you have done.

A. B. LANE, *President.*

I have another letter in which it is stated that there are not enough dates open for auctions for farmers to sell their livestock, and so they must ship it directly to the markets in St. Paul and Chicago because they cannot get an auctioneer or a date when someone else is not having an auction. This letter reads as follows:

Senator SHIPSTEAD: We, a group of farmers, have met tonight to see what can be done about farming in this spring so near at hand. Four counties are represented. We have resolved at this meeting if steps are not taken

immediately to halt the drafting of farmers, we will, one and all, sell off stock and let land lay idle. Men are to be called from farms so fast that there is getting to be a confusion that is at the least alarming. For instance, Jackson County is sending 145 men in February for physicals. Now, in this group there are 89 farmers, in many cases the last help, leaving men and women near 60 years to carry on; in some cases it's the operator of the farm himself. This wild drafting is not only an outrage to our farmers who have tried so desperately to carry on with only 1 helper.

If no halt is called within the next 2 weeks, there will be hundreds more sales, or if no dates are left open for auctions, we will ship our livestock. Government will see too late that there will be no food for our own country and none for lend-lease.

There are thousands of IV-F's who now would pass, who are doing nothing at all or part-time work. Replacement help will help little as we need men who know how to farm and take care of livestock. Farming cannot be learned in a few weeks. Consideration is given industries where these men can be taught in a short time to rivet or weld. We need food for victory, our own boys at the front now are getting rationed food. What will happen if production is cut in half.

Butter will be a thing of the past if help is taken. There is no other way out for farmers. This is now the time of year when we must know. If no halt is called farmers cannot be expected to seed high-priced seeds when they can plainly see that it will be impossible to harvest crops; already last year, even with the heavy rains, not half crops in some areas. Some crops could not be harvested because of labor shortage. Why not draft college students; they can finish college after the war. Please do something about this. Other States are putting up a fight. Is our State going to fail the farmers? Let no time pass but we are asking you to act at once. Thank you.

PETE PETERSON, Sherburn,
ALFRED WILLIAMS, Blue Earth,
GENE CORBY, Jackson,
FLOYD CORDES, Watertown,
Chairmen of Committees.

I have another letter from the west-central part of the State. It is along the same line, so I will not put it in the RECORD because it would be merely a repetition. I have received hundreds of letters over a long period. I assumed that the matter had been cleared up after I telegraphed to the United States district attorney to have the State board cease putting pressure on the local boards. A member of a local board wrote to me, saying, "They are bringing pressure on us, but we are standing pat. I think we are about the only board that does stand pat."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I join in the resolution submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I should like to give a brief explanation of my interest in clarifying the so-called directive which has to do with the Tydings amendment.

In view of what was done by the Governor of Colorado last Friday, I believe, when he instructed local draft boards of the State of Colorado to determine a registrant's status in keeping with the letter of the law, namely, that if a draft board found that a registrant was continuously engaged in agricultural production and that no replacements could be obtained, the registrant should be placed in class II-C, let me say that is convincing evidence of the need to have a clarifying directive issued to the local draft boards of the various counties of the States of the Union instructing them to adhere to the practices and procedures already established by the head of the Selective Service System in determining what registrants come within the terms of the Tydings amendment, as has been done heretofore, and in determining what registrants come outside its terms, as has also been done in the past. I wish to say, as I said a few days ago on the floor of the Senate in respect to the same matter, that I think it is very difficult for General Hershey to give instructions so that each and every draft board can handle in a satisfactory way each case coming before it. I realize that the task is difficult, and I think that in the main the Selective Service System has done a splendid job. I know it has done a splendid job in Nebraska. However, I know that the letter issued on January 2 under the signature of General Hershey has caused confusion in the minds of the local draft boards because it has placed on the local draft boards entire responsibility, not to determine whether, according to the unit rule, a particular registrant is essentially engaged but to determine whether the agricultural production in which a registrant is engaged is more essential than the military needs. That is the instruction which is causing such great difficulty for the local draft boards. In the light of that situation, I do not see how a draft board can do anything else except call in all the farm boys for reexamination, and when that is done, if the local draft boards determine that there is greater production in one branch of agriculture than is necessary, the local boards will be forced to draft the men for military needs.

Many letters have been written about what has been done. I myself have received hundreds of such letters. It is unnecessary to have all of them printed in the RECORD, but I wish to refer to one short letter which is typical. It comes from Friend, Nebr., and reads as follows:

FRIEND, NEBR., *February 9, 1945.*

Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHERRY: I am writing this letter to explain to you the serious hardship worked up on me by the Tydings amendment reclassifying all the farm labor.

I am operating a farm of 320 acres and have a son that will be 18 years of age in several weeks that will be asked to register for military service and no doubt will be inducted into the Army, leaving me by myself in the desperate struggle to carry on the farming operations which will begin in several weeks.

Livestock raising and the farming operations cannot be done by one man, when there is enough work on the same farm for three men.

I have 100 bred ewes starting to lamb within a few weeks, and will also be milking from 8 to 10 milk cows this spring.

I am 50 years of age and in poor health. I own 160 acres of land which carries a heavy mortgage, and, most of all, my oldest son was killed in military service last October. Now can you see the situation I am placed in, Mr. WHERRY? Will Gen. George Marshall consider my situation critical, or will he only ignore my pleas only to see how I can fight it out by myself?

I am a citizen of United States. I have given a son who gave his life for his country. May God grant and give you power to favor and support my plea and situation, and that is to have my youngest and only son stay on the farm where he is so badly needed.

Hoping to hear from you by return mail.

From a farmer.

THEODORE HECKMAN.

Mr. President, the manpower in the State of Nebraska has been combed. The directive to which reference has been made will not take very many more of the farm workers, because I am sure that each one of them who did not come within the provision of the Tydings amendment has already gone into military service. I am also sure that if the Selective Service authorities continue to draft farm workers who do not come within the Tydings amendment there will be caused additional and continued hardships of the kind which have been described in the letter which I just read.

I wish to invite attention to another letter which I have received. It comes from the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, a very fine organization in Nebraska, which has gone right down the line in its support of the production of food and in its cooperation with the military authorities. It is doing its level best to cooperate in winning the war, and in the production of food not only for our military forces, but for our civilian population as well. I quote a paragraph from the letter.

Action on this problem must be taken immediately. The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in their regular session today adopted the following statement and program, released by our president, C. Y. Thompson. "It has been estimated—

I ask the Senators to listen to this—

"that 100,000,000 bushels of corn now piled on the ground is in danger of spoilage unless some organized effort is made to save it."

Mr. President, what is true of Nebraska is also true of your own State, and it is also true of all Middle Western corn-producing States. Because of excessive snowfall and lack of labor to husk the corn and put it into cribs or send it to market, a great deal of the production which has already been obtained will rot.

When the clarifying legislation to which reference has been made comes before the Senate—and I hope it will come as quickly as possible—I shall ask Members of the Senate to do everything they can to cooperate with General Hershey; but I think that every draft board in the United States should be given a clarifying directive so that it will know what the policy is, and so that the counties of all the States may be uniform in their decisions and act in accordance with the Tydings amendment. If that is done I believe there will not be such confusion as now exists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the letter from the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, from which I quoted, as well as two other letters bearing upon the same subject matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEBRASKA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Lincoln, Nebr., February 10, 1945.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation board of directors has been in session the past 3 days working on some of the vital problems confronting the Nebraska farmer. Paramount among these is the wet-corn problem in this State.

We had hoped that previous action in this matter in regard to railroad cars and action on the part of the various agencies of the War Food Administration in this State would alleviate the problem. However, we find that the corn is neither being taken to the market nor is it being placed in suitable cribs so that it will dry and not spoil when spring rains set in.

Action on this problem must be taken immediately. The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in their regular session today adopted the following statement and program, released by our president, C. Y. Thompson:

"It has been estimated that 100,000,000 bushels of corn now piled on the ground is in danger of spoilage unless some organized effort is made to save it.

"This huge crop of corn was produced at the urgence of the W. F. A. and we feel that it is not the farmer's sole responsibility to go to the extra expense and labor necessary to save it.

"We believe it will take the organized efforts of all who can help to actually do the job because we know the shortage of cars, cribbing, labor, and lumber is acute in most areas of Nebraska.

"The Farm Bureau is ready and willing to accept its responsibility in sponsoring this important program and will do all in its power to accomplish the job which must be done." (See enclosed sheet for the program of action asked for by the N. F. B. F.)

Certainly we are not asking too much for the farmer in Nebraska when we say that we hope that the W. F. A. officials will not let the farmer down this time on a job they have done at their request. Farmers were let down on the hog program and they have been let down on several other programs of production after doing the best job in history. Should the same thing occur relative to corn, we are certain that only one thing can result and that is a tremendous let-down in corn production in this State in 1945. Rotting and decaying corn on any man's farm certainly will not be an incentive for him to meet a Government request.

We urge you to take immediate action on this program. Should any of your group question the importance and validity of these statements, we would be more than pleased to take any individual at our expense into the field to actually show him these conditions as they exist on Nebraska farms.

Most sincerely yours,
HOWARD L. PETERSON,
Managing Secretary.

MEADOW GROVE, NEBR., *February 8, 1945.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to the farmer draft, as I am a farmer for the past 4 or 5 years, since I was 21 years old, and have been in class II–C. The other day I got induction papers to go to the Army for February 18, 1945. My classification was supposed to run for 2 or 3 months yet.

I farm 280 acres of land alone, and have around 200 acres of corn a year, and feed all the way from 95 to a 105 head of cattle a year. Also 90 to 100 hogs, mostly all that I have raised but a few that I bought this year.

Before I moved on this farm—when after it had been sold—there were two families here. Where I do the work alone. I raised between 8,000 to 10,000 bushels of corn this last year, also 100 tons of hay. I know that is more than any one man in this precinct raised.

They told me that I was not needed here on the farm, and I did not own my machinery or anything I had; that I was here as a blind. How would I farm if I did not own it. Then I would like to know who would pay my taxes and other expenses; also income taxes if I did not. I think there should be something done about this kind of business, as I had the same thing happen to a brother of mine, who was farming for himself. He has been in the Army since last May 30, 1944.

If they take me this would force me to sell all my cattle, which have been on feed about 40 or 50 days. Also all my hogs and other personal property. I think something should be done before it is too late. There are several cases like this around here.

Also show this to Senator BUTLER, if it is not too much trouble for you.

This comes from Madison County, Nebr.

Yours very truly,
PAUL CARL RENNER.

FREEDOM, NEBR., *February 7, 1945.*
Senator WHERRY.

DEAR SIR: As a farmer, controlling 840 acres (400 of my own land), I am wondering what to do about our farming and caring for livestock. My draft-deferred son and I each put in about 16 hours daily in caring for 58 head of cattle—beef. We have also been milking 12 cows and have been renting 440 acres adjoining this place since 1938. We keep hogs and chickens. The farm land alone comprises 382 acres. I am 57 and have a groin rupture, which hinders me from pitching hay or feed or in scooping grain. If my son is inducted into the Army soon, as 68 or 70 other farm and ranch deferred youths in Frontier County, how can I (and some fathers are worse crippled than I) managed my work, except by letting our own 400 acres lie idle, farm these other places under contract, sell most of our cattle and hogs now, as these other fathers contemplate doing. We will not be able to milk except for our own use, as we (wife and I) cannot lengthen our working day. Other rancher-farmers here are in the same position.

If part of the wet corn rots, do they still figure they have enough grain and meat to feed the Army, Navy, and civilians for the duration. We haven't raised the 1945 crop yet.

Yours truly,
ALFRED ROTH.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGE FOR CERTAIN SENATE RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 52, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I ask that the Clerk read the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 52) submitted by Mr. MCKELLAR on January 25, 1945, and reported by him from the Committee on Rules on February 8 instant, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That any person who shall have served as an employee of the Senate restaurant for 55 years or more shall be entitled, upon making application to the Secretary of the Senate, to be retired and to receive retirement pay at a rate equal to the rate of the basic compensation he was receiving at the time of his last active service as such employee: *Provided,* That this resolution shall not apply to any person while he is receiving an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. Such retirement pay shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall determine eligibility for retirement pay under this resolution on the basis of records or secondary evidence. For such purposes, actual service in the Senate restaurant shall be deemed to be service as an employee of such restaurant whether or not the person performing such service was carried on the Senate rolls as such an employee during the time such service was performed, and any person performing such service for the major part of the time during which the Senate was in session in any calendar year shall be deemed to have performed a year's service as an employee of the Senate restaurant during such calendar year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois if the resolution would not apply to only one employee in the Senate Restaurant who has been employed there for 55 years? The resolution is written in general terms, but its application is to one individual.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I hope the resolution will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have one other resolution which I think is of very great importance.

From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without further amendment, House Concurrent Resolution 18, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read and immediately considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 18), which had been previously reported from the Committee on Rules with amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois about the amendment on page 3. Of course we all know that under the Constitution each House makes its own rules. The proposed joint committee could not amend the rules of either House, as everybody understands, but the amendment provides that it may not even consider or make any recommendation as a joint committee to either House or to both Houses regarding the matter of "rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House."

I wonder why the committee adopted that amendment which would prohibit

the joint committee from even considering or making any recommendations to either House in regard to its rules?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the majority leader that this concurrent resolution came to the committee of which I am chairman because of paragraph (c) of section 3 dealing with the expenses of the committee, which "shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman."

However, I am a member of the Rules Committee, and I attended the meeting when the amendment referred to was discussed. The amendment, as I recall, was proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who did not like the language appearing in the original resolution which has been stricken out and which reads:

That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the time or manner of, or the parliamentary rules or procedure governing, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House.

So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, the language was agreeable to him just as it came over from the House. The Senator from Alabama was very insistent upon his point of view, and he was the Senator who recommended the amendment and the proviso at the end of the amendment which reads:

Provided further, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

The Senator from Alabama who offered that provision thought that the amendment he suggested would protect the Senate in connection with the parliamentary procedure and the rules governing the Senate in a better way than would the provision which was adopted by the House.

That is about all I can say to the Senator. The chairman of the Committee on Rules, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is present and no doubt can explain it further.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I recall, the size of committees and the number of committees are prescribed by the Rules of the Senate. In this streamlining process, which has been talked about a great deal in the Congress and in the press, there have been various suggestions as to the reduction in the number of committees of the two Houses. Inasmuch as that is a part of the rules of the Senate and the House, under this language the joint committee could not even consider that.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is wrong in that respect, and I again call his attention to the proviso at the end of the amendment which reads:

That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidation and reorganization of committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. That function is a part of the Rules of the Senate, as we all know.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that matter I will say to the Senator from Kentucky was discussed, and, under the proviso, as the Senator will note, studies and recommendations as to consolidations and reorganization of committees are exempted from the prohibition.

I will say further to the Senator from Kentucky that this is a concurrent resolution, as he understands, and the Committee on Rules is of the opinion that a joint committee should not be empowered to recommend changes in the rules of either the House or the Senate. That may be done only by a committee of the respective bodies, not by a joint committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator knows that the rules cannot be changed without action of each separate House and that any recommendation of the joint committee would go to the appropriate committees of the two Houses.

I am not pressing the point, but it seems to me that if the proposed committee is going to function to bring about a reorganization or any improvement in the legislative process of the two Houses, it ought to be given as wide discretion as possible in making recommendations, and of course their recommendations could be completely ignored by the Senate and the House and by any committee to which they might be referred.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky submitted a Senate concurrent resolution similar to the House concurrent resolution on behalf of the late Senator from Connecticut, as he will recall, and it contained exactly the same prohibition, except that it has been amplified and clarified.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is in different language.

Mr. BYRD. The language is not greatly different.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not the author of the resolution. I submitted it at the request of the then Senator from Connecticut, who was ill at the time and from which illness he later died.

Mr. BYRD. I read the language of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kentucky on behalf of the late Senator from Connecticut:

Provided, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the time or manner of, or the parliamentary rules or procedure governing, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House.

That is just as broad, I think, as the language adopted by the Rules Committee of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was language put in the resolution originally by the late Senator from Connecticut and the coauthor of the resolution in the House of Representatives so that the joint committee would not deal with the question of debate—that is, the limitations on debate and the rules of procedure in the consideration of a bill in the Senate and also in the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that is exactly what this amendment does, but it does it in a little clearer language, as the Senator will notice. It is as follows:

That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorized the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further,* That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

That is primarily what it is for, and as the Senator knows each House is required by the Constitution to make its own rules.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that. The language in the amendment prior to the proviso divides it into two categories. One is—

With respect to the rules—

That is the permanent rules of the Senate—

parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House—

That is one thing—

or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House.

So that there are two separate prongs to the provision.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator has not the floor, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as I understand, the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate Committee on Rules was placed in the resolution for the purpose of eliminating from the consideration of the proposed joint committee any question which had to do with the rules of procedure governing debate in either House of Congress. It is my view that the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama in the committee and subsequently recommended to the Senate goes a little bit further than that when it adds the language "or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House."

For example, a Member of the House, Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, has been advocating a change in the House rules which would permit periodic appearances of members of the executive branch of the Government—I think it is confined to members of the Cabinet—for the purpose of questioning, under certain regulations or rules. I believe the joint committee could have considered a proposal of that nature under the language of the resolution as it was adopted by the House of Representatives, but I think it would be excluded from considering it under the language recommended by the Senate committee. In other words, the language proposed to be stricken out by the Senate committee's amendment did prevent the committee from considering anything which had to do with debate, and the regulation or control of debate or procedure in the course of which a bill had to pass before being acted on by

either House of the Congress; but I think the amendment of the Senator from Alabama goes a little further, and would exclude from the consideration of the joint committee—if the resolution should be agreed to—consideration of any suggestions having to do with any matter on the floor of either House. I think that is the difference between the language in the resolution as agreed to by the House and the language proposed by the Senate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the Committee on Rules.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the words "House of Representatives" and the period, it is proposed to strike out "Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 23, after the word *"Provided,"* to strike out "That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the time or manner of, or the parliamentary rules or procedure governing, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House" and insert "That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further,* That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 1, after the word "duties" and the period, to strike out "The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 18, after the words "may be" and the period, to insert "All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules of the Senate and the appropriate committees of the House."

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses, and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided,* That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further,* That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

SEC. 3 (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than April 1, 1945. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the reports shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules of the Senate and the appropriate committees of the House.

GIANT CORPORATIONS FINANCIALLY MORE POWERFUL THAN CITIES AND STATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, late in 1929 President Herbert Hoover named a special Research Committee on Social Trends of which Dr. Wesley C. Mitchell was the Chairman. Its report was issued in the fall of 1932 under the title "Recent Social Trends."

To this report a notable chapter was contributed by Dr. Charles E. Merriam, in which appeared a table comparing certain corporations, States, and cities with respect to their revenues and the number of their employees. The purpose was to show that certain corporations are greater and more powerful in terms both of their receipts and their employees than most cities and States.

At my request the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has brought this table up to date in terms of the latest available figures, namely, those for 1942. Both tables are of the utmost significance as illustrating the difficulties that beset the principle of individual economic freedom in an organized economy. In 1930, for example, New York City enjoyed the largest gross revenues of any political organization in the whole country. Its revenues were, however, scarcely half those of the United States Steel Corporation, which 12 years ago reported larger receipts than any organization, public or private, in the United States. United States Steel in 1932 took in more than $1,201,000,000, as compared with $611,000,000 received by the city of New York. The receipts of New York State that year amounted to a little less than $273,000,000.

United States Steel in terms of receipts has now surrendered leadership among the giant corporations of the country to General Motors, and the revenues of the Empire State have become much greater than those of its principal city. Whereas in 1930 United States Steel took in only twice as much as the largest public organization in the United States except the Federal Government itself, in 1942 General Motors' receipts were almost three times greater than those of New York State, which is not only the richest State in the Federal Union but has now outstripped even its own great metropolis.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks the table taken from President Hoover's Recent Social Trends, and also the table as brought up to date by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of certain corporations, States, and cities with respect to gross revenues and number of employees

Corporation or political unit	Gross revenues [1] [2]	Employees [2]
United States Steel Corporation	$1,201,377,367	211,055
Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co	1,053,692,882	40,000
General Motors Corporation	996,687,332	172,938
Pennsylvania Railroad system	616,638,650	166,607
New York City	611,571,726	86,509
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana	465,752,175	44,520
General Electric Co	396,242,631	78,380
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	292,014,871	324,343
New York State	272,940,372	28,798
Chicago	241,748,819	41,982

Footnotes at end of tables.

Comparison of certain corporations, States, and cities with respect to gross revenues and number of employees—Continued

Corporation or political unit	Gross revenues	Employees
Detroit	$154, 619, 790	19, 436
Los Angeles	152, 166, 523	16, 975
Philadelphia	133, 522, 058	21, 997
California	116, 919, 827	17, 495
New Jersey	91, 068, 090	8, 385
Boston	79, 095, 089	20, 606
Ohio	78, 527, 215	6, 426
Illinois	69, 901, 391	13, 134
North Carolina	41, 401, 317	6, 506
Maryland	28, 165, 361	6, 962
Maine	18, 014, 201	2, 500

[1] Corporation gross revenues include income from all sources for the year 1930. Figures from annual reports or from Standard Corporation Records. State figures are revenue receipts for 1929 and are from U. S. Bureau of the Census, Financial Statistics of States. City figures are revenue receipts for 1928 and are from U. S. Bureau of the Census, Financial Statistics of Cities.

[2] Figures on municipal and State employees are for 1930 with the exception of the States of New York and New Jersey, which are for 1928. The figures are not necessarily comparable because some of the items include only those in the classified service; some include educational employees and others do not.

[3] These figures include a part of county receipts and receipts of special districts as allocated by the Bureau of the Census.

Comparison of certain corporations, States, and cities—gross revenues and number of employees, 1942

Rank in 1942 gross revenues	Corporation or political unit	Gross revenues	Employees	Rank in 1928–30, gross revenues
(1)	General Motors Corporation	$2, 250, 548, 859	314, 144	(3)
(2)	United States Steel	1, 862, 951, 092	335, 866	(1)
(3)	American Telephone & Telegraph	1, 469, 263, 216	327, 107	(8)
(4)	Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.	1, 378, 147, 240	----------	(2)
(5)	General Electric Co	913, 656, 277	139, 939	(7)
(6)	Pennsylvania R. R. System	838, 474, 622	151, 604	(4)
(7)	New York State	720, 306, 000	55, 873	(9)
(8)	New York City	714, 653, 000	[1] 132, 975	(5)
(9)	California	517, 261, 000	[2] 29, 010	(14)
(10)	Standard Oil of Indiana	464, 558, 256	----------	(6)
(11)	Illinois	368, 572, 000	20, 999	(18)
(12)	Ohio	358, 380, 000	[3] 20, 277	(17)
(13)	New Jersey	202, 685, 000	13, 898	(15)
(14)	North Carolina	132, 662, 000	14, 616	(19)
(15)	Chicago	114, 763, 000	[4] 31, 318	(10)
(16)	Detroit	104, 981, 000	[5] 23, 758	(11)
(17)	Philadelphia	81, 405, 000	[6] 19, 699	(13)
(18)	Boston	77, 620, 000	[7] 12, 606	(16)
(19)	Maryland	76, 887, 000	[8] 9, 253	(20)
(20)	Maine	40, 342, 000	[9] 6, 196	(21)
(21)	Los Angeles	39, 832, 000	[10] 19, 070	(12)

[1] General government, 100,626; public-service enterprises, 32,349.
[2] General government, 28,486; public-service enterprises, 524.
[3] General government, 18,928; public-service enterprises, 1,349.
[4] General government, 27,807; public-service enterprises, 3,509.
[5] General government, 16,629; public-service enterprises, 7,129.
[6] General government, 18,696; public-service enterprises, 1,003.
[7] General government, 12,075; public-service enterprises, 531.
[8] General government, 9,176; public-service enterprises, 77.
[9] General government, 5,940; public-service enterprises, 256.
[10] General government, 10,997; public-service enterprises, 8,073.

Notes on public employment: Figures exclude schools, work relief, and contract-work employment. Unless otherwise indicated, employment total relates to general government only.

Source: Standard and Poor's, corporation records; and publications of the U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, during the studies of the Temporary National Economic Committee several years ago I made a comparison of the giant corporations of the country—the billion-dollar corporations, so-called—with the States of the Union, not upon the basis of their receipts but upon the basis of their assessed valuation. This information I had brought up to date during the last session of Congress when as chairman of a subcommittee of the George Post-War Committee I filed a report with that committee. The table, which is now a part of Senate Document No. 106, is significant in comparison with the tables which I have already mentioned. Furthermore, Mr. President, the United Press makes it a practice every year to compile a list of the billion-dollar corporations in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the table taken from Senate Document No. 106 of the last Congress and the table of the United Press on the asset rating of the largest corporations in the United States may also be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 6

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER—SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Total assessed valuation of States (1940) compared with total assets of 34 "billion dollar" corporations (1942)[1]

States	Corporations	Billions	
New York			25. 69
Pennsylvania			11. 24
Ohio			9. 18
California			8. 50
Michigan			6. 46
Massachusetts			6. 44
	Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. (New York).	5. 99	
New Jersey			5. 51
Illinois			5. 29
Indiana			5. 08
Wisconsin			4. 94
	Prudential Insurance Co. of America (Newark, N. J.).	4. 93	
	Chase National Bank of New York.	4. 57	
	American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	[2] 4. 53	
Texas			4. 21
Missouri			3. 83
	National City Bank of New York.	3. 76	
Iowa			3. 25
	New York Life Insurance Co.	3. 14	
North Carolina			3. 13
Connecticut			3. 10
	Guaranty Trust Co. of New York.	3. 00	
	Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States (New York).	2. 93	
Kansas			2. 78
	Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association (California).	2. 77	
Kentucky			2. 67
Maryland			2. 47
	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.	2. 22	
Virginia			2. 21
	Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.	2. 20	
	The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	[3] 2. 19	
Nebraska			2. 16
	United States Steel Corporation.	2. 12	

Footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT 6—Continued

States	Corporations	Billions	
Ninnesota			2. 02
	General Motors Corporation.	1. 98	
	Southern Pacific Co.	[4] 1. 89	
West Virginia			1. 82
	First National Bank of Chicago.	1. 77	
	New York Central Railroad Co.	[5] 1. 72	
	Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co. (New York).	1. 64	
	Bankers Trust Co. (New York).	1. 63	
	Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York.	1. 59	
Georgia			1. 58
	Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. (Milwaukee).	1. 53	
Rhode Island			1. 52
Tennessee			1. 50
	Manufacturers Trust Co. (New York).	1. 42	
Louisiana			1. 37
District of Columbia.			1. 35
Florida			1. 31
	Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.	[6] 1. 31	
	Chemical Bank & Trust Co. (New York).	1. 29	
	John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. (Boston).	1. 29	
	Travelers Insurance Co. (Hartford, Conn.).	1. 23	
	The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.	[7] 1. 23	
Oklahoma			1. 20
	Union Pacific Railroad Co.	[8] 1. 17	
	The First National Bank of Boston (Massachusetts).	1. 17	
Washington			1. 17
	The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.	[9] 1. 16	
Colorado			1. 11
	Commonwealth & Southern Corporation.	[10] 1. 09	
	Irving Trust Co. (New York).	1. 04	
	National Bank of Detroit.	1. 04	
	The First National Bank of the City of New York.	1. 01	
Alabama			. 96
South Dakota			. 95
Oregon			. 90
Maine			. 67
New Hampshire.			. 58
South Carolina			. 57
Mississippi			. 54
Utah			. 52
Arkansas			. 45
North Dakota			. 45
Arizona			. 39
Idaho			. 39
Vermont			. 35
Wyoming			. 34
Delaware			. 33
Montana			. 32
New Mexico			. 32
Nevada			. 19
		73. 55	143. 31

[1] Total assets for corporation as of the fiscal year ended Dec. 31, 1942.
[2] After deduction of $1.56 billion "Depreciation reserve," carried as a liability.
[3] After deduction of $0.47 billion "Accrued depreciation—equipment and road," carried as a liability.
[4] After deduction of $0.19 billion "Accrued depreciation," carried as a liability.
[5] After deduction of $0.24 billion "Accrued depreciation," carried as a liability.
[6] After deduction of $0.12 billion "Depreciation reserve," carried as a liability.
[7] After deduction of $0.21 billion "Accrued depreciation and amortization—road and equipment," carried as a liability.
[8] After deduction of $0.15 billion "Accrued depreciation and amortization—road and equipment," carried as a liability.
[9] After deduction of $0.12 billion "Accrued depreciation—road and equipment," carried as a liability.
[10] After deduction of $0.11 billion "Depreciation and retirement reserve," carried as a liability.

Source: State figures from Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Corporation assets from Moody's Manuals.

METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE CO. DISPLACES BELL TELEPHONE AS WORLD'S LARGEST ENTERPRISE; ASSETS TOTAL $6,463,803,552

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. during the past year replaced the Bell Telephone System as the largest private business enterprise in this country, the United Press disclosed today in a copyrighted survey.

The study also revealed that membership in the Billion-Dollar Club—composed of business enterprises with total resources of $1,000,000,000 or more—has increased to 41 from 38 at this time last year, and 32 on December 31, 1941, a short time after the United States entered the war.

The 41 business agents, on the basis of latest available statistics, possess aggregate assets of $92,504,426,132 against $82,830,994,287 for these same companies at the close of 1942.

All but two of the current members—United States Steel Corporation and Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.—showed year-to-year increases in their assets, the survey revealed.

Three new members joined the billion-dollar group during 1943; namely, Aetna Life Affiliated Companies, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., and the Ford Motor Co. The Aetna group consists of the Aetna Life Insurance Co.—almost a billion-dollar organization by itself—Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., and Standard Fire Insurance Co.

The latest enrollment of billionaire enterprises comprises 16 banks, 9 insurance companies, 7 industrial or manufacturing concerns, 6 railroads, and 3 public utilities.

Metropolitan Life, which for years ran second to the Bell System, finally managed to move ahead of the latter and become the No. 1 member with assets of $6,463,803,552.

The Bell System, comprising American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its telephone subsidiaries, was in second place with $6,313,256,718.

Prudential Insurance Co. was third with resources of $5,373,979,917.

Chase National Bank of New York, the world's largest commercial bank, was fourth with assets of $4,990,183,000, while National City Bank of New York ranked fifth with $4,410,418,000.

First on the list of the railroads and tenth in general standing was Pennsylvania Railroad Co. with $2,811,694,778. Standard Oil Co. (N. J.) led the industrials and was twelfth on the list with resources of $2,327,808,847. General Motors Corporation ran thirteenth on $2,236,372,067, and United States Steel ranked fourteenth on $2,106,062,460.

Following are members of the billion-dollar club and their latest known assets, compared with assets on December 31, 1942:

Company	Latest assets	1942
Metropolitan Life Ins	$6,463,803,552	$5,994,915,576
Bell Telephone System	6,313,256,718	6,092,697,837
Prudential Ins	5,373,979,917	4,927,047,492
Chase National Bank (N. Y.)	4,990,183,000	4,569,496,000
National City Bank (N. Y.)	4,410,418,000	3,761,671,000
Bank of America, NT & SA	3,975,493,000	2,771,690,000
Guaranty Trust Co. (N. Y.)	3,601,236,000	2,995,499,000
New York Life Ins	3,342,956,430	3,142,232,054
Equitable Life Assurance	3,189,654,385	2,932,856,359
Pennsylvania Railroad	2,811,694,778	2,652,851,189
Contl. Ill. Natl. Bank	2,483,461,000	2,197,459,000
Standard Oil (N. J.)	2,327,808,847	2,220,178,391
General Motors	2,236,372,067	1,747,250,191
U. S. Steel Corp	2,106,062,460	2,123,435,264
New York Central Railroad	2,102,431,268	1,952,770,540
First National Bank, Chicago	2,085,761,000	1,767,083,000
Southern Pacific Co	1,921,986,233	1,787,848,939
Bankers Trust Co	1,867,126,000	1,625,080,000
Manufacturers Trust Co	1,797,641,000	1,419,495,000
Central Hanover Bank	1,732,713,000	1,643,855,00
Mutual Life Ins	1,651,346,466	1,587,529,495
Northwestern Mutual Life	1,637,443,394	1,525,724,943
Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe Ry	1,560,599,828	1,437,202,778
First National Bank, Boston	$1,495,400,000	$1,168,027,000
Union Pacific Railroad	1,455,960,126	[1] 1,310,000,861
John Hancock Mutual Life	1,441,468,994	1,288,048,650
Consolidated Edison	1,420,805,962	1,423,379,919
Chemical Bank & Trust Co	1,408,350,000	1,289,984,000
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad	1,322,633,092	1,281,115,767
Travelers Insurance Co	1,315,815,674	1,231,914,216
Irving Trust Co	1,279,314,000	1,040,271,000
National Bank of Detroit	1,268,267,000	1,036,192,000
Security-First Natl. Bank, L. A	1,255,098,000	870,431,000
Commonwealth & Southern Corporation	1,202,085,102	1,200,327,567
Bank of the Manhattan Co	1,158,292,000	994,538,000
First National Bank (N. Y.)	1,139,258,000	1,014,254,000
Aetna Life Affiliated Cos	1,138,564,206	976,409,854
E. I. du Pont de Nemours	1,135,282,714	1,041,089,533
Bethlehem Steel Corporation	1,044,869,730	[1] 1,005,646,523
Socony-Vacuum Oil	1,030,449,701	970,115,471
Ford Motor Co	1,009,092,488	813,079,878
Total combined resources	92,504,426,132	82,830,994,287

[1] Revised.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Do the tables also include the data the Senator has mentioned in reference to the Government corporations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The Federal Government assets, of course, are much greater, until we stop to think that most of them should be written in red ink.

Mr. WILEY. It is also true, is it not, that a great many of the corporations the Senator has mentioned have had the benefit of loans from Government corporations, and owe debts to Government corporations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Whether they were loans or not might be questioned. Some of the corporations doubtless have had loans, but during the war the Federal Government, through the Defense Plant Corporation, through the R. F. C., and otherwise, has expended billions of dollars in the construction of plants which are operated by some of these great companies.

PROPOSED DRAFT OF LABOR

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have just received from a very distinguished citizen of our country who is of Serbian extraction, a letter which expresses some views with reference to the manpower situation which I think are original and interesting. I ask that the letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, speaking to the country over the radio last Sunday night, urged the immediate adoption of the labor draft bill, arguing that it was needed "to back our fighters to the limit" and "to shorten the war."

I propose to demonstrate here that the War Department and the administration, in their latest attempt to railroad the Nation into compulsory labor service, have not come here with clean hands. I propose to prove that for more than 3 months the War Department and the Administration have had at their disposal a reservoir of combatant manpower, situated close to the battle fronts, comprising hundreds of thousands of fighters eager to shorten the war and to back our boys to the limit, and that this forgotten army of a recognized and honorable ally has been waiting in vain for even a word of encouragement from our War Department and administration.

Ever since October 28, 1944, General Mihailovich, who first raised an army in the Balkans to resist and to fight the Nazi hordes and who is now in control of a large part of his native Serbia, has been sending frantic appeals to the Allied commanders and Governments offering to place himself under their supreme orders and asking for arms to enable him to fight the Germans. General Mihailovich has 80,000 warriors with him in the mountains, but is sorely in need of modern equipment and ammunition. It is conservatively estimated that he can within a short time mobilize an additional quarter of a million men, if only we could spare for him some of the lend-lease material we are shipping all over the world.

On November 8, 1944, General Mihailovich addressed a formal appeal to General Maitland-Wilson, then Allied commander in the Mediterranean and now with the Combined Chiefs of Staff in Washington, copies of which went to our Government and War Department. After giving details of the situation in Yugoslavia and after declaring that the Russians accept only the cooperation of the Communists, General Mihailovich stated:

"We have decided, dear General, to forward you our following request: (1) to be myself, together with the entire forces of the Yugoslav Army in the country, placed under your command, and that I may receive from you direct orders and directives for action in order to be included in the general offensive scheme of the Anglo-American Armies which shall operate in Yugoslavia. * * * (2) for such actions which you would order us to execute it would be necessary that you supply us with ammunition for which we are in great need. Besides that, all our units are in great necessity of equipment, shoes, uniforms, and food. (3) It would be necessary that you send to my headquarters and to all my commanding officers in the field your military missions, in order to coordinate our actions according to your plans. (4) It is of the utmost importance and urgency that by your authority and orders the Communists be prevented from attacking our units and from murdering the innocent population. * * * I beg you to give me your reply most urgently.

"General MIHAILOVICH."

No answer was ever received by Mihailovich or his authorized representatives abroad to this appeal and offer of services. Since then repeated representations have been made by Yugoslav officials in Washington, and further desperate pleas from Mihailovich have been conveyed to our Government. All of these have gone unanswered. There, in the middle of the Balkans, within easy reach of the Mediterranean, stands a forgotten army of veteran and loyal Allied soldiers who cry for an opportunity "to shorten the war" and to liberate their country from terrorists and invaders, and their cry remains a voice in the wilderness.

How loyal to the cause of the Allies and how true in their friendship for America are these soldiers of General Mihailovich has been revealed to the people of this country only the other day. On Wednesday, January 31, most of the leading newspapers of the Nation published an official United States Army Air Forces photograph, showing three American airmen forced down in Mihailovich territory, wearing blankets given them by his Chetniks who aided them in making good their escape. The three Americans were Lt. Carl H. Voss, of Philadelphia; Sgt. Harold Sykes, of Stelton, N. J.; and Sgt. Fred A. Dodge, of Westpoint, Pa.

Now it can be told that nearly 500 American airmen, who had been forced down earlier in the war on hazardous missions against the Rumanian oil fields of Ploesti which the Soviets seem to have appropriated, were rescued by Chetniks and enabled by them to be repatriated in recent months. Without exception these 500 Americans bear unanimous testimony, from their first-hand experience, to the unflagging loyalty of the Mihailovich forces to the Allied cause.

"The people sacrificed and went without food so we could live," declared Sgt. Leon W. Carver, according to the Salt Lake City Desert News, upon his return home after spending 17 months within the Mihailovich country.

"When we hit the ground, which was in Serbia, we were picked up by the Chetnicks," reported another airman, Staff Sgt. Douglas Poland, Jr., to the Seattle Daily Times. Sergeant Poland came down with his left leg riddled with bullet wounds. "The wounded were separated from the others," his account continues, "and we were taken to a Chetnik hospital up in the hills where I stayed for 38 days. We never saw the other members of the crew after we were separated. I heard later that my pilot, First Lt. Charles L. Sevenson, whose home is in Snohomish, is safe and his wife expects him to return home."

Among the hundreds of eyewitnesses, all American heroes of the air, coming from different parts of our country, who have had direct contact with what I have called the forgotten army of General Mihailovich, perhaps Lt. John N. Scroggs, of Kansas City, has voiced their sentiments best.

"Those of us who know the real circumstances in Serbia," writes Lieutenant Scroggs, "are enraged at the unfair attacks against the Chetniks and their leaders. If only someone could open the poor blind eyes of the spoiled American public, a wonderful group of people might receive their due recognition. Unfortunately, those of us who lived with these people are few and far between, but believe you me, never will we forget how the men and women of Serbia unquestioningly risked their very lives for us, fed us, clothed us, and gave us shelter when they themselves were ill-clad, cold, and hungry * * * I vowed to myself that if I could ever possibly repay those people for all they had done for me, I wouldn't hesitate to do so. I suffer with them, in their present plight, and in the injustices rendered to them by the American press as well as the American and British Governments."

There is no blinking at the fact that a state of civil war exists in Yugoslavia. That gallant land which was the first in southeastern Europe to challenge the monstrous power of Hitler's war machine is now torn in two camps. There is the Communist domain, ruled over by Tito, who has just refused the requests of the British and American Governments to allow British and American correspondents to see for themselves what is going on there. And there is the camp of Mihailovich, who is pleading for Allied missions and press representatives to come and see for themselves what he and his people stand for.

Above all, we owe it to the American people to let them know what the 500 American airmen have found out, what has long been known but buried in certain high bureaus in Washington, namely, that in southern Europe there stands ready an army of over 300,000 men, eager to join the fight against the common enemy and to shorten the war, if only we would give them guns and ammunition and perhaps some food rations. And let us remember that this forgotten army is fighting not for communism, but for self-government and for freedom.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John F. X. McGohey, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice James B. M. McNally, resigned.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral William B. Young, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be a pay director in the Navy with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from June 1, 1942;

Col. David R. Nimmer, to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from January 20, 1945; and

Col. William W. Rogers, to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from January 20, 1945.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY—ELLIOTT ROOSEVELT

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army which had previously been passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as all the Army nominations have come over from a previous day, and inasmuch as there is only one of them which I think will occasion any comment, that being the nomination of Col. Elliott Roosevelt, I ask unanimous consent that his nomination be taken up first and disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Col. Elliott Roosevelt to be brigadier general?

Mr. BUSHFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield for that purpose?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Eastland
Bankhead	Byrd	Ellender
Barkley	Capper	Fulbright
Bilbo	Chandler	George
Brewster	Chavez	Gerry
Bridges	Connally	Green
Briggs	Cordon	Guffey
Buck	Donnell	Gurney
Bushfield	Downey	Hatch
Hayden	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Hickenlooper	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Millikin	Tobey
Johnson, Calif.	Moore	Tunnell
Johnson, Colo.	Murdock	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Vandenberg
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Wagner
La Follette	Overton	Walsh
Langer	Pepper	Wheeler
Lucas	Radcliffe	Wherry
McClellan	Reed	White
McFarland	Russell	Wiley
McKellar	Stewart	
Magnuson	Taylor	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are absent from the Senate on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota yields in order that I may propound, on behalf of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], a question to the Military Affairs Committee. The Senator from Maine prepared and requested me, in the event that he was not in the Chamber when the nomination of Colonel Roosevelt came up, to ask the Military Affairs Committee this question for him:

Will the Military Affairs Committee furnish the Senate with information as to the number, names, and character of instances in which men entering the service with the rank of captain or lower, without previous military experience or qualifications as specialists, have risen in a period of 4 years to the rank of brigadier general?

May I propound that question to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] with the permission of the Senator from South Dakota?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah for the purpose of answering the question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not know whether we have that information in just that form or not; but if we have it, the Senator from Kansas will get the answer.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on January 20, 1944, I objected to confirmation of the nomination promoting a gentleman named Colonel Hill. I did not personally know the individual. I knew nothing about him except that he was fifty-fourth on the list of colonels, and was being advanced, without apparent reason, to the rank of brigadier general in the Quartermaster Corps. I made that objection on behalf of the commissioned officers of the Army.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that in cases of this kind, and cases such as the case of the colonel whom I mentioned a moment ago, the mouths of the officer corps are sealed. There is no one to speak for them. They do not dare protest promotions, even though they may be unfair. This afternoon I am happy to say a word in behalf of the officers of the United States Army because someone outside the Army is the only source from which protests can come.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to enter into this question in a personal way. The individuals involved are immaterial so far as I am concerned; but there are on the list today approximately 9,600 active colonels, any one of whom is ready for promotion when it comes his way, if it ever does. Of those 9,600 colonels, 2,351 are graduates of the Military Academy at West Point. They are men who have spent 4 years in study and preparation for their chosen profession, the Army of the United States. Those men naturally have the ordinary human reaction of protest, even though it must be silent, against the advancement of youngsters who are wholly and completely amateurs in the military game, except for recent activity in the present war.

On last Saturday I asked a general in the Army what was the average time within which an officer in the Army could hope to become a captain in peacetime, and he said 10 years. I asked him how long a time would be required to become a colonel, and he said 28 years.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a few interesting records with regard to years of service. Gen. Robert E. Lee had 36 years of service in the Army before he became a brigadier general. Gen. George Marshall was in the Army for 35 years before he became a brigadier general. General Arnold had 32 years to his credit, General Eisenhower 30 years, General Pershing 24 years, and General MacArthur 21 years before reaching the rank of brigadier general.

The job of a general is not one to be undertaken as one would enter on the position of managing the hosiery department in a department store. An officer arrives at the rank of general after he has served for many years and has thoroughly learned his profession. A man who becomes a brigadier general has the lives of thousands of men under his jurisdiction and care. In this particular case, I understand that this young man of 34 will have 5,000 men under his command. The lives of those men require, as a matter of justice, the most competent care that we are able to provide for them, and the most able commanders, and not commanders who are selected hit-or-miss.

Mr. President, it strikes me that any man who is honored—and it is a high honor—with the uniform of the United States Army owes to his country and to that uniform something which is almost indescribable. In this connection I am referring particularly to the fact that a man who dons the uniform of the United States Army, with its insignia upon his shoulders, owes it to the United States Army and to the United States of America so to conduct himself that he will not bring discredit or criticism upon the uniform or upon his country. The Army code is a strict code, as it should be; and there are many things which an officer may not do. In the Army code is a clause designated as "Conduct unbecoming an officer." Before I shall have finished I wish to discuss that item very briefly, without any thought whatsoever of personalities.

In the New York World-Telegram of February 9 I find the following:

> Protests arose when Elliott was commissioned a captain in the Specialist Reserve on September 23, 1940. Afraid lest the disturbance interfere with his father's campaign, just getting under way for the third term, Elliott handed his resignation to General Echols, then commander of Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, where he was stationed.
>
> RESIGNATION REFUSED
>
> Refusing to accept it, General Echols explained why in the following extract from a press release from his office October 15, 1940.
>
> "General Echols has refused to accept his resignation on the grounds that Captain Roosevelt's physical examination shows that his eyesight is such that it renders him unfit for either combat or flying duty * * *. Instructions from the Chief of the Air Corps are that these reserve officers will be commissioned from personnel not physically fit for flying."
>
> When and if his promotion is approved Colonel Roosevelt will become one of the few Air Force generals who has never been to college, and even rarer, one who does not have pilot's wings. He earned a private pilot's license in 1933 after taking a civilian flying course.

A moment ago I spoke about the duty of a man in uniform, and especially the duty of an officer, to guard his every act and his every word so that no reflection may be cast upon the service and upon his country. The same duty applies even more strictly in the case now before us.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. A moment ago the Senator quoted from an article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram, referring to a statement by General Echols, who was the general in command at the time when Elliott Roosevelt was a captain. In the article General Echols is quoted as saying that due to Elliott Roosevelt's eyesight, he was unfit for either combat or flying service.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to say to the Senator that I listened with a great deal of attention to the reading of the record which was prepared by the War Department and was read to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the distinguished chairman of the committee, and by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], another member of the committee. I do not recall that in the memorandum and data which they read there was included anything to the effect that Elliott Roosevelt was unfit for either flying or combat duty. If any such statement was included, and if I am mistaken in the statement I have previously made, I should like to be corrected now by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator for calling attention to that fact.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Referring to the observation just made by the Senator from New Hampshire, let me state that on page 693 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 1, 1945, is to be found a part of Col. Elliott Roosevelt's record, as submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The following note appears:

> Colonel Roosevelt, to date, has a total of 1,100 flying hours. Of these 1,100 hours, 300 have been on combat missions.

I call the attention of the Senate to the following:

> Colonel Roosevelt has recently piloted single-controlled planes on 303 combat missions. A single-controlled plane has but one pilot. And on each of these flights he (Colonel Roosevelt) has been the pilot.

I should also like to hear some comment from someone who knows the facts as to how, when, and why Colonel Roosevelt should now be able to operate a plane if he was not able to do so at the time when General Echols made his observations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am sure the Senate will be glad to have that information placed before it, if there is any source from which it can be obtained.

Mr. President, a moment ago I was about to discuss the duty which an officer in the United States Army owes to himself and to his uniform. In the present case there is a double duty. A son of the President of the United States is the individual involved in the present case. I say to the Senate that a son of the President of the United States owes a greater duty. He owes a duty to the office his father holds so to conduct himself that there will be no discredit or reflection upon the President's office.

I desire to refer briefly to a newspaper article regarding the matter now before the Senate. The article appeared in one of the daily newspapers published Sunday, and in it the statement is made by the War Department or by someone speaking for it that the granting of an "A" priority to a bulldog is wholly unauthorized, was a serious mistake, and cannot be justified.

A slip which has been laid upon my desk today contains the following statement, in substance:

Colonel Ireland, who has taken the rap for this matter, issued the priority "A" without anybody's request. The statement is also published that Mrs. Boetteger, the sister of the gentleman involved in the incident, ordered the dog shipped without anybody's request.

Obviously, both statements must be taken with more than one grain of salt. Nobody is going to grant an "A" priority to a bull dog, when space is at such a premium as it is today, unless someone asks for it. Nobody in the White House is going to order a dog shipped to California unless someone has suggested it or asked for it. There is only one individual of whom I can think who was sufficiently interested to make such a request.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator from South Dakota should read the report of the subcommittee appointed to study priorities, which went into this case especially. He will note that on page 3 of the report, which I think is on his desk—if it is not, I hold one in my hand and I will give it to him—there appears a statement somewhat different from the statement the Senator made. Therefore, I think the RECORD should be made correct at this point. I read from the report:

On January 5, 1945, Col. Ray W. Ireland, assistant chief of staff for priorities and traffic, Headquarters Air Transport Command, received a telephone request from Mrs. John Boettiger at the White House that Colonel Roosevelt's dog Blaze be transported from Washington to Mrs. Elliott Roosevelt in Hollywood, Calif. No mention of priority was made in the conversation. Colonel Ireland, however, established an A priority for the dog, and on January 9, 1945, the dog was shipped on a military cargo aircraft which left Washington about noon.

That statement is contained in the report of the committee made public on Saturday, and I am sure the whole country has read it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator, but I wish to say in comment that I am not so naive as to believe that the dog was shipped in any such manner.

Incidentally, the same Colonel Ireland has mysteriously left the country since the incident occurred. I suppose the Senator knew that.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I desire to ask the Senator from South Dakota if, on the other hand, there is any evidence to establish the fact that this supposed Colonel Ireland was even in the city at the time when the incident occurred?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no knowledge at all upon that subject; but he is now reported to be overseas.

Mr. BUTLER. Information has been given to me—I frankly admit I do not have positive proof of it—that he was not even in the city at the time when this incident occurred.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is this the same Roosevelt boy who was appointed captain?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. This is the same one.

Mr. LANGER. Is this the same one who was appointed captain without any previous training?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. So far as I can ascertain from the record relative to the subject under discussion today, he had never had any military training of any kind or character prior to his appointment as captain. He is now 34 years of age. Our distinguished military leaders had attained ages far in excess of that when they became brigadiers, as I stated a moment ago. Our own beloved General Marshall had had 35 years of military service before he became a brigadier general.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in connection with the last statement of the Senator from South Dakota, I think it should be pointed out—and probably this is in answer to the question asked by the Senator himself—that there are now in the Army of the United States six other persons, Reserve officers and other members of the Army of the United States, who have attained the rank of brigadier general, and none of them had a rank higher than that of captain at the time when they entered the service. Their promotions have been consistent with the service they have rendered, just as the Senator from Utah feels that Elliott Roosevelt's promotion has been.

I believe that it is hardly necessary for me to point out that in the history of our Army its officers have required a long time in order to reach the exalted rank of brigadier general. Throughout the entire history of our Army there have been glorious exceptions of men who won high rank in less time than has Elliott Roosevelt, and for acts which were probably equal to or greater in importance than his. It has always been a part of the custom of the United States Army to recognize merit when it is achieved. I am not in the least sorry that in the Civil War, in 1861, General Forrest rose from the rank of lieutenant to that of lieutenant general within 2 years, I am not sorry that Custer rose from the rank of second lieutenant to that of major general in 2 years. I am especially not sorry that General Sheridan was able to rise from a second lieutenancy to a lieutenant generalcy within the period of 3 years. Thus we might go on.

Mr. President, let us remember certain facts in connection with these promotions. It is only in the Air Forces of the United States that such extraordinary promotions have occurred. I realize that the Senate is not arguing against the method of the Army in making its promotions. But these are extremely exceptional matters. Every one of the officers who was promoted to the rank of brigadier general from the rank of lieutenant or captain since the beginning of the war was a man who had served in the Air Forces. The Senator knows that the air service was very small at the beginning of the war. The Senator also knows that it has expanded as no other branch of the service has expanded. The Senator also knows that there have been instances of members of the air personnel having obtained remarkably rapid promotions. It seems to me that it is just as remarkable for a man to rise to the rank of lieutenant colonel because of valor in action as it is for a man who had had a certain amount of training when he entered the Army to rise from a lieutenancy to a lieutenant generalcy. I say that in fairness, and not to argue with the Senator, because this is no matter for quibbling.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator. I ask the Senator from Utah a question: Does he, as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, believe that because Elliott Roosevelt is very brilliant he should be promoted over the heads of many other officers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator should read what Elliott Roosevelt has done to gain his promotions. I do not wish to make comparisons. What he has done has made him very worthy of the honor which has come to him, and he has gained such honor as the result of his service. At the proper time I shall be happy to read an account of his service to the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield so that I may propound a question to the Senator from Utah?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield so that the Senator from Kansas may propound a question to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. REED. Does the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee consider the statement which he made a few minutes ago with reference to six instances of promotion—if I heard him correctly—to have been responsive to the question which was asked him?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not know whether it was responsive or not, but I have the statistics which deal with six men who were promoted to the rank of brigadier general in the Air Forces of the United States. I believe that in a way my statement was an answer to the question.

Mr. REED. The question which the Senator from Maine prepared, and which I propounded on his behalf, asked for the names and the instances in which men entering the service with the rank of captain or lower, without previous military experience or qualifications, had risen in a period of 4 years to the rank of brigadier general.

I may say that I knew nothing about this until a few moments ago; but I do not believe the answer of the Senator from Utah was responsive to the question propounded by me in behalf of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah is entirely in agreement with what the Senator from Kansas has said. I cannot answer the question extemporaneously, but I shall be glad to obtain the information later. I merely gave such information as I had at hand, because it seemed germane to what the Senator from South Dakota had said.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe that the question which the Senator from Kansas addressed to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee did not receive consideration during the course of the discussion of Colonel Roosevelt's nomination before the committee. At least it did not receive consideration to my knowledge.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. I therefore got in touch with the War Department and asked them the question. The answer which they have just given me over the telephone is that there are only two men in the service who were inducted into the Army, or who came into the Army with the rank of captain, or a lower rank, who are now brigadier generals. There are four others who entered the service with the rank of captain, or lower, who are now brigadier generals, but they had had previous military service. There are two exceptions which are well known. One of them is General Knudsen, who was made a lieutenant general because of being a specialist, and in order to give him rank to enable him to perform his duties. The other exception is General Osborn, who was brought into the service for a specialty assignment in connection with Army morale. But there are only two men without previous military service who went into the service with the rank of captain or below that rank and who are now either brigadier generals or are recommended on this list to be given the rank of brigadier general.

Mr. REED. May I inquire from the Senator from New Hampshire, with the permission of the Senator from South Dakota, what character of service those men rendered in connection with their promotion to the rank of brigadier general?

Mr. BRIDGES. At the moment I am unable to say, but within a few minutes I shall be able to answer the Senator's question. One of the men to whom I refer was born in 1906 and the other was born in 1903. They both entered the Army in 1942.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in pursuing the thought which was expressed by the Senator from Utah a few moments ago, I wish to read some figures covering the period from 1939 to 1944, inclusive.

In 1939, 4 Military Academy graduates and 5 others who were not Military Academy graduates, making a total of 9, were raised to the rank of brigadier general; in 1940 the number was 73 from West Point and 65 from the outside; in 1941, 84 from West Point and 88 from the outside; in 1942, 182 from West Point and 340 from the outside; in 1943, 130 from West Point and 205 from the outside; in 1944, 146 from West Point and 160 from the outside.

I again invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that today there are slightly more than 9,600 colonels in the Army, any one of whom might be made a brigadier general. I realize that they are not all in the Air Corps; but what effect will the rapid promotion of Elliott Roosevelt have upon the approximately 10,000 colonels who are all subject to being promoted to brigadier generals if they can obtain the nod from the right man?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. REED. They are not all sons of the President. That answers the question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have a perfect flood of mail in my office protesting against this nomination.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to something that just occurred:

> The District of Columbia Council of the American Legion, which represents 50 capital posts, adopted a resolution calling for the careful consideration of Elliott's meteoric rise in the Army from a captain's bars to a general's stars in less than 4½ years.
>
> The council, which numbers veterans of the present war as well as the first war in its membership, was virtually unanimous in urging most careful examination of the merits of the case by the Senate committee. The resolution was adopted in this spirit at the meeting during which veterans of two wars regretted the nomination of the President's son.

Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to something of this young man's record. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] said he would present his record presently. I want to present some of it from the facts I have before me.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. If the nominee were not the son of the President of the United States, but was some other person, would the Senator be making objections to the confirmation of his nomination?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That would depend upon the circumstances.

Mr. STEWART. The circumstances, I assume, would be the same. Would the Senator be making objection if it were the nomination of John Doe instead of the nomination of the President's son?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. John Doe's name would not be up for confirmation for appointment as brigadier general. If the Senator wants to know my position I have no hesitancy in stating my views at any place or any time.

Mr. STEWART. I am quite aware of that, and that is the reason I asked the able Senator the question. I repeat, assuming that the nominee was not the son of the President would the Senator be making objection to the confirmation of his nomination in the Senate?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I certainly would.

Mr. STEWART. Has the Senator gone into the record of each one of the other nominees whose names were sent in at the same time for brigadier general as carefully as he has gone into this one?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator knows I have not.

Let me call attention to the record that came from the War Department to me this morning. This record has particular reference to the travelings of the young man whose nomination is before the Senate today. I find that on November 15, 1940, leave was given to this young man; another leave was given him from September 24, 1943, to October 6, 1943, and still another leave was given on December 16, 1944.

Now as to his temporary duty assignments: November 1–3, 1940, temporary duty to Corpus Christi, Tex.; December 19, 1940, temporary duty to Washington, D. C.; December 21–27, 1940, temporary duty to Dallas, Tex.; May 1, 1941, temporary duty to Bolling Field, District of Columbia; June 5 to June 14, 1941, detached service to Ottawa, Canada; June 17 to June 21, 1941, detached service to Washington, D. C.; June 30, 1941, detached service to Argentina; August 18 to September 12, 1941, detached service to Scotland, England, Iceland, and Washington, D. C.; September 18 to December 20, 1941, temporary duty at Kelly Field, Tex.; March 5 to May 7, 1942, detached service to Africa from Bolling Field, District of Columbia; July 8 to July 31, 1942, temporary duty to Colorado Springs, Colo.; November 6 to Nov. 10, 1942, detached service to Benson from England; November 17, 1942, detached service from England; March 20 to March 26, 1943, detached service from North Africa; May 4 to May 18, 1943, detached service from North Africa; July 19 to October 14, 1943, temporary duty to Washington, D. C.; September 6 to September 13, 1943, temporary duty to England; February 20, 1944, temporary duty to the Mediterranean area; November 14 to December 30, 1944, temporary duty to Washington, D. C.; November 19 to November 30, 1944, from temporary duty in Washingtoon to Wright Field; December 27 to December 29, 1944, from temporary duty in Washington, D. C., to Farmingdale, N. Y.

This letter is signed by a major general of the United States Army.

Mr. President, I said in my opening remarks that a man wearing the uniform of the Army of the United States owed a duty to himself and to his uniform so to conduct himself that he would not be subject to the criticism. The facts are undisputed, as found by a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, that somebody, whoever he may have been, requested an A priority to ship a bulldog on a plane flying from somewhere in the East to California.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. In order that the RECORD may be kept accurate, let me say that it was a mastiff and not a bulldog.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am not enough of a dog fancier to understand the difference, but I thank the Senator for correcting me. The dog weighed 110 pounds, did it not?

Mr. TOBEY. I understand it weighed 130 pounds.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Very well; 130 pounds.

The plane, I understand, according to the record, the news record at least, arrived at Memphis, Tenn., in the course

of its trip, and three servicemen, one of whom, I understand, was on the way to the funeral of his mother were "bumped" from the plane.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. According to the report from the War Department, the servicemen were not "bumped" from the plane on account of the dog; that had nothing to do with it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. They were "bumped" from the plane because of the added weight of the dog and its cage, were they not?

Mr. STEWART. No; but because the plane had to take on a cargo which had a B priority, which is superior to the priority the servicemen had.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But the dog was not put off the plane, was it?

Mr. STEWART. No; because the dog had an A priority. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But the three servicemen were put off, were they not? Will the Senator answer my question? The three servicemen were put off the plane were they not?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; they were put off, but I want to call the Senator's attention to the report of the War Department, the report of General George, filed with the subcommittee. The report stated that these men did not lose passage because of the dog at all. Whether the dog had been on the plane or not they would have had to get off to make space for the cargo which was loaded on the plane because the cargo had a B priority which was superior to the priority held by the three servicemen. Of course the dog, which had an A priority, and the cage he was in displaced an equal amount of cargo; there is no question about that; but these men, according to the Army report, could not have ridden on the plane anyway.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The dog also had a priority superior to that of a United States Senator, did he not?

Mr. STEWART. I think that is correct. Will the Senator let me read a portion of the report?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Tennessee for that purpose?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. I quote from the report, as follows:

The flight on which the dog was carried was a scheduled cargo flight and terminated at Dayton, Ohio. The flight west from Dayton, to which the dog was transferred, originated at Newark, N. J., and carried, in addition to cargo, three passengers—two Navy enlisted men and one Army technical sergeant, all of whom were on emergency leaves, traveling on C priorities. At Memphis, Tenn., approximately 3,700 pounds of cargo and the three passengers were off-loaded to take on B priority cargo. A backlog of B priority freight existed at Memphis and this would have displaced the three passengers even if the dog had not been on board, but the dog did unquestionably displace an equivalent amount in weight of B priority freight. The Dayton flight terminated at Dallas, Tex., where the dog was transferred to another routine scheduled military cargo flight which proceeded to Mines Field, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Let me ask the Senator a question. The B priority freight was pretty important for the war effort, was it not?

Mr. STEWART. Undoubtedly, it must have been. I do not know what it was, but it had a high priority.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. This dog displaced some of that freight, the Senator says?

Mr. STEWART. According to the report it displaced an amount equivalent to the weight of the dog and the crate, which I understand to have been about 285 pounds.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am confused about these priorities, but am I correct in understanding that as a result of them all, the dog stayed on the plane and the men got off?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is quite right, the dog remained, and the men got off, the men in the service, on urgent trips.

Mr. STEWART. And the same thing would have occurred if the dog had not been aboard.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes, but the dog was not taken off; do not forget that.

In closing my remarks, Mr. President, I wish to refer once more to what I stated a while ago, that there are some acts which are unbecoming an officer, and I feel very strongly that this is one of those cases. I hope the Senate will reject the nomination.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before the yeas and nays are called, I should like to have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD one or two matters.

Mr. REED. I wonder if the Senator will permit me to propound a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kansas for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REED. As I understand the Senator from Utah, he said he could not furnish the information called for in the question which I asked him on behalf of the Senator from Maine. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; that is correct. I said I could not furnish it, but that I would try to get it for the Senator.

Mr. REED. I appreciate very much the intention of the Senator from Utah to get the information for us, but I respectfully suggest that we should have that information before we vote upon the confirmation of Colonel Roosevelt's nomination.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the question was a complex one. It involved many factors other than the one which I answered. As to the number of brigadier generals now in the Army, that question has been answered, and we know what it is. They are all from the Air Forces, and therefore they are exceptional officers, every one of them. As to the remainder of the question, it is of such a complex nature, that I think it will take some time to get the information.

Mr. REED. I have just talked briefly with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who could not get the information completely over the telephone. I take it this is information of a character which the War Department could furnish in a day on request of the Senator from Utah, the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I have no desire unduly to delay this nomination. It is an extraordinary matter. It was extraordinarily bad taste that the nomination was ever sent to the Senate, and surely before the Senate has to express its opinion, it should have the information for which it asks, if we are justified in asking for it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should think we should at least know on what the Senate committee based its report and the information it had. We have had no opportunity to give that information to the Senate. If, after the information is received and a recommendation comes unanimously from the committee, there are still some questions, naturally I think it would be well to have the questions answered.

Mr. President, in order that Senators may be informed about the situation, I ask that the report of the subcommittee dealing with priorities be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
February 10 1945.

At the request of the subcommittee appointed by the chairman to inquire into the incident of transporting Col. Elliott Roosevelt's dog on military aircraft, Maj. Gen. H. L. George submitted the following statement, delay having been occasioned in its release due to the need for securing information overseas:

"On or about November 13, 1944, Col. Elliott Roosevelt departed from a European air field in a B–17 bomber, under his command, for the United States by way of Iceland. He arrived at Presque Isle Army Air Field, Presque Isle, Maine, on November 14, 1944, at approximately 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

"Colonel Roosevelt made the flight under orders from the Eighth Air Force and pursuant to War Department authority. In addition to Colonel Roosevelt, the personnel on the bomber included four officers and five enlisted men. Other than personal baggage, no cargo was carried. The dog, Blaze, weighing between 110 and 115 pounds and a female pup weighing 20 pounds were transported in this bomber.

"On arrival at the Presque Isle Army Air Field, both dogs were declared by Colonel Roosevelt upon United States Customs Form No. 6063, which is the baggage declaration and entry form.

"As the bomber was proceeding directly to New York and would arrive there in the late evening of November 14, it was suggested, due to the absence of any facilities for the dogs on arrival in New York, that they be kept at Presque Isle until they could be conveniently transported to Washington. The dogs were taken to the search and rescue kennels at the air base, where, after tests and inspection, a health certificate was issued by the station veterinarian and given to the customs officials.

"On November 23, 1944, a B-25 type airplane, on an operational flight, and carrying military personnel, was scheduled to be flown from Presque Isle Army Air Field to LaGuardia, N. Y., with an intermediate stop at Grenier Field, Manchester, N. H. Both dogs were placed on the airplane, which arrived at LaGuardia at about 4:30 in the afternoon of November 23, 1944.

"Later that afternoon a Marine Corps pilot en route to Washington, with a stop at Newark, N. J., informed Operations at LaGuardia that he had room for any servicemen waiting for a ride to Washington. The marine pilot was informed that there were two servicemen who were waiting for transportation to Washington, and was asked if he had adequate room to also take along the two dogs. He stated that he had plenty of room and would be glad to take the dogs along. He was informed that the dogs belonged to Col. Elliott Roosevelt and were to be delivered to the White House. On arrival at Washington, the marine pilot telephoned the White House, which sent a station wagon to the airport and picked up the dogs.

"It should be pointed out that there is no provision in Army Air Forces Regulations or those of the Eighth Air Force which prohibit the carrying of pets in an operational type aircraft, such as the B-17 bomber which transported these dogs from Europe to the United States.

"On January 5, 1945, Col. Ray W. Ireland, Assistant Chief of Staff for Priorities and Traffic, Headquarters Air Transport Command, received a telephone request from Mrs. John Boettiger at the White House that Colonel Roosevelt's dog, Blaze, be transported from Washington to Mrs. Elliott Roosevelt in Hollywood, Calif. No mention of priority was made in the conversation. Colonel Ireland, however, established an A priority for the dog and on January 9, 1945, the dog was shipped on a military cargo aircraft which left Washington about noon.

"The flight on which the dog was carried was a scheduled cargo flight and terminated at Dayton, Ohio. The flight west from Dayton, to which the dog was transferred, originated at Newark, N. J., and carried, in addition to cargo, three passengers—two Navy enlisted men and one Army technical sergeant, all of whom were on emergency leaves, traveling on C priorities. At Memphis, Tenn., approximately 3,700 pounds of cargo and the three passengers were off-loaded to take on B priority cargo. A backlog of B priority freight existed at Memphis and this would have displaced the three passengers even if the dog had not been on board, but the dog did unquestionably displace an equivalent amount in weight of B priority freight. The Dayton flight terminated at Dallas, Tex., where the dog was transferred to another routine scheduled military cargo flight which proceeded to Mines Field, Los Angeles, Calif., and from there the dog was delivered to Mrs. Elliott Roosevelt.

"The fundamental basis for the establishment of any priority, whether for passengers or cargo, is that the mission of the passenger or the need for the cargo is of such urgency that transportation by air is necessary and also necessary to the prosecution of the war. Therefore, establishing an A priority for the dog was unauthorized under regulations relating to air priorities. A serious mistake was made and it cannot be justified."

In answer to a question from Senator STEWART regarding references in the press to three Army Air Forces officers at Patterson Field (Dayton) bound for Pyote, Tex., on D priorities, who stated that they might have been carried on the flight out of Dayton except for the Roosevelt dog, General George stated: "Investigation discloses that the officers concerned would not have traveled even if the dog had not been carried, as there were both C and D priority passengers ahead of them.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have an extremely sad duty to perform. It is not a part of the discussion of the pending matter, but it illustrates the tragic times in which we are living, and how even a slight delay on our part may have an effect which none of us would desire to have brought about. The last-named colonel on the list recommended for promotion to be brigadier general is William Herbert Eaton. Since the names were sent to the Senate, in fact since last week Colonel Eaton crashed in his plane, and is now dead. His name will remain with the group, and I trust the Senate will confirm his nomination, along with the others, and that, in accordance with the law and the custom of the Army, he will receive this great reward, although he is now dead.

In this connection, in order that I may keep the record straight, I ask that the clerk read a letter from Secretary of War in regard to Colonel Eaton's death, so that it may be a part of our record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 12, 1945.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Information has been received in the War Department that Col. William H. Eaton, Air Corps, whose nomination for brigadier general has been submitted to the Senate for confirmation, was killed February 6, as a result of a plane crash in France.

Colonel Eaton's services were outstanding in every respect and as a consequence, on January 19 I recommended to the President that he be promoted to brigadier general. His name is included, therefore, on the present list of nominations and confirmation is requested in order to consummate his posthumous promotion under the provisions of section 3, Public Law 680, Seventy-seventh Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, when this group of nominations was presented to the Committee on Military Affairs it was considered by the committee as all other nominations are considered. Of course, it is true that, due to circumstances connected with the case, particularly the dog incident, questions were asked, and a priority committee was appointed, and all matters in relation to that question were considered; but there was not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs—and I know their sentiment is shared by all Members of the Senate—who did not feel that any man who was recommended for this great honor and promotion must have proved his worth in the Army of the United States, as the Army is now organized and directed.

The fact should be taken into consideration that when a man is promoted in the field, because of his activity, his promotion comes through in the regular way, it is reviewed, and, finally, no recommendation for promotion is sent to the President of the United States without initialing by the Chief of Staff, and without action taken upon the promotion by the Secretary of War. Therefore when we considered the promotion in question it seemed to me, as I think it seemed to all members of the committee, that a criticism of the promotion was in reality a criticism of the Army scheme. The fact that a man happens to be a son of the President of the United States ought not to be a liability to him in his efforts to serve his country.

I ask what the country would have said had the sons of the President of the United States not responded to the call to military duty? Regardless of position, regardless of the apparent advantage which they have all had, regardless of everything else, the realization of the services they have rendered should cause all of us to stop and to listen and to be considerate before we pass judgment upon any of them.

Mr. President, it is difficult to become a brigadier general of the Army of the United States or the United States Army or of the reserve. The degree in which Army routine is followed is known by every man who has ever served in the Army of the United States. Promotions do not come in a haphazard way. Thank goodness, the people of the United States have faith in their Army because of the honesty which exists in it, especially with regard to promotions.

In this particular case we who are members of the committee did our very best—I am sure I speak for all members of the committee—and if the recommendations with respect to the promotion of this colonel had not been forthcoming in an orderly and a proper way and had not received the sanction of all the persons I have mentioned, the promotion would not have been reported for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] a few moments ago rather sarcastically suggested that one had to have a nod from someone before one could become a brigadier general. I should like to know whether there is any evidence in the record that discloses any favoritism shown toward Elliott Roosevelt in connection with his promotion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We have found no such evidence, Mr. President. Had there been a charge of favoritism I am sure that every member of the Military Affairs Committee would have urged full investigation of the charge. General Marshall is too great a man, the Secretary of War is too great a man, the President of the United States is too great a man to allow anything of that kind to enter into their actions in connection with such a matter. Personally, I do not know, but I think it must require a great deal of consideration on the father's part to allow his son's name to be presented here for promotion. A father would give a great deal of consideration to such a matter with respect to one whom he loved, a member of his family. It seems to me that all of us know enough about family relationships to cherish the ideals of fatherhood which the President

showed in allowing his son's name to be presented to the Senate, rather than to assume that it was an advantage-taking affair.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with what the Senator has said, and I say that it is unfortunate that any Senator should intimate at this particular time, when we are in a death struggle, that these able officers who are being promoted are being promoted through favoritism of some kind, and that it is necessary to get a nod from someone higher up before a promotion can be obtained. In my opinion, that is not happening, and I hope the country will consider the case in just the light the Senator from Utah has explained it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Certainly that is not happening.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator from Utah that the Committee on Military Affairs possibly did investigate the matter as thoroughly as it could investigate it, but as I look over the list of names of officers submitted to the Senate for promotion I see the name of Thomas Benton Catron 2d. I know that he comes from my State. He is the son of a former Member of this body. He graduated from West Point many years ago. He did not start as a captain or lieutenant colonel in the Army. We all know that so far as training for the Army is concerned, West Point does a very fine job. But, in comparison with such training, with the time spent in becoming prepared finally to achieve the rank of brigadier general, was any evidence submitted to the committee with reference to Colonel Roosevelt, as to his background of education and training?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, Elliott Roosevelt was not a trained soldier until he came into the Army as a Reserve officer, but he never would have been commissioned as a Reserve officer without examination, without proving his ability to serve to his superior officers in the Army of the United States. There are rules and regulations relating to commissioning of officers in the Reserve just as there are in the National Guard and as there are in the Regular Army. It is to be assumed that the conditions prescribed in the rules and regulations must have been met, otherwise a commission would not have been forthcoming. I think present now in the Senate of the United States there are many Senators who have gone forward in their examination in this regard and who know that care is always exercised in such examinations, and that the officers who are on the examining boards are extremely cautious in respect to granting commissions and recommending promotions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As we all know, and as I think has been stated heretofore, the promotion of all the officers on the list now before the Senate and which we are considering today, was in process of being completed long before the happening of the episode which has created so much discussion. The promotions had been initiated in the field. That means in the cases of many of these promotions that the process had to be initiated across the water, either in Europe or in the Pacific area, wherever these officers have been serving. The recommendations for promotions had to come up from the bottom. The President does not simply promote men, neither does the Secretary of War recommend promotions, neither does the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, recommend promotions, until they have come up through the various processes and have reached the general staff, where they are submitted to critical examination before the Chief of Staff passes them on to the Secretary of War, and they are again by him submitted to critical examination before they are passed on to the President.

It is my understanding that all the nominations for promotion we are considering today were transmitted to the President at one time as recommendations from the Chief of Staff to the Secretary of War. They came over together. The President could have taken a lead pencil or pen and stricken the name of Elliott Roosevelt off the list, and have sent the other names to the Senate; but if he had done that, he would have been discriminating against an Army officer whose services had been regarded as being worthy of reward by promotion by all the Army generals and all the Army staff and all those before whom his name had to go before it reached the President.

Certainly no one ought to expect the President to strike his son's name from the list simply because he happens to be the father of the officer involved, and because an unfortunate episode had occurred with reference to the transportation of a dog, with which he had nothing to do, and with which, so far as we know, the subject of this controversy had nothing to do except that he asked somebody to see if he could get this dog out to California. If the President had stricken his son's name, which he could have done, would he have been doing justice to the recommendation of the Army officers, many of whom had passed upon this promotion as they passed upon all these promotions, before it was ever placed on his desk for his approval?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course it would have been a very improper thing on the part of the Commander in Chief to strike from the list the name of an officer who had been considered and whose promotion was supported by the facts, as the record of Elliott Roosevelt shows.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose that all of us who are fathers can put ourselves in the place of the Commander in Chief when the recommendation came to his desk concerning his own son. I have never talked with the President or anyone else about this matter, but I can very well understand, as a father with a son in the Army myself, that if I were in the position where I had to nominate a list of officers, and my own son's name came across my desk, it might be embarrassing, because I would realize that I might be criticised for promoting, even in a routine way, my own flesh and blood. We can very well understand the reactions of any father who might happen to be President and Commander in Chief of the Army if such a recommendation should cross his desk. He could not afford to discriminate against one officer who had been recommended for promotion by all those who pass upon such matters before they ever reach the President. If he had done so by eliminating this one name from the list of 58 names which are now before the Senate, regardless of anything that took place after the process was in motion, and almost after it had been completed, or if he had done anything to discriminate against the promotion of this officer because of that situation, I can very well understand what the reaction might have been to it, not only on his part, but on the part of the country in general.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. REED. Following the last thought developed by the Senator from Kentucky, let me ask the Senator from Utah if he is naive enough to believe that once a son of the President is recommended by his immediate superior for promotion, any one, from the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, or the Chief of the Air Corps on down, is going to take that name off the promotion list?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It should not be taken off if the officer receives the recommendation of his immediate superior. It would be a very unwise superior who would take the name off unless there were good reason for doing so.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Utah knows that in every long promotion list, in the winnowing and screening process, names are taken off. There is always a considerable list of names taken off.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not believe that the names of worthy men are taken off. That is a generalization which is extremely unjust, just as it is rather a slip of the tongue for the Senator to ask whether I am naive enough to believe something. I do not even know what the word means. Possibly I am naive; possibly not. I do not know. However, I do know that I have had a great deal of experience with Army officers, and that they are pretty good men.

Mr. REED. I have often paid tribute to the learned Senator from Utah. Being a college professor, he certainly ought to know the definition of "naive."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator might know what the dictionary says it means, but he might not know what it means in the mind of the Senator propounding the interrogatory.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. During the course of the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] he read a letter or press release from General Echols, who was commanding officer of Colonel Roosevelt. In that press release there was the statement that Elliott Roosevelt, by virtue of some trouble with his eyesight, could not take training to become a combat pilot. Immediately thereafter I called attention to the record, containing a statement in the nature of a note from the Military Affairs Committee, that the record indicates that Colonel Roosevelt has approximately 300 flying hours to his credit as the pilot of a single-seat plane. There is a discrepancy between the two statements. To complete the record and clear the discrepancy I should like to have the chairman of the committee explain it, if his information is adequate in that regard.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I know nothing about the recommendation of officers in regard to Capt. Elliott Roosevelt. However, his first commission was not a commission in the Air Corps. He was commissioned in the Specialist Reserve in September 1940. Perhaps he did apply for a commission in the Air Corps, and perhaps it was not granted because of his disability. That may be the case. I do not know. However, he was commissioned in the Specialist Reserve in 1940. That was his first commission.

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator will yield further on that point, I shall endeavor to supplement the record. Captain Roosevelt was commissioned on the 23d of September 1940.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. On the 21st of February of the following year he was transferred to the same grade in the Air Corps Reserve.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. CORDON. In checking his record as it was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I do not find any notice of his having had any course in flying training. Can the Senator supply any information in that connection?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am unable to give information as to Elliott Roosevelt's life before he entered the Army. It was stated by the Senator from South Dakota that he had taken a civilian course in aviation and that he had learned to fly under civilian auspices. I believe that is correct.

Mr. CORDON. I have reference to his military record in that connection. His record indicates that he was a student, first in Texas, in connection with a course in navigation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be very glad to give his military record. I have it before me quite completely. Perhaps if I give the complete record, Senators will have the answers to their questions.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to have the record completed in that regard. It will have some bearing on my conclusion, at least.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I believe that time will be saved in the debate if I first state the record. Then I shall be glad to answer questions.

I have already stated that he was appointed a captain in the Specialist Reserve on the 23d of September 1940. He was transferred, in grade, to the Air Reserve, on February 21, 1941. He was promoted to be major, Army of the United States, on the 26th of March 1942, to rank from the 1st of March 1942. He was promoted to be lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps, on August 6, 1942. He was promoted to be colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps, on March 22, 1943, effective on the 23d of February 1943. He was promoted to be colonel, Army of the United States, on March 11, 1943.

Colonel's Roosevelt's service is as follows: Colonel Roosevelt was called to extended active duty on October 7, 1940, in the grade of captain, and reported to the Matériel Command, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio. On April 24, 1941, he was transferred from Wright Field to the Twenty-first Reconnaissance Squadron, at the Newfoundland air base, and began a survey for the establishment of ferry routes across the North Atlantic.

Mr. President, I ought to call attention to that date and to the date when the ferry service started. Elliott Roosevelt was a pioneer in that service, and was called to the task of working out what has become one of the most successful services carried on during this war. It was entirely developed during this war.

This duty took him to Greenland, Iceland, and England. On September 10, 1941, he was ordered to Kelly Field, Tex., to take a course in navigation, and from there to Brooks Field, Tex., as a student in the aerial observers' course. Upon completion of this latter course, on December 15, 1941, he was ordered from Brooks Field to duty with the Sixth Reconnaissance Squadron in California.

On February 26, 1942, he was assigned to the First Photographic Group and proceeded overseas for duty in north Africa. Since that time Colonel Roosevelt has been on continuous duty overseas in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, the United Kingdom, and France, commanding photographic reconnaissance units. At the present time he is commanding the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photographic Reconnaissance Wing, European theater of operations, with an approximate strength of 5,000 officers and men.

The Colonel's decorations and citations were very effective in causing our committee to act as it did. Therefore, I will call attention to them:

The Distinguished Flying Cross was awarded on the 23d of December, 1942, while Colonel Roosevelt was a member of the Third Photographic Group, Twelfth Air Force, by command of General Doolittle. I will read the citation into the RECORD if the Senate so desires.

Mr. President, there is the first of our successful generals to pass upon Colonel Roosevelt. He was given that citation by General Doolittle, who himself, within the memory of all of us, was a captain a very short time ago, and who now is a lieutenant general.

Colonel Roosevelt was granted an award by the Sultan of Morocco on the 23d of January, 1943.

He was awarded the Air Medal on the 8th of May, 1943, by General Spaatz, and a citation was given Colonel Roosevelt at the same time.

Colonel Roosevelt received a letter of commendation dated October 12, 1943, from the commanding general, Army Air Forces, commending him for his work in reorganizing the reconnaissance program of the Army Air Forces.

Mr. President, let me digress long enough to say one word about the Reconnaissance Service of the Army. Due to the activities of the Air Force in connection with aerial photography, the Reconnaissance Service has made unusual progress in the present war. Much that has been done in the promotion of the war effort and in contributing to the success of our commands has been due to the enlarged activity of the Reconnaissance Service. I am sure everyone is aware of that fact.

Colonel Roosevelt was awarded the Legion of Merit on December 25, 1943, by General Eisenhower. With that award went a citation.

Colonel Roosevelt also received a letter of commendation dated September 28, 1944, signed by Lieutenant General Bradley, commanding general, Twelfth Army Group, to the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photographic Wing (Reconnaissance), commanded by Colonel Roosevelt, commending the whole unit for the work it had done.

Mr. President, when we realize that the promotion is recommended by the Chief of Staff and by the Secretary of War, and that Colonel Roosevelt has received citations from General Doolittle, General Spaatz, General Arnold, General Eisenhower, and General Bradley, I think it can be admitted by all, and I think it should be, that his record is one of exceptional attainment. Certainly none of those distinguished officers would stoop to do an unfair thing either one way or the other.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. So far as I am concerned, I am not interested in some of the citations which have been referred to. I should like to know whether the promotion is an unprecedented one, considering the age of the young man and the rapidity of his promotion. Is it out of the ordinary? Is it an exception from all other promotions?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There are six other persons who have risen as rapidly, beginning with the rank of first lieutenant, captain, or some lower rank.

Mr. WALSH. Are they of the same age?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They are either the same age or approximately so.

Mr. WALSH. Am I to understand that the case is not one which stands out as indicating upon the record that a special and extraordinary effort has been made to advance this one officer?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No. Incidentally, it should be pointed out that all cases of extraordinary advancement

from the rank of lieutenant to high rank—for instance, to brigadier general—have occurred in the Air Forces.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, there is nothing worse in either the Army or the Navy than to have discrimination made in connection with promotions, as I am sure the Senator realizes; but I take the Senator's word that the present case is not an extraordinary one.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say that either the Senator from Utah is mistaken or the Senator from South Dakota is mistaken. I understand that of the six cases, four are those of men who had prior military experience, and one is that of General Knudsen, of General Motors. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Oh, no. The question the Senator from Massachusetts asked was whether it was exceptional to rise from a low rank to a high rank.

Mr. LANGER. As I understood the question of the Senator from Massachusetts, he asked whether this case was an exceptional one. The reply of the Senator from Utah was that there were six cases just like it. As I understood from the questioning a while ago—and let me say that so far as I am concerned the matter means nothing to me—the Senator from Utah said there were four other officers who received rapid promotions. I understood, however, that they had had military experience, and that one of the six was Lieutenant General Knudsen.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; General Knudsen was mentioned by some other Senator. I did not bring his name into the discussion. It has no place in it. General Knudsen and General Osborn were both appointed from private life to high rank without military experience in the Army.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I was attempting to point out that if the promotion is an exceptional one, we should not oppose it because the person involved is the son of the President. But if the case is one of exceptional promotion, we should have some evidence to show that the officer involved is an extraordinary, efficient, and capable officer, who merits having an exception made in his case.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should add that in the case of the seven officers including Colonel Roosevelt, two have been killed. So Mr. President, we should bear in mind the fact that two of the seven brigadier generals have lost their lives. I think the group is rather an exceptional one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the record of Colonel Roosevelt made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the record was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD OF ELLIOTT ROOSEVELT

1. Superior efficiency record for 1942, 1943, and 1944. Has excellent efficiency record.

2. Recommendations:

(a) In January 1942, Maj. G. B. Dany, commanding officer, navigation school, Kelly Field, Tex., said: "This officer is a commanding, impressive, cooperative, and aggressive officer who is a brilliant thinker. He obtains excellent results through enthusiastic and diligent application. He is highly informed on world affairs and technical subjects in which he has been trained."

(b) In December 1943, Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz, commanding general, Twelfth Air Force said: "An aggressive, forceful officer whose foresight has created an organization of utmost value to our air and ground operations."

(c) In July 1944, Lt. Gen. J. H. Doolittle, commanding general, Eighth Air Force said: "Dynamic and forceful, technically and professionally qualified. This officer is performing duties commensurate with the next higher grade."

I. APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONS

A. Appointed captain, Specialist Reserve, September 23, 1940.

B. Transferred in grade to Air Reserve, February 21, 1941.

C. Promoted to major, Army of the United States, on March 26, 1942, to rank from March 1, 1942.

D. Promoted to lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States (Air Corps), August 6, 1942.

E. Promoted to colonel, Army of the United States (Air Corps), March 22, 1943, effective on February 23, 1943.

F. Promoted to colonel, Army of the United States, March 11, 1943.

II. SERVICE

Colonel Roosevelt was called to extended active duty on October 7, 1940, in the grade of captain, and reported to the Matériel Command, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio. On April 24, 1941, he was transferred from Wright Field to the Twenty-first Reconnaissance Squadron at the Newfoundland Air Base, and began a survey for the establishment of ferry routes across the North Atlantic. This duty took him to Greenland, Iceland, and England. On September 10, 1941, he was ordered to Kelly Field, Tex., to take a course in navigation, and from there to Brooks Field, Tex., as a student in an aerial observer's course. Upon completion of this latter course on December 15, 1941, he was ordered from Brooks Field to duty with the Sixth Reconnaissance Squadron, Muroc, Calif. On February 26, 1942, he was assigned to the First Photographic Group and proceeded overseas for duty in north Africa. Since that time Colonel Roosevelt has been on continuous duty overseas in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, the United Kingdom, and France, commanding photographic reconnaissance units. At the present time he is commanding the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photographic Reconnaissance Wing, European theater of operations, with an approximate strength of 5,000 officers and men.

III. DECORATIONS AND COMMENDATIONS

A. The Distinguished Flying Cross awarded December 23, 1942, while a member of the Third Photographic Group, Twelfth Air Force, by command of General Doolittle (citation attached).

B. Commander of Ouissan Alaouite awarded January 23, 1943, by the Sultan of Morocco.

C. Air Medal awarded May 8, 1943, by General Spaatz (citation attached).

D. Letter of commendation dated October 12, 1943, from the commanding general, Army Air Forces, to Colonel Roosevelt, commending him for his work in reorganizing the reconnaissance program of the Army Air Forces (copy of letter attached).

E. Legion of Merit awarded December 25, 1943, by General Eisenhower (citation attached).

F. Letter of commendation dated September 28, 1944, signed by Lieutenant General Bradley, commanding general, Twelfth Army Group, to the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Photographic Wing (Reconnaissance), commanded by Colonel Roosevelt, commending this unit (copy of letter attached).

NOTE.—Colonel Roosevelt to date has a total of 1,100 flying hours. Of these 1,100 hours, 300 have been on combat missions. Colonel Roosevelt has recently piloted single-controlled planes on 30 combat missions. A single-controlled plane has but one pilot. And on each of these flights he has been the pilot.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In view of the fact that the Senator from South Dakota referred to what he called the unbecoming conduct of Colonel Roosevelt, I wish to ask the Senator from Utah to read those citations to the Senate, so that the Senate may know what General Eisenhower, General Arnold, General Doolittle, General Bradley, General Spaatz, and other of our high-ranking commanders think of Colonel Roosevelt's conduct, and so that we may know, not what some Senator characterizes as unbecoming conduct, but what are the true facts relative to the conduct of Colonel Roosevelt as a soldier, as a leader, and as a fighting man.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be glad to read the citations. Before doing so, I should like to read into the RECORD a further note relative to Colonel Roosevelt, so as to complete the record which I commenced to make:

Colonel Roosevelt, to date, has a total of 1,100 hundred flying hours. Of these 1,100 hours, 300 have been on combat missions. Colonel Roosevelt has recently piloted single-controlled planes on 30 combat missions. A single-controlled plane has but one pilot. And on each of these flights he has been the pilot.

That answers a question which was asked by several Senators.

Mr. President, as we read the citations, it will be found that some of the flights which Colonel Roosevelt made were extraordinary in that they were made outside the normal duties of the ranking officer of his command. The citations are as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, TWELFTH AIR FORCE,
A. P. O. 650, December 23, 1942.

GENERAL ORDERS, NO. 10: AWARD OF DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

SECTION 1. AWARD OF DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

Under the provisions of AR 600–45, as amended, and pursuant to authority contained in Circular No. 6, Allied Force Headquarters, October 19, 1942, the Distinguished Flying Cross is awarded to the following-named officer in the name of the commanding general, European theater of operations:

Elliott Roosevelt, O–398475, lieutenant colonel, Third Photographic Group, Twelfth Air Force, United States Army. For heroism and extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flights. As a member of parties making aerial surveys of important ferry routes, Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt participated in long and dangerous flights over Arctic, sub-Arctic, and Equatorial regions many of them being over water and uninhabited areas. On one expedition, Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt was the only member who made every operational flight. As a result of his experience and energy, he has been of great assistance in the establishment of ferry routes. As commanding officer of a photographic group assigned to the American forces in north Africa, Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt personally participated in

many flights deep into hostile and heavily defended areas acting as observer, navigator, photographer, and radio operator. He made these flights voluntarily with complete disregard for his personal safety as he well knew the extremely vulnerable characteristics of his unarmed airplane. The efficiency of his photographic group as proven by the valuable information it has obtained, is due in a large degree to the ability, leadership, and inspiration of Lieutenant Colonel Roosevelt. His courage and skill reflect credit both upon himself and the military service.

By command of Major General Doolittle.

HOYT S. VANDENBERG,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Chief of Staff.

Official:

P. M. WHITNEY,
Colonel, A. G. D., Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS NORTHWEST AFRICAN AIR FORCES,
A. P. O. 650, May 8, 1943.

GENERAL ORDERS, No. 70: AWARD OF AIR MEDAL

SECTION I. AWARDS OF AIR MEDAL

1. Under the provisions of AR 600-45, as amended, and pursuant to authority contained in Circular No. 50, Headquarters NATOUS, 5 April 1943, the Air Medal is awarded to the following-named personnel, Air Corps, United States Army, residence as indicated, in the name of the commanding general, north African theater of operations, for meritorious achievement while participating in five (5) sorties against the enemy.

* * * * *

Elliott Roosevelt, O398475, colonel, Benbrook, Tex.

* * * * *

By command of Lieutenant General Spaatz:

E. P. CURTIS,
Colonel, U. S. A. A. F., Chief of Staff.

Official:

WILLIAM W. DICK,
Colonel, A. D. G., Air Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS, NORTH AFRICAN THEATER OF OPERATIONS,
A. P. O. 534, December 25, 1943.

GENERAL ORDERS, No. 164: AWARD OF LEGION OF MERIT

Under authority contained in section IV, War Department Circular No. 131, dated 3 June 1943, a Legion of Merit medal is awarded in the name of the President to each of the following-named individuals.

* * * * *

Elliott Roosevelt, O398475, colonel, Air Corps, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services from 1 November 1942 to 30 October 1943. By his dynamic energy and inspiring zeal, he built the small photographic and reconnaissance group which he commanded, into a photo reconnaissance wing which controlled the preparation of photographic intelligence for all planning staffs and operations in the theater. His keen insight into the invaluable aid of aerial photography, and the knowledge of its practical application, enabled him to make an outstanding contribution to the success of the Tunisian and Sicilian campaigns, and of the initial operations in Italy. Entered service from Benbrook, Tex.

By command of General Eisenhower:

E. L. FORD,
Brigadier General, G. S. C., Chief of Staff.

Official:

H. V. ROBERTS,
Colonel, A. G. D., Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS, TWELFTH ARMY GROUP,
A P. O. 655, September 28, 1944.

Subject: Letter of commendation.
To: Commanding officer, 325th Photo Wing Reconnaissance, A. P. O. 634, United States Army.
Through: Commanding General, Eighth Air Force.

1. It is desired to express the appreciation of Twelfth Army Group for the outstanding work which has been accomplished by the officers and men of your command.

2. The A-3 and A-3 progress sections have at all times been ready and able to execute exacting requests from the Army group for aerial photos, mosaics, and the reproduction of prints. The officers and men of these sections have appreciated the fact that in practically all instances, due to the rapidly moving situation, the time element has been a vital factor, and have exerted themselves to the utmost to meet the commitments in time to have their work be of value.

3. By their untiring efforts the laboratory section of the wing has produced vast quantities of prints which have proved of great value to the Army group. It is especially desired to bring to the attention of each officer and man the importance of the work which has been accomplished by them.

4. The Seventh Photo Group has accomplished at considerable loss in planes and personnel the flying of many hazardous missions in a manner which reflects great credit upon their own unit and photo reconnaissance aviation as a whole.

O. N. BRADLEY,
Lieutenant General, United States Army, Commanding.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
HEADQUARTERS, ARMY AIR FORCES,
Washington, October 12, 1943.

Subject: Commendation.
Through: Commanding general, Northwest African Allied Air Forces.
To: Col. Elliott Roosevelt, commanding Officer, Northwest African Photo Reconnaissance Wing (Prov.).

1. The careful and thorough work you have performed in the reorganization of the reconnaissance program of the Army Air Forces is most pleasing to me and I desire to commend you for your contribution to this important project.

2. Your practical experience has been of inestimable assistance in establishing plans and procedures for the use of reconnaissance units in the field and in setting up new tables of organization based on the actual needs of present-day warfare. Your advice and counsel have also been most helpful in revising our training program in this country, forming the present Reconnaissance Command of the Third Air Force and setting up the necessary staff branch in this headquarters.

3. The thorough knowledge you have of these matters and your wholehearted cooperation at all times reflect great credit upon yourself.

4. A copy of this letter will be made part of your efficiency record.

H. H. ARNOLD,
General, United States Army, Commanding General, Army Air Forces.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him so that I may propound a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. REED. Did not Colonel Roosevelt have anybody helping him win the war thus far?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have no answer to that question. Colonel Roosevelt is commanding a unit of 5,000 men. I doubt very much whether he has ever stood in front of that unit and patted himself on the chest and repeated the words of a certain movie actor, namely, "I dood it." I do not think that is done in the Army of the United States. I think it will be found that pride does not come into an officer's heart when he receives one of these awards. He becomes a very humble individual and realizes that he must live up to the honor in every way.

I think we misjudge entirely the whole military scheme, the whole reason for awards, if we judge that all a man fights for is to get a ribbon, and all that he wears a ribbon for is to bask in his own individual glory. I trust that there is no Member of the United States Senate who does not realize that we are dealing with someone who probably has contributed much to the saving of lives of men, and perhaps to the saving of lives of men related to some of us.

Mr. President, in addition to what I have already said, there is a record dealing with the superior efficiency of Elliott Roosevelt in 1942, 1943, and 1944. He had an excellent efficiency record and recommendation.

In January 1942, Maj. G. B. Dany, commanding officer, Navigation School, Kelly Field, Tex., said:

This officer is a commanding, impressive, cooperative, and aggressive officer who is a brilliant thinker. He obtains excellent results through enthusiastic and diligent application. He is highly informed on world affairs and technical subjects in which he has been trained.

In December 1943, Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz, commanding general, Twelfth Air Force said:

An aggressive, forceful officer whose foresight has created an organization of utmost value to our air and ground operations.

In July 1944, Lt. Gen. J. H. Doolittle, commanding general, Eighth Air Force said:

Dynamic and forceful, technically and professionally qualified. This officer is performing duties commensurate with the next higher grade.

In other words, Colonel Roosevelt was acting in the capacity of an officer of a grade above the one he held at the time that statement was made by General Doolittle.

Mr. President, I realize that the reading of these long general orders has been rather tedious. I also realize that they probably call for the remark that we are dealing with merely one officer, but, in truth, there is only one officer under consideration by the Senate. In the Committee on Military Affairs we did not attempt to go into comparisons. We assumed that the recommendations of those in charge of the Army were recommendations we should respect.

I asked all members of the committee who were present whether, when we reported the nomination, and when we got to the floor of the Senate, I could make the statement that, so far as those present were concerned, the report was without opposition, that the nomination was reported unanimously. The recommendation did come from the com-

mittee as a unanimous recommendation of those present on the day the recommendation was agreed upon.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I have in my hand the release which apparently was made by the Committee on Military Affairs under date of February 10, reciting the facts in connection with the dog incident. It appears that the entire responsibility has been assumed, or somehow assigned to, Col. Ray W. Ireland, who at this moment appears to be several thousand miles away from Washington. I have pretty good reason to think that this Colonel Ireland was not even in Washington when this episode happened, and I should like to know from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs whether he is able to tell me if there is any truth in the assertion to which I refer.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I cannot answer the question. A subcommittee of three was appointed, and perhaps the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] may be able to answer.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee, I should like to say that General George told us that he had spoken to Colonel Ireland about the matter, so Colonel Ireland must have been here.

Mr. BUTLER. I have no reason to question the accuracy of the report at all, but I should like to know absolutely whether the report I have had, that Colonel Ireland was not even in the city when the report of the committee infers that he was in the city, is true. I should like to have a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, at his early convenience, informing me personally in writing whether Colonel Ireland was in the city at the time this episode occurred.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall try to get the information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Colonel Elliott Roosevelt to be brigadier general? The yeas and nays have been requested.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Before we vote on that question, if our leader will permit me to say so, I should like to state that Elliott Roosevelt's name appears on the list with a great number of other officers. In order that there may not be any confusion, I trust that in his confirmation it will be understood by the Senate and understood by the War Department, and all others concerned, that, even if he happens to be confirmed one moment before the rest, his name in the list of those confirmed should appear in the place in which it is now on the list. I think that is fair to all the other officers and fair to Elliott Roosevelt.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it should be made certain that that will be attended to after all the nominations have been confirmed, so that the confirmations will appear in the order in which they were sent in on this list, without regard to the fact that the Senate considered the nomination of Elliott Roosevelt first.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the pending nomination now before the Senate be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs for further study.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; the legislative clerk proceed to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. One Senator had responded to his name on the call of the roll. The clerk will proceed with the roll call.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. WHITE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll call is on the demand for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. It is not on the question of the determination of the presence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry. Did not the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] ask for a quorum, and was a roll call not ordered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll call on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota had been ordered and the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] had been called and he had voted. The clerk will proceed with the roll call.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], detained on important public business.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—14

Brewster	Cordon	Reed
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Tobey
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Wherry
Butler	Langer	White
Capper	Moore	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Gurney	Overton
Barkley	Hatch	Pepper
Bilbo	Hayden	Radcliffe
Briggs	Hill	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Chandler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wiley
Gerry	Millikin	
Green	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews	Hoey	Robertson
Austin	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bailey	McCarran	Scrugham
Ball	McMahon	Shipstead
Brooks	Mitchell	Smith
Burton	Morse	Taft
Capehart	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Ferguson	Murray	Wheeler
George	Myers	Willis
Glass	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hawkes	Revercomb	

So Mr. BUSHFIELD's motion to recommit was rejected?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. HILL and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on important public business.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—53

Aiken	Guffey	Murray
Bankhead	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hatch	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Pepper
Briggs	Hill	Radcliffe
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Chandler	Kilgore	Taylor
Chavez	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	White
Gerry	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Murdock	

NAYS—11

Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Butler	Langer	Wherry
Capper	Moore	

NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Austin	Hoey	Scrugham
Bailey	McCarran	Shipstead
Ball	McMahon	Smith
Bridges	Mitchell	Taft
Brooks	Morse	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Moses	Wheeler
Capehart	Myers	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	Revercomb	
Glass	Robertson	

So the nomination of Elliott Roosevelt to be brigadier general in the Army of the United States, for temporary appointment, was confirmed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] asked the question as to whether or not Colonel Ireland was in this country. I made the statement that General George had stated, at a meeting at which there were present the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and myself, that Colonel Ireland had assumed all responsibility and had made all the arrangements.

I called General George to ask the specific question which was asked by the Senator from Nebraska. General George tells me that Colonel Ireland had accepted entire responsibility for all the arrangements, and had so stated to him. As to whether or not Colonel Ireland was at the airport when the dog was delivered, he could not say, but he stated that he would investigate. The arrangements were made 3 days in advance. I merely wished to keep the record straight, so that there might be no misunderstanding as to what I had previously stated.

ADDITIONAL ARMY NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now ask that the other Army nominations passed over be now confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the remaining Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I also ask that the President be immediately notified in all these cases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL TO FILE INTERIM REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool has held a hearing since its life was extended by action of the Senate last week. It held several hearings during the last session. It will probably be in a position to file an interim report with the Senate before the Senate is next in session. I understand that it is the intention of the majority leader to ask that the Senate adjourn until next Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is still in executive session.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the special committee to which I have referred may have permission to file a report with the Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? Without objection, as in legislative session, the request is granted.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT OF CONFERENCE BETWEEN PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL, AND MARSHAL STALIN (S. DOC. 8)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at 4:30 p. m. eastern war time today an important statement is to be issued not only in Washington, but in London and in Moscow. I think it would be not only desirable, but very interesting, to have this statement included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read from the desk by the clerk. I cannot ask that that be done until 4:30, which is only about 3 minutes from now. Therefore, I ask that the Senate stand in recess until 4:30, in order that this statement may be read from the desk to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess until 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

At 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled on being called to order by the Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that Senators who were not advised about the matter may be in the Chamber, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Murray
Bankhead	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Gurney	Overton
Bilbo	Hatch	Pepper
Brewster	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Reed
Briggs	Hill	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taylor
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Capper	La Follette	Tobey
Chandler	Langer	Tunnell
Chavez	Lucas	Tydings
Connally	McClellan	Vandenberg
Cordon	McFarland	Wagner
Donnell	McKellar	Walsh
Downey	Magnuson	Wherry
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ellender	Mead	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	
Gerry	Moore	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, simultaneously in Washington, in London, and in Moscow, at 4:30 p. m. today, eastern wartime, there has been issued a joint statement by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Marshal Stalin of the Soviet Union. I think it would be interesting to have the statement read from the desk by the clerk, because in my judgment it is a momentous document indicating that there has been a general agreement among those representatives of the three great nations, who have been in session in the Black Sea area, which turns out to be in the Crimea.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read from the desk the joint statement issued by those three heads of governments.

The first two pages of the statement contain the names of the representatives of the three Governments. I ask that the names be not read, but be included, and that the statement beginning at the top of page 3 be read by the clerk.

The statement, which was read by the Chief Clerk, is entire as follows:

REPORT OF CRIMEAN CONFERENCE

For the past 8 days Winston S. Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain; Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America; and Marshal J. V. Stalin, Chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, have met with the Foreign Secretaries, Chiefs of Staff, and other advisers in the Crimea.

In addition to the three heads of government, the following took part in the conference:

For the United States of America: Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State; Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy, U. S. N., Chief of Staff to the President; Harry L. Hopkins, Special Assistant to the President; Justice James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion; General of the Army George C. Marshall, U. S. A., Chief of Staff, United States Army; Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, U. S. N., Chief of Naval Operations and Commander in Chief, United States Fleet; Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Commanding General, Army Service Forces; Vice Admiral Emory S. Land, War Shipping Administrator; Maj Gen. L. S. Kuter, U. S. A., Staff of Commanding General, United States Army Air Forces; W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; H. Freeman Matthews, Director of European Affairs, State Department; Alger Hiss, Deputy Director, Office of Special Political Affairs, Department of State; Charles E. Bohlen, Assistant to the Secretary of State, together with political, military, and technical advisers.

For the United Kingdom: Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; Lord Leathers, Minister of War Transport; Sir A. Clark Kerr, H. M. Ambassador at Moscow; Sir Alexander Cadogan, Permanent Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; Sir Edward Bridges, Secretary of the War Cabinet; Field Marshal Sir Alan Brooke, Chief of the Imperial General Staff; Marshal of the Royal Air Force Sir Charles Portal, Chief of the Air Staff; Admiral of the Fleet Sir Andrew Cunningham, First Sea Lord; General Sir Hastings Ismay, Chief of Staff to the Minister of Defense, together with Field Marshal Alexander, Supreme Allied Commander, Mediterranean theater; Field Marshal Wilson, head of the British Joint Staff Mission at Washington; Admiral Somerville, Joint Staff Mission at Washington, together with military and diplomatic advisors.

For the Soviet Union: V. M. Molotov, Peoples Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U. S. S. R.; Admiral Kuznetsov, Peoples Commissar for the Navy; Army General Antonov, Deputy Chief of the General Staff of the Red Army; A. Y. Vyshinski, Deputy Peoples Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U. S. S. R.; I. M. Maiski, Deputy Peoples Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the U. S. S. R.; Marshal of Aviation Khudyakov; F. T. Gusev, Ambassador in Great Britain; A. A. Gromyko, Ambassador in United States of America.

The following statement is made by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the President of the United States of America, and the Chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the results of the Crimean Conference:

THE DEFEAT OF GERMANY

We have considered and determined the military plans of the three Allied powers for the final defeat of the common enemy. The military staffs of the three Allied nations have met in daily meetings throughout the conference. These meetings have been most satisfactory from every point of view and have resulted in closer coordination of the military effort of the three Allies than ever before. The fullest information has been interchanged. The timing, scope, and coordination of new and even more powerful blows to be launched by our armies and air forces into the heart of Germany from the east, west, north, and south have been fully agreed and planned in detail.

Our combined military plans will be made known only as we execute them, but we believe that the very close working partnership among the three staffs attained at this conference will result in shortening the war. Meetings of the three staffs will be continued in the future whenever the need arises.

Nazi Germany is doomed. The German people will only make the cost of their defeat heavier to themselves by attempting to continue a hopeless resistance.

THE OCCUPATION AND CONTROL OF GERMANY

We have agreed on common policies and plans for enforcing the unconditional surrender terms which we shall impose together on Nazi Germany after German armed resistance has been finally crushed. These terms will not be made known until the final defeat of Germany has been accomplished. Under the agreed plan, the forces of the three powers will each occupy a separate zone of Germany. Coordinated administration and control has been provided for under the plan through a central control commission consisting of the supreme commanders of the three powers with headquarters in Berlin. It has been agreed that France should be invited by the three powers, if she should so desire, to take over a zone of occupation, and to participate as a fourth member of the control commission. The limits of the French zone will be agreed by the four governments concerned through their representatives on the European Advisory Commission.

It is our inflexible purpose to destroy German militarism and nazi-ism and to insure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world. We are determined to disarm and disband all German armed forces; break up for all time the German General Staff that has repeatedly contrived the resurgence of German militarism; remove or destroy all German military equipment; eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for military production; bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment, and exact reparation in kind for the destruction wrought by the Germans; wipe out the Nazi Party, Nazi laws, organizations, and institutions; remove all Nazi and militarist influences from public office and from the cultural and economic life of the German people; and take in harmony such other measures in Germany as may be necessary to the future peace and safety of the world. It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany, but only when nazi-ism and militarism have been extirpated will there be hope for a decent life for Germans, and a place for them in the comity of nations.

REPARATION BY GERMANY

We have considered the question of the damage caused by Germany to the Allied Nations in this war and recognized it as just that Germany be obliged to make compensation for this damage in kind to the greatest extent possible. A commission for the compensation of damage will be established. The commission will be instructed to consider the question of the extent and methods for compensating damage caused by Germany to the Allied countries. The commission will work in Moscow.

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE

We are resolved upon the earliest possible establishment with our allies of a general international organization to maintain peace and security. We believe that this is essential, both to prevent aggression and to remove the political, economic, and social causes of war through the close and continuing collaboration of all peace-loving peoples.

The foundations were laid at Dumbarton Oaks. On the important question of voting procedure, however, agreement was not there reached. The present conference has been able to resolve this difficulty.

We have agreed that a conference of United Nations should be called to meet at San Francisco in the United States on April 25, 1945, to prepare the charter of such an organization, along the lines proposed in the informal conversations at Dumbarton Oaks.

The Government of China and the Provisional Government of France will be immediately consulted and invited to sponsor invitations to the conference jointly with the Goverments of the United States, Great Britain, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As soon as the consultation with China and France has been completed, the text of the proposals on voting procedure will be made public.

DECLARATION ON LIBERATED EUROPE

The Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the President of the United States of America have consulted with each other in the common interests of the peoples of their countries and those of liberated Europe. They jointly declare their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three Governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems.

The establishment of order in Europe and the rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of nazism and fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice. This is a principle of the Atlantic Charter—the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations.

To foster the conditions in which the liberated peoples may exercise these rights, the three Governments will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state or former Axis satellite state in Europe where in their judgment conditions require (A) to establish conditions of internal peace; (B) to carry out emergency measures for the relief of distressed peoples; (C) to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people; and (D) to facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections.

The three Governments will consult the other United Nations and provisional authorities or other governments in Europe when matters of direct interest to them are under consideration.

When, in the opinion of the three governments, conditions in any European liberated state or any former Axis satellite state

in Europe make such action necessary, they will immediately consult together on the measures necessary to discharge the joint responsibilities set forth in this declaration.

By this declaration we reaffirm our faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, our pledge in the declaration by the United Nations, and our determination to build in cooperation with other peace-loving nations world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom, and general well-being of all mankind.

In issuing this declaration, the three powers express the hope that the Provisional Government of the French Republic may be associated with them in the procedure suggested.

POLAND

A new situation has been created in Poland as a result of her complete liberation by the Red Army. This calls for the establishment of a Polish provisional government which can be more broadly based than was possible before the recent liberation of western Poland. The provisional government which is now functioning in Poland should, therefore, be recognized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. This new government should then be called the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity.

M. Molotov, Mr. Harriman, and Sir A. Clark Kerr are authorized as a commission to consult in the first instance in Moscow with members of the present provisional government and with other Polish democratic leaders from within Poland and from abroad, with a view to the reorganization of the present government along the above lines. This Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates.

When a Polish Provisional Government of National Unity has been properly formed in conformity with the above, the Government of the U. S. S. R., which now maintains diplomatic relations with the present provisional government of Poland, and the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America will establish diplomatic relations with the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, and will exchange ambassadors by whose reports the respective Governments will be kept informed about the situation in Poland.

The three heads of government consider that the eastern frontier of Poland should follow the Curzon line with digressions from it in some regions of 5 to 8 kilometers in favor of Poland. They recognized that Poland must receive substantial accessions to territory in the north and west. They feel that the opinion of the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity should be sought in due course on the extent of these accessions and that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should thereafter await the peace conference.

YUGOSLAVIA

We have agreed to recommend to Marshal Tito and Dr. Subasic that the agreement between them should be put into effect immediately, and that a new government should be formed on the basis of that agreement.

We also recommend that as soon as the new government has been formed it should declare that:

(1) The Anti-Fascist Assembly of National Liberation (Avnoj) should be extended to include members of the last Yugoslav Parliament (Skupschina) who have not compromised themselves by collaboration with the enemy, thus forming a body to be known as a temporary parliament; and

(2) Legislative acts passed by the Anti-Fascist Assembly of National Liberation will be subject to subsequent ratification by a constituent assembly.

There was also a general review of other Balkan questions.

MEETINGS OF FOREIGN SECRETARIES

Throughout the conference, besides the daily meetings of the heads of governments and the foreign secretaries, separate meetings of the three foreign secretaries and their advisers have also been held daily.

These meetings have proved of the utmost value and the Conference agreed that permanent machinery should be set up for regular consultation between the three Foreign Secretaries. They will, therefore, meet as often as may be necessary, probably about every 3 or 4 months. These meetings will be held in rotation in the three capitals, the first meeting being held in London, after the United Nations Conference on World Organization.

UNITY FOR PEACE AS FOR WAR

Our meeting here in the Crimea has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible and certain for the United Nations in this war. We believe that this is a sacred obligation which our governments owe to our peoples and to all the peoples of the world.

Only with the continuing and growing cooperation and understanding among our three countries and among all the peace-loving nations can the highest aspiration of humanity be realized—a secure and lasting peace which will, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

Victory in this war and establishment of the proposed international organization will provide the greatest opportunity in all history to create in the years to come the essential conditions of such a peace.

WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
J. STALIN.

FEBRUARY 11, 1945.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no purpose at this time to comment upon the momentous document which has just been read, except to say that it is a source of great gratification to me, and I am sure that it will be to all peace-loving people throughout the world, that the three heads of the three great nations represented have been able to travel such a distance in composing the differences which may have existed among them growing out of the war and of the occupation of territory liberated, and proceeding from our desire and prayer for permanent peace in the world.

If I may say so, I think it is not at all inappropriate that this document should have been released today. Although I have no doubt that it was purely coincidental, yet I think that it is a happy thing that the document has been released on this day, upon which we celebrate the birth of a great American, Abraham Lincoln.

I hope, as I am sure we all hope, that whatever other details in the composition of the world situation which has distressed and now distresses all humanity it may be necessary to settle, they will be worked out in the same spirit of harmony and accommodation which seems to have characterized the conference held in the Crimea by the representatives of the three great nations. The announcement of the agreement today seems to me a most happy omen.

If we can accomplish the objectives set forth in the document, that accomplishment, for ourselves and generations yet to come, will go a long way in justifying the terrible sacrifices we are making in treasure and in blood in this great war.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, giving to the statement which has just been read full faith and full credit, as I do, I must say that I regard it as one of the great forward steps which have marked the onward movement of our people. It seems to me it speaks in forthright terms with respect to a world organization dedicated to the cause of security and peace among men and women everywhere. I think that for the first time, perhaps, and certainly more clearly stated than they have ever been stated before, there are announced the ways and means by which these purposes, which we all hold dear, will be effectuated.

Mr. President, I feel that a great work has been done, and I think the entire world will be better and happier because of the agreement reached at the conference.

PROTECTION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPATRIATION OF LIBERATED PRISONERS OF WAR AND CIVILIANS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is another brief release dealing with another phase of the subject which I ask to have read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A comprehensive agreement was reached at the Crimean Conference providing detailed arrangements for the protection, maintenance, and repatriation of prisoners of war and civilians of the British Commonwealth, Soviet Union, and United States liberated by the Allied forces now invading Germany.

Under these arrangements each ally will provide food, clothing, medical attention, and other needs for the nationals of the others until transport is available for their repatriation. In caring for British subjects and American citizens the Soviet Government will be assisted by British and American officers. Soviet officers will assist British and American authorities in their task of caring for Soviet citizens liberated by the British and American forces during such time as they are on the continent of Europe or in the United Kingdom, awaiting transport to take them home.

We are pledged to give every assistance consistent with operational requirements to help to ensure that all these prisoners of war and civilians are speedily repatriated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in addition to having the documents printed in the RECORD, they are of such importance that I feel justified in asking that they be printed as a Senate document, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 12, 1945:

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

William A. Brophy, of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice John Collier, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral William B. Young, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12, 1945:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Courtney Whitney
Hammond Davies Birks
Charles Booth Spruit
James Francis Collins
John Carroll Kennedy
Charles Royal Lehner
Charles Sabin Ferrin
William Lemuel Mitchell
Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt
George Windle Read, Jr.
Donald Fowler Fritch
Selby Harney Frank
Harold Haney
Rex McKinley McDowell
John French Conklin
Einar Bernard Gjelsteen
Edwin William Rawlings
David Hazen Blakelock
Thomas Sarsfield Power
Thomas Merritt Lowe
William Archer Hagins
Francis Hudson Oxx
John Brandon Franks
Cornelius Edward Ryan
Lotha August Smith
Clarence Charles Fenn
Bernard Linn Robinson
George Francis Wooley, Jr.
Thomas Benton Catron 2d
Benjamin Grant Weir
Robert Merrill Lee
Ralph Townsend Heard
Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck
Cyrus Higginson Searcy
William Fulton McKee
Gustav Joseph Braun
Pearson Menoher
John Hubert Davies
Walter King Wilson, Jr.
Garland Cuzorte Black
James Roy Andersen
Frank Denis Hackett
George Arthur Lincoln
LeGrande Albert Diller
Charles Day Palmer
John Koehler Gerhart
John Keliher
Harold Albert Nisley
Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr.
Eugene Lynch Harrison
James Harve Johnson
Marion Van Voorst
John Archer Elmore
Edward Ward Smith
Augustus Milton Gurney
Emons Bert Whisner
Roy Victor Rickard
James Frederick Phillips
Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr.
Harold Quiskie Huglin
Lawrence Edward Schick
Calvert Hinton Arnold
Henry Irving Hodes
Robert Clarence McDonald
Ralph Parker Eaton
Max Frank Schneider
Eugene Ware Ridings
Charles Eskridge Saltzman
Edward Clark Rose
Georges Frederic Doriot
William Henry Draper, Jr.
Elliott Roosevelt
Bernhard Alfred Johnson
Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr.
John Joseph O'Brien
Gene William Hall
George Hamden Olmsted
William Herbert Eaton

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

W. H. Knight, Shreveport, La., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, Thou who from everlasting to everlasting changeth not, we humble ourselves this noonday in Thy holy presence, and offer unto Thee this, the sincere prayer of our hearts. Lend Thou Thy gracious ear unto our petition, and grant us Thy divine favor.

We give thanks for our beloved Nation, her people, her ideals, her honorable history. We thank Thee for the officials of our Nation, for those chosen by the free suffrage of the people, to make our laws and to execute them. We beseech Thee to bless, through the abundance of Thy grace, this body of Thy legislative servants. Bless their homes and families and all the interests of their hearts consistent with Thy divine will and plan. Guide them as they seek to thus make their contribution toward the solution of the problems of a distraught world.

We remember today our sons and daughters, husbands, sweethearts, and friends who have answered the call of duty "where e'er the sun doth his successive journeys run." Be Thou graciously near every one of them. Comfort those who are called upon to make the supreme sacrifice. Heal the hurt of the wounded and cheer the hearts of those in prison, or who for any reason long for the loving fellowships back at home. Bless and strengthen loved ones who wait and labor in the homeland and who pray. Hear our prayers, O gracious God, in these momentous days. Give victory to our armed forces on land and sea and in the air. Confuse, we pray, the brutal plans and nefarious purposes of our enemies. Hasten the day when the forces of right shall be regnant on earth, even as it is in heaven. In the name of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 9, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM GENERAL MacARTHUR

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FEBRUARY 10, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: General MacArthur has asked that the following message from him be delivered to you:

"On behalf of all ranks of this command, I express respectful thanks and appreciation for the magnificent tribute expressed through you by the House of Representatives. Such a message from this great body, representative of the spirit and conscience of the citizenry of the United States, will serve as an unfailing inspiration to our completion of the task which lies ahead of us, the complete defeat of Japan."

It is a great privilege and pleasure for me, as an agent of the War Department, to transmit this message to you.

Sincerely yours,

MILES REBER,
Brigadier General, G. S. C.,
Deputy Chief,
Legislative and Liaison Division.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of giving the insurance companies of the country an opportunity to adjust themselves to the decision of the Supreme Court, but I am not in favor of the House bill as it was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. If you look at section 3 of the bill you will find that it exempts all the business of insurance companies and agents from the original Federal Trade Commission Act, and all amendments thereto, as well as the Robinson-Patman Act; in my opinion no honorable insurance company or honorable agent would want to be exempted from these acts. It will give an opportunity to fly-by-night insurance agents and companies to indulge in all the false advertising they desire, and they will be exempt from prosecution if that provision in the bill stands.

Section 3 of the House bill reads as follows:

> Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

This certainly sets a precedent. The Congress has never so far as I know ever exempted any business from the original Federal Trade Commission Act as amended or the Robinson-Patman Act. You will note the language "or to acts in the conduct of that business." That plainly means that advertising would be construed as an act in the conduct of the insurance business.

I sincerely hope that this matter will be thoroughly considered by the Judiciary Committee and before this bill is called

up that the committee will agree to eliminate section 3.

I will not vote for the bill as it was reported by the committee unless section 3 is stricken from the measure.

THE LATE HARRY CLIFFORD CANFIELD

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a former distinguished Member of this body from the State of Indiana.

Harry Clifford Canfield, a Representative in Congress for 10 years from the old Fourth Indiana District, died Saturday, February 10, at his home in Batesville, Ind., after a protracted illness. Mr. Canfield was a shining example of a self-made man in this land of opportunities. Born on a farm in Dearborn County, Ind., his finances were so meager that he was thrown upon his own resources to obtain an education. He worked his way through Moores Hill College, Moores Hill, Ind.; Central Normal College, Danville, Ind.; and Vories Business College, Indianapolis. After teaching school for a time in Dearborn County he moved to Batesville and entered upon a business career as a manufacturer and retailer of furniture, with banking and farming interests. In the business world he achieved a high degree of success.

His service as a Representative in Congress covered 10 years, from 1923 to 1933, an eventful period in our country's history, and as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Ways and Means Committee he was active and influential in shaping some of the most important legislation of that decade. His relations with John N. Garner, then the Democratic leader, were very close. While he was in Congress his apartment at the old Congress Hall Hotel, the site of the present New House Office Building, where he lived with his wife and their son and daughter, was a center of radiant Hoosier hospitality. He was a wise counselor and a faithful friend and his public service brought distinction and credit to the district he so ably represented and to the State that gave him birth.

NATURAL GAS SITUATION IN DETROIT AREA SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED—CHAOS MAY RESULT AGAIN

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and include several short excerpts from Detroit newspapers in the RECORD at this point relative to the confusion and near hysteria created last week end at Detroit over the local gas company's bungling of Government orders affecting natural-gas service. This is a further report to the House, following my address of last Monday, February 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar here with the dire emergencies that may grow out of a prolonged spell of bad weather in the wintertime. We accepted without alarm the embargo placed on freight shipments from Chicago eastward when snow impeded the movement of vital war materials, and with the same degree of calmness and order the War Production Board 10 days ago considered the steps to be taken to rescue the vast Appalachian region from a dangerous natural-gas shortage then impending. Thus, on Thursday, February 1, the W. P. B. Director of War Utilities dispatched orders throughout the threatened area from Louisville north to Saginaw, and eastward to the seaboard. His directives went out primarily to the pipe-line executives controlling gas-well output and pipe-line gas flow, and thence to the officials of local gas distributing companies, including the gas utility, Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., at Detroit.

Now what was the nature of the emergency? We certainly cannot obtain those facts from the panicky headlines of Detroit newspapers, but investigation will reveal that local gas-utility officials at Detroit and elsewhere understood clearly exactly what the Government sought to accomplish. Investigation will show, too, that everywhere except at Detroit the orders were carried out with competence and due appreciation of the complex situation confronting W. P. B. officials. Now if Detroit were the exception—if at Detroit our war production was thrown into a tailspin, if our war workers lost half a million dollars in wages, if the national taxpayers footing the war bill at Detroit were burdened with extraordinary expenses, if the morale of management and labor alike was threatened—is it not important for the Congress to understand why Detroit was the exception? Since the W. P. B., having no control over the weather, has warned that a similar emergency may recur in the Appalachian region and at Detroit, should not an investigation be undertaken now to prevent another costly disruption of the war production at Detroit? I believe we all know where our duty lies, and as Representative of the most heavily industrialized district of the United States, and for that matter, of the entire world, I intend that all the facts instead of fiction shall be brought forth.

I have asked, "What was the nature of the emergency?" It consisted simply of the fact that cold weather had produced such an unusual demand for natural gas by families—not by war industries—in the region eastward from Indiana that gas pressures in the intricate pipe-line systems were dropping to a dangerous low. This was recognized by the gas utilities throughout the area and by the Government. This must have been known also to the gas-utility executives at Detroit, but please keep in mind that gas pressures were not dropping at Detroit. Our area was not faced with a shortage of supply, for two reasons: First, the pipe line to Detroit does not draw its natural gas supplies from the waning gas reserves in the Appalachian area, but from the vast reserves of southwest Kansas, western Oklahoma, and the Texas Panhandle; second, Detroit's natural gas supplies were augumented by so-called standby equipment of the local gas utility, available for the manufacture of a gas having the same heating quality of natural gas, and for intermixture with the natural gas brought in from the Southwest.

Now for the second question: "How was the emergency to be met?" Mr. Edward Falck, W. P. B. Director of War Utilities, has informed us as follows, and I quote from Mr. Falck's public statement of Saturday, February 3:

> When the possibility of collapse in the Appalachian area became imminent it was imperative to put into immediate effect measures previously prepared and authorized by telephone.

I ask my colleagues to keep in mind his phrase, "Measures previously prepared and authorized by telephone." Meantime, let me present the situation as it appeared to the executives of war plants, to war workers, and to the population generally in the Detroit area, nearly 24 hours after W. P. B. officials had taken their precautions and ordered necessary safeguards; that is, the precautionary safeguards "previously prepared and authorized by telephone."

The near-hysteria at Detroit is evidenced by the newspaper headlines, some of which I hold up for your inspection. Here is the Detroit News' "blue streak" edition of Friday, February 2, with a headline 3 inches high, and I quote it: "W. P. B. cuts off gas flow to 100 war plants here—Ban made to relieve Ohio crisis—Detroit workers face lay-off." As war plant managers and workers turned from this comparatively modest presentation, their apprehension and indignation mounted as they encountered the "red line" edition of the Detroit Times. To the simple directives issued from Washington 24 hours previously, the news of which had been withheld deliberately from the Detroit public, the Detroit Times added a special headline in red ink, with an exclamation point, and the headlines were nearly 6 inches high, reading as follows:

In red ink: "War plants closing!"

In black ink: "Bars, movies stay open in 3-day gas holiday—Factories hit by U. S. order curtailing gas."

Several hours later, on Thursday evening, the first edition of the Detroit Free Press for Friday, February 2, reached the streets with this 8-column headline: "Detroit escapes cut in gas," followed by "W. P. B. ban is lifted at last minute; 30,000 made idle in dozen war plants."

My colleagues in the House are fully aware of the highly complicated and interdependent nature of war production at Detroit. Not only is each plant an intricate mechanism in itself, geared to strict schedules with all departments functioning at set tempos, but many plants are also interlinked with the output of other related plants. Experience has demonstrated time and again that any obstructive incident, such as a delay in the execution of a Government directive and a failure to publicize its nature properly to plants and personnel, can create in a few hours a degree of chaos which can be resolved only by days

of corrective effort. Thus, I have presented the Detroit Free Press headline in its first Friday edition, appearing Thursday night. During the night, it appears, Detroit industrialists poured their woes in an unending torrent upon the Mead committee of the Senate, with Detroit's own Senator HOMER FERGUSON, a member of that committee, as their intermediary. So now we come, a few hours later, to a final Free Press edition of Friday, February 2, with another screaming headline, as follows: "Bungling shuts Detroit war plants—United States asked to probe gas order—FERGUSON calls chaos inexcusable—W. P. B. admits error; 50,000 made idle," and here I quote directly from the Free Press article:

A congressional investigation to determine the responsibility for the bungling which sent 50,000 Detroit war workers into idleness and jeopardized the city's entire week-end war production will be demanded. The request will be made by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan, Republican.

The Senator acted Friday night on protest from Detroit's industrialists. They were aroused at being thrown into confusion and shut-downs following a series of contradictory War Production Board orders to 100 of the largest plants drastically curtailing their use of natural gas.

FERGUSON said that the investigation would fall under the jurisdiction of the Mead committee, formerly the Truman committee, of which he is a member.

While a critical gas shortage has developed in the Appalachian area because of the prolonged cold weather, Senator FERGUSON said the forced shut-downs in Detroit were inexcusable.

High-priority products from Detroit are sorely needed on the western front and, W. P. B. officials admitted Friday night, the Detroit gas cut-down would have brought no improvement to the shortage area.

"While this needless damage to the war effort cannot be undone," Senator FERGUSON said, "an investigation should prevent repetition of such costly bunders."

Meanwhile, following a day of wild confusion which saw vital plants sending thousands of workers home for the week end, production experts were working late in the night trying to restore production of the needed war materials.

An ambiguously worded order curtailing the use of industrial gas and a drastic interpretation of it by the W. P. B. in Washington resulted in closing the heavy-armament-producing factories.

The day of bewilderment for industry rounded into a complete fiasco at 5:35 p. m. Friday when the earlier orders suddenly were rescinded.

As matters stood late Friday the plants are to continue production if the shifts sent home for the week end can be reassembled.

At the root of Detroit's chaotic day was the prolonged cold wave. It had stripped Ohio and eastern communities of their normal coal supply and placed a heavy drain on gas pipe lines.

Before the curtailment orders were recalled for Michigan, Chrysler Corporation, General Motors Corporation, Continental Motors Corporation, Bohn Aluminum & Brass Co., and Aluminum Co. of America plants had closed.

So had numerous smaller but highly vital war industries.

I have presented here merely the high lights of the first accounts of this deplorable situation as presented by Detroit's three daily newspapers. Through Saturday, Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday the newspapers continued to blaze away, both in their news columns and with thundering editorials. The Free Press on Monday declared:

War plants must not be placed so senselessly in jeopardy again. The Mead committee should probe deeply and thoroughly. Thereafter strong safeguards should be erected against repetition.

The Detroit Times on the same day asserted:

Michigan's Senator FERGUSON indicated he might start an investigation. If he still is of the same mind, he should start one and finish it. We cannot afford the luxury of such dangerous mistakes at this stage of the war.

On Tuesday the Detroit News chorused in the same vein:

Senator FERGUSON should pursue his inquiry so that it may be determined how the blunder was made and who is responsible for it.

The admission that just a mistake accounted for shutting off gas supplies to industrial customers here was made by Alexander Macomber, Director of the Gas Division of the Office of War Utilities. Although the correction was quickly attempted by the local War Production Board office, the confusion was such, after the plants were closed, that in a number of cases full production could not be resumed until Monday.

Mr. Speaker, in my address to the House on last Monday I pointed out that much, if not all, of the confusion at Detroit, with its disruption of war plant morale, can be traced directly to the management of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., the local gas utility, and that much of the near hysteria appearing in the newspapers may likewise be attributed to those utility officials, due either to their failure to publicize and implement Government orders promptly or to their giving to the newspapers an incorrect and unfair interpretation of the real problems confronting W. P. B. and the steps initiated by W. P. B. to avert virtual disaster throughout the Appalachian region. I wish now to return to that grave charge.

As a result of the chaos prevailing last week end at Detroit, these four measures have been taken toward the facts, rather than the fictions of the situation:

First. Senator FERGUSON has conferred with W. P. B. officials and is quoted by last Sunday's Free Press in part as follows:

"It does appear, however, there was real necessity for the order Friday morning," FERGUSON asserted. "It seems to me it was a matter of judgment based on facts." He said a further investigation would be made particularly to determine what action could be taken to avert a repetition of the confusion caused to Detroit's war-producing machinery.

Second. Further conversations with W. P. B. officials have been undertaken by myself, with results to be presented to the House.

Third. An investigation has been launched by the U. A. W. (C. I. O.) with a possible view to seeking "some sort of recompense from the Government for the estimated $500,000 in wages that was lost." The quotation is from the Free Press of Monday, February 5.

Fourth. Two principal Government officials have gone to Detroit to restate their official position in the controversy.

From the manifold inquiries in progress, these facts are emerging, in contrast to confusing interpretations appearing in Detroit newspapers:

First. The natural-gas reserves and pipe-line facilities connected to Detroit are adequate to supply that area.

Second. Any need which may arise in the future for the borrowing of a part of the natural gas intended for Detroit, and its temporary diversion to homes in Ohio, cannot properly be seized upon by the Detroit gas utility management as a justification for spending $70,000,000 to duplicate existing pipe-line facilities, as a further burden on rate payers.

Third. The gas curtailment, which for a few hours, threatened Detroit, is a restriction which has been calmly and frequently accepted by hundreds of industrial communities in the Appalachian area, large and small, during periods of prolonged cold weather.

Fourth. No bungling by the War Production Board officials occurred in connection with curtailment orders affecting Detroit's supply. An admission by Alexander Macomber, Director of the W. P. B.'s Gas Division, that "we made a mistake" has been misinterpreted in the newspapers as indicating that W. P. B. had ordered the Detroit curtailment through error. Mr. Macomber has informed the Detroit public on this subject, according to the Detroit Times of Wednesday, February 7, as follows:

"The only mistake, if there was a mistake, was to include Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois among the States in which amusement places were affected by a similar curtailment order," he continued.

He explained that inclusion of those three States in the later separate order affecting amusement places had been contemplated. They were included in a preliminary draft of the order, but were dropped out before the order was issued because secret military weather information by that time had indicated the Detroit area crisis was ended.

Fifth. The confusion and near-hysteria which occurred at Detroit, and the losses sustained by taxpayers and war workers, were the result of bungling by the management of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. and not by the Government, and it is this bungling which needs to be investigated by Congress, if recurrence is to be avoided, for W. P. B. officials are warning that a similar emergency may develop before the winter passes.

Now, let us fill in the background of this costly blundering by Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., in which a few slick operators, seeking to utilize a Government directive to promote their private or corporate ambitions overplayed their hands.

For approximately 15 years the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. at Detroit, and its predecessor, Detroit City Gas Co., has been conducting a ruthless form of guerrilla war against every threat of competition for the great gas market which it dominates, a deliberate campaign in which it has had the assistance of the powerful Columbia Gas & Electric Corporation, and, more recently, of others whose activities merit attention.

Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. is a subsidiary of American Light & Traction, which is a subsidiary of United

Light & Railways, which is a subsidiary of the vast and sprawling United Light & Power Co. Controlling this top company is a small group of voting stockholders, headed by Mr. Harrison Williams, husband of the ex-"best-dressed woman in America." The value of the holdings of all of the voting shares of United Light & Power have been estimated by the Securities and Exchange Commission to be less than 2 percent of the total assets of this top holding company. I should state here that American Light & Traction controls not only Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., at Detroit, but also the Detroit Edison Co., thanks to a quirk in administrative problems of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The conduct of this guerrilla war against competitors has been a principal responsibility of one William G. Woolfolk, a former lieutenant of Samuel Insull, who has been maintained by the Harrison Williams group as president of the three holding companies and currently as chairman of the board of directors of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. A study of the present affairs of the United Light & Power set-up will quickly reveal the precarious situation of the Harrison Williams shareholders and the Woolfolk management, arising from requirements of the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

This vital legislation has been on America's statute books for nearly 10 years, but only now is the Securities and Exchange Commission coming to grips with the problems of disentangling the United Light & Power combine. In that process the Commission has ordered, thus far, the dissolution of the top company, and has, significantly, ordered United Light & Railways, second from the top, to dispose of its interest in and control over the third holding company, namely, American Light & Traction Co. A third important demand of the Commission is that American Light & Traction dispose of its interest in shares of Detroit Edison Co.

Mr. Speaker, it requires no wise man from the east to recognize the perilous status of Harrison Williams, William G. Woolfolk, et al., arising from the Commission's application of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended. Their first personal concern, in the grand toss-up of these properties, is to come down on their feet. For example, with the dissolution of United Light & Power Co., of which the Williams-Woolfolk group now control less than 2 percent of assets, how can they perpetuate their present control of the second holding company, United Light & Railways, which is not faced with dissolution?

Again, in the Commission's order for separation of American Light & Traction, third holding company, from United Light & Railways, how can the present control of American's subsidiaries by the Williams-Woolfolk management be preserved? Out of their months of mental travail, Mr. Woolfolk has given recent birth to a unique proposal, on which the Commission has been asked by Mr. Woolfolk to decide favorably.

The proposal, briefly, calls for the following steps:

First. American Light & Traction Co. would be dissolved. By this process the Williams-Woolfolk clique would be rid of a minority group of stockholders owning almost one-half of the voting power.

Second. After this minority has been eliminated as an effective check, the subsidiaries of American Light & Traction Co., now under the Williams-Woolfolk control, would be so maneuvered as to become the owners of a natural-gas pipe line, to be constructed under supervision of the Woolfolk group, and presumably to be operated by Mr. Woolfolk and associates.

Third. Initial funds for construction of such a pipe line would be obtained by Woolfolk and others through the sale of Detroit Edison Co. shares now held by American Light & Traction Co.

Fourth. As a necessary requirement for obtaining a pipe-line certificate to construct such a pipe line, Mr. Woolfolk and others must obtain from the Securities and Exchange Commission a permit to organize a pipe-line company, and this permission is now being sought.

The pipe line, as proposed, would supply gas to present American Light & Traction subsidiaries in Wisconsin, at Madison and Milwaukee, and to Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., at Detroit. Unfortunately for Mr. Woolfolk, however, bitter opposition to the above objectives has arisen among both preferred and common stockowners of the holding companies, as expressed to the Commission. Further, public officials representing gas users at Milwaukee and Detroit are eyeing the Woolfolk pipe-line proposal with extreme caution, and hearings are pending before common councils in both cities. Aside from a natural desire by the Williams-Woolfolk clique to come down on their feet in the Commission's reshuffling, Mr. Woolfolk and some of his corporate associates are the controlling owners of a tidy investment in natural-gas-producing properties in southwest Kansas, in the very field where the proposed Woolfolk pipe line would originate. And the public officials of Wisconsin and Michigan are not unmindful of that investment, nor of the history of its acquisition.

And so we come down to Thursday afternoon, February 1, in the year of our Lord 1945. Throughout the vast Appalachian area, which, with Detroit, is the mind and sinew of the mightiest production for war in the history of the world, pipe-line officials and gas-utility executives are nervously watching the constant drop in gas pressures. They are aware of what must be done and what can be done, and they know that the War Production Board officials at Washington are prepared. Preliminary instructions have already gone out. Curtailments have been necessary before, and the operation itself has become an expected occurrence when the icy hand of winter keeps its grip too long.

Therefore, in the late afternoon of Thursday, about 5 or 6 o'clock, the orders for curtailment go out from Washington for the institution of such measures as will maintain necessary gas pressures, particularly in Ohio, where the companies supplying millions of homes have no stand-by or emergency service to supplement natural-gas pipe-line supplies. One of the steps necessary to maintain the pressures is the diversion, for a limited time, of a part of the natural gas being pumped from the Southwest into Michigan by the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. The Government officials also recognize that, for the first time, Detroit industries may be required to surrender, temporarily, a part of their accustomed deliveries of gas.

And so a directive from Washington went forward also to W. P. B.'s representative at Kansas City, who controls there the allocation of Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co.'s available gas supplies, directing him to pump into the depleted pipe-line system of Ohio, reaching almost to Pittsburgh, every cubic foot of natural gas that could be obtained from the Panhandle Eastern system. The directive meant, if disaster to millions of people was to be averted, no more than temporary curtailment of natural gas delivered to Detroit where no shortage of supply otherwise would occur. Within a few hours, the necessary instructions had been forwarded to Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. at Detroit, where the utility management received them about 9 p. m. According to such accounts as may be gathered from the press, the instructions ordered, and I quote: "a total curtailment to the maximum extent possible without damage to service and production facilities to all plants using over 30,000 cubic feet of gas per day."

Here, evidence would indicate, is where the proverbial fat was thrown into the fire. With Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. in receipt of the curtailment order at 9 p. m. Thursday, or thereabouts, a fatal pause ensued. But the clock ticked busily away, as before, and the emergency grew—9, 10, 11, midnight, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and noon, Thursday. And as Ohio gas pressures dropped, the headlines on Detroit newspapers, more than 12 hours after the curtailment order had been received there, leaped higher and higher.

And what had transpired, meantime, at the gas company? Had the management foreseen such an eventuality during all the previous weeks when neighboring utility officials to the south had been wrestling with an identical situation in Ohio? Why were not the orders immediately publicized, and the public's cooperation enlisted in conserving gas supplies? In a patriotic community like Detroit, under these circumstances, every facility of press and radio is available for such enlistment. Who will deny that such immediate conservation might have resulted as to tide the war plants over the emergency period, assuring adequate gas both for their needs and for gas-starved systems in Ohio? Who can challenge the conclusion that such conservation by domestic and commercial users might have immediately resulted in such manner as to permit war plants to curtail gas use in an orderly manner, should that extreme measure have become finally necessary?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the charge to the House made by me on Monday, February 5. Detroit's confusion and near-hysteria, upturned war production, losses to workers and disruption of morale in industrial management may be traced directly to the fact that the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. slept on the order all night, instead of instituting the measures one might ordinarily expect of an alert and competent public-utility official in such an emergency.

It is significant that when the curtailment order finally was disclosed, the gas company accompanied it with a public statement that included the following:

The condition in which Detroit finds itself today emphasizes the importance of the consummation of the plan for the building of an independent $70,000,000 pipe line from the Hugoton fields at Kansas to Detroit in which Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. would own a major interest and which plan is being currently actively advocated before interested governmental agencies.

Thus, it appears that the gas company, during precious hours when it could find no time to tell the public the facts and enlist its cooperation, could nevertheless find time for the preparation of publicity purporting falsely to show that favorable action by the Government on the Woolfolk pipe-line proposition might avert a recurrence of Government curtailment orders. The gas company's delay, in view of the timing of such publicity, was without a shred of logic or justification. From John W. Batten, president of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., and local hatchet man in the tong war Mr. Woolfolk conducts on competition, has come the alibi that the W. P. B. orders received by him from Kansas City on Thursday night were ambiguous, and he could not place them in effect without further consultation directly with W. P. B. at Washington.

Direct light on Mr. Batten's claims is thrown by the visit of W. P. B. officials to Detroit last week. The Detroit Free Press of Wednesday, February 7, contains this statement:

He—

Edward Falck, Director of the Office of War Utilities, W. P. B.—

said the original order had gone out late Thursday to the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. At noon Friday, Michigan Gas notified this area's prime users of industrial gas of the shut-down.

He said he understood that some confusion was caused because certain companies refused to take telephone orders from the gas company and demanded a written directive from Washington.

In this same connection, I refer to the Detroit Times of Wednesday, February 7, and the following:

Both Macomber and Falck challenged an assertion of John W. Batten, president of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., blaming ambiguity of the order received here for a part of the delay in notifying the public of the crisis. Batten insisted, however, it included new phraseology.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of all America and so that this inexcusable blundering may never recur at Detroit or anywhere else, I trust that the demands by Senator FERGUSON, by the Detroit newspapers, and by labor and management at Detroit for a thorough investigation may result in an immediate, penetrating, and conclusive investigation either by the Mead committee of the Senate, as Senator FERGUSON has proposed, or by a responsible committee of the House. I refer again to the fact that House Resolution No. 18, now pending before the Rules Committee, which I introduced in the last Congress and have again sponsored here, is adequate for the purpose of conducting such an inquiry under authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is my intention to speak again on this subject.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an essay by the late Pvt. Robert Kenneth Osterberg, 19 years of age, of Chicago, who died in action in Germany last November 27, and who understood what he died for.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times on lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on the subject of world peace by that distinguished lawyer and former Ambassador to Great Britain, Hon. John W. Davis, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by me before the graduating class of the officers candidate school at Camp Lee, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 15, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article. I am advised that this article will cost $138.67 over and above the amount allowed under the rule, but I ask that it be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two articles, one entitled "The Rural Mail Carrier—A Faithful Public Servant," which was taken from the Austin Daily Herald of Austin, Minn., and the other entitled "Remember the Loyal Mailman," which was taken from the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Gazette Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the statement of Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur in presenting the Snow medal on behalf of the American Social Hygiene Association to Maj. Gen. Merritte W. Ireland; also an extract from the report of the award committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Saturday Evening Post on the manpower problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a

senate concurrent resolution recently adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the soldier vote bill from the Creston (Iowa) News Advertiser, and further to extend my remarks and include an address delivered on February 9 before the Mu-So-Lit Club of Washington, D. C., by our colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two separate matters and include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print two extensions in the Appendix of the RECORD, one to include a letter from a County Farm War Board, and second, to include a tax speech I made in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I made on the Blue Network on February 9 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. L. R. Durkee, Bureau of Community Facilities, Federal Works Agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] may have permission to extend his remarks and include therein an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by John W. Scoville, economist for the Chrysler Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of treaty ratification and include two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the civil functions appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we would like to have the matter in such shape that all points of order are reserved on the bill. May I state a parliamentary inquiry, How may we do that?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. TABER. At this time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do so at this time.

Mr. TABER. May that be done now or after unanimous consent is granted?

The SPEAKER. It makes little difference whether it is done before or after.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the completion of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEASING OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader if arrangements can be made to bring up tomorrow a joint resolution making provision for the leasing of hospital facilities in New York City. The Public Health Service reports that the Staten Island Marine Hospital is wholly unable to take care of emergency cases and recommends leasing supplementary quarters. The Committee on Appropriations has unanimously reported the joint resolution and would like to bring it up tomorrow immediately after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand this is noncontroversial.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is noncontroversial. There is, so far as I know, no difference of opinion on any provision of the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have talked to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and I also spoke to the chairman of the Committee on Rules about it. It is agreeable to them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. That will be conditioned, of course, upon the limitations stated by the majority leader the other day, that if any roll call came up the matter would go over.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely. That is the reason why I asked if it was noncontroversial. If I make a statement to the House, of course, I shall keep it. I want to keep any promise I make to the House. I understand this is noncontroversial and that there will be no roll call. I understand that other than a colloquy under a reservation of objection explaining the bill there will be no controversy or discussion on the bill, and no amendments offered to it. The understanding is if any debate is undertaken or an amendment offered, it would be withdrawn. Is that the understanding?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, the situation is something like this: The marine hospital, under control of the Public Health Service, is completely filled. They only have four or five beds available, and it is overcrowded now. More and more are coming in all the time, and they must have some place to put them. They felt they should proceed immediately with equipping this hospital, which it is proposed to take over from the City of New York, it having been closed because the City of New York was unable to get the personnel to operate it. That is the situation, and it really is a situation that should be taken care of.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With that understanding, I hope to call up the bill tomorrow. If there is objection, of course, at any stage of its consideration, I will withdraw the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. From what committee did this legislation come?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is an appropriation reported from the Committee on Appropriations, under authorization of law.

Mr. RANKIN. This is for a marine hospital?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is for the lease of a hospital belonging to the city of New York, the Neponsit Beach Hospital, which is to be used to supplement Staten Island Marine Hospital.

Mr. RANKIN. It is to be a part of the Staten Island Marine Hospital?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; under the same jurisdiction, providing for the same class of cases.

Mr. RANKIN. How much is involved?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. $184,000 for alterations, fuel, and equipment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the war record of the General Motors Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 127) providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered, as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage, without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent, Mr. G. W. Selvidge, of Henryetta, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my Budget message of January 9 I called attention to the need for immediate action on the Bretton Woods proposals for an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It is my purpose in this message to indicate the importance of these international organizations in our plans for a peaceful and prosperous world.

As we dedicate our total efforts to the task of winning this war we must never lose sight of the fact that victory is not only an end in itself, but, in a large sense, victory offers us the means of achieving the goal of lasting peace and a better way of life. Victory does not insure the achievement of these larger goals—it merely offers us the opportunity—the chance—to seek their attainment. Whether we will have the courage and vision to avail ourselves of this tremendous opportunity—purchased at so great a cost—is yet to be determined. On our shoulders rests the heavy responsibility for making this momentous decision. I have said before, and I repeat again: This generation has a rendezvous with destiny.

If we are to measure up to the task of peace with the same stature as we have measured up to the task of war, we must see that the institutions of peace rest firmly on the solid foundations of international political and economic cooperation. The cornerstone for international political cooperation is the Dumbarton Oaks proposal for a permanent United Nations. International political relations will be friendly and constructive however, only if solutions are found to the difficult economic problems we face today. The cornerstone for international economic cooperation is the Bretton Woods proposal for an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

These proposals for an international fund and international bank are concrete evidence that the economic objectives of the United States agree with those of the United Nations. They illustrate our unity of purpose and interest in the economic field. What we need and what they need correspond—expanded production, employment, exchange, and consumption—in other words, more goods produced, more jobs, more trade, and a higher standard of living for us all. To the people of the United States this means real peacetime employment for those who will be returning from the war and for those at home whose wartime work has ended. It also means orders and profits to our industries and fair prices to our farmers. We shall need prosperous markets in the world to insure our own prosperity, and we shall need the goods the world can sell us. For all these purposes, as well as for a peace that will endure, we need the partnership of the United Nations.

The first problem in time which we must cope with is that of saving life and getting resources and people back into production. In many of the liberated countries economic life has all but stopped. Transportation systems are in ruins and therefore coal and raw materials cannot be brought to factories. Many factories themselves are shattered, power plants smashed, transmission systems broken, bridges blown up or bombed, ports clogged with sunken wrecks, and great rich areas of farm land inundated by the sea. People are tired and sick and hungry. But they are eager to go to work again, and to create again with their own hands and under their own leaders the necessary physical basis of their lives.

Emergency relief is under way behind the armies under the authority of local governments, backed up first by the Allied military command and after that by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Our participation in the U. N. R. R. A. has been approved by Congress. But neither U. N. R. R. A. nor the armies are designed for the construction or reconstruction of large-scale public works or factories or power plants or transportation systems. That job must be done otherwise, and it must be started soon.

The main job of restoration is not one of relief. It is one of reconstruction which must largely be done by local people and their governments. They will provide the labor, the local money, and most of the materials. The same is true for all the many plans for the improvement of transportation, agriculture, industry, and housing, that are essential to the development of the economically backward areas of the world. But some of the things required for all these projects, both of reconstruction and development, will have to come from overseas. It is at this point that our highly developed economy can play a role important to the rest of the world and very profitable to the United States. Inquiries for numerous materials, and for all kinds of equipment and machinery in connection with such projects are already being directed to our industries, and many more will come. This business will be welcome just as soon as the more urgent production for the war itself ends.

The main problem will be for these countries to obtain the means of payment. In the long run we can be paid for what we sell abroad chiefly in goods and services. But at the moment many of the countries who want to be our customers are prostrate. Other countries have devoted their economies so completely to the war that they do not have the resources for reconstruction and development. Unless a means of financing is found, such countries will be unable

to restore their economies and, in desperation, will be forced to carry forward and intensify existing systems of discriminatory trade practices, restrictive exchange controls, competitive depreciation of currencies, and other forms of eonomic warfare. That would destroy all our good hopes. We must move promptly to prevent its happening, and we must move on several fronts, including finance and trade.

The United States should act promptly upon the plan for the International Bank, which will make or guarantee sound loans for the foreign currency requirements of important reconstruction and development projects in member countries. One of its most important functions will be to facilitate and make secure wide private participation in such loans. The Articles of Agreement constituting the charter of the Bank have been worked out with great care by an international conference of experts and give adequate protection to all interests. I recommend to the Congress that we accept the plan, subscribe the capital allotted to us, and participate wholeheartedly in the Bank's work.

This measure, with others I shall later suggest, should go far to take care of our part of the lending requirements of the post-war years. They should help the countries concerned to get production started, to get over the first crisis of disorganization and fear, to begin the work of reconstruction and development; and they should help our farmers and our industries to get over the crisis of reconversion by making a large volume of export business possible in the post-war years. As confidence returns, private investors will participate more and more in foreign lending and investment without any Government assistance. But to get over the first crisis, in the situation that confronts us, loans and guaranties by agencies of Government will be essential.

We all know, however, that a prosperous world economy must be built on more than foreign investment. Exchange rates must be stabilized, and the channels of trade opened up throughout the world. A large foreign trade after victory will generate production and therefore wealth. It will also make possible the servicing of foreign investments.

Almost no one in the modern world produces what he eats and wears and lives in. It is only by the division of labor among people and among geographic areas with all their varied resources, and by the increased all-around production which specialization makes possible, that any modern country can sustain its present population. It is through exchange and trade that efficient production in large units becomes possible. To expand the trading circle, to make it richer, more competitive, more varied, is a fundamental contribution to everybody's wealth and welfare.

It is time for the United States to take the lead in establishing the principle of economic cooperation as the foundation for expanded world trade. We propose to do this, not by setting up a supergovernment, but by international negotiation and agreement, directed to the improvement of the monetary institutions of the world and of the laws that govern trade. We have done a good deal in those directions in the last 10 years under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and through the stabilization fund operated by our Treasury. But our present enemies were powerful in those years, too, and they devoted all their efforts not to international collaboration but to autarchy and economic warfare. When victory is won we must be ready to go forward rapidly on a wide front. We all know very well that this will be a long and complicated business.

A good start has been made. The United Nations Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods has taken a long step forward on a matter of great practical importance to us all. The Conference submitted a plan to create an International Monetary Fund which will put an end to monetary chaos. The Fund is a financial institution to preserve stability and order in the exchange rates between different moneys. It does not create a single money for the world; neither we nor anyone else is ready to do that. There will still be a different money in each country, but with the Fund in operation the value of each currency in international trade will remain comparatively stable. Changes in the value of foreign currencies will be made only after careful consideration by the Fund of the factors involved. Furthermore, and equally important, the Fund Agreement establishes a code of agreed principles for the conduct of exchange and currency affairs. In a nutshell, the Fund Agreement spells the difference between a world caught again in the maelstrom of panic and economic warfare culminating in war—as in the 1930's—or a world in which the members strive for a better life through mutual trust, cooperation, and assistance. The choice is ours.

I therefore recommend prompt action by the Congress to provide the subscription of the United States to the International Monetary Fund, and the legislation necessary for our membership in the Fund.

The International Fund and Bank together represent one of the most sound and useful proposals for international collaboration now before us. On the other hand, I do not want to leave with you the impression that these proposals for the Fund and Bank are perfect in every detail. It may well be that the experience of future years will show us how they can be improved. I do wish to make it clear, however, that these Articles of Agreement are the product of the best minds that 44 nations could muster. These men, who represented nations from all parts of the globe, nations in all stages of economic development, nations with different political and economic philosophies, have reached an accord which is presented to you for your consideration and approval. It would be a tragedy if differences of opinion on minor details should lead us to sacrifice the basic agreement achieved on the major problems.

Nor do I want to leave with you the impression that the Fund and the Bank are all that we will need to solve the economic problems which will face the United Nations when the war is over. There are other problems which we will be called upon to solve. It is my expectation that other proposals will shortly be ready to submit to you for your consideration. These will include the establishment of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, broadening and strengthening of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, international agreement for the reduction of trade barriers, the control of cartels and the orderly marketing of world surpluses of certain commodities, a revision of the Export-Import Bank, and an international oil agreement, as well as proposals in the field of civil aviation, shipping, and radio and wire communications. It will also be necessary, of course, to repeal the Johnson Act.

In this message I have recommended for your consideration the immediate adoption of the Bretton Woods Agreements and suggested other measures which will have to be dealt with in the near future. They are all parts of a consistent whole. That whole is our hope for a secure and fruitful world, a world in which plain people in all countries can work at tasks which they do well, exchange in peace the products of their labor, and work out their several destinies in security and peace; a world in which governments, as their major contribution to the common welfare, are highly and effectively resolved to work together in practical affairs, and to guide all their actions by the knowledge that any policy or act that has effects abroad must be considered in the light of those effects.

The point in history at which we stand is full of promise and of danger. The world will either move toward unity and widely shared prosperity or it will move apart into necessarily competing economic blocs. We have a chance, we citizens of the United States, to use our influence in favor of a more united and cooperating world. Whether we do so will determine, as far as it is in our power, the kind of lives our grandchildren can live.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 12, 1945.*

FORM OF ADDRESS OF A MEMBER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under the long-established rules of the House you must refer to a Member as "the gentleman from such and such a State." About 30 years ago the first woman came to the House of Representatives, and today we have several in the House. I notice that the usage has grown up of referring to those ladies as "the gentlewoman from such and such a State." I find no rule to that effect, but it seems to be a custom. When I address one, I address her as "the lady from such and such State." yet

when the RECORD comes back it is changed to "gentlewoman."

I think that one of them should be addressed as "the lady from Massachusetts" or "the lady from New Jersey" or "the lady from Illinois."

Let us see what a gentlewoman is.

Webster's Dictionary defines gentlewoman as—

A woman of good family or breeding.

Also:

A woman who attends a lady of rank.

So, it seems to me that not only are you encumbering the RECORD with unnecessary verbiage and compelling Members to use a word that is unhandy but you are placing them one step below the male Members of the House from the standpoint of social designation.

Mr. O'NEAL. Read the definition of "lady."

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks that I read the definition of "lady" and see what the word "lady" means. A lady is defined as—

A woman who looks after the domestic affairs of a family; the female head of a household; a woman having proprietary rights—

Do not laugh too soon.

A woman having proprietary rights, rule, or authority; a woman to whom obedience or homage is owed as a ruler or feudal superior—

And so forth.

A feminine correlative of lord. Lord or lady of high degree.

So far as I am concerned Members' wives are designated as "congressional ladies." We use the word "lady" when referring to a woman in the same sense we refer to a man as a gentleman and I think we should address one of the lady Members of the House as a lady and not as a gentlewoman. And when a Member addresses one of them as a lady the RECORD ought not to be changed to make it appear that he referred to her as a gentlewoman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] raises a very interesting question, one to which I believe every Member of the House should give serious consideration, and which I think should arouse the interest of the entire country. In these serious days of war, giving consideration to this important question will, I am sure, constitute a normal, healthy, and wholesome relaxation for all Members of the House and for the people throughout the country. However, there is something basic in what the gentleman says.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I merely took this moment at a time when there is no business before the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have discussed this matter with some of the people involved. They feel, as I do, that this policy should be changed.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me the Committee on Rules, which is laboring hard on many other matters at this time, might labor a little harder and consider this important question. I suggest that in their consideration of it they invite all of the lady Members of the House to appear before the committee and give their viewpoint. About a year ago one of the distinguished Members of the House of the feminine sex, whom I had referred to as "gentlewoman," in a very dignified way, called my attention to the fact that under the rules of the House all Members must be referred to as "gentleman." On one or two occasions I have in a most friendly way referred to what she said and admitted that there was at least some color of justification for the remarks she made to me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I gladly yield to the distinguished parliamentarian from Michigan, whose knowledge of parliamentary law is recognized by all in the House to be unsurpassed. I know my friend will approach the question with the seriousness it deserves.

Mr. MICHENER. This matter came up and, if I recall correctly, received some consideration when Mr. Longworth was Speaker. I recall in particular that Ruth Hanna McCormick was a Member from Illinois at that time, and there was some question as to whether we should say "the lady" or "the Member" or "the gentlewoman." Mr. Longworth always said "the gentlewoman." I have always said "the lady," but when my minutes came back from the reporters it is always changed to "the gentlewoman."

I spoke to one of the reporters on one occasion some years ago about it, and he said that he had been instructed by the Speaker to use the word "gentlewoman" because that was the proper designation according to one of the Speakers. But some of our most fluent orators on the floor always say "the gentle lady." Now, that is certainly not correct; there is hardly such a thing as a "gentle lady."

Mr. McCORMACK. Just to protect my friend from Michigan, does he want to let that remark stand? I want to correct him.

Mr. MICHENER. That is an awkward way of putting it. I thank the gentleman and know he knows what I mean.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The Official Reporters will correct it probably and make it read "gentlewoman."

Mr. MICHENER. The ladies are assumed at least to be gentle.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me ask my friend from Michigan, does the gentleman realize the difficulty of a member of the male sex referring to a member of the opposite sex as gentle?

Mr. MICHENER. I realize that the rules provide a Member of the House shall be addressed as, for instance, "the gentleman from Massachusetts." However, we have ladies or women or females who are not provided for by the rules of the House insofar as their designation is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under those circumstances, cannot we meet that situation by custom or practice which will be accepted by the House and refer to them as gentlewoman or lady, whichever you want?

Mr. MICHENER. By an off-the-record decree of a former Speaker of the House the Official Reporters of Debate were instructed to use the word "gentlewoman" as I am advised. I have always used the term "lady" and my remarks come back as "gentlewoman."

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman advise the House why he uses the term "lady" in preference to the term "gentlewoman"?

Mr. MICHENER. The word "lady" expresses to me everything that is intended. It is not quite so awkward and is not so much of a mouthful as the other word.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman feel in the absence of consideration of this question by the Committee on Rules and a recommendation from that committee to the House and in view of the impropriety of referring to them as "gentlemen", might we not agree to establish a custom for the time being and refer to them as either "ladies" or "gentlewomen"?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may proceed for an additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he has not heard a parliamentary inquiry with reference to the rules of the House as yet.

Mr. RANKIN. As I pointed out in the beginning, this proposition is not covered by any rule of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN. But the reason I refer to one of them as the "lady" is that I think it is a little more dignified. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that it is not quite so cumbersome. I should like to see the custom established of referring to them as ladies from now on.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman recognizes the fact that some reference other than "gentleman" should be made when referring to them?

Mr. RANKIN. I expect to call the men gentlemen as I always have done. I think that the ladies of the House should

be addressed as "the lady from such and such a State." We refer to other women as ladies when introducing them, or address them, and I see no reason why we should not treat our colleagues of the opposite sex with the same respect.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Mississippi who brought this question to the attention of the House if this is an indication of his endorsement of the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I prefer not to have my remarks cluttered up with extraneous matter no matter how important it is. The gentleman from Mississippi, if he will permit me to suggest, may answer it "Yes" or "No" and then let it go.

Mr. RANKIN. This proposition does not have anything to do with the Constitution. It is merely a question of the manner in which we address lady colleagues—whether we address one of them as a "lady" or as a "gentlewoman."

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but we are discussing a very serious matter which confronts the House.

Mr. RANKIN. It is simply ridiculous to address one of our lady Members as a "gentlewoman," when you refer to her as a "lady" every time you address her or introduce her, outside the House. You use the term "lady" when referring to your wife, your mother, or your sister, and I submit that the lady Members of this House should be treated with the same courtesy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in calling to the attention of the House this serious matter was that not only the Members of the House but the people of the entire country who are interested in the orderly procedure of the House in wartime might receive a lot of relaxation if they also considered it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the present occupant of the chair made any ruling on this matter or given any directions to the official reporters of debates?

The SPEAKER. Not that the Chair remembers.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the seriousness of this question and perhaps will take the advice of the majority leader and confer with the ladies to see whether they can agree between themselves, which they generally always do, especially those who are Members of this House, as to how they feel about this matter.

Unfortunately we have a few minor matters before the Rules Committee, such as the George bill, the Commodity credit bill, the rivers and harbors bill; about 50 other applications for rules on bills, resolutions and joint resolutions and between 40 and 50 investigating resolutions upon which hearings have been requested. If, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has stated, it is of great importance that we accord a proper salutation to the ladies of the House—whether it be "gentlewoman," "gentlelady," or "lady," I may postpone the hearings on the mentioned rules, bills, and resolutions and call a meeting of the ladies to obtain their feelings and views in the matter, after which I may call a formal meeting of the Committee on Rules to consider the changing of the rules of the House to make clear how the ladies should be addressed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

NANCY HANKS, MOTHER OF LINCOLN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1936, the late Arthur Brisbane, writing in his column on the anniversary of the birth of Lincoln, said:

> Without Nancy Hanks there would have been no Abraham Lincoln. This, his birthday, is a good day to honor him and his mother.

This is Lincoln's birthday, and it is an appropriate time to pay honor to him and to his mother. I arose to tell the membership present that the birthplace of Nancy Hanks, the mother of Abraham Lincoln, is in the congressional district that I have the responsibility to represent. She was born in a little hut near Antioch, Mineral County, W. Va. Mothers have ever been the molders of men. So often they go unapplauded. We can remember now the modest hillside marker for this woman who nurtured a great and good President.

When we recall Nancy Hanks and the son she bore I would also like to say to my colleagues that there is a poet, Karl Myers, an invalid, living at Parsons, in my congressional district. Several years ago he wrote a touching tribute to the Emancipator, which I feel is particularly timely during this dark period. It follows:

IF ABRAHAM LINCOLN COULD TALK TO YOU

If Abraham Lincoln could talk to you
Over the radiophone tonight,
Could for a moment the veil step through,
Out of the silence and far skies bright.

Gentle and great as of old—what then,
Think you, the theme of his speech would be?
Preachings, perchance, to the sons of man,
Muddled and restless, beyond the sea?

Haply a word on affairs of state,
Out of his storehouse of wisdom rare?
Maybe a fling at the low birth rate?
Pleas for the virtues of days that were?

Making orations inspired and grave,
Think you the seconds he'd speed away,
Casting his pearls on the wireless wave
Unto all people and nations? Nay.

Somehow I fancy him standing here,
Knowing the heart of the world is sad,
Spinning a yarn of the yesteryear,
Telling a story to make us glad.

I think we pay tribute to Lincoln not so much because of his brilliance of mind but because of his depth of understanding, his capacity for service, and his humility of heart.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial entitled "War Forest Production."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and quote some brief excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

FORM OF ADDRESS OF A MEMBER

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered about this "gentlewoman" recognition. We are always entitled to be addressed as gentlemen, whether deservedly or otherwise. Let us protect the lady Members and allow them to be "gentlewomen," whether or not their attitude or remarks belie the title. I might be tempted to prefer "lady," thinking that perhaps at some time someone might be entitled to be called "the shrewist lady" from a certain-named State.

You can put an adjective before the word "lady" but when you say "gentlewoman" you in fact remind her to be

gentle. We are protected by calling ourselves "gentlemen," even if we are not.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on January 31 the New Hampshire Legislature passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law an amendment relative to treaty-making powers of the President of the United States. The resolution is as follows:

That whereas a bill (H. Res. 16, 79th Cong.) has been introduced in the Congress of the United States proposing that the Constitution of the United States shall be amended so that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members in each House concur; and

Whereas the enactment of such a resolution and its submission to the several States for ratification would provide for and promote the chances of this Nation joining a world organization to preserve the peace and to insure our successful participation in building a peaceful society: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, hereby urge the Congress of the United States to immediately enact the before-mentioned resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of the legislative branches of the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, United States Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Congressman CHESTER MERROW, and Congressman SHERMAN ADAMS requesting them to do all in their power to secure the passage of the said resolution.

NORRIS COTTON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
DONALD G. MATSON,
President of the Senate.

House Joint Resolution 16 referred to in the concurrent resolution passed by the New Hampshire Legislature was introduced by me on January 3, the day the Seventy-ninth Congress convened. The resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution to read as follows:

The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members present in each House concur.

Last week the Committee on the Judiciary of the House ordered reported favorably House Joint Resolution 60, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] on the 8th of January. This resolution contains an amendment to the Constitution to read thus:

Hereafter treaties shall be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of both Houses of Congress.

The Committee on the Judiciary is to be highly complimented upon its prompt action. I shall be most happy to give my wholehearted support to House Joint Resolution 60.

It is gratifying that in my own State of New Hampshire the legislature has so strongly expressed itself in favor of amending the Constitution so that a majority of the Congress will be empowered to ratify treaties. New Hampshire, if given the chance, will be one of the first to ratify the proposed amendment. It is the duty of Congress to act at once and present to the State legislatures, over 40 of which are in session this year, an opportunity to express themselves on this most fundamental of all issues affecting the future peace.

The proposed amendment could easily be placed before the State legislatures within a period of 2 weeks if the Congress would but assume the leadership in this matter which the Nation is constantly demanding. Now is the time for action. Now is the time to begin to forge the machinery for making a just and lasting peace. For the future safety and security of this Republic we should act at once to effect a much needed reform of the constitutional mechanism for the validation of treaties.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. This may be extraneous, perhaps not, but has the gentleman heard the advocates of this proposal state whether or not they would be willing to have a bare majority of the Congress override a Presidential veto?

Mr. MERROW. I have not.

Mr. BREHM. It seems to me if we adopt one perhaps the other should also be adopted.

Mr. MERROW. I may say to the gentleman it seems to me the proposition he advances is not analogous to this matter; therefore it does not have any bearing on the question under discussion.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is taking a very active part in promoting this resolution and he has succeeded in getting a favorable report from the Judiciary Committee. The matter will now come before the House. May I suggest to the gentleman that, in my judgment, the hard going for his resolution will be found at the other end of the Capitol. May I suggest that the gentleman exert every effort at that end of the Capitol.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for his excellent contribution to the discussion of this subject but I feel that in reference to this matter the House must take the lead just as the House took the lead in passing the Fulbright resolution in the Seventy-eighth Congress. That resolution was adopted by such a large majority the Connally resolution followed within a short time at the other end of the Capitol. If we can act upon this immediately and pass it by far more than the two-thirds vote required, it will in all probability be the greatest spur to action as far as the other side of the Capitol is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to hear the gentleman's remarks because I am in complete agreement with the position he has taken in supporting such an amendment to the Constitution. In light of our Nation's history up to this time, I feel that it is a change that is not only justified but necessary for the best interests of our country today and in the future. What the gentleman from Michigan stated is correct. Of course, practically everything the gentleman says is correct, and I say that not by way of flattery but with a feeling of great respect for his judgment throughout the years I have been associated with him.

The gentleman from Michigan will agree, I am sure, with the position taken by the gentleman from New Hampshire, who has the floor, that it is our responsibility to act without regard to what the other body might ultimately do and that the passage by the House will be an act on the part of the House which would create and mold public opinion. That in a democracy, after all, and properly so, is the controlling influence in the passage of legislation or in the prevention of the passage of legislation.

Mr. MERROW. I am very grateful for the remarks of the distinguished majority leader and for his expression of approval of the proposed amendment. May I ask him if he thinks it will be possible for us to act on this in the near future as far as the House is concerned?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a question which I welcome from the gentleman. As soon as the Rules Committee reports a rule making this matter in order, it will be the pleasure of the gentleman from Massachusetts now speaking to put it on the program of the House just as soon as possible thereafter. There is no uncertainty about that. That will mean within a week or 10 days at the most.

Mr. MERROW. I appreciate that statement from the gentleman very much.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. The proposition that the gentleman advances is a very, very interesting one to me and one in the consideration of which I cannot ignore the provisions of the Constitution, which provide that the Constitution and the laws of Congress passed pursuant thereto and the treaties adopted under the authority of the United States are the supreme law of the land.

If the gentleman's amendment to the Constitution is adopted by a simple majority vote of both Houses of the Congress, you would be able to adopt laws and treaties which would be the supreme law of the land of equal dignity with the Constitution itself, which now can only be amended by the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of each House and the further concurrence of three-fourths of the States. The Constitution does not say anything about which shall be supreme, the treaties of the United States adopted with the approval of the Congress of the United States or the Constitution or the laws adopted pursuant thereto. The change in the Constitution

in respect to treaties reduces their ratification to the level or to the standard of a law for establishing and regulating barbers in the District of Columbia, for example, a bill which we would adopt by a simple majority vote in each House.

May I ask the gentleman to express himself on the question whether or not we want to set up a law in the form of a treaty which is the supreme law of the United States by a simple majority vote of the Members of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MERROW. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof become the supreme law of the land. The laws we pass here by a simple majority are the supreme law of the land. It might be stated that both Houses of Congress by majority vote can abrogate, by failing to pass implementing legislation or subsidiary legislation, treaties that are ratified, and it would seem as though the same agencies which can abrogate treaties ought to have a part in the formulation of treaties.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman is not answering my question at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman's statement is in accord with my understanding of what is correct, that if we pass a law after a treaty has been confirmed, or if we pass a law amending or abrogating it, the latter law supersedes the law passed following the ratification of a treaty. Furthermore, the distinguishing feature is that the amendment to the Constitution, its proposal, passage, and ratification, is entirely different than a law passed by the Congress. It has to be approved by two-thirds vote of both branches and then ratified by three-quarters of the States in the method provided by the Constitution, and there is the difference in fundamental law and statutory law.

Mr. MERROW. That is correct.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman will yield further, that is just the point, that we have a Constitution per se as the supreme law of the land; that is, the act itself, the act of Congress passed by both Houses and signed by the President, becomes the supreme law of the land only when it is made pursuant to the Constitution, and then when an act of the Congress is enacted which is pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, it is just as much the supreme law of the land as the Constitution itself. That is one part of it. There is nothing in the Constitution which says that a treaty duly ratified must conform to the Constitution. It stands on its own feet and it must be authorized merely by the Government of the United States, whatever that means.

MONEY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the birthday of America's greatest inventor, Thomas A. Edison. Today is the birthday of one of the two or three very greatest Americans who ever lived, Abraham Lincoln. All I have asked for this time is to read two quotations, the first one from Edison, the second one from Lincoln. My quotation from Edison is as follows:

> The only dynamite that works in this country is the dynamite of a sound idea. I think we are getting a sound idea on the money question. The people have an instinct which tells them that something is wrong and that the wrong somehow centers in money.
>
> The danger of paper money is precisely the danger of gold—if you get too much it is no good. There is just one rule for money and that is to have enough to carry all the legitimate trade that is waiting to move. Too little and too much are both bad.
>
> If our Nation can issue a dollar bond it can issue a dollar bill. The element that makes the bond good makes the bill good also. The difference between the bond and the bill is that the bond lets money brokers collect twice the amount of the bond and an additional 20 percent interest, whereas the currency pays nobody but those who contribute directly in some useful way.

Then a letter from Abraham Lincoln written to Col. E. D. Taylor:

> CHICAGO, ILL., *December 1864.*
>
> Col. E. D. TAYLOR:
>
> I have long determined to make public the origin of the greenback, and tell the world that it is one of Dick Taylor's creations. You have always been friendly to me, and when troublous times fell upon us, and my shoulders, though broad and willing, were weak and myself surrounded by such circumstances and such people that I knew not whom to trust, then I said in my extremity, "I will send for Colonel Taylor; he will know what to do." I think it was in January 1862, on or about the 16th, that I did so. You came and I said to you, "What shall we do?" Said you, "Why, issue Treasury notes bearing no interest, printed on the best banking paper. Issue enough to pay off the Army expenses and declare it a legal tender." Chase thought it a hazardous thing but we finally accomplished it, and gave to the people of this Republic the greatest blessing they ever had—their own paper to pay off their own debts. It is due to you, the father of the present greenback, that the people should know it, and I take great pleasure in making it known. How many times I have laughed at you telling me plainly that I was too lazy to be anything but a lawyer.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> A. LINCOLN.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by pointing out that in view of the fact that there was $450,000,000 of United States money issued to help finance the Civil War, there has been a saving even at a simple interest computation at 4 percent, let alone compound interest, to the people of this Nation since that time of $1,476,000,000.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. He did say there was danger of having too much.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, and I agree. I agree heartily. But the basic question is whether the Nation shall continue to be forced to pay interest on its own credit. Both Thomas Edison and Abraham Lincoln have told us "No."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a most unusual letter which I received this morning and which I believe should be read by all the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OUR DEBT TO POLAND

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is Lincoln's birthday. February 12 is the birthday of another lover of freedom, Thaddeus Kosciusko. Providence works in strange and devious ways. It is more than coincidence that these two outstanding lovers of freedom should be born on the same date, February 12. Hence, while we honor and remember Lincoln on this day—let us also honor and remember Kosciusko, for he, too, was a model of a freedom-loving person.

When America was desperately in need of help in the summer of 1776, Kosciusko arrived here to give his fortune and life in the fight for freedom. Pending the decision of the Board of War upon his application, he found employment at Philadelphia, in the construction of fortifications against the expected attack by the Delaware. This gained him his commission from Congress, October 18, 1776, as an engineer in the Continental service with pay of $60 a month, and the rank of colonel. In the spring of 1777, he joined the northern army, where his ability as an engineer was of invaluable use in the campaign against Burgoyne. His fortification at Van Schaick and elsewhere, his able judgment in the choice of battlegrounds, contributed much to the skillful retreats and the firm stands of the Continental Army before Burgoyne's rash advance. He was ordered by General Gates to erect the fortification in the defense of Saratoga, and his task was accomplished with great brilliancy and speed.

With justified pride Poles regard the role played by their national hero in the victory at Saratoga, a victory which won for America not only a campaign but France's recognition of her independence.

For long the question of the defense of the Hudson had been of paramount importance; the brief respite gained by the defeat of Burgoyne rendered this a favorable moment to render it impregnable. West Point was chosen for its commanding position, and its fortification was

finally conferred, over the head of the French engineer, Radiere, upon the Pole.

Mr. Kosciusko—

Wrote McDougall, now in command of the northern army, to Washington—

is esteemed to have more practice than Colonel Radiere, and his manner of treating the people is more acceptable than that of the latter.

Little is now left of the fortifications, but the monument erected to his memory by American youth will remain a grateful tribute forever. That America today can regard West Point with pride is, in large measure, due to Kosciusko, who first suggested for a national military school the spot where it now stands.

In the summer of 1780, General Gates requested Washington to transfer Kosciusko to the south, where the Army was now under his command. But before the Pole was able to reach him, his old friend had been defeated at Camden—deprived of his command, and General Nathanael Greene—after Washington, the finest general in the Continental service—had been appointed his successor. While awaiting Greene's arrival, Kosciusko spent some time in Virginia among the planters. He saw there the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with the Negroes in slavery. It was then that, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, he acquired that profound sympathy for the American Negro, which, 17 years later, was to dictate his parting testament to the New World.

Kosciusko was present through the whole campaign of the Carolinas and was regarded with strong affection and admiration by General Greene. True to his ideals, at the Battle of Eutaw Springs, he restrained a carnage which outraged his feelings, and he is said personally to have saved the lives of 50 Englishmen. When the campaign changed to one of guerrilla warfare, he fought as a soldier, not as an engineer. At length Charleston fell. And on December 14, 1782, the American Army entered the town in a triumphal procession, in which Kosciusko rode with his fellow officers, greeted by the populace with flowers and cries of "Welcome."

Kosciusko had fought for 6 years in the American Army. Nathanael Greene best sums up what the Pole had done for America and what he had been to his brother soldiers.

Colonel Kosciusko belonged—

Wrote Greene—

to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken to nothing his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems, nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance, and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never manifested desires or claims to himself, and never let opportunity pass of calling attention to and recommending the merits of others. Congress, in 1783, belatedly conferred upon Kosciusko the rank of brigadier general with an acknowledgment of its high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorious service.

In the fall of 1784 Kosciusko reached his native country. A great wave of effort—a nation's magnificent effort to save herself by internal reform, which culminated in the Constitution of the 3d of May 1791—was sweeping at that time over Poland.

For the next 12 years he remained in Europe—through the infamous partitions of Poland and the many battles fought in connection therewith. It was in 1794 that Kosciusko was seriously wounded in the battle of Maciejowice and was taken prisoner by Russia, not to be released until 2 years later.

On the 19th of December 1796, Kosciusko left St. Petersburg with his friend and fellow prisoner, Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, and a young officer, Libiszewski, who eagerly offered to serve the maimed Kosciusko till he again reached America. He carried Kosciusko from carriage to church, distracting his sadness by his admirable playing of the horn and by his sweet singing. In good time the party arrived in Stockholm, where Kosciusko was greeted with enthusiasm. From there he passed on to Gothenburg to await a ship for England. On May 16, 1797, the Poles embarked and after a 3 weeks' passage landed at Gravesend and thence to London, staying at the Sablonniere Hotel, Leicester Square.

The Gentleman's Magazine announced:

Kosciusko, the hero of freedom, is here.

The whole of London made haste to visit him. Politicians, men of letters, the beauties of the day, and the rulers of fashion, all alike thronged to his rooms. To Walter Savage Landor, then a mere youth, the sight of Kosciusko awakened a sympathy for Poland that he never lost, and to which English literature owes one of his Imaginary Conversations. More than half a century later he looked back to the moment in which he spoke to Kosciusko as the happiest of his life. The Whig Club presented Kosciusko with a sword of honor; the Duchess of Devonshire pressed upon him a costly ring, which went the way of most of the gifts that Kosciusko received—he passed them on to his friends; tokens of admiration counted for naught in Kosciusko's life; now they were the merest baubles to him who had seen his country fall. In the portrait that without his knowledge Cosway painted, said by Niemcewicz to resemble him as none other, we see him lie with bandaged head in an attitude of deep and sorrowful musing.

Bristol was at that time the English port of sailing for America, and it was there that, after a fortnight's stay in London, Kosciusko betook himself, passing a night in Bath on the way. He found in Bristol old friends of American days, and now was the guest of one of them, and that time United States consul. A guard of honor received him, processions of the townsfolk flocked to catch a glimpse of the hero, a military band played every evening before the consulate, and he received as the gift of the city a handsome silver service. One who visited him here records his impression of a soul unbroken by misfortune, by wounds, poverty, and exile; of an eagle glance, of talk full of wit and wisdom.

The journey down the Avon to where Kosciusko's ship lay at anchor was a triumphal progress. He was accompanied by English officers in full dress, by the American consul, and hosts of well-wishers. All heads were bared as he was carried on board. The whole length of the river handkerchiefs were waved from the banks. Farewell resounded from every rock and promontory, where spectators had crowded to see the last of the Polish hero. Boats shot out from the private dwellings on the waterside, laden with flowers and fruits for the departing guest. Not a few men and women boarded the ship and accompanied Kosciusko for some distance before they could bring themselves to part with him.

The ship had sailed on June 18, 1797. For 2 months Kosciusko and his Polish companions tossed on the Atlantic, on one occasion near shipwreck. Philadelphia, their destination, they reached on August 18, 1797, Claypole's Advertiser, for August 19, 1797, reported:

In the ship *Adriana*, Captain Lee, arrived here last evening from Bristol, came passenger that illustrious defender of the rights of mankind, the brave but unfortunate Kosciusko, the Polish general, accompanied by two Polish gentlemen. On the arrival of the vessel at the fort the commander of the garrison, being informed that the veteran general was on board, welcomed him by a Federal salute, and when the vessel came to anchor in our harbor the sailing master of the frigate had its barge manned with eight masters of vessel and waited upon the general to take him on shore. On his landing he was received with three cheers. And, as a further mark of popular respect for this great character, the citizens insisted upon drawing him to his lodgings. The general appears to be in good spirits but has suffered very materially from his wounds and inhuman imprisonment. We trust, however, he will long live to enjoy in these peaceful shores that liberty and happiness which he assisted in fighting for, but which he fought in vain to obtain for his native land. We understand the general is personally known to most of the characters in our Revolution.

On August 23, 1797, Kosciusko wrote to General Washington at Mount Vernon:

By sending packet delivered to me by Lord St. Clair for you, I have the honor to pay my respects not only to my chief commander, but to a great man whose eminent virtues to his country rendered him dear to every feeling breast.

And 8 days later Washington from Mount Vernon replied, congratulating Kosciusko on his safe arrival and welcoming him to the land "whose liberties you had been instrumental in establishing."

No one—

He continues—

has a higher respect and veneration for your character than I have and no one more sincerely wished, during your arduous struggle in the cause of liberty and your country, that it might be crowned with success. But the ways of Providence are inscrutable, and mortals must submit. I pray you to believe that at all times, and under all circumstances, it would make me happy to see you at my last

retreat, from which I never expect to be more than 20 miles again.

Kosciusko was, however, never able to visit his commander at Mount Vernon.

Yellow fever prevailed at Philadelphia at this time, so Kosciusko, with his poet friend Niemcewicz, journeyed on to New Brunswick, the home of Gen. Anthony Walton White. Later he proceeded to New York, where he was the guest of General Gates at Rose Hill, where he remained until September 29, 1797. Before leaving New York, he received from Congress a grant of 500 acres in recognition of his military services. This property was located on the extreme western border of the United States military lands, on the east side of the Scioto River, in Perry Township, Franklin County, Ohio, the site of the present city of Columbus. After a short visit in Elizabethtown, he returned to the home of General White in New Brunswick, where he remained until November 28. Kosciusko, whose convalescence was slow, spent nearly all his time reclining on a sofa, sketching and painting in water color and India ink. From General White's home Kosciusko repaired to Philadelphia and took residence on Second Street. Bevies of visitors and admirers again surrounded him, and Kosciusko drew into great intimacy with Thomas Jefferson, at this time Secretary of State. Jefferson wrote to Gates:

I see Kosciusko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known, the kind of liberty which extends to all, not only to the rich.

On January 23, 1798, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to issue to Kosciusko a certificate of indebtedness of $12,260.54 with interest at 6 percent from January 7, 1793, to December 31, 1797. The final settlement of the account was made by a payment amounting to $15,227.87.

Sometime in March 1798 a packet of letters from Europe was handed to Kosciusko. His emotion on reading the contents was so strong that, despite his crippled condition, he sprang from his couch and stepped without a helping hand to the middle of the room. "I must return at once to Europe," he said with no explanation. Jefferson procured his passport to France under the name of Thomas Kanberg and, with only Jefferson's knowledge, with no word either to Niemcewicz or to his servant, Stanislaus, for both of whom he left a roll of money in his cupboard, he sailed for France. Before embarking at Baltimore he gave Jefferson his power of attorney and wrote out the will in which more than half a century before the Civil War, the Polish patriot advanced the cause of emancipation:

I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name, in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

T. KOSCIUSKO.

FIFTH DAY OF MAY 1798.

There was difficulty in putting this testament into effect as Jefferson was of advanced age at the time of Kosciusko's death. It was never carried out; but in 1826 the legacy went to found the colored school at Newark, the first educational institute for Negroes in the United States, and which bore Kosciusko's name.

By the end of June or early in July 1798 Kosciusko reached Paris. His arrival centered upon him the gaze of the whole world. Sympathy with himself and the Polish cause he heard expressed upon all sides. At the news of his return the Polish legions awakened to renewed life. He negotiated at length with the Government of France for France's help in the restoration of Polish independence. This was promised him many times, but his cautious request for guaranties was never complied with. When Napoleon was proclaimed First Consul, Kosciusko, mistrusting him, commenced to withdraw from relations with him or his officials. After the disastrous expedition of the Polish legions to San Domingo, Kosciusko severed all relations with him.

But Kosciusko's intercourse with his American friends did not slacken. In 1800, at Paris, at the request of Gen. William R. Davie, then envoy from the United States to France, Kosciusko prepared in French his Maneuvers of Horse Artillery and published them. General Davie requested the United States Military Philosophical Society of West Point to have the manual translated and published. This was done, and Colonel Williams, the translator, presented President Jefferson with a copy of this work, the first upon its subject to be published in America.

At this period Kosciusko became acquainted with a Swiss family by the name of Zeltner and moved to their home at Berville, near Fontainebleau. The name of Zeltner will ever arouse gratitude in the Polish heart; beneath the roof of these friends Kosciusko found the hospitality and domestic charm which gladdened his declining years that only death ended.

Napoleon, in 1806, from Berlin, now summoned Kosciusko to assume the leadership of the revolting Poles. But the former Polish commander in chief had little faith in the fortune of the Emperor and none in his promises. He declined to obey the call and remained in Paris.

In May 1815 Russia, Austria, and Prussia signed an agreement for a new partition of Poland. An autonomous kingdom of Poland was, it is true, to be formed with the czar as king, but it would be but a small part of the true Poland. Provinces that remained under Russian rule were severed from the kingdom and incorporated wholly with Russia. Kosciusko heard these things. In dismay he wrote to the czar. In vain he waited for an answer. Then, openly, as to the czar he could no longer write, he appealed to Czartoryski, in denunciation of the czar's betrayal, but in vain. Kosciusko refused all offers of office and honor in the newly partitioned Poland. He felt that his very presence, even, would lend sanction to the new partition. He chose therefore a voluntary exile. Not desiring to live in a Bourbon France, he settled in Switzerland with the devoted Zeltners in Soleure.

Here, in serene communion with nature, among eternal mountains, in unceasing meditation upon the future of Poland, he spent the 2 last years of his life. And here on the sad autumn evening of October 15, 1817, far from his fatherland, though close in spirit, among strangers, with not a Polish face nor a Polish word to gladden his heart, Kosciusko died. Even in his loneliness he was faithful to Poland—her purest soul and the greatest of Poles. And his greatness was greatest in that it was not his own personal greatness merely; it was the greatness of Poland.

Kosciusko's body now rests in the Wawel Cathedral in Cracow, where lie Poland's kings and her most honored dead; but his heart is in the Polish conquerors. To his memory, 3 years after his death, the nation raised a monument perhaps unique of its kind. Outside of Cracow towers the Kosciusko Hill, fashioned by the hands of Polish men, women, and children, bringing earth in the battlefields where Kosciusko had fought. The act is typical. To this day the name of Thaddeus Kosciusko lives in the hearts of the Polish people, not only as the object of their profound and passionate love, but as the symbol of their dearest national aspirations. His pictures, his relics, are venerated as with the devotion paid to a patron saint. Legend and music have gathered about his name.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES BY CONGRESS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire has brought up a very interesting point, and I learned then as we all did from the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, that we may have a measure before the House within 10 days or so on the question of treaties and their ratification by a majority vote in both the House and Senate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Indeed, I yield to the distinguished gentleman, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I said as soon as possible after the rule is reported out, and probably not more than a week or 10 days thereafter.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has pointed out a

provision of the Constitution which reads:

> This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land—

The punctuation in that important sentence is very interesting and might indicate that the Constitution and the laws enacted pursuant thereto are one thing, and treaties are another thing. If we fail to give due consideration to that fact we may find ourselves with two bodies of supreme law; first, the Constitution and law which is enacted pursuant to the Constitution; and second, that which is made by treaty. I do not believe that question, as a question, has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. I do not know just why, unless perhaps it has not been brought up before the Supreme Court in a test case. But at all events it is something which should be decided either by the Congress and the States through a proper rewording of that particular sentence and paragraph or through an interpretation by the Supreme Court. It might even be decided that the Supreme Court had no jurisdiction over the question of constitutionality of a treaty.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that if he goes into this proposition he will find it has been held, you might say, from the beginning of the Government that wherever there is a conflict between a treaty and a law passed by Congress, the law prevails.

Mr. HINSHAW. Perhaps, but it has not been decided when there is conflict between a treaty and the Constitution itself, which prevails.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the Constitution, of course.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is presumed.

Mr. RANKIN. The Constitution prevails over a law passed by the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is presumed because the Constitution itself says that this Constitution and treaties shall be the supreme law of the land.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but the Constitution takes precedence over any law or any treaty. You cannot amend the Constitution by treaty, or by an edict of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HINSHAW. I take it then, if a treaty were ratified by the United States Senate which violated the Constitution, that the treaty itself would be null and void; is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly it would be null and void.

Mr. HINSHAW. That would be my position exactly; but, on the other hand, there has been no positive decision on that point as yet to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me go a step further, if the gentleman will pardon me. I will try to get him some more time if he needs it.

If the Supreme Court of the United States should go so far astray as to attempt to set aside any part of the Constitution, or hold that a treaty prevails over the Constitution, the members of the Court would be subject to impeachment. This question has not been brought to the floor of the House probably in the history of this country, but it was tried out by British Government.

The British House of Lords is the supreme court, and when certain courts there undertook to override the constitution or the supreme law as laid down by the House of Commons and the House of Lords, those judges, if I remember correctly, were tried for treason and hanged.

It is about time this subject was impressed upon the American people, and probably upon some of the judges themselves, that when they set aside a law without rhyme or reason or excuse, they subject themselves to the penalty of impeachment.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate what the gentleman has to say, but there have been cases in which treaties were enacted, ratification having been given by the United States Senate, which were in violation of the Constitution. Likewise, there have been other treaties, merely negotiated but not ratified, that are in violation of the Constitution itself. I have in mind a treaty negotiated by the State Department, I believe, in 1880 or 1881, which provided for free trade between the United States and the then Kingdom of Hawaii. That treaty was transmitted from the State Department after signature by the President to the Senate of the United States for its ratification. At that time the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives held meetings and determined that this treaty, if enacted into law by ratification by the Senate, would be unconstitutional, because it violated the privilege of the House, under the Constitution, in its power to initiate revenue legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Extensive hearings were held recently before the Committee on the Judiciary on this matter. The hearings are printed and are available. If all Members interested will read those hearings I think they will get a very good idea of the various arguments. For instance, I call attention to the argument made by a former member of this House, Mr. David Lewis, of Maryland, along the line suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. I believe that a treaty violating the Constitution of the United States is now pending before the United States Senate for ratification.

Last year at about this time I called that matter to the attention of the House of Representatives by raising a question of the privilege of the House in connection with the treaty, citing article IV, section 3, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, which provides that—

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States.

I believe that this treaty, by obligating the Congress to make appropriations and by disposing of certain property of the United States violates the Constitution. It is my belief that the House of Representatives should take cognizance of the various facts connected therewith and make its position known in relation thereto. I believe that should be done in relation to all treaties. The House of Representatives is not impotent in regard to treaties if the Constitution is of itself the absolute and supreme law of the land, because the Constitution does provide certain functions that must be performed by the House of Representatives in its proper order. In some cases the House must take prior action, as for example, in taxation and revenue matters and in appropriation matters.

It likewise must take prior action in reference to such matters as authorizing the disposing of property of the United States; and there are other paragraphs, sentences, and phrases in the Constitution giving the House of Representatives certain powers that, in my humble opinion, cannot be circumvented except through inaction on the part of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman object to Members of the House passing upon the very treaty that he refers to that is now pending in the other body?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly my point. I think the House of Representatives should carry out its power through its legislative function prior to the treaty's being approved by the Senate.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not my question. My question is: does the gentleman object to the Members of the House passing upon the pending treaty in the other body.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If we are going to change the Constitution with reference to the ratification of treaties by the House, I believe the House should be given the power to pass or the confirmation of Presidential appointees.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not interject that material into this particular discussion. I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman that it undoubtedly will be raised when this matter comes before the House; we might as well discuss it now.

Mr. HINSHAW. Not in my time, if the gentleman please. I appreciate the gentleman's ideas.

Mr. RANKIN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman is interested in the case connected with the water treaty.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am interested in treaties of all kinds, but, of course, especially in the treaty which is pending before the Senate now.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have 5 additional minutes; I took up a part of his time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California desire 5 additional minutes?

Mr. HINSHAW. I would appreciate 5 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that I have an open mind on the question of that water treaty to which he refers. I am intensely interested in it, because it involves the question of water power in the Western States.

Mr. HINSHAW. It involves more than that.

Mr. RANKIN. I was not trying to sidetrack the gentleman from a discussion of that important issue.

Mr. HINSHAW. It involves rights to a great deal more than water power; it involves, of course, the question of the lifeblood of the West, which is water itself.

But, speaking generally on the subject of treaties, the House has on numerous occasions in the past taker cognizance of the fact that a treaty was pending before the United States Senate, and by resolution, the House on occasion has called the Senate's attention to the privileges and prerogatives of the House in connection therewith. For example, in 1852 when the Gadsden Purchase Treaty was before the United States Senate, the House of Representatives through a resolution by its Appropriations Committee, I believe, called upon the Senate not to complete its act of ratification until the necessary appropriations legislation providing for the $10,000,000 that was to be expended pursuant to the treaty in the purchase of the land, had been passed. A considerable debate ensued in the House of Representatives. I believe it lasted 2 or 3 days under the then rules of the House which I presume are the same today, namely, that a question of constitutional privilege of the House called for unlimited debate unless a unanimous consent arrangement had been made in advance of entering upon the debate. I believe it lasted 3 or 4 days. In the meantime, of course, the Senate decided they should give ear to the House, and the House did ultimately appropriate $10,000,000 for this purpose.

It may interest the Members of the House present to know that history shows there was also a question of whether they should spend an additional $5,000,000 and buy a large piece of the Mexican State of Sonora and all of Lower California known as Baja California. It would have been a very cheap purchase, but the legislative body of that time did not have the foresight apparently that can come only with living longer and looking back on history. So Lower California and a piece of Sonora large enough to give us entry from the Gulf of California was not acquired at that time, 1852. The Congress was feeling parsimonious after the War of 1848.

Prior to 1852 there were numerous other occasions on which the question of the privilege of the House in connection with the treaty-making power was brought out on the floor of the House through questions of the privilege of the House.

I believe that the first instance was at the time of George Washington in connection with the Jay Treaty in 1793. That is a long time back. The House itself has not since 1881 chosen to exercise any positive right or privilege or prerogative in connection with treaties that have been ratified by the Senate. No doubt that was because the House was satisfied with the terms of the treaties and no one raised the question; nevertheless, it is quite possible that in connection with this Mexican water treaty, this gentleman from California now addressing the House, or some other person may want to represent to the House again the privileges of the House in connection with that treaty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my slight contribution to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin on Thaddeus Kosciusko. "For your freedom and ours," was his credo. He was the first true internationalist of his day who realized that the threat to freedom anywhere is a threat to the freedom of the world.

I hope that we will repay the debt of gratitude we owe Kosciusko by being eternally vigilant of the dangers to democracy and by seeing to it that his beloved country shall once more rise a free, sovereign, and independent nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 5 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 13, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a meeting on Tuesday, February 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 59.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, February 14, 1945, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia. The hearing will be held in room 362 (caucus room), Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing beginning at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, February 14, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 97) to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (with respect to certain patent matters). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, February 14, 1945.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Pensions at 11 a. m., Tuesday, February 13, 1945, for organization purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the postwar ship disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

201. A letter from the Acting Librarian of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period; to the Committee on the Library.

202. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

203. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service for the period December 1, 1944, to January 31, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

204. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to

amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to receiving of stolen public property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to permit eviction proceedings brought thereunder to be instituted in the Federal courts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

206. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 129. A bill to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants; with amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 127. Resolution for the consideration of S. 35, authorizing the consideration, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1705. A bill providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2126. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 2109. A bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the lands belonging to the United States within the exterior boundaries of said monument to the same status held immediately prior to the issuance of said proclamation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2110. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2111. A bill to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2112. A bill to permit the naturalization of native-born Filipinos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 2113. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2114. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2115. A bill relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 2116. A bill providing for termination of the family allowance under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, with respect to a wife adjudged by a competent court to have committed adultery or fornication; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2117. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment furnished by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2118. A bill to restore one of the "four freedoms," the freedom of expression; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2119 (by request). A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2120. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States by adding the following new section, to be known as section 5219A; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 2121. A bill to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2122. A bill to extend to 6 months after the termination of hostilities the period during which females may be employed in the District of Columbia for more than 8 hours a day, or 48 hours a week, under temporary permits; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2123. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2124. A bill to amend sections 11 (c) and 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2125. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. Res. 128. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Indian Affairs to investigate the condition of the American Indian in the United States and the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. Res. 129. Resolution to investigate erroneous statements concerning the Battle of Saipan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. Res. 130. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Indian Affairs to investigate the condition of the American Indian in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law an amendment relative to treaty-making powers of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2127. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Morton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2128. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen, review, and readjudicate the case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States, No. 34450; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 2129. A bill for the relief of Edward Lawrence Kunze; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2130. A bill for the relief of Daniel S. Bagley, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Daniel S. Bagley, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

63. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution of the Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies endorsing the principles of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

64. By Mr. HOPE: Petition from residents of Ford County, Kans., relative to peacetime conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

65. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. C. A. Bowers, Newton, Iowa, and other members of the Zoar Reformed Church Women's Guild in opposition to peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

66. By Mr. WELCH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13 of the California Legislature, relating to exchange of United States and Japanese nationals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

67. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9 of the California Legislature, memorializing the Senate of the United States not to advise nor consent to a proposed treaty with Mexico, signed February 3, 1944, relating to

the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and the Rio Grande; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

68. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 10 of the California Legislature, relating to the San Joaquin Experimental Range; to the Committee on Appropriations.

69. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 9 of the California Legislature, relating to removal of temporary war housing facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

70. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 8 of the California Legislature, relating to reconversion to peacetime operation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

71. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 of the California Legislature, relating to the bear flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

72. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 5 of the California Legislature, relating to wartime employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

73. Also, Resolution No. 3 of the California Legislature, relating to opium; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Racine, Wis., protesting prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

75. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the County Officers' Association of the State of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of House bill 693 and recommending to the Congress of the United States its prompt enactment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

76. Also, petition of the president of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to international business agreements adopted by the board of directors of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God, be merciful unto us and bless us, and cause His face to shine upon us, that Thy way may be known on earth, Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless. God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatlin, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1808. An act to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 210. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11 and 12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941;

S. 214. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943;

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina;

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation, in the State of New York; and

S. 374. An act to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 338. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat.

CRIMEAN CONFERENCE

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, no conference of the Allies in this war previous to that historic meeting just completed on the Crimea has had a greater significance. It was a conference destined to lay the foundation of the world of tomorrow. The results of the conference are better than the most optimistic expectations. They are better because they are based on a truly growing confidence among the Allied Governments. They breathe sincerity and strength.

Each great power made concessions. They were based on the American concept of conciliation of different points of view and not the triumph of a single opinion.

The five most important points are:

First. The unconditional surrender clause has been explained in such a way as to encourage the German people to revolt against Hitler.

Second. The Crimean Conference provides for democratic self-government everywhere in Europe.

Third. On the question of Poland, Roosevelt has won a very definite concession. The Lublin Government will be modified into a new provisional national unity government composed of representatives of all democratic factions with a definite guaranty for free and secret elections.

Fourth. The great principles of the Atlantic Charter have been reaffirmed. They have become the basic philosophy of the new world organization.

Fifth. The fact that the United Nations conference in San Francisco is being called by the five major powers will speed victory in the Atlantic and the Pacific. The inclusion of France and China as equals among the sponsoring nations of this all-important conference is a further guaranty that the nations which met on the Crimea do not intend to engage in power politics but are instead determined that all nations, regardless of size or economic condition, shall have equal opportunity in the postwar family of nations.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my congratulations to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS], who has just addressed us, and to express also my hearty agreement with her interpretation of the results of the conference of the Big Three which has just terminated. The Allied Nations have been hearing very many things to encourage us in recent weeks from all theaters of action, but I feel there is nothing more heartening and that will give the American people a greater thrill than the unity and the concord and the splendid manner in which these three leaders of the three great nations of the earth have reached an agreement which will mean much toward shortening this war and winning the peace. I trust and I know the American people hope that our own great President may shortly be returned home to us safe and well after this great achievement.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial that appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune of Lawrence, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RACIAL BIGOTRY

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, racial bigotry has no place in this Nation and least of all in the House of Representatives.

Last week democracy was shamed by the uncalled for and unfounded condemnation of one of America's great minorities. I am not a member of that minority, but I will always oppose anyone who tries to besmirch any group because of race, creed, or color.

The subject that precipitated the disgrace of last week was caused by one Dr. Horner, supposedly representing the American Dental Association, introducing religion as a qualification for a scientific profession.

Since then, Dr. Horner's position has been castigated by the board of directors of the American Dental Association, the council of education, and the president of that body of Houston, Tex. Two Catholics of the New York City Council have introduced legislation calling for an investigation of bigotry in the dental schools of New York. Likewise, a similar bill has been introduced in the State legislature. Yesterday the alumni of the Dental School of Columbia University unanimously went on record opposing Dr. Horner and his un-American position.

Let us give leadership to this Nation in terms of racial and religious tolerance and stop petty bickering in this body.

ELEANOR FISHER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 131), as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Eleanor Fisher, sister of Flora L. Shelton, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Flora L. Shelton.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry I cannot agree with the two previous speakers concerning the Big Three Conference, which turned out to be nothing but the "big one" conference. To me it is the second victory scored by Propaganda Minister Goebbels for nazi-ism. Propaganda Minister Goebbels made a statement when the Atlantic Charter was announced that the Atlantic Charter was mere propaganda; that it would never be lived up to or enforced even if the Allies won.

The thing that happened at the "big one" conference proves that Propaganda Minister Goebbels' prediction came true. To me, Propaganda Minister Goebbels scored his first victory at Munich and he scored his second victory at the conference in the Crimea. The selling out of Poland, in my judgment, is a stab in the back of freedom. The selling out of Poland, in my judgment, is a stab in the back to the most freedom-loving people, the Poles, and the most freedom-loving nation, that has done more to crush nazi-ism than any other country on the face of the earth.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and after the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House today for 1 hour on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 12, was the anniversary of Lincoln's birthday. The RECORD indicates that on that great anniversary day, not one Republican rose in the House to do honor to his memory. Perhaps we were ashamed to try, considering what has been happening to his belief in government by the people, of the people, and for the people. Perhaps we felt that Lincoln had been repudiated by the House of Representatives in its passage of a bill to enslave the workers of America.

In any event, it is disappointing that on this great anniversary, we Republicans, either because of indifference, neglect, or despair, lacked the gumption to observe, in the House of Representatives where Lincoln first served, the birthday of that inspiring and immortal leader, Abraham Lincoln.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein three tables from the United States Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a speech which I made in New York on January 25 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therewith an article by Eric Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a description by Sgt. Al Hine, of Yank, the Army weekly, which appeared in the Dutton News on January 25, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include as part of the same a resolution unanimously passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Seabee journal called the Seabee Coverall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a memorial from the State Legislature of Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

BIG THREE CONFERENCE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I also want to express my gratitude to the gentlewoman from California for the address she made to the House this morning. I want to say for my part that perhaps the most important provision in the statement of the leaders of the three great United Nations is the statement that in all liberated nations new governments shall be formed by the process of open elections by secret ballot guaranteed and supervised by all three of those nations. I submit if, as I confidently believe will be done, this plan is carried out, then freedom for small nations can be secured, and America will have fulfilled her traditional role of freedom's guardian. We should continue vigilant to see that this is done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the remarks I shall make in the House today that I may insert certain documents having to do with our foreign policy, including the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and other brief items.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by E. L. Dean, of Jonesboro, Ark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a letter from J. W. Burch, director of the agricultural extension service of Columbia, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by Major General Ord.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio broadcast on price control in Australia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement by the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an article by Ernest Lindley, appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in response to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] about nothing having been said in the House on yesterday, the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, I call attention to the fact that several addresses on the life and character of Mr. Lincoln were made by Members on our side of the House, and I am sure that Members on both sides of the aisle shared the sentiments they expressed.

One of the greatest insults to the memory of Abraham Lincoln I have ever seen is contained in a pamphlet the Communists are sending out with Earl Browder's speech and Karl Marx's picture in it, trying to make the American people believe that Abraham Lincoln was a sympathizer of Karl Marx—the most dangerous enemy of our Christian civilization and our American way of life whose vicious and nefarious propaganda has ever crept into America.

I come from the Deep South, from Mississippi, the home State of Jefferson Davis, who, along with Abraham Lincoln, joined hands and fought together in the Black Hawk War, when Jefferson Davis, then a colonel in the United States Army, swore Abraham Lincoln in as a captain of Infantry to help in fighting a common enemy.

If those two great Americans were here today, they would be backing the men in our armed forces who are fighting our enemies from abroad; and they would also join hands in combating those un-American attempts that are now being made to undermine and destroy our constitutional form of government and our American way of life.

God give us more of such men in the trying years that lie ahead.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the induction into military service of young farmers, and to include therewith two letters.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

FOOD AND FUEL PRODUCTION

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in this all-out global war effort the commodity having first priority is food. Second priority, of course, is fuel—fuel of all kinds—oil, gas, coal, coke, and so forth.

It so happens that my home county, Fayette County, Pa., has been known for 60 years as the hub of the bituminous coal center. Coal, of course, is the second priority in this war effort. In my county in 1944, we produced more than 20,000,000 tons of the finest bituminous coal in the world. More than 22,000 men worked in the mines in my county to produce this coal. These men are real war heroes, if any civilian worker is to be called a war hero.

That is not all. In this same county we operated in 1944 more than 7,000 coke ovens, producing the finest coke in the world. Of course, you realize that to make steel we must have coke, and we produce in my county three-fourths of all of the bee-hive coke manufactured in the United States. The men who toil at these red hot coke ovens are indeed patriotic heroes in our war effort.

Yes, my friends, if there is any group producing war commodities that deserves the Army E or Navy E or any other recognition of patriotic all-out service, it is the coal miners and the coke makers, such as I have in my district. This group should have had long ago an increase in their pay and I advocate now that they be given a pay raise commensurate with the finest steel workers or other commodity workers engaged in this war effort.

RELIGIOUS TESTS NOT REQUIRED BY DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on behalf of the American Dental Association in reply to a statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] wherein he stated that he had been informed that the council on dental education had advocated certain religious requirements in order to be eligible to enroll in a college of dentistry.

I now wish to state that the council on dental education, meeting over the week end in Chicago, adopted a resolution going on record as opposing any racial or religious requirements as a prerequisite for admission to a college of dentistry.

This entire controversy arose because of the individual statements of one man who happens to be a member of the council on dental education.

The members of the American Dental Association cannot be held responsible for the rash statements of one of its members, any more than the Congress of the United States should be held responsible as a whole because one of the Members of the Congress should fly off at a radical tangent and make irresponsible statements.

The adoption of the resolution above referred to should allay any fears regarding the consensus of opinion of the American Dental Association or the council on dental education regarding racial or religious discrimination.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes on the food situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and other special orders, my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House on Friday next for 30 minutes immediately following the special order of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION, FISCAL YEAR 1945, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 100, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this resolution calls for $144,000 to provide for the equipping and fixing up of a hospital which it is necessary that the Public Health Service take over immediately and operate. The marine hospital on Staten Island has a bed capacity, with every facility taxed to its utmost, of a little less than 1,200; in fact there are only 5 empty beds in that institution now, following the terrible tanker collision of last week. Under the circumstances the committee felt they should bring this resolution out; and I believe consent for its consideration should be granted and the resolution passed immediately.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish only to inform the House that both the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from New York talked to me about this resolution. It is of such nature and importance that I thought there was no need for a rule, that consent would be granted and thereby save time. I hope no one will object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional amount of $184,000, fiscal year 1945, for "Pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals," Public Health Service, including the objects specified under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1945, and including the lease of a hospital and auxiliary facilities and not to exceed $55,000 for the necessary major repair, remodeling, and alteration thereof without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a).

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is brought in to alleviate a critical congestion in the Staten Island N. Y., Marine Hospital. Normally they have capacity of 869 beds. By crowding every aisle and corridor, the capacity has been increased to 1,200 beds. They are still short of meeting emergency requirements brought about by the war situation.

The purpose of this bill is to lease a supplementary hospital which will provide 300 additional beds.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. There is a provision in here "without regard to section 3709." What does that refer to?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is necessary to have additional beds at once and the emergency does not permit compliance with the statute without serious interference with prompt provision of the necessary hospital facilities. Under the circumstances it was felt that it would be unwise to invoke the statute in this particular case.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] as to the time for general debate?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have so few requests for time that perhaps we better just run along temporarily and fix the time later. I think we will save time. Let us go along in the Committee of the Whole and see what happens.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory. I ask unanimous consent that general debate be equally divided between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that it is intended to dispose of this bill today?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We are hoping to dispose of it shortly. That is why I made the suggestion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2126, with Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee charged with the responsibility to hear and determine the justifications for appropriations for the civil functions administered by the War Department has discharged its duty and is now ready to

submit its findings and conclusions to the House for further determination.

The work of this committee has been very harmonious. I am very grateful to each and every member for the interest shown and the cooperation demonstrated in our efforts to bring before you a bill that we feel is entitled to full support. Perhaps there are items in the bill that do not have the full endorsement of each member, but the measure presented here represents the cooperative and combined judgment of the entire membership of the committee.

The bill now before us is to provide funds for the following activities: Cemeterial expenses, Alaska communication system, river and harbor and flood control under the Corps of Engineers, United States Soldiers' Home, and the Panama Canal.

For all these activities there is recommended a total amount of $99,165,940, which is the smallest amount provided for these activities since the division of the civil from the military appropriations some 8 years ago. This is in keeping with the thought that only the bare necessities should be provided for civilian functions during the period of active hostilities. We realize, of course, that when the war has reached a successful conclusion, which we all hope will be soon, we may be called upon to provide greater sums of money to carry on some of the activities that have been partially neglected during these times.

The amount proposed for cemeterial expenses is an increase of $34,700 over that appropriated for the present fiscal year. It is regrettable that an increased expenditure is necessary in this item, but the reason for it is understandable; and if this appropriation will, in a small way, express our appreciation for those who have so gallantly served their country and alleviate the sorrow of those most directly affected, it will have served a splendid purpose.

No change is made in the amount of funds proposed for the Alaska Communication System. The amount of $227,840 is the same as appropriated for the past 3 years and represents an amount substantially the same as that required for the civilian needs of the Service at a peacetime level. Additional requirements of the Service will be contained in estimates for military appropriations which will be considered later in the session.

The item of appropriation for rivers and harbors shows a decrease from $54,124,000 for fiscal year 1945 to $41,358,000 proposed in this bill, a decrease of $12,766,000.

Few new river and harbor projects have been undertaken during the war period and those only to meet highly urgent requirements, as, for example, the construction of the MacArthur lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to insure delivery of the iron ore needed to turn out the record production of steel, and the enlargement of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in the interest of the safe movement of critical petroleum products. Aside from features of this nature which have been necessary in the interest of the war effort, new construction on river and harbor projects has been reduced to the minimum necessary to protect and maintain the river and harbor works previously provided.

The $3,970,000 proposed in this bill for improvement of river and harbor works is a reduction of $4,204,000 from the amount provided for the present fiscal year for new construction. Such reduction will require the holding of such new construction to a minimum until the more urgent manpower and material requirements of the war have been satisfied. The new construction will be on the following projects:

New York and New Jersey Channels	$1,600,000
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida	165,000
Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers	1,000,000
Ohio River open-channel work	507,000
Kanawha River, W. Va	198,000
Illinois Waterway, Ill	500,000
Total	3,970,000

There are approximately 1,000 authorized active river and harbor projects scattered throughout the continental United States, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and the Hawaiian Islands. Those projects are either completed or have had a substantial amount of improvement performed on them so that they are serving useful purposes to general navigation and wartime shipping. They range in size from small port improvements to extensive canalized systems hundreds of miles in length. I believe they involve as great a variety of structures and construction methods as a single organization has ever been charged with. During the war period the rivers, canals, and connecting channels have accommodated water-borne commerce having a tonnage about 40 percent higher than equal peak pre-war periods. The ports of the country have suffered material losses in regular import and export commerce but have been put to greater use during the war in the accommodation of military and naval vessels for the movement of matériel and personnel. Maintenance, however, has not kept pace with peacetime standards and in the not too distant future must be given more consideration.

Of the $14,037,000 proposed in the bill for general flood control slightly more than $7,000,000 is for new construction on the projects listed on page 4 of the report and consists largely of strengthening or completion of projects where critical conditions warrant the undertaking of this work as soon as the availability of materials and manpower can be established.

Flood control on the Mississippi River and its tributaries is being prosecuted in accordance with acts of Congress and the $30,000,000 proposed is less than the average annual appropriation for the past several years. It should permit a continuation of the work of bringing the main line levees to project grade and section consistent with wartime conditions.

We are hoping that the weather in the next few weeks will be such that the snow in the upper reaches of the Mississippi and the Ohio will go away with sunshine rather than with warm rain, because if it goes away with warm rain we can look for a flood down the Ohio and the Mississippi of much greater magnitude than we had in 1936. Back in western Pennsylvania, in the Pittsburgh region, we have had 55 days of snow out of the last 62. There are many, many feet of snow remaining. I merely mention this to show that whatever work is done to protect the levees and what-not on the lower Mississippi and the Ohio is surely worth-while construction work.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I might also say that in the 1936 flood the property damage in the Alleghany and Ohio Valleys alone at Pittsburgh was $300,000,000.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that contribution. He might add, I think, that the mere spending of approximately $100,000,000 in building the reservoirs that have been built in the flood-control area of western Pennsylvania since 1936 will lessen the floods in Pittsburgh proper to the extent of about 5 or 6 feet.

Mr. GAVIN. I think it has proven conclusively the economic justification for spending the money that has been appropriated for that purpose. Right now the people throughout that entire valley are preparing for this coming flood, and there is no question but that it is going to be a very severe one unless the water runs off gradually.

I may say that up in the northwestern part of the State of Pennsylvania and in southwestern New York is a drainage area of 11,580 square miles, which contributes four-fifths of the flow of the Ohio at Pittsburgh. In my last trip home I noted that the fields and woods throughout all western Pennsylvania have 3½ to 4 feet of snow on them. I would not be a bit surprised if there were terrific, damaging floods. There is no question but that this flood-control plan should be adopted and these flood-control dams built to control the water throughout this entire region to prevent these devastating, recurrent floods that come periodically in the spring and fall, so that we may impound the waters for the useful purpose of sanitation, for domestic and industrial purposes, and for control of stream flow and stream purification. I think this is the wisest investment we can possibly make. I hope the Congress will wholeheartedly support this measure.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for his further contribution.

There is nothing particularly new or different in the other items of the bill. I do, however, wish to call attention to the fact that there is provided in different items of appropriations carried in the bill amounts to be used for so-called post-war planning. There is included in the amount proposed to be allowed for flood control $2,000,000 for advance planning. This amount was approved by the Budget prior to the enactment of the recent Flood Control Act, approved December 22, 1944, and is not proposed for work under the provisions of such act. The committee is informed that additional

amounts have been requested for that work and will, no doubt, be along later in the session for our consideration. The Corps of Engineers has inaugurated a construction program to cost $1,000,000,000 and has provided, to date, the plans and specifications for a little more than one-half the work, which would provide 558,000-man years of employment. The funds provided in this bill will advance the planning for the program to almost three-fourths completion.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. On page 9, line 4, the item of $30,000,000 is allocated to flood control in the Mississippi and tributaries. What part of that $30,000,000 is allocated to the Ohio River?

Mr. SNYDER. None of it. Ours is under general flood control. I believe it is $507,000 for open-channel work. The Flood Control Act has two special headings, and "Flood control, general," covers everything in the United States except the Mississippi.

If the bill now pending in the House, recently passed by the Senate, should become law, authorizing some 290 additional projects, it is estimated we shall need $10,000,000 to do the planning work, which will provide work that will cost $382,000,000 and provide many thousand man-years of employment for the postwar period.

Of course, I know the sentiment of Congress on this flood-control program. That sentiment is to go all out as far as possible to see that the floods in future years from the streams and hills of the United States will not destroy our homes and our property as they have in the past. But it is encouraging to state to your constituents when the war stops, which we hope will be soon, the Army and Navy engineers will have in the pigeonholes blueprints on river, harbor, and flood-control projects in the United States on which they expect to put men to work equivalent to 1,000,000 man-years.

The present bill carries no funds for post-war planning for river and harbor work. However, during the past 3 years there has been provided for this purpose $4,300,000, which has been sufficient to complete the planning for work that has been authorized. If the bill now pending in this House becomes law authorizing some 290 projects at an estimated cost of $382,000,000, it will be necessary to provide additional funds for advance planning. The estimate of funds necessary for such work has not been worked out at this time.

Included in the funds for the Panama Canal are $424,000 for planning for such items as plans and preparations of sites for living quarters for native employees, and designs and studies for various projects that will be needed after the war. Much of the equipment used in the locks and other installations of the Canal has been in use for almost 30 years and some thought must soon be given to replacing and renewing it to keep the functions up to required standards.

Funds in the amount of $45,000 for detailed architectural and engineering plans and specifications are included in the amount proposed for the Soldiers' Home. To keep abreast of the times some new construction and modernization of the home will be required in the post-war era.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, one of the first items of this bill I notice is an appropriation for cemeterial expenses, and the upkeep of national cemeteries. This is a subject which is very dear to my heart. I think the entire House is going to have to regard the subject of cemeteries and the question of taking care of the graves of our heroes who have died on the battle fronts throughout the world very seriously in the next few months. I for one would like to see adequate steps taken to bring back the remains of every man killed in this war so that we can see them placed in the hallowed ground of their own localities; so that they can be accorded a burial which their families and loved ones can witness; so that returning home once more they may be placed in the little churchyard in the communities where they were raised and where they in life desired to have their remains rest hereafter. We should all be thinking very carefully about this because scattered throughout the entire world on the fifty-odd battle fronts of this war there are the hastily dug graves of these heroes who have died. They have a right to expect that their final resting place will be in American soil.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's opinion with reference to the desired place for burial of our heroes. In the committee I asked the general in charge of this work if they planned to try to establish some program whereby these soldiers would be buried in the national cemeteries or if they would encourage the burial of the soldiers in the family cemeteries. They think the soldiers should be buried in the family cemeteries. However, if some parents would like to have their sons buried in the national cemeteries then they want to provide that.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman. I think that is the privilege of the individual family to decide. However, I do want to emphasize that, although the national cemeteries are a great institution, we should not forget the privilege and choice ought to be given to every individual family to have their boys brought back to the little plot of ground belonging to the family in the small cemetery in the locality where the soldier had lived.

Mr. NORRELL. I agree with the gentleman. Surely the national cemeteries cannot be expected to be used very much. The desirable place that anybody would like to rest is in his own family cemetery.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to add to that by saying if we are going in for national cemeteries to the extreme, we must recognize that we are going to regiment our graves. We are giving the idea to the country that these boys are going to be brought back by the hundreds of thousands and buried in national cemeteries. I do not think that is what the public wants. I think they want the bodies returned to their own little towns and communities so that their final resting place may be in the atmosphere of peace and tranquillity under the shade of their home town.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. After the last war, it is my understanding that the body of every young man whose nearest of kin wanted the body brought back was brought back to this country. Undoubtedly that will be the result after this war. What is the gentleman worrying about?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is not worrying about anything, except to point out that no provision has been made to do this after the present war so that they can be brought back and buried in their own family cemeteries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] has introduced a very good bill on this matter. Also the Senator from Alabama, Senator HILL, has introduced one in the Senate. Yesterday I was talking about that very thing with General Wright. I approve of what the gentleman said. His statement is that while there is a comparatively small percentage, there are a great number who are really demanding a place as a national cemetery to be buried. One cannot go for any patriotic services at a cemetery of their own choosing. The parents of many of the boys who have buried them in local communities will attend and participate in activities and ceremonials at the national cemeteries.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There is no question but that presently there is absolutely no provision which can be put into effect in this war to bring these remains back. There is no existing provision of law and no appropriation made to bring these bodies back to this country and I think the Congress should consider bringing them back just as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] 20 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a copy of the Dumbarton Oaks plan for world peace, a plan tentatively adopted here in Washington by the four great powers a few weeks ago and upon which a full United Nations conference will be held beginning April 25, 1945, in San Francisco. I do not believe as many

as 100,000 Americans have ever read it. Our estimated population is 138,100,000. In other words there are probably 138,000,000 Americans who have never seen or heard or read or had a chance to read the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. And while we are talking about figures, there are probably 100,000,000 Americans who have never read the so-called Atlantic Charter, and the Fulbright and Connally resolutions on world peace. The documents to which I am referring will in a measure shape the destiny of our Nation for a thousand years and more.

You have observed that I am not discussing the bill before us. The pending bill provides for the annual appropriation for the civil functions of the War Department. It was carefully prepared by our subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, approved by the full Committee on Appropriations and is now before the House for your approval. The hearings which we conducted were both on and off the record, and rather extensive. Some of the testimony of Major General Mehaffey, Governor of the Canal Zone, could not be printed for security reasons. But the printed hearings embody a hundred and thirty-six pages, are reasonably complete, and are available to all Members of the House.

Other members of our subcommittee have discussed the bill and I shall say no more about it because I want to utilize the time allotted to me to discuss these other matters, particularly since there is no controversy about the bill.

The world knows by now of the recently concluded meeting of Prime Minister Churchill, Premier Stalin, and President Roosevelt, and most Americans have heard a report of some of the things which were determined at the conference. The representatives of the Big Three met not only to discuss plans for war and victory, but principally to decide some vital questions having to do with plans for world peace. In the first few hours of the conference plans for prosecuting the war were agreed upon. Plans for peace were the more difficult considerations.

I personally feel that there has been too little discussion in the House of Representatives and in the country of the proposed world peace organization, and I propose that today we shall launch in America an intensive campaign of study and discussion. It will be particularly fitting now in view of the recently concluded conference and in view of the future plans which have been announced. There are two supremely vital things before us today, and I mean right now, today and every day. The first thing is winning the war, and putting every resource we have into it without stint. The second thing is planning and forming a world peace organization. The plans for the organization must largely be made within the near future and not at some indefinite far away future time.

Some time ago I was called upon to make a series of four talks on the subject What Is Actually Being Done in America Toward Formulating Plans for World Peace? The Secretary of State had mailed to all Members of Congress a copy of the so-called Dumbarton Oaks proposals, but I could not readily lay my hands on the copy which had been sent me. I could not find a copy of the proposals in the voluminous issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Finally, I located Senate Document No. 245 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which is the Senate print of the proposals. Of the State Department document, 75,000 copies have been printed for the Department and 75,000 additional copies are on order. The Public Printer is printing 20,000 copies for sale to the public at 5 cents per copy. Only 1,500 copies of the Senate document have been printed; others have been ordered. The supply of a relatively few thousand which have been printed by the Government would not go very far in making the document available to the multiplied millions of Americans who ought now to read it and give it careful study and consideration.

It is quite evident that the American people have not had an opportunity to either read or study the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which since the announcement of yesterday have become more vitally important than ever to the future of our country. The same can be said of the Atlantic Charter, the President's declarations on the "four freedoms," and the Fulbright and Connally resolutions. My point is that if Americans, generally, wanted to study the proposed program for world peace, insofar as it has been formulated, I doubt that they would have available the documents which would of necessity form the basis of such study.

I do not have a definite plan as to how this information might be furnished to the public, or how public interest might be more adequately aroused, but I do think that the facts of the situation should be recognized by the public and by the Congress. Of course, many of the leading periodicals of the country are printing articles on these subjects, some of them good, but few of them contain the documents involved; rather they express some man's opinion.

I was talking this past week to a new Member of Congress who is serving on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. He manifested the greatest interest in his committee, remarking that the committee was having conferences with high officials of the Government on questions of foreign policy, conferences which were extremely interesting and important. I applaud the fact that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate have been in close and constant contact with the Secretary of State and the President on questions of foreign policy. I hope I am not in error when I suggest that as much of that information as can be safely made public should be freely and frequently discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives for the information of the Congress and the country.

I may be in error but I do not recall that anyone in the House during this session of Congress has discussed the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and references to the details of the proposals in the last session were quite fragmentary and incomplete. In my judgment this indicates wholly insufficient discussion of a proposal which may so vitally affect the destiny of this Republic. Mr. Cordell Hull, before he retired, expressed the hope that these proposals would be fully discussed by the American people, and I now quote his words:

> It is my earnest hope that, during the time which must elapse before the convocation of a full United Nations conference, discussions in the United States on this all-important subject will continue to be carried on in the same nonpartisan spirit of devotion * * *

I have before me a copy of the statement of the President regarding the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and I quote the following:

> These proposals have been made public to permit full discussion by the people of this country prior to the convening of a wider conference on this all-important subject.

Mr. Chairman, let me hasten to say at this point that while I think the discussion has been inadequate, the interest in the subject has not to any degree been inadequate. I hope that in our country we may begin today a fuller discussion of these proposals. The most appropriate time for the study has arrived because of the announcement on yesterday that a further conference on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will be held by all the United Nations in San Francisco about 10 weeks from today.

I certainly want to make it clear that nothing I have said is in criticism of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. The Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees are doing an outstanding job in keeping in touch with the international situation. At no previous time in our history has there been such close cooperation in matters of foreign policy between the Congress on the one hand and the President and Department of State on the other hand. Every American can be thankful for this hopeful situation. This vastly improves the chances for the adoption of a satisfactory peace organization.

Before making further reference to the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, I should first like to discuss some collateral matters which very definitely fit into our foreign-policy picture.

I have in my hand a copy of the speech which the President of the United States made in this room to a joint session of Congress on January 6, 1941, the speech in which he enunciated the so-called "four freedoms." I quote the following from that speech:

> In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.
>
> The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world.
>
> The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world.
>
> The third is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants everywhere in the world.
>
> The fourth is freedom from fear, which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

Of course this speech was made before our entry into the war and must be

interpreted in the light of more recent events.

I now have before me a copy of the so-called Atlantic Charter, which was agreed upon by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill at a meeting in the North Atlantic in August, 1941. I am referring to House Document 358 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

[Signed] FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
[Signed] WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

I should now like to read the so-called Fulbright resolution, which passed the House of Representatives on September 21, 1943:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

You will note that the House of Representatives officially said at that time that it favored the creation of international machinery for the promotion of peace among the nations of the world; that it favored participation therein by the United States. As to the power of this organization, the House of Representatives said, and I quote:

With power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world.

This resolution may be rather broad and indefinite, but the implications are tremendous.

The United States Senate on November 5, 1943, echoed the sentiments of the House of Representatives in passing the Connally resolution. I shall not take your time at the moment to read the resolution, but I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the Connally resolution, adopted by the Senate of the United States November 5, 1943:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

And speaking of the other body, we recognize that under our Constitution the Senate has the exclusive privilege of ratifying treaties, the constitutional provision being as follows:

He—

Meaning the President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

It should be pointed out that at the last session of Congress, and, I believe, again at this session, the Judiciary Committee of the House has acted favorably on a House joint resolution which proposes the following change in the Constitution, the suggested language being as follows:

Hereafter treaties shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of both Houses of Congress.

A similar proposal for such constitutional change has been introduced in the Senate at this session of Congress. It may also be mentioned that in the last Congress a resolution was introduced in the Senate proposing a change in the Constitution so as to provide modification of the two-thirds rule for Senate ratification. It reads as follows:

The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Senators concur.

I should now like to revert to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the proposals which were worked out here in Washington during August, September, and October of last year in the old red brick house at Dumbarton Oaks.

As everyone knows, only the Big Four—the United States, Great Britain, China, and Russia—participated in these discussions.

At the conclusion of the meeting last October, the President said, and I quote:

Although I have not yet been able to make a thorough study of these proposals, my first impression is one of extreme satisfaction, and even surprise, that so much could have been accomplished on so difficult a subject in so short a time.

The delegates of the four great powers did not settle all of the questions which were pending before the conference, but they did unanimously agree upon many very vital proposals. In fact they agreed upon all the proposals which are embodied in the so-called Dumbarton Oaks proposals for the establishment of a general international organization. It is significant that Mr. Stettinius pointed out that there was not only agreement upon these proposals, but unanimity of agreement. There was agreement upon the framework for the world peace organization which will be charged with the responsibility of maintaining peace at the conclusion of this war.

There was agreement upon the purposes of the organization; the membership; the general nature of the set-up, including a general assembly, a security council, an international court of justice, and many other features which time does not permit me to discuss at the moment.

There yet remains a number of open questions. For example, what shall be the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice? What shall be the voting procedure? Will unanimity of the five great powers be required before military force can be used to prevent aggression in the future?

I shall insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the full text of the proposals, feeling that it will be convenient to have these proposals and other documentary references available in this issue of the RECORD.

In fact my chief object in taking the time of the House today is not to undertake to settle any problem of foreign policy. Rather, I wish to make a plea for a campaign for more intense study, by the Congress and the American people, of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the one bona fide officially accepted plan and step toward a world organization for peace. The best basis for such study is the document itself and for that reason I shall include it in the RECORD today.

It is my opinion that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, while incomplete, form an excellent basis from which the nations may seek at the San Francisco meeting to work out a more complete program. In fact, if the recent conference

of the Big Three has been as successful as we hope it has been, we may expect that the San Francisco conference of all the United Nations will undertake to draft a charter which will be submitted to the individual United Nations for approval.

Mr. Chairman, I have probably already taken too much time, yet I cannot believe that this House could take too much time in discussing matters so vitally important as plans for peace.

While men are fighting and dying for the Nation, those who remain at home can do no less than back them up in the war effort and try to insure that lasting peace insofar as possible shall come when victory has been achieved.

I have taken this time because of the urgent feeling that more intense study and consideration should be given to all pending proposals for world peace organizations. A current song on the Hit Parade is entitled "Don't Fence Me In." In the matter of international relations, we have found that we cannot fence ourselves in and we have been unable to fence war out. We have always been a peace-loving nation. We have sought to avoid war, but it seems clear that the only way to preserve peace and security in America is to join with the peace-loving nations in seeking to prevent war throughout the world.

If we can spend so many billions of dollars to win this war, and sacrifice so many thousands of precious lives to win, and join ourselves in a cooperative movement with all the United Nations, giving and talking, as it were, for the common cause and in order to achieve victory, certainly we will be willing to make more than a token effort to work out a plan with the peace-loving nations for the peace and security of our country in the years to come.

When we were ruthlessly attacked at Pearl Harbor 1,163 days ago, a mighty tide of public opinion arose throughout this country, a huge ground swell of public demand that we rise and fight and pay whatever price might be necessary in order to avoid the destruction of our country—in order to preserve our freedom and our cherished liberty. If maximum success is to be achieved in the realm of world peace there must be a similar public demand and concerted effort.

It seems to have been the custom in the past for the people to fight the wars, thousands of them, millions of them, but we have left the making of peace to a little handful of experts, a small group. We would not get very far winning the war if we left the task exclusively to a small group of men and we are never going to have a peace organization and a peace movement in this country or in this world that will be worthy of the name or that will achieve success unless the same people that take an interest in fighting the war and winning victory join in a determined and concerted effort to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations.

The road to victory in this war has been long and hard and costly and the end is not yet. There has been nothing easy about it. The disappointments have been many. We might as well be frank—there will be more. In seeking to follow the road to lasting peace, we will encounter heartbreaking disappointments, many disillusionments and difficulties. We will be a very foolish people if we fail to realize the pitfalls and disappointments which lie ahead, and we will be unworthy of the sacrifices which are being made for us if we permit ourselves to be dismayed or thwarted in our high quest for a world at peace.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his very fine statement and the study he is giving this great world problem. Next to the winning of the war the question of a just peace as well as a lasting peace is certainly the greatest problem now before the people of this country and also of the world.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. THOMASON. I am not able to say that we are ready to pass a constitutional amendment by which this body shall have a voice equal to that of the Senate in the ratification of treaties. But certainly the time has come when the people of the United States, speaking through their Representatives here in the House of Representatives, are entitled to be apprised of what the true facts are.

Civilization and Christianity cannot go through another war such as the one in which we are now engaged. So it becomes all the more important, I think, that all of the Members of this House do as the gentleman from Texas has done; that is, give this great question thorough and accurate study. I refer not only to the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks meeting but likewise to what happened at the great conference now known as the Crimean Conference during the last 10 days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. It should be pointed out that at this recent conference of the representatives of the Big Three, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were undoubtedly considered. It should also be pointed out that the forthcoming meeting of the United Nations at San Francisco will be a meeting to get down to the facts, realizing that a peace plan which does not get down to specific details is not going to accomplish very much.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear the gentleman say he proposed to insert in his remarks the findings and recommendations of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, or that part of it which can be released to the public at this time. I also hope that he will be able to so correlate that with some of the things which have happened at the recent international conference that not only the people of your own district but likewise the people of the entire country may be able to have an exact factual statement. We must not make a mistake in the next peace treaty. There must not be just an international agreement but also the force necessary to back it up. Those of us here have a grave duty and heavy responsibility. It must be not only a just, but also a lasting, peace. I think the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, has made a very fine contribution toward a full and fair discussion of this great question. His remarks show research and study and I am sure will provoke thought as well as stimulate interest in the solution of this great world problem.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his generous statement. A peace organization without adequate power behind it will not succeed. My point is we cannot, of course, at the moment learn the answers to all the intricate problems which confront us. But certainly this is a time for intense study by the American people of plans for peace.

The text of a program for peace is not very exciting reading, not as thrilling, for example, as the recent War Department story of the liberation of those 513 brave Americans from the prison camp near Manila. Such an event captures the imagination of all Americans, and rightly so; and it is important. It is not so exciting, but it is no less important that we should read and study the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and other plans for and problems of peace.

Yet victory will be an empty victory if we do not make it as lasting as is humanly possible.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Is it not true that no peace can be lasting unless it is a just peace, and that no lasting peace can be based upon injustice? That is true, is it not?

Mr. MAHON. I think that is right.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. A peace, in order to be lasting, must be just to all concerned.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Both friends and enemies?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct, but we cannot wait until we have precisely and completely formulated a perfect plan before we go into action. You have to build toward perfection but you never quite reach it. If we had waited for a perfect automobile until 1944, we would have never had one. We had to start with the best thing we could get and build from there. We have to formulate the best possible plans for peace now, and at the conclusion of this war, and from there seek to improve from time to time the structure which has been built.

The people cannot and will not support a peace program of which they have no information. There must be, first, understanding, and then agreement if progress is to be made.

It would be well if public sentiment could be crystallized either for or against pending peace proposals in order that the attitude of the people may be clearly

known both within our country and to the world.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] mentioned the necessity of a just peace in order to have a lasting peace. We are all in agreement with that, I think, but I am afraid there is over the country some feeling that any peace that is harsh enough to pull the teeth of the aggressors would be an unjust peace. I hope the gentleman will not, in his agreement that we must have a just peace, overlook the importance of a lasting peace. We are all in full agreement with the gentleman from Michigan that we must have a just peace and I feel sure that he would agree that justice does not require that we leave the aggressors with their ability to wage offensive war unimpaired. A just peace does not preclude a real effective peace; one that will make it impossible for the Germans and the Japs to ever again start on a war of aggression. The only way you can make it impossible for these aggressors to repeat their aggression is to take away from them the ability to make war. You cannot change the inclination of these people to invade the lands of their neighbors but you surely can take away from them the physical implements with which to carry on war, and without those implements the desire will not be so tragic to the rest of the world. However, with the implementation of heavy industry, both Germany and Japan will undoubtedly carry on war again in 25 years. If we are going to let our feeling that somebody is going to suffer a loss in their standard of living affect our peace plans, we had better see to it that the people who started this war suffer the reduction in standard of living rather than that the rest of the world suffer this reduction of living standards each generation.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Let me say that the only just peace will be a harsh peace upon those who brought forth all this misery and suffering among the people of the world. No peace will be an effective peace which does not rob forever the aggressor nations of the chance and opportunity to make war upon their innocent neighbors. Leave open to them the pursuits of peace, but as the gentleman so well stated, close the door of opportunity to prepare for or make war.

I yield briefly to my friend from Michigan. I did not interpret his remarks to mean that he was in favor of any flimsy peace proposal.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I do not think there is any difference between the opinion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and myself.

Mr. MAHON. I agree.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I am thinking primarily of a peace based upon justice to our own allies, our own friends. I am very much concerned about the Polish situation. That is the type of thing I am concerned about.

Mr. MAHON. It may be pointed out that if the American people should be led into believing that all we had to do is write upon a few scraps of paper and have a lasting peace we would have done a great disservice. We have got to do as the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, said in an article in one of the leading magazines. To be successful, we must make peace just as aggressively as we make war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of saying I desire to join in commending him on the clear statement he has just made.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. Really about all I have done actually is to assemble in one speech a number of documents having to do with plans for peace. For that reason I asked unanimous consent before we went into the Committee of the Whole today to include in the RECORD immediately following my remarks the full text of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield briefly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. A moment ago the gentleman mentioned the meeting of the United Nations that is to be held in San Francisco. Does not the gentleman believe that there should participate in that meeting some of the men in uniform, some of the men who have had to bear the brunt of this war?

Mr. MAHON. We should have the best possible representation, both civilian and military.

As I said in my previous remarks, never before in the history of this Nation has the Executive, on the one hand, and the Congress, on the other, worked more closely for the formulation of plans for peace; and it is for that reason that we can have some degree of optimism.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I merely wanted to commend the gentleman and thank him for the brilliant and important speech he has made on this timely subject.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman in connection with his study of this subject, recently read the writings and speeches of Woodrow Wilson on the subject of lasting peace?

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that while I am an admirer of Woodrow Wilson and have read much of his writings, I have not read recently the work to which my colleague refers.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then I may venture the thought that if the gentleman from Texas and his colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], will reread some of the writings of Woodrow Wilson on what is necessary for a lasting peace, they might want to modify some of the expressions they have given here this afternoon.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman knows that we made the first important step when we adopted the Fulbright resolution which originated in this House. Does not the gentleman believe we are now ready for a second step in the form of a resolution embodying the Dumbarton Oaks agreement and move further in the same direction?

Mr. MAHON. Let me say to the gentleman from Alabama that the time allotted me has about expired. I hope that we may have more discussion in the House of these important matters. I think you share my feelings that there is a great urgency about these vital things.

Mr. Chairman, having received unanimous consent to do so, I now insert for printing in the RECORD at this point the so-called Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which were agreed upon by representatives of the four great powers at the meeting in Washington, D. C., which began last August 21 and adjourned October 7:

STATEMENT ISSUED SIMULTANEOUSLY BY THE PARTICIPATING GOVERNMENTS

The Government of the United States has now received the report of its delegation to the conversations held in Washington between August 21 and October 7, 1944, with the delegations of the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Republic of China on the subject of an international organization for the maintenance of peace and security.

There follows a statement of tentative proposals indicating in detail the wide range of subjects on which agreement has been reached at the conversations.

The Governments which were represented in the discussions in Washington have agreed that after further study of these proposals they will as soon as possible take the necessary steps with a view to the preparation of complete proposals which could then serve as a basis of discussion at a full United Nations conference.

OCTOBER 9, 1944.

PROPOSALS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

There should be established an international organization under the title of The United Nations, the Charter of which should contain provisions necessary to give effect to the proposals which follow.

CHAPTER I. PURPOSES

The purposes of the Organization should be:

1. To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes which may lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems; and

4. To afford a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of these common ends.

CHAPTER II. PRINCIPLES

In pursuit of the purposes mentioned in Chapter I the Organization and its members should act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.

2. All members of the Organization undertake, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the Organization, to fulfill the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter.

3. All members of the Organization shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

4. All members of the Organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Organization.

5. All members of the Organization shall give every assistance to the Organization in any action undertaken by it in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

6. All members of the Organization shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which preventive or enforcement action is being undertaken by the Organization.

The Organization should ensure that states not members of the Organization act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

CHAPTER III. MEMBERSHIP

1. Membership of the Organization should be open to all peace-loving states.

CHAPTER IV. PRINCIPAL ORGANS

1. The Organization should have as its principal organs:

a. A General Assembly;

b. A Security Council;

c. An international court of justice; and

d. A Secretariat.

2. The Organization should have such subsidiary agencies as may be found necessary.

CHAPTER V. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Section A. Composition

All members of the Organization should be members of the General Assembly and should have a number of representatives to be specified in the Charter.

Section B. Functions and Powers

1. The General Assembly should have the right to consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; to discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member or members of the Organization or by the Security Council; and to make recommendations with regard to any such principles or questions. Any such questions on which action is necessary should be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion. The General Assembly should not on its own initiative make recommendations on any matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which is being dealt with by the Security Council.

2. The General Assembly should be empowered to admit new members to the Organization upon recommendation of the Security Council.

3. The General Assembly should, upon recommendation of the Security Council, be empowered to suspend from the exercise of any rights or privileges of membership any member of the Organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council. The exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended may be restored by decision of the Security Council. The General Assembly should be empowered, upon recommendation of the Security Council, to expel from the Organization any member of the Organization which persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter.

4. The General Assembly should elect the non-permanent members of the Security Council and the members of the Economic and Social Council provided for in Chapter IX. It should be empowered to elect, upon recommendation of the Security Council, the Secretary-General of the Organization. It should perform such functions in relation to the election of the judges of the international court of justice as may be conferred upon it by the statute of the court.

5. The General Assembly should apportion the expenses among the members of the Organization and should be empowered to approve the budgets of the Organization.

6. The General Assembly should initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation in political, economic and social fields and of adjusting situations likely to impair the general welfare.

7. The General Assembly should make recommendations for the coordination of the policies of international economic, social, and other specialized agencies brought into relation with the Organization in accordance with agreements between such agencies and the Organization.

8. The General Assembly should receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council and reports from other bodies of the Organization.

Section C. Voting

1. Each member of the Organization should have one vote in the General Assembly.

2. Important decisions of the General Assembly, including recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security; election of members of the Security Council; election of members of the Economic and Social Council; admission of members, suspension of the exercise of the rights and privileges of members, and expulsion of members; and budgetary questions, should be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. On other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, the decisions of the General Assembly should be made by a simple majority vote.

Section D. Procedure

1. The General Assembly should meet in regular annual sessions and in such special sessions as occasion may require.

2. The General Assembly should adopt its own rules of procedure and elect its President for each session.

3. The General Assembly should be empowered to set up such bodies and agencies as it may deem necessary for the performance of its functions.

CHAPTER VI. THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Section A. Composition

The Security Council should consist of one representative of each of eleven members of the Organization. Representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China, and, in due course, France, should have permanent seats. The General Assembly should elect six states to fill the non-permanent seats. These six states should be elected for a term of two years, three retiring each year. They should not be immediately eligible for reelection. In the first election of the non-permanent members three should be chosen by the General Assembly for one-year terms and three for two-year terms.

Section B. Principal Functions and Powers

1. In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the Organization, members of the Organization should by the Charter confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and should agree that in carrying out these duties under this responsibility it should act on their behalf.

2. In discharging these duties the Security Council should act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Organization.

3. The specific powers conferred on the Security Council in order to carry out these duties are laid down in Chapter VIII.

4. All members of the Organization should obligate themselves to accept the decisions of the Security Council and to carry them out in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

5. In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments, the Security Council, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Chapter VIII, Section B, paragraph 9, should have the responsibility for formulating plans for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments for submission to the members of the Organization.

Section C. Voting

(NOTE.—The question of voting procedure in the Security Council is still under consideration.)

Section D. Procedure

1. The Security Council should be so organized as to be able to function continuously and each state member of the Security Council should be permanently represented at the headquarters of the Organization. It may hold meetings at such other places as in its judgment may best facilitate its work. There should be periodic meetings at which each state member of the Security Council could if it so desired be represented by a member of the government or some other special representative.

2. The Security Council should be empowered to set up such bodies or agencies as it may deem necessary for the performance of its functions including regional subcommittees of the Military Staff Committee.

3. The Security Council should adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

4. Any member of the Organization should participate in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the Security Council considers that the interests of that member of the Organization are specially affected.

5. Any member of the Organization not having a seat on the Security Council and any state not a member of the Organization, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, should be invited to participate in the discussion relating to the dispute.

CHAPTER VII. AN INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

1. There should be an international court of justice which should constitute the principal judicial organ of the Organization.

2. The court should be constituted and should function in accordance with a statute which should be annexed to and be a part of the Charter of the Organization.

3. The statute of the court of international justice should be either (a) the Statute of

the Permanent Court of International Justice, continued in force with such modifications as may be desirable or (b) a new statute in the preparation of which the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice should be used as a basis.

4. All members of the Organization should *ipso facto* be parties to the statute of the international court of justice.

5. Conditions under which states not members of the Organization may become parties to the statute of the international court of justice should be determined in each case by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council.

CHAPTER VIII. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY INCLUDING PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION OF AGGRESSION

Section A. Pacific Settlement of Disputes

1. The Security Council should be empowered to investigate any dispute, or any situation which may lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

2. Any state, whether member of the Organization or not, may bring any such dispute or situation to the attention of the General Assembly or of the Security Council.

3. The parties to any dispute the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security should obligate themselves, first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement, or other peaceful means of their own choice. The Security Council should call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

4. If, nevertheless, parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 3 above fail to settle it by the means indicated in that paragraph, they should obligate themselves to refer it to the Security Council. The Security Council should in each case decide whether or not the continuance of the particular dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, and, accordingly, whether the Security Council should deal with the dispute, and, if so, whether it should take action under paragraph 5.

5. The Security Council should be empowered, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 3 above, to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

6. Justiciable disputes should normally be referred to the international court of justice. The Security Council should be empowered to refer to the court, for advice, legal questions connected with other disputes.

7. The provisions of paragraph 1 to 6 of Section A should not apply to situations or disputes arising out of matters which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the state concerned.

Section B. Determination of Threats to the Peace or Acts of Aggression and Action With Respect Thereto

1. Should the Security Council deem that a failure to settle a dispute in accordance with procedures indicated in paragraph 3 of Section A, or in accordance with its recommendations made under paragraph 5 of Section A, constitutes a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security, it should take any measures necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Organization.

2. In general the Security Council should determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and should make recommendations or decide upon the measures to be taken to maintain or restore peace and security.

3. The Security Council should be empowered to determine what diplomatic, economic, or other measures not involving the use of armed force should be employed to give effect to its decisions, and to call upon members of the Organization to apply such measures. Such measures may include complete or partial interruption of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication and the severance of diplomatic and economic relations.

4. Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade and other operations by air, sea or land forces of members of the Organization.

5. In order that all members of the Organization should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Such agreement or agreements should govern the numbers and types of forces and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. The special agreement or agreements should be negotiated as soon as possible and should in each case be subject to approval by the Security Council and to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

6. In order to enable urgent military measures to be taken by the Organization there should be held immediately available by the members of the Organization national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action should be determined by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in paragraph 5 above.

7. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security should be taken by all the members of the Organization in cooperation or by some of them as the Security Council may determine. This undertaking should be carried out by the members of the Organization by their own action and through action of the appropriate specialized organizations and agencies of which they are members.

8. Plans for the application of armed force should be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in paragraph 9 below.

9. There should be established a Military Staff Committee the functions of which should be to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, to the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, to the regulation of armaments, and to possible disarmament. It should be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. The Committee should be composed of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any member of the Organization not permanently represented on the Committee should be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires that such a state should participate in its work. Questions of command of forces should be worked out subsequently.

10. The members of the Organization should join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

11. Any state, whether a member of the Organization or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of measures which have been decided upon by the Security Council should have the right to consult the Security Council in regard to a solution of those problems.

Section C. Regional Arrangements

1. Nothing in the Charter should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the Organization. The Security Council should encourage settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies, either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

2. The Security Council should, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority, but no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

3. The Security Council should at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

CHAPTER IX. ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COOPERATION

Section A. Purpose and Relationships

1. With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, the Organization should facilitate solutions of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Responsibility for the discharge of this function should be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in an Economic and Social Council.

2. The various specialized economic, social and other organizations and agencies would have responsibilities in their respective fields as defined in their statutes. Each such organization or agency should be brought into relationship with the Organization on terms to be determined by agreement between the Economic and Social Council and the appropriate authorities of the specialized organization or agency, subject to approval by the General Assembly.

Section B. Composition and Voting

The Economic and Social Council should consist of representatives of eighteen members of the Organization. The states to be represented for this purpose should be elected by the General Assembly for terms of three years. Each such state should have one representative, who should have one vote. Decisions of the Economic and Social Council should be taken by simple majority vote of those present and voting.

Section C. Functions and Powers of the Economic and Social Council

1. The Economic and Social Council should be empowered:

a. to carry out, within the scope of its functions, recommendations of the General Assembly;

b. to make recommendations, on its own initiative, with respect to international economic, social and other humanitarian matters;

c. to receive and consider reports from the economic, social and other organizations or agencies brought into relationship with the Organization, and to coordinate their activities through consultations with, and recommendations to, such organizations or agencies;

d. to examine the administrative budgets of such specialized organizations or agencies with a view to making recommendations to the organization or agencies concerned;

e. to enable the Secretary-General to provide information to the Security Council;

f. to assist the Security Council upon its request; and

g. to perform such other functions within the general scope of its competence as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.

Section D. Organization and Procedure

1. The Economic and Social Council should set up an economic commission, a social commission, and such other commissions as may be required. These commissions should consist of experts. There should be a permanent staff which should constitute a part of the Secretariat of the Organization.

2. The Economic and Social Council should make suitable arrangements for representatives of the specialized organizations or agencies to participate without vote in its deliberations and in those of the commissions established by it.

3. The Economic and Social Council should adopt its own rules of procedure and the method of selecting its President.

CHAPTER X. THE SECRETARIAT

1. There should be a Secretariat comprising a Secretary-General and such staff as may be required. The Secretary-General should be the chief administrative officer of the Organization. He should be elected by the General Assembly, on recommendation of the Security Council, for such term and under such conditions as are specified in the Charter.

2. The Secretary-General should act in that capacity in all meetings of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, and of the Economic and Social Council and should make an annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization.

3. The Secretary-General should have the right to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten international peace and security.

CHAPTER XI. AMENDMENTS

Amendments should come into force for all members of the Organization, when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by the members of the Organization having permanent membership on the Security Council and by a majority of the other members of the Organization.

CHAPTER XII. TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

1. Pending the coming into force of the special agreement or agreements referred to in Chapter VIII, Section B, paragraph 5, and in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 of the Four-Nation Declaration, signed at Moscow, October 30, 1943, the states parties to that Declaration should consult with one another and as occasion arises with other members of the Organization with a view to such joint action on behalf of the Organization as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. No provision of the Charter should preclude action taken or authorized in relation to enemy states as a result of the present war by the Governments having responsibility for such action.

NOTE

In addition to the question of voting procedure in the Security Council referred to in Chapter VI, several other questions are still under consideration.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 7, 1944.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, it is a fine thing to talk about peace; but I want you to remember that today we are at war. Let us exert our total efforts toward winning the war; then we can adjust the peace if necessary afterward. Win the war, then talk over the peace. Stop talking of the peace, because you are fooling the American people by talking peace when we have a real job on our hands to win the war. The people, many of them, think the war is over, except celebrating. This is no way to win a war. I recall very distinctly last September and October when we were leading the people to believe that the country was about ready to celebrate its victory over Germany, yet we are still fighting those boys over there. I think we ought to drive, drive, and drive and do everything we know how toward winning the war at the earliest possible moment before we get too excited about the peace that may be established and especially how Poland will be divided up as well as Finland and a few other small countries over in Europe, which we will finally call, probably, a just peace. But I question if we can call it a final peace.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today an appropriation bill providing appropriations for the civil functions administered by the War Department totaling $99,263,240. If we are going to win the war we will have to keep this country solvent and the way to do that is to stop all unnecessary expenditures. We can get a good start right here in this bill. As a matter of fact, we can cut out a whole lot of money from every one of these appropriation bills that come up here for consideration. A country that is still at war with Germany and Japan ought to conserve all of its resources so that it can give the knock-out blow any time that our Army, Navy, and Air Corps are in position and have the power to do so. We must be a solvent Nation if we continue to be a fighting Nation.

The question may be asked, How can we save some money so far as this bill here is concerned? Let me give you just a slant on the condition we are in today. We have at the present time the greatest national debt in all our history, a total of $232,836,086,873.12, a staggering sum. That is going to bend the backs of all the American taxpayers not only in the present generation but in many future generations to come, for years and years and years.

While we are at war we want to do those things that are essential to the winning of that war, and hold up certain other things for future consideration that can be postponed. In the running of our plants back home when we cannot do something that it may be very necessary to do, if we do not have the money we just shove it aside and wait until we can do it. If we haven't manpower we put off till a day when we can.

Let us consider for a moment the bill before us and the amount of money provided for flood control. Of course, I realize flood control is a very essential thing in this Nation but when we have money expended for that purpose which involves taking engineers that the Army needs, men that are needed in industry and agriculture, it should be put aside till this war is won. The Army needs engineers. Observe the amount of money provided in this bill for surveys. According to the hearings, on page 131 there is provided to be spent this year and next year a total sum for surveys of some $8,000,000. The Army has not enough engineers to do the necessary work to the winning of the war, so why go out here and survey new projects when there are now enough flood-control projects on the books to take care of us for the next 10 years? It is not necessary to provide additional engineering facilities for flood-control projects such as we have in the bill now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes, and may I ask the gentleman if he will yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The $8,000,000 which the gentleman has referred to on page 131 are not included in this bill.

Mr. RICH. I am coming to that. That involves projects that the Army wants to go ahead and complete. However, there is a lot of engineering in this bill. There are a lot of new engineering projects in this bill that ought to be eliminated and this committee should see to it that they are eliminated from the bill.

A lot of work is being done on dredging, a lot of work in connection with the building of dams and a lot of work on flood control, all of which ought to be postponed on account of the shortage of manpower, until the war is won In very many locations you have in this bill, especially the rivers out in California, they are begging for men in the airplane factories, they are begging for men in the shipyards and they are begging for men in agriculture. Those are all essential to the welfare of the country and the winning of this war. These items are not essential in any sense to the winning of this war and therefore we ought to eliminate millions of dollars from this bill and save manpower to win the war. A few minutes ago somebody said that there was $30,000,000 appropriation for the Mississippi River, and that it was the smallest amount we have appropriated in a number of years for this river. I realize that, but you have had more money spent on the Mississippi River and will continue to have as long as you Members of Congress live. A lot of this work can be postponed and you can use these men in essential and vital industries necessary to the winning of the war.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I say for the record that the flood-control work on the Sacramento River is

necessary to protect war industries, and without the flood-control work you might wipe out whole towns out there.

Mr. RICH. We have to take our chances with many things. You take a chance every day you live. It is like the fellow who took a chance on the manpower bill or draft. He said, "You have two chances. One is that you will go across the seas, and one is that you will stay here, and after you get over there you still have two chances. One is that you will get into the war at the front and the other is that you will stay back and not get into it. Another chance is that you may be put in the front lines and may be killed, and you have a chance that you will not, and after you take those chances, if you are killed, you still have two chances."

The same thing is true with this flood-control bill. You can take chances. The chances are you are going to have floods and the chances are you are not. So why not put this off until we get through with this war? That is the thing that is vital and essential to the welfare of this country and to the winning of the war; and after we win the war, then we will have sufficient manpower for flood-control purposes. We want the jobs that this bill is going to carry, but why not wait till the war is won? Flood control is important and I am for it, but I want to win the war first. I think that is the thing for us to do. Let us get the pruning hook out here and let us clip the wings of this bill and put in a few amendments to cut down millions of dollars. If you do that, you will be a whole lot better off; you will be considered among your people back home as being better American citizens and as trying to do the things that are necessary to be done at the proper time. The thing to be done now is to win this war and let a lot of these flood-control projects remain on the trestle board until after we win the war. If you do that, you will be doing a thing that is best for this country of ours.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], with respect to the appropriations carried in this bill for plans for post-war flood-control construction. As is stated in the bill, and as shown by the report for general flood control, there is appropriated $14,000,000, in round numbers.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As shown by the report, $2,000,000 is for the purpose of preparing plans for post-war construction. Under the break-down of the $14,000,000, while it does not appear in the report, there is an additional amount of $2,000,000 for preliminary plans and surveys.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. To provide the relief that many Members of Congress ask for almost weekly, if not daily, where there have not been any examinations of projects or of streams in this country. Secondly, as stated in the report, on page 5, attention is called to the fact that the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, was passed after the Budget submitted its recommendation.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is no amount carried in this bill for preparing the plans for those works which are for post-war construction under said act of December 22, 1944, and it is contemplated, as I understand—and I am asking this question to ascertain if I am correct—that additional funds will be carried in a supplemental appropriation bill for plans for construction under the said Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. SNYDER. It is so anticipated.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am glad to have the information requested for the RECORD.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Montana has a special order today for 40 minutes. In view of the fact that he is using his time during general debate, thereby saving some time for the meeting that is to follow here this afternoon, I yield him 20 minutes of the time on this side.

THE LEDO ROAD

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am today presenting to the House a report on the Ledo Road and pipe line which will, I hope, give to the membership a realistic picture of the difficulties encountered in building these projects and the possibilities they offer in assisting China and us in our fight against our common enemy. For much of this material I am indebted to the leader of the Marauders, Maj. Gen. Frank Merrill, deputy commander of the India-Burma theater; Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, commanding general, advance section No. 3; Col. C. S. Davis, executive officer, advance section No. 3; Lt. Col. Edwin O. Shaw, Capt. George C. West, and many others.

General Merrill made it possible for me to make the 3-day jeep ride over the road—an experience I will never forget; General Pick was unstinting of his time and advice and the road well merits its name of "Pick's Pike" for, as I shall endeavor to point out, he furnished the drive and intiative. Colonel Davis, out of the fund of his knowledge, furnished a great deal of the material in this report and the pictures now on display in the Speaker's lobby, and to him and his immediate staff I am extremely grateful. Colonel Shaw and Captain West explained many of the details connected with the building of the road and were always generous with their time and information. Many others contributed to this report and to them—Maj. Gen. Howard C. Davidson, commanding general Tenth U. S. A. A. F.; Brig. Gen. Vernon Evans, chief of staff, India-Burma theater; Col. W. F. Breidster, deputy chief of staff, N. C. A. D.; Col. J. A. Stewart; Col. DeWitt T. Mullett; Col. I. S. Ravdin and Col. Thomas J. Cook of the Twentieth General Hospital; Col. A. C. Welling, executive officer, S. O. S., Delhi; Col. Rothwell H. Brown, commanding officer of the Chinese-American tank forces in Burma; and Lt. Col. Jim Pinkney, of the Tenth Air Force—I am grateful.

Full credit should go to the commanding general of the India-Burma theater, Lt. Gen. Dan I. Sultan, a real soldier and a man of whom we Americans can be proud. He is no desk soldier but one who, like Howard Davidson, Frank Merrill, Vernon Evans, and Lewis Pick, is more at home in the field with his men. Together they comprise a grand team and they have played a real part in the building of the road.

The Ledo Road was Gen. Joe Stilwell's vision, General Pick's job, and the G. I.'s monument. The boys who did the work, whether they carried rifles, drove tanks, caterpillars or tractors, flew planes, or built pontoon bridges, are heroes. Every one of them—and the nurses who looked after them—performed distinguished service in behalf of our country and China.

Recent reports indicate that supplies are being shipped into China in ever-increasing amounts. The tonnage over the Hump has increased from 35,000 tons for November 1944 to 44,000 tons for January 1945. Trucks, which formerly had to be flown into China, are now going over the road into Kunming under their own power. Before another 2 months have passed we will be transporting from India to China a minimum of 13,000 tons of oil and 12,000 tons of supplies every month over the Ledo-Burma Road, and I think that before 1945 is out that we will be shipping supplies into China over the Hump and the road at the rate of 100,000 tons a month. In the China theater that amount will be worth four times as much on a use basis than it would in any other theater.

In previous reports to the House I have stressed the importance of our routes into China. Now I should like to call to your attention the background of the Ledo Road and the pipe line so that the American people—through its representatives—can be aware of the epic job being done by its Army in the outermost area of operations at the end of the line.

By midyear of 1942 the area occupied by the Japanese had been extended to include all Burma. As the Japanese swept up from the south, English, Burmese, Kachins, Anglo-Indians, and a defeated army of British, Chinese, and a few Americans escaped as best they could into neighboring India. The Burma Road was closed, and with it the last supply route to the beleaguered Chinese.

The situation was critical. In Egypt the Germans were pounding at the gates of Alexandria, apparently preparing to strike to the east. Toward Burma, the formidable barrier of the uncivilized frontier beginning with the Patkai Mountains proved itself a sturdy bulwark, for at that moment it was all that stood between the Japanese and India.

In 1943, all eyes turned to the Orient. The Chinese were barely able to carry on, and only the trickle of supplies which crossed the Hump by plane kept their heads above water. It was evident that the dominant mission in the Far East at

that point was the reopening of a supply line to the Chinese.

The map of India took on new importance. An inadequate railroad wandered lazily up the Bramaputra Valley to the farthest outpost of civilization in the northeast corner of Assam. Designed to service only the normal peacetime needs of the tea plantations in this part of India, the railroad terminated at Ledo, an insignificant native village surrounded by jungle-covered hills. This same village had been the end of the trail for those refugees from northern Burma who fled ahead of the Japs in 1942. From Ledo, so named by the Italians who first opened the coal mines in the adjacent hills, began to unwind the road which was to make famous the name of the obscure Indian village.

Beyond the railroad lay the unbroken barrier of the Patkai Mountain Range stretching out like a giant finger from the Himalayas. It forms both natural barrier to communication between Assam and Burma, and at the same time a boundary between these two countries which nevertheless has remained too wild to be clearly defined or explored. Running east and west across northern Burma, these mountains blanketed by a 200-foot deep impenetrable jungle served as home only to the uncivilized tribes of Naga head hunters who are native to this portion of the world. From May through September the war monsoon winds, which sweep north over the plains of Burma, deposit the terrifically heavy rainfall over the entire area through which a road was to be built by the United States Army engineers.

The whole region in which operations were planned had the unsavory reputation of being the unhealthiest portion of the world. Veterans of the Philippines, Central America, and the South Pacific damned this country from Assam to the Hukawng as the worst jungle of them all. The Bengal tiger, king cobra, and blood-sucking leaches which infested it were far less dangerous than the unseen germs from which no part of this land was free and no man immune.

Staid Britishers dismissed the plan of a road as an impossibility. Professional soldiers had shaken their heads and said "no military vehicle will cross those mountains on its own power," and scoffed at the thought of trucks and tanks ever moving beyond the Ledo railhead. But during the final weeks of 1942 and the early part of 1943, plans for the project went on and the initial effort was begun.

The undertaking has no parallel in military history. It is a combination of building a major modern highway through virgin jungle-covered mountains and valleys, and at the same time having to fight a first rate, well-equipped enemy for the ground over which the road is to run. It departs from the usual strategic concepts in that the construction phase—Services of Supply—is the primary objective; the fighting—combat—is secondary, to brush the enemy aside from the road route. Although by comparison with other theaters the number of men involved is not large, the whole enterprise, in manpower, materials, and objective, is on an unprecedented scale. Furthermore, the defending Jap was capable of being the superior force. The situation has not been simplified by the fact that, in the scheme of global warfare, this theater is both at the end of the longest line of communication in the world and not the highest on priorities.

The road is an ever-lengthening dragon with an insatiable appetite. Its mouth is at Ledo and its extending tail pushes through the hills and down into Burma. A triad of effort sustains it.

First. Engineer: To develop the base from which the dragon feeds and to see that the tail grows steadily in the right direction.

Second. Supply service: To feed the hungry animal rations and material.

Third. Medical: To conserve the effective manpower doing the job. On this same organization for construction is superimposed the heavy burden of supplying and hospitalizing combat troops.

Inevitably, no one of these three essential services is able to secure all the personnel, equipment, supplies, or housing it considers necessary for the accomplishment of its mission. It has been a kaleidoscopic scene of mud, insufficient and overtaxed equipment, rain, malaria, disappointment, heat, language difficulties, jungle fighting, landslides, and homesickness. The work has gone forward by dint of a prodigious expenditure of sustained physical and emotional energy on the part of all concerned.

The mission is best viewed in its four main phases, during each of which the activities of the three essential services had to be readjusted to meet the changing needs. First came the 100-mile drive through the Patkai Mountains into the Hukawng Valley, climaxed by the break-through to Shingbwiyang of the lead dozer on the 27th of December 1943; second, the valley campaign which ended with the dry season; third, Myitkyina; and finally, mopping up and the junction of the Ledo and Burma Roads.

B. FIRST PHASE: THE ROAD TO SHINGBWIYANG

During the exodus from Burma in the face of Jap aggression, 30,000 refugees started up this narrow trail into India. Thousands died—of fever, hunger, exposure, exhaustion. Bit by bit, personal belongings were abandoned. Reliable observers estimated 20,000 persons perished on this 110-mile trail. Months later, as engineers pushed the road through the jungle, their skeletons seemed almost to pave the trail in places.

In its first 100 miles the road covers seven summits of the Patkai Range. From the peak at Pangsau Pass, four countries can be seen: China, Tibet, Burma, and India. From Hell's Gate to Pangsau Pass, a distance of 7 miles, the climb is straight up, with 220 hairpin curves in this stretch.

In contrast with the Ledo Road, the Burma Road is a narrow trace with a high crown of hand-laid rock. No rock of any structural value is available anywhere along the route of the Ledo Road. As a result the road is graveled, the material being secured from rivers along the way. Minimum shoulder-to-shoulder width of the road in the mountains is 33 feet, while in the valleys it is a minimum of 49 feet. Although the Ledo Road was built with temporary bridges for combat expediency, its standards are those of a freight highway designed to carry more than 60,000 tons per month (an average of 8,500 vehicles pass one military police post in a 24-hour period). It is a safe 2-way road with a maximum 10-percent grade. All temporary bridges have been replaced with modern steel structures, the latest design in military stream-crossing equipment being installed. Because of the tremendous rainfall along the route, prodigious culvert installations are required. For every mile of road, 10,000 feet of culvert have been installed.

The Ledo Road was first covered by advance survey parties that determined the best routes. Next the lead bulldozer blazed a path through the jungle. This was followed by clearing crews, who blasted the trees with tons of dynamite and pushed the debris aside. Next, leveling and grading was performed, culverts, drains, and ditches dug. Finally the road was metaled with gravel, hauled from gravel points at rivers, sometimes many miles from the spot being covered. Lastly, the gravel was spread over the highway surface. Through the mountainous sections the road was built almost entirely with bulldozers. In the valleys, these same tractors were used to pull scrapers.

Work was begun in December of 1942 and continued through the winter in the hands of three battalions of colored American engineers, together with a small number of other troops, but initial progress was slow. During the following March heavy rains began and work on the road was seriously impeded. Little advance was made because work crews were forced to concentrate on maintaining that portion of road already cut and to keep it open to traffic.

During the remainder of the 1943 monsoon season, all forward progress on the road was halted and the men battled against nature to hold the narrow ribbon of roadway. They widened the trace, installed culverts, graveled the roadbed. The incessant rains continued. Dozers were lost over banks. Men were soaking wet all the time; not even their beds were dry. Equipment was buried by slides. By September 1943 the toughest road job in the world had come to a standstill only 42 miles from the starting point, and all concerned were thoroughly discouraged. It was evident that new leadership was needed if the road was to go through.

In October 1943 Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick took over the job of building the Ledo Road and supplying General Stilwell's combat forces. He analyzed the situation, reorganized his forces, and promised Stilwell that the road to Shingbwiyang would be open for traffic on New Year's Day. On December 27 the primary objective of the Ledo Road was completed; the building of a road into Burma over which Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell could bring men and equipment and supplies in his return march against the Japs. The road reached the village of Shingbwiyang 4 days ahead of the scheduled dead line. This cut through the matted, malarious, jungle-covered

mountains was outstanding in all the brilliant achievements by the Corps of Engineers.

The Patkai Mountains are one of the foothill chains of the Himalayas. Peaks in the immediate vicinity of the road reach an elevation of about 6,000 feet; the highest point on the road itself is about 4,500 feet. The soil is clay with an insecure shale foundation; vegetation is a dense tangle of tropical hardwood, bamboo, and ferns. The valleys are steep and narrow, and the streams become torrents when rain falls in their watersheds. Population is thin, and the small villages cling to the tops of the hills. All native trails climb the slopes at steep grades and follow high saddles across the ridges. After 2 weeks on foot in this territory, an engineer colonel, who had spent much of the last 20 years in Alaska, termed this the roughest country he had ever seen.

The first phase comprised the extending of the road through the mountains until it entered the Hukawng Valley of northern Burma at Shingbwiyang—mile 102. It was entirely construction. Combat was limited to minor patrol activity. During this phase construction, supply, and evacuation were complicated by the fact that everything had to move over a single gravel road building through the mountains. Bypasses were precluded. Mud, broken bridges, and landslides were chronic. The use of native porters, utilization of short-cut trains for foot traffic and air-dropping were purely supplementary.

Late in December 1943 Americans and Chinese were pouring into Shingbwiyang over the break-through trail, an air strip was in operation, and a hospital unit was receiving Chinese casualties. The lead bulldozer had plunged down Kabkye Hill and reached the valley on the 27th of December. The first leg of the race to China had been covered.

C. SECOND PHASE: THE VALLEY CAMPAIGN

On December 31 two bulldozers started cutting a new road south of Shingbwiyang through the Hukawng Valley to the Tanai River (upper Chindwin). Because this was definitely a combat zone, guards from both the Chinese and American armies were out in front and on both flanks of the engineers. At Taihpa Ga, a company of America engineers constructed an airfield while being subjected to Jap artillery and sniper fire. The men worked on armor-plated equipment, took to slit trenches during a barrage, then went back to work. A number of men were wounded, but the field was completed in record time.

By February 1944 the lead bulldozer had advanced to mile 134.5. At the end of May the lead bulldozer was at mile 190.5—Warazup—where progress was halted by enemy action. Airfields at Shingbwiyang, Tingkawk Sakan, and Warazup were completed or under construction when the rains started. The end of May brought the monsoon in full strength. The rains, though later, were heavier than in 1943. In one 2-day period at Tagap a rainfall of over 15 inches was recorded. At Shingbwiyang, total rainfall for the season was over the 150-inch mark.

Slides, washouts, cave-ins, and waist-deep mud in many places were encountered. All new road construction was halted and once more the engineer troops turned to maintenance work to hold the road against encroachments of the monsoon. There were black days, one after another. Six major bridges were swept away by flash floods during one 24-hour period. But never was the road blocked more than 96 hours, and great convoys of trucks rolled over the road into Burma all during the 5-month-long rainy season.

The Japanese had to be pushed back to make way for the road. Tactically this required clearing the valley by a series of frontal pressures and flanking movements. There were several difficult river crossings. The combat command was comprised of two American-trained Chinese divisions. In later weeks Merrill's famous "Marauders" moved down the line. The Japs refused to withdraw and had to be pushed back by the sheer viciousness of repeated battles—Yupbang, Taihpa Ga, Maingkwan, Malabum, Shaduzup.

Once in the flat lands, the road-construction problems changed in character in three respects: First. The old refugee trail ran across the valley through the principal villages. This was developed into a two-track combat road. Along it occurred the main action. It was the main supply line.

Second. The Ledo Road followed a different route along higher ground in an arc to the east and rejoined the old trail at the lower end of the valley. This eliminated the necessity of this section carrying freight until it was ready for traffic. It also permitted the use of bypasses, and basic work proceeded at several points simultaneously. The dense jungle growth resembled that of the hills, but the construction problem changed from sidehill cutting to raising the roadbed over marshy areas.

Third. Flat land facilitated the building of airfields at vital locations. These were extensively utilized for movement of supplies and personnel, and as bases for fighters and bombers so that our air superiority could be maintained.

In April and May, the Chinese were fighting their way down out of the Hukawng and into the Mogaung Valleys, meeting increasingly stiff opposition. At the same time, a combat team of Americans and Chinese crossed esatward into the Irrawaddy Valley, and secretly moved toward the airfield at Myitkyina.

The dry season was virtually over; the road was graveled to about mile 151; a final 15-mile link to the advance subdepot at Tingkawk was incomplete. Access by ground to the latter town was over the old Combat Road, which joins the new road trace at this point, and which was becoming increasingly difficult to navigate due to rain. Construction of a pipe line had kept pace with the road and by now it was supplying fuel to Tingkawk. An improved gravel road ran 20 miles south to Warazup (mile 185), where a new air strip was under construction. Fighting on the Kamaing front was only a few miles below, and the supply road was built right into the artillery emplacements.

D. THIRD PHASE: MYITKYINA

The beginning of the monsoon could reasonably be supposed to preface a general let-down in the intensity of the Allied advance; a period of quiet waiting and relaxation could be expected. Academically, it was impossible to supply the 50,000 troops so far forward of the railhead under such conditions. So reasoned the Japanese.

But Uncle Joe Stilwell turned to Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, white-haired boss of Pick's Pike, whose problem also it was to keep the combat troops supplied. Can continued operations in the valley be supported plus a surprise attack in force on Myitkyina during the monsoon? It was a bold stroke, and on General Pick's answer hinged the decision. He loaned Uncle Joe two of his combat engineer battalions to assist in the attack and committed himself to support the operation.

The airfield at Myitkyina was seized at the end of May. Surrounded by Jap territory, the Americans and Chinese clung desperately to their position; they depended entirely on air supply and air evacuation. June brought with it everywhere rainfall well above the average. The fighting continued vicious and without quarter, but by the 3d of August the town had fallen and the area was mopped up. The advance was months ahead of schedule.

Meantime, another force of Chinese, British, and some Americans pushed down the valley from Warazup through Kamaing and Mogaung to Sahmaw. This push was supported in part along a badly flooded road and by barge down the Mogaung River, but mainly by air. Eventually this force established contact with the Myitkyina troops, and the situation at the end of summer was well in hand.

Throughout the monsoon, the engineers were fighting to hold their own. The finished road stood up. Supply depots and medical installations were developed near the airfields at Shingbwiyang, Tingkawk, Warazup, and Myitkyina. In spite of all the hardships, in spite of the rains, the campaign had been pushed and won.

E. FOURTH PHASE: ROAD JUNCTION

With the coming of dry weather in October 1944, the ground forces again came into their own. The old road running through Kamaing and Mogaung to Myitkyina was rehabilitated and was carrying convoys in November. The new road trace is being pushed forward with incredible speed. Myitkyina is a great forward base with airfields, warehouses, and hospitals. With this support, combat has pushed down toward Katha, Bhamo, and beyond. Japanese forces have been completely routed.

THE PIPE LINE

Integral in the project to supply China is the pipe line. It was designed as a continuous system starting with a tanker unloading terminal at Calcutta; following the Brahmaputra Valley through Bengal and Assam; across the Patkai Range into northern Burma; on into China with the eastern terminus at Kunming in Yunnan Province. The line parallels the Ledo Road from Assam to

its junction with the Burma Road, then it will follow the latter into Kunming.

As the line progressed, completed portions furnished gasoline and high-speed Diesel fuel to the fighting and construction forces driving south. Later it was a vital factor in supplying aviation gasoline to the numerous newly constructed airfields along its route.

The line was divided into two sections: One section was a 6-inch line from Calcutta to Tinsukia, in northern Assam, approximately 750 miles, where it emptied into a large storage terminal. The other section consisted of two 4-inch lines starting at Tinsukia and ending at Kunming, China, approximately 1,000 miles.

In the early fall of 1943 materials for the 4-inch lines began to arrive in the Ledo area, and in October General Pick gave the signal to begin construction. There were no trained pipe-line personnel available, so engineer general service troops were pressed into service. Work started at Digboi, Assam, where motor gasoline and high-speed Diesel fuel could be obtained from the Assam Oil Co.

At first many difficulties were encountered and the untrained personnel made slow progress, but after a few weeks of practice these men were constructing pipe line like veterans and had completed 50 miles of the first 4-inch line before trained engineer petroleum distribution companies arrived to relieve them. On the second anniversary of Pearl Harbor the pipe line had delivered its first gasoline to Ledo, and the storage tanks at Mile 0, official starting line of the Ledo Road, were filled. The first section of the Tinsukia-Kunming line was in operation, greatly easing the burden of moving motor gasoline by truck or rail.

Many difficulties confronted the crews as they progressed. Although the line paralleled the Ledo Road as closely as possible, many times the right-of-way had to deviate from the road due to the terrain. In some cases bulldozer traces had to be cut down and around a mountainside in order to get pump equipment and pipe on the proposed site. In one instance a whole pump station was dismantled and portered piece by piece 4 miles through the jungle and then reassembled on location. Numerous cable suspensions were constructed over the many chasms that had to be spanned. For one 20-mile section reaching up to Pangsau Pass, one-tenth of the line had to be supported by cables.

All this tended to slow down construction, but by February 1944 the completed pipe line was supplying gasoline needs for the first 50 miles; by the end of March as far as Shingbwiyang—mile point 102.

Construction of the line moved on south toward Tingkawk Sakan. The monsoon season began with full force, and mud and water seriously hindered transportation of materials. Progress was slow, and on some days only a few hundred feet of line were completed. However, by midsummer high-speed Diesel, motor, and aviation gasoline were pouring through the line to Tingkawk.

Past Tingkawk the line was pushed on toward Warazup. Simultaneously work began at Warazup on a line to Myitkyina, and from there another crew began a meeting line. Part of this would remain in place as a section of the permanent installation; the remainder isolated by a shorter route would be removed and reused elsewhere when its job here had been completed.

On the section south of Warazup the old native roads had become impassable. Water was 4 or 5 feet deep along some of the proposed right-of-way. Material was hauled by truck as far as the roads would permit or dragged through by tractors. Then pipe rafts and pontoons with outboard motors were called into play to float the pipe where needed. Many times men had to wade waist deep in water to get the pipe strung; they then had to work all day in the same water to get it coupled together. Progress was difficult, but 4 days before the October 1 target date the line was completed to Myitkyina. The arrival of gasoline and Diesel fuel through the pipe line released many cargo planes for other critically needed supplies.

The maximum output of the two 4-inch lines is nearly equal to the carrying capacity of 400 cargo trucks. In a 24-hour period they will deliver approximately 8,000 barrels of fuel, or 336,000 United States gallons.

At the present time motor gasoline, high-speed Diesel, and aviation gasoline are being dispensed at all required points between Ledo and Myitkyina and beyond. One-third of the 1,000-mile line was in operation by early December supplying the fuel for tanks, road graders, bulldozers, cargo trucks, jeeps, and cargo and combat planes.

Early in November an advance party for the China section of the line was flown over the hump to Yunnanyi to set up a headquarters, and three engineer petroleum distribution companies followed soon afterward. On December 1, construction began in the China theater. At the same time the line was moving south from Myitkyina, on toward China, keeping pace with the road. The Calcutta to Kunming pipe line will become a reality early in 1945.

Behind this feat, one of the epics of this war, lies an engineering achievement unsurpassed anywhere. While not an inch of the pipe line built has been damaged by enemy fire, work on more than one occasion proceeded under Japanese assault.

The vital urgency of the job was felt by all who worked day and night under protection of sentries, throughout the monsoon when floods exceeded the protection of gum boots, and with malaria causing havoc among personnel. The work progressed amidst wild animals and snakes, many of which were killed, while leeches, unwelcome but tenacious companions, not to mention other crawlers of the jungle, were a pest. The Tenth U. S. A. A. F. rendered valuable aid, dropping rations, medical necessities, and mail to inaccessible parties.

Three quarters of a million section pipes, each of 20-foot length, were brought from America. American labor employed received special training for 3 months in the States. This labor was supplemented in the first stage by over 7,000 coolies, supplied from tea-garden labor and latterly by the Indian Pioneer Corps, 2,000 of whom were employed at one stage.

It is impossible to describe the day-to-day difficulties which had to be contended with, mainly in the matter of transport, in building the line. The pipe has been laid at an altitude of over 4,000 feet and will cross ranges of 8,500 feet in China. It has been suspended over rivers and laid under rivers At some stages of the construction obstacles appeared insuperable but were overcome, one by one. Every problem faced sharpened resources of solution.

The engineers feel that the worst part of their job is yet to come when the line will have to be taken over high mountains in China. But these sturdy, determined men of skill, who have overcome heartbreaking set-backs and vile weather, will see it through and enable precious fuel to be pumped to China in the common cause—to lick the Japanese as quickly and completely as possible.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Since neither construction nor combat can proceed without able-bodied men, the function of the medical department is to conserve manpower. This program has developed along several essential and interlocking lines of attack. These phases may be roughly grouped as preservation of health by sanitary measures and malaria control, meticulous medical care to troops within their own units, hospitalization for more serious conditions which require specialized attention, and the handling of battle casualties, both American and Chinese. The integration of all these activities is no small project. The terrain, the torrential rains, the limited facilities, the difficult communications, and the shortage of personnel have been overcome by flexibility, ingenuity, and persistence.

This is the most highly malarious area in the world; dysentery is ever present in the native population; heat and humidity of the long monsoon sap energy and decrease efficiency; leeches penetrate leggings and socks to produce tropical ulcers—but all these have been combated by unflagging attention to control measures and the scientific application of sanitary discipline.

Initial medical care for the troops has presented problems which, during the past year, have resulted in shifting the emphasis from the unit surgeon as an implement of the organization to which he is assigned. Of necessity he has become increasingly the neighborhood doctor, wherever he may be. A new and informal administrative system has been developed to assist each medical officer along the road to provide integrated medical care, and sanitary supervision for the troops in his immediate zone, regardless of to whom they may belong. This system is reinforced by a chain of improvised dispensaries.

In the 15-month period since active fighting began thousands of battle casualties have been treated in U. S. A. A. F. hospitals. Many cases were handled under extremely difficult circumstances of housing, equipment, and transportation. Modern methods of treatment and

the latest drugs—such as penicillin, plasma, and the sulfanomides—have been used side by side with crude bamboo emergency splints, a home-made blood-bank organization, and the use of rain water as intravenous fluid. The results have been most gratifying.

The difficulty of handling the wounded in jungle country, particularly in the summer months when ground communication is drastically curtailed, has resulted in increasing dependence on air evacuation. The last 8 months have been a striking example of the value of complete air superiority. Our unarmed supply transports shuttle all over northern Burma carrying reinforcements, rations, and ammunition, and returning with casualties and sick. In time, it was found to be both economical and efficient to rely on air evacuation. The tendency to locate hospitals with reference to major air fields resulted in an apparent heavy concentration of hospital beds toward the rear, two or three hundred miles from the fighting front. This meant, however, better built and better supplied hospitals. For the patients, it meant well organized and highly specialized treatment within a minimum of time after being wounded.

Liaison planes fly casualties back from isolated spots or from undeveloped strips. They are picked up at major fields by air ambulances or empty transports and distributed to the hospitals. This system at one period reportedly was handling one of the heaviest turnovers of air evacuation of any American theater. It has certainly resulted in an incalculable saving in man-hours of ambulance transportation, which is favorably reflected in casualty mortality and morbidity statistics.

In spite of the potential health hazards natural to the country, and the physical difficulties in getting the right team on the right spot in time, progress is always forward. The road troops receive the highest grade of medical care, and Chinese and American fighting men in this sector are getting surgical attention equal to any that can be provided throughout the world.

With the capture of Bhamo on December 16, 1944, and of Wanting, in China, on January 21, 1945, by the C. E. F., the last two combat obstacles to completing the road were overcome. The Chinese First and Sixth Armies, American trained under Generals Sun and Liao, had done their job well and now the road can be rushed through to completion. Trucks, which we have had to ferry over the Hump, are now traveling over the Ledo-Burma Road clear to Kunming, and before spring we will be shipping in thousands of tons of needed matériel over the road to China, and our pipe line from Calcutta, the longest in the world, will be feeding the hungry tanks of the planes of the Fourteenth Air Force. The completion of the road and the pipe line will mark an achievement that America can be proud of because the boys who built them and the girls, the nurses who looked after them, did their jobs under the most trying and difficult conditions anywhere in the world.

In conclusion, I should like to quote the words of the Generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, who, on the occasion of the first convoy over the Ledo-Burma Road reaching Kunming on January 28, 1945, said:

> Now comes this caravan, roaring into China over an area which the Japanese thought just yesterday to hold in everlasting peace. For this turn of events, we and our allies have paid no small price, but we have proved to the enemy that neither the will power of China nor the will power of her allies to win the war can be shaken.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the 1,044-mile road from Ledo to Kunming is now in operation. While it will contribute greatly in defeating Japan there is another road yet to be traversed—the road to Tokyo—a long, tough highway. When that is completed—and it will be—then we can build the kind of a road our boys and our people would, above all else, like to construct—a road to security, understanding, and a permanent peace.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. May I point out at this point in the RECORD that General Pick is an Alabaman and we are very proud of the work he has done and his accomplishments.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman. Alabama can be very proud of that job that General Pick has done, and is doing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If we are going to indulge in bestowing honors around here and claiming reflected glory for the antecedents of General Pick, it should be pointed out that immediately previous to this assignment to the building of the Ledo Road, Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick was the Missouri River division engineer stationed at Omaha, Nebr., in charge of the military construction of the Army throughout the Missouri River division. He was there during the heavy period of construction for the war effort and during that time carried on the largest construction program of any division engineer in the United States. He came there at a time when some work in the valley was behind schedule due to bad weather and adverse conditions of one sort or another. He brought it all up to schedule and completed every single project ahead of schedule. At that time he became interested in the responsibility placed on him by the Congress for studying flood problems in the Missouri River Valley and became the author of the Pick plan for control of floods in the Missouri River Basin. He had formulated that program and made recommendations to the Congress and had hoped to stay with it when he was called for this job building the Ledo Road, which, as the gentleman has so well stated, is one of the outstanding engineering achievements of the world. So the people of the Missouri River Valley and the Midwest generally who are familiar with the tremendous driving character of this man Pick also take pride and pleasure in the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman. From what he has just said, it would appear that General Pick is doing what he has been accustomed to doing all along—being sent somewhere where a job has to be done at which time he takes up the slack and not only brings it up to what it should be but pushes it on to completion ahead of schedule.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. May I concur in what the gentleman from South Dakota has said about Gen. Lewis Pick. We folks who are in the Middle West and the Missouri River Valley know what fine work he did in making plans that will be carried out in the next 50 or 100 years out in our section, and we are pleased that he is taking such a prominent part in this war.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman. I can assure you all that General Pick is still very much interested in the development of the Missouri River even now, though he is probably 12,000 miles away. He tries to keep up on what is happening in this country, because he seems to have had his heart set on a proper development of the Missouri River so that all the States along it would achieve the utmost benefits as it develops. I should like to add also that he made personal inquiry of me about his good friends, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who have all just spoken. Their sentiments, I know, are echoed by all of us who live along the Missouri.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. A close personal friend of mine, returning from this operation about which the gentleman has spoken, told of the difficulties encountered in the mud, saying that he had actually witnessed a large bulldozer practically disappear in the mud. Would the gentleman have any comment to make on that?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. As I mentioned in my statement, if the gentleman will recall, equipment was lost in the mud and over the sides of mountains. While it is something to regret, it is far better to lose equipment than it is to lose lives. I want to say for General Pick, Colonel Davis, and General Sultan, and all the officers in charge of the operations out there, they have done everything in their power to conserve manpower, and they have done what they can to build a road with the least loss of lives and with the greatest use of machines and materials. Of course, some machines are lost, but that cannot be helped, and, besides, it is little compared to what has been achieved.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Maj. Elmer E. Apt is the individual I referred to, from Fort Dodge, Iowa.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these few moments to speak very briefly of the experiences which some of us were privileged to have last summer. I am inspired to do this partly by what was said in the discussion of the conditions of the overseas cemeteries. I assume we would all agree that in the final analysis the loved ones of those who have been lost in battle will determine their last resting place. I hope it will be of some consolation to families in the meantime to know, however, that the cemeteries are now being very carefully attended. It would be hard to say enough in tribute to our Quartermaster Corps for the fine care given the cemeteries that our congressional party visited last September. This was an informal mission. It was an interesting coincidence, however, when we 10 finally converged in Normandy there were 5 from each side of the aisle. It was wholly nonpartisan in character. We visited the cemeteries at LeCambe and St. Mere Eglise. I think those were the high moments of our trip. As we reflected on the trip we agreed in the cabin of the *Queen Mary* on our return that this experience had a profound meaning for us and that perhaps none of us would ever be the same again. We were impressed by the fact that the coming victory will be at a terrific cost. We were inspired by a very interesting and beautiful symbolism in the fact that when we visited the grave of Lieutenant General McNair there was buried near him a sergeant and men of lower rank. The white crosses were there in abundance and there were also Stars of David to remind us that Christian and Jew had fought together; and that represents something very precious in the life of America. The visits to those cemeteries meant a great deal to us for that reason.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like to say to the gentleman, confirming what he said about the cemeteries, when I returned home after having visited the grave of a young man who was killed near there, his mother asked me what I thought about the future for his grave. I gave her as my considered advice the opinion that the grave be left in that cemetery, that is, in the cemetery you mentioned where General McNair is buried. I think it is a grand spot, well attended, and they are doing a very fine job.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman will recall the scenic beauty as well and the very meticulous care given to the graves of our men.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I might say to my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, as he knows, I was also privileged to make the trip with the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from Arkansas.

I can testify to the truth of his remarks in regard to the care of that particular cemetery. It was absolutely spotless. There was not a weed in the cemetery. It could not have been cared for any better. One of the interesting things that was told us at that time was the fact that many of the French civilians in the nearby countryside had selected certain graves to which they brought fresh flowers. We saw flowers on many of the graves at that time. The people of the countryside are also interested in the keeping of these cemeteries in good shape. The Quartermaster Corps is doing a wonderful job.

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to have these expressions from my colleague, evidencing the sentiment that I believe all of us shared.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I have been much interested in what has been said today and on previous occasions with reference to the work of Gen. Lewis A. Pick in road building on the Ledo Road. It has been my privilege to know General Pick for some time. He was division engineer for the Corps of Engineers, located at Omaha, Nebr. I think General Pick is one of the finest of all public servants. He is more than an engineer. He is a great soldier, a great statesman, a great citizen, and a great engineer.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Briefly.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I agree with what the gentleman says about General Pick, who has done a great job on the Ledo Road, but I would like to see at least a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the House visit India, Burma, and China, so that they could see for themselves and report back to us occasionally just what these boys are going through, and what a magnificent work they are doing under most difficult circumstances. A visit of this kind would be a great morale builder and it would also show the service folk out there that we are interested in them and that we appreciate the difficult job they have done.

Mr. CURTIS. I think those visits have been a good thing, and have been beneficial to the Congress.

I now wish to ask the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill a question about the bill if I may. I notice we appropriate the sum of $2,000,000 for detailed planning of flood-control works. However, the report reveals that none of this money will be spent in planning the projects authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944, which just became a law late in December. I would like to know what the plans are for making money available for further detailed planning for the projects contained in this recent Flood Control Act.

Mr. SNYDER. I can say to the gentleman that the projects which the Army and the Navy, the War Manpower Commission, or the War Production Board believe are necessary to be completed in the next month or the next year, if the war continues, will be completed if the money is asked for. I assume they will come back and ask for an appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand. I am not talking about costruction funds. I am speaking of funds so that detailed plans for post-war construction can be prepared.

Mr. SNYDER. They have requested $10,000,000 for post-war planning for construction work of new projects offered in the bill that was passed December 22, 1944.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, why was that not in this bill?

Mr. SNYDER. The Bureau of the Budget has not passed on it; it did not reach this committee? Is that right? I ask the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. What are the plans of the committee with respect to bringing it in at a later date?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the normal course of business, as soon as the Budget Bureau estimates come before the Congress it will go to the appropriate committee. Had those estimates come up in time to be considered by the subcommittee dealing with civil functions of the War Department, they would have been considered for this bill. We interrogated the Army engineers on that point and the gentleman will find in the hearings on pages 131, 132, and 133 a breakdown of the proposed $10,000,000. Two million dollars of it is allowed by the Chief of Engineers for working plans for these newly authorized projects during the balance of this current fiscal year. The additional $8,000,000 he is requesting for planning work on these recently authorized projects in the new fiscal year, 1946. The Budget Bureau has not completed its consideration of those requests from the Army engineers; consequently, there was nothing officially before the Congress on that matter in the way of a Budget estimate. It is anticipated that when the Budget has completed its consideration and transmits the estimate to Congress that the supplemental estimates will come to the deficiency subcommittee.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it likely, then, that this item will perhaps have to go over another year? Is that the intent of the committee?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is hardly a correct conclusion. If they come up in time that the deficiency committee can consider them during the present session and acts favorably on them, they will be reported to Congress some time this spring.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope funds can be made available for this detailed planning. It is necessary and important.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 10 minutes.

GENERAL PICK OF PICK'S PIKE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the building of the Ledo Road have a special interest for anyone who has followed the work of the Army engineers. This pending appropriation bill deals with the civil functions of the War Department, and it is of interest for one who follows the work of the Army engineers on flood control and military construction in this country to know that when the War Department was called upon for this tremendous job of building the Ledo Road they turned to the man who made an outstanding record in this country, Gen. Lewis A. Pick.

I recall the time when General Pick was called to Washington in September of 1943 from his work as division engineer of the Missouri River division at Omaha. He was here for 3 or 4 days, given only that short period of time to take the initial steps in organizing the staff he was going to take with him to set up this work in Burma and India. He said to me: "I cannot tell you where I am going, but I am going a 'fur' piece." I did not try to press him further but because of general conditions I was able to make a fairly accurate guess of where he was going. I have heard from him two or three times. He was attacked by malaria and himself had to meet the rigors of going from a midwestern climate in the United States to that of India and Burma; yet he carried on to outstanding success.

When the Committee of the Whole goes back in the House I shall ask permission to include in my remarks an article which appeared in last Sunday's magazine section of the New York Times treating also of the building of the Ledo Road, or Stilwell Road, or Pick's Pike, whichever name you want to call it.

The article referred to follows:

GENERAL PICK OF PICK'S PIKE—THE BUILDER OF STILWELL ROAD IS MORE LIKE A COUNTRY DOCTOR THAN A HARD-DRIVING ENGINEER

(By Tillman Durdin)

MYITKYINA, BURMA.—When the first convoy of American war supplies for China rolled across the Burma border into Yunnan the other day, a big, white-haired man, whose gentle smile and mild blue eyes registered quiet satisfaction, sat in the leading jeep. The man was Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, builder of the Ledo Road—now officially named the Stilwell Road—the greatest engineering feat in the annals of the United States Army.

General Pick had a right to be proud. He was witnessing a scene that represented the triumph of himself and his men over the most formidable natural obstacles ever surmounted by road engineers. He was seeing the fruition of 2½ years of struggle with jungles, mountains, floods, disease, death, and loneliness.

Scores of competent engineers had said it could never be done. It had been done. Pick's Pike was open, delivering supplies to the Chinese people.

When General (then colonel) Pick took command of the Ledo Road project in October 1943 the road, after a year of work, was stalled in precipitous, rain-soaked jungle in the dark heart of the Naga Hills, 45 miles from its starting point. Some of the men connected with its construction had broken under the terrible pressure of the job and the unimaginable ordeal of the monsoon. Some were ready to say, "It can't be done."

Pick called his officers together.

"The Ledo Road is going to be built," he said. "Mud, rain, and malaria be damned."

Pick spoke quietly but every man in his command soon knew he meant what he said. He moved his headquarters far up the road, instituted day and night work with the use of all illumination that could be mustered. He ruthlessly weeded out ineffective officers, set a hard schedule and demanded the utmost of his men. The road started going ahead by leaps and bounds.

Pick's shrewdness and drive as an engineer were clearly displayed at this stage. Asked by Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell on November 3 to build a jeep track 50 miles from the roadhead to Shingbwiyang through the worst stretch of the route, Pick thought a bit and said: "I can't build you a jeep track but I will build you a military highway for trucks. When do you want it?"

"Can you get it through by January?" asked Stilwell.

Pick smiled his quiet smile and said, "O. K."

He rushed bulldozers and other equipment through an old trail, then dropped some gear from airplanes, used air-dropped supplies and got the work going at 3 different points at once. On December 27 the lead bulldozer broke through to Shingbwiyang followed by 53 trucks carrying Chinese troops and equipment. Even Stilwell had doubted Pick could do it and Stilwell was never a man to say anything was impossible.

After Pick had put his road through to Shingbwiyang Stilwell suddenly asked for a quick combat supply road to the Taro area, 20 miles away and off the main route. In addition, he wanted a combat road through the Hukawng Valley and work to continue on the main highway. A number of airfields also would have to be constructed.

Associates remember a night when Pick paced his tent in the rainy stillness of the jungle, talking out his problems. Every now and then he would say, "It's too much. I don't see how I can do it." But do it he did. He never said no to Stilwell, never once failed the general.

Others pioneered the Stilwell Road, but the main task has been General Pick's. And it was General Pick who conquered the mountains and jungle, faced down the monsoon and bridged the raging rivers, licked malaria with one hand while conjuring up new miracles of engineering with the other; and all the time solved the problem of leadership and of men slaving against time, nature, and the Japanese in a strange wilderness thousands of miles from home.

A MILE A DAY

In 15 months he pushed the road from the 45-mile mark to a junction with the Burma Road 420 miles away. This represents progress of about a mile a day over a route that passes through 102 miles of mountains and over two 4,000-foot passes. Through the mountains 100,000 cubic yards of dirt were moved for each mile of road constructed. In all, about 13,500,000 cubic yards of earth, enough to build a solid dirt wall 3 feet wide and 10 feet high from New York to San Francisco, were moved.

The jungle was an even more formidable obstacle. Practically every foot of the road had to be cut through a dense forest. And for 6 months out of a year this work had to be carried on during an almost unceasing downpour that totaled more than 150 inches for a monsoon season.

During last year's monsoon a low section of the road through the Hukawng Valley became flooded. Engineers almost marooned in waterlogged tents wondered if the road wasn't a complete failure. Pick stepped in and ordered the construction of a 2-mile causeway. Two Army lumber mills were set up in the valley and a million board feet of lumber were sawed. The causeway was laid over the inundated stretch of road in 40 working days, the biggest job of maintenance engineering in the history of the Engineers. Traffic on the Stilwell Road was resumed.

Some had said the road could not be built because of malaria. At times, in the early days, a high proportion of the forward battalion personnel was hospitalized with malaria. Stern disciplinary measures, sanitary campaigns and the use of atabrin kept the disease at such a low level that construction was not hampered. Twice disease struck at General Pick but he never left the job. Once when he got fever Col. Robert A. Hirshfield put him to bed for 48 hours and made him stay there. He was unable, however, to keep Pick from using the telephone.

The Stilwell Road crosses 10 major rivers and 155 secondary streams. There is a bridge crossing for every 3 miles of road. If the culvert pipe used in the drainage system were placed end to end it would form a continuous conduit 105 miles long, about a quarter of the length of the entire road. Such figures gives some idea of the mammoth undertaking this job has been.

The road is a monument of engineering ability. The route over much of its length had to be discovered by aerial reconnaissance and engineering instinct, for the Japanese were always just ahead of the lead bulldozer, and it was not possible to send out survey parties to select the route in advance. Many unprecedented problems had to be solved, such as floating bridges to span rivers that rise 45 feet in a few days of monsoon rains, and draining underground springs that broke out under the roadbed.

But Pick always managed to find a way. In some cases his way made engineering history, such as his anchoring of a huge floating bridge across the Irrawaddy, near Myitkyina. Just how this was done cannot be revealed now, but some day it will be told and it will astonish orthodox engineers.

One of the big reasons for General Pick's success in building the new back-door overland supply route to China is his reliance on able key subordinates. For the Stilwell Road job he entrusted a big share of the responsibility to these men. Colonel Hirshfield handled his forward base organizational and supply problems, Col. Charles Davis the rear base at Ledo, while Col. Joe Green, chief road engineer, directed the troops in the actual road construction.

General Pick's inspiring leadership was a major factor in helping his officers and men fight the terrible depression bred of the jungle and the rains. He constantly tried to make life along the road as bearable as possible by insisting on plenty of good food, stoves in living quarters, and lots of movies. When the first convoy went to China, he saw to it that the Negroes were represented in recognition of their contribution to the road's construction.

To the men working for him along the length of the road, he was known as the man with the stick. This name came from his famous cane, a long rattan stick with a hooked end for a handle. Many other men on the road had sticks, for the bent ends were handy for catching onto branches and pulling up slopes, but none was as long as Pick's. The stick became part of his personality, one of the little touches that mark character and individuality.

MAN WITH THE STICK

By the time he had finished the road, this rattan stick had grown short, worn down by much prodding up and down the hills and valleys of north Burma. General Pick put his stick away when he crossed the border on the first convoy to China. Now he is having bands put around it inscribed with the names of his lieutenants. He plans to keep it as a memento of his hardest job.

Pick takes his triumph calmly, for such is his nature. The predominating characteristic of the man who built the road is strength in repose. Six feet tall, sturdily built, broad jawed, Pick looks more like a kindly country doctor than a hard-driving road boss. Friends who knew him before he took over the road say it has changed him profoundly. He is more patient now, and his voice is more gentle.

As a rule he speaks softly, with a southern drawl. Men who worked under him on the road cannot remember a single occasion when he "blew his top." Pick can get smolderingly angry and impatient, but in a way that jibes with his generally subdued behavior. He rarely laughs outright, but a slow smile that crinkles about his mouth and eyes reflects his ever-ready sense of humor.

He bears his 54 years well and stands as straight as a jungle hardwood. On the Stilwell Road he displayed amazing energy. He was out on the job from 12 to 15 hours a day, walking, jeeping, inspecting. He knew what was going on everywhere along the way and he used the telephone constantly to keep in touch with his battalions. Often he went up in a small liaison plane, scouting out new trails or traveling from one end of the road to another.

Close friends describe General Pick as an old-school American with a background of southern breeding. He was born in Brookneal, Va., but now counts Auburn, Ala., his home. He is typically American in that he is fundamentally a man of peace, even though he has been a professional soldier almost all of his adult life. Soon after he was graduated from Virginia Polytechnic in 1917 as a civil engineer he entered the Army, and he has been in the Engineer Corps ever since.

MIND ON THE MISSOURI

It is an anomaly that the builder of the Stilwell Road does not consider himself a road builder. His main concern is building up his country through flood control and reclamation. For years he was one of the outstanding Army flood-control engineers. Before he came to the Stilwell Road he was division engineer of the Missouri River division.

While directing more than a billion dollars' worth of Army construction from his headquarters at Omaha he worked out a plan for comprehensive development of Missouri River flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, and irrigation. The plan which has been approved by Congress and the President envisages one of the biggest public-works projects in the history of the United States.

The Missouri River plan is the thing dearest to Pick's heart. Around the north Burma campfires he loved to talk about the Missouri Valley, using his long stick to draw designs in the dirt of Burma that he may some day execute in the good earth of the Missouri Valley.

Now, I wish to direct your attention to one part of the committee report on this bill making appropriations for the civil functions of the War Department, particularly the item dealing with the Panama Canal. During our consideration of the bill we happened to note the record of the Panama Canal throughout this year in renegotiating a rental agreement through the Panama Railroad with the Tivoli Hotel. The Tivoli Hotel was operated by the Panama Railroad and for a number of years has been paying only a dollar nominal rent.

That was due to the fact that for many years it made no money. The audits of the General Accounting Office and of the accounting firms employed by the Panama Railroad Co. developed the fact that this hotel was now making a profit averaging $12,500 a month.

This came to the attention of the committee a year ago. There was some discussion of it at that time, following which the authorities of the Canal Zone arranged an agreement under which the Tivoli Hotel is now paying rent at the rate of $36,000 a year. While that may not be an adequate compensation, in view of profits of $144,000 a year or better, it is an improvement, and if the profits continue, the amount of rent may be subject to further negotiation.

Looking into audits of Panama Canal, I noticed that the General Accounting Office in its report called attention to the fact that they were not making an audit of the Panama Railroad and that they could not count the cash in the hands of the collector or paymaster because the funds of the Panama Canal are intermingled with those of the Panama Railroad and Canal Zone funds. This shocked me.

The audit committee from the General Accounting Office said that any attempt to determine the cash on hand would be futile. It occurred to me and other members of the committee that if the cash could not be counted the audit could hardly present a complete or accurate story at any given date. So we have printed portions of the report of the General Accounting Committee in the report on this bill, pages 7 and 8. I shall ask permission when we return to the House to place some of those in my remarks. I call attention to the situation at this time because some legislative committee of the House should give consideration to the fact that the General Accounting Office has been making recommendations for years suggesting that legislation is needed if a complete audit is to be made of all the funds in the Panama Canal, including the offices of the collector, the paymaster, and the other fiscal officers pertaining to the Panama Canal, the Panama Railroad, and the Canal Zone.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I see on the floor some members of the Committee on Military Affairs. I share the gentleman's view and hope that the committee will thoroughly explore this and bring in appropriate legislation to take care of the situation which the gentleman is so ably presenting to the House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The General Accounting Office committee in its comment says that a complete accounting could be made at the same time with considerable saving in cost to the Government and with additional advantages. What those advantages would be no one can tell until we have a complete audit and a complete check of the cash to see what economies might suggest themselves.

The last report which I hold in my hand here is a report of many pages with long tables. In addition to covering the operations of the Panama Canal, it reports on irregularities, an embezzlement, and a theft of Government property. I am not suggesting that an audit of the Panama Railroad by the General Accounting Office will uncover irregularities, but it will make possible checking of the cash mingled in the offices of the collector, paymaster, and other officials. And it is entirely conceivable that economies in operation will suggest themselves to the authorities if a complete and integrated audit can be made, a simultaneous audit, if you please.

Where you have the General Accounting Office pretending to make an audit of the Panama Canal or the Canal Zone, then independent accountants at another time making an audit of other activities on the Canal Zone, and having those funds intermingled, it is impossible to make a positive statement of the cash in the various funds as of a simultaneous date.

Moreover, the General Accounting Office can give force to its findings in ways not open to a nongovernmental agency.

So it seems to me that this recommendation of the General Accounting Office should receive the early and careful consideration of the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from South Dakota has been a member of the subcommittee longer than I have. I should like to ask him this question. Has it been his observation that, generally speaking, the Canal Zone has been efficiently run during the time that he has been a member of the subcommittee and has had an opportunity to observe the workings of the Canal? I know the gentleman at one time made a trip to the Canal Zone.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did visit the Canal Zone early in 1941 about a year after I was assigned to the subcommittee. As far as I know the Panama Canal has been pretty well run but it is impossible to know the full story about the Panama Railroad until we have a comprehensive accounting of the intermingled funds with a checking of the cash.

And now, Mr. Chairman, by permission from the House, I insert at this point pertinent portions of the report of the committee of the General Accounting Office dated June 19, 1944. I urge every Member to read them:

INTERMINGLING OF CASH BY THE COLLECTOR AND THE PAYMASTER

(150) With respect to the counting of cash in the hands of the collector and the paymaster, principal acccuntable officers of the Panama Canal, this committee was faced with the same conditions that have confronted former committees. The committee did not count the cash in the custody of these officers but accepted certificates of the Comptroller, the Panama Canal, for the amount of cash to the credit of the agencies whose accounts were examined.

As has been reported by previous committees no verification of Panama Canal and Canal Zone funds actually in the hands of the collector and the paymaster at any given date can be effected, because such funds are intermingled with Panama Railroad Company funds (48 U. S. C. 1327), and the committee was not authorized to examine the accounts of the railroad or its business auxiliaries. While a segregation is made in the accounting department of the thousands of transactions affecting the Canal, the railroad, and the Canal Zone government, thereby enabling the collector and the paymaster to maintain book controls with respect to their accountability to these agencies, nevertheless there is no

physical separation of the cash belonging to such agencies in those offices.

Therefore, the counting of cash in either office by representatives of the General Accounting Office (or by the private firm of accountants who audit the accounts of the Panama Railroad Company to determine that cash is on hand in sufficient amounts to equal the stated accountability of only one or less than all of the agencies involved would be futile.

(151) In connection with this recurring question of cash intermingling there is submitted for the attention and consideration of those concerned a prior committee's suggestion that:

"* * * a complete audit should include verification and reconciliation with submitted or approved accounts of all cash in the offices of the collector, the paymaster, and other fiscal officers, pertaining to the Panama Canal, the Panama Railroad, and the Canal Zone government, as well as special deposit or trust funds, which verification could readily be accomplished if concurrent audits of accounts of all such agencies of the Government were made in the Canal Zone, preferably on a fiscal-year basis."

(152) With respect to Canal Zone funds it is to be noted that accounts, records, and other data relative thereto have been made available to committees for verification and audit, but no accounting for such funds is rendered to the General Accounting Office. These funds, consisting of postal money order and savings funds, and clubhouse funds derived from operations of restaurants, motion-picture theaters, cigar and newsstands, bowling alleys, swimming pools, etc., are received and disbursed by the collector, who accounts therefor to the comptroller, the Panama Canal. While it appears that these funds are quasi-public or trust funds of the classes comprehended by the provisions of section 19 and/or 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1232–1233), and properly subject for accounting to the General Accounting Office, it is believed that the verification thereof by General Accounting Office committees, while on the Isthmus, is sufficient in scope and detail to meet the audit requirements of the General Accounting Office, and that no further accounting to said Office for such funds need be furnished by the Canal Zone government.

(153) Insofar as the Panama Railroad Co. is concerned the Acting Comptroller General in his annual report for the fiscal year 1937 held that in view of Executive Order No. 2135, dated February 4, 1915, there is no present legal authority for requiring the railroad company to render an accounting to the General Accounting Office. The accounts of the Panama Railroad Co. are approved and audited by the comptroller, the Panama Canal, and subjected annually under contractual arrangement to an additional restricted examination by a firm of public accountants.

On the basis of actual costs as reflected in the records it is believed that the annual audits of the accounts of the Panama Railroad Co. and its business auxiliaries could be made by enlarged General Accounting Office committees concurrently with the verification of the accounts of the other agencies on the Isthmus at no greater, and in all probability, at much less cost to the Government than under the present arrangements with the firm of public accountants, and with the additional advantages which, obviously, would accrue from complete and simultaneous audits of all activities on the Zone.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say a few words with reference to the work of the Army engineers overseas. There has been talk in the last few months, as we all know, in reference to the possibility in post-war days of taking away from the Army engineers some of the work which they customarily do in time of peace. I have reference especially to the work that the Army engineers perform in connection with flood control and with the rivers and harbors of our country.

After witnessing the work that these engineers overseas are doing I have reached the conviction that the peacetime work of the engineers is vital to the excellent performance of that same Corps of Engineers in time of war. I was a member of the group that went overseas in November and December from the House Committee on Military Affairs. Mr. Chairman, if one takes the time to analyze the work of the engineers, he is utterly amazed at the work being done by them in the combat zones.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman has made the statement that in some quarters they want to take away certain work of the Army engineers, namely, flood control and river and harbor work. Is there any suggestion as to what group or organization this very important work would be placed under if the Army engineers would be shorn of that duty?

Mr. BROOKS. No; unless it be civilian engineers.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. May I ask the gentleman if he does not think that that is the real source of this propaganda, that is, the civilian engineers, who have always been jealous of the work that has been done by our Army engineers? I think the country recognizes that the Army engineers are probably the most efficient public servants in our Government, and they are doing the finest job but there has been some jealousy on the part of our civilian engineers and they have been trying to take away, inch by inch, a lot of important jobs that they have been doing.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much for his fine contribution.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman stated that he had been to Europe recently visiting some of the soldiers fighting in that part of the world. It seems to me that I have read newspaper reports within the past 2 weeks to the effect that the gentleman from Louisiana, who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] were heartily in favor of the idea of a subcommittee, at least of the Committee on Military Affairs, visiting the Far East. I hope the gentlemen mentioned will do all that they can to see that such an inspection trip is undertaken at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to the gentleman that I think very valuable information is accumulated and picked up by committees visiting the actual scene of combat operations. The information cannot be obtained in any other way.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the newspaper for the China-Burma-India theater, the C. B. I. Roundup, has published a complaint about the fact that military committees go everywhere but to the C. B. I. Those boys out there feel that they are at the end of the line, and I feel that they are entitled to the recognition of, at least, a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs going out there, just so it can be seen what has been done and an up-to-date report presented to the Congress. Believe me, the service men and women out there would certainly appreciate it.

Mr. BROOKS. I understand those men feel as though they have been neglected, and perhaps they have been, and perhaps a subcommittee from the Congress ought to go out there and see exactly what the conditions are and talk to those men personally. It may be of great help to us legislatively and it may be a great morale booster for our troops.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It would be money well spent, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. It would accomplish a great good. At this point, I want to say that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has just rendered a most excellent account of a portion of his travels into China and along the Burma road. The able gentleman is rendering an outstanding contribution to the war effort in the orient in the valuable information which he is bringing to this Congress and which I understand he is giving to the executive department. Selection of the gentleman from Montana who is a student of oriental history to take over this mission was in my judgment a most fortunate one.

Mr. Chairman, proceeding with that which I have in mind in reference to the work of the engineer forces in Europe, evidence of the very valuable work these engineers are doing is seen the very moment one puts his foot upon the shores of continental Europe. Our committee, for instance, landed at Cherbourg in France. We visited the peninsula where the D-day invasion occurred. We had as a companion a colonel in the engineers who showed us exactly where the landing was initially made and told us of the vitally important work of a small detachment of Army engineers who preceded the Infantry at the initial landing.

On the Utah beach, a small concrete shaft has been erected on the shores of the peninsula looking toward England. They tell me it was built by the labor of German prisoners of war but it is dedicated to the United States Army Engineers. As I stood there, looking out over the English Channel, I read the inscription on the side of this simple stone shaft: "In proud memory of our dead. First Engineer Special Brigade. H-hour 0630. D-day June 6, 1944."

Another tablet on this monument lists all of the units in and operating with the First Engineer Special Brigade for that operation. This shaft speaks in silent eloquence of the heroic engineer dead.

Mr. Chairman, these events which impressed me deeply as I touched foot upon the shores of Normandy caused me to

make a special effort to obtain facts about the work of the Army engineers in the liberation of Europe. I sought occasion to learn of this work of building the roads, the bridges, waterways, the depots and arsenals of that portion of Europe now under control of our armies. In assembling this information, I sought facts from many of the engineers in the ranks and many of the engineer officers. I give you the story of magnificent heroism and gallantry of which every American must be truly proud.

THE STRATEGY OF LIBERATION

Mr. Chairman, at H minus 30 minutes on the morning of June 6, 1944—a full half hour before assault infantry was scheduled to hit Omaha Beach in that long-awaited assault on Hitler's impregnable Fortress Europe—three companies of Engineers from the Twenty-ninth Infantry Division heard their small boats scrape bottom on the Normandy beach, stormed ashore and, under the most withering observed artillery and small arms fire from the expectant Nazis, blew great gaps in the antitank wall there.

A short time later, slightly behind schedule, these Engineers were relieved when the infantry—in unending columns—poured through these gaps to come to grips at long last with the enemy. The battle for the beachheads, which would soon grow into the Battle of France, was joined.

What was happening at that moment on the narrow strip of Omaha assigned the Twenty-ninth Division was happening over and over again up and down the grim stretch of inhospitable Normandy coast. The traditional engineer mission of clearing the way for the armies was being fulfilled again—this time for keeps.

So, we were on the beach. But it was the next 48 hours which would determine whether we could stay there or not. It was more than the next 48 hours which would decide this. It was the 2 years of preparation and training which had gone before which would really decide it. And here was another engineer mission.

Getting men on the beach was a small part of the invasion problem. Supplying those men—and a modern army is no dainty nibbler: its giant maws consume, by the hour, tons of petroleum, ammunition of all calibers, automotive vehicles upon which today's armies move, working equipment, medical supplies, hundreds of other items, any one of which may spell the difference between defeat and victory—was a more worrisome and gargantuan problem than the landing of men.

Early on D-day, the Engineer Special Brigades—organized and trained and equipped for the terrific job of putting these supplies ashore without benefit of ports or port facilities—had also come ashore and had taken up their task of feeding the fighting men the things he needed to fight with. Now that the battle had been joined, it was upon the shoulders of these men that its issue largely depended.

By the third day after our landings in Normandy, it was clear how the wind was blowing. You had only to stand on the beaches to see. Where no ports had been before, now there were thriving bustling ports with improvised breakwaters, docks built in England and towed across channel to the beaches. Bulldozers chugged about—cutting new exit roads for the movement of supplies in the wake of our moving armies, covering up forts which the enemy for 4 long years had reared against our coming and which were obstacles to our supply operation. Trucks rolled from the beaches in never-ending lines. If this was a war of logistics, of supply—as everyone agreed it was—then the Engineer Special Brigades were making it possible for us to win that war of supply.

By the clear, cold application of military logic, the German high command knew that any force large enough to successfully cope with the massed forces gathered on the rim of Europe would require ports and port facilities to meet its terrific supply problems. Rommel expected, then, that our prime blows would fall against either Le Havre or Cherbourg, the major Normandy ports, and had disposed his forces accordingly. For days after our troops hit the beachheads, he refused to move troops from either of these two vital areas, still believing that the beachhead stroke was a diversionary one and that the main blow would fall at Cherbourg or Le Havre.

By the time he realized that we had fabricated ports of the bare beaches, it was too late. The battle for Normandy was virtually won, and we were far along the path toward winning the battle for France. It was a sort of magic that had reared such ports on the barren coast—ports which were to take many times the normal peacetime capacity of Cherbourg, an amazing tonnage. But it was a man-wrought magic. And no magic at all to those who knew the miracles of American engineering, converted now from the ways of peace to the ways of war.

The beaches had been won by air power and fire power and the sheer indomitable guts of the American G. I. But behind the air power and fire power was yet a third power—American work power. War is a matter of force; the side with the greatest force can impose its will upon the side with lesser force. American work power is the most overwhelming force in the world today—and the first phase of the battle for Europe was won months ago in cities like Detroit, Birmingham, Moline, and Oklahoma City.

A SPEAR, BERLIN BOUND

If you use a common military simile, the force we had landed on the Normandy beaches could be called a spearhead. Pushing the spearhead is the shaft, stretching back across the Channel to the United Kingdom and back, still farther, to the United States and to factories and plants built or converted in a few short months to a production which outstripped that of the Nazis, built over a whole decade. Here was American work power in action; if Pearl Harbor found us with our fire power and air power down, nothing was wrong with our work power. American contractors had designed and were using the best, the biggest, the most awe-inspiring construction equipment in the world, and it was futile to stand Nazi slave labor against it.

But it would be wrong to think of our victory as a machine-made one. We had the machinery, yes; but, more than that, we had the men to run that machinery, to keep it in repair, to alter it in the field, so that it would adequately meet every local requirement, overcome any peculiar difficulty of terrain or circumstance.

And we had men trained to supervise that machinery and its operators. In the long years of peace, the Corps of Engineers is not idle. Its personnel work at the great peacetime jobs which confront the Nation, river and harbor work, flood control, the giant dams which have been constructed throughout the Nation. In the engineer districts and divisions of the continental United States, these men are trained in the efficient performance of gigantic engineer operations. And just as the work power of the Nation was turned from the tasks of peace to labors of war, so were the energies and directive ability of these trained engineers diverted to the ends of quick victory. In a war which saw men and machines arrayed against men and machines we were not totally unprepared. The nucleus of the force which would retake Europe was in existence. Only time was needed.

For before the spearhead could be finally launched at the heart of the Reich, the shaft must be prepared and the impelling force built up.

THE BATTLE FOR SUPPLY LINES AND BASES

The prime mission of the engineers is to keep the armies moving. An army moves only so far and so fast as its supply lines move. So the prime mission of the engineers becomes the establishment and maintenance of supply lines. The first 2 years of our participation in the war were largely devoted to building these supply lines and bases for operation in the United Kingdom, close to the point of attack.

A modern army is a huge and complex organization, and in the dramatic glare of combat it is easy to lose sight of the fact that a large percentage of the army's energy must be devoted to simply living and moving; only a small segment of the army ever comes to actual grips with the enemy. The vast preparations behind each yard of territory wrested from the enemy, behind each bombing raid over Berlin, are often lost in the more dramatic climaxes of such preparations.

Yet, 2 years ago the engineers started out to prepare a fighting base of operations in the United Kingdom. From this base the air bombardment of Hitler's industrial backbone was launched. From it, a substantial part of the African invasion was launched. From it—when the chips were really down—the invasion of Europe, too, was launched.

The primary action against the European Continent—and almost the only hostile action we were able to take—during the two years of preparation for invasion was from the air. But air power is earth-bound. It is tied to the airdromes from which planes must take off and return at mission's end.

In this theater of operations, the roads, runways, and hardstandings needed by the United States Army Air Forces are

equivalent to construction of a 20-foot concrete highway from New York to Moscow. Moreover, these fields had to be built to high construction standards to permit all-weather, uninterrupted operations.

Despite the turnover of many completed airfields by the British and the construction of many more with British labor, it was a full year from the time the first United States troops arrived in England before the initial 300-bomber raid was launched. It was 19 months before a 1,000-plane raid could be staged.

The ground forces, too, required great quantities of material and accommodation. First, the huge forces marshalled for invasion had to be sheltered in a country the size of Pennsylvania and New York combined, but twice as densely populated. Over 100,000 buildings were constructed or requisitioned to accommodate them, from small cottages to sprawling hangars and workshops. All construction in the theater—except signal installations—is done by engineers. Engineers also have the responsibility of acquiring real property for the Army.

Actually, the provision of such accommodations was a responsibility accepted by the British Government but, exhausted by 3 years of war, their civilian labor resources were sadly depleted and inadequate to meet the requirements of our forces. Thus it was necessary to bring large numbers of engineer troops into the theater to prepare the bases for other troops to follow.

Construction in the United Kingdom by engineer troops was equal to a lifetime of work for 15,000 men—8 hours a day, 6 days a week, with no time out for training or vacation.

But aside from the terrific construction program necessary in the United Kingdom, the Construction Division of the Corps of Engineers had other, even more difficult, assignments in these pre-invasion days. Using every item of intelligence available, it was the job of the Division to foresee and plan for the reconstruction of installations in Europe essential to the success of our Armies.

The port of Cherbourg is an example of this planning. They had to foresee, insofar as it was possible, the damage that would be done to the port installations there and plan for their speedy repair. This meant estimating the materials that would be needed—as well as the number and kinds of troops—and order them far enough in advance from the States so that they would be on hand when required.

The same thing applied to the railroads, shattered already by our growing air blows. Just as in the reconstruction of Cherbourg, the Construction Division had to visualize the damage that would be done to rail lines, bridges, marshalling yards and see that adequate manpower, equipment, and materials would be at hand for their speedy repair. Bridging for the repair of railway bridges on the Continent had to be ordered 2 years in advance in order to be designed, fabricated, and delivered to the United Kingdom in time to be of value.

Similar estimates and advance plans had to be made in every phase of construction—and the construction essential for a modern army runs a wide and varied gamut—we would have to undertake on the Continent. In addition, engineers did all of the construction for—and much of the mounting of—the invasion.

INVASION: A JOB FOR SPECIALISTS

Even though we knew that we had developed an organization, techniques, and equipment for supplying our armies over the beaches, we also knew that ports would be essential, first, because, with the late autumn Channel storms, the improvised beach ports would be useless or approximately so; and, second, because the expanding operation of huge armies spreading out across the Continent necessitated deep water berthage for Liberty ships and more direct and capacious unloading facilities.

The result of this need was the provision, before invasion, of the special engineer units—engineer port construction and repair groups—whose mission was the repair of captured ports which would be damaged first by the retreating Nazis, second by our own air bombardment and siege operations. Composed of specialists—divers, top-hand steel construction men, marine construction specialists—these groups were ready to quickly put back in repair the ports which would fall to our hands.

Training of such specialist groups to accomplish their specific missions on the Continent—an invasion is a job for specialists—was no small matter. There are at the moment more than 50 various types of engineer units in action in the European theater of operations. Each of these groups represented a special problem in training, equipment, organization, and the work of the troops' division was not one to be glossed over in a few weeks. There were dredge crews, fire-fighting platoons, dump-truck companies, forestry battalions, foundry teams, gas-generating units, shop companies, maintenance companies, model makers, searchlight companies, petroleum-distribution companies, utilities detachments, camouflage companies, and depot groups, to name only a few.

In addition, general service regiments in many cases were prepared in England for special missions. Two such regiments, for example, were selected in the United Kingdom for railway work, were trained in railway bridging on the Thames. Schools were set up in bridging, camouflage, booby traps, and mines, and training teams were constantly on tour from one camp to another.

Because so many of the ordinary operations which confront the combat infantryman in this war are really engineer in nature, it became clear, too, that at least a basic engineer training in the use of explosives, the flame-thrower, and the bangalore torpedo was essential for assault troops about to hurl themselves at Hitler's European fortress. Such a training course was set up at the assault training center under the direction of engineer officers thoroughly versed in enemy fortifications and assault doctrine.

It was easy to understand, once the invasion commenced and the veil of secrecy began to lift from the 2 years' activity in the United Kingdom, why 2 years were necessary in preparing for a return to the European Continent. Firstly, the construction and preparation for continental construction was a time-consuming business; so was the training and equipping of the engineer specialists whose mission was to keep the armies moving by building and maintaining their supply lines.

But, secondly—this was of vital import—Engineer Intelligence, upon which the invasion depended to such a tremendous degree, had to have time to accomplish its work. Army engineers are responsible for the maps the Army uses. It prepares them, prints a large proportion of them, distributes them.

The western part of France, where the invasion would start, had not been mapped for military purposes since Napoleon's day. Late in 1942, British and American topographic units started out to map 20,000 square miles of critical territory—mostly from aerial photography supplied by the R. A. F. and the A. A. F. Although the sorties were flown over heavily defended, enemy-held territory, the superiority of our maps over those of the Wehrmacht was tacitly admitted by the German high command when it reproduced for use by the German Army copies of these sheets captured by them, adding only their own military grid.

No small item, either, was the printing and distribution of them. Approximately 125,000,000 maps—6,000 tons—were printed in advance of operations and salted away in special depots. Actual printing of these maps had to be delayed as long as possible to insure their being up to date, with latest details included in them. New roads are built, woods disappear under the forester's ax, structures are erected. And an old map can bring disaster to a military force operating in strange country.

The quantity of maps required by a force the size of the American Army in France is terrific, no longer measured in pieces but by tons. Thirty tons of maps per day are consumed by the United States field armies, and to distribute these huge quantities of maps to scattered units under battlefield conditions is far from simple. In the first 90 days of our continental operation approximately 6,000 tons, or 125,000,000 maps, were distributed, over 500 tons of them moved by air. Printing of such quantities of maps, many of them by topographical outfits in the field in trailer print shops, is no easy job, either. One hundred fifty lithographic presses, working 24 hours per day, are required to meet this need.

Since the invasion began on June 6, 1944, Engineer Intelligence has been furnishing much of the general intelligence, in addition to maps, by which Army commanders are guided. This is only natural, for in a war such as this, where armies move upon the engineers' ability to provide and maintain supply lines, the engineer officer must have at his fingertips every item of knowledge about enemy construction and activity; he must thoroughly know the terrain across which these supply lines will run. Because of these detailed demands, the engineers have built an intelligence service which adequately meets the needs of most other arms of the service.

The prediction of tides and height of waves on the beaches on D-day—predictions made well in advance of the landings—plus the wealth of information provided assault troops on the fortifications to be found on the beaches when they landed, are examples of Engineer Intelligence at work. Use by the enemy of mines and booby traps posed even new weapons for engineers in this war.

THE BEACHHEAD PERIOD

After storming ashore on the beaches, the American forces pushed westward toward Cherbourg, an early objective. Flooded areas, blown-out bridges across the many streams which criss-crossed Normandy gave new meaning to the engineer mission of keeping the armies moving. Spearhead of the spearhead was now combat engineers who threw tactical bridging across the rivers Taute and Vire under the heaviest enemy artillery fire. One engineer group with First Army lost five of its six field grade officers—deaths in action against the enemy—before we had broken out of Normandy. Bridging was a repetitious job—the enemy knocked them out time and again with his massed artillery, but as fast as he knocked them out, engineer soldiers put them back.

They kept the Army moving!

They kept the highways open, filling shell craters, blowing out enemy pillboxes so that Germans could not sneak back into them by night; they removed mines and booby traps. And when the hedgerow country was reached and the bitter hedgerow fighting began, the engineer soldier—with his tank dozer—cut great gaps in the tough, century-hardened hedgerows and opened the trail for the Infantry. They kept the Army moving.

But behind the combat soldier, engineers were keeping the armies moving, too. Engineers of the advanced section, communications zone—more familiarly known as Adsec—were seeing to it that the shaft of the spear kept up with the spearhead; that none of those items essential to the fighting man's progress—food, munitions, petroleum, supplies—were wanting for faulty links in the supply chain. Behind the combat soldier came the engineer petroleum distribution companies, laying pipe line from the beaches to the fighting fronts at amazing speed, assuring gasoline for tanks and trucks where it was needed, when it was needed and—at the same time—easing the already choking traffic that stretched as far as the eye could reach along the one east-west highway we held in Normandy.

One Engineer Port Construction and Repair Group, awaiting the fall of a port to work upon, was busy during this period piling up an amazing list of "firsts" in reoccupied France. At Isigny, this group sent the first Allied divers below the surface in France—to open the canal locks at Isigny and relieve the flooded countryside across which our troops were even then fighting; it raised the first sunken ship—a German flak ship, also at Isigny—which blocked a berth necessary for unloading supplies; it built the first railroad bridge—across the Taute River—on debris of the bridge retreating Nazis had demolished; it ran the first railroad train in France, from Lison Junction to Isigny, when General Bradley requested locomotives there to be transferred in readiness for the movement of supplies.

A second Port Construction and Repair Group, meanwhile moved into the Nazi-destroyed port of Cherbourg and set to work to bring order out of chaos. Supplemented by an Engineer Special Service Regiment, and, at first, one General Service Regiment, this group cleared away the debris; repaired the existing installations; and, because Cherbourg was never a great freight port, multiplied its normal, peacetime capacity by the construction of new installations and berthage.

NESTS FOR OUR BIRDS OF PREY

But the engineer mission of keeping the Armies moving means more than the building and repair of highways and bridges for the attacking troops and the opening of paths through minefields for their passage. It means more than the maintaining and construction of lines of communication and supply behind these assault elements.

On D plus 2, aviation engineers with the Ninth Air Force completed the first fighter landing strip in the beach area. They have been building them ever since. For a vital part of the American strategy in France has been close tactical air support for soldiers in the line. Just as it is the job of ground forces to keep the battle lines moving forward, it is the job of the aviation engineers to keep air cover over them; to keep the fighter lines moving forward.

When ground forces advance, old fields are abandoned and new ones built, close at hand. Much of this construction has been done under fire so that fields are ready when ground forces have advanced far enough so that the field can become operational. Their work is never done; frequently 8 to 10 fields are under construction simultaneously. Quick construction techniques—pierced steel plank, prefabricated hessian surfacing, square meshed track—specially developed equipment and trained specialists in these units assure air support—and within a few minutes flying time—for any American unit requiring it.

FUNNEL INTO FRANCE

Late in July, when sufficient reserves of supplies had been built up in the beachhead, the drive to break out of Normandy began. Assault infantry smashed at St. Lo—and took it after some of the most bitter fighting of the war. And through Le Haye du Puits and on the Periers-Lessay sector, the Infantry of the Eighth Corps advanced slowly after heavy artillery preparation through what promised to become the funnel into the continent's interior.

Fulfillment of the promise, however, depended largely upon whether the armored spearheads ready to follow the infantry could move through Lessay rapidly and exploit the infantry's accomplishment. Yet, both Fourth and Sixth Armored Divisions must move down one highway—that leading through Lessay—and Lessay was the most mined and booby-trapped town in France. Where the German soldier had failed to stem the surging tide of our assault, German mines and booby traps threatened to delay us until the Nazis could again mass their men for defense.

Into this situation moved the Engineer Technical Intelligence team of the Eighth Corps, a unit trained and organized to combat mines and booby traps. Working with combat engineers, they removed in a few hours hundreds of land mines; in a single afternoon, they took out over 300 booby traps. Thus, where our armored spearheads might have been delayed for days, they were now able to roll out in only a few hours. As Fourth and Sixth Armored turned westward, slicing the Breton Peninsula and enclosing German garrisons there in rings of steel from which escape was impossible, General Patton was sending the armored units of Third Army eastward. They were not stopped again until they reached the Siegfried line.

THEY KEPT THE ARMIES MOVING—FAST

First and Third Armies raced across France, far ahead of any preconceived timetable. Ahead of them, combat engineers threw Bailey bridges across the streams for infantry, treadways for the armored columns. But the problem of keeping the armies moving was no longer a major combat problem. SOS engineers were now carrying the ball. It was not the enemy forces ahead of them which concerned Army commanders; it was their supply lines behind them which were causing them concern. To keep the armies moving now, supply lines had to be built at a mad, unheard-of pace.

But if the armies were tied to their supply lines, Army engineers were determined to make those supply lines as fluid and mobile as anything Patton could work up. The ties would not bind if American manpower and workpower could make miracles. And they could.

A network of one-way highways—the famed red-ball highways—was designated as a prime source of supply for the fast-moving armies. Across France, Engineer general service regiments rolled up their sleeves and went to work, bridging, resurfacing highways already worn by 4 years of heavy duty and few repairs, setting up depots and workshops and all the essential items of such a road system.

But no major military operation of modern times can be supplied without railways. Ahead of the armies, our Air Force had pounded at the rail system on the Continent, destroying this vital link in the Nazi supply system. Railway bridges were knocked out, marshalling yards bomb-plastered and useless, great stretches of track laid waste. Even before D-day, the Germans had given up repair of the rail lines as hopeless.

Nowhere is the irony of modern war more apparent than here. Defeat of the Wehrmacht depended to a large extent upon such destruction, and the railways of France were paralyzed. Overnight, however, the success of our own operation came to depend upon the quick repair of the very lines we had destroyed so completely.

On the morning of August 13, shortly after the break-through, General Patton asked the engineers to have the railroad leading into Lemans and Laval from St. Lo ready to receive ammunition trains in 48 hours. It was a monumental job if spread over a period of months; it seemed impossible within the brief time allotted. It meant rebuilding seven railway bridges in various stages of demolition; the repair and laying of totally new main lines in three huge marshaling yards; the laying of miles of track approaching the bridges and yards; the provision of switch and watering facilities along the line.

Two general service regiments with attached dump truck companies had been working on the stretch of line at the time. But if General Patton wanted ammunition trains in Laval and Lemans within 48 hours, the engineers were determined that no lack of railway line would prevent their being there.

Three additional regiments were rushed into the area; all the heavy equipment that could possibly be spared from other equally pressing jobs was moved to the bridge and yard sites; by day and by night, highways leading from Cherbourg and the beaches were jammed with trucks immediately dispatched for essential materials. Even while the bulldozers were clearing the debris—a 48-hour job in itself—engineer officers in hastily thrown-up drafting tents on the sites were designing new bridges for the jobs.

As the deadline approached, trains—one after the other, heavily laden with ammunition and gasoline—inched up the track past Coutances, into Avranches. By midnight, August 15th, they passed St. Hilaire du Harcourt, across the last bridge remaining to be completed, and on to Laval and Lemans and Patton's fighting men—on time!

ONE MORE RIVER TO CROSS

Tradition has the engineers as bridge-builders. When you think of an Army engineer, you think of men throwing pontoon bridges across a stream under enemy fire. So, it is perhaps fitting that one of the last and biggest jobs of keeping the armies moving toward Berlin should be a bridge-building job.

Roughly, you can divide the continental operation into four phases, four turning points—first, the landings in Normandy; second, the break-through out of the Normandy beachhead; third, breaching the Siegfried line, and now, bridging the Rhine.

Nor is the last the least of these. Bridging the Rhine—for such is its geography and defensible position—is every inch a major operation. You can compare it with the channel crossings. Its difficulties are terrific, its potentialities almost terrifying.

But if the battle for Germany depends upon a Rhine crossing, then that almost sacred German river will be bridged in spite of whatever hell the Nazis can cook up, high water or Hitler.

For the ultimate mission of Army engineers is to keep the armies moving—to victory.

Mr. Chairman, such is the story of the work of our engineers in the liberation of Europe. Exploits are too numerous and events too crowded to attempt to narrate all of them here. In the handling of this job it is of outstanding interest to know that our engineers used machinery and methods which they had learned in times of peace. In their rivers and harbors work and in their work of flood control, they learned to meet many of the problems which are presently confronting them now in the war zone.

As I moved around behind the front in France and in Italy I saw many of the large machines used normally in flood control and in rivers and harbors work. Bulldozers, drag-lines, steam shovels, trucks, and other dirt-moving equipment used in more peaceful days along the far reaches of the Mississippi, the Red, Ohio, Missouri, and along the reaches of countless other great rivers of the Nation are all there in use today. They are contributing their bit to the reconstruction of Europe, to the maintaining of supply lines and to the winning of this war; and the usages to which these giant machines are placed while under enemy fire are surprisingly similar to the performances with which we are familiar in the work of Army engineers in this country.

The engineers boastingly admit that the training which they received in their magnificent peacetime program is the basis upon which much of the war work is predicated. They will tell you of contracts handled and large groups of men employed in their pre-war work in such harbors as New York, San Francisco, New Orleans, and Norfolk; they will tell you of their pre-war experiences in solving the problems of drainage and flood control along the Tennessee, the Tombigbee, the Red, and the Sacramento. This was their pre-war training to meet the problems presented in the reopening of such harbors as Cherbourg, Le Havre, Marseilles, Antwerp, and Naples; in opening again such great inland waterways as the Albert Canal and in building the bridges and roads forming the lifeline of combat communications in France.

The Army engineers are doing a truly magnificent job in time of war. They are living up to the traditions of the service and to the high standard of perfection which they set in other wars and at other critical times in our Nation's history. No small part of the credit for this work is due to the able Chief of the Army engineers, Gen. Eugene Reybold, and to his most competent staff of officers; but credit is likewise due the most humble soldier in the ranks of the Army engineers who has made this work possible.

I have heard it debated in the past for months that our engineers may be shorn of some of their peacetime authority in the post-war days. I have heard it argued that others should perhaps be given authority over some flood control or river and harbor development projects. Such action, Mr. Chairman, would surely be a serious mistake. It would certainly not be proper reward for splendid service rendered in the past in the building up of this Nation, and it most assuredly would not be reward for a superlative job done under most exacting conditions during time of war. To strip our Army engineers of authority in the post-war days will constitute a sad commentary in the history of the development of our Nation. Army engineers constitute a most effective weapon of war and likewise they constitute a most beneficent agency of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I impose myself on the patience of the House and I would give anything if my heart would dictate to me to renege in this instance. My heart is heavy today and I must speak. I could not live with my conscience if I failed in this cause.

I feel there is a crucial development on the international scene which has taken place, which ought to cause all thinking people throughout the world to stop and consider. I want to say at the very outset that I know I am more or less on the spot, because from the remarks I am going to make there are certain to be those who are going to answer me by saying I am a Nazi sympathizer, or that I could not have given Propaganda Minister Goebbels any better reason for propaganda than the remarks which I made to cause disunity among the Allies.

At the outset I want to say that I come from descendants of a Polish family. My father and mother were born in Europe around the Posen section. Polish people and Nazis just do not jell. The Polish people have always hated the Nazis. The Nazis have been killing the Polish people for 5 years or more. Poland has not produced a single Quisling in all its history. I am that kind of an American and Pole. I certainly hope there will not be anyone in this House or outside who will accuse me of being a Nazi sympathizer simply because I happen to disagree with the outcome of the Black Sea Conference. The Poles were the first of all people with courage to fight the Nazis. Even when a Pole is dead his spirit will still fight the Nazis.

I cannot help but feel away down deep in my heart. I hope no one will ask me to yield, because these words that I have to say are too deep in my heart, and the things I am going to say are so deep within my conscience that the ideas which I have are more or less tense, and I am afraid if someone asked me to yield I am liable to get off the track of the message I want to put across. I am sorry I did not have time to prepare this so that I would be more at ease and so that I could yield to anyone who wanted to ask any questions. I ask your indulgence as my heart pours out to you and pleads for justice and honesty to a deserving people—the people of Poland.

I see absolutely no rejoicing at the outcome of the Black Sea Conference. Today I picked up a little writing that took place after the Munich Conference. These are harsh words, but I cannot help but feel that with the announcement of the crime of Crimea we have had a repetition of the Munich. This Crimean

tragedy will go down in history as the second Munich.

After the first Munich Conference, which took place in Europe when the powder keg was set off for the thing that we are so dearly paying the price for now, this is what was said about Chamberlain when he came back from the Munich Conference:

The Archbishop of Canterbury called Mr. Chamberlain the happy warrior. The poet laureate compared him with Priam, King of Troy. Mr. Burgin, immoderate in his transports, called him the greatest character in the world.

From The Hague—mind you, from The Hague—a large floral tribute was sent to Chamberlain by air. A correspondent of the Times suggested that 2,000,000 souvenir stamps should be printed, and the proceeds, £50,000 should be presented to Chamberlain for his work at Munich. General Smuts said: "We are grateful to the four leaders of Europe. A great champion has appeared in the lists, God bless him"—Chamberlain. In France a subscription was opened to buy Mr. Chamberlain a chateau. Somebody suggested that the Nobel Peace Prize, which consists of I do not know how many pieces of silver, should be divided among the four men of Munich. The Swiss canton, of Neuchatel, decided to send a gold chronometer to Chamberlain. A Lisbon newspaper opened a subscription for a monument to the memory of Mr. Chamberlain's heroic action in the defense of peace. The Times said:

No conqueror returning from the battlefield has ever come back with nobler laurels.

Herr Hitler eloquently thanked him as "Germany's only real friend"; and that other "great man" Benito Mussolini casually threw in a word of appreciation for "the other two statesmen" who made this agreement possible.

Mr. Chamberlain received after Munich from throughout the world over 20,000 telegrams of approval and wagonloads of flowers.

But, Mr. Chairman, just as those words about Munich are today the laughingstock of the world, just as that praise which was sung of Mr. Chamberlain has now become the laughingstock of the world, just so the words of praise now being sung about the Black Sea Conference will some day fall into the same category with this eulogizing of Mr. Chamberlain.

We talk about the Atlantic Charter; in my judgment the Atlantic Charter is no longer a living document. The stabbing in the back of Poland and the partitioning of Poland, the sixth partitioning of Poland in her history, but the first partitioning with the consent of the great Nation—the United States of America, I am sorry to say—the sixth partition of Poland is a definite denunciation of the Atlantic Charter. I do not see how anyone can speak of the Black Sea Conference and the Atlantic Charter in the same breath or in the same speech, because the two just do not jell. The Atlantic Charter states:

We desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

What Pole was ever consulted when the Big Three met at the Black Sea Conference and partitioned Poland? What European government was consulted? It might interest you to know that the Black Sea Conference which partitioned Poland was not a European group. It was not a European bloc that decided the fate of Poland, for not a single living European representative was a member of that conference. Stalin is not a European, Churchill is not a European, our own President is not a European; and yet these outsiders go in there to decide the fate of Europe when the Atlantic Charter says it should not be done unless with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. No Pole or no Polish leader was ever consulted about the fate of Poland. The Atlantic Charter has been torn to bits and thrown into the Black Sea.

Here is another statement from the charter:

We respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live.

I would say to you that the government under which the liberated Poles are living today is a government that represents less than 2 percent of the Polish people; yet, as a result of the Black Sea Conference they are forcing that rule down the throats of the millions of gallant Poles; and you cannot speak of it in any other way than the use of force. They tell us they are going to have a plebiscite. I will tell you a little later on what a joke and a farce a plebiscite is.

The Atlantic Charter contains this statement also:

All the nations of the earth for realistic as well as for spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force.

I remind both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill that force is being used today to choke down the throats of the Polish people a form of government they do not want.

So there we have three instances where the Atlantic Charter has been scrapped—torn to bits. The Black Sea Conference, in my judgment, has sounded the death knell of the Atlantic Charter. The Atlantic Charter has become a joke. If there are some of us who still think that the Atlantic Charter is the reason why we are fighting this war, we might as well forget about it because it has been scrapped.

I come now to the point where some of the newspapers, I notice, state that it has been a great moral victory for Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill because they have got Mr. Stalin to consent—think of that—to a plebiscite in Poland after the war; and then to add insult to injury they are going to have that plebiscite supervised by the three great powers. What kind of a plebiscite is that going to be?

There are a lot of things I could tell you. I could tell you the story of Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, but I am going to use just one of those countries as an illustration to show you how foolish and how silly a plebiscite will be in Poland after this war is over. I am going to give you Lithuania as an illustration because Lithuania is merely an example of what has happened in Latvia, Estonia, Finland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and it is going to happen wherever the thing stretches out. You know what I mean. So I am going to give you the story of Lithuania to show you how silly a plebiscite will be after this war. There was a plebiscite in Lithuania. Lithuania consented to join the Soviet Union. Why? Because Russia adopted the policy of exporting and putting into exile every intelligent Lithuanian, and imported Russians in their places. When they got the Lithuanians out and the Russians in, then they called the plebiscite and Molotov ran as the representative of Lithuania in the Soviet form of Government. Believe it or not.

It is a well-known fact that Russia's chief demand, next to territorial annexations, is to have Soviet-friendly governments established in all countries bordering upon Russia. A model of such a friendly government was that of Lithuania in 1939–40.

On October 10, 1939, the Soviets had concluded with that Government a 15-year mutual assistance treaty. After its signature said Lithuanian Government faithfully executed all Moscow orders. In the summer of 1940 the Soviets, in search of a pretext for the annexation of Lithuania, forwarded an ultimatum, dated June 15, to the Lithuanian Government demanding that the latter consent to the occupation of Lithuania, and to a number of other most humiliating conditions. The Lithuanian Government complied with all these demands.

You would think that would be the end. But no. In spite of that all the members of the Government were arrested, all the members and leaders of the Lithuanian Government were arrested and transported to Arctic Russia together with their families. Only the President, Anthony Smetana, and the war minister succeeded in escaping abroad, but he too was double-crossed by a spy, he was caught, and sent back to exile. Then they went through and they got all the scholars, the educators, and all of the professional men—lawyers, doctors, ministers, priests—all the educated people, and they too were transported to Siberia.

Here is how they lived.

They were living in wooden barracks and sleeping on a bare floor. Their food consisted of one plate of soup and a pound of bread daily. They had to rise at 4 in the morning and retired at 9 p. m. The place where they worked was about 6 miles distant from their prison. Their working day lasted 14 hours. It was hard manual labor consisting in uprooting trees in the Arctic regions. The work made it often necessary for them to stand for hours waist-deep in water.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what happened to more than 50 percent of the Lithuanians who believed in and were faithful to the Lithuanian Government. They took these 50 percent of the Lithuanians, transported them into Siberia and to other places. Then when the Russians found they had a majority they called a special election and they were inaugurated into the Soviet Union.

What happened to Lithuania is going to happen to every one of the countries that the sphere of influence applies to. It is already happening in Poland today. By the thousands the Poles who were fighting the Nazis for more than 5 years are now being murdered, executed, imprisoned, sentenced to exile and annihilated. By whom? By one of our allies.

Let me give you an illustration. When they got to Lublin Province, the first day they were in Lublin, 2,100 Poles were arrested in Lublin Province and sent to prison. Who were they? They were of the 2,100,000 Poles who fought with the home army. They were fighting the Nazis barehanded for 5 years. They took whole divisions of the home Polish Army and transported them into exile. Here is what is happening to the Poles and that is why they are so willing to give in to a plebescite. In the town of Lwow they have already conscripted all the men between the ages of 18 and 55. What did they do with them? They transported them over into Siberia, into prison camps and what not. They have already conscripted all the women up to 35. Here is something that I am driving at. Immediately when the Soviet Government takes over a liberated area, the people in charge are given orders to clear that area of "undesirable" people as soon as possible.

In this case it happens to be the Poles who are in sympathy with the Government in London. In this case it happens to be the 2,000,000 Poles of the Polish underground who for 5 years fought the Nazis and killed them with bare hands, bare bodies, and empty stomachs. Immediately on liberation, orders were given by the Soviet head, Mr. Stalin himself—for instance, when they took over Lwow and that territory east of Lwow—that no Poles should remain in those areas by January 15; that everyone should be out of there. That is happening all over Poland today. They are conscripting men between the ages of 18 and 55 and women from 16 to 35 and taking them over into Siberia. What are they doing? They are bringing in Russians in their places. Then, when they get a majority, and they are given a definite date by which to get them out of there, sure, they are in favor of a plebiscite. What a sop to hand Poland. They are sending them into exile, into prison camps, and putting Russians in their places, and then when they get them filled with Russians they call for a plebiscite. They also want to give the Poles 15,000,000 Germans, and when they put in the 15,000,000 Germans plus the 15,000,000 Russians they are going to call a plebiscite in Poland and ask them what kind of a government they want. That is just about what this plebiscite amounts to; just another sop to Poland, merely to keep them sitting for another day hoping that the day of reckoning will never come.

I think the greatest tragedy on the face of the earth is the fate that has befallen Poland. Wherever the fight for freedom in this war has taken place you have always found the Poles. When it came to the break-down of France the Polish Army was the last one to give up, but they went back again and fought in Holland and in Belgium.

When the Desert Fox, Marshal Rommel, was running over Africa, it was a small Polish Army that stopped him and turned him dead in his tracks. You know the fate of the Polish Army at Cassino Hill in Italy. You know what happened there. You know what happened in Britain. If any country ever owed a debt to Poland, it was Britain, when they were down on their knees crying for help. At the beginning of this war the only help they got was from a small Polish air force, and they knocked out one of every eight German planes that went over London, and that at a time when Britain was down on her knees praying for help. After 5 long years of suffering, misery, and starvation, deprived of all the implements of war, the Polish Home Army still fought, and they had, up to August 1944 when they had that sad fate happen in Warsaw. Even as little as 2 months ago there was a Polish underground army of 2,000,000 people ready to fight and bear arms. For 63 days a Polish Army of 250,000 men and women held Warsaw against the mightiest military force the world has ever known, Germany. For 63 days they held out barehanded, led by that great, gallant patriot, General Bor. What has been their reward? Today General Bor is in exile. He is accused as a traitor. He is in a Russian prison camp together with hundreds of thousands of other Poles of the Polish Home Army who did more to stop nazi-ism than any other country on the face of the earth.

That is the fate those people are suffering today; and what has been their reward? It pains me deeply to say this. Being a Pole, I am glad that it did not happen, but it is strange that if Poland had been a collaborating country, a satellite country, they would have gotten better treatment than they got because they chose to stand up alone and fight the enemy for more than 5 years empty-handed. Take the case of Italy, a satellite country. They are not getting the treatment the Poles are getting. Take Bulgaria, a satellite country; they are not getting the treatment the Poles are getting. They are not being carved up and handed over lock, stock, and barrel. Take the case of Rumania. They are not being badly treated; they are not being carved up and dissected.

Take the case of any one of the satellite countries. The fate they are going to get out of this war is going to be much better than that of Poland. In other words, Poland is being punished for her patriotism, she is being punished for her constant efforts, no matter what the adverse circumstances were. Poland is being sold down the river. That is her reward for her constant efforts at stopping the reign of nazi-ism throughout the European countries.

There are those who say that General Bor had no business starting that uprising. Just to show you how strange things were, I am going to read you something now from the Russian press. This was before General Bor asked for the uprising in Warsaw.

One of the main charges put forward by Moscow against the Polish Government in London and the Polish high command is the charge of causing a "premature" uprising in Warsaw which began on August 1, and continued for 63 days. The Moscow press and radio, which during June and July called upon the inhabitants of Warsaw and the Polish Home Army for an armed uprising, began around the middle of August to charge that the Warsaw uprising was criminal folly and "anti-Russian" intrigue. The true light on Moscow's methods is shown by a booklet, Poland—Our Neighbor, published in London in April 1944, by the Russia Today Society—

That is the propaganda organ in England—

and which is a reprint of the official magazine of the Russian Government, War and the Working Class.

On page 22 of this booklet we read the following, and this is what Russia said about Poland before the uprising in Warsaw:

In Poland, the followers of the émigré government—according to their own assurances—have long been ready for an armed fight against the German invaders, but they do nothing, awaiting a signal from London. From London, however, we do not hear calls for action, but words of caution from the commander in chief, Sosnkowski, and his collaborators: "You must retain cold blood," "you cannot give way to unbridled instinct of despair," etc. If the inhabitants of Poland give heed to those calls to remain passive, the German invaders can feel completely secure in Poland and can continue their cruelties against the Polish people unhindered. Fortunately, true Polish patriots, like the patriots in other countries, reject with contempt those treasonable instructions and wage a stubborn and heroic fight against the German criminals.

The article goes on asking the Polish underground for action.

So, the word was given from the Polish government in London and from London itself to General Bor in Warsaw to rise because Russia was only 25 miles from Warsaw, that now was the time to strike. So General Bor with 250,000 Polish patriots, without any food in their stomachs and without any implements of war in their hands, struck, and held Warsaw for 63 days against the mightiest military power on the face of the earth. And what is their reward? Prison. They are traitors. They are being annihilated, they are being sent to Siberia. That is their reward for holding Warsaw 63 days under the most adverse circumstances.

The story of Poland is a sad story indeed. The proceedings of the Black Sea Conference, in my judgment, are going to go down in history as one of the most gross injustices ever perpetrated by any country on any people.

If any people of any country, or if any country deserved a reward for what they have gone through after 5 long years of war, of constant crucifixion and deprivation, it is certainly the people and country of Poland. That country has been put on the auction block of appeasement just as Czechoslovakia was put on the auction block of appeasement at Munich. So today you have Poland put on the

auction block of appeasement. Just as Munich has resulted in great deprivation and has resulted in the United States of America losing already almost a million lives and incurring a three-hundred-billion-dollar debt, I predict to you now, Members of the House, that likewise the second Munich, the Black Sea Conference of appeasement, is going to have telltale disastrous effects for all time to come.

Hail the Black Sea Conference. Hail the crime of Crimea. We are fighting a war for freedom. The crime of Crimea has denied freedom to 100,000,000 Europeans. That is just the beginning. The crime of Crimea puts a stamp of approval for slavery in Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. On black Monday, February 12, 1945, ironically Lincoln's and Kosciusko's birthday, the Big Three approved slavery for Poland, too. The crime of Crimea has handed 100,000,000 human beings in bondage. Black Monday, February 12, 1945, will go down in world history as the most ghastly international crime of the ages for which the world will pay a heavier price than we paid for World War No. 2. What a sorry spectacle that almost a million of our own boys gave their lives for a new kind of bondage, a new order in Europe. What comfort the crime of Crimea must give to Hitler and Goebbels.

Hail the great humanitarian, Mr. Roosevelt; he went forth with four aces and was bluffed by a pair of deuces. Only Moscow has reason to rejoice. All other decent living people today have just reason for sorrow.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute simply for the purpose of making an announcement to the Members of the minority that the Republican conference which was scheduled to follow the session this afternoon has been postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control, general: For the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including printing and binding, newspapers, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, and for the purchase in the fiscal year 1946, of not to exceed 40 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and 1 motorboat, and for preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies in connection with the flood control, $14,037,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys, and prepare plans and specifications, necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project: *Provided further*, That no part of appropriations made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for preliminary examinations and surveys, as authorized by law, for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds of flood-control projects, shall be obligated for initiating work upon new projects or for prosecuting work upon projects heretofore commenced, unless they accord with priorities specifically approved by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 7, line 10, strike out all of the flood-control section down to and including line 17 on page 9.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we are in a precarious position today in this Nation of ours because of the fact we are at war with Germany and we are at war with Japan. The most important task which we confront as a Nation today is to win that war. I do not believe there is a man on the floor of the House or a man in America who is a real true American who does not want to win the war. We have been talking too much lately about what we are going to do after the war is won. Gentlemen, when you are in a fight you want to stand right up and fight, fight, every minute of the time until you win, because sometime somebody might give you a knock-out blow and you will not have a chance to win the fight. This country is in danger financially. It is financially in danger as well as being in danger from the standpoint of manpower. You were asked last week to try to draft the men of this country and force them to go to work. You cannot do it. The American people do not want to be forced, to be led to a job and be told, "You work at that job." But if you will tell them the real necessity for working in a war industry so that we will win this war, there is not a man in America but who will stand up and take the job and say, "I will do what I can." You have a lot of projects provided for in this bill and there are a lot of projects that will come up in other bills, just because many Members of the House and many people back home want to see them finished. They require a lot of manpower. I am interested in two things. I am interested in saving manpower today, for men to work on the farms, men to work in industry, men to work in all the plants that are necessary to build the airplanes and ships to win this war. We can save a lot of manpower right here in this bill if we will cut out this flood-control section. The Army engineers can have all of this year to use the money which we appropriated last year. If by our action here today we say we do not want them to go ahead and build a lot of flood-control projects, we will save enough money so that we can continue our flood-control projects beginning July 1, 1946.

There is an appropriation in this bill for the purchase of a lot of passenger-carrying motor vehicles. There are not enough automobiles now to take the men to work in industry. There are not enough automobiles and tires for the farmers of this country to raise the crops to feed not only the people of this country but to feed the men, women, and children of all the nations of the world.

I want to see flood-control projects built in my district, but I want them built when we have the manpower available to put them on this construction, and not take them away from war industries.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I was very much impressed with the self-appointed watchdog of the Treasury——

Mr. RICH. Now, I do not yield any further.

Mr. BAILEY. I wonder where the gentleman was when they built the Capitol——

Mr. RICH. I do not yield further, Mr. Chairman. I am here to save this country of ours. If the new dealers are going to come here and squander the money, they will find out that some day we will not have a Nation that is worthwhile talking about even. I do not care who you are or where you come from; when the time comes to criticize me for economy in Government you can do it right here on the floor of this House or do it back home or wherever you want to, but I want to preserve the solidarity of this Nation. I want to keep it sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

I dislike to rise in opposition to my good friend and colleague from the State of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] lives on the Susquehanna River. I live in the watershed of the Ohio River. We all recall, even the Members of Congress who have never visited that section of the country, the floods of 1936 and 1937. As I said in presenting the bill today, if there are 2 days of warm rain in the gentleman's district and in mine and the snow goes away, the $30,000,000 in this bill for the Mississippi River will be a mere handful toward covering the damage that would be caused by such a rain. In other words $300,000,000 would not cover the damage done in 1936 and in 1937. There are no items in this bill that are not intended to be used for the economy of the Nation. For instance, there are places on the Mississippi River where the levee is only one foot and it should be on an average of seven feet. If the water would ever break through at one of those places and go out in the meadows and regions beyond, there would be more than $30,000,000 damage done.

In other words, it is a matter of relativity—a relatively small insurance against a possibly great loss. One word further, in the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] the Susquehanna now is covered with ice that varies in depth from 1 to 3 feet. The Army engineers are preparing right now to dynamite the ice downstream to keep it from piling up behind bridges and obstructions to cause loss not only of

property but of life. This fund should not be cut in this war emergency.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I call attention to the following colloquy on page 36 of the hearings:

Mr. MAHON. My own personal feeling is that we should conserve as much manpower as is possible at this time. Do I understand from your statement to the committee that you have cut this estimate to the irreducible minimum in presenting it to us?

General REYBOLD. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, Congressman MAHON, we cannot start any new work without an authorization from the War Production Board, and even in those cases those projects must have a close relationship to the war effort.

Mr. MAHON. In fact, the estimate you are requesting is for something directly of interest to the promotion of the war effort?

General REYBOLD. To the promotion of the war effort, or, in some minor instances, to protect the works that already exist.

Mr. MAHON. This estimate is presented to us with the view that the whole war picture will continue for some time as it is now?

General REYBOLD. Yes, sir.

I join with the chairman of my subcommittee in wanting to keep this bill to the irreducible minimum and in saving every possible dime. We want nothing in this bill that is not absolutely essential. We have been told and we believe the things in here are essential. I therefore join with my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] in opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. SNYDER. I want to emphasize General Reybold's statement just read by the gentleman from Texas:

We cannot start any new work without an authorization from the War Production Board, and even in those cases those projects must have a close relationship to the war effort.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I realize that continuous effort is needed to guard against floods; and I do not want to see a flood either in my district or any other district, but I say our first duty is to win this war. I ask the gentleman which he would rather do: win this war or have flood control?

Mr. SNYDER. I believe this to be necessary in winning the war and saving life, money, and property.

Mr. RICH. How about the engineering item in the bill which has to do with planning for projects in future years?

Mr. SNYDER. That is planning.

Mr. RICH. Yes. Why do that now when they have enough plans for flood control to keep everybody busy for 10 years to come. Why not stop this engineering planning now?

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman is in error. The completed plans right now would not keep one-fiftieth of the men busy for 1 year.

Mr. RICH. There is where I differ with the gentleman. I believe there are completed plans for a sufficient while in the future. We should cut it all out now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may submit a consent request to close debate on this amendment?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] will proceed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania should, of course, be defeated and will be defeated. I believe we all understand and appreciate the motives that prompt his action but I do not believe many of us are going to agree with him. The fact of the matter is this appropriation of $14,000,000 for flood control is very small indeed. The further fact is that the only projects upon which this money will be expended are those which, as has been pointed out by members of the committee, have a direct relationship to the war. I want to illustrate that point and I think perhaps what I have to say may be of some value. In my own district there is a flood-control dam intended to protect the communities which lie below it from disastrous flash floods such as we have in California. That dam stands today only partially completed. In its present state of completion there is perhaps a greater hazard than would have been the case had the dam not been started, because until it is completed to its proper height, with proper gates, and so forth, it cannot give the protection it should. For years, however, work upon that dam has been delayed for the very reason that it has been contended by the War Production Board that it was not absolutely necessary from the standpoint of the war. My personal opinion, of course, is that the dam ought to be finished, just as soon as possible.

I want to point out, in contrast, that there are places on the coast of California where harbors are needed to accommodate the ships of the Navy and the ships of the merchant marine, where it is important that rivers be controlled in order that the harbors will not be silted up, and where it is absolutely essential that the Army engineers have a certain amount of money in order to enable the very war itself to be properly carried on. That, as I understand it, is the purpose of this appropriation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to testify to the facts the gentleman has just stated to the House, and that is true not only with reference to the dam mentioned by the gentleman but to the Lockheed aircraft plant that required priorities for the construction of flood-control channels to protect it, which are being washed out, and I may say the same condition surrounds the Douglass aircraft plant, all of which is very vital to the war effort and contrary to arguments presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is correct. The only reason I asked for this time was to emphasize the fact that whereas in peacetime the appropriation for flood control—and the gentleman from Mississippi will correct me if I am wrong—has sometimes been larger than $150,000,000, we now have before us only an item of $14,000,000. I think this sum will recommend itself to every Member of the House as being the very irreducible minimum which the Corps of Engineers believes it can get along with in protecting the war effort itself.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I would like to emphasize what the gentleman from California has just said so well. In the section of Missouri from which I come, I have in mind the Clearwater Dam and Reservoir which, when completed, will make available a rich river valley that will produce food to help win this war, and it will do just what the gentleman from Pennsylvania insists that we do, namely, win the war first. We have got to have food. The completion of that flood-control dam on the Black River, the principal tributary of the White, will add many thousands of fertile acres to the food-production acreage of this country.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate what the gentleman says.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Does the gentleman realize that the work in dollars and cents that has been done on the Sacramento River and its tributaries is in excess of $100,000,000 and that there are only $2,000,000 carried in the pending bill to carry on and maintain this work in a part of the country that is producing food supplies second to none in the whole United States?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not realize that those were the exact figures, but I know what the gentleman says is true. I may say to him that I would be glad to settle for a small part of his $2,000,000 if I could get the Santa Fe Dam completed.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The committee went into the matter very carefully, and for the record may I say that the members of the committee were unanimously in favor of this bill as it

now stands, and so far as these particular items are concerned the committee was unanimous in its report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to call attention to the fact, in reference to this particular item, that there seems to be some confusion as to the purpose of the $14,000,000. On page 7 of the report it is stated that this particular fund is for the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for flood control. Most of this money is going into maintenance. That is not something which can be abandoned.

Further, I call attention to the fact that a part of this money is to be used for contingencies in connection with flood control. See the language in line 2. Only a very small portion of this $14,000,000 involves plans or surveys or studies to which reference has been made. Most of it is for maintenance of existing flood-control works and to meet contingencies that may arise during the year.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Is it not very likely, on account of the fact we have had considerable snow and ice over such a widespread area, that many of these contingencies will arise? We hope they will not. It seems very likely there will be contingencies. Will this fund cover special flood-relief activities?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is some contingency money in here. Of course, the gentleman realizes that this particular bill is for the fiscal year 1946, and this money is not available until June 30; but under a similar heading in the appropriation for the current fiscal year of 1945, contingencies, if they should arise from existing snow, would be met.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in all kindness I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to strike out the provisions of this bill for appropriations for flood control, carries on its face its own condemnation. The preceding paragraph of this bill provides approximately $41,000,000 for rivers and harbors as distinguished from flood control. That amount for rivers and harbors is largely for maintenance, and there is some small, comparatively speaking, construction that is in the promotion of the war effort. If maintenance and construction for the war effort are essential in rivers and harbors, surely they are essential in flood control.

This bill carries about $14,000,000 for general flood control. That applies to all rivers in the United States, save the lower Mississippi River, and the Sacramento River. In normal peacetimes this appropriation was more than $100,000,000 annually, so that this bill has reduced the normal appropriations for general flood control to the minimum. Of the $14,000,000 carried in this bill only about $7,000,000 is provided for construction, and in the area where there have been in the past 2 years five successive floods. This construction is confined to the stretch of the Mississippi River between Cairo and St. Louis. If these floods should recur, the railroad along that area crossing the Mississippi River, as well as other transportation facilities, will be interrupted, as well as damage done to improvements, including farm lands that have been overflooded successively five times in the past 2 years. If it does not constitute an emergency to restore and rebuild and enlarge the levees in that area it would be difficult to find a proper meaning for the word "emergency." Two millions of the $14,000,000 is to provide for preliminary examinations and surveys. There are many areas and there are many streams that have never been examined. Bills are constantly being introduced by members, and without this provision there would be no funds for investigations in those places where flood control projects have not been adopted. It also provides for maintenance of the projects that have been constructed at a cost of many millions of dollars. It provides $2,000,000 for plans for the construction of works following the war, and those plans must be made now for construction then, otherwise you have got work-make projects. This appropriation is in the interest of economy.

With respect to the emergency authorization mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee, there is carried in this bill $500,000 for emergency work; and yet we appropriated some $10,000,000 for emergency repairs during the last fiscal year; we appropriated some $10,000,000 during the previous fiscal year for emergency repairs; and for the whole United States we are providing the small sum, in the interest of economy, of $500,000.

With respect to the appropriation for the Sacramento River, it is to provide for the maintenance of projects already constructed and for essential construction for the protection of the bread basket of that vital State close to the Pacific in the war effort.

In the lower Mississippi Valley it provides substantially $10,000,000 for the maintenance of projects in which the Government of the United States has invested about half a billion dollars and provides for $20,000,000 for the continuance of the construction of the adopted project. If we had a major flood similar to that in 1927, where the damages were more than $400,000,000, there would be extravagance instead of the economy that is promoted here. Under the terms of the bill, we provide spending $20,000,000 in order to add about a million acres of land to the public domains of Arkansas and Louisiana by the elimination of the floodways in those States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 7, line 10, strike out all of the flood-control section to the bill and insert the following:

"Flood control, general—For the maintenance of flood control: Have Army do only what is actually necessary for maintenance of projects now started, that the appropriation for 1944–45 be curtailed, and that the unexpended balance be used for 1945–46 for maintenance only."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to offer that amendment, but the other one that is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended (33 U. S. C. 702a), including printing and binding, newspapers, lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, and for the purchase, in the fiscal year 1946 of not to exceed 50 used motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $30,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that the amendment just read by the Clerk has already been considered.

Mr. RICH. No; I offered the amendment to cut down the Mississippi River appropriation from $30,000,000 to $10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment the Clerk read has been withdrawn.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand, but my recollection is that the amendment that was just rejected provided for striking out all of the title "Flood Control" on page 7, line 10, down to and including line 16 on page 9, which would include the item that the gentleman now proposes to strike out, or amend. It should have been amended before the motion to strike was entertained.

The CHAIRMAN. The other paragraphs have not yet been read.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Without objection on the part of the committee, that amendment was considered and voted down a few minutes ago, and that amendment was to strike out the entire section on flood control.

The CHAIRMAN. We have yet to read the remaining paragraphs of that section.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I appreciate that the bill is considered by paragraphs, but I also appreciate—and I undertook to refresh my memory—that the amendment that was just voted on not only covered that paragraph but covered that part of the bill down to page 9, line 16, beginning with line 10, page 7.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The amendment sought to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania was apparently intended to be offered to a paragraph that had not been read. The Clerk has now read, however, the paragraph headed, "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries," and the amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has sought to offer should now be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. It was the purpose of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as the Chair understood, to offer an amendment to line 20 on page 8. However, he has withdrawn that amendment, and the amendment he intends to offer now has not yet been reported.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I went to the desk and read the amendment we voted on a few moments ago. The Clerk gave me the amendment, and, regardless of the gentleman's intentions, it provided for striking out all under "Flood control," beginning on page 7, line 10, and going down to and including line 16 on page 9, embracing four paragraphs, three of which had not been read, without any point of order. I was answering a long-distance telephone at the time the motion to strike was offered. That was the amendment we just voted on, and rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has been talking about the last paragraph that was read. The Clerk has now read a new paragraph, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 9, line 4, after "vehicles", strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I believe I was a member of the Committee on Flood Control way back in 1932 or 1933 when we spent fifteen or twenty million dollars on the Mississippi River. In those days that was considered a great sum. Then we started to appropriate for this river hundreds of millions of dollars, and since that time the appropriations have run into an enormous sum.

I do not want to cut down on flood control in the Mississippi River but I do want to win this war. I want to conserve the energy of every single individual and I want to conserve every single dollar that we can in order to win the war. If we are going to do that then it is necessary for us to reduce the amount on this item. We can do it because we already have spent so much money on that river that we ought to have it in pretty fair shape by this time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fine work which the gentleman from Pennsylvania did on the Committee on Flood Control. I believe I had the honor of being a member of the committee while the gentleman served on it. I am sure the gentleman has forgotten that the watershed of the Mississippi River which the gentleman is talking about covers thirty-some-odd States. The water from those thirty-and-some-odd States converges in the section which I come from. I am sure that that money is well spent.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield to the gentleman any further. I only have 5 minutes. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out some of the items contained in this bill. There is provided $100,000 for advanced planning on the Mississippi River. Why, we have been doing that for 20 years. There is no use spending money in advanced planning on the Mississippi River at this time. We must win this war. That is what I am trying to drive home to the Members. We must win the war and there is no use talking about rivers or anything else. There will not be anything left for you to talk about. May I ask the majority leader if he does not agree with me that if we do not win the war we will have nothing left in this country? I wish the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] would help me save a few dollars so that we can save this Nation of ours.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I was listening to my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania with deep interest. Inasmuch as he asks for an expression from me on this matter, may I observe that my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania is wrong in this instance and I hope he will not press his amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to cut down expenses here. There are too many men who will be used on these projects who are needed on the farms along the Mississippi River. You are going to need those very men to work on the farms, as Marvin Jones says, to raise farm produce enough to feed not only the people of our own country but to feed the people of all the nations of the world. To me it is a serious thing. We do not want floods, but if floods do come that is a chance we are taking because we need the money and the manpower to do the important job of winning the war. However, we may not have these floods and we can do this work after the war is over when we have the manpower available. I hope the Members give consideration to this one item. If you will read the report you can find lots of items that are not essential at this time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just to say, with reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and rejected, I thought I was correct when I stated it was included in the amendment previously reported, and I have verified it. The House voted previously to the motion just put, on the motion by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] which was rejected—to strike out all commencing on page 7, line 10, down to and including line 17 on page 9; so we voted on the amendment to strike out the appropriation for the Mississippi River twice, whether it was noticed or not by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. It was rejected both times.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Governor of the Panama Canal is hereby authorized to employ by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and at such rates (not to exceed $50 per day for individuals exclusive of necessary travel expenses) as he may determine, the services of architects, engineers, and other technical and professional personnel, or firms or corporations thereof, as may be necessary.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want the membership to know that it is not an easy job to get up here and criticize any appropriation bill. The Committee on Appropriations has worked over the bill and has reported it to the House. I have served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and I know how people come to that committee and ask them to put in this project for their district, or some other project for John Jones' district. We like to do favors for our friends sometimes, but you must remember this, and you can take it as coming from a poor country Congressman, the pennies make the dimes and the dimes make the dollars. I can count when I get up to a dollar. I think I have some idea what this bill means, but in the last 10 years bills have been passed through this House that none of the Members had any idea the amount of money that was involved. None of the Members knows how serious this country is if you say that all we have done in the past 10 years was the proper thing to do. None of you knows how serious it is, if you come to the realization that the things you did in getting this country into the position in which it is, passing all the bills that have been passed, when you see the trouble we find ourselves in now. I tell you Members of this House, you want a little more backbone and a little more conservatism in you if you are going to win this war and win the peace and save the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2126), making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I made this afternoon in the Committee of the Whole I may extend an article that appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times with respect to the building of the Lido Road, and also that I may insert certain excerpts from the report of the auditing committee of the General Accounting Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON] may extend his own remarks and include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader tell us what the program is for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Committee on the Judiciary intends to exercise its rights under the Calendar Wednesday rule and call up the insurance bill. I have been a little bit uncertain myself and I am glad my friend from Massachusetts asked the question so I could advise the House because we like to keep the House informed as fully as possible on the program. I talked with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] today, and he definitely told me, and I believe he also told the gentleman from Massachusetts, that it was his intention to call up the insurance bill tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He gave me that same assurance.

Mr. McCORMACK. This will mean that the calendar of committees will be called on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday. That is the best information I can give now.

I may also say that it is hopeful the Committee on Rules in the wisdom of its members will tomorrow report out a rule—and I hope it is an open rule, but a rule anyway—on the George bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am sorry I cannot share the sentiments of the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I appreciate what prompts him to make that statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. But in disagreement we each respect the other's views. If a rule is reported out on the George bill, it will come up on Thursday.

If the George bill is disposed of on Thursday, I hope to call up the Commodity Credit bill on Friday of this week and dispose of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the river and harbor bill coming up?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not until next week. The early part of next week there will be an appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Am I right in understanding that a rule has already been granted on the Commodity Credit bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; the rule is on the river and harbor bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two articles from two separate newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances in the Appendix; in one to include a statement on the Mexican Water Treaty and how it will affect the United States; and in the other, a letter dealing with beach erosion in southern California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from a registered nurse on the subject of the drafting of nurses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk tomorrow and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a couple of news articles, and I also ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHY WE MUST ARREST THE SPANISH CONSUL GENERAL TO MANILA, JOSE DEL CASTANO, AND TRY HIM AS AN AXIS WAR CRIMINAL

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, while the American armies of liberation were freeing Manila, the editors of the New York Post published an editorial called The Charge Is Murder. This editorial must not remain without notice by this House. It declares, and I quote it in its entirety:

THE CHARGE IS MURDER

Presumably our troops, fighting from street to street in Manila, are rounding up fifth columnists, of which Manila has a number. If so, we have a name for them to look up, provided they can get State Department permission.

The name is Jose del Castano. The charge is murder.

Señor del Castano was named consul general from the Fascist Government of Spain to the government of the Philippines with the approval of our State Department.

As Franco's chief in the Philippines, Del Castano, according to the authoritative study by Allan Chase of the Falange, organized a Fascist army of 10,000, then had the members join the civil emergency administration as air-raid wardens. This was in 1941.

The pay-off came during Manila's first big air raid. Most of the sirens never sounded, loyal wardens were found dead at their posts. Confusion and fifth-column activity was so great that the United States Army disavowed any further relations with the civil emergency administration.

When the Japs marched in, Del Castano, says Congressman COFFEE, prepared a list of dangerous Americans for the conquerors. The Japs killed everyone on the list.

We don't know how to get Del Castano. He has a diplomatic passport and had, at one time, the approval of our State Department.

The Department should take action to get him out of Manila. But it cannot confine itself to his removal. He should be tried as a war criminal. For he killed Americans as surely as though he had pulled the trigger.

The facts about Del Castano and his crimes against the American people are not a secret to this House. Again and again, since June 1943, I have risen on this floor to tell you about the role of this Axis war criminal against the United States.

For the RECORD, I would like briefly to summarize the facts in the Del Castano scandal.

On November 3, 1940, Jose del Castano, chief of the National Delegation of the Falange Exterior—or the overseas division of the German-run Falange Party of Spain—was appointed Spanish consul general to Manila. Twenty-four hours later, the official newspaper of the Falange in Madrid, Arriba, published the

official announcement that Jose del Castano had also been named chief of the Philippines cells of the Spanish Falange. A veteran leader of the Falange—the Spanish branch of the Nazi Party—Del Castano had long taken orders from Gen. Wilhelm von Faupel and the other Nazi officers who really control the Falange.

At the same time that Del Castano was sent to Manila, the Nazi-Falange Spanish Government also sent Genaro Riestra to Habana as consul general. Riestra was just as important in the Falange as Del Castano, but Cuba was more alert to the Falangist menace than we were. Within 60 days of his arrival in Habana, Riestra was thrown out of Cuba—thanks to a courageous campaign led by Senator Augustin Cruz, and to the determination of the Cuban Government to stamp out falangism.

In Manila, Falange leader Del Castano was to suffer no such indignities. He built up the Falange, and, when Manila broke diplomatic relations with Germany, Italy, and Japan, on June 18, 1941, Del Castano took over their official duties in the Philippines. The Spanish Consulate, under Del Castano, became the clearing house for all Axis confidential messages.

As the war crisis rose, Del Castano sent his Falangist followers into the civilian-defense services. They did their job well—for the Falangist Axis motherland. How well they did it can be judged from the fact that on January 5, 1942, at a meeting of the Falange in Granada, Spain, the Japanese Imperial Government presented to the Philippine section of the Falange a decoration for its aid in the capture of Manila.

To us the attack upon Pearl Harbor and Manila was a crime against decency. But to the official organ of the Falange Party—which Del Castano heads in the Philippines—the Japanese triumphs were omens of good. Let me quote again from Arriba, the official paper of Franco's Falange, on the subject of Pearl Harbor and Manila:

> The ancient and renowned culture of the magnificent oriental empire, and its exceptional human values, are shown in the important victories of the first days—victories that have won for Japan—the admiration of the world.

Shortly after the Japs occupied Manila all the foreign consuls in the city were herded into one room by the Japanese military authorities. The Japs asked them each to prepare a list of Americans they considered most dangerous to the Axis. The only diplomat in that room who consented—and consented is, I assure you, the wrong word—who consented to prepare such a list for the Japs was Jose del Castano. Need I describe for you the tragic fate of every American named on Del Castano's list who was subsequently caught by the same Japs whose "exceptional human values" had the admiration of Del Castano's Falange?

All of these facts are known to our Government in great detail. I do not doubt but that they are also known to the intelligence officers attached to General MacArthur's staff in Manila. But, how can we expect the American military authorities in Manila to arrest Jose del Castano when that murderer is protected by his diplomatic immunity?

Our State Department must immediately declare Jose del Castano to be persona non grata. This will clear the way for the American military authorities in Manila to arrest and hold for a speedy trial a Fascist who has on his hands the blood of thousands of Americans.

We must act quickly. As long as he is allowed to move freely about Manila, as long as he can send messages by coded cables and by coded phone calls to the Spanish terminal of the Berlin-Tokyo-Madrid Axis—for just that long will the American dead on Bataan go unavenged, and the living in Manila remain menaced.

There is another vital reason for speed in dealing with del Castano. In 2 weeks the conference of the American republics opens in Mexico City. Every democratic republic south of our borders is seething with fear and hatred of Falangist Axis Spain.

In brave little Guatemala, one of the first things the new liberal Government did after ridding its people of their own tyrant was to break diplomatic relations with Nazi-Falange Spain.

In Chile, in Cuba, in Colombia, in Uruguay, and in many other Latin countries the delegates to the forthcoming conference of American nations are now weighing the pleas of great portions of their peoples that they speak out in favor of an all-hemispheric diplomatic break with the Nazi-Falange regime of Franco.

The people of Latin America are sick to the death of the squadrons of del Castanos who enjoy diplomatic immunity to undermine freedom and democracy from Manila to Panama to Montevideo. They have seen how other del Castanos helped bring fascism to Argentina and Bolivia. They want desperately to rid the American republics of Hitler stooges who bear Spanish diplomatic passports.

The complete story of Jose del Castano's treachery in Manila has been well known in Latin America for the past 2 years. It has been published in books, magazines, and newspapers of wide circulation in every Spanish-speaking republic of this hemisphere. Today, as the Japanese armies so admired by Franco and the Falange are driven out of Manila, the democratic people of Latin America must of necessity look upon Jose del Castano's head as the barometer of our sincerity in this war against fascism.

Falangism, spread via the diplomatically immune offices of the Spanish foreign office, is the chief Fascist threat in Latin America. Let us arrest and bring to justice the Axis war criminal, Del Castano, before the Mexico City conference opens, and the delegates will know that at long last we have stopped handling the Spanish section of the Berlin-Tokyo-Madrid Axis with the silk gloves of appeasement.

In the name of those who were stabbed in the back by the Falange when the Philippines fell to the Japs 3 years ago, in the name of simple justice, in the name of our moral prestige as the leader of democracy in the Western Hemisphere, I call for quick action by the State Department in the matter of the Axis war criminal, Jose del Castano.

The charge is murder.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the New York Times on February 9, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, antiracial bias has again raised its ugly head. It seems that in spite of the fact that we are now engaged in a life and death struggle against the forces of evil in this world and against the philosophy of hatred, our own country is not free from antiracial activities. The free spirit of America which taught the whole world to admire and respect the liberty of the individual is sometimes insufficient to teach our own people how to rid itself of this insidious poison.

It would surely be a calamity of the worst kind if this war which is waged to destroy fascism and nazi-ism throughout the world shall not result in the destruction of such ideologies at home.

Here in our own House of Representatives we had the unfortunate spectacle of a Member of this House throwing anti-Semitic utterances into the face of another Member. Such a spectacle is not conducive to good feeling and surely will not help to eradicate antiracial bias from our midst.

It is with great reluctance that I am again obliged to call attention to an unfortunate attempt to inject bias into American eductaion.

Some years ago a great deal of time was consumed in discussing conditions prevailing in our medical schools where many a promising young man would not be permitted to enter because he was Jewish or because he was Negro or because he was of Italian extraction or of the Roman Catholic faith.

It is so contrary to the spirit of America, that words are inadequate to express the utter abhorrence all right-thinking citizens must feel to see our country involved by such foreign ideologies. If, as a result of the recent action of the American Dental Association, there will come a clear appreciation among the people of the United States as to what constitutes racial bias and how bigotry is to be doomed wherever it appears, perhaps some good will come out of this unfortunate situation.

Now, let us look at the facts.

It seems that the secretary of the American Dental Association, who, it is now said, acted on his own responsibility and was not authorized to do so by any responsible organization, sent a letter to Columbia University and New York University, two large educational institutions in the city of New York, in which he made a subtle suggestion that in view of the fact that the student body of both

schools is predominantly of one racial strain, it would be in the best interests of the United States to do something about it by establishing quotas for entering students based on their national extraction.

Such a statement, of course, is as irresponsible as one would wish to make it. It is irresponsible because it gives no facts, no figures, and is based on the scientifically discredited racial theories of the Nazis.

After all, our educational institutions are, or should be, open to everybody. Nobody can complain that a so-called white Anglo-Saxon American who wishes to obtain a professional education anywhere in the United States is ever denied admission to any school. Our schools are open to those persons who belong to the favored racial group at any and all times. Our schools will go out of their way to cater to such people and if a particular school will have a larger number of people belonging to another racial group, it is simply because there are not enough Anglo-Saxon whites who wish to take advantage of the educational institutions which are open to them. As a matter of fact, the same argument could be made with reference to the charge that was made on this floor that a large percentage of doctors in the armed forces or in the veterans' hospitals are of Jewish origin. If such is the case, it is because a large percentage of Jewish doctors have seen fit to give their services to our armed forces or our veterans' hospitals, which can only inure to the credit of these doctors and should not be used as a means of attacking the profession.

In the same category would also be the statement that there are many prospective Jewish students of medicine and dentistry. If such is the case, it simply means that many people of Jewish origin are imbued with a desire to study these branches of professional work, for the benefit of the people of this country, irrespective of their national or racial origin.

Are not we all Americans? Does it really make any difference of what racial strain an American might be if he is honest, law-abiding, and has the qualifications to attend our educational institutions?

No true American should propose discrimination against any particular group. Quite the opposite. What we should do is to open up the doors of our institutions to all groups and not inquire about their racial or religious origin. The Civil Service of the United States, for instance, has a special provision forbidding any inquiry of any applicant as to his racial or religious affiliation. Should not the same rule apply to educational institutions which are open to the public and which can derive their value only in the measure in which they are supported by the public?

The insidious feature of the proposal of the American Dental Association's secretary was the suggestion that there should be a sort of Government subsidy based on the racial origin of the candidates for admission to dental schools.

This, of course, would have spelled an end to America as a country of freedom and liberty to all. It would have put America precisely on the same basis as the many European countries which were torn apart by their being split up into racial or religious minorities.

If we are going to split up the United States into a conglomeration of discordant races and groups, we shall accomplish exactly what Hitler expected us to become, a broken-up country, disunited and impotent in every way. May God preserve us from such a fate.

The educators have long known that discrimination in admission to colleges and professional schools has been a practice indulged by many institutions. This practice, however, is something that we should be ashamed of and not try to write into law.

It was in the spirit of putting an end to this type of discrimination which has been practiced for many years in our medical schools that I introduced a bill in the last Congress as well as in the present one to institute a system of medical training in the Public Health Service in the United States, by way of medical academies, on the style of West Point and Annapolis.

It is in the same spirit that it became necessary for various State legislatures to enact statutes forbidding discrimination in the schools and colleges of their respective States.

There was a time when this discrimination existed only with reference to a teaching body, and many a distinguished scientist could not find a place in a college or professional school, simply because he was not of the proper racial origin or religion, but discrimination usually feeds upon itself and once started there is never any end to it, and so, instead of discarding it in the various faculties, it became enlarged by including the student body as well.

In a very interesting article in the New York Times, this situation is gone into at some length and I wish to include this article of February 9, 1945, and make it a part of my remarks:

EDUCATORS FIGHT COLLEGE QUOTAS — ASK ROOSEVELT TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL FAIR EDUCATION PRACTICE COMMITTEE

(By Benjamin Fine)

Spurred on by the report of the Council on Dental Education concerning admission of dental students, educational leaders joined yesterday in requesting President Roosevelt to establish a National Fair Education Practice Committee to help eliminate quotas and other forms of racial and religious discriminations in the Nation's colleges, it was learned yesterday.

Sponsoring the request are the Department of Higher Education and the Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education, divisions of the National Education Association, and the education division of the Independent Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The National Education Association has a teacher membership in excess of 300,000.

Denouncing the action of Dr. Harlan H. Horner, secretary of the American Dental Association's education council, who recommended to the Columbia and New York University Dental Schools a quota policy for student's admissions based on racial origins, the educators, in a telegram to the President, said that this move demonstrated the need for a national committee to study the entire field of college and university admission practices.

The statement was signed by Dr. Alonzo F. Myers, chairman of the department of higher education at New York University, and chairman of the education committee of the Independent Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions; Dr. Ralph McDonald, executive secretary of the department of higher education, National Education Association, and Dr. Donald DuShane, secretary of the Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education.

AID OF PUBLIC IS SEEN

A "capable and distinguished national committee," the educators declared, would get the cooperation of most colleges and accrediting bodies through force of public opinion without need for legislative action. If necessary, the expenses of the committee would be met through contributions of individuals and groups interested in abolishing intolerance and discrimination, the wire to President Roosevelt said.

Although the immediate point of departure was the recent report of the dental association, it is known that a number of educational organizations and civic groups had been planning to ask President Roosevelt for the formation of an antidiscrimination committee for education before the current controversy broke. Several meetings have been held in the last month looking toward the establishment of a proper formula to start the machinery rolling.

A charge was brought by the educational groups that racial and religious discrimination is now taking place in relation to returning servicemen seeking education under the G. I. bill of rights. Under this measure the veteran is entitled to 4 years of free college training and is to receive from $50 to $75 maintenance, while his tuition, if $500 or less, is paid by the Government.

"Certainly it is reasonable to expect that they must not be thwarted by quotas and other forms of racial and religious discrimination," Dr. Myers declared. "But that is exactly what they will encounter unless something is done about it now. Indeed, some have already encountered it. Every college and university should adopt and announce a forthright policy against discrimination."

Educators have long known that discrimination in admission to colleges and professional schools is common practice rather than the exception, Dr. Myers said, adding that it is practiced in some State universities. He condemned as a "Nazi practice" the establishment of quotas for the number of Jews to be admitted to medical, dental, or law schools.

I still believe that my bill to establish military academies for the training of doctors will go a long way toward eliminating prejudice in medical schools, and if the people of this country will realize how obnoxious discrimination can become public opinion will force the elimination of this poison from our midst.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follow:

S. 211. An act or the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11, 12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 214. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange and Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York; to the Committee of Military Affairs.

S. 374. An act to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 338. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protesting the allotments of producers of cotton, wheat, and peanuts.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, February 14, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a meeting on Wednesday, February 14, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 59.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, February 14, 1945, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia. The hearing will be held in room 362 (caucus room), Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing beginning at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, February 14, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 97) to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (with respect to certain patent matters). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, February 14, 1945.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the post-war ship-disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 20, 1945, to begin public hearings on H. R. 693—a bill to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

207. A letter from the Secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

208. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting her twelfth annual report as Secretary of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

209. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

210. A letter from the national commandant, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting a copy of proceedings of its seventh annual reunion held at Kenosha, Wis., June 1, 2, 3, 4, 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 131. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses to Eleanor Fisher, sister of Flora L. Shelton, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 29. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEFAUVER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 60. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs House Resolution 37. Resolution expressing the approval of the House of Representatives of certain resolutions adopted at Santiago, Chile, on April 15, 1944, looking toward the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1531. A bill to provide for the control of confidential business data submitted to the War Production Board; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 98. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of fire-cure cured and dark air-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; with amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1527. A bill to exempt the members of the Advisory Board appointed under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 312. An act for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 315. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 317. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 335. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; without amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. S. 410. An act for the relief of Marino Bello; without amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 949. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 952. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 958. A bill for the relief of Joe Koor; with amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1034. A bill for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion;

with amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1058. A bill for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; without amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1230. A bill for the relief of Donna May McNulty; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1263. A bill for the relief of E. E. Armstrong; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1308. A bill for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1325. A bill for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer; without amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1396. A bill for the relief of Anne Loacker; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Henry B. Tucker; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1536. A bill for the relief of the Fidelity & Casualty Co., and the Baugh Chemical Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1546. A bill for the relief of C. Y. Webb; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1793. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; with amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1837. A bill for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1841. A bill for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of Mauger Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Anna Mattil and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Frank Lore and Elizabeth Vidotto; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1949. A bill for the compensation of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2055. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2063. A bill for the relief of Peter Paul Bacic, Charles C. Cox, H. Forest Haugh, and Luther M. Durst; with amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1566. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Siegfried Olsen Shipping Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2133. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2134. A bill to confer upon the Governor of Alaska the power to pardon and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against laws of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 2135. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2136. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to locate, establish, construct, equip, and operate a hospital for the insane of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 2137 (by request). A bill to authorize the sale, exchange, or other disposition of certain securities held by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2138. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2139. A bill to authorize the completion, by the use of Lanham Act funds, of hospital projects initiated by the Works Progress Administration and the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2140. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment furnished by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2141. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment furnished by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOCH:

H. R. 2142. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to authorize the construction of a national system of foot trails; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2143. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to reopen the eminent-domain case of the city of Cape May, N. J., against the United States, No. E-618, and to correct the constitutional errors therein, if any, by an additional judgment against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 2144. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Jefferson County, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2145. A bill to authorize investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in the breeding and production of domestic rabbits, cooperation with Federal, State, and other agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2146. A bill to amend section 33 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide that the payments for counties provided therein shall be distributed by the treasurer of said counties; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2147. A bill to prohibit the employment of alien seamen; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 2148. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment furnished by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 2149. A bill to provide for recognition of active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol as veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2150. A bill to provide eligibility for pension, if otherwise entitled thereto, to the widow of any deceased veteran, if married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death or if she gave birth to a child by the veteran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2151. A bill to repeal the act establishing daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 2152. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2153. A bill to incorporate the American Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 132. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the effect which wartime conditions and regulations have had on the three Pacific Coast States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 133. Resolution requesting information from the Alien Property Custodian as to ownership and control of J. M. Lehmann Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. Res. 134. Resolution to investigate the question of effective legal protection for property and proprietary rights and ownership in original thoughts, conceptions, and ideas in art, literature, science, mechanics, and the pure and useful arts; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps immediately to return the United States to standard time and abolish daylight-saving time by terminating the War Act of January 20, 1942 (ch.

7, 56 Stat. 9); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass the McCarran-Sumners bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2154. A bill for the relief of John W. Magee; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence V. Magee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2156. A bill for the relief of Lee Harrison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 2157. A bill for the relief of Margaret Redmond; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2158. A bill for the relief of the Cowden Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2159. A bill for the relief of Clem H. Congdon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2160. A bill for the relief of John J. Gall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 2161. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine and render judgment upon the claims of Algernon Blair, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2162. A bill for the relief of Walter Mark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN:

H. R. 2163. A bill for the relief of Teresa Tine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2164. A bill for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2165. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C No. 13, in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2166. A bill for the relief of Barbara Jean Tillman and Elizabeth Ann Tillman, minor daughters of Franz Tillman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2167. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Orvis Welch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAYFIEL:

H. R. 2168. A bill for the relief of Charles Zucker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2169. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Zucker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2170. A bill for the relief of Morris Zucker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2171. A bill for the relief of Solomon Schtiernman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2172. A bill for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

77. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition signed by 68 representative citizens of Metropolis, Ill., and surrounding community, expressing their opposition to any legislation designed to enforce compulsory military training in the United States in peacetime; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

78. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of J. Walter Hammond, president, Texas Farm Bureau Federation, favoring House bill 1690; to the Committee on Agriculture.

79. By Mr. RICH: Resolution unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of the sixteenth district caucus of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, held in the Borough of Jersey Shore, Pa., on January 16, 1945, urging the passage of certain amendments to the G. I. bill of rights; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, mightiest among the mighty and purest among the pure, we pray that today we may dedicate ourselves to a mission of ministry, and that our decisions may be wise, our vision broad, and our brotherhood loyal. In the serious affairs of our homes and business, in the halls of education, and in our relaxations of amusements, in all our ways, be Thou with us in the shared presence of Thy blessing.

Dark and hoary evils challenge and are in conflict with our most holy faith. Do Thou purge this warring world of its corruption, banish its degrading vices, and transform its channels by the purifying fires of religion. Forbid that the more fortunate should settle into the ashes of unconcern, but rather be torch bearers and preservatives against moral decay until the hierarchy of evil spirits is no more. Our Father, we bring our prayer before Thee as incense in glad obeisance and in the pouring forth of the devout appeal of our hearts. On this day of penitence, reinforce in us the essential attributes of love, purity, and mercy, and Thine shall be the glory. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Ivy W. Duggan, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, on December 12, 1944. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer stating that the extension will take 2½ pages and will cost $130. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be printed.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on shipping construction and to include therein a letter from Admiral Land and a summary from the Maritime Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article from the Washington Daily News of February 13 regarding the Chicago labor plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley before the Advertising Club of New York commemorating the thirty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CARE

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROE of Maryland addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Superintendent of Public Health in connection with the physically fit program. I have consulted the Printer, and I am told his statement will require two-thirds more space than is allowed and will cost $138.80. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding, the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter which I received from retired railroad workers in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONGRESS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, House Resolution 37.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses its approval of the following resolutions looking toward the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress which were adopted on April 15, 1944, at Santiago, Chile, at a session attended by a committee of the House of Deputies of Chile and by the parliamentary delegations of a number of countries of the Western Hemisphere (including the delegation representing this House) which met in such city for the celebration of the Day of the Americas:

1. The parliamentary delegations of Peru, Uruguay, Colombia, the United States, Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, and Chile agree to promote through their respective Parliaments a movement of continental unity;

2. To accomplish such project, they proposed the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress for which the delegates will solicit the approval of their respective Parliaments;

3. To set up a permanent committee composed of the chairmen of the attending delegations, presided over by Don Pedro Castelblanco, President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile, for the purpose of organizing and fixing the time, place, and subject matter of the Interparliamentary Congress of America;

4. To communicate those resolutions to all the countries on the American Continents and invite the countries whose Parliaments were not represented to adhere to these resolutions.

Therefore the Permanent Committee to Promote American Unity Through the Parliaments, and in compliance with the third resolution, is constituted as follows: President, Pedro Castelblanco, of Chile; and members, Messrs. Luis Carlos Mese, of Colombia; Jose Albertassi Munoz, of Costa Rica; Jose Erasmo Pacheco, of El Salvador; Pete Jarman, of the United States; Carlos F. Madrazo, of Mexico; Carlos Morales, of Nicaragua; Roberto Jimenez, of Panama; Carlos Sayan Alverez, of Peru; and Luis Batlle Berres, of Uruguay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. JARMAN. I shall be delighted to explain it for the benefit of the minority leader and the House. As the gentleman will remember, last year the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile invited the members of all other parliamentary American republics to participate in a celebration of Pan-American Day, or the Day of the Americas, as they call it, in the Chamber of Deputies of Chile in Santiago on April 14. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] and I were designated to represent the United States on that occasion. On the following day the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile invited all the delegates to participate in an informal round-the-table discussion looking toward the creation and continuation of pan-American unity. At that informal discussion the resolution which has just been read was adopted, with the understanding that we would all report it to our respective Houses of Representatives or Chambers of Deputies and request the approval of these legislative bodies of the resolution.

It will be noted that the resolution authorizes no appropriation and does not create a pan-American organization. It simply creates a committee for the purpose of arranging therefor. The State Department has surveyed this very carefully; its report indicates that further legislation will be necessary before anything except the approval of the idea can occur.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This amendment, then, is merely approval of the idea. I understand the reason for its coming up now by unanimous consent is that another pan-American meeting is to be held next week.

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], who will attend that meeting, to answer that question. It is at his request that the matter is called up this morning by unanimous consent.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, this is merely an expression of approval on the part of the House. It is not legislation in any sense of the word, it is merely a House resolution which expresses the belief that it would be a wise thing if we had a parliamentary union of the Americas only.

The reason I thought it desirable that this resolution be passed by the House now is that next Wednesday there will be a meeting of the American republics, and this would be an expression of good will on the part of the House. It does not bind us to any action, but is an expression that we favor the idea.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose we passed this resolution and then invited the representatives of these American republics and their staffs to come to Washington; would the O. D. T. tell this meeting just like they have the churches that they cannot convene if their number exceeds 50? Has the gentleman thought of that?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Let me say to the gentleman that that is a highly hypothetical case. This interparliamentary body would not be created by legislation until after the war and then everybody will travel whenever and wherever he wants to.

Mr. RICH. But if you do not stop the things you are doing in this country you will have a dictator by that time, and nothing under the heavens will stop it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I do not agree with the gentleman; I have heard that speech before.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House that this resolution, House Resolution 37, was approved unanimously by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I have long favored the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress to consider the specific problems of the Western Hemisphere. We of the New World might well take the lead in calling together representatives of the parliaments of all the countries on the American continent to discuss and study the problems with which we will be confronted in the post-war world.

All this resolution does is express approval of this idea that representatives of the various legislative bodies of the Americas be brought together at some future suitable date. By so doing I firmly believe that we can consolidate the ties of understanding and confraternity among the American republics.

It is not too early to strive to bring about ever increasing cooperation and mutual assistance between the American republics.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the Member yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I have one or two questions I wish to ask. In the first place I should like to know why these duties cannot be performed by the Pan American Union? Why set up an interparliamentary body to do what the Pan American Union, already established, is supposed to do? And this new interparliamentary union would embrace only a portion of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. JARMAN. In the first place, we are not setting up a parliamentary body. In the second place, the other body of this Congress is not considered in this matter at all; this is what might be called a matter for the consideration of the so-called lower House. Should we say the "upper House" is not concerned with this?

Mr. RANKIN. No; it is not the upper House; it is the other body.

Mr. JARMAN. The other body. At any rate, this is a matter of the House of Representatives or Chambers of Deputies of the parliamentary American republics.

I call the gentleman's attention further to the fact that there are members of the Pan American Union who have no Houses of Representatives and who were not invited to this and will not participate.

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to get to that question next. I notice you did not refer to Canada. The Canadian Government not only has a parliament but there are various states or provinces of the Dominion which have parliaments. I am much more interested, to be perfectly frank with the gentleman, in maintaining a closer liaison with Canada than with almost any country in the world,

and I make that statement advisedly. I notice Canada is not even included here.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Answering that question, I may say the gentleman overlooks the fact that the 21 American republics have not included Canada because of Canada's connection with the British Empire. I would say to the gentleman further that it is being considered and suggestions have been made and may be worked out whereby Canada will become a part of it.

Mr. RANKIN. In answer to the Member from Texas, that is one of the reasons why we should be careful about these things. In 1925 a document was signed by the Premiers of the various Dominions of the British Commonwealth of Nations declaring their independence—and I refer to Canada, South Africa, New Zealand, Australia, and so forth. They are subject to no compulsion whatever. If we are going into a parliamentary union of the American governments, there is no reason whatsoever why Canada should not be included to begin with, and, in my opinion, there is every reason why she should be included, because Canada is all American, she is right here at our border, she has our system of parliamentary procedure, and the people of Canada speak our language. For all time to come we are going to have to maintain the closest possible relations with Canada.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Before legislation is passed creating this organization, if it is created, the suggestion the gentleman has made will have had time to be considered.

Mr. RANKIN. Some of these countries in Central and South America do not have any parliaments at all. Brazil does not have any parliament. She abolished both houses of her congress. There may be other countries in South America that have no parliaments. So that it seems to me we ought to proceed rather carefully in setting up an organization of this kind.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. We are not setting it up now. This is just an approval of the idea.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand. The idea is supposed to bear fruit later.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Maybe.

Mr. RANKIN. I know a good deal about the parliaments and the alleged parliaments in those countries. I want to register my protest now against setting up any such organization at this time or in the near future that does not include Canada.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. This is a very salutary movement that has been presented by the two very distinguished gentlemen of the House of Representatives from Alabama and Illinois. Some 3 years ago I had the privilege as a member of an official committee of this body of traveling to certain Latin-American states. We were invited onto the floor of the chamber of deputies of two such states. We were welcomed very happily. Reply was made in the Spanish language by the Honorable Richard M. Kleberg, of Texas, who speaks Spanish perfectly. We were all convinced at that time that if there was a closer communion of fellowship and spirit between the chambers of deputies of these Latin-American republics and the House of Representatives of the United States of North America many of our differences, if there be any, could be straightened out and solved with very great expedition and happy results. We were also convinced that the greatest barrier to common understanding is our failure each to learn the other's language. I hope that when the proposed arrangements are made that Members of this House who speak either Spanish or Portuguese may be appointed to attend meetings of the Pan American Union, and that, meantime, each of us here will qualify by studying either or both of these great languages. I salute the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Illinois for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I hope that it will go forward expeditiously.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse the statement made by the gentleman from California and to say that I think this is a very commendable move. It seems to me that the world for too long has been limiting its international relationships to the executives of sovereign governments. I think anybody who studies the pages of history will discover that the record has not been too successful. It may develop it is not too successful today. I hope that in the post-war world, not only in the Americas but in other countries where they have legitimate and effective parliamentary bodies, we can increasingly conduct international relationships on a parliamentary level instead of only on the executive level. Certainly, parliamentary participation in these relationships cannot conceivably produce more gory pages of history than the centuries-old record created by the executive domination of this field.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Alabama one more question in order to get this proposition straightened out? This resolution provides for inviting the other American countries to join in this movement.

Mr. JARMAN. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN. Does that include Canada?

Mr. JARMAN. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the Member from Alabama accept an amendment that we also include Canada and have it understood that you will invite Canada?

Mr. JARMAN. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we cannot on the floor of this House amend the resolution that was passed in Santiago on last April 15. This resolution simply proposes to approve the resolution which was passed then.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but I think we ought to include Canada, and have it understood here and now that Canada, so far as we are concerned, will be invited to join.

Mr. JARMAN. I disagree with the gentleman's opinion that this is the occasion to decide that ticklish question.

Mr. RANKIN. I think we might just as well decide it as to Canada as to be deciding it for all of these Central and South American countries.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman can conceive of no difference between Canada and the other British Dominions and Chile, can he?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; there is a difference but the difference is in Canada's favor.

Mr. JARMAN. I have no desire to engage in a controversy with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not want this resolution to go through unless it is provided that Canada is to be invited to join.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Let me say to the gentleman that this resolution is merely to express approval of the idea.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. When the legislation comes before the House, if it does come, that will be the proper time——

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman permit me to answer his statement? Personally I believe it would be very fine to have Canada included, and I think that that might be worked out, but this resolution cannot be changed now because it is an endorsement of a resolution that has already been adopted.

Mr. RANKIN. The Member from Texas is wrong. This resolution is introduced in the Congress of the United States by the gentleman—the Member from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN]. I am going to call you Members from now on in order not to have any more confusion of tongues. But it also provides that we communicate this resolution to all of the countries on the American Continent and invite the countries whose parliaments were not represented to adhere to this resolution. Now we are asked to pass this resolution by unanimous consent. What I want to do, if Canada is not covered, is to include in this resolution the words "including the Dominion of Canada."

Mr. JARMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon but he does not understand the resolution, astute though he may be on all such matters.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; I have read it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object. I want the gentleman from Mississippi to be sure about this thing.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

CONTESTED ELECTIONS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter which I addressed on February 12 to one of my colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, comparatively recently a private citizen in Virginia has entered upon a course of conduct claiming he is contesting the seats of, I believe, 71 Members of the House of Representatives. A colleague of mine the other day asked me to make some examination and write him a letter. I made that examination and have written him the following letter:

FEBRUARY 12, 1945.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Supplementing the statement made to you over the telephone this morning with reference to notice to appear and give testimony in proceeding by Moss A. Plunkett, of Roanoke, Va., representing himself as contesting your right to a seat in the House of Representatives, beg to advise that I have looked over a copy of the paper served upon you and other Members of the House of Representatives, including myself, and have also made some examination of chapter 7, title 2, of the United States Code, which deals with the subject of contested elections.

The House of Representatives, under the Constitution, of course, is sovereign and independent with reference to the determination of the election and the qualification of its own Members. No act of Congress could, in the slightest degree, affect the exclusiveness of power of the House of Representatives to determine with reference to those who are entitled to be a part of its membership.

Section 7 of title 2 referred to therefore is merely an act of comity on the part of the Congress for the purpose of aiding the House of Representatives to whatever degree the House of Representatives may see fit to avail itself thereof. But this alleged contestant, Moss A. Plunkett, does not even come within the provision of this title.

Section 226, the last section of chapter 7, title 2, referred to, contains these words as the first part of the first sentence:

"No contestee or contestant for a seat in the House of Representatives shall be paid exceeding $2,000 for expenses in election contests."

The contest contemplated by the Congress in which it sought to give aid by statute is a contest by a "contestant" and "contestee," "for a seat in the House of Representatives."

Even if this language were not incorporated in the statute, common sense and public necessity would preclude any notion that the Congress intended to put it within the power of any person so disposed to institute proceedings to oust many persons who happen to be Members of Congress, and require them to turn aside from the discharge of their public duties to appear and give testimony at the summons of such a person who had not even been a candidate for Congress and who could not therefore be a "contestant for a seat in the Congress."

It seems to me to be not only the right, but the duty, of the Members of the House against whom this proceeding has been attempted, not to turn aside from the discharge of their official duties to give attention in the slightest degree to that which the said Plunkett is attempting.

Sincerely yours,

HATTON W. SUMNERS.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman advise the House how, in his opinion, this unreasonable situation should be met?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. By paying no attention to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, following up what the Member from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], the very able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, has said, I want to call attention to the fact these radicals who are attempting to harass Members of Congress about this matter have not a leg to stand on. They really are acting in contempt of the House, and in contempt of the Senate, because they have attempted to subpena Senators, as well as Members of the House.

This question has been thrashed out before. The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution provided that where certain people were denied the right to vote in any State, representation from such State should be proportionately reduced.

Mr. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, calls attention to the fact that it means when they are denied such rights by State laws or acts done under State authority.

But, as Mr. Blaine also points out, the fifteenth amendment states that no such law shall be passed, and as he says, that to all intents and purposes wiped out that section of the fourteenth amendment.

If there is anything wrong with the State law, the place to contest it is in the courts. If there is anything wrong with a Member's right to sit in this House, the place to contest it is before a committee of the House, by a resolution introduced in the House by the person who is directly affected.

So these attempts to harass the Members of the House and Senate are simply in contempt of both Houses, and as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. SUMNERS] said, they should be ignored.

CONSIDERATION OF INSURANCE BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Committee on the Judiciary will exercise its privileges under the Calendar Wednesday rule, and, as I understand, the insurance bill will be called up. I take this brief period to advise the Members of the House, and particularly the new Members, as to the situation.

If the bill called up is on the House Calendar, there will be 1 hour of debate on it. If it is on the Union Calendar, the bill will be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and there will be 2 hours of general debate, the time being equally divided and controlled by the Member in charge on the majority side of the committee and by the ranking minority Member present of the committee.

However, the latter situation will not obtain in the consideration of the bill that will be called up later. That bill will be called up and be considered under the rules of the House, and the Member in charge of the bill can at the end of an hour move the previous question. If the previous question is ordered, of course, that eliminates any opportunity for amendments to be offered to the bill and eliminates the possibility of debate upon such amendments.

I simply call this to the attention of the Members so they will have the situation in mind. Of course, the time for debate will be under the control of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary or the member in charge. I see that the gentleman has risen, and I yield to him.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest for the information of the House and for the information of the leader that if we have time this afternoon we have another bill, the reorganization bill, that we should like to have considered under this clause of the rules.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman says that it will be impossible to offer amendments, but if the motion for the previous question is voted down it will be possible to offer amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose is to advise the House as to the situation without expressing my own position. Of course, if the previous question is voted down, then the situation is entirely different. Then a Member who is recognized thereafter to offer an amendment will have the floor for 1 hour and will have control of the time during that period. Therefore, the gentleman's statement, as I understood him, is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand it, this is to be taken up under the Calendar Wednesday rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; under the Calendar Wednesday rule. But the bill being on the House Calendar and not on the Union Calendar, it will be considered under the regular rules of the House and not in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN. When it is disposed of, the next committee will be called, I presume, under the Calendar Wednesday rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that if the committee has another bill to call up, it would be in order. But I would not want to undertake to state just what will be called up.

Mr. RANKIN. What I am trying to get at is, you are not dispensing with Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; we are not dispensing with Calendar Wednesday. It is quite probable that the Committee on

the Judiciary will answer the call and the first bill will be the insurance bill. I have risen at this time to advise the House of the unusual circumstances under which it will be brought up, and that the Member in charge will have control of the time and that at the end of an hour he can move the previous question, which will preclude the offering of amendments. In order for the offering of amendments to be in order, the previous question would have to be voted down.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the committees, and when the Committee on the Judiciary was called:

REGULATION OF INSURANCE BUSINESS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I call up the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill and the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

(b) No act of Congress, except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress, until June 1, 1947, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance, or to acts in the conduct of such business, and until January 1, 1948, the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall not apply to such business or to acts in the conduct thereof.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

SEC. 6. As used in this act, the term "State" includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

"SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

"(b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

"SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

"SEC. 4. (a) Until January 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct thereof.

"(b) Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

"SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or the act of June 5, 1920, known as the Merchant Marine Act, 1920.

"SEC. 6. As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 7. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. WALTER. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 17]

Anderson, Calif.	Brumbaugh	Combs
Biemiller	Cannon, Fla.	Courtney
Bolton	Clevenger	De Lacy
Boren	Colmer	Dondero
Eaton	Lyle	Shafer
Elston	McGregor	Sheridan
Fernandez	McMillan, S. C.	Short
Gardner	Madden	Sikes
Gwinn, N. Y.	Morgan	Taylor
Hare	Mott	Thomas, N. J.
Harless, Ariz.	O'Hara	Vorys, Ohio
Harness, Ind.	Plumley	Vursell
Havenner	Powers	Wasielewski
Hébert	Reece, Tenn.	West
Heidinger	Rees, Kans.	White
Henry	Rivers	Wilson
Izac	Robsion, Ky.	Winter
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rooney	Woodrum, Va.
King	Rowan	
	Schwabe, Okla.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 375 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DOMESTIC RAISING OF FUR-BEARING ANIMALS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2115) relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE BUSINESS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the measure under consideration represents a compromise. If you will recall at the last session of the Congress, by a vote of 283 to 54, the House, in most unmistakable terms, signified its belief that the law as it was understood to be up to June 5, 1944, should be reaffirmed.

When the Supreme Court handed down the unusual decision, written by a minority of that Court, in which 75 years of well-accepted, well-known law was changed, the insurance business of this country was confronted with a very serious situation. Both Justice Jackson and Justice Frankfurter, in well-considered minority views, pointed out the chaos that would come through the hurried action of the Court, and through a sudden change in the well-known theory with respect to insurance companies. Their predictions have come true. I say that because within the last month the attorney general of the State of North Carolina has held that the State can no longer collect the taxes paid by insurance companies doing business in the State of North Carolina because insurance is now interstate commerce and therefore the regulations imposed by the several States are not legal.

It is very significant, in considering this entire question, to bear in mind that when the rule of law was first laid down, upward of 75 years ago, in the case of Paul against Virginia, the case got to the Supreme Court of the United States by an insurance company resisting the right of the State of Virginia to impose any regulation on its business. Today we find ourselves in the position where the insurance companies are at a loss to know just exactly where they stand.

Since the law was first laid down, through a series of legislative enactments, through all sorts of regulatory

provisions, the business of insurance grew into one of the biggest businesses in our Nation. The companies, through their own experience, were able to regulate themselves in a manner that has been satisfactory to almost every one. When I spoke a moment ago of this compromise, I spoke advisedly. Personally I would prefer to see the bill, that we passed at the last session of the Congress so overwhelmingly, reenacted, but I recognize the practical side of this situation and I am entirely in accord with this compromise measure.

In that connection I would like to call your attention to the fact that after the impasse was reached in the Senate, at the suggesion of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and of several Senators, representatives of all phases of the insurance business, through a series of conferences held over a period of at least 3 months, agreed on this compromise measure. That is the compromise measure that was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, with the exception of the language contained in section 4 (a) of the Senate bill. This is the bill that was agreed on by the insurance commissioners of all of the States, the American Life Convention, the American Mutual Alliance, the Association of Casualty and Surety Executives, Inland Marine Underwriters' Association, National Association of Insurance Agents, National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, National Board of Fire Underwriters' Insurance Executives Association, the National Association of Insurance Brokers, the National Association of Casualty and Insurance Agents, they being all of the people in the industry affected through the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not a matter of record that since the passage of the bill referred to in the House, the Supreme Court has denied a petition for a rehearing of the Southeastern Underwriters' Association, which makes this action imperative?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; an application was made to the Supreme Court for a rehearing, and it is, indeed, unfortunate there was not a rehearing participated in by a majority of the Court. I think this decision by a vote of 4 to 3 was shocking, to say the least, because where a well-accepted rule of law is changed, as Justice Marshall put it a great many years ago, the change should come only when a majority of the Court participate in the decision. This is another reason why it is imperative that something be done immediately; but the most important practical phase of the whole situation is that taxes due and owing to the insurance departments of the several States are collected between the 20th of February and the 10th of March. It will be easy to compromise our views with the bill passed by the Senate; our views are contained in the bill recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have carefully and with a great deal of interest read the gentleman's bill and the committee report. I believe I am very much in favor of both. I wish, however, to submit this question: The gentleman read a list of those organizations that go to make up the insurance industry; is that group all agreed on the House bill as now presented to us as a substitute for the Senate bill?

Mr. WALTER. That is the group that agreed on the House bill with the exception that in the House bill the following language in section 4 (a) of the Senate bill was stricken out:

> For the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress.

With the exception of the omission of that language the two bills are similar.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I preface my question by saying that I ask it for the purpose of obtaining helpful information. Can the gentleman tell us what the attitude of the Department of Justice is with respect to this bill? I presume we are considering H. R. 1973.

Mr. WALTER. H. R. 1973 was the bill reported by the committee and subsequently made an amendment to S. 340. So the amendment of S. 340 is H. R. 1973.

As to the attitude of the Attorney General, frankly I do not know. He testified before our committee, and when various changes were suggested he agreed with the position we took. I am sure his testimony will bear out that statement. The other day when the bill was called up on the Consent Calendar the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I believe it was, made the statement that the Attorney General was opposed to the bill as reported by the House committee. I subsequently called the Attorney General and asked him what his objections were, and he told me he had not read the bill. This is as much as I know about his attitude; but I believe that is immaterial. I would say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that, after all, this is a compromise. The Committee on the Judiciary did what the President of the United States in a letter to a Senator from Maryland suggested be done, namely, that a moratorium be granted so these great companies could find out just exactly where they stood and what they have to do to meet the new thought, if you please.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The President of the United States by no means recommended section 3 as in the bill passed by the Senate and also in the bill reported by the House.

Mr. WALTER. Why, of course, he did not; all he did was to write a letter in which he suggested a moratorium. I do not know of any other way to provide for a moratorium than as provided in this measure. We merely state that until January 1, 1948, the laws under which the insurance companies were prosecuted are not applicable except for certain things. It seems to me that there is the moratorium the Chief Executive suggested should be granted to these companies.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman certainly does not want to stand on the floor of this House and tell the Members that he is in favor of insurance companies or insurance brokers putting out false advertising in connection with the conduct of their business.

Mr. WALTER. Well, if they do, it seems to me that is a matter that can be very easily reached. We are not concerned with things of that sort. This is merely a moratorium. That is all it is. It is to give these people a breathing spell so that they can decide how they may operate their business in the future. That is all this is; it is a moratorium.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman that far, but when he says "we" I do not know for whom he speaks. I, as one Member, will not vote for the moratorium if you leave section 3 in the bill.

Mr. WALTER. I do not think the gentleman voted for the bill when it passed the House previously.

Mr. COCHRAN. I voted against the bill and I will not vote for this one, unless section 3 is eliminated.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In order to keep the record straight, I communicated with the Attorney General when the bill was on the Consent Calendar and he told me he was absolutely opposed to the bill as it is now written and as it is now before the House. I asked him why and he said he was opposed to it because there was stricken from the bill language which would proscribe and make unlawful not only acts to intimidate, boycott, and to coerce but also agreements to coerce and to boycott.

Mr. WALTER. That is not what the Attorney General said when he testified before the Committee on the Judiciary. But what his personal views are is immaterial to me. He did testify on this very subject before the Judiciary Committee of the House.

Mr. CELLER. I am simply giving the conversation.

Mr. WALTER. We pointed out to him the possible construction that could be placed on the word "agreement" that was put in the bill and he agreed with us. There is no question about that.

Mr. CELLER. I am only repeating what he told me.

Mr. WALTER. It bears out what I have stated.

Mr. CELLER. I am repeating his conversation with me over the telephone.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania yielded back the balance of his time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman stated he reserved the balance of his time.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate decision of the Supreme Court in the Southeastern Underwriters case, decided last June, has thrown the insurance business into a state of utter confusion. That decision by four members out of nine members of the Supreme Court changed the established law of the land, it reversed the will of Congress and created a new policy regarding the control and regulation of the business of insurance. The decision has been rightly called judicial legislation.

A committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, of which the Honorable Robert E. Dineen, of my State, is a member, drafted a bill several months ago that contains much of the language of the bill now before us but has a much stronger section 4 than the one in the present bill. You can find it and an interesting discussion of it in the 1944 annual report made by Mr. Dineen to the New York State Legislature. The attitude of the State commissioners is reflected by the declaration made by the committee to accompany its proposed legislation. I quote a portion of that statement:

> The National Association of Insurance Commissioners sincerely believes that the States can adequately regulate the insurance business, and because of legal considerations and the close proximity of State supervisory officials to the people affected, are in a better position to regulate that business than the Federal Government. In that regard it has regulatory machinery available, including regulatory statutes and trained personnel.

Heretofore the insurance business has been subject to regulation by the States because an unbroken line of decisions of the Supreme Court have held not only that insurance is not interstate commerce, but that it is not commerce at all. The decision makes insurance interstate commerce, and therefore subject to all the statutes we have enacted dealing with interstate commerce. There are four, I believe: The Federal Trade Commission Act, the Patman Antidiscrimination Act, the Clayton Act, and the Sherman Act.

Unfortunately, we cannot repeal the decision of the Supreme Court. What we can do, however, is to suspend the operation of the statutes we have passed, limit their scope, and grant exemptions or exceptions.

Under that decision insurance, if written by a company in more than one State, is, as matter of law, interstate commerce today and will be so until another Supreme Court comes along and reverses this decision. Therefore the taxes imposed on insurance companies in many States may be regarded as burdens on interstate commerce and, therefore, unlawful. As a result, many companies are refusing to pay their insurance taxes, that is, taxes on the insurance written within the several States. Others are paying taxes under protest, because they are threatened with stockholders' suits. The officials of an insurance company may not with impunity pay unlawful taxes. They are liable personally to their stockholders if they do so. Therefore it is imperative, if we are to preserve the rights of the States to tax the insurance companies on business written within their boundaries, that we pass an act authorizing them so to do. We have attempted to accomplish that purpose by sections 1 and 2 of the committee amendment to S. 340. I am not certain that we can do it but this bill goes as far as we can in an effort to maintain the rights of the States to tax the insurance business within their respective boundaries. A vast amount of State revenue is involved, and it is a matter of extreme importance to the States that action be taken to meet an immediate emergency.

There are only two main features in the bill. The second is to grant a moratorium on the application of the antimonopoly laws until January 1948. Personally, I would rather go much further than this bill goes. I was a strong supporter last year of the Walter bill, and I would support it today, plus this provision with reference to taxes. But we believe we cannot pass that bill as the Senate is now constituted, and we are told with some assurance that the President would veto it. So the best we can do now is to ask for a moratorium and leave the final decision open; not with instructions to the Congress or the various legislatures to pass laws to conform to the Supreme Court decision, and not with instructions either to the Congress to pass laws to exempt insurance permanently from all the antimonopoly laws. As we have written this bill, and brought it to you, we have left the question wide open.

There are quite conflicting views on this question among the commissioners of the various States, among the group of people who desire complete Federal control, and that other and larger group that believes in State control of the business of insurance. There are some slight differences between this bill and the bill as passed by the Senate, but they are not important in my view.

This bill is, in effect, what has been agreed upon by the insurance commissioners of all the States and by various insurance groups, the fire-insurance companies, the casualty companies, and the life-insurance companies and agents.

I hope this bill will receive practically unanimous support so that your conferees can go to the Senate with strong backing by this House.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of a compromise, but it is well to keep in the background the tremendous power and potency of the various large insurance companies. We have to make a decision sooner or later as to whether or not we are going to be ruled by a cabal or a combination of these powerful companies or whether we are going to allow the small independent companies to function under competitive conditions in the various States.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, which is interested indirectly in quite a number of the small farm mutual companies, has expressed grave concern that even this compromise will force these small companies catering to the farmers to jack up their rates. Already, for example, the State of Montana, realizing that this compromise bill may go through, has passed a statute compelling every insurance company in the State of Montana to join a rating bureau and to apply to their policyholders uniform rates. This means in essence that in every State where large insurance companies exercise control, and they do exercise control in many of the States, there is no blinking that fact—I can give you any amount of evidence to prove it, but time will not permit at this juncture—these companies, through powerful lobbies, will cause enactment of bills forcing companies with lower rates to jack them up, so that in the State of Montana and other States these small companies are compelled to join the rating bureaus, are compelled to abide by uniform rates, and in many instances, under guise of uniformity, competition goes out the window. Low rates must be upped.

Therefore, during this period of moratorium you will have the larger insurance companies rushing into the various State legislatures asking for these uniform rates and compulsory joining of rating bureaus, to the very grave disadvantage of all of these small mutual companies catering to the farmers.

I am going to put into the RECORD a communication received from the American Farm Bureau Federation under date of February 3, 1945, in that regard. It follows at the end of my remarks.

Further, there has been left out of this bill that has come out of the Committee on the Judiciary a very important word. That word is "agreement." There is, properly, proscribed in the wording of the pending bill acts "of boycott, coercion, or intimidation." You will find that on page 4, lines 19 and 20 of the bill before you. The Senate version, however, had in addition to "any act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation" the word "agreement" to boycott, coerce, or intimidate.

What is the danger in leaving that word out? There is a great deal of danger. These great companies can issue a blacklist. It need not be in writing, there need not be a so-called overt act, it could be an oral blacklist, and they would frighten the wits out of all these small companies. In addition there could be an "agreement" for what is known as separation. Let me tell you something about the "separation." Under "separation," if an agent wrote insurance for an outside or marked or proscribed company, or a blacklisted company, he was immediately stripped of his privileges; that is to say, he was not permitted to write insurance for any of the members of the self-constituted governing organizations known as boards. If a member of any of the boards wrote business through that agent which represented independent or nonmember companies, such member company was subject to punishment and was compelled to give up the business.

That is why I want the word "agreement" put back into the bill. We have no opportunity to amend the bill and to

put it back. For that reason, I must perforce oppose the bill, and the Attorney General for that reason is opposed to this bill.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1945.
Honorable CHAIRMAN,
Judiciary Subcommittee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN: The American Farm Bureau Federation is a national nonprofit membership organization, representing approximately 850,000 farm families in 46 States. The organization is a federation of State organizations.

The American Farm Bureau Federation does not own, control, or operate any insurance company. The State organizations, however, have developed mutual insurance services for the individual farm-family membership within their several States. Seven of the State Farm Bureaus have organized and are operating mutual insurance services for Farm Bureau members and farm families in 20 or more States. Experience seems to justify the conclusion that farmers, as a class, in many lines of insurance have more favorable experience than the public generally, or of certain other groups. With few exceptions, the Farm Bureau companies have not operated on manual or bureau rates. Rates have been established that experience seems to justify, and even under such rates that are generally lower than manual or bureau rates permit the distribution of policy dividends. The American Farm Bureau Federation, therefore, and its member States for their farm families, is very much interested in any legislation, either Federal or State, that affects the operation of insurance companies operating on the principle of giving the insured the lowest possible rates consistent with safety.

Having been advised by our general counsel that S. 340, as amended by your subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, is dangerous from the viewpoint of the many casualty and fire insurance companies affiliated with the Farm Bureau and other farm organizations, and against the interests of farmers and others insured by these and similar low-cost companies, we urge you to take steps to correct the situation.

As we understand it, the effect of the removal of the Senate amendment in lines 3, 4, and 5 of page 2 of the bill as it came to the House, is to give to insurance companies a permanent exemption from the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act (as to any acts authorized or permitted by a State law) despite the references in section 4 to a temporary and partial exemption, unless and until Congress at some later date passes legislation making these acts specifically applicable to insurance.

In view of the fact that bills are now being introduced in a number of State legislatures which would result in the fixing of compulsory uniform rates, tend toward monopoly, and prevent our members and others from securing insurance at lower costs, we believe that your committee and the Congress should make it clear that it is not the intent or purpose of S. 340 to encourage such price-fixing and monopoly-forming legislation, but on the contrary, Congress desires to exercise some measures of restraint over such developments.

As a first step in this direction, we strongly urge the restoration of the Senate amendment which would eliminate permanent exemption from the Sherman and Clayton Acts. This would serve as a strong deterrent to present undesirable trends in State legislation.

Even with the Senate amendment restored, the bill should be safeguarded further by adding at the end of section 4 (a) a proviso approximately as follows:

"*Provided, however,* That this exemption from the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act shall not apply to any new State legislation which would result in fixing compulsory uniform rates for all companies of a given class or other restrictions that would have the effect and result of requiring all companies of a given class to charge approximately the same rates or costs to the insured."

If the Senate amendment is not restored to section 2 (b) the above proviso should be attached to that section rather than to section 4 (a).

As the bill now stands with your subcommittee amendments, it is an open invitation for those insurance companies who do not like competitive rates to rush into the State legislatures to secure the enactment of laws which will give them all the rate-fixing and monopolistic privileges they have heretofore partially attained through collusive action which, until recently, was free from the restraints of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. Under your section 2 (b), the opportunity held out to such insurance companies or associations to secure the same or greater rate-fixing results and full immunity by the enactment of State laws is already resulting in tremendous pressure upon State legislatures.

Surely your committee and the Congress should do something to safeguard this situation. The amendment we suggest would give such a safeguard and still retain all necessary immunities from the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

We note with approval your committee's amendment eliminating the first clause in section 4; that is, the words "for the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress." This language has been cited in some States as evidence that Congress expects the States to enact legislation presented by certain insurance groups and which, if adopted, would have the effect of eliminating competitive rates.

But we feel that this mere elimination of language is not sufficient to correct wrong impressions already developed. In view of some of the language contained in previous committee reports on this and similar bills, we ask you to state explicitly in your committee report that it is not the intent or purpose of Congress to encourage price fixing through compulsory uniform rating bureaus or other monopolistic practices, and that any such tendencies in new State legislation might quickly result in the withdrawal by Congress of the immunities granted.

Respectfully yours,
EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the question raised by the gentleman from New York interests me. Subsection (b) of section 4 on page 4 reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

It has been called to my attention that under that language an act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation will be illegal, but a combination, conspiracy, or compact to coerce, boycott, or intimidate will be free from legal consequences.

It has been suggested to me by the Attorney General that if the following language is used that would be corrected:

to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

I would like to ask my friend in charge of the bill if this language is objectionable to him, and if not, when this bill goes to conference, if it does, if the gentleman would agree to accept that language?

Mr. WALTER. Of course, I would. I would like to point out to the gentleman that when there is the kind of agreement he speaks about then it becomes an act and then under the very language of the law it is a violation.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I will not take issue with the gentleman on that, but will the gentleman accept that language?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the very outset that the colloquy just participated in by the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Pennsylvania should remove a great many objections to this bill in the minds of the Members of the House. I am not completely satisfied with the bill, as will develop. But I do think it is a fine evidence of the desire to work something out that the gentleman has accepted that language suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Perhaps he can give some additional information which I was going to seek from the distinguished majority leader who quoted the Attorney General. I would like to know if the language is accepted as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, whether he is or you are authorized to say then the bill would be acceptable to the Department of Justice.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I can say that I have discussed that very language time after time with officials of the Department of Justice. I am convinced that language at least would be acceptable to the Department of Justice. Is that not correct?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend I was addressing myself to that particular part of the bill and no other, and apparently the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has stated he will accept that language if the bill goes to conference.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed with what I have to say.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I want to vote for this bill if it is a compromise agreement between all parties concerned. But I am in a quandary because the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice informed me just 10 minutes ago they were irrevocably opposed to the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. They are; and that is exactly what I want to discuss, if the gentleman will permit me to do so.

I desire to call to the attention of the Members House Report No. 68, which is the report of the Committee on the Judiciary upon this bill and which in its conclusion states that this bill has been endorsed by a great number of organizations, including the National Association

of Insurance Commissioners, the American Life Convention, and so forth.

I want to challenge the statement and say to you that if what the Committee on the Judiciary wanted was something that had been endorsed by these groups, then it should have reported to the House the bill H. R. 1590, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], is also the author. I would say to him in the words of St. Paul, "That which you have worshipped without knowing come I to declare unto you," because this is this bill, H. R. 1590, and not the other that the insurance commissioners have approved. It was H. R. 1590 that has been submitted as a compromise bill and not the other. I think it too bad that the statement has been made here that it has been endorsed by these groups, because it has not been so endorsed. I will tell you why it has not been endorsed. The American Life Convention, the American Mutual Alliance, the Association of Casualty and Surety Executives, and all these other groups referred to, issued a press release which I have in my hand and which everyone is at liberty to examine. That press release clearly points out why the language that the Committee on the Judiciary has stricken out is in this bill. That press release says:

> For the purpose of enabling the business to make necessary adjustments in organization and operating methods, and in order that the legislatures of the various States may have time in which to adopt laws designed to authorize concert of action in rate making and other cooperative activities when approved by State supervisory officials, section 4 of the compromise bill granting a moratorium on the Sherman law to June 1, 1947—

And so forth. That is the basis of the moratorium. That is the basis upon which the letter was sent to Senator RADCLIFFE by the President of the United States. I told the House of Representatives when I opposed the Bailey-Walter bill that you were just marching your army up the hill to march it down again, because there was not any chance of its final enactment. Months later we find out that that is true.

I tell this House if you adopt the bill, H. R. 1973, you have again marched up the hill and got precisely nowhere because you must put into that compromise the things that the contracting parties have agreed to. They have all agreed that that language which recites the reasons for the moratorium should be in the bill; that it belongs in the bill, and that it must not be taken out of the bill. I say to you that 41 out of the 44 State insurance commissioners who were present at the meeting approved the bill with that language in it. If you doubt it, here is a report from the Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York. I hold it in my hand. You may look at it at page 9 if you wish. Here is a report of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York and similar reports by other organizations recommending S. 340 as it was, which included the compromise language.

They have endorsed a bill that states the reason for a moratorium. If somebody wants to look at it, it is here.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The fact of the matter is that the bill (S. 340), as these parties have agreed upon, is not the bill passed by the Senate at all.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Exactly. The gentleman is correct. S. 340 was not the bill agreed upon in the industry compromise. That is entirely correct. If this House will vote down the previous question I would like to offer the bill earlier presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], H. R. 1590, which is the bill agreed to by everybody, which the insurance commissioners have approved, and which the Department of Justice has approved. On the basis of that, the Attorney General went to the President of the United States with this bill, and on the basis of an examination of this bill a letter was sent to Senator RADCLIFFE, indicating that moratorium legislation would be approved. Why gum up the works at this late date?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even though the language of the committee substitute does not specifically direct the State legislatures or encourage them, does it not by the moratorium create the opportunity for the State legislatures to take action?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I agree with the gentleman, but the point is that the commissioners themselves desire that it be stated in the bill that the moratorium shall be for specific purposes. The insurar ce companies realize that they are now in a serious position. The verdict of the Supreme Court of the United States is the law of the land, whether you like it or not. These people who are subject to the decision are in a terrible spot if something does not happen. So they went to the Attorney General and said, "Give us time and we will put our house in order." Consequently into the bill was written words designed to permit them time to make the adjustments. Then the insurance commissioners came in and said, "We are not ready with our rate-making structures. We have to ask the State legislatures to pass new laws." Therefore, into the bill went words to permit the States time to enact legislation. That is why H. R. 1590 carries the statements of the purposes in the moratorium. They are the words in the language of the bill as drafted by every interested party. No one can contradict that. The press release issued January 15, by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners is here for your inspection. There is no need to be misled by the committee report that says this has been approved by organizations that did not approve it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman also opposed to section 3 of this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think it would be a fine thing if legislation relating to the Federal Trade Commission Act, now included in section 3, could be stricken from the bill, but I would not oppose the passage of H. R. 1590 with that language in it, because we could thereafter proceed to pass other necessary legislation to take it out. I would like to carry out the terms of the agreement exactly as originally agreed upon. Then I know there is some chance of final enactment of our bill. Every State in the Union is up against a serious problem, and you do not serve your constituents if you unnecessarily bog this down by passing a bill that nobody wants and that neither the industry nor the Commissioners have approved.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that section 3 is permanent law—not just a moratorium? It goes away beyond any agreement.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I will not argue with the gentleman because I am not a lawyer, but I know it is too bad if we do not vote down the previous question and substitute the bill which everybody has agreed upon.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. As I understand the gentleman his request is that we vote down the previous question in order that he may offer the agreement as made?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is right. I would then offer H. R. 1590. I would like also to point out, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] pointed out, that S. 340 did not conform to that agreement either. I think the House has a right to pass something that exactly conforms to the agreement.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why cannot the gentleman take out the section that relates to the Federal Trade Commission and the Robinson-Patman Act?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I have tried to explain it. I want to see a bill passed that can be enacted into law prior to the closing days of February, at which time the insurance companies must pay their taxes to maintain the insurance departments in the various States. There is a specific date involved. Personally I would like to see it out, but I want to see a bill passed today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, when the Supreme Court last year decided the Southeastern Underwriters case it immediately made applicable to the business of insurance many laws that we have heretofore passed regulating interstate commerce. When we passed those acts, Congress did not have in mind insurance; as a matter of fact when Congress passed the Sherman Act it was with

the distinct understanding that it did not apply to insurance, because insurance at that time was not interstate commerce, under Supreme Court decisions. The net result of the Supreme Court decision therefore was to put the Federal Government in the field of control then being exercised by the States. The methods of control exercised by the States and by the Federal Government are conflicting, and the sole purpose of this bill is to take out as much of that conflict as possible until we can determine whether Congress will regulate insurance, or whether it will permit the States to regulate it.

I believe there is no substantial difference, no difference of consequence, between the bill passed by the Senate and the bill we now have before us. I intend to take up the amendments that have been discussed here a little later. Before I do that let me say a word about H. R. 1973. It starts out with the statement that insurance shall be subject to State control. The Congress, of course, cannot delegate to the States the power to regulate insurance. What we are trying to do is to make it clear to the States and to the insurance companies that we are as far as possible removing ourselves from the field.

The second thing the bill states is that no act of Congress governing interstate commerce shall apply to insurance unless the act specifically so states.

The third section goes on to enumerate two acts. I believe section 3 is not necessary in the bill, but it was inserted, I suppose, to make it clear that the Federal Trade Commission Act should not apply to insurance and that the Robinson-Patman Act should not apply to insurance. The reason is this: The Robinson-Patman Act was passed with the intent that it should regulate and control the sale of commodities. It was not meant to cover insurance any more than it was meant to cover the banking business. If the Members wish a bill of the character of the Robinson-Patman Act to cover insurance, then I submit a special bill should be introduced which should cover it more equitably and more accurately than the Robinson-Patman Act, which was not written with insurance in mind.

The bill before us states in another section that it will not affect the coverage of the Wagner Act and the Wages and Hours Act so far as insurance is concerned. The Court has already held in the Polish Alliance case, you remember, that the Wagner Act did apply to insurance because insurance was something that affected interstate commerce.

The important part of the bill is that section which provides for a moratorium as far as the application of the Sherman and Clayton Acts are concerned. Part of the Sherman Act is in effect right now; in fact, that part having to do with boycotts, coercion, and intimidation. The rest of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act will not take effect until January 1, 1948.

I wish now to say a word or two touching some things that were in the Senate bill that have been taken out. If you will turn to the bill, you will notice that the provision dealing with boycotts, and so forth, is made to apply to an act, not to an agreement, as the Senate bill had provided. The House took out the word "agreement" because we believed that to do so brought the law into line with our general notion of criminal law. For instance, if you and I agree to kill someone we will be punished by the courts. I have read in the Bible that he who thinks evil is as guilty as he who commits it, or words to that effect.

In the courts no prosecution could be had until some act had been committed in pursuance of that unlawful agreement. However, the use of the word "agreement" would open up to the prosecuting agencies of this Government an opportunity to constantly investigate agreements between insurance companies. I think that is the purpose in trying to get the word in there. In my judgment, it would have no effect whatever, so far as the legitimate prosecution for boycotting, coercion, and intimidations are concerned.

Another sentence we took out, and to which the gentleman from New Mexico has referred, is found in section 4—"for the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress," and so forth.

Whether that is in or out makes not the slightest difference to the bill. What the bill does is to grant a moratorium. It provides that until January 1, 1948, there will be no prosecutions under the Sherman Act except as indicated above. During this period of time a State may revamp its laws, and the Congress may revamp the laws. Why you should make so much fuss about a pious expression in a bill that means nothing is more than I can understand.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand the bill we are considering amounts to a moratorium until 1948?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct, except as to acts of boycott, coercion, and intimidation.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the amendments which the gentleman from New Mexico proposes to offer change it? In other words, I would like to vote for a bill that would circumvent the decision of the Supreme Court entirely.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. You cannot do that.

Mr. JENKINS. That is not politically wise or it may not be parliamentarily wise. But does the gentleman's amendment go further than this bill?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The amendment the gentleman talks about does not make one bit of difference.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What is there to stop the Attorney General from disregarding the provisions of this bill and going ahead, getting a grand jury and going after the insurance companies?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. This is what we do in substance: We repeal, so to speak, or at least we suspend the operation of the Sherman and Clayton Acts until 1948 except as to acts of boycott by insurance companies.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman. He referred to this proposed amendment as a pious gesture.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. In this day of promulgation of administrative law, in this day of judicial decisions which worm in and worm out and leave everybody in doubt as to whether the snake that made the crack was going in or backing out, it is a pretty good idea to keep things on the surface mighty clear, is that right?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. If these words do not mean anything or make 5 cents difference, why is the gentleman afraid of them?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I cannot see any reason for putting in a bill the reasons why we are writing the bill, and that is all that amounts to. We give them a moratorium. Why should we undertake to tell the States anything beyond that fact? If they want to revamp their laws during the period of moratorium, that is up to them. Why should we express the hope that they will write other laws to conform with the notions of some Members of Congress?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman understands the Attorney General has the duty to prosecute these people; but he says, "I shall not do it, provided you get your house in order."

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The Attorney General has no business advising the States what kind of laws they should enact; neither do we.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has any testimony been submitted as to the amount of taxes involved running to the States and Territories?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. This bill will not entirely clear that up, but the amount in my State is about $2,000,000. The total amount in the country for 1 year is about $120,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That, of course, is a tremendous sum as related to the budgets and the treasuries of these particular units of government.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is true. There are two limitations as far as the States are concerned when they tax insurance companies. One is the Constitution. I am afraid some of the taxing policies of some of the States will have to be revamped, because they are probably unreasonably impeding interstate commerce. We cannot do anything about that, of course. The other limitation of the right of the States to tax in-

surance companies would arise if Congress itself would move into the field. In this bill we are making it clear that we do not move into the field.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I think we all appreciate that this legislation is desirable in some form. There is a difference of opinion as to just the particular form. The House passed a bill last year in the form that suited the House. The Senate passed a compromise bill which, with certain committee amendments, is now before us.

It seems to me that the sensible thing to do is to pass this bill expeditiously and send it to conference. There the differences may be worked out. If they are not worked out, the bill will be sent back to the House for another vote on the conference report, which is the final passage. If the House does not want to accept what the conferees have agreed upon, then it can vote against the report, which will be a vote against the bill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, George Washington once said:

> In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public should be enlightened.

A casual glance at Senate Resolution 340—the McCarran bill—which is before the House for concurrence, well illustrates Washington's idea that the people should know the facts. This is particularly so since the legislation proposed affects many millions of our citizens and in its present form is decidedly dangerous to a large group of citizens—particularly the little businessman.

Instead of this legislation being sent, as it was, to the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary, it could better still have gone to the special committee set up by this House to study the problems of the small businessman. This proposal, if approved, will add a burden to those least able to carry it. It grants favor to the very group that has grown rich and strong at the expense of the weak and the defenseless. It presents the picture of the big bully convicted of kicking the little fellow around, who then comes to Congress and asks the privilege of going on kicking the little fellow for another year or two until Uncle Sam can do something about it.

It is beyond doubt the most selfish and most vicious piece of proposed legislation that has been brought to the floor of this House in the past decade. It is a surprise to me that the backers of this class of legislation are not contending that this is necessary to win the war.

For the past 75 years it has been the practice of this very group—the stock fire-insurance companies—now begging for special favors, to resist the efforts of the several States to regulate insurance. Their stock argument being that they were above and beyond the State's power to regulate. In other words, they were engaged in interstate commerce. Now, that the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the business of insurance does come under the commerce clause of our Constitution, they plead with Congress to approve legislation that will excuse them and exempt them from the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, and in fact any other act that in any way interferes with their doing business at the same old stand and in the same old way.

The peremptory and summary manner in which the legislation was rushed through the Senate and House committees without the formality of public hearings finds its equal only in the act of a dictatorship for which the world is paying so dearly today—in tears and sweat and blood.

The proponents of this legislation take far too much for granted. Because the insurance officials of a few States, whose political policy is controlled and directed by the ramifications of these huge insurance combines, approve the McCarran bill, they would have the Members of Congress believe that a satisfactory agreement has been reached and that this bill has been sugar-coated so it pleases everybody. I doubt seriously if any of the "sugar" got into the bill. I shall later show how and why it will be "sour grapes" to the little businessman in the cities, villages, and at the crossroads who cannot pay his Federal, State, and local taxes, and at the same time pay tribute to these insurance barons.

They even imply in their press releases that Attorney General Biddle, who so stoutly opposed the passage of this legislation in the Seventy-eighth Congress, is satisfied—now that he can look through the dim mists of the future to a time when he will be permitted to enforce the law, provided the Eightieth Congress does not spread this immunity over another twilight zone, and provided further that the Attorney General does not get the double-cross on this legislation.

It is a significant fact that the gentleman from Indiana, Representative LA FOLLETTE, who waged such a gallant but losing fight against a similar bill in the last Congress, is absent from the Capital on official business, at a time when this crime against the millions of insurance policyholders is being perpetrated. It is further significant that he was also chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee handling this legislation and refused to permit my appearance in an effort to amend this bill.

The gravity of the situation forces me to cast aside my determination to sit silently through the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress—as all good freshmen are expected to do. I cannot help but protest and plead that this House ponder well the evils that are sure to result. I know not why others, who once fought this legislation, are now crying compromises or are permitting their names to be used as being party to a compromise. For me there can be no compromise—so long as there is discrimination.

It is dangerous legislation in that it sets a bad precedent. If this grant of immunity is voted, the insurance industry, what is to prevent—let us say Kuhn, Loeb & Co., one of the Nation's largest investment brokers—from demanding similar exemption from the provisions of the Securities Exchange Act? What, may I inquire, is to prevent even the Standard Oil Co. from resuming its monopolistic practices—through Congressional fiat.

It is unfair to legalize the practice of rate discrimination. Especially is that true when the violations are so flagrant, and the States are left powerless to protect themselves.

For better than 8 years, as assistant State auditor of my home State of West Virginia, it was my duty to assist in administration of the insurance laws. In West Virginia the State auditor is ex officio State insurance commissioner. I believe the Members of this House will readily agree that a man of even average intelligence could learn something about the intricacies of even so complicated a matter as the insurance business.

In West Virginia, and I am sure similar conditions exist in many other States, statistics indicate 40 percent of all insurance written is written outside the authority of the State insurance commissioner and without even the knowledge—at that time—that such insurance is being written. Here is the story of how it is done:

In the New York metropolitan area and in the adjoining State of Connecticut a group of old-line stock fire-insurance companies conspire—and I use this word advisedly—to set up a dummy or better still a "pup" insurance company. This dummy outfit has no assets beyond some gilded policy forms and the glittering diamond studs in the shirtfront of regular company officials "sitting in" at their board meeting. This dummy company is not licensed to do business in West Virginia or any other State, with the possible exception of New York. It has no assets that would qualify it to do business in my State.

Soon after the dummy is ready for business, its offices are visited by concerns having property in all sections of our country. They apply for and get a blanket policy covering their property in many and often all the States. They are given this blanket policy and within the matter of hours or days at the most, this dummy policy is underwritten or reinsured by one or more of the old-line companies back of the dummy set-up.

The rate per $100 of insurance paid under this blanket policy is as low in some instances as 10 cents. One such company—and there are scores of them—owns property in my State of West Virginia. They own a building on the main street of our capital city of Charleston. The building adjoining is occupied by a small businessman. The rate on his property is determined by a rating bureau in the adjoining State of Ohio and he pays a rate of $1.57 on the $100 and this is not the worst of it. If one of the properties covered by one of these blanket policies should burn, as they often do, then the full 100 percent of loss is charged against West Virginia's loss experience for rate-making purposes which in turn boosts the rate on the independent businessman. There, once again, the discrimination is in favor of the stock-insurance company.

West Virginia has a 2-percent tax on each $100 of premium paid on all fire-insurance policies. In this instance, the tax is on the 10-cent rate of premiums and not on the $1.57 rate. Since our State collects an annual tax of $1,000,000 from 60 percent of the insurance business it stands to lose $600,000 annually in taxes, by reason of this discrimination in rates.

There is a third major reason why this legislation is objectionable. It creates a "no man's land" zone in which irresponsible, fly-by-night concerns, not able to qualify in any State, continue to ply their trade of selling policies through the mails, by newspaper advertising and over the radio. It is estimated that millions of dollars have and are being invested in this worthless form of insurance. These practices are beyond State regulations and are just one more proof that a sizable part of the insurance, if regulated at all, must come under the commerce clause of our Constitution as was recently affirmed by our Supreme Court.

It is perfectly clear and obvious that the intent of the Judiciary Committees of both House and Senate were not to grant a moratorium so much as their intent seems to be to escape responsibility and defer a troublesome question to some later session of Congress.

If the moratorium were proposed to expire September 1, 1945, it would be easy to understand that the moratorium provisions of the bill were the full intent and purpose of Congress. The legislatures of 40 States are in session today and will be in session for at least another 30 days. Do the Members of Congress think that the several States are so dumb that they are unable to solve their own particular difficulties without the help of the insurance company lobby? In the meantime, a congressional grant of monopoly and price fixing, and all of the other insidious practices that have been prevalent in the insurance business for many years is being imposed upon the people of this Nation. The State of West Virginia is capable of managing and handling its own affairs without the assistance of the supergovernment or lobby of the insurance industry, but if this bill becomes law, the companies' lobby will come into our legislature and probably successfully defeat any corrective legislation that may be introduced in our legislature.

I am impressed with the idea that the Members of Congress have been led astray by the insurance lobby and have gone far afield by proposing to grant a monopoly by specific act for a period of 2½ years with respect to the Sherman Act and a period of 3 years with respect to the Clayton Act. It is worthless to the people of the United States and is of no particular value to the various States' insurance departments, and only tends to confuse the situation in the 40 State legislatures which are now in session to the point where it will be impossible for any corrective legislation to be adopted by the several State legislatures.

I am not opposed to the idea of granting a brief immunity to the stock fire-insurance companies. I understand it is necessary to revamp their present method of procedure to prepare for eventual Federal regulation. Two simple amendments which I shall offer (a) to remove discrimination in rates, (b) to effectively control and safeguard our citizens against fake and worthless insurance, would make this proposed legislation entirely satisfactory.

Unable to get a public hearing before either of the committees handling this legislation, I have no other recourse than to oppose its passage. If it cannot be amended, then my urgent plea to the Members of this House is that it be defeated. I trust it will be your pleasure to do so.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just preceded me referred with vehemence to the measure now before us as class legislation, but that has no application to this measure. The bill now under consideration is an effort to try to protect the States, and the insurance business in the several States, following the decision in the case of the United States against the Southeastern Underwriters Association.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that it was my desire to bring out the fact that I want to amend the present bill. I will approve the present bill if it can be amended. However, I did not have time to bring that out.

Mr. SPRINGER. This bill provides a moratorium. That is the important feature contained in this bill. Everyone knows that great consternation developed following the decision in the case of the United States against Southeastern Underwriters Association, et al. The States did not know what to do following that decision, and the insurance companies certainly did not know what to do. The question of taxation was involved, and the question of the control and regulation of insurance companies by the several States was also involved. At the present moment, unless this measure, or similar legislation, is passed to protect the States and protect the insurance companies with regard to their control and the question of taxation, utter confusion will result and utter chaos will reign in the several States.

My thought has been, as has been stated on the floor of the House by others, that I would far prefer to take the question of insurance entirely out of the commerce clause of the Constitution and entirely away from any Government control. But this emergency is immediate and it is necessary to pass this legislation now. The States do not know what to do with respect to the collection of taxes and the insurance companies do not know what to do with respect to the payment of taxes. The several States have no charted course with respect to the control or the regulation of insurance companies, since the case above cited, has been decided. Confusion and chaos has been brought about by that very peculiar decision.

Mr. Speaker, since this measure has been pending many insurance companies, and many State state officers, have written to me respecting that resulting confusion. It is essential that this measure be passed promptly in order to avoid confusion in the future.

This measure seeks only to establish a moratorium until January 1948 in order that the several States may continue their control and regulations over the insurance business and to proceed with the collection of taxes, in the manner and form intended by Congress. At the end of that period I hope—and I am confident a majority of the Members also hope—that this matter may be worked out in a proper manner—preserving to the several States their rights to control and regulate the insurance business within such States, and to collect the taxes now permitted—all without Government interference. I intend to support the measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, there are a good many provisions of the bill as reported by the House which I do not like and which I thought should have been changed before the bill was brought before the House for consideration. For instance, I doubt the wisdom of section 3. I doubt if the Members of Congress should, without giving the question fuller consideration, permanently exempt insurance from the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Robinson-Patman Act. It seems to me it would have been much better to have included these acts under section 4 and thereby declare a moratorium on their operation for 2 years and in the meantime we would have an opportunity of going into the situation more fully to determine just what final courses should be taken. Also, section 4–b should be amended so as to include any "agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate." In the committee I offered an amendment to this effect but it was voted down. The chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has indicated that in conference he will accept this amendment to section 4–b. Also, in conference, I greatly hope that the provisions of section 3 may be included in section 4–a as I do not think at this time we have enough information to justify the permanent exclusion of these two acts insofar as they relate to the business of insurance.

This is, of course, emergency legislation. It is necessary that some legislation be passed to meet the necessities of the immediate situation. I hope that in conference the bill may be amended in the manner I have above suggested. If it were amended in this way, I think the bill would pretty closely follow the plan of the agreement which was reached by all parties concerned.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted to me I hope I may be able to state the facts with reference to the insurance situation in such a manner as to be helpful to the Members in making up their minds Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court, which has been referred to, the business of insurance was in the control of the States. The decision of the Supreme Court establishing the interstate commerce characteristics in insurance disestablished State control in large measure, established Federal power, and put the whole thing in a state of chaos, as has been discussed by Members who have preceded me. I am one of those who regret this shift of governmental responsibility. I know it is not an easy job. A good many people in this country, however, feel the time is at hand when the States should have some hard, tough meat to chew on if they are to retain their governmental teeth. The fact that there are difficulties in the State handling of this matter is not, in the judgment of some people, a good reason why it ought to be moved into the Federal Government. But since this decision of the Supreme Court the whole thing is in a state of chaos, as I have stated. Insurance companies are hesitating to pay taxes to the respective States, and so forth. This bill is brought here for the purpose of creating a moratorium until everybody can find out just what the situation is and what should be done about it, what can be done about it. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has stated it is a moratorium. Is not section 3 permanent law?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I get the purport of the gentleman's question. I think, and I am very candid with the gentleman, section 3 should at least be moved down into section 4, where the expiration date is 1948. But section 3 is not permanent law in an absolute sense, of course. Congress can repeal section 3 at any time. I do not want to dodge the point. I agree with the gentleman. I think it ought to be down in section 4, but it is not permanent law except in a technical sense.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a matter of fact, would not section 3 be subject to be changed in conference?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think we can do something about it.

Mr. PATMAN. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know whether it can or not, but it does not make so much difference, because it is not permanent law except in the sense that it has no expiration date. Congress could repeal it even before 1948. Section 3 suspends no law or power which obtained before the Supreme Court decision referred to. Section 3 is in line with the moratorium objective, lacking only the expiration date. It is to be suspended. I want it distinctly understood, however, I would be willing to change it in conference so as to make its suspension terminate in 1948. I think perhaps it can be done. If it cannot, I would support an independent act, if necessary. Let me speak now to the point which my distinguished friend, for whom I have great respect, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], has raised. He objects to the elimination from section 4. I quote:

> For the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress.

That language violates the principle of absolute moratorium and ought to be out of this bill. That is my position. It is not substantive law, I admit, but I hope in the intervening time we may be able to work out an arrangement under which the Federal Government may work out a policy which will be as adjusted, as possible, to the desire of the Congress and the people and that the States be aided and not hindered in assuming more and more governmental responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, if in the interim we can work out a system that would reestablish the power of the States to control insurance, would not that be a good thing to do? With all the power in this country moving into the Federal Government ought we not try to halt that movement if we can? I do not want an expression in this bill declaring that the moratorium is exclusively for the purpose of enabling the States to accommodate themselves to this new expression of Federal power. I want this time to be spent in seeing if we cannot work out a plan to contract in some degree this Federal power. At least that time should be not committed. It should be an open period for broad examination of the whole matter for everybody—those who want more power in Washington and those who want less.

I would like to have an opportunity to see what we can do within the entire picture. These bills have been drawn in the House and in the Senate under great pressure. New facts come in from time to time which indicate there should be some changes. There is not much difference. We cannot compose it here. In such a situation this is what I think we should do: Get this legislation to conference as quickly as we can, let the conferees, with all the information we have, get together and work out the best bill they can, and bring it back and submit it to the judgment of the House.

They will have a very good picture of the problem of the insurance companies and the problems of the States. They will have a good picture of the differences in the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to invite attention to the fact that it is the bill S. 340 that is now under consideration. The House committee proposes to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a new bill. That means the whole thing would be in conference. The gentleman is correct, section 3 could be rewritten or could be taken out entirely in conference.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Thank you, Jere. When I hear the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee speak I just wish the Lord had made two people as smart as he is, and that I was one of them.

I have nothing further to say, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico) there were ayes 152 and noes 59.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. COCHRAN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with an amendment striking out section 3.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COCHRAN) there were—ayes 62, noes 171.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WALTER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 315, nays 58, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—315

Abernethy	Barrett, Wyo.	Brumbaugh
Adams	Barry	Bryson
Allen, Ill.	Bates, Ky.	Buck
Allen, La.	Bates, Mass.	Buckley
Andersen, H. Carl.	Beall	Buffett
	Beckworth	Bulwinkle
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bell	Bunker
	Bender	Burch
Andresen August H.	Bennet, N. Y.	Burgin
	Bennett, Mo.	Butler
Andrews, Ala.	Bishop	Byrne, N. Y.
Andrews, N. Y.	Blackney	Byrnes, Wis.
Angell	Bland	Camp
Arends	Bonner	Campbell
Arnold	Boren	Canfield
Auchincloss	Bradley, Mich.	Carlson
Baldwin, Md.	Brehm	Case, N. J.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Brooks	Case, S. Dak.
Barden	Brown, Ga.	Chapman
Barrett, Pa.	Brown, Ohio	Chelf

Chenoweth	Heselton	Price, Fla.
Chiperfield	Hess	Priest
Church	Hill	Quinn, N. Y.
Clark	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Clason	Hobbs	Rains
Clevenger	Hoch	Ramey
Cole, Kans.	Hoeven	Ramspeck
Cole, Mo.	Hoffman	Randolph
Cole, N. Y.	Holmes, Mass.	Rankin
Combs	Holmes, Wash.	Reed, Ill.
Cooley	Hope	Reed, N. Y.
Cooper	Horan	Resa
Corbett	Howell	Rich
Cox	Jarman	Richards
Cravens	Jenkins	Riley
Crawford	Jennings	Rizley
Cunningham	Jensen	Robertson, N. Dak.
Curley	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson, Va.
Curtis	Johnson, Ill.	Robinson, Utah
Daughton, Va.	Johnson, Ind.	Robsion, Ky.
Davis	Johnson, Luther A.	Rockwell
Delaney, James J.	Johnson, Okla.	Rodgers, Pa.
Dingell	Jones	Roe, Md.
Dirksen	Jonkman	Roe, N. Y.
Dolliver	Judd	Rogers, Fla.
Domengeaux	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Doughton, N. C.	Kearney	Rogers, N. Y.
Douglas, Ill.	Keefe	Ryter
Drewry	Kefauver	Sasscer
Durham	Kilburn	Satterfield
Dworshak	Kilday	Schwabe, Mo.
Earthman	Kinzer	Scrivner
Eberharter	Knutson	Sharp
Ellis	Kopplemann	Simpson, Ill.
Ellsworth	Kunkel	Simpson, Pa.
Elsaesser	Lane	Slaughter
Engel, Mich.	Lanham	Smith, Maine
Engle, Calif.	Larcade	Smith, Ohio
Ervin	Latham	Smith, Va.
Fallon	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Fellows	LeFevre	Snyder
Fenton	Lemke	Sparkman
Fisher	Lewis	Springer
Flannagan	Luce	Starkey
Flood	Ludlow	Stefan
Fogarty	Lyle	Stevenson
Forand	McConnell	Stewart
Fuller	McCormack	Stigler
Fulton	McCowen	Stockman
Gallagher	McDonough	Sumner, Ill.
Gamble	McGehee	Sumners, Tex.
Gathings	McGlinchey	Sundstrom
Gavin	McKenzie	Taber
Gearhart	McMillen, Ill.	Talbot
Geelan	Mahon	Talle
Gerlach	Maloney	Tarver
Gibson	Manasco	Taylor
Gifford	Mansfield, Mont.	Thom
Gillespie	Mansfield, Tex.	Thomas, Tex.
Gillette	Martin, Mass.	Thomason
Gillie	Mason	Tibbott
Goodwin	Merrow	Tolan
Gorski	Michener	Towe
Gossett	Miller, Nebr.	Traynor
Graham	Mills	Trimble
Granahan	Monroney	Vinson
Granger	Mundt	Vursell
Grant, Ala.	Murdock	Wadsworth
Grant, Ind.	Murphy	Walter
Gregory	Murray, Tenn.	Weaver
Griffiths	Murray, Wis.	Welchel
Gross	Norrell	Welch
Gwynne, Iowa	O'Konski	West
Hagen	O'Neal	Whitten
Hale	Pace	Whittington
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patman	Wickersham
Hall, Leonard W.	Patrick	Wigglesworth
Halleck	Peterson, Fla.	Winstead
Hancock	Peterson, Ga.	Wolcott
Hand	Philbin	Wolfenden, Pa.
Harris	Phillips	Wolverton, N. J.
Hartley	Pickett	Wood
Hedrick	Pittenger	Woodhouse
Hendricks	Ploeser	Woodruff, Mich.
Herter	Plumley	Woodrum, Va.
	Poage	Worley
		Zimmerman

NAYS—58

Bailey	Folger	Lesinski
Bloom	Gordon	Link
Bradley, Pa.	Green	Marcantonio
Cannon, Mo.	Hart	Miller, Calif.
Carnahan	Healy	Morgan
Celler	Holifield	Neely
Cochran	Hook	Norton
Coffee	Huber	O'Brien, Ill.
Crosser	Hull	O'Brien, Mich.
Dawson	Jackson	Outland
Delaney, John J.	Kee	Patterson
Dickstein	Kelley, Pa.	Powell
Douglas, Calif.	Kelly, Ill.	Price, Ill.
Doyle	King	Rabin
Feighan	Kirwan	Rayfiel
	Lea	Rooney
Russell	Sheppard	Torrens
Sabath	Somers, N. Y.	Voorhis, Calif.
Sadowski	Spence	Weiss
Savage	Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—59

Anderson, Calif.	Havenner	Mott
Biemiller	Hays	O'Hara
Bolton	Hébert	O'Toole
Boykin	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Cannon, Fla.	Heidinger	Powers
Clements	Henry	Reece, Tenn.
Colmer	Izac	Rees, Kans.
Courtney	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rivers
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Rowan
De Lacy	Kerr	Schwabe, Okla.
Dondero	LaFollette	Shafer
Eaton	Landis	Sheridan
Elliott	Lynch	Short
Elston	McGregor	Sikes
Fernandez	McMillan, S. C.	Thomas, N. J.
Gardner	Madden	Vorys, Ohio
Gwinn, N. Y.	Martin, Iowa	Wasielewski
Hare	May	White
Harless, Ariz.	Morrison	Wilson
Harness, Ind.		Winter

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma for, with Mr. Havenner against.

Mr. Gwinn of New York for, with Mr. De Lacy against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Vorys of Ohio for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. D'Alesandro for, with Mr. Rowan against.

General pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. May with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Landis.

Mrs. NORTON changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. MAY. No, Mr. Speaker; I was attending a committee hearing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1973) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Our Sunday Visitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

JUSTIFICATION OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S FOURTH TERM

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am what is generally referred to as a party man. I have believed in, and do now support generally, the policies of the present administration. Even so, there has always been in my mind the question of whether or not there was any justification for the departure from our long accepted precedent in limiting the term of the Presidency to 8 years.

I have never believed in the indespensability of any man as I have always thought there would be raised, or some individual would arise, who would meet any emergency of our country.

The events of the last week, however, in my opinion, have justified the action of the American people by breaking that long cherished precedent. Not that President Franklin D. Roosevelt is the only individual that could have cooperated with our allies in the establishing of what I believe is the basis of an enduring peace, but by his action he has demonstrated that he has accomplished what the American people wanted done. He has not failed them.

If he had failed the people, the third and fourth term certainly would not have been unjustifiable, but because of the action taken at the recent Crimean Conference, it certainly justifies the action and historians will record the wisdom of the American people in this instance. If we build wisely on the foundation now laid, the world can look forward to a long period of peace. The high patriotic position of the leadership of the minority party is equally praiseworthy. It has not been, and cannot be, a partisan peace. But an American peace. To endure it must have the same popular support as has the Monroe Doctrine.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, February 21, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, the gentleman from Ver-

mont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject Peacetime Military Training.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REQUEST ON RULE ON GEORGE BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the George bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman from Massachusetts sure there will be a vote on the George bill in the committee today?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not sure, but I am making the request in case there is.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the particular rush? Why should not the rule lay over the regular day?

Mr. McCORMACK. This request is not for consideration but simply to give the Committee on Rules until midnight tonight to file a report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does that mean the rule will be called up tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. If it is filed before midnight tonight; yes; because I announced yesterday that if the rule was reported today the bill would be called up on Thursday.

I may say that I am submitting this request in behalf of the gentleman requested by the chairman of the Rules Committee to submit it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman would withdraw his request for the moment in order that we may consult about it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be pleased to.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary I call up the bill (H. R. 37) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 37) to amend the Bankruptcy Act, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to a few features of this bill, some of which have been covered in the report of our Judiciary Committee and some of which have not. By reason of my long service on the Judiciary Committee, I am more or less familiar with the legislation which has been recommended by that committee relating to reorganizations of railroads in financial difficulties. In 1933 we recommended a bill, which subsequently was enacted as section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, entitled "An act for the relief of debtors." The purposes were plain—primarily to expedite reorganizations of railroads. You must appreciate that, although it was put in the Bankruptcy Act, it was not really a bankruptcy statute. Bankruptcy looks to the sale of the debtor's property and the distribution of the proceeds among the creditors. No such thing can be done with a railroad. A railroad cannot be sold like an ordinary business. The public service demands that it be kept in operation. You need no better illustration of the importance of the railroads to the public than the job that has been done by the railroads of this country since the war—not only the so-called solvent railroads, but those which were undergoing reorganization under this statute.

One of the purposes we sought in section 77 was to do away with the inequities of the old-fashioned receivership which had been pointed out by the courts and in Congress. The process of equity receivership was expensive and left the control of the reorganized company generally in the hands of the bankers. We thought we would get away from all that. We thought we would endow the Interstate Commerce Commission with the power to revise the capital structures of these companies, so that they would not be crippled and thrown into receivership by the burden of fixed charges, or by the fact that many had bond issues falling due in the period of the depression, when it was impossible to refinance such maturities and impossible to raise the necessary funds to provide for the additions and betterments which the transportation system must have if it is to serve the public's needs. We thought, too, that we would expedite reorganizations and that we would save the expenses for lawyers' and bankers' fees, which had in some cases reached almost a public scandal.

The first thing we did was to give the Commission power to rearrange the capital structure by changing it into a form where the fixed charges could be reduced to a point where there was no danger of further bankruptcy. Nothing was said in the statute about the total capitalization of these reorganized companies. All that was said was that the rights of creditors generally, or of stockholders, could be altered, and this we expected to be done.

Within 2 years, it was found necessary to make some revisions of the statute, and most of those embodied in the 1935 amendments were recommended by the late Joseph B. Eastman, then Federal Coordinator of Transportation. Again, nothing was said about the total capitalization of the reorganized company, but, at the suggestion of Mr. Eastman and his counsel, we inserted a valuation clause, which gave the Commission power to find and certify to the court a valuation of any portion of the property where a valuation was desirable. One of the elements of this valuation was required to be due consideration of the earning power of the property, past, present, and prospective, and all other relevant facts. This was enacted at a time when railway earnings, particularly on those 30 or 40 companies that were undergoing reorganization, were at the lowest point in their history. It was in the bleakest days of the depression. It never was intended that these depression earnings should be used as a measure of earning power, and, therefore, a measure of value.

Now, what has happened under this statute? The Commission has so interpreted the law that its estimates of earning power are the basis upon which it fixes future capitalization, and the Supreme Court has held that the Commission's action in this respect is final and not subject to review by the courts.

What is the result? In considering past, present, and prospective earnings, the Commission has put the accent, not on the past earnings, but on the depression earnings, and has failed to temper its judgment by any fair conception of prospective earnings. Prospective earnings, as Mr. Eastman has said, constitute a mere guess, and that is obvious to any thinking man. The records in these cases before the Commission were made in the late thirties when earnings were at their worst; the Commission announced its plans along in 1938, 1939, and 1940, without reference to the fact that, even before Pearl Harbor, the earnings had begun to improve, and without giving consideration to the other fact that all during the depression these reorganized railroads were improving their properties, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, with the sure and certain result that operating efficiency would be substantially increased thereby and future earnings correspondingly improved. Without the improvement program which I have just mentioned, the roads would have been unable to render the magnificent public service which they have rendered throughout the emergency.

But, as construed by the Supreme Court, section 77 makes the judgment of the Commission, for all practical purposes, final. The courts will not touch it unless it is clearly arbitrary. In case after case, they have refused to disturb these findings.

The effect has been the destruction of hundreds of millions of dollars of railroad securities, all representing actual investment in the property—all made, to some extent—in reliance upon the belief that they could not be confiscated by the mere act of the Commission, and that a stockholder, before he was deprived of his property, would have his day in court to determine the value of his property by the judicial process.

These stockholders are not Wall Street bankers; they are little fellows, scattered from one end of the land to the other, and their investment in these railroad stocks represents their savings. Viewed

with relation to a capitalization of several hundred million dollars, it does not sound like a very large item in these days when we speak in billions, but to the retired railway conductor, or to the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, who has put his little savings in railroad stock, the loss of $1,000—or $2,000—is a very serious matter. It brings home to him the importance of this law in a way that nothing else could do.

I hold in my hand a list of the stockholders of two of the large railway companies now undergoing reorganization, classified accordingly to the amount of the shares they hold. I will take the first one: Out of 13,119 shareholders, 5,525 hold 10 shares or less. Another 2,413 hold from 11 to 25 shares; another 1,500 own from 26 to 50 shares. Those who own 51 shares or over are only 3,650. Ten thousand out of the 13,000 are the little fellows.

Or, take another road, figures of which are available to you, if you want to see them: Out of 12,201 shareholders, 5,398 of those people own 10 shares or less; 2,000 own 25 shares and down to 11 shares; 1,400 own up to 50 shares. Or a total own 50 shares or less of 8,900 shares, out of 12,000. These are the people who are being wiped out. I have no doubt that the same ratio holds in the other companies where the capital stock has been eliminated.

I mention these figures to show that the people who are being hurt in this situation are not the great financial institutions of our metropolitan centers—it is the little fellow scattered throughout the country who is suffering. The large bondholding institutions which are able to get together and protect their interests throughout these proceedings, have reaped a rich reward, for they will own the reorganized companies. They have appeared in every case—sometimes separately, more generally as a group consisting of a dozen to a score—never more than 25. The result has been victory for them—for the property is being turned over to them, while little stockholders—more than a hundred thousand in number—have been left out in the cold.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and I am in favor of the bill. I believe our committee was unanimous in its report on the bill.

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The impression among some of our brethren is that Wall Street has the security, that it now has the stock, and that this bill is in the interest of Wall Street or the high security holders. If I understand the bill correctly, it has just the opposite effect, it is to help the little folks.

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct. This bill proposes to remedy that situation. Its first and main effort is to provide that the courts shall have the power and the duty to review judicially all the findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission upon which the plans of reorganization are based. This will add nothing to the volume or the complexity of the evidence. All the evidence is now before the court. It will not change the scope of the hearing or of the testimony which the court may consider. It will merely direct that the courts exercise the judicial power, as was contemplated by section 77 in its present form, and give to the parties and the public the benefit of that judgment of a coordinate power of our Government. It will correct the present misconception of the Commission's powers, so that no longer can an administrative body, without review by the courts, destroy millions of dollars of property by fiat.

Second, and as a means of guiding the Interstate Commerce Commission, we have prescribed a standard which applies to the total capitalization of the reorganized company. It does not affect the power of the Commission to change the capital structure so as to insure that the fixed charges will not sink the new ship; it does say that total capitalization shall not be reduced so long as it does not exceed either the actual investment in the property or the findings of value made by the Commission itself under the physical-valuation provisions of section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand correctly, a number of the Federal courts that have been administering our bankruptcy laws relating to railroads have favored this legislation as being just and right and equitable.

Mr. REED of Illinois. I could not say whether the courts themselves favor it, of course. I assume the courts would believe in judicial review.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I correctly understand that this measure favors the common stockholders in railroad reorganizations?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman estimate how many millions or billions of dollars' worth of their property might be saved to those common stockholders by this legislation if enacted?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I will cover that in a moment.

You will remember that since 1913 the Interstate Commerce Commission, by authority of Congress, has been investigating every item of railroad property in the United States, with a view to fixing a physical valuation for each railroad. This work has gone on for 30 years, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars both to the public and the railroads, and every carrier has had a finding made of the physical value of its properties. Under the new dispensation, these valuations are ignored. They might as well be thrown into the wastebasket.

The adoption of this standard does not mean that the Commission cannot reduce the capitalization if there is water in the stock. It does not apply to such a situation at all but where stock represents actual investment, then the first principle upon which our Government is founded demands that that investment be protected. It is strange to me that the Commission, in its handling of these reorganizations, has not recognized the importance to the public of protecting the existing investment, and it is even stranger that the courts have permitted the Commission to get away with it. We cannot have a transportation system in these United States unless we show some willingness to protect the man who puts his money into it, not merely the banker who lends money on the bonds, but the little fellow who buys the stock. We must keep railway investments attractive for stockholders. It is folly to expect them to finance new railroad capital by wiping out the investments they have already made.

It is particularly difficult for me to understand the inconsistencies of the Interstate Commerce Commission which in all its pronouncements has laid such emphasis on the necessity for a proper balance between stock and bonds in rail capital structures. The Commission has very properly pointed out that the great risk for repeated bankruptcies is the high ratio of debt, as compared with the investments represented by stock or equity. It was because the railroads were temporarily unable to meet their obligations as they matured that so many railroads were forced to avail themselves of the provisions of section 77 during the early days of the recent depression. The Commission is very rightly undertaking to safeguard future solvency by reducing the fixed charges, yet in nearly every plan which it has brought out, it has defeated its purpose by wiping out the stocks, and thereby forever destroying the market for railroad stocks as investments.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding, and even some misrepresentation, of the purposes and the effect of this bill. I emphasize again that this bill does not disturb the present duty of the Commission with respect to fixed charges. The Commission, if in its judgment the situation demands it, can convert the entire capitalization into securities which bear no fixed charges whatever—income bonds, preferred stock, or even common stock. Nor does this bill require that the new capitalization should consist entirely of common stock, exchanged for old common stock. We give a leeway whereby the excess over the Commission's estimate of capitalized earning power up to the point of the present capitalization can be converted into no-par stock. If the earnings are there, the new no-par stock will get it. It cannot harm the bondholder, who is secure in his earnings and who is paid in full before the stockholder participates.

One more reason why the Commission's interpretation of the existing statute must be corrected is that the earning power of the carriers generally is within the control of the Commission itself. It is the Commission's duty so to regulate the rate structure that there will be a fair return on the value of the property as determined by the Commission under section 19a. The law requires it; the Constitution requires it. It is that provision which justifies an investor in investing his funds in railroad securities. To say that, because the Commission has failed for any reason whatever to obtain this result, it should be allowed to correct its failure by destroying the investor, is

certainly not due process of law and cannot conceivably benefit railway credit. And that, after all, is one of the most important features of the railway problem. We must have railway credit to enable our transportation system to maintain itself at the present level of efficiency. In war, it has been the first line of defense, for without transportation there would have been no matériel sent to the Army, there would have been no ships, no guns, no ammunition. We must keep it that way. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the passage of this bill.

Statement showing ownership of outstanding capital stock of St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. as of the close of business Nov. 15, 1943—separated as between common and 6-percent stock

Holding	Number of holders	Number of shares, common	Average number of shares held	Number of holders	Number of shares, 6 percent	Average number of shares held
1 to 10 shares	2,614	17,943	6.86	2,911	19,220	6.60
11 to 25 shares	1,240	23,658	19.07	1,173	22,848	19.47
26 to 50 shares	813	34,015	41.83	722	30,867	42.75
51 to 100 shares	1,162	110,779	95.33	986	94,745	96.09
101 shares and over	833	464,348	557.44	669	321,148	480.00
	6,658	650,551	97.70	6,461	488,828	75.65

Statement showing above information combining the common and 6-percent stock

Holding	Total number of holders, common and 6-percent	Number of shares, common	Number of shares, 6-percent	Total	Average number of shares held
1 to 10 shares	5,525	17,943	19,220	37,163	6.72
11 to 25 shares	2,413	23,658	22,848	46,506	19.27
26 to 50 shares	1,535	34,015	30,867	64,882	42.26
51 to 100 shares	2,148	110,779	94,745	205,524	95.68
101 shares and over	1,502	464,348	321,148	785,496	522.96
	13,119	650,551	488,828	1,139,379	86.84

Statement showing ownership of outstanding capital stock of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. as of the close of business Apr. 4, 1944

Holding	Number of holders	Common	7 percent preferred	6 percent preferred	Total	Average number of shares held
1 to 10 shares	5,398	11,364	13,972	8,669	34,005	6.29
11 to 25 shares	2,072	16,808	13,923	10,358	41,089	19.83
26 to 50 shares	1,420	24,094	19,591	15,576	59,261	41.73
51 to 100 shares	1,894	90,475	45,040	43,223	178,738	94.37
101 shares and over	1,417	600,858	201,642	173,333	975,833	688.66
	12,201	743,599	294,168	251,159	1,288,926	105.64

It will be noted that 44 percent of the stockholders own an average of 6.29 shares each; that 17 percent own an average of 19.83 shares; that 12 percent own an average of 41.73 shares, and that 73 percent of the stockholders own 50 shares or less—an average of 22.61 shares.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the battle now being waged by Wall Street against Main Street has terrific postwar implications, since it threatens the whole future of railroad service of the United States by destroying the confidence of the investing public in railroad securities. But the winning of this battle for Main Street cannot be postponed until after the war, because the slaughter of the small bona fide investors is now going on.

Wall Street owns high-priority railroad bonds, bonds secured by mortgages. No one questions the absolute necessity of insuring full payment of these bonds, both principal and interest. The pending bill, H. R. 37, would not affect such adequate existing insurance. Like Portia, however, this bill insists that Wall Street has a right to demand its pound of flesh but no blood.

Wall Street is now taking advantage of the "slaughter of the innocents"—Main Street bona fide investors in common stock and junior bonds—by buying bonds whose unearned increment is being built up by wiping out Main Street's junior securities. As usual, however, Wall Street is taking no chances. It is speculating on a certainty. There is no speculation, and will be none, in those classes of so-called securities now held by Main Street. Wall Street knows its game. Its denizens are, as usual, profiting by the killing of "the goose that lays the golden eggs." Since Wall Street wrote the rules by which this game is played, there is no hope for Main Street without amending those rules. National need of adequate railway service requires the protection of the investments of both Wall Street and Main Street in railway securities. The cardinal principle of fair play demands equal justice to both. Hence this bill.

The preservation of railway service will require credit of the kind extended by both Wall Street and Main Street and the restoration of what was supposed to be the true connotation of the word "securities." Security must mean complete assurance for the high-priority mortgage-bond investors and at least reasonable assurance for the investors in common stock and bonds of lower priorities. Otherwise fewer railroads will run, and those that run will operate inadequately. Each of these deplorable results means fewer jobs for railroad men and lowered wages for labor as well as management.

From 30 to 40 percent of the railroad mileage in the United States is in receivership or reorganization. Yet there is no overcapitalization. As required by section 20A of the Interstate Commerce Act, all the "water" has been squeezed out of railroad stocks and junior bonds. Of course there never was any "water" in high priority bonds—Wall Street has always seen to that. Under section 19A of the Interstate Commerce Act, the honest appraised value of the physical properties of all railroads has been carefully made and is kept current by the Interstate Commerce Commission. So, under the law, we know that the stocks and all other securities issued by railroads have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission as fair to the investing public for the last 25 years, and, also, we know the fair market value of rights-of-way, tracks, yards, depots, rolling stock, supplies, and everything else the railroads own, less depreciation and obsolescence. Therefore, there should not be much uncertainty in the calculation of the value of either railroad paper or physical properties. The only serious question grew out of the fact that properly capitalized and equipped railroads vary in earning power. So, in 1935, Congress amended the law so as to require that in addition to all the accurate and dependable information furnished by the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the value of railway paper and equipment, it should in conjunction with the ascertainment of these values, go further and consider earning power, past, present, and prospective.

In the reorganization of railroads under this amended statute, however, the Interstate Commerce Commission seems to discard two-thirds of the formula fixed by the amendment—to wit, present and prospective earnings—and to pay little or no attention to the value of railroad paper and equipment as fixed by the Commission itself under sections 20A and 19A of the Interstate Commerce Act. The apparent theory being that the war has caused present railroad earnings to be abnormally high and that future earnings are unpredictable, so that the actual earnings of the depression period is the only criterion left for fixing values, no matter what the Commission may have said theretofore. This means that the capital structures now being fixed by the Commission for reorganized railroads are based almost exclusively upon depression earnings. These, of course, were as notoriously low as the war earnings are notoriously high. Neither is a fair criterion. The law required and still requires that—

> The value of any property used in railroad operation shall be determined on a basis which will give due consideration to the earning power of the property, past, present, and prospective, and all other relevant facts.

The purpose of the Bankruptcy Act particularly of section 77 was to relieve debtors of some of their burdens, not of all of their properties.

With these ideas in mind, last June I commended to your careful study the

unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary, recommending the passage of the then pending bill, H. R. 4960, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which as reintroduced is now H. R. 37 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The report of the new bill, which is the same as the old bill, is practically the same report and it, too, is unanimous.

It is my sincere hope that you have studied this report, for it gives both factual and legal background and justification for the pending bill.

The passage of this bill is necessary now in order to save the equities owned by thousands of bona fide owners of railroad stock and junior bonds. It is also necessary now if we would save railroad credit, without which railroad service in the post-war period will be seriously impaired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, a member of our committee and one of our most distinguished and honored friends.

Mr. SPRINGER. Primarily the purpose of this bill, as I understand, is that in cases where the Interstate Commerce Commission has wiped out the rights of stockholders, then they have the right to a judicial review to establish whatever equities they may have had. Is that correct?

Mr. HOBBS. That is not only correct, but as the distinguished and learned senior member of our Subcommittee on Bankruptcy the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] chose to express it, it also gives them a "rain check." In other words, they have a right to keep the piece of paper which they bought at par value when offered for sale to the public with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As I understand it, the bill presented this year is improved by a year's study, in addition to the bill that was introduced at the last session?

Mr. HOBBS. We did not think it could be improved. We studied it some more but reported the same bill. The first one was reported after more than a year's study, and after listening to experts from all over the Nation, who testified as you see in the printed hearings.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No changes at all?

Mr. HOBBS. No changes at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. HOBBS. I yield myself 1 additional minute in order that I may yield to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] a member of our committee.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This does not authorize any increase in freight rates or passenger rates, does it?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Not at all?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It just gives a "rain check" or a right to go to the courts, and their heads cannot be cut off without a hearing in the courts. When the court held that, it held something that it was not the intention of Congress to put into the bill at all?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We are setting out more clearly the intention of the original bill?

Mr. HOBBS. We are setting out more clearly the intention of the original bill. As you know, that is exactly what Mr. Joseph Eastman, who was then a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, told us; that it could not have any such effect. We told the House when the bill was unanimously passed, that it could have no such effect. Now the Supreme Court says it does have that effect.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want a word of assurance with reference to this bill regarding pending reorganizations that have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission and then taken to the courts and have been there for several years, by various parties, through protective associations. How does it affect those pending that have already been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always delighted to have the gentleman from Massachusetts ask me a question and am always so happy if I can answer. We tried to make it as plain as it was possible through the use of English language that it covered every single case of that kind. Only those cases that have been finally approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission and finally approved by the courts are beyond the reach of this bill after it becomes law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is rather too bad that this legislation, which is of such great importance, could not be debated more at length than is possible under this procedure. I say this not because I do not believe the legislation is worthy, for I am supporting the bill and believe it should be passed; I say it because this is one of the matters the Committee on the Judiciary has spent a great deal of time on during the past 5 or 6 years.

To begin with, the matter was brought up under a bill filed by our colleague from Nebraska, Mr. McLaughlin, during the time he so ably served as a Member of the House. Very extensive hearings were had resulting in voluminous testimony. We had some of the best experts on railroad reorganization, and law, and legislation in the United States appear before the committee. After Mr. McLaughlin left the House of Representatives the bill was filed by our distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. During the past 2 years we have again had very full and extensive hearings on this proposal.

At this time I wish to pay a special tribute to the patience and ability of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] in working out this legislation. He has given untiringly of his time and effort trying to bring out this legislation in such form that it would give relief to a group entitled to relief and would at the same time treat all classes of creditors equitably. The fundamental purpose of this bill is to try to give a little something that may be left over, if anything is left over, to the holders of preferred and common stock in reorganized railroad companies; and, secondly, to give the court a right of independent judicial review. I was somewhat worried about the provision for independent review by the court in the beginning because I felt that the Interstate Commerce Commission, being an expert body on railroads and railroad reorganization, would be in the best position to judge the equities of the situation and the classes of stock to be issued, but the Supreme Court decided that the courts either had to take everything the Interstate Commerce Commission had reported or nothing; so we had a situation of the Interstate Commerce Commission's making a report to the court, and the court without the right to make modifications. In the bill therefore we provided for an independent review, which, I believe, is desirable. But there was one difficulty we might have encountered; we might have run into the situation where every time the matter came before a court somebody who felt they had not been treated properly would secure another hearing so there would be a continuance of hearings, and they never would be able to get a railroad reorganized. We limited to some extent the scope of the court review.

To take care of that situation the last paragraph states:

> The opinion of the reviewing court that the findings of the Commission shall not be taken, shall not be sent back for another hearing unless there is a substantial change or changes that may have occurred since the hearing, or for clarification.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this bill is in the public interest. It has been a rather controversial matter. It seems to me that it is only fair and right that the holders of all kinds of securities may be entitled to a chance of receiving something.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, the holders of other securities should have, as somebody has expressed it, a cup to get the drippings in the event something is left. In the second place, the court should have a larger part in the review of these cases than they have had under the interpretation of the Supreme Court. This will give it to them and, in my opinion, represents a just remedy.

Mr. Chairman, we owe a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and to the other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle for their work in connection with this bill and I want to refer particularly to the excellent work of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] with reference to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the subcommittee, and I voted for this bill. I believe that it is a good bill. As some of the previous speakers have stated, it will give the common stockholders a chance to retrieve or get something out of their investment. The value of common stocks are governed largely by the earnings of a corporation.

We recently went through the worst kind of a depression this country had ever seen and, naturally, a good many of the railroads went through bankruptcy. We are now on the mend. During the last few years the railroads have had pretty good earnings. If the stockholders are given a chance to hold on to their securities and not be wiped out, they will have an opportunity to get something back out of their investment.

The railroads are going to do pretty well in this country for several years to come; and if a stockholder who has common stock can hold it, he has a good chance of getting back some part of his money at least. I am, therefore, in favor of the pending bill and urge its passage.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I have no other requests for time; therefore, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, is amended as follows:

1. Subsection (b) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The capitalization of the reorganized company shall not be less than the capitalization existing on the date on which the debtor's petition to the court was approved as properly filed, with such adjustment therein as may result from the issue or retirement of securities during the reorganization proceedings: *Provided,* That such existing capitalization does not exceed either—

"(i) the actual investment in the debtor's properties; or

"(ii) the valuation found by the Commission under section 19 (a) of the act, plus expenditures for additions and betterments less retirements since the date of such valuation, whichever is the lower: *And provided further,* That any part of such capitalization in excess of the value of all of the debtor's property as certified by the Commission pursuant to subsection (e) shall be represented by shares of stock without par value of the reorganized company at the rate of one share of such stock for each $100 of such excess."

2. That so much of subsection (d) of such section as reads as follows: "After the filing of such a plan, the Commission, unless such plan shall be considered by it to be prima facie impracticable, shall, after due notice to all stockholders and creditors given in such manner as it shall determine, hold public hearings," is hereby amended to read as follows: "After the filing of such a plan, the Commission shall name one of its members to confer with the parties in interest and to endeavor as a mediator to reconcile differences which may exist between them and unless such plan shall be considered by it to be prima facie impracticable, shall, after due notice to all stockholders and creditors given in such manner as it shall determine, hold public hearings."

3. That so much of subsection (e) of such section as reads as follows: "After such hearing, and without any hearing if no objections are filed, the judge shall approve the plan if satisfied that (1) it complies with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, is fair and equitable, affords due recognition to the rights of each class of creditors and stockholders, does not discriminate unfairly in favor of any class of creditors or stockholders, and will conform to the requirements of the law of the land regarding the participation of the various classes of creditors and stockholders;", is hereby amended to read as follows: "After such hearing, and without any hearing if no objection is filed, the judge shall make full and independent judicial reexamination and review of the plan and of the evidence presented at such hearing, in the event of such hearing, and thereafter shall approve the plan if, in the exercise of his independent judgment based upon such judicial reexamination and review, he is satisfied that (1) the plan complies with the provisions of subsections (b) and (d) of this section, is fair and equitable, affords due recognition to the rights of each class of creditors and stockholders, does not discriminate unfairly in favor of any class thereof, and will conform to the requirements of the Constitution and statutes of the United States; (2) the determination of value made by the Commission and certified to the court under the provisions of this subsection is supported by substantial evidence, adequately reflects the true value of the property at the time of hearing, or at the time of certification of the plan by the Commission, in the event no hearing is had before the court, and does not omit consideration of any relevant facts."

4. Subsection (e) of such section is amended by redesignating clauses "(2)" and "(3)" as "(3)" and "(4)," respectively.

5. So much of the first proviso of subsection (e) of such section as reads as follows: "*Provided,* That submission to any class of stockholders shall not be necessary if the Commission shall have found, and the judge shall have affirmed the finding," is amended by striking out "shall have affirmed the finding," and inserting in lieu thereof "in the exercise of his independent judgment, after consideration of the evidence presented at the hearing before the court, in the event of such hearing, shall also find."

6. So much of the second proviso of subsection (e) of such section as reads as follows: "*Provided further,* That submission to any class of creditors shall not be necessary if the Commission shall have found, and the judge shall have affirmed the finding," is amended by striking out "shall have affirmed the finding," and inserting in lieu thereof "in the exercise of his independent judgment, after consideration of the evidence presented at the hearing before the court in the event of such hearing, shall also find."

7. So much of the fourth paragraph of subsection (e) of such section as reads as follows: "The value of any property used in railroad operation shall be determined on a basis which will give due consideration to the earning power of the property, past, present, and prospective, and all other relevant facts. In determining such value only such effect shall be given to the present cost of reproduction new and less depreciation and original cost of the property, and the actual investment therein, as may be required under the law of the land, in light of its earning power and all other relevant facts," is amended by striking out "as may be required under the law of the land" and inserting in lieu thereof "as will conform to the requirements of the Constitution and statutes of the United States."

8. Subsection (s) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(s) Proceedings pending under this section (act of March 3, 1933, as amended by act of August 27, 1935, and act of June 26, 1936, and act of August 11, 1939) shall continue under, and be governed by, the provisions of this section as hereby amended, except where the property dealt with by the plan has been transferred and conveyed to the debtor or another corporation or corporations provided for by the plan, or retained by the debtor pursuant to the plan, as provided in subsection (f) of this section, or where the plan has been submitted to creditors for acceptance or rejection pursuant to subsection (e) and has been accepted by or on behalf of the requisite percentage of creditors of each class to which submission is required, prior to the effective date of this amendment. If such property has not been so transferred and conveyed or retained pursuant to the plan, or if such plan has not been so submitted and so accepted, no final decree shall be entered in any such proceedings unless and until subsequent to such effective date the judge of the court to which the plan was certified by the Commission shall have made a supplemental finding, subject to judicial review, that the plan conforms to the requirements of this section as amended.

"Except as provided in this subsection (s) the enactment of this amendatory section shall not annul the record made at any hearing before the Commission or in any court proceeding prior to the enactment of this amendment, but such record may be amplified in accordance with the provisions of this amendment, if in the opinion of the reviewing court such amplifications may be necessary or desirable (1) by reason of any substantial change or changes that may have occurred since the hearing, or (2) for clarification."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 37) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, had directed him to report the same back to the House without amendment with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 19]

Anderson, Calif.	Fellows	Peterson, Ga.
Barden	Fernandez	Pfeifer
Biemiller	Fogarty	Powers
Bland	Gardner	Quinn, N. Y.
Bolton	Granger	Rains
Boren	Gwinn, N. Y.	Reece, Tenn.
Bulwinkle	Hare	Rees Kans.
Burch	Harness, Ind.	Rivers
Burgin	Havenner	Rogers, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Rowan
Case, S. Dak.	Heidinger	Sadowski
Celler	Henry	Satterfield
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman	Schwabe, Okla.
Colmer	Holifield	Sheridan
Courtney	Izac	Short
Curley	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sikes
D'Alesandro	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson	Kirwan	Stockman
De Lacy	LaFollette	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Landis	Vorys, Ohio
Dondero	McGregor	Vursell
Durham	McMillan, S. C.	Wasielewski
Eaton	Madden	White
Elliott	May	Wilson
Elston	Mott	Winter
Ervin	O'Hara	Woodrum, Va.
		Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 352 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. HOBBS, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed and all other Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, further proceedings under the calendar will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file a report on the George bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "There Ought To Be a Law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon at the time of the roll call on S. 340 I was attending a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs and was unable to attend the House session in time to answer that call. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Col. William Cattron Rigby, retired, at the memorial services for Mr. Justice Sutherland. I find that the cost of the insertion of this extension is $234, making four and one-half pages of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the cost, the address may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GERMAN WAR PRISONERS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include New York Times articles dated January 16, 17, and 18, 1945, and editorials dated January 16 and February 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to discuss the problems we are facing in relation to German war prisoners now in the United States. The problems are vital and pressing and we are being forced to face them by the activities of the prisoners themselves as well as of certain other groups who have appointed themselves their guardians. An organization known as the Victory Committee of German-American Trade Unionists, and other good people of this country, is asking for money contributions from the American people for the purpose of educating the Nazi prisoners in this country. There are about 359,140 Nazi war prisoners in the United States at the present time.

It is very fine for certain good and neighborly people to look that far ahead and to seek to raise money in the hope of educating the coming generation of Germans, but to attempt to educate Nazis in this country is, in my opinion—and I believe the American people will feel as I do—a complete waste of time, money, and energy. You cannot educate Nazi prisoners because they were brought up on the political, racial, and economic theories of the Nazis; their bible was Hitler's Mein Kampf; their whole outlook on life is based upon Nazi ideologies with which they have been indoctrinated from their early childhood. Their minds are poisoned by the Fascist teachings of their Nazi tutors. The whole generation of Germans who grew up under Nazi domination is incurably diseased, mentally and emotionally; they are a lost generation as far as the civilization of the world is concerned. It would be absolutely futile to attempt to reeducate such outcasts whose hands are stained with blood, who are responsible for the brutal murder of millions of innocent people, who in their unholy lust for power have destroyed a number of peace-loving countries and their inhabitants, and who have embroiled the whole world in this ghastly slaughter which practically brought us all to the brink of destruction. Would any sane person believe for a moment that young Nazis, nurtured upon the creed of nazi-ism, believing in nothing but force and cruelty, would ever react to an educational program as outlined by the group I mentioned before. No one who faces this problem realistically could be fooled into accepting such fantastic theories. Do you think for one moment that if we do undertake this great program advocated by some good Americans—and I am ashamed to say there are some prominent Americans on this committee who are sponsoring this movement—these prisoners would spread the gospel of democracy when they go back home? Do you think for one moment that if we attempt to educate these Nazi murderers in this country that they are going to repent and change despite their background? No. These organizations are making a great mistake in undertaking this kind of a program.

It is most unfortunate that the American people are very soft. We are chicken-hearted. Our boys in the concentration camps in Germany are dying by the thousands. They are surrounded by barbed-wire fences charged with electricity, so that when they move against them they die.

In this country our War Department, the guardian of these Nazi prisoners, has allowed at least 1,301 prisoners to escape from the camps. They say they have recaptured most of them. It takes an army of men to guard these prisoners, who are relatively free, who go where they like, and almost do what they like.

As a matter of fact, these prisoners eat better than we do. I am going to give you a menu at one particular camp. A 1-week menu at that camp would have required 45 meat points and 63 processed food points per prisoner. At dinner they got turkey a la king, parsley potatoes, cauliflower, celery, pickles, bread and butter, chocolate cake, and coffee. For breakfast the next day they got grapefruit, dry cereal, fresh milk, eggs, toast, butter, jam, and coffee, and another helping if they wished. For lunch they got veal steak, lyonnaise potatoes, stewed corn, fruit salad, bread and butter, peaches, and coffee. For supper they got veal loaf, gravy, scalloped potatoes, green peas, cabbage, pineapple salad,

bread and butter, cinnamon rolls, and coffee. They get butter three times a day. In the same week they had fried pork chops, fried eggs with ham, veal stew, and roast veal. And if they do not like that, they can order what they like and get it. American boys held by the Germans say if it were not for the Red Cross they would starve in these camps. They say they are getting no food. They are getting no medical treatment. They are getting nothing but suffering. Yet we are pampering a lot of criminals in this country who are let loose and can play ball to keep them in good physical shape. In good shape for what? For another assault upon the peace-loving people of the wo..d? While they have their recreation periods they will throw the ball over the fence at least a dozen times so that our soldier boys who are guarding them will have to go on the other side of the fence and get the ball back for them. And they do it deliberately.

In one particular case brought to my attention a few Nazi prisoners, when they were taken off the boat, were offered some warm milk by the Red Cross workers. They spit in the eye of the Red Cross lady, slapped her hand and threw the milk in the gutter. Those are the kind of people these superidealists want to educate to bring back democracy to Germany. Mr. Speaker, it cannot be done. Did you know, my friends, that they have a court of their own; judges of their own, and a court martial of their own within the war prisoners camps? They try their own members if any of them should fail to display the proper respect for Hitler and nazi-ism or show any sign of wavering in their devotion to the Nazi cause. There were six or eight tried in these various camps and the verdict was guilty with a sentence of death and six to eight Nazi prisoners were executed by their fellow prisoners based upon the court martial of the Nazi prisoners in this country of ours. Yet the War Department did nothing to prosecute them for their crimes. Can you educate murderers of that character? How can we attempt even to think about reeducating such fanatics? Despite our sad experience with impudent supermen, I see a statement in the press today that Major General Lerch, Provost Marshal General of the Army, is quoted as saying that we need more prisoners for labor. Well, in the first place we do not need these prisoners for labor, and if we needed them as desperately as the gentleman seems to think—and I do not agree with him, it still does not mean that we have to treat them as guests. I feel sure that none of the prisoners have ever experienced such a well balanced and cared for existence before. Not even their country clubs in dear old Germany provided them with all the good food and recreation they are getting here. Right now a number of them who have escaped, who in my judgment are dangerous, are roaming around the country. God knows how many are at large endangering the safety of our country. Even the War Department admits that 1,301 prisoners have escaped up to February 9, 1945.

If you want workers and farm help, why not open a few free ports and allow some real decent suffering people to come here, temporarily? They would be glad to work. They would be glad to work 20 and 24 hours a day. Is it not the duty of our country to open our ports to and permit admission of thousands of real farmers, real agriculturalists, real mechanics, who have been the victims of nazi-ism, who are waiting and begging us to save their lives? Why not open these free ports, only for temporary purposes, until the war is over? We can have all the labor we want. We would not have to be afraid to be murdered by an escaped Nazi murderer in this country. The American people will be much safer if that program is adopted.

They say these prisoners did some work for private contractors. How is a private contractor going to watch those men? About 10,000 prisoners were assigned to private contractors, who are making money out of their contracts. Others have been employed in laundries; others in warehouses, and some day there will be trouble, some day we will discover to our sorrow what price we will have to pay for this convenient source of labor.

We have made a great mistake. Now comes a general saying, "We want some more; bring in another hundred thousand." Some of our people in this country, with all the prosperity of this great country, cannot even get a bottle of milk for their children, while the Nazi prisoners feast on the fat of the land. Are we so soft? Are we so charitable? There seems to be no end to our gullibility.

In my remarks I will try to give you a few examples of what public opinion on this problem is—it is definitely opposed to our pampering the Nazi prisoners—yet I have been informed indirectly that even the War Department is contemplating a program to "educate" these murderers. You can educate a Nazi from now until doomsday, and that murder in his heart will never be removed by all the teaching you can give him. All the money that can be collected from the American people whose sons and daughters were murdered by these various gangsters, will only do harm to the world and to our own people because it will create a new illusion as to the good, reeducated, reformed Nazi. If people want to educate others, if they are so generous and willing to contribute money by the hundreds of thousands, let us start at home to educate some of our own people who need it very much. Let us do something for our own people in certain sections of the country who have been deprived of much education because they did not have the money. They are not dumb. They could learn, but we never took care of our own people.

I say to all these committees and groups in my city and in other sections of the country: "Use your money for better purposes than to try to stimulate a belief in decency in a Nazi who has killed millions and millions of people only because they were decent human beings and who has destroyed at least 20,000,000 families in his reign of terror." I feel like every American ought to feel—we should live up to our treaty obligations but under no treaty are we obliged to do the things we are doing for these Nazi prisoners. It is costing us millions and millions of dollars to feed them. In some of the camps the prisoners do not even like eggs and bacon, but throw them aside. Do you know almost 80 percent of them have a picture of Hitler hanging over their cots? Do you know that if one Nazi does not salute another he has to be tried? And that right here in this country. Yet we have the War Department telling us there is nothing wrong about anything, that everything is going along very nicely. The three articles from the New York Times which I shall insert at this point give a clear picture of Nazi terrorism in our prison camps:

[From the New York Times of January 16, 1945]

PRISON CAMPS, RID OF NAZI TERRORISM—WAR DEPARTMENT LIFTS SECRECY NOW THAT GESTAPO ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN STAMPED OUT

(By Russell Porter)

WASHINGTON, January 15.—Six murders and two forced suicides have occurred in German prisoner-of-war camps in the United States, and investigation by the War Department has indicated that in all but one of these eight cases the victims were anti-Nazis who had been accused of treason by fellow-prisoners. Some were charged with giving information to the American authorities, others with speaking or writing anti-Nazi views.

Sentences were imposed by "kangaroo" courts composed of prisoners and were carried out by gangs of men operating in the dead of night, Gestapo fashion, either by hangings or beatings. Fearing reprisals by Gestapo agents in the camps, many witnesses have been unwilling to testify, while others have arrogantly refused to do so.

Prompt and apparently effective action to put a stop to such crimes has been taken by the military authorities in charge of prisoners of war. As soon as they realized they were dealing with Gestapo murderers as well as legitimate prisoners of war, the officials in charge tightened up their methods and procedures to prevent further outrages.

COURTS MARTIAL EFFECTIVE

Immediate courts martial were held, dealing with every person against whom sufficient evidence of participation was found. These proceedings evidently have persuaded the prisoners as a whole that terrorism will not be tolerated. Gestapo activities have been stamped out, at least on the surface. As Hitler's fortunes wane, the dominance of the Nazi element in P. O. W. camps decreases. Special protection is provided for those who ask for it.

As a result, no such crimes have been recorded for more than 9 months, all proved crimes having been committed in the period from September 1943 to April 1944, inclusive. The authorities point out that Gestapo activities in their heyday were confined to a few camps and that the P. O. W. homicide and suicide rate is considerably lower than that in civil life, despite the abnormal living conditions behind the barbed wire of P. O. W. camps.

Nevertheless, the authorities are cognizant of sections of public opinion which have appeared inclined to believe that conditions were worse than they actually were and are still bad. They recognize that if the public has been misled by inadequate or inaccurate reports, a contributing factor has been the secrecy with which they have been compelled to surround the P. O. W. camps because of military security and the reciprocal terms of the Geneva Convention governing the treatment of prisoners of war. Now that the situation apparently has been brought under

control, it is felt that an objective presentation of the facts should enable the public to see the situation in its true light.

THE CASE OF A SUICIDE

A typical case of the Nazi terror at work was that of Capt. Felix Tropschuh, a 30-year-old engineer from the Sudetenland, who committed suicide on the night of October 18, 1943, at Camp Concordia, Kans. Investigation showed that he was suspected by the Nazis of having given information, shortly after his capture in Tunisia, that several fellow-officers were planning to escape. On the morning of October 18 Gestapo agents found his diary in which he had written down his hatred of Nazi ideology. That afternoon the other P. O. W. officers held a meeting at which the German camp spokesman, a colonel, denounced Captain Tropschuh as a "traitor" and called him to "trial" before a "court of honor." He was found guilty of "treason to the Fatherland," stripped of his insignia of rank, and ordered "expelled" from the "German community of fellowship."

Attempting to escape to American protection, Captain Tropschuh ran toward a passing American guard truck. He was followed by a crowd of Germans, so that the driver thought he [the driver] was being mobbed, and speeded out of the P. O. W. compound. Later Captain Tropschuh asked for an interview with the American compound commander, a captain, saying he feared personal violence and wanted to be removed, but the German colonel spokesman persuaded the American captain that the matter was so trivial it could wait until the next day and gave his personal guaranty of Captain Tropschuh's safety.

That night, after the American personnel—mess sergeants, clerks, and the like—had been withdrawn for the night from the interior of the prisoners' barracks and compounds, Captain Tropschuh was taken from his room by other German officers on the pretext that his roommate refused to live with him any longer and was placed in solitary confinement in another room in the officers' compound. Two German officers were posted at his door ostensibly to protect him from the wrath of the other prisoners. He was apparently forced to sign a note, written by another German lieutenant, which said: "I voluntarily take leave of my life." Then he was left alone in the room with a table, a chair, and a piece of strong rope.

This was about 9 o'clock. Captain Tropschuh was heard pacing the floor for about an hour, when a noise was heard, and one of the German lieutenants opened the door and found him hanging from an overhead beam. This was reported to higher German officers, who notified the camp authorities. When an American medical officer arrived he found the body still hanging and ordered it cut down, saying that if this had been done at once it might have been possible to save the man's life. The medical officer had been delayed in reaching the scene by a German guide who said he had trouble locating it.

The official inquiry found it was a case of suicide due to mental and perhaps physical coercion, but that action against the other German officers could not be sustained except for the case of the one who supplied the rope, whose identity could not be learned. Except for this, the German officers frankly admitted their roles as described above. The German spokesman said that after Captain Tropschuh was ostracized he collapsed and begged for a rope to hang himself, there being no pistol available, under the traditional German officiers' code of honor in case of officers found guilty of high treason.

TROUBLEMAKERS TRANSFERRED

Both the American camp commander, a colonel, and the captain in charge of the compound were relieved of their duties, and the German colonel-spokesman and another colonel were transferred to a special camp for troublemakers.

The second forced suicide also occurred at Camp Concordia. This was on January 11, 1944, and the victim was Pvt. Franz Kettner, a 39-year-old truck driver from a province in Austria, now a part of Italy, who was captured in Tunisia as a member of the German Air Force. He spoke Italian and had a wife and son in Bolzano, Italy, whom he wanted to bring to this country after the war.

He said he had been ostracized from the "German community of fellowship" because he was an Austrian and a non-Nazi, and had refused a demand of Nazi Party members to steal articles from American stocks. He and his family back home were threatened, he said. American soldiers reported hearing him booed in the mess hall.

For his own protection, he was placed in the guardhouse under custody of American soldiers. Plans were made to transfer him to a special camp for non-Nazis; but he developed hysteria from fear, could not eat, and lost weight rapidly. He was discovered at 4 o'clock in the morning, lying face down on his bunk, his wrists slashed with a razor.

THE GESTAPO IN AMERICA

Facts belatedly made public by the Army authorities and reported for this newspaper by Russell Porter indicate that fanatical Nazi agents created a reign of terror in some German prisoner camps in this country between September 1943 and April 1944. Six prisoners who proved "disloyal" to the Hitler regime were killed. Two others were driven to suicide. On our own soil, in the presence of our own armed guards, Nazi "courts" were set up and Nazi sentences carried out. These outrages might have been prevented if the authorities had realized that we were capturing Nazi gangsters as well as run-of-the-mill soldiers. They have now learned that gangsters may be found in any German military unit and that capture and internment does not humanize them. These creatures have supposedly been segregated and their activities halted.

This ugly episode has a moral for the rest of us as well as for those whose duty it is to guard German prisoners. The completely indoctrinated Nazi is not converted by being beaten and captured. He will not be converted when the German armies are cut to ribbons and Germany itself occupied by the Allies. He will understand that he was unsuccessful but not that he was wrong. Not all such individuals can be convicted of crimes for which they can be kept out of circulation after peace has been won. Many in Germany itself will have to be turned loose, free of any restraints except such as are imposed by the occupying armies on all inhabitants. There will be a difficult police problem while such sanity as remains in Germany is reasserting itself and while a new generation is being educated for a civilized existence. And this is another reason why compromise with the Nazis is a vain and menacing dream. They will have to be policed in Germany as they now are in prison camps. In small conspiracies as in large ones, they prove their unfitness for life in a civilized world.

[From the New York Times of January 17, 1945]

EX-YORKVILLE MAN SLAIN AS PRISONER—GERMAN CORPORAL WITH PARENTS LIVING HERE WAS ONE OF FIVE SILENCED BY NAZIS IN CAMPS—CRITICIZED HITLER REGIME—OTHERS KILLED IN UNITED STATES INCLUDED REICH NAVY MAN HANGED ON NIGHT HE REACHED CAMP

(By Russell Porter)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—One of the five German prisoners of war murdered by Nazi fellow-prisoners in American prisoner of war camps because of anti-Nazi activities, as reported in a previous article, was a former resident of the Yorkville district of New York City, whose parents are naturalized Americans still living there. He was Corp. Hugo Krauss, 25, who died on December 23, 1943, after a beating 6 nights earlier at Camp Hearne, Tex.

His murder took place during a period when there was one such killing or forced suicide every month as the result of Gestapo methods, kangaroo courts, and other forms of terrorism.

The reign of terror seems to have been ended by measures taken by the United States military authorities in charge of the camps, notably the holding of prompt court-martial proceedings against all prisoners shown to have taken part in these crimes. These steps apparently have been successful, since there has been no case of this sort for more than 9 months.

Krauss, who was born in Germany in 1919, came to this country with his parents in 1928 and returned to Germany in 1939 as a result of his friendship with a German-American Bund member, who arranged for payment of part of his travel expenses. He was in Germany when the war started and was drafted, but was released when he claimed American citizenship. Later he joined the German Army and fought first in Russia and then in North Africa, where he was captured.

HIGHLY COOPERATIVE AT CAMP

Speaking English well, Krauss was employed as an interpreter at Camp Hearne. The American authorities regarded him as highly cooperative at all times. Investigation disclosed that he was regarded by some of the prisoners as anti-Nazi and a traitor. He often criticized the German Government and the Army, indicated his belief that the United States would win the war, praised this country, said he considered himself an American citizen and intended to stay here after the war. He said he was going to get a Christmas furlough to visit his parents in New York and expected to arrange things so he could join the United States Army, according to some statements.

He had a radio which his parents had sent him and he used to infuriate some of his fellow prisoners, especially the younger and more fanatical Hitlerites, by tuning out German music in favor of American broadcasts, which he interpreted with emphasis on American victories and derision of German claims. On various occasions he is said to have refused to join German ceremonies and singing. The Nazis charged him with making disloyal statements about Germany and its Fuehrer.

The immediate cause of his murder was apparently the transfer of some German noncommissioned officers to another compound on the charge that they were inciting other prisoners not to cooperate in the P. O. W. work program on the score that it was helping the American war effort. Some of these noncoms had been suspected of complicity in other beatings. Evidence developed in the investigation that Krauss was suspected of giving information against these men.

After the lights were put out at 9 p. m. on December 17, 1943, from 6 to 10 men entered the compound through a hole they had cut out in a wire fence separating it from another compound, invaded Krauss's barracks and gave him a severe beating with clubs. He screamed for help but no one came to his aid. His barracks mates looked on while his skull was fractured, both arms were broken, and his body was battered from head to foot.

NAVY MAN HANGED LATER

Within 6 hours after his arrival at the P. O. W. camp at Papago Park, Ariz., Werner Dreschler, an enlisted man of the German Navy, was hanged in a washroom early on the morning of March 13, 1944. He was first beaten and strangled in his barracks by a group of men, and when he broke away they caught him and hanged him. The investigation indicated that about six men partici-

pated, and that they probably belonged to his own crew.

It was learned that other prisoners regarded him as a traitor and suspected him of having given information about a U-boat to American interrogators. His execution was reportedly ordered at a kangaroo court which denounced him as a dog who had broken his oath and had the lives of his comrades on his conscience. A submarine captain among the prisoners was quoted as saying all anti-Nazis were traitors and should be put out of the way.

Hans Geller, a parachutist, 21 years old, who had been wounded twice before his capture, and all of whose three brothers had been killed in action as German soldiers, died at Camp Chaffee, Ark., on March 25, 1944, of a beating received two nights earlier. Geller, who spoke and read English well, was distinctly anti-Nazi and cooperated actively with the Americans in trying to get work out of a detail of prisoners in his charge. He reported that two men assigned to the detail by the company leader, a German sergeant, appeared to be spies, who were trying to find out whether the prisoners were talking to the Americans. As a result the two men were dismissed from the detail.

That night a "stranger"—a prisoner from another compound—appeared at Geller's barracks and said a new prisoner from the German town of Sudern wanted to talk to anybody from his home town. Geller, who came from Sudern, unsuspectingly walked out into the darkness. He was attacked by men who leaped at him from behind a building. One chased him and hit him several times over the head with a thick piece of lumber about 2 feet long. His assailant disappeared as Geller staggered into a lighted orderly room with a fractured skull and other injuries. He said he knew who had attacked him but would not tell their names; he would settle with them later.

What some American officials consider a case of action by a Vehrgericht or secret court of vengeance, a sort of black-hand organization, occurred in the murder of Corp. Johann S. Kunze, of Leipzig, found beaten to death at Camp Tonkawa, Okla., on November 4, 1943. After the murder a meeting of the compound was called in a mess hall. The German spokesman in the camp said that other prisoners had accused Kunze of high treason in transmitting military information to the camp authorities. He defended the killing as self-defense and said it would be so reported later to a German military court.

If Kunze had been called before a court of honor at the camp, the Nazis said, he probably would have put himself under the protection of the American authorities so that the other prisoners could not stop his treasonable actions.

Corp. Horst Gunther, 24, of Westmark, Germany, who had been denounced as a traitor by a fellow prisoner, was found dead near Camp Gordon, Ga., on the night of April 6, 1944. The evidence indicates he was lured to a tent at the Aiken side camp, South Carolina, where he was strangled to death, and then his body was carried elsewhere and tied to a telegraph pole to make it appear he had hanged himself.

[From the New York Times of January 18, 1945]

VIOLENCE IS ENDED IN PRISONER CAMPS—MILITARY AUTHORITIES POINT TO 9-MONTH LAPSE, CREDIT PREVENTIVE, CORRECTIVE METHODS—HAD MANY COURTS MARTIAL—CRIME RATE AMONG 300,000 MEN IS CALLED BELOW PUBLIC'S—WORK PROGRAM HELPS

(By Russell Porter)

WASHINGTON, January 17.—Military authorities in charge of the over-all administration of prisoner-of-war camps in this country are convinced that they are solving the problem presented by the series of violent deaths among German prisoners.

As reported in previous articles, there were six murders and two forced suicides in the German P. O. W. camps between September 1943 and April 1944. All but one of these were disclosed to have been the result of terrorism against prisoners accused of anti-Nazi activities, sentenced by "kangaroo courts," and hanged, beaten, or coerced to death by Gestapo methods.

The authorities believe the corrective and preventive methods they have taken are reflected in the fact that no such crimes have been committed for more than 9 months. They emphasize that every German prisoner who could be linked with the crimes has been promptly tried by court martial. These proceedings, they believe, have convinced the prisoners as a whole that neither German military "courts of honor," Nazi "vengeance courts," nor Gestapo terrorism will be tolerated in the prison camps.

CRIME RATE CALLED NOT HIGH

Considering there are some 300,000 German prisoners of war in the United States, the authorities say the situation was not so bad in the P. O. W. camps at its worst. Besides the 6 murders and 2 forced suicides, there were a total of 43 suicides, many of them doubtless due to insanity, up to January 1. It was pointed out that the suicide and homicide rates in the United States were higher than among the prisoners of war.

Various corrective measures have been taken. Where necessary the administration of certain camps has been strengthened. In addition, troublemakers and their potential victims have been segregated. Those who show themselves to be disturbing influences are transferred to a special camp or to special compounds for noncooperatives. Those asking protection are sent to another special camp. In every compound in every camp there is a notice on the bulletin board that any prisoner who feels himself in danger has only to report to the nearest American officer and he will never be returned to that camp.

Another factor believed to have reduced friction in the camps is the large-scale work program which has now been put into effect for P. O. W. labor. Most of the trouble took place before this program got well under way and when the men had little to occupy their time.

This work program is unprecedented in the history of prisoner-of-war labor. The work is done strictly in accordance with the Geneva Convention of 1929.

There are some 400 P. O. W. camps, large and small, scattered all over the country, wherever the labor shortage has made advisable the use of this huge pool of available manpower. Some 85 percent of the prisoners able to work are now employed, two-thirds in private employment, largely in agriculture, and the rest on Army posts. They are under guard at all times.

Within a few months after the hordes of German prisoners taken in north Africa began streaming into this country, relatively small groups of fanatical Nazis began to impose themselves as dominating factors on the German prison-camp committees. The Nazi minority adopted the same methods in the prison camps as the Hitlerites used at home and in the occupied countries.

TALKED REPRISALS AGAINST KIN

Propaganda was circulated that only the Nazis were worthy Germans, that all others were traitors, and that the duty of the Nazis was to keep the other prisoners pure, and to return them to Germany after the war just as good Germans as they were when captured. Reprisals were threatened, not only against the non-Nazi prisoners but also against their relatives back home.

There were reminders that sometimes prisoners of war were exchanged, and good Nazis could take back to Himmler the names of bad Nazis. When they themselves went back to Germany after the war, the non-Nazis were told, they would be confronted by the Nazis with their records as prisoners of war.

These tactics enabled the Nazis in many camps to elect their choices as spokesmen, although in some cases figureheads were chosen and the real Nazi Party and Gestapo leaders remained in the background to conceal their identity from camp authorities. The Nazi spokesmen began to run a great deal of the camp activities, especially at night, when the prisoners were left alone within their barracks and compounds.

Under such conditions it proved difficult for the camp authorities to spot all the fanatical Nazis, the cleverest of whom pretended to be cooperative, or to recognize all the anti-Nazis, many of whom were afraid to declare themselves or to ask for transfer to safe camps lest they label themselves in Gestapo records and endanger their families at home. There were numerous beatings and fights and finally came the series of violent deaths previously described, followed by the corrective measures taken under the disciplinary clauses authorized by the Geneva Convention and Articles of War.

It is my best judgment that for our interest in the world and our own people we are setting a very very poor example. No matter how you treat the Nazi prisoners, no matter what good you do for them, there is no reciprocity whatsoever, and this in spite of the fact that we are doing all we can outside of giving them steam-heated rooms. They get two blankets when it is cold and they raise hell with the keepers if it is still cold. You are not going to satisfy the Nazi Government, because Messrs. Goebbels and Streicher are still broadcasting how brutally we are treating their men in this country to excite whatever they have left in Germany in the way of potential soldiers. Just a month ago I happened to pass by a prison camp in Florida. I believe it was MacDill Field, Fla. There, Mr. Speaker, were a couple of thousand of these Nazi murderers lying under bamboo trees, chewing on something, I do not know what they get in between meals—and I suppose they get tea in the afternoon. There they were lying around. They have escapes almost all the time, and there are hardly enough guards to protect them. I do not care about their protection but I do care about protecting the American people, for there are still enough fanatic, crazy Nazis in these camps who would do almost anything to help their Fuehrer's cause by sabotaging this country.

Why is it necessary, Mr. Speaker, to have 443 prison camps? This means 443 different spots in the United States where there are concentrations of these dangerous prisoners. It also means thousands of people needed to look after them, to watch them. It is impossible to guard them adequately, for there are no fences, there is nothing. They go as they please and come as they please, and if they do not come—why they just escape. An article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 13, 1945, which I am inserting at this point is a good illustration of the point I am trying to bring out:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 13, 1945]

SENATORS TOLD NAZIS ROAM AT WILL IN ARIZONA—INQUIRY ORDERED ON FLYING OF SWASTIKA—CHARGES OF WAR PRISONER PAMPERING

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Chairman ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah, said today the Senate Military Committee will inquire into complaints from Arizona of German war prisoners roaming the streets and of others carrying the Nazi swastika.

Senator THOMAS acted after Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, Democrat, of Arizona, read to the Senate a letter from Judge Harvard C. Speakman, of Phoenix, asserting the people of that area are sore and disgusted.

Senator MCFARLAND demanded the investigation during a speech in which he read a half dozen letters, including Speakman's, and a resolution by the Phoenix Central Labor Council denouncing as fantastic and highly improbable an Army report on the escape of 25 prisoners of war December 24 from the Papago Park camp.

This resolution said newspapers reported that Col. William A. Holden, commander of the camp, had said a 200-foot tunnel bored through rock was the means through which the prisoners escaped. The council said its members who helped construct the camp and are familiar with the formation of rock in the area branded this statement as fantastic and highly improbable.

Judge Speakman's letter said that escapes of German prisoners are not escapes, the Germans just walk off from the job. He added "They roam the neighborhoods, steal from the people in the vicinity, pilfer houses where there is no one at home. They seem to do so at will."

Like the others, Judge Speakman referred to the display of the Nazi swastika in Chandler, Ariz., by a truckload of German prisoners. Speakman added:

"People are sore and disgusted, especially men who have sons overseas; when armed guards stand with rifles and prevent red-blooded American people from searching the damned Nazis to take from them a swastika, I think the War Department deserves condemnation."

A number of letters from Arizona citizens complained that war prisoners are being pampered in camps in that State.

Senator MCFARLAND said the people of his State are not satisfied with investigations made by the Army and with denials.

"I feel that the people have a right to be indignant when a truckload of prisoners flies the swastika," MCFARLAND said.

"Talk about abiding by the Geneva convention rules for the treatment of prisoners. We know what would happen if an American prisoner raised the flag of the United States. He'd be struck down in a minute."

THOMAS said that if the incidents are as described a reform ought to be instituted immediately. He said he would take up the letters immediately with the War Department.

Asserting the Army attributed its kind treatment to Germany's having lived up to the Geneva Conference rules, Judge Speakman declared:

"I guess they failed to see the pictures of dead American boys in the snow in Germany, after being killed immediately after capture."

In another letter, Arthur Morton, of Phoenix, told of the truck carrying prisoners through Chandler with the swastika flying from it. He said that Roy Wolf, city marshal, reported an Army captain prevented him from searching the truck.

A. S. Brayman, commander, and R. C. Muse, post adjutant, of the Chandler American Legion, reporting on the swastika incident, said the Army captain was insulting to civilian officers for stopping the truck.

"Only recently," they reported, "a truckload of German prisoners was parked on the main street of Chandler while the guard went into the barber shop for service and the prisoners were allowed to run the street unattached."

Joining in the request for an investigation, Virgil Shute, president of the Chandler Rotary Club, asserted that the behavior of the war prisoners is something we cannot reconcile with the Malmedy massacre.

It is my belief that if we must keep these prisoners here, if we must submit to having them here under War Department mandate, we should concentrate them in one particular spot and guard them in a much more adequate way than we can guard 443 prisoner camps spread all over the country.

A few days ago I received information about the fact, that in the civilian alien detention camps, a German Gestapo is functioning. In fact, I was requested to take immediate steps to end the continued existence of Nazi cells under our very noses amongst interned German nationals at Algiers, La.; Bismarck, N. Dak.; and Ellis Island, N. W.

In this connection, the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League stated that the excellent example of the War Department in dealing with such cells among prisoners of war, as reported by Secretary Stimson this week, should provide a ready model. Pro-German activities of Gestapo type amongst interned persons in America are by no means limited to prisoners of war but are carried on with equal flagrance in civic detention camps as well.

In a detailed documentation of investigation, which it has made during the past 12 months, the Anti-Nazi League charged that Nazi elements at alien detention camps had in several instances, notably at Ellis Island, set up their own gauleiters, who had in many instances even assumed the right to censor communications sent by other internees to acquaintances or to public officials outside of the detention quarters. At Ellis Island and elsewhere, the league charged such a cell leader had repeatedly attempted to effectuate their rule through threats of bodily harm and through actual physical assaults. On other occasions, less flagrant in character, the league's investigation revealed, anti-Nazi Germans interned along with Bundist or Gestapo elements had been victims of various devices designed to prejudice their future treatment by our own Government as a result of refusal to heed warnings or obey instructions from cell leaders. One device used to "punish" such individuals was the introduction of pictures of Hitler or of other obviously propagandistic material into the private possessions of the victims, following which anonymous denouncements would be made on instruction from the pro-Nazi cell leaders.

The league also questioned the propriety of permitting Christmas parties and other special occasions among civilian internees to fall into the hands of pro-Nazi elements. Funds for Christmas parties at Ellis Island and other detention points have been supplied by the German Government through Swiss agencies, the league said, both in 1943 and in 1944, and in some instances internees have been compelled to sign papers expressing their allegiance to Germany or their desire to be repatriated to the Fatherland, as a prerequisite to share in this Yuletide largess. Fifty-five Ellis Island internees were allegedly influenced to sign such a statement at one time, the league charged, largely through the influence of the gauleiter named Ernst Kerkhoff. In the same connection the league expressed doubt as to the propriety of allowing certain speakers selected by these cell leaders to take part in occasions arranged among internees, citing particularly the instance of a Christmas address made at Ellis Island by Dr. Hesselbein, an internee and avowed advocate of negotiated peace, who boldly circulated this address to the spokesmen of the German group of internees at other detention camps. Dr. Hesselbein is the author of In the Name of God End This War.

Activities of this type, both in civilian detention camps and in prisoner-of-war camps, according to the league, have recently become much more flagrant than previously, and seem to have been planned to accompany the German invasion of Belgium in the December counter offensive.

An interesting commentary on the situation was received by the league from an internee of anti-Nazi stripe:

The attitude of the interned civilian of Nazi sympathy as well as the Nazi prisoners of war in this country is seemingly determined by Nazi agents still operating in America, else the phenomenon of their arrogance, fearlessness, and self-assurance cannot be explained. What makes the interned Nazis here think it so safe for them to act as they do? It is not reasonable behavior unless there have been warranties of support, and that support evidently comes from the outside.

The league's communication to me said:

At a time when our soldiers are giving their lives to rid the world of Nazi influences, it is short-sightedness of the worst sort, to use a charitable characterization, to permit such activities to continue in our own country amongst interned or imprisoned Germans. There is no possible question of putting an end to the gangster-like tactics of pro-Nazi fanatics who want to take away the rights, and even the lives, of those who will not adjust their every act and word to conform to these arrogant alien-minded deputies of der Fuehrer.

The communication concluded:

If we have to take care of the prisoners, let us take care of them in a sensible way. Do not let them escape, do not coddle them and play up to them, do not make them feel much superior than they are, because they think they are the tops.

Another time when I passed this Florida camp I previously mentioned I saw a number of these Nazis on the road walking along as though they were on a vacation. It was just about the dinner hour, and when the bell rang, they ran as fast as they could to get their grub. In certain camps these prisoners are dissatisfied with the cooking, in some other camps they do not like the clothes they are forced to wear and in other camps they spit in the eyes of our guards. As I gathered from some of the people in the vicinity of the camp our guards are under orders not to touch them, not to do anything to them at all. They have to take all the insults and all the spit-in-

the-eye stuff. They have to chase after the prisoners' ball when they play ball, or engage in these so-called athletics.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a shame that we should permit our soldier boys to be humiliated this way by the murderers of their brothers and friends.

It is one thing to live up to an agreement and another to let oneself be bullied into a lot of unnecessary services toward unappreciative, corrupt "young supermen" who still think they can go on giving orders to the rest of the world.

The poisons of hatred and disregard for the rights of others have been injected into the Nazi youth so skillfully by Hitler and his gang of educators that the only language they will understand and respect is force. If there is any hope for the redemption of these Nazis it certainly does not lie in playing up to their fanaticism and insolence but in firmly crushing everything that nazi-ism and fascism stands for. Only complete destruction of everything Nazis believe in and hold indestructible might convince them that Hitler and all their other little heroes were not as godlike as they were led to believe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

STRIPPING THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, there are a few things going on in the Congress of the United States that I, as a representative of American citizens, do not quite like.

I feel that we should condemn and oppose this move to strip from the Commerce Department of the President's Cabinet one of its most natural and effective functions.

The press frequently refers to the move as the Wallace-Jones controversy. To state that it is a mere controversy between the interests of any two men is certainly a wide understatement. It involves an issue that was a running issue when Thomas Jefferson was President, the issue as to whether laws and public action should have a mind to all the people of this country or to a mere part of the whole population.

Mr. Henry A. Wallace represents for America:

First. An economic bill of rights in form and thought that is both understandable and workable. Is this visionary or hazy?

Second. A real plan for peacetime prosperity? Can America afford or will Americans dare say such a plan is visionary merely?

Third. A real plan for the tackling of post-war problems. Is it visionary, and should it be regarded as haze, to undertake such a plan?

Fourth. A sincere effort to approach and work out an expanding economic structure for America and all its people. Is not that something that must eventually be done, or is it an idler's pipe dream? What are we now doing? Nothing is really settled in a democracy until settled right.

For 8 years while Mr. Wallace was serving as Secretary of Agriculture, taking over that patience-trying job under extreme and difficult circumstances, he administered the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farm Security Administration, the Commodity Credit Administration, and other authorities, and operated them with a diligence, a study, and a fairness that attracted the admiration of all who made any appreciable study of his labors—or of the results of those labors.

He accomplished that which the opponents of the legislation had declared could not be done and more than many of the proponents of the legislation believed possible. A study of the work of Mr. Wallace and how his work turned out shows that he is not to be placed in the visionary class. He is not a visionary dreamer but is actually a down-to-earth hard worker. It is impossible for a man to keep his nose to the grindstone and to have his head in the clouds at the same time. The strongest opponents of Mr. Wallace acknowledge his industry and his honesty. What he does is to merely show by application, study, and understanding that things the indifferent or unwilling regard as visionary are often workable and feasible. None is so blind as the man who will not see.

Mr. Wallace attended the loaning of more than $6,000,000,000 through the agencies of the Agriculture Department, making over 11,000,000 separate commodity-credit loans and in excess of a million rural rehabilitation loans. Above 20,000 tenant farmers were enabled to buy farms for themselves by reason of the wise and extremely careful operation of his administration. This has been a most wholesome American achievement which will blossom in the gratitude of our people of the future generations. What field of financial action in all America could have called for more specific, nonvisionary, down-to-earth thinking and hair-splitting business care?

Mr. Wallace has stated that these loans were made in the public interest. How true. Yet, they had to be made on a sound business basis. Time has already been enough to prove they were so made, and time will continue so to prove. Those who were most noisy when the undertaking was begun are exquisite in their silence today.

All this is one small sounding in one small spot, only a fair representative sounding of the service Mr. Wallace has rendered this Nation.

The issue involved in the opposition to the seating of Mr. Wallace after his nomination for the secretaryship by the President is, as we all know, the same issue involved in the George bill. It is the old, old fight between the supporters of legislation and public action for the good of the whole people and the supporters of legislation and public action for the benefit of a part of the people. The conflict has run many seasons and those alined on its two sides have been called by many names—those on each side. The issue, however, is vital. It is operating today as a vital issue and will be operating and vital when this war is over and after world peace has been restored.

Are the advocates of progressive legislation in Congress, after having gone through so many brave, uphill, hard-fought battles for the whole people, going to dig in at this point? Are they looking to the winning of the principle involved or merely to the winning of this stand? They tell me it is a maneuver. It is certainly no better than a compromise. Not much of a maneuver it seems. Cowards often feel that they are conducting clever maneuvers when merely running away from a fight. Cowards—a word that never stays long around a progressive camp.

No progressive in Congress is more eager than I to see Mr. Wallace occupy the station of Secretary of Commerce, but I do not like this compromise. It is too principle-sacrificing. It cuts too deep into what we have been so long fighting to achieve. Pyrrhic victories do not well serve progressive achievement, as a rule. I am having difficulty in bringing myself to trust this as a clever maneuver. It is already making progressives feel uneasy on this floor, and I am one of them.

I am still willing to hear what other Congressmen have to say. This George bill is being brought up tomorrow for action on the floor. My present feeling is that we should stand up and be counted against it. This bill is not so much aimed at Mr. Wallace as aimed at what Mr. Wallace represents. A victory for the George bill, whether attained by compromise or by other means, does not promise a victory for the whole people of the United States of America.

This has been a long, hard fight. We have been fighting it for years. It started 150 years ago. This is an effective tapering-off process. I am still willing to listen. I am still a Democrat, but I do not like this position of progressives in Congress being placed on the spot so that if they vote for a bill that is distasteful to them they may be said to have voted against the seating of Mr. Wallace, one of the greatest progressives in America.

I am not so sure that we had better not just fight it out on this line if it takes all this session of Congress. I will finish making up my mind tomorrow, when all available facts are in.

PRICES OF HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, the people in my district are honest, hard-working people who have contributed a lot to the welfare of this Nation and to the rest of the world as well. Copper and iron from the mines of Michigan have been exported to many parts of the world as well as being shipped to many parts of this country. Even today, the war-production program depends on the copper mines of Michigan for a very important share of the copper needed for the prosecution of the war.

The same kind of thing has been true about the lumber from the forests of Michigan. The war program revived what had once been a very thriving industry in Michigan. Lumber from our part of the State was a major part of the supply on which the building and manufacturing industries of the Midwest depended for the lumber they needed.

Yes; the people of my district have done very well for this Nation. But unfortunately the Nation has not always done so well for these people. Wages and family income in this district have been low even though prices have been as high as they are in better paid sections of the country. As a result, the people of this district have had to go without many of the necessities and the little conveniences which are so well known in other parts of the State of Michigan and the rest of the country.

I had hoped that after the war, when the manufacture of appliances and similar devices begins again, these people would be able to buy some of these conveniences and comforts. Our plants have expanded. They are better tooled, and the productivity of our workers is higher. I hoped, therefore, that prices on things like vacuum cleaners, stoves, and washing machines would be lower, and that more of the common people of this country, people like those that I and many of you represent, would be able to buy them.

I was very much disturbed, therefore, to find out that firms like the General Electric Corporation are planning on maintaining the prices which they charged before the war and that they intend to charge as much or more for these appliances as they charged before we built all these new plants and installed all of this new machinery. I have learned from the newspapers that the Department of Justice, through its Antitrust Division, has just found it necessary to institute suit against the General Electric Corporation, to prevent this organization from renewing certain agreements held by the Antitrust Division to be illegal, which have in the past had the effect of keeping up the prices of many of the appliances which were common in the stores of this country before the war, but not so common in the homes of the workers of this country.

Let me point out that the jobs of the people who live in the congressional districts where these appliances are made depend on the ability of my people and of others like them to buy the appliance. Jobs depend on customers, and the people of my district are among those customers upon whom the jobs of the people in manufacturing areas depend. If prices are high, our people are unable to buy what factory workers produce. Without our buying power, these workers will go without jobs and the whole Nation will suffer.

As the labor policy committee of the O. P. A. recently advised the labor movement, after the war, full employment will depend on the people being able to buy everything that our workers will be able to produce. This means that prices must be low enough and wages high enough so that there is money enough to buy all the goods and services which our farms and factories can provide.

If the 1941–42 prices were to prevail, prices would be so high in relation to present wages that widespread unemployment would be forced upon the people of this country.

However, most industries which were converted to wartime production are demanding even higher than 1941–42 prices for their new peacetime goods. Every increase in prices over the 1941–42 level will increase the number of unemployed, and increase the number of jobs which Government will have to provide to save the country from a severe post-war depression.

I want therefore to compliment the Department of Justice and its Antitrust Division on their vigilance in bringing in cases of this kind. I feel sure that this House of Congress stands ready to support every effort which any governmental agency will make to keep the prices of consumer goods down to fair levels so that all of the people can buy them, and all of our workers have jobs making them.

I hope that the Office of Price Administration, which has direct power and specific authority to protect the Nation in this respect, will do everything in its power to see that when these goods which have been out of production return to the shelves of our stores, they will be priced at the lowest possible prices which can be fairly set, so that the level of business in this country can be as high as possible, and the number of jobs can be as high as possible, and the level of living of our people can be as high as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the things confronting us today is the question of the Little Steel formula. I think it bears a relationship to the very things I am talking about. I think the Little Steel formula should be revised at this time so we may be able to have consumers and customers buy and produce. How in the world are we going to get the 60,000,000 jobs which are necessary to have prosperity after this war unless we have consumer purchasing power and consumption to such an extent as to provide for those 60,000,000 jobs.

The newspaper article referred to is as follows:

[From the Shipyard Worker of February 12, 1945]

WHAT I READ IN THE PAPERS

Sometimes, it seems, a fellow is better off if he doesn't read the papers.

I read them when I can, and then I go out and tell people what's so and what isn't. I think I know, because it's in the paper. And then, like as not, some fellow who didn't read it comes out and shows that the things I thought were so, really aren't after all.

That's what happened to me in connection with some speeches which I read recently. One was a speech made by C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors. It was about the kind of a country we are going to have when the war is over. It told what business had to do to make it possible for everybody who wants one to have a job so that everybody can have food and clothing and the other necessities of life.

Wilson told the people who were listening to his speech that industry doesn't make jobs. Jobs, he said, are made by customers. If you want people to have jobs, you've got to give people enough money so that they are willing and able to buy what the workers in the plants can produce.

ENCOURAGED BY FORESIGHT

That makes sense, as far as I'm concerned, and I was vastly encouraged about the post-war because here was a responsible business leader, head of one of the largest businesses in the world, agreeing with what labor leaders have been saying for more years than I can remember.

I felt even more encouraged when I came across a speech by another Wilson, this one head of General Electric, and he was saying pretty much the same thing. He was talking about wages and prices, and how we are going to get the customers that G. M.'s Wilson said we need for jobs and prosperity.

And G. E.'s Wilson said, "We are putting aside all ideas of a limited two-cylinder production and placing it in volume and wide distribution. In 1920 some $15,000,000,000 in income was shut off with the closing of plants and reductions in working hours. There were 100,000 bankruptcies and a 44-percent drop in industrial pay rolls. That must not happen again. It can happen again during the post-war period of readjustment unless there is a strong effort upon the part of every business to hold down its prices, utilize its productive efficiency, cut its extravagant distribution costs, and maintain its workers' incomes."

After reading this one, I really felt good. Evidently, so did a lot of consumer and labor leaders who reprinted the speech.

THEN ENTERS JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

But then along came some people from the Department of Justice. They hadn't read the speeches, so they didn't know that business was now going to be so organized that we were all going to work at high pay and buy at low prices so that everybody could have a job.

Maybe they hadn't read the speeches because they were too busy looking to see what these fellows were actually doing about prices and production in the post-war world. And a good thing, too, for what they found isn't what the speeches mean at all.

As far as Mr. Wilson's G. E. is concerned, they found that his corporation was getting ready to renew a lot of cartel agreements which it had made in the days before the war. These agreements would again have meant high prices on a lot of very important electrical appliances. They would have kept a lot of companies which wanted to make these appliances out of the manufacturing business.

By admission of a high official of the International General Electric Corporation, the agreements are frankly intended to keep low-priced competitors out of G. E.'s markets so that G. E. may keep its prices higher than competition would permit.

CAUGHT IN WEB OF PATENTS

The people who are looking to new industries to provide business and jobs ought to be interested in the fear of the Department of Justice that the fluorescent light industry

is already becoming caught in the web of patents, agreements, and licenses which gave General Electric control over the lamp business. In the past, these agreements have been used to keep prices up, and new, competing commodities out. The Department is afraid that the same treatment is going to be given to this new and better type of lighting.

The antitrust suit is being brought at this time because the Department is afraid that, if the agreements are allowed to stay in force, they will again be applied to those countries which are now at war with us, as soon as peace is declared.

I'm not quite sure what the moral of this story is, but I do know that the next time I read a speech or a newspaper story about some big-shot corporation head being for low prices and high wages, I'm going to go easy on telling people the battle for prosperity is all over. I'm going to look first to see if this is one of the boys who has always been addicted to low employment and high prices and profits, as both General Electric's and General Motor's Wilsons have been.

If it is one of those boys speaking, I'm going to hide the story under the mattress at home while I go out and talk to the Department of Justice or to somebody else who's likely to really know the score. When I can find one of these hard-headed investigators who is willing to say that prices are actually going to be held down while wages go up—then, and not until then, will I believe what the speeches say.

PATMAN HANDBOOK FOR VETERANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1808. An act to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, February 15, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Pensions at 11 a. m., Thursday, February 15, 1945, for organization purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 20, 1945, to begin public hearings on H. R. 693—a bill to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the post-war ship-disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

211. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 5); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

212. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

213. A letter from the Secretary, National Park Trust Fund Board, National Park Service, transmitting a statement showing the financial status of the National Park Trust Fund as of June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

214. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report of the Selective Service registrants deferred as of December 1, 1944, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 137. Resolution for the consideration of S. 375, to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2173. A bill to authorize appropriations for roads and trails and other aids to transportation serving lands and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Office of Indian Affairs in Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. R. 2174. A bill to exclude certain publicly controlled carriers from the definition of "employer" in the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and section 1532 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 2175. A bill to provide for the adequate protection of seed of legumes required in the war food production program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2176. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of persons who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, while serving in the armed forces of the United States during World War No. 1 or World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 2177. A bill to provide for financial control of Government corporations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 2178. A bill to provide for the management of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and to amend the First War Powers Act of 1941; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2179. A bill to amend section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1927, entitled "An act to prescribe certain of the qualifications of voters in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2180 (by request). A bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 merchant marine veterans; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2181. A bill to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2182. A bill to provide for promotion of officers on retired list receiving pay of a higher grade and to give retired officers benefits already granted by law to the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Cost and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2183. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2184. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care furnished by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the establishment of uniform laws with respect to marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Res. 135. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to fisheries of the North Atlantic; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 136. Resolution to provide for payment of certain compensation to Robert E. Stripling; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to preserve in the post-war military organization, insofar as it relates to the civilian components of the Army of the United States and specifically to the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, the basic principles of the policies laid down in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, and in cognate acts, especially the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, relating to the status of the National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 2185. A bill for the relief of Willis Cory; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2186. A bill for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2187. A bill for the relief of the Bunge Corporation, the Corporacion Argentina de Productos de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal & Ore Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 2188. A bill for the relief of George W. Bailey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Clifford E. Craig; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Earl M. Fulmer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2191. A bill for the relief of Cleo E. Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2192. A bill for the relief of Andre Dacharry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 2193. A bill for the relief of G. Hinders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 2194. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Philip M. Perry; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

80. Mr. ANDREWS of New York presented a resolution of the County Officers' Association of the State of New York, regarding proposed amendment to the Securities & Exchange Act of 1934, House bill 693, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1945

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President, who said: Rev. Henry Edward Russell, minister of Trinity Presbyterian Church, of Montgomery, Ala., and brother of the able and distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], will offer prayer.

Rev. Henry Edward Russell offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we praise Thy holy name and thank Thee that we have been taught to call Thee Father. With grateful hearts we would acknowledge Thy goodness to our Nation. Thou hast been our help in ages past; Thou art our hope for years to come. Forbid, Heavenly Father, that in any way we should turn aside from Thee.

From the ground of our common suffering and with knowledge of Thy grace, we beseech Thy loving favor upon all mankind, asking that Thy mercy and goodness in the Prince of Peace may be known to all men.

Grant this day Thy wisdom to these Thy servants who deliberate on matters of government. Give them a vision of the destiny of this people whom Thou hast made great. Illuminate the thoughts of all who exercise power and grant that they may labor as those who seek Thy kingdom and its righteousness.

In days of battle, Lord God of hosts, we pray for a clean unsullied victory and a durable peace. Let Thy strength sustain those who represent us in battle. Comfort the distressed and sorrowful, we pray; wipe away the tears of those who mourn with the remembrance of Thy faithfulness, which is our eternal hope. We pray for our enemies who seek to destroy us and ask for Thy grace that we may be sincere in this prayer. Turn their hearts to Thee.

Quicken the hearts of our citizens to a proper sense of individual responsibility. Instruct our hearts in righteousness that we may be fitted for a fearless and faithful performance of every duty.

Father, since we cannot discern or know the full scope of our need, we ask Thee to look with mercy and allow our deepest need to be our truest prayer, for Jesus' sake, in whose name we pray. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

CHARLES O. ANDREWS, a Senator from the State of Florida, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings on Monday, February 12, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 37. An act to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended;

H. R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 338. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton, wheat and peanuts; and

H. R. 1808. An act to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following House bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 37. An act to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SPEECHES DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that no Senator may think that my objection is directed to him, I wish to announce now that I shall object to any speeches or any statements during the morning hour that extend beyond 5 minutes. Under the rule, no Senator is entitled even to speak at all in the morning hour; but if remarks are limited to not more than 5 minutes, I shall not object.

SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, I present the credentials of the newly designated Senator from the State of Connecticut, Admiral THOMAS C. HART, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the credentials, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Executive Department.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Connecticut, I, Raymond E. Baldwin, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint THOMAS C. HART a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Francis T. Maloney, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness, His Excellency our Governor, Raymond E. Baldwin, and our seal hereto affixed

at Hartford, this 8th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1945.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Governor.

[SEAL] CHARLES J. PRESTIA,
Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator-designate is now present in the Chamber and ready to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. HART, escorted by Mr. McMAHON, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF NATHAN ROSS MARGOLD TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 23, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Nathan Ross Margold, of the District of Columbia, to be associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Bolitha J. Laws. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

ADDRESS BY SENATOR AUSTIN AT LINCOLN DAY NATIONAL REPUBLICAN DINNER

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I delivered an address on February 12 last at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on the occasion of the Lincoln Day national Republican dinner. The address is entitled "The Two Great Challenges of Our Times," and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I invoke the liberalism of Abraham Lincoln to invigorate the Republican Party in the most vital service that it can perform at this time.

In a similar period, Lincoln appealed to the people, saying:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we bethink anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

I speak of the two great challenges of our times: The winning of the war, and the equipping of peace forces.

It is amazing that both of these objectives have met with opposition which challenges the sacrificial strivings of the millions of our own people and of our allies.

The opposition is made by various tactics. Some vigorously assert the objectives, but vigorously block the most potent means of attaining them.

Others admit that some such means should be set up, but oppose the proposals on the ground that they are imperfect. Still others oppose on the alleged ground that these proposals do not conform to constitutional powers. They see only the peace powers and the safeguards of peacetimes, and close their eyes to the much greater war powers set forth in the Constitution.

Listen to Lincoln:

"They tell us that the law is unconstitutional. It is the first instance, I believe, in which the power of Congress to do a thing has ever been questioned in a case when the power is given by the Constitution in express terms. Whether a power can be implied when it is not expressed has often been the subject of controversy; but this is the first case in which the degree of effrontery has been ventured upon of denying a power which is plainly and distinctly written down in the Constitution. The Constitution declares that 'The Congress shall have power * * * to raise and support armies.' * * * The whole scope of the Conscription Act is 'to raise and support armies.'

"Shall we shrink from the necessary means to maintain our free government?

"Are we degenerate? Has the manhood of our race run out?"

Physically speaking, this is a war of materials and men. Every mobile person in Germany and Japan is mobilized, and charged with a fanatical zeal. The tough, brutal armed forces of the enemy constitute only a part of the enemy front. Therefore, every mobile person in the United Nations ought to be enlisted to overcome the total strength of the enemy. Our democratic allies have, by law, effected such mobilization. The United States has not done so. We have the men in the field, and we are now threatened with a let-down in materials because of the shortage of civilian manpower.

In two former Congresses, Republicans introduced national service bills. Probably the most familiar one to you is the Austin-Wadsworth bill. Although it had the backing of a large majority of our people, it did not get out of committee.

We have, by many laws, mobilized capital, property, and management, but by failing to legislate for manpower mobilization, we have left the President of the United States in a position where he has been obliged to use Executive orders backed by indirect sanctions for this purpose.

Now we have before us a specific proposal known as the Bailey-May bill, which would accomplish part of the mobilization aimed at by the Austin-Wadsworth bill.

Every department and agency of Government responsible for raising and supporting armies and maintaining navies has appeared and demonstrated the need for this bill.

For just one instance, Mr. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board, testified:

"We need it so desperately that I hope we do not spend weeks quibbling about detailed mechanics when the whole structure of war production is coming down."

The Commander in Chief, the Chief of Staff, the Admiral of the Fleet, who know the cost in human life and matériel of every battle that has been fought, and who are qualified to judge of the requirements for the future, urgently press upon Congress and our people the need for stepping up recruitment by 900,000 men for the armed forces, and 700,000 men for civilian service, and the increasing of supplies and transportation to maintain momentum.

What more persuasive call could be made upon us—excepting, perhaps, one; that is, the call of our fighting men. And they are calling.

Stars and Stripes, in an editorial of February 7, republished in the New York Times, said:

"What the front needs is men and more men, weapons and more weapons, supplies and more supplies."

Continuing the quotation—

"They call the proposed manpower law 'the May bill.' That name ought to be changed. There can't be any 'may' about it. 'Must' is the word."

While this proposed legislation is not perfect, it would enable recruitment of the 900,000 men for the armed forces, replacement in industry of those assigned therefrom to battle duty, stop turn-over and hoarding, and direct from nonessential activities the required 700,000 additional workers to service in war industries.

It would remedy, if properly administered, the causes of many delays in critical programs and many shortages of schedule. It would enable us to meet the additional and ever-increasing demands of a war that is getting its stride.

Moreover, it would prove to the men at the front that Congress has not overruled their commanding officers, and it would prevent revision of schedules now laid out for future tactical operations planned in the European and Pacific wars.

Mr. Krug further testified:

"At the moment, according to the best information I have, we have sufficient supplies at the front to take care of the operations as planned, but unless we meet the schedules that are now laid out for the future, tactical operations planned in the European and in the Pacific wars will have to be deferred."

I want every father and mother in America who hears me tonight to consider this: A single day's prolongation of the war would cost the lives of many American boys.

In the remaining time, I can but briefly discuss the equipping of peace forces.

All peace-loving nations earnestly pray for guidance of the leaders of the three great powers in planning the structure of security and peace.

Progress toward the objective is represented by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

Earlier in this program, our distinguished former President, Herbert Hoover, briefly addressed us and gave us the glad tidings that the three great powers had arrived at an agreement.

Through the thoughtful kindness of Mr. Ogden Reed, I have been furnished with a copy of the agreement, which includes the following:

"We are resolved upon the earliest possible establishment with our allies of a general international organization to maintain peace and security. We believe that this is essential, both to prevent aggression and to remove the political, economic, and social causes of war through the close and continuing collaboration of all peace-loving peoples.

"The foundations were laid at Dumbarton Oaks. On the important question of voting procedure, however, agreement was not there reached. The present conference has been able to resolve this difficulty.

"We have agreed that a conference of United Nations should be called to meet at San Francisco in the United States on April 25, 1945, to prepare the charter of such an organization, along the lines proposed in the informal conversations at Dumbarton Oaks.

"The Government of China and the provisional government of France will be immediately consulted and invited to sponsor invitations to the conference jointly with the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As soon as the consultation with China and France has been completed the text of the proposals on voting procedure will be made public."

Progress has also been achieved through bilateral treaties between Russia and Britain, Russia and Czechoslovakia, and between

Russia and France, for separate policing and pacification of the enemy.

We are profoundly grateful for this advancement toward the great objective.

The American people are determined to employ this great opportunity to reconstruct international relations on such a foundation that their children and their children's children for generations will not have to go to war and will be able to increase in spirit, grow in wisdom, and employ their initiative and released energies in the arts of peace.

The record of the past 3 years justifies faith in the ever-increasing adherence of American citizens to the liberal doctrine of interdependence of nations for the welfare of all.

Isolationism is not dead, however. If it were, we would not need to devote so much energy to preparation for the presentation to the Senate of such basic treaty or treaties as may be submitted. This battle for peace in the future is a complementary part of our present war effort.

The plan for peace is neither Republican nor Democratic. It is American.

Both Democrats and Republicans served directly in crystalizing policies expressed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. As a political party we gave leadership in this great cause through policies adopted at Mackinac. The Fulbright resolution, the Moscow declaration, and the Connally resolution followed. The Republican National Convention at Chicago took the next step forward.

It was the Republican Party which gave to the country and to the world the phrase "peace forces," which comprehended all of the sanctions specifically referred to in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The direction of peace forces is for the purpose of preventing or repelling military aggression. It is not for the purpose of waging war. The most important of the peace forces are those that are to be employed first—conciliation, arbitration, litigation, application of economic sanctions, and any other pacific force for meeting a threat to international peace.

We believe, as we have declared, that a peace that will prevail and have elements of growth must be founded upon reciprocal interests and spiritual values and cannot rest upon military force alone. We have declared the policy to develop conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability. We recognize that economic peace is absolutely necessary to political peace. We aim to foster a world understanding that will influence nations to right conduct. We shall seek to have removed or remedied the basic causes of world disorder. In these efforts we advocate the development of international law, including a bill of rights for men in their international relations, and the establishment and use of international tribunals of justice for their administration.

The ideal sanction for peace is self-discipline. However, realism in the present stage of civilization calls for force as the imminent sanction for security and peace. This we advocate as a party.

Peace forces referred to in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals would include quotas of the different branches of the armed forces which would be subject to direction by the council. Policing of the enemy would be done under separate treaties between the victors in accord with the Moscow declaration.

The historic method of unilateral interposition of force by individual states has been futile and has been followed by world war.

The new method, which would vest in organized society the responsibility for suppressing threats to international peace, places the duty right where it belongs. No excuse for disobedience could be based upon the claim that the decision or the action was imperialistic, selfish, or aimed at exploitation or aggrandizement.

Every opportunity, including such as is afforded here tonight, should be employed to strengthen the faith of our Chief Executive that he has the moral power of this Nation to support his position and give effect to his advocacy of the organization for security and peace.

I close with Lincoln's admonition: "Let us strive * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

FOREST-PRODUCTS UTILIZATION SERVICE IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have addressed to the Honorable MALCOLM C. TARVER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture for the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. Accompanying the letter is a memorandum of reasons for establishing a forest-products utilization service in the Pacific Northwest, which I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1945.

The Honorable MALCOLM C. TARVER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture for the Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TARVER: In the budget of the United States Forest Service, under the Department of Agriculture, there is an appropriation item entitled "Forest products" in the amount of $1,228,900.

This is a request for an additional $40,000 to be added to the above amount and earmarked for the establishment of a forest utilization service for the Pacific Northwest.

I have taken this problem up with the Portland, Oreg., office of the United States Forest Service and have been advised that this amount is needed as a minimum to make the necessary study of post-war development of our forest products.

To substantiate this request, I have attached herewith a memorandum showing the tremendous possibilities present as the result of modern research in the proper utilization of raw materials now going to waste.

I would very much appreciate notification of the time at which you will be conducting hearings on this item in order that I may appear in person.

Very truly yours,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

MEMORANDUM OF REASONS FOR ESTABLISHING A FOREST PRODUCTS UTILIZATION SERVICE IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

The dominance of the Pacific Northwest in the lumber industry of the United States makes the establishment of a forest products utilization service in the area very desirable. This position of leadership in the lumber industry has come about entirely in the twentieth century and largely since about 1920. Certain of the major sources of saw timber, notably the Douglas fir and the ponderosa pine, are located almost entirely in the Pacific Northwest. Experimentation on increasing the utilization of these western timbers could most logically be carried out in the western areas. Statistics which form the basis of this report are taken almost entirely from Federal sources and show the importance of the lumber industry in this area.

The forest lands of the Northwest area are among the most promising of the Nation. As shown in table I, although its total area of forest land is but 15.8 percent of that shown in the United States, the Northwest contains 50 percent of all standing saw timber, and 58.8 percent of all standing softwood saw timber (these figures are for 1938):

TABLE I.—*Forest land in the Pacific Northwest and in the United States as of 1938*

	Pacific Northwest	United States	Pacific Northwest as percentage of United States
	Thous. of acres	*Thous. of acres*	
Total forest land	99, 514	630, 158	15.8
Total commercial forest land	73, 842	461, 697	16.0
Stand of saw timber (total)	*Mil. bd. ft.* 882, 632	*Mil. bd. ft.* 1, 763, 651	50.0
Softwoods	877, 676	1, 493, 120	58.8
Hardwoods	4, 956	270, 531	1.8

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1943, p. 698.

Of the western softwoods, the Pacific Northwest produces the majority of the following kinds of wood: Douglas fir, Ponderosa pine, true fir, western hemlock, western larch, and western white pine.

Nearly all western hardwoods are also in this area.

TABLE II.—*Stand of western softwoods in the Pacific Northwest and the United States, 1938*

[In millions of board feet]

Kind of wood	Pacific Northwest	United States	Pacific Northwest as percentage of United States
Douglas fir	426, 464	489, 905	87.1
Ponderosa pine	129, 462	224, 904	57.6
Western hemlock	115, 551	115, 551	100.0
True fir	72, 908	121, 737	59.9
Spruce	26, 664	62, 821	42.4
Western larch	25, 306	25, 306	100.0
Western white pine	18, 333	18, 333	100.0
Lodgepole pine	12, 043	38, 620	31.2
Others	50, 945	119, 005	42.8
Total	877, 676	1, 216, 182	72.2

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1943 p. 699.

The Pacific Northwest has become the leading lumber-producing area since 1919. In 1899 it produced only 7.1 percent of the Nation's lumber; by 1939 it was producing 30.9 percent.

TABLE III.—*Lumber production in the Pacific Northwest and the United States, 1899–1942*

[In millions of board feet]

Year	Pacific Northwest	United States	Pacific Northwest as percentage of United States
1889	1, 628	23, 842	6.8
1899	2, 485	35, 078	7.1
1909	6, 717	44, 510	15.1
1919	8, 590	34, 552	24.9
1929	13, 504	36, 886	36.6
1939	9, 955	[1] 24, 975	39.9
1940	10, 843	28, 943	37.5
1941	12, 868	33, 476	38.4
1942	12, 819	36, 332	35.3

[1] Excludes lumber sawed by New England mills from timber salvaged from the hurricane of 1938.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1943, p. 704.

On the basis of decennial statistics, Washington ranked fifth and Oregon eighteenth among lumber-producing States in 1889; by 1909 Washington ranked first with Oregon ranking ninth; in 1929 Washington still ranked first and Oregon second; by 1939 and since then Oregon has ranked first and Washington second.

In 1939 Washington produced about 83 percent of the shingles made in the United States and Oregon about 12 percent; Washington produced 29 percent of all lath in the United States; Oregon, 25 percent; Florida, 6.4 percent, and Idaho, 6.6 percent.[1]

Washington has made similar gains in production of veneers and wood pulp. It has ranked first in production of veneers since 1929. This is due largely to the dominance of Douglas fir in manufacturing veneers. In 1939 it produced 363,612,000 feet, log scale, of veneers, or 30.5 percent of the United States production of 1,193,979,000 feet, log scale.[2] In 1919 Washington produced 83.575 short tons of wood pulp. In 1941 it produced 1,609,917 short tons, outranking all other States.[3]

In 1938, of the 44 largest sawmills in the United States (those cutting over 50,000,000 board feet a year), 15 were in Oregon and 14 in Washington; thus 66 percent of the largest sawmills of the country are located in these two States.[4]

Another way of looking at the importance of the lumber industry in the Northwest is to view it in terms of employment. Lumber is the leading industry in number of wage earners in each of the four Pacific Northwest States (also in five other States of the Union). In 1937, 15 percent of all lumber wage earners worked in Washington and 11.1 percent in Oregon; corresponding figures for 1939 were 10.5 percent for Washington and 10.1 percent for Oregon.

TABLE IV.—*Wage earners in lumber and timber products industry in Washington, Oregon, and the United States, 1937 and 1939*

	Number	Percent of all wage-earners in State	Percent of lumber wage-earners in United States
1937:			
United States	323,928	----------	100.0
Washington	48,615	48.0	15.0
Oregon	36,040	54.6	11.1
1939:			
United States	287,970	----------	100.0
Washington	30,117	33.3	10.5
Oregon	28,985	45.6	10.1

Source: National Lumber Manufacturers Association. Lumber Industry Facts, 1941, p. 14; from U. S. Bureau of the Census.

The future development of the lumber resources of the West will depend largely on the development of new uses and new markets rather than on expansion of sawmill capacity or other industries increasing the aggregate drain on the forest. The Forest Service in July 1944, prepared for the Senate Small Business Committee a section of a Department of Agriculture report, "Agricultural and Forestry Development in the Western States in Relation to Employment" which contains many references to need for research in utilization of western forest products. Some are quoted here:

"It is estimated that more than three-fifths of the volume of trees cut is lost in the manufacture of lumber. This huge volume of some 2,000,000,000 cubic feet, or 20,000,000 cords, annually is a reservoir of material that awaits industrial utilization. Economic factors, the speed of technological developments, the discovery of new processes and products, research along these lines, and human initiative and ingenuity all influence the rate and extent of additional industrialization based on this unused raw material.

"The prospect is bright along the line of chemical conversion. The pulp industry of the Northwest is the outstanding present-day successful example, but this industry is producing only a fraction of the production quota it may be called upon to meet in order to fulfill future pulp and paper requirements. New byproducts from cellulose hold promise for the future. The extraction of alcohol from wood waste after converting cellulose to wood sugar has been approved for industrial trial in Oregon. High-protein-content livestock feeds can be derived from cellulose. Lignin, the other principal component of wood, yields phenols and cresols which are valuable industrial chemicals. Converted lignin products may be made into fertilizers, plastics, and other uses.

"A number of new products with new names such as compreg, impreg, papreg, and uralloy have been developed by chemically and physically treating wood to give it resilience, added strength and durability, and resistance to moisture. With further experimentation, these products may be outlets for the utilization of wood now wasted.

"Remanufacturing or fabrication of plywood, furniture, sashes, doors, millwork, and a host of finished wood products can be developed further in the West as a basis for additional industry and employment. The larger population and more intensive development of the West means greater local markets for these finished products and enhances the economic practicability of such industrial expansion. By this means a thousand board feet of logs can provide far more employment than if simply cut into lumber and other primary products for shipment out of the region.[6]

"Although there are great potentialities for the utilization of hemlock bark in the Pacific Northwest for tanning purposes, this is not being done at present.[7]

"Despite efforts of the past 15 years which have proven partially successful in reducing logging waste, the fact that nearly one-fifth of the wood in a tree never comes out of the forest remains a challenge to the ingenuity of the forest engineer and the chemist to develop economically profitable uses for this raw material.[8]

"The total amount of sawmill and seasoning waste is twice that of logging waste, and, moreover, is concentrated at lumber-manufacturing centers. Therefore, this easily accessible and continually replenished source of wood waste offers the most favorable opportunity for post-war utilization of wood through chemical conversion.[9]

"A number of new and valuable chemical products have been developed in the past few years from the cellulose and lignin components of wood. Their manufacture on a commercial scale depends upon their economic profitability and upon further research and technical development.[10]

"Native plants of the western forests doubtless contain materials of value as pharmaceuticals and in the fiber field. They have not been thoroughly explored with these objectives in mind because of the knowledge of such properties in Old World plants, nor have those plants which are known to be of value for such purposes been commercially developed. The utilization of such forest products is doubtless some years in the future and requires much more technical investigation than has been devoted to this field in the past. A number of forest plants are known to yield rubber latex. Other plants such as the milkweeds yield a fiber similar to kapok. Considerable exploration of certain western shrubs has been carried on in recent years as a possible source of quinine. These are but examples of what the future may hold." [11]

In conclusion the following statement of the Industrial West Foundation sets forth the importance of lumber industry of the Northwest in such a way as would appear to justify a forest products utilization laboratory to meet the needs of that region:

"From the standpoint of competition, western mills and especially those near the coast, are in a favorable position with respect to many of the American and foreign markets. With proper management and the right kind of public and governmental cooperation and support, the forest resources of the West should continue indefinitely to supply many of the American and world markets. In doing so, they will support a multitude of large and small industries and provide a livelihood for a large segment of the population of the West." [12]

[1] National Lumber Manufacturers Association. Lumber Industry Facts, 1941, p. 48, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

[2] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1943, p. 707.

[3] Same, p. 709.

[4] National Lumber Manufacturers Association. Lumber Industry Facts, 1941, p. 20, from U. S. Bureau of the Census.

[5] U. S. Congress, Senate. Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. Problems of American Small Business. Hearings—pursuant to S. Res. 66 (78th Cong.). Pt. 40, July 25, 1944, pp. 4927-4954.

[6] Same, p. 4928-4929.

[7] Same, p. 4934.

[8] Same, p. 4939.

[9] Same, p. 4940.

[10] Same, p. 4946

[11] Same, pp. 4949-4950.

[12] Industrial Service Encyclopedia of Resources, issued by the Industrial West Foundation, San Francisco, Calif. (1944), p. V-A 5.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in the nature of an order regarding committee service, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] be excused from service on the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be excused from service on the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be assigned to service on the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and that the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] be assigned to service on the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. The order would provide for an exchange of committee service between the two Senators from Washington, which is agreeable to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following reports and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The twenty-second annual report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Commerce.

REGISTRANTS DEFERRED BECAUSE OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Selective Service registrants deferred as of December 1, 1944, because of their employment in or under the Federal

Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the National Commandant of the Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures from January 1, 1944, through December 31, 1944, and a report of the proceedings and activities of the club (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the annual convention of the County Officers' Association of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 693) to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

Two resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Enrolled House Resolution 7

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to Continue the House Committee on Small Business

"Whereas there was created in the Seventy-sixth Congress a committee known as the Committee on Small Business; and

"Whereas this committee has functioned for the betterment of the small businessman as a fact-finding group, whose results to date have been instrumental in affording protection to small business throughout the Nation, and in formulating laws beneficial to the small businessman; and

"Whereas should the House committee be abolished and its activities be eliminated by the Seventy-ninth Congress small business would lose an active defender: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Oklahoma Legislature, That we memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to recommend that the Committee on Small Business be continued in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 15th day of January 1945."

"Enrolled House Resolution 17

"Resolution memorializing Congress to issue a memorial 50-cent piece in honor of Will Rogers, great Oklahoma humorist, philosopher and world citizen

"Whereas Oklahoma is the birthplace and final resting place of the beloved philosopher, humorist, and cowboy statesman, Will Rogers, who walked with kings and did not lose the common touch; and

"Whereas we desire to keep alive his memory as the outstanding example of Oklahoma and world citizenship, and to perpetuate those virtues of humility and good will which he expressed in his life; and

"Whereas a proposal has been advanced in the National Congress that a memorial 50-cent piece be coined in honor of Will Rogers, and this project has been endorsed by Members of the National Congress, the Will Rogers Memorial Commission, and others interested in preserving the name of Will Rogers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That we memorialize Congress to speedily pass legislation authorizing the coinage of a 50-cent Will Rogers memorial piece, and that we urge the Oklahoma Members in the National Congress to use their best efforts to push this legislation to a successful conclusion; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be printed in the journal and that the clerk of the house be directed to send by registered mail a copy of this resolution to the honorable Members of the Oklahoma delegation in Washington, D. C.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of February 1945."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Enrolled House Resolution 15

"Resolution petitioning and memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the Stigler bill providing for an additional United States military academy at Muskogee, Okla.

"Whereas on January 1, 1945, Congressman WILLIAM G. STIGLER, of the Second District of Oklahoma, introduced a bill 'To establish an additional United States military academy at Muskogee, in the State of Oklahoma'; and

"Whereas said bill is now pending for consideration by the Congress; and

"Whereas said bill, if enacted into law, would benefit the Government of the United States, and the State of Oklahoma; and

"Whereas the hills and valleys of eastern Oklahoma constitute an excellent location for said military academy, presenting all the field problems for field trials necessary to solve by cadets in attendance in such academy; and

"Whereas there is no such academy located in this part of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of Oklahoma and surrounding territory have been loyal, patriotic Americans; this State being the present place of abode of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians; and

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma has cooperated loyally and faithfully with the Government of the United States in every enterprise to prepare and conduct and carry on any and all wars the United States has been engaged in: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That the Congress of the United States be and is petitioned and memorialized to enact into law the bill introduced by Congressman STIGLER; be it further

"Resolved, That the historical society, the highway department, the conservation department, the game and fish department, and any other department of government in this State familiar with the topography of that portion of the State in and around Muskogee, Okla., be requested to cooperate fully and furnish any and all information available or possible should the same be requested; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is instructed to forward by air mail a copy of this resolution to each member of the delegation in Congress from Oklahoma.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 6th day of February 1945."

By Mr. MCFARLAND:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial requesting the Senate of the United States to ratify the treaty with Mexico relating to the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers

"To the Senate of the United States:

"Your memorialist represents:

"That it is the belief of this body that the pending treaty between the United States and Mexico, respecting the waters of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Tia Juana Rivers, signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, as clarified by the protocol signed November 14, 1944, will, as it pertains to the waters of the Colorado River, prove very beneficial to the United States and to the State of Arizona.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That your honorable body ratify the proposed treaty at the earliest possible date.

"Adopted by the senate January 11, 1945.

"Adopted by the house January 12, 1945.

"Approved by the Governor January 15, 1945."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial requesting Congress to pass the McCarran-Sumners bill

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"In view of the numerous regulatory and administrative agencies, possessing quasi-judicial functions, which have in recent years been added to the administrative branch of the Federal Government, and because of the many rights of citizens affected by the regulations and decisions of these agencies, it is deemed of the highest importance that legislation be enacted prescribing fair and impartial procedure by which these agencies shall be governed in the discharge of their functions, and providing for adequate judicial review of their rulings.

"Such legislation is proposed in the McCarran-Sumners bill (S. 7, H. R. 1203), pending before the Congress.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That the Congress enact the McCarran-Sumners bill.

"Adopted by the senate January 19, 1945.

"Adopted by the house January 31, 1945.

"Approved by the Governor February 3, 1945."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

By Mr. WILSON (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Whereas the return to standard time will help increase food production and help win the war and mean more daylight working hours for agriculture; and

"Whereas daylight saving time has proven a burden; and

"Whereas daylight saving time has failed to save daylight or accomplish its purpose: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to immediately take the necessary steps to return the United States to standard time and abolish daylight saving time by terminating the War Act of January 20, 1942 (c. 7, 56 Stat. 9), said act providing that Congress had power by concurrent resolution to terminate said act.

"That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress."

DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS—RESOLUTIONS OF THE FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH OF PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. MYERS presented a resolution adopted by the First Unitarian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a just peace, maintained by a genuine world community, is surely faith's ideal; and

Whereas the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, though they fall far short of the ideal, do nevertheless, present a historic possibility for a greater good than any workable alternative known at present: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the First Unitarian Church of Pittsburgh, That we endorse the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a presently practicable step in the direction of the ultimate ideal of a just peace maintained by a genuine world community; and

That we commend their support to our members and friends and the general public, with such improvements as may now or later be effected; and

That this resolution is adopted without prejudice to the convictions of any minority present or absent, without binding our consciences, and with respectful consideration for the views of any who may disagree with us.

INCREASED QUOTA OF FARM MACHINERY—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have received several resolutions from various farm organizations in Nebraska having to do with their request for a larger quota of farm machinery. The present situation has developed because of the fact that the distribution of farm machinery has been based on historical data which should not govern in connection with the distribution of farm machinery at this time. I think the matter is an extremely important one. Accordingly, I wish to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred together with the names of the signers.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD with the signatures attached, as follows:

RESOLUTION FOR LARGER QUOTA OF FARM MACHINERY

Since the recent demand by the armed forces for many young farm workers will seriously jeopardize the food-production program, and since the machinery on farms is each year becoming more worn and obsolete and present replacements are inadequate, we, the members of the undersigned Farm Bureau units, request that you bring pressure to bear upon the proper authorities, that they release more farm machinery in order that the farmers may carry out the production program asked by the War Food Administration. We believe that this is the only way that the production goal can be attained.

Franklin County Farm Bureau, Franklin Unit: E. H. Monie, Edward Brotherton, Violette Brotherton, Roy R. Dunlap, Guy T. Rogers, Mrs. Guy T. Rogers, Mrs. H. Brotherton, Harry Brotherton, Charles J. Mucklow, Earl Bell, Mrs. Earl Bell, Mrs. Fern Mucklow, W. K. Versaw, H. W. Wistrand, Hobart L. Robertson, Alfon Horing, Mrs. W. K. Versaw, Mrs. H. W. Wistrand, Mrs. Ethel Horing, Laura Robertson.

Riverton Unit of Franklin County Farm Bureau: Nelson Kugler, Herold Hundt, Ralph Detlefsen, Mildred Detlefsen, Edna Hundt, Myrl Kugler, Milo Kugler.

Macon Unit, Franklin County Farm Bureau: Alfred Kloser, Frank Cahill, M. J. Hafermann, H. J. Yelken, Carl K. Rademacher, John Bienhoff, John C. Frecks, Otto F. Johnson, Albert Fritso, John F. Jelken, William F. Fruhling, Tom L. Dom, Louis Meyer, George F. Schuman, Jr.

Hildreth Unit, Franklin County Farm Bureau (25 members): George Warnken, John T. Stuhmer, William Knight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 519. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Straka; with amendments (Rept. No. 48).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 49); and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 50).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 46. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, to provide for the appointment of five additional inspectors, and to provide for adjustments in salaries; without amendment (Rept. No. 52); and

S. 47. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 51).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 64, agreed to January 29, 1945, the Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 15, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 338) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton, wheat, and peanuts.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 532. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Swiss colony at New Glarus, Wis., and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 533. A bill to create United States civil service boards of appeals; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 534. A bill for the relief of Michael McGinn; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 535. A bill to prevent pollution of the waters of the United States and to correct existing water pollution as a vital necessity to public health, economic welfare, healthful recreation, navigation, the support of invaluable aquatic life, and as a logical and desirable post-war public-works program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 536. A bill to direct the Attorney General to conduct an investigation to determine whether Charles Chaplin should be deported; to the Committee on Immigration.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 537, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide for certain exclusions from gross income for income-tax purposes in the case of persons who served in the armed forces during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 539. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. TOBEY) introduced Senate bill 540, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 541. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 542. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Minnie A. Beltz;

S. 543. A bill for the relief of Felix Frederickson;

S. 544. A bill for the relief of Dave Hougardy;

S. 545. A bill for the relief of Anne Loacker; and

S. 546. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims with respect to the taking of lands in the southeast portion of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 547. A bill for the relief of Benjamin E. McCall; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 548. A bill to create a Commission to be known as the Alaskan International Highway Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 549. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act by striking out present section 226 and substituting a new section 226; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 550. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 551. A bill for the relief of Presly Holliday, quartermaster sergeant, Quartermaster Corps, on the retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 552. A bill to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 553. A bill to provide for the investment in United States savings bonds of pay and allowances credited to prisoners of war and certain other persons absent from their posts of duty; and

S. 554. A bill for the purpose of regulating the conditions of employment of mechanics and helpers at all Government navy yards, naval stations, arsenals, and other Government establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate bill 555, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 556. A bill to establish a commission to study and report legislative recommendations on a coordinated transportation policy affecting aircraft, railroads, busses, and trucks, including their communications needs; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. WHERRY introduced Senate bill 557, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 558. A bill to provide for the adequate production of seed legumes required in the war food-production program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 559. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service," approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after October 31, 1941; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 560. A bill providing for suits for damages against national banks, their officers and directors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 561. A bill to grant free postage to veterans, soldiers, sailors, or marines while being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution relating to the appropriation for the roofs and skylights over the Senate and House Wings of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution identical to one I introduced at the last session of Congress. The joint resolution will, if passed, authorize the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to the Honorable Cordell Hull, in recognition of his outstanding work in the promotion of peace and his years of outstanding service to the people of the United States.

I think it is particularly appropriate at this time to have such a Medal of Honor conferred upon Mr. Hull, in view of the fact that he has been tentatively designated as the chief adviser of the conference to be held at San Francisco in the spring.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Kentucky will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of a Medal of Honor to the Honorable Cordell Hull; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PREVENTION OF RACIAL AND OTHER DISCRIMINATION BY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial which appears in the New York Herald Tribune this morning. The title is "Bridgehead at William and Mary," and the editorial is as follows:

BRIDGEHEAD AT WILLIAM AND MARY

In these touchy days, when the Nazis have made all men more than ever conscious of the evil import of race discrimination, the affair at the College of William and Mary has, despite a local and temporary threat to campus free speech, cheering elements. Miss Marilyn Kaemmerle, who wrote an editorial in the campus paper neatly and competently disposing of "white supremacy nonsense" along with Nazi race theories, is still in college. Only the paper, the Flat Hat, is suspended, although the college board of visitors has voiced "thorough disapproval and condemnation" of the editorial and ordered corrective and disciplinary action. Their reaction recalls that of some Members of Congress when faced with a somewhat similar text in a factual pamphlet called the Races of Mankind, intended for use in Army orientation courses. Demands of Mr. ANDREW J. MAY, House Military Affairs chairman, and others, though low-pitched in the intellectual scale, were shrill enough to effect a working censorship of publications issued to soldiers.

What really calls for three rousing cheers in the William and Mary case is the attitude of the student body, who would have none of such censorship. This is in the oldest college of the South, whose students have read in their own newspaper an oracle completely heretical from the southern point of view, suggesting that the time may come when Negroes mingle freely with their fellows on that Virginia campus and even "marry among us." Do these students, most of whom doubtless are trained to the Congressman MAY type of reaction, give vent to emotional debate of the heresy? They do not. Rather, they rise in true Voltairean spirit, not to defend Miss Kaemmerle's statement, but passionately to defend her right to say it.

Whatever the outcome of their protest, the stand of this group of collegians in the South itself, suggests really breath-taking advance in the outlook of this new southern generation. It is as though a bridge had been thrown across a formidable stream while we slept. A bridgehead of tolerance established by youth on the other side should withstand any counterattack aging forces of reaction can muster.

In view of what took place at William and Mary College, Mr. President, I am introducing a bill for appropriate reference, which I wish to read. It is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no college or university which, in the opinion of the United States Commissioner of Education, in any manner discriminates against any person on account of his race, color, or creed, or on account of his views with respect to such discrimination, or in any way attempts to prevent or restrain the freedom of expression of such views by any person, whether in student publications or otherwise, or the faculty or board of trustees or directors of which so discriminates or so attempts to prevent or restrain such freedom of expression, shall be entitled to receive any aid from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated by the Congress.

The bill (S. 537) to prevent discrimination by colleges and universities on account of race, color, or creed, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and myself I introduce a bill for reference to the appropriate committee, and I should like to make a statement about it. I am sure the statement will not take more than 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the Senator will be allowed to make his 5-minute statement.

The bill (S. 540) to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. TOBEY), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, this bill—which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and I are introducing jointly—has as its purpose the effectuation of the agreements drafted at Bretton Woods, N. H., last July. Its enactment will make possible the creation of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

These two institutions will provide a concrete foundation for general economic cooperation among the peace-loving nations of the world. They will create the kind of financial atmosphere needed for the expansion and balanced growth of world trade. The fund will ensure an orderly system of exchange rates and will outlaw all the aggressive and discriminatory monetary practices that have plagued the world in the past. The bank will stimulate and encourage sound private international investment in productive projects, and will be of great assistance in the reconstruction of areas devastated by enemy action.

In drafting the bill, the Senator from New Hampshire and I have had three principal objectives in mind. First, we wanted a bill which would give congressional approval to United States participation in the international fund and the international bank. In the second place, we wanted to make certain that the bill contained all the affirmative legislation necessary for the United States to participate in the fund and the bank, including the payment of the subscriptions of the United States. And, finally, we wanted to prevent any fundamental changes being made in the fund or the bank, or in the participation of the United States in these institutions, without the specific approval of Congress.

We believe that the bill which we are introducing accomplishes all these objectives. Under it the United States will be enabled to assume its rightful position of leadership in international monetary and financial affairs. Because of the great importance of the bill, I should like to outline briefly the contents of its various sections.

Section 1 gives the bill a title, and identifies it with the United Nations Conference which was held at Bretton Woods last summer.

Section 2 authorizes the President to accept membership for the United States in the international fund and the international bank. In drafting this section, we have used as a guide the act of Congress which authorized the President to accept membership in the International Labor Organization.

Section 3 calls for the appointment by the President, with the consent of the Senate, of governors and executive directors of the fund and the bank.

Section 4 requires the President to report to the Congress at least twice each year on the participation of the United States in the fund and the bank.

Section 5 will prevent the making of any fundamental changes in the fund or the bank without the approval of Congress. Unless Congress approves, the following things are prohibited:

First. Any change in the subscription of the United States to the fund.

Second. Any increase in the subscription of the United States to the bank.

Third. Any increase in the capital stock of the bank.

Fourth. Any change in the value of the United States dollar.

Fifth. The making of loans to the fund or the bank by any agency of the United States Government.

Sixth. The adoption of any amendments to either the fund or the bank agreement.

Section 6 makes it clear that when the fund begins to operate the United States dollar will have exactly the same gold value that it has today.

Section 7 authorizes the Federal Reserve banks to act as depositories and fiscal agents of the fund and the bank.

Section 8 provides for the payment of the subscriptions of the United States to the fund and the bank. Part of the money needed will be taken out of the existing stabilization fund, which will be reduced from over $2,000,000,000 to $300,000,000. The balance of the money needed will be paid from time to time out of the proceeds of sales of United States Government securities. There is also provision for the substitution of non-interest-bearing Government bonds for cash balances held by the fund and the bank. This provision will reduce the cost to the United States of financing its subscriptions.

Section 9 authorizes the President to collect statistics which the United States will need to participate fully and wholeheartedly in the work of the fund and the bank.

Section 10 suspends the operation of the Johnson Act with respect to those countries which are members of the fund and the bank. If countries are members of these institutions, they will be good credit risks for future loans and the restrictions of the Johnson Act should not apply to them.

Section 11 confers upon the district courts of the United States jurisdiction to try any case in which the fund or the bank is a party. It also provides a procedure for the removal of such cases from State courts to the district courts of the United States.

When the United States has accepted membership in the fund and the bank, and the two institutions have been established, section 12 will confer upon them a legal status and certain immunities and privileges which are called for by the agreements. It will also make unenforceable in our courts certain exchange contracts which violate the letter and spirit of the fund agreement.

Briefly, I have stated the effect of the bill. However, before concluding my remarks, I should like to urge upon all Senators that they study the Bretton Woods proposals carefully and consider them in the light of their importance to the post-war economy of the United States and the other United Nations. I believe that this is one of the most important bills to be considered at this session, and I hope it will be given the sympathetic reception it deserves.

RETURN TO STANDARD TIME

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for returning to the use of standard time.

The bill (S. 557) to provide for returning to the use of standard time, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution relating to the termination of the act establishing daylight-saving time.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9), was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight-saving time," approved January 20, 1942, the Congress hereby designates the date on which the two Houses of the Congress concur in the provisions of this concurrent resolution as the date on which such act shall cease to be in effect.

Mr. WHERRY also presented several petitions of sundry citizens, members of the Merrick County (Nebr.) Farm Bureau, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

CENTRAL CITY, NEBR., *January 4, 1945.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, Merrick County Farm Bureau members and others go on record petitioning that the national daylight-saving time be returned to standard time, in as much as it has proved uneconomical in regard to light and fuel, has shortened farmers' working hours where hired help is concerned, and proved an inconvenience between rural and urban business hours.

M. K. GARRETT,
HAZEL D. FUNK,
MATILDA GALLEY

(And sundry other citizens of Central City and vicinity, Nebraska).

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. FERGUSON) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 36) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, as amended, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KILGORE also (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. FERGUSON) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT RULES CONCERNING THE SUBJECT MATTER OF BILLS AND MODE OF AMENDING LAWS

Mr. ANDREWS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there are hereby established the following joint rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

"1. Every bill or joint resolution passed by the Congress shall embrace but one subject and matter germane thereto and properly connected therewith, which subject shall be briefly stated in the title of such bill or joint resolution.

"2. No law shall be amended or revised by reference to its title, number, or other citation only; but in every case the law or section thereof, as amended or revised, shall be reenacted and published at length."

PAYMENTS FROM THE CONTINGENT FUND IN CONNECTION WITH INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Senate shall not (1) authorize the payment from the contingent fund of the Senate of the expenses, in excess of $5,000, of any inquiry or investigation hereafter authorized, or (2) increase the amount heretofore authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with any inquiry or investigation, unless, prior to adoption of the resolution authorizing such payment or providing for such increase, the committee or subcommittee thereof authorized to conduct such inquiry or investigation shall have submitted to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a budget, in such form as the committee may require, setting forth its estimates of expenses proposed to be incurred for personal services, hearings, and travel, and such other information as the committee may require.

SEC. 2. Whenever the head of any department or agency of the Government shall have detailed or assigned personnel of such department or agency to the staff of any Senate committee or subcommittee thereof, the appropriations of such department or agency from which the personnel so assigned or detailed is paid shall be reimbursed from funds available to the committee or subcommittee prior to the detail or assignment in the amount of the salaries of such personnel while on such detail or assignment; and the services of any personnel so detailed or assigned shall not be accepted or utilized unless, at the time of such detail or assignment, funds are available to such committee or subcommittee for the reimbursement of appropriations, as herein provided, for the period of such detail or assignment.

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this resolution shall become effective on January 1, 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is authorized to make such studies as may be necessary to enable it to prescribe uniform requirements as to the form and content of budgets required to be submitted under the

first section of this resolution and otherwise to carry out its functions under such section.

CAMPAIGN TO SAVE CORN IN MIDWEST

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, last Tuesday on the floor of the Senate a discussion occurred concerning the need for farm labor, especially the need for labor to save the corn crop which is now upon the ground, not only in Nebraska, but in many other States, due to excessive snow and rain and wet weather. At that time I made the statement that in Nebraska alone there were over 100,000,000 bushels of corn on the ground.

I have in my hand a news release from the World-Herald of Omaha, dated February 11, which calls attention to conditions in the State of Nebraska, and to conditions generally in the Missouri Valley, stating that the people are opening a campaign to save the wet corn, over 100,000,000 bushels of which is on the ground.

The title of this news release is, "Campaign Opens To Save Wet Corn Worth One Hundred Million. Third of Crop To Spoil Soon if Uncribbed."

So, Mr. President, along with our discussions of the manpower shortage, certainly it is necessary that we do everything we can to see that the corn on the farms in these Middle Western States, and especially in Nebraska, is cribbed.

I ask unanimous consent that the news release to which I have referred, which occupies only about one column in the World-Herald, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTEERS WANTED—CAMPAIGN OPENS TO SAVE WET CORN WORTH $100,000,000—THIRD OF CROP TO SPOIL SOON IF UNCRIBBED—CITY DWELLERS NEEDED TO HELP SALVAGE WAR-VITAL FOOD

Will you volunteer to do your part in a State-wide campaign to save $100,000,000?

The problem: Nearly one-third of Nebraska's record crop of 330,000,000 bushels is on the ground and in grave danger of spoilage.

The solution: The corn—estimated at 100,000,000 bushels—must be placed in well-ventilated cribs within the next 32 days.

And it's a job not for farmers alone, but for all Nebraska.

It doesn't matter whether you are a high-school boy or a shoe clerk, a grocer, a member of a labor union, or a banker, you stand beside the farmer and face the same prospects of loss or profit.

Can the corn on the ground be saved before the rays of an unpredictable sun set the spoilage agencies to work?

CAN BE SAVED

It not only can but will be saved if Nebraskans over the State meet the corn crisis with these words: "Yes; I will do my part" and then do their part.

Your job—if you work in towns or cities—will vary from loading snow fence on a truck to building a crib or shoveling corn onto a portable elevator.

Your job—if you are a farmer with corn on the ground—calls for action now in sizing up your needs, conveying that information to the proper authorities, and then seeing to it that the wet corn is cribbed properly before the deadline of March 15.

Here's the procedure, approved by officials of the extension service of the University of Nebraska Agricultural College and other organizations and individuals taking part in the save-the-corn campaign:

County extension-service agents have been designated as county chairmen of the wet-corn campaign.

The agents will appoint subchairmen for each noncounty seat town, which in many cases will be the same persons who served as community victory garden chairmen.

The services of each community and precinct committeeman of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration have been pledged to the program, and in many counties they will be designated by the county agent as wet-corn subchairmen.

Each county agent's office, beginning Monday, will become a county clearinghouse for both manpower and materials or any other needs of farmers.

Volunteer workers—either individually or by groups representing business establishments, fraternal, patriotic, and civic organizations—will register, starting Monday, with the agent in county seats or with subchairmen in other towns and cities.

The World-Herald and other daily and weekly newspapers over the State will publish the names of county subchairmen as soon as the agents designate their coworkers.

However, individual communities may speed the procedure if they will check Monday with their county agents and obtain the names of their subchairmen.

Railway cars are not available to move the corn. And if the cars were available, the elevators couldn't handle the corn because most of them are jammed.

The only answer is the immediate construction of cribs and the moving of the corn into cribs. And since it takes manpower to do this, volunteer labor is the only reservoir.

PREVAILING PAY PLEDGED

Agricultural officials and farm leaders expressed the assurance that manpower-pinched farmers will pay prevailing wage scales to volunteer workers.

Why does the job have to be done by March 15?

If the job is not completed by the time the first spring rains come, spoilage will be inevitable. Officials point out that corn, even in well-ventilated cribs, is taking on moisture each day.

Secondly, farmers must start their plowing and other field work by March 15. If the corn is not off the ground by that time, other operations will be delayed.

The next 32 days will offer Nebraskans the only opportunity possible to avert the threat of spoilage.

Corn spoilage today is not above normal. But it will become unprecedented in the history of the corn industry in Nebraska unless immediate steps are taken to save the crop.

Nebraska's 1944 production of 330,000,000 bushels is a conservative figure in the mind of Federal-State Crop Statistician A. E. Anderson, of Lincoln.

HOG CROP DOWN

The State's normal corn production is 225,000,000 bushels. For figures even slightly comparative, we must turn back to the 294,000,000 bushels produced in 1927 and the 278,000,000 bushels produced in 1896.

However, Nebraska's hog crop this year is down 39 percent from last year.

"The hogs," says Mr. Anderson, "that we didn't raise this year would have consumed about 50,000,000 bushels of corn."

It would take 60,000 railway cars to move the 100,000,000 bushels of the corn on the ground. But there are no cars—and officials say that the car situation will become worse before it improves.

If care is to be taken, it must be taken by the farmer. And if his manpower needs are to be filled, it must be done by volunteers.

It was to meet this critical situation that a group of public-minded Nebraska citizens established the emergency wet corn committee.

SWINBANK, CHAIRMAN

Chairman of the group is J. C. Swinbank, of Lincoln, secretary of the Nebraska Grain Improvement Association, who is directing the campaign launched today.

Other members are Ralph Hanks, State commodity loan supervisor of the A. A. A.; Phil Runion, secretary of the Nebraska Merchants Association and the Nebraska Grain Feed Dealers Association; Richard R. Larson, chairman of the State railway commission; D. L. Gross, State extension service agronomist; Howard Freeman, representing the Nebraska Bankers Association; William McDonald, farm program editor of Lincoln Radio Station KFAB; E. P. Gaines, representing Nebraska Association of Insurance Agents; Howard Peterson, secretary of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation; and George Round and Everett Winter, of the extension service public relations office, all of Lincoln.

Railways of Nebraska and State and county highway departments are offering snow fence and ties to farmers, through county agents, for the construction of temporary cribs. Lumber dealers over the State are offering their facilities and advice.

Mr. Hank's organization is conducting an extensive survey over the State to check on what materials are available and what materials are needed in the various counties and communities. His findings will be published from time to time as part of the campaign to place materials at the right spot at the right time.

Russell Harris, district War Production Board manager, announced in Omaha Saturday that his organization is "going all-out in this campaign and we will do everything that is possible to obtain the necessary materials to do the job."

Farmers who have not obtained the necessary crib materials should communicate immediately with their county agent. If the materials can't be found in the county, calls will be sent out to other counties. And if W. P. B. assistance is needed, Mr. Harris said that his office stands ready to lend all aid possible.

That's the picture facing Nebraska today. It's a situation calling for immediate action.

Food is too important a weapon of war to run the risk of losing 100,000,000 bushels of corn by spoilage. And the mission must be carried out by volunteers among the home-front soldiers.

The job is up to Nebraska as a whole. Let's not fall down on this 32-day mission.

RECORD OF COL. W. H. EATON, JR.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper clipping dealing with the record of Colonel Eaton, whose tragic death was recorded this past week in France. Since there was reference to his record at the last session of the Senate in connection with the discussion of the confirmation of the nomination of a brigadier general, in justice to Colonel Eaton I feel that his most unusual career should be made a matter of record, as he was cited as one of the two men who had risen from the rank of captain to the recommended rank of brigadier general during the period of the war, as a possible analogy having a bearing on the question of the promotion of Elliott Roosevelt, which the Senate was then considering. It appears from this article that Colonel Eaton had a most remarkable record in private life, rising in 10 years from a young graduate of Harvard Law School to be sales manager of the

Shell Oil Co. Furthermore, while the fact was not disclosed in the debate the other day—I have no doubt, as a result of lack of information—Colonel Eaton had devoted himself for many years to flying as a private citizen and had a record of more than 500 hours of solo flying in private life before he entered the Army.

I am sure it is a matter of regret to everyone that it seemed advisable 2 weeks ago to defer the confirmation of Colonel Eaton's nomination to be brigadier general, so that his confirmation could have antedated his unfortunate demise.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONEL EATON KILLED IN FRANCE—FORMER SHELL OIL OFFICIAL

Col. W. H. Eaton, Jr., was killed in a plane crash in France, February 6, according to information received from the War Department by his wife, Mrs. W. H. Eaton, Jr., of New York.

Only 38, Colonel Eaton was sales manager of Shell Oil Co. at the time of his entry into the service. Along with 77 other colonels, his name had been up for confirmation in the Senate for promotion to the rank of brigadier general. The Senate in its action Monday thus confirmed the elevation posthumously.

Colonel Eaton was graduated from Williams College in the class of 1928, and received his law degree from Harvard Law School in 1931. Four years later he joined Shell as an attorney in its New York office.

In 1936 he was made assistant in the president's office and in 1938 he was appointed manager of the transportation and supplies department. Two years later Shell organized its Atlanta, Ga., marketing division, and he was appointed division manager. In November 1941 he became sales manager of Shell's east of the Rockies territory.

Colonel Eaton was an aviation enthusiast in private life, and had received his pilot's licensee in 1936 with over 500 hours of solo flying to his credit. He accepted a commission as captain in the Army Air Forces in the spring of 1942.

In addition to his wife, Colonel Eaton is survived by a daughter, Patricia; a sister, Mrs. Lawrence T. Bartlett; and his father, William H. Eaton, of New York, president and publisher of the American Home magazine.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, today it is my honor and high privilege to pay a brief tribute to a truly great American, in my judgment, one of the great personages of all time.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago today, Susan B. Anthony, emancipator of women, was born in the little town of Adams, Mass.

I might again call attention of the Senate, as I did 11 years ago today in this Chamber, to the fact that the month of February has presented this Nation with the three greatest fighters for human liberty and freedom in all our history—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Susan B. Anthony.

I feel deeply that the Father of His Country and the immortal Lincoln would themselves feel honored, if they were with us today, to have Miss Anthony named with them as composing the triad of American liberators. All honor to all three for the victories they won.

George Washington lived to see the country he had freed from European domination well on the road toward its place in the world family of nations, free to forge its own destiny if it chose to do so.

Abraham Lincoln lived to strike the shackles from the slaves and to know that the Union was preserved—that Union which Washington had forged from the Thirteen Colonies.

Susan B. Anthony did not live to see national woman suffrage. At the time of her death in 1906, only four States in the Union had recognized the political equality of women.

Susan B. Anthony could only envision, during her lifetime, the victory which was in sight when she passed to the Great Beyond, of which we know so little, of which we hope so much.

Only a few short weeks before her death she attended a suffrage convention in Baltimore. In the very Valley of the Shadow this indomitable spirit urged her followers and successors to carry on.

"Failure is impossible," were her closing words.

Mr. President, she spoke the truth.

Failure is impossible to the dauntless and the indomitable, to those who know they are fighting the cause of right and justice. Failure is impossible, even though the victory may come years, even decades, sometimes centuries, after the life work of the individual apparently is ended.

In this brief life span allotted to each of us—and I who am approaching my four score years can testify how brief the time has been compared to what I had set out to do in the flush of youthful vigor—in this brief span of time none of us can hope to bring to complete fruition the dreams of youth. To few, indeed, comes even the opportunity of initiating; none can hope to complete a great and lasting undertaking in his own lifetime.

The one who can say, truthfully, as he faces the last rays of the setting sun, "What I started out to do is finished," that one, Mr. President, has not had the vision which inspires to great deeds.

The life work of the Master was not finished when He was crucified. It was only begun, as none knew better than He.

The work of George Washington was not completed when he passed on. He had only planted the seed and cultivated the ground for it, the seed from which a great Nation is growing.

Abraham Lincoln struck the shackles from the slave. He gave to the Negro the right to be free. He gave to this Nation the right to live.

"No nation can exist half free and half slave," said Abraham Lincoln.

But Abraham Lincoln did not really free the slaves, in a completed sense. He did not guarantee the continued existence of this Nation. He was the instrumentality that granted the Negro the right to freedom and to this Nation the right to continue its existence as a Nation.

It is we, the heirs of Washington and Lincoln and those who supported them, who must carry on if the Nation and the freedom they and others made possible are to bear fruit.

But without these great ones, the ones who have vision, who have courage, who have in them the essence of immortality in spirit, in mind, and I verily believe also in body, the rest of us would never rise above the level of the age into which we happen to be born.

Susan B. Anthony was truly one of these great ones. She had vision, she had courage—the courage that perseveres, which goes deeper and carries further than the courage of reckless abandon. She had that immortality of mind and spirit, the physical stamina which also is necessary not only to visualize a goal, but also to plan how that goal can be attained; to organize the forces for its attainment; to battle along sound lines with organized forces in successive advances toward the goal which she had visualized.

Susan B. Anthony was born of Quaker parentage. She had a good mother and a noble father. It always has been a matter of pride to me, as a man, and myself coming of Quaker stock, that throughout his lifetime her brother, Col. Daniel Anthony, of my native State of Kansas, not only sympathized with her ambitions and aspiration, but also himself supported her and her cause with unfaltering loyalty and courage.

I never have been one of those who held that Susan B. Anthony's noble fight for woman suffrage was a battle solely for the rights of women.

She fought for recognition of women, it is true, but also she was battling for rights of all mankind.

Susan B. Anthony visioned, as had the immortal Lincoln, that, no more than could a nation, could mankind enjoy worth-while existence half free and half slave. It must now be admitted, I believe, that when Miss Anthony entered on her battle woman's legal status in this country, indeed largely throughout the world, was, in many respects, practically that of enslavement.

The wife, under the law, was the property of the husband. He could dispose of her property—not just their property, but her property—to suit himself. If she earned or received any money, it belonged to the husband. He could sell anything she possessed, including her wedding finery, and could even will away her unborn child. She had no political rights. She could not vote. The right of free speech was not guaranteed her. For years after the majority of school teachers in this country were women they were not allowed to speak at teachers' conventions.

Some of the bitterest experiences of Miss Anthony's career as a teacher came when she tried unavailingly to obtain recognition in her own right to speak at a convention of teachers. She finally won that right, but only after having insults, and even threats, directed at her.

We have come a long way since then. The right of women to vote has been granted. Professions are open to them. They are in business, in the professions, in industry, in legislative halls, in executive positions, even in the armed services. Women are everywhere.

This is due, in large part, to Susan B. Anthony and the loyal band of women who worked with her and who carried on after her own time had passed. All honor to her and to them.

I hope it will not be out of place at this time to ask also some small recognition for the men of America, Mr. President. It took Susan B. Anthony and Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton—and hosts of others, including noble women in my own State, such as Lilla Day Monroe and Lucy B. Johnson—to educate men to the great injustice they were doing to women. But, after all, when the pleas had been made, when the cause had been justified by faith and by works, after all it was the men of the United States who granted to women equal political rights, from which, in the long run, all equality and recognition have come and are coming.

Mr. President, 11 years ago today, I paid tribute in this Chamber to the memory of Susan B. Anthony, on the one hundred and fourteenth anniversary of her birth. I ask unanimous consent that there may be placed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the excerpts from my remarks made on that occasion which I now send to the desk. And I also ask unanimous consent that, following these excerpts from my tribute delivered February 15, 1934, some newspaper clippings from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, concerning the life and works of Miss Anthony, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I said before, Susan B. Anthony, while battling for the rights of women, also was battling for the rights of all mankind. And I say that fact also should be given due recognition when the accounts are balanced.

And may I express the hope that somewhere in this National Capital a fitting memorial, in keeping with the memorials erected for George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, may be erected to that other great American, Susan B. Anthony.

It is not my intention to tell the life history of Susan B. Anthony and her times, although that is an interesting and an inspiring story.

She was a born crusader, as well as an intelligent fighter, and rarely equaled leader, on behalf of the underprivileged; for the betterment of all people.

Not all of Susan B. Anthony's lifetime of conscientious endeavor was devoted to the cause of woman suffrage. She taught school for 15 years. It was toward the end of that time that she obtained for women teachers the right to the floor in teachers' conventions. It is difficult for us to realize, in this day and generation, that women were not even allowed to speak in teachers' conventions—even though they were in a great majority in such conventions—until after Susan B. Anthony had won for them that right.

Her next fight was for the cause of temperance. I have always been somewhat surprised that Miss Anthony's part in the temperance movement has not been more generally recognized. Perhaps it is because, after several years' connection with that movement, Miss Anthony decided that the basis of success in control of the liquor traffic in the long run depended upon women gaining the ballot. And, in my judgment, she was correct; that is where the cause of temperance will be won.

Susan B. Anthony took an active and at times prominent part in the antislavery movement. Her urge for freedom found expression in the troublous days preceding the Civil War, when she was a pronounced abolitionist. Miss Anthony never believed in half-way measures. She never sacrificed principle for expediency; and in that lay part of her strength.

Susan B. Anthony, once she decided upon the ultimate objective, was never satisfied with less. Even the great Lincoln would have been satisfied, at one time, with limiting slavery to the States in which it was an established institution and preventing its extension further—but not so Miss Anthony. She believed in "immediate and unconditional emancipation." So she joined Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison, and those other intrepid spirits who risked their lives in the cause of abolition. She, with them, faced infuriated mobs in city after city; she, like them, was insulted and rotten-egged, and faced threats of death with equanimity and dauntless intrepidity.

Many meetings were broken up. Women were run out or dragged out of the meetings by mobs. Not always. It is recorded that at one of these meetings the mayor of the town sat on the platform with a loaded shotgun and compelled attention while Miss Anthony made her speech.

But it is as the leader of the woman-suffrage movement that Susan B. Anthony is best known, and best deserving to be known. From 1852 until her death in 1906, she led that fight, organized the fight, and fought the fight.

During the stormy days preceding secession, and during the war years, she devoted all her energies to the cause of abolition and toward winning the war.

After the war Susan B. Anthony suffered one of her many disappointments. She had understood that the abolitionists, after getting freedom for the Negro slaves, would take up the battle for woman suffrage, but most of them failed her, and she had to start from the beginning again. She based her campaign this time on the assumption that, if women were to win freedom, they would have to win it first for themselves and by themselves.

She also decided, with clear vision and sound logic, that the ballot is the basis of political liberty. It is this clear vision that keeps the primary in effect wherever the voters are intelligent. The ballot is the basis of political liberty.

In 1869 the Woman's National Suffrage Association was organized. In the 22 years that followed, Susan B. Anthony developed into a marvelous field general as well as an inspiring leader. The women organized all over the United States. Public opinion, slowly, indeed, for four decades—at time of her death in 1906, as before noted, suffrage had been granted women in only four States—public opinion finally swung to her cause.

But public opinion did not swing to the women's cause of its own volition or just from chance or even from the general trend of events. It was largely the perseverance and generalship of Susan B. Anthony that brought the final victory. And I say this without in the least detracting from the credit due to the other suffrage leaders.

"Convention after convention, for 50 years, planned and managed by one woman," comments Ida Husted Harper, her biographer. "Was there ever such a record?"

She led or directed campaign after campaign to win individual States. Fate chalked up failure after failure on the records, with an occasional victory, with more and more promises of ultimate victory as the years wore on.

As a matter of fact, before her death, Susan B. Anthony knew that her cause would win.

"Failure is impossible," the words she used at her last convention, was more than an inspiring slogan for her followers. It was a promise of the result; it was a prediction, and a prediction justified by the constantly increasing number of adherents to the cause.

There is nevertheless something very touching in another statement she made at that same time—on the occasion of her eighty-sixth birthday anniversary.

"Just think of it," she said, "I have been striving for 60 years for just a little bit of justice, and yet I must die without obtaining it. It seems so cruel."

Then the indomitable fighting spirit shows again. "Failure is impossible."

Mr. President, my regret this morning is my own inadequacy to convey to you and to the country the depth of my admiration, my respect—aye, I would almost say my worship—for this brave spirit to whose memory I have addressed myself this morning.

I am well aware that, even if I were gifted with the power of eloquence and oratory, there would be nothing I could say which would add to the great thing which she accomplished; nothing I could say which would add to the imperishable record of achievement which she wrote in the pages of history.

There is one thing I would say to the women of America. Susan B. Anthony, with dauntless courage and indomitable will, with vision and wisdom, and practical leadership, wrung for you a heritage of freedom and of opportunity. In doing that she also bequeathed to you great responsibilities. In the period of travail through which we are passing, it may well be that the power given women through the inspiring leadership of this woman—one of the great figures in human history—it may well be in your hands rests the final decision as to whether this civilization of ours will move on to higher and higher levels, or will plunge into the abyss of ruin. If the latter happens, mankind will have to start the long march upward over again, as it apparently has countless times in past history.

If you women of America, if we men of America, can live up to the spirit of Susan B. Anthony, then I have no fear of what the future will be. But the responsibility now is shared by you women with us men, and it is my hope that all of us may arise to our responsibilities as did that brave soul to whose memory I have tried, in feeble words but with sincere appreciation, to pay my tribute today.

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of February 10, 1945]

MAKE ANTHONY HOME WORLD SHRINE

Susan B. Anthony will be a world figure for many years to come. She is a symbol of woman's rights the world over. All her activities for women's right to vote, for their right to an education comparable with that offered to men, for their right, as their capacities justified, to participate with men in all fields on a basis of equal opportunity, were conducted from her Rochester home, which still stands at 17 Madison Street.

Miss Anthony's birthplace at Adams, Mass., is maintained as a shrine by New England women. Her Rochester home, much more significant as the center of her activities, ought to be in the hands of women who will keep it as a shrine for women the world over and as a mecca from which further realization of her aim can be inspired.

Next Thursday, February 15, will be the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of her birth. The Rochester Federation of Women's Clubs has had a plan for purchase and maintenance of the Madison Street home for some time. It has not received the support it should. The one hundred and twenty-fifth birth anniversary would be an appropriate time for Rochester women's organi-

zations, particularly, to show more interest in the project.

Note will be taken of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary in the Unitarian Church tomorrow. Miss Anthony's parents, and she and her sister Mary, who was a quiet but effective partner of Susan in the woman's-rights movement, attended the church during all their Rochester years. For Miss Anthony herself this was more than 50. A tablet in the church records the sisters' attendance, and the church's own historic interest in their cause.

But the anniversary next Thursday ought to be of city-wide importance, for Miss Anthony was a distinguished Rochesterian as well as one of the half dozen women of world significance in all history.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY'S MEMORY HONORED ON ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY

First Unitarian Church tomorrow will celebrate the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony. At the 11 a. m. service, Dr. Arthur J. May, of the University of Rochester, and Dr. Kenneth B. Gell of Charlotte High School will deliver memorial addresses.

Members of the Susan B. Anthony Memorial Committee of Charlotte High School will participate in the service and will place a wreath on the Anthony tablet in the church. Miss Anthony was a member of the Unitarian Church for more than 50 years.

Although Miss Anthony was born in 1820 in Adams, Mass., she came to Rochester as a young woman and made her home in this city during her active life, at 17 Madison Street. She died in 1906. Member of a Quaker family and graduated from a Quaker school, Miss Anthony became active in various reform movements early in life. She was strongly in favor of the antislavery cause before the Civil War, was active in the cause of temperance reform, and became the outstanding American leader of woman suffrage agitation, even to the extent of casting her ballot and being arrested for that offense against the laws of the period. Eventual triumph of the suffrage movement is ascribed largely to her efforts.

CLUB TEA MARKS ANNIVERSARY OF MISS ANTHONY

Members of the Rochester Federation of Women's Clubs, holding a preliminary observance of the birthday of Susan B. Anthony yesterday at the Rochester Museum, heard with interest the reading of a telegram which assured them that Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, will speak in the Senate on the noted suffragist's birthday Thursday, and his tribute will be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. George Howard read a telegram from the former Governor of Massachusetts, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, saying that he had arranged the tribute. She also read a letter from the National Council of Women in New York City telling of the organization's great admiration for Miss Anthony. Mrs. Howard announced that a broadcast in the feminist's honor would be made at 9 a. m. Thursday over WHAM, that the Democrat and Chronicle would carry her story tomorrow, and that the April issue of the Library Quarterly would display an article on the worker for women's rights, written by Prof. Blake McKelvey.

Mrs. James A. Small related the ways in which the federation had honored Miss Anthony, and Mrs. Herman J. Bakker talked on the challenge to women today. Sgt. Cylvia K. Margulies, of the WAC recruiting office, spoke and Frederick G. Bell and two sergeants who have returned from active service told of the need for women to help in industry.

An episode of the organization of the federation by Miss Anthony was given with Mrs. L. H. Jacobs in the role of Miss Anthony and Mrs. James F. Bisgrove serving as narrator.

Following the program, tea was served, the hostesses wearing gowns of the period of half a century ago. The Valentine motif was carried out in table decorations. Pouring were Mrs. Hawley Ward, Mrs. William F. Washburn, Mrs. Small, and Mrs. James F. Bisgrove. Serving as hostesses for the Women's Advisory Council were Mrs. Clifford Dix Ford, Mrs. Carl S. Hallauer, and Mrs. Carl B. Barusch. Mrs. Thomas W. Oliver, chairman of the hospitality committee, assisted by Mrs. J. A. Waite, Mrs. W. T. Fulkerson and Mrs. E. Wainwright Johnson, served.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, this, the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony, reminds us that so frequently outstanding leaders are denied during their lifetime the opportunity of seeing full measure of success for their efforts. What Susan B. Anthony so vigorously and so wisely began, her successors are bringing to completion. Today no one even suggests that woman suffrage be eliminated. Legislation, pending or in near prospect, will, when it becomes the law of the land, insure that sex will not determine the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of our citizens.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, Gov. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, delivered a Lincoln birthday address at Pittsburgh on Monday evening, February 12, 1945. As usual, he claimed for the G. O. P. many accomplishments, but in vague terms, and he likewise gave his audience many misstatements regarding the Democrats and the New Deal.

However, he did praise, as we all do, the great work of Lincoln during the Civil War, and tried to make his fellow reactionary high-tariff Republicans believe that the Republican Party is the same as that of Lincoln.

In his Lincoln Day address in Democratic Pittsburgh, he attacked the Atlantic Charter as a myth and a publicity stunt. He did so, unaware that on that very day, the official report of the Big Three conference at Yalta had been issued, upholding the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

In a word, the Governor of Pennsylvania took issue with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who not only endorsed the Yalta agreement, but has been named to represent the United States at the forthcoming world security conference to be held in San Francisco next April.

The Governor of Pennsylvania also took issue with ex-President Herbert Hoover, who declared that the Yalta agreement provided a sound basis for enduring peace.

We Pennsylvanians know what it means when our Republican governor is afflicted by a sudden rush of words to the microphone. We simply look at the calendar, figure out when his term of office is due to expire, and smile. For Governor Martin of Pennsylvania was elected in 1942 on the then Republican platform that the war was a failure.

Now that the war is a success, and the Governor faces a clock which is ticking away a term of office obtained on the basis of this misstatement, he feels he must do something. The Republican Governor of Pennsylvania made a gallant but belated effort to climb aboard Lincoln's coattails. He missed them and fell flat on his gubernatorial face in a hodgepodge of innuendo and misstatements intended to fool those who heard it or read it in the public press.

Let me repeat the facts concerning this unlucky performance by Governor Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh on February 12, 1945.

On the very day that Governor Martin made his speech, there was announced to the world the agreement reached by President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill at Yalta in the Crimea, which contains the following point:

> A broadly stated declaration on liberated Europe in which the Big Three powers pledge themselves to carry out the principles of the Atlantic Charter by guaranteeing the right of all peoples to choose their forms of government, to destroy the last vestiges of nazi-ism and fascism, and reserve the right to intervene where necessary to accomplish those objectives. France is invited to join in this procedure.

Does Governor Martin still think the Atlantic Charter is a myth? If he does, he would probably have regarded the Gettysburg Address as a publicity stunt.

Governor Martin stated that we lost the peace after World War No. 1 because of secrecy, misunderstanding, and international bickering. We did lose the peace after World War No. 1 but we lost it because of the malice and bitterness of Republican leaders like Governor Martin; namely, Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, and Senator Knox, of Pennsylvania—men like the radical Republicans who wept at Lincoln's funeral and then murdered Lincoln's wise policies of reconciliation with the Southern States.

Governor Martin also stated:

> We must rely upon old-fashioned thrift, hard work, courage, humility, the sweat, tears, decency, and blood of the real American.

If these words are to be personified by the past actions of reactionary Republican leaders, then the great masses of the people of this country certainly do not want to rely upon that kind of old-fashioned thrift, and so forth, which resulted in millions of unemployed, bankruptcies, suicides, and foreclosures.

The American people, in four great mandates, have shown that they want none of Governor Martin's policies. I doubt that Abraham Lincoln, if alive today, would want them, either.

Mr. President, can you visualize Honest Abe going, hat in hand, to Joe Pew? I cannot.

BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, as this is Boy Scout Week, it is my pleasure to invite attention to the magnificent record of service to the Nation that has been made by the Boy Scouts of America. This great agency was organized 35 years ago. Since then the history of the Boy Scouts has been a history of

service, service to boyhood and service to our country.

Since the war, however, their record has been so extraordinary that it is deserving of more than passing attention. Various Government agencies have requested of the Boy Scouts more than 60 separate projects dealing directly with the war effort. Of course, these do not include the thousands of local contributions which have been made.

Boy Scout service has soared into figures which are astronomical. For instance, in the matter of salvage of all kinds, they have collected a total of over 1,000,189,000 pounds. Take the matter of milkweed pods alone. Last fall a request was sent out to collect these pods because the milkweed floss was needed to replace kapok in life jackets. The Boy Scouts alone collected more milkweed floss than the Government knew existed in the country. Their collection was sufficient for 1,000,000 life jackets.

In August and September, in addition to the regular paper salvage that troops had been carrying on as a part of their good turn, the Government asked for a special waste paper drive. In those 2 months the Scouts collected over 2,000,000,000 pounds of paper—35,000,000 pounds more than the amount that was requested of them. So I might go on. I could tell the Senate that they had distributed pamphlets, posters, leaflets, and other governmental information material last year amounting to one hundred sixteen and a half billion pieces.

A major war service was in the production of food. In 1943 alone the Boy Scouts of America gave more than 100,000,000,000 hours of service to raising food for ourselves and our allies. In 1944, the record was higher. A conservative estimate shows that 126,000 worked on farms and 184,000 had their own victory gardens. A big campaign is planned for this year.

Their greatest service has been helping various agencies in local communities. They have helped to finance the war starting with the first war loan. It has been estimated that they have been responsible for the sale of practically $8,000,000,000 worth of War bonds and stamps. They have visited millions of homes, not only to deliver information material, but actually to take orders for bonds.

The Boy Scouts of America have a current active membership of nearly 2,000,000. In the past 35 years more than 12,000,000 persons have been members of this great organization. It is estimated that 4,000,000 of the 12,000,000 now serving the colors have had some Scout training. Many of them have distinguished themselves with the utmost gallantry. Here on the home front, Boy Scouts continue to carry on in practical fashion, aiding wherever they are needed in the war effort, contributing greatly to national morale and ultimate victory.

EXTENSION OF SUBSIDY PAYMENTS FOR STRATEGIC METALS, ETC.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on February 12 I made a few remarks about Senate bill 502—a bill to permit extension of premium payments on strategic and critical metals and minerals and petroleum and petroleum products—which I recently introduced for myself and a distinguished group of other Senators. I wish to amplify somewhat the remarks made at that time and, in addition, to point out the real need for prompt action on this bill.

Unfortunately, the amendment to the Stabilization Act of 1944, which prohibited subsidy payments after June 30, 1945, probably went further than really was intended. While designed to check the wholesale application of consumer rollback and similar subsidy devices, these vital producer subsidies affecting principally copper, lead, zinc, petroleum, and petroleum products were not exempted as previously has been the case.

Prior to the passage of the restrictive amendment, the Metals Reserve Company had announced the extension of the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc until July 31, 1945, a month beyond the limiting date afterward established by the Stabilization Act of 1944. I am informed that certain individual contracts had been made for even longer periods. Obviously the Government has been placed in an anomalous position with respect to the producers with whom it contracted; and, without explicit permission from Congress, it is not able to carry out its contractual obligations.

The industry, including both employers and employees, is being affected adversely by the uncertainties of the situation. As far as is known to thousands of mine operators, they must close down within the next few months or must start making arrangements to do so. The Metals Reserve Company, I am informed, is in a position to announce the terms of premium payments for the new fiscal year the moment the Congress gives it the green light. Producers should know at the earliest possible moment what they may expect, so that they can plan for the future. There never has been a time when full production is so urgently necessary, and we must permit nothing to stand in the way of making the maximum effort. If the ordinary course of events is followed, it will not be possible to provide funds for producer subsidy payments except in an appropriation bill following the passage of the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act, and this may mean that the prevailing uncertainty might continue until May, thus accentuating the already unfortunate adverse effect upon production.

Although I am more familiar with the metals and minerals situation, I am assured that oil producers are similarly affected.

There can be no doubt that this program has been remarkably effective in saving the Government and the people large sums of money, due to its deflationary effect. Mr. Chester Bowles is authority for the statement that up to the first part of last year premiums on copper alone had effected a saving to the consumers of $600,000,000. It has also been authoritatively stated that to date between one and one-half and two billion dollars has been saved in the ultimate cost of finished goods made all or in part of copper, lead, or zinc, of which the Government is the principal user.

The reasons for continuing the payment of these producer subsidies are so cogent that I feel sure Congress would without question eventually vote the necessary appropriations. As I have pointed out, however, time is an important element in this instance, and we cannot permit our raw-material industries to become disorganized.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduced Senate bill 502, which will permit immediate announcement of a plan to continue these subsidy payments and to relieve the producers of these important sinews of war from their dire dilemma. I feel that both labor and industry should be assured that production will continue undisturbed for at least another fiscal year; and I trust that if this bill becomes law the Government will promptly reannounce the plan for premium payments for another fiscal year, upon terms not less satisfactory to industry than those heretofore in force.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER ON SELLING OF SURPLUS WAR PLANTS

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of an address entitled "Selling Surplus War Plants," delivered by him before the steel committee of the Western States Council, Salt Lake City, Utah, February 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY LOOKS FORWARD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Republican Party Looks Forward," delivered by Senator WILLIS, at Niles, Ohio, on McKinley Day, February 9, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF NORTH PACIFIC AREA—ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY A. WALLACE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, former Vice President of the United States, at Seattle, July 9, 1944, on his return from a trip to China and portions of Soviet Russia, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEBREW FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY PETER H. BERGSON

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Hebrew Freedom," delivered by Mr. Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, at Carnegie Hall, New York, N. Y., on December 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY JOSEPH H. KASZUBOWSKI

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day dinner address delivered by Joseph H. Kaszubowski at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., on February 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PENDING WATER-DISPOSAL TREATY WITH MEXICO—ARTICLE BY SUMNER WELLES

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Inter-American Unity," written by Sumner Welles, and relating to the pending water-disposal treaty with Mexico, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEXICAN WATER-DISPOSAL TREATY DISPUTE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial en-

titled "Treaty Dispute," published in the Washington Post of February 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY DOES HITLER HANG ON?—ARTICLE BY H. V. KALTENBORN

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why Does Hitler Hang On?", written by H. V. Kaltenborn and published in the February 1945 issue of the Rotarian, which appears in the Appendix.]

A WHITE CROSS AND A DOG TAG—LETTER FROM A SOLDIER IN FRANCE

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Sgt. Claron L. Oakley, printed under the title "A White Cross and a Dog Tag," in the Y News, published by the students of Brigham Young University, at Provo, Utah, on January 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference. This bill is the Missouri Valley Authority bill, similar to the one which I introduced at the last session. I consider this to be one of the most important pieces of legislation which will be introduced at this session, and I wish to make a statement in connection with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Sentor's statement does not take more than 5 minutes, and there is no objection, he will be permitted to make it.

Mr. MURRAY. I assumed that we had reached the end of the morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business has not been concluded.

Mr. MURRAY. Then I shall defer my statement until the morning business is concluded. I wish to make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The bill (S. 555) to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Resolutions coming over from a previous day are in order.

Morning business is closed.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. TUNNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL and Mr. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I would suggest the absence of a quorum, in view of the fact that I understand the Senator from Delaware is about to make a speech.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to yield now to the Senator from Montana for a few minutes, inasmuch as he has said he wishes to speak briefly.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill which I consider to be probably the most important piece of legislation which will be introduced in this session of Congress. When I introduced the bill I requested the privilege of making a statement in connection therewith. The Chair has allowed other Senators to make statements which took as much time as I shall be willing to take, and I think I should be permitted to proceed at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Montana that the Chair is making the best endeavor of which he is capable to enforce the rules of the Senate. The Chair will say that he appreciates what the floor leaders are doing to support him in that endeavor. The Chair has no intention of doing anything which is not fair to Senators.

The Senator from Delaware has yielded to the Senator from Montana, and he may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, at the last session of the Congress I introduced a bill providing for the creation of a Government corporation to be known as the Missouri Valley Authority to accomplish the great task of developing the water and other resources of the Missouri Valley. The purpose of that bill, as set forth in section 1 thereof, was to provide for the control and prevention of floods in the Missouri Valley region, and the reclamation of public lands, to safeguard the navigable waters, to promote navigation, and to encourage the fuller development and utilization of the resources of the region, all for the purpose of fostering and protecting the commerce among the several States, strengthening the national defense, conserving the water, soil, and forest resources of the Nation, and promoting the general welfare of the United States.

The bill which I have today introduced is substantially the same bill. It likewise provides for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority charged with the same high duty. Such changes as have been made in the present bill are for the most part designed to expand and clarify the objectives and purposes to be attained. For the past 6 months a substantial part of my time and efforts has been devoted to a study of the problems of the Missouri Valley. My introduction of the original bill on August 18, 1944, was inspired by the conviction that only through a single unified authority would it be possible to bring about the fullest development of the Missouri River Basin and its vast resources in the interest and welfare of the people of the region.

For a century and a half we have been trying to cope with the problems of river control and river development, but never until the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, have we seen fit to look upon a river as Nature made her, namely, a single, undivided whole. Instead, we have directed one agency to improve a river for navigation; we have instructed another agency to build dams for reclamation; still others for flood control, or for power. We have been working on the Missouri River for generations, and have spent tens of millions of dollars on navigation and flood control alone. We have not succeeded because we have been applying the discredited piecemeal method instead of dealing with the problems of a single river as a unity.

What has transpired since last August has only served to strengthen me in my conviction. When I introduced the original bill I stated to the Senate at length the reasons for my conviction as to the need for a Missouri Valley Authority. I stated then—and I reiterate now—that the full development of the resources of this great region might well rank as the most important national development since the Louisiana Purchase. I stated then—and again I reiterate—that the full development of the resources of that region will come when, and only when, the Congress sees fit to entrust this great task to a single agency, charged with sole and undivided responsibility, and possessed of powers commensurate with the magnitude of the task at hand.

I should like to state briefly what the bill which I have today introduced provides. The general scope of the bill is outlined in section 2 thereof, wherein the policy of the United States is declared to be as follows:

(a) That the Federal Government shall establish and maintain a broad program of unified water control and resource development for the Missouri Valley region, consisting of the entire Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, and such adjoining territory as may be related to or materially affected by the development consequent to this act;

(b) That the administration of such a multipurpose program shall be entrusted to a Federal regional agency having its principal headquarters in the region, which shall be directly responsible to the President and Congress, with full authority and responsibility for carrying out the program herein authorized;

(c) That such regional agency shall utilize to the fullest possible extent the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region, and their public and private organizations, local and State, as well as the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the existing operating agencies of the Federal Government.

By the enactment of this bill, Congress will extend to the Missouri Valley the policy of unified development of the resources of the region which has proved so successful in the Tennessee Valley.

The development as a unit of the resources of the Missouri River, a watershed embracing a territory of nearly 530,000 square miles, 17½ percent of the area of the continental United States, is a sound engineering concept. If undertaken with due regard to the principles which I have enumerated, the development cannot fail. If these principles are disregarded, the undertaking cannot be executed with the necessary efficiency and economy, and will fail to achieve the desired results.

The task to be performed by the Corporation is outlined in section 11 of the bill. The Corporation is authorized to construct, operate, and carry out such projects and activities on the Missouri River, its tributaries, and surrounding region, as will best serve to control and

prevent floods, to safeguard the navigable waters, to reclaim the public lands, to encourage irrigation, to foster navigation, and to generate electric power to whatever extent is consistent with those primary purposes.

The Corporation is charged with the duty of reconciling the conflicting demands of reclamation, flood control, navigation, and power, and reporting back to the Congress within 2 years a unified plan for the development of the Missouri Valley, the plan to go into effect only after the Congress has had an opportunity to approve or reject it.

At the last session of the Congress we authorized, in the flood control bill, the construction of projects in the Missouri Valley at a total cost of $400,000,000, on the basis of an incompletely engineered compromise plan hastily agreed upon by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in an attempt to thwart the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. The circumstances under which this compromise plan was conceived and promoted have been graphicall described by Rufus Terral in an article published in the magazine Survey Graphic; and I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

BIG MAGIC FOR THE BIG MUDDY—MISSOURI VALLEY, THE NATION'S SECOND GREATEST, BECOMES ALIVE TO ITS OPPORTUNITY AND, IN A FERMENT OF CONFLICTING IDEAS, SEEKS A PLAN

(By Rufus Terral)

"Thank God I don't have to do anything about the Missouri River," a top ranking Government engineer once said. For the Missouri is a lawless rogue of a river—never flooding without changing the course of its channel somewhere—and flooding nearly every spring. Those floods spill and waste precious water that Montana and Wyoming, Colorado, and the Dakotas sorely need. In Nebraska and Kansas, Iowa and Missouri, the river's erratic course and that of its tributaries carry away and waste a huge tonnage of choice topsoil—dumping it into the Mississippi.

Thus the river is the Missouri Valley's sorrow, as the Hwang Ho is China's. That is called the Yellow for the same reason that the soubriquet of the Missouri is "Big Muddy." They are two of the most destructive rivers in the world, spendthrift of earth and water and latent energy. It remains to be seen whether in the years ahead, the Chinese or the Americans will be the first to turn them from regional sorrows into regional assets. Plans are afoot in both countries.

MEET THE MISSOURI BASIN

Everyone knows now that something has got to be done about the Missouri. The farmers at the top of the valley know that the stability of their agriculture—of their statehood, even—depends upon it. Great urban centers, such as St. Louis, Omaha, and the Kansas Citys, know that their protection against floods depends upon it. The something which has to be done must be on a big scale—a united effort. That is the new thing that is taking hold.

For this is a big valley which the Big Muddy traverses. It is a valley of a half billion acres, composes one-sixth of the area of the United States, takes in a territory the size of Germany, France, and Italy combined.

Three mountain streams, the Gallatin, the Jefferson, and the Madison, come together at Three Forks (Mont.), northwest of Yellowstone National Park, and form the Missouri. Eastward the river flows into North Dakota, thence rambles southeast. Altogether it is 2,460 miles long. Its watershed stretches north into Canada, west to the eastern slopes of the Great Divide and the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. Taking in segments of nine States, it is the second largest river valley in the United States.

Here is the home of some 6,750,000 people. Most of the population and nearly all the large cities and industrial establishments are concentrated in the eastern third of the region. So great is the contrast in density with the western third that the entire State of Wyoming—with roughly a quarter million—has less than one-third the population of the city of St. Louis. So great is the spread in elevation that it ranges from 13,000 feet in the west to 400 feet at the southeast.

This huge basin contains millions of sheep and cows, thousands of acres of wheat, enormous forests, and deposits of coal, copper, gas, iron, lead, manganese, oil, and zinc. Its people range from ranchers on the lonesome plains to swing-shifters in the teeming war-industry plants of Kansas City and Denver, St. Louis and Omaha.

As for the electric-power possibilities of the Missouri River system, they have barely been touched. In 1934 the total capacity of all existing hydroelectric installations was computed at 500,000 kilowatts by the Mississippi Valley Committee (Morris L. Cooke, chairman) of the Public Works Administration. The committee estimated that the river will support a power system with a generating capacity of 2,500,000 kilowatts. This would bring it abreast of the T. V. A.

THE FLOODS OF 1943—AND COLONEL PICK

The urgency of doing something about the Missouri was borne in upon the entire valley early in 1943. In March and again in April, floods inundated 2,000,000 acres and caused damage to farms, towns, and cities that was estimated at $26,000,000. Congress was aroused and the Flood Control Committee of the House called upon United States Army engineers to submit immediately a plan for the control of floods throughout the whole basin.

The Army engineer at that time in charge of the Missouri River division, with headquarters at Omaha, is a remarkable personality. This was Col. Lewis A. Pick, whose name later became the familiar designation of the Missouri River report prepared under his direction. Colonel Pick has a flair for stirring up good will by personal contact and extending it by sound techniques. Into his division office he introduced the first public-relations man—and to date the only one—ever to operate in the sacred and somewhat tongue-tied purlieus of the Army engineers. This was William E. Langdon, an able ex-journalist from New England.

Colonel Pick has considerable rough and readiness, and no liking whatever for folderol. He knew his fellow engineers would look down their noses at any report trumped up in fewer than a couple of hundred pages and having a gross weight of less than 5 pounds. But he knew, also, that there was no time to prepare such a ponderous document and that, with public interest stirred by the floods, a report in the hand would be worth two in the bush.

So he set his office about the business of preparing what became a sort of prospectus, or statement of intentions. Flood control and navigation were to be sketched in broad outline. Irrigation, power, erosion control, forestation, and the other elements of a comprehensive plan were to be represented by a series of nobly conceived and boldly executed blank spaces. At the same time, Colonel Pick busied himself with speaking engagements, bringing word of what was under way. In 3 months, the work was completed.

Meanwhile the United States Reclamation Bureau had become alarmed. For 5 years this Bureau had been working on a survey of the Missouri Valley; but partly because there had been little public urgency about it, and partly because the Bureau was handicapped by a shortage of engineers, the project had strung out and was not nearly completed. When Army engineers let it be known from one end of the valley to the other that their planning was on the stove and would soon be served up, the Reclamation Bureau forthwith announced that the same was true of the progress of its 5-year study.

The Pick report was made public in August 1943. It called for a system of 12 dams on the Missouri River and its tributaries, and for levees from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth, at a total cost of $490,000,000. One of the first obvious facts about it (once it was examined, rather than merely heard about) was that the report was not a comprehensive plan at all, even for flood control. What it offered was a practical start plus a unified framework into which, as the text itself explained, the components of an overall program were to be fitted in detail as the work of planning and building went on. In other words, here was a beginning, and, while only that, it looked to be a good one.

CONGRESSIONAL SHOALS

A storm of objection to the plan—or statement of intentions—broke out, not over the flood-control bill itself, introduced in Congress to implement the Pick report, but over another measure. An obscure passage in the river and harbor bill was discovered by Governors Moses, of North Dakota; Ford, of Montana; and Hunt, of Wyoming.

This passage related to a proposal by the Army engineers to deepen the navigation channel in the Missouri downstream from Sioux City, Iowa—from its present 6 feet to a proposed standard depth of 9. It simply said, innocently and obliquely enough, that the engineers thought they would be needing a certain specified amount of the flow of the Missouri River annually for navigation purposes.

The governors of the irrigation States had found to their amazement and consternation that the amount which the Army engineers specified was virtually all the average flow of the Missouri for the past 10 years. Hence their objections and those promptly registered by the Reclamation Bureau, and the National Reclamation Association. In self-defense or retaliation, Senators and Representatives from the irrigation States offered competing pieces of legislation which were equally one-sided. One of the most drastic, introduced by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, sought to reserve to the Upper Valley States all the waters of the Missouri River that originated within their boundaries.

The Army engineers protested that the disputed clause in the river and harbor bill would not constitute a legal reservation of water for navigation. The reclamationists, frankly, did not believe them. The Army engineers said there was plenty of water in the Missouri for both irrigation and navigation. The reclamationists did not believe that, either, and they wondered why, if it were true, the Army engineers were in such a rush to get in their priority. The Army engineers declared that if there ever were a conflict between irrigation and navigation, they would not dream of standing in the way of irrigation. The reclamationists said that was fine, and would the Army engineers just put it in writing? Oh, no, the Army engineers said; that was not necessary; the reclamationists could trust them implicitly. So the reclamationists distrusted them more than before.

The issue was joined in the valley itself, no less than in Congress. Extremists on both sides belabored each other with heat and without compromise. Among the pro-

ponents of navigation, the Mississippi Valley Association and the Kansas City Star shouted "parasites!" at the reclamationists. Among the proponents of irrigation, the Miles City (Mont.) Daily Star yelled "robbers!" and "water filchers!" right back at the navigationists. The Omaha Evening World-Herald lifted its eyebrows and tucked in its skirts. "Even old-time fighters for Missouri River development," it commented, "are astonished by the heat generated by the present battle. This is more than a sectional battle. This appears to be Armageddon."

Into the fracas stepped the brief, beetling Governor of South Dakota, Merrell Q. Sharpe. The South Dakotan looks like the War Labor Board's Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, with a case of dyspepsia, added, and he is not of the hail-fellow-well-met type. In conversation he avoids looking at his vis-a-vis, and is apt to give his whole attention to the floor. A hard man to meet, as even his friends admit. Also a tremendous worker, with an amazing singleness of purpose, and an equally amazing ability to persuade and lead, as even his enemies admit.

Governor Sharpe is chairman of the Missouri River States Committee, an organization consisting of the governors (and their citizen appointees) of the nine Missouri Valley States. Last March, when virtually nobody was agreeing on virtually anything, Governor Sharpe called the committee together at Omaha. He had been plugging for the Pick plan ever since Colonel Pick started his missionary work in the valley.

OMAHA—AND GOVERNOR SHARPE

By this time the colorful colonel had gone overseas where he was building the fabulous malaria-ridden, leech-and-orchid-strewn Ledo Road to reopen the China lifeline, the Burma Road. The burden of support of the Pick plan at Omaha fell upon Governor Sharpe, and the outcome of the conference was a personal triumph for this irascible, stubborn, hard-working Dakotan. He was the only one of the nine Governors present who really approved the Pick plan, but because of his insistence upon a front of unity, the public utterances of every Governor contained a few kind words for it. If there was a sound as of the grinding of teeth—if, at times, the true feelings of one or another Governor broke through the calm surface—the fact remained that because of Sharpe the conference acted as one man right down to the adjournment.

Colonel Pick's successor, Col. Miles Reber, himself an ingratiating personality, was on hand along with Publicity Director Langdon and a formidable array of engineers. These technicians went into a day-long huddle with the Governors. One of the first questions the State executives plumped at the engineers was by what facts they arrived at their conclusion that there was enough water in the Missouri for both navigation and irrigation. One of the very first answers from the Army engineers was that they did not know. They were sure there was enough water, but they did not know how much "enough" would have to be, because they did not know how much they would require for the channel.

When question after question brought only these dubious answers, it was sober, mannerly Gov. John C. Vivian, of Colorado, who rose and banged his fist on the conference table. "By God" he cried, "if you don't know, maybe we can find out." And that was the declaration upon which the conference acted.

Forthwith a committee composed of engineers from the nine States was set up. To begin with, it was to find out how much water there is in the Missouri River; then it was to determine whether this is enough for irrigation and navigation; and, if possible, to synthesize the plans of the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau. Three months later the nine-State engineers' committee came out with a report which studiously said nothing much, but said it with a harmony that was encouraging.

THE DISPUTE WELLS UP IN WASHINGTON

Hearings on one phase or another of Missouri River development were held by the Commerce Committee in the Senate and by the Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Committees in the House. In May, the Reclamation Bureau finally issued its long awaited report (90 dams, cost $1,250,000,000). Senators and Representatives of the irrigation States fought water grabbing with water grabbing, and Governor Sharpe sought to push the Pick plan through Congress before anyone could say too much against it. Through it all, it began to look as if the people of the Missouri Valley were being thwarted by the very form and habits of government, legislative and administrative, that existed to serve them.

The nub of the matter was put by Governors Moses of North Dakota, Ford of Montana, and Hunt, of Wyoming. They declared to a congressional committee: "It was inevitable that these two agencies of the Federal Government—the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau—would come into conflict over the use of the waters of the upper Missouri River. Here are two separate Federal agencies working under entirely different basic laws, responsible to separate committees of Congress, and serving conflicting purposes."

"The suggestion has been made," observed the Minneapolis Tribune, "that the reports of the Reclamation Bureau and the Army engineers be synthesized—to bring about a workable, equitable plan for the whole basin. The Senate subcommittee testimony indicated that the difficulties in such integration might be virtually insurmountable."

So much was this the case on Capitol Hill that proponents of a unified approach could not even obtain the consent of the House committees concerned to sit together and consider the problem. No; the Flood Control Committee must consider flood control, and the Rivers and Harbors Committee, navigation, and never the twain should meet. In the Senate the Commerce Committee would function, and as for irrigation, there was quite another committee for that. As David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, wrote in his book, T. V. A.—Democracy on the March, one of the most bothersome things about Nature is that it cannot be made to conform to the organization chart of the Federal Government.

ENTER THE EDITORS

This was how things stood in mid May, when the St. Louis Post-Dispatch addressed a letter to the editors of the Missouri Valley. This was accompanied by a list of representative editors of the valley, a map of the Empire of the Missouri (p. 376), and a Fitzpatrick cartoon showing irrigation, navigation, and flood control, as all one river (p. 378). In its full-page editorial the Post-Dispatch proposed an independent Federal development corporation modeled on the successful Tennessee Valley Authority.

"Where," asked the newspaper, "is the plan that will solve the one big problem of the one big river?

"The Missouri Valley must find that plan. The place to begin with is with the newspaper editors up and down the 2,460 miles of the valley itself. In this editorial we address them.

"We address the editor of the Miles City Star, of Montana; the editor of the Bismarck Tribune, of North Dakota; the editor of the Pierre Capital Journal, of South Dakota; the editors of the Sioux City Journal; the Omaha World-Herald; the Emporia Gazette; the St. Joseph News-Press. We address the editors of the Kansas City Star, the Jefferson City Post-Tribune, and all the other editors up and down the valley.

"We address them because finding the plan is a job for all of us, working together; because time is precious if we are to master the river instead of permitting it longer to enslave us. The floods of this spring are the final and convincing proof that we have got to accept the river's challenge now.

"We address them because the plan that will rule the river is one that must be chosen and formulated through public education, understanding, and popular acceptance. Through such a plan, all dwellers in the valley can be made neighbors, pulling together in their common task. This is the creative function of journalism. This is what editors are for."

The Post-Dispatch had early supported the Pick plan as a good start toward a comprehensive plan. Later it had repudiated the indirect attempt, in accompanying legislation, to discriminate against irrigation by putting priority on the lion's share of Missouri River water for navigation. The paper now urged that irrigation and navigation receive equal treatment, that neither receive legislative quotas of water, that an impartial administrative agency be set up to determine, on the basis of good engineering, how the water should be used in specific situations as they arose. In order to start from a position of fairness to everyone, it proposed that irrigation be included in the uses of the water impounded by Fort Peck Dam on the Missouri River in Montana—a project hitherto limited by act of Congress to navigation, flood control, and power production.

The editors of the upper Missouri Valley responded eagerly to the invitation to friendly discussion with the lower valley. (See above.) As for a T. V. A. on the Missouri—that was another thing.

Between much of the opinion of the upper and lower valleys there is this marked difference: The upper valley has come to realize it must have the support of the lower valley for its legislation. There are many in the lower valley who are blind to this community of destiny. And there are others who propose "compromise"—by having everything their own way: The Mississippi Valley Association, the Kansas City Star, the Omaha World-Herald, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Senator Bennett Champ Clark, of Missouri.

FOUR ALTERNATIVES

Through what device can all the States of the Missouri Valley work together? Four possible methods have been suggested:

1. Joint operation by the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau, with the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Power Commission consulted in their fields;

2. Interstate compact;

3. An independent Federal corporation, similar in principle to T. V. A.;

4. A commission, roughly patterned on the Mississippi River Commission.

The joint-operation idea is represented in the current Congress by a bill introduced by Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana. This would partition the Missouri River, giving the main stream over to the Army engineers and the tributaries to the Reclamation Bureau. The utter inability of the two agencies to get together on their plans has not created too much enthusiasm as to their ability to get together permanently on joint operation.

An interstate compact is favored in the Upper Valley States. Some of them even have State sovereignty over water written into their constitutions as ratified by Congress. "I believe," says Gov. Samuel C. Ford, of Montana, "in States' rights. We shouldn't expect the United States Government to provide dams for reclamation and flood control. We in Montana want to pay for all the water we get for reclamation. When we surrender this to the Federal Government we are surrendering inalienable rights to the water in those streams."

Says Gov. Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa: "Regulations and operation should be in the

hands of the States. Sentiment is against an M. V. A. Full Federal control is too apt to emphasize one phase of the program over another."

Says Gov. Merrell Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota: "When the Governors of the Missouri Valley States took this to their people, they found that inevitably there was sentiment against a T. V. A. or an M. V. A., on the theory that we didn't want to relinquish States' rights to some superstate set-up by Federal action."

Says Gov. John C. Vivian, of Colorado: "If any system of development similar to T. V. A. is ever constructed on the Missouri River, it should be by private enterprise. There is entirely too much government in business. Private business is entitled to any of the benefits to be derived from power generated on our rivers. So far as Colorado is concerned, it would strongly favor private enterprise in the development of electric power on the Missouri River as against unwarranted and unfair encroachments of the Federal Government in this connection."

Nonetheless, there is sentiment for a Federal developmental corporation to make the Missouri Valley blossom as the Tennessee Valley has been made to blossom, and this is the most vigorously growing sentiment in the river basin. Alone among the Governors, Gov. Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming, a State in which State sovereignty over water is guaranteed by its constitution, has said: "Wyoming is not opposed to comprehensive, overall development of the Missouri River, similar to that achieved through T. V. A., provided Wyoming's rights to prior use of all the water originating in Wyoming are guaranteed."

The National Farmers' Union, with the bulk of its membership in the Missouri Basin, has come out unconditionally for a Missouri Valley Authority. And the people of the Missouri Valley cannot fail to hear confident voices from elsewhere such as that of the Washington Post:

"In establishing the T. V. A., Congress directed that the resources of that valley were to be developed not separately, as in the past, but in a unified way. A demand for this sort of development has arisen in the valley of the Missouri River. T. V. A. has furnished a pilot operation which should be a goal to the Government in remedying the problem which has arisen upon the Missouri which, evidently, cannot be solved piecemeal."

T. V. A., in its proved success, provides the most promising principle of Missouri Valley development. Two factors hinders its application to this river basin: First, many of the people, particularly in the upper valley, lack exact knowledge of what T. V. A. is and how it works. They labor under the delusion which enemies of T. V. A. have spread so diligently: That T. V. A. is solely a power agency. Second, a strong sentiment in the upper valley toward any Federal developmental agency is one of distrust.

THE LONG VIEW

Can the facts about T. V. A. be presented to the people of the Missouri Valley so well that they will catch the vision of its meaning in terms of their own lives and the future of their region? Can legislation creating a Missouri Valley Authority be so drawn, and can men of such caliber be appointed to direct it that irrigationists will trust the law and its administrators to protect their interests?

Before minds can meet, they must be open. In the Missouri Valley today we see that process unfolding in a search for a device that will work, and one that can gain public acceptance.

Above the clamor of the breast-beaters and the professional special pleaders there are beginning to be heard the voices of those who see the whole as a whole. There is beginning to be seen the vision of those who understand that in building the future it is important to make no little miracles. There must be nothing less than big magic for the Big Muddy.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, no appropriation has been made for the projects to which I have referred, because manpower and materials will not be available during the war. The bill which I have introduced today authorizes the Corporation to construct those projects, but provides that the Corporation shall at the same time restudy the plans, determine their engineering merits and feasibility, and report back to the Congress. The Corporation is also authorized to construct such projects included in the so-called comprehensive plan as it finds to be consistent with the ultimate unified plan for the development of the valley.

I shall not comment at this time on the detailed provisions of the bill except to state that, in general, the administrative organization is modeled after that of the Tennessee Valley Authority which has worked so admirably in practice. Many of the detailed provisions are similar to those in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and, in addition, I have drawn heavily upon the experience of that agency, as well as other Federal agencies, and have incorporated in the bill many proposals which seem desirable in the light of actual knowledge and experience.

MANAGEMENT

Mr. President, I have given careful consideration to the question of what type of management would be most suitable for the Missouri Valley Authority. In recent years there has been much discussion of this subject in which the advantages of a single administrator as contrasted with the board type of management have been emphasized. To be sure, it may be conceded that there are certain advantages in the single administrator system in certain undertakings. However, after weighing the question at some length, and after considering the vastness of the project here to be administered, I feel convinced that the authority undertaking the task outlined here would best operate under a board of three directors, with a general manager supervising the program under their control. I shall not take the time now to elaborate on this matter.

The final decision of this question, of course, must lie with the Congress. If the single administrator type of management should, after full hearings and study, prove to be the more desirable and efficient method of administration, it can be adopted. I am sure the Congress will give this question serious consideration.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Section 5 of the bill provides for an Advisory Committee composed of the principal officers of the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, and War, the Federal Power Commission, Federal Security Agency, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In addition, it calls for nine representatives from the Missouri Valley, three from agriculture, three from commerce, and three from labor, all appointed by the President.

This Advisory Committee is to act in a consultative capacity upon such matters of broad policy as may be refererd to it by the Board. It has the additional function of receiving the annual report of the Board and its transmission to the President.

I feel that such an Advisory Committee could add much to the successful operation and management of the Missouri Valley Authority. It would make available the collective knowledge and experience of the governmenta' agencies interested in various phases of the work delegated to the Authority. At the same time, it would also have at its disposal the knowledge and experience of men from the valley proper, representing the various segments of population and economic interests involved.

Of course, this, too, is a question for the Congress to decide after full hearings on the bill, and I shall therefore omit further comment on the matter at this time.

FAMILY-TYPE FARM

Mr. President, section 13 of the bill will be of great interest not only to the people of the valley, but to the Nation as a whole. It provides for the irrigation of family-type farms not to exceed 160 acres, exclusive of such amounts of nonirrigable land, contiguous or noncontiguous, as may be necessary to the formation of a family-type farm.

Farm owners served by the water-distribution system of the Corporation will have to enter into an agreement with the Corporation to dispose of any excess land holdings of irrigable land over and above the limitation of 160 acres. Such sales of land, of course, are to take place within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed 5 years, and at a price which is not to include the increment on account of the construction of the project.

It is my firm conviction that just as we must avoid the concentration of industrial and financial control in the hands of a few, we must likewise safeguard against the concentration of land in the hands of a few large landholders. Monopolistic control of either is bound to bring disaster to our citizens and undermine the very foundation of our democracy.

There is nothing new or strange in the suggestion of this plan for river development—a Missouri Valley Authority. The need for unified development of our river systems has become more and more apparent through the years. Finally, in 1933, Congress set up the pattern for such development by creating a new kind of agency to develop the rivers of the Tennessee Valley. It is now well recognized that this same type of organization can be applied with equally successful results to the Missouri Valley. Senator Norris saw the need for such an agency in 1937 and vigorously urged the Congress to create a Missouri Valley Authority. The disastrous effects of the droughts and floods of recent years have since brought home to the people of the Missouri Valley the absolute necessity for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority to provide unified water control and utilization. The futile efforts of the established centralized Federal bureaus and departments, with all their conflicting activities and highly involved administrative methods to cope

with the problems of the Missouri River have served to emphasize the need for a unified regional approach through a single Federal agency. The outstanding example of T. V. A. in the Valley of the Tennessee has helped guide us toward an understanding of the kind of unified plan and administrative set-up necessary for the development of the Missouri River as well as the resources of the entire river basin.

The people of the Missouri Valley are fully aroused to the need of an Authority. In ever-increasing numbers they are taking part in the great public debate on the problem as to how their river and the tremendous resources of the valley shall be developed and administered.

We in the Congress are receiving hundreds of letters from citizens in the Missouri Valley asking pertinent questions and urging the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. Farmers and farm organizations, workingmen and labor unions, business and professional men, local chambers of commerce, and other trade associations, as well as State and local officials—all are discussing the merits of a Missouri Valley Authority in characteristic American fashion.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a statement made by the president of the Missouri Farmers' Association, Mr. F. V. Heinkel, which has been widely published in the press. I shall quote only briefly:

> The State legislative committee of the Missouri Farmers' Association has recommended that its 86,000 members in Missouri support a Missouri Valley Authority. This decision was made by the committee after several months' study of the flood-control problem. In arriving at its conclusion that the interests of Missouri farmers would best be served by an M. V. A., the committee took into account these two points: One, that the present flood-control law, signed recently by the President, does not meet the needs of the Missouri Valley; and, two, that a Missouri Valley Authority, patterned after the tried and proven Tennessee Valley Authority, would give the people in the valley a comprehensive, over-all plan which will not only control floods but conserve our natural resources and properly utilize the surplus waters at the same time, which will benefit all of the people in the region * * *."

After reviewing the inadequacy of the recently enacted flood-control law and dwelling upon many other vital issues involving the life and progress of the people of the valley, the official statement concludes with these words:

> Under proper management—and do we not always have to take chances on good management whether in private or public undertakings?—an M. V. A. can produce an environment here in the Missouri River Valley where cheap electricity and low-cost transportation will promote the development of a great industrial empire. Our farm lands will be conserved and improved through adequate soil-conservation measures, which spell a more prosperous State and Nation. Water for irrigation in the dry sections will take the gamble out of farming for thousands of good people. As new industries are developed in the region, more jobs will mean better markets for the products of midwest agriculture.
>
> Such a plan as M. V. A. is an ambitious one, but the situation calls for it. And yet, it is not a visionary plan, because it has been tried and proven in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. President, the widespread interest in the Missouri Valley Authority is not accidental. The people of the valley are recognizing that the M. V. A. is something in which every group will have a stake. They understand that everyone will benefit by the elimination of floods, the extension of irrigation, the availability of cheap electricity, and low-cost transportation. They realize that a Missouri Valley Authority will have no special ax to grind for any particular group or area; and they heartily concur in its decentralized organization by which all major decisions will be made in the region close to the people rather than by absentee control from Washington.

The people and organizations of the Missouri Valley are going about their investigation of the pros and cons of the Missouri Valley Authority in the right sort of way. They are trying to find out about the resources and problems of the Missouri Valley and why they have been handled the way they have up to now. Moreover, they are studying how the Tennessee Valley Authority has handled analogous problems of water control and resource development in the valley of the Tennessee. Some of them have taken advantage of the Tennessee Valley Authority's invitation and, at their own expense, have gone to the Tennessee Valley to see for themselves what the T. V. A. has done and how they have done it. For example, a delegation of farmers from the Missouri Valley States recently spent a week in the Tennessee Valley making an exhaustive study of the T. V. A. on the ground. Following their trip they made an enthusiastic report, which I intend to have inserted in the RECORD at a later date.

Not only has the Missouri Valley Authority attracted interest and support in the valley of the Missouri; it has gained Nation-wide attention. Many outstanding newspapers, such as the New York Times, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Post, the St. Louis Star-Times, the Chicago Sun, and the Philadelphia Record, to mention only a few, are giving the M. V. A. full support. Magazines of national circulation are devoting editorials and special features to the Missouri Valley Authority. Thus, Collier's magazine, in editorials in its September 30, 1944, and January 6, 1945, issues, has endorsed the proposed Missouri Valley Authority and has published a colorful special feature on the M. V. A. in its December 9, 1944, issue. The Reader's Digest, in its October issue, contained an article calling attention to the problems of the Missouri region and to their solution in a Missouri Valley Authority based on the Tennessee Valley Authority pattern. The New Republic, the Free World, and many other reputable and serious magazines have published articles and editorials on the subject of an M. V. A. These papers and magazines are making a genuine contribution to the enlightenment of the American people in regard to this subject.

At a later date I shall introduce in the RECORD the full statements of the seven Governors of the Tennessee Valley in which they testify to the accomplishments of the T. V. A. At this point I should like to quote a few excerpts from some of their statements. I call especial attention to the remarks made by Gov. J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina:

> I am a strong believer in States' rights, but T. V. A. has done nothing which to my mind embodies any threat to the rights of this State. In building Fontana Dam, for example, it was necessary for T. V. A. to pond a highway. The agency agreed to build a satisfactory substitute road and also to extend a park area. There was nothing arbitrary about this, the whole thing being arranged through amicable negotiations.

Governor Ellis Arnal, of Georgia, made a similar statement when he said:

> There has been no encroachment on States' rights, and I believe the States actually have received more money under the T. V. A. system of payments in lieu of taxes than they did before the Federal agency went into operation.

The statement by Governor Prentice Cooper, of Tennessee, to my mind, typifies the attitude of the officials and people of the Tennessee Valley who know the value of the T. V. A. idea not from hearsay but from actual experience. I quote from his statement the following:

> It would be little short of a crime if the benefits of such unified regional planning were not extended to other regions with undeveloped resources * * *.

The radio is also carrying this great public debate. Recently, for example, the University of Chicago Round Table, over the N. B. C. network, carried a discussion of the M. V. A. in which the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], Prof. Herman Pritchett, and myself participated.

As I have stated, this bill has the support of the people of the Missouri Valley and of the Nation. It also has the support of the President. On September 21, 1944, in a special message to the Congress, he recommended the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority patterned along the lines of the T. V. A. Since reelection the President has twice again urged the creation of an M. V. A. as soon as possible.

This is in keeping with President Roosevelt's statement made at the time he requested the Congress to create a T. V. A. In his message of April 10, 1933, President Roosevelt said:

> If we are successful here (in the Tennessee Valley) we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders.

Since it is now generally conceded that we have succeeded in the Tennessee Valley beyond our fairest dreams, the time is at hand, Mr. President, to march on into the great valley of the Missouri.

OPPOSITION TO THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

There is, of course, opposition to the Missouri Valley Authority. There is always opposition to a new way of doing things. That is only natural. Some of it is based upon lack of understanding of the true merits of the M. V. A. idea, and a great deal of it is founded on fear that it will injure a real or fancied vested interest. Most of the arguments advanced against the M. V. A. were leveled at the proposed T. V. A. legislation 12 years ago. These arguments have been

fully answered by the Tennessee Valley Authority's successful record.

Now that the results of the application of this unified development principle are universally acknowledged, it is inconceivable that anyone should attempt to interfere with the people' desire to make wider use of that principle.

I should like it clearly understood, Mr. President, that the M. V. A. bill here proposed is much more comprehensive than the Missouri River program provided in the flood-control bill. That measure merely authorized the construction of the so-called flood-control projects and the reclamation projects by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, and the President has relegated them to the shelf of post-war projects. The compromise agreement between the Army and the Bureau, incorporated in the bill, did not provide any operating policy between the two agencies in the construction and operation of dams and water-control facilities. It is doubtful whether any workable operating policy between two separate agencies could be devised even with the best of intentions.

The scope of the programs to be administered by the Missouri Valley Authority is much broader than those of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Thus, there is the whole problem of water control on the land—of providing measures for retaining runoff in the land under conditions which will preserve and enhance soil fertility.

The Missouri Valley Authority is assigned the task of dealing with these water-control problems in the river and on the land as a unity.

A further responsibility of the Missouri Valley Authority, not covered in the flood-control bill and not possessed by any single old-line bureau, is the job of studying all the natural resources of the Missouri Valley and of relating their development to its water-control and utilization programs. Thus, the Missouri Valley Authority is authorized in section 20 of my bill to make studies and plans designed to foster and stimulate the agricultural and industrial development of the Missouri Valley and to carry on such engineering and economic research and demonstrational work as will, among other things, promote the widespread use of electric power and the most improved irrigation practices.

In the last analysis, it is the way the Missouri Valley Authority is set up to administer these Federal programs which makes the enactment of the Missouri Valley Authority Act so imperative. Everyone is more or less agreed that the Missouri River must be controlled and utilized to a far greater extent than it has been so far. Everyone believes, or at least professes to believe, that there should be a single comprehensive plan for the development of the river. Most people think that the Federal Government should provide some aid and assistance in promoting the development of the other resources of the valley.

The only question to be answered is whether these Federal programs should be carried out in the old way by existing centralized Federal agencies, with all their inherent conflicts and complicated proceedings, or by a Missouri Valley Authority, a regional agency to be responsible for the unified water and resource development for the whole region.

The President has insisted, and rightly so, that the Missouri Valley Authority is the only answer to the problem. In his message to the Congress on September 21, 1944, the President recommended a Missouri Valley Authority patterned along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Again, in his message to the Congress on November 27, 1944, he recommended that the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers "be authorized as a basic engineering plan to be developed and administered by Missouri Valley Authority, such as I have already recommended in my message of September 21, 1944."

In signing the flood-control bill on December 22, 1944, the President took the occasion to reiterate his belief in the necessity of a Missouri Valley Authority, stating:

> Authorization of the projects listed in the bill will augment the backlog of public works available for prompt initiation, if necessary, in the post-war period.
>
> I note, however, that the bill authorizes, for construction by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, those improvements in the Missouri River Basin which, on November 27, 1944, I recommended be developed and administered by a Missouri Valley authority. My approval of the bill is given with the distinct understanding that it is not to be interpreted as jeopardizing in any way the creation of a Missouri Valley authority, the establishment of which should receive the early consideration of the next Congress.

In closing, I should like to reiterate that it is my understanding with the responsible leaders of both parties that the present M. V. A. bill will receive a prompt and fair hearing before the proper congressional committee. I am confident that the Congress after such a hearing will be convinced of the need for prompt enactment of this legislation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should like to ask one or two questions. I have listened very carefully to the statement of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have the floor, and have yielded for just a few minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. TUNNELL. For a question; yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is all I care to ask.

Mr. TUNNELL. It has been almost half an hour since I yielded for a short time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator yielded for a statement in explanation of a bill, and I was about to ask one or two questions regarding the procedure for handling the bill. I understood the Senator, the author of the bill, to say that it follows very largely the pattern set forth in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask the Senator who introduced the bill whether he indicated a preference as to the committee to which he wished to have the bill referred.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I asked that it go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as the committee which had handled the original T. V. A. Authority, and also has before it some other bills providing for authorities for river development.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Has the bill been introduced at the desk?

Mr. MURRAY. It has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been introduced.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Has the bill been referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is informed that the Vice President ordered the bill referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that that is a mistaken course. The bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I so requested on the bill. I want the bill to go to a committee which will give it fair and full hearing and consideration. I do not want it to go to a committe which has preconceived ideas, and intends to take advantage of its position to destroy the bill, to emasculate it. I want it to go to a committee which will give it an honest and full and fair hearing. That is all I want. I ask unanimcus consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know nothing about this matter, but, as I understand, the bill has been referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MURRAY. No; it was not requested that it go to the Committee on Commerce; it was requested that the bill go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHITE. To what committee does the Senator want it to go?

Mr. MURRAY. I want it to go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WHITE. To what committee has it been referred?

Mr. MURRAY. I am informed that it was ordered referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WHITE. Let me ask again, has the Chair made that reference?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. I do not know who requested it, or why the Chair did it, but apparently that was done, without my knowledge and without my consent. I am willing that the Committee on Commerce should make a motion to have the bill sent to that committee, but I think I would have a right to have it referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as the proper committee, the committee which handled the origi-

nal T. V. A. bill, and which is handling a similar bill relating to the Arkansas Valley.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I decline to yield for a discussion as to where the bill should go. I yielded for a short statement to be made by the Senator from Montana, and that was a half hour ago. I think it unfair to engage in further discussion of the matter.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the question could be settled very quickly. If the Chair would authorize the bill to be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and then let the Committee on Commerce make a motion to have it transferred to that committee, that would end the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not prepared to make a statement on the matter. All the present occupant of the chair knows is that the Vice President has ordered the bill referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. I object to the procedure suggested by the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Delaware said he would not yield further, and I am not going to ask him to yield. I appreciate his situation.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have waited half an hour.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall not delay the Senator. I do not want this matter disposed of——

Mr. TUNNELL. I did not object to the Senator's objection.

Mr. BAILEY. I have my objection in, and I hope that when this matter comes before the Senate I can discuss it. I think the bill has been properly referred. I did not like the statement that the Committee on Commerce would not be fair about it. That is a strange statement to make on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I asked on the bill as I filed it that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think that is where it should be sent, and if the chairman of the Committee on Commerce wishes to have the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry discharged from the consideration of the bill and have it sent to his committee, it would be proper for him to ask to have that procedure followed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the discussion at the expense of the Senator from Delaware——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Vice President, who is now temporarily absent, has referred the bill to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; and if the Senator from Montana wishes to have that changed, he can make a motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. The question as to where the bill should go may not be very clear——

Mr. TUNNELL. I decline to yield further.

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly we should not try to settle it in the absence of the Vice President, who has already referred the bill to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. The only way to settle the matter now is for the Senator from Montana to make a motion to discharge the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware declines to yield for a motion.

Mr. MURRAY. I make that motion, that the Committee on Commerce be discharged——

Mr. TUNNELL. I decline to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not in order, if the Senator from Delaware refuses to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I doubt that we should try to settle this question now. Such a motion is in order at any time.

Mr. MURRAY. How long will the Senator from Delaware take with his statement?

Mr. TUNNELL. I should imagine about an hour.

Mr. MURRAY. Then at the conclusion of the statement by the Senator from Delaware I shall renew the motion.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield one moment, I wish to point out that the Senator from Delaware is about to make his report of a joint trip which he and I took at the direction of a committee of the Senate. He gave notice that we would report to the Senate today. I understand that the Senator has the consent of the Senate to make his report, to be followed by me. Therefore I should not like to split the report between two sessions of the Senate, if that can be avoided, and I hope the Senator from Montana will postpone his motion until I can make my report.

Mr. MURRAY. Very well.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Murray
Andrews	Guffey	Myers
Austin	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hart	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hatch	Overton
Bankhead	Hawkes	Pepper
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McMahon	Tydings
Cordon	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Donnell	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Mitchell	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate on account of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN NORTH AFRICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, a subcommittee of the Mead committee, consisting of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and myself, left Washington on December 28, 1944, for the Mediterranean and Middle East areas.

We landed at Bermuda, and, as the plane was compelled to stop for a few hours in Bermuda, a hearing was held and testimony taken there. Here we met Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Jones, the commanding general in Bermuda. He was extremely hospitable and cooperative. The principal Army installation at Bermuda was Kindley Army Air Base. We found that the site on which the airport at Bermuda was located was procured, not as a result of the trade for 50 destroyers but by a separate contract on a 99-year lease. The terms of our rights in Bermuda are set forth in House Document No. 158.

The airport is a good one. The location is strategic, and the United States should obtain a permanent lease for this bit of territory. Our Government has already spent more than $42,000,000 on the site and its improvement, including the related installations. There are plans calling for more expenditures yet.

Also, we ascertained that the lease in no way provided any commercial rights. During the whole of this lease, unless it shall be modified, neither our Government nor our people will have a right to use the airport for the landing of commercial planes. In other words, no matter how much money we shall spend on the airport, it cannot be used for commercial purposes, even after the war is concluded. We believe that, if possible, our rights under this lease should be broadened. The location is desirable as a stop-over for planes for the United States. We were told that the location was probably not so valuable for the defense of the Panama Canal as it is for the defense of our east coast and as a listening post in the whole western Atlantic.

It is interesting to note that Bermuda is 760 miles from Halifax, 750 miles from Portland, Maine, 700 miles from Boston, 697 miles from New York, 746 miles from Philadelphia, 794 miles from Baltimore, 806 miles from Washington, 683 miles from Norfolk, 746 miles from Wilmington, N. C., 803 miles from Charleston, S. C., 865 miles from Savannah, Ga., 913 miles from Jacksonville, Fla., 956 miles

from Miami, Fla., 1,091 miles from Key West, 1,675 miles from New Orleans, 960 miles from Windward, Cuba, 870 miles from Mona, P. R., 860 miles from San Juan, 1,350 miles from Trinidad, 3,204 miles from Freetown, South Africa, 2,801 miles from Dakar, 2,800 miles from Gibraltar, 1,806 miles from the Azores, 2,494 miles from Reykjavik, and 1,042 miles from Argentia. We thus see that this location is in the center of so many strategic points that its future use is extremely important to the people and to the commercial interests of the United States.

We found that the naval base is at the opposite end of the island from the airport. Provisions intended for the airport are delivered at the naval base. They cannot be delivered at the airport because of the lack of depth of the water. Therefore, supplies are delivered to the naval station at the opposite end of the island, and then transported to the airport, usually by truck. The approaches both to the Army airport and the naval station must be made through waters controlled by Great Britain.

We left Bermuda in the evening of December 28, 1944, and ate our breakfast at the Azores. We found our installation on the Azores in rather an uncertain situation. Our officers there do not know how permanently they are located. The islands are owned by Portugal, but our military forces are uncertain as to what sort of right or control our Government has over the airport where we landed, and from which we embarked, except that our use is by permission from the British. This strategic point or resting place far out in the Atlantic Ocean may be of great importance in the near future. We were told that an average of 10 A. T.-C. airplanes a day are stopped at the Azores for refueling, bound for the United States. The very fact that our military planes are compelled to stop there for refueling shows the importance of these islands in our after-the-war economy. It also shows how important they may be from a commercial standpoint after the war.

On the 29th of December, after eating breakfast in the Azores, we embarked for Casablanca in Morocco, and reached there about the end of the day. At Casablanca we found an American airport being held by American authorities. We spent December 30 in French Morocco. We were met by Brig. Gen. Egmont F. Koenig, commander general of the Mediterranean Base Section; Admiral Hewitt, commanding admiral of the Eighth Fleet; and J. Rives Childs, American Chargé d'Affaires in Tangier. We also met, and later took testimony from, other Army and Navy officers and heads of civilian agencies, such as the Foreign Economic Administration, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Office of War Information, War Shipping Administration, Office of Strategic Services, the Red Cross, and others. I might say in passing that we found them uniformly courteous and cooperative. They attempted in every way to give us the information we were seeking.

The United States has a preferred position in French Morocco, and has had since about the time of our Declaration of Independence. American offenders in Morocco are tried by American authorities today. We have a position equal to that of the most-favored nation in that country. The United States is the only Government that has not surrendered that superior right.

We visited the naval airport at Port Lyautey, and took testimony there. This port is also in American hands, and is being placed in excellent condition. All Americans agree that the airport at Casablanca and the one at Port Lyautey are likely to be of tremendous importance after the war. French Morocco is inhabited very largely by Arabs, but is a French protectorate, governed to a large extent by a French Governor General. American representatives in French Morocco believe that this area has a wonderful trade future, and are very much opposed to the United States relinquishing any airports or other installations which it has made in that territory. Semitropical fruits and phosphate fertilizer are among the exports from this section. The race question may at some time become critical in Morocco. The Arab is in much the same state of civilization that he was 2,000 years ago. The ox and camel, side by side, are found hitched to a plow. The donkey and the automobile use the same highway. Large flocks of sheep, goats, and nondescript cattle are seen and met along the highway. Permanent roads have long been built in French Morocco. The Arab has little or no communication with visitors. There may come a time when the Arab will assert the power which he holds by reason of his numbers.

Your subcommittee held hearings in Algiers, Casablanca, Oran, and Caserta. En route we visited and inspected activities at Tunis, Palermo, and Naples. These cities are all in what is generally referred to as the Mediterranean area. Here we found, at least on the African side, a closing-out of American interests so far as military equipment is concerned. Where a million tons of supplies had been, there were at the time we were in north Africa, less than 100,000 tons. This equipment is being disposed of in what appears to be an efficient and intelligent manner. We found the remainder of the equipment, which was no longer needed for military purposes there, bundled, boxed, and ready for shipment. After everything which can be shipped is taken out the remainder, being principally scrap and salvage material, is sold to the natives. Nearly all the equipment is being transferred to a more active war theater. The materials which are not worth shipping or which cannot be shipped economically are being sold advantageously. We were told that boxes, wire, scrap iron, or any material which can be used for any purpose at all, is salable in north Africa at good prices.

We visited the naval hospital at Oran, Algeria. There we found our American boys in an American hospital, with American equipment, attended by American nurses. This hospital is efficiently managed, and is doing a wonderful work. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and I also visited a cemetery at Oran, where British, American, and other soldiers are buried. We each placed a wreath of flowers in the cemetery in memory of our American dead. This cemetery is continuing to be used for burial of the bodies of those who die in the service.

Another thing to which we devoted some time was the lend-lease situation. Articles are distributed to the French under two classifications. One of these is known as civilian lend-lease, and the other is known as military lend-lease. There has been advanced to the French in north Africa, on civilian lend-lease, $212,000,000 worth of goods. We were informed that these goods have been paid for, or soon will have been paid for, completely in cash. This accounts for the fact that American lend-lease goods are found on counters for sale in many sections of the world. The French have bought these goods, and have paid for them, and are entitled to sell them. In the Mediterranean area, accounts of lend-lease for military purposes are kept in the area. We found the situation well in hand so far as the accounts were concerned. We found that wherever possible the French were paying rentals for buildings occupied by the United States military or civil authorities. If these expenditures are never paid for, the obligation will be upon the French, rather than upon the United States. These costs are being assumed and credited to the French on reverse lend-lease.

We found that there is an active O. W. I. organization in north Africa which is functioning efficiently. No effort is being made by the O. W. I. to influence public opinion among the Arabs. Their efforts are devoted in the Mediterranean area almost entirely to building up favorable sentiment toward the United States among French, Italian, and Spanish citizens.

We also have a large investment in implements for broadcasting, near Algiers. We had been warned of the large investment that the United States has in that location, and we were anxious to ascertain the real situation. There is no question that the investment was entirely justified at the time when the stations were oufitted and the expense incurred. It seemed to your committee that the thing which should be watched is to be sure that these installations are not abandoned unless there is a purchase and payment from someone to the United States. Many of the instruments can be moved, and no doubt will be moved if the United States moves all its forces from north Africa, unless some policy is determined and some arrangement made for the continued use of the facilities there. It seemed to your subcommittee that the commercial interests of the United States might be benefited very greatly if those installations could be kept for the benefit of world trade after the war. My recollection is that the investments made there for broadcasting purposes have amounted to more than a million dollars.

The greatest investments which we have in north Africa are in airports. Nearly all of these have been entirely built, or have been greatly improved, by the United States military authorities.

When the installations were begun, there was no certainty as to where the airports would be needed or how soon the lack of them might be fatal. The military authorities are to be commended for the celerity with which they have constructed these airports. In some instances, they seem now to have served their military purpose, and to be no longer needed for military operations. In some instances they have been but slightly used. However, it seemed absolutely necessary that the United States have those airports for war purposes at the times when they were constructed. The subcommittee has a list, not yet complete, of the African constructions for airports in the Mediterranean area, together with a partial statement of their costs. We do not believe that these costs have been accurately kept.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wished to ask the Senator whether there was a lease in each case, or whether the airports were constructed without leases.

Mr. TUNNELL. I shall take up that matter later, but now I will say that in some instances there was no lease.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TUNNELL. The military authorities, realizing the urgency, constructed these airports with little inquiry as to the cost or the title to the land on which the constructions were made.

The airport at Salé is a notable illustration. This airport was constructed largely at the expense of the United States, and was abandoned by it in 1943. Great Britain is now using the airport. It seems that either on the day when it was abandoned by the United States, or shortly thereafter, the French transferred it to Great Britain. An inquiry into the cost of this airport to the United States disclosed the fact that the military had not kept a very accurate record of the costs. We were told that the airport cost in excess of a $1,000,000. Later, from the books kept for this purpose, we were told that the actual out-of-pocket cost was about $52,000. This is mentioned only for the purpose of showing that in the haste of war, tremendous expenditures are made which are entirely justified. However, if the airports are not to be kept by the United States, they should be paid for at a reasonable price by those who do keep them. This is exceedingly important, and the subcommittee believes that the War and Navy Departments appreciate this fact. It is suggested that in view of the possibility that these airports will be of value for trade after the war, the State Department should be kept in close touch with the situation as to each of these installations.

In an airport now in process of construction, the location of which it is considered best not to disclose, we were unable to ascertain that any right or title was being acquired by the United States. Some of these points may be of great importance in the near future for commercial aviation.

In some of our new airports, we are informed, our rights will end 6 months after the termination of the war.

In this whole region, Mr. President, the Red Cross has done a commendable work at all times. The committee found close cooperation between the Army and Navy as to both purchase and sale of installations, and the sale of surplus war equipment. Nearly all installations were constructed for military purposes, and exact costs were not considered at the time of the construction. However, as the tide of war moves on and the installations cease to be of use for war purposes, it is advisable that a close calculation of costs by the United States be made, so that at the final settlement our representatives may have facts upon which to make adjustments.

In Sicily your subcommittee found that the Navy was making soup from surplus vegetables for the people of Sicily. This soup, which was seen and inspected by your subcommittee, seemed palatable, and was used by between two and four thousand people a day in Sicity. It was a wonderful instrument of good will in the hands of the United States in that area.

In Italy we found that only temporary repairs to roads and bridges had been made by the United States. There are now in Italy some removable bridges belonging to the United States. Direct damage done by the war is still apparent in Sicily and on the mainland of Italy.

In Palermo, Sicily, we observed the United States Navy repairing locomotives and putting them in condition to perform work between our ports and the fighting front. It is interesting to know that our forces are repairing not only engines, but ships. We are told that our forces are not attempting to make permanent repairs of ships, but are attempting to put them in condition so that Allied shipping may reach home ports. We observed repair crews of Italian prisoners repairing shoes, shirts, cots, and tents, and other crews rebuilding machine guns, tanks, rifles, and other military equipment. Much of this work is being done by civilian labor which is hired at reasonable rates. It was a rather inspiring sight to see the amount of repair work which was being done on the other side. Hundreds of Italian girls are engaged in this work. The immense shoe shops and tailoring shops are worthy of inspection and commendation.

The subcommittee spent several days at Naples and Caserta, Italy. Here we met General McNarney and Mr. Alexander Kirk, our new Ambassador to Italy. The palace at Caserta is used as the headquarters of the British and American Armies, and is called Allied Force Headquarters.

The subcommittee obtained records as to expenditures and rights in north Africa, which are under the headquarters in Caserta. It also took testimony concerning the Allied Commission, which is charged with the administration of the armistice in Italy.

We found that although our representative, Admiral Stone, is the chief commissioner on the Allied Commission, there are two British officials who are superior to him; namely, Mr. MacMillan, who has the title of Acting President of the Commission; and Marshal Alexander, who is the Allied commander.

The subcommittee found that the United States has an organization known as the Office of Strategic Services, which, comparable to a British organization of the same kind, is doing good work for the American Army.

Cairo is in a different area from the rest of north Africa. We found General Giles in command there. He told us that he had a twin brother in Washington who is a lieutenant general. We also met our American Minister, S. Pinckney Tuck. It might be well to mention the fact that the consular force of the United States at Cairo is not housed and quartered as well as is the British Embassy at Cairo. The British have a handsome building, sufficiently large to accommodate their forces. The consular officials of the United States are quartered in three separate buildings. It is the opinion of your committee that this will not be without harmful effect on future prestige and influence affecting our trade in that quarter of the globe. Representatives of the United States should be placed in a position to uphold the dignity and prestige of the United States.

The president of the American University at Cairo, Dr. Watson, called on us and asked that we mention to Americans that this university is desirous of any assistance that can be rendered to it by way of surplus equipment which it could use. The president believed that in its activities the university could use almost any surplus commodity.

We passed through and drove around the new Jewish city of Tel Aviv. This city has been built within the last 25 years on what was practically waste land in Palestine. It now has a population of approximately 200,000, with up-to-date buildings, streets, stores, and other facilities for an active eastern population. This, of course, has all been accomplished through activities of the Zionist movement.

Your subcommittee was given information that the U. N. R. R. A. is being used by the military for purposes other than were originally considered as the reason for the creation of that organization. It is the opinion of your subcommittee that U. N. R. R. A. should not be under the control of the military at any time. The reason given for its use is that there must come a time when the military will surrender its control of relief to the U. N. R. R. A., and the two must work together. However, this may lead to unpleasant disagreements as to the propriety of certain uses of the U. N. R. R. A. by the Army of any of the Allied Nations. Charges of such improper use with regard to the situation in Greece were furnished your committee. Whether or not U. N. R. R. A. employees were used practically for combat purposes to quiet a rebellion of the citizens of Greece is of much less importance than that the immense U. N. R. R. A. fund should not be used in the future for anything other than the purposes for which it was created, namely, that of relief following in the wake of Allied military forces. The integration of U. N. R. R. A. with armed forces by making U. N. R. R. A. an agency of such forces would be a miscarriage of

the announced purposes of this organization. In our opinion, the U. N. R. R. A. is making efforts to prevent any such thing happening in the future.

Your subcommittee visited Abadan. This port at the head of the Persian Gulf has been the landing place for much lend-lease material for Russia. An immense amount of good has been done at that airport. Russia has taken large numbers of airplanes and trucks from Abadan to its battle fronts. Many of them have been taken directly at Abadan by the Russians. A great work has been done at that station. We held hearings in Abadan as to both civilian and military activities. We met Mr. Leland B. Morris, American Ambassador to Iran—since relieved, we understand; Mr. Loy W. Henderson, American Minister to Iraq; and General Booth, commander of the Persian Gulf Command.

One of the most interesting investigations made by this committee was with reference to the oil situation. The Middle East, your subcommittee was told, is one of the four great oil regions of the world. The question of striking oil by wells is not one which disturbs the oil producers of that region. Tremendous quantities of oil can be reached by comparatively few wells. However, those wells are not in the section of the world where oil can be profitably consumed. Your subcommittee went through the tremendous oil refinery at Abadan. This refinery is the largest in the world, and from a very few wells it is refining and marketing 300,000 barrels of oil a day. It is the belief of many oil men that there are resources in that area of 200,000,000,000 barrels of oil.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Has the Senator made mention of the ownership of the oil refinery at Abadan?

Mr. TUNNELL. It is owned and operated entirely by British interests. However, there are no refineries to take care of increased production. Within a comparatively short time there will probably be five hundred thousand barrels of oil refined in this area a day. A pipe line from that area to the Mediterranean would be between one thousand to thirteen hundred miles in length. While American interests own approximately fifty per cent of the oil prospects of the Middle East, they control at this time a very small percentage of the output. Even pipe lines for oil pumped on American leases would probably cross lands controlled by other governments.

Our contacts with the oil interests in the Middle East were pretty largely with those persons interested in the sale of oil, and not with those who take a broad view of oil prospects and world civilization. Colonel Leavell, an employee of the State Department, went with us from Cairo to Abadan and returned. He is the best-informed man on world prospects as to oil that your subcommittee has contacted. This subject is worldwide in its scope. The Middle East oil region situated somewhere near the original Garden of Eden is close to the center of the world's population, but is far from the center of the world's use of oil. There are those, including Colonel Leavell, who believe that the enormous quantities of oil which will be produced in that area are capable of materially raising the standard of living and of civilization in that area. It seems unbelievable and undesirable that this great storehouse of wealth should be removed and transported to other sections of the world, with the vast population of Asia living around it and capable of developing itself in civilization by the use of oil. The removal of this oil to the people of the world where it can be used involves tremendous transportation charges. However, your committee believes from all that it ascertained in its investigations that it is unlikely that any great increase in oil for this world war can be obtained from the middle eastern fields, due to the lack of refineries and transportation facilities. Your subcommittee believes that our Government should take into consideration this situation in its broadest aspects at the peace table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did the Senator ascertain where the output of this oil is going, where it is being used?

Mr. TUNNELL. It is all being used for Allied war purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In what theater?

Mr. TUNNELL. All over the world, as we understood. There was no question raised as to that. We asked questions there and found that it was being so used. While we did not ask how many barrels were being used in this theater or that, it is being used for the Allied forces wherever needed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been informed that the oil which is used in India, in the Chinese campaign, and the Pacific campaign, or most of it, is derived from United States sources.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think that is probably true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It ought not to be true.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think it cannot be otherwise. There are being refined in the United States at this time, we are told, about 5,000,000 barrels of oil a day. In that whole area there are only about 400,000 barrels a day being refined.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the oil refinery at Abadan operating at full capacity?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. If I may interject, there was a time a few months back when the Mediterranean was not safe, but it is open now, and some of the oil is going into the Mediterranean theater and some of it is going down the Persian Gulf to India. It must be remembered, however, that this output is only a small percentage, as the Senator has explained, and it must also be recalled that at one time we were furnishing 95 percent of the high-octane gas for all the United Nations.

Mr. TUNNELL. The refinery at Abadan is being used for the production of high octane gas. We were shown samples as they stood on tables, and we were satisfied by statements of our own witnesses as well as by our observation and the information we could gather that everything is being done that can be done to use the oil of that section in the present war; but there are not the refineries and there are not adequate pipe lines to make it possible to use as much as the region is capable of producing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know whether or not any of the products of this refinery were turned over to our Government by way of reverse lend-lease?

Mr. TUNNELL. I was never told that, but I did not think it was important. Perhaps the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] may have obtained some information on that point, but I do not think we went into the details as to how it was being used. We were satisfied that it was being used for Allied war purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent were our forces using any of the crude oil and the refined products of the British owned refinery at Abadan?

Mr. TUNNELL. As I have said, we did not even inquire as to that, because all this oil is being furnished for Allied purposes, and we did not ask what proportion was used here or there or by this army or that army, but ascertained that it was being used for Allied purposes.

Finally, your committee believes that never again will the United States have an opportunity to share in world trade such as is offered to us by circumstances prevailing in the Mediterranean and middle eastern areas. However, the United States Government will have to take positive steps in order to make this possible. The United States at the close of this war will have the greatest fleet of ships ever owned by any nation in the history of the world. It will have the greatest production facilities that any nation has ever had. It will have the business interests capable of producing and selling its products. It will have sufficient wealth to produce and sell to the rest of the world the necessities of life, permitting a higher scale of living and a higher level of commercial trading than ever existed in that portion of the world.

At the end of this war we shall have airports which can be made beacons of commercial activity to an extent never before dreamed of. Notwithstanding all these facts, our commerce may be limited by lack of commercial treaties, by an entire absence of the right to trade with many of the nations of the world. Our air lines do not now have any commercial rights in most of the Mediterranean area. Our commercial air lines in Africa were abandoned in the early days of the war. This seems to have been done with the consent of our military authorities and perhaps at their instance. I have no doubt that they had their reasons for agreeing to the action taken. Commercial efforts must be resumed and proper negotiations for a continuation of our facilities must be made with other nations of the world.

In addition to the difficulties above named there is what is known as the sterling block which together with local situations make it practically impossible for Americans to trade in those lands.

The natives of those countries have no way of paying for American goods with American dollars. Your subcommittee inquired as to the advisability of establishing United States banks in that territory. We were told that it was improbable that those banks would pay, or even be self-sustaining under present conditions. Your subcommittee believes that the United States may be in serious danger of being entirely eliminated from world trade in that area, first, by reason of commercial treaties between other world powers and the smaller nations of the Mediterranean and Middle East areas; secondly, by a lack of commercial agreements between the United States and the nations of those areas; and lastly, by the lack of credit agreements permitting citizens of those areas to purchase and pay for American goods with American dollars.

We found that condition in Egypt and Iraq. No nation except the British are entitled to have an ambassador. So that there are many things which will have to be met and overcome if we are to have our share of the trade in that immense area.

There are sufficient articles produced in north Africa which are not competitive with American products to make this trade desirable. It is your subcommittee's belief that many articles produced in this area would not be seriously competitive with American products. However, the prospect of sales in those markets is much greater than the present prospect of purchases. This problem is respectfully submitted to the Government and people of the United States for solution. It is recommended that our Government and our businessmen seriously consider this situation in the sale and disposition of our surplus products in the era succeeding this war. It would be an anomalous position for the United States to occupy, after putting up the men, the money, and enduring all the sacrifices which these mean, to have our country precluded from the markets which we have liberated.

It is exceedingly important that our State Department shall have power to investigate trade conditions and that it shall assume the obligation of directing American economic interests after the termination of hostilities. All nations can and should attempt to enlarge other economic and civilizing influences throughout the world. This will benefit not only Asiatic peoples but it will greatly increase the prosperity of the nations that take advantage of this opportunity. If our State Department does not have sufficient authority at this time, greater statutory authority and direction should be given it. The branch of Government best fitted for this activity should be our State Department.

I might say that we found that the British had a representative there who was entitled to sit in the British Cabinet. We saw him in Jerusalem. He is looking after the interests of Great Britain in that locality. I am not criticizing that; I merely say that I think the United States should have an organization devoted entirely to the advancement of American interests in that area which would be commensurate with the efforts which are being made by our trade competitors, and I do not think that at present that is being done. I believe that the State Department recognizes the situation, but I think it may feel it has not the authority which some of our competitors have.

Mr. President, I desire to submit as a part of my remarks a brief statement of the findings and conclusions of the subcommittee with reference to the problem of disposal of surplus movable property and surplus fixed installations in north Africa and the Middle East. I feel that it should be given careful attention by Senators, because it clearly sets forth, in summary form, our findings on the facts as presented in 18 hearings in 9 different cities with approximately 130 witnesses, whose testimony alone comprises a record totaling approximately 800 pages. In addition, we accumulated voluminous exhibits, memoranda, and documents.

This statement is not to be considered as a final report of the subcommittee, but merely the result of the preliminary inquiry made in the field. It does little more than state the broad outlines of the surplus-disposal problem abroad. The subcommittee has already held informal conferences with representatives of the State Department, the War and Navy Departments, and the Surplus Property Disposal Board in Washington. It proposes to hold further hearings for the dual purpose of completing its study of surplus disposals abroad by obtaining facts and testimony which are available in Washington, and following the progress that is being made in this field in line with the traditional policy of the Mead committee.

ITINERARY

The itinerary of the subcommittee was as follows and hearings were held in places in italics:

December 28, 1944: Washington, *Bermuda.*

December 29, 1944: Azores, Casablanca (Morocco).

December 30, 1944: Casablanca, Rabat, *Fort Lyautey,* Marrakech (Morocco).

December 31, 1944; Marrakech, *Casablanca* (Morocco).

January 1 and 2, 1945: *Oran* (Algeria).

January 3, 1945: *Algiers* (Algeria).

January 4, 1945: Tunis (Tunisia), Palermo (Sicily), Naples (Italy).

January 5 and 6, 1945: Naples and *Caserta* (Italy).

January 7, 1945: Pompeii, Sorrento (Italy), Tripoli (Libya).

January 8–10, 1945: *Cairo, El Shatt* (Egypt).

January 11, 1945: Tel Aviv, Jaffa, Jerusalem (Palestine).

January 12–14, 1945: Bethlehem (Palestine), *Abadan* (Iran).

January 15, 1945: Cairo (Egypt).

January 16, 1945: Tripoli (Libya).

January 17, 1945: *Casablanca* (Morocco).

January 18, 1945: Washington, D. C.

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE MEAD COMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS OF SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL IN NORTH AFRICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST—SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee found that:

First. Records as to costs of installations, in many instances, were poorly kept. I am speaking now of the middle eastern area, not of the Mediterranean area. The subcommittee recommends that steps be taken by the armed services and other agencies operating abroad to make a complete and accurate appraisal of the value of our installations abroad as indicated by the cost of acquisition, erection, and installation of all fixed properties and real estate interests.

Second. Documents containing terms of our rights in installations should be assembled, indexed, and preserved.

Third. Where title and rights in installations are not clear, they should be immediately clarified.

Fourth. Where rights are possessory only, possession should not be relinquished without due regard to our national interests.

Fifth. Full information as to surpluses, both movable and immovable, and estimates as to cost of dismantling, removal, disposition, and so forth, should be collected.

Sixth. Such information should be made available to the State Department.

Seventh. Future negotiations for rights in real estate for military and other wartime installations should be conducted in consultation with the State Department.

Eighth. The subcommittee found that accounting on reverse lend-lease transactions within the foreign theaters, particularly in the Middle East, was deficient in the respect that, as to many transactions, no value or price was agreed upon as to the value of the services or material furnished to our forces under reverse lend-lease. The Navy, however, has secured an agreement from the British Admiralty to place prices on invoices covering transactions subsequent to January 1, 1945. The subcommittee recommends that steps be taken at once to render as accurate and up to date as possible the accounting on lend-lease and reverse lend-lease transactions within a theater. Our information since coming to Washington is that efforts are being made to have this done. However, there was a shortage of figures, on reverse lend-lease in particular.

Ninth. The subcommittee found that, in some instances, installations—such as airports, camps for road maintenance, and other camps—had been abandoned by our Army, and that inadequate measures were being taken for the maintenance of records on cost, fair rental value or sale value, and that no adequate investigation was being made as to the propriety of charging up against those of our allies receiving benefits from installations erected at our expense, the fair value of such benefits. This should be done, particularly where they are taken over by another nation for commercial purposes.

Tenth. The subcommittee found that, although instructions had been issued by

the War Department to its various military commands to the effect that no disposition should be made of important installations without prior consent or approval of the War Department in Washington, no adequate clear-cut policy has been expressed to guide the responsible officials in the field in the disposition of installations either by an adequate definition of the word "important" or by instructions on the procedure of disposal of "unimportant" facilities. The Navy has instructed its commanders in the field not to abandon Navy installations without approval, as to each separate installation, from Washington. That probably takes account of the naval installations, and meets our criticism.

The subcommittee believes that fundamental policies must be established promptly by the appropriate agencies of our Government so that our post-war interests in security and commerce will be fully protected in the handling of the disposal of surplus movable properties and surplus installations abroad.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTIES ABROAD

The disposal of surplus movable property and surplus installations abroad presents unique problems beyond those encountered in domestic disposals.

As to movable property, problems of foreign exchange and foreign trade, tremendous distances involving high transportation charges if property is to be returned to the United States for disposal here, the maintenance of a disposal staff on foreign soil, and relations with foreign governments and their nationals, among other problems, tend to complicate and make more difficult the task of realizing the maximum out of our surpluses abroad for the purpose of reducing to the minimum the cost of the war.

As to immovable installations, such as camps, hospitals, air bases, radio stations, port facilities, prison camps, assembly factories for airplanes and trucks, camps for road maintenance, communication facilities, warehouses, and so forth, the problems are even more difficult than as to movable surpluses abroad. The basic and most serious problem as to such fixed structures and improvements is the problem of determining what is surplus. It is altogether possible that for our national post-war security and economic interests, some of such installations might be retained, or rights in them might be retained. If a policy has been determined on this point, it has not yet been disclosed to representatives in the field who are presently in possession of and charged with responsibility with respect to such installations.

As to installations which are determined to be surplus to our post-war national needs, there remain difficult problems to solve, as indicated by the following questions:

First. Should the installation be dismantled and the salvage therefrom be disposed of as personal property either where it is located, at other points abroad, or in the United States?

Second. Should the installation be disposal of in toto as a going operation—

(a) to the foreign government where located?

(b) to some other foreign government with interests in the territory where the installation is located?

(c) to our nationals, including American educational institutions and foreign missions?

Should such disposals be cash sales or exchanges for other tangible properties or rights in them, or for other intangible rights as may be indicated by our national interest in security and commerce?

SURPLUSES IN NORTH AFRICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

In north Africa and the Middle East, the problems of disposal of surplus properties are just beginning to appear. The solution of these problems has not yet been worked out.

The subcommittee believes that certain concrete steps can and should be taken at once to aid in an orderly and effective disposal of surplus properties. However, it is firmly convinced that major policies as to United States post-war rights and interests must be determined and clearly enunciated before proper decisions can be made as to what we ought to retain and what we ought to dispose of—and to whom, in what manner and for what consideration the transfer should be made.

The subcommittee feels further that the delay in making such major policy decisions will inevitably make more difficult the job of realizing the most for the American taxpayer out of our surpluses abroad. The subcommittee fails to find a basis for postponing the making of such decisions until the war is over and points out that our allies are not taking that course. The cost of the preservation of such assets until the time of the peace conference, the probability that the market for such assets will never be better than it is now in time of scarcity, the fact that once a large military establishment, which might well be of use in accomplishing the disposition of such assets, is now rapidly shrinking and may be entirely withdrawn before the peace conference, are some of the factors which indicate that delaying the establishment of basic policies as to our post-war interests in this region may be extremely costly to our taxpayers.

MOVABLE SURPLUSES

Aside from disposals of salvage material and obsolete or unsalable items, there is likely to be very little material declared as surplus by our armed forces in north Africa and the Middle East, because of the fact that such materials are needed in other theaters of active combat. In Oran, Algeria, the subcommittee was shown a salvage yard of Army material, which was being disposed of at a very favorable price because of the severe shortages of materials in that area and the ready market for items that would normally be considered junk. One of the items of surplus to be disposed of was some 10,000 telephone and power line poles, which had been shipped to the north African theater, without requisition, for use in communication and power lines in support of the north African campaign. By reason of the nature of military developments, it was never necessary to use them. Although these poles have not been disposed of, testimony before the subcommittee indicated that there is a good likelihood of selling them to the communications system in Algeria at little or no loss. Another substantial item of disposal is expected to be trucks used in connection with operations in the Middle East, which, because of the heavy service required of them, are in such condition as not to be suitable for transfer to other active theaters.

Another possible source of substantial amounts of surpluses, of which practically none have appeared as yet, are items expected to be returned to our Government agencies for disposal, which were originally furnished to foreign governments under lend-lease. At the time of the subcommittee's trip to north Africa, it was contemplated that such disposals would be handled by the Foreign Economic Administration, whose representatives testified that one of their responsibilities was to make certain that other governments having both lend-lease items and items of their own of like character would not dispose of their own items first, continuing to use the lend-lease material; but rather, that, in the event of surpluses developing in that character of material, the lend-lease items be returned to our Government for disposal, first.

The problems in connection with the disposal of movable property are principally—

First. The cost of transportation and handling in removing surplus materials from their present location to other markets.

Second. The selection of the order of preference, if any, in which the items are to be offered to prospective purchasers.

Third. Problems of foreign exchange.

Fourth. Administrative problems involved in the maintenance of a disposal agency on foreign soil.

1. PHYSICAL HANDLING OF MOVABLE SURPLUSES

Physical preservation of materials and equipment, reconditioning them for sale, and storage constitute more serious obstacles to disposal in foreign areas than do the same features of disposal in the United States. For example, testimony was presented to the subcommittee that approximately 5,000 trucks, which are being declared surplus in the Middle East, are scattered at a number of widely separated locations in the area. Some of these trucks are now in the hands of the British, having been furnished under lend-lease. Present plans contemplate the sale of these trucks at their present locations to avoid the expense of transporting them to a central point for disposal or to some other possible market which might substantially diminish the net return from their sale. Plans also contemplate the sale of some of such trucks through British agencies.

2. ORDER OF PREFERENCE OF PURCHASERS

According to the testimony before the subcommittee, many of the surpluses will be in demand by the governments of the areas where located. There undoubtedly will be a tendency for such governments to desire that transfers of such

surpluses be made to them under the terms of the Lend-Lease Act. Care must be taken that transfers not be made under lend-lease unless properly and necessarily in furtherance of the purposes of the Lend-Lease Act.

Representations were made to the subcommittee by the American University in Cairo that an opportunity be given it to obtain surpluses which it might need in connection with the preparation of a site and the construction of new buildings which it contemplates. Also, representatives of American oil companies in the Middle East indicated their desire to obtain materials if and when they were declared surplus.

If a preference is to be shown in the disposal of surpluses, it should be in accordance with a definite policy which is related to our national interests.

3. FOREIGN EXCHANGE

Are disposal sales to be made only for dollars, or should they be made for the currency of the country in which they happen to be sold? This question raises the problem of foreign exchange in north Africa and the Middle East. There is an acute scarcity of dollars in most of these areas, notably, Egypt, Palestine, and Iraq. The problem is further complicated by the existence of the so-called Sterling bloc. These countries and others are in what is known as the sterling area, which means that dollars received in those countries are required to be pooled in London. Those countries are then permitted to acquire dollars for the purchase of imports from the United States only to the extent permitted by the British.

The State Department furnished the subcommittee with copies of the report of the American Trade Mission, also known as the Culbertson Mission. This report impressed the subcommittee as a very valuable study of trade problems facing the United States in north Africa and the Middle East. The "sterling bloc" is an impediment to free trade with this area. Any dollars used by the countries in the "sterling bloc", or in other countries where dollars are scarce, for the purchase of our surpluses there would obviously reduce the dollar resources of that area. There would be fewer dollars available for the purchase of the products of American industry. This would, obviously, be a limiting factor upon our foreign trade in that area. On the other hand, the sale of our surpluses for the currency of the country in which they might be sold would complicate our disposal problem by requiring us, in turn, to dispose of such currency at a fair value.

Historically, our imports have not been great from north Africa and the Middle East. There does not seem to be any likelihood of a substantially increased demand by the United States for the products of that area. Consequently, the disposal of their currencies presents a difficult financial problem. It has not yet been solved.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

Our military and naval forces in north Africa and the Middle East are rapidly shrinking. The principal function now remaining on the part of the armed forces is the support of the air routes operated by the Air Transport Command. Moreover, civilian agencies, to a large degree, have depended upon our Army and its supply system for their subsistence. The military establishment is equipped to perform many of the services necessary to disposal, such as the storage, preservation and reconditioning of materials, the keeping of records, making of deliveries, and the actual conduct of sales. In the event that our military forces are completely withdrawn while property yet remains to be disposed of, these functions will have to be performed by others—either by an agency of our own or by some arrangement with foreign governments or their nationals.

SURPLUS INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES

The subcommittee cannot report at this time upon the total value, or even a total list, of installations and facilities created or improved, wholly or in part, with United States funds.

The most comprehensive summary of such installations was presented to the subcommittee in the Persian Gulf Command. There our expenditures totaled some $60,000,000, half of which was represented by highway construction costs. Other important installations there included road maintenance camps, troop camps, air bases, truck assembly plants, an aircraft assembly plant, depots, dockage facilities, railroad yards, and other miscellaneous facilities.

Two other Army commands were visited by the subcommittee, one being called U. S. A. F. I. M. E., meaning United States Army Forces in the Middle East, with headquarters at Cairo; and the other being the M. B. S., meaning Mediterranean Base Section, comprising French north Africa, with headquarters at Casablanca. The facilities are of a similar type in the latter two Army commands, but the subcommittee was unable to obtain any summary of the total cost of installations in those commands.

The subcommittee is of the opinion that there are two important phases of the situation with respect to these installations which ought to be brought to the attention of the Senate at this time:

First, records of cost of construction, and, second, the terms of our rights.

RECORDS OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Before leaving for north Africa, the subcommittee requested the War Department to furnish it with a list of Army installations in the area which the subcommittee proposed to visit, showing the cost of construction and other pertinent data. These reports were incomplete. For example, as to the summary of air bases, a list of 25 airports was furnished. As to 8 of these, it was noted that:

As to the approximate cost of installation, estimated cost totals cannot be given because basic data—troop labor, equipment, materials, and so forth, compiled from quantity surveys in the field—have not been evaluated.

As to the approximate cost of installation of five of these, it was stated:

Information not available.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Did the subcommittee learn whether or not, when local labor was hired in Africa, for example, it was paid American wages, or the going wages in Africa?

Mr. TUNNELL. The labor is being paid a very low scale of wages compared with wages paid in America. The amount received by the laborers was said to be very satisfactory.

Mr. LANGER. Unsatisfactory?

Mr. TUNNELL. Very satisfactory to the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Was the work done by native labor?

Mr. TUNNELL. Much of it was being done by native labor, and in many instances was being paid for by reverse lend-lease.

Mr. MEAD. In many instances, if I may interject, the scale of wages was the same as was being paid by one of the other Allied countries for similar work.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct. We found that situation to be rather satisfactory.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TUNNELL. As to two airports, of which the location was listed, it was noted:

No record available of a U. S. A. A. F. installation.

As to two air bases on which figures of approximate cost of installation were furnished, it was noted:

Portion of costs borne by British and a possible reverse lend-lease charge.

As to one airport, of which an approximate cost of installation was furnished, it was noted:

Cost estimates prepared by post engineer do not include cost of hangars and portable buildings obtained in the United States.

At the various hearings, the subcommittee inquired in some detail into the manner in which records were kept on cost of construction. It was found that, on the whole, the records of cost as to the Army air bases were wholly inadequate.

The subcommittee did not approach the problem with a desire to be critical of deficiencies in the accounting for the cost of such airports, and the subcommittee is impressed with the fact that the problems are difficult, particularly with reference to airports constructed for combat early in our participation in the north African campaign, as distinguished from those constructed for transport use. The maintenance of accurate records of cost was considered to be of secondary importance, and rightly so.

However, combat operations have long since ceased in the area visited by the subcommittee. There has been adequate opportunity to assemble data and figures on costs. Moreover, some of the more expensive airports were not constructed for combat purposes, but have been built and improved solely for use in connection with the operations of the Air Transport Command.

The principal deficiencies in the cost records arise from the fact that no clear instructions have been issued directing the manner of accounting for such expenditures; records are incomplete as to construction work done during combat operations; the work done with troop labor has not been evaluated; costs with respect to a particular airport have not been assembled and totaled; and the records are not being kept by trained accountants. We think that is a particularly important matter, as I said before, if these airports, which were constructed by American troops, are being or are to be transferred to any other nation for commercial purposes or for any purposes, by which they will make a profit.

In this connection, two brief excerpts from the testimony are in point:

At the hearing at Cairo, Egypt, held on January 10, 1945, Maj. Norris B. Shumate, Corps of Engineers, testified as follows:

I would like for this statement to go on record. We do not have the costs of all the airfields, or what we consider the accurate cost of airfields and other installations besides airfields which have been under this headquarters from the time the United States Army occupied the Middle East.

At the hearing in Casablanca, Morocco, held on January 16, 1945, Maj. Sam S. Williams, Army Air Forces, Engineer Command, Operations Section, testified as follows:

Mr. MEADER. Major, are you an accountant?

Major WILLIAMS. No, I'm not. I'm an engineer.

Mr. MEADER. Have you had any accounting training?

Major WILLIAMS. No, sir.

Mr. MEADER. Has anybody in your office had any such training?

Major WILLIAMS. No, sir; none whatsoever. My figures are obtained from units in the field working on engineering. They send reports on the number of man-hours they expend on various fields.

It should also be noted that reports of construction costs are now required from the theater. This indicates the War Department's appreciation of the importance of assembling complete records on cost. In fact, it was never seriously urged to the subcommittee that the preparation of reports on the cost of installations was not important.

It may also be said that, at least in the area visited by the subcommittee, in which naval operations were comparatively minor in size and number, it appeared to the subcommittee that the Navy's records on cost were in much better shape than those with respect to similar installations of the Army.

TERMS OF OUR RIGHTS

The subcommittee also inquired at its various hearings into the terms of our rights in the installations and facilities erected or improved wholly or partially with United States Government funds. In almost no instance did it find that our rights were clear-cut and set forth in documentary form. In contrast to the rather elaborate and detailed legal procedure for acquiring sites for fixed installations in this country, involving the negotiation of terms of transfer, condemnation proceedings, the furnishing of abstracts of title and deeds, leases, or other documents evidencing the transfer of title, the subcommittee found that frequently our rights were based upon possession or occupation alone, without any written evidence of right or title. In some instances, rights were based solely upon an exchange of correspondence, which did not disclose a meeting of minds, and in other instances they were based solely upon the broad terms of an agreement for entering the territory, not related to any specific installation.

In fairness to those who had charge of the acquisition of these sites and locations it should be pointed out that, at least in the early stages of our participation in the military operations in north Africa, the advance of the military campaign was the important thing, and there was little time to inquire about legal niceties or detailed documents containing terms of rights. This was properly so, and this subcommittee would be the last to urge that progress of military operations should be hindered in any way by attention to the legal side of our occupation of sites for military purposes.

It should also be noted that our rights in these installations basically depend upon the political relationship between our Government and that of the territory where the installation was acquired, of which relationships there are a great variety in the territory visited by the subcommittee. It would be inappropriate here to go into any detail on this subject; but in order to appreciate the difficulty of the problems involved, it should be noted that our relations are different with each of the 12 countries the subcommittee visited. French north Africa includes Morocco, which is a French protectorate, and Algeria, which is virtually a department of metropolitan France, and Tunisia, which, although a protectorate, is under much closer control by the French than is Morocco. The situation is vastly different in Egypt. Egypt is an independent country—although subject to British influence—and is a neutral in the war. Iran, likewise, is an independent country, which declared war on Germany on September 9, 1943, long after we had established ourselves there. Iraq declared war on January 7, 1943.

In French north Africa, for example, our rights in military and naval installations are governed in a general way by the terms of the so-called Darlan agreement dated at about the time of our landings in north Africa on November 7 and 8, 1942. Since this territory was in hostile hands and was occupied only after combat, the situation in it is vastly different from that in areas in which our rights were acquired only with the permission of the governments involved.

For the purpose of presenting the problems of construction cost and terms of our rights in the installations, the facts, as found by the subcommittee with reference to four air bases, are set forth briefly. They are:

First. The naval air base at Port Lyautey, French Morocco.

Second. The Army air base at Rabat-Salé, French Morocco.

Third. The Army airfield at Cairo—John Payne Field.

Fourth. Mellaha Army Airfield at Tripoli, Libya.

1. THE NAVAL AIR BASE AT FORT LYAUTEY, FRENCH MOROCCO

Port Lyautey is located on the Atlantic coast of French Morocco, about 50 miles to the north of Casablanca. The Navy has established an excellent air base there by improving an airfield previously operated by the French. It is suitable for the landing of large transoceanic landplanes. It is situated upon the horseshoe bend of the Sebou River, which is excellent for the landing of seaplanes, since, regardless of the wind direction, there is a straight stretch of river which would permit the most advantageous landing of such seaplanes—the river generally being very crooked. The base is also used for blimps. The Navy Department has furnished a breakdown of the construction cost at this airport which totals $2,196,782.

Our rights in this airport, basically, are governed by the so-called Darlan agreement, which was referred to previously. The Navy has agreed to furnish us with supplementary documents showing in greater detail our rights in this port, but the subcommittee has not as yet received such documents.

This airport has been under the continuous control of the Navy since its first occupation at the time of the landings in Morocco, in November of 1942, and is being actively used at the present time. There is no immediate prospect of the cessation of such use.

The Navy officials, both in the field and in Washington, seem to be well aware of the post-war value of this airport, both for military and commercial purposes. They have stated to the subcommittee their intention of not abandoning possession, or withdrawing from the airport, without prior consultation with those responsible for the advancement of our post-war security and commercial interests.

2. THE ARMY AIR BASE AT RABAT-SALÉ, FRENCH MOROCCO

Rabat is the capital of French Morocco. Salé is a city across the river (Wadi Bou Regreg) from Rabat, near which is located the Rabat-Salé airport. This was a relatively small airport built by the French before the war. In connection with the operations in French Morocco, this airport was used for combat operations jointly by the American, British, and French forces. During the latter part of 1942 and the first half of 1943, this airport was improved largely, if not entirely, by the expenditure of United States funds. At a hearing in Casablanca on January 1, 1945, the subcommittee was furnished with a statement of the value of property improvements totaling $1,000,000, as follows:

First. Field: Salé Air Base, Salé, French Morocco.

Second. Date of occupancy: November 1942.

Third. Nature of construction:

(a) Installation of drainage system, information building, hangar floor, and concrete taxiway.

(b) Two pierced plank runways 5,000 feet by 150 feet, 1 Irving grid runway, 756,000-square-foot light bar and rod taxiway, 260,000-square-foot light bar and rod hardstandings, 36,000-square foot heavy bar and rod taxiway, 160,000,-square-foot heavy bar and rod hardstandings.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I noticed from reading the report of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on its investigation in Canada about a year ago, that in every instance of runways having been built by the United States, Canada retained title to them. In not a single case of an airport constructed by our Government was title to the runways retained. Was any distinction made in any of the airports to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. TUNNELL. It would seem that when our representatives went into the territory it was at a time when the airports were important from the standpoint of war. Our representatives did not stop to obtain rights. They went in and built. I do not believe there is any connection between that situation and runways installed in Canada, for example, where we had time to settle the questions involved. The subcommittee is trying to stress the fact that while we did not have time to settle these questions at the time the airports were constructed, we now have time to figure out what they cost, and they should not be surrendered until some understanding is arrived at with reference to cost, because the properties certainly are valuable assets.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. A different situation existed in north Africa than existed in Canada or any other country outside the war zone. In north Africa a dual authority existed since that territory was under the mandate or protectorate of a nation in Europe. In one instance the nation was fighting on our side, and in the other instance the nation was actually, at least during the early part of the campaign, divided, and some of its forces were fighting with us and some were fighting against us.

There was another complication in that the enemy country and its forces were located only a little distance from our forces. So there was not a clear picture in Africa, it being a very active and yet a very complicated military combat zone.

As the Senator has pointed out, it was difficult to make any arrangements because of the situation to which I have referred. However, there is now a splendid opportunity to make satisfactory or suitable arrangements for the proper disposition of the assets.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to know whether our Government owns any runways in any of the places which the Senator has named.

Mr. TUNNELL. We have not found a permanent title in the United States in any instance with reference to which we were able to obtain information. I do not believe we have title in any instance.

Mr. President, I shall continue with the data which I was presenting at the time I was interrupted.

Fourth. Estimated cost of construction:

(a) Estimated contract cost, $57,420 or 2,871,000 francs.

Material furnished by the United States of America, $10,580 or 529,000 francs.

Total, $68,000 or 3,400,000 francs.

Estimated cost of construction:

(b) In arriving at the cost, the following basis was used:

Average price of troop labor, 10 francs per hour.

Cost of materials, double the price in the States.

Total estimated cost $1,000,000.

Fifth. Nature of restoration: None.

Sixth. Estimated cost of restoration.

Seventh. Date of approval, August 1, 1943.

Eighth. Valuation by F. M. Walker, Jr., first lieutenant, Corps of Engineers.

Ninth. Remarks: The Salé Air Base was formerly a French installation. It will be turned back to the French as is.

At a subsequent hearing held January 7, 1945, in Caserta, near Naples, Italy, at the headquarters of the command within which Salé Airport is located, a statement was presented showing that the cost of this airport to the United States was $352,500, as follows:

First. The best available information in this theater on the cost to the United States of construction of the above-named airdrome, is as follows:

(a) Troop labor and equipment, $287,500.

(b) Materials, $15,000.

(c) Civilian labor and contracts, $50,-000.

Total estimated cost to United States, $352,500.

Second. The cost of pierced steel plank used at the airdrome is not included because it is recoverable. Approximately one-half of the total amount of pierced steel plank, originally laid at the airdrome has already been recovered.

At Casablanca on January 16, 1945, further testimony was presented to the committee to the effect that United States out-of-pocket costs were $52,000.

It should be noted that the last two figures treat the pierced steel planking for the runways as movable property and not as having been installed in the airport. The man who gave this testimony did not get along very well with the subcommittee.

Sometime between August 1, 1943, and November 12, 1943, American forces ceased to use Rabat-Salé airport and the control of the field was assumed by the British. On November 12, 1943, a contract for the occupation of Salé airbase was entered into between the British and a Lieutenant Brochet, purporting to act for the French Government, whereby the Salé airbase was put at the disposition of the British authorities "until further orders" without any restrictions as to its use.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was an attempt made to distinguish between what is known as real property and personal property? For example, the Senator said that metal slabs were laid down on which runways were constructed, and that they were treated as movable property. Did the Senator ascertain that any distinction had been made between real and personal property, so that the real property would pass with the real estate, and we would have the right to remove only the personal property?

Mr. TUNNELL. I believe that a great many persons in the military service did not know the difference between real property and personal property.

Mr. FERGUSON. And the property which was fixed permanently was not treated any differently than the other property.

Mr. TUNNELL. No. The accountant attempted to make us believe that any property which had been bought and paid for by the United States, but which could be removed or salvaged, was not obtained at out-of-pocket cost.

Mr. FERGUSON. Whether we removed it or not?

Mr. TUNNELL. Whether we removed it or not.

Mr. FERGUSON. In this particular case, is it not true that the movable property which was laid down on the ground was taken over by the British?

Mr. TUNNELL. About half of it was so taken.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that, so far as any recovery was concerned, we had no right to go in and get any of the property.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is as I understand it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I believe the point which has just been made indicates the necessity of turning over assets such as air bases to the State Department or to some department other than the military having the knowledge which, as the Senator pointed out, the military did not have in this instance. Here was a case of an airport, built with United States funds, it might be said, being abandoned by the military without the matter being brought to the attention of the State Department. That air base was turned over by a French officer, whose authority is unknown insofar as our subcommittee is concerned, to the British authority, which to all intents and purposes is now using an American installation in which we have no future rights or interests.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What the Senator has said would indicate very strongly that we need to establish a policy so that our men in the field may know what they can do and what they should do under given circumstances. I agree with the able Senator from New York that

that should be done by the State Department, because they are more interested in foreign relations with other countries than is the military, which is more interested in getting on to the next battle or the next airfield, and winning the war. The State Department is the agency which should handle those airports, and our relations with the foreign countries so far as our property in such countries is concerned.

Mr. MEAD. I understand that to be the recommendation of the subcommittee.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. TUNNELL. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I wish to say that the attitude which has been described was the attitude found by us in talking to the military. When they are through in a particular locality they want to get out. They say, in effect, "We cannot afford to leave our men here; we want to get to the fighting front." But what the subcommittee has in mind is what they leave when they go away. We think there should be a very strict accounting for those things, as nearly as it can be made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware has the floor. Does he yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield again to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. In relation to the cost of the airports, did the subcommittee find that the military agency was particular in keeping track of all of the costs of their personnel, for instance, their officers and privates and noncommissioned officers? Were those figures kept in an orderly way, or did the subcommittee find that they varied so greatly that the committee could not tell when it got through what the airport did cost?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think the Senator has described it. I think we were not interested in costs then; we were getting ready to fight the enemy, and we did not stop to figure how much our men were worth a day, or anything of that sort. We wanted to win the war.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, did they have a thousand men 1 day, and two thousand men the next, and a hundred the next because they were moving on, and so they kept very little track of the actual cost of labor?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did they attempt to keep track of the material that was purchased in that country compared to what we took over there and installed, or did they not?

Mr. TUNNELL. I would say that a good deal of the property that was purchased in French Morocco, which is the place we are now discussing as to some of these matters at least, was paid for by the French.

Mr. FERGUSON. How was it paid by the French Government?

Mr. TUNNELL. It was paid either in cash or else it was charged against them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the committee investigate to find out whether money that was paid by the French was lend-lease money?

Mr. TUNNELL. Oh, no; the money that was paid for all this civilian lend-lease was paid in cash by the French authorities.

The majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] reminds me that there were records of the labor of troops but there was no valuation placed on it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Were the records kept on an hourly basis or otherwise?

Mr. TUNNELL. They were kept on an hourly basis.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Would the distinguished Senator have any objection to telling the Senate how the subcommittee proceeded? Did it, for example, put witnesses under oath and examine them or were statements filed?

Mr. TUNNELL. We did not put them under oath. We merely called them before us, or they were produced either by the Army, the Navy, the State Department, the F. E. A. or whatever organization was furnishing the witnesses. We did not attempt to swear them. We asked them questions, and I think we got about as good answers as they could give.

Mr. LANGER. Did the committee during the time they were over there divide up or did the members of the committee remain together?

Mr. TUNNELL. We divided up once. That was one time when we had too much work to be done during the day we had to spend in Cairo, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] went one place and I took charge of the testimony in another. That is the only time, as I remember, that that happened.

I call attention to the fact that when the French officer attempted to transfer the airport at Salé it was without further order and without any limitation as to its use commercially or otherwise. The British proceeded to make certain improvements on Salé. Among other things, they constructed concrete runways and added three new hangars to the three hangars which were already in existence at that field. It is common knowledge that the British are using the field presently, and intend to use it in the future, for commercial air flights. Testimony before the subcommittee was to the effect that the British are now operating scheduled flights between Salé Airport and Montreal, Canada. We were given some information that an officer of the British consulate at Casablanca had recently told our minister there or one of his assistants that they were ready to give it up, but I have not heard as yet of their doing so.

The subcommittee made inquiry as to whether or not the value of the improvements made with United States funds at Salé Airport had been recovered from the British, either under the Lend-Lease Act, or otherwise. The testimony before the subcommittee indicated that no such recovery has as yet been made, but that the propriety of making a charge against the British was in the process of being considered in Washington. There was likewise testimony, however, that we had not abandoned the airport, and considered it important, although the British were in sole control there.

The subcommittee does not present the foregoing as the final story of the Salé Airport, but proposes to go into the facts in greater detail. The foregoing has been presented as an illustration of the confused situation with regard to records of the cost of construction and the uncertain status of title and rights in the installation, which, I may say, was provided for war purposes and of course rather hastily agreed upon, if agreement was made at all. It seems perfectly obvious that a determination of our investment and our rights in the Salé Airport ought to be made without delay for the purpose of protecting our rights in its disposal.

I may say further that, so far as Salé is concerned, it is comparatively unimportant when we think of the large investments we have all over that section of the world; so that if the Army, the Navy, and the State Department are doing as we feel they are doing, making every effort to prevent a repetition of that situation, the time is well spent.

3. THE ARMY AIRFIELD AT CAIRO—JOHN PAYNE FIELD

The instance of John Payne Field at Cairo, Egypt, is a notable exception to the general situation found by the subcommittee; namely, that in the usual situation, our State Department representatives generally knew little about the installations which had been erected or improved by the Army in connection with military operations. Apparently the Army had not sought the advice of Foreign Service officials in the acquisition of sites for installations, nor had they informed such officials of the nature of rights acquired or the amount of expenditures. Furthermore, the Foreign Service officials had not sought to learn about such installations.

This, however, was not the case with respect to John Payne Field. On September 9, 1944, the Legation in Cairo despatched to the Secretary of State in Washington a confidential memorandum containing a narrative description of the history of Army occupation of John Payne Field, enclosing a résumé of negotiations with the British, a map of the area, and a summary of construction costs.

The subcommittee was surprised to learn that there had been so little exchange of information and requests for assistance between the Army and the Foreign Service officials in connection with the acquisition of sites for military installations. It does not intend to imply that there was any friction or that there was any legal obligation on the Army to consult with Foreign Service officials. In fact, the instance of John Payne Field is a demonstration that when requested the Army gave excellent cooperation and made complete disclosure of the facts. However, it must

also be noted that the services of the State Department were not solicited or used by the Army in connection with the acquisition of the site.

It also should be noted that in the informal conferences held by the subcommittee in Washington after its return, it has been advised both by representatives of the State Department and the War Department that officials of both Departments are now collaborating in the determination of our rights and the making of plans for their proper disposition and that plans for future activities call for even closer cooperation and collaboration. The subcommittee is very favorably impressed with the attitude of officials toward the problem of dealing with the disposition of military installations abroad. Regardless of the failures of the past, it now appears that there is an appreciation of the difficulty of the problems involved and a determination to work together in solving them.

The items of cost as to John Payne Field are in much better condition than many of the other airports constructed by the Army, particularly those that were built in areas where there were combat operations. As of the date of the State Department's report, September 9, 1944, the expenditures on this field were estimated to total approximately $2,653,260.80, of which approximately 7 percent represents reciprocal aid from the British.

However, the condition of the title and rights of the United States in the airport is far from being as clear and as favorable to the United States as is desirable. On this point, it should be noted, first, that the British acquired the land for the field under the terms of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of Alliance; second, that the British reserved the right to "take complete control, whenever justified by military necessity"; and, third, that the British reserved the right to use the field for a squadron, which the subcommittee observed in actual possession of a part of the field.

The following comment in the State Department's memorandum is significant:

Evidently the first decision to be made is whether it is desired to retain Payne Field as an American airport for post-war civil air-transport purposes. If so, it would appear that immediate steps should be taken to regularize its status. Britain's treaty obligations for the defense of Egypt make it understandable that special provisions should be made for the use of the field in time of war. Moreover, it seems unlikely that the United States Government or any American air-transport company would wish to purchase outright the large stretch of desert where Payne Field is located. It is entirely possible, however, that a sufficiently long-term lease could be arranged, either through the British or directly with the Egyptian Government and the Heliopolis Co. The first step would be to discuss the matter with the British, and it is my considered opinion that such discussion should be initiated by the Department in Washington at the earliest possible moment. * * *

Major General Giles and members of his staff have been most helpful in providing us with information on this subject.

4. MELLAHA ARMY AIRFIELD AT TRIPOLI, LIBYA

Mellaha Airport at Tripoli is now in the process of construction and is not expected to be completed until March or April of 1945. It is erected solely for the use of the Air Transport Command and is not a combat field.

Costs of construction are being kept, and accurate figures should be available from reports which are required to be made to Washington. However, the title and the rights of the United States in the field are far from clear.

Tripoli is a point of considerable importance as an airfield because of its being located approximately midway between Casablanca on the Atlantic coast of Morocco and Cairo, Egypt, being roughly 1,200 miles from each. Regardless of the improvement in efficiency of aircraft, in order to permit the carrying of a maximum pay load, this stopping point at Tripoli is likely to continue to be of importance.

The colonel who was operating our plane told us that the distance from Casablanca across north Africa to the Red Sea was about the same as the distance from New York to San Francisco.

There is another airport at Tripoli constructed by the Italians, now operated by the British, known as the Castel Benito Airport. Due to excessively heavy traffic at Castel Benito, it was decided that we make arrangements for some other location for an airport for our transport planes. Accordingly, in June of 1944 our Army made surveys and determined upon a location some 4 miles to the east of Tripoli, near property devoted to the production of salt, by the use of large evaporating areas, which had been in operation for many years. The following letters set forth the circumstances preceding the commencement of construction of the Mellaha Airport:

(Letter dated June 8, 1944, from Col. William L. Ritter, G. S. C., Chief of Staff, Headquarters, United States Army Forces in the Middle East, Cairo, Egypt, to Air Officer Commander in Chief, Royal Air Force, Middle East)

Subject: Acquisition of Mellaha Airdrome, Tripoli, Tripolitania, for use of United States Army.

1. Projected heavy increases in aircraft transport and ferrying operations of the Air Transport Command, United States Army Air Forces, clearly indicate that it is necessary a site be made available in the vicinity of Tripoli, Tripolitania, for the construction of a separate airfield for A. T. C. use. Authority to proceed with this project has been secured from the War Department, Washington, D. C.

2. Representatives of this headquarters, with the active help and advice of the C. R. E. at Tripoli, have made a thorough survey of unused and abandoned airfields in that area and have arrived at the conclusion that Mellaha Airfield is the most satisfactory for United States requirements. This decision was based primarily on the fact that numerous buildings and facilities now existing at Mellaha can be utilized in expediting the construction program, to permit an earlier completion of the necessary facilities.

3. Final requirements in general will consist of three 2,000-yard runways, 300,000 square yards of parking apron, operational buildings, housing, and other facilities for a total of 3,000 personnel.

4. It is therefore requested that the Mellaha Airfield and the necessary surrounding area be acquired for development by United States forces of an airport to be used for military purposes.

(a) Boundary of area to be acquired, subject to final adjustments on completion of accurate surveys and design, is to be as follows:

From the Mediterranean Sea to a point approximately 1,500 yards east from the extended center line of existing north-south runway at Mellaha, due south to a point approximately 700 yards south of the main road from Tripoli to Tajura; thence west to the point of intersection with the western boundary of the desired area which is a line projected due south from the Mediterranean Sea at a point approximately 2,000 yards west of the extended center line of the existing north-south runway at Mellaha.

(b) All land, runways, roads, buildings, and other facilities included in this area are to be under the control of the United States Army.

(c) Use of the commercial salt pans enclosed in the eastern portion of this area is to be discontinued.

(d) The cantilever roof on the masonry grandstand, the judge's tower, both aprpoximately 1,600 yards to the east of the east end of the existing east-west runway at Mellaha, are to be demolished.

5. In order that work on this project may start at once, an early reply to this request will be greatly appreciated.

(Letters dated June 28, 1944, from E. Betts (?) for Air Marshal, Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Headquarters, Royal Air Force, Middle East, to Commanding General, U. S. A. F. I. M. E.)

MELLAHA AIRFIELD

Reference is made to U. S. A. F. I. M. E. letter AG 686 Tripoli, dated 8th June, 1944, and to this headquarters interim reply S. 59524/Org., dated 20th June, 1944, concerning the use by the U. S. Army Air Forces of Mellaha Airfield for Air Transport Command purposes.

2. Information has now been received from the Air Ministry at London that they concur in the use and development of Mellaha Airfield by the U. S. Army Air Forces, subject to confirmation that Castel Benito cannot cater for the additional American traffic through Tripoli. May this confirmation please be given?

3. The Air Ministry have agreed to the undertaking of the necessary construction work at Mellaha by the United States forces, but have stipulated that the execution of works services should have regard to the needs of the Mediterranean area as a whole in regard to use of available labor, plant, and material.

4. The control of land, runways, roads, buildings, and other facilities included in the area nominated below will be vested in the United States Army Air Forces, under the overhead control of Headquarters, Mediterranean Allied Air Forces, but the Air Ministry desire that arrangements should be made that facilities at Mellaha may be made available to the Royal Air Force in the event of circumstances making this necessary.

5. The boundary of the area required for United States Army Air Force purposes in this connection (subject to final adjustments) is to be from the Mediterranean Sea to a point approximately 1,500 yards east from the extended center line of the existing north-south runway at Mellaha, due south to a point approximately 700 yards south of the main road from Tripoli to Tajura; thence west to the point of intersection with the western boundary of the desired area which is a line projected due south from the Mediterranean Sea at a point approximately 2,000 yards west of the extended center line of the existing north-south runway at Mellaha.

6. The United States forces will accept liability for any compensation necessitated in the acquisition of such land, runways, roads, buildings, and other facilities in the above area, together with that arising from the disuse of the commercial salt pans in the eastern portion of the area and the demolition of the cantilever roof on the masonry grandstand and the judge's tower east of the existing east-west runway at Mellaha. In this connection the B. M. A. Tripolitania has already been acquainted with American requirements.

7. Permission given to the United States forces for the use of Mellaha Airfield under these arrangements will be for official purposes and for the duration of the war only, it being clearly understood that any facilities which the United States forces may create will carry with them no post-war rights of ownership or user.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I understand that this Mellaha Airfield was built in Libya and that Libya was formerly Italian territory, and to all intents and purposes still is.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. Therefore why is it necessary that all these restrictions be imposed upon us by another Allied power, a friendly Allied power? Is there any reason for that?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think the answer to that, in any case to which any official of ours is a party, is contained in paragraph 4 of Colonel Ritter's letter, at the bottom of page 41, as follows:

4. The question of post-war rights raised in paragraph 7 of your letter is not deemed appropriate for determination at this time. It is assumed that what is done by your command and this command relate to military operations only and will be without prejudice to the post-war disposition by the interested governments of the rights of ownership and user in the field. All such matters will doubtless have to come up for review on the cessation of all hostilities in the light of political circumstances obtaining at the time.

In answer to the question asked by the Senator from New York, I will say that this territory which was taken over by us was at that time held by British forces. I think that is the answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, it had been Italian territory?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was taken over by the British or by the United States?

Mr. TUNNELL. It was taken over by the British, as I remember.

Mr. FERGUSON. And then we built our airport on it after the British took it over?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, am I to understand that our allies refuse to make any agreement in relation to this airport until after the war is over?

Mr. TUNNELL. They attempted to make an agreement. In their letter they stated the terms under which we could hold the area, and the United States authorities did not accede to those terms.

Mr. FERGUSON. But did they not indicate in the statement the Senator just read that they desired that we let everything go until after the war is over, except their restrictions?

Mr. TUNNELL. What the Senator refers to was contained in the letter from Col. William L. Ritter, Chief of Staff, Headquarters, in which he said that we did not accept the terms as to post-war use, and that that question would have to go over.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Ohio find anywhere that an officer in our armed services would say, "This is our policy, and this is what we want to do," or was it found that the policy varied from place to place and depended upon the individual officer in charge?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, it seemed that situations were different everywhere. Tripoli and Tunisia comprised captured territory technically, and the situation there was not the same as we found it to be in most of the territory we visited.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was the policy the same in all captured territory, or did it vary according to the officer who might be in charge?

Mr. TUNNELL. There was a difference even in captured territory. We participated very largely in the capture of French Morocco, so that perhaps we had greater rights there than the British had.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, it did make a difference whose army captured a given area?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes, I think it did, or at least it made a difference whose army had control.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, I see.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I am sure the Senator from Delaware will recall that frequently when we were in Libya the question came up by what right the British were exercising such control, and the reply always was, "By right of conquest."

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; that is correct. That is what they claimed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did we have a policy under which we held property by right of conquest?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think our people generally take the position they did not want any property.

Mr. FERGUSON. By right of conquest?

Mr. TUNNELL. By any right.

Mr. FERGUSON. But we do find that the British used the "right of conquest" to take over certain property?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think that is an old policy of Great Britain. I have heard of it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has heard of that policy before?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am glad to hear the Senator make the statement he has made. When the Senate committee of which I was a member was overseas a little more than a year ago we found that Americans were following their traditional policy of taking territory, and then when the trouble was over abandoning it. Our traditional policy is to fight for and take territory when we are in danger, or in trouble, or when our friends are in trouble; then when the trouble is over we abandon the territory at the earliest possible moment, and we are expected to do so by some of our allies, and we do so, and get out, and go other places. We follow the fight, and then when the fight is over we go home.

Some of our allies who help us in the fight, or not, just as circumstances arise, when the fight is over go to the places where the fighting has been completed and start to do business on the old scale and under the old conditions.

Other nations find it very easy to deal with another country which takes property in its own defense, or apparently in its necessary defense, or the defense of its Allies, and which then abandons it and goes home and says, "We do not want anything." It is easy to deal with such a country as that, and some of those who deal with us want something, and especially they want what we have abandoned, because it is of great value to them. I am glad to have the Senator's reaction to things that I know and saw. We have built airfields and installations all over the world, and it was necessary for us to build them in order to win the fight. In many places we have this right—the right to get out when the war is over, and the other fellow confidently expects that that is what we will do.

Mr. TUNNELL. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that in many places we do not have the right to possession; we simply have possession.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then we freely give up possession and move on with the fight, or go home; and in many instances, if I correctly understand what the Senator said earlier, we do not even take the pains to look out for what we have taken or what we have built; we allow it to disintegrate; we leave the installations there; we do not even take pains to see that the investment we have is policed or kept up in some way.

Mr. TUNNELL. What I have said is not intended, Mr. President, to be in criticism of our allies. I rather admire their keeping what they have some color of right to keep.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am glad the Senator makes that statement, because I said the same thing a year and a half ago. I then said, "I am not fussing about the British or our other allies." I said, "I rather admire them for their alertness and their smartness." Many persons in the United States criticized us when we made our report, because they said we were anti-British or anti-something else, when we merely complimented the British on the realistic way they dealt with things. We meant to say to our own people, "Why do you not have the same realistic attitude toward these things?"

Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Delaware has said. I think we should not always stand in the shadow of the British or anyone else. We should make our own policy and it should be dictated in a measure by the interests of the American people, and by our interest in the investment we have made,

and by the job we have done. But when the fight is over we seem to become oblivious to what has gone before, and we are in a hurry to get out and go home. Other nations are in a hurry to go in and consolidate their gains. When they are asked, "By what right are you here?" they answer, "By right of conquest."

Mr. TUNNELL. I will say to the Senator that we are trying in this report—at least I am, and I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and I have agreed on everything from the time we left home until the present, so far as I know—we are trying to establish that since conditions are so different now from anything we have ever known before, an unusual condition will face the United States, and we think the United States perhaps should adopt a different policy insofar as a different policy might protect the interests of the United States in post-war trade and post-war safety.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. In this war we have, with the loss of life and material, taken areas which were in the hands of our enemies and of enemies of our allies. The alternative to maintaining possession of them is to cling to the old policy of take and retreat and abandon, and then go back when trouble arises again, and again have our men killed in taking the same places, while helping our old friends when they are in trouble again.

Mr. TUNNELL. Many months ago I said on the floor of the Senate that if the United States were to police the territorial possessions of other nations throughout the world it would be on the assumption that it was a paying proposition for somebody, and that if it was a paying proposition I think we should get in the business, especially if we have to pay the expense of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is exactly correct. In our sphere of influence, or in a reasonable area which we are committed to defend, and where if trouble were to come again, the burden of taking care of the situation would be upon us, ought we to be installed and in possession of the area, or ought we to abandon it and run the risk of having our men killed because of the necessity of taking possession again in order to help our friends and help ourselves? I refer to areas to which we are definitely committed, which are in the sphere of our influence, and where we are entitled to have at least an equal opportunity to trade.

Mr. TUNNELL. I entirely agree with the Senator. Since we have spent so much to build these airports, we should keep them and other installations which will put us in a postion for after-the-war trade, or in a position for subsequent defense of these possessions if it should become necessary.

Mr. CHANDLER. I applaud the Senator's statement. I remind him that when the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and others of us took a similar trip more than a year ago, we were unanimous in our conclusions on these same questions. It makes me feel very good to have two of my colleagues see the same things, and come back with a report which is almost on all-fours with the things which we saw and interpreted.

Mr. TUNNELL. In certain places which the Senator from Kentucky visited, we found that conditions seemed to have changed for the better; but in no instance did we find that the Senator and his colleagues were not pursuing the right course with respect to conditions as they found them, or thought them to be.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the junior Senator from Kentucky a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. If my memory serves me correctly, in the report made by the junior Senator from Kentucky a year and a half ago, he gave an example of a barren island where the United States Army moved in with about 1,500 men and built an airport costing $50,000,000, as I recall.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator have in mind Iceland?

Mr. LANGER. No; I have in mind a barren island, where there was no civilization at all.

Mr. MEAD. Perhaps it was Christmas Island.

Mr. CHANDLER. We visited Christmas Island; but, as I recall, the installation there did not cost so much money. Because the Senator mentioned the sum of $50,000,000, I identified the place as Iceland. As I recall, that was the approximate cost of the installation on Iceland.

Mr. LANGER. As I remember the Senator's report, concurred in by the other Senators, when we had finished building that magnificent airport and spending all that money, the American troops marched out, the American flag came down, and one Englishman came in with a desk, and the British flag went up. Does the Senator remember that part of his report?

Mr. CHANDLER. That situation is not confined to any one place. It is repeated over and over again. The British always come in. They went in on Tarawa. After the American marines took the island of Tarawa, with the loss of about 3,500 marines in 72 hours, a lone Britisher there ran up the British flag forthwith, after the battle. They never fail to come in. I do not criticize them for that. They think it is their property, although our soldiers were killed in taking it. They are always on hand to take possession and control, and operate their own property. I think we ought to do the same thing. At least, we ought to be as awake and alive to situations which may make for trouble in the future if we are not wide awake to American interests.

Mr. LANGER. What puzzles me is that after the previous trip the five Senators came back and made a report, but nothing has been done. The Army, the Navy, and the Department of State received the report; our entire Government received it, and a year and a half has gone by. I should like to have someone tell me what has been done to remedy the situation which was found to exist a year and a half ago when five distinguished Senators made a tour of inspection.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I may be permitted to answer briefly—I do not wish to transgress on the time of the Senator from Delaware—all we got for mentioning the subject was harsh criticism, because it was felt that our observations came under the head of criticism of our allies. We answered that charge by saying that if we could not tell our allies the truth, we were certainly not on very good terms with them. If, as American Senators, representing the American people, we could not, without offending our allies, view military installations built by American engineers and paid for by the people of the United States, and at least request that the American people assert that we had certain interests which needed the protection of the American people, we were not on very good terms with them. If we have reached the point where we cannot mention such things without offending our allies, we are not on very good terms with them.

A definite policy should be established by the President and the State Department, supported by the American Senate. As the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has said, we are in the world to stay. This is one world; and we are a part of it. If we are to stay in the game, we shall have to put in more marbles and learn to shoot straight. If we stand in the shadow of the British, and permit them to make the policy which we follow, in my judgment we shall not get any further than we have in the past. We must establish an American policy, and it must take into consideration the interests of the American people. It should not be antagonistic to our allies if we can help it, but at least it should be assertive of American interests, so that we can deal with our allies at arm's length, across the table, face to face, and man to man. Our diplomats are accustomed to following the British. They have not learned to do anything else. I am pleading for different instructions to our diplomats. I believe it would be better for us.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I am not criticizing the British. I am pleading for an American policy which will take care of our interests without antagonizing the British or any other nation.

Mr. CHANDLER. I went a little further than does the Senator. I said that I did not wish to be cruel or harsh to our allies or our friends. I voted for every measure for which the President asked as a matter of defense and helpfulness to the British and to our other allies; but the time has come when we must speak realistically to our friends.

Mr. TUNNELL. The time may come when I shall do so.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should not like to be called an enemy of our allies merely because I may do so sooner than does the Senator. That is the position in which I find myself. I may have spoken

realistically to our friends sooner than has my good friend from Delaware, but I thought they should be spoken to realistically.

The American people are patient. For a long time they have followed the policy of not desiring the territory of other nations. We do not wish to take anything from anyone. The other fellow says, "You do not want anything. We do, so we will move in."

Mr. TUNNELL. I think the time has come when it will pay the United States to assert its own rights.

Mr. CHANDLER. It will save trouble, too.

Mr. TUNNELL. It will save trouble.

Mr. President, it is therefore obvious that the construction has proceeded without clarification of the rights which the United States will have in this airport. The Army officials are to be commended for refusing to commit our Government to an admission that it would acquire no post-war rights in the field. On the other hand, there is hardly a clear understanding as between the British and ourselves as to the terms under which we are now occupying this site, since the permission was given upon the understanding "that any facilities which the United States forces may create will carry with them no post-war rights of ownership or user."

In connection with the British stipulation, above quoted, it should be noted that Tripoli is located in Libya, which prior to this war was Italian territory. Presumably, Libya's post-war status has not yet been determined. At the present time, it seems merely to be territory which has been occupied by the Allied forces in the course of this war.

In the opinion of the subcommittee, an investigation ought to be made at once to determine the present status of our rights in this airfield and to have a clear understanding with the British with respect to them.

It was also with considerable interest that the subcommittee learned that neither the United States nor any of our American air lines have obtained any franchises to operate in north Africa. On the other hand, the British Overseas Airways Corporation is running regularly scheduled commercial flights, accepting nonpriority passengers when space permits. On a much smaller scale, the French and the Belgians are operating in north Africa.

In 1941, Pan-American Airways operated across central Africa to Khartoum, thence to Cairo, Palestine, and Basra. The British objected. On November 1, 1942, the Army Air Transport Command took over this operation.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION RADIO STATION AT ALGIERS

The Office of War Information is operating a radio station in Algiers with two short wave and one medium wave transmitters. It is using wave-length bands which probably will be lost if operations at this station are discontinued. This radio station is well-situated for use as a booster station for the purpose of reaching Europe, Russia, and the Middle East. It represents an investment of over a million and a quarter dollars of United States funds. The French have indicated an interest in having this station transferred to them on lend-lease. Office of War Information activities in this area are diminishing.

This station represents an opportunity for the United States to have available for the transmission of news, messages, etc., an alternative to the present wireless and cable monopolies. The Office of War Information rightly feels that a determination of the disposition of this asset is beyond the scope of its authority, and it has made an appeal that those responsible for determining our policy and negotiating for putting it into effect instruct it as to what should be done. It is also faced with the impropriety of expending taxpayers' funds in continuing operations where the sole or main purpose is to maintain a going concern for its greater value as a unit than as an abandoned installation.

LEND-LEASE AND REVERSE LEND-LEASE ACCOUNTING

Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease accounts are in such condition that it is impossible to tell with certainty the exact status of balances for intratheater transactions. There are two serious discrepancies between the methods used by our forces and those used by the British, which have contributed to this confusion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator permit an interruption for a question?

Mr. TUNNELL. Certainly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Before the Senator leaves the matter of the radio station, let me inquire whether he has informed himself regarding what legislation, if any, would be appropriate to be enacted in order to determine a policy of this character?

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not done so; but I thought, and I still think, that this matter should be handled through the State Department. I understand that the State Department does not think that at the present time it has all the authority which I have suggested or which has been suggested in this report. So it seems to me that the State Department itself should make some suggestions regarding what increased authority it should have.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator agree that in connection with our general constitutional function of advising in respect to questions of foreign policy, it might be appropriate for Members of the Senate to bring to the attention of the appropriate committees of this body dealing with such questions the related matters of policy, with the idea that the departments downtown would realize that we also are concerned about this matter and that we would welcome constructive suggestions from them?

Mr. TUNNELL. Our chairman suggests that we will do that.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that would be most appropriate.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, there are two serious discrepancies between the methods used. The first is the refusal of the British to price invoices on materials and services lend-leased to us in the theater. The second is the policy of the British to charge 42 percent on their cost for transportation, insurance, and handling charges on material and equipment turned over to us under reciprocal aid in the theater, whereas the charges of the American forces for such items have been 25 percent. Perhaps this is the result of some agreement between our State Department and the British, but our information came particularly from those in Abadan, where they were not familiar with what had been done on lend-lease from Washington. Washington was familiar with what they had done but Abadan was not familiar with what Washington had done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the committee ascertain the reason why the British would not price these invoices at the present time?

Mr. TUNNELL. I understood it was because of a lack of clerks; they could not hire a sufficient number of clerks.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was the reason which was assigned, was it?

Mr. TUNNELL. That was the reason which was assigned. That procedure has been followed, in that the number of items is charged, without any total.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I flew west 2 days ago with one in command of an air base in England, who said a report was very widely circulated there—and I think the matter should be cleared up, regardless of whether the report is accurate—affecting the item of gasoline, in particular, the intimation being that for gasoline secured from the British a charge was made very considerably in excess of the charge made for the gasoline when it was delivered to the British. Did that matter come to the Senator's attention at all?

Mr. TUNNELL. The only thing along that line which I remember having come to our attention was at Abadan, where some of the witnesses protested that on articles which had been handed from our lend-lease authorities to the British, and which subsequently had been taken back by us from the British, because we needed them—as sometimes happens, we were told—to the original cost a charge of 25 percent for transportation was added by us.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator was informed that our people had added that charge?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; we were informed that our people had added a charge of 25 percent, and that when the article was later handed back to us there was a disagreement between the British and our people regarding the charge which they should add to the 25 percent. I did not hear gasoline specifically mentioned, but there was a difference between them.

I may say, in order to be perfectly fair, that I understand that our State Department has been satisfied, at least

in part, to have the matter of pricing go over. But regardless of whether it goes over, our committee did not think the method used was the proper one.

Mr. President, the more serious of these two discrepancies is the first. Both the Army and the Navy have been seeking to persuade the British to price their invoices. The British have consistently refused to do so on the basis that they did not have sufficient bookkeeping manpower. After extended negotiations, the Navy secured from the British Admiralty an understanding, which became operative on January 1, 1945, that they would price invoices on all transactions subsequent to that date, and would assist the Navy in going over invoices on transactions prior to that date, so that they might also be priced.

The Army has as yet been unable to secure a similar commitment from the British, so we were informed. In lieu of such pricing, it has been the practice of the Army to place its own estimates of values.

The seriousness of the foregoing can readily be appreciated when it is realized that warehouses full of unpriced invoices will be accumulated, and that if such articles are ever priced, they will undoubtedly have to be priced by persons not familiar with the original transaction—persons who possibly will not have the proper catalogs or other reference sources to enable them to determine accurately the value of such lend-lease transfers. Apparently the British maintain prices for their own records; and unquestionably there will be a discrepancy between our estimate of the total value of British reciprocal aid in the theater and the estimate which the British will have. As an example, the British presented in their official documents a report of some $175,000,000 worth of material transferred to us on lend-lease, but it was appraised by our Navy at a value of only $10,000,000.

I understand that what really has happened is that our people have obtained valuations on only $10,000,000 worth of material. At any rate, there is a great deal of difference between the bookkeeping methods and between the total figures obtained.

In negotiating for the settlement of obligations under the Lend-Lease Act, it is obvious that this confusion as to accurate balances between our governments will make lend-lease settlements much more difficult than they would have been if invoices on such transactions had been priced.

As to the difference between the 25 percent charged by our Army and the 42 percent charged our Army by the British for transportation, handling charges and insurance, our officials have expressed the feeling that there should be no such differential; that it is an arbitrary estimate of a factor to be used in all cases regardless of the actual costs for such items; that the costs are probably the same for the British as for ourselves, and that such factor should likewise be the same.

CONCLUSION

The subcommittee feels that a more businesslike job could have been done in connection with the maintenance of cost records and terms of rights in our installations abroad. It also feels that closer coordination between the military services and the State Department, through the exchange of information and the utilization of our foreign service officials in the respective countries where the military installations were being constructed, would have been desirable. However, the subcommittee also realizes that, especially in the early days of our combat operations in North Africa and in the rush of establishing the transportation facilities and other activities in the Middle East, details as to expenditures and care as to the legal aspects of the title to be acquired should not have been permitted to interfere with or delay the speediest possible progress of military campaigns. The subcommittee feels, however, that a more businesslike job of recording our expenditures and clarifying our rights could have been done without impairment of military operations.

This neglect will be expensive in terms of preventing as good a job of disposition of those assets and installations as otherwise might have been accomplished. The task of compiling records of cost and clarifying our rights at this time is a different one and will take considerable time. Until such information is available, however, an intelligent and well-informed decision can hardly be made. Furthermore, as to some installations, the best time for making disposition may already have passed or will arrive before the information needed to make a proper decision can be compiled.

The subcommittee feels that there has been a fundamental obstacle to proper disposition of our foreign installations in the apparent lack of any definite and well-understood national policy concerning our post-war security and economic aims, which, in the final analysis, should control the disposition to be made of such installations.

Based on the conferences held in Washington since our return, however, we are encouraged by the interest of officials concerned with this problem. We feel that they are aware of the importance of the problems we encountered and also of the importance of taking immediate action to solve them. The Mead committee will devote attention to following the progress that is made.

Mr. President, before taking my seat, I wish to say that there was uniform good feeling between our representatives abroad and the British. I never heard a single criticism of the British attitude toward our people. Individually they were fine, and there was not the slightest conflict of feeling between our representatives and those of the British. So anything which I may have said on that point was said with reference to a policy which should be pursued. However, I wish to stress the fact that good feeling existed.

At this time I wish to compliment those who were responsible for the transportation which was furnished us. Everything was done which could be done by the Army, the Navy, the State Department, and every other organization having to do with our trip to make it possible and pleasant.

In conclusion, I wish to state that the committee sent with the Senator from Ohio and myself a very good representation. The Army sent a representative, the Navy sent a representative, and the Air Forces sent a representative. We had with us our own attorney, Mr. Meader. Everything was done to make it possible for us to ascertain the facts. If we had not ascertained the facts, I think it would have been our fault.

I wish also to say that the committee could not have sent a man who would have worked harder than did the Senator from Ohio, who accompanied me. He worked much harder than I did, and stayed with the work longer hours than did I. Incidentally, he is one of the most agreeable traveling companions whom I have ever known.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation of the statement which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] made on behalf of our subcommittee, and also his kind remarks with reference to my part in the investigation. In view of the interest expressed in the presentation made by the Senator from Delaware, and after consulting with the majority leader and the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make my statement at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday next, rather than at this late hour today. Therefore, without proceeding with the discussion at this time, I give notice that I shall ask for the floor on Monday next following the morning hour, in order to resume discussion of the matter to which the Senator from Delaware has addressed himself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Wallace Murray, of Ohio, now Director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iran; and

Felix Cole, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, consul general and first secretary of legation at Monrovia, Liberia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ethiopia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John F. X. McGohey to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral William B. Young, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be pay director in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David R. Nimmer to be brigadier general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William W. Rogers to be brigadier general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 15, 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

DIRECTOR OF BUDGET AND REPORTS

Capt. Ezra G. Allen to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 15, 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John F. X. McGohey to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

IN THE NAVY

William B. Young to be a pay director in the Navy with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from June 1, 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be brigadier generals for temporary service, from January 20, 1945

David R. Nimmer
William W. Rogers

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Henry J. Stein, Clinton.

MINNESOTA

Joseph C. Berg, Leroy.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Helen B. Hoven, Hoven.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who hast been our guide and companion in all the yesterdays, we pray that the memory of Thy goodness may inspire us to enter faithfully and courageously upon the tasks and duties of this day.

Fortify us against those specters of fear and cynicism which come to us in our hours of perplexity. Sustain us by Thy grace when our minds are baffled and our hearts are burdened. When we are tempted to surrender to futility and defeatism, may we seek more eagerly the counsel of Thy wisdom and the consolation of Thy love.

Enable us to keep a clear and steadfast vision of that day when the whole earth shall be illumined with the radiant splendor of the Prince of Peace and His spirit shall be triumphant. To Thy name we shall give all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on small business.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TALBOT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

REVISION OF CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a brief statement at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain such request if the statement exceeds 300 words.

Mr. KEOGH. It will not exceed that limit, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous authority of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, I have today introduced, as a reported bill, H. R. 2200, a bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, Crimes and Criminal Procedure. This bill is the result of intensive work over a period of a year in which distinguished members of the bench and bar of the country participated. During the progress of the revision, the committee sought to keep the entire membership of the House currently informed and sought always to invite suggestions and criticisms from the Members, as well as any citizens interested in the work. We renew this invitation with respect to the pending bill. It is our hope to place the bill on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar shortly, and I should be deeply obliged if those of the Members who are interested would be good enough to advise us of their reactions to the measure. This work is in furtherance of our committee's ultimate objective of enacting the entire United States Code into positive law and in conformity with our established slogan that "Making the laws understandable is as important as making the laws."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a sermon by the Most Reverend William A. Griffin, bishop of Trenton, at the pontifical mass honoring the heroes of Warsaw, Sunday, January 28, 1945, at St. Hedwig's Church, Trenton, N. J., and I also ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor James H. Griffiths, S. T. D., chancelor of the military ordinariate, at the pontifical mass for the victims of Warsaw at St. Hedwig's Church, Trenton, N. J., January 28, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on Lincoln delivered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] last Sunday at Ford's Theater.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] may be permitted to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Chattanooga News-Free Press on February 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include some short excerpts from public auction notices and from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain excerpts.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 20]

Biemiller	Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, Mich.
Bolton	Havenner	O'Hara
Boren	Hébert	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Heidinger	Reece, Tenn.
Colmer	Johnson,	Schwabe, Okla.
Curley	Lyndon B.	Short
Dawson	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
De Lacy	Kerr	Sumner, Ill.
Eaton	Kilday	Thomas, Tex.
Elliott	King	Vursell
Ervin	LaFollette	Wasielewski
Fuller	Landis	Weaver
Gardner	McMillan, S. C.	White
Hare	Morrison	Winter

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ninety-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 137 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if the Speaker will notify me after I have used 10 minutes, because I have promised time to other Members on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution or rule makes in order the bill S. 375, which has been unanimously reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is not a gag rule nor is it a closed rule. It provides for 4 hours of general debate after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule and any germane amendment will be in order, even the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], which would separate the ex-Secretary of Agriculture and ex-Vice President of the United States from membership on the Export-Import Bank. Though the amendment might be held in order I feel it should not be agreed to because I consider it a spite amendment which would add insult to injury to a great American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said to the effect that the Secretary of Commerce, when named, will have certain powers as a director or as ex-officio member of the bank. The Committee on Rules before acting called Mr. Leo Crowley, President of the Export-Import Bank, who made it clear that notwithstanding the fact that originally the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State had been requested by the President to incorporate this bank, he—Mr. Crowley—now is chairman and holds all of the common stock and has jurisdiction to name the directors or trustees; therefore the argument generally made that Mr. Wallace may control that bank is not well founded. I believe that in Mr. Crowley the Government has a splendid man, one who has demonstrated his fitness. Of course, this also applies to the ex-Vice President of the United States who has served this country with distinction not only as Secretary of Agriculture but also as Vice President and he has performed certain important functions for the country that were of great benefit to the United States; therefore the objection that has been raised to him as a member of the board I say is unfair and not justified, especially in view of the testimony of Mr. Crowley who has complete jurisdiction. In all fairness, I state, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Michigan is not entitled in fairness or justice to consideration and should be defeated.

I realize that there are some people who are opposed to ex-Vice President Wallace for any position but I cannot understand why. Is he dishonest? Is he not able? Has he not performed his duties splendidly and in the interest of our country? Oh, I surmise that some of these cartels and some of the representatives of the big institutions feel they may not be able to control him. Perhaps they will not, because he is a man who believes in justice and fairness; a man who will give the common people an opportunity to live and to exist decently. So I feel we should not add insult to injury and adopt the amendment that will be offered.

Of course, I am reminded that a similar political movement was undertaken many years ago, even longer than I can remember and longer than I have been a Member of this House. You may remember that President Jackson appointed Van Buren Minister to Great Britain, and the Senate refused to confirm him, but within a few short years Van Buren became the President of the United States. Perhaps your unfair activities here will bring about a similar condition and history may repeat itself.

I do not know, and I cannot understand, why some of the outstanding interests and reactionaries should be opposed to the New Deal. Is it not a fact that the New Deal brought greater prosperity to our country than any one ever dreamed of? Is it not a fact that the New Deal inherited a bankrupt country, when all the insurance companies were insolvent, and the banks were bankrupt, and that the only business that was flourishing were the undertakers because of the suicides that were taking place day in and day out?

We are today the most prosperous country in the world. Our people have over 100 billion dollars in bank deposits. Our income is over 168 billion dollars as compared to 42 billion dollars in 1932, or four times as great when the New Deal came in. Big business has reserves and surpluses of over 100 billion dollars. Forty corporations in the United States now have a capital of 88 billion dollars, twice as much as the national income under the Hoover administration in 1932. Our exports up to 1943 have increased 3 billion dollars. Our people are earning more money than ever before. No one can deny that every section of our country is enjoying greater prosperity than ever before, and especially the States of Virginia, Georgia, and Mississippi have enjoyed greater benefits under this New Deal administration than nearly any other State in the United States. Therefore, there must be another reason for the opposition. I am constrained to say that it must be because of prejudice against progressive and liberal policies as I actually do not believe that some of the Democratic Members who oppose administration-sponsored legislation or legislation in the interest of the common people are deliberately or willfully aiding the Republican Party, who, in the present instance, notwithstanding that ten of the Republican members of the Committee on Banking and Currency voted unanimously in committee for the reporting out of the bill, have commanded that they pursue the unfair course they are now following.

Mr. Speaker, years ago we who voted for relief legislation to reestablish business and to provide for employment to relieve the lot of the farmers and laboring people were labeled as "rubber stamp" Congressmen. I say to the reactionary Democratic Members opposing

this bill to examine the vote that will be cast by the Republican Members and they will find that they have voted to a man against the rule as well as against the bill. Until final action is taken on the bill, they will continue to use every parliamentary procedure and to pursue every dilatory tactic to defeat the bill in order that the Republican press may again point out in large headline articles to a Republican-Democratic coalition of opposition to this measure. But, Mr. Speaker, unless I am greatly mistaken, I feel that the good people of those States will not approve—yes, will resent—their representatives giving aid and comfort to their enemies.

Oh, I appreciate that some of you Republicans do not like to hear these facts. You never want to be reminded of the condition under Hoover, and you do not like to see or hear what has been done for the country by the New Deal under the leadership of the greatest President in the history of our country, Franklin D. Roosevelt, a man whom the world recognizes and acclaims the greatest statesman in the history of our country. Instead of making it easier and cooperating with him during these trying days, you are endeavoring to make his tasks still more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan stated before our committee that the President by appointing Mr. Wallace is again veering to the left. We did not hear a peep from him or other Republicans when he appointed Mr. Stettinius, Mr. Clayton, and other of his assistants. One does not have to stretch his imagination to realize that the amendment will be offered purely for political reasons. It should be defeated and I appeal to every honest, sincere Member who believes in justice, righteousness, and fair play not to be prevailed upon by the opposition to vote for this amendment. It is my hope that there will be very few gentlemen on our side who will be led astray by this clever, shrewd Republican maneuver. I urge the membership to read section 4 of the bill which plainly sets forth:

> No functions, powers, or duties shall be transferred from the Federal Loan Agency under the provisions of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or any other law unless the Congress shall otherwise by law provide.

I know that the membership will agree with me that the effect of this section makes unnecessary the consideration or adoption of the proposed amendment by the gentleman from Michigan with respect to the transfer of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, these are troublous times and the burdens of office weigh heavily upon the shoulders of our President and Commander in Chief. He has most graciously, in the interest of harmonious action in this critical period of war, agreed to the proposed legislation in its present form. I feel that the membership, regardless of on what side they may be, have been impressed and are pleased and gratified with his achievements and accomplishments and we owe it to ourselves to lessen his burdens and to cooperate in eliminating as many annoyances in order that he may continue to devote his great ability, courage, and statesmanship in bringing about an early ending to this horrible war and a lasting peace, happiness, and contentment to the suffering people the world over and, last but not least, the reuniting of our brave and courageous boys with their wives, families, and loved ones.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the best evidence that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules does not have a very good position in this matter is the fact that he has just completed a political address. I will leave that part about the greatness of the New Deal to the people of America, especially future generations, your children and my children, who will have to pay this $300,000,000,000 of debt.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman has stated, this is an open rule. It provides for 4 hours of general debate. Any amendments that are germane to the bill will be permitted.

I dislike to be opposed to any rule. Since I have been on the Committee on Rules I have tried to go along with the majority of the members of the committee. The best evidence of that is that only a few days ago we passed seven rules here without a roll call. Whenever the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], or others like them come before the Committee on Rules they explain the purposes, the designs, and the intentions of the bills concerning which they seek rules, and we do not have any trouble in letting the bills go through the Committee on Rules and passing them on the floor of the House without even a record vote.

What is the history of this bill, Mr. Speaker? Some time back the President of the United States wrote probably the most unjustifiable letter ever written in the history of this Nation by any President. He demanded the resignation of a faithful servant, Jesse Jones, a conservative and able man, as the political pay-off for someone who did some political work during the last campaign. He wanted to replace Jesse Jones with Mr. Wallace.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules has just stated that Mr. Wallace is a very able man. We know that he served as presiding officer of the United States Senate for 4 years. He associated with his colleagues in the Senate, and after that association still, but a week or two ago, his own colleagues, a majority of his own party, overwhelmingly said he is not capable, that he is not able to perform the duties connected with running the many loan agencies. They passed this Senate bill by a vote, I believe, of 74 to 12, denying him custodianship over these various agencies.

However, they forgot to take out one very important agency, the Export-Import Bank. I thought when they failed to do that, our Committee on Banking and Currency would of course consider this bill and bring in witnesses as they do in regard to every other bill, but instead they came before the Committee on Rules without any hearings. A few amendments were offered and withdrawn or voted down.

Then some unexplainable things happened before the Committee on Rules. It is true we had Mr. Crowley before our committee yesterday. He said he had authority to administer, to appoint the board of directors, that he had control of the stock. I quote him:

> I have made changes in the trustees from time to time. I have appointed men within the organization of the Export-Import Bank. I have appointed different ones from the State Department at various times, and the personnel has shifted from time to time. I have nominated different people from time to time. That is under my control, and I have the right to nominate anyone I want. There is nothing in the law that says I must appoint anyone at any particular time.

The Export-Import Bank was created by Executive order. Last year when Mr. Jones and Mr. Wallace were having trouble, the President through Executive order appointed Mr. Crowley to administer these many powers. If the President of the United States had the right then to appoint Mr. Crowley to have all these powers, he could rescind that order and write another Executive order giving Mr. Wallace all the powers that Mr. Crowley has at the present time. I believe and I hope that this body will vote down this rule. If not, I hope that you will vote to recommit this bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes here under rather extraordinary circumstances. While a majority of the Rules Committee is opposed to this rule, the committee did not feel it could withhold from the House the privilege of determining whether it wanted to consider the bill or not. The committee is opposed, two to one, to Mr. Wallace becoming Secretary of Commerce under any circumstances. They do not believe that the coat worn by Mr. Jones can be cut down to buttonhole size without destroying the entire garment. When the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency came before the Committee on Rules he stated that this bill should be handled as ordinary legislation and made to stand or fall upon its own merits. With that statement the Committee on Rules was in complete accord. While the committee had no desire or disposition to go behind the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but when the disclosure was made that the committee had held no hearings on the bill, the question arose naturally in the minds of the members of the Committee on Rules if the measure was being handled as ordinary legislation and if democratic procedure was being followed. The question that most disturbed the Committee on Rules was as to how to report this rule so that the House would have free opportunity to work its will on the measure. When the so-called Wolcott amendment was reduced to writing it was found to be major legislation within itself and the Com-

mittee on Rules could not within the limits of propriety report a rule making that amendment in order.

Now the impracticals, the pinks, the Reds, and the what nots who are clamoring for the naming of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, are not in position to accuse those who differ from them with acting upon prejudice without at the same time confessing the complete unfitness of Mr. Wallace for the place, for the adoption of the George bill was a vote of lack of confidence in Mr. Wallace, and also without at the same time confessing that the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency reporting this bill 27 to 0 was likewise a vote of lack of confidence. No Member who votes for the bill can be accused of acting from prejudice because they will have done no more than the Senate and the Committee on Banking and Currency in that their vote was one of lack of confidence.

Nobody has any desire to stand in the way of Mr. Wallace being rewarded for anything he may have done in the past, but there are those who feel that to put upon him the load that Jesse Jones has been carrying would break his back; that any engine that is all whistle pulls few cars.

I am not hostile to Mr. Wallace. I think he has many fine traits. I do not contend, as some, that he lives in the clouds, seldom planting his feet upon solid ground, but I do know, or I think I know, along with all common-sense people of this country, that this thought of bringing into existence here on earth a Utopia where nobody works but father and he would not work all day is sheer nonsense. Rivers flowing with milk and honey and streets paved with gold are not to be found this side of heaven.

I want to say to you, my friends, this measure comes to us under extraordinary circumstances. To discuss it entirely free of persons connected thereby is an impossibility. If you do not want Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, with all his fantastic dreams and his global schemes and fables of the sky, then you have that opportunity to say by voting down this rule. This is the time for realistic behavior on the part of the people's representatives. It is not mistakes of the past which should trouble us but the dangers that lie ahead that should challenge our deepest concern. If Mr. Wallace has not the qualifications to fill the Cabinet post of Secretary of Commerce as everyone admits, then why become a party to arrangements made whereby such a public calamity might become possible?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this rule in the committee and expect to vote against it on the floor, for two reasons. First, that while the rule is an open rule, in actuality it prevents the House of Representatives from considering three important amendments to the bill submitted in the Committee on Banking and Currency, and in that way will prevent the House expressing its will on three real and important issues.

Second, I oppose this rule because I feel that due legislative processes were not followed by the Committee on Banking and Currency in the consideration of this measure. The information I was able to obtain in the Rules Committee shows that the Committee on Banking and Currency spent less than 1 hour in considering this legislation—that it went into executive session and voted not to hold hearings, considered six or seven amendments, rejected them, and adjourned, all in less than 1 hour.

I believe, therefore, that by voting this rule down we may obtain the desired result, to wit, either a new or different rule which will permit the House to work its will, or to have the Banking and Currency Committee take back the measure, hold hearings on it, and consider the bill in the usual legislative way.

I hope the House will vote down this rule.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I have only 2 minutes.

By voting down the rule we will maintain and secure the right of this body to pass upon all amendments which have been suggested to this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks under the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, probably because of great congressional confidence in Jesse Jones, we permitted a system to grow up under which the great lending agencies of the Government came under the control of the Secretary of Commerce. This was bad practice. It needs to be corrected.

The country is looking to the Congress to reassume its proper responsibilities. We must by proper legislation bring about that measure of control and direction of our lending agencies which will assure the protection of the best interests of our people.

Of course, the removal of Jesse Jones and the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce has brought the Congress and the country to a sudden realization of the need for action. Probably an exception should be made of certain of the radical supporters of Mr. Wallace who first violently opposed this bill or anything like it, only to insist now that we pass it without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t" since they seem to believe that, without the passage of this legislation, Wallace cannot be confirmed.

At any event, the Senate postponed consideration of the Wallace appointment and passed this bill.

The question now is, Shall we adopt this rule and consider this bill? My answer is that we should defeat this rule and here is why:

This bill seeks to separate the lending agencies from the Secretary of Commerce. It is an important bill. And yet, the Banking and Currency Committee refused to hold hearings, refused amendments which should very properly be a part of this bill, and railroaded the bill through.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the committee stated there was no demand for hearings?

Mr. HALLECK. No; the testimony before the Rules Committee was that certain of the members of that committee insisted vigorously on the necessity for hearings and wanted to have hearings.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield briefly.

Mr. BARRY. As the gentleman knows, I have no particular enthusiasm for Mr. Wallace, but I cannot understand how 1 director out of 11 on the Export-Import Bank is very important one way or the other; and if we amend the bill to prohibit the Secretary of Commerce becoming a director it will convey to the people of the country that we have stripped the Secretary's Office of some important function.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further. If the gentleman will listen to what I have to say he will get the answer, and everyone else will get the answer.

I respect and admire the very able chairman of that committee, but as to lack of consideration, attention to, and an understanding of this bill, he stated at the outset before the Rules Committee that he did not know what other lending powers or agencies might be left in the Secretary of Commerce by this bill.

Now, if we are separating the lending agencies, a careful, considered, and complete job should be done. There is no reason to proceed piecemeal. The Export-Import Bank is one of the great lending agencies. It promises to become greater. It is now controlled by the Foreign Economic Administrator by virtue of his ownership of the common stock of the corporation transferred to him by Executive order at the time of the Jones-Wallace difficulty a year or so ago. If the gentleman from New York will bear with me now, may I say that in the first place the set-up of the bank is bad. It should be controlled by an independent board. But that is not all. Unless we do something about it, we may have another Executive order transferring the stock of the bank to the Secretary of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we might then find our taxpayers' money being used to pay that milk bill all over the world.

The point I want to make is, that certainly this is the time and the place to put the Export-Import Bank on a sound, continuing, commercial basis, subject to a measure of congressional control and direction. That the Banking and Currency Committee refused to do. It even refused to fairly consider it.

Mr. Speaker, there are other matters that should be considered and acted upon if we are to do a full and complete job with this bill. That is the reason why I moved in the Rules Committee to delay action until next Wednesday and that without success. Likewise did I make a futile attempt to so frame the rule that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] be made in order in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it the only thing for the House to do is to vote down this rule. Let the Banking and Currency Committee give this important matter careful and full consideration and then bring in a bill which will accomplish that which we should accomplish. Voting down this rule will not kill the bill. It will simply assure that we can do the job that we ought to do.

The minority members of the Banking and Currency Committee can speak for themselves, but I suspect that when they were rebuffed on all sides in their efforts to get hearings and amendments, and the issue arose as to whether to vote for some such bill separating some of the lending agencies or not to vote for it, they were motivated by many of the impulses that motivate a lot of us in our consideration of this matter. We want legislation but we want it to do the job that should be done.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I was asked the question when I appeared before the Rules Committee whether there were any lending agencies in the Department of Commerce and I said at that time I did not think there were. I have since made an investigation and I find there are no other lending agencies in the Department of Commerce. There are in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. HALLECK. It occurs to me, and I say this in all humility, that if that great committee, leading us in the House of Representatives, carrying the initial and primary responsibility for the determination, brought before the Rules Committee a measure, the extent of which they did not know, certainly that indicates we ought to vote this rule down and give them a chance to go over it and do what ought to be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States on Monday of this week sent a most able and scholarly message to this body in which he outlined the chaos that is going to confront Europe and the rest of this world when the present war is over. In great detail he outlined, very ably, the steps that will be necessary to make possible the foreign trade of this country and to provide the foreign credit that will be necessary to permit the world, this damaged and devastated world, to get back on its feet.

I intend to vote for these measures that will be recommended by the President at the proper time, provided that I, as an individual Member, feel deep down in my own heart that the man or men who will administer these almost unbelievable billions of dollars in the rehabilitation of this world see with a clear eye. I say further that it is perfectly obvious to anyone that if this program of the President, which he so carefully outlined on Monday of this week, is to be carried out, it will be carried out to a large extent by the Export-Import Bank, which must make these credits available. Yet I say, and I dare anybody to challenge this statement, that up until 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon there was not one Member of this body of 435 men and women who could tell you what the Export-Import Bank has been doing, how it is functioning, or how Mr. Crowley comes by his present authority.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I do know this, that the Committee on Banking and Currency could not give us that information. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] gave us a statement of what he understood the situation to be which, of course, was entirely hearsay. I know that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], gave us a somewhat different statement, and I know that we were compelled to sit in session all day yesterday, and it was only at 4 o'clock in the afternoon that we got a true story of this important bank, this important agency, which will be used under the President's plan to administer this money.

I say that on the basis of the record—and I do not say it critically of the Committee on Banking and Currency—they are handling big things; they have to; but I do say that on the record, on the lack of information that they were able to give us, this bill has been hastily considered, the rule has been precipitously adopted. It was adopted for one purpose, and that was so that the House could not say that the Committee on Rules is trying to bottle up legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rule be voted down and that the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized and directed to continue its study.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised to listen to the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, who just preceded me. If I interpret what he said correctly, he says even if the President of the United States recommended legislation that he favored and thought was necessary for the best interest of our country, that he would vote against it unless he personally felt that some individual was administering the law satisfactorily to him. That is a rather broad position to take.

This bill is before us to undo something that we did. The responsibility for the situation that exists rests upon the Congress of the United States. It is our responsibility because we brought that condition about by legislation that passed this body and passed the other body. I am frank in stating it should never have been done.

The present bill has, as its purpose and objective, undoing that which we did before and which we should not have done. Mixing the appointment of Mr. Wallace with the passage of this bill is unsound thinking, in my opinion. So far as most of my friends on the left are concerned, you and I know that it is politics, unadulterated politics, that prompts them to do that. The proper thing for us to do is to pass this bill and undo the harm that we have already done.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask if the gentleman feels upon reflection that this opposition is entirely politics?

Mr. McCORMACK. The effort, so far as voting down this rule is concerned, and so far as the Republican Party is concerned, and the great majority who will vote against ordering the previous question, I repeat, is unadulterated politics.

The House Committee on Banking and Currency has gone along in the regular procedure. There is nothing unusual about a committee of the House not holding hearings, particularly when hearings were held in the other body. We know that. The committee met and all the amendments were considered.

The rule before us is an open rule, not a closed rule. It is a rule that comes in in accordance with the established rules of the House. Those who oppose this rule want to go further. The chairman of every committee ought to be interested in preserving the open rule. If this happens with reference to every committee that reports out a bill, then it will lead to legislative chaos.

The rules of this House were established as the result of over 150 years of experience in this body, those who preceded us in this body, and you and I here today. This is an open rule, the most complete rule for legislative consideration.

Speaking for the majority leadership of this House on this bill, I urge that the previous question be ordered and that the rule be adopted.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, up to the present time this matter has not been considered without rancor. I hope the House today, however, will decide this matter on the very broad issue of

whether the Congress desires to exercise its constitutional duty and become again an integral part of the Government of the United States.

It is unfortunate that a personality enters into this debate, because there are issues involved transcending any personality, any group, or any political faction.

I speak today not only for myself but I know for many on both sides of this aisle who have exhibited a great deal of concern in respect to the trend which America is taking, the trend toward socialism, the trend toward fascism or nazi-ism or communism or some other kind of ism. There is a decided trend in America today toward some form of collectivism, with its attendant abuses and destruction of the American way of life.

All we ask is that this House in accordance with democratic processes be given an opportunity to assume and voice its responsibility in respect to important Government issues.

Before the Committee on Banking and Currency this great issue of whether the American people, the sovereign power, through their trustees, you and me, are going to exercise the constitutional duty which we are sworn to observe, was presented, and we were voted down.

We were voted down, and we reported out this bill unanimously, because we had faith and confidence in the great Committee on Rules of the House to make in order amendments which would not only crystallize this issue of whether the American way of life shall continue but whether we should have a voice in it. That is why we reported this bill out. The Committee on Rules, as I understand it, from the remarks made by Members today, are divided on this rule, six of them, at least, being against the rule. However, they did not think that they should stifle any opportunity for the House to be heard on it. So the matter is clearly before the House today as to whether we shall exercise our constitutional prerogatives to protect and defend the Constitution and exercise our duties as Members of the Congress under the Constitution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], it seems to me, got himself in a rather awkward position when he accused the majority of us who are voting against this rule of being prompted by unadulterated politics. I am not answering for Members on the other side, but the Members on the Democratic side who are disturbed over this proposition to the extent of helping to vote down this rule are just as good Democrats as the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Members around me who are going to vote for the rule say plainly that they are doing it because they are afraid Mr. Wallace might also get control of the R. F. C.

When this bill came over here it came with a vote of a lack of confidence in Mr. Wallace to handle the R. F. C.—a vote of more than 6 to 1.

My contention is that if it is dangerous for him to have control of the R. F. C., it is just as dangerous for him to have the powerful position of Secretary of Commerce. For that reason, I for one expect to vote against this rule, and if the rule is adopted, I expect to vote for a straight motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the matter of the necessity for the reorganization of the management of the Export-Import Bank. It appears in the press as late as the day before yesterday that Mr. Crowley would be before the Congress sometime during this session asking for an increase in capital of $1,500,000,000. The capital of the Export-Import Bank at the present time is $700,000,000. The Export-Import Bank has done, on that capital, over a $3,000,000,000 business. It is a tremendous thing to contemplate when we expand that capital to $2,200,000,000, how broad the scope of the activity of the Export-Import Bank can be. Yet the authority to manage that bank is virtually in one man today. The disposition of the voting stock is vested in the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, and is now in the hands of Leo Crowley. Now, Leo Crowley is a delightful individual. I respect him. He has done a splendid job. But we have no more assurance that Leo Crowley will remain at the head of the Federal Economic Administration, of which the Export-Import Bank is a part, than we had assurance that Jesse Jones would remain at the head of the Federal Loan Agency. There is nothing in the law today which would prevent the President from naming Earl Browder to the board of the Export-Import Bank, transferring every dollar of voting stock to Earl Browder. And you would not have one single thing to say about it. Perhaps Mr. Wallace's efforts along the line of global economic and social reform are advisable. I contribute to the thought that there must be global economic and social readjustment, but as a trustee of the sovereign power of this Nation I insist upon the right of this Congress to establish the standards under which that readjustment and those reforms should take place.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sorry but I cannot yield now.

Mr. Speaker, I may paraphrase the words of a great American. It seems to me it does not make any difference whether I am a Republican or whether I am a Democrat, I am primarily an American. It matters not what others in this House do or how they interpret their obligation toward the sovereign people of this Nation, I feel it is my duty to do everything I can to protect the American people against this very decided trend toward the socialization of America. So far as I am able physically and mentally, I am going to continue to combat any attempts on the part of any individual to effectuate any reforms, economic, social, or otherwise, with the taxpayers' money, unless the Congress of the United States has something to say about it.

Now, what do we do with respect to this amendment? We create the Export-Import Bank of Washington as an independent agency of the Government. We transfer the voting power to this board, members of which must be confirmed by the Senate, after nomination by the President. We pattern it after the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, so that you and I may have some voice in the management of it, the same as we have a voice now in the management of all of the agencies under the Federal Loan Agency.

Let me close with this: It is more important that we exercise jurisdiction over the Export-Import Bank than it is that we exercise control over the Federal Loan Agency, for the reason that the Federal loan agencies operate primarily domestically, and the Export-Import Bank operates internationally and is in a position to influence our foreign policies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] in his expression of hope that we may dispose of this matter dispassionately. We are going to have a great many serious questions, and I hope we will be able to consider them calmly as time rolls along.

It seems to me that what the Committee on Banking and Currency may have done or failed to do in the way of hearings or otherwise is completely answered by the fact that every member of that committee, 27 in number, was present and voted to report this bill, and there is no minority report.

The complaint against the rule is that it does not go beyond the general rules of the House. It was suggested that this particular rule should go beyond the general rules, and waive the time-honored rule of germaneness on certain features. This is tantamount to an attack upon the rule of germaneness so long observed in this House, and points a course of action which by confusion and conflicts of the subject matter has in the past more than once resulted in no legislation. To say that if the pending rule is not adopted the House will be unable to work its will on the bill thereby made in order is to maintain that the rules of the House are inadequate. If you vote down this rule you are saying that the rules of the House adopted by you are not adequate to enable you to work your will upon a given piece of legislation.

Since the bill proposes the transfer from the Secretary of Commerce certain powers and duties relating to the Federal Loan Agency, in particular the R. F. C., it seems clear, at least to me, that an amendment would be in order under the rule of germaneness prohibiting the Secretary of Commerce from exercising any powers or duties connected with the Federal Loan Agency, particularly the Export-Import Bank, if the House is disposed to go that far. But that is quite a different thing from undertaking in the consideration of this

measure a complete reorganization of the Export-Import Bank, or dealing with the war powers of the President.

It is well understood, I think, that Congress is to consider at an early date the important question of the Export-Import Bank. In the meantime it is distinctly not under the control of the Secretary of Commerce. The Honorable Jesse Jones was formerly in control of both R. F. C. and the Export-Import Bank, and when he became Secretary of Commerce he carried these agencies with him under a special arrangement by reason of his proven experience and fitness. Those functions and duties have long since been transferred to and are now under the control of the Director of Economic Warfare, whose ability is nowhere questioned.

It is my understanding that the only function or duty that the Secretary of Commerce might presently exercise in connection with the Export-Import Bank would be to act as one of its several directors. It seems clear that the House may, if it sees fit, in the consideration of the pending bill prevent even that, but I could never give my own assent to any such course. It is, in my opinion, wholly unnecessary and smacks too much of persecution.

I have hardly any personal acquaintance with Hon. Henry A. Wallace, nor can I follow far his school of thought. But it should be remembered that he served not without distinction as Secretary of Agriculture during a considerable period in which agriculture gained at least some measure of relief from its long distress. He has since served as Vice President of the United States. He is now chosen to head the Department of Commerce by one who has four times received a mandate from the American people. We should have a care not to violate their ever-present demand for fair play by stripping a Cabinet officer of some petty power or duty just because we happen not to approve the appointment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that never in my life have I heard of such a proposition as the House refusing to allow consideration of a bill unanimously reported out by a committee when every member of the committee was present and voted to report it. You may say some should not have voted for it, just as we heard a little while ago from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. It is a rule of our committee that when a member votes to report out a bill he may reserve the privilege of changing his mind and voting otherwise in the House if he wishes. No such reservation was made.

I am speaking from the minutes. All 27 members voted to report out the bill, and not a single reservation was made. Am I to believe that Members on the other side of the aisle will not be fair enough to let us discuss this bill and pass on the merits of same?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the rule.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 202, nays 192, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—202

Allen, La.	Gorski	Outland
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gossett	Pace
	Granahan	Patman
Bailey	Granger	Patrick
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Patterson
Barden	Green	Philbin
Barrett, Pa.	Gregory	Pickett
Barry	Harless, Ariz.	Poage
Bates, Ky.	Harris	Powell
Beckworth	Hart	Price, Fla.
Bland	Havenner	Price, Ill.
Bloom	Hays	Priest
Bonner	Healy	Quinn, N. Y.
Boren	Hébert	Rabaut
Bradley, Pa.	Hedrick	Rabin
Brooks	Heffernan	Rains
Brown, Ga.	Hendricks	Ramspeck
Bryson	Hobbs	Randolph
Buckley	Hoch	Rayfiel
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Resa
Bunker	Hook	Richards
Burch	Huber	Riley
Burgin	Hull	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Camp	Jackson	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Mo.	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Carnahan	Johnson, Luther A.	Rogers, N. Y.
Celler		Rooney
Chapman	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rowan
Cheif		Ryter
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Clements	Kee	Sadowski
Cochran	Kefauver	Sasscer
Coffee	Kelley, Pa.	Savage
Combs	Kelly, Ill.	Sheppard
Cooley	Keogh	Sheridan
Cooper	Kilday	Sikes
Crosser	King	Snyder
D'Alesandro	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Daughton, Va.	Kopplemann	Sparkman
Davis	Lane	Spence
Dawson	Lanham	Starkey
Delaney, James J.	Lea	Stewart
	Lesinski	Stigler
Delaney, John J.	Link	Sullivan
	Ludlow	Sumners, Tex.
Dickstein	Lyle	Tarver
Dingell	Lynch	Thom
Domengeaux	McCormack	Thomason
Doughton, N. C.	McGlinchey	Tolan
Douglas, Calif.	Madden	Torrens
Douglas, Ill.	Mahon	Traynor
Doyle	Maloney	Trimble
Drewry	Manasco	Vinson
Durham	Mansfield, Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Earthman		Walter
Eberharter	Mansfield, Tex.	Weaver
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	Weiss
Fallon	Miller, Calif.	West
Feighan	Mills	Whitten
Fernandez	Monroney	Whittington
Fisher	Morgan	Wickersham
Flannagan	Murdock	Winstead
Flood	Murphy	Wood
Fogarty	Neely	Woodhouse
Folger	Norton	Woodrum, Va.
Forand	O'Brien, Ill.	Worley
Gallagher	O'Brien, Mich.	Zimmerman
Geelan	O'Neal	
Gordon	O'Toole	

NAYS—192

Abernethy	Arends	Blackney
Adams	Arnold	Boykin
Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Brehm
Andersen, H. Carl	Baldwin, N. Y.	Brown, Ohio
	Barrett, Wyo.	Brumbaugh
Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Buck
Andresen, August H.	Beall	Buffett
	Bell	Butler
Andrews, Ala.	Bennet, N. Y.	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bennett, Mo.	Campbell
Angell	Bishop	Canfield
Carlson	Hand	O'Konski
Case, N. J.	Hartley	Peterson, Ga.
Case, S. Dak.	Henry	Phillips
Chenoweth	Herter	Pittenger
Chiperfield	Heselton	Ploeser
Church	Hess	Plumley
Clason	Hill	Powers
Clevenger	Hinshaw	Ramey
Cole, Kans.	Hoeven	Rankin
Cole, Mo.	Hoffman	Reed, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Holmes, Mass.	Reed, N. Y.
Corbett	Holmes, Wash.	Rees, Kans.
Cox	Hope	Rich
Cravens	Horan	Rizley
Crawford	Howell	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cunningham	Jenkins	
Curtis	Jennings	Robertson, Va.
Dirksen	Jensen	Robsion, Ky.
Dolliver	Johnson, Calif.	Rockwell
Dondero	Johnson, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.
Dworshak	Johnson, Ind.	Roe, Md.
Ellis	Jones	Rogers, Mass.
Ellsworth	Jonkman	Schwabe, Mo.
Elsaesser	Kean	Scrivner
Elston	Kearney	Shafer
Engel, Mich.	Keefe	Sharp
Fellows	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Fenton	Kinzer	Slaughter
Fuller	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Fulton	Kunkel	Smith, Ohio
Gamble	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Gathings	Latham	Smith, Wis.
Gavin	LeCompte	Springer
Gearhart	LeFevre	Stefan
Gerlach	Lemke	Stevenson
Gibson	Lewis	Stockman
Gifford	Luce	Sumner, Ill.
Gillespie	McConnell	Sundstrom
Gillette	McCowen	Taber
Gillie	McDonough	Talbot
Goodwin	McGehee	Talle
Graham	McGregor	Taylor
Grant, Ind.	McKenzie	Thomas, N. J.
Griffiths	McMillen, Ill.	Tibbott
Gross	Martin, Iowa	Towe
Gwinn, N. Y.	Martin, Mass.	Vorys, Ohio
Gwynne, Iowa	Mason	Vursell
Hagen	Merrow	Wadsworth
Hale	Michener	Weichel
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.	Wigglesworth
	Mott	Wilson
Hall, Leonard W.	Mundt	Wolcott
	Murray, Tenn.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Halleck	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff, Mich.
Hancock	Norrell	

NOT VOTING—37

Bender	Hare	Reece, Tenn.
Biemiller	Harness, Ind.	Russell
Bolton	Heidinger	Schwabe, Okla.
Bradley, Mich.	Judd	Short
Cannon, Fla.	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	LaFollette	Thomas, Tex.
Courtney	Landis	Wasielewski
Curley	McMillan, S. C.	Welch
De Lacy	May	White
Eaton	Morrison	Winter
Elliott	O'Hara	Wolverton, N. J.
Ervin	Peterson, Fla.	
Gardner	Pfeifer	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Biemiller for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. De Lacy for, with Mr. Harness of Indiana against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma against.

Mr. Wasielewski for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mr. Curley for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

General pairs:

Mr. May with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Gardner with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Kerr with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. LaFollette.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I desire at the outset to say that this morning I introduced a bill for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. That is the bill for which the President asked consideration and passage in his message to the Congress on Monday.

We all realize that there is a rapidly world expanding economy in a contracting world. We have tried to settle international disputes in the past by political considerations, we have tried to settle them by the adjustment of territorial boundaries, but this is a new venture in international relations to establish an economic set-up that may bring good will and future peace and prosperity to the world.

Mr. Chairman, today in both Houses of Congress, on each side of the central dome which stands as a symbol of unity, an historic piece of legislation is being introduced in Congress.

It is an auspicious time to introduce legislation which we hope will serve as one of the cornerstones of the "just and lasting peace among ourselves and other nations" for which Abraham Lincoln voiced the hope many years ago. This is a good time for us to act—following so closely upon the Crimean Conference.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which I am about to introduce is a bill to assure the economic side of world peace. The first action by any of the 44 participating nations to confirm the proposals made at the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference is being inaugurated in the United States Congress today. It is our honor, our privilege, and our responsibility, to be the first legislative body to take this initial step toward outlawing economic warfare on the earth and to set in motion a positive program for economic peace.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, was written on Capitol Hill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and I together with our Senate colleagues, Senator WAGNER, of New York, and Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, studied these problems on a nonpartisan basis. The four of us were among the delegates at the Bretton Woods Conference. There we discussed international monetary problems with the representatives of 43 other nations. In the 8 months since Bretton Woods we have been collaborating with other legislators to prepare a bill which will make the international monetary fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development an integral part of world-wide economic cooperation after the war. Technical aid and assistance from the executive branch has been graciously provided on our request.

This bill, which is being introduced by Senators WAGNER and TOBEY in identical form today, is the fruit of cooperation and collaboration on a national and on an international level. It is the fruit of nonpartisan cooperation, the work of Representatives and Senators, of Republicans and Democrats, of the legislative and executive branches.

The ground work for political peace was laid at Dumbarton Oaks and furthered at the Crimea Conference. The basis of military peace is being carved out with explosives and projectiles, at the cost of millions of human lives, on the western front, the eastern front, and in the Pacific. It is my heartfelt hope that we in Congress will consider well, above and beyond considerations of partisan politics, and that we will do well, in the spirit of cooperation and collaboration that has carried the work thus far, the job that is before us of paving the high-road to economic peace.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the House on the vote just taken. It is carrying into effect democratic processes. It would be a futile and indefensible thing if the House failed under the rules of the House to consider legislation that had been brought to the House by unanimous vote of a legislative committee.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some criticism of the Banking and Currency Committee because extended hearings were not held in regard to this measure. The issue is simple. Of course, if you inject into a simple bill all of the collateral issues that might be injected, you are going to make a complicated matter out of it. But no such issues are presented here. The issue is not involved.

Secretary Jones was Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He built that great financial empire that extends not only throughout this country but throughout many other sections of the world. He built it with skill; he is a financial genius; and when he was made Secretary of Commerce, he was Federal Loan Administrator. All of these agencies were put in the Commerce Department because Jesse Jones was made Secretary of Commerce. The Congress and the President at that time wanted him to administer it.

Mr. Chairman, that was personal legislation, and personal legislation is always dangerous. There was no other reason why these great financial institutions should be placed in the Commerce Department except that Jesse Jones was the Secretary of Commerce. When he is no longer Secretary of Commerce, it is the opinion of all of us that those lending agencies should be restored to their former status. I think that that is a correct solution of the problem. I think they ought to be taken out of the Department of Commerce, and I think they ought to be independent agencies of Government, whoever might be Secretary of Commerce, because they have no relationship to the Department of Commerce, and they do not belong there.

I am amused at hearing the statements made that the minority are going to prevent dangerous tendencies of the Government and that future generations are going to render their decision as to this act.

We do not have to go to the future generations. Last November we had the verdict of the American people, and they set their seal of approval on a President who three times before that had been overwhelmingly elected President of the United States. It seems to me that the majority has spoken, and although some of you are afraid of the future actions of the President, as you seem to be, the American people as a whole are not afraid of him. It has been suggested by some of our Republican colleagues that the President might select Earl Browder as the chairman of this great financial institution. That is an entirely unjustified reflection upon the President of the United States who has shown his abilities and the American people have demonstrated that he has their confidence and that he has retained it longer than almost any man in public life. This bill not only takes the lending agencies out of the Department of Commerce, but provides a comprehensive method for the auditing of their accounts. The General Accounting Office is the agent of the Congress. It is presided over by a man who once held a place of great distinction in this body, the Honorable Lindsay Warren. Under the provision of this bill the General Accounting Office will make an independent audit of all of the lending agencies owned by the Federal Government. It will be an efficient and honest audit. It will be an audit made by capable people. They will not only report the financial condition of those institutions to us but the Comptroller General will tell us whether or not, in his opinion, they have proceeded within the law and whether or not they have violated any of their duties.

I think that this is a most important measure, and we should always have the advice and the assistance of this great independent agency.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. When the amendment was proposed in the Senate by Senator BYRD it read "the financial transactions of wholly owned Government corporations shall be audited." When it is printed in the Senate bill, and the bill which we referred out of our committee, it reads "financial transactions with Government corporations."

Does that mean a corporation in which the Government owns all of the stock?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; in my opinion, it means the corporations in which the Government owns the stock.

Mr. BARRY. All of the stock?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; I should say all of the stock. "Owned or controlled," I do not know what that phrase would mean.

Mr. BARRY. Because the change in the language might be interpreted to mean corporations in which the Government has a majority of the stock or a minority of the stock.

Mr. SPENCE. I think the bill is intended to refer only to wholly Government-owned corporations.

I think an amendment providing for audit of agencies "owned or controlled" by the Federal Government would be exceedingly difficult of construction.

I think the only practicable statement of the law would be that they should audit wholly Government-owned institutions.

Mr. BARRY. Where the Government owns all the stock?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am just a little bit baffled by the statement the chairman has just made. I understood him to say he did not know what "all Government corporations" included.

Mr. SPENCE. I know what the Government corporations include. Under this bill they are corporations that are wholly owned by the Government. But as to what are Government-controlled corporations, as proposed in the amendment, I have no definition for that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As that language is used in the bill in section 5, then, what does the bill mean when it says that the financial transactions of all Government corporations shall be audited?

Mr. SPENCE. It means the corporations owned by the Government, in my interpretation. "Government-controlled corporations" was the language of the proposed amendment. I do not think anybody would know just how far that would go or just what corporations it would apply to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does that mean 100-percent owned or 51-percent owned?

Mr. SPENCE. I cannot yield further.

Of course there is politics in this bill. Who will deny it? Who will say there is not politics in the bill when you look over the vote that has just been recorded?

May I say another thing. Many of you think you are destroying Henry Wallace. It is beside the question as to whether or not he is well qualified to administer this great financial institution that is about to be taken from the Department of Commerce. But more men have been made powerful by persecution than by praise, and you are going in a peculiar way to destroy him. I think what you are intending to do will build him up rather than hurt him. The most vigorous denunciator of Henry Wallace will not dare compare him with Daugherty or Fall. His life has been incorruptible. He has been an honorable man, and I do not believe anybody will deny it. In saying that I do not disparage the services of Jesse Jones. But no man can say that Wallace has not rendered faithfully the services the people have charged him with.

Taking that into consideration, why has not the President of the United States the right to appoint the man of his choice as Secretary of Commerce? I think the only thing that Congress has the right to consider is his moral character. If we attempt to legislate, attempt to place duties upon great departments of government with reference to the peculiar beliefs of the men who are about to administer them, we will have a government as unstable as water and as variable as the wind.

We want a government of laws, a government of stable laws, a government that will not be changed because of the ideas of the legislators, as to the peculiar beliefs or characteristics of the incumbents of public office.

That would be most inadvisable and a poor way to legislate. I hope that the Congress will consider this bill with dispassionate reason. I know no argument that I can make and no argument that anybody else can make will have any effect upon the vote.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. In view of the pending amendments I believe the chairman should explain to the House we are going to hold hearings shortly on the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; we will hold hearings on the Export-Import Bank in the near future.

Mr. BARRY. That is the proper time in which to amend or reorganize that agency.

Mr. SPENCE. It will be necessary to hold hearings. The Export-Import Bank has asked for a large increase in its borrowing powers. Before this year is over we will have to hold extensive hearings with reference to the bank. At that time all of these amendments can be considered and we will go into that subject exhaustively. That is the time to consider these questions and not to consider them as collateral issues to this bill which is simple both in its language and in its purpose. It cannot be misunderstood.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. During the first administration of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Agriculture he was invited to a meeting of the National Grange in my city of Hartford, the insurance center of the world. When he came to my city, the executives and the presidents of the insurance companies of my town invited Henry Wallace to a luncheon. I was present and listened to words of praise and good will of him because of his accomplishments in helping to save what many of us believe to be the greatest financial institution of the world—insurance. He did this through his economic policy of saving the farms and the farmers. Our insurance companies held mortgages on these farms, which were in default, and as a result the insurance companies were in danger. The genius and ability of Mr. Wallace was proven, and millions of policyholders today are thankful.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say we ought to take our vote on more solid and more substantial considerations than personalities. If the vote is not based upon that, but upon the merits, you will vote to take this great lending institution out of the Department of Commerce and reestablish it as an independent agency of the Government, as it was before the Honorable Jesse Jones took it with him into the Department of Commerce. I do not see any reason why politics should be injected into this. You may say that the other body has cast upon us a responsibility which is not ours. I do not think that is true. We have an obligation and a duty to perform. The act is a meritorious act and should be passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the Member speaking in this body may not refer to the Senate or Senators.

Mr. SPENCE. I corrected that. I understand that. I called them the other body. Does the gentleman think that is sufficient? If this bill is not passed, it may result in the gentleman who has been Vice President of the United States and Secretary of Agriculture becoming the Secretary of Commerce with all of these immense lending agencies under his jurisdiction and control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes. During my career in Congress I have had my ears boxed a good many times for the things I thought were right, proper, and patriotic. Of course, we will abide by the majority which has indicated by its vote that they want to consider this legislation without any opportunity to do a whole job. I think if we had had the time and the opportunity to develop the issues as they were developed before the Committee on Rules there would have been little or no question that there would have been sufficient votes to have defeated the rule.

In so doing it would have been possible for the Committee on Banking and Currency to have held hearings on this bill and corrected all of the abuses which have been charged against the administration of any of the lending agencies. We could have done a whole job, as it is expected we shall do.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. The gentleman from Michigan will remember that at the close of our very brief executive session devoted to this bill I made protest against the practice of not holding hearings on such an important measure. I stated then that I regarded it as most unfortunate that hearings were not held. This point and the reasons therefor are being developed by the gentleman from Michigan, and I am sure he will support me in my statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I not only support the gentleman but I want to thank him for calling attention to the fact at this point that demands were made for hearings, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, indicated by a question that no demand had ever been made for hearings. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] would remember that when we appeared before the Rules Committee we predicated the necessity for opening the rule sufficiently so that certain amendments could be made in order, on the fact that we had demanded the right to have a hearing in the committee, and had been denied that right by a majority vote. We expected the Committee on Rules to give us an opportunity to amend the bill so that we would do a complete job. I say it is unfortunate that we did not have the opportunity to develop those issues before this committee, as we did before the Committee on Rules, because it is very apparent from the remarks made by members of the Rules Committee that the majority of the Rules Committee did not favor the adoption of the rule.

The remarks which have been made this afternoon in respect to Henry Wallace show the danger of building legislation around an individual. I was a little surprised, if not amazed, at the remarks made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN] praising Mr. Wallace as a gentleman and a great administrator. He and others who have lauded Mr. Wallace today have said that he was a man of great ability, in whom the country had great confidence; a man of integrity. Nobody denies he is a man of integrity. The ironical part of it all is that you who are lauding him, you who are praising him, are voting to take these powers away from him. Why are you doing it? Have you not such faith and confidence in Henry Wallace that you would leave with him the management of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Defense Plans Corporation and several other corporations under the lending agencies which have available $33,207,017,057, of lending power? Have you not confidence enough in Henry Wallace that you will vote against this bill to make it possible for this great exponent of everything which is good in government and in the world to administer the functions of an agency which has obligations outstanding today of $12,604,105,996? That shows the danger of building legislation around an individual. It shows the reason why we should do a much better job than we can today by giving a great deal of consideration to legislation which will enable the Congress to reclaim some of the powers and prerogatives vested in it by the Constitution which it has erroneously or otherwise delegated to the executive establishment. As a matter of permanent policy are you going to continue agencies which are not responsible to the Congress?

There is not any question of war in this bill; there is not any question of victory in the amendments which have been suggested making the Export-Import Bank an independent agency of the Government, because that agency will not function fully until after the war. What we are doing in a great deal of the legislation we are considering is building a foundation for a post-war social and economic structure, as I understand it, under the Constitution, which will make it possible for America to continue to progress. Just a word in this particular to those gentlemen who say—and we all have received such letters—we must have a certain individual administer certain agencies of the Government, otherwise we are not going to employ 60,000,000 people. We should have in mind, of course, in accomplishing that goal that at the present time about 62,500,000 people are gainfully employed in the United States, and that 60,000,000 is only two and one-half million less than we are employing now at the peak of our production, the all-time peak of our production. But that is a desirable goal, and I do not know of a man or woman worthy of the name "American citizen" who does not sympathize, contribute all he can, and cooperate with any one who will make that possible. Surely there is nothing partisan in that statement, because if the result of the election last November had been different, had a Republican been elected as the Chief Executive of the United States, you good Democrats surely would have cooperated as effectively with him as we on the Republican side are willing to cooperate with the President today, tomorrow, and for the next 4 years in making possible full employment, all of the employment which our economy can stand. It does not make any difference who is President of the United States, it does not make any difference who is administrator of the Federal lending agencies, it does not make any difference who manages the affairs of the Export-Import Bank, he is not going to influence many jobs. As a matter of fact, it would be difficult for the Congress to stop the post-war prosperity which is bound to be with us. It is bound to come.

Mr. Chairman, this country is prosperous because we believe in free enterprise, we believe in freedom of activity in respect to our daily pursuits, we believe in the competitive system, we believe in making it possible for a lowly individual without capital to become a wealthy individual through his own efforts and the efforts of those with whom he might associate himself. That is what our form of government stands for. It is our form of government that has made it possible for America to become the greatest nation under God's heaven—economically, financially, and, we hope, spiritually.

Let us see how big a country we have and how far we have gone. We have about 7 percent of the world's population. We normally produce and consume 50 percent of the world's goods. Now, having that in mind, let us review some of the dreams which have been put forth and published in the last few years in respect to our participation in international affairs—politically, economically, and socially. As I understand, certain of these philosophies in respect to global, economic, and social reforms, they teach that we should build an imaginary stock pile of world goods. All of the countries should contribute all of their products. In other words, they teach that all of the nations of the world shall contribute to this imaginary stock pile of world goods. If we can visualize it, we see this stock pile of all the manufactured goods, all the fruits of the production of our farms in this stock pile; then under their theory of raising the standards of living of all the people throughout the world, we start distributing from that stock pile on a per capita basis. Figuratively, we are told we should put a bottle of milk on everyone's doorstep. We start distributing from this imaginary stock pile on a per capita basis and America gets back 7 percent of the world's goods, although she has contributed 50 percent of the world's goods.

Our standard of living under this philosophy of global economic reform drops from 50 to 7. That shows how serious this whole situation is, and how important it is for us to reflect on whether we want to make it possible for any of these theories—whether they are Mr. Wallace's theories or not is immaterial—to be effectuated until we, the trustees of the people's sovereignty, establish the standards under which this redistribution process takes place.

We are concerned, as I said, not only with Mr. Wallace. Mr. Wallace is merely an individual, the same as you and I. Mr. Wallace, you, and I, could pass out of existence tonight, and this great country of ours, because of the standards which we have created, would go on, forever progressing, slowly, but surely, leading the other nations of the world economically, socially, and spiritually, and not tagging on behind them.

It is not necessary for us to subordinate our political existence as a Nation to that of any other nation in the world. The world is looking to America today for leadership. They are looking to us for credits with which to rehabilitate and with which to reconstruct the devastated areas. If we destroy the America which our ancestors and we have built, then we will be in no position to lead the other nations of the world and we will be in no position to make available the fruits of our industries and our farms in order that their standards of living might be increased. There is a social problem involved in increasing the standard of living of any people. We studied it when we set up the slum-clearance program. A great archbishop told us that slum clearance was as much a social problem as it was a matter of bricks and mortar and lumber and plumbing. He recited as an example the fact in the great city of Boston certain people who enjoyed a high standard of living, a social standard higher than those in other quarters,

moved, shall we say, uptown, out of clean homes into more modern homes, and the slum dwellers moved into these homes that had been vacated. Inside of 2 weeks, lo and behold, these good, clean homes became hovels; they became slums. So the good archbishop told us that in order to effectually clear the slums in our large cities we must create in the slum dwellers a desire for a higher standard of living, otherwise although you might create castles for some of the slum dwellers the castles might become hovels. So it is with increasing or raising the standard of living of the Hottentots. I use that term inasmuch as it has been used before.

You first have to create a desire in those people for a higher standard of living. Any large amount of material things which you give to them without accompanying it by an educational program encouraging them to a higher standard of living will be that much waste. There will not only be waste of material goods but, because of these philosophies of global economic and social reform, there will be a wasting away of our economic, political, and social position in the world proportionate as we give of our money and our credits and our materials to people who are not ready for a higher standard of living. That is why some of us perhaps may be excused for advocating that we proceed with caution in order that we may effectuate our purpose and not destroy it, as so many would do if their theories were adopted today.

Let us get to the meat of this coconut, which is the Export-Import Bank. At the present time the Congress has practically no control over the Export-Import Bank. The Congress has no control whatsoever over the use of the Export-Import Bank funds which might be used in the development of a foreign policy which would negative any policy which we might establish through treaty or otherwise.

I like to think that we accomplished something at Dumbarton Oaks. Many of us like to think that we took a step in the right direction at Bretton Woods. There is such a close affiliation between the use of the Export-Import Bank and the funds and resources of that bank in world affairs, and Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods, that this Congress cannot in justice to any of those subjects divorce the Export-Import Bank and its potentialities from them.

We are going to be asked during this session of Congress to authorize appropriations of almost $8,000,000,000 for the reconstruction of Europe and Asia and for the physical rehabilitation of the countries which have been devastated in this war. We are going to be asked to provide billions more in credit in order that they may acquire the heavy goods, the producer goods, which will make possible economic rehabilitation. So this picture has to be viewed as a whole, not one little piece, and the Committee on Banking and Currency should sit down with this whole picture, at least with all the pieces of the picture, and try to put them together so that when it does come out here on this floor you, the representatives of the people, will have the whole picture and not a piece of it. It cannot be done if we allow the considerations of any individual in the Government, no matter who it is, to warp our judgment. You might say, "I believe in his philosophies," but you cannot say it honestly and safely without studying them. So you cannot say, "I believe in the Export-Import Bank" until you know within what limitations the Export-Import Bank is to function. We have no control whatsoever over the operation of the Export-Import Bank. It is an integral part of this whole picture. Therefore, before we consider the provisions of this bill in respect to the loan agencies which are integral parts of it, before we consider Bretton Woods, before we appropriate one more dollar for international use, we must put this picture together so that you and all the people of this Nation will know where we are going.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who preceded me said that in his judgment it made very little difference who was President of the United States in regard to jobs and in regard to post-war prosperity. I can remember back a few years when the only thing we were told and the only steps that were being taken for jobs was the promise that prosperity was just around the corner. Then the American people decided to make a change. They decided to make a change from the 12 years during the 1920's, when we were building on a false foundation which resulted in the biggest depression in American history. They demanded and they got a New Deal. I think the fact that Mr. Roosevelt has been reelected for a fourth term indicates that the American people as a whole have a very good idea as to whether or not the President of the United States has any effect upon post-war prosperity.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. If I may be permitted to finish my statement first, I shall be glad to yield later.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time because I wanted to say a few words about one of the most important conditions underlying this legislation. The divorcing of the R. F. C. loan agencies from the Department of Commerce is one thing. However, I believe that this would never have come up, at least it would not have come up at this time if the President had not nominated one particular man to be Secretary of Commerce. Consequently, it is impossible to separate from a discussion of this bill the name of Henry Wallace, and I should like to use the few minutes I have to comment briefly on Mr. Wallace.

May I say first, however, I think it is a very heartening sign that the Members of the House of Representatives are paying attention to Presidential appointments to Cabinet positions. I was going through a list here this morning of some of the appointments to the Cabinet during the 1920's. There must have been very little interest on the part of the Members of the House of Representatives at that time. I am wondering if some of these men represent the American way of life as the opponents of Mr. Wallace today interpret it. I come to the name here of Secretary of the Navy, Edwin Denby, in the Harding and Coolidge years. I am wondering if he represents the way of life that some of the opposition would have us return to. I come to the name of Andrew W. Mellon, former head of the Aluminum Trust. Members on the minority side, does he typify the type of American life that we want to get back to? Next I come to the list of Attorneys General. I see the name of H. M. Daugherty. Does he represent the kind of man we wish to think of as typifying the American way of life? Then I turn to the Secretary of the Interior. I see the name of Albert B. Fall, of New Mexico. Does he, Members of the House, typify the kind of Cabinet officer we want? I say it is a heartening thing that the Members of the House are taking an interest in the type of person the President nominates for Cabinet positions.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I am sorry, I cannot yield now, but I will yield just as soon as I finish my statement.

Now, I am wondering why all of these objections have been raised to Mr. Wallace. I am wondering why the Republicans were so unanimous in their opposition to a rule which even permits the discussion of a bill where he is indirectly concerned.

I am wondering why they were perfectly willing to permit the R. F. C. to be included in the Department of Commerce under Mr. Jones but not under Mr. Wallace.

I am wondering why this fear and furor that seems to be pervading this body, and that we read in the newspapers and that we hear over the radio. I am wondering for example, if it is because Mr. Wallace has the courage and frankness to state his position and not do any pussyfooting. For example, I quote briefly from an article by Mr. Wallace, in the Saturday Evening Post, October 23, 1943. Is there anything in this philosophy, Mr. Chairman, to which we can object?

> Capitalism throughout the world, and even in our own country, has often been the object of derision. Not its inherent faults but its misuse has been the underlying reason for this attitude. Considered in its essentials, however, capitalism can be the most efficient system of organizing production and distribution on principles of freedom and equal opportunity yet devised by man. It should not, as many radical reformers have suggested, be uprooted. It should be modernized and made to work. Indeed, it must be made to work if we are to maintain the foundations of those things which we believe to be the essentials of American society. The chief trouble with capitalism has been the perversion of its instruments and their misdirection by small, powerful, privileged groups for purposes they were never intended to achieve.

Gentlemen, what is wrong with this statement?

I am wondering if it is the frankness with which the former Vice President of the United States discusses monopolies and cartels that has caused all of this antipathy to be raised against him. I am wondering if it is the fact that Henry Wallace has come out flat-footed for the rights of the small businessmen of America, that has caused all of the uproar to be raised against him. I am wondering if it is a fact that Mr. Wallace says that in our American democracy, as we conceive it, every individual, regardless of his national background, his racial background, or his religious background, shall have the chance to develop the capacities and talents which the Almighty has given him, and that nothing—no artificial barriers of any kind, be they race, religious, or economic—shall be allowed to stand in the way of the development of those individual traits. Perhaps it is the fact that Mr. Wallace has advocated greater cooperation between agriculture and labor. I could quote at length from some of his statements before Senate hearings on that particular point, but his position on it is too well known to discuss it at length here.

Is it the fact that Mr. Wallace has advocated greater cooperation between private enterprise and government, contending that they are not necessarily incompatible, but contending that they can be made to cooperate in developing a more satisfying economic life for America as a whole. I am wondering if it is the fact that Mr. Wallace contends that in peace as well as in war we can bring about full production in America, and that we do not have to have a wartime economy in order to find jobs for all. I am wondering just which one of those particular things it is that is causing all of the furor to be raised, and all of the fears to be expressed about the future of America. Personally, I find it difficult to ascertain.

I should like to emphasize a point that I made a moment ago, namely, for four consecutive terms the American people have chosen a particular man to represent them as President. They have had confidence in that man's judgment or they would not have elected him. When the President of the United States, therefore, nominates a particular individual for a position in his Cabinet, I for one make the assumption that the American people as a whole have faith in that particular act, as well as in the acts which he has made in the past. It seems to me that a man must be pretty good, that he must not have very many serious faults, when the only thing we can really say against him is that he is an idealist; that he is a dreamer. I think the great achievements of American history, and some of the greatest achievements of world history, would not have been possible unless men had held ideals in front of them; unless men dreamed a dream of a better world in which people of all religions, of all races, of all nationalities, might have greater opportunities to go forward and develop their own abilities.

If the worst we can say about a man is that he is an idealist, then his faults must not be very serious. God help us when we in America lose our ideals and our idealists.

Personally, I feel convinced that when the American people learn all of the facts in this case it will be as the chairman of our committee said—it will do more to make Henry Wallace than to break him. The American people like fair play, and they abhor unfair tactics. In the present case, every possible type of unfair tactics is being used against Mr. Wallace, and the American people are beginning to realize that fact. But in the long run he will emerge from this ordeal even bigger than he is today. The more he is persecuted, rather than praised, the further he is going to go. I for one have no lack of confidence in just how far that is going to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from California who just left the floor, I may say I have looked all through this bill but cannot find the name "Henry Wallace" in it; so I think we are discussing something besides Henry Wallace here this afternoon.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The previous speaker, the gentleman from California, in his moving enconium about Henry Wallace, refused to yield. I wanted to ask him what I believe I have since found out, whether or not the gentleman from California did not vote for this bill to take away from this paragon of wisdom and virtue he described the powers the President wanted to give him. Did he not?

Mr. BUFFETT. That is right.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to answer?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield briefly.

Mr. OUTLAND. I beg the gentleman's pardon for not yielding to him; I should have done so, but I thought my time had about expired.

Answering the gentleman's question briefly, in my judgment, these lending powers should not have been placed in the Department of Commerce in the first place. I believe we are taking an excellent step in making this separation, regardless of who may be Secretary of Commerce. My point was that I felt pretty strongly that if Mr. Wallace had not been nominated, this bill would never have come up.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield briefly, but I must proceed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it had not been for the issue coming up as it did the support for this bill that we now have would never have come from that side of the aisle. Necessity has been the mother of virtue in this case.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I must refuse to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I speak on behalf of 12,000,000 uniformed patriots of America, whose future is vitally affected by our decision on this problem, the problem of our philosophy of public debt.

It was recorded in Roman times that a monument was then in existence, beside the Macedonian road at Thermopolae, which bore the following inscription:

> Oh, Passer By, tell the Lacedemonians that we lie here in obedience to their laws.

This was the epitaph to the handful of Spartans who died to the last man in delaying the Persians at the Pass. No simpler words ever noted a greater sacrifice.

Today all over the world American boys lie buried in obedience to our laws. To me that means we have an obligation here at home, a very real obligation to preserve the system they fought to defend. The foundations of civilization, the existence of human liberty depend upon the maintenance of a sound monetary system. Most if not all of the so-called liberal governments of modern times have been wrecked, as Candidate Roosevelt said in 1932, on the shoals of loose fiscal policy; and it is fiscal policy we are talking about today.

The fundamental question that Congress will determine in its labors on this bill comes down to this: Will Congress reassume its full responsibility as the custodian of the public purse, otherwise known as the monetary system of the United States? Mr. Chairman, the first obligation which that purse must meet is held by the widows, orphans, and wounded veterans of World War No. 2. They are not here, but they are counting on this Congress to carry out its responsibilities. A few days ago I noted a statement by General Hines in which he said there are 350,000 compensation cases of World War No. 2 already on the rolls. He stated further that in another year or two there would be almost 1,000,000 compensation cases of this war on the rolls. That means those people have a genuine interest and a prior claim against the Treasury of the United States. It is up to this Congress in its every decision to remember that the first claim against the United States Treasury is held by those veterans, by their widows, and by their orphans. Simply because they are not here we cannot afford to ignore that claim, and if this Congress is fully awake to its duty it will remember that responsibility on every bill relating to monetary policy.

The second obligation against the public purse is to the savings bondholders of the United States. Those people number 85,000,000 and they have an interest in this bill. They have an interest in the philosophy of public debt which this Congress approves by its legislative actions.

The third obligation connected with that purse is our responsibility to keep our monetary system in such condition that the people of America will have confidence in the integrity of those who are charged with its custodianship.

The fourth responsibility of Congress in connection with this purse is to assist and help the rest of the world in its labors for recovery. That is the fourth,

in my judgment, of the obligations of this Congress in its administration of the public purse.

Congress must choose in this instance between safeguarding that purse until our soldiers come home and the obligations to our bondholders are fulfilled; or of turning over this purse to a disciple of the school of thought that believes the capacity of the American taxpayer to underwrite global spending is unlimited. For my part I question the right of the Congress to entrust the savings of a Nation, already under obligation to millions of veterans, to the irresponsible hands of a visionary for further experimentation with financial schemes that have failed wherever they have been tried.

I think we should look back a minute on this subject to 1932—I heard that date mentioned a moment or two ago—when Mr. Roosevelt said:

> What I would like to do is to reduce insofar as possible the problem of our national finances to the terms of a family budget. The credit of a family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good. If in some crises it lives beyond its income for a year or so, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates; but if like a spendthrift it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, if it extends its taxing powers to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

I think the people of America should know from this Congress how far down that road to bankruptcy this Nation is. We have been on that road 12 years now since Mr. Roosevelt talked about its dangers. The boys out on the battle fronts have an interest in how far down that road we are, and this Congress should get the answer to that question before it entrusts to free-spending hands the custodianship of our immense governmental corporations.

I looked at a Treasury statement this morning, and I find that thus far this fiscal year our deficit is $33,000,000,000. That is since last July 1. That is 50 percent higher in 7½ months than the entire debt that Mr. Roosevelt was worried about in 1932.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is it for a year?

Mr. BUFFETT. What was it a year back?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. BUFFETT. I do not have those figures.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is right there.

Mr. BUFFETT. The figure is running about a billion dollars a week.

The boys on the battle fronts around the world are interested in the promises of the G. I. bill. Those promises and others veteran benefits can be made good only if our Budget is balanced. That fact is of supreme importance to those who make the sacrifices of this war. So we have seen the results of financial liberalism all over Europe. We have seen totalitarianism come out of this kind of reckless spending. We have seen it bring disaster in every land where it has been tried.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask the gentleman to define just what a Republican is?

Mr. BUFFETT. I am talking now about the finances of the Government. If the gentleman is interested, he will get a great deal of information if he will just keep his ears open and listen carefully.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. What does the gentleman mean by "new philosophy of public debt," and who has announced that new philosophy?

Mr. BUFFETT. That new philosophy of public debt has been announced by Alvin Hanson and A. A. Berle and other New Deal economists who say that each year you can increase the debt ad infinitum. They have been doing pretty well at securing New Deal acceptance of that theory, if the rise in the debt is any indication.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman quote the exact language that they used?

Mr. BUFFETT. I will be glad to furnish the gentleman with the precise quotations.

Mr. PATMAN. And what authority they had to represent the administration?

Mr. BUFFETT. I will be glad to furnish the gentleman with the precise information.

This country has gone along now for 12 years of inflation. Of course, inflation has been covered up by price control, but the inflation that has been created is in existence and threatens our country right today. We can see it in the growth and in the circulation of money from $15,000,000,000 2 years ago to something over twenty-five billion today.

Let me remind you in passing that money in circulation is something like ration stamps. It is a claim for goods that has not yet been exercised, and when those claims pile up we find in the case of ration stamps, at least, that they cannot handle them all. That is the problem this Congress is facing, and it is facing it on its deliberations on this bill.

There are other questions that should be answered in the discussion of this bill by those who adhere to this new philosophy of global spending. How is a great advance in commodity prices to be prevented if the public debt is allowed to increase continuously? Does not history show that an enormous rise in the public debt always results in disastrous inflation? That is the most basic situation which this Congress faces.

The war will be won one of these days, but winning the war will not solve this problem. The winning of the war is probably a lesser final problem than the problem of getting the finances of the United States on a sound basis.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman referred to what he called the new philosophy. I suppose in view of the fact that he referred to Mr. Hanson and Mr. Berle that he meant the doctrine of compensatory spending. That philosophy, as the gentleman knows, is embodied in a recent spending bill offered in the Senate by which the Budget Department is supposed to make estimates for a volume of all of the business in the United States for such a length of time that probably the average businessman could not estimate for his own individual business, and then use the Government's money to pay the deficit in creating jobs. Does not the gentleman consider that a new philosophy, which, of course, is the philosophy of compensatory spending?

Mr. BUFFETT. I will answer the gentlewoman with a recent contribution by Seymour Harris, associate professor of economics at Harvard University, lately on leave with the Office of Price Administration. Mr. Harris suggests:

> In one sense there is no limit to the growth of the public debt, for as debt charges rise the taxation of holders of this debt may rise at an equal rate.

This idea is quite a gem. We can sell the people the bonds and then we can tax them against the interest on the bonds until they get no interest at all. On that theory the debt could go up forever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. In the period before 1837, although the Federal Government followed the traditional Jeffersonian principle of economy in government, the States indulged in great extravagance, even usurping functions later left to private enterprise. So many of the States defaulted their debts, after spending much as the Federal Government has been doing in the last 10 or 12 years, that after those defaults it was commonly said in Europe, where industrialists had been hard hit by the defaults in State securities, that the United States was one vast swindling shop from Maine to Florida. Does not the gentleman believe the same thing might happen as a result of extensive spending in the same way by the Federal Government now?

Mr. BUFFETT. I will amplify that point for the gentlewoman. Here is the most significant point in this whole problem:

> With unlimited debt expansion we cannot prevent inflation without the use of totalitarian methods of control.

You have seen some evidences of those totalitarian methods of control already.

> No compromise or half-way measures can adjust the difficulties. The choice is between regimentation and inflation.

Germany made the choice of no inflation, but they had regimentation and totalitarian methods of control. In every country where the debt continued to go up they have wound up with one or the other, either inflation or regi-

mentation. We have evaded making a decision on this problem for a long time.

Here is what Harold Moulton, of the Brookings Institution, says about it:

The foregoing analysis (the new philosophy of public debt) serves to disclose the gravest danger with which the United States is now confronted. Unable to, unwilling to, perceive basic inconsistencies, or to choose between clear-cut alternatives, we drift toward the deep financial waters from which there is no return other than through repudiation in one form or another.

This controversy gives this Congress a chance to retrieve these controls and may save us from later having to make the dangerous choice of repudiation in one form or another. There is no other out. It is regimentation or inflation if we continue to spend our savings and capital funds over the rest of the world.

I have the conviction that this Congress should set up controls over our financial system, so that when our veterans come back and when their widows and orphans come up to the Public Treasury they will find there for them the pensions and the payments promised. I do not want to have happen to them what happened in Germany after the last war, when their veterans sold the gold braid off their uniforms, their household furnishings and their personal effects in order to get food for their children.

In rejecting at this time the philosophy of unlimited spending, this Congress will be giving our soldiers concrete evidence that at long last, their elected representatives are taking a serious interest in bringing under control the reckless spending of this administration.

Mr. Chairman, answering the questions raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], "What does the gentleman mean by 'new philosophy of public debt'? Who has announced that new philosophy, and what authority had they to represent the administration?" Earlier in my remarks I offer the following:

The National Resources Planning Board, official agency of the administration some time ago, with respect to the broad field of economic and social planning, in its pamphlet entitled "Full Employment—Security—Building America," outlined an extensive post-war agenda. In the section entitled "Plans for Financing and Fiscal Policy," one finds in the list of issues raised no reference to a balanced Budget or control of the growth of the public debt. On the other hand, the Board asks, among other things: First, what policies should determine the proportion of required Government outlay which should be met by taxation and by borrowing; and, second, what special methods of financing, such as non-interest-bearing notes, might be used?

It is evident from these questions that it is assumed that a substantial portion of the Government's funds would permanently come from borrowing operations.

Of the numerous individuals within the Government who are advocates of the new philosophy, the most outstanding has been Alvin H. Hansen, lately special economic adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The scope and character of Mr. Hansen's conception are indicated in the following excerpts from his various writings. In a signed pamphlet issued by the National Resources Planning Board he expresses himself thus:

Every cent expended, private and public, becomes income for members of our own society. Costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield.

In other publications we find the following:

We shall come out of the war debt free. We shall have no external debt, only an internal debt.

A public debt, internally held * * * has none of the essential earmarks of a private debt. A public debt is an instrument of public policy. It is a means to control the national income and, in conjunction with the tax structure, to regulate the distribution of income.

An internal debt is in fact so different from what we commonly think of as debt * * * that it should scarcely be called a debt at all.

That Mr. Hansen believes it is not only unnecessary to maintain a balanced Budget but that a permanently expanding public debt is essential to prosperity and full employment is indicated by the following:

The attack on chronic unemployment by means of public expenditures financed by a continually rising public debt is essentially a conservative proposal.

Note: The source of much of my remarks this afternoon is contained in a booklet published by the Brookings Institution entitled "The New Philosophy of Public Debt."

LEGISLATIVE BODY—CONGRESS—DETERMINES GOVERNMENT POLICY ON PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object to anyone's saying what the new philosophy or the philosophy of the public debt is without giving consideration to the expressions of the legislative body in this country, that determines what that policy shall be. I do not think it is right to take quotations from some person who happens to be connected with a Government bureau or agency and point to them as determining the philosophy of the public debt or any other philosophy. We should look to the proceedings of the Congress, the legislative body that is elected by the people of this country.

I do not believe there are any Members in either House of Congress—in this body or in the other body—who can be charged even indirectly with trying to destroy the private enterprise system in this country or the American way of life. Who are they? You do not know who they are. You are not willing to point one out. They are not here. Read the proceedings of Congress and determine for yourselves. The Members of Congress believe in the competitive system, the private-enterprise system, the American way of life. All this talk about there being some conspiracy or clique or plan or organization within the Congress trying to destroy the American way of life, I think, is loose talk, because, when it comes to pointing out the people who are guilty, you cannot do it. When you want to determine the policy of this Government, go to the accredited proceedings of the Houses of Congress and there you can determine that policy. I want to deny now that there is any new philosophy about the public debt, in favor of spending without reference to need and spending without reference to the size of the debt. The only philosophy I know is the philosophy that we spend just as little as we can, and to win the war, but at the same time not be stingy about it, but to spend every dime which is necessary, regardless of the cost, to save human lives first. We want to spend as little as we can on things not having to do with the war.

PHILOSOPHY OF NATIONAL DEBT

We want to pay this debt off just as quickly as possible. That is the only philosophy I know. I do not know of any other person—I do not know of any person—who has the right to speak for Congress or those in authority in this Government who has announced any different philosophy from that.

DEBT, 10 TIMES HIGHER IN 1944 THAN IN 1932, EASIER FOR PEOPLE TO PAY

This administration has done more to make it possible for this national debt to be paid than any other administration that has ever been in power in Washington. In 1932 the debt was just one-tenth of what it was in 1944. The interest on that small national debt, however, was harder for the people to pay than it was in 1944 when the debt was 10 times as much. May I point out to you that this administration has been reducing the interest on the national debt from an average of about 4 percent during the 12 years preceding Mr. Roosevelt to the point now where the average interest rate paid on Government bonds and securities is 1.9 percent. Therefore, the debt, although 10 times as high in 1944 as in 1932, costs the people only 3 times as much in interest. So instead of trying to create a new philosophy which some people would have you believe would cause us to go into debt for an undetermined amount without any concern, a policy has been adopted which will enable us to pay off a huge national debt even though it should run to $300,000,000,000 when this Second World War is over, or even more than that. Therefore, it is an entirely different philosophy.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman, I know, has given much study to the question of finances and the national debt. Can the gentleman tell at this stage of the discussion what the national debt was when this war broke out in December 1941? Have you those figures available?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know just what the figure was. It was something less than $50,000,000,000. You see, the country was wrecked in 1932. May I call

the attention of the Members to this astounding fact, the entire national income of the people in 1932 was less than the people paid in taxes in 1944.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The statement was made today that our children and our children's children will be worrying about this New Deal debt of $300,000,000,000. The gentleman agrees, I am sure, that most of that money has been spent in the prosecution of this war and it has been an expenditure of money supported by the American people as a whole, irrespective of party.

EASY TO CRITICIZE, DIFFICULT TO CONSTRUCT

Mr. PATMAN. And by our friends, the members of the Republican Party on the opposite side of the aisle. I do not know of a single large appropriation bill that did not receive a majority of the votes on that side. Which one of these bills should not have been passed? I do not know. Of course, it is easy to criticize. It is difficult to construct. But the fact is that we are not trying to fight a cheap war.

USE MACHINES INSTEAD OF MEN

We do not want to send a man against the enemy, in a place of danger where his life may be taken, if a machine can be sent there instead, regardless of the cost of that machine. It is true we have spent billions of dollars to try to save the lives of the finest soldiers on earth. By spending that money we have saved a great many lives, and by reason of that, more of these fine young American boys will return to their homes and firesides in America.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman mentioned with pride the fact that our tax burden is as great as the entire national income was in 1932. Is the gentleman boasting about that?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I was deploring the fact that the country was so wrecked in 1932 that the national income was not as much then as the people were able to pay in taxes in 1944.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The reason the people could pay those taxes in 1944 is because of this inflated income caused by war spending, is it not?

POLICY OF LIVE AND STARVE

Mr. PATMAN. Well, some of it is, yes. Of course, it is entirely out of proportion. The national income is up now. Then we had a policy of permitting people to live and starve. We do not believe in that policy. We believe in permitting people to live and prosper and have the things they should have. That is the philosophy in which we believe.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman then approves of this gigantic national income caused by war spending, which is based on deficit financing?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I want to keep up the national income. I want to pay off the national debt just as quickly as is possible. In fact, I will vote for higher taxes right now, because every time we pay a dollar in debt now, we save $2 in the long run, because when you borrow that money you will have to pay a dollar in interest by the time the debt has been paid.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Let me get the gentleman clear. We are not paying off any debt at all. We are piling it up.

Mr. PATMAN. That is very true; on account of the war.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman asked someone to point out somebody who had approved of deficit spending here in Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I did not say anything about deficit spending. The gentleman is entirely wrong in that. I did not use the phrase "deficit spending" at all.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has just been giving high praise to deficit financing, compensatory spending, the dynamic debt theory working in war.

WHICH NEW DEAL LAWS ARE SO BAD?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am just taking the situation as it exists and trying to comment upon it in the best way I can. I am not defending and do not endorse deficit spending if it can be avoided.

So, the New Deal laws that they talk about being so bad——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. What are those New Deal laws? Our friends on the Republican side voted for every one of them. The Republican Party could very well be called a New Deal party, because they voted for all the New Deal laws. I do not believe the leader on the Republican side could name one New Deal law that the Republicans voted against, or would be willing to repeal if they came into power.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield if the gentlewoman will give me some more time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I will yield the gentleman a minute. I think the gentleman should not forget that in 1939, the Republican Party voted unanimously against the $7,000,000,000 pump-priming bill, and the next day business started back up.

Mr. PATMAN. 1939? Oh, that was just a temporary appropriation measure. I am talking about real, basic, fundamental laws, New Deal laws. I would like the lady to name one she opposed.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. To us $7,000,000,000 is real money.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but that was just a temporary proposition. I am talking about basic laws, permanent laws. Name one of them the lady opposed, so-called New Deal laws. I am willing to yield to her.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. To do that would take the rest of the afternoon.

Mr. PATMAN. No; name just one of them.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Very well, beginning with last week, the agricultural census bill.

Mr. PATMAN. No, not last week; start with 1933 when the New Deal came into power and name any New Deal laws that the lady would repeal.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was not a party to that.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentlewoman would not be a party to repealing any of them, nor have I ever seen any bill that she has ever introduced seeking to repeal any of them. Neither would the American people be a party to repealing them.

PEOPLE BEHIND PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

The American people are behind this administration. For the last 12 years we have had but 1 candidate running on the Democratic ticket for President and we have been breaking all records. In 1932 our friends received only 59 electoral votes at the election; in 1936 they received only 8 electoral votes; in 1940 they received 82 electoral votes; in 1944 our candidate, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, running the fourth time, broke all records and the Republicans received only 99 electoral votes. If all those electoral votes were rolled into one they would have received in those 4 elections combined 18 electoral votes less than the 266 electoral votes required to elect a President of the United States one time.

I believe in a constructive, militant minority party, but why just criticize all the time? Why not help us construct? And then if we make mistakes show us how those mistakes can be corrected.

Mr. BUFFETT. You made one last week.

Mr. PATMAN. Speaking about the inflation the gentleman mentioned——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman from Texas expressed with apparent pride the fact that the return to those who lend money to the Government has been constantly diminishing. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. GIFFORD. Interest on Government loans?

Mr. HALE. Yes; the gentleman commented on the delightful fact that the rate of interest on the Government debt was going down so that anybody who wished to lend money to the Government now would get a much lower rate than he formerly got. I should like to have the gentleman comment on that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I have often commented on that, and I may make some more pleasant comments today. This has been a pleasant debate thus far. It reminds me of the old days during the debate on the reorganization bill when so many of you did not really want to vote for it. What a day that was! You who were here then will remember that the Speaker and the majority leader charged our side with unadulterated politics. Thereafter many of you collapsed under the party whip and the reorganization bill went through by a scant majority. Today we see what can and does happen under that act by which we authorized the President to manipulate and transfer the functions of government as he pleases. We are now told that Mr. Crowley holds all the common stock of the Export-Import Bank, under Executive order. The

President may later turn it over to Henry Wallace or to anybody else. We had best pass some restrictive legislation to curb this dangerous power. It was called unadulterated politics when we opposed that highly dangerous delegation of power. I rather think that today there are quite a few Democratic votes that would be cast with the Republicans, but the party whip is very persuasive. But your leader took the floor and shouted "unadulterated politics." I have never seen such a clear case of unadulterated politics in my 22 years here as is now demonstrated by the majority party, beginning with the President's letter acknowledging the great political debt owed to Mr. Wallace.

Will you now seek to aid him in paying that debt in the fashion contemplated?

Unadulterated politics. I do recall that "the pot called the kettle black," as you are doing today. Now, do not challenge me because the facts speak for themselves.

The gentleman from Texas spoke about majority votes. Of course, you had the majority of the votes. We did not make any bid to Earl Browder to join us. I read the other day a statement which appealed to me somewhat, namely, that "all who were with Roosevelt were not crackpots, but all crackpots were with him." Do not take too much pride in such a victory. I have seen communities where good men ran against each other, but there were a certain number of "gimme" votes to be won over. The candidate who promised them the most would get those votes, and would be elected. I would not take too much pride in this vast sum of money as described by the gentleman from Texas. There are now about $161,000,000,000 available and spendable. Do you really think you will avoid inflation? You had better worry a little about it. It is probably too late to put up the warning signs.

There were so many wrecks at a certain place on the coast that it was decided to erect a lighthouse. Afterward one Indian said to the other, "The light she shine; the bell do ring; the horn go 'whoop whoop'; but the fog he come in just the same." The fog generated by the huge public debt and other New Deal spendings will come in just the same, in spite of your whoops in favor of bills of debt-created money and low interest rates—so low that the people will not desire to hold the securities.

The gentleman from Texas would even manufacture money for the Government to pay its bills. I am thankful that my country does borrow the money, even though it pays our people such a low rate of interest. There is at least a due date on bonds. They will have to be paid or be renewed. But if we should simply print money, we might well wonder what provision we would make to retire it. I would not want to boast about all this debt-manufactured money and so-called deficit spending. Rather should we worry about it. We may erect lighthouses to guide us on the way, but the fog will come in just the same.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman does not think I am boasting about it?

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope not, but it rather sounded like it.

Mr. PATMAN. I was simply deploring the situation.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman has a queer way of deploring.

Mr. PATMAN. When the Democratic Party came in power there was a deplorable situation and we are fighting the war now by using money and machines as much as possible in order to save the lives of American soldiers.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; hark back to those happy days of 1932 when Roosevelt after his election refused to cooperate with Hoover. I might like to take the time to picture those 4 months before President Roosevelt assumed office. We knew the conditions prevailing in the previous October and even in November. The banks were not closing then. Just why did the banks close? What made Senator GLASS refuse to accept the offer of the Secretary of the Treasury? He suspected what the newly elected President had in mind regarding finance. History should, and will show what brought about those very unhappy days of finance in February 1933.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. With the greatest of pleasure. Am I wrong?

Mr. ROE of Maryland. There were 2,253 banks closed in 1931.

Mr. GIFFORD. That may be so. At that time many small mushroom banks were created in many States. Now we guarantee bank deposits. They should not fail any more, should they?

Mr. ROE of Maryland. I do not think so. The guarantee bank deposit law is one of the finest laws we ever passed.

Mr. GIFFORD. That may be. It will take some time to prove it. The several States that tried it failed miserably in that endeavor. "The fog will come in just the same."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Our friend tries to convey the impression that credit is due to the New Deal or the Democratic Party. The fact is the President himself opposed the very amendment offered by Senator VANDENBERG.

Mr. GIFFORD. Indeed he did; but our Democratic friends want you to forget that. The sins of the Democratic Party are extremely heavy when compared with the Republican Party. If we delved into the past what an indictment might be brought.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The F. D. I. C. only guarantees that the bank give back to a depositor the number of dollars he deposits in that bank. The F. D. I. C. does not guarantee any value whatsoever. It guarantees no purchasing power, and any government can guarantee its banks in that way because all it needs to do is to print more money to make good. The country ought to realize that that is what this F. D. I. C. amounts to.

Mr. GIFFORD. I did not intend to talk along this line, but the debate thus far makes it an enticing subject. We Republicans have so little to be ashamed of in connection with the recent national election. Certainly we do not have Earl Browders and other rather reddish followers to whom we are indebted. If that is the kind of election you want to boast of, keep it up. As you state it, "It was the voice of the people." We can only ask, "What people?" I really do not believe you enjoy the jubilation of the Daily Worker. You probably now read it. Are you really proud to have the Daily Worker so enthusiastically on your side? I think a great deal of the Democratic Members of this House. I have lived so long with you. You are conscientious, you are honest, but it seems you are forced to be real politicians at the crack of the party whip. If today there is unadulterated politics, it is on your side, beginning with the President's letter to Mr. Jones. I did want to talk a little about the Export-Import Bank, although none of us knows much about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Certainly. I have been hoping the gentleman would interrupt.

Mr. McCORMACK. What did the gentleman say about "unadulterated politics"?

Mr. GIFFORD. You shouted it first early in the debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Sure. I said the great majority on the gentleman's side, or practically all, were engaging in unadulterated politics. Does the gentleman deny that he ever engaged in unadulterated politics?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, many times "politician" simply means "statesmanship."

Mr. McCORMACK. Ah, but my good friend qualified as a statesman one day when he made a speech against a bill and the next day got up and made a speech for the bill, and said that reluctantly he had to vote for it. That is a real statesman.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, but "consistency is the product of little minds, some educators and divines." I can often be convinced of error.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman admits that he has a big mind, and I admit he has, also. I never took a position to the contrary.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am so glad the gentleman said that I had a big mind. One thing I have not got is a swelled head, nor anything approaching it. I am an example of complete humility.

The Export-Import Bank was to be my topic of discussion. However, the gentleman from Michigan covered that subject very well, indeed. I have no criticism at the moment of their past activities, as I know too little about the matter. But we should inform ourselves as to what they are doing. How large do they want to grow? Are we not aware that there is great danger in granting long and large credits to other nations?

They have told us that Mr. Crowley owns the bank. However, Mr. Pierson is its president. They will be asking, I think, for some $7,000,000,000. They now have seven hundred million. We should know how they are investing it. Of course, they are offering foreign countries, like Brazil, lower rates of interest than they can secure at home. By keeping interest rates down, we keep down interest rates on loans to all business. The plan is to give Henry Wallace all the money he wants and let the Government underwrite all loans to furnish 60,000,000 jobs. My Government has underwritten too much already.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman is opposed to the present rate, what rate of interest would the gentleman have the Government pay?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have said on the floor many times that 4 percent is a fair rate, and that is the rate Mr. Pierson claims is a fair rate, even for Brazil. He has loaned Brazil $45,000,000 at 4 percent, to have a steel industry built up. Brazil, mind you, seems to get an 18-year loan at 4 percent. Private banks cannot lend on that type of activity.

Mr. PATMAN. At 4 percent a $300,000,000 loan would cost $12,000,000 a year for interest alone. You would not have money for anything else.

Mr. GIFFORD. Do not quote figures to me. They can be arranged to lie so terribly. Statistics can be so arranged that we are easily misled. You generally arrange your statistics beginning with 1933, a very sick year. Begin with an average year? Seemingly you never do that.

Well, you are really good politicians. I do not seem to qualify. However, one can never convict me of being overambitious. When did I try to be ambitious in this body? I can say, "Mr. Leader, as long as I have known you, wonderful man that you are—we served together in Massachusetts—I have accomplished something that you could not seem to do. I have been here 22 years entirely unfettered. You must be living a dreadful life, because 'to want fame is purgatory, but to have it is hell itself.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman from Michigan told you that the Export-Import Bank would be a corollary, probably, of the proposed huge international bank. You will probably want to keep them both. It certainly ought to be merged in that larger bank. It has loaned foreign nations money so that our exporters could get their money, but all have paid, I believe, but one—the Polish Government. I wonder if they can pay now.

Of course, debts are always current, because they generally renew the loans. You can always keep current with your bank if they renew the loans. When will the losses ever be shown?

Mr. COFFEE. Tell us a story.

Mr. GIFFORD. Very well. If we keep this Export-Import Bank, there probably will be a moratorium. We heard much of moratorium yesterday. We had a moratorium which released the foreign governments from their debt payments. The moratorium seems now to have meant the end of those debts.

The gentleman asked for a story. Here it is: The teacher was discussing a moratorium with his class. He told them that England owed us money, and that we granted a moratorium. He then asked a boy to explain. The boy did. He said, "A moratorium. The President sent the English King a bill for a debt he owed us, and he tore it up. The President sent the King another bill and he tore it up. He sent the King another bill, and he tore it up. The more he sent, the more he tore 'em."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wonder that the debate has gone rather far afield and that many subjects not under consideration have been discussed. I think that is the best proof that could be submitted that this bill, unanimously reported by the committee, should be unanimously passed by the House.

I make bold to maintain, first, that if the George bill had not been passed by the Senate and Mr. Wallace had been appointed and confirmed as Secretary of Commerce, he would not hereby have become Administrator of the Federal Loan Agency, and it would have taken a public resolution or law of the Congress before he could have been in charge of the loan agencies of the Government.

Secondly, I make bold to assert as I undertake the discussion of the bill under consideration that if the George bill is passed as reported by the committee and as passed by the other body and if Mr. Wallace is confirmed as Secretary of Commerce, he will have no more power or authority with respect to the Export-Import Bank than he had when he was Secretary of Agriculture before he became Vice President. Or to put it another way, if Mr. Wallace were now appointed Secretary of Agriculture instead of Secretary of Commerce he would have the same power and authority with respect to the Export-Import Bank that he would have if he were confirmed Secretary of Commerce and this bill were to pass.

A bare recital of the facts in connection with the Export-Import Bank will substantiate these statements. The bank was organized under the National Industrial Recovery Act, under Executive order of the President, February 2 and February 14, 1934. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce had the voting of the common stock and the R. F. C. voted the preferred stock under the Executive order which provided the common stock, the R. F. C. being authorized to provide the preferred stock.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman made a misstatement.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I want to make a connected statement as the gentleman did and my statements are correct. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has misspoken himself.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is in error, as I shall show more in detail as I proceed. The Executive order established the Export-Import Bank which was approved by Congress in 1935 and was amended by Congress in 1940. The bank as originally organized was under the reorganization placed in the Federal Loan Administration. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies were placed under the Federal Loan Administrator under that Reorganization Act in 1939. Mr. Jones was appointed Secretary of Commerce in 1940. He was the Administrator of the Federal Loan Agency and that agency continued for 2 years as such with him as Administrator by virtue of an act of Congress before it was transferred to the Department of Commerce.

In 1943, while the other agencies of the Federal Loan Administration remained in the Department of Commerce, the Export-Import Bank by Executive order was transferred to the Office of Economic Warfare and that office was reorganized as the Foreign Economic Administration some 2½ months thereafter.

When this bank was originally organized there were the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce named or represented on the board of trustees or as stockholders. Today that same situation obtains and there are representatives from those Departments among the 11 trustees. At the present time the entire common stock and the entire preferred stock is voted by Mr. Crowley, the Administrator, and he names the 11 trustees, he being the chairman, and appointing the other 10. So that I assert if this bill passes, Mr. Wallace would have no more power or authority as Secretary of Commerce than he had when he was Secretary of Agriculture prior to 1940. Moreover, I assert as I now read the public resolution that Congress passed September 13, 1940, providing for the combining of the offices of Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator, Henry Wallace under that resolution could not be Secretary of Commerce and Administrator of the Federal Loan Agency without congressional authorization, as the said Public Resolution 97, passed by Congress in 1940, is personal to Jesse H. Jones, and this resolution is as follows:

That notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, Jesse H. Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, may continue in such office and be appointed to, in the manner now provided by law, and may exercise the duties of the office of Secretary of Commerce: *Pro-*

vided, That the total compensation to be paid him as Secretary of Commerce and as Federal Loan Administrator shall be that provided by law for the Secretary of Commerce.

Under the administration of Mr. Crowley, he names the trustees and he names the representatives from the Commerce, the Treasury, and the Agriculture Departments, and the Department of State, and he names the other six trustees. So that Mr. Wallace, as Secretary of Commerce, if this bill passes, as it should, will have one vote. I am one of those who assert that the Federal Loan Agency should be continued as an independent establishment; that the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States made a mistake in approving a consolidation, at the request of Jesse Jones. Having made the mistake, the purpose of this bill is to provide now that that agency be placed just where it was when it was transferred to the Department of Commerce, and provide for an auditing of Government corporations.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not now. I will yield after I have finished my statement.

What about the Export-Import Bank? There are now outstanding approximately $220,000,000 in loans unpaid. Approximately $485,000,000 in loans have been made, and $256,000,000 have been repaid. Under the terms of the law, if this bill passes reestablishing this as an independent agency as provided by the Reorganization Act of 1939, Mr. Wallace would be one of eleven voting on loans by the bank.

Let us analyze the situation. I assert that under the terms of this bill, which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] voted to report favorably, and against which I have not heard a voice raised in the debate this afternoon, this agency will be placed where it was when it was transferred to the Department of Commerce, as an independent establishment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield, now?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield for a question; not for a speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I asked the gentleman to yield; not to take issue with him but to correct a misstatement.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the correction? If I am in error I will be glad to be corrected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Secretary of Agriculture has nothing to do with this. The Secretary of Agriculture was never named as one of the incorporators.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is in error. I have before me the Executive order establishing the bank in 1934. I repeat that Daniel C. Roper, Secretary of Commerce, and Chester C. Davis, Administrator, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, were among the incorporators. I have before me a copy of the last annual minutes of the bank showing that the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce are represented on the board of trustees as they have been substantially from the original organization of the bank. At the same time the common stock was subscribed in the name of the Secretary of State and Secretary of Commerce, but the Department of Agriculture has always been represented either as incorporator or trustee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But the gentleman said it was organized with him. That is what I am trying to correct. It does not say that the Secretary of Agriculture has anything to do with it. It says the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated that the Executive order authorized the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce to subscribe and vote the common stock. The preferred stock was voted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and it really controlled, but substantially since its organization, and certainly since the approval of the bank by acts of Congress up to this good hour there have been 11 trustees and those 4 Government departments have been represented on the board of trustees. The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Treasury did not ask to be named. The custom was for them to suggest representatives from their departments who were named. Evidently Jesse H. Jones as Secretary of the Department of Commerce suggested that he himself be named instead of some subordinate in the Department. I repeat my statement that if Wallace is confirmed as Secretary of Commerce, he would have the right to name himself or a subordinate to be appointed as trustee by Mr. Crowley, which is the same right he had when he was Secretary of Agriculture before he became Vice President in 1940, but in any event the Department of Commerce would have but 1 vote out of 11.

The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce were among the original incorporators and have been on the board of trustees ever since the bank was organized. If the bill passes, the policy would be continued. I believe this bill should be passed without amendment.

I extend by saying that the Export-Import Bank was organized under Executive Orders No. 6581 of February 2, 1934, and 6601A of February 14, 1934, the original incorporators being Daniel C. Roper, Robert F. Kelley, Chester C. Davis, Stanley Reed, and Lynn P. Tolley, all officials of the Government, both the Department of Commerce and Department of Agriculture being represented in the original incorporators, Secretary Rober representing the Department of Commerce and Chester C. Davis representing the Department of Agriculture. Both of these Departments have always been recognized on the board of trustees since the Export-Import Bank was established. Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture at the time Chester C. Davis was Administrator, and if he had desired he could have been named as one of the incorporators as well as a trustee while Secretary of Agriculture, and he would have had the same power as he would have as the Secretary of Commerce, with or without the George bill, which bill of course should pass as the lending agencies should be divorced from the Department of Commerce or any other department of the Government.

In the Executive order under the National Industry Recovery Act $1,000,000 of common stock for the Export-Import Bank to be voted by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Commerce was provided. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation as authorized by Congress subscribed $174,000,000 preferred stock, and with equal voting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation controlled.

The Export-Import Bank, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, was approved by Congress by the act of January 31, 1935, and Public 792, approved September 26, 1940.

For some 10 years there have been 11 trustees, and the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Agriculture have been represented. While Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace might have suggested himself as trustee up to the time when he became Vice President in 1940, just as Jesse Jones suggested himself as the representative from Commerce, although the Departments of State, Treasury and Agriculture had alway been represented by a subordinate official.

Under the Reorganization Act of July 1939, the Export-Import Bank was placed in the Federal Loan Agency.

Under Executive Order 9071, February 24, 1942, the Federal Loan Agency was placed under the office of the Secretary of Commerce.

Under Executive Order 9361 of July 15, 1943, the Export-Import Bank was transferred to the Office of Economic Warfare, and under Executive Order 9380 of September 25, 1943, the Office of Economic Warfare was reorganized into the Foreign Economic Administration. Under the Executive order, paragraph 2 thereof, all of the capital stock, including the stock originally held by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State under the Executive order establishing the bank and the preferred stock, were transferred to the Foreign Economic Administration. Since September 25, 1943, the preferred and common stock under authority of the Executive order have been voted by Hon. Leo T. Crowley, the Administrator, and he has appointed the other 10 trustees. The trustees approve the loans. The Secretary of Commerce would have one vote. He would have, I repeat, the same vote he would have had if he had named himself as Secretary of Agriculture before he became Vice President in 1940.

It took a public resolution by Congress, as I have pointed out, passed September 13, 1940, to provide that Jesse H. Jones as Federal Loan Administrator could be Secretary of Commerce. The act is personal. It does not provide that the Loan Administrator may be Secretary of Commerce, but it stipulates that Jesse H. Jones might serve as Secretary of Commerce. I therefore repeat my statement that if the George bill had not passed the Senate and Henry Wallace had been appointed Secretary of Commerce, it would have taken a public resolution to provide that he be both Secretary of

Commerce and Farm Loan Administrator. Congress would again have to provide for combining the two offices. It made a personal combination in the case of Jesse Jones inasmuch as the act of 1940 was personal to Jesse Jones.

If Congress made a mistake in 1940 in providing for one man holding the position of Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator, it was at the request of Jesse H. Jones. That mistake should now be corrected.

While I do not agree with the economic views of Henry Wallace, I want to be fair. I do not want to be picayunish. Nor do I want to be mean. The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture have been represented in the original incorporation of the Export-Import Bank, Secretary Roper of Commerce and Chester C. Davis of the Department of Agriculture being among the original incorporators, and the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture have been represented as trustees down to the present date. It is common knowledge that the representative is named by the head of the Department. Secretary Wallace could have named himself at any time before his term of office as Secretary of Agriculture expired.

As matters stand, the Export-Import Bank is under the administration of Leo T. Crowley. Under the George bill the Secretary of Commerce would have the same representation that the Secretary of Commerce has always had, whether that Secretary was Jesse H. Jones, Harry Hopkins, or Daniel C. Roper.

As I have stated, the Export-Import Bank has actually made loans aggregating approximately $485,000,000 of which approximately $256,000,000 have been repaid. There are outstanding loans today aggregating approximately $220,000,000. Substantially one-half of the outstanding loans have been made to Brazil and to China. Substantially no additional loans will be made without further authority of Congress. Amendments to the Export-Import Bank Act could then be adopted, and provision to safeguard the loans of the bank could be made.

The purpose of the pending bill is to provide that the Federal Loan Agency shall be administered as an independent establishment. Amendments can be made when the Export-Import Bank amendments to increase the authorizations for loans or the powers of the bank are under consideration.

A mistake was made in combining the office of Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator. The purpose of the bill is to correct that mistake. If corrective legislation is essential respecting either the Export-Import Bank or Reconstruction Finance Corporation or other banking agencies owned by the Government, such amendments should be considered on their merits. The proposed Export-Import Bank amendment is partisan and is intended to embarrass the President of the United States in the exercise of his executive functions.

Additional legislation with respect to Government loan agencies and with respect to auditing Government corporations is necessary, but hearings will have to be conducted so that Congress may be fully advised in the premises. The bill is being considered under an open rule. While there were no hearings by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, there were hearings in the Senate, and these hearings are available to the House in accordance with the custom that obtains. A repetition of the hearings was wholly unnecessary. I trust the bill will pass without amendments that would cripple and prevent the Federal Loan Agency being established as an independent establishment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I simply asked the gentleman to yield to correct what I thought was a misstatement, when I thought the gentleman said the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State were instructed to organize the Export-Import Bank. I want to read from Executive Order No. 6581 in that respect:

> The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce—
>
> The Secretary of Agriculture is not named—
>
> are hereby authorized and directed to cause said Corporation to be formed, with such certificates of incorporation, and bylaws, as they shall deem requisite and necessary to define the methods by which the Corporation shall conduct its business.

Then further it goes on to say:

> It is hereby further directed that any common stock in said Corporation standing in the name of the United States shall be voted by such person or persons as they—the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce—shall appoint as their joint agent or agents for that purpose. Any vacancies occuring in the initial board of trustees shall be filled by the board of trustees, subject to the approval of the President of the United States.

The point is simply that the board as such never had any authority to delegate to anyone the voting stock; that under the President's Executive order which was frozen by an act of Congress continuing the Export-Import Bank, the President had no authority if he did issue any such Executive order—and I understand that he did not—to turn the voting power over to anyone contrary to the provisions of the Executive order which we froze in its condition then by the law which extended the life of the Export-Import Bank; and I want to read that for emphasis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The President in that Executive order stated:

> It is hereby further directed that any common stock in such Corporation standing in the name of the United States shall be voted by such person or persons as they, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, shall appoint as their agent or agents for that purpose.

And I defy the gentleman from Mississippi, or anyone else, to find anything whatsoever in any Executive order which authorizes Leo Crowley to vote the stock of that Corporation, or authorization of the President contrary to the terms of the act. The President surely would not do that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

The President surely would not have any authority to nullify or amend an act of Congress in that or any other respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss this bill for just a moment divorced from the question of Mr. Wallace. I do this only because I spent 4½ years as personal assistant to the Secretary of Commerce some 20 years ago and have been tremendously interested in the functioning of that Department in relation to other departments of the Government.

The pending bill has come before us for political reasons and political reasons only; it was not considered on its merits as a piece of constructive legislation from the point of view of the organization of this Government. The Department of Commerce was organized in the first instance to be of assistance to American business in both the domestic and foreign fields. It was organized out of a number of independent units such as the Bureau of Standards and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, but perhaps its most important function was through what is known as the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. In other words, it has always been insisted that the Secretary of Commerce should be the individual in the Cabinet whose responsibility was for both the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States.

When the Federal loan functions were transferred to Mr. Jesse Jones as Secretary of Commerce I believe the right move was made from the point of view of simplifying the terrible tangle of independent agencies we now have in this city at the present time. In the foreign field there is nothing more hideous than what is going on from the point of view of fighting of these various independent agencies. If we are now again because of the political situation that faces us with respect to one man going to take away from the place where they properly belong these lending agencies, it seems to me we are taking a step in the wrong direction. Further than that, insofar as the Export-Import Bank is concerned, I am sorry to say I differ with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan. I believe very strongly that from the point of view of permanent organization that one man who should without any question sit on the board of the Export-Import Bank is the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. Gladly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say that under the amendment I propose to offer the President is now precluded from nominating the Secretary of Commerce as one member of the board of directors, but he must be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman. I did not understand the amendment that way. I fully approve the amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Under the law as it now stands the board of directors is appointed by Mr. Leo Crowley entirely.

Mr. HERTER. That, to my mind, is a completely bad piece of governmental organization. I think the whole set-up of the F. E. A. is a bad piece of governmental organization. The functions of the F. E. A. ought to be under the Secretary of Commerce or under the Secretary of State. We have a situation today in Washington whereby there are so many independent agencies, all of them reporting directly to the President of the United States, that it is impossible for any one living man to try to get any information about what they do. The Cabinet was set up for the purpose of trying to unify policies under the President of the United States; yet we have today literally scores of independent agencies, every one of which reports to no one but the President of the United States, and they are responsible for more confusion than any other single factor in our governmental set-up. Much has been said about the size of these Federal lending agencies and putting them under the Secretary of Commerce. To my mind, that is an entirely extraneous argument again. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission or the Maritime Commission itself, have during this war period spent and disposed of infinitely more money than is represented by all of these lending agencies put together. There is no reason in the world why one man should not be qualified to carry out those responsibilities and add to better structure of government rather a worse set-up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, the George bill has come to the House of Representatives with the unanimous support of the Banking and Currency Committee, accomplishing the separation of the loaning corporations that formerly were a part of the Federal Loan Agency from the Department of Commerce.

What controversy remains revolves about the desire of some members of the committee to secure the passage of amendments to the George bill which will further delimit the activities of the Secretary of Commerce.

It is obvious that the proponents of these amendments realize that the confirmation of Henry A. Wallace is a foregone conclusion, and it is the desire to reduce the activities of the Department as a specific curb on Mr. Wallace.

I shall address my remarks largely to the proposal that the Secretary of Commerce shall be stripped of his relationship to the Export-Import Bank.

The Secretary of Commerce is now 1 of the 11 trustees of the Export-Import Bank, an institution of New Deal origin that in 10 years of existence has had profits of $35,000,000 and is now operated by a force of some 70 persons. That news ought to gladden the heart of some prophets of doom and destruction.

It is my contention that the Secretary of Commerce is rightly a trustee of this institution, and that the very purposes of his Department—the enlargement of the foreign trade of this country—dictate that he should have a voice in the management of this bank.

Of the 11 trustees of the bank now in office, 1 represents the Department of State, another the Treasury Department, another the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, another the Department of Agriculture, another the Foreign Economic Administration, and another the Department of Commerce. All these departments have a direct and vital interest in the development of foreign commerce, and each trustee from the scope of his departmental duties can give experienced advice in the management of the bank.

It is therefore the purpose of some to exclude the Secretary of Commerce from an institution in which he has a prime and essential interest.

Presiding over the Department of Commerce, the Secretary now directs the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which gathers information about business in every part of the world, studies trade outlets for American products, examines foreign exchange problems, and collects credit information about business houses.

Describing the official duties of this Bureau, the Congressional Directory says:

> The Bureau continues to bring specific foreign-trade opportunities to the attention of businessmen throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions and has available detailed facts regarding individual foreign firms. It makes studies of foreign transportation and communications and furnishes information to shippers regarding freight rates and facilities to enable them to route shipments advantageously. The Bureau facilitates also the amicable adjustment of commercial disputes and misunderstandings arising between foreign traders in the United States and their clients in foreign countries. It aids in the protection abroad of American industrial property, such as trade-marks and patents. It investigates world stocks of raw materials and is constantly in touch with the course of price trends of commodities of international trade.
>
> Foreign businessmen visiting the United States are aided by the Bureau in establishing suitable contacts with proper American firms.

This information, so valuable to experts who are studying the soundness of proposed loans, is now used regularly by the Export and Import Bank. Its service is utilized because the managers of the bank wisely determined that it would be a waste of money to set up a duplicate branch in the bank.

Examination of applications for loans and their acceptance or rejection is the work of a set of men of long experience in foreign trade who know the credit records of foreign banks, and who have the judgment to decide whether the credit of foreign merchants is acceptable. A small and competent set of men drawn from great financial institutions of the country engaged in foreign trading perform this work for the Export and Import Bank. Their work, as evidenced by the balance sheet of the bank, would demonstrate their competence even to the satisfaction of the chronic critics of the New Deal.

It is true that the board of trustees of the bank, like in every banking institution, finally approves or disapproves of contemplated loans.

And it is also true that the Export and Import Bank, being organized under the banking laws of the District of Columbia, is subject to regular examination, as is the national bank in your home town, by the Comptroller of the Currency.

It is true also that the Export and Import Bank is subject to examination by the General Accounting Office.

In the light of these facts, the movement to remove the Secretary of Commerce from this board is picayunish and political; and, if successful, will accomplish nothing in the interest of wise management of the bank.

If we are to deal with personalities, it is well to remind the House that Henry A. Wallace, during 8 years as Secretary of Agriculture, presided over bureaus in that Department which loaned some $6,000,000,000 to farmers of the country in their days of desperation. Some of the representatives of these farmers now want to curb him from the right of being 1 of 11 trustees to make export loans that, under present law, cannot exceed $700,000,000.

Add this to the fact that Mr. Wallace is the founder and stockholder of a business that does an annual business of $1,000,000 and you have sufficient qualifications to qualify him to be 1 of the 11 trustees of the Export-Import Bank.

I shall recall from our history an incident that parallels the present fight on Mr. Wallace.

When the United States Senate rejected the nomination of Martin Van Buren for Minister to Great Britain, Andrew Jackson said for the ears of the Members of that body: "They have broken a Minister and elected a President of the United States."

What the friends of Mr. Wallace might not be able to do, his enemies are on the way of accomplishing.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the President's message to Congress on February 12 recommending that Congress enact into law the Bretton Woods proposals is, to say the least, a remarkable document in that it grossly misstates facts.

After delineating in broad general terms the investment features of the Bretton Woods proposal for an international bank, the President refers to the

fund proposal in respect of which he says:

> We all know, however, that a proposed world economy must be built on more than foreign investment. Exchange rates must be stabilized, and the channels of trade opened up throughout the world.
> * * * the fund is a financial institution to preserve stability and order in the exchange rates between different moneys.

In the first place there is nothing whatever in the Bretton Woods proposal which really provides for stabilizing the currencies of member countries. It is true that one of the purposes of the fund is stated to be—

> to promote exchange stability, to maintain orderly exchange arrangements among members, and to avoid competitive exchange depreciation.

But the proposal not only fails to provide any prohibition against a member country debasing its currency but actually provides that it shall be free to go as far as it wishes in this respect. Section 5 (f) of Article IV of the agreement provides that if the Fund is so satisfied it shall not object to a country debasing its currency because of "the domestic, social, or political policies of the member proposing the change."

Since domestic, social, or political policies provide the only possible reasons for any country to debase its currency, the field would of necessity be left wide open to all countries to do precisely as they pleased with respect to changing the par value of their currencies.

It is therefore clearly false to say that the Bretton Woods proposal for an international monetary fund contains anything which provides for stabilizing the currencies of the countries that became participants in the scheme.

Furthermore, to bring about stabilization of the currencies of members it would be necessary for them to balance their budgets and to live within their income. A balanced budget is an absolute prerequisite to the stabilization of the currency of any country. No slightest hint is given in the Bretton Woods proposal that even remotely suggests the need for balancing budgets as a requirement for stabilizing currencies.

The President says further:

> It does not create a single money for the world.

This can be very misleading. Section 1 (a) of article IV provides as follows:

> The par value of the currency of each member shall be expressed in terms of gold as a common denominator or in terms of the United States dollar of the weight and fineness in effect on July 1, 1944.

What terms could possibly be used to state more plainly that there shall be created a single money for international transactions than those contained in this paragraph? It provides that the par value of the currency of each member shall be expressed in terms either in some unnamed unit of gold or in terms of the United States dollar.

Now, whether the par value of the currency of a member was expressed in terms of a gold unit or in terms of the dollar, the arrangement would of necessity eventuate in a single currency for the world, certainly for international financial transactions. The par values of the currencies of all member countries would be regulated by either a selected unit of gold or the dollar.

Should it be argued that the unit of value chosen to regulate the par values of members' currencies applies only to the transactions of the fund, that it would not involve those exchange transactions that took place outside the fund and that, therefore, the unit of account chosen by the fund would not become a single world money, the answer is that there cannot be more than one international standard of value. In fact, the Bretton Woods proposal takes care of this by vesting in the fund the power to regulate and control the world price of gold.

Furthermore, the way is left open in this paragraph for the adoption by the fund of Keynes' "Bancor," or Morgenthau's "Unitas," or any one of numerous other terms which have been suggested to designate the international unit of value.

The President, in his message, categorically denies that the scheme proposes to set up a "supergovernment," which also is untrue. The Bretton Woods proposal, even standing by itself, proposes the establishment of a world government. The body governing the fund would be vested with broad powers to pass legislation which would vitally affect the internal policies of the United States as well as other countries. Most of the decisions of the fund would be effectuated by a majority vote. Since the United States would have only 27 percent of the votes, the other countries would be in control, so far as this aspect of the apportionment of control is concerned. Article XVII provides for amendments to the proposals of the scheme. It provides for amending every provision in it with the exception of three, namely, the right to withdraw from the fund, the provision that no change in the members' quota shall be made without its consent, and the provision that no change may be made in the par value of a member's currency except on the proposal of that member. This last does not apply to the provision relating to making uniform changes in the par values of members' currencies.

In appraising the true significance of this proposal for an international monetary set-up, it should be realized first of all that the Congress of the United States would lose its power over our money which the Constitution vests in it. That power would go to the international body. The President, as the representative of the United States, would be in control of 27 percent of that power. With respect to some of the provisions, he would have what might be termed veto power, but it must be realized that the purposes and general plan of the scheme are such as would make the President an integral part of the world body in a manner similar to that of a Congressman representing his particular district but at the same time also the National Government as a whole under the Constitution.

Here are a few examples of the power of legislation that would be given to the scheme.

The fund could amend article IV, section 1 (a), which provides that the par value of the currency of each member shall be expressed in terms of gold as a common denominator or in terms of the United States dollar of the weight and fineness in effect on July 1, 1944, and make the unit of value of the world whatever it pleased.

It is provided that a country may borrow from the fund an amount equal to its quota. This could be changed by amendment so as to make it possible for a country to borrow in excess of its quota.

The proposal provides for the payment of small interest charges on loans made by the fund. This could be stricken by amendment so as to reduce or even eliminate all interest charges. It should be recalled that Morgenthau's draft proposal contained no provision for interest charges.

By amendment the United States could be made to directly assume debts owed by Great Britain to India, Egypt, South American, Scandinavian, and other countries which amount to upward of $12,000,000,000. It should be remembered that Morgenthau's two first draft proposals provided, at the suggestion of Lord Keynes, for the assumption by the United States of those debts.

Numerous other similar changes in the law which created this international scheme could be made by the international body.

Furthermore, President Roosevelt's statement that this does not set up a world government is not in harmony with the thought expressed by the father of this scheme, Lord John Maynard Keynes. In his proposal for an International Clearing Union, he says:

> The Union might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world.
> Without it other more desirable developments will find themselves impeded and unsupported. With it, they will fall into their place as parts of an ordered scheme.
> The Union might set up a clearing account in favor of international bodies charged with post-war relief, rehabilitaton, and reconstruction. But it could go much further than this. For it might supplement contributions received from other sources by granting preliminary overdraft facilities in favor of these bodies, the overdraft being discharged over a period of years out of the reserve fund of the Union, or, if necessary, out of a levy on surplus credit balances. * * *
> The Union might set up an account in favor of any supernational policing body which may be charged with the duty of preserving the peace and maintaining international order. If any country were to infringe its properly authorized orders, the policing body might be entitled to request the governors of the Clearing Union to hold the clearing account of the delinquent country to its order and permit no further transactions on the account except by its authority. This would provide an excellent machinery for enforcing a financial blockade.
> The Union might set up an account in favor of international bodies charged with the management of a commodity control, and might finance stocks of commodities held by such bodies, allowing them overdraft facilities on their accounts up to an agreed maximum. By this means the financial problem of buffer stocks and ever-normal granaries could be effectively attacked.
> The Union might be linked up with a board for international investment. It might act on behalf of such a board and collect for them the annual service of their loans by automatically debiting the clearing account of the country concerned. * * *

There are various methods by which the Clearing Union could use its influence and its powers to maintain stability of prices and to control the trade cycle. * * * If an international investment or development corporation is also set up together with a scheme of commodity controls for the control of stocks of the staple primary products, we might come to possess in these three institutions a powerful means of combating the evils of the trade cycle, by exercising contractionist or expansionist influence on the system as a whole or on particular sections. This is a large and important question which cannot be discussed adequately in this paper; and need not be examined at length in this place because it does not raise any important issues affecting the fundamental constitution of the proposed Union. It is mentioned here to complete the picture of the wider purposes which the foundation of the Clearing Union might be made to serve.

In line with Lord Keynes' suggestion for world government, the President recommended in the message here referred to the following:

The establishment of the food and agriculture organization of the United Nations, broadening and strengthening of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, international agreement for the reduction of trade barriers, the control of cartels and the orderly marketing of world surpluses of certain commodities, a revision of the Export-Import Bank, and an international oil agreement—

And so forth.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. It seems to me that boiled down to the lowest common denominator, it is simply a case of setting up either a fund or a bank in which the borrowers control the bank.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Indeed that is the case. The borrowers would have a majority of votes and would be in absolute control of the lending policies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this procedure seems to have degenerated, shall we say, in large measure, into a political controversy.

I mentioned on the outside that I thought I would ask for a little time. In talking to a friend of mine he advised me not to go into politics. He said, "The Republican Party is dead, without promise of a resurrection unless they experience a new birth."

So I said, "In view of the fact that you may have something there, I believe I will refrain from entering into that controversy."

I do not know that it makes much difference, though I think it is pertinent to refer to it, that this is a Senate bill. This bill came to us from the Senate, voted as it was, by a majority of 74 to 12. If there is any political fact connected with the appointment of a Secretary of Commerce by the President of the United States, it would seem to have found its origin, at least, in the Senate.

Whether the bill came to us because of a feeling in the other body that it should be done anyway, or that some people would prefer the Federal lending agencies should be separated from the Department of Commerce on account of someone being suggested to that body for confirmation, or whether it came because its author had been thinking about it a year or two but just happened not to introduce the bill until a short time ago, I have not heard anybody object seriously to a divorcement from the Department of Commerce of the lending agencies, many in number, comprehended under the Federal Loan Agency administration, including the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. So that probably we will all agree that however the bill found its way here, whatever the occasion was that caused its introduction and passage by the other body by an overwhelming majority, it is not a bad piece of legislation. It comes to us in that fashion. The Committee on Banking and Currency has received some little castigation. I do not mind that, although I am a humble member of that committee, because you know if a man thinks he is pretty nearly right and somebody who does not know anything about what he is talking about wants to criticize him, he can take that criticism very easily.

It does not disturb me at all. The trouble about this whole thing is—I am not going to say that with political design, but for some reason or other—we are not content to let the Senate work its own way in the confirmation of the President's nominee as Secretary of Commerce, but we want to put our hand into it and go to Bretton Woods, go to the Export-Import Bank, and drag things into the consideration here that have no place in this matter so far as the bill itself is concerned, or the appointment or confirmation of a Secretary of Commerce is concerned.

What right have we, the House of Representatives—put it upon any basis you wish—to say to the Senate: "Your bill is not right, your bill is faulty in that it is deficient"? And we want to go into the great ramifications of the operations of the Export-Import Bank at a time when that agency of the Government must deal particularly with international affairs affecting the post-war period, affecting the policy of the Government of the United States and its people with respect to our treatment of the rehabilitation of the world, or our contribution to bringing it about. We say we will drag that into this bill which the Senate has sent us and the Banking and Currency Committee approved just as it came to us because it is largely a Senate matter, but we concede that it is a good bill; yet there is a proposal to add to it, on some pretext, agencies involving other problems of vast import.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I cannot quite follow the reasoning of the gentleman from North Carolina. It has been my thought that in legislative processes the House is never supposed to accept a Senate bill—neither is the Senate supposed to accept a House bill—without the opportunity of offering amendments and changing the bill. I believe we are within our rights certainly and that we have a right to express our interest in the future of this Government by seeking to improve a bill which Members of the House feel can be approved by amendment.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I believe I get the idea without any enlargement of it. No; I do not deny the right of the House to amend bills that come to it from the other body. These amendments were offered in committee and were voted down. I am making the point, however—take it from any angle you wish—that this bill, having originated in the Senate, affects the conduct of that body in that it involves a duty that they themselves are charged with and something with which you and I, under the Constitution, have nothing to do. It would, therefore, be presumptuous on us, highly presumptuous, to take a bill that is sent to us by that tremendous majority in the other body and undertake to add to it very serious enlargements that in actuality have no place in this controversy; and whether done for that purpose or not, it begins to affect the right of the Senate to pass upon the confirmation of the nomination of a man to be a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States. The President sent his name to the Senate for confirmation, not to the House.

It is quite presumptuous on our part to undertake to stymie the purposes or to stop or to interfere with the Senate in the performance of the duties which the Constitution placed upon it by gumming up this bill. I do not think we ought to do it.

The bill ought to pass as it is written.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation comes before us by reason of a very unusual and unnecessary procedure. The President of the United States has the authority to select the members of his own Cabinet, subject only to confirmation by the Senate. Regardless of whether Jesse Jones was an efficient Secretary of Commerce, the President still had the right to ask for his resignation and the right to recommend Mr. Wallace for that position. When the President sent his appointment to the Senate there was only one proposition to be considered, and that was whether the Senate would accept the President's recommendation and confirm Mr. Wallace's appointment.

The bill before us today is the result of an effort to evade the responsibility of approving the appointment of a man who was considered by nearly everyone to be incompetent to fill the very responsible position of Secretary of Commerce.

I have listened with interest to the debates this afternoon—those on the rule and also those in general debate. Our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] raised the claim that this was a political issue as far as the Republicans are concerned. I am sure that it was more than a political issue with the Republicans, because usually the Republicans do not vote 100 percent at any time, but today they voted 100 percent in opposition to the rule which brings this

bill up for consideration by the House at this time. The fact that the vote in another body of Congress on taking away from Mr. Wallace all power over these great financial institutions was about 6 to 1 proves conclusively that if there was any politics in this it was the politics that manifested itself in another body where as many Democrats voted in favor of taking this responsibility from Mr. Wallace as did Republicans. Whatever politics there is in this matter in either body of the Congress of the United States is the politics that manifested itself in resentment against the selection of a man for this very important position who has demonstrated in many ways his total incapacity to fill the place.

If it had not been for the opposition by the Democrats in another body of this Congress, Mr. Wallace would have been confirmed and this legislation would not be here today. They have laid aside the confirmation of Mr. Wallace until this legislation or some other legislation might be passed that would shear from him all powers over these great financial institutions and organizations.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is one of the Government's greatest financial agencies. I was a Member of this House when the bill setting up this great organization was passed. I took a very active interest in the setting up of this great organization and President Hoover showed his fairness by selecting as one member of the directing force of this organization a strong Democrat, who is none other than Jesse Jones. There was no politics from the Republican standpoint when Mr. Jones was appointed and there has been no politics, as far as the Republicans are concerned, in the management of the R. F. C.

There are other mighty agencies that have been built up that should not be the subject of political activity and should not be handled by incompetents, and especially by anyone who expects to hand out favors.

If it should develop that a majority of the Congress are in favor of passing legislation that will in effect take from the Secretary of Commerce the control over any and all these great financial institutions, then I hope that this bill might be recommitted to the Banking and Currency Committee so that that great committee would bring forth a bill that would do the job. This bill will only do a part of what should be done. This only applies to certain financial institutions and is not complete in every respect. The Secretary of Commerce should be a Secretary of Commerce and not a moneylender or a financial representative of the Government of the United States. That work should be done by a special agency adequately equipped and ably represented.

Our great country has demonstrated its greatness more in the financial field than in any other way in the last 20 years. We are the greatest financial power in the world. After the war more will be expected of us than ever. All financial stabilization efforts wherever attempted in the world will take into consideration the power and the wishes of the United States. It would be dangerous to our financial structure and would be a terrible blow to our prestige as a nation to have an incompetent representing us on this important work. As the bloodstream is the life of the body, so finance is the real bloodstream of national life and progress. The values of all commodities and the practical things of life are measured in terms of money. National improvements in all nations of the world will depend largely upon the financial structure of the country in which the improvements are proposed. When the war is over these great financial institutions will move into places of prominence in national affairs. While the war is on the Army and the Navy occupy the front rank in our interest. The Army and the Navy, in order to win the war, must be destructive. Property must be destroyed and lives must be lost but in peacetimes the reverse is the program. Properties must be rehabilitated and lives must be rehabilitated. All these programs cost money.

It is too dangerous to place these great financial programs in incompetent hands.

I shall vote to recommit this bill, and I hope I shall be in the majority in that respect.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER], who just preceded me on the floor in this debate, urged that we should pass S. 375 without amendment. The Senate has acted on this bill, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] says that we should accept it as passed by the Senate because this is a matter for consideration by the Senate.

The Constitution wisely provides for a Senate and a House of Representatives. Each body is free to work its will. It is the duty of the House to consider any bill passed by the Senate and in its wisdom it may amend the bill, accept it, or reject it.

A great many Democrats and Republicans think that this bill should be amended to keep the President from turning over the Export-Import Bank, with its lending capacity of billions of dollars to foreign countries, to the Department of Commerce.

If Mr. Wallace is not competent to efficiently operate the R. F. C. and its affiliate lending agencies, then he is not competent to operate the great Export-Import Bank.

WHO BROUGHT UP THE POLITICAL ISSUE?

The distinguished Democratic leader charges that the Republicans injected politics into this matter. He is in error. President Roosevelt directly raised the political issue. He wrote the Honorable Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, a letter in which he praised Mr. Jones as a very able, efficient, and honest public servant, but stated that in view of the fact that the Honorable Henry A. Wallace had rendered service to him in the last Presidential campaign he was compelled to ask Mr. Jones to resign to make a place for Mr. Wallace and pay a political debt to Mr. Wallace, although Mr. Jones has always been a very active and effective Democrat. The appointment of Mr. Wallace was nothing more than a payoff of a political debt. The President proposes to place Mr. Wallace in charge of the great Department of Commerce to which the President transferred the R. F. C. and many other affiliated lending agencies of the Government that have power to lend, own, and control perhaps $40,000,000,000 worth of money, notes, securities, and other property.

Never was the spoils system invoked in such a flagrant and unjustifiable manner as in this instance, when the President of the United States brazenly states in a letter that he is demanding the resignation of an able, honest, experienced public official in order to make a place for Mr. Wallace and pay a political debt.

The Corrupt Practices Acts passed by Congress have tried to eliminate such deals and juggling with public offices. It was this act on the part of the President that immediately caused a burst of indignation among a great many able Democratic Senators and condemnation generally by the press and the people of the Nation.

The friends of Mr. Wallace got busy and urged his confirmation. The Democrats have 57 Members in the Senate, the Republicans only 38. These Democratic Senators knew Mr. Wallace, his character, and his abilities well. Most of them knew him intimately for 8 years as Secretary of Agriculture, and he had presided over the Senate for 4 long years as Vice President. The Democrats set out to defeat the confirmation.

They were unwilling to trust Mr. Wallace with these forty billions of assets of the R. F. C. and affiliated lending agencies. They realized that as a general rule the President may select whomsoever he wishes as a member of his Cabinet; however, a majority of the Democratic Senators were unwilling to risk all this business and assets in Mr. Wallace's hands and therefore they postponed the consideration of the nomination until March 1, 1945. On the motion to take up the nomination then the motion lost because there were 42 for the motion and 42 against it, and final consideration of the nomination was deferred until March 1.

It was Mr. Wallace and his friends who were backing off. They wanted time to get a bill through Congress divorcing the R. F. C. and the affiliated lending agencies from the Department of Commerce, so that Mr. Wallace might have a chance to get through if the office carried no more than the powers and duties of the Department of Commerce itself.

The R. F. C. and affiliated agencies should never have been transferred by the President to the Department of Commerce. I spoke and voted against the bill giving to him that authority, and it was opposed by practically every Republican in the House and Senate. I was pleased today to hear Mr. MCCORMACK, the distinguished Democratic leader, say that it was a mistake to have placed the R. F. C. and its affiliated lending agencies under the Department of Commerce. They claimed, when we had the bill up giving the President power to reorganize the departments and bureaus of the

other agencies of the Government that it would make them more effective and would save money. Of course, we know that they are less effective, and it has increased the cost greatly and has increased the number of Federal officeholders so that we now have 3,309,000 Federal officeholders. I am glad today to support this bill to divorce the R. F. C. and other Federal lending agencies from the Department of Commerce and to have a thorough check and audit made of these agencies by the Comptroller General.

A bill, S. 375, was introduced by an able Democratic Senator. That bill came up in the Senate and it passed by a vote of 74 to 12.

What was the title of S. 375? "To provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government."

And what are its provisions? It provides that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its other affiliated loan agencies be separated from the office of the Department of Commerce. It also provided that the Comptroller General of the United States shall audit the records and accounts of the R. F. C. and its other lending agencies.

The title of the bill condemns Mr. Wallace as unfitted to handle the Department of Commerce with R. F. C. and its affiliated lending agencies attached, because it provides, as we have stated heretofore, that this act is necessary for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government. In other words, Mr. Wallace could not effectively administer the R. F. C. and the other lending agencies, and in order that the R. F. C. and the other lending agencies be effectively administered, they must be taken from the Department of Commerce.

Now, this is a severe condemnation of Mr. Wallace. The Republicans did not introduce that bill. They did not put that statement in the bill. It was the distinguished Democratic Senator who introduced the bill and it was voted out by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, controlled by the Democrats. And on the passage of the bill a majority of the Democrats voted for that bill with that language, saying in effect that Mr. Wallace is not the type of man who could handle money and securities and make loans and direct the fiscal affairs of the R. F. C. and the other lending agencies of the Government.

It comes with poor grace on the part of the distinguished Democratic leader of the House to say that this is Republican partisan politics. The condemnation is more severe because it comes from the Democratic majority of the Senate over which Mr. Wallace presided for 4 years, and from the Democratic majority who knew him 8 years as Secretary of Agriculture. And the strange thing about it is that Mr. Wallace and his friends have been moving heaven and earth to have this bill passed, this S. 375. They are willing to accept it with all its bitter coating of condemnation. They want Mr. Wallace to have a job and they want it very much indeed. They know that he cannot get the job as Secretary of Commerce unless the R. F. C. and the other lending agencies and all of the business and assets of these concerns are separated from the Department of Commerce. And therefore Mr. Wallace and his friends are willing to swallow this bitter pill in order that he may get back on the pay roll and at the feed trough in Washington.

The bill, after it passed the Senate, came to the House and was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, controlled by the Democrats. They would not permit the bill to be amended in the public interest. Every Democrat on the committee joined in voting S. 375 out, which says as effectively as the English language can state it that there could not be an effective administration of the R. F. C. and these other lending agencies of the Government under Mr. Wallace.

THE DEMOCRATS DON'T WANT MR. WALLACE

Some of Mr. Wallace's close admirers and friends in the beginning insisted that he have the Department of Commerce, with the R. F. C. and other affiliated lending agencies. They stated that it was necessary for him to have these $40,000,000,000 of assets in order for him to help the little man. I am wondering if the President really wanted Mr. Wallace to have this place. If he did, why did he write that awful letter to Mr. Jones in which he stated that he was appointing Mr. Wallace to this very, very important office in order to pay off a political debt? Did not the President realize that such a letter would doom the ratification of Mr. Wallace's appointment? Although Mr. Wallace had been Secretary of Agriculture for 8 years and was Vice President of the United States, the Democratic National Convention refused to renominate him. Their slogan for President Roosevelt was that it would be unwise to change horses in the middle of the stream and nominated Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term, and at the same time they took the other horse, Mr. Wallace, after one term, out of the team in the middle of the stream.

We pointed out that when he was named for this important post, the Democrats arose up in arms in the Senate and refused to confirm Mr. Wallace. The coat and shoes of Mr. Jones were too big for Mr. Wallace. They must cut them down. Mr. Wallace and his close friends said that if they would take away the R. F. C. and other lending agencies from the Department of Commerce there would be scarcely anything left, but the Democrats introduced S. 375 and put it through the Senate, and I assume they are going to put it through the House, that cuts down the coat and the shoes of Jesse Jones, trying to make it fit a much smaller man for a smaller job, and it is not at all certain that Mr. Wallace will be confirmed even if these important agencies are separated from the Department of Commerce. Apparently a majority of the Democrats do not have faith in the executive and administrative ability of Mr. Wallace. Mr. Wallace must have a very thick skin. What other man, unless he is very hungry for public office, would accept the appointment as Secretary of the Department of Commerce, appointed as he was as a political pay-off, and in view of the action taken by the Senate, and Democrats of the House in presenting and urging the passage of S. 375. The press generally, Democrat, Independent, and Republican has condemned this appointment. Certain groups have been very vocal in urging the appointment. The Communists, the radical Socialists, and other radical groups, have been and still are very active.

I have received many letters from many people in all walks of life in my district and I have talked to many persons and his appointment is generally condemned. In fact, I have received only one letter urging me to support Mr. Wallace.

The R. F. C. with its affiliated lending agencies, is a powerful force for good or evil in this country. Think of the power that goes with $40,000,000,000 of money and other assets. This immense power and money would enable a man, if he desired, to change, yes, to destroy private enterprise, individual initiative, and change our free economy and democracy into a radical, totalitarian form of government. This should not be turned over to any man, except one with the highest patriotic purposes, with wide experience and profound business sagacity and judgment. These forty billions belong to the taxpayers of the Nation. These billions of money and other assets must be used to promote the welfare of the American people. That must not be destroyed or frittered away to promote the political interests of any man or group or to change our form of government. Does anyone doubt if Mr. Wallace and those around him if entrusted with all of this money, assets, and power would not find a way to justify their use in promoting his candidacy for President in 1948? They could very well believe they would be doing the country a service in promoting the political interest of Mr. Wallace.

IS MR. WALLACE QUALIFIED BY TRAINING OR EXPERIENCE?

He was Secretary of Agriculture for 8 years. He is regarded as being an influential force in the left wing of his party. The Communists and other radicals would rejoice to see him come into power. We know something about Mr. Wallace's notions of how to bring about prosperity. He says that he wants to use this great influence with the R. F. C. and other lending agencies to insure prosperity following the war. For 8 years he had billions at his disposal. He championed the policy of scarcity to bring about prosperity. It was Mr. Wallace who conceived the idea and put it into execution that in order for our country to be prosperous we should burn 5,000,000 pigs, kill 250,000 mother sows that were about to bring pigs that he declared would average about 6 pigs to the sow. In other words, 6,500,000 pigs and mother sows were destroyed; millions of head of cattle and sheep were destroyed. He ordered tens of millions of acres of corn, wheat, barley, oats, rye, rice, tobacco, and cotton plowed under. He paid out billions to big corporations and individuals not to produce on their farms and at a time when President Roosevelt was saying to the Congress and the

American people that one-third of the American people were poorly fed and poorly clothed. These farm products which were being destroyed would have provided food and clothing. Millions of acres of productive land was taken out of production, and at the same time through his program hundreds of millions of dollars were spent to bring unproductive land into production.

Of course, this policy of Mr. Wallace was finally abandoned. How could there be prosperity and happiness on an economic policy of scarcity? Through all the centuries the peoples of all nations and at all times have held days of thanksgiving to their God or gods for having given them bounteous crops. Mr. Wallace worked in reverse. I do not believe there can be prosperity through scarcity. We must have plenty.

DID HE HELP THE LITTLE MAN?

We hear much talk that if Mr. Wallace could get in and control these $40,000,000,000 of money and other assets it would be a great help to the little man, as he is a special friend to the little man. Let us again examine the record. In the farm cut-out benefits program did it really help the little man or the big man. We recall that through his plan approximately a million dollars was paid out to a big cotton corporation in the South not to produce cotton. Another million dollars was paid a corporation not to produce sugar. A great many big insurance companies that had foreclosed their mortgages and had taken over farms were each paid all the way from $30,000 to $200,000 not to produce on their farms. One group of persons received $245,000 not to raise hogs. Five rice concerns received from $50,000 to $100,000 each not to produce rice. The State Penitentiary of Mississippi received $50,000 not to produce cotton, and thousands of other concerns during this program received from $10,000 to $200,000 not to produce cotton or sugar or corn or wheat, and what a list of names there were of those who received $5,000 or more not to produce on their lands. For a long time the American people had no way of knowing who was receiving these big sums. Mr. Wallace took the position that it was a private affair, although they were being paid out of the taxpayers' money. He refused to disclose the names, and after a long fight in Congress lasting 2 or 3 years, we finally got a bill through requiring Mr. Wallace to publish the names of those receiving $10,000 or more annually in these benefits, and what a long, long, impressive list that was.

Now what about the little farmer—the little man? They received on an average the paltry sum of $66 per year. Knowing those facts as I do I have never been able to class Mr. Wallace as a great friend to the little man. Mr. Wallace talks about producing 60,000,000 jobs after the war. I am inclined to thing that we can have the 60,000,000 jobs without Mr. Wallace or Mr. Roosevelt. These will come about because of the demand from the American people and other parts of the world, and the people can buy and pay for these goods and services if they can get the money on their bonds.

Commissions were appointed to investigate the effect of this cut-out program of Mr. Wallace on the jobs of the American people. It took away the jobs of literally millions of people. Mr. Wallace, I understand, has made some money through the patent he secured on hybrid corn, and we have heard it said many times that his hybrid corn seed business was pushed rather vigorously while he was Secretary of Agriculture and was in touch with the American farmers, and except for that we know of no successes that Mr. Wallace has had in a business or professional way.

It is little wonder that the Democrats, knowing Mr. Wallace's record as Secretary of Agriculture and as Vice President, took him out of the team at the Democratic Convention at Chicago, and his Democratic brethren in the Senate, with whom he was associated for 4 years, refused to confirm him as Secretary of Commerce and let him play with these $40,000,000,000 of assets with his feet off the ground and his head in the skies. Mr. Wallace has already cost the American people billions of dollars and denied to them the prosperity to which they were entitled.

The friends of Mr. Wallace are vocal. The Democrats have been trying for a long time to get rid of Mr. Wallace. They know that he cannot conduct the Department of Commerce, the R. F. C., and these other lending agencies, with ability and efficiency and Mr. Wallace's friends know that he cannot be confirmed unless the R. F. C. and other lending agencies are divorced from the Department of Commerce, and therefore the Democrats bring in this bill, S. 375, with the title "To provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government." They know that they cannot be efficiently administered under Mr. Wallace and if they are efficiently administered they must be under some person other than Mr. Wallace.

The only fear is that the President, unless Congress prevents, will give him other agencies; for instance, the Export-Import Bank, that perhaps in a month or two will have a loaning power and authority of eight billions. Mr. Wallace can use this tremendous power in developing his world-wide notions in taking care of the world.

I shall vote for an amendment that will prevent the President from turning over the Export-Import Bank to Mr. Wallace if he is confirmed. If he is not able to handle the forty billions, I am unwilling to giving him an agency whereby he can handle eight billions. I believe that Mr. Wallace is an inexperienced, impracticable, crystal-gazing public official. I do not believe there could be an effective administration of the Export-Import Bank under Mr. Wallace. The Banking and Currency Committee of the House did not hold any hearings on this bill. We have very little information except what was submitted in the Senate. I shall vote to recommit this bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency in order that they may hold hearings and give it further study and consideration. If Mr. Wallace had proved himself to be capable, in my opinion he would not have been turned down at the Chicago convention by his party and the Democrats in the Senate would not have balked at his confirmation.

I wish to repeat, it is most remarkable that after having presided over that great body in which there are 57 Democrats and only 38 Republicans, he could not immediately upon his retirement be confirmed to an office to which he was appointed by the President and with all the pressure the President and his administration put back of Mr. Wallace.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, many charges have been made on this floor in the last few days against a great American, Henry A. Wallace. These charges have been intemperate and vague. No substantiation in the way of facts have been offered to support them.

Can it be possible that his accusers are resorting to hysteria and calumny to bolster a cause which in their hearts they admit to be groundless?

Mr. Wallace has been labeled "visionary," "impractical," "wild-eyed dreamer," and other names of like character.

His accusers have not been specific in their accusations. I believe that Mr. Wallace has been uncommonly frank in stating his ideas. I challenge his accusers to attack his ideas and not the man.

His opponents may defeat the man at this time, but good ideas cannot be defeated. Good ideas live on in the minds of men long after their champion is gone. The following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 25 presents a challenge to those who would destroy a man because of his good ideas:

WALLACE'S WILD AND VISIONARY IDEAS

We have carefully read the "wild" and "visionary" 6,500-word statement which the radical and "crackpot" Henry Wallace made yesterday before the Senate Commerce Committee. Then we read it again to find out who was crazy, Wallace himself or those who say that for him to replace Jesse Jones means the doom of our Republic.

Wallace thinks private enterprise—we repeat, private enterprise—can produce 60,000,000 jobs after the war.

He reasons this way: We are now producing goods worth two hundred billions a year, or twice as much as we produced before the war. He thinks if we can produce guns, ships, and planes we can also produce houses, cars, and clothing. How crazy is that?

This man has faith in America. He thinks that, since we led the world in establishing political democracy, we have also the stuff to lead it in establishing economic democracy. Well, haven't we?

However, Wallace does not think that the job of making 60,000,000 jobs can be tackled by 20,000 big enterprises alone; but that 3,000,000 small businesses must also produce jobs. If that's radical, Thomas Jefferson is revolving in his grave.

Wallace believes the future of the American worker lies in the well-being of private enterprise, and vice versa, and that working as a team they are unbeatable. What, no socialism, no communism?

In order to provide jobs Wallace says we must have great business expansion and this should be financed through private investment capital. However, in cases where special risks are involved, the Government should step in and guarantee the lender against loss.

This is exactly what the Government is now doing in the case of V loans, F. H. A. loans, etc. Maybe it should not guarantee against risks now and maybe it should not guarantee against risks after the war. So far as we could figure out, this part about guaranteeing private lenders against risk, in the interest of an expanding post-war economy, was the most radical thing in Wallace's speech.

Of course, America was built by risk takers, people who fondly embraced the inalienable right to lose their shirts. If we had a few men around like Bet-a-Million Gates, maybe Henry Wallace wouldn't have brought up the subject at all.

But to go on with a sketch of the radical Henry's ideas. He thinks private investors can gainfully lend twenty billions a year after the war.

New construction and expansion should provide 5,000,000 more jobs a year in this field than we had before the war.

In a nutshell, he thinks that if we are going to have jobs for all, we must have expanded private industry. This industry will be privately owned, privately operated, and privately financed, with Government stepping in only to share with the private investor unusual and abnormal risks which may be involved in getting started.

Along with a bigger domestic market, we should have a bigger foreign market. Our heavy-equipment industries will sell a lot of their production abroad. Our farmers will ship boatloads of cotton, tobacco, and wheat. And so on.

With reciprocal trade agreements and our already existent Export-Import Bank, along with new measures for international credit and currency stabilization, Wallace thinks America can play a big—and profitable—role in developing the economies of other nations. A lot of people who haven't been accused of crack-potism think so, too.

If private enterprise cannot produce 60,000,000 jobs, what then? Wallace thinks the Government should be on watch, and when employment begins to fall below 57,000,000, a reservoir of public works should be tapped.

But public works, he thinks, should not produce Government, or relief, or leaf-raking jobs. No, says Wallace, they should produce private jobs. Construction should be done by private firms under contract to the Government, private firms to employ private labor.

Other dangerous ideas of Wallace:

Wages should be kept high after the war to provide purchasing power for expanding economy.

Profits should be kept high, too.

Taxes should be lowered.

Farmers should have good incomes, enabling them to have better homes, indoor bathrooms, and electric lights.

Monopolies and cartels should not be encouraged, as they stand in the way of free enterprise.

New businesses like aviation, television, frequency modulation, fibers, plastics, should let in the little fellow, as well as the big fellow.

Small new firms become great firms.

We should build through private enterprise 2,000,000 homes a year.

We should get rid of slums.

We should be a land of home owners, and new homes should have all the fine new gadgets.

We could use more hospitals, more clinics, more doctors.

We need a broader social-security program.

We need more schools and more teachers.

So goes the radical program of the crackpot Wallace. To his detractors, after outlining the program, he says:

"There are those who say that these goals are the dreams of a 'man willing to jeopardize the country's future with untried ideas and idealistic schemes.' These people think they are realists. Actually they are the persons of limited vision and stunted imagination. * * * These people think the same as those who said the President was dreaming when he declared in 1940 that the American people would produce 50,000 planes in 1 year."

Maybe Mr. Wallace is all wrong. Maybe he is a crackpot and a visionary. Maybe our private enterprise can't produce, as he thinks it can, 60,000,000 jobs a year. Maybe we can't have more cars, more homes, more bathtubs, more clothes, more gadgets. Maybe we can't be a healthy, prosperous, independent, happy people.

But if the time has come when Americans cannot share with Henry Wallace an optimistic view of their own future; if the time has come when America cannot flex its muscles and look to the future with high hope and the old covered-wagon determination, then God help us!

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, pursuant to House Resolution 137, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today in the Committee of the Whole and include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole an editorial from the Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from the Air Force magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post on the rights of witnesses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CRIMEAN CONFERENCE AS RELATING TO POLAND

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, at the Black Sea port of Yalta, President Roosevelt concluded an historic conference with the leaders of Britain and the Soviet Union. The joint planning which was so successfully undertaken at Teheran just over a year ago was continued in an atmosphere that bespoke mutual understanding and pride in the accomplishment of the great alliance of the United Nations in the prosecution of the war against nazi-ism. With the heads of the three governments went military and political leaders to assist in devising the strategy which will soon defeat our common enemy and thus lay the foundations on which we will build a secure and just peace. The Yalta Conference occurred at a time when the world is taking fresh hope from the progress of the Soviet armies in the east and the forces of the United States, Britain, France, Canada, and others of the United Nations in the west. It was in this atmosphere of mutual confidence that the three leaders met.

Out of their deliberations came concrete proposals and agreement for the treatment of a conquered Germany, the further implementation of the work begun at Dumbarton Oaks last summer, and solutions for such complex problems as those of Poland and Yugoslavia. In a stirring communique issued at the conclusion of the conference, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin struck a resounding blow for victory and for a decent post-war world.

The conference was a success because of this spirit of mutual confidence, and the desire shown on all sides to see the other fellow's point of view.

I have had an opportunity to study with some care the communique which was issued, and I think that the decisions reached guard our interests adequately. I am sure that we are all agreed that what we are fighting for during the war and what we will continue to fight for when the war is over is the kind of a world in which we are not all constantly endangered by aggression from without and tyranny from within. We fought in our own Revolution for the right to choose our own Government, and we believe in the right of other peoples to choose their governments, and it has been made manifest to all that this sacred principle has been preserved in the decisions reached at the conference.

One of the most intricate problems with which the United Nations have been faced was that of the reestablishment of a truly independent Poland. There can be no doubt about the sentiment of the

United States on this question. We believe in the rights of the Polish people to recreate a free and independent nation with a government of their own choice, and we have long insisted upon these rights.

I am not going to read you the text of that portion of the communique from the Crimean Conference which relates to Poland, although it is not too lengthy, but I do want to emphasize the provision which was made to assure a free and independent Polish nation, governed by a freely elected democratic government. The communiqué states that the liberation of Poland calls for the creation of a provisional government of national unity established on a broad democratic basis. Our Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Mr. Averill Harriman, together with the British Ambassador and the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, will serve as a commission to consult with the present provisional government and other democratic Polish leaders wherever they may be with a view toward effecting the contemplated reorganization. The reorganized government will be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and the secret ballot, and all democratic and anti-Nazi parties will have the right to participate in the election and to name candidates for office. After the formation of this democratic government, it will be recognized by the Soviet Union, the British, and ourselves.

With respect to boundaries, the decision was that the eastern frontier of Poland should in general follow the Curzon line. It was recognized that Poland must receive substantial additions to its territory in the north and west and that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should await the peace conference.

Now, I think that the solution regarding Poland worked out at Yalta is a fair and honest solution to a very hard problem. I do not think anybody put anything over on anybody else. It is evident that the three leaders at Yalta were able to thrash out this matter in a spirit of real cooperation, and that the thing that motivated them was the desire to provide for a free and independent Poland to be governed by men freely chosen by the brave and courageous Polish people, who have suffered longer than any other United Nation the cruelties of the Nazi oppressors.

I am very much afraid that too many people have wittingly or otherwise confused this paramount issue—the reestablishment of a truly, democratic Poland with the territorial question.

Because of this confusion and the uncertainty in the public mind regarding the territorial question, and particularly the Curzon line, I have looked into the matter of how this line came to be established.

The line, as originally drawn by the Supreme Allied Council set up by the Treaty of Versailles, was based upon careful studies made by a subcommission of the peace conference, in which the American representative took a leading role. The members of this commission, as well as anyone who has studied this complex problem from an ethnographic or historical point of view, realize that because of the ebb and flow of populations, past wars, and religious differences, it is well-nigh impossible to fix upon any solution of a frontier in this area which would be satisfactory to all.

We all know how difficult it is, even in peacetime, to work out satisfactory frontier solutions between nations. In wartime solutions are even more difficult to arrive at. I have learned, however, that the members of the Peace Conference Commission who worked on the problem of the eastern frontier of Poland, were in general agreement that the line now known as the Curzon line represented, as nearly as the complex situation permitted, the eastern ethnographical frontier of Poland. The members of the Commission, while working on this problem, were guided by the principle in the thirteenth point of President Wilson's Fourteen Points, which called for the establishment of an independent Polish state in "the territories inhabited by undisputably Polish populations."

On the basis of various studies made on this question, it has been established that the territory east of the Curzon line is inhabited not only by many Poles but also by other large ethnic groups. The non-Polish groups, together, form the majority of the population in this area.

It is perhaps pertinent to point out that the United States Government's position in 1920 in regard to the Curzon line was expressed in a note to the Polish Government which indicated that the latter should take the opportunity "to declare its intention to abstain from any aggressions against Russian territorial integrity; to state that its policy is not directed against the restoration of a strong and united Russia and that, pending a direct agreement as to its eastern frontier, Poland will remain within the boundaries indicated by the peace conference". I have also learned that the British Government took the position at that time that it considered the Curzon line to be the ethnographic eastern frontier of Poland and that any territorial changes to the east of that line were matters for decision of the Allied Powers and not for Poland alone.

Unfortunately, we must all recall that in 1920 the Polish Government, contrary to the admonitions of the Allied and associated powers, decided to take matters into its own hands and, through the use of military force, endeavored to establish the Polish frontier many miles to the east of the Curzon line. Lord Curzon proposed that this line be used as an armistice line between the two governments pending settlement of the dispute. This offer was not accepted and finally in a treaty concluded in Riga in March 1921 the Polish and Soviet Governments agreed upon the frontier which divided the two states from then until 1939. Since Poland had acted against the expressed advice of the Allied and associated powers, these powers were reluctant to accept as the definitive frontier between the two states the frontier established by Polish armies, which is over a hundred miles east of the Curzon line. It was not until March 15, 1923, that the successors to the Supreme Allied Council, the Conference of Ambassadors, finally accepted the line delineated in the Treaty of Riga as the Polish-Soviet frontier. It is interesting to note in this connection that the United States Government acquiesced in accepting the Riga Treaty frontier only in April 1923, at which time the Polish Government was informed that the United States Government had taken cognizance of the assertion of territorial sovereignty by Poland and therefore would accept the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors.

While the declaration of the Supreme Allied Council which delineated the Curzon line provided that "the rights that Poland may be able to establish over the territories situated to the east of the said line are expressly reserved," the Allied and associated powers were most reluctant to accept the Riga Treaty frontier which is so much farther to the east, which included in Poland large groups of non-Polish peoples.

It is clear from the recorded minutes of the subcommission of the peace conference which delineated the Curzon line that the subcommission felt that this line represented as nearly as possible the eastern ethnic frontier of Poland and probably would become the definitive frontier. Nevertheless, the subcommission envisaged the possibility that some adjustments of the frontier in Poland's favor might be agreed upon. The Yalta proposals envisage a similar possibility.

I have heard it said not only that we have sold out the Polish Nation, which I do not believe, but that we have abandoned the Atlantic Charter, which I do not believe, either. Only a little more than a month ago the President, in his message to this Congress on the state of the Union, reiterated our determination to use our influence to secure, so far as is humanly possible, the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. But as he also pointed out, the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and every one of the tangled situations which face us. The charter, he said, is a good and useful thing, an essential thing, because we must have principles toward which we can aim. Those who would tell you that the settlement of the Polish problem at the Crimean Conference means the scrapping of the Atlantic Charter are trying to confuse you and confuse the very issues with which the conference was faced. No charter of principles alone will secure for us the defeat of our enemies and the establishment of a sound peace. The only way we can accomplish those things is by working with our allies to seek solutions by mutual understanding which will provide for the fulfillment of the expectations and hopes of all the peoples of the world. These aims, I think, were achieved at Yalta, and I do not see how anything more can be asked than that principles, when applied to a difficult situation, should guide us to a fair settlement. The nations upon whom much of the burden of securing the peace will

fall have sat down and sought to find a decent solution which could be maintained. That, I think, they did, and the Crimean Conference is, therefore, to be commended and not condemned.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LITHUANIA

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy with the opportunity when I realize that with these remarks I pay tribute on this twenty-seventh anniversary to the birth of Lithuanian independence and freedom.

Lithuania is a land that commands our attention. I speak of this remarkable nation that has existed on the shores of the far-distant Baltic Sea from time immemorial. I speak of a proud race of people who, down through the centuries, have remained apart from the Teutons, Scandinavians, Finns, and Slavs; a country of noble heritage, small in size, but truly and properly shaped as a heart. And it is this heart that lies in the military pathway of two great rumbling and crushing empires—Germany and Russia.

In the fifteenth century, Lithuania had claimed a vast domain extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, and men and women of Lithuanian blood all over the world thrill with pride when their mind goes back through the pages of history to the brave deeds of Vytautas the Great. This great warrior king was certainly the most imposing personality of his time in eastern Europe, and his martial valor was combined with statesmanlike foresight.

Lithuania is a land of surpassing beauty. It is resplendent with lakes, rivers, and beautiful forests. Few hills are to be observed in the softly rolling country. It is little wonder that the people have a deep passion for their beloved homeland and desire only that all invaders will depart and leave them in peace. They appreciate the beauty of their Baltic home and they tenderly care for the soil which so abundantly nourishes them.

Since the day, a quarter of a century ago, when that clear clarion call to awake as a restored republic was issued at Vilnius, the Lithuanian Nation has bent every effort to restore her great natural wealth, political prestige, and position among the nations of the earth. The Government followed an enlightened program of doing those things that were for the best interests of the greatest number of its people.

Man is essentially religious, and in his continued search for God he leaves the mark of culture. Through the instrumentality of her great leaders, the Christian faith was introduced to Lithuania and the cross of Christ was placed on the altar within the newly built church, erected on the very foundation of a pagan chapel. This great people knew that a nation should have its own clergy, and Lithuanian youth was encouraged to take up the study for the orders of the church. Down through the years the Lithuanian clergy have been to the forefront in all things that were for the good of their people, their Nation, and their church.

My friends, it is quite correct to say the Lithuanian has a great deal of cultural wealth, and daily in the Nation's Capitol its trumpeters send out a call which is really a prayer of thanksgiving to the Maker of Man.

It was customary for the Lithuanian-Americans to observe at this national shrine the Fourth of July. Since a replica of the Liberty Bell had been sent from America as a gift from the Sons of Lithuania, it was fitting that it should be rung on this occasion. And on this bell appear the words, in Lithuanian, which, translated, mean: "Forever toll to Sons of Lithuania. Whoever fails to defend their liberty is unworthy of it." This should serve as a token of the everlasting friendship of America with Lithuania.

Let me read for you the resolution of the Lithuanian Taryba given on February 16, 1918. By this resolution the die was cast and Lithuania was pledged to the cause of complete and untrammeled liberty. This resolution read:

> The Taryba of Lithuania, as the sole representative of the Lithuanian people, in conformity with the recognized right to national self-determination, and in accordance with the other conferences of Lithuania held in Vilnius, September 18 to 23, 1917, does hereby proclaim the restitution of the independent state of Lithuania, founded on democratic principles, with Vilnius as its capital, and declares the rupture of all ties which formerly bound this state to other nations.

Only a prophet can accurately foretell future events, but a study of Lithuania's past would seem to indicate that the expression "Kas bus, kas nebus, O Lietuva neprazus," which means, "Come what may, Lithuania will always stay," has always been correct. This mighty and ancient people have been bred to hardship and inured to pain and suffering from time immemorial. They have seen nations in turmoil. They have felt the stirrings of nations on the move. They have known hardship in warfare against such redoubtable foes as the Crusader, the Tatar, and the German. They have passed through the crucibles of hate and have never completely bowed before Slav or German. They have always won through to victory.

Many people were prone to think that with the coming of the Bolshevik in 1940, Lithuania was definitely through as a nation. They were quite willing to designate to her a position subservient to Hitler when his legions marched through the land in the 1941 campaign against Russia. However, one recalls that the Lithuanian is not easily uprooted from the soil that has been his since time immemorial. The size of Lithuanian landholdings has varied between 20,000 square miles centering about the Nemunas River to the vast empire of Vytautas, which extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Lithuania has learned one lesson that precludes any desire for grandiose expansion. She wants nothing more nor less than that portion of eastern Europe which is hers by right of continuous settlement and which is approximately 35,000 square miles in extent with Vilnius as the traditional capital city.

Another Lithuanian proverb is to the effect that if one is in a hurry it is wise to go slowly. Patience is required of those who would move slowly and surely forward, but the Lithuanian is eminently fitted for this role in history. Time does not have a great significance if the true ends are eventually served. The fact that Lithuanians will never be content without complete and full liberty is sufficient reason to believe that they will succeed. They are no strangers to hardship and sorrow. They have been hardened by long periods of resistance to their traditional enemies. They have won notable victories over the pressing Teutons.

During her period of twentieth century independence, Lithuania demonstrated an amazing national vitality. Her financial conidtion remained sound from beginning to end. She built up a foreign trade that was gaining in strength until checked by the restrictions of war operations in the Baltic and North Seas. She made notable gains in such fields as education, scientific research, and agronomy. Her levels of living advanced far beyond those prevailing around her. She was definitely facing westward and sought the privileges of western civilization.

In keeping with the principles expressed in the Atlantic Charter, and reaffirmed by the great leaders of the United Nations, the breath of life, and the enjoyment of liberty, with God's help, will once again be assured to Lithuania.

All around the world there are some ideas which millions of men hold in common, and one of these is the mixture of respect and hope with which the world looks to the United States of America. Our common liberation includes giving to all peoples freedom to govern themselves as soon as they are able and the economic freedom on which all lasting self-government inevitably rests. The way to make certain that we do revere our traditional American way of life for all is to create a world in which all men, everywhere, can be free. The history of Lithuania is the most eloquent advocate of her right to enjoy this way of life.

I am indebted for a great deal of my information on this important subject to a most valuable book entitled "Timeless Lithuania" written by Owen J. C. Norem, D. D., Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Lithuania.

To students of history of this country, comparatively unknown outside of Europe, I urge a study of this excellent work.

My friends, as we join in paying tribute to Lithuania's day of independence, in this year of 1945, it is difficult to foresee with complete certainty the exact status of the Lithuanian Nation. Sore and troubled, indeed, has been her tragic lot.

But observance of Lithuanian independence day on February 16 is a grim reminder that this anniversary will not be observed in Lithuania itself. For the 2,500,000 Lithuanians in Lithuania, or the portion of them that survives, are

not in a position to celebrate. There is no free Lithuania; nor is there likely to be unless the ideals of the Atlantic Charter are translated into action.

The distress signal most frequently heard by ships at sea is "three short, three long, and three short." The call letters are S O S and it would seem fitting to regard this as meaning "Sudiev O Sudiev" Lietuva. Sudiev means "God be with you." May I close this expression of my deep feeling with that word, "Sudiev" addressed to you and to Lithuania. Lithuania is a country which has placed her trust in God, and God will never forsake her.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, indefinitely, to attend as a delegate of the United States at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace meeting in the city of Mexico;

To Mr. HARE (at the request of Mr. RICHARDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1808. An act to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 16, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, February 16, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Monday, February 19, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue the hearing on H. R. 97, to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (with respect to certain patent matters). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee Room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 20, 1945, to begin public hearings on H. R. 693—a bill to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday, February 22, 1945.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on S. 63 and H. R. 1648, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the postwar ship-disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

215. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Chesley Brazil, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2195. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code entitled "General Provisions"; without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2196. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States"; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2197. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2198. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code entitled "Arbitration"; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2199. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2200. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; without amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 1534. A bill to amend the Fact Finders Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2157) for the relief of Margaret Redmond, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2195. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 2196. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 2197. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 2198. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 2199. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

H. R. 2200. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2201. A bill to provide that the performance of notarial acts by commissioned officers of the armed forces of the United States, in certain cases, shall have the same effect as though performed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2202. A bill to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 2203. A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2204. A bill to authorize the payment of certain funds of insolvent national banking associations to stockholders after depositors have been paid in full and 5 years have elapsed since any creditor's claim has been filed against such association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 2205. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care furnished by the

Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2206. A bill establishing a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of disease or injury existing within 5 years after discharge from service in the armed forces during the present war; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 2207. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2208. A bill to provide for a 20-percent increase for the duration of the war in the amount of the Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and in the amount of Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 2209 (by request). A bill to make honorably discharged veterans eligible for civil-service employment notwithstanding commission of misdemeanor prior to entry into service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 2210. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the property known as Temple Heights to be used for the duration of the war as a recreation center for Government employees and immediately thereafter as a site for a memorial building in commemoration of the sacrifices of the defenders of the Union during the Civil War, and dedicated by them as their memorial to the American youth of today who have sacrificed their lives on the battlefields of the world; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2211. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International monetary fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 2212. A bill for the purpose of regulating the conditions of employment of mechanics and helpers at all Government navy yards, naval stations, arsenals, and other Government establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2213 (by request). A bill to confer a permanent status on veterans under temporary civil-service appointments during the present war; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 2214 (by request). A bill to increase monetary benefits payable to those receiving vocational rehabilitation and training under part VII and part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2215. A bill to establish community and county committees of farmers to administer those phases of all Federal programs involving farm contact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to recommend repeal of certain acts by the insular government of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the relief of the Fort Pierce port district, Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H J. Res. 105. Joint resolution relating to emergency crop, seed, and feed loans and to regional agricultural credit corporation loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. Res. 138. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the official conduct of Albert W. Johnson and Albert L. Watson, district judges of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2216. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept title to certain tracts of land in Bennett County, S. Dak., as an addition to the La Creek National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2217. A bill for the relief of Rae Glauber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 2218. A bill for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2219. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James Arthur Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 2220. A bill for the relief of Howard H. Thames; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2221. A bill to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2222. A bill for the relief of J. L. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 2223. A bill for the relief of Catherine Bode; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2224. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2225. A bill for the relief of the Baldwin Bros. Paving Co., Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2226. A bill for the relief of Hugh P. Gunnells and Mrs. Dezaree Gunnells; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. R. 2227. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

81. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of Emma J. Marshall and 202 other residents of the community of Stronghurst, Henderson County, Ill., supporting the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

82. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Memory Post, No. 61, Catholic War Veterans, Inc., Bronx, New York City, relative to the preservation of the boundaries of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

83. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, at a regular meeting November 25, 1944, at the State House, Boston, Mass., protesting against certain civil-service appointments and petitioning the President of the United States by Executive order, or through congressional legislation to restore discharged veterans to their relative standing on the civil-service registers; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

84. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the Boston Chapter, No. 10, Disabled American Veterans, Boston, Mass., for enactment of suitable legislation to restore members of the armed forces or discharged veterans to their original relative standing on the civil-service registers by voiding permanent appointments made during the war which are prejudicial to the civil-service rights of said members of the armed forces or discharged veterans; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we are again seeking Thee in the fellowship of prayer, humbly asking that daily we may be brought into a grateful and glad obedience to the divine will.

Grant that we may see how wonderful and sacred it is to yield ourselves to a mind whose wisdom never errs and to surrender to a heart whose love never fails.

We pray that our feeble and faltering spirits may be touched and kindled by that wisdom and that love into centers of light and hope to lead groping and suffering humanity in its quest for freedom and peace.

May we be partners in thought, in word, and in deed with all who are striving to help mankind enter into a life that is more abundant and a peace that is enduring.

Hear us in the name of the Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two communications received with respect to the racing ban.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COLLIER'S CONGRESSIONAL AWARD

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a letter from Collier's magazine, signed by Richard Chaplin, stating that—

> Collier's is announcing a congressional award of $10,000 to the Member of the Senate and the Member of the House who best serve their country during the present year. Selections will be made by a committee of distinguished Americans headed by Owen D. Young.

Being a Member of the House and trying in my small way to serve my country, I egotistically fancied myself eligible for this contest. I could see my record among those to be considered and judged by the committee of distinguished Americans. So, thinking that this letter might apply to me, I read on—an advance copy of the editorial which will announce the award and which will appear in the February 16 issue of Collier's. On the committee to select the winners I found there were indeed some distinguished Americans. In addition to Mr. Young, there were President Ernest Hopkins, Dartmouth College; President Harold Dodds, Princeton University; Dr. Alan Gregg, Rockefeller Foundation; Paul Hoffman, Committee on Economic Development—and then could I possibly believe my eyes? On this list of distinguished Americans was Sidney Hillman, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. My astonishment would have been no greater had I found the name of King Herod on a list of great humanitarians.

When I came to Mr. Hillman's name I read no further; I cast aside any delusions I had about this letter pertaining to me. Mr. Hillman, of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, is also of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and spent a great deal of time trying to defeat me in the last election. I could not delude myself that I would be selected for honest and intelligent public service with Mr. Hillman as one of the distinguished Americans on the committee. I tossed the letter aside and regretted the time I had wasted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a letter and in the other a brief poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I wrote to the Secretary of War and also an article from the Associated Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF EQUIPMENT OF ARMED FORCES IN THE EUROPEAN AREA

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on January 31 there appeared an Associated Press article which read in part as follows:

> American troops shifted from Europe to the Pacific after the German defeat will leave the bulk of their equipment behind under present plans and will be armed anew in Japan.

I have written a letter to the Secretary of War asking him whether that was based upon a War Department release, what their policy was, for a detailed statement, and other questions which will appear in the RECORD. I took the position, in view of the fact that Congress has the responsibility of appropriating money under the Constitution, and that our subcommittee has the responsibility of drafting the War Department appropriation bill, that it is our function to look into the matter and perform that duty.

I am placing the Associated Press article in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a copy of the letter I wrote to the Secretary of War asking for detailed information regarding this proposed policy. I hope the Members of this House will find the letter interesting.

"UNADULTERATED POLITICS"

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, our genial majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], is usually careful in his statements, and quite efficient in debate. Like most of us, however, he has his off days. Yesterday he flatly stated that the opposition to the rule and the passage of the George bill was "unadulterated politics." It seems to me that statement was a very unwise one for him to make. In pugilistic terms, he led with his chin. If I can read the English language, the President in his letter to Jesse Jones, very plainly acknowledged that the appointment of Wallace to replace Jones was an act of unadulterated politics. He acknowledged the appointment was a political pay-off. Not so much for what Wallace himself had done in the campaign but rather, I believe, for what Wallace's friend Hillman and his P. A. C. had done in the campaign. And so if the opposition to the Wallace appointment is to be classified as "unadulterated politics," then, if we are fair, we must concede that Wallace's appointment by President Roosevelt, in the first place, was "unadulterated politics."

WHERE IS THE LIMIT?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the paper yesterday an article headed "Leaders see need to boost the debt limit to $300,000,000,000."

Looks as if the sky is the limit for the New Deal national debt.

Mr. Speaker, when the New Deal came into power in 1932 the debt limit amounted to $28,000,000,000. On January 30, 1934, they increased the authority for notes outstanding in the sum of $10,000,000,000. Then they increased the debt limit to $45,000,000,000 in 1938. On June 25, 1940, they increased it $4,000,000,000. On February 19, 1941, they increased the debt limit to $65,000,000,000; on March 28, 1942, to $125,000,000,000; on April 10, 1943, to $210,000,000,000; on June 9, 1944, to $260,000,000,000; and now they are talking about $300,000,000,000.

Where is the limit? It seems to me the sky is the limit with this administration. Unless the New Deal economizes in the operation of Government, this country will go into bankruptcy. No more could be said than that, in my effort that you should get some degree of economy in this administration of the affairs of our Government. I charge this administration of being the most extravagant administration each year it has been in office. You never fulfilled a promise of your desire to economize. If the Nation is financially wrecked you are to blame. You have been in the red each year and each year you are redder, in every way. Oh, can we not have some semblance of economy in the operation of Government? If you do not soon get it, we will be forever swamped in national debt and more and more and more taxation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota in

which the legislature requests the President, the Congress, and our Federal officials to follow and uphold the spirit of the Tydings amendment in dealing with matters affecting farm labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered on February 14 by George E. Stringfellow, a long-time business associate of Thomas A. Edison, paying tribute to Mr. Edison.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, with the shortage of manpower on our farms becoming more pronounced every day because of the drafting of men, it is imperative that the production and distribution of farm machinery be immediately increased. This increase should be in an amount large enough to keep all the farms going without a let-down in the production of food.

The farm manpower situation is affected not only by the operation of the selective-service law, but by the lure of higher wages in war plants. We must not be unmindful of those patriotic farmers who are working 72 hours and more per week to provide food for our armed forces, our allies, and ourselves. Many farms must either stand idle or a nearby farmer will have to take over and operate additional land. This cannot be done without machines.

There is an urgent need for tractors, trucks, combines, corn pickers, and all the other kinds and types of machinery that are absolutely essential to large-scale production of food. The Farm Machinery Division and the Steel Division of the War Production Board and the Farm Machinery Division of the War Food Administration should take cognizance of the acute manpower shortage on the farms that has arisen since January 1. More farm machinery must be made available.

SURPLUS MEDICAL SUPPLIES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials by David Lawrence, appearing in the Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot entitled "United States Future Depends on Avoiding World War III," published in the Worcester Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the New York Times. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will cost $52. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Paul Dispatch, my home-town paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two topics, in one to include newspaper editorials, and in the other to include a resolution adopted by the American Committee for Spanish Freedom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

DEFICIT FINANCING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was speaking about the debt, he seemed to be glorying in that debt, he made the statement that we have been deficit-financing since the war began. I wanted to interrogate the gentleman and ask him what the basis of our financing was prior to the war, but he refused to yield. I am reminding the House that the deficit-financing of the New Deal did not begin with the war, it began with the New Deal.

May I say also that last week, when I made a speech concerning the farm census, I was vigorously attacked by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] who claimed I had no case. My opposition to that census is justified by the mail I am receiving.

BOMBARDMENT OF TOKYO

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, during all this bombardment of pessimism to which we have listened this morning, I call attention to one note of gladness and inspiration to Americans everywhere, and that is the fact that our air force has just been engaged in one of greatest bombardments to which Tokyo has ever been subjected.

The headline in today's paper reads:

One-thousand-three-hundred-plane raid on Tokyo covers big jab at Iwo.

The paper further says:

More than 1,300 American planes from a huge armada 300 miles off the Jap coast smashed at the Tokyo area for 9 hours today in the heaviest raid ever made on the enemy capital.

This means we are really getting somewhere in smashing those savage apes and destroying the greatest enemy the white man's civilization has ever known.

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow."

BOMBING OF IWO JIMA AND TOKYO

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the news of the attack by airplane carriers protected by battleships and other vessels of our Navy is a great inspiration to the American people. It is evidence of the great work that has been done in the far Pacific by the United States Navy.

Fortunately, we have in that area great commanders on sea and on land and in the air. The commander in that area of the United States Navy is one of the great leaders of this war, a quiet gentleman, a man who says little but who acts, who evidences his leadership by action. He was sent to the Pacific theater after Pearl Harbor. In those dark days he gave, and is giving, in cooperation with the Army, to the Navy and to our people that leadership which has brought about the great advances in the Pacific theater by our forces on land, on sea, and in the air. I refer to that man who says nothing but who acts and who accomplishes results, Admiral Nimitz, Commander in Chief of the United States Navy in the entire Pacific. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] the other day asked unanimous consent that the House of Representatives request the Speaker of the House to transmit to General MacArthur the thanks and feeling of appreciation of this body, I ask unanimous consent on this occasion that the Speaker be requested to send an appropriate telegram to Admiral Nimitz conveying to Admiral Nimitz in such words as the Speaker may desire the congratulations and thanks of the House of Representatives, not only to Admiral Nimitz but to all the officers and men of the United States Navy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Include the Air Forces in that, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. Including the Air Force.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I understand it, the gentleman from Massachusetts also includes the men of the Navy?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I ask that such a message be sent to Admiral Nimitz, the officers and men of the United States Navy, and the Air Force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a copy of a letter sent to the President of the United States by 14 college presidents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my observation of the Members in this Chamber for nearly 12 years brings me to the conclusion that the Members on both sides of the aisle desire to do right and usually they do; that is, if they understand the bill under consideration. I am not like some of those who think that prejudice controls a majority of the Members of this House. I am sure it will not, in voting on this bill.

The George bill contains five sections. Section 5 deals with the audit of the financial transactions of Government corporations. I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will offer an amendment to include not only Government corporations but those owned and controlled by the Government. I do not think it is desirable at this time to pass this amendment, because it involves many things that are rather dangerous. For instance, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has the controlling stock, 51 percent, in some of the private banks of this country, and in many railroads and life-insurance companies. It is an important question, and I am afraid we are getting too far afield, especially in view of the fact that the Senator from Virginia, Senator BYRD, has introduced a bill, as I understand, to have an independent audit made of all corporations owned and controlled by the Government.

The other four sections of this bill deal entirely with Federal loan agencies. That is all there is to the bill. The George bill takes from the Department of Commerce all loaning agencies. Is that what you want to do? It takes all of them.

There has been much misunderstanding about what agencies were in the Department of Commerce. Many Members on the Democratic side and many on the other side have thought that the Export-Import Bank was in the Department of Commerce. It is not. What else do you want to do? What else can you do?

We may have our desires about who should be the head of the Department of Commerce, but I do not want to invade the prerogatives of the other body. That is up to them. We are trying to do something that was started in my committee and brought to this House. What was it? Everybody wanted Jesse Jones to be Administrator of the Federal loaning agencies, and when he was appointed to a Cabinet office, we reported a resolution from our committee, and it passed both Houses, so that he could still be Federal Loan Administrator. That was a concurrent resolution. We did not put it in the Department of Commerce. The resolution gave Mr. Jones, and only Mr. Jones, the right to hold both offices.

A great many now ask why we did not introduce this bill before. The answer is we had no opportunity. We seized upon the first opportunity we had, when Mr. Jones went out of the Cabinet post, to bring back these agencies. I am a great friend and admirer of Mr. Jones. That is all Jesse Jones has ever asked Congress to do, bring back the lending agencies from the Department of Commerce. Does anybody want anything else? Do you want to invade the functions of the Department of Commerce? functions they have had for a century? No. I believe that if you understood all the facts you would not want to go any further.

I noticed yesterday that my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], who made the first speech on the rule on his side, was still under the impression that the Export-Import Bank was in the hands of the Department of Commerce. I can take his own speech and convince any man on the floor that the gentleman from Illinois is for the George bill. What did he say? He said:

> They did a good job over there in the Senate. They passed this bill by a vote of 74 to 12. However, they forgot to take out a very important agency, the Export-Import Bank, forgot to take it out of the Department of Commerce.

He was not present at the hearing before the Committee on Rules the other day when I tried to explain it before the committee. I stated clearly that the Export-Import Bank is in the hands of Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, who controls all the stock and appoints all the members of the board of trustees.

Here is what the gentleman from Michigan did in the committee. I take this from the minutes:

> Mr. WOLCOTT moved that the Secretary of Commerce should hereafter be ineligible to act as a director on the board of the Export-Import Bank.

Wallace is not on it. He is not on it today, and would not automatically become a member by being appointed Secretary of Commerce. Yet the gentleman used the word "hereafter." I understand he has now amended that. Why? Because the Export-Import Bank is not in the Commerce Department. I expect to show you where it is.

I quote the following from one of the morning papers:

> Mr. WOLCOTT may not offer a milder form of his Export-Import Bank amendment which Speaker RAYBURN is ready to rule germane.

This one simply bars Wallace from membership on the 11-man Export-Import Bank board.

The newspapers themselves carry confusing accounts of this bill, especially that relating to the Export-Import Bank. I am not blaming the Members for being confused. The President has issued so many Executive orders that it is impossible to keep up with all of them. I am not therefore blaming people for being confused, even the newspapers; but so many people seem to think that today Wallace is one of the board members of the Export-Import Bank. This is one of the most confused issues, and has been confused in the main by the newspapers not understanding it.

In 1939 all the 10 loan agencies of the Government were combined, under the Reorganization Act, and transferred under one head, and that was Mr. Jesse Jones, Administrator of all the loan agencies. Later on, 5 other corporations were organized in the R. F. C. and placed under Mr. Jones as Administrator. That dealt with all the lending agencies including the Export-Import Bank. In 1942, the President, on the 24th day of February, issued 2 Executive orders. The first order is No. 9070 which transferred the F. H. A., Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and 2 more agencies dealing simply with loans on homes, to the National Housing Authority.

On the same day the other 11 loan agencies were transferred by Executive Order No. 9071 to the Department of Commerce. Now, we have the Export-Import Bank in the Department of Commerce in the year 1942.

Later on what was done? The President transferred the Export-Import Bank out of the Department of Commerce and placed it in another agency and today the Export-Import Bank is under Mr. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, who has control of the stock.

The Export-Import Bank was organized under the laws of the District of Columbia just like any other corporation. It was organized by five members under Executive order of the President and it was operated and is being operated now like any other banking concern. I expect to produce the chain of title to show you that the stock and all the stock is now in Mr. Crowley and he, as sole stockholder, elects the trustees annually.

Now, we have the Export-Import Bank out of the Department of Commerce. We have it in the hands of one of the finest men, one of the best businessmen in America. We have it there and they cannot stand on the leg that it is now in the Department of Commerce. The next peg they are pinning their hopes to stand on is this: "We have no confidence in the President," they say, "because he may transfer by another Executive order the functions of the Export-Import Bank back to the Department of Commerce."

Well, why would he? Mr. Crowley is there already. Who does he select? He selects the men to aid him in undertaking to find out about the export-import trade. The Export-Import Bank is going to prove in this great crisis and afterward to be one of the most important agencies in America to help gain back our foreign trade. Who does he appoint? He appoints men well trained and skilled in the art of international law and finance. Who are they? He happened to pick two from the Department of State, two from the Department of Commerce, some from the Department of Agriculture, and others. For what purpose? To give him the information so that he may successfully operate this great agency.

Why should we take it from him? The President took it away from Mr. Wallace at one time. Why should he give it back to Mr. Wallace? Even if Mr. Dewey had been elected I am satisfied he would stand on the proposition that Mr. Crowley is the best man in America to operate and run this great agency and he would have kept him there.

Let me give you the chain of title to the voting stock in the Export-Import Bank. The first I produce is the Executive order creating the Export-Import Bank on February 2, 1934.

The next is the certificate of the incorporation of the Export-Import Bank, and who are they? Daniel C. Roper, of the Commerce Department; Robert F. Kelley, of the State Department; Chester C. Davis, of the Department of Agriculture; Stanley Reed, now a member of the Supreme Court, then of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and Lynn P. Talley, of the R. F. C.

Why should we not have 1 of the trustees from the Department of State and 1 from the Department of Commerce, 2 agencies that are supposed to be skilled in their line of duty, in foreign trade and international matters? Why should you bind the President and say he should not have 1 trustee, of the 11, from the Department of Commerce, but at the same time he can take 1 man as trustee from the Department of Agriculture? How silly that would be.

The next chain is the Executive order transferring from the Federal Loan Agency under order No. 9071, dated February 25, 1942, to the Department of Commerce.

Next is Executive Order No. 9361, dated July 15, 1943, transferring the Export-Import Bank to the Board of Economic Warfare.

Next is the Executive Order No. 9380, dated September 25, 1943, transferring, through consolidation of the Office of Economic Warfare into the Foreign Economic Administration, to the Foreign Economic Administration, of which Mr. Leo T. Crowley is Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute and a half.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The Export-Import Bank is absolutely under the control of Mr. Crowley to supervise it and operate it like all banking institutions are run. I know that many Members on the Republican side do not want to defeat the purpose of this bill, but by voting to recommit you defeat it absolutely, because the committee considered everything that was germane under this bill. If this bill is recommitted to our committee we would still have to observe the rules of the House as to the germaneness. Therefore nothing could be considered in our committee on this bill except what is germane on the floor here today. No one would want to pass the Wolcott amendment which would take away from the President the powers that he has under the First War Powers Act. My committee has no jurisdiction of these matters. Those functions belong to the Committee on the Judiciary, and to send it back to my committee would mean that it is dead as a doornail. We did everything that I thought you wanted us to do, that is take out of the Department of Commerce all the loan agencies, and let me tell you, you had better adopt this bill because a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, we may be concerned about who is head of the Department of Commerce, but those functions belong to another body, and we are trying under this bill to take away all the lending agencies of this Government from the Department of Commerce. That will leave the Department of Commerce with the only powers, duties, and functions it has had for the past century.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to us under very peculiar conditions. It was obviously introduced in the other body because of the possibility that Henry Wallace might become Secretary of Commerce. Then, the other body, instead of acting immediately on the confirmation, held up the confirmation until they thought this bill would become a law. Thus the bill is tied up directly with the appointment of Mr. Wallace.

Under the Constitution, the Senate has to confirm the appointment of members of the Cabinet. Many people say that the President should be allowed to pick his own men but certainly our forefathers had some good reason for putting Senate confirmation into the Constitution. This confirmation should not then become a rubber stamp. The Senate should, in my opinion, under the Constitution, go over carefully the qualifications of every Cabinet appointee.

In his letter to Mr. Jones, the President did not advance any other reason for appointing Mr. Wallace except that Mr. Wallace had helped in his campaign and, therefore, should, to quote "get any appointment that he, Mr. Wallace, felt himself qualified for." The President did not emphasize in his appointment the qualifications which Mr. Wallace's admirers present, but placed the appointment solely on the basis of political reward for a political campaign and this in the middle of a great war.

I believe, as I have stated, that the Senate should carefully scrutinize the qualifications of every Cabinet appointee according to the Constitution written by our forefathers. This scrutiny, however,

becomes much more necessary now due to the extraordinary powers granted to the executive branch of the Government—and in most cases properly so—because we are at war. These Executive powers have put in effect a great many Executive orders and these Executive orders are now carried out, generally speaking, by people in the executive branch of the Government. Thus the qualifications should most certainly be carefully weighed. From what I know of Mr. Wallace's background, ability, and experience, I would not feel that he is qualified to fill the post of Secretary of Commerce and I hope that he is rejected.

This bill, as I said at the start, is the direct consequence of Mr. Wallace's appointment. It was passed by the other body and came before our committee. Our committee considered it for about an hour. The majority members of the committee voted against having any hearings. They also voted down amendments offered by the minority. When the vote came in committee to vote it out, I voted to report the bill out on the theory that a little bite was better than the whole apple in view of the possibility of Mr. Wallace being appointed. I did, however, hope at the time we reported it out that the Rules Committee would grant a rule which would enable the minority members of our committee to present the amendments to the House which were turned down in committee. When the Rules Committee did not do this, I voted against the rule and if the bill is not amended with further restrictions, I intend to vote to recommit.

This is not a question of persecuting Mr. Wallace or anyone else—it is a question of safeguarding our constitutional processes and restoring to the Congress, who directly represent the people, their constitutional power to control the spending of the taxpayer's money and preserve our American way of life.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Members of the House for a few moments and ask that I be not interrupted until I have laid the foundation for what I want to say in the introduction of an amendment at the proper time, the purpose of which I will explain in a few moments.

It seems to me that one of the difficulties that confronts us today is this: All during this discussion up to this moment not a word has been said about the Federal Loan Administrator. No one knows who that Administrator will be. He will be appointed by the President of the United States. What I am vitally concerned in is the term of office that he shall have when he is appointed, and my amendment will go to that point.

Let us stop for a moment and think of this paradoxical situation. We are dealing today with an act that has a peculiar genesis when you trace it out. First of all we have at the outset a member of the President's Cabinet that is set up by an act of the Congress in the office of the Secretary of Commerce. You next have by direct reference in this bill the office of the Comptroller General of the United States.

May I stop long enough to pay tribute to one of the ablest and most outstanding men in America, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, a former Member of this House, a man who has carried on that office with the highest degree of fidelity and courage and real ability, and a man in whom all America can take pride.

The next thing we have is the creation of this particular office with which we have been dealing. Let us review the facts for a moment and see where we are. First of all, we have an act known as the Reorganization Act, passed on April 3, 1939, the purpose of which was to expedite, simplify, and reduce the number of bureaus of Government. Following that the President issued a reorganization plan known as No. 1, and in that reorganization plan there was set up under section 402 the Office of Federal Loan Administrator. Get this thought at the start: That office was not set up under the direct voice of the act of 1939 but under the President's reorganization plan, which came into existence as a result of that law.

Next we have War Powers Act No. 1, which will terminate 6 months after the close of hostilities. Based upon that act we have an Executive Order No. 9071, by which certain loan agencies of the Federal Loan Administrator's Office were transferred to the Secretary of Commerce. In this bill here today we seek to retransfer those loan powers and bring them back under the control of the Federal Loan Administrator.

All of the discussion which has taken place so far involving personalities has revolved about the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, and the former Vice President of the United States, with not a word about the Federal Loan Administrator to be.

So much for the legislative and legal foundation of what we are doing here today. Now for another angle.

During the past few years no charge has been hurled at the Congress of the United States with more vehemence, more directness, and probably with more certainty, than that the Congress has delegated away its powers, that it has given too much power away to the executive branch of the Government, and that as a consequence the great fight should be, if we are to preserve our integrity and independence as one of the coordinate units of government, to recapture and regain control of the offices to which we have delegated the power on the side of the executive branch of the Government. We hear that charge on every side.

How can this be done? We are in the midst of a war. We cannot repeal the War Powers Act without crippling the war activities. That is out of the question. We have no right in any way even to criticize the President for his choice of the Secretary of Commerce. That is purely his right and his duty. It is the function of the Senate of the United States to pass upon the qualifications of his nominee and approve or reject him by a majority vote. So that is out of our province.

But we here in the legislative branch do have a solemn duty to perform and that is to preserve our own integrity, and to see that there are no grants of power that take away from the legislative branch of the Government the inherent power which the people want us to exercise and to control, under the tenth amendment, which provides that all powers not given to the Government of the United States nor prohibited by the Constitution to the States are reserved to the States respectively and to the people, and we are the representatives of the people. First of all why do we want a definite term? We as Members are required under the Constitution to be chosen for 2 years, and Members of the Senate for 6 years. Aside from the judges who hold office during life or good behavior, only two officers in this Government have a term longer than that of the President, excepting the Senate and ourselves, and that is the Comptroller General of the United States and his assistants who are appointed for 15 years. All others have a definite fixed term. What would be the practical result if this amendment of mine were adopted? Let us think for a moment of the tremendous power we are giving away and have given away. I am reading now from the testimony of Mr. Jesse Jones before the Senate Commerce Committee, wherein he was questioned by Senator BAILEY:

Question. Is there any limit on how much you can lend?

Answer. We can lend anything that we think we should.

Question. That means the sky, does it not?

Answer. Any amount, any length of time, any rate of interest.

Question. And to anybody?

Answer. To anybody that we feel is entitled to the loan.

Why, no such power was ever given to any man in the history of the world as Mr. Jones said that he had in the capacity in which he served. I now quote Senator HARRY F. BYRD, who is probably one of the best informed men in the United States on this subject. What does he say? I quote him:

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with its 10 subsidiaries, is the most colossal banking institution the world has ever known, either public or private. By reason of blanket authorization for loans, and the right to issue bonds, fully guaranteed by the Government, it is virtually immune from the control of Congress. I have frequently pointed out that it is an actuality, as it now operates, a fourth branch of the Government. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and its kindred corporations, has made either loans or commitments in excess of forty billions of dollars. Loans are revolving in the sense that when paid off they can be used to make commitments or loans for other purposes.

A few days ago the honored Member from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] introduced a bill to increase the bonded debt of this Nation to $300,000,000,000, a figure so vast and utterly staggering as to be absolutely incomprehensible. Yet here we delegate without any restriction, as it were, as to tenure of office, the control over almost $32,000,000,000, to one man, and, further, with no restrictions upon him. What is this amend-

ment which I propose to offer? It is a simple little amendment of only a few lines. The amendment is as follows:

On line 2, page 2—

Of this bill—

Insert a new subsection as follows:

"SECTION 1. The term of office of the Federal Loan Administrator created by section 402 of the present reorganization plan No. 1 under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1939 shall be for a period of 1 year unless he is sooner removed by the President upon reasons being communicated by him to the Senate; and he shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum."

That is the same rate he had when the office was created; the same appointing power as the President now has to appoint him. He is protected by the action of the Senate. The language I have used is the identical language used in the creation of the office of Comptroller General of the United States. Under the circumstances which I have narrated, I want to bring to your attention a section of this act which I think is the most humiliating thing that has probably ever been placed in a bill about to be enacted into law in the United States.

I direct your attention to page 4, wherein it is stated, with reference to the duties of the Comptroller General:

The report shall also show specifically every program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law.

No more humiliating thing was ever placed upon the statute books of any country in the world, that we confess that the man who audits these accounts must be convinced that something has been done outside the law, utterly beyond the authority granted this individual, and shall make a report. To what low estate have we come? To what depth have we dropped? Is there any wonder there is criticism all over the United States of the Congress, that it has been remiss, that it has failed to do its duty; that it is utterly at fault in its protection of the people of the United States? I do not care who the administration is or who their officers are, we cannot escape the obligation upon us, our duty to protect the people; our duty to protect the public treasury. It has been said that the power to tax, if unwisely used, is the power to destroy. Yet, I say to you the power to appropriate and the power to expend those appropriations, unrestricted, unlimited, is the power to control your economic, your social, your financial, your whole structure of life in the United States of America.

What is the next thing that confronts you? You are told in one breath that this War Powers Act will expire 6 months after the termination of the war. Quite true. And Executive Order 9071, will expire at the same time. But every realist sitting here within the sound of my voice knows this happens: If our enemies capitulate—and it is our prayer and hope that Germany soon will—then follows the war with Japan. But here is the danger of what I am pointing out to you; that under the economy set up under wartime pressure, the exigiencies and emergencies of war, and the powers granted to the Executive branch of this Government, your peace economy is going to be worked out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the Machiavellian maneuvers of my esteemed Republican colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee who unanimously reported this bill out, and who are now trying to scuttle it, I feel it necessary for the RECORD to make my position clear. The public is definitely confused by yesterday's vote on the rule, and will be more confused if the motion to recommit carries today.

I am supporting the George bill for two reasons: First, I never did approve of the transfer of the lending agencies under the control of the Federal Loan Administrator to the Secretary of Commerce, even though I entertained then, and do now, the highest respect for the ability and integrity of Jesse Jones. It is always unsafe to assume that any man will continue in office indefinitely. My second reason for supporting this measure is that I am opposed to Mr. Wallace administering the lending agencies. I am opposed to him not only because of his lack of experience in matters of finance, but also because of many of his impractical and irresponsible utterances. He, to my way of thinking, is that type of liberal who has both feet firmly planted in midair and is frequently walking in opposite directions at the same time. Now, in the history of our Nation, only six Cabinet officers, to my knowledge, have been rejected by the Senate. I am, therefore, not too confident of Senate adverse action after the President returns. The persuasive power of the Chief Executive has impressed me greatly during my membership in this body. I fear that if we delay passage of this bill or amend it so that the President will have an excuse to veto it, some Senators will take that as a way out to go along with Mr. Wallace, and the House will be ridiculed for its tactics by the Nation.

Furthermore, the proposed Export-Import Bank amendment strikes me as a pretty feeble proposition. In the first place, Secretary Jones was only 1 out of 11 directors and my query is, How can 1 director out of 11 run a bank?

In the second place, all the stock is held by the Federal Economic Administrator, Leo Crowley, in whom practically all of us have confidence; not only is it held by Leo Crowley, but it was transferred by the President from Wallace and Jones to him. Would it not be somewhat absurd for the President to transfer it back to Mr. Wallace as was contended as a possibility here yesterday? Last, but not least, the Banking and Currency Committee will soon hold hearings on the continuance and expansion of the Export-Import Bank, and at that time Congress will be in a position to place whatever safeguards we think necessary around it. It is my conviction that the wisest course for the House to pursue is to pass the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I take it, then, from the gentleman's statement, that if he were passing on the confirmation of Mr. Wallace, passing on that proposition alone, the confirmation of Mr. Wallace, either as Secretary of Commerce or head of the R. F. C., the gentleman would vote against him.

Mr. BARRY. I would definitely vote against him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, we were asked many times by the opposition during debate on yesterday why the friends of Wallace are now asking that this legislation be passed when it takes from him the authority that is presently under the appointment the President is attempting to give him. Every newspaper answers that question. The people of America are not so confused that they do not know. The issue is merely whether or not we will be able to clear this for the seating of Mr. Wallace after nomination.

Mr. Chairman, the conservatives in the House have no greater friend than Senator GEORGE, the author of this bill. Surely there is no violation there which threatens the conservative Democrats and their position. I am interested in the Republican leadership that has been shown recently by my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. He calls Mr. Wallace an impractical dreamer. Yet Mr. Wallace was head of the rural-electrification program so cherished by the gentleman from Mississippi. Has the time come when we cannot even see a dreamer of dreams as a member of the Cabinet of the United States?

Mr. Wallace is a dreamer of dreams but he is a worker, a fact acknowledged by all. He is a man of vision, but takes his daily turn at long toiling, and it is a hard thing to have a man's head in the clouds and his nose to the grindstone at the same time. The United States of America knows no harder worker than this dreamer of dreams, Mr. Henry A. Wallace.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I cannot yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman ought to yield. He mentioned my name.

Mr. PATRICK. I cannot yield. The gentleman can get time.

Mr. Chairman, think where we were going. One of the greatest dreamer of dreams in the world is a dreamer in international power, Hitler, and he was able to throw the whole world into a terrible war. Can we not seek a dreamer of dreams who dreams of a granary, an ever-normal granary, to sit in our President's Cabinet and work for the people? It was dreamers of dreams, you know, who gave us America, dreamers of dreams who dreamed that America could

be established on the basis of equality for men. Thomas Jefferson made a great President as a dreamer of popular government and executor of his dreams.

Another man dreamed of equal and exact justice to all and that dreamer, Abraham Lincoln, became President of the United States. The time has come in America when we pass onto higher ground.

When Thomas Jefferson was President the doctrine in America was root hog or die. When Abraham Lincoln was President, the doctrine of America had become live and let live. Today we have moved to the point where we will have to live by the doctrine of live and help live.

One of those opposed to this bill yesterday, said: "We want all the employment our economy can stand." The economy of America if properly developed can provide employment in this rich Nation of resources for every man who wants to work and is able to work and we as a free people have not reached that practical dream until it is accomplished.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the creature of expediency. From its inception it has followed a path of confusion. Primarily, the confirmation of a Cabinet officer was the motivating reason for the bill.

The President sent the name of Henry Wallace to the Senate as his choice for Secretary of Commerce. The President desired that all the power now vested in the Secretary of Commerce should be transferred to Mr. Wallace. There was much difference of opinion in the country as to Mr. Wallace's suitability for the job. This apprehension immediately manifested itself in the Senate. After committee consideration and debate in the Senate, it was evident that Mr. Wallace could not be confirmed unless the lending powers presently exercised by the Secretary of Commerce were first removed from the Commerce Department. The matter was debated in the Senate and by a vote of 74 to 12 that confirming body decided that Mr. Wallace should not be appointed unless these lending powers were first removed from the Secretary of Commerce.

In the Senate there are 57 Democrats and 38 Republicans. Therefore, the Senate action on this bill was not a purely political one. This bill was hastily passed by the Senate, sent to the House, and immediately referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Surprising as it may seem, that committee refused to hold hearings on the important matters involved. Indeed, we are told that only an hour and a half was consumed by the committee. No amendments were permitted and, under the whip and the lash of certain influences, the bill came to the Rules Committee. That committee heard the members of the Banking and Currency Committee. It developed that the Export-Import Bank, one of the loaning agencies of the Government, had connection with the Secretary of Commerce. It was also learned that the bank contemplates asking for amendments to the law which controls and regulates it. In these circumstances, the Rules Committee had the benefit of the testimony of Mr. Leo Crowley, chairman of the board of trustees of the bank. The further the hearings progressed the most uncertainty and misunderstanding developed so far as the whole bill is concerned. I voted against bringing the matter before the House under those conditions. The majority of the committee, however, thought otherwise, and the bill has been debated here under the rule and in general debate for 5 hours—an unusually long time for an ordinary piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the debate has in no way clarified the issues here presented. There is more fog than ever. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] tells us that genuine confusion exists in the House and among the people of the country as to just what this bill will accomplish and just what effect it will have on the office of Secretary of Commerce if placed upon the statute books. I should not criticize the Committee on Banking and Currency if it does not understand its bill, because without hearings and further study it could hardly be expected to inform the House. The bill should never have been reported in its present form without committee hearings and investigation.

I have paid close attention to the debate and I admit that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is right when he says we are all confused. This legislation should not be enacted until there is definite knowledge, not only on the part of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but also on the part of the general membership, as to just what might happen under this proposed law.

Yes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT], another member of the committee, who has just addressed the House, reiterates the assertion of the gentleman from Georgia that there is confusion here. I agree with this statement; but I cannot accept as sound his conclusion that the short way out is to pass the bill without any amendments and trust to luck in the hope that the bill does do what is contemplated.

While the incentive back of all this is evidently a desire to make possible the confirmation of Mr. Wallace, with or without lending authority, yet the House should not be swept off its feet in doing something that it should not do. Sane, unprejudiced, unbiased, and thinking legislators must not be stampeded, regardless of expediency, political or otherwise. It is the possibilities in which we should be interested and not the probabilities. This legislation should not be railroaded through the House to make effective any political promises, regardless of how much the proposed beneficiary is entitled to reward for honest, sincere, and untiring campaign effort.

The Department of Commerce deals with the commercial and business interests of the country and no man should be appointed as Secretary who is not qualified to properly administer matters of this kind. The Senate by an overwhelming vote has decided that Mr. Wallace should not be confirmed unless the office of Secretary is so sterilized that much of the power is removed. Present law should not be changed for the express purpose of making it possible for a particular individual to qualify for a job. Mr. Wallace is either qualified or he is not qualified, for the position. The answer to this question rests entirely with the President and the Senate. It is none of the House's business. The House should not be asked to take this extraordinary, unprecedented, unwarranted, and hasty action without being fully advised in the premises.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that wisdom requires that this bill be sent back to the Committee on Banking and Currency where hearings will be held, where representatives of the several agencies to be affected will be given an opportunity to appear and state the facts, in order that an informed committee may draft adequate legislation based upon possibilities and without so much indefiniteness. To this end I shall vote to recommit the bill. In doing this I know that within a week or 10 days a new bill can be before the Congress for its deliberate consideration. To me this course makes sense. Why should the House not concern itself with writing adequate law and leave the duty of confirming Cabinet officers to the Senate?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I want to take this opportunity to try and correct in the RECORD, if I may, my opinion of Mr. Wallace concerning his appointment as Secretary of Commerce. Unfortunately the press this morning in its account of yesterday's action on a vote on the rule misconstrued the attitude of a great many members in voting for the rule to report the George bill. They were quoted as being in favor of Mr. Wallace because they voted for the rule to bring this piece of legislation before the House. I voted for the rule because I thought it was proper and this was the proper place to discuss and debate the question which is before us. But that does not mean that I am for Mr. Wallace for Secretary of Commerce or any other position in this Government because I am not. If I had been in the United States Senate the other day when there was a tie vote, we would not have needed this legislation to eliminate Mr. Wallace from the Department of Commerce, because I certainly would have voted against his confirmation. But I thought this was the proper place to debate this bill, and it was proper that it should be brought before this House for debate as it has been.

We are not dealing in this particular piece of legislation with whether or not we like Henry Wallace or approve of his political and economic philosophies. We have a question to decide in this bill, and the only question involved is whether or not the House is going to approve the action of the Senate in divorcing the lending agencies from the Department of Commerce. It is certainly not the prerogative of the lower branch of the Congress to approve or confirm Presidential nominations. It is beyond our preroga-

tive as Members of Congress to do that. It is unfortunate that the Members of the Senate did not have the courage to meet this question in the right way when it first came before them. Much as I should like to see the confirmation of Mr. Wallace withheld in the Senate, if we send this bill back to the committee have we any assurance that the Senate will reject Mr. Wallace? We do not know what is in the minds of the United States Senate any more than we know what was in their minds when they held up this confirmation till this bill was reported out. So I say that, considering this problem from every angle, this House and the Members who are now fighting to have this bill recommitted would certainly have a great deal to answer for to their constituents if we should send this bill back to committee, and should then find that the United States Senate took the attitude that we were usurping their powers, and confirmed Mr. Wallace with all the powers he would have without this legislation.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman says he is not sure what the Senate would do. Of course, nobody can be sure, but does the gentleman not think, and is not the gentleman convinced, that if the House passes the George bill Mr. Wallace will be confirmed, but if the House refuses to pass the bill Mr. Wallace will be rejected? Is not the gentleman convinced of that?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I feel reasonably sure that if this bill passes he will be confirmed as Secretary of Commerce. I have no way of knowing whether, if we do not pass this bill, he still will not be confirmed with all the powers that are now vested in the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MOTT. May I ask the gentleman further if he does not believe, in view of what he said, that in voting for the George bill he is making himself a party to the intention of the Senate to confirm Mr. Wallace after this bill is passed?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I certainly am not, and do not think that for a minute. The Senate is an independent body of this Congress and the Senators have their own responsibility. How they are going to exercise it, I do not know. I have no way of knowing whether or not Mr. Wallace would be rejected even if we passed this bill. I have seen the Senate do so many things and change their minds so often that I do not know and I have no way of knowing—and I do not think any Member of the House knows—what the Senate is going to do if we pass this bill or do not pass it, but I think that to safeguard the matter and to be sure that Mr. Wallace will not have control of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the other lending agencies that are taken away from him under the George bill we should pass the bill and be sure of at least that much.

I may say to my Republican friends that they were the first ones who advocated the passage of the George bill. Why? Because they thought it was the only way we were going to stop Mr. Wallace from having these powers. But they have changed and changed, and they are changing again. Let us be consistent. This is not a political measure. This is a measure which is going to assure the people of this country that nobody, neither Henry Wallace nor any other person who is nominated for Secretary of Commerce, will have the vast powers that were, probably without proper consideration, given to the Department of Commerce, even though it has been admirably administered under the leadership of Jesse Jones.

I take this opportunity to say, and I reiterate to my friend, that I am just as much opposed to Henry Wallace, everything he stands for, and his political philosophy, as he is.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that there is no politics in this controversy.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I did not say the controversy; I said the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. In the bill, then; but does not the gentleman think it is very strange that no Republican voted for the rule when it was voted on yesterday?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I cannot answer that. Unfortunately, politics has gotten into it. But this bill, regardless of who is Secretary of Commerce, merely divorces from him the vast powers delegated to him, powers that everyone admits now should never have been delegated to any one man.

I also want to say to my Democratic friends the discussion, and the fight put up over the nomination of Henry Wallace should certainly make us sit up and take notice. I have received numerous letters against the confirmation of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce; and the only letters of endorsement I have gotten have come from the radical socialistic groups in this country, practically all the leftist organizations. Therefore, let us, you and I, as Democrats, wake up to what is happening in this country and to our party. These people who are parading under false banners would not have any chance of getting consideration from the people of this country if they paraded under the label and banner which they should. But they parade under a cloak of the Democratic Party and use it as a shield. They use the prestige of the Democratic Party to break down every Democratic principle and every fundamental principle of the Democratic Party which has been the foundation of the party since its beginning. Those same groups which were organized as independent organizations a few years ago to my mind do not belong in the Democracy, I know, although they come in now and want to be called Democrats. They do not believe in the fundamental principles which have made this country great. You and I as Democrats are challenged to meet this situation. Oh, yes, it is very easy to drift with the tide. It is harder to buck the wind and try to fight off the influence of these organizations and preserve our party, to keep it the Democratic Party as we have known it. I have been called a rebel many times for not going along with the party regardless of what was involved. But I say to you that I will go along with the Democratic Party just as long as they stick to democratic principles and just so long as it is controlled by men who, I believe, believe in principles of the Democratic Party and in democracy. But I will use every bit of strength and energy and bend every effort to fight the movement which I see within our party to make it the party of the leftists and Socialists in this country and to fool the people who believe in democracy. I intend, whether I am called a rebel Democrat or not, to fight that movement within my party. It is a challenge to every Democrat in this House. Let this be a lesson to us as to what is happening. You are going to have and are having, and we are seeing it day in and day out, people coming into the party assuming the cloak of democracy and practicing a philosophy that has nothing more in common with democracy and democratic principles than democracy has in common with nazi-ism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, we know what the issue is before us today. As practical men and women no amount of theatericals and window dressing will deceive us.

We have heard impassioned appeals and have been given smooth and plausible arguments that to recommit the George bill will be a grave mistake; that we are going beyond our legislative duty; that we are conniving and contriving, really, to embarrass the President; and that we have no rights, no duty, and no responsibility in the matter of the selection of a servant of the people.

The plain fact of the issue before us is that we are asked by those who want the George bill enacted into law "as is" to do this net one thing: to approve a political horse trade; to approve the bestowal of a public office of the United States in payment of a political debt.

The advocates of this measure say that to recommit it would work a mistake, that those opposing the bill would rue their action.

Well, I do not think it is a mistake. The only mistake I can see is in the bill's title. That ought to be amended so that it will read: "An act to reduce the President's political debts by palming Henry Wallace off on the Nation."

And this is the kind of bill we are in practical fact considering. No amount of pious remonstrance can change this fact. That is what is really sought here. If some Members of the House have perhaps forgotten—although this is not likely—let me remind them of the Roosevelt-Jones exchange of notes—an abysmal low in Presidential correspondence, and a disgrace to the country.

But the letter of the President to Mr. Jones amazes me only a trifle more than the charge that those opposed to this bill are going beyond their legislative duty. This complaint has also been whiningly made in the columns of some of the press. Yet, oddly enough, when the George bill was being considered on the other side of the Capitol, it was

urged also, by some of the press, that the measure should be defeated.

Listen to this, from the Daily Worker, on what to do. This is the advice that they gave on what to do:

> You can help the cause of national unity today—by telling your Senators and Senator JOSIAH BAILEY, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, to defeat the George bill and to confirm Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce for the Nation's good.

Yes; that is from the Daily Worker, the Communist organ.

But now that we have the George bill before us we see these same columns in the press, and also propaganda messages indicating fanatical zeal, demanding that we must pass the George bill without any amendment.

The Communist organ—the Daily Worker—is not confused. The people that run this paper and the select clientele they cater to, know perfectly well what they want and what this bill is all about.

We know that behind the George bill, throwing a long and ominous shadow, is the real issue. And it is to get at this issue, to decide it, that I shall vote to recommit the measure. If the motion to recommit fails, there will be nothing left for me to do, unfortunately, except to vote for the bill in order to make it impossible for the President to keep the functions of the War Loan Agency in the Department of Commerce.

We are charged, also, with obstructionist tactics; that we are envenomed against the President; that our purpose is to embarrass the administration and, perhaps, even the conduct of the war.

If the George bill is recommitted, I think it fair to expect that such action may work a real embarrassment to the New Deal leadership and, perhaps a little, just a little, to the President. But whatever embarrassment may result certainly cannot be said to be of the minority's making. But rather that the administration suffer embarrassment, temporarily, than that the Nation be saddled with a Henry Wallace and that it be plagued and perhaps mortally hurt by being made a guinea pig for his leftist and collectivist experiments and exploitations. Let us remember that any embarrassment to the administration will be incidental. The President can always find another Secretary of Commerce. This will be far easier than for the Nation to withstand the fuzzy type of the Wallace brand of economics and his ideas on the necessity for radical, revolutionary changes in the American way of life.

I am not resisting this proposal out of any desire to embarrass or hamstring this administration. And to charge that we are even embarrassing the conduct of the war by refusing to give of our approval, not to say, enthusiasm, in the enactment of this bill is just sheer nonsense. I have the highest respect for Mr. Wallace's personal character and integrity. But because I totally distrust his capacity or bent for the secretaryship of Commerce or as head of the War Loan Agency does not mean, certainly, that I am sabotaging the war effort because I do not think it is necessary or desirable to appoint him one of our economic generals, to head one of the greatest departments in the Government.

Why this bill? If the body on the other side of the Capitol feel that Mr. Wallace is all that is claimed for him by way of qualifications for one of the most responsible offices in the Government, then why this bill?

And if in this House the New Deal majority want to protect and support the President's position on the nomination of Mr. Wallace, then again, I say, Why this bill?

Perhaps the advocates of the measure here and the majority on the Banking and Currency Committee have graded Mr. Wallace's qualifications. If they have done this and have found him qualified for appointment as Secretary of Commerce but not as head of the War Loan Agency, why do they not tell us? If they do not share my fears, and the country's fears, as to the over-all qualifications of Mr. Wallace—if they have no apology to make at all—then, again, Why this bill?

But I shall let the question go. Perhaps it is too embarrassing to my friends on the administration side. I simply want to leave one reminder. That on January 21, last, only a little time ago, there was not the haziest notion or idea that suddenly the Banking and Currency Committee would meet and that it would bring out a bill of this kind—to separate the Commerce Department from the War Loan Agency. On January 21 everything was tranquil in the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. Jesse Jones was head of the Commerce Department. The country was satisfied and so was the Congress. Yet today we are in grips on this measure. When we courteously ask if Mr. Wallace's nomination had anything to do with rushing this bill onto the floor we are told, also courteously, but quite firmly, that the question is irrelevant.

Maybe it is irrelevant from the standpoint of the New Deal, but it has not proven irrelevant from the standpoint of the Nation and a great many of us here in this House. There is no use blinking the issue.

We are asked, by this measure, to smooth the way for the appointment as head of a great agency of the Government of a man whose political and economic philosophy rates him as one of the key leftists or collectivists; goes out of his way, for instance, to see great good in the Russian collectivist accomplishments and who cannot wax eloquent enough about the communistic political and economic system. Only a couple of years ago he envisioned the development of a "new democracy" in which the United States and Soviet Russia would lead the world. I shall quote only a small part of an address by Mr. Wallace before the Congress of American Soviet Friendship on the point of this "new democracy." These are his words:

> Russia and the United States have had a profound effect upon each other. Both are striving for the education, the productivity, and the enduring happiness of the common man. The new democracy, the democracy of the common man, includes not only the Bill of Rights, but also economic democracy, ethnic democracy, educational democracy, and democracy in the treatment of the sexes.

This sounds very much like he feels he has received a call to change the New Deal to the New Communism. Well, it is at least enlightening to know that the Russian system is democratic.

The whole credo of this man suggests an apology for the America that we are, of the traditional American institutions and values, for the things that have made Americans count beyond match elsewhere in the world. He is the great reformer, the great crusader, but of the type who would substitute our traditional values and our proven genius to keep America on the march for his own brand of collectivist government.

In whole truth, parade as he may as a liberal, his credo is the antithesis of traditional liberalism, just as much as totalitarianism runs counter to liberalism. In short, his fanatic zeal for the ordered, the planned state, puts him down as one who has lost faith in the genius of America, in our ability to retain individual freedom and yet secure an even more bountiful and happy life.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this is an important measure. I doubt if any matter of greater importance has been presented to this great law-making body at this session, than is the one now before us. I make that statement advisedly, because this measure brings before us, directly, the ponderous question of the right of the Congress to determine its own policies, and to function as it was intended to function under our Constitution. This is not alone a question for us today, but this is a question which reaches far into the future. This is a question that will chart the course, in future years, respecting the functions of this body as the representatives of the people. Therefore, as we approach the questions involved in this measure, we should do so with great care and caution. This measure does not merely apply to one man, but it applies to the future policies of this great body. It has a direct application to the deliberations of the representatives of the people, and that is no small item as all will concede.

While we debate this measure, I have been constrained to view with suspicion the hurried manner in which this bill has been brought to the House, by the committee. I was greatly surprised when I learned that only approximately 1 hour was consumed in the consideration of this measure by that committee, and that time was largely consumed in executive session. It is abhorrent to witness the fact that any committee, in the Congress of the United States, with a very important matter pending before it, would make a report upon such measure with but approximately 1 hour of consideration. And, in all such instances, I firmly believe the membership of the House should require a more careful survey and a more exhaustive study of the pending matter before permitting such matter to be considered in the House. Such a makeshift or cursory examination of any important question is mere

mockery and highly objectionable, and the membership of the House should resent it in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Chairman, the very method of handling this measure—which is very unusual, to say the least about it—creates suspicion and confusion in this great law-making body. Quite often the people and the press and the commentators make charges against the Congress, much of which is unfounded. Many of those charges are very misleading, and I am confident, in the main, those charges are without any merit whatever. However, it is such unfortunate instances as we have here—where a committee with an important matter before it reports a measure out for passage without having first given that matter careful and painstaking consideration—that creates suspicion against the Congress and gives rise to the censure that is so often heaped upon us.

The one way to avoid that unjust criticism is to fairly and honestly consider all matters that arise and when a bill is referred to a committee, no matter who or what is involved in it, that committee should give such item very careful and painstaking consideration and after hearings have been completed, and the executive sessions have been held, to make its report fairly and honestly based upon the facts produced before the committee. That is the charted process which should be followed, and that is the process which should have been followed in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, when evidence is produced before this honorable body that any committee in the House has failed to comply with that rule of action—when any committee has reported out any important measure without having first fairly and carefully examined that question, in the usual and regular way, I feel that it is my sworn duty to resist such methods, and to cast my vote in that manner which will, if possible, cause that committee to make a further and careful study of that problem, and to make its report, in the end, based upon the facts adduced before the committee, all to the end that justice may obtain. Any short-cut method, which fails to meet the standard fixed, will not receive my approval. The very purpose of submitting measures to the several committees in the House is thwarted by such short-cut methods and immature consideration, as is here presented. What the Members desire and what the people want are the facts involved in each and every hearing upon each and every measure, and they want full hearings and the full facts presented to them.

May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that those Members in the House who were not members of the committee reporting this measure out have no hearings, they have no evidence, and they are without advice upon this piece of legislation, except as the same is orally explained to them during the debate upon it. This procedure is not consonant with reason and justice, as that great majority of this membership who were not members of the committee making this report, and who could not participate in any of the committee discussions, are laboring under a serious handicap on this measure; they have no facts, and they have no evidence before them.

It is my hope that this short-cut procedure will not be forced upon the Members of the House again but that the committees will entertain and hold full hearings upon each measure—make a full and complete report thereon based upon the facts adduced, all to the end that the membership of the House may know what the circumstances are upon which the report was made, and in justice to every other Member when the matter is presented for debate and vote.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the rule which has made this bill in order at this time. I did so because I did not feel that reasonable and adequate study had been given the bill in the Banking and Currency Committee where, it was agreed, the entire session devoted to this important measure consumed less than 1 hour.

Many groups which opposed the pending bill, the George bill, at the outset are now among its active supporters and they urge its passage without any amendments whatsoever. The passage of this important measure is urged on the ground that it is advisable to take the lending agencies out of the Department of Commerce. If the rule be sound, and it is sound, then why should not the Banking and Currency Committee have considered the extent of other loaning powers which are within the office of the Secretary of Commerce and are not included within the pending bill?

Why should we not consider the possibility that other loan agencies might hereafter be vested in the Department of Commerce? It is quite generally agreed that the amendments discussed here on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Michigan will be ruled out of order as not germane to this bill. But what about the Export-Import Bank with its far-reaching effect—not only in this country but abroad. The R. F. C. and its kindred agencies are domestic in their application, but the Export-Import Bank is world-wide in its operation. If this House is so anxious to divorce these domestic loan agencies from the Department of Commerce, it should be a hundred times more anxious to make certain that the Export-Import Bank, or any similar agencies world-wide in scope, should not be placed in that Department of the Government.

And what about the possibility of still additional loan agencies being created? We have an R. F. C. and what assurance is there that the Executive might not set up an R. C. F. or an F. D. R.? If such things are done, and those powers vested in the Commerce Department, then the whole action of the Congress in passing the George bill could be completely nullified.

As I said, less than 1 hour was given to this important bill in the Banking and Currency Committee, and I shall vote for the motion to recommit the bill to that committee in the hope that it will be given the complete and careful attention that it demands.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, under date of February 5, 1945, I introduced in the House a companion bill to the then George bill in the other body. I was very much in favor of that bill at the time I introduced it. I should like to be able to vote for a similar bill today. Later the other body approved S. 375 in the form in which it is before us today. In the committee I supported the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] in his effort to amend S. 375. When the bill was reported I voted to report the bill. On the floor I voted against the rule, so as to bring out additional studies, and try to get a more acceptable proposal. I shall vote to recommit this bill, and if that vote fails, I shall vote for the bill. My judgment is that Henry Wallace will be confirmed as Secretary of Commerce, irrespective of what this body does with this bill that is before us today.

Mr. Chairman, we shall have before us very shortly a bill which deals with the Bretton Woods report on the stabilization of currencies, and the International Bank. The functions of those two organizations, or machines, as we might call them, will be tied in very closely with that of the Export-Import Bank. We know that the savings of our people are running at the rate of $35,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000 or more per annum; we know that the working capital of our business corporations today approaches $45,000,000,000. It is the purpose of the administration to have the Export-Import Bank further implemented, to have the Bretton Woods proposals approved by the Congress, the fund and the bank created, and then to use those machines of government for the purpose of channeling out of the United States the surplus funds of the people of the United States, through loans to the people of other countries, those loans being promoted by Government propaganda or educational material, and thus export to other countries the necessary capital to carry out the programs as set forth in the purposes of the stabilization fund and the purposes of the International Bank.

There is no question in my mind but what the international agreements, peacetime and otherwise, will be agreed to by the Congress of the United States. They will, at least for the moment, be accepted by the people of the country, and in due course we shall undoubtedly place back of those, billions and billions and billions of our capital in an effort to make them operate.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that would be sufficient notice to any thinking man or woman, Members of the Congress of the United States, that we should have at the head of the Export-Import Bank organization, the stabilization fund, and the International Bank, the soundest, the best-qualified men or women that we can find in the United States. In my opinion, Mr. Wallace is not the man for that purpose, and as far as I am concerned, I would not support a proposal which would put him in charge

of the Export-Import Bank operations, or the fund, or the International Bank.

The philosophy of the administration is to the effect that our country has developed to a point where we can no longer here at home absorb the savings of our people and that therefore we must export capital from the United States to other parts of the world. That is a policy of the administration. That is the theory and philosophy of those who are guiding the administration's proposals in connection with the fund and the bank and the Export-Import Bank and the building of a great debt.

I am not in a position to agree with that philosophy at the present time, but after you have put three or four hundred billion dollars or more into a war; after you have sacrificed through blood and strife a million or two or three million men and women, and after you have surrendered so many ideals and institutions of liberty and freedom, is it reasonable to assume that the Congress will not go a step further and put these proposals into operation, as an experimental measure, if nothing else, in preference to going into another war 10 or 15 or 20 years from now?

My judgment is that all of these proposals will be approved by the Congress in due time and by "due time" I mean within the next 12, 18, or 24 months. So here is a good time for us to start placing at the head of these operations some very sensible people, the very best we can get.

It is generally immaterial to me who the President puts in his Cabinet, because I accept the philosophy that the President is entitled to put in his Cabinet almost anyone he pleases if that person is accepted as a decent American citizen, and, of course, subject to the confirmation by the Senate. I think Mr. Wallace is—I do not think, I know—so I am not going to waste any great amount of energy on that. But that does not impose upon me the duty or responsibility of supporting him in putting him at the head of an operation similar to the Import-Export Bank, or similar to the Bretton Woods fund, or the Bretton Woods International Bank.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I should like to inquire how the gentleman reconciles his statement that the President is permitted to appoint almost anyone he pleases as a Cabinet member as long as he is decent, with the constitutional requirement that the nomination of the President in that regard must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That of course is all included in my concept, and the acceptance by the Senate as a general rule of whomever the President sends up is an American institution itself. So I am not going to quarrel with that at all. It is very proper for the Senate to inquire, and now and then decline to confirm, but generally it goes along and supports the Executive. Referring to these lending agencies, in order to secure those dollars the Secretary of the Treasury sells bonds to our people, bonds that are going down in interest rate. In my opinion this cheap money, so-called, that we are dealing with is destroying the savings initiative of our people, is striking at the roots of our whole private enterprise system, because you cannot say to one man that he must put a certain portion of his money in Government bonds and receive 1½ or 2 percent interest on it while at the same time you say to another person that he can invest his money in business that yelds returns of 4, 5, or 6 percent on the investment and which is controlled by the Government. We are not going to get away with that kind of a proposition. So the Secretary sells these bonds, and the next issue will undoubtedly bring a lower rate of interest than the present one. That pushes up the market value of the present ones and you get into a whole new field of operations there where new economic forces are put into operation. So we have a fantastic thing before us at the present time in connection with the financing of the war. The Secretary sells these bonds to us in the name of war, but many of the dollars go into the hands of those who manage these Government corporations, and the people do not know what is going on, and every day they are becoming more confused about it, as evidenced by the letters our constituents write us, saying, "If I buy some more bonds what is that money going to be used for?"

If we want money to be spent in Britain or for Britain's benefit we should label it a "British" issue, and by the same token we should say an "Indian" issue, a "Brazilian" issue, or a "Russian" issue, so the people of this country would know what was going on and let them bet their savings on their judgment with a fair knowledge in their hands of what is going on. But no; we have got into all this bucketshop operation which the Government would not permit individual corporations to do at all. It grows worse every day, it grows worse with every bond issue that is put out, and the people over the country as a whole do not know what is going on.

It is time for Congress to assume its responsibility as to who shall head these Government lending agencies. As far as I am concerned I am ready to start today and lay down some very strict rules, because when the next bond issue comes out and the rate of interest is cut, the fellows who purchased bonds in excess of what they wanted to keep in their own portfolios the last time will take another joy ride by selling the last issue at a nice mark-up premium. That is going to be something for us to think about, and that operation will no doubt go on with every issue that comes out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wallace recognizes that when the war is over and our soldiers return home, there will be a need for approximately 60,000,000 jobs. He foresees that the problem of full employment will be the one absorbing and vital issue. In order that we may not be caught unprepared for peace, as we were for war, he advocates post-war planning. Those who still believe in the laissez-faire philosophy, immediately hold up their hands in horror and then proceed to throw themselves headlong into their fox holes, all the while screaming "Communism," "Fascism," and "Collectivism."

While such actions are dramatic and may impress those who run from phrases or labels, I confess that I am unimpressed. In this modern world the individual who does not plan for the future finds himself impoverished when the rainy day arrives. The businessman, be he large or small, that fails to plan for future contingencies or competition, wakes up in the bankruptcy courts. The nation with no plans for its future, either economically or politically, is preparing for its exit from the international stage. So, Mr. Wallace unhesitatingly states that for the good of our domestic tranquillity and welfare, we must plan for full employment of our people in the post-war period.

FULL EMPLOYMENT THE NATION'S GOAL

By full employment he means that we must strive to reach the President's goal of 60,000,000 jobs when the war is over. He thereupon proposes the basic idea that the American people are entitled to an economic bill of rights. He says:

> We now must establish an economic bill of rights not only out of common decency, but also to insure the preservation of our political freedoms.

What are those economic rights which Mr. Wallace advocates? In his appearance before the Senate committee where he testified for over 4 hours, he very frankly outlined them. In his books and in magazine articles, he has clearly and concisely stated his ideas on this subject. Because I believe Mr. Wallace is a man of honesty, and because his ideas of how to solve our future problems present a blueprint for the future, I wish to record his views in his own words on this important subject.

First—

AMERICA'S CAPACITY TO PRODUCE NOW AND IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD

> America's known capacities are not difficult to calculate. We are now producing goods and services to the gigantic total of $200,000,000,000 a year with 52,000,000 workers and 12,000,000 soldiers. * * * America is producing twice as much as she had ever produced before the war. * * * I know and you know, that if we can produce a huge flow of ships and guns and planes and tanks, we can also produce an abundance of houses, cars, clothing, and provide education, recreation, and the other good things of life for all Americans. And I know and you know that when our boys return home from the war and are again able to put their power into the stream of peacetime production, America's capacity to produce will be even greater than it is today.

Having stated our present production capacity and pointed out the increased potential production capacity when our boys return, Mr. Wallace then pegs the responsibility for employment. What does he suggest?

PROTECTION OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Does he suggest a change in our form of government to some utopian collectivist form? On the contrary, he comes out firmly for the protection and

strengthening of private enterprise. He says:

If we are going to have remunerative jobs for all, we must have an expanded private industry capable of hiring millions more men. I propose that the Government do its part in helping private enterprise finance this expansion of our industrial plant. It will be privately owned, privately operated, and privately financed, but the Government will share with the private investor the unusual and abnormal risk which may be involved in getting started. * * * Through this program we will be merely extending to the financing of old and new business, the principles which have proved so successful in our experience with the V loans, T loans, and the Federal Housing Administration loans.

Thus we see Mr. Wallace advise the Government to stand firmly behind private enterprise. If the goal of full employment has not been reached by private enterprise, then and only then, does he advocate the closing of the gap of unemployment by direct Government action.

He says:

It is inevitable, however, that an economy of free enterprise like ours will have some fluctuation in the number of jobs it can provide. Adjustments in employment are an essential part of an expanding economy.

Whenever the number of gainfully employed in the country falls below 57,000,000 our Governrment should take prompt steps to see that new jobs are made available to keep the total from falling significantly below that figure.

This is the floor below which we must not allow employment to fall.

THE RIGHT TYPE OF PUBLIC WORKS

What kind of jobs does Mr. Wallace advocate? Does he advocate relief work for the sake of charity or subsistence level employment, leaf-raking jobs which were at one time the means of distributing charity to the unemployed? No; he says:

We must have a reservoir of planned and approved Federal, State, and local projects ready to be tapped. And when employment falls below this floor of 57,000,000 jobs, this reservoir of planned and approved public works should be opened up to provide more jobs and take up the slack. Such useful and essential public works should not produce relief jobs, however. No; they should provide private jobs. This is possible if we insist that this construction be done by private firms under contract with the Government: Private firms employing labor at the prevailing rate of wages and under standard labor conditions.

LABOR'S RIGHT TO DECENT LIVING

What is Mr. Wallace's views on another important principle in the economic bill of rights that is, the right of the worker to earn enough to provide clothing, food, and recreation? His answer is—

America must remain preeminently the land of high wages and efficient production. Every job in America must provide enough for a decent living * * * the gains made by labor during the war must be retained in full * * * and wage rates should be constantly increased as productivity increases * * * we all know that unless the worker does get his share of increased wages and unless business gets its share of increased profits neither will prosper, and all—businessman, wage earner, and farmer, will lose.

FARMER'S RIGHTS

Mr. Wallace has had a lifetime of experience with the farm problem, as the editor of a prominent farm periodical started by his father, and years of experience as Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture. He clearly states the farmer's position and future problem. He says, "The right of every farmer to raise and sell his product at a rate which will give him and his family a decent living" is an important principle in the economic bill of rights. He further states:

American farmers now have by far the largest income in history * * * we must assure the farmers that there will always be a market for all their output at good prices. Concretely we should maintain an adequate floor on farm prices and thereby assure the farmer against the danger of falling prices for his products. * * * There should be a comprehensive Federal crop-insurance program which will secure the farmer against the hazards of crop failure. * * * We must press forward with rural electrification and improvement.

PROTECT FREE ENTERPRISE AGAINST UNFAIR COMPETITION

Mr. Wallace believes that the preservation of free enterprise depends upon the protection of small business against the ruthless competition of great monopolies in the domestic field, and their evil parallel in the foreign field, the international cartels. He says:

No special class of business deserves to be the spoiled darling of government. The American people have no interest in preserving the vested interests and monopolistic privileges of greedy big business—we must break through the barriers of monopoly and international cartels that stand in the way of a healthy expansion of free enterprise.

We must overcome the monopolistic frame of mind which thinks of business in terms of restricted output at high prices per unit. We must pass on to the workers and consumers the benefits of technological progress and large-scale production. Free enterprise in the American tradition can flourish only by doing a large volume of business at a small profit per unit. We must protect free enterprise against monopolies and cartels through continued vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws. Private enterprise yields its full advantage to the consuming public and to other business only when it is genuinely free and competitive. He is a sinister enemy of free enterprise who pays lip service to competition but also labels every antitrust prosecution a persecution.

There must be a place in these new business areas—as everywhere in our economy—for enterprising small firms. It is from these new and small firms that the great industries of the future will grow. We need new industries and new firms to have industrial progress. We must not permit them to be stifled by monopoly.

By a long-range building program we can accomplish the elimination of slums, through the erection of 15,000,000 new houses by private builders. Mr. Wallace says:

To the fullest extent possible, we must assure every family an opportunity for home ownership by making certain that there is available private credit on terms which will reduce the down payment and cut the monthly cost of buying homes one-third.

OUR HEALTH GOAL

Mr. Wallace thinks all our people are entitled to adequate medical care. He believes that by protecting the health of our people we would add to the total wealth of our Nation. He believes that—

Federal and State Governments have just as much responsibility for the health of their people as they have for providing them with education and police and fire protection. We must see that medical attention is available to all the people.

Of course, this is an advanced viewpoint—worthy of a goal for the future—but lest the specter of "socialized medicine" frighten some of our more near-sighted friends, Mr. Wallace goes on to state how this worth-while object can be accomplished in a practical way, he says:

But this health program must be achieved in the American way. Every person should have the right to go to the doctor and hospital of their own choosing. We need more hospitals and doctors. We should make sure that such facilities are available, and that we build hospitals in every community, rural and urban, that does not now have such facilities for all of its people.

THE RIGHT TO ECONOMIC SECURITY

The platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties contained promises to broaden the base of social security. Humanitarians have long deplored the insecurity, privation, and slow starvation of those who, because of sickness and old age, could no longer earn their actual living expenses. In a changed world, a world of potential plenty, can we continue to enforce the rules of a scarcity economy on the sick and aged?

Mr. Wallace says:

We cannot neglect these groups without serious dangers to the stability of our whole economy. A broader social-security program will be needed after the war. Old-age insurance should be adequate to provide all our older men and women with the means for decent living. Our present old-age benefits are definitely inadequate. A decent, self-respecting old-age social-security program, deemed to be a right, not a charity, a right springing from the years of service each person delivers to the sum total of a better America.

EDUCATION FOR ALL

The blight of illiteracy which extends over the backward portions of our Nation is a national disgrace. This was brought to our attention very vividly in the past 3 years when Selective Service turned down over one-half million able-bodied young men because they could not read or write. Millions more had less than a high-school education. One of the most important principles in Mr. Wallace's economic bill of rights is the right to a good education. On this subject, he says:

We must have an educated and informed America. Even now, most of our rural areas and some of our urban areas are poorly provided with schools. Our teachers are underpaid. Our schools are badly under staffed; we need more schools and at least 500,000 more teachers. Through Federal aid to poorer communities for the development of locally controlled educational programs, we should equalize and extend educational opportunities throughout the land.

We should provide facilities for technical and higher education for all qualified young men and women without regard to their financial means. In this America, the pioneer of free education, the right to technical and higher education should be as universal as the right to a secondary-school education * * *.

The millions of more productive jobs that this program will bring are jobs in private enterprise. They are jobs based on the expanded demand for the output of our economy for consumption and investment.

CONCLUSION

These, then, are the ideas of Henry A. Wallace on some of the most important facets of the post-war problem. In my humble opinion, they present an approach to the problems of the post-war period, which must be solved if democracy reaches its fruition. They are a challenge to his opponents, and, until his opponents present a better plan, they remain as an indictment of their narrow and near-sighted approach to the vital problems of tomorrow. Ignore these ideas today, and they will be hurled in your face some day by the boys who are fighting today for an America of opportunity. Because these are the things they are fighting for and expect to get when they return—a job, a decent house to live in, adequate food and clothing, medical services for themselves and their families, social security for their aged parents.

What will you say in that day when unemployment stalks through the land, when the humming factories are silent, when unemployed civilians and returned soldiers gather in sullen groups on the corners of the Main Streets of America? I repeat the question, gentlemen, What will you say when they ask you, "Why did you fight the man who had the courage to voice his vision of a better world?"

You called the ideas of Henry A. Wallace impractical. What alternative do you propose?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the controversy involved in the passage of the measure now before the House is merely one of personalities. If those who are now seeking to strip the Commerce Department of various functions could devise a way to restore to Mr. Jesse Jones his former powers, they would be just as vigorous in their efforts to do so.

It is the historical struggle between progress and retrogression. Every great statesman and man of vision has been persecuted and ridiculed by those who were not ready to acknowledge and recognize the new factors at work in the world and to deal with them realistically.

This Nation is fortunate to have two such leaders as Roosevelt and Wallace, whose understanding of the problems of the people leads them to devise and work for the economic bill of rights.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a rather unusual situation in the House when a bill has been reported unanimously by one of the major committee of this House, 27 to 0, and then finding one party voting almost unanimously against taking the bill up. It is even more absurd to see the minority party advocating that the bill, which was unanimously adopted in the committee, be recommitted—after the House has had 4 hours of general debate and time to read and consider this bill under the 5-minute rule.

It is even more unusual to hear leading Members of the minority party say they cannot understand this bill and that the situation is confused. In my opinion, the confusion results from a strictly political approach to this piece of very understandable legislation. They are the source of this so-called confusion.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation now before us is the most logical piece of legislation that has been brought before this Congress in recent days. It simply seeks to draw a logical dividing line between two very separate and distinct functions of government, two functions that were thrown together, with the approval of the Congress, in order to honor a man we all greatly respected and in whose business judgment and capacity we had and still have confidence.

We permitted the consolidation of the vast lending agencies with the Department of Commerce because we believed Mr. Jesse Jones was a man of unusual ability. I still believe that, but if you will read Mr. Jones' testimony before a Senate committee, you will find that he admits it is difficult for any man seeking to serve this great country in these two great jobs to find the hours and the long days to do the work that both of these important tasks require.

I may say now that the post-war situation on developing post-war trade and commerce is important enough to demand a full-time director of that business in the Department of Commerce. I say also that the lending functions of this Government are so important that we have the right to demand and expect in the post-war period a full-time director of those lending agencies. That is simply what this bill seeks to do. It gives this normal and business-like division of power, authority, and responsibility that was intended. In business it is unusual to expect any one man to have great talents to serve as both credit manager and sales-promotion manager of a business. Usually any man will lean toward the direction of his greatest interest.

Yet we find presented before our committee and the House a determined attack to confuse this bill with many extraneous issues. A determined effort has been made to embarrass and strip of even logical duties under the Department of Commerce the man the President has nominated for that Cabinet post.

When you dig back down into the reasons for this attack you will find that although it has been slightly over 3 months since the people of this Nation intrusted the President and Commander in Chief with the responsibility through the war to run this country for the next 4 years, they are now coming to the Congress and asking a vote of "no confidence" in him. Why do I say that? You only have to look at the Wolcott amendment introduced in the committee, and if germane to this bill, it will be introduced on the floor, which would deny to the President powers under the War Powers Act to transfer any agency of Government, whether it is necessary to the war or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Loan Agency, created by section 402 of the President's Reorganization Plan No. I under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1939, shall continue as an independent establishment of the Federal Government and shall continue to be administered under the direction and supervision of the Federal Loan Administrator in the same manner and to the same extent as if Executive Order 9071, dated February 24, 1942, transferring the functions of the Federal Loan Agency to the Department of Commerce, had not been issued.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAHAM: Page 2, line 2, insert a new subsection as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) The term of office of the Federal Loan Administrator created by section 402 of the President's Reorganization Plan No. I under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1939, shall be for the period of 1 year, unless he is sooner removed by the President, upon reasons to be communicated by him to the Senate, and he shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPENCE. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill. It goes far beyond any purpose of the bill in that it changes the organic law of the lending agency and is not germane to this legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the point of order.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, under the Reorganization Act of 1939 five subjects were set forth under part I. It is not necessary for the purpose of this argument to repeat them all, but I refer particularly to the third subparagraph of the group: "Coordinate and consolidate agencies of the Government as nearly as may be according to major purposes."

Under subparagraph No. 1 we find the following:

He shall designate in such cases as he deems necessary the name of any agency affected by reorganization and the title of its head.

In pursuance of the authority granted the President of the United States under this Reorganization Act of April 3, 1939, the President issued his first plan on Government reorganization, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting the first plan on Government reorganization and accompanying orders. That is House Document No. 262 of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

On April 25, 1939, that document was referred to the Select Committee of Government Organization and ordered to be printed. Under section 402 (a) of that document under the heading "Federal Loan Agency" there is the following:

> There shall be at the seat of the Government a Federal Loan Agency, with a Federal Loan Administrator at the head thereof. The Federal Loan Administrator shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I bring to the attention of the Committee these facts that the Office of Federal Loan Agency was established by the first plan on governmental reorganization. In that plan an agency was first established and a Federal Loan Administrator was created. He was to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and his salary was fixed at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

My amendment, which is in the nature of a subsection, does only two things in addition to what is set forth. First, it limits the term. Up to this time no term or tenure of office is set forth in the paragraph or section above quoted. There is no change in the salary. It remains the same, at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The amendment refers to the President's reorganization plan, specifically designating the section referred to.

In addition, as I stated, not only is reference made to the specific section of the President's reorganization plan but also to the Reorganization Act of 1939.

The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has objected to this amendment and made a point of order against it, specifying four reasons. I address myself to one, that it broadens the scope of the act.

Mr. Chairman, I argue to you in all sincerity and all honesty that there is no broadening of this act by this amendment. It does not create a new agency; it does not create a new administrator; the title remains the same, the Agency is still in effect, the Administrator is still designated as the Federal Loan Administrator, and the salary remains the same. Only two changes are embodied in my amendment. One is fixing a definite term, which is surely within the power of the legislative branch of the Government to do, and the other is the protection to the individual named by the President that he shall not be removed except upon reason communicated by the President.

The Chairman, I further address myself to section 1, article I, of the Constitution, which is as follows:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

All legislative powers are vested in us, the coordinate branches of this Congress, the Senate and House of Representatives.

Under the powers granted, this Congress may declare a war, may issue the rules of war, may borrow money on the public credit, and may levy taxes, imposts, and the like. But in clause 18 of section 8 there is this language:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

That is our authority.

The office of a Cabinet member is not a constitutional office. The words "Cabinet member" do not appear in any legislative act of this Government until the 26th day of February 1907. It is purely an advisory office, subject to the will of the President, and the Cabinet member is removable at his will or whim.

This is a legislative office created under the powers that inhere to us under the Constitution, in which it is delegated to us, in the interest of the protection of the people and the Public Treasury, to enact laws vesting in the departments and bureaus the correct tenure of office. That is the point on which I address myself to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. SPENCE. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment to section 1 of the bill. The amendment provides for two things as to the Federal Loan Administrator. One is that he shall retain his office for 1 year unless sooner removed by the President. The other is that he shall be confirmed by the Senate.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, in his closing remarks, addressed the Chair on the subject of the Constitution. The Constitution is not involved in this question. The only question that is involved is as to the germaneness of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Rule 16, paragraph 7, has been in force for 123 years. It reads as follows:

> And no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

There are numerous precedents on this question. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] provides that the Federal Loan Administrator shall hold office for a year and be confirmed by the Senate. The bill under consideration has but one object, that is, to remove from the Department of Commerce all of the Federal loan agencies. Therefore, the Chair holds that the amendment is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am considerably amused by the self-righteousness which has developed on the part of the majority Members in connection with the consideration of this bill. Only necessity has brought about this virtue. When the proposal was made to combine these functions under Jesse Jones you came before us and said, "It is important to do this. This is a good thing to do." Now we are told that the Congress did a bad thing when we permitted Mr. Jones to hold both offices.

I am reminded of an incident that happened at the White House. Somebody has told me that under proper protocol you cannot quote what the President says, so I am not going to quote the President directly but I want to tell you of an incident that occured in the White House. A few years ago it happened that the then Speaker of the House, the late lamented Mr. Bankhead, and his Senator brother, were concerned over a flood situation down in the South. At the same time there was a drought in some Midwestern States. The Bankheads sponsored a joint committee of the House and of the Senate which went to the White House.

I see the gentleman from Kansas in his seat. He was a member of that committee and he may remember this incident.

The President had prepared for our coming. He proposed solving the problem by handing it over to the Disaster Loan Corporation which had some money and could deal both with flood situations and drought situations. Then noting that some of the members of the joint committee were just a little bit long-faced, the man sitting behind the big desk said, "Oh, yes; I know some of you think Jesse Jones is a tightwad, but it is all right. He protects the Government."

"He protects the Government." That was the White House estimate of Jesse Jones then. And he was a big enough man that the Congress did give him this double job. Now what is said to us? Not that the President has found somebody better or bigger than Jesse Jones, but only that "I have a political debt to pay." And so Jesse Jones is told to get out and the House is told to pass this bill because the functions in the double job should be separated anyway.

Members on my side of the aisle, the minority, did voice doubts about merging the jobs in the first place. They yielded at the time only because of confidence in Mr. Jones. The majority Members did not then or later question the principle involved until it was apparent Mr. Wallace could not be confirmed for the dual position.

So it is not virtue itself but rather it is necessity that drives you to righteousness. This bill is a meritorious bill. The only thing wrong with it is that it does not go far enough. It has two virtues: First, it separates these banking functions from the educational and service functions of the Secretary of Commerce. Second, it establishes an audit for all Government corporations by the General Accounting Office.

That audit of all Government corporations by the General Accounting Office is a thing that ought to be enacted by Congress. It is the recommendation of the Byrd committee. It is embodied in the Byrd-Butler bill which has been introduced in the other body. It is embodied in the identical and companion

bill which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and I have introduced, H. R. 2177 and H. R. 2051, respectively.

This is accomplished by section 5 of the pending bill which has been discussed very little but is perhaps the most meritorious part of the bill before us. It proposes to bring all Government corporations under the authority of the General Accounting Office for audit.

The bill ought to be passed. It ought to go further. I voted to vote down the rule yesterday because I thought the bill should go further in two or three directions. It ought to go further in the direction of the amendments which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] sought to offer. It ought to go further in the direction of incorporating the other features of the Byrd-Butler bill, providing for an annual budget program by each of the Government corporations, subject to review by the Congress. It ought to go further. I wish it did. But I am certainly going to vote for the bill because it does two things and is good as far as it goes. And my convictions in this regard are not brought on by any problem of paying political debts.

And I have spoken because I do not want the majority membership to get by with the claim of self-righteousness that they have been making the last 2 or 3 days that this is a good bill and they are for it and that the Republican position is political. How can it be? We have no political debt to pay.

They have not been for the principles of the bill in the past. I am glad that necessity now drives them to a position of supporting these two meritorious propositions: Separation of loaning and borrowing powers from the secretaryship of commerce and establishment of an audit by the General Accounting Office for all Government corporations. Let us keep the record straight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this short observation with reference to this measure. I believe I am a liberal. I hold no brief for Jesse Jones. But I could never in good conscience vote to help put into the important office of Secretary of Commerce an inexperienced, starry-eyed theorist, with wild hair and wilder ideas. I think it is fine for a man to have his head in the clouds, if he also has his feet on the ground. If ever there was a time to carefully select men who are experienced and able, in order to create jobs for returning veterans and to successfully and intelligently grapple with the many perplexing post-war problems, now is the time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, as I view this controversy raging around the head of Mr. Wallace, in my humble opinion it is a sort of battle between progressives and reactionaries—between liberals and hard-boiled conservatives—and Wallace is only a symbol in the battle. To those who are opposing Wallace so strongly I say they are forgetful of the constitutional provision which says that only the Senate shall have the right to confirm or disavow an appointee of the President to his Cabinet. In that regard I fear their emotions are getting the better of their calmer judgment.

Among those outside this Chamber who oppose Wallace are the banking fraternity, the industrial bourbons, business troglodytes, and defenders of the status quo; the same group that opposed social security, the Wages and Hours Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation, all forward New Deal legislation that sought the greatest good for the greatest number; that placed human rights above property rights. Most of the selfish opponents of the pending measure and of Wallace, particularly outside this Chamber, I would designate as having the best minds of the eighteenth century. Those advocate a laissez-faire doctrine; they are purblind Adam Smiths. Their words sometimes remind me of that which emanates from old moth-eaten holes of a parlor sofa. The controversy now storming about Wallace's head goes to the heart of the struggle that in these times casts its shadow across the American scene. It is a struggle between progress and retrogression; the conflict between forward looking and backward looking. It is a controversy that will range in history as important as the Lincoln-Douglas and the Haynes-Webster debates. Wallace is sniffed at, smeared, and vilified by the same reactionaries who actually opposed, in the Hoover administration, the original set-up of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and later its affiliates—the Export-Import Bank, the Metals Reserve Company, and the Defense Plant Corporation.

They feared these financial entities like the R. F. C. would poach on their private banking and insurance preserves, and they shrieked that they would mean the destruction of private initiative and enterprise. They prophesied that the R. F. C. would usher in bolshevism. Those are the phrases that were used way back in that decade when we brought in the R. F. C. See how solicitous they now are of the very R. F. C. and Defense Plant Corporation they opposed. They now sing a different tune. They bend those organizations to their own will, of course; they have sucked themselves full from the breasts of these agencies. They fear their unholy source of supply will be cut off. It is high time they were weaned, and Wallace would do just that. Nonetheless, in all this I intend no reflection upon Jesse Jones and numerous of his colleagues for whom I personally have a high regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Did the gentleman just receive instructions from the minority leader?

Mr. HOFFMAN. As I have at times told the leaders on the majority side, unlike the membership over there on your side of the aisle, we individually over here do our own thinking, our own speaking, and cast our votes as judgment dictates.

That course involves a little more work, a little more research, a little more thinking than does the one of playing the game of following the leader, as the majority seems so often to do.

Permit me also to express regret that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has so unfavorable an opinion of those who at the moment happen to disagree with his conclusions.

As I listened to him, it became very, very clear that no one, whatever may have been the service rendered to his country, however great his intelligence, however sound his judgment, who ventured to disagree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] could be intelligent, possess sound judgment, be patriotic, or have any knowledge of what was transpiring, or of what was good for the Nation as a whole.

It is indeed fortunate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is here to advise and instruct us. It is well also, perhaps, that so few of us follow his advice. Or it may be that, if he continues, from the vast store of his knowledge, to advise and instruct us, we may some day be able to follow in his footsteps and attain merit in his eyes. In the meantime, most of us will just struggle along, doing our best attempting to exist without his approval.

Many times, members of the minority have been advised that they were guilty of all sorts of unpatriotic acts as well as thoughts, because they did not, without criticism or questioning, accept the ideas, the proposed legislation, handed down from the other end of the Avenue.

Well do I remember the occasion when all of those who would not vote to cheat the service people by giving them the Federal ballot, but insisted that those in the service be given full opportunity to vote, were charged with seeking to deprive the soldiers of an opportunity to vote.

Yet the result shows that those of us who insisted upon the so-called State ballot were right and, since the figures have been handed out, we have heard little, if anything, from the floor of the House about the sin of refusing to accept the Federal ballot.

Well do I recall that, a few days ago, we were cautioned by the leadership on the majority side—and the Speaker himself took the floor—that if we did not pass that work-or-fight bill right away, even before 5 o'clock of that day, we were going to lose the war. We passed it. It went over to the other body; and there it is, buried. But, contrary to the

predictions, the war has not yet been lost and the news from the front today is most encouraging. I wish some of the gentlemen who were so anxious to win the war would go over there and dig it up if they can find it.

TRIMMING THE OFFICE TO FIT WALLACE

When on February 15 the rule making in order consideration of the so-called George bill was before the House, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], advocating the adoption of the rule, among other things said—and I quote:

This bill is before us to undo something that we did. The responsibility for the situation that exists rests upon the Congress of the United States. It is our responsibility, because we brought that condition about by legislation that passed this body and passed the other body. I am frank in stating it should never have been done.

The present bill has, as its purpose and objective, undoing that which we did before and which we should not have done. Mixing the appointment of Mr. Wallace with the passage of this bill is unsound thinking, in my opinion. So far as most of my friends on the left are concerned, you and I know that it is politics, unadulterated politics, that prompts them to do that. The proper thing for us to do is to pass this bill and undo the harm that we have already done.

* * * * *

The effort, so far as voting down this rule is concerned, and so far as the Republican Party is concerned, and the great majority who will vote against ordering the previous question, I repeat, is unadulterated politics.

Speaking only for myself, permit me to say that I agree with the gentleman that the vote on the rule and on the bill, for that matter, will be actuated by political motives.

The gentleman now frankly concedes, and circumstances force him to concede, that the act granting this power to the President should never have been adopted.

It was put through Congress in June of 1933, long before we were at war and it was not a war measure. It purported to be an act to encourage national industrial recovery, to foster fair competition and to provide for the construction of certain useful public works and for other purposes.

The Export-Import Bank was created by Executive Order No. 6581 of February 2, 1934, pursuant to the authority of section 2, title 1, of the National Industrial Recovery Act (Public Law No. 67).

While the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, now says that the House should never have given the President the authority which he now exercises, it will be recalled that he voted for the adoption of the rule which enabled the House to consider the bill and that he voted for the bill upon final passage.

At that time, it was acknowledged that the passage of the bill would make the President of the United States a dictator over industry. Mr. POU, chairman of the House Committee on Rules, calling up the resolution which made the bill in order, among other things said:

So, Mr. Speaker, it amounts to this: Those gentlemen who sincerely desire to follow the President—

See! The old, old story. That was before the war. That was back in June of 1933.

Those gentlemen who sincerely desire to follow the President of the United States—

And I may say to the gentleman who just asked me whether I had received my instructions; sometimes, you know, I do not follow the President, but you on that side seem to follow him, and you follow him when he is wrong just the same as you follow him when he is right.

Those gentlemen who sincerely desire to follow the President of the United States in his effort to bring this Nation out of the bottomless pit of hell—

Just look how far down we had gotten, way down in the bottom of hell!—

in which we find ourselves will support this rule. It is up to you whether you take it or leave it.

Now, listen to this—this is a Democratic chairman of the Rules Committee speaking back in 1933:

It is very true that under this bill—and I shall not attempt to discuss its merits—

They seldom do. They just listen for the crack of the party whip.

The President of the United States is made a dictator over industry for the time being. But it is a benign dictatorship.

Well, now, ask some of these folks who have been under this dictatorship.

Sad to relate, the gentleman was completely mistaken, and we now know that the power which the President said he had returned to Washington and which, in improper hands, he said would shackle the liberties of the citizen has now fallen to a large extent into improper hands, and it is now proposed to give to the spender, Mr. Wallace, the power to dissipate the resources of the Nation.

But the party of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], although this bill was acknowledged by the chairman of the Rules Committee, his fellow party member, to make the President a dictator over industry, forced it through the House, and, under it, the President has created this vast authority which now, as a reward for political service, he would place in the hands of Henry Wallace, one of the spokesmen for the P. A. C., a man who is acknowledged as a candidate for the Presidential nomination of 1948.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] yesterday charged the Republicans with being motivated by political considerations. In my judgment, that charge is true. In my judgment, this has been a political matter from the beginning.

The purpose, from the day when the dictatorship bill was passed, in June of 1933, has been to give to the President and his henchmen political power and the taxpayer's money to aid them in imposing their political theories upon the people of the United States.

Experience has now demonstrated, according to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], that that power was improvidently granted; that it should never have been given to the President. He now seeks, as he said, to—and I quote—"undo the harm that we have already done."

His repentance, his admission that he sinned, is encouraging. But I doubt very much whether he has been converted; whether any degree of reformation has taken place.

From the President's own letter we know that, as a reward for political service rendered, in payment for mileage traveled and speeches made by Henry Wallace, the President has appointed him to be Secretary of Commerce.

We know that, in 1940, the President told the Democratic National Convention that if they wanted him as their standard bearer they would take Henry Wallace as his running mate.

We know that in 1944 the President ditched Mr. Wallace in favor of Mr. Truman, in order to secure the support of the Southern Democrats and certain members of the Democratic Party.

We know that in August 1944, after the Democratic Convention was over, after Mr. Wallace had been denied a place on the national ticket, the President congratulated him on his fight for the Vice Presidential nomination and told him that, so long as the present administration remained in office, an important post would be open to him.

We know, too, that in the letter of January 20, last, written to Mr. Jones, in which Jesse Jones was notified that he was fired, he was also told that Henry Wallace deserved almost any office which he might think himself qualified to hold.

The letter to Mr. Jones and the prior proceedings and statements make it clear that, in violation of section 249 of chapter 8 of title 2 of the Code and in violation of section 61 (b) of title 18 of the Code, the President, as a reward for political service rendered, appointed Mr. Wallace.

So the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] should not complain that Republicans are guided by political consideration.

The Democratic majority in the other body has concluded that it would be dangerous to permit Henry Wallace to exercise the power now held by the Secretary of Commerce.

It is evident that, because of his political beliefs, an overwhelming majority of the other body regards him as a dangerous administrator. Yet, instead of voting squarely upon the issue, the other body seeks to minimize the harm which might be done by his confirmation by stripping the Secretary of Commerce of a portion of his power—therefore the George bill.

If Mr. Wallace is an unsound administrator of the power now possessed by the Secretary of Commerce, he would be an unsound administrator to entrust with any Federal power.

As a Republican, I do not believe in the theories nor the practices of Henry Wallace. Therefore, it is my purpose to do everything I can to prevent any power, any office, being granted to or given him.

It is matter of common knowledge that he is a political ally of the P. A. C.; of Earl Browder, the Communist; of many

other leftist groups. It is matter of common knowledge that his theories, if followed, would strip this Nation of ours of its natural resources—yes, and of much of its manpower.

It is matter of common knowledge that he believes that, instead of caring for our own people, promoting our own national welfare, we should look after nations and people on the other side of the seas, even though we impoverish—yes, beggar—ourselves; make paupers of our people, force them to a substandard of living. He would give to the Hottentots and the Bushmen a quart of milk a day, but to our own people the bluest of water.

How any northern Democrat or any Democrat from the South or from the far West can vote to place Henry Wallace in a position of power, where Federal funds to the amount of billions of dollars can be added to the millions of dollars of the P. A. C. under Sidney Hillman, and all used to change our whole theory of Government, defeat sitting Members of Senate and of House, who believe in the American system, and, in their place, elect the representatives of the P. A. C., of the Communist Party, who believe in some sort of ism which is un-American, is beyond me.

When I vote to give my political opponent public funds and public power to aid him in destroying constitutional government, in defeating me, I will be older than I am now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I told the Members of the House something of the remarkable work performed by Mr. Wallace on behalf of the insurance industry of America when he saved the farms and the farmers. The insurance companies had millions of dollars invested in mortgages on farms and, through his realistic economic policy which he put into practice, he saved in a large measure not only the insurance companies but the policyholders as well.

Something has been said here about why Mr. Wallace was appointed, and the claim was made that it was a political move. Let me tell you something of the other side of the story.

Seldom have words been tossed about with so little meaning as in the recent criticisms of Henry A. Wallace as a visionary, a dreamer, and a wild-eyed radical. What are these words supposed to mean?

The history of this country is full of visionaries and dreamers. They are the men like Patrick Henry, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson, whose spirit and vision gave us America.

What kind of men are these who have so little faith in our country's future that a program of 60,000,000 jobs for American workers seems to them an idle dream? What does this war and all the sacrifices it has cost mean to the people who consider equality and justice for men of every color, creed, and industry as visionary? What sort of future can our workers and veterans expect from those who look upon decent housing, adequate medical care, and social insurance as wild-eyed radicalism?

The little people of America, the farmers who prospered when Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture, the workers who stumped for him at the Chicago convention, and the little businessmen who need his help—they know what his experience has been and they are satisfied.

The vested interests against Wallace have overplayed their hand. They have exerted all the pressure they could muster for Wallace's defeat. They have attempted to snuff out a flaming candle of hope and inspiration to 60,000,000 people. These 60,000,000 have not and will not sit silently by. They demand Henry Wallace for Secretary of Commerce.

When the devaluation of the dollar was under consideration, there was much discussion about the so-called commodity dollar. Sir Joshua Stamp, the famous economist and financier, made the statement that there were only 12 people in the world who understood international finance, monetary values, and exchange, and he named among these 12, Henry Wallace.

For years Henry Wallace kept a large book in which were entered daily the prices of the commodities on the Fisher index in various markets all over the world. When Wallace was asked why he kept these elaborate figures, he said in order to keep himself posted on the values of the prices that farmers would get for their crops in terms of United States dollars.

Wallace, through the Department of Agriculture, instigated and carried on terrace plowing and farming throughout the hilly sections of the South, thus improving the quality of the crops by the retention of a topsoil which ordinarily would be washed away as a result of heavy rains.

In some areas, under the old Resettlement Administration, as high as 85 percent in dollars of the farm loans were repaid in the first 3 years. This was notably true in New England where loans were used to pay off farmers' debts.

The operations of the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with large packers, offers plenty of evidence of Wallace's cooperation with private enterprise everywhere.

I have many letters and telegrams from the people who urge my vote for this bill. They give as their reason that they want a lasting prosperity and a higher standard of living. These people who have written me come very largely from what are termed "the independent voters of this country." They look to Mr. Wallace, with his God-given qualities, as a leader and a guide in the difficult days that are ahead of us.

To me, it seems that the fight over Mr. Wallace has reached a new low in misrepresentation and recrimination.

The record of Mr. Wallace as a public servant has amply proven to America and the world that he is a man of tremendous mental and practical ability. His social ideas are not alone mine but the ideals of all progressively minded people. It would be a loss to America if his services were refused by any act of our Congress.

Like most humans, he has some foibles and even frailties, such as diets, a belief in the Bible, respect for his fellow men, and belief in the dignity of labor.

I urge upon you for the good of America and our people that you vote for the bill that is now before us.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand that the gentleman is supporting the pending bill?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, the appointment of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, which brought about this bill, S. 375, together with the so-called directive of General Hershey, requiring the reclassification of agricultural workers, and H. R. 1752, the so-called May, work-or-fight, work-or-jail, work-or-starve bill, amending the selective service law, appear to me to be all parts and parcels of the same plan and pattern. That pattern and plan is to strengthen bureaucratic controls of our economy and our social order in anticipation of the possible—I say the possible—cessation of hostilities in Europe.

Each one of these is tainted, if not polluted, with manifestations, misrepresentation, and distortion of facts, which manifests nothing other than reaching for bureaucratic power which has been the ruling and consuming passion of New Dealers for 12 years.

Of the May bill, which passed this body last month on the pious plea that it would be administered by the draft boards and not by the bureaucrats, a prominent Democrat on the Hill is alleged to have said a few days ago:

> Officially and on the record they advocate that the powers under the bill be delegated to Mr. Justice Byrnes. In private contacts with Senators on the Military Affairs Committee they urge that these powers be placed under the selective service. This is a good example of the dirty double-crossing that goes on in the executive departments of this administration.

The gentleman does not only say that he thinks this is an act of double-crossing, or that it is an act of double-crossing, but that it is a good example of the double-crossing that is constantly going on in the administration. Now we do not have to ask who is double-crossing whom and why. To even the superficial observer it has been obvious that ever since the New Deal, and for over 12 years it has contained an element which seeks to change our economy and social order and gain perpetual and totalitarian control of the Government of the United States. That it must work under cover and pretends one objective when it seeks the opposite, springs from the very nature of its objectives.

It is not of primary importance that through the May bill the bureaucrats are double-crossing the old-line Democrats

or the IV–F's who will be forced to work where told or go to jail. But of a certainty it is important that the people are thereby saddled with bureaucratic instead of democratic government.

When General Hershey used an alleged offhand statement by the President, who could not possibly know the facts, that the 360,000 deferred farm hands between the ages of 18 and 26 were more necessary in the armed forces than on the farm, and that the old people could operate the farms, and published the directive of January 3, he in effect repealed the Tydings amendment. That he thereby double-crossed the draft boards, the farm hands, and the farmer is of secondary importance. But of far greater importance is the fact that the American people, whose Congress has made the Tydings amendment the law of the land, were by this unlawful action of General Hershey, robbed of democratic government and handed government by bureaucracy instead.

Who is being served by the firing of Jesse Jones and the hiring of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce? The people of the United States? No one, not even the least enlightened, can read the President's letter to Jesse Jones and be so naive as to believe that. No; the President says in his letter that Jesse Jones has done a splendid job and he is well pleased with Jesse's work but—Henry says he wants Jesse's head.

And while, like King Herod, when certain interests demanded the head of John the Baptist, he regrets to do it, the Wallace crowd has dictated and so the political head of Jesse Jones is served to them on a platter. The President is still clearing everything with Sidney.

Time was when the people did not know of the connection between the Hillman crowd and the Wallace crowd, or that they were identical. For instance, how many people realized that in 1940 the Wallace crowd demanded the head of Jack Garner and dictated the nomination of Wallace as candidate for Vice President. It was thought that Mr. Roosevelt dictated this nomination when he told the convention leaders he would refuse to run unless Wallace was nominated. The "clear everything with Sidney" in the 1944 convention and the Jones-Wallace fiasco certainly throw the light on who was the dictator in 1940.

Henry A. Wallace has exercised far more influence in the New Deal and the changing of our economic and social order than most people realize. Of course they know him best as the man who was responsible for the plowing under of crops and the killing of the little pigs in 1934.

His prominence, together with that of Rexford Tugwell, in a ring that sought to change our social order and economy, leaked out at a dinner party as early as September 1, 1933, which culminated in a congressional investigation in the matter of letters from William A. Wirt, a superintendent of schools in Gary, Ind.

The leak was occasioned by two heads of departments in the Department of Agriculture, and Henry Wallace and Rexford G. Tugwell, Secretary and Under Secretary of that Department, were referred to as sponsors of a "concrete plan to change our social order." True, the congressional committee investigating reported that Dr. Wirt had dreamed the whole thing, but the minority report states otherwise, and clearly claims that the investigation was a case of suppression and whitewash. I am satisfied that a vigorous and impartial investigation would have uncovered plenty of corroboration for Dr. Wirt.

In fact, two planks of the plan were already palpably fait accompli at that time, and a third was palpably in operation until in 1935 it was stopped by the Supreme Court. I have reference to the third, fourth, and fifth planks of the concrete plan as I gave it on January 23. They are:

Third. Commercial banks cannot make long-time capital loans, so destroy by propaganda the other institutions that have been making capital loans.

Fourth. Then push Uncle Sam into positions where he must make these capital loans.

Fifth. When Uncle Sam becomes our financier he must also follow his money with control and management of industry and commerce.

Now, Mr. Chairman, had the people known of this concrete plan, they would have understood the bank holiday of March 1933. The people would have understood why Governor Comstock, the then New Deal Governor of my State, closed the Michigan banks on February 13, 1933, sabotaging the rest of the banks in the United States which were not closed, until Mr. Roosevelt took office on March 4. Then they would have understood why the majority of sound and solvent banks were closed along with the smaller number of unsound ones.

The bank holiday was not aimed at the insolvent banks, which were few. With bank examiners going through the books of every bank once or twice a year, they could have selected those which were insolvent or tottering and closed these only. But instead they gave the country the tremendous shock of stopping its economic blood circulation entirely.

Last year the Michigan banking commissioner reported that up to that time the 564 State banks, closed in Michigan by the bank holiday, had paid back 94 percent of their deposits, and that after all the waste and loss from forced liquidation of assets.

Now, had the people known of this concrete plan, they would have recognized that the bank holiday was in accordance with it and the teachings and writings of Karl Marx and other socialists who have always advocated the taking over of the credit facilities, banks and finances of a country as the first necessary step to change the social order. The bank holiday made 1933, the first year of Mr. Roosevelt's administration, the blackest year of the depression, and when the banks were permitted to reopen, they had been shorn of their ability to make long-time capital loans in accordance with the plan, and this function had been transferred to Federal loan agencies, the very agencies that Henry Wallace and his crowd would now like to control and use for their "milk business."

I need not discuss the fifth plank, for we all remember how the closing of the banks was immediately followed by the N. I. R. A., which regimented all labor, industry, and commerce, and which happily was knocked in the head by the Supreme Court decision of 1935, and put a crimp in this socialization plan.

I would like to discuss other planks in this concrete plan, but time forbids. It is my opinion that these loan agencies should be divorced from the control of the Secretary of Commerce, and, therefore, I shall probably vote for this bill, but I do not like the method under which it is accomplished, and which has for its purpose to put Mr. Wallace in a position where he can again carry on his socialization schemes, which are contrary to the American way of living which with all its faults and vices, has raised the American people to a higher plane of living in every way than that enjoyed by any other nation under the sun.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of the divided Democratic majority in this House. I am tired of hearing them imposed upon and criticized unjustly. They correctly state their position, but give the wrong reason for it. While a majority of the Democrats are opposed to the motion to recommit, they are more divided as to the reasons for their respective positions than the Members on the two sides of the House are divided by the party aisle. About half of them are voting against the motion to recommit because they want to give Mr. Wallace more power, and the other half are voting against it because they want to keep power away from him. One crowd is voting its enthusiastic confidence in Mr. Wallace's fitness for Secretary of Commerce, and the other crowd is voting its positive lack of confidence in Mr. Wallace's fitness to head the R. F. C.

It is the most anomalous situation I have ever known. When this bill was sent over here by the other body it reminded me of the old man who saw the burglar come in the front door. He turned in the burglar alarm, scrambled under the bed, and shouted to his wife to hide the family assets.

It is nothing in God's world but a storm cellar in which some of them hope to escape the righteous wrath of an outraged public opinion.

I do not want you Republicans to keep abusing men on my side who are already mad at each other. The pro-Wallace crowd is hardly on speaking terms with the anti-Wallace crowd, who are voting with them.

We have just had that great statesman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], preaching Mr. Wallace's virtues to the very crowd that has less confidence in his argument than anybody else in the House.

We have just had that great windowsill farmer from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN] telling us what a wonderful servant this man is who now proposes to give every Hottentot a quart of milk a day—telling us what a wonderful thing he has done for the farmers—although

the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN] would not know a cotton stalk from a cocklebur. He would not know wheat from barley. Why, I dare say that he imagines Mr. Wallace taught all the farmers how to milk ducks.

He is for giving Mr. Wallace all power, while others who are voting with him against this motion to recommit, do not want him to have any power at all.

In 1933 this same Mr. Wallace was having the farmers of this country killing the pigs and plowing up the cotton that had already matured, in order to promote prosperity. Ten years later he came into this Capital and ate muskrats at a public banquet as an example of thrift to the rest of the country. No wonder my colleagues are so badly divided.

I think it is unfortunate that this bill has come over here in this form and under these conditions to have enthusiastic Wallace fans lecture us farmers about what he has done for the farmers of the country, and others to magnify what he did to them.

Many fear that he is getting ready now to do something to the businessmen of the country; and that if he is as successful in plowing under commercial enterprises and killing small-business establishments as he was in plowing up matured cotton and killing all little pigs, they are in for a bad night—under his new order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. All powers, functions, and duties of the Department of Commerce and of the Secretary of Commerce which relate to the Federal Loan Agency (together with the respective personnel, records, and property, including office equipment, relating to the exercise of such functions, powers, and duties) are hereby transferred to the Federal Loan Agency to be administered under the direction and supervision of the Federal Loan Administrator.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the record of Henry A. Wallace while Secretary of Agriculture needs no defense. During the time that he served as Secretary of Agriculture more legislation which has been beneficial to farmers was enacted into law than during any other comparable period of time in all of our history. While he was Secretary of Agriculture he did more to aid the farmers of the Nation than any of his distinguished predecessors. If that is not a correct statement I would yield for any Member of the House who wishes to challenge its accuracy.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I could not point out a time I may say to my colleague from North Carolina in which more legislation was passed, but it would be a simple matter to point out where legislation already on the books for the farmers of this country yielded a greater income than they got during the 8 years of the regime of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. But my friend must remember that the farmers of this Nation had never been in such a deplorable condition as they were at the time when Wallace became Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman refresh the memory of the gentleman from Wisconsin as to what cotton, wheat, corn, and all farm commodities were selling for when Hoover got through?

Mr. COOLEY. I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin is thoroughly familiar with the prices which prevailed and the situation which existed at that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I do not believe he is. He does not want to go back to those days.

Mr MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman asked someone to answer his question. I am ready to answer his question.

Mr. COOLEY. I shall be glad for the gentleman to answer.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has a poor memory.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman from North Carolina asked for it.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I asked for it. This idea of standing on the floor of the House and ridiculing and vilifying Mr. Wallace just does not seem appropriate, in view of his splendid record. Never before in all history was as much done for agriculture as was accomplished during the time that Henry Wallace served as Secretary of Agriculture. There is no need for me to enumerate the many things he advocated and did. His record will stand as a monument and the farmers of the Nation will always remember him and they will remember him as their friend. How many other Secretaries of Agriculture do we remember? We shall always remember Henry Wallace because of his outstanding record, but I want to ask the Democrats of this House to tell me the name of Henry Wallace's immediate predecessor. Is there a man here who can even name him? Can it be true that we have forgotten him so soon?

Mr. RANKIN. Wallace.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no; Wallace's father was Secretary of Agriculture under Coolidge. What I want to know is who was Henry A. Wallace's immediate predecessor. We have had many Secretaries of Agriculture, but I will bet that there is not a Member of the House who can name three of them.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I could.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman could?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to know that the gentleman is so well informed, but I would still like to know the name of the man who Mr. Henry A. Wallace succeeded. Personally, I think that Henry A. Wallace made a great Secretary of Agriculture and I would be perfectly willing to entrust him with all of the powers that are now being exercised by Jesse Jones. I am sure that he would be faithful to every trust and that he would discharge the duties of his office with great ability and with distinction.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has me very much confused. Was not the gentleman from North Carolina chairman of the subcommittee that investigated these activities of Mr. Wallace?

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, yes; I was chairman of a subcommittee that investigated the Farm Security Administration, which, I am frank to say, was not properly administered, but Mr. Wallace had nothing to do with the creation of the Farm Security Administration. It was created by an Executive order of the President, but everyone knows that Mr. Wallace has carried the fight for relief and for the rehabilitation of the underprivileged men and women engaged in agriculture.

We have heard a lot about the national farm program. Now I want to ask you Republicans over here to pick out and name one part of the national farm program that you want repealed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will refer the gentleman to the report of his own committee.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is also a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. In addition to that part of the New Deal farm program which was repealed by action of the Supreme Court and the Congress I would like to see the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act repealed.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not agree with the gentleman, but at least he has the courage of his convictions.

Henry A. Wallace is a great American, and yet as a citizen of the world he loves the earth and those who till the soil, and he has always been interested in the welfare of the farmers of this Nation. With sterling integrity and with a genius for work, he has applied himself diligently to the discharge of every duty which has been assigned to him in the different capacities in which he has served his Government. He is neither a "pink" nor a "punk" nor a fly-by-night man. Let us not overlook the fact that in addition to his service in the Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture, he was actually elected by a popular vote of the citizens of this country to the high office of Vice President, and even when he was not nominated he did not become ruffled and he did not display white feathers. As a thoroughbred he took his defeat and continued to champion the cause to which he has devoted his life. In defeat or in victory he is still a champion of the cause of agriculture and the rights of the underprivileged in all walks of life. His greatness depends not upon his confirmation as Secretary of Commerce, and defeat will not destroy him. When the history of the past decade is written his name and his fame will cover one of its brightest pages, and through the decades to come he will be remembered as a friend of agriculture.

Henry A. Wallace knows that our Nation is and ever shall be a part of the

world. He further knows that as a nation we must play a major role in the rehabilitation of a world that is now being devastated by the cruel arts of war. He is the man who advocated and sponsored the ever-normal granary, and as a result of his great vision our storehouses were filled to overflowing with food and fiber, and agriculture was ready for the conflict when war was suddenly thrust upon us. Just because he has suggested that we should aid in the rehabilitation of a distressed and starving world, an effort is now being made to crucify him. You and I know that after we have liberated the peoples of other nations we shall very definitely aid in their rehabilitation, and yet we seem to find fault with the man who reminds us of the duties which will devolve upon us in the post-war world.

I believe that most of us on both sides of the House are for the pending bill, yet many Members will vote against the bill in an effort to bring about the defeat of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce. Frankly, I do not know of a man in America who is better qualified to discharge the duties of the position as Secretary of Commerce than is the man who has recently been designated by the President. I, therefore, hope that this bill will be passed, to the end that the confirmation of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce may be facilitated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are no amendments pending to section 2. I therefore move that all debate now close on section 2 and all amendments thereto.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The unexpended balance of the funds made available to the Secretary of Commerce by Public Law 365, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 28, 1944, for administrative expenses of supervising loan agencies, shall be transferred to the Federal Loan Agency to be used for the administrative expenses of that Agency.

SEC. 4. No functions, powers, or duties shall be transferred from the Federal Loan Agency under the provisions of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or any other law unless the Congress shall otherwise by law provide.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 2, line 20, at the end of section 4, add a new section as follows:

"Section 1 of Public Law 354, Seventy-seventh Congress, is amended as follows: At the end of said section 1 strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That hereafter, no order providing for the redistribution of functions or providing for the transfer or consolidation of any existing executive or administrative commission, bureau, agency, Government owned or controlled corporation or office, or the duties, powers, or functions thereof, shall be effective unless the Congress shall provide otherwise by concurrent resolution.'"

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the pending bill is merely to take out of the Commerce Department the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as it now exists and there is no change made in the organic law. This amendment attempts to repeal the War Powers Act vesting in the President all the extensive powers necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

The proposed amendment certainly cannot be germane to the pending bill. I make a point of order against the amendment for the reasons stated.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] desire to be heard?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the amendments which was submitted to the House Parliamentarian. It was also submitted to the Banking and Currency Committee when the bill was under consideration. It was one of the amendments which because of the informal opinion given by the House Parliamentarian we asked to have made in order by the Rules Committee.

Failing that I present it to the House for such action as is desirable and merely make the statement that I have always taken the position the amendment is in order inasmuch as the bill itself seeks to amend the authority of the President under this act and this is merely a further limitation upon the President's authority to transfer and consolidate executive agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This amendment was submitted to the Chair beforehand.

The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that it is not germane. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan seeks to take from the President all authority under the War Powers Act. The War Powers Act was reported to the House by the Committee on the Judiciary. Again the Chair calls attention that the definition of "germaneness" is that it must be closely allied to the bill which is under consideration. The Chair, therefore, rules that the amendment is not germane and sustains the point of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 2, line 20, at the end of section 4, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. (a) The management of the Export-Import Bank of Washington shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of five persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the five members of the board, not more than three shall be members of any one political party. Each director shall devote his time not otherwise required by the business of the United States principally to the business of the corporation. Before entering upon his duties each of the directors so appointed and each officer of the corporation shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. The terms of the directors appointed by the President of the United States shall be 2 years. The terms of the first of the directors so appointed shall run from the date of appointment until January 22, 1947. Whenever a vacancy shall occur among the directors so appointed the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. The President shall designate one of the board of directors of the corporation appointed as hereinbefore provided as chairman, and he shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum. Each of the other directors of the corporation so appointed shall receive salaries at the rate of $10,000 per annum each. No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the corporation shall in any manner, directly or indirectly, participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"(b) Except as they may be in conflict with the provisions of subsection (A) of this section, the provisions of all acts and Executive orders in respect to the Export-Import Bank of Washington shall remain in full force and effect until and unless the Congress shall otherwise by law provide.

"(c) No functions, powers, or duties of the Export-Import Bank of Washington except as provided in Executive Order 9361, dated July 15, 1943, and Executive Order 9380, dated September 15, 1943, shall be transferred to or consolidated with any other department, agency, or corporation of the Government unless the Congress shall otherwise by law provide.

"(d) All acts and Executive orders or parts of the same which are in conflict with the provisions of this section are hereby repealed and rescinded."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this section or to the bill. The bill attempts merely to lift the Reconstruction Finance Corporation out of the Commerce Department unchanged. This is an attempt to change the organic law under which it was created. It goes further than the bill contemplates. It has no relation to the purposes of the bill, and, in my opinion, is not germane.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, briefly, this is the second amendment which was submitted to the House leadership and the House Parliamentarian. An opinion was given before the matter was submitted to the Committee on Rules that this amendment would not be in order. It was for this reason also that we asked the Committee on Rules to make it in order, so there might be no question but that the House would have an opportunity to exercise its constitutional prerogative to give consideration to all legislation which was necessary to do the job sought to be done under the bill. We have always taken the attitude that this amendment is germane to the general purposes of the bill S. 375. If the Chairman holds in his wisdom that this is not in order, then, of course, it merely adds to the advisability for recommitting the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency for further consideration of this and other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

For the reasons given by the Chair in sustaining the point of order against the Graham amendment, the Chair sustains

the point of order against this amendment.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to read from the Republican platform:

The times cry out for the pruning and abolishing of unnecessary agencies and personnel, and for efficiency and economy.

The amendment just proposed, for the reorganization of the Export-Import Bank, provides for a corporation with five directors, the chairman of which would receive $12,000 a year, and four other directors $10,000 a year. Then you will note a provision in the amendment that there shall be two Republican members at $10,000 a year. Is that carrying out the platform of the Republican Party for economy and efficiency?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOM. No; I am going to conclude my statement first.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, so many misstatements have been made in respect to what the amendment provided that I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will speak in order.

Mr. THOM. Under the present organization of the Export-Import Bank the 11 trustees of the Export-Import Bank now receive no salary as such trustees.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in order, inasmuch as the Export-Import Bank amendment has been ruled out of order in respect to this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the fact that under the rules of the House he must speak in order.

Mr. THOM. I am addressing myself to striking out the last word of the amendment.

Therefore, the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan proposes to increase public expenses rather than reduce public expenses, and is in violation of the Republican platform, and shows the insincerity of Republican demands for economy.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I understand that no amendments are pending to section 4.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 4 and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) The financial transactions of all Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representative of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. The audit shall begin with the current fiscal year.

(b) A report of each such audit for each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit of each corporation and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus, or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the several corporations, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital noted in the audit and recommendations for the return of such Government capital or the payment of such dividends as, in his judgment, should be accomplished. The report shall also show specifically every program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the corporation concerned at the time submitted to the Congress.

(c) The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of all Government corporations as provided in section 5 (a) of this act may be paid out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized for the purpose: *Provided*, That by agreement between the General Accounting Office and said corporation the expenses of said audit may be paid from funds of such corporation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 2, line 22, after the word "Government", insert the words "owned or controlled."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane to this section or to the bill. No one has more confidence, respect, or admiration for the able man who presides over the General Accounting Office, the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, than I. For years he served in this body. He had a fine conception of the great problems of government. He was a leader in this body. He had the respect of all the Members of this body. We all rejoiced when he was appointed Comptroller General because we knew he would discharge the important duties incumbent upon him with great ability. But this amendment, while it attempts to enlarge his powers and duties, is an amendment of the act creating the General Accounting Office. It is not germane to this bill. Its effect cannot be foretold at the present time. What is a Government-controlled corporation? The Comptroller General audits Government-owned corporations in a most thorough manner. It seems to me "Government-controlled corporation" is hard to define. The Government has bought stock in railroads, banks, and insurance companies. We have aided industrial enterprises and commercial enterprises. In many instances they have acquired the stock of those corporations. They may have written contracts which give them control over those corporations. What would be the result of this amendment? I do not think anybody knows. I feel confident the Comptroller General would not know.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman just stated that he does not think the Comptroller General would know what Government-controlled corporations would mean. I am interested in knowing what the gentleman thinks "all Government corporations" means. I am wondering if the gentleman would say that the interpretation of what "all Government corporations" means in this connection would be within the discretion of the Comptroller General?

Mr. SPENCE. We discussed that yesterday, and I think I informed the gentleman that I thought the "Government-owned corporations" were corporations which were entirely owned by the Government. I think that is quite easy to understand. But "controlled" is another thing, having very wide implications, which I do not think anybody can with assurance define. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my remarks to the germaneness of the amendment. This is an amendment to the organic act creating the Comptroller General's office, the General Accounting Office, and is far beyond the scope and intent of the bill. It is not germane to the bill now being considered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The section provides that the financial transactions of all Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office. There is a great deal of dispute as to what is meant by the term "Government corporations." I cannot conceive of there being a Government corporation which is not controlled by the Government. I would not like to think there were any Government corporations which are not controlled by the Government. I can think of many, however, which may not be considered wholly owned by the Federal Government.

The word "owned" is susceptible to interpretation, and in order to clearly indicate what is intended by the Congress in respect to the corporations which may be audited, it seems to me it is absolutely essential, to add to this the fact we intend that a Government corporation is one in which the Government controls the voting stock. There have been several corporations set up which were not audited by the General Accounting Office. There was a time, I understand, when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was not audited by the General Accounting Office. It is doubtful whether it can be said that the Federal Government owns all of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Likewise, that same thing is true of the Federal Reserve. It may be true of several other corporations.

We have acted in respect to those corporations and brought them under the

audit of the General Accounting Office. The survey made by the so-called Byrd committee, in response to which I understand the bill S. 469 was introduced in the Senate, and a similar bill introduced in the House by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] lists purely Government-owned operations, and then it also lists several mixed corporations, calling them "mixed ownership Government corporations." They include the Central Bank for Cooperatives, the regional banks for cooperatives, the Federal land banks, and the Federal Home Loan Bank.

Surely, if this language in the bill is to be interpreted to include Government corporations which are controlled by the Government, then the amendment which I have offered does not broaden the scope of the bill sufficiently to bring it outside the category of a germane amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I submit a brief observation on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In connection with the bill to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has referred, I invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that title II of the bill which has been introduced in both the House and the Senate, and which was based upon studies made by the General Accounting Office, is entitled "Mixed Ownership Government Corporations." It recognizes and specifically defines the term "mixed ownership corporations" as meaning the Central Bank for Cooperatives, the regional banks for cooperatives, the Federal land bank, and the Federal Home Loan Bank. They are not Government owned and not fully Government controlled.

The test of germaneness—at least, the test that seems to be pertinent in the pending amendment—is whether or not the amendment expands the scope of the section to which it is offered. It is offered to modify the phrase "all Government corporations." It seems to me the amendment is limiting in that it restricts the phrase to Government-owned corporations and Government-controlled corporations, and excludes in effect mixed-ownership Government corporations as presently defined or understood to be defined by the General Accounting Office.

Since it restricts the application of all Government corporations to two types of corporations—those that are owned and those that are controlled—and excludes those which are only partially owned or those which may have been created by the Government and in which at one time the Government had stock but may not now have, the amendment is limiting and restricting, and consequently would seem to be germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BULWINKLE). The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, in the opinion of the Chair clearly broadens the scope of the bill. The gentleman from South Dakota stated that the effect of the amendment was the limitation, but in the opinion of the Chair it would in all probability, or it might, bring in the mixed corporations of which the gentleman spoke. It, therefore, broadens the scope of the bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAND rose.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Chair states the motion, permit the Chair to say that the Chair had promised to recognize the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the motion, to permit the Chair to recognize the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, it may be presumptuous for a new Member to make this observation, but it seems to me that the present debate is almost wholly irrelevant. The speeches being made have to do very largely with the personal qualifications of Mr. Wallace. His qualifications to be Secretary of Commerce are surely of great importance to the country, but this is a matter which, under the Constitution, must be passed upon by the Senate. It may be, as it has been said, that the Senate in passing the George bill was seeking to evade a part of its responsibility. I do not think we should permit it.

The legislative question before the House of Representatives is confined to a very narrow issue. Is the bill under consideration a good bill? Should the lending powers heretofore transferred to the Secretary of Commerce by Executive order be returned to the Federal Loan Administrator as a wholly separate executive function?

This is the only question which properly confronts us.

I believe the George bill to be meritorious legislation. I think the great majority of the membership of this House likewise believes that. I predict that when this question comes to a vote, it will be overwhelmingly passed. In the meantime these discussions concerning Mr. Wallace, it seems to me, should be had on the floor of the Senate and not here.

I propose to vote for the George bill as it was passed in the upper House.

Believing as I do that it should be passed without amendments which might tend to cripple it, I am quite reluctant to vote for a motion to recommit it to committee. If I do so vote, it will not be for the purpose of burying the bill, because I think it should pass promptly, but will be because I feel, on legislation of such great importance, the opportunity for public hearings on the bill should have been afforded by the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

These brief observations I make with all respect to the House and that committee, but I reiterate that I think the debate is largely beyond our jurisdiction and concern, and that the bill should be promptly passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In view of the decision of the Chair, and in view of the fact the bill does not carry a definition of all Government corporations, I wish to ask if in the opinion of the Chair, the phrase "all Government corporations" and the sentence, "The financial transactions of all Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office," and so forth, places upon the General Accounting Office the matter of interpreting what are "all Government corporations"?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair states to the gentleman from South Dakota that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I merely withheld my motion for the purpose of allowing Members to extend their remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take any time but merely ask permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SPENCE. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

"ALL GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS"

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee in charge of this bill, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has said in response to my questions both yesterday and today that the phrase, "All Government corporations" includes all Government-owned corporations. The section which deals with this subject and which we are now discussing is section 5, which requires that all Governrment corporations be audited by the General Accounting Office.

Since the General Accounting Office under the Comptroller General will administer this section, I believe it will be of interest to the House to know that the Comptroller General in a letter to me today states that the corporations which that office would be called upon to audit if the bill is enacted are those corporations described as the wholly owned corporations in the so-called Byrd-Butler bill, and the like bills which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and I have introduced in the House. When the Committee of the Whole rises and returns to the House, I shall ask permission to insert the complete letter of the Comptroller General at this point.

The letter referred to follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 16, 1945.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: The following information is furnished in response to the inquiries in your letter of February 15, 1945, with reference to section 5 of S. 375, now pending in the House.

In the interest of certainty in the provisions of section 5, and of effective administration of the section if enacted into law, I feel it would be most helpful if the section could be perfected in three particulars, all of which I am certain are noncontroversial.

In the first place, the so-called Byrd-Butler bill, S. 469, and the bills H. R. 2051 and H. R. 2177, introduced by yourself and by Representative WHITTINGTON, respectively, providing for financial control of Government corporations, all cover two types of Government corporations, wholly owned and mixed ownership, both types of which are equally Government corporations. Section 5 of S. 375 does not define the term "all Government corporations" as used therein, it being understood that such a definition was inadvertently omitted. A listing of all of the corporations covered by the bills referred to above, which are the corporations this office would feel called upon to audit if section 5 should be enacted, would eliminate any doubt, in the matter. These corporations are as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation.
Central Bank for Cooperatives and regional banks for cooperatives.
Federal intermediate credit banks.
Federal land banks.
Production credit corporations.
Regional agricultural credit corporations.
Farmers' Home Corporation.
Federal Corp Insurance Corporation.
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Defense Plant Corporation, Defense Supplies Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, War Damage Corporation, Federal National Mortgage Association, The RFC Mortgage Company.
Disaster Loan Corporation.
Inland Waterways Corporation, Warrior River Terminal Company.
The Virgin Islands Company.
Federal Prison Industries, Inc.
United States Spruce Production Corporation.
Institute of Inter-American Affairs.
Institute of Inter-American Transportation.
Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc.
Inter-American Navigation Corporation.
Prencinradio, Inc.
Cargoes, Inc.
Export-Import Bank of Washington.
Petroleum Reserves Corporaiton.
Rubber Development Corporation.
United States Commercial Company.
Smaller War Plants Corporation.
Federal Public Housing Authority (or U. S. Housing Authority), Defense Homes Corporation.
Federal home loan banks.
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
United States Housing Corporation.
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
Panama Railroad Company.
Tennessee Valley Authority, Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

You will note this list covers both the wholly owned and mixed ownership type of Government corporation. To go any further and attempt to define "Government controlled corporations" would be fraught with great difficulty.

In the second place, the enactment of section 5 will place a heavy burden on the General Accounting Office but one which the Office should and will gladly undertake. However, in view of the fact that the fiscal year 1945 is more than half completed, it might prove impracticable to commence the audit with such fiscal year as proposed in the bill. Therefore, an amendment which would permit the audit to begin with the period commencing July 1, 1945, in any case where in my discretion I should determine it impracticable to begin with the current fiscal year, would permit the audit to commence at the earliest practicable date and not later than July 1, 1945, but would allow a little leeway to enable the Office to get staffed and organized for the purpose.

Also, in view of the present state of the labor market and the difficulty of organizing for performing this task, I would feel that a better job could be done if section 5 of the bill was amended to authorize the employment of personnel for the audit, without regard to the usual restrictions on the employment of Federal personnel, such as the Civil Service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

There are other perfecting amendments to section 5 which I could suggest, but in view of the present legislative situation I am limiting my suggestions to those enumerated above, all of which I am sure are in no way controversial and would greatly improve the administration of the section if enacted.

I trust the foregoing will serve the purpose of your inquiries.

As Representative WHITTINGTON has this morning called me about the same subject matter covered in your letter, I am taking the liberty of sending him a copy of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the average American has a lot at stake in this fight.

Were it just a fight between two personalities—between Henry Wallace on the one hand and Jesse Jones on the other—very few, if any, of us would care to become involved. Men do not go out of their way simply to become involved in personal brawls.

No; this is not a fight between two great personalities. It is a fight between two viewpoints, between two philosophies of government. Camouflage it with all the trickery, with all the deceit, with all the rottenness money can buy; turn your press and radio commentators loose with instructions to picture the one as a wild-eyed radical, the leader of a wild-eyed crowd, bent upon tearing down our American system of government, and the other as a respectable, level-headed, patriotic American businessman, determined, at all costs, to protect our American system of government, and, be not deceived, you have not fooled a single soul. Everyone is onto the latest technique in character assassination—call the would-be victim a Red or a radical or a wild-eyed destroyer of constitutional government, and keep on repeating the charges until you convince the public it is true. But I tell you, you are not fooling anyone. Oh, you may put on a pretty good show of the off-colored variety and get a few people worked up to a fanatical frenzy, but take heed to my words: After the last editorial has been written, after the last hireling has given vocal expression over the radio to the thoughts of his master, the average American will still know what he knows today, and what has been apparent since the inception of this fight—Wall Street and Main Street have again entered the arena. Wall Street because it wants to regain its control over Government, Main Street because it is still struggling for recognition in the affairs of Government and is anxious to hold onto the gains made under the Roosevelt administration. And remember there are a lot of us who live on Main Street and on the alleys and highways leading from the countryside into Main Street.

The war brought Main Street and Wall Street pretty close together. A common danger sobered our thinking and broadened our vision and changed our Main Street-Wall Street points of view into the American point of view. I had hoped that the common dangers, the common sacrifices, entailed upon all of us by this horrible war, had so broadened our vision and quickened our common love of country as to forever submerge our divergent viewpoints into the one and only viewpoint—the American viewpoint. And the American viewpoint, my colleagues, is not focused on Main Street, it is not focused on Wall Street, it is focused on America and should be concerned not in promoting the interest of Wall Street over Main Street or the interest of Main Street over Wall Street, but in promoting the general welfare of all, regardless of class.

It is indeed unfortunate that this old conflict in views should again arise. While we are still at war we need unity, and this fight, instead of promoting unity, is bringing about disunity. We have very little to fight for if after the war our Government is turned over to men with either a Wall Street complex or a Main Street complex. The need is for those in charge of our Government to be imbued with the American complex.

Our Government for some years prior to Mr. Roosevelt's election had been in charge of men with the Wall Street viewpoint. We all know where this viewpoint led—to financial and economic chaos. Upon assuming office, Mr. Roosevelt, who, in my opinion, is richly endowed with the American viewpoint, did his best to place in responsible position men imbued with, not the Wall Street viewpoint or the Main Street viewpoint, but the American viewpoint. Henry A. Wallace was one of the men selected by Mr. Roosevelt for high position. He was placed in charge of Agriculture, and agriculture, as you know, had been destroyed by the Wall Street viewpoint. That Mr. Wallace has demonstrated time and time again that he has the American viewpoint, that he has labored to promote the general welfare of all, will be conceded, I believe, by all who are not blinded by some preconceived viewpoint. That he has been inept as a politician is probably true. And it is likewise true that much of the criticism that has been leveled at Mr. Wallace has been brought about by twisting and distorting certain of his pronouncements in such a manner as to convey ideas as foreign to Mr. Wallace as they are to you or to me. But as to his capability, his honesty, his

courage, his vision, his Americanism, there can be no cavil.

Oh, I know that many of those who led Mr. Roosevelt's fights to administer this Government in the interest of all—from the American viewpoint—have been branded as radicals bent upon destroying our American way. Why, I remember, and so do the older Members, when our beloved Speaker was chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and led the fight for the securities and exchange bill and the bill regulating the power companies—bills that were necessary in order to correct abuses that had grown up under our Government when administered by those who entertained the Wall Street point of view—that he was branded as a radical. Yea, more, all of us who supported the Speaker in those great fights were likewise branded as radicals, bent upon the destruction of our system of government. Well, who is there today so bold as to question the wisdom of either piece of legislation?

And I remember, too, when Henry Wallace was advocating a broad American farm program—a program that recognized no sections—a program that considered the needs of the wheat farmer in Kansas, the corn farmer in Iowa, the tobacco farmer in Virginia, and so forth—that he was likewise branded as a radical. Well, under the leadership of Wallace we put the program over—and remember it was the first national farm program ever enacted in this country—and brought relief to the stricken farmers in every section of our country. Well, who is there today so bold as to question the wisdom of the Wallace farm program? Do my Republican colleagues? I pause to give them an opportunity. No; of course they do not question the wisdom of the farm program though put through by the man that they still, for political reasons, brand as a radical. Why? Let me tell you why they do not question the program: Simply because it is a sane, sound farm program, worked out from the American and not the Wall Street or Main Street point of view, designed to bring relief to all engaged in agriculture. We have had three national elections since the program was adopted, and in each of these elections the Republicans not only adopted but applauded the program.

Mr. Wallace, I believe, will make a great Secretary of Commerce. And he will make a great Secretary because he has the ability, the honesty, the courage, the vision to administer the affairs of the high office from the American point of view and with an eye single to the general welfare of all. Under Wallace's administration neither Main Street nor Wall Street will be overlooked and, in my opinion, each segment of our population will be given a square deal.

While I think we acted unwisely in bringing the R. F. C. under Commerce and that the two should be divorced, I hope that whoever is appointed to head R. F. C. will be a man with the American point of view who will administer the great loaning agency, not in the interest of Wall Street, not in the interest of Main Street, but in the interest of all. And while I am on R. F. C. let me make a few further observations. While I do not desire to get into the Jones-Wallace controversy, I do think that Congress should know a little more about the Reconstruction Finance Corporation especially the status of the loans held by the Corporation and the service it has rendered small business before it indulges in further panegyrics as to how the Corporation has been handled.

While I believe Mr. Jones, from his point of view, has been an able administrator, my belief is based upon newspaper and publicity reports and not upon personal knowledge. It seems to me that Congress, when it comes to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has indulged in faith to the *n*th degree. I am not decrying faith. It is a great thing to have faith in your fellow man. Nor am I intimating that the faith the Congress has in Mr. Jones has been misplaced. The thought I desire to convey is this: It would be well for the Congress to make an independent investigation into the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at stated intervals. This having been done, the report of each investigation should be made public. The R. F. C. is a creature of Congress, and certainly the duty rests upon Congress to see that the affairs of the Corporation are being conducted in the right way and in accordance with the intent of the Congress in bringing it into existence. When Congress created the Federal banks, it did not rely upon the faith it has in the officers and directors of the banks as to their proper conduct. It went further, although the Government has no money invested in the banks, and provided that there should be a distinterested investigation of the banks at stated intervals. Now all funds handled by the R. F. C. are Government funds—some thirty-five or forty billions of dollars—and it does seem to me that these funds should be guarded in a more substantial way than by faith alone. The least we can do, in my opinion, is to direct that the affairs of the R. F. C. be independently investigated at stated intervals.

While I hope and believe the affairs of the R. F. C. are in good shape, as for me, I am going to withhold further praise until I know.

I do know that the Congress did not know about the Dawes loan until it was too late.

I am not trying to shake your faith. I am only trying to provide substance upon which to base that faith.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of striking out the last word and then ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, every ruling that the Chair has made declaring the Wolcott amendments to the George bill out of order is another argument for recommitting this bill. I have no quarrel with the Chair's interpretation of the House rules as applied to this bill. Those rulings show the narrow scope of this bill. Instead of dealing with the broad problem of the classification and limitation by Congress of the powers of Cabinet officers, this bill merely trims off certain functions of one Cabinet officer. It is a bill based entirely on personalities, not principles. We have before us no reports of hearings to show the functions of the Secretary of Commerce or of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Due to the fact that hearings on this bill were stifled, Congress has had the laughable, yet lamentable, spectacle of having one of its great committees report to the House without knowing whether or not the Export-Import Bank was part of the job of the Secretary of Commerce.

As a result of the presentation of this narrow-gage bill, without hearing and without consideration on principles, we have had a debate here which has been strong on politics and personalities, and weak on principle. This bill should be recommitted to the committee which has the power under the House rules to consider the broad principles involved, to hear the views of the departmental officers and of outside students of government, on the best way to define and limit the powers of Cabinet officers and agency heads, so as to eliminate the need for weighing and discussing the personalities of the President's appointments in the House. As long as we put too much power in a particular official or agency, we will be forced to consider the personal qualifications of the man who heads that office or agency. We realize now that we gave Jesse Jones too much power for Jesse Jones or any other man. While we are on the subject, we should consider at least a few of the other agencies which may be overpowered.

I received a number of form telegrams requesting my support of the George bill without amendment. Here is the form letter I used in answering them:

DEAR MR. ———: I received your form telegram requesting my support of the George bill without amendments. It would certainly be unintelligent for me to decide in advance to vote against all amendments to a bill until I know what the amendments are.

I presume that your telegram is prompted by a desire to help in the effort to secure Senate confirmation for some kind of Cabinet job for ex-Vice President Wallace. There is a lot of political maneuvering going on here by both supporters and opponents of Mr. Wallace. I happen to disapprove of Mr. Wallace for any Cabinet post, but I do not believe that this should be a factor in considering the George bill.

I believe that the time has come to place proper limitations upon the powers of Cabinet officers and other officials and to place proper limitations upon the power of the President to combine or searate departments and agencies, and the House should consider bills and amendments for this purpose on their merits. We should not be controlled by surmises as to whether the Senate will pass or defeat a bill or by advance threats or promises that the President will veto or sign a bill. The House should not try to take over the responsibilities of the President and Senate in appointing or confirming officials; on the other hand, neither the President nor the Senate should control the House in passing upon bills or amendments. I shall consider the George bill on this basis.

Yours very truly,

JOHN M. VORYS.

My vote to recommit is made in accordance with the views stated in this letter. If my vote is also interpreted as showing lack of confidence in ex-Vice President Wallace, this would be a correct interpretation because I lack confidence in him as a Secretary of Commerce.

If the motion to recommit this bill is defeated, I shall vote for the narrow-gage George bill which is at least a faltering short step in the right direction. If my vote for this bill is interpreted as a vote of confidence in Henry Wallace, as a move to help him secure at least a limited job as a reward for his political services to the New Deal, this would be a wrong interpretation, for reasons I have already stated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Kentucky will yield, I suggest that he request that all Members have the right to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. That request will have to be made in the House.

Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, pursuant to House Resolution 137, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill, S. 375, to the Committee on Banking and Currency in order that further consideration may be given to the advisability of amending the same.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 196, nays 204, answered "present" 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—196

Abernethy	Auchincloss	Buck
Adams	Baldwin, N. Y.	Buffett
Allen, Ill.	Barrett, Wyo.	Butler
Andersen, H. Carl	Bates, Mass.	Byrnes, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Beall	Campbell
Andresen, August H.	Bell	Canfield
Andrews, Ala.	Bender	Carlson
Andrews, N. Y.	Bennett, Mo.	Case, N. J.
Angell	Bishop	Case, S. Dak.
Arends	Boykin	Chenoweth
Arnold	Brehm	Chiperfield
	Brown, Ohio	Church
	Brumbaugh	Clason
Clevenger	Hinshaw	Powers
Cole, Kans.	Hoeven	Ramey
Cole, Mo.	Hoffman	Rankin
Cole, N. Y.	Holmes, Mass.	Reece, Tenn.
Corbett	Holmes, Wash.	Reed, Ill.
Cox	Hope	Reed, N. Y.
Cravens	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Crawford	Howell	Rich
Cunningham	Jenkins	Rivers
Curtis	Jennings	Rizley
Dirksen	Jensen	Robertson, N. Dak.
Dolliver	Johnson, Calif.	Robsion, Ky.
Dondero	Johnson, Ill.	Rockwell
Dworshak	Johnson, Ind.	Rodgers, Pa.
Ellis	Jones	Rogers, Mass.
Ellsworth	Jonkman	Schwabe, Mo.
Elsaesser	Judd	Scrivner
Elston	Kean	Sharp
Engel, Mich.	Kearney	Short
Fellows	Keefe	Simpson, Ill.
Fenton	Kilburn	Simpson Pa.
Fuller	Kinzer	Slaughter
Gamble	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Gathings	Kunkel	Smith, Ohio
Gavin	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Gerlach	Latham	Smith, Wis.
Gibson	LeCompte	Springer
Gifford	LeFevre	Stefan
Gillespie	Lemke	Stevenson
Gillette	Lewis	Stewart
Gillie	Luce	Stockman
Goodwin	McConnell	Sumner, Ill.
Gossett	McCowen	Sundstrom
Graham	McDonough	Taber
Grant, Ind.	McGehee	Talbot
Griffiths	McGregor	Talle
Gross	McKenzie	Taylor
Gwinn, N. Y.	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa	Tibbott
Hagen	Martin, Mass.	Towe
Hale,	Mason	Vorys, Ohio
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Merrow	Vursell
Hall, Leonard W.	Michener	Wadsworth
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Weichel
Hancock	Mott	West
Hand	Mundt	Whitten
Hartley	Murray, Tenn.	Wigglesworth
Henry	Murray, Wis.	Wilson
Herter	O'Konski	Winstead
Heselton	Philbin	Wolcott
Hess	Phillips	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hill	Pittenger	Wolverton, N. J.
	Ploeser	Woodruff, Mich.
	Plumley	

NAYS—204

Allen, La.	Dickstein	Jarman
Anderson, N. Mex.	Dingell	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Bailey	Doughton, N. C.	Johnson, Okla.
Baldwin, Md.	Douglas, Calif.	Kee
Barden	Douglas, Ill.	Kefauver
Barrett, Pa.	Doyle	Kelley, Pa.
Barry	Drewry	Kelly, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Durham	Keogh
Beckworth	Earthman	Kilday
Biemiller	Eberharter	King
Bland	Engle, Calif.	Kirwan
Bloom	Ervin	Kopplemann
Bonner	Fallon	Lane
Bradley, Pa.	Feighan	Lea
Brooks	Fernandez	Lesinski
Brown, Ga.	Fisher	Ludlow
Bryson	Flannagan	Lyle
Buckley	Flood	Lynch
Bulwinkle	Fogarty	McCormack
Bunker	Folger	McGlinchey
Burch	Forand	Madden
Burgin	Fulton	Mahon
Byrne, N. Y.	Gallagher	Maloney
Camp	Gardner	Manasco
Cannon, Fla.	Geelan	Mansfield, Mont.
Cannon, Mo.	Gordon	Mansfield, Tex.
Carnahan	Gorski	Marcantonio
Celler	Granahan	May
Chapman	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Chelf	Grant, Ala.	Mills
Clark	Green	Monroney
Clements	Gregory	Morgan
Cochran	Harless, Ariz.	Morrison
Coffee	Harris	Murdock
Combs	Hart	Murphy
Cooley	Havenner	Neely
Cooper	Hays	Norrell
Courtney	Healy	Norton
Crosser	Hébert	O'Brien, Ill.
Curley	Hedrick	O'Brien, Mich.
D'Alesandro	Heffernan	O'Neal
Daughton, Va.	Hendricks	O'Toole
Davis	Hobbs	Outland
Dawson	Hoch	Pace
De Lacy	Holifield	Patman
Delaney, James J.	Hook	Patrick
Delaney, John J.	Huber	Patterson
	Hull	Peterson, Fla.
	Izac	Peterson, Ga.
	Jackson	Pfeifer
		Pickett
		Poage
		Powell
		Price, Fla.
		Price, Ill.
		Priest
		Quinn, N. Y.
		Rabaut
		Rabin
		Rains
		Ramspeck
		Randolph
		Rayfiel
		Resa
		Richards
		Riley
		Robinson, Utah
		Roe, Md.
		Rogers, N. Y.
		Rooney
		Rowan
		Ryter
		Sabath
		Sadowski
		Sasscer
		Savage
		Sheppard
		Sikes
		Snyder
		Somers, N. Y.
		Sparkman
		Spence
		Starkey
		Stigler
		Sullivan
		Sumners, Tex.
		Tarver
		Thom
		Thomason
		Tolan
		Torrens
		Traynor
		Trimble
		Vinson
		Voorhis, Calif.
		Walter
		Weaver
		Weiss
		Welch
		White
		Whittington
		Wickersham
		Wood
		Woodhouse
		Woodrum, Va.
		Worley
		Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Boren	Domengeaux

NOT VOTING—29

Bennet, N. Y.	Heidinger	Robertson, Va.
Blackney	Johnson, Luther A.	Roe, N. Y.
Bolton	Kerr	Rogers, Fla.
Bradley, Mich.	LaFollette	Russell
Colmer	Landis	Schwabe, Okla.
Eaton	Larcade	Shafer
Elliott	Link	Sheridan
Gearhart	McMillan, S. C.	Thomas, Tex.
Hare	O'Hara	Wasielewski
Harness, Ind.		Winter

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Wasielewski against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma for, with Mr. Link against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Thomas of Texas against.

Mr. Robertson of Virginia for, with Mr. Luther A. Johnson against.

Mr. Boren for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

General pairs:

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Russell with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Landis.

Mr. ADAMS changed his vote from no to aye.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. THOMAS, who if present would have voted "no." I withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "present."

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I have an active pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERIDAN, who if present would have voted "no." I withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 400, nays 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—400

Abernethy	Allen, La.	Anderson, Calif.
Adams	Andersen, H. Carl	Anderson, N. Mex.
Allen, Ill.		

Andresen, August H.	Ellis	Kelley, Pa.
Andrews, Ala.	Ellsworth	Kelly, Ill.
Andrews, N. Y.	Elsaesser	Keogh
Angell	Elston	Kilburn
Arends	Engel, Mich.	Kilday
Arnold	Engle, Calif.	King
Auchincloss	Ervin	Kinzer
Bailey	Fallon	Kirwan
Baldwin, Md.	Feighan	Kopplemann
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fellows	Kunkel
Barden	Fenton	Lane
Barrett, Pa.	Fernandez	Lanham
Barrett, Wyo.	Fisher	Latham
Barry	Flannagan	LeCompte
Bates, Ky.	Flood	LeFevre
Bates, Mass.	Fogarty	Lesinski
Beall	Folger	Lewis
Beckworth	Forand	Luce
Bell	Fuller	Ludlow
Bender	Fulton	Lyle
Bennett, Mo.	Gallagher	Lynch
Biemiller	Gamble	McConnell
Bishop	Gardner	McCormack
Bland	Gathings	McCowen
Bloom	Gavin	McDonough
Bonner	Geelan	McGehee
Boren	Gerlach	McGlinchey
Boykin	Gibson	McGregor
Bradley, Pa.	Gifford	McKenzie
Brehm	Gillespie	McMillen, Ill.
Brooks	Gillette	Madden
Brown, Ga.	Gillie	Mahon
Brown, Ohio	Goodwin	Maloney
Brumbaugh	Gordon	Manasco
Bryson	Gorski	Mansfield, Tex.
Buck	Gossett	Marcantonio
Buckley	Graham	Martin, Iowa
Buffett	Granahan	Martin, Mass.
Bulwinkle	Granger	Mason
Bunker	Grant, Ala.	May
Burch	Grant, Ind.	Merrow
Burgin	Green	Michener
Butler	Gregory	Miller, Calif.
Byrne, N. Y.	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	Mills
Camp	Gwinn, N. Y.	Monroney
Campbell	Gwynne, Iowa	Morgan
Canfield	Hagen	Morrison
Cannon, Fla.	Hale	Mott
Cannon, Mo.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mundt
Carlson	Hall, Leonard W.	Murdock
Carnahan	Halleck	Murphy
Case, N. J.	Hancock	Murray, Tenn.
Case, S. Dak.	Hand	Murray, Wis.
Celler	Harless, Ariz.	Neely
Chapman	Harris	Norrell
Chelf	Hart	Norton
Chenoweth	Hartley	O'Brien, Ill.
Chiperfield	Havenner	O'Brien, Mich.
Church	Hays	O'Konski
Clark	Healy	O'Neal
Clason	Hébert	O'Toole
Clements	Hedrick	Outland
Clevenger	Heffernan	Pace
Cochran	Hendricks	Patman
Coffee	Henry	Patrick
Cole, Kans.	Herter	Patterson
Cole, Mo.	Heselton	Peterson, Fla.
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Peterson, Ga.
Combs	Hill	Pfeifer
Cooley	Hinshaw	Philbin
Cooper	Hobbs	Phillips
Corbett	Hoch	Pickett
Courtney	Hoeven	Pittenger
Cox	Hoffman	Ploeser
Cravens	Holifield	Plumley
Crawford	Holmes, Mass.	Poage
Crosser	Holmes, Wash.	Powell
Cunningham	Hook	Powers
Curley	Hope	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Horan	Price, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Howell	Priest
Daughton, Va.	Huber	Quinn, N. Y.
Davis	Hull	Rabaut
Dawson	Izac	Rabin
De Lacy	Jackson	Rains
Delaney, James J.	Jarman	Ramey
Delaney, John J.	Jenkins	Ramspeck
Dickstein	Jennings	Randolph
Dingell	Jensen	Rankin
Dirksen	Johnson, Calif.	Rayfiel
Dolliver	Johnson, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Domengeaux	Johnson, Ind.	Reed, Ill.
Dondero	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Reed, N. Y.
Doughton, N. C.	Johnson, Okla.	Rees, Kans.
Douglas, Calif.	Jones	Resa
Douglas, Ill.	Jonkman	Rich
Doyle	Judd	Richards
Drewry	Kean	Riley
Durham	Kearney	Rivers
Dworshak	Kee	Rizley
Earthman	Keefe	Robertson, N. Dak.
Eberharter	Kefauver	Robertson, Va.
		Robinson, Utah
		Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell	Somers, N. Y.	Vinson
Rodgers, Pa.	Sparkman	Voorhis, Calif.
Roe, Md.	Spence	Vorys, Ohio
Rogers, Fla.	Springer	Vursell
Rogers, Mass.	Starkey	Wadsworth
Rogers, N. Y.	Stefan	Walter
Rooney	Stevenson	Weaver
Rowan	Stewart	Weichel
Russell	Stigler	Weiss
Ryter	Stockman	Welch
Sabath	Sullivan	West
Sadowski	Sumner, Ill.	White
Sasscer	Sumners, Tex.	Whitten
Savage	Sundstrom	Whittington
Schwabe, Mo.	Taber	Wickersham
Scrivner	Talbot	Wigglesworth
Sharp	Talle	Winstead
Sheppard	Tarver	Wolcott
Short	Taylor	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sikes	Thom	Wolverton, N. J.
Simpson, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.	Wood
Simpson, Pa.	Thomason	Woodhouse
Slaughter	Tibbott	Woodruff, Mich.
Smith, Maine	Tolan	Woodrum, Va.
Smith, Ohio	Torrens	Worley
Smith, Va.	Towe	Zimmerman
Smith, Wis.	Traynor	
Snyder	Trimble	

NAYS—2

Lemke Wilson

NOT VOTING—29

Bennet, N. Y.	Johnson, Luther A.	Mansfield, Mont.
Blackney	Kerr	O'Hara
Bolton	Knutson	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	LaFollette	Schwabe, Okla.
Colmer	Landis	Shafer
Eaton	Larcade	Sheridan
Elliott	Lea	Thomas, Tex.
Gearhart	Link	Wasielewski
Hare	McMillan, S. C.	Winter
Harness, Ind.		
Heidinger		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Link with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Lea with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Knutson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article by Raymond Moley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will the gentleman from Massachusetts tell us what the program is for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to.

On Monday, the Unanimous Consent Calendar will be called, and there will be a suspension of the rules to permit consideration of House Resolution 37, dealing with the American Interparliamentary Congress, which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] sought to have passed by unanimous consent earlier this week.

On Tuesday there will be a call of the Private Calendar. After the Private Calendar is disposed of there will be general debate for the balance of Tuesday on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. General debate on the Treasury-Post Office bill may be continued on Wednesday, but in any event the balance of Tuesday will be taken up by general debate on the Treasury-Post Office bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We are going to have a legislative session on Washington's Birthday, I understand?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

On Wednesday there will be a continuation of consideration of the Treasury-Post Office bill, and if that bill is disposed of in time and a rule is reported out on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be taken up. If a rule is not reported out on that bill, the river and harbor bill will be taken up.

On Washington's Birthday there will be the appropriate exercises for the day.

That is the program for next week.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF MEMBER TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to on February 7, 1945, the Chair designates the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately after the reading of the Journal on Thursday, February 22, 1945.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There as no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon I may insert a letter from the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include the appeal made by Premier Bonomi to President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein statements made by the Polish-American Congress in Chicago and by the Polish Telegraph Agency, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include therein a resolution of the Nevada Legislature, and some excerpts and comments from leading stockmen of Nevada on the proposed grazing fee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. S. P. Lindsey, Jr., Director, Emergency Crop Feed Loan Section, Farm Credit Administration, before the Committee on Agriculture on February 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next I may address the House for 30 minutes after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 27, I may address the House for 20 minutes following the special orders already entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 30 minutes following the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address I delivered at a Lincoln Day dinner in Toledo, Ohio. This material runs over somewhat, but I have an estimate from the Public Printer of the cost. I ask that this may be included notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

POLAND

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I received a great many telegrams and letters from my constituents, many of whom have sons serving in our armed forces. One of the telegrams is from the father of four sons who are in military service. They express great disappointment at the treatment accorded Poland in the recent conference held at Yalta in the Crimea by the three great powers.

Russia contemplates taking a considerable portion of Polish territory. Poland is one of our gallant fighting allies. She was the first nation to defy the Nazis. Before Hitler attacked Poland, he invited her to join his new order, with the view of attacking Russia. We still remember Hitler's promises in the early days of his regime, that he wanted to save Europe from bolshevism. Poland refused to join the Nazis, stating she had a 10-year nonaggression pact with Russia and intended to live up to it.

We now know that Hitler's aim was to rule all Europe and to take a considerable part of Ukrainia. Had Poland submitted to his demand, he would have consolidated his conquered territories and their resources and he would have gained time and been in a much better position to accomplish his purpose. Poland, by her defiance of the Nazis, has frustrated Hitler's plan. Poland, together with the other allies of the United Nations, has helped to save democracy.

Poland should not be treated as an enemy. By her bravery and sacrifice on the land, in the air, and on the sea, she has earned and is entitled to the treatment of an ally and her former boundaries should be restored.

I am sure Poland, together with all the other small European countries, desires Russia's friendship and they want to be peaceful neighbors.

I had hoped that upon the defeat of Germany all the small countries in Europe would be restored and given an opportunity to be free and independent nations. I know that was the hope of many millions of others.

Russia has a rare opportunity to establish world peace, win the good will and friendship of her neighbors, and thereby insure security for herself and all of Europe. She can set an example to all other nations by being fair and just with them, and the best method would be by giving them their freedom and independence, without the loss of any part of their territorial boundaries and natural resources.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial which recently appeared in the Boston Post entitled "Crimea Compact."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS CAUSE DRASTIC REDUCTION IN FOOD SUPPLIES FOR 1945

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, since the production of food on the farms of America is not considered as a vital war industry by the administration, I have taken this time today to discuss food supplies for 1945 and to demonstrate that Government policies and regulations are actually discouraging and curtailing the production of vital foods, so necessary to win the war, maintain our civilian economy, and fulfill our commitments to Allied countries.

In considering the food supplies for the coming months, I want to first call your attention to an Associated Press article which appeared in the Sunday Star on February 11 which contained the following headline, "Food officials see public meat counters bare by midsummer." Also, "Production dropping in face of war needs, survey indicates." The article was written by a responsible Associated Press writer, Ovid A. Martin, and reads, in part, as follows:

Meat may virtually disappear from civilian markets by midsummer, Government food officials predicted yesterday. The forecast

accompanied new steps to divert the larger portion of current production into war stocks.

Civilian supplies could be expected, however, to reappear when fall marketings of livestock begin their increase.

It is possible that per capita civilian consumption this year may fall to the lowest level since 1935, when meat supplies dropped after emergency slaughter of drought-stricken cattle on western plains in 1934 and a reduction in hogs because of the Government's pig-killing program designed to improve farm prices.

Action taken by the Government yesterday to divert more meat to the armed forces and lend-lease countries was an order requiring Federally inspected slaughterers to set aside 70 percent instead of the previous 50 percent of their utility grade beef for production of canned meats.

We all agreed that our men and women in the armed forces should have all essential foods in abundance. Every true American will gladly submit to stricter rationing of meat and other essential foods in order that our fighting men will secure a full supply of such vital foods so that they can continue in their fight for victory.

An examination of the reports of the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, the O. P. A. and other agencies disclose the prediction that in 1945 there will be less butter, less beef, less pork, less poultry, less eggs, less canned foods, less potatoes, and less fresh vegetables than the people had in 1944. I have also found, as many of you know, that we will have less essential labor on the farms of this country to produce the necessary food for our armed forces, and to take care of civilian needs and other commitments made by our Government to feed the starving people of the world.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], let me point out that since the beginning of the war-production program in this country, more than 16 percent of our farm population has gone into war production and the armed forces. Most of these men and women, who have left the farms, were engaged in the production of food and fiber products. I make this observation to show what a magnificent job the remaining men and women on American farms have done to produce the largest food supplies in the history of our country under the most trying circumstances. Not only shortages of experienced farm labor and essential machinery have complicated food production but, in addition, hundreds of directives and orders from Washington have actually discouraged and retarded maximum production of vital foods on American farms.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does not the gentleman believe that by the policy, recently established and now in effect, of reclassifying young men on the farms between the ages of 18 and 25 and taking them into the armed forces—and I speak only of the young men who have heretofore been deferred because of agricultural necessity—we are contributing very substantially to the reduction in the production of food in this country?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that.

We learned about 6 weeks ago that 364,000 young men who had been deferred as being essential farm workers were now being reclassified and most of them are being placed in the armed forces. These were essential men. The local draft boards had passed upon them and under the Tydings amendment had deferred them because it was found they could not be replaced on the farms and were needed there in the production of food.

On January 3 the President of the United States established a new policy which virtually set aside the Tydings amendment and set up a new yardstick, which made the comparison that if a man was more essential in the armed forces than he was in producing food on the farm, he should no longer be deferred. So out of these 364,000 men who had been deferred as essential farm workers, a large number will go into the armed forces, and food production will suffer as a result.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is it not a fact that regardless of the policy presumed to be established by the President, the Tydings amendment is still the law of the land, and neither a directive of the President nor of anyone else can set aside that law?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The President has no more right to set aside the laws enacted by Congress than the gentleman or I. The Tydings amendment is still the law. The Tydings amendment states specifically that a local board shall pass upon the essentiality of a man in agriculture, and if he cannot be replaced then he must be deferred as an essential worker.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. A violation of that is a definite violation of the law itself. In fact, the men who violate that law as members of the draft boards in the different sections of the country lay themselves open to prosecution under the law, because, after all, a violation of this law is as much a violation of the law as is a violation of any other law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The only thing the President can do is to appeal from a decision of the local board after the local board has passed upon the registrant as to whether or not he is essential to agriculture or any other industry. That is the only right the President has. But he has set himself up above this law and has assumed the responsibility of passing an opinion on the Tydings amendment which is contrary to any intent ever had by Congress and contrary to the language of the Tydings amendment itself.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, the President has no opportunity to pass on this thing until it has come to him through the regular process of the law itself.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He can take an appeal from a decision of a local board. He has that right. General Hershey has that right and the President as Commander in Chief, I assume, would have the same right to appeal from a decision of the local board out in the gentleman's district or in any other district of the country. But the local board, according to the law passed by Congress, is still supreme and has the power and the responsibility to pass upon the essentiality of any worker. Then if the State director or General Hershey or the President does not like the decision of the local board, the only thing they can do under the law is to appeal to the appeal board.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. In no single instance insofar as these agricultural laborers are concerned has that policy been followed:

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; that is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Minnesota is making a contribution by bringing this out, because it affects the food situation. While the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct that the local boards are in error, it seems to be rather peculiar that the Congress of the United States should have to get at this situation by the introduction of a House joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 106, providing that the boards shall follow the law, that they shall not be misled by the reports and letters and other documents coming out of Washington at the present time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, the local boards are confused. And that is not surprising, when the President of the United States makes a statement which was sent to the local boards by General Hershey on January 3 setting up new standards to determine essentiality to agriculture.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman think that perhaps part of the difficulty is because in the public mind the fact that the President is Commander in Chief of the troops is interpreted generally to mean that he is also Commander in Chief of the draft boards and Commander in Chief of civilians? As a matter of fact, while he is in charge of armies after they have been raised, he has no power in the United States to raise armies. They are raised by Congress and nobody else can raise them. I have talked to some draft board members who sort of feel they must follow the President because he is Commander in Chief. But he has absolutely no power over them until we raise them and put them in his hands. Is that not true?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct. But what the President did confused a lot of draft boards who want to follow the law, and who realize that it must take essential manpower to produce food.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. Therefore, I want to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota, my colleague, for bringing the subject up because I hope we can get the people reeducated and read the

Constitution and discover that Congress and Congress alone has the power to raise armies.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There are a good many people, even officials, who disregard the Constitution and would like to relegate it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. As a matter of realism, is it not a fact that even though the Tydings amendment is the law of the land, the determination as to whether or not a specific registrant falls within the provisions and protection of the Tydings amendment is a matter for the exercise of discretion on the facts produced by the local draft board?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. And no one can interfere with the exercise of that discretion on the part of the draft board in determining whether or not a specific registrant falls within the provisions or protection of the Tydings amendment. It is perfectly true, is it not, that with each local draft board there is a Government appeal agent?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. I have the situation in my district in one or two draft boards where the appeal agent is very active, apparently feeling that it is his duty to scrutinize very closely the determinations of the local draft boards. In one case which came to my attention this morning the local board, after considering all the facts and the evidence, determined that this particular registrant should properly be given an agricultural deferment as being engaged in an essential agricultural occupation. The appeal agent appealed to the appeal board and the board upon the record reversed the draft board and placed this registrant in I–A. That is clearly within the province and prerogatives under the law of the appeal board and they would have the correlative right to reverse the local board and give the registrant a deferment if it had been refused by the local board. In this case the only thing this man can do whose position has been determined by the appeal board is to make his appeal to the President. That in effect means to appeal to the State director of selective service, which is in most cases a rather futile sort of procedure, as I have observed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will say to my colleague he cannot make an appeal if the decision of the appeal board is unanimous. In that case that would be the end of it.

Mr. KEEFE. In this particular case the decision was 4 to 1.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the decision was 4 to 1, then it was not unanimous.

Mr. KEEFE. It would authorize the appeal to go directly to the President. After all is said and done the point I am getting at is that the law is here. It is on the books. We have given the local boards this prerogative of listening to the position of registrants, taking the testimony, filing the affidavits, and making up the record.

Then the local board considers that record and says this man is or is not entitled to deferment. It is assumed that when they make that determination it is semijudicial in character; that they are operating, having in mind the provisions of the Tydings amendment. Who is going to say that they did not give consideration to the Tydings amendment when they made their determination? That is what bothers me?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, anybody might question a decision of the local board; any interested party.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to say that I understand the State director may, even though a deferment has been denied by unanimous decision of the appeal board, appeal the registrant's case. Not only can the State director appeal a case, but the National Director of the Selective Service can likewise appeal a case and review it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman may be correct on that, but it has been my understanding that where the decision of the appeal board was unanimous, no appeal to the President could be taken.

Mr. COOLEY. No appeal as a matter of right rests in the registrant.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The State director or General Hershey probably could do it within their discretionary powers.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think that while Selective Service is again screening the farm deferments, they might well screen the Government deferments, amounting to more than 265,000, in an effort to increase the manpower, meet the manpower needs of the Army?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that, because we now have over 3,500,000 civilian employees on the Federal pay roll, 400,000 of whom are in some other country outside the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. The press reports yesterday and today indicate that Government deferments amount to over 265,000 men.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am astounded that there are so many.

Mr. JUDD. Twice as many as there were a year ago.

Mr. COOLEY. Twice as many as there were a year ago. I think the Government can spare manpower much better than the farmers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman mean that most of those 265,000 men would be eligible physically for service in the armed forces?

Mr. COOLEY. Absolutely. There are 80,000 deferred because they are IV–F, or physically incapacitated, but that leaves a substantial number of men that should be made available to the armed forces.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that is a matter that we should take up with the President in our committee.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will have the President come before our committee we will be glad to discuss it with him.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would certainly like to have him. Of course, the gentleman from North Carolina is very close to him and might prevail upon him to come before our committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Before we got into this matter of discussing induction of farm boys, the gentleman had just finished a profound statement, when he listed the different commodities of which we are sure to have less production this year than in 1944. No doubt, the gentleman is absolutely certain, and his research has indicated that he is right in his position. If he is right, that in itself is a tremendous fact. If you add to that this fact that for the last 8 years, we have been blessed by Lord God Almighty with the most favorable weather, and if we should have one season of bad weather where production would be reduced 10 or 15 or 20 percent, we might be in bad shape.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct. I thank the gentleman for bringing me back to the subject I had intended to talk about. The other day, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] made a speech criticizing some of us for having urged unlimited production back in 1943. He quoted what we said. He quoted me correctly, because I said at that time, that unless we did away with all scarcity programs we would have a famine in the United States. The gentleman from Michigan who made that statement, and others in the New Deal who claimed credit for all the food that has been produced in the United States, had better thank the Lord and nature, and the men and women on the farms for the abundance of production we have had the last 3 or 4 years, because that has been responsible for it, and not the New Deal.

Mr. JENKINS. It is a fact that the Republican Food Study Committee, of which the gentleman is a valuable member, has always held that as one of its cardinal principles—increased production.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Abundant food production to supply our needs has been our consistent effort. It was only last year that the administration removed all the restrictions on corn production. 1944 was the first year the farmers could plant all the corn they wanted to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. May I inquire if I understood correctly when the gentleman was reading the list of commodities whether it was primarily less production of each of those commodities that we were going to have, or less to eat no matter what the production was, or both?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Less to eat.

Mr. JUDD. The loss or decrease in production is not comparable to the shortage on the shelves, is it?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There will be less production as well as an increased demand; and I am going to point out some of the items with your permission. I mentioned that there would be less of certain vital foods in 1945 according to the War Food Administration. The O. P. A., which has canceled ration stamps and put on higher restrictions has established policies that bring about this additional scarcity of foods. It is a man-made policy, it is not caused by the farmers, it is not caused by nature, but it is due to regulations put into effect here in Washington which are discouraging production. The manpower situation is one. We all know, of course, that it takes manpower to produce all kinds of food just as it takes manpower to produce war materials, but so far the administration has not recognized agriculture as an essential war industry; so they feel they can take these young men who are now out on the farms producing food. They said we were going to have less butter and that is also due to a Government policy. The increasing shortage of butter is because the O. P. A. fixed a higher price for whole fluid milk which meant about 7 cents a pound more for butterfat sold in whole fluid milk than for butterfat sold for the production of butter. It is only natural that farmers would sell their whole milk instead of selling cream to be processed into butter, for they get 7 cents a pound more for the butterfat in the whole milk than for the butterfat in cream sold to be processed into butter. Only recently has the War Food Administration come to realize what a good many of us have been insisting on for a long while, that they should equalize the dairy payments they are making to the farmers so that the man who sells his cream for butter would get just as much as the man who sells his butterfat in the form of whole milk. I do not know whether the new policy that was announced yesterday will bring it about, but something must be done to increase either the price or the subsidy on butter if the people of America are to secure more butter.

The production of butter since the war started has dropped as much as 25 percent, in certain dairy sections, at a time when we are producing the largest milk supply in the history of the country. Now let us take beef.

I also said that the shortage of beef would be due to a regulation made here in Washington that placed a price ceiling of beef on the hoof. The best beef we have is that which comes from the feed lots of the country; but with that price ceiling on the animal on the hoof, no farmer is going to take the chance of feeding those feeder cattle for several months of the year to put on 300 or 400 extra pounds of beef with expensive feed without knowing what the price is going to be 6 months from that time, or he may lose a good many dollars on the animals he is trying to feed to make more and better beef. That means that most of the beef going to the market in the next several months will be from 300 to 400 pounds less in weight under this policy. The Army has properly taken nearly all the best beef and from now on 70 percent of the utility beef has been ordered to be set aside for the armed forces and lend-lease.

There is no scarcity of beef on the hoof. According to the W. F. A. there are nearly 80,000,000 head of beef cattle in this country, but the recent order of the O. P. A. to place a ceiling price on live cattle, which action was taken without the recommendation of the War Food Administrator, discourages the feeders of range and unfinished cattle from feeding them so as to put an additional 300 or 400 pounds on each animal—securing better beef and larger supplies for the armed forces and civilian needs. Cattle feeders should be encouraged by the Government to go the limit in feeding of unfinished cattle, at a time when we have one of the largest supplies of corn and wheat in the history of our country.

So there may be something to the story that appeared in the Star to the effect that beef will virtually disappear from the meat counters by the middle of the summer this year.

Let us look at the pork situation. We are facing a most serious shortage of pork for the next 6 months. It seems as though our officials should learn a little from experience. Back in 1942, when the farmers did a pretty good job in raising pork, we had around a hundred million pigs raised that year. Still there was a shortage in this country. The price went up to the ceiling, so the farmers got a top price for the pigs they raised. But there was a demand for more pork.

The O. P. A. does not want an abundance. They must have a scarcity if they are going to function, because if there is an abundance of pork or any other commodity, the effect of that abundance holds down the price, requires less rationing, and gives the people an opportunity to get the food and also we have the supplies to take care of our other needs.

So the War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture back in the fall of 1942 told the farmers: "We must have more pork. We want 20 percent more pork." The farmers responded and increased their production of pork by over 20 percent in 1943 and instead of having a hundred million pigs raised in 1943 we had 120,000,000 pigs. What happened? We had an abundance. The O. P. A. had to take rationing off of pork. The price went down—yes, it went down too far. The farmers were promised a floor under prices, but that floor did not hold because some of the hogs weighed more than the support price permitted or the weights covered by the support prices. But instead of taking the abundance of pork that was produced in 1943 and marketed in the fall and winter of 1944 and building new storage houses for it, why it was just dissipated until we now have the greatest shortage of pork that we have ever had in the history of our country and during a time when we could have an abundance.

What happened in 1944? After having a big supply in 1943, the O. P. A., of course, could not function, so someone decided farmers should reduce hog production in 1944 by 20 percent so as to get it back to around 100,000,000 pigs. Then they put on a support price. But the farmers did not know what was going to happen here in Washington.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the farmers did not know what was going to happen here in Washington, so that in 1944 instead of producing 20 percent less pigs they produced 30 percent less than in 1943. It will be about the same in 1945. You will not be able to get much bacon, ham, and pork chops over the civilian counters.

I could go on down the line if I had more time and point additional facts out to you; however, before I close I want to touch briefly on the poultry situation because you cannot buy much poultry now unless you go into the black market. Virtually all of the poultry throughout the eastern sections is being sold in the black market and the situation is becoming critical because poultry has been one of the unrationed foods that the people have been able to get.

I had a man come to see me the other day from over in Baltimore. He wanted our food study committee to hold a meeting over there because, he said, the merchants were not able to buy poultry, that it was all going into the black market. I asked him why the O. P. A. with some of its thousands of enforcement officers could not go out and correct that situation and he answered: "We have talked to them and they will not do anything." I asked him what his remedy was. He said: "We must have the Government buy all of the poultry in the United States and let the Government itself be the buying agent and the distributing agent."

These dealers are getting so desperate for poultry that they feel they must surrender to the Government and say, "Now, Mr. Uncle Sam, you go out and buy this and then you sell it back to us so that we can supply our customers." They are going to have an additional shortage of poultry in 1945. The situation has now become so critical that the officials of the War Food Administration as well as the officials of the O. P. A., particularly if the war in Europe continues, are wondering how they are going to get enough supplies of these vital foods to take care of our armed forces and civilian requirements, and to supply the tremendous commitments which the Administration has made to the people of the world who are asking for us to send them food. Will we be able to meet our commitments? The farmers

are doing their part to produce in abundance. It is now up to the Administration to revamp its food production policies and put into operation programs that will encourage food production in abundance during the war period and thus avoid disastrous shortages. This can be done, and the first step to take is to recognize agriculture as an essential war industry. I will have more to say on the subject of food shortages at a later date.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the F. E. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] be given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include a newspaper article, and a short letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE FOOD PROBLEM

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables and extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, in my opinion took in just a little bit too much territory when he asked everyone to subscribe to everything that took place in the agricultural world during the last 8 or 12 years. I think our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] pointed out one thing that is not any great credit to the New Deal, and that is the fact that after they tell us so much about the iniquities of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act they come back in 1939 and 1940, after they have been in power all those years, and put on the statute books a law that prohibits the exportation of seed from the United States to any portion of the world, and also to have the office of the Secretary of Agriculture say that the purpose of passing that legislation was to keep the people in China and other countries from raising some tobacco that might compete with us.

Out in Wisconsin we have a bigger heart. We have distributed livestock all over the world. We vary a little from Mr. Wallace, because we want them to feed the cow as well as do the milking. We do not want to furnish the milk and also furnish the work which goes along with that quart of milk. We surely never felt like we should keep a corner on the milk in Wisconsin.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if he was not convinced that the bill that the gentleman referred to was a meritorious bill, and if he did not vote for it in committee and on the floor of the House?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina that I was very careful to look that up before I mentioned it. I went to the Committee on Agriculture and looked it up. At the time that matter was before the Committee on Agriculture I had only been here a few weeks, and I was much more modest then than I am willing to be since that time. The first year I was here I did not say much to anybody unless they said something to me. But I did not vote for that bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not trying to embarrass my colleague at all. If he says he did not vote for it, I will accept his statement. But I still maintain that it was a meritorious bill, sponsored by my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], and my recollection is, it passed the House by unanimous vote.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There are a lot of bills that do. The pension bill did.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the Kerr bill passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That point to me is only an individual case. I can give other cases. But I do not want to put this down on a narrow basis. Let us put it on a broader basis.

There are two things that this administration is doing. How in the name of conscience they can pass a piece of legislation like the tobacco seed embargo bill is more than I can comprehend. Then we have the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture out in Milwaukee talking about the reciprocal trade treaties, and what a wonderful thing they are doing for the rest of the world. Here in Congress they put legislation like the tobacco seed embargo bill on the statute books. I do not understand how Secretary Hull ever let it go through. They tried to do it on cottonseed, but they were a little slow on that. Those people in other parts of the world got their cotton started before they were cut off from the cottonseed here.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think when they tried to put it on cottonseed a good deal of the cottonseed had been sent down to Mexico and Brazil so that they have the foundation stock down there.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman from Minnesota and say that all I know about the cottonseed-embargo legislation is what I read in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, and it took place before I was here. That is No. 1. That is the thing that I think is going to get us into trouble. I do not want to go into sectionalism, I do not want to go into the cheap politics the Agricultural Administration has followed, because all during the time of this war neither I nor any other Member from Wisconsin has ever stood on this floor and tried to air any of our grievances in our State. We have never asked for one dollar for our State that we did not want the United States to have. We never have in any way tried to do anything that would disrupt the program that was being carried on by this administration in connection with the war-food program. The only time we have ever spoken up was when it was in the interest of the war-food program.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to compliment him. I think he is a very sincere friend of those engaged in agriculture. I say that from a national standpoint. I am certain the gentleman is very, very loyal to the dairy interests of his own district and to the country at large. But I do want to ask the gentleman this question. Does the gentleman think we should encourage the growth of tobacco in other countries, which would ultimately take away the American market?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I think it is an unwise policy not to have your legislative acts and your verbal utterings coincide exactly. When we follow one course with one hand and then follow another course with the other hand, we are surely indulging in double talk. We either should not pass it, or if we do pass it we should carry it straight across the board. I think it is poor policy at this time to have such legislation on our legislative books.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. It all depends on whose ox is being gored, does it not? In that particular case it was tobacco. They would not stand for putting a tariff, perhaps, on tobacco because they do not like tariffs, they are denouncing them. They want free trade. So they accomplish the same thing, they say, by passing a law to prohibit the sending of seed over to China to prevent them from raising tobacco which might be sold in competition with the tobacco interests.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. You are just beating the devil around the bush with that sort of argument, are you not?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I do not think so at all. I think that was very, very meritorious.

Mr. KEEFE. Either you believe in protection for your tobacco interests or you do not.

Mr. COOLEY. I believe in protection for our tobacco interests.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman says he believes in protection?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. You believe in protecting them through that roundabout method of saying, "We will not sell any seed to China so they can raise any tobacco."

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his remarks. There is a handmaiden to this same type of legislation and that is this. For several years we have been paying an export bounty in order to get rid of crops, and we are doing it at the present time. I should like to know how we are going to continue doing that and still have on our own statute books laws that prevent dumping into our own country. If the farmers, themselves, as I think was brought out again last night at that meeting by John Brandt, want to take a world price for their products, that is their business, but when you take public funds, as much as $40,000,000 in 1 year, out of section 32 funds, 30 percent of the customs receipts, and subsidize crops or products, I should like to know how you are going to have friendly relations with the rest of the world.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman opposed to the use of the section 32 funds for the purposes for which they are set apart?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am opposed to having them dissipated as they have been under the New Deal.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows the section 32 fund which represents 30 percent of customs receipts was set apart for the benefit of agriculture; is that not true?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If they were used for the benefit of agriculture, I would surely be glad, and whenever they are I will be pleased to hear about it.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman wants to be fair. I am sure he wants to be fair. Suppose he points out in what respect those funds have been misused.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. They have been misused in my opinion by being used to subsidize exports.

Mr. COOLEY. That is the very purpose of it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There is no use having any law on our own statute books which prevents dumping into this country and then to have a program or legislation that allows dumping on the foreign countries. That is going to get us into trouble before we get done with it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. To give an illustration, at least of what I think to be a misuse of this fund. They take these customs funds under section 32 and use them for the purpose of subsidizing manufacturers who are making insulation material out of so-called short-staple cotton and paying them 9 or 19 cents a pound in a direct cash subsidy to get them into competition with the other insulation manufacturers of this country who are not subsidized, and doing it on the theory that they are aiding agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman argue that is an illegal use of this fund or unauthorized use?

Mr. KEEFE. It is not illegal in the mind or contemplation of the theorists and the legalistic concepts of the New Deal.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman just does not agree with the program.

Mr. KEEFE. They have the right perhaps to use it for that purpose.

Mr. COOLEY. All right, then it is not a misuse of the funds.

Mr. KEEFE. I am asking the gentleman this question. You say those funds were set apart to be used for the purpose of promoting agriculture?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Do you think that to use these funds in order to subsidize the manufacturers of insulation and to set up insulation manufacturers in direct competition with the other manufacturers of this country is in aid of agriculture?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not entirely familiar with the program that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I have given you an illustration. I hope you will look it up.

Mr. COOLEY. I do say these funds are very closely administered in all respects insofar as my knowledge of the use of these funds is concerned.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman says he has no familiarity with this particular instance. I suggest before he makes such a broad statement he familiarize himself with that use of these funds to which I have called attention. I think he will then agree with me it is wrong.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of course, I will say to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, that is the use of the funds in the domestic program. As I remember the gentleman has quoted five to six millions being used for that purpose annually. The point I am trying to make is that you cannot subsidize exports as long as we have on our own statute books provisions of antidumping legislation and expect to have what should be called anywhere near a good-neighbor policy.

Mr. COOLEY. Was not that one of the main purposes, that the fund should be set apart to subsidize the exportation of surplus commodities from this country?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Then it is paradoxical to talk about a good-neighbor policy. We see it so many times. I do not have to stay with cotton. I can get out of the South on this subject. We could take wheat.

Mr. COOLEY. Did not the gentleman vote for section 32 funds to be set aside for that purpose?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I was not here at the time. I am not on the witness stand, but I will answer that I was not here. I have not yielded to the gentleman. Let us consider wheat for example. We have practically an embargo on wheat imports. We have the quota system that allows but 800,000 bushels a year to come in. The administration has implemented the Smoot-Hawley tariff by a near embargo on this crop. The duty of 42 cents per bushel is still maintained as provided in the Smoot-Hawley Act. But why the near embargo with one breath and talk about a good-neighbor policy the next? We are now paying 33 cents a bushel to get rid of it, in the form of an export subsidy. Talk about manpower. It takes fertilizer, and labor, and everything else to produce wheat. Then we pay 33 cents a bushel to get rid of it. I am certainly glad to know they have stopped that silly piece of business. But we are still subsidizing the export of flour right now. We are paying $20 a bale to get rid of cotton right this minute. Why do we waste fertilizer and manpower during the war to raise a crop we have to pay $20 a bale to get rid of, to say nothing about the fact that we are going to jeopardize our relationship with other countries if we are going to do the same thing which we prohibit by our own legislative acts.

A DISCUSSION OF THE DAIRY SITUATION

Mr. Speaker, my reason in asking the indulgence of the House today was for the purpose of presenting the dairy picture of the Nation. With the facts in mind it affords us an opportunity to not only consider the wartime needs for dairy products, but also gives us an opportunity to look into the post-war period.

The following table shows the monthly and annual production of milk by years from January 1, 1934, to January 1, 1945:

Monthly milk production on farms, United States

[Millions of pounds]

	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
January	7,652	7,084	7,292	7,388	7,438	7,807	7,841	8,362	8,739	8,773	8,634
February	7,144	6,690	7,159	6,899	7,089	7,411	7,688	7,935	8,299	8,380	8,584
March	8,272	7,823	8,244	8,041	8,443	8,725	8,881	9,240	9,641	9,734	9,780
April	8,760	8,440	8,807	8,560	9,120	9,195	9,308	9,921	10,305	10,245	10,230
May	10,182	10,222	10,507	10,466	10,881	10,903	10,918	11,711	12,124	11,873	11,904
June	10,477	10,991	10,948	10,955	11,226	11,277	11,641	12,058	12,555	12,576	12,540
July	9,796	10,384	9,893	10,323	10,581	10,498	10,710	11,250	11,765	11,765	11,625
August	9,004	9,402	8,695	9,192	9,545	9,515	9,681	10,279	10,766	10,571	10,360
September	8,160	8,258	8,049	8,071	8,445	8,394	8,761	9,240	9,498	9,255	9,380
October	7,835	7,702	8,090	7,735	8,073	7,945	8,389	8,836	8,903	8,711	9,072
November	7,185	7,003	7,322	6,981	7,396	7,433	7,731	8,200	8,172	7,980	8,417
December	7,154	7,206	7,404	7,297	7,570	7,689	7,961	8,466	8,473	8,277	8,705
Total	101,621	101,205	102,410	101,908	105,807	106,792	109,510	115,498	119,240	118,140	119,231

This table shows a total gain in United States milk from 106,000,000,000 pounds in 1939 to 119,000,000,000 pounds in 1944, or an increase of nearly twelve and one-half billion pounds, to be exact. It also shows that in 1942 more milk was produced without subsidy than was produced in 1944 with the subsidy.

There were other factors which influenced the relationship, because in 1942 the labor situation was not as tight, some backlogs of feeds were still available, and the producers had not had so many years of hard work and long hours behind them. The table also shows how difficult it was to increase the national milk production very materially in any one year. You will note that the greatest increase in milk production was 1941 over 1940, but even this increase was less than 6 percent. The increase in milk production from 1940 to 1945, with above-average weather conditions and with other incentives has been but 10 percent and there has not been much of any increase in production since the declaration of war. Since that time the dairy farms have had to exert every energy to maintain the production. Exceptionally favorable seasons for milk production have prevailed from 1940 to 1945. When one realizes that this production has a triple labor problem in that first the labor is required to raise the feed, and then this feed has to be changed into the form of milk, and then again labor must be considered which is required to process and transport the products, the total labor problem involved becomes apparent.

BUTTER PRODUCTION

Under normal times about 40 percent of the national milk production was diverted to the butter industry. While in 1930 over 121,000,000 pounds of farm butter were sold, this production of farm butter is rapidly declining, as by 1942 only 61,000,000 pounds of farm butter were sold.

Creamery butter: Production in factories, United States

[Thousands of pounds]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
1935	106,056	100,512	110,166	129,482	179,879	199,696	184,161	159,285	141,786	119,748	96,462	105,147	1,632,380
1936	110,666	108,744	121,543	133,290	177,847	190,699	156,463	141,556	133,021	135,493	111,535	108,550	1,629,407
1937	107,957	102,963	124,074	131,396	181,700	198,191	171,687	147,069	128,266	118,878	103,242	111,548	1,623,971
1938	116,122	112,340	128,735	147,628	197,259	202,528	185,099	168,688	151,081	136,999	116,841	122,852	1,786,172
1939	130,671	124,650	142,550	147,525	197,089	202,549	182,151	167,038	133,755	123,243	112,251	118,265	1,781,737
1940	129,558	128,143	140,730	153,628	195,332	206,555	187,687	167,704	146,247	136,812	117,783	126,647	1,836,826
1941	135,143	129,804	147,507	162,490	214,206	210,250	194,611	168,787	146,430	133,695	112,566	116,694	1,872,183
1942	119,685	116,963	134,976	147,857	200,313	202,159	187,494	168,210	138,300	124,770	106,548	116,779	1,764,054
1943	123,075	122,012	140,093	150,380	190,535	202,195	181,335	151,880	126,485	107,645	92,965	97,650	1,686,055
1944	104,051	105,843	124,833	130,760	171,467	177,625	153,722	130,230	113,354	100,332	85,897	87,880	1,486,399

This table shows that the production of creamery butter has decreased from 1,781,000,000 pounds in 1939 to 1,486,000,000 pounds in 1944, although national milk production increased by some 12,500,000,000 pounds during that period.

In other words, the national butter production has gone downward, while national milk production has increased. Some reasons why this butter production has not been maintained may be found on page A328 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

From the following table you will note the gradual reduction in the amount of farm butter produced in the United States:

Amount of farm butter produced in the United States, 1934–44

[1,000 pounds]

1934	558,649
1935	539,110
1936	501,900
1937	472,270
1938	453,990
1939	428,689
1940	402,690
1941	395,476
1942	366,370
1943 (preliminary)	340,360

A very small amount of farm butter is sold to individuals or to a market.

CHEESE

The following table shows the monthly production of American cheese from January 1, 1935, to January 1945:

Cheese, whole-milk American Cheddar: Production in factories, United States

[Thousands of pounds]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
1935	22,197	21,919	26,914	32,825	48,926	60,560	55,238	53,101	49,053	42,114	28,811	27,341	468,999
1936	28,881	26,211	30,804	35,324	53,008	64,145	51,029	45,228	44,933	45,629	33,088	29,296	487,576
1937	28,515	27,765	32,262	39,061	56,268	64,454	55,706	48,824	42,701	38,875	30,209	27,401	492,041
1938	30,535	30,670	38,884	48,469	70,263	74,363	65,881	55,682	44,277	43,069	30,173	28,276	560,542
1939	29,575	28,900	36,311	43,649	62,189	70,739	61,884	54,895	46,046	40,687	31,662	30,761	537,298
1940	32,280	33,945	41,704	48,996	67,702	77,343	68,321	59,776	53,460	47,923	36,073	35,267	602,790
1941	38,329	37,830	47,086	56,155	81,960	85,022	78,050	75,972	70,824	66,996	56,347	58,551	753,122
1942	62,292	63,939	78,049	91,670	119,919	112,734	96,419	85,243	67,523	56,492	41,851	40,719	916,850
1943 [1]	45,720	46,990	58,015	67,770	87,560	97,600	87,340	77,185	65,950	54,560	41,340	41,610	770,610
1944 [2]	43,160	45,766	58,219	68,340	94,712	103,125	88,155	74,340	65,797	59,672	48,795	47,800	799,780

[1] Estimates, subject to revision.
[2] Figures for January and February are from preliminary enumerations, subject to revision.

You will note at a glance that while in 1939 only 537,298,000 pounds of cheese—10 pounds of milk for 1 pound of cheese—or 5,372,000,000 pounds of milk were converted into American cheese, that by 1942 over 9,000,000,000 pounds, and in 1944, 7,997,000,000 pounds of milk were diverted to the manufacture of this product. You will also note that this diversion of milk to cheese production accounts for a portion of the increase in the national milk production or for from two to three and three-quarters billion pounds of the increase.

The War Food Administration has tried to curtail or freeze the national production of foreign cheeses, but has encouraged the increase in production of American cheese.

In addition to the above American or Cheddar cheese production, there is also to be considered the other types of cheese such as Limburger, Swiss, brick, Italian, and others usually designated as foreign types.

The foreign-type cheese production is as follows:

Other types of cheese production other than American

	Pounds
1935	151,732,000
1936	154,698,000
1937	156,784,000
1938	164,783,000
1939	171,229,000
1940	182,700,000
1941	203,039,000
1942	192,486,000
1943 (estimated)	228,205,000
1944 (estimated)	208,949,000

Percentage increase and decrease in foreign type cheese production:

Nineteen hundred and forty-four production represents a 38 percent increase over 1935 production, 35 percent increase over 1936, 33 percent increase over 1937, 27 percent increase over 1938, 22 percent increase over 1939, 14 percent increase over 1940, 3 percent increase over 1941, 9 percent increase over 1942, 8.4 percent decrease over 1943, 1944, base.

EVAPORATED MILK

The production of evaporated milk as shown by the following table has had an increased production from 2,170,000,000 pounds in 1939 to 3,434,000,000 pounds in 1944 or an increase of over 50 percent.

Production: Evaporated milk, case goods, unskimmed

[Thousands of pounds]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
1935	113,393	121,134	146,500	177,264	236,512	252,831	202,274	160,522	134,809	105,710	86,337	101,604	1,838,890
1936	117,253	113,951	148,174	178,657	235,361	254,858	200,279	181,209	184,136	186,141	129,736	114,004	2,043,759
1937	119,152	126,509	153,290	184,829	239,136	252,535	205,752	162,506	138,376	124,126	92,322	104,012	1,902,545
1938	127,302	131,765	171,440	203,249	285,673	278,601	227,443	185,808	151,122	125,000	102,056	114,739	2,104,198
1939	131,320	139,717	179,848	203,867	263,215	268,840	226,600	190,902	158,271	144,568	123,694	139,759	2,170,601
1940	158,212	171,125	201,286	225,606	273,824	293,173	259,114	229,696	197,991	171,881	134,192	148,568	2,464,668
1941	172,262	169,493	208,296	254,215	354,803	350,063	310,791	307,855	290,634	281,683	259,768	286,684	3,246,547
1942	314,920	304,804	340,999	361,154	445,605	397,567	314,349	270,024	221,679	203,114	165,956	178,333	3,518,504
1943 [1]	204,698	210,315	252,339	288,923	376,015	386,000	335,500	275,500	232,763	188,896	155,999	168,100	3,075,048
1944 [1]	191,031	208,992	266,621	313,508	413,364	412,500	358,000	312,000	275,000	245,000	210,850	227,189	3,434,055

[1] Estimated.

This product has a great war demand, as well as a strong domestic demand. You will note that a relatively large portion of the increase in the national milk production has been diverted to this good product. This increase in evaporated milk required about two and one-half billion pounds of the increase in the national milk production.

DRIED SKIM MILK FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Production of dried skim milk for human consumption for the period January 1, 1935, to January 1, 1945, is shown on the following table:

Production: Dried skim milk (for human consumption)

[Thousands of pounds]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
1935	11,854	11,795	15,232	17,272	22,723	24,100	17,570	16,889	15,364	13,015	9,902	11,805	187,531
1936	13,319	13,410	16,601	19,542	25,165	27,266	19,124	17,019	18,448	19,822	16,129	17,982	223,827
1937	18,495	15,790	19,671	22,211	28,848	29,611	24,442	19,635	17,646	16,049	13,731	18,382	244,511
1938	20,327	18,724	23,455	27,580	34,555	32,482	27,621	23,212	22,762	22,548	17,154	18,701	289,121
1939	20,108	18,401	22,502	24,048	30,666	31,489	24,360	20,260	18,848	18,013	18,041	21,124	267,860
1940	24,495	23,370	27,442	29,036	35,358	38,578	31,094	26,631	22,157	22,564	19,030	22,088	321,843
1941	25,714	25,715	31,142	34,449	43,781	41,780	31,953	29,293	27,016	25,253	22,816	27,543	366,455
1942	33,900	36,198	47,429	54,868	71,617	68,846	58,696	52,999	43,646	36,664	28,622	31,929	565,414
1943 [1]	27,459	28,234	39,366	44,443	57,294	64,027	54,000	42,399	33,171	23,832	17,459	23,020	454,704
1944 [1]	25,150	28,900	47,750	59,250	78,025	79,350	67,000	51,300	40,650	35,775	29,845	37,300	582,805

The war needs are shown in this production table. In order to obtain a complete picture regarding powdered skim milk, I wish to call your attention to the figures on the following table showing the production of powdered skim milk for animal feed:

Dry skim milk animal feed, production by months

[Thousand pounds]

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943 [1]	1944 [2]
January	11,011	10,931	9,800	4,462	1,984	1,190
February	10,445	11,148	9,349	4,683	1,602	850
March	12,844	14,987	12,331	6,199	2,500	1,050
April	14,943	17,776	13,774	6,939	2,712	1,425
May	18,929	20,585	15,835	8,158	3,301	3,175
June	17,316	19,664	14,363	7,567	3,504	2,550
July	12,543	13,705	9,824	6,359	2,758	2,400
August	8,799	11,935	7,620	5,396	1,881	1,800
September	8,660	10,685	5,987	3,625	1,472	1,350
October	7,947	10,556	3,930	3,072	1,063	1,075
November	7,126	8,462	3,500	2,387	790	850
December	9,957	9,528	3,729	2,301	879	775
Total	140,520	159,962	110,042	61,148	24,446	18,490

[1] Preliminary figures.
[2] Estimated.

You will note that while powdered skim milk production for human consumption has more than doubled between 1939 and 1944, the production of powdered skim milk for animal feed has been reduced from 140,000,000 pounds in 1939 to only 18,000,000 pounds in 1944. This was a most desirable diversion and the product powdered skim milk for human consumption, with a 35 percent protein content, has had increasing appreciation during the war. You will note that about one-half of the increase in powdered skim milk for human consumption resulted in the shift from the powdered skim formerly used as animal feed.

If 100 pounds of fluid milk is converted into 5 pounds of butter and 8 pounds of powdered skim, or if the 100 pounds of milk is converted into 10 pounds of cheese, or if the 100 pounds of milk is converted into 50 cans of evaporated milk, or if the 100 pounds of milk is converted into 13 pounds of powdered whole milk, or if the 100 pounds of milk is consumed as fluid milk about the same amount of human food is obtained.

POWDERED WHOLE MILK

The national production of this product has expanded during the war. However, the percentage of the national milk production being converted into powdered whole milk was only seventeen one-hundredths of 1 percent in 1939, and was only eighty-nine one-hundredths of 1 percent in 1943. While the production of this product may have been further increased in 1944, the amount is in reality only a very small portion of the national milk production. Many people are looking to a further rapid expansion in the markets for this product, and time alone will tell the importance of the product in the dairy markets of the country or of the world.

BEEF PRODUCTS DERIVED FROM DAIRY INDUSTRY

Seldom does it appear that we realize the importance of the dairy business to the beef supply of the Nation. In the War Food Administration 1945 goal book we find the following:

Cattle and calves: Suggested number on farms Jan. 1, 1945, and 1946, imports, calf crop, and slaughter, with comparisons

[In million head]

	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
Milk animals on farms Jan. 1:							
Cows 2 years old and over	24.9	25.5	26.4	27.1	27.6	28.2	28.2
Heifers 1–2 years	5.5	5.7	5.8	6.0	6.2	6.2	5.8
Heifer calves	6.0	6.2	6.6	6.9	7.0	6.2	6.2
Total milk stock	36.4	37.4	38.8	40.0	40.8	40.6	40.2
Other cattle on farms Jan. 1:							
Cows 2 years old and over	10.6	11.2	12.1	12.9	13.7	13.2	12.0
Heifers 1–2 years	3.4	3.8	4.0	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.0
Steers 1 year and over	5.3	5.9	6.4	6.9	7.5	7.8	7.0
Bulls 1 year and over	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.7
Other calves	10.9	11.5	12.2	13.1	13.5	11.8	11.8
Total other cattle (beef)	31.8	34.1	36.4	39.1	41.3	39.2	36.5
Grand total all cattle	68.2	71.5	75.2	79.1	82.2	79.8	76.7
Calf crop	29.8	31.1	32.9	33.1	34.2	34.4	33.8
Imports of cattle and calves	.6	.7	.7	.6	.3	.5	.5
Into sight	30.4	31.8	33.6	33.7	34.5	34.9	34.3
Total supply cattle and calves	98.6	103.3	108.8	112.8	116.7	114.7	111.0

Cattle and calves: Suggested number on farms, Jan. 1, 1945, and 1946, imports, calf crop, and slaughter, with comparisons—Continued

[In million head]

	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
Disappearance:							
Slaughter:							
Cattle:							
Federally inspected	9.8	10.9	12.3	11.7	14.0	-------	-------
Noninspected	5.2	5.5	5.7	6.0	5.7	-------	-------
Total	15.0	16.4	18.0	17.7	19.7	20.6	19.5
Calves:							
Federally inspected	5.4	5.5	5.8	5.2	7.7	-------	-------
Noninspected	3.7	3.8	3.9	4.7	6.5	-------	-------
Total	9.1	9.3	9.7	9.9	14.2	14.4	12.5
Total slaughter	24.1	25.7	27.7	27.6	33.9	35.0	32.0
Other disappearance	3.0	2.4	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Total disappearance	27.1	28.1	29.7	30.6	36.9	38.0	35.0
Number end of year	71.5	75.2	79.1	82.2	79.8	76.7	76.0
Change from previous year	+3.3	+3.7	+3.9	+3.1	−2.4	−3.1	−.7

Note the increase in slaughtering of cattle from 15,000,000 in 1940 to 20,000,000 in 1944, and the calf slaughtering increase from 9,000,000 in 1940, to 14,000,000 in 1944. If dairy cattle numbers are maintained and the total cattle numbers reduced we will apparently be eating part of the stock pile. The future will determine whether this is a desirable or an undesirable policy to follow.

You will note that the grand total of cattle increased from 68,200,000 on January 1, 1940, to 79,800,000 on January 1, 1945. You will also note that in 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1943 the numbers increased some 3 percent a year, but in 1944 there was a decrease of over 2 percent and an expected decrease of 3 percent in 1945 with the hope of maintenance of supply in 1946.

The meat supply may not be in keeping with the numbers sold as they may be shipped to market at lighter weights.

The main point I wish to call to your attention is that in 1940 there were 36,400,000 of dairy cattle, and 31,000,000 of other cattle, and on January 1, 1945, there was an estimated 40,000,000 dairy cattle and an estimated 39,000,000 other cattle on the farms of the United States. You will note that it is expected there will be a maintenance of dairy cattle numbers in 1945 but only time can tell.

You will also note that there is a hoped for or anticipated reduction in other cattle numbers of some 2,700,000 head in 1945, so that on January 1, 1946, we will have 36,500,000 of nondairy cattle in comparison to 39,200,000 on January 1, 1945, and 41,300,000 on January 1, 1944.

It is usually estimated that the dairy industry furnishes some 40 percent of the beef supply of the Nation. When the importance of the dairy industry is considered in connection with the national farm income, the dairy industry should also be credited with the beef and veal production. Instead, the dairy industry is credited with only 20 percent of the national farm income and that applies to milk production only.

The above facts show the importance of this industry—the greatest agricultural industry of our country.

The more I study these production figures, the greater is my respect and admiration for the men, yes, and the women and children, that have made this production possible. If the women and children were eliminated from the dairy production picture, the dairy production would be very drastically reduced.

When one realizes that 100 pounds of grain fed to dairy cows produces four times as much human food as when fed to some other farm animals, and twice as much human food as would be obtained from feeding it to any farm animal, the efficiency of the dairy cow, the "foster mother of the human race" can really be appreciated.

The dairy cow uses untold numbers of acres of land as pasture which could not be utilized to advantage for other classes of livestock. This feed is converted into one of the greatest foods known to man. As once stated by Thomas A. Edison:

> The Almighty knew His business when He apportioned milk. He is the best chemist we have. I am an experimenter and I have tried many diets, but I've always come back to milk. It has done more for my health than anything else.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HAYS, for 10 days, on account of necessary absence from the city.

To Mr. CURTIS, for the week of February 19, on account of illness in family and official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Monday, February 19, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue the hearing on H. R. 97, to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (with respect to certain patent matters). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee Room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 20, 1945, to begin public hearings on H. R. 693—a bill to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday, February 22, 1945.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on S. 63 and H. R. 1648, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the postwar ship-disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

216. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to fix the salary of the Director of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

217. A letter from the rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life into the United States Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve during the period December 1, 1944, to January 31, 1945, inclusive, who have not had prior commissioned military service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

218. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the ninth annual report of the National Labor Relations Board and supplementary data, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Labor.

219. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting copies of letters addressed to the heads of the agencies listed below which establish limitations on the amounts which may be expended for travel from sums set apart in appropriations to these agencies for special projects; Selective Service System, War Production Board; to the Committee on Appropriations.

220. A letter from the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner, transmitting the report of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, for the third and fourth quarters of the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

221. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft in the State of South Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2228. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Medal of Honor to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 2229. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2230. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2231 (by request). A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2232. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, nationality, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 2233. A bill to prohibit the prosecution of any claim against the United States or against any Government corporation by any employee or by certain ex-employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 2234. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to States, political subdivisions of States, and municipalities for developing and maintaining dental health plans consisting of effective measures for dental health education; effective measures for the prevention, treatment, and control of dental diseases; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 2235. A bill to increase the Federal contribution to States for old-age assistance by amending section 3 of the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2236. A bill to amend Public Law No. 361, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 20, 1941; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2237. A bill to provide a temporary exemption from customs duty for screenings, scalpings, chaff, and scourings of certain grains and seeds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2238. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 29, 1935," approved June 24, 1937, known as the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2239. A bill to simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transferring assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterans to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2240. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to reaffirm the necessity of the Tydings amendment in our war effort, and creating a congressional committee to investigate the necessity of agricultural deferments; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take certain steps relative to production of and placing price ceiling control on all dairy products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant and to extend deferment to farm laborers under the Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2241. A bill for the relief of Florence Zimmerman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 2242. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lessie L. Bryant and Miss Jimmie Alexander; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2243. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Guarino; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2244. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Thurber; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2245. A bill for the relief of Sven Oltedale; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2246. A bill for the relief of Joseph O. Mello and Antonio Mello as next of kin of Michael O. Mello; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2247. A bill for the relief of Christian O. Mello; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2248. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Alarie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2249. A bill for the relief of the Cape & Vineyard Electric Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2250. A bill for the relief of Mildred E. Waldron; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 2251. A bill for the relief of Catherine V. Sweeney; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

85. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, October 14–16, 1944, urging and supporting the submission of an amendment to the United States Federal Constitution which shall have for its purpose the abolishing of the requirement that treaties must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate and substitute therefor ratification by a majority vote of Members present in both Houses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

86. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Home Owners of Illinois, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their request to permit a 20 percent increase in rentals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of hope, through dust of conflict and through battle flame we turn to Thy ever-waiting presence, where beyond these voices of tumult there is peace. The havoc which has wrecked the earth reveals to us the ghastly outcome when man forsakes Thy light of truth and defies Thy law of love. We thank Thee for a vision of a new earth, the glory of whose coming has been heralded by the prophets of old, who saw the sun-touched mountain peaks and declared that the peoples who sit in darkness shall see a great light and be bathed

in its effulgence. We rejoice in the reborn hopes with which the awakening world is thrilling, for the rainbows that this day are seen through the tears as the devices of the wicked are broken and his arrogant might ground into the dust of defeat.

Grant that our dear land may play its full part in the fulfillment for all men of the radiant hues of that bow of promise now arching the stricken earth. Grant to our generation the wisdom to plan and the power to achieve an order which shall protect all nations from fear and want, in a leagued commonwealth in which Thy good gifts shall be more fairly shared; where no more shall nation lift up sword against nation; where each people shall enrich the world with the gifts of its excellence. Stir us with the creative faith that no desire or design of ours can be too great and too good for Thee to fulfill. Wilt Thou answer our petitions according to Thy will, in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government.

GREETINGS FROM THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF COSTA RICA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate for publication in the RECORD a translation of letter from the President of the Republic of Costa Rica delivered today by the Vice President of Costa Rica. The letter will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The letter from the President of Costa Rica is as follows:

[Translation]

THE DIRECTORS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONGRESS OF THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA

Whereas it is of fundamental importance for the ideal of the unity of America to strengthen the bonds between the nations of the Continent, especially today when a common destiny finds us in close embrace fighting for the triumph of liberty and justice;

Whereas Deputy Licenciado don Francisco Fonseca Chamier, Vice President of this chamber, is about to depart for Mexico and the United States of America:

Be it resolved, To confer upon the deputy, Vice President of the Congress, Licenciado don Francisco Fonseca Chamier, the authority of the Constitutional Congress of the Republic of Costa Rica to present to the Houses of the Republics of Mexico and the United States of America the cordial greetings of his Costa Rican colleagues.

Done in the city of San Jose, capital of the Republic of Costa Rica, on the 23d day of January 1945.

JOSÉ ALBER TAZI AVENDAÑO,
President.
ABEL MORA, *First Secretary.*
JULIO MUNOZ, *Second Secretary.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENT FROM GENERAL MACARTHUR OF RESOLUTION OF THANKS ADOPTED BY THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter embodying acknowledgment by General MacArthur of the resolution adopted by the Senate expressing its thanks to him and the men under his command, which will be read.

The letter was read by the Chief Clerk and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1945.

Hon. LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIFFLE: General MacArthur has asked that the following message from him be delivered to you:

"Please express to the Senate my most respectful thanks for its generous Resolution No. 75. This great legislative body, always so noble in its leadership, has inspired all ranks of the command by its splendid tribute."

As the representative of the War Department it gives me great pleasure to transmit this message to you.

Sincerely yours,
MILES REBER,
Brigadier General, G. S. C.,
Deputy Chief,
Legislative and Liaison Division.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR GLASS AS PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE—RESOLUTION BY DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the recent Democratic conference at which the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] announced his desire not to be reelected as President pro tempore of the Senate a resolution was unanimously adopted by the conference with reference to the retirement of the Senator from Virginia as President pro tempore of the Senate and his distinguished services here and elsewhere. I ask unanimous consent that that resolution may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Honorable CARTER GLASS, senior Senator from Virginia, has for a number of years served as the honored President pro tempore of the United States Senate; and

Whereas in addition to his long and distinguished service to his country as a Member of the House of Representatives, as Secretary of the Treasury, and as United States Senator, he has served with distinction in the position of President pro tempore of the Senate; and

Whereas Senator GLASS expressed his desire not to be considered for reelection as President pro tempore during the Seventy-ninth Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Democratic conference of the Members of the Senate, That we express to Senator GLASS our profound appreciation of the loyal and distinguished service he has rendered to his country in all the capacities in which he has served, and that we especially express our deep appreciation of the efficiency and courtesy with which he performed the duties of the high office of President pro tempore of the Senate during the years of his service in that capacity, and express our regret at his voluntary retirement from this position;

Resolved further, That the Democratic conference express to Senator GLASS its sincere wish for his speedy and complete recovery to the vigor of health and strength.

This resolution is unanimously adopted by the Conference.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Chairman, Conference of the Majority.

HEARING ON NOMINATION OF NATHAN R. MARGOLD TO BE JUDGE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I gave notice about a week ago that on the 23d of this month we would hold a hearing in the Committee on the Judiciary on the nomination of Nathan R. Margold to be a judge of the Federal court in this district. Due to the request of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], we have deferred the hearing, and it will be held on February 27.

REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of Congress with reference to regulation of the business of insurance.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WALSH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2; and agree to the same.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
JAMES W. MOTT,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts for the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the conference report merely eliminates the Senate amendment which included an authorization for some housing in connection with certain naval activities. The House of Representatives objected to the authorization for housing, and the Navy Department agreed to eliminate the provision, and it has now been eliminated. That is all that is involved in the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CHESLEY BRAZIL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Chesley Brazil (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

SALARY OF DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix the salary of the Director of the Bureau of Mines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

ADJUSTMENT OF DEETS OF INDIVIDUAL INDIANS, INDIAN ASSOCIATIONS, OR INDIAN TRIBES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the American Association of Airport Executives, favoring the enactment of legislation to set in motion a Nation-wide airport construction and improvement program embracing Federal, State, and municipal governments, and offering to the Congress the advice and counsel of the officers, board of directors, and members of the association; to the Committee on Commerce.

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the honorable the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist," the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in the seventeenth regular session assembled, does most respectfully submit that:

"Whereas this legislature now convened is facing the task of devising ways and means of safeguarding the Territory's population and welfare during the present conflict and of planning for a broader economic development that will insure a sound future for our own returning veterans and thousands of others in the armed forces and large numbers of civilians, all of whom are looking forward to a home in the northern frontier; and

"Whereas the President of the United States and the Secretary of State are proclaiming the 'four freedoms' and the Atlantic Charter and are supporting the right of small nations and minorities to choose their own government and to have control of their own destinies and have pledged the resources and life blood of the Nation to that end; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, while publicly voicing a desire to aid and assist in populating the Territory and developing its resources, has notwithstanding followed a persistent course to the contrary and, through questionable interpretation of his powers, has withdrawn vast areas of land and water from the public domain and prohibited their use and development by the people, and has continued and accentuated his policy during the present war under the guise of national emergency and has created a condition of confusion and uncertainty among the people; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has exercised his vast bureaucratic powers to the point where the principles of democratic government are evaded in fact if not in intent, in direct conflict with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the 'four freedoms'; and

"Whereas the resources of Alaska are generally controlled by a single man, and the existence of such an undemocratic condition prevents our planning for the logical development of our great Territory; and

"Whereas the Department of the Interior, at the direction of its Secretary, is now proposing to establish huge reservations in southeastern Alaska, covering both land and water, and such reservations, if created, will operate to withdraw from development and use in the normal and customary manner, most of the resources of that section, consisting, among other things, of 78,500,000,000 board feet of timber with a possible yearly cut in perpetuity of 1,000,000,000 board feet; undeveloped water-power resources totaling 800,000 horsepower, or sufficient to meet the needs of a population of over 200,000 people; and

"Whereas the areas of southeastern Alaska located within the reservation actually proposed and described by notices published in the Federal Register, produce an average of 704,000 cases of canned salmon, consisting of 48 1-pound cans per case, annually, besides millions of pounds of halibut, king salmon, and other species of commercial fish; and

"Whereas the annual production of canned salmon and other commercial fishery products in the other and greater areas of southeastern Alaska where reservations have been requested but not yet approved, or the boundaries definitely described are beyond accurate calculation, but will total more than 2,000,000 cases per year of canned salmon alone:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in seventeeth regular session assembled, respectfully petitions that the Congress of the United States immediately investigate the policies of the Secretary of the Interior to the end that relief may be granted the people from the ever-growing burden resulting from such policies.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, January 26, 1945."

RESOLUTIONS OF ARKANSAS LEGISLATURE—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TAXES ON INCOME, GIFTS, AND INHERITANCES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two house concurrent resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Arkansas, in which Congress is memorialized not to amend the Constitution relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances.

The resolutions presented by Mr. McCLELLAN were referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Whereas Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10, by Senator Abington, was adopted by the fifty-fourth general assembly; and

Whereas the purport of this resolution was misunderstood by various members of the house and senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the adoption of the Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10 by the fifty-fourth general assembly be, and is hereby, rescinded by the fifty-fifth general assembly.

BEN LANEY, *Governor*.

Approved February 14, 1945.

House Concurrent Resolution 4

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to amend said Constitution relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances by providing for a limitation of taxes thereon to 25 percent; and

Whereas the people of the State of Arkansas are opposed to such amendment to the Constitution of the United States being passed at this time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized and petitioned to defeat the efforts now being made to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the effort to submit a proposed amendment which would limit the maximum rate of gift, income, and estate taxes to 25 percent; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Arkansas be, and he is hereby, directed to forward a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Arkansas Member thereof.

BEN LANEY.
EMORY A. THOMPSON.

FEBRUARY 14, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate concurrent resolutions identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

MEMORIAL OF THE SENATE OF ARIZONA—PRICE PLAN FOR COPPER, LEAD, AND ZINC

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I present a memorial from the Arizona State Senate requesting the continuation of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc. This memorial is in support of Senate bill 502, which was introduced by me and several of my colleagues.

The memorial presented by Mr. McFARLAND was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Memorial 1

A memorial requesting continuation of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc

To the Congress of the United States and the War Production Board:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

In the interest of the prosecution of the war, the Congress enacted and the War Production Board carried into effect what is known as the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc.

The premium-price plan was designed, not to afford a profit to producers, but to bring out more of these essential metals than the low-ceiling prices could provide—to encourage overquota production involving careful planning, capital investment, and increased production costs which can only be liquidated over a long period.

Hundreds of producers, large and small, have done and are doing their part to carry out the program.

Announcement has been made that the premium-price plan will be closed as of July 31, 1945, and as to certain classes of premiums prior to that date, on 30 days' notice.

This action, if carried out, will work a very great and unjustified hardship upon a large number of producers, and especially small mine operators, who have made investments and incurred obligations in compliance with the Government's wishes, which have by no means been liquidated, and which were assumed and undertaken with the understanding that the duration of premium prices was guaranteed until the national emergency ends.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

1. That the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc, including all classes of premiums, be continued to June 30, 1946, and that no provision be made for the cancelation of any class of premiums during the intervening period except in cases necessitating individual operating corrections.

2. That the Congress appropriate sufficient funds for carrying out the existing plan until such date.

Adopted by the senate February 5, 1945.

Approved by the Governor February 7, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF TRANSPORTATION OF LIQUOR DURING THE WAR—PETITION FROM KANSAS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from Rev. C. M. Nutter, pastor of the Methodist Church of Lincoln, Kans., together with a petition which is signed by 38 citizens of Lincoln, Kans. I ask that the letter and petition be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and petition, without all the signatures attached, were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1945.

A good many of us here are exercised concerning our manpower problem, especially as it relates to the farm and production of food. We see the liquor business as a waste of manpower from several angles, as a waste of vital products.

We know that the liquor interests have a strangle hold on our Government but we register this protest nevertheless.

This form was prepared by the chairman of our conference board of temperance, and these signatures were received on Sunday morning, February 11, by passing it among the congregation during service.

To the Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,
War Mobilization Director,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned parents and friends of sons in the armed services, commend your action stopping dog and horse racing as an aid to the war effort by conserving transportation and manpower.

We endorse your suggestion to restrict all large conventions to relieve overcrowded railroads by reducing travel, and dim-out of electric advertising to save coal.

We observe the President's request for universal manpower control by law and also his order to General Hershey to draft farm labor.

Through working long hours the farm industry is now dangerously understaffed—farm foods, meats, canned goods, sugar, etc., cannot now be bought freely. Shoes, cotton goods, lumber, hardware, farm implements, and other elemental necessities are also scarce. However, it is possible to buy beer and liquor at all hours without restriction. Railroads and farm producers have to date done a magnificent job but face the possibility of a break-down.

We therefore, in behalf of our men under arms, respectfully petition to aid the manpower shortage, to relieve overburdened carriers, to help our understaffed farms, that you immediately order all beverage liquor transportation stopped, just as you have racing and other nonessentials to the war effort.

C. M. NUTTER.
B. G. HALL.
MRS. B. G. HALL.
MRS. PEARL CASE
(And sundry other citizens of Lincoln, Kans.).

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MEETING OF ITALIAN CENTER, STAMFORD, CONN.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution unanimously adopted by more than 400 persons attending a meeting of the Italian Center at Stamford, Conn.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas reports from Italy, both private and official, indicate that the Italian people in the liberated provinces are in immediate need of aid to alleviate the disastrous conditions arising out of the war; and

Whereas citizens of Italian extraction in this country are deeply concerned not only with the plight of their immediate relatives but with the country as a whole and its destiny in the democratic family of nations.

Be it resolved by the Italian-American community of Stamford assembled in annual meeting at the Italian Center, That it call upon its representatives in Congress to urge:

(a) Immediate and effective relief through U. N. R. R. A. and other Government agencies in the way of food, clothing, medicines, and other essentials of life.

(b) Recognition of the Italian people in the liberated areas and their government as Allies of the United Nations in the struggle against the common enemy and for the establishment of a just peace following the military victory in Europe and in the Pacific.

HENRY A. COSTANZO,
Chairman, Italian Center Board of Governors.

RESOLUTIONS BY COOPERATIVE CREAMERIES IN NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present a letter from th manager of the Tekamah Cooperative Creamery Co., of Tekamah, Nebr., together with a resolution adopted by 1,108 members of that company at their annual meeting held January 27, 1945; also a letter embodying a resolution from the executive secretary of the Nebraska Cooperative Creameries, Inc. I ask that the letters together with the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letters and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEKAMAH COOPERATIVE CREAMERY CO.,
Tekamah, Nebr., January 29, 1945.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the annual meeting of our 1,108 shareholders held January 27, 1945, the enclosed resolution was adopted. Your support of this resolution would not only help to relieve the shortage of butter but would be beneficial to the Nebraska dairy farmer now and in post-war.

Unless something is done to increase the butterfat price to a more equitable base as to grain and livestock the butter shortage will be more acute in 1945. The milk and cream check of Nebraska farmers in 1944 was over $55,000,000. Our State ranks fourth in the production of butter; therefore, our farmers would be benefited more by encouraging butterfat production for butter. Forty percent of the Nation's milk is used for making butter.

Thanking you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

K. N. NELSON, *Manager.*

On motion duly made and passed, we the members of the Tekamah Cooperative Creamery Co. in their usual meeting assembled, endorse the action of the butter industry committee in their recommendation to the War Food Administration, to increase butter production.

1. That the feed subsidy payment for the butterfat be increased to one-fourth that paid for milk, or 15 cents.

2. That the price of butter be increased 6 cents per pound—from 41 cents to 47 cents per pound.

3. That limitation be placed on bulk 40 percent and plastic cream, that butterfat from this source may be diverted to butter. We most urgently request that these recommendations be promptly adopted and incorporated into W. F. A. orders that producers of butterfat will be encouraged to produce butterfat for butter, that the American people may have sufficient supply to meet their needs.

In our creamery territory, as in all Nebraska and neighboring States, particularly to the north, south, and west, facilities are not available for conversion to whole milk. Also, distance between farms, condition of roads, and transportation preclude conversion. Producers with present labor supply and value of grain and livestock have reduced butterfat production. Only when butterfat production is on a par with milk and the price of butter increased, will there be

an incentive to encourage production for butter use.

TEKAMAH COOPERATIVE CREAMERY CO.,
K. N. NELSON, *Manager.*

NEBRASKA COOPERATIVE CREAMERIES, INC.,
Omaha, Nebr., January 29, 1945.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting held January 24 in Chicago by a joint committee representing the three national creamery associations; namely the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, National Creameries Association, and the American Butter Institute, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved,* That the butter industry urgently requests immediate action by governmental food production and pricing agencies to relieve the present alarming butter supply crisis:

"1. By increasing the base prices of butter as set forth in RMPR 289 by 6 cents per pound; and, by adjusting the production payment subsidy paid for butterfat sold as cream so that this payment per pound of butterfat is at least equal to one-fourth of the production payment paid for 100 pounds of whole milk.

"2. Furthermore, by extending limitation orders to cover all sales of cream."

This resolution has been sent to the following: James F. Byrnes, Director, W. M. R.; Fred M. Vinson, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization; Lt. Col. Ralph W. Olmstead, Director, Office of Supplies, W. F. A.; M. L. Brenner, Deputy Director, Office of Supplies; Marvin Jones, Administrator of W. F. A.; Chester Bowles, Administrator of O. P. A.; T. G. Stitts, chief of the Dairy and Poultry Branch, W. F. A.; C. H. C. Beakes, chief, Dairy and Poultry Price Branch, O. P. A.

On January 25, 1945, the executive committee of the Nebraska Cooperative Creameries, Inc., had a meeting and discussed the action by the joint committee and concurred 100 percent with their action. It was requested that the action of the joint committee and our executive committee be transmitted to you as it is the intention of the joint committee that, if no action is taken by the various bureaus in charge, the matter will be carried directly to Congress. It is a matter of life and death to the butter industry and it is action that will certainly increase the supply of butter that is so vitally needed today.

The 6 cents per pound increase in price is asked because the increased cost of production has made it impossible for farmers to produce butterfat for butter making. The change in the feed-subsidy payment that would increase the butterfat payment to one-fourth of the total production payment based on whole milk would increase the subsidy rate on butterfat on the present basis of payment from 10 cents per pound to 15 cents per pound in our area as the present rate is 10 cents per pound butterfat and 60 cents per hundred pounds of milk. This latter action is recommended because at the present time the price relationship between butter and other dairy products is positively detrimental to the production of milk for butter making.

The second part of the resolution asking for limitation orders is also very necessary. There are, at present, millions of pounds of butterfat sold in whole cream used to prepare various spread concoctions covered neither by price ceilings or limitation orders. It appears, also, that eating establishments are using heavy cream in preparation of meals which also is cutting the production of butter.

It is in the hands of O. P. A. and W. F. A. to act on these matters. Their continued policy of absolutely ignoring this matter so vital to the butter industry and to the entire dairy industry is reason enough for the industry to go directly to Congress.

Yours very truly,
G. J. ZIMMERMAN,
Executive Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 35. Resolution to investigate certain activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 53), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 562. A bill for the relief of Klau-Van Pietersom-Dunlap Associates, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 563. A bill declaring to be citizens of the United States certain spouses of United States citizens serving honorably in the armed forces during the Second World War; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 564. A bill to provide for renewal of national service life insurance policies at the expiration of the term for which issued; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 565. A bill to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 566. A bill relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 567. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Freda Gullikson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 568. A bill for the relief of John M. Grady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 569. A bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Heuther Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 571. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide for the issuance of annuity bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 572. A bill relating to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 573. A bill for the relief of Lee D. Hoseley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 574. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.," approved June 13, 1934; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 575. A bill to provide promotion of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served during the War with Spain or World War No. 1; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 576. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 577. A bill for the relief of William F. Van Stienburg; and

S. 578. A bill for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 579. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arreas, also known as Joseph Arraes; and

S. 580. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 581. A bill to confer to certain persons who served in a civilian capacity under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 582. A bill to amend sections 4 and 313 of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, with respect to disposition and removal of housing; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 583. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 584. A bill to prohibit the severance of service connection by the Veterans' Administration except in case of fraud; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 585. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pool of farm machinery for release to returning veterans who desire to engage in farming operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 586. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen, review, and readjudicate the case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States No. 34450; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 587. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1940 providing for the recording and releasing of liens on automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 588. A bill granting an increase of pension to Earl W. Newlon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 589. A bill to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to receiving of stolen public property; and

S. 590. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to permit eviction proceedings brought thereunder to be instituted in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition of the property known as Temple Heights to be used for the duration of the war as a recreation center for Government employees and immediately thereafter as a site for a memorial building in commemoration of the deeds and sacrifices of the defenders of the Union during the Civil War where the relics and records of all Union veterans of the Civil War may be preserved for posterity; and dedicated by them as their memorial to the American youth of today who have sacrificed their lives on the battlefields of the world; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. CAPPER also introduced Senate Joint Resolution 36, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

PRESENTATION OF GOLD MEDAL TO DR. JAMES EDWARD WEST

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, authorizing the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, a gold medal to Dr. James Edward West, Chief Scout of the Boy Scouts of America, in recognition of his services to the youth of the Nation.

Dr. West served as Chief Scout Executive of the Boy Scouts of America for more than 30 years. He initiated many movements for youth which are now accepted practices. For example, in his native city of Washington, D. C., he established the first juvenile court and the first playground for children. In the Nation he was a leader in the movement which launched a campaign to place orphaned children in childless homes. His deep-seated interest in children caused him to take a leading part in the cottage system of caring for orphaned children. Dr. West served as chairman of the first White House conference for children which was begun under President Theodore Roosevelt. Dr. West has served in the same capacity in each of the decennial White House conferences for children since that date. His further activities in this particular field included the development of a balanced reading program for children and the initiation of the first Children's Book Week. Dr. West's leadership has affected the lives of nearly 11,000,000 Americans and the Scout movement has grown from a few scattered troops to a great national agency.

Dr. West is an author, an editor, a public speaker, and is actively identified with many agencies for youth. His honors include the Silver Buffalo of the Boy Scouts of America for distinguished service to boyhood and the Silver Wolf from the British Boy Scouts Association; the Silver Carabao from the Philippine Scout Association; and the highest award from the Belgian Boy Scouts; Cross of Honor, United States Flag Association; Gold Medal of Honor, National Institute of Social Sciences; medal for outstanding service to children, Parents' Magazine; Gold Medal, Veterans of Foreign Wars; LL. B., Kalamazoo; M. H. Springfield College; LL. D., Hamilton College.

On Dr. West's sixty-fifth birthday anniversary, May 16, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, honorary president of the Boy Scouts of America, of which he has been an active leader for many years, paid Dr. West this tribute:

During these perilous times I am more conscious than ever of the patriotism of our Boy Scouts and the strength of their leadership. To you belongs much of the credit for the effectiveness of Scouting in this country. I desire, therefore, to take this means, on your birthday, and on your thirtieth anniversary as Chief Scout Executive, to tell you how much we appreciate your accomplishments in behalf of American boyhood.

Your service to Scouting over the years emphasizes the effectiveness of the American way of providing equal opportunity to youth. You have, through your work, rendered your country great service.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to James Edward West, chief scout of the Boy Scouts of America, in recognition of his services to the youth of the Nation.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WHEELER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place under the caption "Education" in the appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs insert a new paragraph as follows:

"For tuition and for care and other assistance for Indian pupils of less than one-quarter Indian blood, attending public school at Dodson, Mont., whose parents reside on nontaxable Indian land, $1,600."

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—PROPOSED CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 555

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution providing for the discharge of the Committee on Commerce from the further consideration of Senate bill 555, the Missouri Valley Authority bill, and its reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution (S. Res. 78) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 555) to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of recreational possibilities, the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at this time I wish to serve notice that I intend to call this resolution up for consideration on Thursday, next, when the next session of the Senate will be held, I understand.

• The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

INVESTIGATION OF TREATMENT BY THE JAPANESE OF PRISONERS AND CIVILIANS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. WILSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 79), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to take testimony from civilians and military and naval personnel returning to the United States from the Philippine Islands, for the purpose of making a full and complete record concerning the treatment accorded by the Japanese in the Philippine area to persons captured by them and to the population of the Philippines. The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time, with such recommendations as it deems appropriate.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF A SELECTIVE SERVICE ORDER ON THE PRODUCTION OF FOOD AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 80), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Whereas the production of food and other agricultural products is essential to the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the provisions of the directive issued on January 3, 1945, by the Director of Selective Service, insofar as it relates to the induction into the armed forces of agricultural workers, threatens seriously to disrupt and impair agricultural production: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service is hereby requested (a) to issue a directive to local selective-service boards for the purpose of clarifying his directive of January 3, 1945, insofar as it relates to the induction into the armed forces of persons engaged in agricultural work, (b) in the administration of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to comply with the spirit as well as the letter of the provisions of section 5 (k) thereof, commonly referred to as the Tydings amendment, and (c) to review the status of all deferred Federal employees with a view to making the greatest possible number of such persons available to the armed forces.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation with a view to ascertaining the effects of such

directive of January 3, 1945, upon the production of food and other agricultural products essential to the successful prosecution of the war, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ANNIE MADEOY

Mr. BILBO submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 81), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the financial clerk of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Annie Madeoy, widow of Jack Madeoy, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AWARD OF THE DODECANESE ISLANDS TO GREECE

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 82), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that northern Epirus (including Corytsa) and the 12 islands of the Aegean Sea, known as the Dodecanese Islands, where a strong Greek population predominates, should be awarded by the peace conference to Greece and become incorporated in the territory of Greece.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE BILL 340 DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this morning conferees were appointed on Senate bill 340, to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, and the House has agreed to a conference. In all probability, the House will appoint conferees this afternoon. The conference will take place perhaps during the recess of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the Senate may file their report with the Secretary during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE ITALIAN ARMISTICE TERMS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion, both in this country and elsewhere, relative to the so-called Italian armistice terms. Because a long time has elapsed since they were agreed upon, and there have appeared in publications in neutral nations the purported armistice terms accorded the Italian Government, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, an article which appeared in the International Law Review, which is an outstanding legal journal of Geneva, Switzerland, edited and published by Dr. Antoine Sottile, former consul, and permanent delegate to the League of Nations, and himself an outstanding legal authority. I ask that the copy as printed be published, together with a free translation into English from the original.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, Mr. President. I wish to reserve the right to object, whether I do object or not. I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire concerning the authenticity of this document, how he happens to get it, and whether it has been released by any of the governments.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know whether it is authentic or not, let me say to the majority leader, but I have a photostatic copy of a page from the International Law Review, published in Switzerland, and I am asking that it be printed for what it may be worth, with the thought in mind that we should know, after all this time has elapsed, whether it is accurate or inaccurate.

Mr. BARKLEY. We do not know now, and will not know after it is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BRIDGES. This at least shows what other countries have access to.

Mr. BARKLEY. They do not know whether the document is accurate, if it is not official. It has not been given out officially. The mere fact that it is printed in a law journal, even though it be an international law journal, does not indicate its accuracy. I do not know whether it is accurate. I should like to ascertain, if there is any way to do so, whether this publication, purporting to be the armistice agreement between the nations, which has not been given cut by the nations involved, is accurate. There must be some reason why they have not made it public officially. No matter how diligent some law reporter or law magazine may be in ferreting out what they may think the agreement is, no one at this time can vouchsafe its accuracy.

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot say whether it is accurate or not. I do know that it has been published abroad as the purported Italian armistice terms, and I thought, inasmuch as these things are published abroad, it would be perfectly permissible certainly to publish this document in this free country for what it may be worth.

Mr. BARKLEY. A private magazine may obtain something which it thinks approximates an official copy of an agreement, and publish it on its own responsibility, but that is quite different from the Congress of the United States publishing it in its official proceedings, carrying with it the implication that it is accurate, although neither our Government nor the Italian Government, nor any other government involved, has given out this document for publication. I do not know that there is any harm to be done by publishing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for what it may be worth, but I do not think it is worth much unless it has the official sanction of the governments involved as being accurate. It may turn out that it is wholly inaccurate, yet it will have gone out as an official document of the United States Senate, and can be circulated all over the United States under the franks of Senators, as well as of Members of the other House. I do not think it is good practice to insert in the RECORD purported copies of official documents which have not been made public by the governments involved, when we are bound to assume these governments have some legitimate reason for not making them public.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am perfectly frank with the Senator, and say that I do not know whether this document is accurate or not. I do know that I have felt very strongly that we in this country have not had access to the news which the people in some other naticns have had and that we are entitled to this news and information.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the International Law Journal have circulation in this country?

Mr. BRIDGES. I assume it has perhaps a very limited circulation in this country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Where is it published?

Mr. BRIDGES. In Geneva, Switzerland. I merely ask for the right to put it in the RECORD for what it may be worth.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the theory, since it is not officially approved—and we know that it is not sanctioned by any announcement or any statement that has been given out by the governments involved—that it is worth nothing, I shall not object to its publication.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ITALIAN ARMISTICE TERMS

(The International Law Review (Revue de Droit International), Geneva, vol. 22, No. 2, 1944, p. 170. Founded and edited by Dr. Antoine Sottile, former Consul, Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations, Bachelor (Licencié) of Law, Bachelor (Licencié) of Philosophy, former teacher of International Law in the University of Geneva, Professor at the Academy of International Law at The Hague, Member of the International Academy of Diplomacy.)

NOTES ET DOCUMENTS

Les clauses de l'armistice Italo-Allié.[1] Le traité est formé de quatre parties, plus un protocole comprenant 44 articles dont voici les principaux.

Clauses militaires: 1. L'Italie s'engage á faire son possible pour s'emparer de toutes les troupes allemandes se trouvant sur son territoire. 2. Elle remettra aux Alliés sa flotte de guerre, son aviation et toutes ses fortifications. 3. Après la guerre, elle mettra à la disposition des Alliás également sa flotte marchande et son aviation civile. 4. Elle accepte d'être complètement désarmée.

[1] Texte publié par les journaux et provenant de source non officielle. Son authenticité ayant soulevé des doutes, nous le publions sous toutes réserves. (N. d. R.)

Clauses territoriales: 1. La Grande-Bretagne recevra les iles de Pantelleria, de Lampeduse et d'autres ilots dans les eaux de la Sicile ayant une importance stratégique considérable. 2. La France recevra l'ile d'Elbe et modifiera à son avantage la frontiére occidentale italienne, à savior la frontiére avec le Piémont et la Ligurie. 3. La Yougoslavie recevra toute l'Istrie avec les villes de Fiume et de Zara. 4. La Grèce recevra toutes les iles italiennes de la mer Egée. 5. L'indépendance de l'Ethiopie est reconnue par l'Italie. 6. Le sort des colonies italiennes—Libye, Somalie et Erythrée—sera réglé par la conférence de la paix et l'Italie s'en remet à ses décisions. 7. Dans les ports italiens, il sera établi des ports francs à l'avantage des Etats-Unis, de l'Angleterre, de la France, de la Yougoslavie et de la Grèce.

Clauses économiques: 1. Le gouvernement italien s'engage à ouvrir immédiatement tous les crédits qui lui seront demandés par les trois gouvernements d'Alger, de Grèce et de Yougoslavie. 2. Tous les frais d'occupation des armées seront à la charge de l'Italie. 3. Le gouvernement italien reconnait que la responsabilité du ravitaillement de la population de la Péninsule n'est pas à la charge des vainqueurs. 4. Le gouvernement italien reconnait un contrôle anglo-américain sur l'industrie lourde nationale ainsi quer sur les banques italiennes. 5. Après la fin de la guerre, 50% du capital de ces entreprises italiennes sera aux mains des puissances anglo-saxonnes. 6. Après la fin de la guerre, le gouvernement italien consentira l'envoi de deux millions d'ouvriers dans les pays vainqueurs pour l'œuvre de reconstruction. 7. Cette masse de travailleurs sera ainsi répartie: 800.000 en U. R. S. S., 200.000 aux Etats-Unis, 200,000 en Grande-Bretagne, 200.000 en Australie, 200.000 en Afrique du Sud. 200.000 au Brésil et le reste dans d'autres Nations unies.

Clauses politiques: 1. Toutes les lots raciales seront supprimées. 2. Toute l'influence fasciste sera abolie. 3. M. Mussolini sera remis aux Nations unies, ainsi que tous les fascistes compris dans les listes des "criminels de guerre".

Clause additionnelle: Les Alliés se réservent d'apporter des adoucissements aux clauses d'armistice suivant l'importance de la participation de l'Italie à la lutte contre l'Allemagne.

[Translation from French]

THE CLAUSES OF THE ITALIAN-ALLIED ARMISTICE

The treaty is composed of four parts and a protocol, comprising 44 articles, of which the following are the principal ones:

MILITARY CLAUSES

1. Italy obliges herself to do her (all) possible to seize upon all the German troops which are found on her territory.

2. She will deliver to the Allies her Navy, her aviation, and all her fortifications.

3. After the war, she will also place her merchant fleet and her civil aviation at the disposal of the Allies.

4. She accepts to be completely disarmed.

TERRITORIAL CLAUSES

1. Great Britain will receive the islands of Pantelleria, Lampedusa, and the other small islands in the waters of Sicily which have a considerable strategic importance.

2. France will receive the island of Elba and shall modify to her advantage the western frontier of Italy, that is, the frontier with Piedmont and Liguria.

3. Yugoslavia shall receive all of Istria with the cities Fiume and Zara.

4. Greece shall receive all the Italian islands in the Agean Sea.

5. The independence of Ethiopia is recognized by Italy.

6. The fate of the Italian colonies—Libya, Somalia, and Erirea—shall be settled at the peace conference, and Italy shall reconcile herself with its decisions.

7. In the Italian ports, free ports shall be established for the benefit of the United States, England, France, Yugoslavia, and Greece.

ECONOMIC CLAUSES

1. The Italian Government obliges herself to immediately open all credits demanded of her by the three Governments of Algiers (France), Greece, and Yugoslavia.

2. All the occupation expenses of the Allied armies are charged to Italy.

3. The Italian Government recognizes that the responsibility for the nourishment of the population of the peninsula is not charged to the conquerors.

4. The Italian Government recognizes an Anglo-American control over the national heavy industry as well as over the Italian banks.

5. After the end of the war, 50 percent of the capital of these Italian enterprises shall be in the hands of the Anglo-Saxon powers.

6. After the end of the war, the Italian Government will consent to the sending of 2,000,000 workers to the conquering countries for reconstruction work.

7. This group of workers shall be portioned out as follows: 800,000 to U. S. S. R., 200,000 to the United States, 200,000 to Great Britain, 200,000 to Australia, 200,000 to South Africa, 200,000 to Brazil, and the rest to the other United Nations.

POLITICAL CLAUSES

1. All the racial laws shall be abolished.

2. All Fascist influence shall be abolished.

3. M. Mussolini shall be delivered to the United Nations as well as all the Fascists comprised in the lists of war criminals.

ADDITIONAL CLAUSE

The Allies reserve for themselves to bring about a softening of the armistice clauses in proportion to the importance of the Italian participation in the fight against Germany.

(Text published by the Swiss press and deriving from nonofficial sources. Doubts having been raised about its authenticity, we publish it with all reserve.—Note of the editor.)

UNITED WE STAND—ADDRESS BY R. T. HASLAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address entitled "United We Stand," delivered by R. T. Haslam, director of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey before the New Brunswick (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce on February 12 last, be printed in the body of the RECORD. While I do not agree with everything this gentleman said on this occasion, his address gives what we on the progressive side call the other side of the question, and does it splendidly.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the address will occupy three-quarters of a page more than the two pages allowed without extra cost, and that it will cost $143 to print the address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One hundred and thirty-six years ago Mr. and Mrs. Lincoln had a son. He was what today we are given to calling a common man, although he grew to be a very uncommon one.

It is interesting to note that his parents named him "Abraham." It is pertinent to what I have to say today to wonder whether in 1945 the Lincolns would have chosen to attach to their son this ancient and honorable label of so many sons of Israel.

It is also pertinent to my theme that Abraham Lincoln grew to manhood in the years that saw a small rift between the newly United States of America widen into a tragic division and civil war. The seeds of disruption which are inherent in all sectionalism, in all economic conflict, in all intolerance and prejudice were permitted to ripen into bitter fruit.

We now know that the greatness of Abraham Lincoln was not alone in his great humanity and his emancipation of the Negro, but in his clear perception that unity must be preserved at all costs; that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

We may be sure, when in 1861 the news was brought to him, along with dispatches from the battlefields, that troops of Napoleon III had invaded Mexico and the British Fleet was cruising off our shores, that he know only too well its ominous implications to the country's future.

Adolf Hitler also knew that to be divided is to be conquered, and put the principle into practice. Almost too late did the free nations rise up as one and merge differences of political and economic creeds in a common objective. And we pray that this unity may endure to shape a lasting peace.

Thus we have come to an awareness of the danger of division among the free nations. But today, on Lincoln's birthday, it is appropriate to ask, are we as aware as he was of the dangers of division among our own people?

We are accustomed to thinking that such terms as "divide and conquer" apply only to national groups. I believe, however, that if our thinking goes no further, we run grave risks, because divisions just as drastic in their consequences can occur between groups with in a nation—groups whose differences are social, religious, political, or economic.

Elmo Roper, the well-known analyst of public opinion, recently published a report which many of you have undoubtedly read. In it he discussed the results of a number of samplings of public attitudes over a period of the past 2 years which had for their purpose the measurement of racial and religious prejudice in this country.

In one survey, for example, the question asked was "Are there any groups of people you think are trying to get ahead at the expense of people like you?" One-third thought there were; one-third thought not, and one-third was uncertain.

Those who answered "yes" were asked to name the group. Jews were named by 22 percent, big businessmen by 12 percent, labor groups by 9 percent, politicians by 6 percent, black-market operators by 4 percent, the rich by 4 percent, and Negroes by 3 percent.

Other surveys confirmed the existence, in various forms, of prejudice based on racial or religious differences involving Jews, Negroes, Catholics, and the Chinese.

The point I am trying to make is not a moral one. Elmo Roper said it very well: "America is a Nation of minorities. If persecution of one minority is allowed, it is an easy and natural step to the persecution of still another minority * * * we can prevent open eruptions of intolerance if the majority of our citizens, in the knowledge that they are a collection of minorities, will act courageously."

He goes on to say that the strongest weapon in combating prejudice is not to point out that it works an injustice on many fine people; but in pointing out that the persecution of any minority is a serious blow against the very fundamentals of democracy—and therefore a serious threat against all those minorities of which all of us are members."

It is a very short step to the core of my text. The mental and emotional habits which go to make up prejudice are the consequences of what I call label thinking. Unless a majority of us learn to guard against this kind of thinking, it can endanger all

that we hope to achieve as a Nation in the years ahead.

Let's look at some examples of label thinking. It is part and parcel of such commonly heard expressions as "government versus business," "labor versus management," "common man versus the capitalist," "big business versus small business," "farmer versus factory worker." Notice especially the word "versus." It states that the relationship between the two groups in each case is one of conflict; implies that they are antagonistic and that their objectives are different.

Such words as "big business" and "labor" are labels, and as such they are convenient tools of speech. But these labels, these oversimplified tags on facts, come to be substituted in our minds for the facts themselves, which are infinitely more complicated. They come to mean different things to different people and to have different emotional associations. If we don't watch out, therefore, we can find ourselves thinking, and acting, not on the basis of things as they are, but on unrealistic, emotional notions. We are deluded by symbols, victimized by what the late Justice Cardozo called the tyranny of words. The word "versus" becomes a virus of disunity.

Take the matter of "Government versus business." Is there really a conflict between the two groups? If so, what is the nature of it?

Obviously there are certain basic differences in function, but how are we going to draw a sharp line and say that Government must stay on one side and business on the other?

Our Government was in business long before the war. The Post Office is among the largest businesses in the country. Furthermore, it long has been in competition with private business as any representative of the express or telegraph companies will tell you.

Today our Government is the biggest business the world has ever seen. It not only buys and consumes, but it owns manufacturing plants the aggregate value of which could have a major if not dominant influence on the country's whole private business structure.

But in the face of the war emergency, Government turned to private business for the skill and management brains it needed to achieve its colossal production goals. In fact it is difficult to define to what degree Government is in business and business is in Government.

Yet there is certainly no argument among businessmen as to the Government's responsibility for regulatory and policing functions, for representing our people in dealings with other nations, and for such activities as flood control, public health, social security, irrigation projects, and internal waterways.

Inevitably Government and business functions will overlap. Knowing this, it will be realistic for people both in Government and business to act, not as though there were some essential conflict between the two, but to cooperate in their common objective, which is the common good. Each needs the other—business to produce and distribute goods, Government to govern and carry on essential public functions which business cannot perform.

A business corporation as a citizen depends on Government for the same sort of services for which you and I, as individual citizens, depend on it. In turn, our Government, to be strong, must have strong citizens both individual and corporate.

Where is label thinking leading us if we accept as fact an irreconcilable conflict between management and labor? As part of management, and having known what it is to work with my hands, this particular subject interests me especially.

Again we ask, Is the division one of fact or merely one of labels?

How can we draw a sharp line even in the case of a single organization or single shop when today we are faced with such questions as unions of foremen and the status of minor supervisory employees? Where does "labor" end and "management" begin?

One of the outstanding characteristics of American industry is the constant flow of personnel from shop bench to office desk. We have a saying in our company, for example, that "whenever a president of Jersey Standard dies or resigns, we hire a new office boy."

Our directors are workingmen and came up through the ranks. The 11 of them who sit every day around the table in Standard of Jersey's board room have been in the company's service an average of nearly 27 years; but as directors they have served an average of only 6 years.

Ralph W. Gallagher, chairman of the board, started his career more than 45 years ago as an oiler in the pumping station of a gas-distributing system in Olean, N. Y. Orville Harden, a vice president, started in his teens as an office boy. T. C. McCobb, who recently retired as comptroller, came to Standard in 1913 as a clerk in the Baltimore office.

It would be hard indeed to select any point in the careers of these men and say, "Here you ceased being a worker." To be sure their functions changed, with the passing of years they worked less with their hands and more with their minds, but throughout the whole continuous process their objectives remained the same.

If division occurs between management and labor, both sides will be to blame. Some businessmen speak of labor as they would of a gang of saboteurs loose in their plants. And some labor leaders speak of management as though their sole purpose in life was the subjugation of workers.

Conflicts develop only when groups, misled by labels, seek to expand their own selfish interest at the expense of the common good. Lincoln put it this way:

"Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus, by example, assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Of course, the basic aims of both labor and management are the same. They are both striving to increase production, to improve living standards, to produce more for the benefit of everyone. They need each other. If they fail to cooperate, the enterprise that supports them both will fail and both will be looking for jobs. This brings me to our third example of label thinking: "The common man versus the capitalist." Just what is a common man and what is a capitalist? I venture to say that there is hardly anyone in this room, myself included, who doesn't feel a self-righteous glow for the common man, and a deep suspicion of the capitalist, when I toss out those overworked labels.

Some say a capitalist is anyone who is wealthy. In other words, if you have a lot of currency put away in a deposit box, you qualify. But an economist wouldn't agree. He says that a capitalist is one who consumes less than he is currently producing and puts what is left over—his savings—to work in such a way that future production will be increased. This margin—which is capital—takes the form of equipment which in one way or another increases the capacity of the individual to produce.

There is nothing in the definition which says that a worker cannot entrust his savings to some enterprise. When he does, in the long run it makes more goods, lowers their cost, increases demand for them, and provides more jobs. Such a worker—and the great mass of the American people do put aside a portion of their earnings in bank accounts, War bonds, insurance policies, or in some other form of savings—becomes a capitalist. This is no less true of the member of a labor union a portion of whose dues goes into the union bank for investment purposes.

As another illustration of the nature of this person called capitalist, consider the ownership of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey). It is owned by 151,000 stockholders. And all the 11 directors of the company, taken together, own less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the company's stock. This means that 1 in every 200 families in the United States is a capitalist as far as this 1 company alone is concerned.

For a number of years Standard has operated what it calls the thrift plan. Its purpose is to enable employees to accumulate capital of their own, to guard against the uncertainties of old-age, and generally to provide for life's emergencies.

Under this plan an employee may contribute from 3 to 13 percent of his income to a thrift fund. The company matches the first 3 percent of his savings dollar for dollar. Thereafter it matches his savings at the rate of 50 cents to the dollar, and from year to year, as earnings permit, the company makes special contributions to the fund. In 7½ years 40,000 employees of the Jersey family of companies have put aside $101,000,000.

Of course their savings are not left idle. Part of the money goes into retirement annuities written by insurance companies, which in turn invest their money in productive enterprises. Part of the money can be withdrawn by the employees in the event of emergencies, or to buy homes, educate their children or for any other purpose. Other amounts may be used to buy company stock or insurance.

It's up to the employee to decide how much he wants to save, or whether he wants to take part in the plan at all. It is open to him as soon as he is employed, and he is free to stop his contribution at any time. Its terms are the same for an office boy as for the president. All credits to an employee's account belong irrevocably to him. There is no circumstance under which any part of it can revert to the company.

I go into this detail only to illustrate how the laborer becomes quite naturally a capitalist, how large in bulk the aggregate savings of individuals can become, and how this company for one, and it is only one, recognizes the social importance of individual savings and does everything it can to encourage them.

To make my point still clearer: Suppose any group of 40,000 people saved $100,000,000 and invested it in a single business. They would certainly be considered capitalists. Are they different in this respect from the 40,000 employees of Jersey Standard who have invested an equal amount of money in a variety of enterprises? Are these latter people capitalists too, as well as workers? The fact that they are both shows that there is nothing in the 2 categories which makes them mutually exclusive.

There is only one alternative to the American way of capital accumulation and investment and that is to leave it to the state. Then the individual has no choice as to how much of his earnings shall be set aside nor how they shall be employed.

Personally I believe that freedom in this choice is not only more efficient in the long run from a purely materialistic standpoint, but is a necessary condition to spiritual freedoms. To the best of my knowledge, freedom of thought, of speech, of religion, in all recorded history have existed only where there was also freedom of initiative in the economic field. I would add that such freedom does not constitute license to misuse society's savings, and the responsibility is great on those who control investments to see that they are wisely directed.

We just can't lump people into classes by labeling them "capitalist" or "common man" or anything else. A man may be a capitalist—that is a saver—but he is also many

other things—a citizen, a father, a Presbyterian, a Democrat, a worker with his hands, a consumer. If we fail to recognize this composite nature of all our citizens, and the single nature of our goal, we are promoting, consciously or unconsciously the very division of the American people, class by class, minority by minority, which can weaken or destroy all that we value. Since money is so often at the root of these issues, it might be useful if we examined more frequently the inscription that appears on our coins—"E Pluribus Unum"—out of many, one.

When I was a boy working as a shoe clerk in a small New England town, and later as a mill hand, I didn't think of myself as a capitalist. Yet the savings from my labors then, contributed later to my education, and my education enabled me to increase not only my personal productiveness, but, I hope I can say, the production of others. That was a good many years ago, but I classify myself as no more a capitalist now, nor less a common man, than I was then.

I think we should also look with a critical eye at expressions which tend to establish concepts of "big business versus small business."

Again the labels require definition. What do we mean when we say "big business"? How shall we measure bigness—by gross sales, by asset value, by number of employees, by net profits, by net worth, by the value of outstanding capital stock or by some other criterion? By whatever standard we choose, where does small business stop being small and become big?

Attempts have been made—and I believe they are based largely on expediency—to draw the line by saying that a manufacturer is big if he has more than 100 employees, that a wholesaler is big if his sales volume is over $200,000 a year, and a retailer if his sales exceed $50,000 a year. Such distinctions may be useful for special purposes—but as generalizations, they can only be considered arbitrary.

For example, I recently read a magazine article about a successful Louisville retail druggist who had built up a prescription business to a point in excess of $50,000 a year. I found myself wondering if he regarded himself as a "big businessman." I doubt it.

The point is that there is no real line of demarcation. Bigness indicates merely a direction, and it is unlikely if a point is ever reached in this process where the owners or management suddenly pause in their perusal of the sales reports and shout, "Hurray, now we are big business." (Or perhaps, instead of "Hurray" cry "Alas!").

The real danger in the careless use of these labels is that there is implied an inherent good or evil in the mere fact of smallness or bigness, which of course, does not exist. If we permit ourselves to talk as though this did exist, we only obscure the real problems and delay their solution.

Standard of New Jersey is undoubtedly big business by any yardstick. Its total consolidated assets at the end of 1943 exceeded two and a quarter billion dollars. This represents investments and return of earnings covering many decades. The bulk of that value however is not in the form of money in the bank; it is in the form of refineries, tankers, marine terminals, and other tools necessary to operate a world-wide oil business, which by its very nature requires large investments.

I might point out in passing that if the oil business of necessity is big, it is also efficient. The public pays 40 percent less for gasoline today than it did in 1925—despite the fact that taxes per gallon are 10 times as much as they were then. Research and development have likewise greatly improved quality. In the 10 years before the start of the present war the octane rating of gasoline rose from an average of about 65 to 75. This improvement, which is only a forerunner of what we may expect after the war, permitted an increase of more than 25 percent in the compression ratio of engines, equivalent to an 11-percent increase in mileage per gallon or a saving to the American public of over $550,000,000 in their annual gasoline bill. And that doesn't include the savings represented by the reduced price of gasoline.

I said a moment ago that it is difficult to define big business in absolute terms. Size is relative. Thus the New Jersey company, one of the world's largest, in point of assets, represents less than 10 percent of the capital invested in the domestic oil industry. It does about 8 percent of the country's gasoline business and some 12 percent of its total petroleum products business. In terms of sales volume, therefore, it is quite likely that Standard of New Jersey does a smaller percentage of the total available business in its field than some of you in this room do of the available business in your line in the city of New Brunswick.

Far more important than mere size, it seems to me, is the relation of the various units in an industry to one another. The Jersey Co., like many other large organizations, is an integrated business and is vitally dependent all along the line of its operations upon others—to get part of its raw materials, to carry out its processing, to transport its raw materials and products, and to deliver its products to the consumers.

For example, crude oil is our principal raw material, but we ourselves produce less than half of the domestically produced crude which we require. We buy the remainder from smaller independent oil companies, more than half of which would no doubt be classed as "small businesses."

Furthermore, most of the oil we produce ourselves is produced under leases from some 10,000 individual landowners, who derive considerable income from royalties we pay. The royalties average roughly about $1,300 per year per farmer or landholder. The number of individuals on whom we depend for raw materials, however, is about twice 10,000 because we have to count those whose land is leased to the companies from whom we buy crude.

When it comes to refining, our capacity is largely owned directly, because it is necessary to maintain close technical control in order to achieve the utmost efficiency and economy in manufacturing operations. However, we do buy very large quantities of finished products from a number of small refining companies, and in turn supply petroleum companies much smaller than ourselves.

In marketing, the Jersey Co. functions primarily as a supplier of products for independent businessmen to sell. Our principal products are distributed through more than 20,000 individual businesses, most of which are independent service stations and the balance jobbers. These independent and, in most cases, small-business men are so vital to the conduct of our operations that we make every effort to see that they stay in business and are successful.

Thus we see that over 40,000 small businesses—farmers, jobbers, or dealers—constantly help supply our raw material, crude oil, and help distribute the products of our manufacture.

I have been much impressed by figures showing trends in the number of new enterprises established annually in the United States. In 1925 there was a net addition of 55,000; in 1939 the net addition was only 27,500, and in 1942 there was a net loss of 87,000. With due allowance for the effect of the war, it appears that the means employed to encourage small business have not been too successful.

We have found repeatedly that the chief difficulty faced by small business is lack of knowledge—the kind of knowledge which a large organization with its greater resources applies daily in its research, manufacturing, marketing, and record keeping. So elementary a matter as lack of proper accounting is often the reason for small business failures. On the other hand, small concerns can exercise a closer control over their operations—a real advantage over the larger organization. The way to help small business, therefore is not to destroy big business, but rather to find ways of making the advantages which big business enjoys available to small enterprises.

We believe that what the small businessman wants is not some form of hand-out, but assistance in becoming more efficient.

This is the principle on which the business assistance plan of our company is based. Because we know the oil business, we are in a position to be helpful to smaller units in the industry and to individuals who wish to enter it. We can provide them with the tools and knowledge they need to be successful; we even lend them money.

Such loans are not based on collateral, but are character loans. Perhaps a young man comes to us and says that he wants to go into the oil business. We like his looks; we like the things people tell us about him; we are impressed with his energy and sincerity. If such a man says that he doesn't have a cent, our reply will be that he doesn't need assets of that kind. Our need and the need of the industry is for capable people.

Up to the time of the war, we had loaned over $1,700,000 on this basis, and this plan of making character loans has proved so sound that the credit loses have been only 1.7 percent.

Our experience has been so good that we have advertised our business plan in newspapers throughout our marketing area and after the war expect that the program will be considerably expanded.

In addition to loans—and we have in mind not only present distributors but returning servicemen seeking to establish their own business—the offer of assistance includes practical guidance in service-station operation, such as suggestions for station design, recommended equipment, and expansion to meet post-war needs and opportunities.

As a further example of Standard's efforts in this direction, together with several other oil companies, we are assisting a group of petroleum jobbers in financing a Harvard Business School research project in wholesaling problems. We do this not out of sheer altruism. The health of our company requires that the many small enterprises with which we do business be healthy. We believe that the American system of private enterprise is more effective than any other system in promoting the Nation's welfare. If the system is at times wasteful or inefficient, then it is our common task to do all we can to help improve it.

Yet, though much of our business is done through small independent outlets, a portion is done directly, and for the significant reason that this is the only means of doing it. Could a small company, for example, fuel a merchant steamship line with ports of call throughout the world? Could it service an air line which requires products of constant quality, made to rigid specifications, in continuous supply at dozens of far-flung points of the globe?

It is obvious that labels of big or small business in themselves are meaningless and can contribute nothing but confusion to any sincere attempt to understand the workings of our economic system. American business is an integrated structure in which each part derives its strength from all the others. Indeed, as an engineer, I am reminded that it is a structure which, like one built of concrete, derives its enduring qualities from the diversity of its elements. In making con-

crete, gravel and sand all of one size are not used. It is the combining of sand and gravel of different sizes which binds the cement and gives it strength.

At this crucial point in our history we must guard against loose thinking, against judgments based on labels rather than realities. We need a greater appreciation, by big business and small business, by those who live on large earnings and on small earnings, by management and by labor, by government and by business, by all groups, that we are not a nation of groups in conflict but a nation of individuals with common objectives. We must learn that to enhance the welfare of our particular group or groups is a proper aim only so long as it enhances the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

A heavy responsibility rests on each of us to realize these facts, to examine himself, and to seek in every way he can to minimize false divisions and to promote our national unity.

Great problems lie immediately before us. I believe that our democracy is fully capable of meeting them. I am convinced that the judgment of the American people has been and will be sound, assuming always that the decisions of the majority are based on informed judgment.

The path is not easy; the habits of wishful thinking, of prejudice, of emotional bias are hard to break. The demagog is constantly at work to attain his private ends even at the expense of the Nation itself. But we can learn to guard against him and against all forces of disunity. We can take resolution in the spirit of the man we remember today; we can carry with us no better slogan for the future than the one which helped fuse thirteen colonies into one triumphant nation and which he, Abraham Lincoln, reaffirmed, "United we stand."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY AT ROOSEVELT VICTORY DINNER

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GUFFEY at a Roosevelt victory dinner at Erie, Pa., February 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISCUSSION OF THE YALTA CONFERENCE AGREEMENT BY SENATOR BALL AND SENATOR HATCH

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a radio discussion of the Crimean Conference agreement by Senator HATCH and himself, on Friday, February 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN BIRTHDAY DINNER ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by James A. Farley at the Lincoln birthday dinner of the Catholic Club of Norwalk, Conn., on February 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUTURE INTERNATIONAL AIR TRADE AND TRAVEL ROUTES—ADDRESS BY L. WELCH POGUE

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of international air trade and travel routes of the future, delivered by L. Welch Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFINITION OF A GOOD CITIZEN—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Definition of a Good Citizen," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, chairman of the citizenship committee, New York District of Kiwanis International, at the presidents' conference, Albany, N. Y., January 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD ON SUBMISSION OF NINTH ANNUAL REPORT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement of H. A. Millis, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, on the submission of the ninth annual report to Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NATIONAL-SERVICE LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drop the Work-Fight-or-Jail Bill," published in the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg., of February 13, and an editorial entitled "Becoming the Judges," published in the Oregonian of Thursday, February 8, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE YALTA CONFERENCE—EDITORIAL FROM CHARLOTTE OBSERVER

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Power Politics Given a Blow," published in the Charlotte (N, C.) Observer of February 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIFICATION OF SMALL NATIONS IN CONFEDERATIONS—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Small Nations May Unite in Three Big Confederations," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFERENCE ON URGENT PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE—ARTICLE BY MORRIS H. RUBIN

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Time Is Now, Mr. Roosevelt!" written by Morris H. Rubin and published in the Progressive of February 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS ON THE CALENDAR PASSED OVER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is concluded. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is not much business on the calendar. I understand it contains two small appropriation bills which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has in charge. I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the bills on the calendar may go over. It will be in order to move to take up the two appropriation bills at any time the Senate wants to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the calling of the calendar will be temporarily postponed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BURTON obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have asked the Senator from Ohio to yield to me for the purpose of bringing up for consideration two House joint resolutions. Consideration of them will take only a moment.

Mr. BURTON. I understand they are the two appropriation measures which are on our desks.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. I am glad, Mr. President, to yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 100.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARRAN in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 100) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection to consideration of House Joint Resolution 100. The appropriation is a necessary one for additional hospital facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 100) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for th efiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I concurred in reporting the bill to the Senate because the Congress by reason of previous funds authorized, seems to be committed to the taking of an agricultural census. I wish to say that it is one of those things the wisdom of which could well be questioned. With a so-called manpower shortage in existance, it is questionable whether we should appropriate several million dollars for an agricultural census to be taken at this time, involving the employment of several thousand individuals whose work will be necessary to the taking of such a census. I personally disapprove the project and the appropriation, but because of previous appropriation commitments I believe perhaps the pending joint resolution should be allowed to pass, and I shall raise no further objection.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Tennessee explain the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to do so. Congress passed a law providing for the usual agricultural census to be taken this year. Such a census is taken every 5 years. It is necessary to expend $6,784,000. A joint resolution providing for that amount has been passed by the House of Representatives and approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and I have been directed to report it, and it is now before the Senate. The joint resolution would

furnish money with which to take the usual agricultural census.

Mr. LANGER. Does the census include the amount of livestock and the number of radios which farmers have?

Mr. McKELLAR. It includes everything that pertains to the farming industry.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator give us a list of what the census includes? Does the Senator have such a list handy?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not have a list before me, but the census includes everything that pertains to the farm.

Mr. LANGER. Does it include farm machinery, for example?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, it does.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have received an inquiry from New England as to whether the census is actually in process now. Does the Senator know whether it is?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes, it is; but those taking the census require the amount of money provided by the joint resolution in order to continue it. They do not have enough money to continue it.

Mr. BREWSTER. How much is available now?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall the exact amount.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would $7,000,000 be approximately the amount they already have?

Mr. McKELLAR. $7,250,000 was the original amount allowed. They require $6,784,000 additional.

Mr. BREWSTER. So this is a 100-percent increase?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not quite that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Well, practically that. Can the Senator from Tennessee explain why so extraordinary an increase is necessary or desirable?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not desirable at all, of course, but those who are conducting the census cannot obtain workers to take the census unless they have the additional amount of money provided by the measure before the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean they have doubled the pay of the workers taking the census.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; they have not doubled their pay.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then, why is a 100-percent increase necessary?

Mr. McKELLAR. The House of Representatives allowed originally only $7,250,000. Those taking the census did not obtain all they required. The amount provided by the joint resolution is to supplement the original amount.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not gather the impression of much enthusiasm on the part of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I may answer the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Maine by stating that the increase is due, as the Senator will discover on page 2 of the House committee report, to the rate of pay increase from 50 to 60 cents to 89.8 cents per schedule.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is the principal reason for the increased amount asked, I will say to the Senator from Maine. It was originally intended to pay for each schedule about 60 cents, but those in charge could not obtain men to do the work for that amount, so the pay was raised to 89 cents. Those are the facts, and we all know about the shortage of labor that exists, and the difficulty of obtaining individuals to do such work. We have already committed ourselves to the taking of this census, and the only way it can be done is to increase the amount to be paid.

Mr. BREWSTER. What about the manpower shortage concerning which we now hear a very great deal? No later than last night the Secretary of War pointed out how great was the shortage of manpower.

Mr. McKELLAR. All employees or appointees will be cleared through the United States Employment Service, and may not be employed if needed and available for war work.

Mr. BREWSTER. Are they civil-service employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they are not civil-service employees. The appointees will be cleared through the United States Employment Service, and may not be employed at all if needed and available for other work. Boys, elderly persons, and a great many women, who can do the work, are being employed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Tennessee feel assured that this work will in no way impede the war effort?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure it will not impede the war effort. We have committed ourselves to this census. We have enacted the law, and have appropriated a part of the money. If the work is to be completed, it will be absolutely necessary to appropriate this additional amount.

Mr. BREWSTER. That does not quite answer the question. We have suspended many of our peacetime activities because of the pressure of the war effort.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BREWSTER. This is certainly something we could get along without, if any of the individuals to be employed could contribute to the acceleration of our war effort.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true. It is for that reason that we provided that the employees should be cleared through the United States Employment Service and by the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BREWSTER. As I understand, that is not provided in the bill. It is simply an assurance which the Senator has from the officials in charge.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BREWSTER. Our experience has been such as to create a good deal of concern on my part because of the war situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure that the war effort will not be interfered with in the slightest.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator stated that this census is being taken under authority of existing law.

Mr. McKELLAR. I so stated.

Mr. WHITE. In that statement he is wholly correct. Some time ago we enacted legislation providing for an agricultural census every five years. The fifth year has now been reached and is being provided for in the proposed legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I am in much the same frame of mind about the legislation as is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. We seem to have authorized this work by law; and yet, in my view it will be of comparatively little value to anyone. Conditions are so abnormal that I do not know of any lessons that can be drawn from a census of agriculture taken at this time. I have felt, too, that the increases in pay were quite unwarranted. The testimony before the House committee was to the effect that the enumerators to a very large extent would be women. As the Senator from Nebraska has stated, in past censuses the rate of pay has been from 50 to 60 cents a schedule. In the present instance the rate of pay is proposed to be increased to $1.02 a schedule.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is mistaken. The average is 89 cents.

Mr. WHITE. I believe the Senator is correct. The average is 89 cents, but in many instances the testimony shows that the rate will be $1.02 a schedule. It is estimated that an enumerator can complete eight schedules a day. So it is proposed to pay the enumerators $8 a day for this work. I am glad to see anyone receive $8 a day, but I question very much the propriety of such an increase.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I should read an excerpt from the report:

> It is the opinion of the Director of the Census that if sufficient funds are available, permitting the payment of higher wages per schedule than was contemplated under the original appropriation, competent enumerators in sufficient numbers can be found among people so situated as not to be available for regular employment. It is expected that the chief source of such employees will be members of farm families. However, first preference will be given to honorably discharged veterans, members of their families, and members of the families of men still in the service. All appointees will be cleared through the United States Employment Service and may not be employed if needed and available for war work.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee tell us the number of employees necessary to take this census?

Mr. McKELLAR. Approximately 27,000 enumerators will be required. They will work from 4 to 6 weeks.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for that information. In the face of the manpower shortage, I feel that Senators should know that 27,000 enumerators will be required to make the census. In view of that fact, I was greatly alarmed when this measure came before the Appropriations Committee. In the last session of Congress I opposed the appropriation for this purpose. I talked to an

official in the War Food Administration, one for whom I have high regard. He feels that the census is absolutely necessary at this time in order to obtain information as to the production of food.

As I understand, the Division of Statistics in the Department of Agriculture makes estimates. Such estimates are made in my State. However, the War Food Administration must rely upon authentic information gathered by the enumerators, so as to fit the actual inventories to the estimates which are made. The work is being done on a 5-year basis. Because of the fact that it is absolutely necessary for the military effort in connection with the production of food, I voted to report the joint resolution to the Senate, and I will vote for its passage; but I think it should be regarded strictly as a war measure. The census should be taken only in the interest of the production of food. In peacetimes the creation of an agency with 27,000 employees would be absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask the junior Senator from Nebraska a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Nebraska whether or not the A. A. A. records already show the acreage of farm land and the acreage of principal crops, without the necessity for a census.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to that question, let me say to the distinguished Senator that this statement is absolutely correct. However, I wish to go further and state that the War Food Administration official with whom I talked stated that A. A. A. records did not provide the reliable information needed. He stated that the census had to be taken so that the administration could fit the picture to what the census actually revealed. The man who told me that is a man in whom I have a great deal of confidence. However, it is my opinion that there is duplication in two or three departments, and that when the military need shall have ceased to exist—which I hope will be soon—it will be absolutely unnecessary to take such a census.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAR PROGRAM AND FUTURE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES IN NORTH AFRICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the statement I am about to submit is a report on the war program and future policy of the United States in north Africa and the Middle East.

This statement supplements the preliminary report made to the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, now known as the Mead committee, by its subcommittee on north Africa and the Middle East. It is based upon the trip to that area taken by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] and myself December 28, 1944, to January 18, 1945. This statement also supplements the comments on that trip already made to the Senate by the Senator from Delaware as chairman of the subcommittee.

As the preliminary report has been made available to the Senate and contains the conclusions and recommendations of the subcommittee and as the comments of the Senator from Delaware contain a description of the trip with comments on what the subcommittee observed, I shall direct this statement primarily to an analysis of the lessons which I believe can be drawn from the trip.

I shall do this under six headings: First, the trip illustrates the feasibility of legislative investigations by the United States Senate outside of continental United States; second, a need exists for improved coordination among agencies of the United States abroad; third, a need exists for a clear, vigorous policy as to investments of the United States abroad; fourth, suggestions as to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—U. N. R. R. A.; fifth, petroleum in the Middle East; sixth, north Africa and the Middle East are a proving ground for a constructive, vigorous foreign policy of the United States.

I. THE TRIP ILLUSTRATES THE FEASIBILITY OF LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATIONS BY THE UNITED STATES SENATE OUTSIDE OF CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

This trip has unique value as an example of how the United States Senate can appropriately exercise its investigatory powers outside of continental United States in proportion to the expanding interests of the United States. The report will demonstrate that each of the subjects investigated is well within the jurisdiction and the responsibility of the United States Senate and of the Mead committee investigating the national defense program. It will demonstrate that in order to investigate these subjects intelligently it was necessary to go to the places visited. It will further demonstrate that the investigation of these subjects on the ground by a subcommittee serves not only to advise the subcommittee and, through it, the United States Senate as to such subjects, but also emphasize to administrative officers on the ground the closeness of their responsibility to their Government at home and to the individual taxpayers represented by that Government. The gathering of Government officials to attend subcommittee hearings abroad, as is done at home, brings those officials into contact with each other in a way that is of direct benefit to them and to their work.

Assuming, then, the value of the investigations made on this trip, it is my first purpose to derive from it certain lessons as to the feasibility of such trips abroad from the point of view of time, effort, and expense. The scope of this trip was limited to the jurisdiction of one committee of the Senate, its time was limited to approximately 3 weeks, and its purposes were limited to four specific subjects.

The subcommittee was instructed to report its findings and recommendations to its parent committee, rather than to the Senate or to the public. It was further instructed to omit, as far as possible, news conferences abroad and side trips not related to the specific subjects assigned to the subcommittee. I may say we completely avoided such diversions. The result was that the entire trip from Washington to Iran, on the Persian Gulf, and return took only 22 days. The first 6 of these days came while Congress was in adjournment, and the remaining 16 during the first days of the session when necessarily little legislative action of the Senate could be taken. During these 22 days the subcommittee traveled 100 hours in the air, covered 16,000 miles, stopped in 12 different countries in 4 continents, held 18 hearings in 9 different places, and made inspections of 17 centers where American officials were engaged on important governmental work.

The official party consisted of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] and myself, constituting a subcommittee of two Senators drawn from the membership of the Mead committee. The Senator from Delaware served as chairman. George Meader, assistant counsel for the Mead committee, who now sits at my right in the Senate Chamber, served as legal counsel. Col. Harry H. Vaughan served as executive officer, and Corp. Ralph G. Cederborg was assigned to the subcommittee by the War Department as a stenotypist. In addition, three Army officers and one naval officer were assigned by the War and Navy Departments to accompany the party most of the way. On portions of the trip one or two other officers occasionally accompanied the party in connection with their duties in those areas.

I wish to express my appreciation of the competent leadership which the Senator from Delaware, as chairman of the subcommittee, gave to this investigation. I wish to commend Mr. Meader, as counsel for the subcommittee, for the help he gave its members in preparing material for the investigations made by the committee and in assisting in the conduct of the hearings and in the preparation of the subcommittee report. I also wish to express my thanks for the cooperation, efficiency, and helpfulness of the officers and the enlisted man who accompanied the party.

The utmost courtesy and cooperation were shown to the subcommittee by the Army, Navy, and civilian agencies. The Army Transport Command supplied excellent air transportation.

The trip points to the value of keeping such a party as small as possible. A small committee moves more rapidly, with less disturbance to the areas visited and with less expense, than does a large committee. This is particularly important in a trip abroad, made primarily by air.

To my mind the trip demonstrates also that a party not exceeding five official members is appropriate for such a purpose. The maximum benefit to the Senate will result from the use of small subcommittees visiting special

areas on special assignments and reporting back to their parent committees. Such visits deprive the parent committee and the Senate of a minimum of the time and attendance of their members.

Furthermore, the small size of this party made it possible for it to use the regular trans-Atlantic four-engine C–54 transportation service of the Air Transport Command, and to make the balance of the trip abroad in an Air Transport Command two-engine plane. The plane so used abroad was a C–53, which corresponds for all practical purposes to the DC–3 plane used on regular commercial flights in the United States. It was interesting to me to note that the trans-Atlantic flights were made on the regular schedule of the Air Transport Command on planes operating under contract. In this instance the operation was by the Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc.—T. W. A.—which makes daily flights of this kind, in fact, many flights daily, I may say. The plane carried with it numerous passengers besides the committee to complete the regular loading for those trips. The routine character of these trips today, and, therefore, their availability to the Congress in meeting its overseas responsibilities, are seen from the fact that the subcommittee was told that under this contract there already had been made about 7,500 similar trans-Atlantic trips. With such transportation available on American planes operated by American crews and under contract with the American Government, it is appropriate that the Senate recognize that in the performance of its own duties, as well as in the conduct of modern warfare, the ocean no longer is a barrier to keeping in close touch with the business of the United States overseas as well as at home.

A simple illustration of the closeness of our overseas properties to the Senate was presented on the return flight of the subcommittee. We left Casablanca in Morocco, north Africa, on the regular Air Transport Command flight at 9:30 a. m., Wednesday, January 17. As we boarded the plane, we received a news bulletin announcing the sudden death of the late Senator Maloney of Connecticut. At 6:30 the next morning, the Senator from Delaware and I were at the National Airport in Washington, and at noon we were on the floor of the Senate to hear there the oral announcement of the death of Senator Maloney, and to join in the vote of the Senate to adjourn out of respect to his memory. It seemed almost as though we were responding to a Senate bell calling us from Casablanca to the floor of the Senate. Examining this time schedule more closely, the 5 hours' difference in time between Casablanca and Washington made our arrival in Washington at 11:30 a. m. Casablanca time, or a total elapsed time of 26 hours since the take-off. In computing flying time, there should be deducted, however, a lay-over in the Azores of about an hour, and in Bermuda of about an hour and a half, thus leaving the actual flying time at about 23½ hours. The flying time in the opposite direction, due to the prevailing winds, was about 21 hours. The flight was made most comfortably at about 10,000 feet, with less rough flying than is encountered on most transcontinental flights in the United States. We did, however, have the experience of getting in the way of a flash of lightning which evidently passed through the plane while were were in a bit of a storm over the ocean. This encounter with the lightning was also regarded by the crew as routine, and it in no way interrupted the flight of the plane.

The flight demonstrated that, both in the discharge of its war duties and its post-war obligations, the Senate is less than a full day's travel from the other side of the Atlantic. Therefore, if America is to live up to her responsibilities and opportunities, our governmental operations overseas should be completely integrated with those at home, and the Senate should be able to keep itself as closely in touch with conditions overseas as it does with conditions at home.

Later flights took the subcommittee to 16 great airfields, most of which were operated largely by American citizens, many of them had been built by American engineers with American taxpayers' funds. They are samples of America's widespread investments in airports, and in air experience. Today those American agencies are important agencies of the world. At a later date much business will be readily accessible through those agencies if means are found for continuing them in operation. I mention this subject here because the feasibility of a trip, such as that taken by this subcommittee in the exercise of its governmental functions, depends directly upon the air facilities now operated by the United States Government overseas. At least so long as those facilities of the United States are in operation, the Senate should not fail to recognize their availability and their helpfulness in making it possible for the Senate to keep up with the activities of our Government abroad, and also with the conflicting interests of the world upon which depend the peace and security of the world.

This trip emphasized the value of taking on such a trip a committee stenotypist or reporter. Without interfering with the local agencies the subcommittee, regardless of limited local facilities, was in a position to record hearings on a moment's notice. Through such recorded hearings the testimony in full was made available to the Senate and to all interested agencies on the return of the subcommittee.

The trip also demonstrated the feasibility and benefit, under present conditions, of making such a trip with an absence of press conferences, sight-seeing tours, and official functions not directly connected with the work of the subcommittee. A carefully planned schedule coupled with clear-cut objectives makes such a program feasible, while also observing such amenities as are necessary to foster friendly relations with foreign nations, and emphasizing the serious interest of the Senate in the enterprises upon which our Government is engaged. One of the most favorable reactions to this trip among American enlisted men on its route was the fact that the subcommittee was confining itself strictly to governmental investigations in the interest of the American taxpayer and was not engaging in sight-seeing tours or similar diversions at the expense of that taxpayer.

One of the most interesting and fruitful byproducts of the trip was the opportunity afforded to members of the subcommittee to meet informally with enlisted men, and to attempt to answer their questions as to the policies of the United States. The questions were extremely intelligent and pointed. They confirmed my faith in the soundness of the judgment of American citizens, be they in uniform or out of it. They especially confirmed my faith in the interest of the G. I. soldier in making sure that America should see to it not only that this war shall be won, but that every possible step be taken to make sure that it shall stay won. The universal recognition of the importance of this issue amply emphasizes the need that Members of the Senate keep themselves informed of the conditions and issues confronting the United States abroad as well as at home. This trip has demonstrated not only the accessibility of the world to the Senate, but the obligation of the Senate to make use of the facilities which his country has built in carrying out its world-wide responsibilities. The G. I. soldier today expects his Senate to understand not only the issues at home, but also those which he has encountered abroad. The G. I. soldier recognizes the importance of these issues to the peace and security of the world, and he expects that his Government will be alert to them. He expects the horizon of his Senate to be at least as broad as his own.

II. A NEED EXISTS FOR IMPROVED COORDINATION AMONG AGENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES ABROAD

While the subcommittee could not make an exhaustive study of the coordination among the agencies of the United States abroad, it did, through its 18 hearings, gain evidence of the degree of coordination existing, and the need for improved coordination in many places. On such basis the following observations are at least suggestive of the conditions in this and other areas.

(a) The civilian agencies of the United States in this area are better coordinated than was indicated in the report of the five Senators visiting it a year ago. The overlapping of agencies has been reduced, surplus employees have been largely eliminated, and coordination under the leadership of the State Department is at least generally being sought.

(b) The subcommittee hearings included testimony primarily from the Army, the Navy, the Diplomatic Service of the State Department, the Federal Economic Administration, the Office of War Information, the War Shipping Administration, the Office of Strategic Services, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the American Red Cross, the representatives of private service organizations such as the American Friends Committee and the Unitarian Service Committee, and the representatives of oil interests. Since it has returned, the subcommittee

has reported to its parent committee, and has consulted with the several executive departments affected by its report. The members of the subcommittee are reporting to the Senate at the request of and with the approval of the parent committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he encountered any activities of the Middle East Supply Council?

Mr. BURTON. The Middle East Supply Council was being terminated at about the time we were there. Judge Landis, who had been familiar with the work of that organization, was returning to this country at about that time.

Mr. BREWSTER. What was being substituted for the Middle East Supply Council?

Mr. BURTON. Nothing of a concrete nature was being substituted for it. Judge Landis had made some concrete recommendations, but we understood that the matter was largely being turned over to the State Department and, to a certain extent, to the F. E. A.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator in accord with the recommendations of Judge Landis?

Mr. BURTON. Yes. I shall refer to them later in connection with the importance of supervision of regional problems outside the boundaries of the respective states.

The representatives of these agencies themselves often derived from these hearings information which will help to coordinate their activities. The existing lack of complete information by some agencies about the activities of others and about the all-over purposes of the United States Government indicates that much benefit can be derived from closer contact among the civilian agencies and the armed forces. The State Department, as the principal permanent organization in the field, is the one to take the lead in bringing about this coordination.

(c) Our field agencies frequently lacked information or records as to the investments of the United States. Adequate evidence often was not readily accessible as to the rights of the United States to use the properties occupied by it and upon which large expenditures had been made primarily for military purposes. This is to be expected in the armed forces which have been primarily interested in temporary and tactical operations. They rarely are equipped with an understanding of local law or of all the legal rights and obligations incident to our use of facilities or land for military purposes. The State Department, on the other hand, generally has knowledge of such local law. Substantial benefits to the United States result from the joint consideration of these matters by representatives in the field of our armed forces and our State Department. The more remote these former combat areas become from active military operations the more important it is that questions relating to the rights and obligations of the United States be turned over to permanent civilian agencies of our Government. A step in this direction is the policy of turning over property finally judged to be surplus property for ultimate disposition through the Foreign Economic Administration. A system of property records especially affecting real estate and fixed properties needs to be developed.

Files developed by the Intelligence services of the Army and Navy and the Office of Strategic Services should be preserved in the respective areas after the active armed forces have ceased to occupy them. These files should be placed under the supervision of the State Department and some official in every case should be designated to take direct charge of such files and information on a permanent basis.

The Office of War Information should be closely integrated with the State Department with a view to developing the policies to be followed after the armed forces have moved on in the post-war period. If post-war activities are to be maintained, as they obviously should be, in some localities and not in others, steps should be taken promptly to select the areas in which informational activities are to be continued and to avoid any break in the continuity of the services in those areas.

One important need was recognized by Dean James M. Landis following his experience of the past year or more as the Director of the American Economic Mission of the Middle East with headquarters at Cairo. He has emphasized the value of the regional handling of policies and economic activities in this area rather than the handling of them solely through our diplomatic missions to the separate countries. Our security and economic interests demand such coordination on a regional basis. This need is emphasized by the policy recently developed by Great Britain of appointing a resident minister of cabinet rank who is in a position to coordinate British policies on a regional basis. Dean Landis, through the Economic Mission in the Middle East, was able to render some such service. Although this mission has been disbanded, it still is possible to coordinate our activities on a regional basis in this area through the State Department.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to inquire whether the Senator has found any indication since his return that some such arrangement is being contemplated to integrate the policies in the 15 or 20 countries which are involved?

Mr. BURTON. I have no concrete evidence that it is actually being done. I have in conferences with the State Department emphasized this feature, and I believe they do look with favor upon it, but I do not see any concrete action as yet.

Mr. BREWSTER. I make the inquiry because when the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the other Senators and I came back from our trip we pointed out this very thing. By reason of the extremely efficient way in which British interests were being handled by Mr. McMillan in north Africa and by Mr. Casey, who was then the British representative in the Middle East at Cairo, there was absolutely complete coordination of military and civilian activities under their direction in all areas. At that time we urged something comparable and we thought possibly the sending of Dean Landis to the area was the result to some extent of our conclusions. They is why we view with some concern the dissolution of his activities and the fact that apparently no provision as yet has been made for anything else in their place.

Mr. BURTON. I might mention to the Senator—and I shall refer to it later in this report—that there has been an encouraging step taken by the State Department in connection with the economic problems in this area that may give promise of coordination. An economic mission under the leadership of Col. William S. Culbertson, one of our former ambassadors, had proceeded through this area shortly before we had been there and made its report shortly before we left America. His entire report recognizes the necessity of regional treatment for economic purposes of the interests throughout north Africa and the Middle East. That mission originated with the State Department, and therefore I believe that there will be some steps taken certainly in line with that report which perhaps would supersede the former arrangement previously made through Dean Landis' mission.

Mr. BREWSTER. Within the past week I read of a considerable military mission being sent to Saudi Arabia. Does the Senator refer to that in any portion of his report?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has it come to the Senator's attention?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. BREWSTER. The article spoke in terms of several thousand men being sent there on a military mission. Just what its purpose might be was not made clear, but it would seem to be an appropriate matter of inquiry.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to add my word of support to the argument put forth by both my colleague from Maine and my colleague on the subcommittee who is now making his report. I think that it is all-important that these economic problems and problems involving property interests be treated on a regional basis rather than through a diplomatic representative whose activities and authority are confined to one country. I think it is also important that such regional authority be given comparative rank with similar authority designated by the British.

In my judgment, the question discussed in this portion of the report of the Senator from Ohio is very important; and I am very glad that he recognizes its importance, as did my colleague from Maine and I when we made our trip over a year ago. With our many interests overlapping the boundaries of countries and comparing them with the interests

of other nations, we should be able to deal with them by the regional method indicated in the report of the Senator from Ohio and suggested by my colleague from Maine. I hope that the subcommittee of the Senator from Ohio, and perhaps our full committee, will continue to confer with the State Department, and other agencies of the Government, until such time as this policy becomes formalized and, if we are going to retain our interests, is made a permanent plan of our Government.

I think that the question that is now being discussed calling for the treatment of these economic problems and of our general interests on a regional basis by one of high rank, comparable to the rank conferred upon the regional representative of the British, is a very vital and all-important matter.

I hope the State Department will take cognizance of it, and also I trust the Senate will give us their support until such time as it is an accomplished fact.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe I heard the Senator say why it was that Dean Landis was withdrawn from Cairo and his mission discontinued.

Mr. BURTON. By action of the State Department the mission was disbanded. I think Dean Landis would have rather liked to continue his mission longer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator find out what the objection to it was?

Mr. BURTON. No; it had been done just before we got there. Dean Landis had hoped to meet us there, but left us a letter instead.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator know whether there was any conflict between Dean Landis and the State Department?

Mr. BURTON. I do not know.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask one more question. Does the Senator feel that our State Department is sufficiently strong in its staff and the competency of its members to take care of our interests?

Mr. BURTON. I think our State Department has some excellent representatives, but that we need more strong representatives as we face the issues ahead of us.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Replying to the question of the Senator from Arkansas, I have asked permission to insert in the RECORD—and permission has been granted—an authorized interview with Dean Landis on the observations which he made while in the Middle East. I think if the Senator will read that interview as it will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, he will see possibly why he had stirred up some difficulty.

I will read one passage from the interview which will perhaps suggest appropriate inquiries; and I take it that this is authorized:

"I found we were pretending to operate an Anglo-American agency out there," he says, "But we were really underwriting British policy. I felt we should have our own policy and play our own part. It was wrong to use the term Anglo-American and let the people out there feel that we were behind whatever the British did. Often we didn't even know what it was. I stuck my nose into it." I said, 'We want to know what you're doing, before you call it Anglo-American.'"

The interview is most informative and instructive on this whole situation, and I think it is a matter which should invite the continued inquiry of all concerned in the development of a sound policy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood that perhaps one reason was the disagreement over the policy as to Greece between Mr. Landis and the State Department.

Mr. BURTON. I have not heard any comment on the disagreement as to Greece.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator will read this interview, he will find Mr. Landis goes into that, and that he pointed out the dangers of that Greek policy 6 months ahead, told exactly what would happen, and exactly what he prophesied did happen, and he told the very embarrassing position in which it would leave us.

Mr. BURTON. Dean Landis was not there when we got there. We did not have opportunity to confer with him, or to have his comment in our hearings.

Mr. BREWSTER. But the Senator did confer with the State Department with reference to this matter, and I thought he might have gotten some information from them.

Mr. BURTON. Not on that subject. I wish to underscore the statement made by the Senator from New York on the necessity and value of treating the questions referred to on a regional basis rather than in accordance with national boundaries. Our report shows that we were in 12 different nations, involving 12 different nationalities, so it is obvious they are somewhat small in their jurisdiction. It is also obvious that the combination of their issues amounts to a major issue, and therefore we can well afford to put a man of major prestige in charge of the whole, but we could not afford to put a man of major prestige in charge of each of the 12.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD the interview with James Landis, who was our representative in the Middle East and who has just returned from there. He discusses the very same problems with which we are now concerned, and I believe that he has made a most constructive contribution.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe of February 4, 1945]

CAIRO IS DYNAMITE, MAY BLOW US UP, SAYS DEAN LANDIS

(By Louis M. Lyons)

"I stuck my nose into it," says James M. Landis, telling of the muddle of the Middle East, where he has just finished a wartime hitch on a unique diplomatic mission.

Back on his old job now as dean of Harvard Law School, Landis thinks it is desperately important that Americans take an interest in the vitally strategic area around Cairo, where he was America's economic minister for 24 countries.

"It is full of dynamite," he says.

He found it an area without any American economic policy worth mentioning, where American diplomacy just tagged along after the British. Before he left he felt that American policy "began to make sense."

"I had to be very outspoken with the British at first," he says. "I said they must pay us for the lend-lease materials they had sold to the native populations and governments for political or any other reasons. They wondered about me for a few months. But then they discovered that I was working in the interest of true Anglo-American accord. I said the proceeds belonged to us. They saw the point. So they paid. They coughed up millions of dollars of the proceeds of sales of our lend-lease out there."

WORRIED BY BRITISH POLICY

That was the first thing he did. Result, "Not a single item of lend-lease today is transferred out of the hands of the British military without our consent. That's important," says the law dean, with clipped emphasis.

Landis, who held the reins over Wall Street as Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, kept a fishy eye on what passed in Cairo for Anglo-American policy.

"I found we were pretending to operate an Anglo-American agency out there," he says. "But we were really underwriting British policy. I felt we should have our own policy and play our own part. It was wrong to use the term 'Anglo-American' and let the people out there feel that we were behind whatever the British did. Often we didn't even know what it was. I stuck my nose into it. I said, 'We want to know what you're doing, before you call it Anglo-American.' Well they saw the point. We got on very well with the British after that.

"It is terribly complicated, the Middle East—its finances, politics, economics. It was a fascinating job to try to hammer out a policy and have it make sense. In essence, we had very little policy there. I had a feeling we brought a new sense of life in that area. American business interests are not negligible there. I think they felt that the United States policy was beginning to make sense before I left."

He is frankly worried about British policy in that part of the world.

BRITISH HONEST, BUT UNWISE

"You can't challenge British integrity," Landis says. "It is high class. Their wisdom is another thing. I am afraid they will be led to supporting things as they are out there. The British fear change because of their worry over security in that part of the world. They are afraid of upsetting things. But we would make a mistake if we lack sympathy for the stirring of liberal thought out there to try to lift standards of living that are unbelievably low. How to do it is another question.

"American suspicion of the British in the Middle East comes from the general pervading dominance of the British in that whole area. There is very little true self-government in this area."

I asked him about censorship in Cairo, reputedly the most oppressive and stupid American correspondents have encountered.

"Yes. The censorship on the whole Greek mutiny business came from Cairo. The rigid censorship unfortunately applies not only on news export but within Egypt. Everybody knows much of this is not really Egyptian censorship, but British. That is a dangerous thing to support, and there is less to justify

it. That area is not quite so strategic as it was a year ago.

"One story that never was let out—with no excuse for censoring it either—occurred last April. The King of Egypt was prevented from changing Prime Ministers by the demand of the British Government. He was just forbidden to do it and he refrained under duress. That definitely increased the dislike of the British in that part of the world. Six months later the King did change Prime Ministers and that time there was no interference."

GREEK SITUATION BOTHERSOME

"The Greek situation worries me. The policy I advocated seemed to get nowhere. Long ago it was perfectly plain, back in October, 1943, that either we would let the British go ahead on their line and pick up the pieces later, or we could—as we ought—assume the responsibility of fashioning a joint policy back of which both of us could stand.

"My idea was that the direction of Greek relief should not follow an absolutely military line, but that the general commanding should be responsible for policy to a combined civilian and military head, in which we and the British and hopefully the Russians could unite.

"Of all the things that engendered anti-British feeling in the Near East, the sorest when I got there was their handling of lend-lease. The area was full of rumor, some of it true. It was the first thing I went after, to correct it not only for itself, but to make a sound basis for Anglo-American unity. I think there is nothing wrong now. The British distributed lend-lease materials out there to meet civilian needs without reference to us. But that was our own fault. Our arrangements were so loose that they were violating no law in selling goods that we had consigned to their military. You give a man free rein and he feels entitled to use it for purposes of his own that he can always relate somehow to the war."

NEAR EAST TRUSTS UNITED STATES

"What worries me now is how to make it plain to the American people that they have got to take an interest in the Middle East. I see it as an area full of dynamite. It may well explode in our faces and those of Russia and Britain, in the absence of any joint policy to handle it. It will mean not only disorder there but friction among the three great powers. The United States has a better chance than Britain or Russia to bring about such a joint policy. The people out there are not afraid of us. They know our history of noninterference and they know we have no territorial ambitions out there.

"The security of that area is very vital to the security of the world. It is vital to all communications. Air routes can't skip it. Cairo is vital to air navigation, just as Suez is to shipping. Security in that part of the world has got to be guaranteed. If we fall into the old habit of letting security be the responsibility of one nation, we will tend to commit the same errors as for the past 50 years."

Landis did not wait to come home to talk about the economic facts of life to a people under control of British sterling policy. He opened up the economic problem in a speech in Cairo that was discussed in the Arab press for many days. He talked about things no diplomat discussed. Such as, "What is the value of Egypt's sterling credit?" And of the importance of a country having its own independent banking system. And of the shortage of American dollars in Egypt. And of the effect of the dollar pool and the fact that the assets of these nations are in sterling. Egypt now has enormous sterling credits. How long before they can be liquidated? It will be a long time before British production will have the goods to exchange for them. We will have goods, but the Egyptians won't be able to buy them without dollars. These sterling credits are to Landis the great unsolved economic problem of that whole area, known as "the sterling area."

FLOUTED BRITISH DIPLOMACY

"I talked freely about it," Landis says, tossing over a copy of the talk. "I think many others were scared to talk about it. But when I did, they could comment without fear of reprisals. In that, I believe I did a service because these countries must discover for themselves their financial problems.

"We have very few specialists in economics in our diplomatic missions. We could stand more. Again and again it comes down to that. We have commercial secretaries. But they are sometimes only salesmen for American goods. They don't get down to the guts of the question of how these people are going to be able to buy any of our goods.

"I think the State Department is conscious of this problem. The reorganized Department has that much on its mind. But how to get the talent and wisdom to do it is not easy. I felt that there was at least a 5-year job ahead of my mission to round out and establish American economic policy for that area. But after being away from the law school 3 years I have to get going on the critical job back here."

COVERED VAST TERRITORY

Landis, with rank of Minister, headed an economic mission with responsibility for economic affairs from the eastern border of Tunis to the western border of Afghanistan, north to the Caucasus, south to Kenya, covering 24 countries. He reported direct to the State Department. He had responsibility for the region with Treasury, Agriculture, State Department, and Foreign Economic Administration staffs under him. He was delegated the task of coordinating economic policy for the area. The British leave coordinating authority in the field, as in this single instance Washington did. Landis feels it is a very practical method. The economic problem reaches over all the countries in the area, he says. The sterling problem dominates that area. British sterling policy forces controls over all trading with a hard-currency country such as the United States. Dollars earned in these countries go into a central pool for the benefit of the entire Empire, there to be doled out according to the needs of these various countries as England sees them.

"Of course, England says to Egypt, 'We'll give you the dollars you need for essential purchases from the United States,'" Landis explains. "The danger is, it operates in direct contradiction to our policy of importer's choice. Reconciliation of freedom of trade—our doctrine—with the fact of limited and controlled dollars is not easy. The policy tends to force all purchases to be made from England or other sterling countries.

"But the situation is enormously improved. By the agreement signed January 1 England will make available to Egypt 20 percent more dollars than it has been getting and restore some financial controls to it."

This agreement for liquidating controls after the war was Landis' final accomplishment. He takes satisfaction that the decontrols agreement sets the stage for liquidating war controls on imports in the whole Middle East and reduces the chance of controls that have nothing to do with war. But the problem of sterling credits remains, limiting the trade channels of that part of the world, and limiting the area of our foreign trade. The Bretton Woods agreement does not touch this question. Landis thinks that the sterling area question is one that Americans, especially businessmen, don't understand and need to understand.

BLOCKED IN ETHIOPIA

He tried to open up trade with Ethiopia. But it was impossible. "They had only a few dollars in the whole country. The British, through their control at Aden, had gotten them to give up dollars for sterling. We naturally went after the British to get these dollars back for the benefit of American-Ethiopian trade. The British then did make available these dollar earnings, arising mostly out of hides. They have a lot of coffee in Ethiopia. I tried to get some of it exported to us. But it costs them more to lay it down in New York than the O. P. A. allows it to be sold at. The trouble with their costs is the terrific inflation all over the Middle East. Where our prices have gone up to, say, 130 percent of pre-war, the average in the Middle East is 270 percent. It is 400 percent in Palestine, 900 percent in Syria, 1,200 percent in Persia, and God knows what in Ethiopia. Supplies have been cut off because of the war all through there, and money has poured in from the Russians, the British, and the Americans. There's lots of money and nothing to buy. An aspirin pill a year ago cost 50 cents in Tehran, tires $1,500—black market, of course. Ethiopia is a primitive civilization. They never even developed the wheel there. There are trucks now, but no carts. They jumped from carrying burdens on their backs, or on animals, to automobile transport from outside. Such people need help in analyzing their economic problems and improving the efficiency of their production.

Landis found Cairo "very comfortable—a nice place to be for a while." But the Persian Gulf he found "the most awful place in the world—climate, disease, poverty, absence of associations, no place to go. If I were a private in the Army, it is the last place on earth I'd want to be sent."

Back at his law school, he finds 35 percent of the students already are veterans. Entrance requirements will have to be adjusted to the experience of men coming out of the service and some credit given for their experience, he says. It is going to be an individual problem in each case. He is convinced that the wartime accelerated schedule will stick with the law school. Men now finish in 2 years and 15 weeks by attending three 15-week terms a year. He thinks this timesaving is what men are going to want.

The long summer vacation he sees based on nothing but tradition. "They have 7 weeks' vacation, even in a year of three 15-week terms," Landis says. "That's more than you get if you work for the Government."

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand the Senator's recommendation to be that this change and increase in authority or operation be through the State Department.

Mr. BURTON. Expressly so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How large a staff did Dean Landis' commission have?

Mr. BURTON. I do not know exactly, but it was a small staff. It was a modest staff he had there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the staff remain after the dean left?

Mr. BURTON. I think not.

Mr. FERGUSON. The whole commission was dissolved.

Mr. BURTON. There may have been a few of them transferred to other agencies, but the commission has been disbanded, I understand. There is some hope, however, of other procedures being adopted on the recommendation of the Culbertson commission, but just what

the leadership will be has not been disclosed.

I may say that the Foreign Economic Administration, which worked actively with Dean Landis, is there, and is taking over some functions from the Army and being assigned some from the State Department, and that may become a nucleous of an additional staff that may go in.

Mr. FERGUSON. What was the real mission of the Dean Landis commission?

Mr. BURTON. I think it was precisely what the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was referring to, first of all, the elimination of overlapping agencies, the reduction of personnel, the development of a policy representing the United States interests in that area, which until that time had not been clearly developed and had not been coordinated. I think that was the view, and the Senator may remembmer that the title of his commission was "American Economic Commission to the Middle East," with headquarters at Cairo. It was to straighten out our economic interests, as he was doing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Apparently, according to the Senator from Maine, when he did try to straighten them out, no good was done.

Mr. BURTON. I think that is going too far, but the recommendation of the other commission which has recently reported indicates its appreciation of the need for some such action.

Mr. FERGUSON. But they wiped out his commission. The Senator may say that is going rather far.

Mr. BURTON. Whether it has relation to personnel or the issues, I cannot tell.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is just the question.

Mr. BURTON. It seems to me that the reasoning of Dean Landis pointing out the need of a commission in that field, is inescapable. Our subcommittee underscores that and says:

> Although this mission has been disbanded, it is possible to coordinate our activities on a regional basis in this area through the State Department.

I may add that whereas America might not be able to carry out the suggestion of the Senator from New York by giving the leader precisely the same rank as the British resident minister, we could approximate it. It seems that their resident minister is one of the members of the British Cabinet. We have adopted a policy of having a roving ambassador, or something like that. He could have ambassadorial rank, but I doubt whether under our system we would make him technically a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I gladly yield.

Mr. MEAD. I desired to make a point during the questioning by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, to explain that as a result of circumstances both Great Britain and the United States were called upon to create a great many emergency agencies, with authority in the various active areas of the world. Great Britain, I understood, through a conversation we had in north Africa, learned that a great many questions were being sent back to London to harass the Prime Minister or some other Cabinet officer there. So it was thought that they would create a number of what they told us were "little Churchills," men of cabinet rank, men who could call together in conference the military and civilian agencies, both permanent and emergency, and there in the field, in the area, coordinate and solve the problems which otherwise might have to be returned to London.

Mr. BURTON. If the Senator will permit an interruption for emphasis, their creation of "little Churchills" is due to the fact that they have large governmental interests and many administrative problems. They might have to unravel a great many problems which might involve Cabinet action.

Mr. MEAD. They were there for many years before the emergency, and they will probably be there afterwards. To point out their interest, let me say that when the junior Senator from Delaware made his report, the subcommittee explained the activities of the sterling block in the Middle East area, where the dollars are controlled from London, and where it is difficult for people to buy from America, and vice versa. It is a problem very near to the British administration. It is a problem which should be solved, and probably will be solved in the post-war period.

Then there are other problems, such as that of getting American news in that area. It seems that the British Reuters, which may be subsidized by the British Government, accepts messages from the United States, but at a premium much higher than that at which it accepts similar news items from British sources. Therefore, in some parts of the world it is difficult for America to speak as freely as it is for other countries to speak. For instance, in Australia, in a discussion with a high-ranking American diplomat, I was told that word from America must have a visa to enter Australia, that being so because of customs which have developed throughout the years.

Because of our growing interests, our interests of tomorrow, in trade and commerce, and our interest in speaking to the world so that they will understand us and we will understand them, I think it is important that we approach the problems along the lines set forth by the junior Senator from Ohio. It seems that it cannot be done if the O. W. I. sends out a man to set up a branch of the O. W. I. and to live within the regulations of that agency. It cannot be done if the Foreign Economic Administration sends out a representative to take care of that job and that job alone. It surely will not be done by a minister sent by the State Department to one particular country, because his interests are limited and restricted to the country of his designation. But I think it will be done if we have the coordination of which the Senator from Ohio speaks, and if we have a coordinator with authority to bring all the American interests together, because then he will see the large problem, the future problem rather than his own particular task. So I think this is a very vital matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Delaware discover that the Resident Minister from Britain called by the Senator from New York "the little Churchill" had the power to determine that a question was a political question and not a military question, and therefore that he could take it over and act on it?

Mr. BURTON. Of course we did not have the opportunity to cross-examine him. We did meet him, and we gathered from him that he is of a full Cabinet rank, and therefore has the same discretion that a Cabinet officer has, and can speak very readily for Mr. Churchill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will say, Mr. President, that we were fortunate, on the trip we took, to have a very interesting evening with Mr. Casey, who was then British Resident Minister in the Middle East, and he told us very fully of the arrangement by which at 9:15 each morning—and I very distinctly remember the hour—the British military and naval commanders in the area met with him, and they coordinated the civil and military program for that day and the weeks to come. In other words, there was the most complete coordination of civilian and military activities.

In that connection, I should like to supplement what I have said, by reading from a statement made by Mr. Landis, and I should like to have his statement inserted in the RECORD at the point where the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] inquired concerning the Greek situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The matter referred to appears at the point designated.)

Mr. BREWSTER. This is what Mr. Landis had to say in the interview, the complete text of which will appear in the RECORD. I quote:

> The Greek situation worries me. The policy I advocated seemed to get nowhere. Long ago it was perfectly plain, back in October 1943—

That was a year ago last October—

> that either we would let the British go ahead on their line and pick up the pieces later, or we could—as we ought—assume the responsibility of fashioning a joint policy back of which both of us could stand.
>
> My idea was that the direction of Greek relief should not follow an absolute military line, but that the general commanding should be responsible for policy to a combined civilian and military head, in which we and the British and hopefully the Russians could unite.

At that time Dean Landis was urging this very thing, that we should have a coordination of the civilian and military authorities in connection with the most delicate problem of Greek relief, and I think the developments since then have demonstrated rather conclusively that apparently he was on the right track, and his reward is his removal.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I ask a question of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. From what was said at the conference with the Minister the Senator referred to, did the Senator from Maine take it that in case of a conflict, the Resident Minister with Cabinet rank would have the right to determine that a question was a political question, and that he could dictate its solution?

Mr. BREWSTER. That was the very purpose, and of course if he felt it was important enough he could take it up with London. He could always fly to London, meet with the Cabinet Members, talk with them, and determine the question. But he had virtually all the authority in that area which Churchill himself could exercise.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did Dean Landis, during his period of service in the Middle East, have any such power?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. The first 3 months he was out there—he reported this on his return in December 1943—he could not even discover whom he represented; whether he was a foreign economic or State Department representative. He came back to find out, and went out with a somewhat more definite authority, and carried on for the past year under that authority, with the result which has been disclosed here.

Mr. FERGUSON. In view of that experience I take it we must add to the State Department, if it does not have it today—and I believe it does have it today—the power to solve some of these problems by our representative going, if necessary, directly to Washington.

Mr. BREWSTER. There must be some means of coordination, and I take it, that is what everyone is agreed upon.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Middle East Supply Council was a joint British and American operation which Dean Landis found there, which has now been dissolved, and that as a result both the British and the Americans have continued to operate separately. We operate under the Foreign Economic Administration and the State Department. It is not clear as yet just what will be done by the State Department and what will be done by the Foreign Economic Administration, but Mr. John P. Dawson is the successor to Judge Landis, with somewhat less power. He left for Cairo last Thursday. Exactly what his power will be is yet to be worked out, but he will take charge of the F. E. A. activities there.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. A moment ago the Senator used the term "regional district."

Mr. BURTON. "Regional area" rather than national area, because there are so many small nations and the problems are common so far as we are concerned.

Mr. LANGER. And does the "little Churchill" that was referred to represent three or four little states in this area?

Mr. BURTON. He would represent Churchill over the entire area. He is called Resident Minister of Cabinet rank, and is assigned to the whole of the Middle East, or wherever his Government wants him to function. It is a flexible jurisdiction. I might emphasize, tragic as it is, the importance of that position, by pointing out the fact that Lord Moyne, who was assassinated in Cairo while serving as the representative of the British Government, held that very position. His successor is now proceeding to fill his shoes. They have not given up the position because of the fact that one who occupied it was assassinated in view of the responsibility of that position.

Mr. President, this brings me to the third point in my report.

III. A NEED EXISTS FOR A CLEAR VIGOROUS POLICY AS TO INVESTMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES ABROAD

The most impressive need at practically every station is the need for an American foreign policy to guide the civilian agencies and the armed forces in protecting and developing American interests. The need for such policy becomes increasingly great as the military phases of the American occupation pass into the post-war peacetime phases of that occupation. Need for such policy is felt also in connection with the use and disposition of properties and investments in the hands of the armed forces. The policy as to movable property is reasonably clear. It is to salvage as much as this property as possible, transfer it to locations where there is more need for it in the same agency, dispose of it to other agencies of the United States either of a military or civilian character, dispose of it to American educational institutions overseas, dispose of it to our allies or finally to realize as much cash as possible for it through sales of it on the best available terms. In the case of investments in fixed property, the problem is more difficult. The need for guidance is greater both because of the size of the investment and because of the importance of the policy controlling its disposition in relation to the security or economic development of the interests of the United States. In addition to the need for some policy, there is also a need for fixing the responsibility for communicating that policy to our own civilian and military agencies and to those of the United Nations affected by it. This responsibility should be recognized as that of the State Department.

The need for such an underlying policy is especially great in connection with the development and preservation of our future trade relations, transportation facilities and communication facilities. Absence of an underlying policy will not only be a handicap to the agencies representing the United States but it will detract from respect for the United States and our form of government on the part of those dealing with the United States. Finally, lack of such a policy is bound to deprive the United States of a substantial part of the return which it otherwise might derive from its wartime investments of cash, labor, and good will.

Dean Landis has emphasized the handicap which he found in this area, due to the absence of an articulate American economic policy and the lack of sufficient manpower to implement it. As I shall suggest later the direction toward which our underlying policy should point in this area, it is sufficient here to emphasize the need that the policy, whatever its direction, should be crystallized promptly and communicated to the representatives of the United States.

This brings me to the fourth point in my report.

IV. SUGGESTIONS AS TO THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION (U. N. R. R. A.)

Not only was the trip timely, because it entered the first area from which the United States, on a large scale, is moving out its armed forces and, therefore, is dealing with the reestablishment of permanent local civilian activities, but the trip also was timely in that it encountered some of the initial activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The activities of U. N. R. R. A. in this area fall primarily into two classes: First, those relating to refugees; and, second, those relating to liberated territory.

While the subcommittee was not in a position to make an extensive examination of the activities of U. N. R. R. A., it was able to consider these activities to some extent in the refugee camps at Fedala, Morocco, which has now been abandoned; Philippeville, in Algeria, which is now being operated on a small scale, and at El Shatt and Moses Wells, near Cairo, in Egypt, where they are caring for over 30,000 refugees. The subcommittee also learned of some of the problems of the Balkan mission in Greece and Yugoslavia. We recognized that U. N. R. R. A. is an agency of the United Nations rather than of the United States, but we were cordially received, and information was freely given to us by the officials of U. N. R. R. A. in recognition of the large interest of the United States in that organization. These officials of U. N. R. R. A. in some instances were citizens of Great Britain, but for the most part those interviewed by the committee were American citizens. The chief of the Balkan mission of U. N. R. R. A. is Sir William Mathews, an Englishman, and the deputy chief is the highly competent Neville Miller, former mayor of Louisville, Ky.

Our chief observations as to the refugee problem of U. N. R. R. A. in this area are the following:

(a) U. N. R. R. A. is not confronted with a mass Jewish refugee problem, although an impression has existed in the United States that this would be one of its major refugee responsibilities. The subcommittee was told that in the Philippeville camp there probably are at this time not over 200 Jewish refugees, and it was estimated by those in charge of the Yugoslavia and Greece refugee camps that out of the more than 30,000 refugees there probably were less than 500 Jews. It was suggested to the subcommittee that the Polish refugees still in Africa under the care of the British Government include a substantial number of Polish Jews, but these have not been transferred to U. N. R. R. A. It was pointed out also that many Jewish refugees have been able to find a haven in Palestine, but the primary explanation of the absence of a

large Jewish refugee problem at this time was that many of the Jews persecuted in occupied territory had been killed and that the others had been unable to escape from that territory. It was suggested that the problem of caring for Jewish victims of the Axis invasion would arise more largely in the liberated territories themselves than as a refugee problem outside those territories.

(b) The two major refugee activities of U. N. R. R. A. are those in the vicinity of Cairo, where some 25,000 Yugoslavian and some 8,000 Greek refugees are cared for. These refugee camps exist under primitive conditions where the refugees supply all of their own needs insofar as it is possible to do so through any form of labor. This includes not only the preparation of food and clothing but the making of furniture, tools, the supplying of educational and hospital needs for children and so forth. Some clothing contributed by interested American organizations was of great value, and deep appreciation for it was shown. With the exception of those smaller children who had suffered from rickets and similar maladies during the periods of greatest hardship, the health of the refugees in these camps is generally excellent. I was able to visit personally the Yugoslav camp and found the morale of the refugees exceedingly high. The refugees are enthusiastic followers of Tito, anxious to return at the earliest possible moment to their homes in Dalmatia and to contribute in every way to the reestablishment of their home communities. This service to refugees, although on a comparatively small scale in the light of the major problems of displaced persons in Europe, is a good illustration of a vital need well met through a United Nations organization appropriately adapted to that need. The value of rendering this service through a United Nations organization is in itself substantial. The good will thus created in this area toward the United Nations is important.

(c) The problems faced by the Balkan Mission in the liberated territories of Greece and Yugoslavia illustrate the fact that U. N. R. R. A. is pioneering in this field. The experience gained there will be invaluable in meeting the needs in other areas which may soon confront UNRRA on a far greater scale.

The experience in Greece presented the difficulty of coordinating the initial activities of U. N. R. R. A. with those of occupying forces in newly liberated territory under conditions putting the policy of coordination to the most difficult test. It has been understood in the United States Senate that U. N. R. R. A. is to be a relief agency designed to follow up the relief efforts of the armed forces of the Allies with a view to relieving those armed forces of such responsibility as soon as the relief becomes a matter of civilian activity as contrasted with military activity. The experience of U. N. R. R. A. thus far indicates the existence of this need and the soundness of this conception. It also emphasizes the great value to be derived from bringing the United Nations, as such, in contact directly with the needs of the people in liberated territory. At the same time, it sharply illustrates the necessary dependence of U. N. R. R. A. upon the supply and transportation agencies serving the Allied military forces.

On the other hand, the experience also emphasizes the need for increased care in separating the U. N. R. R. A. activities from those of the armed forces during the period of military combat and military relief. In Greece, for example, the experiment was tried of seeking to coordinate civilian relief with military relief, by integrating the U. N. R. R. A. representatives with the armed forces, which in this case were the forces of Great Britain. The purpose of this integration was to familiarize the U. N. R. R. A. with the needs of the area at the earliest possible date. The experience in Greece, however, demonstrates the fact that it is impossible to foretell precisely what will be the nature of the military operations or the degree to which some sort of combat is likely to continue following the military occupation of a new area. In Greece considerable local hostility grew out of the measures adopted by Great Britain in establishing law and order. The presence, therefore, of U. N. R. R. A. representatives integrated as individuals to a substantial extent with the British forces tended to produce confusion which would have been better avoided.

For example, representatives of U. N. R. R. A. proceeded into the territory not only with the British forces, but wearing British uniforms, distinguished only by flashes and the metal letters U. N. R. R. A. on the shoulders of the uniform. While there was some success in keeping the identity of U. N. R. R. A. separated in the minds of the Greek people from the British combat forces, obviously there also was created some unnecessary and undesirable confusion.

The subcommittee has discussed this experience both with the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Balkan Mission in Cairo, and with Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, the Director General of U. N. R. R. A. in Washington. The subcommittee has recommended that every effort to keep the representatives of U. N. R. R. A. segregated as a group from combat forces, that integration at the most be on a group basis, rather than on an individual basis, and that so far as possible the occupying military forces handle their own military relief by themselves, until such time as their activity ceases to be primarily a military one.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the Senator's conversation with Governor Lehman did he ascertain whether the same policy is being followed on other fronts—for instance, in Italy, France, and Belgium—namely, that the representatives of U. N. R. R. A. wear the same uniform as that worn by the members of the armed forces where they are serving, except as to insignia in the form of letters, and that they go there as a part of the Army?

Mr. BURTON. Let me say that U. N. R. R. A. has not actually gone into those areas. A plan of procedure is now being negotiated, and that plan would overcome the errors made in Greece. I assume that the representatives of U. N. R. R. A. will not be integrated as individuals, but as a group, and I assume they will be so segregated that a ready distinction may be made between the groups.

Mr. FERGUSON. But U. N. R. R. A. had not operated in the same way on other fronts; had it?

Mr. BURTON. Greece was the first example—the first test.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know if that was the only one?

Mr. BURTON. So far as I know, that is the only one where that issue arose. It happened to come up in the first one.

I would say that the necessary integration between the military forces and U. N. R. R. A. should take place by assigning the military officials for temporary integrating duty with U. N. R. R. A. rather than attempting to advance the representatives of U. N. R. R. A. into the uniformed and primarily military activities of the occupying forces. In other words, they can largely integrate back, instead of integrating forward, in order to keep the activities adequately informed of local conditions and needs. A new agreement covering this particular situation is now being negotiated.

It is important to the future relations of the United Nations with the local populations in the liberated territories, that U. N. R. R. A. itself be completely disassociated with whatever conflicts of opinion and use of force may be incident to the activities of the occupying forces.

In Yugoslavia the activities of U. N. R. R. A. apparently have been somewhat delayed through the difficulty of coming to a full understanding between the representatives of the liberated territory and the military forces as to the control and distribution of relief in the liberated territory. U. N. R. R. A. apparently has been ready and anxious to proceed.

My fourth point as to U. N. R. R. A. is as follows: (d) In order that U. N. R. R. A. may be available for the critically important relief, refugee, and health services for which it exists, it is necessary that it develop and hold available a substantial organization ready to enter into the liberated areas promptly when needed. This necessarily has resulted in some inactivity between the time when the relief groups have been assembled and the time when it has been possible to put them to full use. This schedule has been dependent upon military operations and the available communication and transportation facilities in the liberated areas. The necessity for such advance preparation of units of U. N. R. R. A. for this work is clear, and the justification of the existence of an organization of the United Nations to render this type of service probably will become increasingly clear as its operations are extended.

V. PETROLEUM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

This brings me to the fifth question discussed in this report, entitled "Petroleum in the Middle East." The jurisdiction of the subcommittee in connection with petroleum in the Middle East is limited to the relation of the pe-

troleum supply to the conduct of the war. The subcommittee was particularly instructed to determine whether there had been an improvement in the conditions reported a year ago to the effect that the almost unlimited petroleum resources of the Middle East were not being used to the extent which existing refineries and pipe lines would make possible. The subcommittee took special care to look into this situation in connection with the great petroleum resources in Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, and Bahrein Island. Most of these resources are on or near the Persian Gulf. The subcommittee had the benefit of the expert advice of Col. John H. Leavell, assigned to this area by the State Department as a petroleum adviser, and also took the testimony of others who were in a position to know the facts. The testimony was completely unanimous and convincing that at the present time the refinery and pipe line facilities of this area are being put to full use, and that every possible effort is being made to expand them so that still further use may be made of the petroleum resources in this area in connection with this war. This is true of the large refinery resources available at Abadan, in Iran, at the head of the Persian Gulf, where there is now located what is said to be the largest refinery in the world, and which is in process of further enlargement.

Mr. President, whatever is now stated by me beyond this conclusion is not an attempt to intrude upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations or that of the Special Committee on Petroleum Resources. It is merely an attempt to contribute to the Senate certain evidence which may be of interest and value in connection with the major post-war policies of the Nation as to which each Member of the Senate necessarily feels a substantial personal responsibility.

The testimony was impressive that the petroleum resources of Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia are the greatest in the world. The evidence also indicated that these resources can be developed so as to yield a tremendously greater supply of petroleum to the world, and especially to Europe, Africa, and Asia, than is now the case. It showed also that American interests are in a position to participate in the development of these petroleum resources to a substantial degree in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. These fields are currently producing over 400,000 barrels a day. Their proven reserves are in excess of 16,000,000,000 barrels, and the indicated reserves greatly exceed that figure.

This area, in which this tremendous new source of wealth is thus at hand, is peculiarly adapted, from a geographical standpoint, to the ready distribution of petroleum supplies to Europe, Asia, and Africa. These supplies, if properly developed, will probably meet the great potential demands of these continents, while the petroleum resources of the Americas will thus be kept primarily available, and for a longer time, for the natural markets for those resources in the Americas.

Iraq, furthermore, now contains a population only approximately one-tenth of what it accommodated in the days of the greatest prosperity in Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. This great and fertile area might well respond to a new era of prosperity encouraged by the development and sale of the readily available petroleum resources in the immediate vicinity. I may say that would be a welcome source of funds for recovery, as distinguished from borrowing funds from the United States of America.

At present this area is in crying need of additional wealth and resources. If these needs are not met, it is an area which may handicap rather than aid the general recovery of the world under the universal load of world war debts. On the other hand, the development in this area of new wealth of inestimable value derived directly from petroleum will supply to it the very life blood of modern industry and transportation. If adequately developed this will contribute not only to increased prosperity and improved standards of living in this impoverished area, but to the recovery and development of Europe, Africa, and Asia as a whole, and to the market for automotive machinery produced not only in Europe but in America. In the days of economic stress confronting the world following the war, these great petroleum resources will be, therefore, of inestimable value, not only to the localities in which they are placed, but also to the world as a whole, and to the United States of America in particular.

Coupled with this economic value of this area is its obvious importance to the security and peace of the world. The prize represented by this great natural wealth is attractive to the great nations of Europe and Asia; and unless this wealth be made available to the world on some basis that is just and fair to all concerned, it almost inevitably will lead to international controversy, probably leading to armed conflict. The presence of this resource, therefore, confronts the United States and all the other nations of the world with an extraordinary responsibility of bringing into operation at the earliest practicable date such positive and vigorous measures of international policy as are represented by the proposal of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] for an early treaty among the great Allied Nations for the demilitarization of Germany and—in the words of the Senator from Michigan, "as its indispensable sequel"—the establishment at the earliest practicable date of a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. President, this is the doctrine proclaimed by the Senate in its resolution on November 5, 1943, and this is the basis of the program that has since then been outlined in the negotiations in Washington at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. The establishment of some such organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, accompanied by its incidental provisions for an economic and social council, an International Court of Justice, and commitments to specific procedures, thus becomes of increased practical importance in the light of these all-important petroleum resources of the Middle East. Not only may the future economic development of the world depend upon the development of those resources, but the peace and security of the world may also depend upon the development of some world-wide agency dedicated to the maintenance of international peace and security, and the administration of justice to small nations as well as large nations, if the fundamental principle of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us is to replace the law of the jungle as a basis of human relations. Civilizations, as well as the peace and prosperity of the world, will depend upon it. The star of hope and destiny is shining over America, and certainly the prayers of the world will accompany those who meet under that star in San Francisco on April 25, 1945. They must not fail to consolidate the victory against world tyranny which their armed forces are winning.

Mr. President, this brings me to the sixth and last section of my statement.

VI. NORTH AFRICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST IS A PROVING GROUND FOR A CONSTRUCTIVE VIGOROUS FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Returning to the precise jurisdiction of the subcommittee to examine into the war program in north Africa and the Middle East, it readily appears from the above observations that the trip to that area was extremely timely because the area is becoming an important proving ground for the post-war foreign policy of the United States. Our investigation demonstrates that in an area such as this, from which our combat troops are moving on to other areas, and are leaving in their wake millions of dollars of American money invested in transportation, communication, and other facilities, the taxpayers' interest in those facilities extends not merely to their salvage and sale, but includes their relationship to the future political and economic foreign policy of the United States.

The experience gained in the coordination of civilian agencies with military agencies and local governments in this area is of unique value, both in itself and as a pattern for our policy in areas where similar issues will be presented all around the world. Our billions of dollars of investment in air bases and in communication facilities present issues which will recur repeatedly in other parts of the world. Our relationship to the great economic developments of the future through the petroleum supplies of the Middle East, including the investment of American companies in some of those resources, illustrates the extent to which our foreign policy is related to the future security and economic development of both America and the world.

Through a report recently prepared by an economic mission from the State Department to this area, the attention of the subcommittee was called to the critical importance of the policy of the United States in that area in relation to the recovery of private business in the world as distinguished from the wartime practice of doing business solely

through governmental agencies, groups, or cartels. If the Allied victory on the battlefields is to lead to a survival of private industry and to an opportunity for individual citizens to do business as distinguished from the regimented business of governmental control of international trade, it becomes important that in this initial area America at once adopt economic and political policies dedicated to that end. The growth and independence of the small nations of the world, as well as of the individual businessman of the world, is dependent upon such leadership.

Mr. President, unless America develops a program of that kind in this first test area, and encourages recovery along those lines, it may be that the people of the impoverished and regimented nations of Europe will be unable to initiate such a program, even though they might wish to do so. As a champion of the individual businessman, laborer, and farmer in the United States, our Nation also stands as a champion of the individual businessman, laborer, and farmer throughout the world. Our policy is important to the whole system of individual enterprise in the world, and our system of individual enterprise itself will be handicapped and endangered unless the general system also survives outside of our own borders. International stability thus becomes a domestic necessity for America.

Our armed forces are fighting and winning the war so that America may remain free, and so that opportunity for the individual may be preserved throughout the world. Unless America sees and does her full part now our hard-won peace will drift again into the wars which spring from a peace based on force rather than on a continuing purpose to do justice. Involved in all discussions of economics in this area is the question of international exchange and the so-called sterling block. This is a subject which needs readjustment at the present rather than after post-war relations have been frozen into a fixed pattern.

The Senate has no greater responsibility to its citizens, and especially to its citizens in uniform, than the responsibility to see to it that in the unique area of north Africa and the Middle East we forthwith establish a vigorous policy of friendly leadership among our allies in peace comparable to the position we have taken in the war. The high standards set by our men in arms challenges the rest of us to set a similar standard for ourselves in the performance of our share of the duties of our time.

From the trip of the subcommittee I therefore bring to the Senate not only the specific recommendations included in the subcommittee report, and in these remarks dealing with the coordination of departmental agencies, the protection of investments in physical properties, the improvement of the technique of U. N. R. R. A., and the development of petroleum resources in connection with the conduct of the war, but also a conviction that north Africa and the Middle East afford to this country a providential and timely opportunity for us to determine now upon our policies to win the peace as well as the war.

In meeting this opportunity, I emphatically recommend: First, support of the Vandenberg program for an immediate treaty to demilitarize Germany and Japan; second, immediate action pressing for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the Senate resolution of November 1943; and third, initiation of a vigorous political and economic foreign policy in the interest of American agriculture, labor, and industry, which shall set a standard comparable to the standards set by our armed forces, and which in terms of today shall be equal to the destiny which our forefathers set for America when they brought forth this Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that through this Nation there shall come to man, under God, a new birth of freedom.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. As chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, I wish to commend the subcommittee on the work which it has done so well. Mr. President, as is readily realized from the outline of the schedule which has been given to us, the trip of the subcommittee was a hazardous one. It was a strenuous trip because of the hearings and the meetings which the subcommittee held en route. It was a constructive trip, as we will all agree from the splendid account to which we have listened from both the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. The trip was also an ideal one. It was exemplary, and one which any subcommittee or full committee of the Senate might well study if in the future a similar trip is contemplated.

The subcommittee held a series of hearings and conferences before they undertook the trip, and conferred with all the agencies of government that would be interested. During the course of the trip they held 18 hearings in a period of 22 days. Then, when they returned, they not only reported to the full committee but conferred with all the agencies of government that might be benefited by the information obtained by the subcommittee as the result of its trip. Now they are reporting to the Senate itself.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that it was a most useful trip and the mission of the subcommittee was most satisfactorily accomplished, and I suggest that the reports made by the subcommittee be printed as a Senate document, so that we will all have them for our guidance and so that the agencies of government and others interested may likewise be provided with copies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless there is objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] and myself, and the others associated with us, I wish to express my appreciation of the commendation by the chairman of the parent committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, did I understand correctly that the Senator from New York requested that the reports of the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Ohio be made a Senate document?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I so requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules, in the absence of objection, that it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. WALTER, and Mr. HANCOCK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) relating to the marketing of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) relating to the marketing of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

POSTHUMOUS RECOGNITION OF BILLY MITCHELL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President. I have requested the privilege of the floor in order to present a matter which is of special significance today, February 19, 1945, a day of anniversary. This matter is very much akin to the flaming headlines being printed in this afternoon's newspapers. It speaks with the thunder of the heavy bombers over Germany and Japan and with the fury of the gunfire in the streets of Manila. It, too, will live in men's minds as long as the mighty events of this day.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate in continuation of a mission I assumed for myself 4 years ago.

Mr. President, I now reintroduce a joint resolution providing for a great act of American justice. In doing so, I issue a calm but earnest challenge to the men who have heretofore blocked this act of justice.

This joint resolution is for the posthumous recognition of one of America's greatest heroes, a deathless son of my own State of Wisconsin, an immortal warrior for the flag of the United States, Brig. Gen. William L. (Billy) Mitchell.

It is peculiarly appropriate that I do so today, for this is the ninth anniversary of that sad but memorable day, February 19, 1936, when the glorious spirit of Billy Mitchell winged to its eternal place among the other immortals.

The very name of this giant is his monument. Billy Mitchell, prophet, martyr, crusader, pioneer, valiant rebel. Billy Mitchell, son of a great man whose distinguished presence filled this very Chamber. Billy Mitchell, who came up through the ranks from a private, who was the youngest American officer in the Spanish-American War, who was the first American officer under fire in World War No. 1, who was the first American flying officer to cross the German lines, just 16 days after our entrance into that war, who commanded the A. E. F. Air Force in France. The seer who advocated aerial torpedoes, parachute troops, troop transport planes, heavy bombers; the realist who warned us of the Japanese peril to Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippines, and all other foreign possessions in the Pacific; the man of his word who proved that planes could sink the mightiest dreadnaught; the man of courage who dared to blast the swivel-chair generals and rocking-chair admirals from their seats with the accusation that they were negligent in America's national defense; the man of conscience who kept faith with his young aviators by hounding the "brass hats" who gave them "flaming coffins" in which to fly and die; the man of righteous wrath who so incensed his muddle-headed gold-braid superiors that they court martialed him, deprived him of his rank, his command, and his duty, made him forfeit all pay and allowances for 5 years and virtually forced his reluctant retirement on February 1, 1926. Billy Mitchell, the man whose warnings of America's dangers, whose colorful personality, whose fearless counsel filled American magazines and newspapers until his death almost a decade ago. Billy Mitchell, who, at last, speaking of his imminent passing, said:

> I feel that it is better for me to * * * (be laid to rest) in Wisconsin, the home of my family, although I should like to be with the pilots and my comrades in Arlington.

Billy Mitchell, who is buried in Milwaukee, whence, in the unforgettable spring of 1898 he had enlisted as a youth to go off to war.

Mr. President, on no fewer than 10 previous occasions, I have spoken on the floor of this Chamber in the name of Billy Mitchell.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress, on May 20, 1941, I introduced a resolution for the restoration of his rank. The resolution passed the Senate so late that it died in the House. Again, in the Seventy-eighth Congress, on January 7, 1943, I reintroduced the resolution. Once again the Senate adopted it and especially honored itself by conferring on Billy Mitchell the rank of major general. But the resolution failed in the House. And now, for the third time, I resubmit this measure.

I do so not for the benefit of this one man or his kinfolk. For Billy Mitchell, the patriot, would not have had it so. I do so not to vindicate him, for he has long been vindicated before the bar of public opinion beyond the power even of this great body. I submit it not as a salute to the past, but as a salute to the present and the future.

Throughout my previous addresses on this subject, I have stressed the significance of this measure in terms of things to come.

Thus, on June 21, 1940, even before my introduction of the bill, I said:

> If we are really to vindicate Mitchell we must erect a monument to his memory in the sacred shrine of a new concept of security.

On May 20, 1941, I said:

> I am introducing a bill not only for the Billy Mitchell who has gone, but for the countless hosts of Billy Mitchells who are yet to come.

On June 7, 1941, speaking in Milwaukee on this subject, I said:

> We must scrap outmoded ideas, red tape, and mossback thinking. We must insist on open minds, receptive to new ideas. We must slough off the dead timber in our military system. We cannot follow our outmoded thinking of yesterday.

Yes; my accent has always been on the future. I have thought of the American schoolboys who, in generations to come, would read the saga of Billy Mitchell and wonder why this Nation had not done justice to him even in death. I have thought of the young citizens who would hear the great credo "My country, right or wrong, when right to keep it right, when wrong to set it right."

They would wonder why, when the United States Congress knew that America had not been in the right, the Congress did not speedily act to put us in the right. I have thought of the countless young aviators who would read with bitterness of the cruel treatment we meted out to their hero, Billy Mitchell, during his life, which we did not have the gumption to retract even when he had gone. I have thought, also, of America after the war, when the honored spirit of Billy Mitchell will be desperately needed to prevent us from backsliding into a smugness and blindness that will allow our military defenses to deteriorate and another Pearl Harbor to occur.

But I have thought, also, of the present and the immediate past, of the thousands of American boys who, had Billy Mitchell's words been heeded, might not have died at Pearl Harbor, in the Aleutians, in the Philippines, on countless Pacific battle fronts, and yes, too, on innumerable European and African fronts.

What a voice crying in the wilderness was his. How his stirring words still ring in our ears.

Listen to Billy Mitchell talking to us from the grave. In 1925, he said:

> An air force could reduce our Pacific islands easily, and we couldn't defend them with our present armament. Why, conditions are so bad out there that when I was in Hawaii last October and November, I found the commanding general wouldn't speak to the commanding admiral, and they wouldn't even go to the same social functions together.

That is how Billy Mitchell described Pearl Harbor when he testified before a congressional committee 20 years ago in February 1925. He might just as well have said it on December 6, 1941, the day before Pearl Harbor.

Here is Billy Mitchell calling America to arms in June, 1932:

> In case war occurred with Japan, what would Japan do? Would she sit still and await the gathering of our resources for a blow at her or would she try a surprise attack? * * * Japan is much more vulnerable than the United States and we could attack her directly from Alaska; but if we do not organize our air forces to do so, in case of trouble, Japan will have the jump on us and could pull off the greatest military surprise in history. The American people must not think that the Japanese are afraid to do it when they get ready. They are a bold, sagacious, and intelligent people. The American people must not sit back and listen to the doctrines of the mossbacks of a bygone age in the Army and Navy.

Here is Billy Mitchell speaking of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in 1935:

> He is back there now directing the organization of the national defense of the Commonwealth Government which no battleships could protect from an air attack. Planes and nothing but planes can hold those possessions.

Incidentally, I may recall that General MacArthur was one of the judges who sat on Billy Mitchell's court martial. One author has said that following the announcement of the verdict, an enterprising newspaper reporter examined the contents of the wastebasket in the judges' chamber. He made the exciting discovery that MacArthur had voted against the sentence and the reporter so advised Mitchell. We can imagine how much this pleased the great air general, for he and Douglas MacArthur had been intimates since boyhood and Billy had fought under the father of the "Hero of Bataan" during the Philippine Insurrection.

My mentioning of General MacArthur brings to mind the whole galaxy of famous names associated with "Billy" Mitchell—Gen. H. H. Arnold, now chief of the Army Air Forces, who boldly defended Mitchell at his court-martial, Gen. Carl Spaatz, and a host of others.

But it also brings to mind the men who played a more sinister role in the life of Billy Mitchell, the men who jeered him and had him nailed to the cross. The men whose hidden hands have undoubtedly thus far helped to delay the granting of formal recognition to Billy Mitchell.

It is the action of these men which constitutes my last reason for urging the adoption of this resolution in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I cannot, I will not, stand idly by while their bitter, unjustified resentment against this great American preserves the stain on his record long after that record has been cleansed and hallowed by history. I will not name these men, for many still wear the proud uniform of the United States in very high positions, and I do not desire, even by indirection, to cast a shadow upon the American colors. Rather I implore these men to desist in their tactics of obstruction. I say to them that for America to honor Billy Mitchell is not to dishonor his accusers and condemners. They acted in accordance with their lights. History has already dealt them its verdict. They were

blind. But I must advise these men that should they persist in their efforts to prevent the passage of this measure I shall feel compelled to call public attention to them openly, without malice, but in the name of American justice. I call to everyone's attention the fact that the Secretary of War has long stated the position of the War Department as not being opposed to my resolution. I repeat, the Senate has twice adopted the resolution and I again present it to this proud body.

Let us write the final chapter in the epic of this great man. Let us lay this spiritual wreath at his tomb. Let us pay this tribute to all the daring young airmen who follow Billy Mitchell's path "into the wild blue yonder, flying high into the sun," and to all the civil and military planners of vision, of courage, and of adventure, who will insure that America has the finest and most modern defenses in all time to come.

Let the United States Congress, with gentle and reverent hands, carry down from the cross on which he has hung for 20 years, the blessed spirit of Brig. Gen. William I. (Billy) Mitchell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

OCCUPATIONAL DEFERMENTS FROM MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week a number of articles appeared in the press concerning the deferment of men within the service-age groups. Being the chairman of the Legislative Deferment Committee, I asked General Hershey if he would not furnish me with the full details for the committee as to all deferments in the various branches of the Government. I might say that in the legislative branch we have deferred less than 10.

Mr. President, I now have the information which I requested, and not desiring to take the time of the Senate to read it, I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD following these few remarks of mine, so that there may be complete knowledge as to the reasons for the deferments. I may add that this information will be followed up by the War Department, the Navy Department, and other departments for which selective service boards have deferred various individuals within the age groups. I hope that as many of those deferred will be taken into the service as possible without injury to the war factories in order that the armed services can obtain their necessary quotas.

I ask that the letter from General Hershey be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable BURNET MAYBANK,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: This is in reply to your request for information on the procedures of granting occupational deferments to employees of the Federal Government, and a statistical report on such deferments.

On March 6, 1943, the President signed Executive Order No. 9309 prescribing the procedure for making authorized requests for the occupational deferment of employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government. On April 8, 1943, the Seventy-eighth Congress passed Public Law No. 23 regulating the granting of occupational deferments to employees in or under the Federal Government.

The act specified that beginning 60 days after the enactment of the law the Director of the Selective Service System shall make monthly reports to the Congress showing, as nearly currently as is practicable, the names and positions of the persons who have been occupationally deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, and showing whether or not requests for the deferment of such persons have been made in accordance with such Executive order and Public Law 23.

The Selective Service System immediately following the passage of the law prescribed procedures by which Federal Government agencies should authorize the granting of requests. A report form was also prescribed upon which local boards listed as of May 15, 1943, all occupationally deferred Federal Government employees. At the same time, another form was set up, providing for reports on monthly changes in such deferments. This system of authorization and of granting deferments has been retained with minor changes up to the present time.

The number of occupational deferments of Federal Government employees reported by selective service local boards in the continental United States and Territories increased from 86,368 in May 15, 1943, to 130,605 as of December 15, 1943, and to 354,202 as of December 1, 1944. This increase, although large, is however proportionately similar to the increase in the number of occupational deferments granted to workers not employed by the Federal Government. Thus, on December 1, 1943, only 2,205,009 registrants 18 through 37 years of age were deferred because of employment in war production or war supporting activities, while as of December 1, 1944, the total was 5,104,476.

More than 72 percent of all Federal Government employees occupationally deferred on December 1, 1944, were 30 years of age or over. About 80 percent of the 265,909 not physically disqualified were 30 years of age or over, and less than 1 percent were under 26 years of age. Those under 26 years of age not physically disqualified totaled only 2,452, of whom 1,261 were employed by the Navy Department and 623 were employed by the War Department, in munitions plants, shipyards, and other war-production activities. Most of the others were agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and scientists in the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Standards, and Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The State of registration of the young deferred registrants not physically disqualified further indicates the kind of work in which they are engaged. More than 700 are registrants of Hawaii local boards, and most of the others are registrants of States with important navy yards and munitions plants.

The Navy Department was the employer of 155,888, or 44 percent of the total occupationally deferred Government employees, as of December 1, 1944, and the War Department of an additional 112,995, or 32 percent. The Post Office Department employed 33,076 others, or another 9 percent of the cases.

A profound change occurred from December 15, 1943, to December 1, 1944, in the age of all registrants who were given occupational deferments because of employment under the Federal Government. The number under 26 declined from about 41,000 at the end of 1943 to 27,000 in December 1944, of whom only 2,500 were not physically disqualified for military service. The 26 through 29 year age group increased numerically, though not proportionately to the total deferments, from 33,000 in December 1943 to 72,000 by December 1944, of whom 52,000 were not disqualified physically for service. Those 30 through 37 years of age increased both numerically and proportionately from 56,000 at the end of 1943 to 255,000 on December 1, 1944, of whom some 211,000 were not disqualified for service. The great increase in occupational deferments of Federal Government employees was in the age group 30 through 37. It did not represent an increase in the number of such registrants employed by the Federal Government. It represented a change in the basis for deferment. A great many of these Federal employees were previously deferred for dependency and hence not reportable as occupationally deferred. When dependency was no longer a reason for deferment many such registrants were then granted deferment on the grounds of occupation. Last May the armed forces stated that they wanted the men under 26 years of age. In order to meet the requirements of the armed forces for young men, classification policies were adopted by the Selective Service System under which men over 29 are granted occupational deferment upon the mere test of being regularly engaged in an essential activity. These tests apply to public and private employment, including agriculture, industry, and Government. While it may appear, therefore, that Federal Government deferments have substantially increased in the 30 through 37 age group, the fact is that such occupational deferments are largely the result of the transfer of men from dependency deferment to occupational deferment as a result of the demands of the armed forces for younger men.

This headquarters appreciates your interest in this matter and will be glad to furnish such other information as you may find useful.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Connally
Austin	Buck	Cordon
Bailey	Burton	Donnell
Ball	Bushfield	Downey
Bankhead	Butler	Ellender
Barkley	Byrd	Ferguson
Bilbo	Capehart	Fulbright
Brewster	Capper	George
Bridges	Chandler	Gerry
Briggs	Chavez	Green

Guffey	McMahon	Shipstead
Gurney	Magnuson	Smith
Hart	Maybank	Stewart
Hatch	Mead	Taft
Hayden	Millikin	Taylor
Hickenlooper	Moore	Thomas, Idaho
Hill	Morse	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Calif.	Murray	Tunnell
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Kilgore	Overton	Walsh
La Follette	Pepper	Wheeler
Langer	Radcliffe	Wherry
Lucas	Reed	White
McCarran	Revercomb	Wiley
McClellan	Robertson	Willis
McFarland	Russell	Wilson
McKellar	Saltonstall	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in view of the passage of the George bill by the House of Representatives, and the President's statement that he will sign it, the nomination of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce will come before the Senate on March 1. By the passage of the George bill the Congress has shown overwhelmingly its lack of confidence in Mr. Wallace to administer any position where extensive powers and large sums of money are at his disposal. But the passage of the George bill does not greatly decrease the importance of the office of Secretary of Commerce, nor, while the First War Powers Act remains in effect, does it deprive Mr. Wallace of any substantial power or any substantial funds. It is generally admitted that a majority of the Senate was opposed to the confirmation of Mr. Wallace before the passage of the George bill. I desire to present at this time the reasons why any man who was against the confirmation of Mr. Wallace before the George bill should be against his confirmation on March 1.

1. THE SENATE HAS THE POWER AND DUTY TO REJECT CABINET NOMINEES IN PROPER CASES

There is, of course, no doubt about the power of the Senate to refuse to confirm a Cabinet officer. Article II, section 2, of the Constitution says that the President—

> Shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint, ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.

The office of Secretary of Commerce, of course, is established by law.

Mr. Walter Lippmann recently published the most blandly nonsensical argument against the Senate's power to refuse to confirm Cabinet officers that I have ever happened to read. Any college boy has more knowledge about the Constitution than Mr. Lippmann exhibits in this article. I know of no one who has ever before questioned the Senate's right to refuse to confirm.

Mr. Lippmann says that we cannot refuse confirmation because we have a government based on the separation of powers, requiring that the executive and the legislature be independent of each other. Of course we have a government based on the separation of powers but with regard to the appointment of officers the Constitution deliberately imposes a portion of the executive power on the Senate and makes it part of the executive for that purpose. In the same way in conferring on the President a veto power over legislation passed by Congress the Constitution makes the President for that purpose part of the legislative arm of the Government. If the Senate cannot refuse to confirm Cabinet officers, then the President cannot veto a bill. As a matter of fact, the Constitution actually contemplates that the Senate shall be consulted before the appointment is made, in the provision that all officers, including Cabinet officers, shall be appointed with the advice of the Senate. Since the Constitution imposes upon the Senate the function of passing on appointments, it is not only our right, it is our solemn duty under the Constitution, to pass on the qualifications of those appointed to Cabinet positions as well as those appointed to other offices.

Mr. Lippmann argues that if the Senate exercises its power to refuse to confirm, it is assuming the power to appoint officials and make them agents of the Congress, because he says the Senate could reject every name submitted until the man is nominated whom they wish to appoint. Of course, this would be an argument against any power to confirm anyone being included in the Constitution, and it would be just as much an argument against the power to refuse to confirm ambassadors, ministers, judges, and other officers, as Cabinet officers, who are not mentioned in the Constitution at all. If Congress refused to confirm all names submitted, that would be an abuse of its power, but it never has occurred and is never likely to occur.

Mr. Lippmann then advances this strange argument:

> The limits of the power of Congress are clearly indicated by the fact that it has no power to remove a Cabinet officer except by impeaching him and convicting him of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

This remarkable offering would be batted out of the box in any high school debate. There is nothing in the Constitution that implies that the reasons for removal shall apply, or have any relation to the reasons for refusing to confirm. The logic of the argument would be that the Senate could never exercise its right to refuse to confirm anyone unless the appointee were guilty of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. Obviously removal has nothing whatever to do with appointment.

Mr. Lippmann then ruins his own case by admitting that when Congress gives broad powers, like the lending powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it can then object to the appointment of a man whose purpose in the use of those powers is different from that of Congress. For every Cabinet officer today has new powers granted by Congress, and if he has not got them already, they can be transferred to him under the First War Powers Act.

There is not the slightest doubt about the power of Congress to refuse to confirm a Cabinet officer. Of course, it is true that ordinarily Congress as a matter of courtesy has not been disposed to be very critical of Presidents' appointments to Cabinet positions, and it is also true that a better case should be made against a Cabinet appointment than against someone who is not so closely associated with the President. Nevertheless history shows that Cabinet appointments have been rejected.

2. THE PRESIDENT HAS FORFEITED ANY RIGHT TO ASK FOR COURTESY BY THE JONES LETTER AND HIS REJECTION OF WALLACE IN CHICAGO.

Such a case was the appointment by Calvin Coolidge of Charles A. Warren to be Attorney General of the United States. The objection to Mr. Warren was that his interpretation of the Sherman Act 20 years before did not agree with that of the Senate, or later interpretations by the Supreme Court, and that he had actively defended certain sugar companies against prosecution under that act. Of the Senators now in the Senate, Senators GEORGE, JOHNSON of California, MCKELLAR, SHIPSTEAD, WALSH, and WHEELER voted "No" on the confirmation of Warren.

Just after I came to the Senate on January 22, 1939, the Senate confirmed Harry Hopkins as Secretary of Commerce by a vote of 58 to 27. All but 4 Republicans voted against him, and of the Democrats, Senators George, Gerry, Holt, King, and Van Nuys voted against him. There is no precedent requiring the confirmation of all Cabinet nominations.

Since the presumption in favor of Cabinet nominations is created solely by a sense of courtesy to the President, we may well inquire whether that right to courtesy has not been forfeited in the present case. This country has seldom seen a more cynical letter than that of January 20 addressed by the President to Mr. Jesse Jones. He admits that Mr. Jones has done an outstanding job in war service but demands his resignation solely to make the place vacant so that Henry Wallace may be rewarded for political services. If this letter had been written by Boss Hague it would have been spread on the front page of every newspaper as an example of political bossism and the crudest operation of the spoils system. I quote:

Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of our ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited, and I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the administration. It is for this reason only that I am asking you to relinquish this present post for Henry.

If this is a good reason for the appointment of Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, we might as well have Frank Sinatra in the Cabinet as Postmaster General. He also gave of his utmost. He made speeches. He traveled incessantly. He even sang for the ticket.

If the President, solely to reward political services, ousts from his Cabinet a man, who he admits has done an outstanding service to the country in a war job, then he has forfeited the right to any special consideration for the new political appointee.

Furthermore, the President himself indicated very clearly by his actions in connection with the Democratic convention, that he did not want Henry Wallace to be renominated as Vice President of the United States. I can think of only one reason why he took that course, after the strong support Henry Wallace gave him while he was Vice President. The President knew that Henry Wallace's views on domestic economic matters were such that his nomination would seriously interfere with the success of the Democratic ticket. He knew that the people did not agree with Mr. Wallace's philosophy or trust him. The President asserted that the whole issue of the election related to the winning of the war. That was the tenor of his campaign. He attempted to divert the attention of the public as far as possible from domestic issues on which he felt the party was weak. The rejection of the Vice President was in effect a pledge to the people by the convention that the domestic policy of the administration would not be guided by the ideas of Henry Wallace. If Henry Wallace, in the opinion of the President and the Democratic convention, was not competent to succeed to the Presidency because of his views on domestic post-war policy, then he is not competent to be appointed Secretary of Commerce, where he will largely direct that policy in the post-war period. The circumstances again destroy the argument for any special courtesy in considering the nomination of a Cabinet officer.

8. MR. WALLACE HAS CHOSEN TO MAKE HIS VIEWS THE ISSUE

It is sometimes said that we should not inquire into the political or economic views of a Cabinet nominee. I have shown that this has been done in the past. But in this case Mr. Wallace has chosen to make his views the issue before Congress. Mr. Wallace appeared before the Commerce Committee on January 25 and set forth his program, which I shall discuss later. He then said, "I do want to make it clear now that, to the extent that powers are vested in me by Congress, I will use those powers to the fullest possible extent to further the objectives which I will outline to you." He accused the backers of the George bill of taking away the Reconstruction Finance powers from him in order that they might be used only to assist big business. He then went to New York and accused those who opposed his confirmation of desiring to destroy the Democratic Party and the prosperity of the Nation.

4. THE GEORGE BILL DOES NOT PREVENT THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FROM BEING A GREAT POWER IN RECONSTRUCTION

When Mr. Wallace threatens to use whatever powers he has as Secretary of Commerce to forward his views, it is no empty threat, even after the passage of the George bill. We no longer live in an age when the powers of Cabinet officers are strictly confined. Rightly or wrongly, Congress has delegated vast powers to Cabinet officers and other administrative officials. Many laws have been passed conferring powers based on general statements of policy to be worked out by administrative regulations. Congress has a proper interest in knowing whether those appointed to administer these powers will in good faith carry out the policies indicated in the legislation creating them.

Furthermore, Cabinet officers have much greater autonomy than they formerly had. The Government has grown so large that most of these department heads are almost czars in their own domain. Meetings of the Cabinet are held much more frequently than they used to be. This whole tendency has been tremendously exaggerated by the war, which has forced upon Congress the delegation of many emergency powers.

The Department of Commerce includes the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, whose duty it is to plan the economic reconstruction of the country and also its foreign trade. It includes the Patent Office, which can be administered in such a way as to deter initiative and invention. It includes the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board, with almost complete power over aviation, perhaps the most important of all post-war industries.

Furthermore, in spite of the passage of the George bill, it is possible for the President under the First War Powers Act to transfer to the Secretary of Commerce any other powers except those exercised by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its present subsidiaries. For instance, the President may transfer to the Secretary of Commerce the Foreign Economic Administration, which controls the following important corporations: The Export-Import Bank of Washington, Petroleum Reserves Corporation, Rubber Development Corporation, and United States Commercial Company. These corporations have billions of capital, and if it proves to be insufficient, the President can direct the R. F. C. to loan additional billions to them out of its great reserve. Such a transfer would give Mr. Wallace complete control, not only of domestic matters but of the foreign trade of the country, with the ability to make it a Government operation, the ability to lend money to foreign nations in vast sums, and the ability even to affect the whole foreign policy of the United States. We know his views on rubber, on milk for Hottentots, and on controlled world trade. Or it would be possible to transfer to Mr. Wallace many powers of the Department of Agriculture, including the Commodity Credit Corporation and other agencies. And always the President may tell the man who comes to the head of the R. F. C. to loan any of these corporations just as many billions of dollars as he desires to have loaned to them.

In short, the theory that the confirmation of Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce just gives him the Weather Bureau and the Bureau of Standards is a complete fallacy. Entirely apart from the influence which he can exercise through his prestige as Secretary of Commerce, he can be made the most powerful factor in the Administration to deal with governmental economic controls.

The Senate cannot avoid a decision whether it will confirm a man of Mr. Wallace's economic views and lack of balance to a position which will enable him to guide to a large extent the future policy of this country. It is our duty as well as our right to examine his qualifications.

5. MR. WALLACE'S CONFIRMATION WOULD DESTROY BUSINESS CONFIDENCE, ON WHICH POST-WAR PROSPERITY DEPENDS

I propose, therefore, to examine Mr. Wallace's views and the effect of his appointment on prosperity and the standard of living in the post-war era.

In the first place, I believe there is nothing so necessary to prosperity in the post-war period, nothing so necessary to building up jobs and creating new industries and expanding old industries, as the confidence of business enterprisers in the Government of the United States and its policies. These are the men to whom we are looking to expand the economy and provide millions of jobs. Among them we hope to find millions of the most intelligent, most energetic, and most independent of the boys who are fighting throughout the world. They would all have good reason to lack business confidence in a government whose business policy is directed by Mr. Wallace.

A. HE IS HOSTILE TO AMERICAN BUSINESS

First, he has clearly indicated opposition to businessmen and their philosophy and he has done so repeatedly. Thus, in an article written for the New York Times magazine on April 9, 1944, less than a year ago, Mr. Wallace attacked as Fascists a large number of the American people, including especially businessmen. He said:

If we define an American Fascist as one who in case of conflict puts money and power ahead of human beings, then there are undoubtedly several million Fascists in the United States. * * * Most American Fascists are enthusiastically supporting the war effort. * * * Some hope to have

profitable connections with German chemical firms after the war ends.

Some of these Fascists—

He says—

have a vain delusion that * * * they can again bring the common man to his knees and make of him this time a groveling suppliant who will keep to his place.

The New York Times itself took Mr. Wallace to task for this article. It said:

The Vice President of the United States ought not to indulge in merely abusive epithets. * * * It is astonishing that Mr. Wallace cannot see that in going to such lengths he approaches the very intolerance that he condemns. The terribly difficult economic problems that we face today cannot be solved in an atmosphere surcharged with emotion, suspicion, or bitterness.

The problems Mr. Wallace will face as Secretary of Commerce could not be more difficult, and his attitude has not changed. I say again, quoting the New York Times:

The terribly difficult economic problems that we face today cannot be solved in an atmosphere surcharged with emotion, suspicion, or bitterness.

In November Mr. Wallace came into Ohio and made this statement in Cleveland regarding a mild suggestion on my part that we must reduce the over-regulation of business if we wish to create prosperity after the war. He said:

Imagine what that program would have done to the war if business had been given the green light. Businessmen had to be dragged into the war by the scruff of their necks. If they had been given the green light they would have continued to make automobiles and washing machines until the world ended.

That is the man whom it is proposed that we place in charge of the department which is supposed to be concerned with the interests of business and the promotion of business.

That statement shows a hostile and insulting attitude toward businessmen that certainly cannot inspire confidence on their part. I do not suppose a single American manufacturer refused to go into war business when once the Government had made up its mind and decided what it thought he should do. Of course, he did not shut down his plant and throw his employees out of work until he had some order to handle, in order to go to work in the war effort. How can we hope for cooperation between Government and business when Secretary of Commerce representing the Government approaches the problem with the presumption that every businessman, except perhaps Henry Kaiser, is a crook until he proves otherwise?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If I correctly understood the Senator, he implied that Mr. Wallace thinks every businessman except Henry Kaiser is a crook. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. TAFT. I was slightly humorous in my reference, of course. My thought was that Mr. Wallace's attitude on the subject is one of suspicion. His presumption seems to be that businessmen are crooks, primarily, until some attitude otherwise is shown. I would say that is a fair conclusion from Mr. Henry Wallace's writings, and I have read a considerable number of them in the last few weeks.

Mr. HILL. Has the Senator obtained any writings of Mr. Wallace which would sustain any statement of the sort the Senator has just made?

Mr. TAFT. I have quoted one or two on the subject.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has quoted one or two, but I think he should refer to more than that. I have not always found that the Senator is so greatly disturbed about taking the time of the Senate.

The Senator has referred to the automobile industry. With all tribute to the automobile industry and the fine contribution it has made to the war effort, the Senator knows that at least some, if not many, of the firms which are a part of the automobile industry were slow to put an end to the manufacture of automobiles for peacetime purposes, and to devote all their efforts and factories and capital to production for the war effort.

Mr. TAFT. There never was a time when the Government decided what it wanted to do that the manufacturers of automobiles did not do it. Until the Government reached that decision, the various firms engaged in the automobile industry did not stop the manufacture of automobiles and thus throw all their employees out of work, of course.

Mr. HILL. They did it, but some of them were slow to do it.

Mr. TAFT. No; I assert that they were not slow to do it.

Mr. HILL. It was necessary for the Government to put pressure on some of them in order to get them to do it. The statement which the Senator has made with reference to Mr. Wallace cannot be substantiated by the record or by any of Mr. Wallace's speeches.

Mr. TAFT. I have quoted from two speeches, and I shall put other quotations into the RECORD if the Senator wishes me to do so.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama would like to have the Senator from Ohio put some quotations in the RECORD now if he can refer to any which will sustain the statement which he has made about Mr. Wallace and Mr. Wallace's attitude toward business. When the Senator has concluded his remarks if I can obtain the floor I shall quote from some of Mr. Wallace's speeches which show that his attitude toward business is directly opposite to that which has been stated by the Senator from Ohio. No man in America respects business, or the need of business, or the service rendered by business, more than does Mr. Wallace. The complaint which Mr. Wallace has made has been with reference to certain abuses practiced, not by all businesses, but by some businesses.

Mr. TAFT. I invite attention to the fact that the statement made by him in his Cleveland speech, from which I have quoted, was not confined to the automobile business. It was a general statement that American business had to be dragged into the war by the scruff of the neck. I think that answers the Senator's question. The Senator will find Mr. Wallace constantly saying that he is in favor of free enterprise, and at the same time advocating things which would destroy it. Whenever he is called upon for extemporaneous remarks the Senator will find the underlying prejudice which was exhibited in his remarks in Cleveland, as well as in some of his written articles.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Ohio has spoken of lip service. Of course, he knows, as we all know, that actions speak louder than words. There is nothing in Mr. Wallace's record of actions while he was Secretary of Agriculture and dealing with processors, packers, and other manufacturers to show that he was in any way hostile to private enterprise or private business. There is nothing in his record while he was head of the Board of Economic Warfare which will show other than that he endeavored at all times to work with business, to be fair to it, and to help it. Nearly all the purchases which he made as head of the Board—and he made several million dollars' worth—were made through private enterprise.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I can discover, the Board of Economic Warfare practically sabotaged the export and import business of United States importers and exporters. As a matter of fact, while Mr. Wallace was in charge of the Board of Economic Warfare it undertook to exercise control over, and almost entire direction of, foreign trade; and the President of the United States threw him out because he did not approve of the policies which were being established by the Board of Economic Warfare with reference to business.

Mr. HILL. The President of the United States took powers away from Mr. Wallace because of a disagreement between Mr. Wallace and Mr. Jones; but the President later found that more than 90 percent of the transactions of the Board of Economic Warfare under Mr. Wallace had been carried on under Mr. Wallace's authority and jurisdiction through private business and private enterprise. Mr. Wallace was endeavoring at all times to cooperate with private business and private enterprise, and avail himself of them in carrying out the program of the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. TAFT. I will give the Senator one example of what I have said. The Board of Economic Warfare practically destroyed the American coffee-purchasing system in South America and took over, to a large extent, for the Government itself, the purchase of coffee in South America.

Mr. HILL. I am not familiar with the details of the particular coffee arrangement to which the Senator has referred. There were some instances in which Mr. Wallace did step in and act through the Government; but in more than 90 percent of those cases he used existing private business and existing private American free enterprise.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not yield at this time. If the Senator from West Virginia does not mind, I should like to continue, and I shall be glad to yield to him later.

In dealing with the subject of Government control——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield further to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield further at this time.

Mr. HILL. I wish to comment on the coffee matter at some time.

B. HE FAVORS GOVERNMENT CONTROL AND INTERFERENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Mr. Wallace is patronizing toward private business. He talks so much and talks in such vague general terms that much may be found in his speeches which is favorable to what he calls free enterprise, but the things which he advocates are the very things which would destroy the freedom of the individual businessman. In speaking of free enterprise, I may point out that Sidney Hillman and Earl Browder made magnificent speeches during the recent campaign.

Mr. President, in the Century of the Common Man, 1943, Mr. Wallace says:

> Labor must go beyond hours, rates of pay and working conditions, and through the appropriate agency of Government, cooperate vigorously with business.

Again:

> Agriculture must through the appropriate agency of Government, see that the parity principle is applied to feed consumers.

Again:

> Business men will need the help of financial and tax policies which favor the maximum of individual incentive, but which do not shut out the rapid flow of Government funds when these may be necessary for full employment.

In the same book he proposes "a United Nations agency to restore stable conditions in raw material markets, on price terms that assure producers fair income and promote expanded production."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to finish with this particular section of my speech, and not be interrupted in the middle of it.

I have pointed out that Mr. Wallace favors a "United Nations agency to restore stable conditions in raw material markets, on price terms that assure producers fair income and promote expanded production."

He wants a United Nations commodity agency and an international T. V. A. Besides the international bank, he wants a United Nations investment corporation under whose direction public and private capital can be put to work on worldwide reconstruction. He wants an international ever-normal granary. Of course, all those things would necessitate complete government control, or international government control of all world trade, and the establishment of export and import quotas, as well as stabilized prices. It is the very opposite of the traditional democratic policy of freedom in world trade so forcibly supported by Cordell Hull.

Mr. Wallace is the man whom we are asked to confirm as Secretary of Commerce to direct the foreign trade of the United States, to set up vast governmental controls for the regulation of foreign trade, and all other trade between nations.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was about to ask the Senator if Mr. Dewey, in the last campaign, did not also speak about full employment, and the well-being and prosperity of the Nation, and if the Senator did not support him.

Mr. TAFT. Later on in my speech I expect to deal with the problem of full employment, but I shall answer the question. I did not understand Mr. Dewey to advocate a Government guarantee in the sense of a legal right, such as Mr. Wallace advocates, and which he advocated before our committee. I shall deal with the question at some length further on in my speech, and I should rather leave the matter until then.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will yield, I have one further question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Take, for example, an international T. V. A. or an international Reconstruction Finance Corporation. If I am not misinformed, the able Senator from Ohio is opposing or has announced that he would oppose the report of the Bretton Woods conference, in which one of the Senators from his side and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] were able participants, constituting the American delegation, with the Secretary of the Treasury and other responsible men, like Mr. Dean Acheson of the State Department. With all these men participating, they drew up an international conference plan, including an international bank and something like an international investment agency. I understand the able Senator from Ohio opposes that program. Would he say that Mr. Wallace is bad because he advocates that kind of thing?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's assumption is somewhat wrong. I am not inclined to oppose the international bank, but Mr. Wallace goes beyond that. I question the stabilization fund, as do all the experts on the subject I know of outside of the Government. However, so far as the bank is concerned that is a comparatively mild form of what might be called assistance. But Mr. Wallace goes on and wants a commodity agency; he wants an international agency buying and selling wheat and corn and other products. He wants, so to speak, to cartelize the world under Government control. That is the thing that I say is absolutely contrary to the whole theory of Mr. Hull and to my whole theory of protecting and promoting international trade.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if Mr. Wallace did not have in mind perhaps a cooperative agency. I did not know about that, but I am sure that Mr. Wallace never advocated setting up any rigid international authority with any legal power to tell us what we could export and what our quota of exports should be, and that sort of thing. I do not believe that he did. We all recognize the necessity of cooperation in international economic affairs as well as cooperation in political affairs in trying to keep peace and prevent economic chaos and deprivation in some other parts of the world.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Wallace's book, "The Common Man" goes much further than that. It proposes an agency which shall buy and sell and control the whole distribution of commodities in foreign trade throughout the world. If the Senator will read the book, I think he will agree with my conclusion about it.

Apparently Mr. Wallace also favors complete Government control——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer not to yield, if the Senator does not mind. I should like to cover one subject at a time, if I may.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Apparently, Mr. Wallace favors complete Government control of employment within the United States, for he said on September 21, 1944, and I quote from the New York Times.

> There is no peacetime job for profit or self which ever again will be paramount over the needs of all. Government service must be the supreme duty when the need is determined. There can be no slackers as we fight for the common man in his pursuit of the richer life. * * * I believe that this Government, at fair wages, has the first call on all for all. Especially where brains and leadership are in demand, no private industry should have the right to bid unfairly for private profit against Government and public necessity.

Those are fine words, but I do not know what they mean unless they indicate a universal service act to cover everyone in time of peace as well as in time of war.

Mr. Wallace is also fundamentally in favor of the Federal Government being the one to control everything and everybody. In an article in Scribner's magazine in July 1936, he said that the doctrine of States' rights was a barrier to progress even in 1787, and was the cause of the Civil War. He said:

> Today the States mark no common economic barriers that make sense, and they provide only limited instruments for action to meet modern problems.

Again, he said that—

> States' rights are being invoked, not for the rights which they defend but for privileges they protect.

In short, he has a complete lack of sympathy with the maintenance of State and local self-government, and the maintenance of that vital and necessary bulwark against complete stateism.

This attitude of Mr. Wallace in favor of Federal Government control of, and in-

terference with, all industry, trade, labor, and agriculture, is deeply ingrained in his whole philosophy. If he were Secretary of Commerce, it would certainly be completely discouraging to those who are considering the expansion and development of private industries. It would also be discouraging to those of us here in Congress who hope to work out our postwar problems with a minimum of Government regulation and extravagance.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the Senator if he is not familiar with the plan that Mr. Wallace evolved for handling the triple A program, which essentially was that, instead of Washington determining every detail, the decision was put in the hands of the farmers in the counties in the various communities where the decision had to be made? Did not Mr. Wallace work out a program so that the decisions could be made by farmers elected by farmers in the local area, and were they not selected on a nonpartisan basis, while Mr. Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know whether Mr. Wallace evolved the plan or not. Mr. Wallace has evolved so many plans that it is a little hard for me to tell just what he is responsible for. But I was interested in one plan which he published in 1935 about the time of the A. A. A. when he suggested an overall economic council. He suggested we ought to have a council that would have a right to take a referendum of the people on all economic questions. In an article in Collier's magazine of the issue of February 2, 1935, he said:

> I should like to see the day when, before this country could enter a war beyond its borders, a national economic council would be required to call by solemn referendum—with the price of going in, staying completely out, or trying to make a lot of money from side-line operations completely indicated—upon the sober judgment of the mature people. That, probably, none alive will live to see, but we may in our time see a start in that direction. The first step is to provide for general nonpartisan expression of purpose.

Mr. Wallace in 1935 wanted to set up a supreme economic council that would conduct a referendum of the whole people of the United States on every economic question. We could not go to war until this economic council had said to us, "If you go to war you will lose this trade, and if you stay out you will get all this additional trade with different countries.." So, after all the figures in dollars and cents were weighed the Nation could decide to go to war. One cannot go through his books without finding some such plan proposed by Mr. Wallace every year since he has become a public official in the present administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator would have to agree, would he not, that that is just exactly the opposite direction from the Government exercising all power. Mr. Wallace may have concentrated too much democracy in the proposal, but surely he has not the dictator type of mind that thinks the Government, the State, should make the decisions for the people of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. He was discussing then how this economic council was going to put into effect its ultimate power. However, I do not pretend to say that Mr. Wallace's remarks are consistent. I would not contend that all his plans are consistent with each other, for they are not. The difficulty is he has no sense of balance. But I do say that the conclusions I have drawn as to his general attitude toward business and Government control seem to be what he has settled down to and what, after all, was clearly shown in his last appearance before the Commerce Committee of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I merely want to ask a question in view of what the Senator has said about Mr. Wallace's remarks being inconsistent. I have read many reports and statements made by the Senator from Ohio concerning which he has been charged with having adopted different positions on different subjects. Is he condemning former Vice President Wallace today for being inconsistent?

Mr. TAFT. I cannot argue as to everything I may have said or may not have said, but I imagine that, possibly, I would be able to prove that I was consistent. I think Senators will give me credit for saying that my economic beliefs as expressed on this floor have been about as consistent as those of any other Senator. I do not think that will be seriously denied.

Mr. HATCH. I am not criticizing the Senator from Ohio at all, but the Senator from Ohio has just said that he is not willing to argue his own economic beliefs.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, no. I said I could not go back and argue everything I had said to ascertain whether I was consistent or not, unless the Senator would specify. Besides, I am not the issue today; Mr. Wallace is the issue.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. It is a very easy matter to make another man the issue, and not make "I myself" the issue.

Mr. TAFT. The President of the United States has made Mr. Wallace the issue, not I. I should not care to make him an issue at any time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the Senator has been pleading his consistency.

Mr. TAFT. No one is always consistent, but I claim that I am as consistent as any other Senator on the floor.

Mr. HILL. In other words, if the Senator has an opinion one day he usually does not change it the next day. Is that correct? I was thinking, in that connection, that we just observed Lincoln's birthday, on the 12th of this month, and at one time Lincoln made a very wise observation, when he said it was a very dumb man who did not have more sense today than he had yesterday I can well understand how somewhere in the context of an article or a speech back in 1935, when peace-loving men throughout the world were seeking to avoid war, some one like Mr. Wallace might have said that it would be a good thing if nations might organize a council of some kind which might weigh all the economic ills and effects which come from war, having in mind that if people would stop to think of and weigh these economic ills and effects, they would be much slower to resort to war.

I might say that the last vote cast in the House of Representatives before I left that distinguished body to come to the Senate was a vote on the Ludlow amendment, which provided that this Government should not go to war outside the United States without a solemn referendum of the people of the United States. I voted against the proposal, but as I recall, the vote by which it was defeated was very close. At that time peace-loving men everywhere were seeking some way by which to avoid the tragedy of war as we are witnessing it today.

Mr. TAFT. One other point I wish to make on the subject of the lack of confidence of businessmen in Mr. Wallace. Certainly I think American business would not have any confidence under the leadership of a Secretary of Commerce who has so clearly indicated his general sympathy with communism.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. While he makes certain reservations with regard to its use in the United States, a consistent tone of praise pervades all his references to the Russian system.

I decline to yield for the moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

C. HE HAS A DEEP SYMPATHY FOR COMMUNISM

Mr. TAFT. Thus Mr. Wallace said, according to the Washington Post:

> Nearly everyone in Russia feels that he is directly working for the welfare of the whole nation. He has no fear whatever that he is being exploited for the sole profit of management or stockholders.

On November 8, 1942, he addressed the Congress of American Soviet Friendship and unfolded a vision for the development of a "new democracy" to which both the United States and Russia would come, which would be neither communism of the old-fashioned internationalist type, nor democracy of the American type. He indicated his view that we in the United States have overemphasized "what might be called political or bill-of-rights democracy." He says:

> The new democracy of the common man includes not only the Bill of Rights, but also economy democracy, ethnic democracy, education democracy and democracy in the treatment of the sexes.

I suppose what he means is equality and not democracy. I had supposed that for 150 years the whole American system had been devoted to equality and trying to guarantee it in every practical way. I do not know just what the democracy of the common man means. I should think

democracy and equality ought to cover the uncommon man as well as the common man and not try to divide the country into classes as in Russia. I had supposed that the American Constitution had always been directed at securing the utmost in democracy and equality. We may not have succeeded, but Mr. Wallace's ideals are nothing new. It is the extraordinary methods he proposes—including the abandonment of the Bill-of-Rights democracy which is the bulwark of individual freedom—methods which endanger democracy instead of assuring it.

He has supported the League of American Writers, cited as subersive by Attorney General Biddle. He is a member of the National Committee of Sponsors of the National Conference on Civil Liberties, cited as a Communist front organization by Attorney General Biddle. He has endorsed the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, and the League of Equality, all cited as Communist front organizations and subversive by the Dies committee. Certainly Mr. Wallace goes far beyond a mere friendship for Russia as a nation, which all of us have. He is more than sympathetic to the whole Russian system under which every man works where the Government tells him to work. Of course, Mr. Wallace has had the enthusiastic support of the Communist Association, of the Daily Worker, and New Masses in this campaign and today. The great bulk of the liberal newspapers of this country have strongly criticized his appointment.

At one time in 1936 in Whose Constitution? Mr. Wallace in effect threatened violence and revolution if his views were not accepted, or if amendments to the Constitution were not adopted. He said in that book:

> In various countries of the world in the past, privileged classes have often acted in such a way as to make gradual change impossible and have precipitated violent action. We in the United States should eventually be prepared if necessary to work out in the spirit of Madison a mechanism which would embody the spirit of the age as successfully as the Constitution of 1787 mirrored the philosophy of the eighteenth century. We may hope that such action can be taken as bloodlessly as the Constitution was enacted.

This is quite the style of Rexford G. Tugwell.

The confirmation of Mr. Wallace and his activities as Secretary of Commerce, where he will speak to and of business, representing the Roosevelt administration, would destroy the very confidence which is necessary for full employment. It will be the greatest handicap the American people could face in seeking a higher standard of living and a greater production.

It is hard to imagine a more inappropriate appointment as Secretary of Commerce. It will inspire the same confidence among businessmen which the appointment of Sewell Aery as Secretary of Labor would inspire toward the administration from the ranks of labor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the able Senator whether he thinks that the campaign which is being made, and to which he consciously or unconsciously is contributing, in an attempt to make it appear that Mr. Wallace is a Communist, has any more actual and factual basis than the effort that was made in the last Presidential campaign to prove that President Roosevelt was a Communist?

Mr. TAFT. I think I have stated my exact position. I do not think I can improve on it. I did not call Mr. Wallace a Communist. I said he had a professed sympathy for the Russian system, and had not very much sympathy for our system, and had a vague general idea of something in between the two which he would like to see established in this country. That is from his own writings, and I do not think there is any question that that is the fact.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the Senator is a man of great probity and great integrity, and I ask him whether, as a United States Senator, he wishes to make the statement upon the floor of the Senate that the Russian system is preferred by a man who was born and reared in this country, who, so far as I know, has had several generations of rooting in this country, who by appointment of the President of the United States served for 8 years as a Cabinet officer, who was elected by the people of the United States Vice President, who presided over this body, and has been a public figure for many years? If this were a campaign stump speech, and a man, under the impulse of a warm summer day and a good dinner made some general accusations, there might be a certain amount of leeway attributed to his statements, but does the Senator mean to make as a factual statement the assertion that Mr. Henry A. Wallace prefers the Russian system over the American system of Government?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know; frankly, I could not say.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not that the statement the able Senator has just made?

Mr. TAFT. No. I said he apparently had a great sympathy for the Russian system, and is critical of ours. Which he prefers, I do not know, and I did not say.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator referred to Mr. Wallace addressing the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship. Does the Senator from Ohio recall that Mr. Thomas W. Lamont of the Morgan firm, and some of the principal business leaders of this country, and generals of the Army, and other prominent citizens of this country also addressed that Congress of American-Soviet Friendship?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think I have criticized Mr. Wallace for addressing that Congress. I stated what Mr. Wallace said in his speech before the Congress. I do not even state that that organization is one of those which have been condemned by Attorney General Biddle or even by the Dies committee. I quoted the speech Mr. Wallace made before that Congress, and I used the words which he uttered in that speech as evidence of what his beliefs may be. That is all I said respecting what Mr. Wallace said before the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If I understood the Senator from Ohio correctly, he said he did not understand what kind of democracy Mr. Wallace was talking about when he said "The democracy of health," and one thing and another. I wonder if the Senator might infer that what Mr. Wallace was talking about was making medical care and hospital care and dental care in a proper way available to the people of the country; whether that was the kind of democracy Mr. Wallace was talking about?

Mr. TAFT. I suppose what he meant was equality. If he meant equality it is not the same as democracy, and I am in favor of it just as Mr. Wallace is. But when he speaks of ethnic democracy and all other kinds of democracy, I think he is misusing the term "democracy." Democracy is a form of government, a form of rule, it seems to me, not a condition. I think equality is what Mr. Wallace is trying to reach, and I am quite in accord with his ideals in trying to reach it.

Mr. PEPPER. One last question. The able Senator from Ohio referred to the large number of newspapers of the country that were opposed to the confirmation of Mr. Wallace's nomination. I wonder if the Senator has made any calculation to determine whether a larger percentage of the newspapers of the country has opposed the confirmation of Mr. Wallace's nomination to be Secretary of Commerce than opposed the election of President Roosevelt in all his campaigns.

Mr. TAFT. In all his campaigns, yes, I am sure. Let us consider the newspapers in Ohio. I have not checked against the last campaign, but certainly many of the newspapers in Ohio which have supported Mr. Roosevelt frequently have condemned Mr. Wallace. I have made no comprehensive study of that question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. What I rose some time ago to ask the Senator about has long since passed from immediate consideration, but it is still in my mind because I thought the Senator from Ohio stated that he did not think Mr. Wallace was a Communist.

Mr. TAFT. I stated I did not think what?

Mr. HATCH. That Mr. Wallace was a Communist.

Mr. TAFT. No; Mr. Wallace is not a Communist.

Mr. HATCH. Now that is fine!

Mr. TAFT. Communists are a very exclusive class, limited to only a few of the inhabitants even of Russia, as the Senator may know. It is estimated that there are not over 100,000 of them in this country. No; Mr. President, I stand by exactly the words I used in the speech I have made. Mr. Wallace is very sympathetic to the Communist system.

Mr. HATCH. The statement which the Senator from Ohio makes that Mr. Wallace is sympathetic with the Russian Government——

Mr. TAFT. No; with the Russian system. I am sympathetic with the Russian Government, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. HATCH. In one instance the Senator denies that Mr. Wallace is a Communist, but in another breath he implies that Mr. Wallace is. That is the impression I have gained from sitting here listening to the Senator. I wonder what the Senator meant exactly.

Mr. TAFT. In my statement I said:

> Business can have no confidence under the leadership of a Secretary who has so clearly indicated his general sympathy with communism.

My statement is supported by many of his writings.

Mr. HATCH. May I ask that the Senator now tell the Senate and the people of the country, because the people are going to listen to the Senator, exactly what he means by that statement?

Mr. TAFT. I have already done so, Mr. President. The Senator may read it in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was called out of the chamber and have not heard all the Senator's speech, but just a moment ago he seemed to be criticizing Mr. Wallace because he said Mr. Wallace sympathized with the Russian system, and the Senator drew a distinction in his own mind between the Russian system and the Russian Government, and said that he himself sympathized with the Russian Government.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator implied that he did not sympathize with the Russian system. What is the difference between the Russian system and the Russian Government? And is not whatever system they have in Russia imposed by the Russian Government?

Mr. TAFT. No; I was speaking of the Russian nation; not the Russian Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Russian people. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. I was not thinking particularly of the Russian administration. I was thinking of the Russian nation, the Russian people. I probably should not have said "government." I have no particular feeling one way or another about the Government, but I do have a very critical and adverse feeling about the system, and it is one I do not want to see established in the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, to whatever extent that system is brought about by the act of government, the two would be identical. It is one thing to think of the government of any people and another to think of the people themselves. I probably can share the Senator's sympathy for the Russian people. I do not think anyone can travel through Russia, and become acquainted with the Russian people, and undertake to understand their problems, without having a profound sympathy for the Russian people as a people. I think of course we might draw the same distinction in our own country between the people themselves, their mode of living, their activities, and their day-by-day living, and the Government itself, which is a sort of entity which is located in the capital of our country, as the Russian Government is in Moscow. But I do not understand that there is any difference between the Government of Russia and the system of the Russian people which has been brought about largely by the activities of the Russian Government.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator from Kentucky is correct, and I thank him for correcting my statement.

6. MR. WALLACE, AS SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, WILL DIVIDE THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

As a Republican, I suppose I should perhaps welcome the presence of Mr. Wallace in the President's Cabinet, because he would certainly stir up the most intense dissension and division in the Democratic Party. His violent language regarding conservatives includes Democrats as well as Republicans. In his speech on January 30 at the testimonial dinner sponsored by the Union for Democratic Action and the New Republic, he praised the left-wing groups as having made the Democratic Party into a strong progressive party. But he said:

> Unfortunately powerful interests are boring from within and striking from without, striving to make it impossible for a liberal, united Democratic Party to remain in national power.

I do not know who was boring from within unless it be the distinguished Democratic Senators who are opposing Mr. Wallace and his principles.

He accuses those who voted against him in the committee of desiring to make 60,000,000 jobs impossible, and trying to destroy the Democratic Party. I understand Mr. Wallace has been warned to keep quiet since the New York speech, until this confirmation can be got through, but once he is confirmed it seems impossible that he should not continue his fight against those within the Democratic Party who happen to differ with his economic and political plans. Certainly I cannot understand why any Democrat who opposes Mr. Wallace could wish to have him in that Cabinet position where he can give most effect to the principles which they so justly distrust.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida, who is not one of those to whom I was referring. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I believe it would not be overpresumptuous on the part of the able Senator from Ohio and the junior Senator from Florida to say that it is pretty well known to which wings or segments of their respective parties each one belongs. But I wonder if the Senator is not aware that in the speech to which the Senator referred made by Mr. Wallace in New York, Mr. Wallace was talking against the organization of a third party, and referring not to Democrats within the Democratic Party but to forces outside the party which were trying to break up the Democratic Party, and perhaps also the Republican Party, and establish a third party, and Mr. Wallace, as I understand, was taking the position that the Democratic Party was traditionally, by its very nature, the liberal party of the country, and that it was only by continuing to be the liberal and the progressive party of the country that we could keep a third-party movement from growing up in the Nation.

Mr. TAFT. I have the speech here. I do not regard that to be what he said. I think he was referring to the fight being made against him, and meaning that if it were successful, and the conservative wing of the Democratic Party were successful, it would destroy the Democratic Party as a liberal united force in the Nation. That is what I think the speech meant. He particularly attacked the analysis of the Wallace program made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. PEPPER. Senators now present in the Chamber will recall that the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], when that very quotation from Mr. Wallace's speech in New York was referred to in his presence, was explaining what it was that Mr. Wallace had in mind, and the applicability of what he said to the political situation in the State of New York, where Mr. Wallace was speaking.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the speech will bear that interpretation. There was considerable effort the next morning to persuade Mr. Wallace to explain away what he had said, but it did not succeed very well.

Mr. President, I have before me the text of Mr. Wallace's speech. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The speech was delivered in New York on Tuesday, January 30, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, would the Senator mind having it inserted at the end of his speech, so that we may have the contrast?

Mr. TAFT. That is quite agreeable to me. I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Henry A. Wallace in New York on Tuesday, January 30, 1945, be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my address.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the speech may be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am a member of the Committee on Commerce. I am one of those Senators who voted against giving Mr. Wallace the job of Secretary of Commerce together with the lending agencies. I wish to disavow any intention in casting that vote to destroy either Mr. Wallace or the Democratic Party. I would not have voted to give such powers to anyone. I had no intention of being offensive to Mr. Wallace. There was no authority in the law for anyone but Mr. Jesse Jones

to have such powers. We passed a special act giving him the right to hold both positions. I may add, in passing, that I heard him say he never asked for it. I think it was because the President of the United States wanted him to assume both positions.

Generally speaking, unless some good reason to the contrary is shown, I believe that the President of the United States has a right to nominate and have approved for his Cabinet almost anyone he wants. I can think of some Secretaries of Commerce whose appointments Republican Senators have voted to confirm which ought to prevent any Senator who voted for them from voting against Mr. Wallace for this position.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not mind yielding for a question, but I do not like to yield for a speech.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not wish to take the Senator's time, if the Senator objects.

Mr. TAFT. I appreciate that.

Mr. CHANDLER. I brought up the subject because of the question which the Senator raised. I believe that unless some real reason can be found for opposing a man appointed by the President as a member of his official Cabinet, without all the lending powers—which I do not feel should be given to any one man—such a nomination ought to be approved. My reason for casting my vote in the committee against Mr. Wallace having such powers was as I have stated it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I would greatly appreciate it if the Senator would read the first part of my speech in the RECORD. I dealt with that question at some length. I am sorry the Senator was not present. I hope he may read it.

7. MR. WALLACE'S POLICIES LEAD TO INFLATION, NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY, AND A TOTALITARIAN STATE

In view of all the circumstances of the case, I believe it is the duty of the Senate to refuse to confirm Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce if it believes that the policies which he advocates if put into effect would retard prosperity, concentrate all power in Federal bureaus, destroy business confidence and bring about national bankruptcy and inflation. I do not say that we cannot still prevent him from carrying out all his policies, but I do not know why we should put him in a position where we have to struggle constantly to nullify his efforts.

Mr. Wallace's policies, as I have quoted them from his own writings and as set forth in his pronunciamento to the Commerce Committee, deal with the reorganization of our whole economy after the war. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the methods by which this country is reconstituted for peace during the years after the war. We have had to tear to pieces the industrial, commercial, transportation, and educational systems of this country in order to fight an all-out war. The manner in which the country is reorganized will determine the kind of life that we and our children should live for the next hundred years and the kind of government we are to have. Fundamentally, the question is whether we shall continue to enjoy freedom and achieve progress through private initiative and energy, or whether we shall be organized under a Federal government directing all economic processes and ultimately the life of every citizen.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield at the moment.

In my opinion, Mr. Wallace's program does not lead to freedom and prosperity, but must lead to national bankruptcy and a totalitarian state. I agree 100 percent with Mr. Wallace's ideals. So does everyone. I believe in striving for utopia and heaven. I believe in bringing about the highest possible standard of living, and full employment, when we have determined what amount of employment will produce the highest standard of living. But I disagree with Mr. Wallace's measures and programs for attaining those ideals because in essence they are based on the old New Deal theory that a nation can spend itself into prosperity, that deficits are a blessing in disguise, and that the size of our public debt makes no difference because we owe it to ourselves. Mr. Wallace's program is very, very simple, in eight rather extensive points. All we have to do is to pass a law guaranteeing prosperity and full employment, and spend all the Government money necessary to make that guaranty good. The solution of every problem is to spend more Government money.

The spending of Government money, in large blocks, of course, is always accompanied by a great increase in Federal power. We have seen from Mr. Wallace's statements that he thinks the Government should plan everything and regulate everybody. But he counts upon the vast spending of Federal money to make that regimentation easy.

The post-war budget without Henry Wallace will be $20,000,000,000, and that means a terrifically heavy tax burden at best. We cannot escape six billion for interest on the public debt, five or six billion for the post-war Army and Navy, two or three billion for veterans, a billion for public works, one or two billion for the support of agricultural prices, one billion for social security and relief programs, and two billion for Government departments. When we add ten billion for State and local taxes we reach 25 percent of an anticipated one hundred and twenty billion of national income. It will be a difficult and expert task to devise a tax system to raise that amount of money without imposing a burden on business activity discouraging the very expansion to which we look for more jobs and more taxes.

I estimate that Mr. Wallace's plan, if carried out in full, would probably add about $40,000,000,000 annually to that budget. Some of the measures which he proposes are entirely reasonable. Some can be and now are being worked out at a minimum of expense to the Government. But Mr. Wallace has no interest in economy or restraint. He believes in spending for spending's sake.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield at the moment.

Heretofore, the advocates of huge spending programs have carefully avoided any reference to the question of where the money is to come from. Mr. Wallace, however, before the Senate Committee produced the most delightful example of a plan to lift oneself by one's bootstraps that I have ever seen so clearly expressed. He said:

> And this program need place no real burden on the Federal budget, notwithstanding the reduction in taxes which must come after the war. On the contrary, a program of this character can provide America with a national income of such size that it will be possible to reduce the tax rates still further on personal incomes, on business profits, and on consumption, and still collect enough tax revenues to meet the needs of the Government, including orderly retirement of the national debt.

If this formula were true, if by Government spending we could recover in taxes more than the expenditures, why not spend twice as much Government money and all live in luxury? As a matter of fact, the Government could spend $40,000,000,000 and thereby increase the national income by $40,000,000,000, but very little more without a substantial inflation of prices. On the other hand, studies of the Joint Tax Committee show that if national income is increased from $110,000,000,000 to $150,000,000,000, the present tax system at high rates would only produce $15,000,000,000 more. With the lower tax rates, which we must have and which Mr. Wallace advocates, the additional collections would hardly be $10,000,000,000 more. So we have a deficit of perhaps $30,000,000,000 a year to be added to the Government debt instead of a surplus. Even if forty billions of Government spending increased the national income by eighty billions—which it would not—we would have an annual deficit of twenty billion. The trouble with Mr. Wallace is that he cannot add or subtract, and he always moves in a global sphere above the laws of gravity and arithmetic.

Now I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not sure whether I can call the attention of the Senator or whether I can call the attention of the Senate to any two statements he has made which are more illustrative of the basis of the argument he has been making against Mr. Wallace than two statements the Senator has made in the last 5 minutes. One was that Mr. Wallace believes in spending for spending's sake. The second was that Mr. Wallace cannot add or subtract.

With such statements as that and with what is obviously such lack of fact as that, the Senator proceeds to discuss some imaginary plan of Mr. Wallace, and he proceeds to make a calculation as to how much the execution of the plan would cost. Those who are listening to the Senator, but who do not happen to follow the matters in perhaps as much detail as we do, would think there was a concrete Wallace plan which would commit us to spend $40,000,000,000 ,and that the Senator from Ohio had that plan in his head, and so forth.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, this is Mr. Wallace's plan. He

has eight points. I have estimated the cost to be $40,000,000,000, by considering the eight points and figuring the cost of each and adding those costs together.

First, Mr. Wallace proposes that the Government guarantee $20,000,000,000 of capital investments in plants and construction. If he gets out with 20 percent of loss he will be lucky. That would be $4,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TAFT. No; I decline to yield at this point.

Next Mr. Wallace proposes that we foster the resumption of international trade and investment in connection with the foreign demands for the purchase of commodities in this country. I estimate that the cost of such a program will be approximately $5,000,000,000.

Third, Mr. Wallace advocates that if employment falls below 57,000,000 the deficiency be employed in public works. Before the war we never had as many as 50,000,000 workers, but Mr. Wallace now is proposing that even if 50,000,000 people are working, we shall employ 7,000,000 more—more than we ever before had in America—and the cost will be $14,000,000,000.

Next, Mr. Wallace advocates the maintenance of a floor under the prices of the products of the farms. This is the present statutory plan, and the cost has been estimated by the Joint Tax Committee at about $3,000,000,000.

Mr. Wallace also advocates crop insurance, estimated to cost $1,000,000,000; housing, estimated to cost $2,000,000,000; medical care and social security measures, which perhaps will cost approximately $12,000,000,000 in addition to the cost of what we are now providing; and Federal aid to education, which I estimate as costing somewhere between $1,000,000,000 and $2,000,000,000, although some of the estimates amount to $3,000,000,000.

That makes a total estimate for the cost of Mr. Wallace's plan of approximately $40,000,000,000. That total amount is not taken out of thin air. It is the total of normal calculations made by sitting down and figuring out what Mr. Wallace's plan, as presented to the Commerce Committee of the Senate of the United States, would cost.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the first place the Senator has referred to $20,000,000,000 of guaranteed loans. The Senator has simply picked out of thin air his estimate that it would cost the Government of the United States $4,000,000,000 a year to engage in that part of the program. As a matter of fact, a few years ago there were many persons who said that we could never guarantee loans to build houses; and, in fact, until President Roosevelt took office, no government ever started a government housing administration, because many persons said it was not feasible. Yet during Mr. Roosevelt's administration we set up the Federal Housing Administration, with guaranteed loans. Under that program the borrower pays a percentage of his loan to go into the risk fund. The Federal Housing Administration has not cost the United States Government anything, and it has been possible for millions of persons in this country, who otherwise could not have gotten homes, to obtain them.

It was only a few years ago, before Mr. Roosevelt became President, that many good bankers in our country—and let me say that if the opinion of the able senior Senator from Ohio had been asked at that time, I venture the assertion on the basis of his general record in that field, that he might have been with the bankers, who were considered the sound businessmen of the country—many of our good bankers said that bank deposits could not be guaranteed and that an attempt to do so would ruin the country and would be communism and socialism. But under the able administration of President Roosevelt, which the senior Senator from Ohio has always opposed in such matters, today bank deposits are guaranteed by having a certain percentage of the deposits of banks placed in a pool, and today every man, woman, and child in the United States who has up to $5,000 in a bank has his deposit guaranteed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator is making a speech. Let me say that a loan in connection with a house is a very different matter. Mr. Wallace's proposal is that the Government guarantee investments totaling $20,000,000,000 in business enterprises, new private investments, each year. The general history of houses is that they last for many years and retain their value. The history of business enterprises is that approximately two out of every three of them fail; they go broke; they go into bankruptcy. A business enterprise is the riskiest thing there is.

As a matter of fact, the Senator from Florida may know that last year I introduced a bill providing for trying out on a very minor scale the feasibility of applying the Federal Housing Administration principle to small investments only, and only to a very limited extent, as an experiment.

So, I have criticized Mr. Wallace's global figures. He is going to put 5,000,000 men to work building $20,000,000,000 worth of factories every year. Mr. President, we would have so many factories in this country that we could not find anything to put in them, if they were built on the scale Mr. Wallace has proposed.

I am not criticizing all the proposals Mr. Wallace has made. I said before that many of his ideas are perfectly good if we approach them on a sensible, reasonable basis. But Mr. Wallace cannot count. He cannot add the figures together. He cannot see the effect of the program as a whole.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida desire to ask me a question? I should like to yield only for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well; I shall ask the Senator a question.

Will the Senator refer to Mr. Wallace's statement before the Senate Committee on Commerce and see whether Mr. Wallace did not say that the type of loans which would be guaranteed—and I think I now use the words Mr. Wallace used—would be the special and abnormal risks, and will the Senator see whether the purpose of doing that was not stated as being to encourage incentive investment?

Mr. TAFT. I cannot read the whole column just now. I can only say that what the Senator has stated is not the impression I received when I read it.

Mr. PEPPER. I suggest that the Senator read it and see whether he does not find that the loans which Mr. Wallace suggested be guaranteed would be the unusual and abnormal risks.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, if only the abnormal risks are guaranteed, the percentage of loss will be very much greater.

Mr. PEPPER. I referred to the abnormal risks.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think he said that. I think he said that the plan provides a guarantee for any of those up to $20,000,000,000 worth of investments.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What the Senator from Florida has said is absolutely correct. I refer now to Mr. Wallace's suggestion that the loans would apply only to special and abnormal risks.

On page 76 of the hearings we find that Mr. Wallace said:

> Therefore I propose that the Government guarantee the lender against the special and abnormal risks which may be involved in achieving our objective.

In reference to what the Senator from Ohio had to say about his own bill, which, as he said, follows the fundamentals and the principles of the plan Mr. Wallace has proposed, let me say that there seems to be no difference between the fundamentals of the Senator's bill and the fundamentals of the plan Mr. Wallace has suggested.

Mr. Wallace did say, in discussing his program:

> As a matter of fact, a comprehensive investment program of this character—

That is to say, a comprehensive investment program of giving jobs to 60,000,000 persons—

> could make possible $20,000,000,000 of new private investments each year.

But that does not mean the Government would guarantee all the $20,000,000,000 worth of new investments. Mr. Wallace did not say that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there will not be any $20,000,000,000 worth of new investments each year unless the Government guarantees them, because there is no need for such great numbers of commercial plants. Mr. Wallace would put 5,000,000 men to work just building plants, according to the next sentence of his statement.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. Under Mr. Wallace's plan there would be 5,000,000 more jobs in such work than there were before the war.

But the Senator from Ohio has taken these figures out of his head, and he has tried to put them in Mr. Wallace's mouth. That is what I object to. I hold in my hand the official record of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TAFT. Inasmuch as the Senator has the hearings before him, it is unnecessary to have them printed in the RECORD. Of course I should be glad to have them placed in the RECORD, if the Senator wishes that done.

Mr. HILL. I have before me the hearings which include Mr. Wallace's whole statement.

The trouble with the statement the Senator from Ohio has been making is that he continues to build up straw men, by means of figures of his own, taken out of his own head, so that he can knock those straw men down.

Mr. TAFT. I say now that I am prepared to stand by my statement that if the Government undertakes to guarantee all the unusual risks on private investments of $20,000,000,000 a year in plants and machinery, which Mr. Wallace seems to contemplate, the Government will lose $4,000,000,000 a year. My estimate is very conservative, I think, under the conditions I have stated.

Mr. HILL. I am not willing to concede, and I do not believe the record shows, that Mr. Wallace suggested or advocated the Government's underwriting $20,000,000,000 of loans. I will also say to the Senator, who I know wishes to be fair to Mr. Wallace, that in reply to a question of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] Mr. Wallace suggested that it would be wise for the Congress to write into the law detailed and specific policies and functions of the R. F. C. with reference to loans and the use of Government money. He stated that Congress, not Mr. Wallace, should settle such matters.

Even if we tried to impose taxes sufficient to pay for Mr. Wallace's expenditures, it would so choke business activity that we would defeat our own purposes and kill the goose that lays the golden egg. Heavy taxes would make one industry after another unprofitable, requiring Government financing and ultimate Government control. That was the condition to which excessive regulation had almost brought the railroads before the war.

The real inventors of the Wallace spending plan, however, do not intend to levy taxes which might be unpopular. They believe in the delightful theory that the Government debt can be indefinitely increased at the rate of fifteen or twenty billion a year. When it is pointed out that continued Government deficits did not bring prosperity in the 30's, the answer is that the deficits were not big enough. In my opinion, any such policy would lead directly to overwhelming inflation. Government spending has increased prices 30 percent today, in spite of the most rigid and arbitrary controls, and there are many underlying elements of inflation which are held back only by arbitrary control, the effect of which cannot be ultimately avoided.

Tomorrow we are to hear in the Committee on Banking and Currency a proposal of the Federal Reserve Board to reduce the gold in connection with all deposits and Federal Reserve notes from 40 percent to 25 percent.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. We could hope to continue this control only by the most rigid restriction of individual freedom and Government regulation of the daily millions of transactions throughout the country. As a matter of fact, I feel confident that in peacetime these controls will break down as the enforcement of prohibition broke down. Already the black market is almost out of hand.

A continuous Government deficit always has resulted in inflation and always will. If adhered to, it means a rise of prices to astronomical levels, destruction of all saving and life insurance values, hardship to those classes whose wages and salaries do not keep up with the procession, and ultimately the destruction of the financial structure on which all of our business is based. If that breakdown ever occurs, it will force the reconstruction of this country along planned economy and totalitarian lines, and I believe that this is the reason why the left wing radicals are so enthusiastic about a spending program. The maintenance of freedom and free enterprise in this country depends upon a solvent Government, supporting a sound system of currency and a stable price level, on which all may rely in making future plans. Henry Wallace's plans make such maintenance impossible.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. If I correctly understood him, the able Senator from Ohio made the suggestion that Mr. Wallace's proposal, if adopted, is likely to lead to bad times, economic chaos, and bankruptcy, which in turn will be followed by certain evil consequences. Is that the theory of the Senator?

Mr. TAFT. My belief is that if Mr. Wallace were put in charge of the Commerce Department and given a free hand, we would have a tremendous boom for a while, followed by a break-down, which would change not only our business structure but our governmental structure as well.

Mr. PEPPER. Let us turn the question around. Let us assume that the Government does not do what Governor Dewey, as well as Mr. Wallace, advocated, namely, "Republicans are agreed that full employment shall be the first objective of national policy." I have quoted a statement which Mr. Dewey made in his last campaign.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has quoted a statement with which I agree. I agree with full employment whatever that may mean. I will explain why I do not believe that the goal should be 60,000,000 jobs, but full employment should be the objective of Government policy. But how should it be arrived at? By sound plans of finance, and the encouragement of private enterprise. It should also involve the encouragement of men to go into business and produce.

Mr. PEPPER. Each one of the statements made by Mr. Wallace with reference to the subject was calculated to achieve the end to which the Senator has referred. Mr. Wallace has made the statement, as has also Mr. Dewey, that we must have full employment, and that it must be the first objective of national policy. Then Mr. Wallace outlined an eight-point economic bill of rights. Each one of those points was enunciated in the House of Representatives in the message of the President of the United States. The eight-point bill of rights contemplated in every case that aid should be given to private enterprise.

Mr. TAFT. No; it does not so contemplate in every case.

Mr. PEPPER. He advocated aiding private enterprise and stated that private enterprise must carry the burden of furnishing full employment for the country.

Mr. TAFT. He advocated throughout the policy of free enterprise, but always behind it was the Government's guaranty of every job under 57,000,000. That was to be direct Government employment, as I remember it. The Government was to put 70,000,000 people to work.

Mr. PEPPER. No. Does not the Senator know that Mr. Wallace did not make any such statement? He said that our objective should be 60,000,000 jobs, or at least no less than 57,000,000 jobs, and that when national employment fell below 57,000,000 jobs the Government should step in and do a great many things in order to prevent employment from falling to lower levels, and to save the national economy. Is that not what Mr. Wallace stated?

Mr. TAFT. No; he stated that when employment fell below 57,000,000 jobs the reservoir of public work should be used to provide more jobs and take up the slack. He stated that it should be done through private contractors.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. It may be said that the building of a schoolhouse by the Government is a private enterprise because private contractors build it. That is what Mr. Wallace stated.

Mr. PEPPER. No. Does not the Senator know that the program of public works was merely one element in the program to achieve full employment for the Nation? Increasing our foreign trade was another, better health and better housing of people was another, and so forth.

Mr. TAFT. In each of Mr. Wallace's eight points the Government was involved. The Government was to guarantee private investment. The guaranty of jobs is a guaranty of public jobs.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; the Senator cannot support that statement.

Mr. TAFT. The theory is that by spending Government money a high degree of private activity can be induced. That theory runs all though the plan of Mr. Wallace. In promoting foreign trade, how is it to be done? By lending $5,000,000,000 to nations abroad so that they can buy our goods. How would Mr. Wallace render farm support? By the Government supporting prices, buying farmers' goods, and selling them to private individuals at a loss. How would he support his medical and social programs? By direct Government expenditures. Mr. Wallace's plan is based on the theory that if the Government will spend $40,000,000,000 it will produce tremendous private activity. That is the policy I have been attacking today, and

which I have been trying to show is an utterly unsound and dangerous policy. It is very nice to spend Government money and not have to tax for it; it is very nice for people to think they can get something for nothing, and that is what Mr. Wallace is teaching them today under his plan.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure the able Senator wishes to be fair. Can he put his finger anywhere in the testimony of Mr. Wallace on any proposal showing that his program is predicated upon public spending, or that the Government is committed to spend $40,000,000,000?

Mr. TAFT. I thought I went over the whole matter, and I will leave it to any Senator to read Mr. Wallace's program as printed in the hearings, and he will see that, as I have said, it is based on public spending and nothing else.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude; I do not wish to keep the Senate in session, and I think I shall not yield at least until I get to the end of my prepared address.

7A. WHY 60,000,000 JOBS?

I do not have the time here to examine all of Henry Wallace's proposals, nor do I imply any sweeping condemnation of all of them. But the general plan is based on the theory that Government spending in unlimited amount shall stand behind a long list of guaranties. The key to the whole plan is that we must provide 60,000,000 jobs at good wages regardless of expense. Why 60,000,000 jobs? Our aim should be to provide the highest standard of living that the world has ever seen, but it is not at all clear that this would be produced by encouraging 60,000,000 people to go to work. For years we have been steadily reducing the number of people working and the hours which they have to work. In a pioneer society everyone has to work from grandfather to grandchild and from dawn until dusk. We have abolished child labor. In many places we forbid children working until they are 18. We are retiring those older people who are better off if they do not have to work. As against 60,000,000 jobs there are only 33,000,000 families in the United States, plus perhaps 9,000,000 individual workers, so we are asked to provide 2 jobs apiece for some 18,000,000 families. Perhaps we would be better off if the wives and minors had to work in only 8,000,000 families. Fifty million jobs, in other words, may provide a higher standard of living than 60,000,000.

Mr. Wallace proposes that whenever jobs fall below 57,000,000 the Government must provide them at standard wages, which would certainly cost the Government about $2,000 a job. If we had 50,000,000 jobs, and that is more than we ever had before the war, the Government would have to spend about $14,000,000,000 a year under Mr. Wallace's plan to encourage 7,000,000 more to work.

Full employment for those who need to work is the ideal we all have, but a guaranty of employment by the Government as a legal right—it may be noted that Mr. Dewey did not propose any such guaranty as Mr. Wallace does—is something entirely different which will lead to more control and less employment. The idea was presented by the National Resources Planning Board in its report of January 1, 1943. It was backed up by President Roosevelt in his so-called economic bill of rights, in his addresses to Congress in January 1944 and 1945. The C. I. O. Political Action Committee platform of January 1944 says that full employment must "be guaranteed by the Government."

7B. GUARANTEE THEORY A COMMUNIST PROGRAM

But the real origin of the theory is the Constitution of the U. S. S. R. Article 118 of that constitution says:

> Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to work—the right to receive guaranteed work with payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality. The right to work is insured by the socialist organization of national economy, the steady growth of the productive forces of Soviet society, the absence of economic crises, and the abolition of unemployment.

The interesting part of this article is the clear declaration that this so-called guaranty is only insured by the Soviet organization of national economy. The Soviet state has the power to give this guaranty. Everyone can be given a job because the Government can tell them where to work, and determine the real wages which they receive far below anything that American workmen can conceive of. Furthermore, the other side of the picture is given in article 12 of the Constitution of the U. S. S. R., which reads:

> Work in the U. S. S. R. is the obligation of each citizen capable of working, according to the principle: "He who does not work shall not eat."

In short, this whole guarantee idea is based on a State in which the Government can tell every man and woman where he shall work, what he shall receive, and what he shall work at. A legal guaranty cannot be successfully made good without that control, except at a cost which will destroy the job itself. "The Government that can do anything for you, can do anything to you." We should insist on Government policies which will encourage business activity and produce real jobs for all those who wish to work. We cannot provide real jobs by passing a law. Mr. Wallace realizes that 60,000,000 jobs can not be produced by public works or direct Government employment and his 8-point program and guaranty of employment finally turns out to be just the old Keynesian theory of spending yourself into prosperity, in a new disguise and on the Wallace global scale. If we ever adopt it we are lost, and I do not know why we should advise the President to appoint its apostle Secretary of Commerce or consent to his confirmation.

7C. OUR POST-WAR DANGER IS INFLATION, NOT DEPRESSION

I realize there is more sympathy at the moment for Government spending in the post-war period, because the people have been led to believe that they face a great period of unemployment and depression. The depression of 1920 after the last war is frequently referred to. That depression only lasted a year and was brought about largely by the great deflation of the high-price level. This time prices have been held down and are more likely to increase than to drop in many lines.

In my opinion, there is no danger of any serious depression immediately after the war. There may be a brief period while the readjustment of factories is going on, when there will be some unemployment, but I believe this danger has been grossly and deliberately exaggerated by those who wish to provide an excuse for the spending of Government money and extension of Government power. As a matter of fact, we have never had so many reserves in this country to stimulate economic prosperity. I believe there is far more danger of inflation than there is of depression.

When the war ends there will be something like $40,000,000,000 of small-denomination bonds in the hands of middle- and lower-income groups, and vast pent-up demands. There is an excess of $17,000,000,000 of currency in the hands of individuals. Individual deposits in savings banks and checking accounts have increased by 32 billion over what they were before the war. That is a total of 89 billion of liquid spending power. Corporation cash reserves, if the Government settles its bills, will probably be at least 20 billion over the normal pre-war deposits.

Then, we have to consider that there are $6,000,000,000 in State unemployment compensation bonds ready to be paid out to the unemployed, and a very liberal provision for unemployment compensation to discharged veterans, which may amount to as much as $1,000 apiece.

There is another factor which is not generally considered. After the end of the German war we will still be running at a deficit of some 35 billion a year, while the war with Japan continues. War expenses will not suddenly come to an end, but will only be gradually reduced to reach perhaps a $20,000,000,000 figure, perhaps 4 years after the war. Taxes will be reduced more promptly according to present plans. Altogether our expert reports to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation show that even a conservative Government will probably add $60,000,000,000 to the Federal debt after the end of the German war.

We hear a great deal about the necessity of stimulating foreign trade by huge loans, but many do not realize that gold and dollar reserves of foreign countries in this country have been rapidly increasing until on October 1, 1944, according to the Federal Reserve Board, they amounted to $17,000,000,000, which could be used to buy goods in this country. In spite of our huge exports we have an adverse balance of trade because we pay for our imports and most of the exports are given away under lend-lease. Whatever money may be loaned abroad will be an additional reserve to make purchases in this country. The Bretton Woods agreement, if confirmed, would add $6,000,000,000 to this foreign purchasing power. I note that Russia

is asking for a loan of ten billion and the British requests are substantial.

Altogether there seems to be available over some $20,000,000,000 of excess purchasing power which might be available over the three or four post-war years. No, our danger is not depression or unemployment. It is inflation—spending and more spending. Unless it is restrained we will repeat the mistake of the twenties. We will create another new era, to be followed by a crash like that of 1932. There should be no sympathy today for vast post-war Government spending, and it is peculiarly that time not to put Henry Wallace in charge of anything. The common man may be taken on a wild spree but he will wake up with an uncommon headache.

8. CONCLUSION

We are asked to advise the President to appoint Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce at a time when that position may be the key to the administration's post-war policy. We should not do so; because it would destroy the confidence on which post-war recovery depends; because we disagree with his program of unlimited Government spending and Government regulation and believe it would bring an end to individual freedom and produce bankruptcy instead of employment; because he has no sympathy with the American system which has made this country the most powerful, the most productive, yes, and with the highest standard of living in the world.

It is said that we will make a martyr of him by refusing to confirm him. This seems a peculiar reason to confirm a man for a position for which he is not qualified. But it is not a danger. He will continue to urge his program, with the support of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and the Communist Association. The people will identify his views with theirs, as they should be identified. As Secretary of Commerce he would speak to a substantial extent for the Roosevelt administration. The prestige of his office would give publicity and authenticity to his wildest proposals. The President is seldom willing to disown the statements of an official of the Government. That is the reason that Henry Wallace and his supporters sacrificed all self-respect in connection with the George bill to the one purpose of obtaining a position inside the Government.

I cannot understand why any Senator who opposes Mr. Wallace's strange philosophy should vote to confirm him as Secretary of Commerce.

EXHIBIT A

TEXT OF HENRY A. WALLACE'S SPEECH

(The text of the speech of Henry A. Wallace at the testimonial dinner under the auspices of the Union for Democratic Action and The New Republic follows:)

My dear friends, to you who are drawn to me because we serve the same humanitarian objectives with all the passion of our hearts, I wish to say that for me this is a most heart-warming and soul-stirring occasion. Never have I been so deeply moved.

The current situation is not one of personalities, neither is it one of personal prestige. My good friend, Senator BAILEY, knows that Senatorial rejection will enhance my personal prestige. So far as I know, the Senators who are most vigorously opposing me like and esteem me as a man. As Senator BAILEY knows of his own personal knowledge, I have no bitterness in this controversy concerning anyone. But men represent issues and the issues are so important that all of us sooner or later will have to stand up and be counted.

In this audience are representatives of many groups, which fought for Roosevelt in the last campaign. Roosevelt could not have carried New York State without you. The Democratic Party could not have carried Pennsylvania, or Michigan, or Minnesota, or the Far Western States without you and groups like you. You were the balance of power and without you the Democratic Party would have been defeated. You have done your part to make the Democratic Party into a strong, forward-looking, constructive, progressive, united party. Unfortunately, powerful interests are boring from within and striking from without, striving to make it impossible for a liberal, united Democratic Party to remain in national power.

The one outstanding domestic issue in the campaign was set forth by Roosevelt last October at Chicago—60,000,000 jobs and an "Economic Bill of Rights." Those who voted against me in the committee either believe in policies which will make 60,000,000 jobs impossible, or wish to destroy all possibility of a progessive Democratic Party as a national force.

Senator BAILEY, after the close of the hearing, said to a New York Times reporter:

"I am not going to vote to put any man in charge of a department of this Government who is going to bring in the millenium by handing out money in all directions."

BACKED PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Senator BAILEY'S remark is not warranted by the study of my complete statement and replies to Senatorial questions. The Senator will find that I repeatedly emphasized the need for getting the 60,000,000 jobs so far as possible through private enterprise and private financing. The Senator will find that I referred to the desirability of examining the proposals of Ferdinand Eberstadt for governmental stimulation of the maximum flow of private equity capital as an alternative to excessive debt increase whether private or public.

As I look toward the future, first through the eyes of those who are attacking me and then through my own, I am overcome with a feeling of profound concern for my country and the world.

Frank Vanderlipp, a New York banker, after World War No. 1, spoke of the creditor position of the United States and the need for action in conformity therewith and then went on to say that we were a nation of economic illiterates. Our economic illiteracy after World War No. 1 gave us the smash of 1921, the crash of 1929, and economic conditions abroad, which inevitably led to the rise of fascism and nazi-ism.

Economic illiteracy is not dead. It can, if not remedied, cause a greater disaster after this war than it did after World War No. 1.

We may be entering into a period now which politically is somewhat like that of the United States Bank in 1832 when Andrew Jackson, Nicholas Biddle, and Daniel Webster were involved. Concentration of financial power is always a dangerous thing. The R. F. C. without Government audit or check has been built up into the modern equivalent of the United States Bank of the 1830's. The R. F. C. is the most tremendous financial power the world has ever seen. Modern Daniel Websters have defended it.

EXTRAORDINARY ATTACK

The measure of the power of this octopus is the extraordinary attack which is going on against me right now. With regard to financial power let me quote from a very experienced observer:

"In our days not alone is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few; and those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds who administer them at their good pleasure. This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the lifeblood to the entire economic body, and grasping, as it were, in their hands the very soul of production so that no one dare breathe against their will."

This is from a statement by one of the world's great leaders and I shall be interested in discovering which newspapers or radio man is the first to identify the author. The analysis, which was made in 1930, still fits. I have pondered many times on the significance of the statement as I have sat in the United States Capitol and watched the economic forces at work.

The R. F. C. is certain to be a headache for anyone. Even with all the Government auditing I have asked for, even with the congressional investigation I hope for and which the public has long been entitled to, I can well realize that the tremendous ramifications of the R. F. C. are such as to involve a succession of controversial problems as soon as the war is over. Commerce is the staff agency. R. F. C. is in some measure the front-line action agency. While the Senate would relieve me of a great burden by giving me Commerce without R. F. C., I feel that from the standpoint of the 60,000,000 workers, the profits of business, the income of farmers, the welfare of the country as a whole, and the protection of the United States Treasury, I could do a better job if the two were combined than if they were separated. Undoubtedly many good men can be found to head the loan agency, but I wish to make it clear to you that if there were serious danger of a "too-little" and "too-late" man being appointed, I would prefer not to be Secretary of Commerce.

The Nation must not be subjected to an economic Munich or Dunkerque. To have 10,000,000 men unemployed is as dangerous to the Nation as it was for the British to have 250,000 men on the beaches at Dunkerque. Kaiser, Higgins, and a multitude of industrialists like them know the answer and it is the same answer I gave to the Senate committee—full production, full use of all resources. We must give these production-minded men a chance. They must not be ruined by financiers, seeking control through scarcity. Neither must the genius of these men be killed by the end of the war. New Kaisers, new Higginses, new Fords, and new Edisons must be given a chance, and small business must be given an opportunity if the 60,000,000 are to be put to work.

The people who are fighting against me know that they are not fighting a starry-eyed liberal or mystic. If they really thought that, they wouldn't be worried. They are fighting against sound principles upon which America can survive as a great and prosperous Nation. They know that with me in Commerce there would be a continuous campaign for maximum production, maximum sales, maximum exports and imports. They know I would rally business support behind the Department of Commerce to make it the great service institution it ought to be.

What these people don't realize is that in fighting me they are fighting you and millions like you to the third and fourth generations. Without realizing it, they are fighting against the survival of capitalism and free enterprise. The time has come to fight back.

I still hope and pray for a united, progressive Democratic Party. The strategy of the

enemy is to break the Democratic Party in two. They want to push you and me into the futility of a third party. I don't think we shall have a third party. I think we can win within the framework of the Democratic Party. I hope that we are not now in for a political realinement like that which substituted the Republican Party for the Whig Party nearly a century ago.

There will be far less trouble in this country if the progressives can find full and free expression in the Democratic Party.

ECONOMIC BILL OF RIGHTS

You represent many groups here tonight. You have had your differences. But in the pinches you have fought shoulder to shoulder. The day will come when you will federate together. Already you are agreed on a legislative program. In the economic bill of rights you have something specific to sell. Prior to this campaign progressives have been long on words and short on action. If we really believed in our campaign of last fall, we must get to work to organize nationally behind President Roosevelt's eight-point economic bill of rights. We must organize and keep organized, ready for action every month of every year. The economic bill of rights must be made to live. Those who fight this issue must be defeated in 1946. To do this, strong candidates must be agreed on as long in advance of the 1946 campaign as it is possible to get agreement.

What a swell job you did here in New York for Roosevelt last fall. You sense the trend of the times and you do something about it.

We welcome the future joyously. We shall organize an America worthy of our returning heroes. We shall transform our liberal words into concrete action. We shall do something about it when the veterans can't get jobs. Approaching the business, the farm, and the labor problems under the charter of the economic bill of rights, we shall prove that our idealism is more practical in life than that curious mysticism which is called hard-headed common sense.

By blood and tradition I am an Anglo-Saxon with all the inhibitions these words imply. But I do have enough Irish blood and enough exposure to Latin-American customs so that I would like to give you all an "abrazo." You are all "simptico" to me. We believe in the same things. We are headed the same way. And that way is upward toward a better America, victorious in war, just in peace, producing ever more abundantly for all our people the good things of life.

There are two issues in this fight. The first is jobs for all after the post-war boom is over. And the second is like unto it—the common man of America can and therefore must be better off in time of peace than he was in time of war.

POOL OF FARM MACHINERY FOR RELIEF TO RETURNING VETERANS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill, S. 585, to provide for the establishment of a pool of farm machinery for relief to returning veterans who desire to engage in farming operations, and for other purposes. In keeping with the announced ruling made by the majority leader, who stated on the floor of the Senate that from now on no extended remarks were to be made relative to the introduction of a bill during the morning hour, I should like to take a few moments now to say a word or two concerning the bill.

An unusually serious and extremely difficult problem has arisen with reference to veterans who are being discharged from the military forces, who are desirous of engaging in farming.

Many thousands of veterans are being discharged monthly from the service—I understand the figure now is up to nearly 50,000 a month—and among those discharged veterans there are many returning farmers, who sold their agricultural equipment at the time of enlistment or induction, and who now do not have the necessary agricultural equipment which would permit them to reengage in their customary agricultural occupation. There are many other discharged veterans who do not and will not desire to go back into industry, but who will desire to take advantage of the loan provisions of the G. I. bill and who thus will want to engage in an agricultural occupation.

A discharged veteran, who, prior to induction, had been engaged in industry in the production of machinery, finds upon his return from the service that his regular job, or the equivalent, is waiting for him, and along with his industrial job he finds that the necessary equipment and tools are available. On the other hand, what about the farmer who is inducted and who now returns from military service? He finds upon his return that he cannot reengage in his regular agricultural occupation because no agricultural equipment is available to him.

Insofar as occupations are concerned, such needs are parallel and such cases are entitled to the same treatment. A discharged veteran previously engaged in a nonagricultural occupation finds that he can return to his old job without too much difficulty, whereas one engaged in agriculture prior to induction now finds upon being discharged from the service that it is well-night impossible for him to return to agricultural pursuits, because no farming equipment is made available to the veteran. This, unquestionably, is not equitable, nor is it in any way in line with our indicated policy with respect to returning veterans. It is imperative that something be done to eliminate, or at least alleviate, this discriminatory treatment.

Under schedule B of the present farm machinery and equipment order, L–257, only a fixed quantity of farm machinery can be produced, and this quantity represents the absolute irreducible minimum, in order to provide for the needs of those now engaged in agriculture. I think it a safe statement to say that every item of farm machinery which will be produced under this order has been sold, and, further, that there are many thousand more customers waiting for such equipment than can be supplied by what will be produced between now and the expiration date of the order on June 30.

This means that the returning veteran who goes to a dealer in an attempt to obtain the equipment he needs cannot possibly obtain that equipment until such time as his name on the customers' list comes to the top, and this time element may run anywhere from a few months to years.

It is imperative that at least a nominal quantity of farm fachinery and equipment be made available for the veteran immediately and, secondly, that a program be developed and the material made avaiiliable to provide for the manufacture of this equiipment to take care of future veteran requirements. Incidentally, there is no reason why this supplemental program for the benefit of veterans should conflict in any way with our present or future program of governmental agencies for production and distribution of farm machinery. Such quotas or allotments of farm machinery for veterans must be in addition to regularly established agricultural requirements of our farmers.

The facts regarding the manufacture and distribution of farm machinery under L–257, schedule B, are known and established. There is, however, a substantial quantity of farm machinery which has been and is being produced for nonfarm purposes through the Office of Civilian Requirements. This so-called nonfarm equipment is identical to the equipment used in general farming, and is distributed through the medium of priority ratings granted by the different War Production Board divisions.

Just what quantity of equipment has been allocated to date under this program is not known, but it is reasonable to assume that at least a percentage of this equipment could feasibly be made available for the formation of a veterans' pool. It is an absolute impossibility to take a tractor, or any other piece of farm machinery, now being produced under schedule B, and divert it to a returning veteran, because this machinery has been definitely allocated to the dealer by the manufacturer, and the dealer, in turn, has by rotation promised equipment to producing farmers in his area.

The War Production Board at the moment is more concerned with production than with distribution, and it is of little concern to the War Production Board whether the now established and producing farmer receives the equipment or whether such equipment is made available to the returning veteran.

Our farmers who are now engaged in the program of food production need this machinery, and much more consideration along that line than has been accorded them. They have produced food in abundance for America and our allies with a shortage of help and with insufficient equipment and repairs. Certainly, any program now established should not be at their expense.

But under the program set up by the Office of Civilian Requirements material for the manufacture of agricultural equipment was originally allotted, and agricultural equipment under such program has been manufactured, for nonfarm use. Under such allotment some farming equipment has been manufactured and is available for nonfarm use. Today some of such agricultural equipment is on the floors of our implement houses, when it could be put to use by our returning veterans, who desire to reengage in farming. Under this allotment, set aside by the Office of Civilian Requirements, is material for the manufacture of agricultural equipment for nonfarm use, and such material can be utilized in the program which I herewith advance. I refer particularly and specifically to tractors, manure spreaders, lime spreaders, harrows, and many other items, the use of which can definitely be only for agricultural purposes.

Most manufacturers have taken on the production of certain so-called nonfarm items with the expectation that they will sell at least part of them for nonfarm purposes, and that they will at a later date make an appeal requesting that they be permitted to sell this equipment for farm use. There are appeals in the Farm Machinery and Equipment Division of W. P. B. as of today requesting such permission. Either these appeals are being denied or action on them is being deferred.

Further, under such a nonfarm program, the majority of manufacturers will move this equipment for storage to their various warehouses and showrooms; and it is rather difficult to try to establish a sound reason why a farmer desiring a tractor or other items of farm equipment cannot buy such equipment now.

Whatever agricultural equipment program is developed in the way of relief for returning veterans need not be charged against all future programs, to provide necessary equipment for established farmers. They will provide farming equipment for the veteran without in any way cutting into the farm-machinery quota now set up for agricultural uses.

With that purpose in mind, earlier in the day I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a pool of farm machinery for release to returning veterans who desire to engage in farming operations. The bill would place the responsibility for the program and for the distribution of all farm machinery with the War Food Administration of the Department of Agriculture. It is my view that the responsibility for such a program should be entirely in the hands of one agency and one agency alone. I feel that the appropriate agency is the War Food Administration.

NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] addressed the Senate for about an hour and a half this afternoon on the nomination of Mr. Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce. In his address he read excerpts from some of Mr. Wallace's speeches and articles and then proceeded to state, in many cases, that he did not know just exactly what Mr. Wallace was saying or just what Mr. Wallace meant. Then the distinguished Senator from Ohio proceeded to put his own construction on Mr. Wallace's words. He really put words in Mr. Wallace's mouth, and in that way built up a straw man and then proceeded to knock the straw man down.

One might judge from the speech of the distinguished Senator from Ohio that Mr. Wallace was against the free-enterprise system. Mr. President, that is not true.

One might judge from the speech of the distinguished Senator from Ohio that Mr. Wallace is against the profit system. That is not true.

One might judge from the speech of the distinguished Senator from Ohio that Mr. Wallace was against the use of private money, and for the use only of Government money to finance business expansion and full employment. That is not true.

Mr. President, we do not have to accept what the Senator from Ohio says about what Mr. Wallace has said. We do not have to take a straw man which the Senator from Ohio builds up from statements taken out of their context in Mr. Wallace's speeches, or from some foreign and alien interpretation put on Mr. Wallace's speeches by the Senator from Ohio. We have Mr. Wallace's speeches in the RECORD. The fact is that we have excerpts from a number of Mr. Wallace's speeches in the hearings before the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, printed in the hearings on Senate bill 375. Mr. Wallace appeared before the Senate Committee on Commerce on January 25 last. I shall not at this late hour take the time to read the speeches of Mr. Wallace, or the excerpts from those speeches as they appear in the hearings, but I do wish to invite the attention of the Senate to two or three excerpts.

On January 3, 1938, in an address before the Community Forum, Pittsburgh, Pa., on the community of interest between labor, capital, and agriculture, Mr. Wallace said:

> But businessmen in general are not seeking predatory profits.
>
> Business does want a chance to earn an honest return on true investment values. This it can hope to get in the long run only through balanced abundance. Business cannot hope for long to cover the overhead cost of its plant if it operates at 25 or 50 percent of capacity. It must recognize that profits are the reward of initiative and leadership and that ancient plants eventually become valueless. Any attempt over long periods of time to operate at limited capacity and to maintain the values of obsolete equipment will react against the interest of new investors, new capital, and new business leadership. The true interests of capital, seeking opportunity for profitable investment, like the interests of agriculture and labor, lie in balanced abundance.
>
> It is my belief that business management and investors both have everything to gain from a sound working relationship between agriculture and labor. If business management is willing to produce and sell at prices which with full production will return a reasonable yield on the capital invested, and if investors are willing to put their funds into use at moderate interest rates, they will find wide markets for their products and effective use for their funds. The more effectively farmers and labor cooperate to expand production, the wider will be the opportunities for industry as a whole. Yes; there will be plenty of work for all capital which is willing to accept a fair return as soon as labor, capital, and agriculture really understand each other and start pulling together to turn out more goods in such a balanced way that there will be no serious set-backs.
>
> As we consider the absolutely vital functions of capital we should all remember that there are a number of capitalists who are capable of lifting their eyes higher than the problem of profit to the general-welfare considerations involved in getting new industries started in a sensible way. Capitalists with vision should not be blamed for the abuses practiced by the others. Of course there are certain abuses which are inherent in any system of maturing capitalism with which we must wrestle courageously in order to keep capitalism from destroying itself. Insofar as we have set our hand to that task, I hope the utmost of good feeling will characterize all our efforts and that the flow of private capital into productive investment will be encouraged. The time is now rapidly approaching when the general public will demand that labor, capital, and agriculture spend less of their energy in a struggle for relative advantage and more of their energy in devising constructive cooperative ways to increase the national output. We have the inventive ability, the factories, the workers, the farmers, to take care of all of our people in marvelous fashion. Capital, labor, and agriculture cooperating can do the job.

The Senator from Ohio had a good deal to say about Mr. Wallace favoring spending for the sake of spending and how Mr. Wallace would endeavor to meet all our problems, provide jobs, and prevent unemployment, simply by Federal expenditures. It so happens that on Jackson Day, January 7, 1939, at Minneapolis, Minn., Mr. Wallace made a speech on the challenge to the West, in which he said:

> In the future there will probably always be greater Federal expenditures than was the case previous to 1930, but we all hope the day will soon come when private financing will increase and Government financing will decrease. Both the art and science of Government in the years immediately ahead will center in considerable measure around the problem of bringing about this transition as rapidly as possible but without shock.

He was referring to the transition away from Federal expenditures to private expenditures.

On March 13, 1939, in an address before a meeting of the Food and Grocery Conference Committee at Washington, D. C., Mr. Wallace said:

> All of us in government appreciate the way in which the members of the trade groups have worked with us on this important problem (food stamp plan). We rely upon your cooperation, including increasingly effective methods of merchandising, to make this plan successful. In turn you can rely upon the necessary cooperation of Government agencies. It is only through united effort that we can find the way to plenty.
>
> I have been continually delighted with the reports of the mutually fine attitude displayed by the representatives of the different groups. Having confidence in each other, they have got down to work on the mechanical details in a very effective way. The food trades, I am confident, are going to do their very best to do a real job of moving the surplus in the selected cities in such a manner as to demonstrate real efficiency to the public.

On May 21, 1939, in an address at a banquet of the eighty-seventh annual convention of District Grand Lodge, No. 1, of B'nai B'rith, at New York City, on the subject America the Land of Opportunity, Mr. Wallace said:

> The existing physical needs make America a land of opportunity right now for men with training and experience in the investment field. The wise investor does not wait for a high tide of business before he goes ahead, for he knows that by that time the best opportunities are gone. The wise investor puts his capital to work when business is just starting on its upward curve. By his boldness, he helps make jobs for idle men, and he helps create business for all. At the present time the greatest opportunities are open to those who can make the right combination of labor, capital, management, and the democratic powers lent by Government.

There is always room for a difference of opinion on details, but it seems to me the national recovery program sponsored by President Roosevelt deserves all the cooperation that the whole country can give. We can never get full recovery unless everyone—including the leaders of industry, the leaders of labor, the leaders of agriculture, and the leaders of government—are willing to put their shoulders to the wheel.

On June 17, 1939, in an address at a dinner of the Democratic Party in Milwaukee, Wis., on the subject Progressive Foundations That Can Endure, Mr. Wallace said:

The job of stimulating private investment, so that the building of factories and production of articles to be sold to consumers can be kept in balance with each other and with the needs of the American people, is perhaps the principal task which now confronts us.

This job cannot be done—or at least is not being done—by business operating by itself. Neither can it be done by government operating by itself, unless we are willing to go to a system of state capitalism. Under our American system this is a job which must be undertaken by business, with whatever government aid is needed to assure success. Doing this job will give us the kind of foundation we need if our progressivism is going to endure.

In connection with Mr. Wallace's attitude toward business and businessmen, Mr. Wallace, speaking in Des Moines, Iowa, on January 8, 1940, had this to say:

The vast majority of businessmen are honest. Government should, so far as possible, encourage them in their legitimate endeavors. They are the men who pay a large part of the Federal income taxes and who pride themselves on furnishing jobs for laboring men and markets for farm products.

On September 23, 1940, in an address in Cadle Tabernacle, Indianapolis, Ind., on the subject Democracy and Capitalism, Mr. Wallace said:

The substance of democracy that I want to see handed down to my children is a democracy that meets the ideals and protects the interests of the vast majority of Americans—of farmers, of workers, of small businessmen, and of those big businessmen whose great power is matched by good judgment, fairness, and responsibility to the general welfare.

During all this long struggle, we Americans have been trying to protect capitalist business, which includes agriculture, against the growing powers of high finance. There is a difference between business and finance, which some people sometimes try to make you forget. Capitalist enterprise is a familiar process of producing and selling food, clothes, automobiles, and other useful goods and services.

There are plenty of legitimate businessmen in the utility business. They are to be found in most of the operating companies, doing the actual work of managing the generation and distribution of electricity. The engineering achievements of the industry are a testimony to the fact that in the works there are real producers who know and care about production. They are not the ones who lack knowledge or business judgment, if only they were free to exercise their talents.

At Detroit, a little later, on October 24, 1940, Mr. Wallace had this to say:

You all know what a real or working businessman is. He runs a store or a factory. He buys materials, hires workers, sells goods. He may be a success or a failure, but at least he knows what it means to struggle with the real everyday problems of producing and selling. The New Deal has no quarrel with real businessmen.

On December 28, 1942, in a radio address commemorating the eighty-sixth anniversary of the birthday of Woodrow Wilson, under the sponsorship of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, American Political Science Association, and American Historical Association, the subject of the address being America's Part in World Reconstruction, Mr. Wallace said:

When the war is over, the more quickly private enterprise gets back into peacetime production and sells its goods to peacetime markets here and abroad, the more quickly will the level of Government wartime expenditures be reduced. No country needs deficit spending when private enterprise, either through its own efforts or in cooperation with Government, is able to maintain full employment. Let us hope that the best thought of both business and Government can be focused on this problem which lies at the heart of our American democracy and our American way of life.

The war has brought forth a new type of industrialist who gives much promise for the future. The type of business leader I have in mind has caught a new vision of opportunities in national and international projects. He is willing to cooperate with the people's Government in carrying out socially desirable programs. He conducts these programs on the basis of private enterprise and for private profit, while putting into effect the people's standards as to wages and working conditions. We shall need the best efforts of such men as we tackle the economic problem of the peace.

Maintenance of full employment and the highest possible level of national income should be the joint responsibility of private business and of Government. It is reassuring to know that business groups in contact with Government agencies already are assembling facts, ideas, and plans that will speed up the shift from a Government-financed war program to a privately financed program of peacetime activity.

In an article in the American Magazine for March 1943, entitled "What We Will Get Out of the War," Mr. Wallace said:

The American businessman will rise to the challenge of the air age, to the challenge of the new frontier, to the infinite possibilities for development not only in our own country, but in the tropics and in Asia. Just as he has cooperated with Government in time of war to build planes for the saving of civilization, so likewise will he cooperate with Government to make air power the preserver of civilization.

More and more, everyone will recognize that business, labor, agriculture, and Government have just one job in their four-way partnership: To lead the common man to full employment, a higher standard of living, and a peace which will be permeated by the exicting spirit of new frontiers. The creative business man of the future will recognize that, while Government will play a large part in opening up these new frontiers, the Government activity will be such as not to reduce but to increase the field for private initiative. Better Government organization and more individual drive will go hand in hand.

In serving the common man, the business leader will have opportunities for initiative such as he never dreamed of before.

On July 25, 1943, Mr. Wallace, making another speech in the city of Detroit, a speech captioned "America tomorrow," said:

If industrial management can bring the same wisdom in producing for peace that it has shown on many production fronts in the supply program for war, the horizons we face are bright. We have witnessed many evidences of industrial statesmanship, of cooperation with labor to increase production and cut costs. In hundreds of industries the war has demonstrated that management and labor can be friends in the service of the Nation.

Mr. President, in the words I have read today there is nothing but understanding of business, nothing but sympathy for business and appreciation of what business has done and what business means in America. There is not a hint of any hostility toward business or any lack of faith in business.

On the other hand, these words proclaim loudly that Mr. Wallace recognizes that private business is certainly one of the foundation stones of the system which Mr. Wallace himself would preserve, namely, the American free enterprise system.

A little more than a year ago—on October 23, 1943—there appeared in the Saturday Evening Post an article written by Mr. Wallace on the subject We Must Save Free Enterprise. In that article Mr. Wallace said:

The system of free enterprise is based upon the willingness of the businessman to accept risk. As technology grew, as our economy expanded, and as large-scale production came to dominate the economic process, the individual found it impossible to undertake such huge ventures alone. To fill this need, the corporation had the soundest reasons for coming into being. Every new corporation enabled numbers of men to pool their resources and to carry out a venture beyond the means of any one of them. Economic teamplay—yet fully within the framework of competition—was the genesis of the modern corporation. To the corporate form of organization must go much of the credit for the speed with which new industries were founded, railroads were built, and a continent opened up to the American people.

Risk taking was an essential of the free economy. Because a corporation limited the liability of the individual and spread the possible losses, it was destined to become the principal means of attracting venture capital. It encouraged the businessman and the investor to assume the risk of developing new industries. As an elastic, flexible association of risk takers, the corporation was ideally fitted to bring forth new goods and services and to create going concerns. Without the use of the corporate form, the emergence of the railroad, the telegraph and telephone, the automobile and the radio, the large-scale distribution of electric power, to say the least, would have been delayed. Viewed from this perspective, the developments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have proved the social and economic importance of the corporation.

It is clear that the corporation and the patent system were major factors contributing to the growth of modern America. The patent system gave to the little man with the big idea an unparalleled opportunity to utilize his creative imagination and to risk his limited resources in a game where the rewards of success were great and where his own gain served the general welfare.

Then Mr. Wallace said the following:

It is a hopeful sign when Eric Johnston, the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, can say in the September Reader's Digest:

Then there is a people's capitalism.

Mr. President, suppose Mr. Wallace had said something about a people's capitalism. Right away that would have

been seized upon in an endeavor to convict Mr. Wallace of looking toward socialism or communism or bolshevism.

So I wish to make it clear to the Senate that the people's capitalism spoken of in the article is stated not in the words of Mr. Wallace, but in the words of Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. It was Mr. Johnston who said:

Then there is a people's capitalism. I come from it. I want to see it survive for every poor boy and girl in America after me. And not only survive but triumph. Only America, I think, can light the world toward an ultimate capitalism of everybody.

Think of that, Mr. President. Mr. Johnston then said:

Only America, I think, can light the world toward an ultimate capitalism of everybody.

If Mr. Henry Wallace had used those words he would have been accused of going all over the face of the earth, into the darkest jungles and into the most remote places, seeking to change our economy and to set up a new standard of economy by some kind of large expenditure of Federal funds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I cannot see what is wrong with the idea of a people's capitalism. I have understood that that is our system of capitalism. It means that everyone will have some savings which he can invest. I cannot understand what the Senator is talking about or why anyone should criticize what Mr. Johnston said.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if Mr. Wallace rather than Mr. Johnston, had used those words, I am afraid the Senator from Ohio would not have taken them to his breast with such a warm welcome. He would have found many strange and suspicious things behind those words, things smacking of something which was not exactly American or not exactly in accordance with the American system of enterprise or not exactly in line with American capitalism as we know it.

Mr. Wallace further said:

What happens when the little man with the big idea is able to fight the forces of special privilege and power which attempt to strangle him is shown clearly in the development of the automobile industry. The saga of the American automobile industry is one of the proudest chapters in the history of free private enterprise. The importance of this industry to our well-being is readily apparent.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio quoted Mr. Wallace as saying that some automobile manufacturers had to be forced by the Government to cease the manufacture of automobiles for peacetime uses, and engage in the production of war materials, as though Mr. Wallace had condemned all the automobile industry and all those engaged in it. However, here we find Mr. Wallace's tribute to the automobile business and his statement of the pride he takes in what that business has done.

Mr. Wallace further said:

The rebuilding of a war-torn world, the development of new trade routes and new markets, and the endless stream of discoveries which flow from our laboratories will be new frontiers. To the hardy, to the venturesome—in short, to the American businessman with the pioneering spirit—the chance for reward and the promise of useful and fruitful action for the release of those energies which have characterized him are an open road.

He is inviting American business to go down this open road by its own initiative and its own resourcefulness, seeking out its own rewards.

Mr. Wallace then said:

There will be the greatest need for cooperation between business, labor, agriculture, and government.

Does any Senator deny that?

Then he said:

There will be obstacles. There will be discord and disappointments. But none of these hurdles is so great that it cannot be surmounted if American business lives up to its responsibilities.

Primarily, the task of reemployment is the responsibility of businessmen. It is a responsibility which they can meet only if enterprise is free to develop and extend the new lines of industry as well as the presently existing enormous plant capacity.

In other words, he was saying that neither Government nor anyone else must be allowed to take away from business its free-enterprise system, its freedom to grow and to develop and to move forward along the lines of the American system of enterprise.

Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only long enough to read one or two other short quotations. The first is taken from a speech Mr. Wallace delivered at Philadelphia, Pa., on November 3, 1943, about a year ago. He was then addressing farmers and laboring people, and this is what he said to them about business:

The fourth duty of the farmer and worker—

He is not merely advising or suggesting, but he says that the duty of the farmer and worker—

is to see that capital is fairly treated, that the man who risks his name and credit may get his risk capital returned when he has served well in creating new jobs and needed products. Otherwise stagnation and joblessness will increase; otherwise there can be no growth of new enterprise or free enterprise. Free enterprise must not be made a mockery by big enterprise. In the backwash of war the small businessman must not be washed out.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate longer by reading excerpts from Mr. Wallace's speeches which make clear and definite his views with reference to private business and enterprise. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts which sustain and confirm Mr. Wallace's friendship for business, the recognition of the importance of business, and the encouragement which should be given to it if we are to continue the American free-enterprise system.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH AT MEETING SPONSORED BY DEMOCRATIC, CIVIC, AND LABOR GROUPS OF MINNEAPOLIS AT MINNEAPOLIS, FEBRUARY 14, 1944

The development of regional capital markets is a task for local business and financial interests. Here is an opportunity for small investment banking houses and security dealers to expand their services in behalf of local industry. Here is an opportunity to reduce the cost of financing so as to encourage the growth of regional enterprises which will ultimately develop into more financing.

Investment in the development of regional economies will require venture capital rather than the timid capital which seeks safety in the bonds of established enterprises. Federal legislation has done much to relieve those who would invest venture capital of the unnecessary risks that attach to fraudulent financing. A revision of our tax laws can provide further incentives to invest in the common stocks of new enterprises.

The development of regional economies within a full-production national economy will open a new era in American history. New opportunities for employment, for capital investment, for enterprise, will be the first effects. The use of new natural resources, plus the fuller employment of labor and capital, will mean enlarged production, both regionally and nationally. A balanced regional development will provide increased stability for business and the foundation for a new post-war American standard of living.

ADDRESS UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS COMMITTEE, PITTSBURGH, PA., SEPTEMBER 30, 1944

Tonight I want to talk about your community here in Greater Pittsburgh, because this area is a symbol of so much of America's industrial greatness—her power in coal, iron and steel, oil, railroads, glass, aluminum, and electrical equipment. Pittsburgh has been the beating heart of America's vast development since 1860. Pittsburgh boomed during the Civil War and the railroad expansion which followed that war. She boomed again during World War No. 1 and enjoyed the tremendous stimulus which came to heavy industry as a result of the rapid growth of automobile construction during the twenties. Today we stand on the threshold of another post-war era following upon a time when when Pittsburgh has made a greater contribution many times over to the American war effort than ever before in American history. Tomorrow, as in the past, Pittsburgh will be the barometer of the Nation's success in building a prosperity for all Americans in the post-war period.

We are not going to have a planned economy in the United States, but we must plan for our economy in peace just as we did in war. We are not going to have a planned economy, because that means that everything is done from one central spot by one group of people. But we do need specific plans in every city, in every industry, in every State, and coordination of these plans on a national basis. When I visited with the mayors, the chambers of commerce, and the members of the Committee for Economic Development in many eastern cities, I found them doing excellent work. But nearly everywhere I found them thinking just a little too much in terms of an outmoded normalcy and not enough in terms of the truly great abundance which we must have if we are to have full employment. An abundance program for our economy should be based on the needs of the average American family.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have read the testimony of Mr. Henry Wallace before the Commerce Committee. I also happen to have a copy of the discussion which took place between the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] at the Radio Forum of the People's Platform. As I recall, the discussion took place Sunday, a week ago. In that discussion the Senator from Ohio gave voice to practically the same views which he expressed today. The burden of the Senator's attack on Mr. Wallace was the sum and substance of what his attack has been today. On the radio program the Senator from Ohio said:

I believe 100 percent in Mr. Wallace's ideals, as does Mr. Dewey. So does everyone. We must work to bring about full employment.

He then continued:

But I disagree with Mr. Wallace's method of attaining those ideals, because in essence it is the old New Deal pump-priming theory that a nation can spend itself into prosperity. The solution of every problem is to spend more Government money.

When the Senator from Ohio made that statement over the radio and in sum and substance made the same statement today, he was, as I have said before, merely setting up a straw man to knock down and wool around, and putting in Mr. Wallace's mouth statements which he never made. The nearest that Mr. Wallace came in his testimony before the Commerce Committee to a definite and specific suggestion as to how to carry out the program to give 60,000,000 jobs to the workers of the United States, and to fulfill the bill of economic rights as proclaimed by the President, was to say, in answer to a question of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], that Congress itself might well study the whole matter, hold hearings, hear the representatives of the various departments of the Government, as well as representatives of the various American groups and organizations, and then, after thorough study and consideration of the program, let Congress write into the law the proper policies with reference to governing the R. F. C. in the matter of Federal loans and expenditures.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator from Alabama now have any information as to whether or not Mr. Wallace would be willing to take the office of Secretary of Commerce if his nomination were confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Mr. Wallace will have to speak for himself; but it is my definite understanding that if and when his nomination is confirmed by the Senate, as I expect it to be, he will accept the position as Secretary of Commerce. It is also my understanding that he said before the Senate Committee on Commerce that he would accept the position.

Mr. CHANDLER. In the speech which he made in New York he said that he would not accept it.

Mr. HILL. I did not so understand it. I inferred from the speech which he made in New York that unless the right top man were put in charge of the lending agencies Mr. Wallace might not wish to be in the Cabinet. From my understanding of the speech which Mr. Wallace made in New York there was nothing in it which could lead anyone to believe that if the Senate confirmed Mr. Wallace's nomination to be Secretary of Commerce he would not accept the position.

Mr. CHANDLER. I intend to vote for him. If the Senate is prepared now to vote for him I am prepared to vote. The Secretary of Commerce will not have anything to do with the naming of the head of the lending agencies, will he?

Mr. HILL. No; that official will be appointed by the President and the appointment will have to be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. That matter will not come under Mr. Wallace.

Mr. HILL. No. Without attempting to put words in Mr. Wallace's mouth, I am sure that I can assure the Senator that if Mr. Wallace's nomination is confirmed he will accept the position of Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, as I read the testimony and the record of Henry Wallace relative to business, I find that what Henry Wallace is interested in is Government taking such action as will promote the maximum flow of private capital, the maximum activity of private risk takers, and the maximum of private employment. If Government is needed to give the private risk-takers courage, then bring in the Government. Bring in the Government with incentive taxation. Bring in the Government to insure special types of risk, just as the Government insures risk in F. H. A. loans.

When Mr. Wallace appeared before the Commerce Committee he was testifying on behalf of the Federal Loan Agency remaining in the Department of Commerce. He told the committee that if he had control over the Federal Loan Agency his purpose would be to use the powers to bring about full employment and other objectives in which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and Governor Dewey believe 100 percent. But today we are not debating how Mr. Wallace would use his powers over the Federal Loan Agency. Under the George bill he would have no power over the Federal Loan Agency. He could not use the power of that agency to carry out the objectives in which all Americans believe 100 percent. The Senator from Ohio, who also believes in Mr. Wallace's ideals 100 percent, but not in his methods, is no doubt relieved. But the Senator from Ohio is still concerned. He feels that Mr. Wallace, with the limited power of the Department of Commerce, may convince the Congress or the American people of the desirability of adopting certain methods of attaining the ideals in which we all believe.

As I read over the distinguished Senator's views, I find that the essential difference between the Senator and Mr. Wallace is that the Senator is resigned to a post-war employment of 50,000,000 and a national income of $120,000,000,000. Mr. Wallace would shoot for a post-war employment of 60,000,000 and a national income of $150,000,000,000. Mr. Wallace thinks that in the post-war period it will be necessary for a higher percentage of our population to work than have ever worked in peacetime. He thinks that it is only by labor and the largest possible national income that we can carry the interest on the national debt easily. Surely I know of no one who has suggested any other way by which we can carry our debt and meet the interest obligations on the debt.

Mr. Wallace thinks the Government by backing the flow of risk capital can well afford to take the chance of some loss if thereby the national income is increased $30,000,000,000 and national employment at least 10,000,000 workers.

The subject is a technical one, Mr. President, one which does not lend itself to detailed debate on the floor of the Senate at this time, one on which, as Mr. Wallace has well suggested before the Committee on Commerce, extended Senate hearings should be held, at which representatives from the various Government agencies and representatives from the different groups of American economy should be called in and should be heard.

On our intelligent handling of this matter of employment, of jobs, may depend whether or not the United States shall again lose, as it did in the decade of the thirties, 180,000,000,000 hours of man-labor, and over $250,000,000,000 in national income. That was the loss, not to mention all the misery, and the suffering, and the heartaches, of the depression, because we failed in this country to provide employment and jobs and purchasing power to keep our economy going, as the character and genius of our people and our wonderful natural resources make it possible for our economy to operate.

Unintelligent handling in the decade of the twenties of the post-war problems of World War No. 1 laid the ground work for the terrible loss in the thirties. I fear that what the Senator from Ohio has in mind would mean a loss after this war not of 180,000,000,000 hours of man-labor, but of 300,000,000,000 hours; not a loss of $250,000,000,000 in national income, but of $500,000,000,000.

I would not do the distinguished Senator an injustice, and I am sure he would not want to do Mr. Wallace an injustice. In view of the fact that both agree as to the objective and disagree as to method, and in view of the fact that neither has perfected his ideas as to methods, and in view of the fact that any program would have to be approved by Congress, I would suggest that there would be abundant opportunity for the Senator and Mr. Wallace to come to grips with the problem of method after careful and complete study. I reiterate what I said earlier that Mr. Wallace suggested that Congress amend the R. F. C. Act to define very clearly just what Congress desires with regard to carrying out any or all of the program which he set forth.

Mr. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce will no doubt make appropriate presentations to the appropriate committees as to methods which seem to be sound for attaining the objectives in which we

all believe. Such presentation will undoubtedly involve clearance with other Government agencies, including the President and the Budget Director. Under such circumstances the Senator from Ohio, the author of the bill which he now tells us he has introduced, should welcome the presentation of any ideas which are directed toward full employment and the increase of the national income. Even if the methods are novel, he should look at them with an unprejudiced eye.

To win the war, Mr. President, we have to adopt novel methods. To win the war against depression we had to adopt novel methods, and I do not hesitate to say here today that if we are to have the jobs necessary for a strong and healthy economy, if we are to have employment in this country, if we are to avoid the disasters of another depression, we will have to adopt new and novel methods again. To my mind that is one of the most important things about having Mr. Wallace in the Cabinet, in the Government service. There are some who so dislike and hate change that they set themselves adamant against all change. It might be all right for such persons to set themselves up against change if they could prevent change, but we know that at all times, through every hour of the day, there are great social and economic forces at work in our country and at work throughout the world, and these social and economic forces are constantly bringing about change. As they bring about change, we must meet with wisdom, courage and vision, the conditions which those changes bring about, or we suffer the consequences for not doing so.

Because, as I have said, we did not have the wisdom and the courage to do the things necessary to recognize the changes which were taking place in the twenties, we had the terrible depression of the thirties. This man, Henry Wallace, not only has courage and ability and understanding, but he has the vision of which the Bible speaks when it declares that that nation which has not vision will perish. If we are not to perish, if we are to have a strong economy to keep our Nation going, we need the vision and the courage of Henry Wallace in our Government.

Mr. President, I do not agree with Mr. Wallace on all matters, but, after all, our Government is one in which we come together and compromise and bring out the best from all the different ideas we can get. Every time the Senate of the United States passes a bill of any consequence it is the synthesis of the thoughts and the views and the ideas of the 96 Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, Henry Wallace is one of the distinguished economists of the world, and while it is true that he campaigned against the Senator from Ohio in his own State last fall, I am sure that the Senator is a big enough man, a sufficiently devoted patriot, so that he will be glad to look at any proposals brought forward by Mr. Wallace with only one thought in his mind, namely, How can the welfare of all the people be best served?

If we are best to serve the welfare of all the people of our Nation, we need the services of Henry Wallace. We need his knowledge, we need his experience, we need his philosophy, we need his courage, and his vision.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point a stenographic copy of the People's Program, which was a discussion before a moderator, between the able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself, on February 3, which was broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System. The discussion had to do with Mr. Henry A. Wallace, and his appointment as Secretary of the Department of Commerce.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER (Bill Jefferay). The People's Platform. From its studios in the Nation's Capital, Columbia brings you now a discussion of one of the most controversial issues of the day, "Can the Wallace program lead to prosperity?" Guests of People's Platform Chairman Lyman Bryson are Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat from Florida, and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio. We hear first from Lyman Bryson.

Mr. BRYSON. It is getting to be rather difficult these days to decide just what kind of man Henry Wallace is, in spite of the fact that he has been in the public eye now for a number of years. He has been called a wild-eyed dreamer and a mystic, and he has been called a very clever politican who is getting in his innings. He has been accused of a threat to wreck the American economy, and he has also been lauded as the person who can save it.

Senator PEPPER, what is the essence of Mr. Wallace's claim to a prosperity plan?

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Bryson, I wouldn't say that the plan which I shall refer to is exclusively the Wallace plan. It might just as well be called the Dewey plan, because Mr. Walter Lippmann in a recent article of his quotes Mr. Dewey as saying:

"We Republicans are agreed that full employment shall be the first objective of national policy."

Mr. BRYSON. Senator PEPPER, is that all there is to the plan? Just full employment?

Senator PEPPER. Full employment is the essence of it. That is the aim and the objective, and Mr. Wallace believes and I believe that if we could achieve full employment for the people of this country, that would assure the prosperity of the people of the country.

Mr. Wallace enumerated and adopted as his own the economic bill of rights last January laid before the Congress by the President, and just to get those briefly into the discussion, I will enumerate them.

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation.

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

The right of every family to a decent home.

The right to adequate medical care. The opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

The right to a good education.

Mr. Wallace takes the position that when the national job budget—that is, when the number of employed in the country—falls at least below 57,000,000, then it should be the duty of the Government to set in motion a vast program to bring employment back up to about 60,000,000, or at least to see that it doesn't drop below 57,000,000.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Bryson, Senator PEPPER, I think the Wallace program would not only not lead to prosperity, but I believe it must lead to national bankruptcy and then to a totalitarian state.

I believe a hundred percent in Wallace's ideals, as Mr. Dewey does. So does everyone. We must work to bring about full employment. I believe in utopia and in heaven. But I disagree with Mr. Wallace's method of attaining those ideals because in essence it is the old New Deal pump-priming theory that a nation can spend itself into prosperity.

Mr. Wallace made very clear his ignorance of arithmetic and economics when he said before the Senate committee—I quote:

"This program need place no real burden on the Federal budget, notwithstanding the reduction in taxes which must come after the war. On the contrary, a program of this character can provide America with a national income of such size that it will be possible to reduce the tax rates still further."

This is the most delightful example of lifting oneself by one's bootstraps that I have ever seen so clearly expressed. If it were true, why not spend twice as much Government money and all live in luxury? Mr. Wallace's program is very simple. All we have to do is to pass a law guaranteeing prosperity and full employment and spend all the Government money necessary to make that guaranty good. The solution of every problem is to spend more Government money.

I estimate that in many years it would cost $40,000,000,000 and could not increase taxes by more than $15,000,000,000. Deficit: $25,000,000,000 a year.

The possible budget without Henry Wallace will be $20,000,000,000, and the tax burden frightfully heavy. With Henry, taxes would be so heavy as to stifle the very business activity necessary to produce jobs, or else we would add to the huge debt every year. The increase in debt leads inevitably to inflation, which would not only wipe out the people's savings but would destroy the commercial and business structure on which our whole system of production and prosperity and employment is based. Either way, we could only hope for hard times and unemployment, and finally socialism and a reggimented state.

Senator PEPPER. I cannot agree with what Senator TAFT says on Mr. Wallace's methods. In the first place, let me quote from what——

Mr. BRYSON (interposing). Do you agree, Senator PEPPER, that it is a question of method and not a question of objective?

Senator PEPPER. One might say that. I assume that if the Senator favors having 60,000,000 or 57,000,000 people employed in this country and he opposes the Wallace program, of course he has one of his own. Therefore, we will have an opportunity to comment upon his method.

But let me quote from what Mr. Wallace says. This was his address to the Senate Commerce Committee recently.

"I propose that the Government do its part in helping private enterprise finance this expansion of our industrial plant. It will be privately owned, privately operated, and privately financed; but the Government will share with the private investor the unusual and abnormal financial risks which may be involved in getting started."

Senator TAFT. Mr. Wallace wants to insure $20,000,000,000 of Federal investments every year. We know that one in every three business enterprises fail. I think two in every three fail. Certainly, insuring $20,000,000,000 a year is going to cost the Government at least $4,000,000, and he is going to put $5,000,000,000 into foreign-trade loans alone.

Senator PEPPER. Relative to that question of insurance, that was a suggestion made by Mr. Wallace, and I think it is a constructive

suggestion. The Senator will recall that he quoted Ferdinant Eberstadt, a New York businessman, as his authority for it, and he gave as an analogy the Federal Housing loans which have been current for the last few years.

Let me just suggest this: It is my understanding that the Government simply doesn't put up all the money in the pool that assures against losses, but probably the borrowers would pay a fraction of a percent more on the loan, the way the one who borrows money from the Federal Housing Administration to build a house does, and that puts a pool available to guarantee the lender against loss.

Senator TAFT. Yes, but a house is a house, and you have always got it, and a mortgage on a house has always been one of the best investments. This is a proposal to insure the investment in every equity undertaking; that is, every fellow who wants to go into the retail business or the wholesale business or the manufacturing business. As I said, history shows that two-thirds of the money that starts in those things is always lost, and now the Government is going to insure it.

My estimate of losing $4,000,000,000 a year is a very conservative estimate, because the overnment has to make good on that insurance that it gives.

Mr. BRYSON. You think, Senator TAFT, that these private enterprises wouldn't be a good risk for the Government?

Senator TAFT. No, I don't.

Senator PEPPER. Our friends on the opposing side are always talking about risk capital, are always talking about stimulating incentive and enterprise on the part of business. We are perfectly willing to do that, of course, by incentive taxation, but Mr. Wallace goes further and says that those risks which are abnormal and unusual, those things that are attempted in the public interest where the risk is more than the usual risk, would be the kind of risk guaranteed by this credit pool to which Mr. Wallace refers.

Senator TAFT. So the loss to the Government would be that much greater. I don't mind trying the things out on a very small scale. A good many of the things Mr. Wallace suggests are excellent. In fact, I am for many of his proposals. But all of them must be administered on the most economical basis. Certainly his suggestion that you can insure $20,000,000,000 of private investment every year without any loss to the Government simply is not in accordance with the actual facts.

Senator PEPPER. Let us suppose that there is some loss to the Government. In fact, I think one of the greatest discredits in the record of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is that it has made $500,000,000 profit. The people of this country have lost that money if the R. F. C. has made it. In other words, if the Government does sustain a small loss above what is put in the pool by the various credit contributors, that will be so much in the public interest that it will be a very wise investment.

Senator TAFT. I think Senator PEPPER'S argument answers himself when he is trying to establish a business system, but this is only one of eight expenditures by the Federal Government for Mr. Wallace. He is going to put about $5,000,000,000 a year into financing foreign trade.

If he is going to insure jobs, that is the most expensive of all. Suppose we have only 50,000,000 people working, remember, that is more people than ever worked in this country before 1941, when the war started. If he is going to insure 57,000,000, that is 7,000,000 people to put to work at Government expense, which will cost the Government about $14,000,000,000 a year. In many years that probably will be the expense. Why should we insure?

Incidentally, why does full employment mean 57,000,000 jobs? In the past we have always felt that a nation that could do its work with 50,000,000, so the wives didn't have to work, so you could have one man working in the family, supporting the family, had a higher standard of living than one that required children and old people to work.

Senator PEPPER. In the first place, we have something like fifty to fifty-four million people employed at the present time, and we have 12,000,000 in the armed services. The question presents itself to us, shall we, as some want us to do, go back to the 1940 level of employment. That may be acceptable to Senator TAFT. I don't know. But if we go back to the 1940 level of employment, even the Committee on Economic Development, made up of the top businessmen of this country, say that we will have 15,000,000 million unemployed in this country. The question is: Are we going back to the level of 1940 and have 15,000,000 unemployed, or shall we go forward and assure the operation of policies which will give an opportunity, mind you, for work to at least 57,000,000 of the people of this country?

Senator TAFT. I think in 1940 we had 48,000,000 employed, and the Committee on Economic Development says that we should employ 53,000,000. That is only 5,000,000 unemployed, not 15.

My only suggestion is this: If we can establish an economy where 50,000,000 people can do so much work that they can produce enough for all families, so that we don't have to have two jobs to a family (remember, there are only 36,000,000 families in the United States) and we have only one worker in each family, we are going to be so much better off. It is going to be a higher standard of living. After all, the labor people are trying to reduce the amount of work that has to be done. We have got it down to 40 hours a week now.

Senator PEPPER. Unless you are going to have a high wage policy, and I haven't heard my able friend say anything about a higher wage policy.

Mr. BRYSON. That is part of Mr. Wallace's plan.

Senator PEPPER. That is a part of Mr. Wallace's plan. Moreover, I am willing to let the family decide whether only one member of that family is to work or not. There may be cases of families where two or three should work, because they will be adults and they will need an opportunity to work.

But let me get this clear, because I am afraid I haven't made it clear. Mr. Wallace doesn't confine his program just to one proposal. He advocates, for example, that we shall have a vast quantity of community services which shall include better educational opportunities to the mass of the people. I can show you that vast numbers were turned down by the Selective Service because they didn't have enough education to read and write. He advocates better health for the people of the country, so they will be able to produce more and to create more wealth in the country. He advocates, in addition to that, a building program which shall be sort of an incident to that: schools and sewerage plants and hospitals and that sort of thing.

Mr. BRYSON. That is Government buildings?

Senator PEPPER. Government buildings. Understand, that is Federal and local government buildings, not only Federal. In addition to that, he advocates stimulating our foreign trade, and he says that can be trebled and several million added to the number employed.

He also advocates a high-wage level, which will mean the annual wage for the worker, so that he will have an assured yearly income instead of just a daily or a weekly or a monthly income.

Thus, aid to private enterprise by assuring loans and many other things are all a part of the Wallace program.

Senator TAFT. I am in favor of high wages, too. I am in favor of the annual wage, if we can develop it. I think certainly there is very good justification for it. But all of these things that Mr. Wallace wants all together, I estimate—and estimate conservatively, I think—will cost about $42,000,000,000 a year. When we get into the postwar period without Mr. Wallace, it is going to cost $20,000,000,000. So that makes a total tax bill of $62,000,000,000. Our national income may be twice that, so it means that half of everybody's income in effect is going to be taken by taxes. I say that will ruin the very prosperity that Mr. Wallace is trying to assure by spending all this Government money and that the method that he proposes is wholly wrong.

I would like just to make one other point, if I may, Mr. Bryson. That is that the whole theory of a guaranteed wage by Government expense is taken not only from Mr. Roosevelt but also from article 118 of the Soviet Constitution, which says citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to work, the right to receive guaranteed work with payment for their work, and so forth. The right to work is insured by the Socialist organization of national economy. In other words, the Soviet can guarantee full employment because it is a Socialist economy, and it carries with it the corresponding obligation in article 12, "work in the U. S. S. R. is the obligation of each citizen capable of working." In other words, the other side of the picture of the Government's guaranteeing employment is that the man must work where and when the Government says he must work.

Senator PEPPER. I will say to the Senator that if the Soviet Constitution were to say that God is good, that wouldn't make us Communists if we also said God is good over here. Let's get rid of the idea that this has any origin in communism.

In the second place, let's get rid of the idea that Mr. Wallace's plan contemplates compulsory work on anybody's part or that the Government is going to dish all the money out of the Federal Treasury. The Wallace proposal, on the contrary, clearly puts the burden of carrying this program out upon the back of private enterprise, but it takes the same position that the Committee on Economic Development takes as to the part of the Government in aiding private enterprises.

I am reading from a report of the Committee on Economic Development, published September 1, 1944, and members of that board of trustees are such men as Mr. Kettering of General Motors, and outstanding businessmen of the country. Here is what they say.

"Instead, it has been convinced that this gigantic post-war task" (they are talking about giving jobs to at least seven or eight million more than were employed in 1940) "can only be accomplished by a cooperative undertaking in which business, labor, agriculture, and Government all shall do their maximum share."

Mr. Wallace says that it should be the objective of the Government to see to it that conditions exist in this country so that the people of this country shall have a chance to work, to farm, to work in the field and factories, and to carry on the enterprise of the country.

Senator TAFT. I fully agree with the Committee on Economic Development. I don't want the Government to withdraw from the whole field of helping private industry and employment. I am only saying that it has to be done by sound methods, that it has to be done within a balanced budget, one where you raise enough taxes to pay the expenses.

I favor a public-works program, but only where the public works are things that are worth doing, things worth the value that you

have to pay for them, that you don't go out and spend Government money for the sake of spending it. That is, in effect, the Wallace program.

Senator PEPPER. I want to object there to what my friend calls the Wallace program. I question that anywhere in Mr. Wallace's writings or in his statements you can find one word wherein Mr. Wallace says that he favors any kind of public-works program wherein the very best result shall not be gotten for the money spent. On the contrary, he said, in substance, we don't want another W. P. A. Our public-works program must be carefully organized and carefully conceived and executed, and it must be carried out on competitive bids to private enterprise. In other words, every building built under this public-works program must be built by a private contractor hiring wage earners in the ordinary way and paying the prevailing wage.

Senator TAFT. If that is the condition of Mr. Wallace's public-works program, I have yet to see anyone who can find more than about $5,000,000,000 a year of public works on which Federal money may be spent. Five billion dollars a year will employ about 2,500,000 men. We have to put 60,000,000 men to work, according to Mr. Wallace's program, and to put 2,500,000 to work is going to cost $5,000,000,000.

No, there is only one way. You can accomplish more by tuning up the private enterprise system 10 percent. You can put more people to work than you can put to work with the biggest Government spending public-works program that anyone yet has conceived.

Senator PEPPER. That is Mr. Wallace's program. Let's get away from this idea of public works being identified with Mr. Wallace, except no doubt in the same sense that Senator TAFT contemplates it. It is just a sort of stopgap. It is simply a part of the program. Mr. Wallace, in his appearance before the Commerce Committee, predicated his program squarely upon the back of private enterprise, but he says the Government must help private enterprise to do a full job and to provide in peacetime what we are doing in wartime—an opportunity for our people to work at decent wages.

Mr. BRYSON. May I ask Senator PEPPER a question for clarification, Senator TAFT? I am a little bit puzzled. Is it Mr. Wallace's plan that if private enterprise without Government intervention or help permits employment to fall below a certain level, then Government money shall be poured into private enterprise by loan so that private enterprise can hire the people that it otherwise would not be able to hire?

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Wallace contemplates advancing on the problem of full employment on a many-sided front. One thing is to treble our foreign trade. Another thing is to educate and to teach new skills to our people.

Mr. BRYSON. To make us more productive.

Senator PEPPER. Make us more productive. Another thing is to aid our people to work more because they will be in better health, and there will be opportunities to prevent sickness, if possible. In addition to that, he will stimulate private enterprise by loans and by incentive taxation, and by doing all the things that may properly be done to aid private enterprise.

Senator TAFT. I am in favor of a great many of Mr. Wallace's ideas. They must be approached and worked out, however, on a sound basis; and if they proceed to add up, as Mr. Wallace's plans do, to forty billion a year in addition to the regular budget of twenty, then they are going to do a lot more harm then they can possibly do good.

Senator PEPPER. But, my friend just catches the figure forty billion a year out of the air. Mr. Wallace didn't say he was going to add twenty more billion dollars to governmental expenditure.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Wallace's experience in arithmetic is very bad. That is the difficulty. He can't add, and he can't subtract.

Senator PEPPER. He loaned $6,000,000,000 while he was Secretary of Agriculture, and I haven't heard one word of criticism of his record there.

Senator TAFT. I may say that nearly all of that was loaned before he became Secretary of Agriculture, or at least it was loaned by concerns that were not under the Secretary of Agriculture when the loan was made, such as the Commodity Credit Corporation. Most of them.

Senator PEPPER. It is a singular fact that the gentleman speaks about the incompetence of Mr. Wallace, for he was 8 years Secretary of Agriculture, and there were $6,000,000,000, he testified, loaned by that institution, and no criticism has been addressed to the way he loaned that money.

Senator TAFT. I think the quotation I made from the speech in which he said that the more Government money you spend, the more taxes you got back, that you got so much back that you paid all the Government money you invested, is just so contrary to every experience in the knowledge of anbody who has had anything to do with Government finance that it shows that he is not at best an arithmetician.

Senator PEPPER. Senator, I don't recall the statement to which you refer, and I would want to get a little further statement of it.

Mr. BRYSON. There is the paper, Senator PEPPER.

Senator PEPPER. "No real burden on the Federal Budget notwithstanding the reduction in taxes which must come after the war. On the contrary, a program of this character can provide America with a national income of such size that it will be possible to reduce the tax rates still further on personal incomes, on business profits, and on conumption, and till collect enough tax revenue to meet the needs of the Government, including orderly retirement of the national debt."

I believe that to be true. In other words, if you have a national income of $175,000,000,000, obviously you don't have to have such a high tax rate upon the individual.

Mr. BRYSON. Is it your contention, Senator PEPPER, that although the sums demanded by Mr. Wallace's ideas would be very large, that they would so increase the total productivity of the country that they could be met without being a burden?

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Wallace's program, in my opinion, would not increase the tax burden, but would diminish it, because he would, for example, aid small business more than it has been aided in the past. The record of the R. F. C. is pitifully bad in the aid it has given to small business and that is the backbone of this country economically. I think Mr. Wallace believes in greater aid to small business, and I think that would create more wealth and more prosperity and more jobs.

Senator TAFT. It seems obvious to me, and we just had a report from the Joint Tax Committee which shows that you can increase the national income $40,000,000,000 by spending $40,000,000,000 of Government money; but if you do, you increase our present very burdensome tax system by a yield of about $16,000,000,000. So, you have a net deficit of $24,000,000,000. A reasonable tax system at lower rates wouldn't increase anything like that.

Mr. BRYSON. My arithmetic is getting a little bit beyond me here, Senator TAFT. Do you mean if we put $40,000,000,000 of Government money into the stimulation of business, the actual increase production would be $16,000,000,000?

Senator TAFT. No, no. I say that if the Government just issues bonds or prints paper money and pays out $40,000,000,000——

Mr. BRYSON. That is imaginary.

Senator TAFT. It increases the national income $40,000,000,000, it is true. But I say the result of that is only to increase your taxes, the yield about $15,000,000,000. So, you have a net deficit of about $25,000,000,000 a year. That is just an example, roughly speaking. It is obvious that if you could increase your taxes by a sum equal to the amount of Government expense, you ought to spend $200,000,000,000 a year, because it wouldn't cost you anything and you would all be living in luxury.

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Bryson, as a matter of fact, it can easily be proved by simple arithmetic that if it is a question of letting the economy stagnate and letting the economic spiral fall downward, or of the Government's even stimulating prosperity by spending—it can be proved in terms of figures that the spending program will yield very good returns in increased national income. For example, the net increase in the national debt was 26½ billion dollars between 1933 and 1941, and yet during that time the increase in the national income over what it was in 1932 was $234,000,000,000.

Senator TAFT. There is only one way to increase prosperity. That is, in the first place, to inspire businessmen with confidence that the Government is going to have sound fiscal policies, that the Government is going to balance its budget, that we are not going to have inflation, that the Government will take an encouraging attitude and not an adverse attitude to businessmen, and Mr. Wallace has taken just the opposite. We know a great deal about fiscal controls today. We can prevent inflation; we can prevent another depression. But only by sound fiscal policies and by paying our way as we go can we hope to restore prosperity and full employment in the United States.

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Wallace believes thoroughly in a sound fiscal policy, but the thing he believes is important and the thing that I believe to be important is the budget of the people of the United States. If we can provide that these people shall have a chance to work, the farmers to sell their produce, the manufacturers to sell their output, and the other people to perform their part in our economy, we will have a prosperous Nation, and then we will have a balanced National Budget in the true sense.

Senator TAFT. After all, this country has made itself the greatest producing country the world has ever seen under a system which rested on free enterprise, which rested on sound government. We have brought that result about. Let's not abandon it at the very time when we have now a chance to go forward to full employment.

Senator PEPPER. What I think is that we have shown during the war, when we gained full employment, that we can produce an output of $200,000,000,000 worth of goods for war. Why cannot we use that vast productive capacity to make the people of this country better off than human beings ever have been in all history?

Mr. BRYSON. I suppose what the people of the United States most want to know is not whether or not this picture that Mr. Wallace paints of prosperity, and which his friends concur in, is a good thing. It obviously is a good thing. They want to know whether or not it is within reach, and whether or not the attempt to reach it would so jeopardize our system that we would be sorry we tried it. As in so many political matters, it is not a question of the ends on which you disagree, but it is a question of the means. It does not seem to have so much to do with Mr. Wallace's previous experiences as with two conflicting ideas of how you can most successfully use the Government expenditure of money.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point following the insertion of the document to which I have just referred, a tele-

gram sent to me, which is a copy of a telegram sent my able colleague by Mr. Martin Andersen, newspaper publisher of Orlando, Fla., the publisher of two newspapers in Orlando, Fla., and also one of the owners of a newspaper published in Macon, Ga.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORLANDO, FLA., *January 26, 1945.*

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Sent the following wire to Senator ANDREWS today:

"My DEAR JUDGE: Before the election you and I were the little men of the country. I'm still a little man, striving to pay for my newspaper and get ahead. This Wallace-Jones fight has stirred me as no other fight in the history of our country or our town. I am beginning to look upon it as a local matter. Something that should agitate the common people of my town and your town, Orlando. I am wiring you to please consider the little man, to consider Wallace, who represents Martin Andersen, a little man, as against Jones, whom I personally have known for years as a hard-bitten Texas banker who wouldn't give me or any other little fellow consideration because I am just too darn little. I speak from experience. You, too, Judge, were too darn little before you got yourself elected United States Senator, and while you were doing so, I didn't do you any harm. What I'm saying, Judge, is that Wallace is our kind of people, at least he fights for our kind of people. Yours and mine and Charlie, Jr.'s, and Charlie, Jr.'s child, Sandy. I hope these banker-influenced blocs of Senators don't make you forget the hard days you and I had together here in Orlando from 1931 to 1935, and I mean all of this sincerely. My kindest to your dear wife, Daisy."

MARTIN ANDERSEN.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to say only this further, that I cannot escape the conclusion that by and large, and as a generalization, it seems to me that the able Senator from Ohio substantially follows the economic and political philosophies of President Herbert Hoover and the days of President Herbert Hoover, and of President Calvin Coolidge, and the days of President Calvin Coolidge, whereas Mr. Henry Wallace follows the political philosophy and entertains generally the economic views of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. And I believe, Mr. President, that what the Senator from Ohio has said about Mr. Henry A. Wallace, either he or others who have been, like him, critics of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, not only could have said but have said against President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Those issues have been submitted to the forum of the American people in free elections, and four times, Mr. President, those theories and those views have been asserted in the forum of the American Nation by opponents of President Roosevelt, and the American people have made their choice of President Roosevelt as their President, and not the candidates of his opponents who urged and entertained those ideas.

I believe therefore, Mr. President, that the views of Mr. Wallace, by and large, are not only the views of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to whom he attributed the authorship of the eight points which he made the basis of his statement to the Commerce Committee, but they are the views of the American people, not only in the past but they will continue to be the views of the American people in the future.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Why did not the Democratic Convention submit Mr. Henry Wallace's name to the people of the United States, at the last election, if they heartily approved of his views? Why was he denied a renomination to which he was clearly entitled on any basis of service?

Mr. PEPPER. That was due to the fact that the delegates at the Democratic National Convention chose another candidate, but I will say this, that the issues in that campaign were based upon the philosophy of Henry A. Wallace in not only international affairs but in domestic affairs, and Mr. Henry A. Wallace was complimented by the President for what he did in that campaign, and the President said in his communication, which the Senator has incorporated in his speech, that he personally thought Henry A. Wallace was eminently qualified for the office of Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. TAFT. No; the President did not say "eminently." He used no such language at all.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator included the letter in his speech, and the President certainly did say that he fully agreed that Mr. Wallace was fully qualified for the position.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but he did not say he was "eminently" qualified; not at any time.

Mr. PEPPER. Well, he said "fully qualified." If the Senator wants to make a point of the distinction between "eminently" and "fully," very well. But what I wanted to say was that in every campaign in the last 16 years the able Senator from Ohio has made the same speech he has made here on the floor of the Senate today, except generally he has made it against President Roosevelt instead of against Henry A. Wallace. And all the charges that have been made here today against Henry A. Wallace by the able Senator from Ohio and those on his side have been hurled against Franklin D. Roosevelt—that he was a Communist, he was mentioned and supported by the Daily Worker; he looked with sympathy upon the system in Russia; he believed in communizing and socializing America; he was against the American way of life—and all the other things that they say about Henry Wallace they said again and again and again about Franklin D. Roosevelt. But they, Mr. President, have not always been able to get away with it with Franklin D. Roosevelt, and many a man who was aiming at Franklin D. Roosevelt has had to content himself with hitting Henry A. Wallace. It is on the principle that there are many people who will kick your dog who will not kick you.

No, Mr. President; Henry A. Wallace stands for the things that the Democratic Party stands for, Henry A. Wallace stands for the things that the American people stand for, and he stands for the things Franklin D. Roosevelt stands for, and in my humble opinion, Mr. President, he stands for the things that the American people are going to continue to stand for, because they know that that is the only way we can really have prosperity, that we can have health, that we can have security, that we can have well-being of the people of this country.

Henry A. Wallace is a better friend of private enterprise, if the ultimate effects of his philosophy were to be measured in terms of what would happen if they were put into effect or not put into effect, than many men today who claim to be the defenders of private enterprise, but who by their shortsightedness would allow it to be destroyed.

We saw as the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] said, what happened to the economy of this country under Hoover, who was the exponent of the very philosophy which the able Senator from Ohio is the exponent of—the philosophy of doing nothing, but saying prosperity is just around the corner. But when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President he believed in doing something and he did something, and he lifted America out of the slough of depression into which it had been allowed to fall, and started it on its way, which has led our people to magnificient strength and to remarkable accomplishment.

Henry A. Wallace wants to preserve the prosperous and the strong America that we have today. And while he says, of course, that private enterprise must be the steady work horse upon the back of which it must principally be supported, nevertheless he says the Government of the people of the United States cannot callously exercise no concern about what happens to the employment or the health or the education or the welfare of the people of the United States.

That is what he said, and that is good American doctrine, as well as good Democratic doctrine, Mr. President. But there are a few people that damn a man who believes in the welfare of all the people. They want a man who believes in the welfare of just a few of the people. And in the opinion of some, any man who professes to embrace the real principle of democracy by advocating the greatest good for the greatest number, is a Communist or a Socialist. I dare say, Mr. President, that if the able Senator from Ohio were making a speech to this body, feeling as he does the antipathy to Mr. Wallace which he has exhibited, he could find more in the writings of Thomas Jefferson to condemn him, or of Andrew Jackson, than he can find in the writings of Henry A. Wallace.

Henry A. Wallace, Mr. President, will live and be honored when most of us in the Senate will sleep the long sleep of obscurity. Because somehow or other he has touched the hearts not only of the people of the United States but of the world as standing somehow or another in sentiment for the kind of things they are fighting for, and for which this very day many a man in many parts of the world is dying.

You cannot stop Henry A. Wallace, Mr. President, by hurling at him these accusations, because the people know whether Henry Wallace has been a better friend of their welfare than some of his critics have been, whether he has been a safer counselor and a wiser leader for his Nation than some of his condemnors have been. They know whether Henry Wallace is a more certain light to a sure future than many of those who would endeavor to destroy him upon the cross of contumely.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bolitha J. Laws, of the District of Columbia, to be chief justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Edward C. Eicher, deceased.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Ezra G. Allen, to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Albert W. Rogers, to be postmaster at Franklinville, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wallace Murray to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Felix Cole to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar, with the exception of the nomination previously passed over.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received February 19, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George R. Merrell, of Missouri, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to act as Commissioner of the United States of America to India, with the rank of Minister.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Jewell W. Swofford, of Missouri, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of 6 years from March 15, 1945. (Reappointment.)

HONOR GRADUATES FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be second lieutenants, with rank from December 1, 1944

INFANTRY

Leonard Dillon Rogers
John Marion Shaw
Allen Grannis Wilson

FIELD ARTILLERY

James Edward Aud
John Anthony Chiment
Billy Sunday Clark

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Roy Lindsay Baber, Jr.
Charles Alexander McLeod.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Thomas Hagler

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from January 3, 1945

Lt. Col. Joseph James O'Hare, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

To be colonel with rank from January 15, 1945

Lt. Col. Maurice Levi Miller, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

To be colonels with rank from February 1, 1945

Lt. Col. Junius Henry Houghton, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Abram Vorhees Rinearson, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Douglas Jenkins Page, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Nephew Caperton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Frank Clark Scofield, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Humbert Lewis Riva, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. Edward Shaw, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from August 26, 1944.

First Lt. Wayne Creekmore Pittman, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 11, 1944.

First Lt. Carlton Willard Sargent, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 11, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William Joseph Adlington, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 12, 1945.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Major Ernest Eugene Hodgson, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 2, 1945.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be captain

First Lt. Claud Dale La Fors, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 18, 1945.

To be first lieutenant

Second Lt. Jesse Nichols Butler, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 21, 1945.

CHAPLAINS

To be majors

Chaplain (Capt.) William John Walsh, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 13, 1945.

Chaplain (Capt.) James Gordon De La Vergne, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from February 13, 1945.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Warren Earl Ferguson, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from February 28, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Alma I. Jones, Chancellor, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

J. Heard Saxon, Dothan, Ala., in place of M. L. Malone, resigned.

Glenn Draper, Langdale, Ala., in place of J. W. Johnson, retired.

Mary W. Hale, Leesburg, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CALIFORNIA

Margaret C. Monahan, Newcastle, Calif., in place of J. A. Monahan, resigned.

Florence M. Davis, Project City, Calif., in place of I. J. Murphy, resigned.

Lorraine F. Wyckoff, Rutherford, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Arthur L. Benedict, Sonoma, Calif. in place of W. L. Murphy, resigned.

Juanita W. Gay, Topanga, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

COLORADO

Francis B. Flanagan, Holyoke, Colo., in place of T. H. Hargreaves, deceased.

FLORIDA

James E. Woodham, Campbellton, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IDAHO

Grace Fleck Bixler, Heyburn, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ILLINOIS

John L. Haines, Galva, Ill., in place of P. J. Bergland, resigned.

Clara L. Doll, Garden Prairie, Ill., in place of N. M. Porter, retired.

Johanna M. Payne, Hartsburg, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kenneth D. Minteer, Keithsburg, Ill., in place of M. J. Humphreys, resigned.

Cecilia E. Kelroy, Mundelein, Ill., in place of J. M. Dorfler, resigned.

Lenor Hayes, Ogden, Ill., in place of Grace Hiller, retired.

Mary W. Tolar, Pulaski, Ill., in place of Hezekiah Reeves, retired.

Marguerite D. Brown, Richmond, Ill., in place of E. E. Bower, deceased.

Ralph H. Hartman, Sugar Grove, Ill., in place of C. G. Wilson, resigned.

INDIANA

Mae M. Knoisley, Hanna, Ind., in place of R. F. Yeoman, transferred.

Otha H. Scott, Ladoga, Ind., in place of R. L. Strickler, transferred.

IOWA

Ruby I. Rinkler, West Des Moines, Iowa, in place of D. A. Reid, retired.

KENTUCKY

Holland B. Hedgepeth, Canmer, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

LOUISIANA

Susie H. Reid, Gilliam, La., in place of E. D. Farr, retired.

Lucile Arceneaux, Scott, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

H. Emily Cunningham, Damariscotta Mills, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MARYLAND

Guy E. Boston, Berlin, Md., in place of Orlando Harrison, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Fred M. Adelmann, Norwood, Mass., in place of A. R. Ellis, retired.

MICHIGAN

Alice M. Bigelow, Cass City, Mich., in place of Arthur Little, removed.

Margaret A. Cook, Memphis, Mich., in place of Charles Davidson, retired.

Benjamin J. Lawson, Mount Morris, Mich., in place of G. W. Hackney, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Arthur A. Vermeersch, Ghent, Minn., in place of B. B. Hoffmann, removed.

Thomas J. Kosanda, Hopkins, Minn., in place of F. D. Markham, resigned.

NEBRASKA

John H. Hopkins, Omaha, Nebr., in place of H. G. Moorhead, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Patrick J. McGrath, Bayonne, N. J., in place of C. A. Heiser, resigned.

Frank J. Mallia, Lodi, N. J. Office became Presidential February 1, 1943.

Harry Natalo, North Hackensack, N. J., in place of A. C. Smith, resigned.

Sarah E. Burke, Stelton, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Martin E. Couillou, East Northport, N. Y., in place of H. A. Stecking deceased.

Edward J. Blackall, Fort Edward, N. Y., in place of E. J. Kelleher. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1939.

Jess J. Lantry, Hogansburg, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Daniel P. Doran, Jordan, N. Y., in place of A. M. Nesbitt, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Genevieve H. Wright, Cashiers, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NORTH DAKOTA

Oline O. Moe, Galesburg, N. Dak., in place of J. M. Moen, transferred.

Margaret H. Houghton, Hurdsfield, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

George T. Meesig, Bellevue, Ohio, in place of M. J. Callaghan, retired.

F. Stone Trautman, Belpre, Ohio, in place of W. T. Dressel, transferred.

Sue A. Watts, Conesville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alverda Wells, Dellroy, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Inez S. Winget, Edison, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Josiah Eikenberry, Laura, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Pearl Burket, Rawson, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

Gertrude M. Crabb, Arcadia, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Cara M. Masters, Cardin, Okla., in place of W. R. Chambers, deceased.

Hubert E. Williams, Cordell, Okla., in place of C. C. Copeland, resigned.

Amanda V. Schneider, Nicoma Park, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rawley E. Hart, Paoli, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ethel Shoup, Ripley, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Agnes H. Lockard, Tuskahoma, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Goldie R. Strain, Wann, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OREGON

Frances N. McCormick, Gilchrist, Oreg., in place of M. O. Maddox, resigned.

Alta M. Weigel, Oak Grove, Oreg., in place of L. C. Coykendall, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Roseina M. Jackson, Coal Valley, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

J. Frank Mulberger, Elderton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Guido Donati, Kelly Station, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

J. Paul Rice, Line Lexington, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Daniel E. Held, North Apollo, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Morrell E. Devlin, Tamaqua, Pa., in place of E. M. Hirsch, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Frederick Baldwin, Mapleville, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TENNESSEE

John E. Barnes, Ramer, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gertrude S. Moore, Mooresburg, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VIRGINIA

Stacy S. Swart, Fairfax, Va., in place of E. McC. Wiley, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 19, 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Wallace Murray to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Felix Cole, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 19, 1945:

COLLCTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frank H. Duffy, Jr., collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O loving and compassionate Father, who keepest truth and forgivest iniquity to a thousand generations, look upon us in mercy as we come before Thee. Humbly and earnestly we ask for discerning minds that our knowledge of principles and of methods may be wise even in that which seems to be small and trivial. We pray for courage that generously recognizes another's worth and guards another's interest. We rejoice that Thou didst sweep aside the old law, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," and the Lamb of God in the midst of the throne became the Saviour of men. As Thy children, help us to meet despondency with fortitude, disappointment with resignation, and fear with eternal hope. Multitudes are waiting for Thy touch; O Sun of Righteousness, arise with healing in Thy beams; walk beside them in their sorrow; when the day closes, give peace and rest to all, and may we not fear tomorrow. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 16, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 626) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 340) entitled, "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. FERGUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture; and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered yesterday at St. Francis Roman Catholic Church in Lawrence, Mass., in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day, and, secondly, to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BENNET of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter received from Mr. J. W. Winterbottom and Mr. Arthur Connor, of Nashua, N. H., concerning the status of the returning war veteran and his possible acceptance as an apprentice in the various skilled trades; and, second, that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times entitled "A New Turn for America."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from Capt. M. Marshall Kissane, United States Army Medical Corps, in reply to a column of Drew Pearson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from a paper called the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2252) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 158), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article that appeared in a morning paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include copy of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BULWINKLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial published in the San Francisco Examiner with reference to the combined sea-air services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Toledo Times on February 16, 1945, by the great journalist, Mr. Hartley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include a letter and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

ORDER LIFTING ARMY BAN ON REDS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] called attention to the fact that the Communists in this country are going to be taken into our Army. I want to say that during the past few years this administration has been doing everything in this country it could to aid and assist the Communists to get control of our country. We now have Harry Bridges through an organization that has been set up trying to seek the aid and assistance of Members of Congress in an effort to get the President to permit him to remain in this country. We in the Congress here should get after the President of the United States in an endeavor to have him get rid of Harry Bridges and the Communists, otherwise we are going to be in bad shape. The Communists will rule the country. The quicker we get rid of Harry Bridges and all Communists the better it will be for our form of government, our liberty, and our freedom.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Legislature of Michigan and two editorials on the subject of drafting farm help.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include several articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Secretary of War Stimson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by our former colleague, Mr. McCord.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the George bill appearing in the Evening Star entitled "House Acts Wisely."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of universal military conscription.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an address by Lt. Col. J. Howard Berry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

OBJECTORS COMMITTEES FOR CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that the members of the Objectors Committee on the Democratic side for this Congress are the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE]. This applies to both the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that the members of the Objectors Committee on the Republican side for the Consent Calendar are the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]; and that the members of the Objectors Committee for the Private Calendar are the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on the subject of an appeal for national and international unity and for continued, diligent prosecution of the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MR. JUSTICE FRANKFURTER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MCGEHEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that Calendar Wednesday came into being in order that, if it ever occurred that there was a tyrannical or autocratic Committee on Rules, the committees of the House would have a right to have one day when they could be heard. I call this to the attention of the gentleman because, from what I heard last week, the Committee on Rules was going into the question of legislation when it had no right in God's world to do so, calling witnesses before the committee, which is not the province of that committee. Unless that kind of conduct is stopped, I guarantee to you, sir, that the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle who believe in fairness and who believe in orderly legislation will rise en masse and find some way to stop it.

I shall not object to the gentleman's request at this time, because I understand an appropriation bill is scheduled for consideration on that day, but each time thereafter I or someone else will see that we have Calendar Wednesdays.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Committee on Rules, and have never served on that committee, but in my humble opinion the criticism of that committee by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is wholly unjustified.

I have never yet gone before that committee asking for a rule that the members of the committe have not asked me about the legislation involved. They had the right to do so. That is what the Committee on Rules is for. It is not merely a nominal set-up. The Committee on Rules was created in order that when bills are reported out of legislative committees the Rules Committee could go into them, not just pass them through automatically and set the time for debate, but go into the legisaltion to decide whether or not in their opinion it should be taken up by the House under a rule.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. In answer to the gentleman, may I say they have a right to ask any member of the committee about the legislation, but I say they do not have a right to call witnesses before them to hear new matters.

Mr. RANKIN. I have not only gone before the committee myself, but I have taken witnesses with me, and we have had them send out and get witnesses to testify on legislation on which a rule was being sought.

The Committee on Rules was acting within its proper scope when it asked these witnesses to appear and testify as to the necessity or advisability of the legislation on which they were asked to vote a rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted a unanimous-consent request, and I am not going to endanger that request's being granted by getting into this discussion now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

HARBORS OF CAPE CHARLES CITY, VA.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 29) authorizing that the report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 12, 1942, submitting a review of reports on the harbors of Cape Charles City, Va., and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with illustrations, as a House document.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do this only in order to express to the House, since this is the first day the Consent Calendar has been called in this session, the considerations which we of the objectors' committee follow in determining whether or not a bill should properly be considered on the Consent Calendar.

In the past we have rather informally followed the rule of thumb that any bill authorizing an appropriation of over $1,000,000, or any bill reported out by a committee as to which there is a divided vote by that committee, or any bill that has a minority report filed with it, or any bill to which opposition or disapproval has been expressed by the department of Government concerned, or any bill of a complicated technical nature, or any bill which establishes a new policy or a new agency, is not properly on the Consent Calendar. I speak of this only for the purpose of advising the committee chairmen and the members of the various committees so that they may follow the proper course and not put bills on the Consent Calendar which fall within one of these categories.

The resolution now under consideration is the first of some eight resolutions authorizing the printing of certain public documents. I suggest that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama, explain why it is necessary to have a resolution authorizing the printing of a document, which is somewhat contrary to the usual practice.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, that is a very pertinent question. The gentleman will recall that he has never noticed such a resolution on the calendar or ever heard of it being offered in the House before. The reason is that normally these reports go directly from the Secretary of War to the Speaker of the House, who has them printed as House documents automatically. But in the case of these eight documents, I believe there are eight, when the reports reached the Speaker they were accompanied by a tab by the Secretary of War to the effect that military secrets were contained therein, and with the request that they only be considered in executive session and that no

publicity be given to them. Now the Secretary of War has withdrawn that request for secrecy and wishes them published as House documents. The Parliamentarian thought that in view of the time that has elapsed, 2 or 3 years in most cases, and the peculiarity of the situation, instead of being published as they normally are, they should be referred to the Committee on Printing and placed on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is only because of the peculiar circumstances connected with these eight documents that a resolution is necessary?

Mr. JARMAN. That is true. The circumstances surrounding all eight are identical.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is not going to be the usual practice in the future, and further resolutions will not be introduced?

Mr. JARMAN. No; they will not come to us or to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Printing, Were these eight resolutions being brought up now passed during the last session of Congress?

Mr. JARMAN. That is true.

Mr. RICH. Are these eight documents essential at the present time for the winning of the war?

Mr. JARMAN. I would say that if the Secretary of War did not believe so, that is, that if he did not consider them essential either for the winning of the war or for the civil functions of the War Department, he would not request their publication as House documents.

Mr. RICH. How much paper is it going to take to have these eight documents printed at the present time? I know there is a great paper shortage at this time. I know they are trying to prohibit newspapers from securing any additional paper. The fact of the matter is they are cutting down on them. I also know that in the printing department we are printing publication after publication which do not affect the war but hinder the war effort. I would like to know whether it is absolutely imperative at this time that these eight documents be printed.

Mr. JARMAN. The Secretary of War and the Speaker of the House think it is.

Mr. RICH. What is the cost of printing these eight documents?

Mr. JARMAN. Each one is accompanied by a report which shows its cost. I do not have those reports with me but I glanced over them and the cost is approximately $100 each.

Mr. RICH. Only $100 for each of the eight documents?

Mr. JARMAN. Approximately $100 each.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman come down closer so that we can hear him? I want to ask him some questions about this.

Mr. JARMAN. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's questions.

Mr. RANKIN. Are these projects not included in the present rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and I am not. The gentleman can answer that question.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Alabama is a member of the committee that reported this resolution. A great many of the projects in the rivers and harbors bill were inserted by the Senate. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors did not have an opportunity to investigate them. If they are included in the present rivers and harbors bill, which will probably be passed this week, then what is the necessity of making these public documents after they are disposed of legislatively?

Mr. JARMAN. As I told the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] the necessity, as far as I am concerned as chairman of the Committee on Printing, is the fact that the Secretary of War and the Speaker of the House think they should be printed.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but these are with reference to recommendations made back in 1942, almost 3 years ago. Since that time the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has held extensive hearings and has reported out a bill. It went to the Senate and the Senate amended it by putting in a great many projects which the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors had not considered. That bill was passed by the Senate unanimously a few days ago. It was reported out by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I will say frankly, over my protest, because I thought they should be investigated. However, in my opinion, every one of these projects is included. If they are included and the President signs the bill, it will become a law within the next 10 or 15 days and I can see no reason for making House documents of reports on measures that have already been disposed of.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. I notice the first project involves an undertaking in my district. I think that was a war necessity, and the work was done. I know it involved transportation from Cape Charles over to Norfolk, and especially expedited transportation. I think it has been finished.

Mr. RANKIN. It has already been finished?

Mr. BLAND. I think so, but the document is very essential to the future of the development.

Mr. RANKIN. If that project has already been built——

Mr. BLAND. I think so. I am not sure.

Mr. RANKIN. I think it has, and if it has not, it is probably provided for in the present bill. I can see no reason for making a House document of a report on a measure that has already been taken care of and is no longer before the House.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. These reports when printed are a great help in the future development of waterways and also for the general information of the country.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not familiar with the projects mentioned, but it has been the custom to have documents printed setting up these various projects. It has been helpful to Congress. It has been helpful to the engineers and to all concerned. I understand the War Department, for safety reasons, requested that these documents be withheld. The documents should be printed, and they should be House documents. I am somewhat at a loss to see why there should be any objection whatever to placing in the files the same kind of House documents on these projects that have been placed in the files on every project in the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Here is the point I am raising: In my opinion, these projects have already been taken care of.

Mr. BARDEN. Even if they have been completed, there still should be these documents and a record of it, just as there is for every project in the gentleman's district right now. He can go over there and get the House document on every project in his district.

Mr. RANKIN. But those documents are printed before the legislation is passed and before the project is constructed. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If the second bill dealing with the Florida ship canal is brought up I shall object to it because we have had volumes printed on the Florida ship canal. Why they want to print anything more about it I do not know. Personally I am opposed to the Florida ship canal project and I will oppose the second resolution. I do not know anything about the first one.

Mr. BARDEN. Would not the gentleman like to have the record in order that he could better fight the Florida ship canal in the future?

Mr. RICH. I do not know anything about it. I do not know whether it is made to try to convince Members of Congress that it ought to be built; and if it ought to be built, whether it is a New Deal project. If it is it will get enough votes to pass it, but I am going to try to stop it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object; I just wanted to get this information in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter from the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on July 23, 1942, including a report from the Chief of Engineers, United

States Army, dated May 12, 1942, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the harbors of Cape Charles City, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 1, 1941, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with two illustrations, as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATLANTIC-GULF SHIP CANAL, FLORIDA

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing the printing of the report from the Chief of Engineers, on the Atlantic-Gulf ship canal, Florida, together with accompanying papers, and an illustration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that ordinarily these documents would have been referred by the Speaker and been printed at the time they were submitted to the House if it had not been that they were held up because of prudential reasons, at the request of the War Department. I do not know whether the gentleman has looked into this matter, but does he want to stop the mere printing of a report?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MIAMI RIVER, FLA.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 39) authorizing the printing of a report of the Chief of Engineers on the Miami River, Fla.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the next five bills, six including this one, are similar in nature and authorize the printing of reports by the Chief of Engineers of the Army on rivers and harbors and projects, I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House Resolution 39?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter from the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on June 2, 1942, including a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1942, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Miami River, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted March 26, 1940, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, N. Y.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 40) authorizing the printing of a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on the Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter from the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on June 15, 1942, including a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 16, 1942, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed with two illustrations, as a House document.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIPYARD RIVER, S. C.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 41) authorizing the printing of a report by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on the Shipyard River, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter from the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on June 15, 1942, including a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1942, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Shipyard River, S. C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 20, 1941, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDWOOD CREEK, CALIF.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 42) authorizing the printing of a report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on Redwood Creek, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter from the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on February 11, 1942, including a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 3, 1941, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Redwood Creek, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 10, 1941, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEVELAND HARBOR, OHIO

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 43) authorizing the printing of a report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter from the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on May 2, 1942, including a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1942, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 17, 1941, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, MOBILE, ALA., TO NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 44) authorizing the printing of a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on the Intracoastal Waterway from Mobile, Ala., to New Orleans, La., including the Violet Canal route, Louisiana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter from the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on May 19, 1942, including a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 27, 1942, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Intracoastal Waterway from Mobile, Ala., to New Orleans, La., including the Violet Canal route, Louisiana, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 12, 1938, and January 24, 1939, and also authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on June 20, 1938, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with two illustrations, as a House document.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING THE GRADE OF GENERAL IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 197) to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee or someone on this side of the aisle what the report from the Navy Department with regard to this bill is?

Mr. COLE of New York. Their response was in the affirmative; they supported the bill. They recognized that it was a step that needed to be taken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the grade of general is hereby established on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps. The President is authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an officer, now or hereafter holding

the office of Commandant of the Marine Corps, to that grade and rank.

SEC. 2. Appointments under authority of this act shall be made without examination and shall continue in force during such period as the President shall determine. The permanent or temporary status of officers of the active list of the Marine Corps appointed to a higher grade pursuant to section 1 hereof shall not be vacated solely by reason of such appointment, nor shall such appointees be prejudiced in regard to promotion in accordance with the laws relating to the Marine Corps.

SEC. 3. Appointees under this act shall, while on active duty, receive the same pay and allowances as a rear admiral of the upper half, plus a personal money allowance of $2,200 per annum.

SEC. 4. In the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, each officer who shall have served in the grade or rank of general by virtue of an appointment under the provisions of this act shall, upon retirement, have on the retired list the highest grade or rank held by him on the active list: *Provided*, That each such officer shall be entitled to retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active-duty pay provided herein for an officer appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That no officer of the Marine Corps on the active list shall be appointed or advanced to the rank or grade of general in the Marine Corps except as provided in this act.

SEC. 5. This act shall be effective only until 6 months after the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged as proclaimed by the President, or such earlier date as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, may fix.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, insert the words "and rank" after the word "grade."

Page 1, add the following new sentence at the end of section 1: "At no time shall there be more than one such officer on the active list in such grade and rank."

Page 2, line 13, strike out the word "or" and substitute therefor the word "and."

Page 2, line 16, strike out the word "or" and substitute therefor the word "and."

Page 2, lines 20 and 21, strike out the phrase "on the active list."

Page 2, line 21, strike out the words "or advanced."

Page 2, line 21, strike out the words "or grade" and insert the words "grade or" after the word "the."

Page 2, line 22, strike out the word "in" and insert in lieu thereof the phrase "on the active list of."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO OAHU RAILWAY & LAND CO. OF CERTAIN LANDS IN TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 618) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 216) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H. be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in and over a 40-foot strip of land at Pearl Harbor Navy Yard in Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., containing approximately two and two hundred and seventy-eight one-thousandths acres, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department, in consideration of that company's waiving and relinquishing any and all claim to compensation for the taking by the United States of the company's right-of-way easement over and across approximately two and five hundred and seventy-seven one-thousandths acres of land described in condemnation proceedings pending in the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii entitled "United States of America, petitioner, against Certain Lands at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., and Oahu Railway & Land Co., a corporation defendant," being civil No. 493.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 618) was laid on the table.

GRANTING TO CANTON, OHIO, CERTAIN LANDS SITUATED AT CANTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 619) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 213) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for use as a public highway, under such conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip of land containing approximately 1.44 acres, 25 feet in width off the north side of the northwest quarter, section 18, township 10, range 8, Canton, Stark County, Ohio, and extending from Raff Road, southwest, west to the township line between Canton and Perry Townships.

SEC. 2. That if any part of the above-described lands hereby granted to the city of Canton shall be used for any other purpose or purposes, or shall cease to be maintained by the city of Canton for the purpose for which granted, such part shall revert to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 619) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF NAVY TO LEASE CERTAIN LANDS IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 623) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill S. 218, may be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to lease for a period not to exceed 25 years, upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, to the Southern California Telephone Co., a corporation, organized under the laws of the State of California, a parcel of land situated in section 32, township 9 south, range 6 west, San Bernardino base and meridian, consisting of two hundred and fifty-eight one-thousandths of an acre, more or less, comprising a part of the United States Marine Corps training area, Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, San Diego County, Calif., and a parcel of land situated in Pueblo lot 1311 of the Pueblo lands of San Diego County, Calif., consisting of an acre, more or less, comprising a part of the United States Marine Corps rifle range, Camp Matthews, in said county and State, the metes and bounds descriptions of which said lands are on file in the Navy Department, for the construction, maintenance, and operation of repeater station facilities: *Provided*, That when the lands shall cease to be used for said purposes, the lease shall be automatically terminated and the lands shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to execute on behalf of the United States all instruments necessary to accomplish the aforesaid purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 623) was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 1442, REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO FURLOUGH OF OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 624) to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 219) to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but for the purpose of getting information for the RECORD, may I ask some member of the committee to explain to the House just what this bill does and what its objective is?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to extend to officers on the active list of the Marine Corps and to officers of the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating as part of the Navy, the authority which the Secretary of the Navy now has under section 1442 of the Revised Statutes to place on furlough officers of the active list of the Navy. They do not have authority today to place officers in the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard on furlough and this would extend to those two arms of the naval service the same right that exists in the Navy today.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all I wanted. I merely desired the RECORD to show exactly what the bill would accomplish.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1442, Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 228), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "and Marine Corps, and any officer of the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating as part of the Navy. This section shall not apply to Reserve officers of such organizations.", so that said section when amended shall read as follows: "The Secretary of the Navy shall have authority to place on furlough any officer on the active list of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and any officer of the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating as part of the Navy. This section shall not apply to Reserve officers of such organizations."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 624) was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL IN THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1646) to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the same question I asked heretofore: Does this have the approval of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from New York that this bill has been approved by the Navy Department and unanimously submitted to the House by the Committee on Naval Affairs. It has the endorsement of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries which has jurisdiction of the Coast Guard in peacetimes.

We feel that it is but right and proper that this rank be given to the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. May I ask also if this bill has the same provision as relates to the other high commissions which we have authorized?

Mr. VINSON. Identical.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. They are temporary ranks?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I think it would be fitting, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] or the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] would insert in the RECORD in connection with these two bills the statement of the Secretary of the Navy approving both the bill for the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, because every one will agree that the services of General Vandegrift and Admiral Waesche should be related in this way. I think it would be fitting if that was made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. BARDEN. I think you will find those statements in the report on the bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of debate on this bill, if passed, I shall ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill and I shall include the data with reference to the Coast Guard.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I think it should be in the RECORD.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman from New York will read the report he will find statements along the line suggested.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the grade and rank of admiral is hereby established on the active list of the Regular Coast Guard. The President is authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an officer, now or hereafter holding the office of Commandant of the Coast Guard, to that grade and rank. At no time shall there be more than one such officer on the active list in such grade and rank.

SEC. 2. Appointments under authority of this act shall be made without examination and shall continue in force during such period as the President shall determine. The permanent or temporary status of officers of the active list of the Coast Guard appointed to a higher grade pursuant to section 1 hereof shall not be vacated solely by reason of such appointment, nor shall such appointees be prejudiced in regard to promotion in accordance with the laws relating to the Coast Guard.

SEC. 3. Appointees under this act shall, while on active duty, receive the same pay and allowances as a rear admiral of the upper half, plus a personal money allowance of $2,200 per annum.

SEC. 4. In the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, each officer who shall have served in the grade and rank of admiral by virtue of an appointment under the provisions of this act, shall upon retirement, have on the retired list the highest grade and rank held by him on the active list: *Provided*, That each such officer shall be entitled to retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active-duty pay provided herein for an officer appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That no officer of the Coast Guard shall be appointed to the grade or rank of admiral on the active list of the Coast Guard except as provided in this act.

SEC. 5. This act shall be effective only until 6 months after the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged as proclaimed by the President, or such earlier date as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, may fix.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this bill pays fitting tribute to an eminent officer of the Coast Guard. It has been approved by the Navy Department and the Naval Affairs Committee. It provides for the rank of admiral in the United States Coast Guard. A copy of the favorable report is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1646) to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to establish the grade and rank of admiral on the active list of the Coast Guard and to authorize the appointment of an officer holding the office of Commandant of the Coast Guard to that grade and rank.

Section 1 of the bill establishes the grade and rank of admiral on the active list of the Coast Guard and authorizes the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an officer holding the office of Commandant of the Coast Guard to that grade and rank. It provides that there shall be only one officer on the active list in the grade and rank of admiral at any one time.

Section 2 would provide that appointments under the bill shall be made without examination and shall continue in force during such period as the President shall determine. It would also preserve the permanent and temporary status and eligibility for promotion of an officer holding the rank of admiral pursuant to appointment under section 1.

Section 3 would fix an appointee's pay and allowances at the same amounts as those of a rear admiral of the upper half, plus a personal money allowance of $2,200 per annum.

Section 4 would provide that, in the discretion of the President, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an officer who shall have been appointed under the bill shall have, upon retirement, the highest grade and rank held by him on the active list, and retired pay equal to 75 percent of the pay of such grade and rank. The second proviso to this section would limit appointments to the grade and rank of admiral on the active list of the Coast Guard to those made as provided in the bill. Under this proviso no officer could be appointed under section 1 except one who, at the time of appointment, holds the office of Commandant.

Section 5 would limit the period during which the bill would be effective to the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.

At the present time the Coast Guard consists of more than 12,700 officers and 157,000 enlisted personnel. Five years ago the total number of personnel of the Coast Guard on active service was less than 13,000. As of March 26, 1942, when the Commandant of the Coast Guard was advanced from the rank of rear admiral to vice admiral, his

present rank, the personnel numbered approximately 42,000. Since that time, less than 3 years, the size of the organization has increased more than four times to its present total of approximately 170,000 officers and enlisted personnel, plus 50,000 members of the Coast Guard Temporary Reserve added since 1943.

The size and accomplishments of the Coast Guard, in the opinion of the committee, constitute ample basis for the proposed legislation. The bill has the approval of the Navy Department, as indicated by the following letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which is made a part of this report.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

HON. CARL VINSON,
Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The bill (H. R. 1646) to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, was referred by your committee to the Navy Department with request for a report thereon.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to establish the grade and rank of admiral on the active list of the Regular Coast Guard and to authorize the appointment of an officer holding the office of Commandant of the Coast Guard to that grade and rank. Only such an officer could be appointed under the bill, by reason of a proviso to section 4.

Section 2 of the bill would preserve the permanent and temporary status and eligibility for promotion of an officer appointed thereunder. Under section 3 the appointee's pay and allowances would be the same as those of a rear admiral of the upper half, plus a personal money allowance of $2,200 per annum.

Section 4 would provide that, in the discretion of the President, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an officer who shall have been appointed under the bill shall have, upon retirement, the highest grade and rank held by him on the active list, and retired pay equal to 75 percent of the pay of such grade and rank.

Section 5 would limit the effectiveness of the proposed legislation to the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.

It is the view of the Navy Department that the present size of the Coast Guard and the scope of its operations justify the proposed legislation. The Navy Department, therefore, has no objection to the enactment of H. R. 1646.

The Navy Department has been informally advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the above report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Huge expansion in the size and duties of the Coast Guard since the designation of its Commandant as a vice admiral both justify and require this increase in rank. It is, moreover, fitting and desirable that this advancement be made now that admirals of the fleet and generals of the armies have been promoted to five-star rank. Both the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard are now services in the Navy Department; as the Commandant of each has held equivalent rank for many years, this bill is a companion to H. R. 197, which proposes to advance the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the grade and rank of general.

Five years ago, at which time the Commandant of the Coast Guard held the rank of rear admiral, the personnel of the Coast Guard totaled less than 13,000. At the time the present Commandant was advanced to the rank of vice admiral—March 26, 1942—the Coast Guard consisted of under 42,000. In the less than 3 years since that time, the Coast Guard has expanded more than four times, with a present total of almost 170,000 officers and enlisted personnel, plus over 50,000 members of the Coast Guard Temporary Reserve. Only a few years ago, when the Navy was far smaller than today's Coast Guard, four-star admirals were in command.

Not only has the personnel of the Coast Guard shown a huge increase, but the scope and importance of the wartime tasks assigned to it have likewise been greatly expanded. Its combat activities now include convoy and antisubmarine patrol duties, the manning of landing craft in amphibious operations, sea and air operations in heavy ice areas—such as Greenland and Iceland—and air-sea rescue activities. In addition to its own vessels, which have more than doubled in number since the outset of the war, the Coast Guard is providing officers and men for more than 500 Navy and Army vessels—troop transports, LST's, LCI's, destroyer escorts, frigates, supply ships, and numerous other classes.

These combat activities are supplemented by other vital war functions of the Coast Guard. Among these are port security, the operation and maintenance of more than 34,000 aids to navigation, and marine inspection, including safety regulation of the merchant marine. Coast Guard services to the merchant marine are not confined to home ports, for marine inspection details are now located in every part of the globe in which Allied shipping is prominent.

Coast Guard men and ships are now serving in all corners of the world. In addition to its convoy and other seagoing activities, Coast Guard ships and men have participated in all major invasions and have landed attacking waves of marines and soldiers on Guadalcanal, north Africa, Sicily, Salerno, Anzio, Eniwetok, Saipan, Normandy, southern France, Leyte, and Luzon.

The duties and achievements of the Coast Guard have earned that service a high place among the armed forces of the Nation and warrant the recognition which the granting of four-star rank to its Commandant would provide.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 685) to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some one give us a little more information in regard to this bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Is there any particular information the gentleman would like to have?

Mr. RICH. I have read the report and I would like to have a little further explanation of it.

Mr. BLOOM. I will be very glad to try to enlighten the gentleman. This bill allows the Foreign Service Buildings Commission to use the proceeds of sales of property. Today it is able to do everything except to sell the property and use the proceeds. They can exchange or transfer embassy or legation property or do anything they have to under this bill. The Foreign Service Buildings Commission is composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the ranking Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the ranking Republican member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The purpose of this bill is to save money for the Government of the United States. If we are not permitted to sell the property and then use the proceeds to buy other property, that is, for embassies and legations in foreign countries, which it will be necessary to do after this war, and to buy other properties, we will have to remain in the locations that are antiquated, that are not serviceable, and in bad locations, and not be able to have the facilities that we should have in the new scheme of the world. The Government does not lose anything but makes money under this bill. It will make money by allowing this to be done, because at present we can only exchange a piece of property in any country with a person who has something that we want. If they do not have the location that we want, we cannot do business; we cannot do anything at all and our hands are tied. Nothing can be done, let me say to the gentleman, until it has the unanimous approval of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission.

Mr. RICH. In Buenos Aires, for instance, we have a property that in 1930 was worth $283,602.23. Is it contemplated that you want to make an exchange with somebody that has a property that will be better suited for State Department purposes?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. That is a very good illustration of the way it is done now. If we want to exchange that property, we must find a man who has a piece of property we can use and who wants to exchange it for our piece of property.

Mr. RICH. Suppose this man has a piece of unimproved land on which you could build a State Department building; then are you going to give up our embassy there and take this unimproved property, and then ask for $1,500,000 to construct a building on it?

Mr. BLOOM. No, this prevents that, for this reason. We want to sell the property at a high price and buy another piece of property more cheaply in a location we can use in that certain city or country.

Mr. RICH. Then you will probably have to erect a building on that property.

Mr. BLOOM. We have to do that, but we are not asking you for that.

Mr. RICH. I have heard that so much. You are not asking that now, but every time they come in and say, "We are asking for a piece of land now and we want the building later," then they come in later and want the money. I want to know where you are going to get the money for that.

Mr. BLOOM. Does not the gentleman believe that would be the time for him to say, "No, we will not give you the money"?

Mr. RICH. No, I do not. If you have a building that is doing the work of our State Department——

Mr. BLOOM. But it is not doing the work.

Mr. RICH. Well, you want to get on Main Street and we are now on some other street, but we can do the work, and we are not in position today to build any more embassies in any town where we have a good embassy that will take care of our State Department. The gentleman knows that and so do I.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. It may interest the gentleman to know that this bill was gone into in our committee very thoroughly by the Republicans, who are not very eager to spend money, and we were very much of the opinion that we would save money, as the gentleman has said, rather than spend unduly. It is not a matter of getting on Main Street; it is a matter of getting rid of some very poor properties here and there and getting better properties for far less money.

Mr. RICH. The chairman of the committee says it is not going to cost anything and that you will not be coming here asking for money. You have this property in Buenos Aires which the State Department is now using, and which cost $282,000. Suppose you exchange that for a vacant lot.

Mrs. BOLTON. Not necessarily.

Mr. RICH. You might get something in return. But is it not your experience that if you exchange that property now you will be back here asking for additional funds to build in Buenos Aires a building that will be suitable to this committee and this Government?

Mrs. BOLTON. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this is all done under the authority of a committee in Washington. Nothing can be done without their approval.

Mr. RICH. Just where is it not going to cost any more money?

Mrs. BOLTON. We have to act on the basis of what that committee does.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman must remember that in perhaps 20 countries throughout the world our embasies and legations have been bombed and blasted so that we have nothing left there. May I say further that you have already appropriated money to build legations and embassies throughout the world, but our hands are so tied that we cannot operate as efficiently and economically as we would like. I have had 50 years' experience in the real-estate business, and this is the only way you can operate.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, unless there is some indication that this matter can be adjusted I shall have to call for the regular order. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania made up his mind to object?

Mr. RICH. No; I have not. I assure the gentleman that all I want to know is that we are going to do this and do it in a good, sound, business way. If you can prove that to me I will go along with you, but if it is not going to be done that way I am going to object.

Mr. BLOOM. The matter was gone into most thoroughly by the committee, both Republicans and Democrats. We had witnesses before the committee and they all approved it. This is a unanimous report of the committee. This bill should be passed now because it is necessary to go through with these things at the present time.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this item is all right. I will tell him why. I happen to be a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which is now holding hearings on appropriations for the Department of State for the next fiscal year. In those hearings considerable justification was brought forth for the purchase of buildings and grounds for the Foreign Service. As the chairman for the Committee on Foreign Affairs has justly said, many of our buildings have been destroyed during the war. I think the gentleman should not object to this particular item for the reason that it will result in the saving of considerable money to the taxpayers of the United States. When we bring the bill before you making appropriations for the purchase of additional buildings and grounds for the Foreign Service, I think the gentleman then will get a very good explanation of this matter. There are many things that we cannot say publicly in connection with this at the present time. I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania would not object.

Mr. RICH. If that is going to be done, I am satisfied.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs why the property could not be sold, if it is surplus property of the State Department, under the Surplus Property Act which was passed in October.

Mr. BLOOM. We cannot do it because the Foreign Service Building Commission Act allows us to do everything except sell it and use the proceeds. We can exchange it and do everything under the sun, but we cannot sell it and use the proceeds.

Mr. MANASCO. Why can it not be sold under the terms of the Surplus Property Act which was passed in October of last year?

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry, if we could have done it, we would not be here today.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask a question about the consular offices and diplomatic offices, for instance, in London. Is it a proper question to ask whether we own the building in London or not?

Mr. BLOOM. I think we own the consular offices.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How about the building where the Embassy is?

We do not own that?

Mr. BLOOM. We do own the Embassy, but not the Chancery.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It has been my experience that in many foreign countries we have very poor buildings in which to house the diplomatic service.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes, and that is what we are trying to remedy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The building in Mexico City looked more like a firetrap than anything else.

Mr. BLOOM. It is a firetrap. I have been there.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is not the sort of building that our diplomatic corps should be housed in.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman say we already had appropriations for buildings in foreign lands?

Mr. BLOOM. We had an appropriation several years ago of $10,000,000. That is what we are using now for buildings. In some of the countries some of our Ministers have not even a home to live in.

Mr. MOTT. Then I will ask this further question: Having the authorization and having a blanket appropriation under the bill which is now before us, would that permit the agencies and committees the gentleman has referred to to go ahead and build such buildings as they please without having to come back to the Congress and ask either for an authorization or appropriation?

Mr. BLOOM. Only up to the sum that we already have. We cannot go ahead and build any buildings unless it is authorized by the entire commission and the money is appropriated.

Mr. MOTT. The money is appropriated?

Mr. BLOOM. They have to come back to the Congress.

Mr. MOTT. The money is appropriated to the extent of $10,000,000. You have it.

Mr. BLOOM. We have used quite a bit of that. I do not know how much we have used of it.

Mr. MOTT. Let me ask this question. It may be a little hypothetical but I think the gentleman will get it. Suppose you have a piece of property which is undesirable in a city such as London or Paris, that is, for an embassy, and you want to trade it for a piece of property which is in a more desirable location and which could be developed into a good embassy. Suppose your obsolete facility was worth $100,000 and you traded it for another piece of property worth $100,000 but which would not be suitable for an embassy unless you tore down the property on it and rebuilt. You could do that without any more authority except the authority of this bill? You would not have to be authorized by the Congress to build a $10,000,000 embassy or you would not have to ask for an appropriation?

Mr. BLOOM. It would have to be an even exchange. Does not the gentleman see? This enables us to sell a piece of property that might be in a business location, such as Connecticut Avenue, for instance, and we could get a half a million dollars for it. Then perhaps we could buy a piece of property which we could use in a residential section, the same as the British did here, for less money. This authorizes us to exchange it. That is what we are trying to get away from. We want to do business in a business way. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. MOTT. Do you think you would have to come to the Congress for an appropriation?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, yes; certainly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act cited as the "Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph No. 9 and reading as follows:

"9. The Secretary of State, when he finds it to be in the interest of the Government, with the concurrence of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, is authorized to sell buildings and grounds acquired for the use of diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to apply the proceeds of such sales toward the purchase and construction, and preservation of other properties, as in the judgment of the Commission may best serve the Government's interest: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of State shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the Budget estimates of the Department of State."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, after the comma strike out "to apply."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "sales", insert "may be applied."

Page 2, line 8, after the comma, insert the word "furnishing."

Page 2, line 9, after the word "properties", insert "or held in the Foreign Service building fund."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include an editorial and an exchange of letters with the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 689) to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very important bill for the Consent Calendar, because it changes the whole set-up in the Foreign Service. I think we should have some explanation from the chairman of the committee.

I also want to comment on one part of the bill. It calls for post allowances whenever the cost of living may be proportionately higher than it is here. I have seen certain legislation of that type right along, because it has been authorized in appropriation bills, but what I do not like to see is that every time the cost of living is higher in another country, we pay a great deal more money to our representatives there, and whenever the cost of living is low in any other country, our representatives get the benefit.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. That has been the custom in the Department of State for a long time, where due to the exchange, they balance the cost of living in order to give the Foreign Service an even break.

Mr. KEAN. That is what I refer to. Every time I see it in an appropriation bill I wonder about it.

There are also some changes in this, which the report says are minor changes. I would like to know just what those are. Also I am curious to know what a "post allowance" is.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Suppose a man is in a certain position——

Mr. STEFAN. I will tell you what it is. A Foreign Service officer gets rent allowance and living allowance.

Mr. KEAN. It cannot be that, because it says "may be granted allowance for living quarters, heat, light, fuel, gas, and electricity, for representation, and also post allowances." What are "post allowances"?

Mr. BLOOM. That is where the man is located. You must remember in some places some of our representatives have no place to live at all. He goes to a certain location——

Mr. KEAN. I know all of that. It says that right here.

Mr. BLOOM. That is what they call "post allowances."

Mr. KEAN. Why do they say "and" then?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know.

Mr. STEFAN. If the chairman does not know, I assume that "post allowances" has something to do with the Army or Navy, as for instance in Paris, most of our Foreign Service officers in Paris are living in Army quarters. It may be that, if the chairman does not know.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from California, who thinks he may know.

Mr. HINSHAW. The only thing I know about it is that when a committee of which I am a member stopped at a place called Belem do Pará, in Brazil, we found that the vice consul had $50 allowance which he was supposed to use for entertainment, or any other purpose.

Mr. STEFAN. No; that is not a post allowance. That is representation allowance. That is a different allowance from post allowance.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further to the gentleman for the time being, at least not until after I have finished my explanation.

The gentleman will find that such allowances are post allowances, and they are entirely too meager, as I see it, because these men are unable to do very much. Whatever little allowance they have in making the best possible representation of this country before the other countries of the world should not be begrudged them. As a matter of fact, as the gentleman probably well knows, there are certain governments which make it a practice not only to pay their ambassadors and consular representatives elsewhere in the world more money than we pay ours but they likewise give them a station one degree higher than we give our people in order to make us appear perhaps a little less prominent. I may call attention to the fact that right here in Washington the Ambassador of Great Britain receives $10,000 a year more than the President of the United States, and has a very beautiful residence at his disposal which is at least equal to the White House. I believe our own people are entitled to every possible advantage this great country, the greatest in the world, can give them.

Mr. KEAN. I am in thorough agreement with what the gentleman from California has said, but I still do not know what post allowances are.

Mr. STEFAN. The post allowance is not the representation allowance.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I agree with the interpretation of the gentleman from California that the post allowance is a small entertainment allowance to meet the obligations that rest on our Foreign Service officers when they have to entertain in their official capacity.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what arrangements have been made with the War Manpower Commission about the advancement of these wages?

Mr. KEAN. Do not ask me; ask the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RICH. I should like to know whether the gentleman has taken this up with the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BLOOM. It is not necessary.

Mr. RICH. It should be when a salary is increased from $9,000 to $10,000.

Mr. BLOOM. We are not increasing any salaries from $9,000 to $10,000; that is simply the range in salaries of class I.

Mr. RICH. The very first section of the bill states that class I salaries are advanced from $9,000 to $10,000; class II from $8,000 to $8,900. Back home employers are not able to increase the salary of a man getting a mere dollar an hour without permission from one of these war-control boards.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will only wait a minute I will answer him.

Mr. RICH. But to have the Congress increase salaries $1,000 at a jump does not make sense to me.

Mr. BLOOM. Let me answer and it may make sense.

The increases provided for in the bill will not average over $390 per person. The gentleman is reading a reference to existing salary classification rates. There is no increase in salary from $9,000 to $10,000; the bill merely provides that men may be raised from certain grades to certain other grades. For instance, when they find a man in the field who has a great deal of knowledge about a certain thing, the kind of knowledge the department needs in the field, they put this man into a higher grade so the department can get the greatest benefit of his ability. The whole thing amounts to no more than about $390 a person, and not every person will receive a raise. This will mean a total of approximately $400,000, or 1 percent of the total Foreign Service budget.

Mr. RICH. Further reserving the right to object, section 10 states that an increase is made:

Ambassadors and ministers as now or hereafter provided; foreign service officers as follows: "Class I, $9,000 to $10,000."

Now if that is not an increase in salary I do not know what an increase is.

Mr. BLOOM. When their position is advanced, when they are advanced, naturally they take the salary of the advanced classification, and the man worthy of being advanced is worthy of the salary the classification carries. It is an increase in his rating. That is the idea.

Mr. KEAN. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that they are entitled to these increases; but the bill according to the report will cost the Federal Government some $400,000.

Mr. RICH. I am not saying that they do not need the increases, for even today Congressmen are talking about the need for increasing their own salaries. The thing of it is that when the people back home ask for a few cents increase on their hourly wage it cannot be given to them; but here Congress comes along and increases salaries $1,000 at a time. It just does not make sense; it is not right; it is not honest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. I object.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York a question or two about this bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand objection has already been made.

Mr. BLOOM. No. The gentleman reserved the right to object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have objected.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ESCAPES OF PRISONERS OF WAR AND INTERNED ENEMY ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1525) relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever procures the escape of any prisoner of war held by the United States or any of its allies, or the escape of any person apprehended or interned as an enemy alien by the United States or any of its allies, or advises, connives at, aids, or assists in such escape, or aids, relieves, transports, harbors, conceals, shelters, protects, holds correspondence with, gives intelligence to, or otherwise assists any such prisoner of war or enemy alien, after his escape from custody, knowing him to be such prisoner of war or enemy alien, or attempts to commit or conspires to commit any of the above acts, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both. The provisions of this act shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other provision of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REWARDS TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES FOR INVENTIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 744) authorizing payment of rewards to postal employees for inventions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will someone explain this bill?

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to reward employees of the post office, who are not entitled or authorized under law to hold any other job, for such suggestions, inventions, or improvements as they might present in connection with postal matters to promote efficiency and reduce the cost of handling the mails. Many such suggestions and inventions have been placed in effect with no thought of recognition or hope of reward. This bill has the approval of the Post Office Department and is limited to $25,000 in any one year and to $1,000 for any one invention or suggestion or series of suggestions along the same line by an individual. The Post Office Department claims that this bill will be an incentive and will save that department many thousands of dollars a year in increased efficiency in its operations because of mechanical improvements.

Mr. RICH. They will not pay to the man more than they will receive in benefits from the invention?

Mr. McKENZIE. The bill does not make any such provision as that. It is limited to $1,000 for any one invention. If an invention does not merit that much I am sure that the executives of the Post Office Department can be trusted to use some judgment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask this question: If an employee of the Post Office Department creates an invention which is useful and results in a saving to the Government, under the law, as I understand it, he cannot patent that invention or be protected in it?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is my understanding.

Mr. DONDERO. Except by such reward as this bill might give him?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is right.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is not the first bill of this character to come before the Congress to be enacted into law. There have been similar bills for the Interior Department, and some other departments. This matter was up for discussion before the Committee on Patents when a bill was pending with reference to similar action concerning the Interior Department. The other bills to which I have referred went to other committees than the Committee on Patents.

This matter of invention by those in the governmental service is very closely akin to the general subject of patents, and there should not be legislation emanating from various committees with reference to inventions by Government employees. We have passed other such bills and no exception has been taken, but, as I say, we have had the matter under discussion before the Committee on Patents, and I think that the appropriate procedure would be to have a general law with reference to Government employees in all departments of the Government. Such a bill is now under study. This should be done in order that it may be properly introduced for the protection of these employees and without in any way abrogating or interfering with our patent system.

I shall not object at this time to the passage of the pending bill because similar bills with reference to other departments of the Government have already become law, but I do believe that we should take up the proposition of general legislation in this regard and in that general legislation repeal these several laws that have come from the various committees which have nothing to do primarily with patents.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest at that time in consideration of a general bill in relation to Federal employees of any agency or department that has to do with inventions of something which may be beneficial to the agency or department and our Government, that if the invention is used in private fields of endeavor, the Federal employee responsible for the invention be protected insofar as the use of his invention outside of the governmental agency is concerned.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, that would be a matter for general study. Under the present law they are not permitted to take out patents on these ideas. Many inventions have been made by employees of these respective departments which are used almost exclusively by the Government and have been found to be very useful and very advantageous. The purpose underlying this bill and the

others which have preceded it, I think, is a good one. But I think we should be very careful from the standpoint of jurisdiction and not have committees reporting upon matters which do not primarily concern their functions, but have general legislation emanate from the committee which does have the authority and the responsibility of dealing with inventions and patents.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I had in mind was this: I am talking now about a general bill and not this particular bill. It is a very good bill, I think. But suppose I am an employee of the Post Office Department and I invent something which the Department utilizes. Then suppose the invention is something that could be utilized in a private field of endeavor. I think, even though the Government does not pay me a royalty, nevertheless I should not be precluded from having my inventive genius protected where the product of my inventive mind is used in a private field of endeavor.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, that would require modification of existing law. It may be that many of these inventions are made as a result of the work of the employee being done for the Government and perhaps on Government time. I think the whole subject is one that should be thoroughly considered, although I know there are some objections to the policy suggested by the distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts. But I do believe that the subject matter of the pending bill should be taken up in one general law and that it should not be approached in this piecemeal way. For instance, I think there is no such legislation with reference to the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Commerce may have a bill pending to give this consideration to its employees. If none is pending, there will likely be one. It just seems to me that it is improper parliamentary procedure to be taking up this one matter through so many committees and that we should have general legislation that will be applicable to all of these governmental employees.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURCH. I do not think this bill carries it to the extent that the gentleman from Texas believes, if he will read the language. It is only for a series of suggestions; in other words, if we work out a plan by which a postal employee will invent something or improve the Service and thereby create a saving, that he shall be rewarded.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, and I am not averse to this legislation at this time, because similar legislation with reference to other departments has been enacted. But we had hearings, and rather extensive hearings, before the Committee on Patents on the same subject with reference to the Department of the Interior, though the other bills came from committees other than the Committee on Patents. The whole subject is so closely related to the matter of patents and to the policies that we have adopted under the patent system that we should have general legislation in order that there may be no conflict by reason of so many committees dealing with the same subject.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM.. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice that this bill applies only to postal employees. There are just two motives that actuate all of us. One is the hope of reward and the other is the fear of punishment. It seems to me that legislation which takes away that hope of reward or minimizes it really discourages effort on the part of any person to make inventions.

I think we should liberalize the law, if that is the law now, restricting a person from receiving only a token reward for his genius or for his effort. I think some general legislation for the whole Government should be enacted.

Mr. LANHAM. I think the gentleman from Michigan will agree with my observation that we should have one law with reference to the purpose of the pending bill and not take it up by piecemeal legislation with reference to each department of the Government.

Mr. DONDERO. That might be advisable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to pay a cash reward for any invention, suggestion, or series of suggestions submitted by one or more employees of the Post Office Department or the Postal Service, which will clearly effect a material economy or increase efficiency in the administration or operation of the Post Office Department or the Postal Service, and which has been adopted for use.

The total amount of rewards made under this act in any one fiscal year shall not exceed $25,000 and the amount so paid for any one invention, suggestion, or series of suggestions shall not exceed $1,000.

Rewards made under this act shall be paid out of the appropriation for the postal activity primarily benefiting or may be distributed among appropriations for postal activities benefiting, as the Postmaster General may determine. Payments shall be in addition to the regular compensation of the employee receiving the reward. No employee shall be paid a reward under this act until he has properly executed an agreement to the effect that the use by the United States of the invention, suggestion, or series of suggestions made by him shall not form the basis of a further claim of any nature upon the United States by him, his heirs, or assigns.

The bill was orderd to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTMASTERS IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 304) to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to authorize postmasters within the Territory of Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, and for other purposes" (53 Stat. 1219), is amended to read as follows:

"That each postmaster within the Territory of Alaska is hereby authorized and directed to administer oaths and affirmations and to take acknowledgments, and to make and execute certificates thereof, and to perform all other functions of a notary public within said Territory, whenever an oath, affirmation, or acknowledgment or a certificate thereof is authorized, permitted, or required by any act or acts of Congress, or of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 15) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11, 1945, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE AT POST OFFICES, BRANCHES, OR STATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 697) relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 391), entitled "An act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes", is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, whenever deemed necessary in serving military and naval personnel at military and naval camps, posts, or stations, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to detail any postal employee from main post offices to postal units, at such camps, posts, or stations, without changing the official station of such postal employee, and to authorize allowances, not exceeding $4 per day in lieu of actual expenses, while so detailed, without regard to the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, such allowances to be paid from the appropriation 'Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices.'

"SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit for any payments made prior to July 9, 1943, not exceeding the allowances herein provided, to the employees so detailed."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARRING OF CERTAIN CLAIMS BY THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 129) to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the author of the bill explain just what is included in it?

Mr. MANASCO. Under existing law when a check is returned to the Treasury Department there is no bar against the time that proceedings can be begun against the bank or other endorser or guarantor of a Government check in case of forgery or when the money has been obtained by fraudulent means. The purpose of this bill is to protect all the guarantors unless the Government within 6 years from the time the check was presented to the Treasury Department starts proceedings to collect the money.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason for my inquiry is that an item appeared in the press recently indicating that a bank here in the city of Washington was held liable on some signatures on the back of Government checks, because the signatures were forgeries.

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct. If this bill had been the law at that time, it would not have affected that proceeding, because the Treasury Department discovered the forgeries.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the time limit fixed?

Mr. MANASCO. Six years after the time the check has been presented to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no proceeding in any court shall be brought by the United States or by any agency or official of the United States to enforce the liability of any endorser, transferor, or depositary, or financial agent, arising out of a forged or unauthorized signature or endorsement upon or alteration of any check, checks, warrant, or warrants issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, the Treasurer and Assistant Treasurers of the United States, or by disbursing officers and agents of the United States, unless such proceeding is commenced within 6 years after the presentation to the Treasurer of the United States or other drawee for payment of such check, checks, warrant, or warrants, or unless within that period written notice shall have been given by the United States or an agency thereof to such endorser, transferor, or depositary, or financial agent of a claim on account of such liability. Unless a court proceeding shall have been brought or such notice given within the period prescribed herein, any claim against such endorser, transferor, or depositary, or financial agent on account of such liability shall be forever barred: *Provided*, That in connection with any claim presented to the General Accounting Office within the time limitation prescribed by section 2 of the act of June 22, 1926 (44 Stat. 76; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 122), the period within which such a proceeding may be brought or such notice given shall be extended by an additional 180 days, and unless such notice shall be given or a court proceeding brought within such extended period any claim against such endorser, transferor, depositary, or financial agent on account of such liability shall be forever barred.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of the Treasurer of the United States for the amount of any check, checks, warrant, or warrants with respect to which court proceedings shall have been barred pursuant to the provisions of this act upon a showing that the barring of such proceedings did not result from any negligence on the part of the Treasurer of the United States in failing to give the notice required by the provision of section 1 of the act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, after "drawee", insert "of such issued checks or warrants."

Page 3, after line 7, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. If any endorser, transferor, or depositary, or financial agent who is liable to any of the actions mentioned in this act shall fraudulently conceal the cause of such action from the knowledge of the United States or any agency or official of the United States entitled to bring such action, the action may be commenced at any time within 2 years after the United States or any agency or official of the United States who is entitled to bring the same shall discover that the United States or any agency or official of the United States had such cause of action, although such action would be otherwise barred by the provisions of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER FOR BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1705) providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the establishment of the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 393), entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes," the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas shall, upon the recommendation and approval by the Secretary of the Interior of a qualified candidate, appoint a commissioner for the said national park. The district court shall prescribe the rules of procedure and practice for the commissioner in the trial of cases and for appeal to the district court. The commissioner shall be paid an annual salary, as appropriated for by the Congress.

SEC. 2. The commissioner shall have jurisdiction to issue process in the name of the United States for the arrest of any person charged with a violation of any of the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior in pursuance of law for the government and protection of the park, or with the commission within the park of a petty offense against the law, and to try the person so charged, who, if found guilty, shall be subject to the punishment prescribed by section 3 of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 3), as amended. For the purposes of this act, the term "petty offense" shall be defined as in section 335 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 541). In all cases of conviction an appeal shall lie from the judgment of said commissioner to the district court.

SEC. 3. The commissioner shall have power to issue process in the name of the United States for the arrest of any person charged with the commission within said park of any criminal offense not covered by the provisions of section 2 of this act, and to hear the evidence introduced. If he is of the opinion that probable cause is shown for holding the person so charged for trial, he shall commit such person for further appropriate action, and shall certify a transcript of the record of his proceedings and the testimony in such case to the district court, which court shall have jurisdiction of the case.

SEC. 4. All fees, costs, and expenses arising in cases under this act and properly chargeable to the United States shall be certified, approved, and paid as are like fees, costs, and expenses in the courts of the United States. All fines, fees, costs, and expenses imposed and collected shall be deposited by the commissioner, or by the marshal of the United States collecting the same, with the clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS DATA SUBMITTED TO WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1531) to provide for the control of confidential business data submitted to the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as indicated by its title, this bill seeks to establish some measure of control over confidential material submitted to the War Production Board in connection with the war activities of the War Production Board. The exact wording of the bill, however, does not indicate just what is sought to be achieved by the bill other than it says it authorizes the Chairman of the Board to prescribe rules and regulations for the safeguarding of all information. It is a question what is meant by that safeguarding. I think the Committee on the Judiciary without question intended that the person who supplied the information would be protected against the disclosure of that information to the public or to any private interest where it might be used to the disadvantage of the informant. Therefore, I have suggested an amendment and have submitted it to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who has approved it. The amendment would clarify somewhat the intention of Congress, when this bill is passed, authorizing the Chairman of the War Production Board to

establish rules regarding the release of this information. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chairman of the War Production Board is authorized and directed to prescribe rules and regulations for the safeguarding of all information submitted in confidence by any manufacturer or producer to any officer, employee, or office of the War Production Board for the use of such Board; and he shall determine, in accordance with law, what information, so submitted, if any, may be released for publication or private use.

SEC. 2. Any officer or employee, or any former officer or employee of the United States who shall knowingly divulge, make known, or use in any manner whatever, any information which was submitted in confidence to any officer, employee, or office of the War Production Board for the use of such Board, except as permitted by law or by direction of the Chairman of the Board, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both, and shall, if then an officer or employee of the United States, forfeit such office or employment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 1, line 3, after "That", insert a comma and the following: "for the purpose of protecting the rights of the informant against the possibility of abuse of his confidence."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKETING OF FIRE-CURED AND DARK AIR-CURED TOBACCO

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) relating to the marketing of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER'S RESIDENCE IN MANITOWOC, WIS., TO THE OTTO OAS POST, NO. 659, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 29) to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 210) to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the act of June 16, 1938, chapter 472 (52 Stat. 756), entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 29) was laid on the table.

EXCEPTING MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY BOARD APPOINTED UNDER WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT OF 1944 FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE AND REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1527) to exempt the members of the Advisory Board appointed under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (Public Law 395, 78th Cong.) or in section 27 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457, 78th Cong.) shall be deemed to apply to any person because he has heretofore been or may hereafter be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the Advisory Board provided for by section 102 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (Public Law 458, 78th Cong.).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I was given permission to revise and extend my remarks but did not ask, as I recall, to insert therein certain extraneous matter. One was a report to which the gentleman referred. I ask unanimous consent to insert that in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a statement by the Commissioner of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include therewith two brief news editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the Prentice-Hall publication in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent also to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. William G. Holman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONGRESS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 37.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses its approval of the following resolutions looking toward the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress which were adopted on April 15, 1944, at Santiago, Chile, at a session attended by a committee of the House of Deputies of Chile and by the parliamentary delegations of a number of countries of the Western Hemisphere (including the delegation representing this House) which met in such city for the celebration of the Day of the Americas:

1. The parliamentary delegations of Peru, Uruguay, Colombia, the United States, Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, and Chile agree to promote through their respective Parliaments a movement of continental unity;

2. To accomplish such project, they proposed the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress for which the delegates will solicit the approval of their respective Parliaments;

3. To set up a permanent committee composed of the chairmen of the attending delegations, presided over by Don Pedro Castelblanco, President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile, for the purpose of organizing and fixing the time, place, and subject matter of the Interparliamentary Congress of America;

4. To communicate those resolutions to all the countries on the American Continents and invite the countries whose Parliaments were not represented to adhere to these resolutions.

Therefore, the Permanent Committee to Promote American Unity Through the Parlia-

ments, and in compliance with the third resolution, is constituted as follows: President, Pedro Castelblanco, of Chile; and members, Messrs. Luis Carlos Mese, of Colombia; Jose Albertassi Munoz, of Costa Rica; Jose Erasmo Pacheco, of El Salvador; Pete Jarman, of the United States; Carlos F. Madrazo, of Mexico; Carlos Morales, of Nicaragua; Roberto Jimenez, of Panama; Carlos Sayan Alverez, of Peru; and Luis Batlle Berres, of Uruguay.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this resolution, but in order that we may have a hearing, I demand a second.

Mr. JARMAN. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as many of the Members know, the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile invited two members of the house of representatives or chamber of deputies of each parliamentary American country or republic, I am not sure which, to participate in the celebration of the Day of the Americas, in Santiago, Chile, on last April 14. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] and I were designated to represent this House on that occasion.

On the following day the host invited all delegates to participate in a round-table discussion, looking toward the continuing of pan-American unity. That discussion resulted in the approval of a resolution which has just been read by the Clerk. In fact, the whole purpose of this resolution is simply the approval of the resolution passed 10 months ago by delegates from 10 countries in Santiago, Chile. It is a simple House resolution.

The State Department indulged in a favorable report on it when the bill was introduced last fall, and again it was approved under a new Secretary a few weeks ago when it was reintroduced. The Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously approved it and directed me to get action on it, if I could, by unanimous consent last week. The only reason for bringing it up at that time and in that way was because of the conference of American Foreign Secretaries which commences in Mexico City on Wednesday at which Canada will not be represented. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] who has already gone to that conference, felt it might be beneficial from a psychological standpoint for him and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] to be able to say in their conversations with fellow delegates there that this resolution had been passed.

The gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Illinois, and I contacted the leadership on both sides of the aisle and gained their ready approval; in fact, so far as I know, there was not then and there is not now any objection to the passage of this resolution except on the part of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who then objected to it, not, I think, because of any reluctance to agree to pan-American unity, not because of any desire to hinder the progress of the good neighbor policy through such friendly gestures, but simply because of his wish to make sure that Canada be included in the resolution. He wished to amend the resolution passed 10 months ago by delegates from 10 countries; he wished to amend that resolution on the floor of this House which, of course, was impossible. It is true that the gentleman from Michigan officially objected, but he made the statement 10 minutes afterward that he would gladly withdraw the objection if it were brought up again.

The following morning the Foreign Affairs Committee had Assistant Secretary of State Rockefeller before it in executive session. Mr. Rockefeller's sphere is Latin-American relations. He was accompanied by Gen. S. D. Embick, chairman of the Inter-American Defense Board, of which Canada, incidentally, is not a member. I regret very much that it was an executive session because, although those two gentlemen knew nothing so far as I know of what had happened here the previous day, the remarks of General Embick, who, mind you, is chairman of the Inter-American Defense Board, could not possibly have been more appropriate, occurring as they did the day after our failure to pass that resolution on the floor. The gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Texas, and I conferred with Assistant Secretary Rockefeller after the executive session. We told him what had happened here on the previous day. He was naturally considerably perturbed, being charged as he is with Latin-American relations, and offered to do anything possible toward correcting the situation, specifically suggesting that he call the gentleman from Mississippi. In reply I expressed the opinion that he would accomplish nothing by doing so. I then told him that I would be recognized today under a suspension of the rules; and, basing my opinion on the good judgment of the membership of this House, I expressed the positive conviction that no difficulty would be experienced in passing the resolution at this time. He was, of course, very much gratified and told me it would mean so much more to pass it today before that conference next Wednesday than at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to indulge in the sincere hope that no citizen of the United States who may have observed what happened here last week will misunderstand it. Particularly am I anxious that the press and people of Latin America may not misunderstand the prompting cause. I hope the citizens of Latin America will understand that the failure of the House to pass this resolution then by no means resulted from the attitude on the part of anyone, even the gentleman who objected, of being against pan-American unity. I hope they will understand that it resulted entirely from the unanimous-consent rule under which we were operating, coupled with an abundance of precaution on the part of one gentleman, who always wants to enforce his wishes and who shares the desire of all of us that Canada be included in everything in which it reasonably can be.

Let us evaluate the results of what occurred last week. Was anything whatever accomplished except the possible damage that resulted from references thereto in the Latin-American press?

Immediately after objection was heard the gentleman from Illinois called my attention to the fact that this resolution passed 10 months ago in Santiago was probably broad enough to include Canada. He at once proceeded to the gentleman from Mississippi and told him the same thing. But that did not satisfy the gentleman. He wished to amend the resolution that we passed in Santiago 10 months ago to specifically name Canada.

Now, to show you how much ado about nothing it was, inquiry reveals the fact that our host on that occasion agreed with the gentleman from Illinois and Canada was invited several months ago.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Gladly.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. From the gentleman's investigation, then, he makes the positive statement that Canada will be included to participate in this conference?

Mr. JARMAN. If it wishes to.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. If it wishes to, of course.

Mr. JARMAN. I received that information from the Canadian Embassy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I express the belief that I have covered every possible objection. I am going to ask—yes, I am going to urge—unanimous approval of this resolution by the House. I do so, not with any idea of backing the gentleman from Illinois and myself, although we were representing you at the time not with any idea of backing the State Department, two Acting Secretaries of which have approved this resolution, not with any idea of approving the unanimous recommendation of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House or the unanimous opinion of the leadership of the House on both sides, but, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask it, advisedly and after mature consideration, in the interest of the country that we all love. Its progress, its well-being, yes, its future security, can gain nothing by such happenings as occurred on the floor last week. However, I am strongly of the opinion that a unanimous vote today can wipe the slate clean and correct any injury which may have occurred to our country then.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the passage of this resolution, House Resolution 37. It not only has the unanimous approval of the Foreign Affairs Committee but also has the wholehearted support of the State Department as disclosed by the letter from Secretary of State Stettinius, in the report accompanying this resolution. It also has the approval of Mr. Rockefeller, Assistant Secretary of State for American Republic Affairs, as well as other officials charged with those relationships.

Before considering the details of this resolution, I want to endorse and heartily

concur in all the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has said on this subject. He most ably represented this body at a meeting of parliamentary delegates from 10 of our American republics on the occasion of the celebration of the day of the Americas, last April 14, at Santiago, Chile. No one in this body has a better first-hand knowledge than he of the good which would result from a meeting with our sister American republics as contemplated by this resolution.

The only action sought by this resolution is that the House express approval of resolutions adopted by parliamentary delegations of a number of countries of the Western Hemisphere—including our own—April 15, 1944, at Santiago, Chile, looking toward the establishment of an American Interparliamentary Congress.

As Mr. Stettinius points out in the report:

> The resolution merely contemplates the designation of a committee for the purpose of organizing and fixing the time, place, and subject matter of the Interparliamentary Congress of America.

By approval of this resolution no funds are authorized, nor would any specific action for our future participation in such an organization be approved.

If at a later date this committee reported plans for a meeting of an American Interparliamentary Congress, at a suitable time and place, then specific action would be required by this House if we were to participate.

Mr. Stettinius makes that situation clear when he points out in the report:

> Should the Congress desire to offer its collaboration in such a proposed organization, the means for effectuating such a collaboration should be chosen by the Congress itself.

When it was attempted the other day to bring this resolution to the floor of the House by unanimous consent certain objections were raised which in my opinion, after careful analysis, are neither meritorious nor logical.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] was fearful that our sister republic to the north, Canada, would not be included in such an American Congress so he suggested section 4 of the resolutions adopted at Santiago be amended by adding the words "including the Dominion of Canada."

I believe the fears of the gentlemen to be wholly unfounded and not supported by the wording of the resolutions.

Section 4 provides:

> To communicate those resolutions to all the countries on the American Continents and invite the countries whose parliaments were not represented to adhere to these resolutions.

The section can have but one meaning, namely, the resolutions were to be sent to all the countries on the American Continents, which would include Canada; and the language to invite the countries whose parliaments were not represented to adhere to these resolutions, of course, would include Canada without specific reference to her or to each of the other countries which did not attend the last conference.

I have made an investigation and I can state with the greatest assurance that Canada was invited to adhere to the resolutions. Therefore no amendment is needed.

Moreover, in my opinion, we would not have a right to amend or modify the resolutions which were adopted by the delegates of the various countries at Santiago. If we did not approve them in toto we could accept them subject to certain reservations or conditions but not by amendment of the resolutions themselves. And, of course, under the present parliamentary situation no amendments are in order.

It also has been suggested there might be an overlapping of the functions of an American Interparliamentary Congress with those of the Pan American Union. I do not think so at all. The members of the Pan American Union are ordinarily the diplomatic representatives or appointees of the executives of the various countries while the delegates to the Inter-American Congress would be chosen from members of the various parliaments, elected by the people. In the legislative field and in corollary subjects such a legislative congress could ably function without interfering in diplomatic or political matters. In my opinion there cannot be too many ties to bind together we of America north and our sister republics to the south.

There are many inter-American organizations functioning harmoniously. Certainly it can but be helpful to have one more whose roots are so close to the people.

And certainly from the viewpoint of the gentleman from Mississippi whose chief interest seems to concern Canada, there could be no possible conflict because Canada has never been a member of the Pan American Union from its inception in 1890 except to be represented on certain subeconomic committees.

The idea of an international congress for this hemisphere is not a new one. Simon Bolivar suggested such a union in 1824. Many men like Henry Clay, James G. Blaine, Philander Knox, Elihu Root, Secretary Hull, and President Roosevelt have strengthened the inter-American system.

Now when we of the New World have been drawn closer together by the war and its common problems of mutual security and the coming peace, it is a most propitious time for consolidating the ties of friendship and confraternity among the American republics by now looking with approval and hope that representatives of the legislative bodies of all the Americas be brought together at some suitable time in the future to study the complex problems which will confront us in the post-war world.

In my opinion it will be an inducement to those countries which do not have parliaments to return to the democratic processes so they could join in such a cooperative effort for mutual assistance and hemispheric unity.

In view of the important Pan-American Conference beginning this week in Mexico City, to which this House will send delegates, it would seem most timely if we would support the hands of our representatives to the conference with this symbol of our sincere intent to cooperate with our American neighbors both to the north and to the south of us, in the post-war world by the passage of this resolution at this time.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that I am very glad this matter has been brought to our attention for legislative consideration. It is one in which I have been interested for a number of years. It has been my pleasure to attend several meetings of the Interparliamentary Union as an officer of the American group of that Union. It seems to me especially desirable in these times, in promoting the policy of amity and friendship and neighborly spirit among the nations of the Western Hemisphere that we have such an organization. Though it would be only advisory, I believe it would go far toward promoting the solving of the problems and bringing about a better understanding for their solution.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I thank the gentleman, and I think his remarks are particularly true when it is applied to the Western Hemisphere.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman from Alabama has adequately explained the situation which has given rise to this resolution being brought up at this time in this manner.

When it was brought up last week under unanimous-consent agreement, it was brought up without any advance notice to the House and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] very properly, in my opinion, inquired as to whether or not Canada was to be included in this conference. I am sure that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] and all the Members of this House hope and trust that Canada and the South American republics and this great Republic will continue to consider themselves part of one great Western Hemisphere family. At that time the information was not immediately available to give him an answer with sufficient evidence back of it so that he could be convinced that Canada was included, and obviously the resolution could not be amended on the floor of the House to cover the situation, and so an objection was raised.

I think everybody should be satisfied now because it is now clear that Canada has been invited. Canada, all the way through this procedure, has been considered in the same status as any of the other American countries, just as though she were herself one of the American republics, so that that problem is out of the way.

From the standpoint of the wisdom of having these meetings at all, I think that this House should unanimously endorse the request of the gentleman from Alabama and pass this resolution without a single dissenting vote, because above everything else we of the Americas must have a better understanding and a better appreciation of the problems among ourselves. We who live here in

the Western Hemisphere must increasingly get to know each other better.

For that reason in the last session of the Congress and again in this Congress I introduced a bill providing for exchange scholarships among the students in teacher-training institutions of all the American republics. That bill now reposes in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I call the attention of the chairman of our committee to the fact that this bill is H. R. 1740, and I am hopeful that, believing in pan-American solidarity as he does, he will soon call hearings for this legislation, because the State Department feels that it is advisable legislation, and I am sure that it has a large amount of interest down in South America and certainly among the educators in this country. That would be another step in the same direction as this one we are approving today, and that is better understanding and better appreciation of the problems which we have here among ourselves in the Western Hemisphere.

I might give one additional reason why I think it is important that we unanimously approve this resolution. That is, it seems to me that the time has come in world affairs when we must increasingly expand the base of the pyramid upon which we deal with foreign countries.

For many, many long centuries international affairs have been handled primarily by the executive heads of government. History bears mute testimony to the sorry record they have made, and the cruel war we are now in is but one more example of the failure by executives of sovereign nations throughout the world to preserve peace, equity, and mutual respect and confidence among nations.

The world has had wars, secret commitments, intrigue, covert diplomacy, power politics, blocs of personal pledges to produce so-called balances of power, but always the end result has been war, war, and yet more war. Executive diplomacy has always failed to maintain peace.

I heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] say last week that during the past 3,000 years we have had only 227 years of peace. That is the record of international amity conducted at the executive level for the past 3,000 years. I submit to you that at the legislative level we can do no worse, and I believe that at the legislative level we can do, in fact, considerably better. This is an effort to expand the base, to provide international understandings and international agreements at the legislative level.

I should like to state a superlative, which is always dangerous, but this superlative, in my opinion, is true. It is, that in my opinion, the biggest evil from which the world is suffering today, and that includes a lot of vices and a lot of evils, is the fact that too much power for too long a time has been reposed in the hands of too few men. Happily, this country is less guilty of that evil than most countries. Unhappily, however, this country is not entirely free from the guilt. We do not exactly stand before the court of world opinion with lily-white hands.

A meeting like the one starting in Mexico City this week is turning the clock of progress in the right direction. A meeting like this is placing power in the hands of additional people and giving the representatives of the common citizens, the legislative group, a chance to get together on the international level and work out programs for peace, preparedness, and mutual understanding. It is a precedent which merits repetition. It is a tendency which we should encourage, Mr. Speaker, by passing this resolution unanimously today.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want first to pay my respects to these two members of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, the author of this bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] and my colleague from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], both of whom attended this meeting in Chile, and were present when this idea was originally sponsored as official delegates from our Government they worthily represented our Congress and our country. Their work on this trip was an example of distinguished international statesmanship by Members of Congress. We are all proud of them.

Remember that what we do today is not legislation in any sense. It is not even the formation of a nonlegislative group. It is merely approval of the suggestion that a committee be formed to consider such action.

I am one of those who believe that this type of action is of paramount importance in the future. We are going to have a great deal more international participation by our country in the years to come. I do not believe diplomatic processes are sufficient to take care of the need for interrelationships between the various countries.

One of the things that is on trial at this time is democracy, the idea of representative government. To have representatives of the people from various nations getting together to discuss their various problems in nondiplomatic procedure is one of the things that is going to insure continuity to our international participation in the future.

Meetings of lawmakers from the Americas, publicly discussing common problems, with representatives of all paries and not just the party in power from each country, will lack the neat secrecy and smoothness that characterize diplomatic meetings. Something new will have been added—the increased human knowledge and friendship that come when representatives of people, not representatives of sovereigns or sovereignties meet, these contracts will help bridge over and will finally eliminate the periods of diplomatic strains that lead to trouble.

I am, therefore, heartily in favor of this measure and urge that it be adopted and that the committee get to work. I am particularly gratified that word will go to Mexico City, as this historic meeting takes place this week, that the United States House of Representaives has taken this unanimous action in the direction of hemisphere collaboration among parliamentary governments.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, in calling attention to the fact that the vote on this resolution was unanimous, may I express on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] and myself our very deep appreciation. I also express appreciation for the large number of Members in attendance today.

It is most gratifying to us that when the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] proceeds to the conference in Mexico City tomorrow she can tell her fellow delegates from other countries and also our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] that the House has unanimously concurred in this good-will gesture.

MARKETING OF FIRE-CURED AND DARK AIR-CURED TOBACCO UNDER AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) relating to the marketing of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the finding of the total supply of tobacco, the reserve supply level, and the amount of the national marketing quota, and the provisions of section 313 of said act relating to the apportionment of the national marketing quota for tobacco among the States and farms, national marketing quotas for fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco for the marketing years 1945–46, 1946–47, and 1947–48, shall be proclaimed and the national marketing quota and State and farm acreage allotments shall be the same for the marketing year 1945–46 as were established for the marketing year 1943–44, and the national marketing quotas and State and farm-acreage allotments for the marketing years 1946–47 and 1947–48, shall be the same as for the preceding year: *Provided, however*, That an additional acreage not in excess of 2 percent of the total acreage allotted to all farms in each State for the 1943–44 marketing year shall be allotted by the local committees among farms in the State in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary so as to establish allotments which the committees find will be fair and equitable in relation to the past acreage of tobacco (harvested and diverted); land, labor, and equipment available for the production of tobacco; and crop-rotation practices, and an additional acreage equal to not more than 5 percent of the national marketing quota shall be allotted to farms on which no tobacco was produced in the last 5 years (and, with respect to the marketing year 1945–46, on which no tobacco was produced in the 5 years prior to 1944) in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g) of section 313 applicable to farms on which no tobacco was produced during the last 5 years. The Secretary shall proclaim the national marketing quota provided for herein for the marketing year 1945–46 within 5 days after the

effective date of this joint resolution and, if producers disapprove such quota, he shall proclaim the result of the referendum within 5 days after the date of such referendum. This joint resolution shall not have the effect of modifying or repealing any other provisions of said act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 98 affects only two types of tobacco, the dark air-cured and the dark fire-cured tobaccos. It was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and, after hearings and full consideration, it was unanimously reported to the House. It has the endorsement of all representatives from the tobacco district. I am sorry the gentleman from Tennessee, Judge JENNINGS, who is deeply interested in the bill and who has contributed so much to our tobacco program, had to be absent today. It is with his consent that the resolution is called up, and he gave his consent because immediate action is urgent due to the fact that the planting season will soon be here.

The purpose of the bill is as follows: Under the tobacco acts marketing quotas are established. Before quotas can be established, the Secretary of Agriculture has to make certain determinations, which it is doubtful if he can make due to the situation brought on by the war. Under the tobacco acts the Secretary can only proclaim quotas when the total supply of tobacco, that is stocks on hand, plus the current crop, exceeds the reserve supply of tobacco. The reserve supply is the amount required under the Tobacco Act to be kept on hand. Sixty percent of this tobacco is exported. The only thing this resolution does is give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to declare quotas irrespective of any law to the contrary. That has to be done before the tobacco growers can vote upon whether they desire quotas or not. It only sets in motion the necessary machinery to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to call a referendum. I want to call to the attention of the House that none of this tobacco goes into cigars or cigarettes. It is all used for chewing and pipe tobacco, nicotine, and snuff.

As I said, it has been considered by the committee. The representatives from the dark fire-cured and air-cured tobacco areas appeared before the committee and urged its passage. The committee, after hearing their testimony and discussing the matter, made a unanimous report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we hear some great stories, especially during the interim between elections. Then we hear some more stories about campaign time. One of the fallacies we generally hear is that tobacco does not get parity payments. I now read the following from the official reports:

Payments in 1943	
Griffin-Fuller Tobacco Co., Hartfort, Conn.:	
A. C. P. payment	$1,113.60
Parity payment	1,600.49
Total	2,714.09

This $1,600.49 parity payment was made because the tobacco did not bring enough in the market place. Who said the tobacco program was self-sustaining?

This particular piece of legislation we have before us today is of rather minor importance because it only takes in a small part of the total tobacco produced.

The other acreages, representing other kinds of tobacco, have been able to get the thing figured out pretty well before this time; so we drop back now to one or two small quantities or qualities of tobacco.

This is the seventh year I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and it is the seventh year I have had to sit here and watch this piecemeal legislation, one little group grabbing here and another little group grabbing somewhere else. In 1939, after 7 years of the more abundant life, after Marvin Jones had been chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for practically 9 years, and Henry Wallace had been Secretary of Agriculture for about 7 years, this same tobacco group were able to pass through this House a piece of legislation which, to my mind, nullifies all the honeyed words that the new dealers give all over the country as to a good-neighbor policy. That was when they passed the bill that prohibits the exportation of tobacco seed from this country. They did this in 1940.

I call your attention to the fact that there are other farmers in this country aside from those who happen to raise wheat or cotton or tobacco—yes, millions of farmers raising the foods most needed for the war. You can find in the RECORD the figures if you care to refer to them, which will show that in the State of Wisconsin the hourly wage rate was 14 cents gross in 1939. The net hourly wage on a typical Wisconsin farm was 4 cents an hour in 1939. I have gone all through this war period without trying to give one discordant note, but I think there is a time when patience ceases to be a virtue.

I call attention to the fact that in 1939 there were 109,000,000,000 pounds of milk produced in the United States. That was when we had the low prices; that was when we had the 4 cents per hour, if you please. I would like someone to tell me why someone pretty soon does not think of agriculture as a whole, and look forward to a little social security for someone else besides the tobacco grower, the wheat grower, and the cotton grower. When we are keyed up to 119,000,000,000 or 120,000,000,000 pounds of milk, I would like to have somebody tell me what our dairy hourly rate will be after this war is over? You can check this with the Department of Agriculture and I am sure they will tell you there has not been one State that has tried to extend any greater cooperation than has the State of Wisconsin. They have increased their milk production two and one-half billion pounds, which is more than many of the States of the Union produce per year.

A couple of weeks ago they were in here trying to fix it up a little for wheat and cotton. They usually come along with most of this special-interest legislation on the Presidential election year. I would like to yield right now to any new dealer in Congress who will stand up and tell me that he believes we should be kidding the people of this country that we have any good-neighbor policy and then pass legislation that prohibits selling tobacco seed all over the world.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. With reference to the prohibition against the exportation of tobacco seed, I think the gentleman should be fair and give the House a true picture, which is this——

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Now, the gentleman has time on his own account and he can explain that in his own time. I yielded for a question.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I will ask the gentleman this question and then I will make the explanation:

The exportation of tobacco seed has nothing in the world to do with this resolution and does not affect it one way or the other.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is all part of the New Deal scheme to grab a little here and grab a little there. They have done a great many little things for cotton and wheat and some of these other things that were not so little when they came to be paid for. Only last Friday my friend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN] told us how lovely everything was in the tobacco business up in Connecticut, everything was going fine up there. Even that the insurance companies entertained the former Secretary of Agriculture. I do not know whether they feel the same now as they did then since they seem to feel that the New Deal is going to take the insurance companies over. I checked over the other night to see why the insurance companies might be interested and found where they gave one insurance company $115,000 either for growing something or not growing it or because it didn't bring enough in the market place after they had grown it.

Here is one to which I want to call your attention. How about these shade-grown tobacco growers? They tell us the big money there is in the shade-grown tobacco, how they make a thousand dollars an acre up in Connecticut. Talk about class legislation! Here we have in 1943 right in the midst of the war the American Sumatra Tobacco Corporation—and there is not a chance for dispute of what I am reading to you for it is from a Government document—the American Sumatra Tobacco Corporation of East Hartford received $2,791 either for raising or not raising tobacco. No living man knows for sure what they got this money for. But here is the Griffin-Fuller Tobacco Co. of

Hartford, Conn., which received $1,113, either for growing it or not growing it, and $1,600.49 because it did not bring enough in the market place when they had grown it. Are we going to continue as a Congress to keep on spending our grandchildren's money for such silly programs? Are we going to keep on dishing this money out with wanton recklessness? They are interested only in large companies. Listen to this: One insurance company gets $115,000, or more than 5,749 times more than these little fellows we hear about at election time get. They pay the big fellow 5,749 times more than they do the little fellow. The individual members of this great group of small people got $20, or just enough to classify them in the program and just enough to keep them carefully in the right place come election time. The New Deal may have great election-time love for the little fellow but they appear to love one big organization 5,749 times more than they love the little fellow.

So I say to you here today that we are going along the wrong road. I do not care from which side of the aisle the information comes, I should like to know the answer. Again I emphasize the fact that we are going the wrong way. The New Deal looks after the social security of certain groups in total disregard of the other groups of our society.

One thing further: It pains me to oppose the gentleman from Tennessee, JOHN JENNINGS, here. But then I look at my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. Some say that he is always looking after the peanut interests. If I were in his place I would be doing the same thing myself; I do not blame him; there is no reason to blame him, but why when these programs are suggested are they not comprehensive? Why do they not go across the board and deal fairly with all groups? Why do certain groups continuously have to fight only for their own interests and for their own protection? I now yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has gotten a little away from the thing I wanted to ask him about, but I understood the gentleman to say that back yonder in the early days of the good-neighbor policy and the triple-A policy, when they were trying to induce the farmers in South Dakota to accept increased imports of beef, grain, and dairy products, at the same time the New Deal passed the prohibition against the export of tobacco seed. Is that the way the good-neighbor policy was perverted for political purposes? Did they use beef and grain and dairy products to promote good neighborliness and tobacco to promote good profits for the solid Democratic South? Apparently it was not a case of what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is not only in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but it is in a letter from the office of the Secretary of Agriculture. In that letter it is stated that the reason they passed it was so that the people of China and other countries could not raise tobacco to compete with us. That is another reason why I say the New Deal is based on fallacy, deceit, and deception. Plenty for the few, little for the many.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not in any way affect the export of tobacco seed, nor does it provide for any payments out of the Federal Treasury to tobacco producers. The Members may have gotten the idea that it did from what my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has said.

Under the 1938 A. A. A. Act there is a provision whereby when the reserve supply of tobacco reaches a certain point the Secretary of Agriculture shall proclaim marketing quotas, and after he makes that proclamation then the producers of that type of tobacco vote upon the question whether or not there will be marketing quotas in effect that year. If two-thirds of those voting approve, marketing quotas will go into effect.

The war and other factors have so disturbed the tobacco situation that at this time the formula which is in effect under the 1938 act would not require the Secretary of Agriculture to proclaim marketing quotas; however, the producers of this particular type of tobacco desire to have an opportunity to vote on the question whether or not there will be marketing quotas on this type. The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Secretary to go ahead and proclaim marketing quotas for the next three crop-years which marketing quotas, of course, will not go into effect unless approved by two-thirds of the producers of that particular type of tobacco.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, this particular type of tobacco involves tobacco used for snuff and chewing purposes, also smoking tobacco. There are no other types of tobacco involved?

Mr. HOPE. I think nicotine is also made from this type, commercial nicotine for insecticides and all that sort of thing; but it does not involve cigarette tobacco, as I understand it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This legislation in no way prevents a referendum vote on marketing quotas? They cannot be put into operation without a referendum vote?

Mr. HOPE. No. It merely authorizes the Secretary to make the proclamation and after that the producers vote upon the question of marketing quotas. Two-thirds must vote in favor before they can be put into effect.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. In the event this new quota system is established, how much will the additional cost be to the taxpayers of this Nation?

Mr. HOPE. There would be no cost to the taxpayers. This does not provide for payments of any kind.

Mr. JENSEN. It permits larger quotas or a different set-up in quotas. If there is no occasion for it and if these growers do not receive some profits or benefits from this legislation, what would be the purpose of it? Surely they are looking toward the Federal Government and the Treasury to support this legislation with dollars, are they not?

Mr. HOPE. No. This makes no provision whatever for payments and no payments will be made if we pass this legislation that cannot be made otherwise.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman mean to say this will not cost the taxpayers any money?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Is that a fact?

Mr. HOPE. That is a fact.

Mr. JENSEN. It is unusual legislation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa, does not the gentleman think the answer is they do not need any funds because they are able to get funds from the lend-lease to take care of a large percentage of the tobacco surplus, so they would not need to provide for any direct payments in connection with this particular type of nicotine tobacco?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman thinks indirectly we will pay something.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman contend the passage of this legislation is going to cost the Federal Government some money?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Not the day it is passed, no; but if we pass this bill and no payments result, it will be the first piece of New Deal legislation that did not cost the Federal Treasury some money.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman make the contention that there will be any funds paid out of the Federal Treasury as a result of the passage of this legislation?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the answer that it is his observation if it is not in there now, there will be another bill offered to put it in if they ever want it, and if it is not on tobacco it will be on wheat, and if it is not on wheat it will be on cotton.

Mr. HOPE. I do not agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. I challenge him to furnish any proof whatsoever that this legislation will take one dollar out of the Federal Treasury or that it creates in any way any obligation on the part of the Federal Government to make any payment now or in the future.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If the gentleman challenges me, I will ask the distinguished South Dakota Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs how much tobacco was exported in the year 1943 and how much it cost under lend-lease.

Mr. MUNDT. I left my encyclopedia home today. I am sorry I do not have the exact answer. However in 1943 considerably more tobacco was sent overseas through lend-lease than was exported commercially.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is there any reason why this tobacco cannot come under the provisions of lend-lease by which the surplus is taken off the market? They tell me they are using money for that purpose.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman believe this legislation is going to result in the export of any more tobacco either with or without lend-lease?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The hearings show that it is piling up; that they cannot export it. Sixty percent of the crop was exported before the war, and now only 20 percent. They have a big stock pile. They cannot eat the stock pile.

Mr. HOPE. This legislation, if it has any effect at all, will cut down the total supply of this type of tobacco, and there will be less to export under lend-lease or for any other purpose.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us in what States this tobacco will be grown, provided the bill passes.

Mr. HOPE. It is my understanding that practically all, if not all of this type of tobacco, is grown in Tennessee and Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to impress upon the House the correctness of the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] that this legislation will not cost the taxpayers of America one penny. I further want to impress upon the Members of the House that this piece of legislation has the support of every Congressman from the tobacco districts on both the Democratic and Republican sides. The tobacco Congressmen are together on this bill. It is a necessary piece of legislation that has been brought about due to war conditions. It makes it possible for the dark tobacco growers to hold production and consumption in line. The legislation does not affect, in any way, the other types of tobacco. Dark fire- and air-cured tobacco are the only types affected.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 98?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out all after "Representatives." over to and including "selection." on page 2, line 2.

Page 2, line 23, strike out all after *"Provided"*, over to and including "House" on page 3, line 3, and insert "That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees."

Page 3, line 19, strike out all after "duties", down to and including "Government." in line 23.

Page 4, line 11, after "be", insert "All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules of the Senate and the appropriate committees of the House."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, all that is being asked now is to take from the Speaker's table this concurrent resolution and concur in the Senate amendments?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman explain the difference between the resolution as it passed the House and its present form, and give the reason for the Senate changes?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are three amendments that were put in by the Senate. The first amendment struck from the bill the language permitting the committee to operate with vacancies, providing that if a member dropped out or died the committee could go ahead. It also provided for the appointment of new members of the committee. The Senate Committee on Rules felt that that language was unnecessary, that the regular rules of the Senate and the House provided for the filling of these vacancies, and that leaving this language in there might permit the committee to operate with vacancies rather than fill them expeditiously.

The most controversial change was made in the limiting proviso, to change the House language which sought to prohibit the committee from studying or recommending any change in the parliamentary rules relating to the consideration of matters on the floor of either House. This provision was further tightened by the Senate to include that the committee could not make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House. It then added a further proviso that the committee could still have the right to study and recommend the consolidation and reorganization of commmittees.

This further tightens the limitations on the committee to eliminate such things as the Kefauver proposal, which would have permitted the members of the Cabinet to come before the Congress for a question-and-answer period.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, under this legislation, what could this committee do now?

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Ohio will understand that none of these limitations were sought by the committee. They have all been placed in there at various times by one or the other of the two bodies to limit further the study of this committee. We do feel that there is a workmanlike, constructive job that can be done regarding all the activity that goes on before a bill reaches the floor of the House. We have a full range of activity for study and recommendation as to the realinement and consolidation of committees of the House.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. After listening to these limitations, I thought they were broad enough so that, since no change could be made in the rules of the House, and since the committees are governed by the rules of the House, this committee would have to work out some anonymous way of having some Member or some friend sneak around and tell somebody what their deliberations might have been. I think the restrictions are "screwy" and insulting to the committee and insulting to the intelligence of the House itself.

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that the amendment offered by Senator LUCAS, which broadens the Bankhead amendment, the amendment limiting our activities, reads as follows:

Provided further, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That answers my question.

Mr. MUNDT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have been one of the early and consistent advocates of the gentleman's highly constructive program. I think it is fine. I, like the gentleman from Ohio, am distressed to find these curtailing and crippling amendments. I am wondering whether these amendments which have taken away from the authority of the committee were instigated at the suggestion of any committees of this body, or was it some other body that was responsible for them.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that the original limitations were placed in the bill both times by the other body. We sought to satisfy them when the bill was introduced this year by opening up a little bit the limitation they have placed on us in the resolution last year. They quickly closed that limitation and we were back as limited, if not more so, than when we started.

Mr. MUNDT. One other question: If the resolution passes now in its somewhat weakened position, will it still enable you to have open and public hearings and present a printed record of everything that takes place and suggestions which are made regardless of whether they

apply to the specific language of the resolution?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, sir. And it will be in the discretion of the committee whether matters not absolutely germane to this, but included in other testimony, should be ruled out of order or not. I will say to the gentleman that we hoped to be able to get enough money to take care of the printing, but one of the Senate amendments cut us out of accepting voluntarily the help of the departments downtown, and we were limited to $15,000 for 2 years' operation or for a year and a half, or whenever the committee can complete its work. I would like to say at this time that if we cannot possibly get by with this amount, we will probably come back and ask for a small supplemental appropriation so that the hearings and the testimony can be made available to the Members of the House and to the general public. I think many ideas and many recommendations which will probably be made before this committee will be of intense national interest.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope whoever presides over the hearings will exercise a statesmanlike approach and permit suggestions to come in regardless of whether they happen to be particularly germane, so that out of the hearings we can get suggestions from across the country as to how to improve the efficiency of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Strictly speaking, this committee could not formally and legally permit a witness before it or permit a letter to be read before it which might suggest any possible change in the procedure or the rules of these perfect bodies which exist on either side of the Capitol. Is that not true?

Mr. MONRONEY. I hardly think the language would be such that it would force the committee to rule out of order incidental testimony that might be a part of general testimony on the improvement of Congress. I do not believe it goes that far, because it is provided that nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendation with respect to the rules of parliamentary procedure, and so on. We could not make any report recommending those changes if as a part of incidental testimony someone cared to mention something a little bit outside. I hardly think the committee would rule him completely out of order on that.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The point would be that the committee is allowed to expose its collective minds to such matters but cannot expose our minds to it by way of a report. I get the point.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am just wondering if the gentleman from Oklahoma would comment on this possibility: What would happen if some person would make some radical recommendation with respect to the set-up of Congress and the procedure and suggest perhaps that the term of office would be 4 years instead of 2 years or something like that, whether that person would be subject to investigation by the Committee on Un-American Activities for suggesting some change that would be un-American? Would the gentleman care to say anything about that phase of the subject?

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has control of the time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman from Michigan care to say anything about that?

Mr. MICHENER. I have nothing to say on that matter at this time, but I do not think that the Monroney committee will indulge in any practices which the gentleman from Pennsylvania might complain of. I feel that he has enough faith in the committee to believe that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I certainly do not think that the committee which is being discussed now would be guilty of any such action. But some zealous person may have an idea in his mind which might improve the procedure or the set-up of Congress. It occurs to me that the Committee on Un-American Activities might consider that that person would be a subject of investigation and inquisition.

Mr. MICHENER. Not being a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I would not want to express any opinion about what it might think.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just wanted to put out that suggestion as a sort of warning.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I heartily approve of the creation of this committee. I have been very much in favor of the effort of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] in creating the committee. One of the matters originally designed to be investigated by this committee and reported on was the matter of trying to create better relationship between the legislative and executive branches of government; and also to get better information for the Congress. At the time the resolution was filed I was hopeful, and I know the gentleman from Oklahoma was hopeful, that the committee could hear testimony and consider the proposal that I have been sponsoring for many, many, years, to make it possible to have a report and questioning period on the floor of the House during which time members of the Cabinet and high administrators could be invited here to give reports and to answer questions about the conduct of their departments and about public affairs in which Members of Congress are interested. As the resolution passed the House it contained a prohibition, but I understand the gentleman from Oklahoma and members of the Rules Committee considered that that prohibition would not prevent it from considering the proposition in which so many Members were interested, with reference to the report and questioning period. With the amendment added by the Senate, I understand it does prohibit the committee from considering that matter.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am afraid that is the situation. As we prepared the proviso in the House, the committee was prohibited from recommending any change in the precedents governing consideration of legislation on the floor. We were not allowed to recommend any change or suggestion in our parliamentary procedure governing legislation. But the Senate amendment further broadened this. Members specifically objected to the proposal offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, in the Senate Rules Committee. So in order to expedite the passage, we must admit the further limitation on the very interesting and constructive proposal that the gentleman from Tennessee has long advocated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think I should say for the benefit of the Members of the House I appeared this morning before the Rules Committee, together with the gentleman from Oklahoma, and asked the Rules Committee to refuse to agree to the Senate amendment which further prohibited the scope of this inquiry, or if they did agree to it, to agree to it with an amendment, which would give the committee at least insofar as the House is concerned, the right to go into and report on the proposition for a report and questioning period.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee authorized the gentleman from Oklahoma to agree to the Senate amendments. I am in a position where I am very much in sympathy with what the gentleman from Oklahoma desires to do. I dislike very much to stand in the way of getting the resolution agreed to in some form or other. I do not want to delay the functioning of the committee. Yet I am very disappointed, as I am sure many other Members of the House are, that the scope is not broad enough so that this proposition can be considered. Except for the delay and the fact that it might prolong the beginning of the committee for many, many weeks, I would feel inclined to offer a privileged amendment to agree to the amendment with an amendment. I wonder if the gentleman feels that he might recommend such procedure.

Mr. MONRONEY. Knowing the situation in the two Houses of Congress, and the very difficult time we have had over a period of 9 months, I would sincerely hope the gentleman from Tennessee, in his excellent spirit of fairness and cooperation, would permit this study to go forward, and hope that by making some improvements in our organization it will set the way and light the light to guide the Congress to other changes, as those may prove successful. I feel that sending this bill to conference would result in delay and would not accomplish the desirable thing the gentleman from Tennessee seeks.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that reluctant as I am to have the matter in which I am so much interested left out of this resolution, yet in my desire to cooperate

with the gentleman in getting this committee I am not going to object, nor am I going to offer the amendment to concur with an amendment which I had thought of offering. But I do want to say that I believe it is unfortunate for the Congress and for the House of Representatives that we cannot have a wider scope of inquiry and that we cannot consider a proposition which has been favorably recommended by leading citizens both in and out of Congress for many, many years.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate the great sense of fairness the gentleman from Tennessee has shown.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I wonder if my colleague from Oklahoma could enlighten the House somewhat as to the reason behind the reason for the wisdom of the other body's inserting in the resolution a provision that would preclude this committee from considering or at least making recommendation as to procedural matters here in the House, or as to the matter in which the gentleman from Tennessee is so much interested? I am at a loss to understand it. Perhaps the gentleman can give us some information as to the reason behind the reason.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the inquiry of my colleague. I believe the fundamental difficulty was fear that some recommendation or suggestion might be made by this committee modifying the rule of cloture in the other body. That has long been a very important question in the Senate and the effort was to prevent that from getting into the area of discussion. There was a limitation in last year's bill which prevented us from going into any recommendation or studying any change in the rules of either House. We sought to modify that so that we could preserve the precedents and the rules of procedure on the floors of the Houses in the consideration of legislation and draw a dividing line on that point; but in considering this over in the Senate Rules Committee they further insisted that there be a protection of the floor of the Senate against changes in cloture and the question and answer period.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to add that when the Monroney-Maloney resolution was before the House in the last Congress I made some observations with reference to the matter to which the gentleman has referred; in short, section 2 tells the committee to go on and make an investigation as to all factors affecting the carrying on of the business of the Congress, provided, however, it is prevented from doing a number of things. No clean-cut directive is given to the committee to investigate whatever the committee might think would be helpful and report back to the Congress. I am convinced, however, that this is the most authority the committee can get.

I doubt whether this committee will be permitted to consider or report any matter affecting the procedure on the floor of either House. That is about the sum of it. A half a loaf is better than no authority at all.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include a newspaper clipping and some resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech delivered on Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article written by Mr. R. H. Markham, entitled "Our Political Immorality," which appeared in the January 31, 1945, issue of the Christian Century.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short resolution by the Legislature of the State of Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain news articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

INTENT OF CONGRESS WITH REFERENCE TO REGULATION OF BUSINESS OF INSURANCE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, with House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. SUMNERS of Texas, WALTER, and HANCOCK.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICA'S PHYSICAL FITNESS FAILURE

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, do you realize that if one-half of the Selective Service registrants rejected for military duty because of physical unfitness had qualified, it would not have been necessary to draft a single American father; that there would have been no disruption of the thousands of American homes?

Rejections for service in the Navy averaged 54.9 percent and the Army about 50.1 percent. These appalling statistics certainly constitute a problem of grave importance and national concern. This high rate of physical deficiencies was brought to light by some 33,000 doctors and 10,000 dentists in their examination of 14,000,000 Selective Service registrants up to January 1, 1945. Even when the physical standards were lowered, the rejection rate continued at such an alarming level as to preclude the filling of military quotas except through the induction of married men and fathers. Up to January 1, 1945, the IV-F pool reached the amazing total of approximately 5,000,000 registrants. In addition, the Army has announced the release of thousands of soldiers on Certificates of Disability Discharge because of their inability to stand the arduous and rigorous duties of all-out war training. Conservatively estimated, the figures for those between the ages of 18 and 37 who are adjudged incapable of military service with the fighting forces now exceed 5,000,000 men.

These figures clearly emphasize a national health need of the greatest importance. This health need, like war itself, calls for an all-out national effort. As Col. Leonard G. Rountree, Medical Director of Selective Service, so aptly stated in his treatise in Hygeia, the magazine copywritten by the American Medical Association:

> We have seen only the top of the iceberg as revealed in the examination of the registrants constituting about one-tenth of the population of the Nation. The registrant presumably represents a cross section of the best manpower in the Nation. The physical fitness of the total population may be inferred by comparison.

The higher percentage of health deficiencies is, however, only part of the picture which has been revealed since the outbreak of the war. Another factor was equally startling. Obviously, even the healthy—those who could be classified I-A—were often below the physical top condition which could and should have been expected of healthy American men. The Army and Navy found that the healthy American youth did not possess the strength nor the endurance required to stand the physical strain or to do the vigorous physical work necessary without preliminary laborious conditioning. Most men needed 3 or 4 months of systematic physical training before they were capable of full participation in military activity.

Through National Selective Service the spotlight of public opinion was focused for the first time on the neglect of physical fitness of American men, women, and children in general. What ails American

youth? Did we in this generation shed our inheritance of the durable, hardy, and rugged qualities of our founding fathers? Have we grown soft because of too much button, lever and pedal ingenuity?

These statistics startled me. They made me realize how important and essential a high degree of physical fitness is toward insuring the future welfare of our Nation, no less in peacetime than in time of war. With that objective in mind, on February 7, 1945, I, a Democrat, in collaboration with my Republican colleague—to avoid any political partisanship—the gentleman from New Jersey, FRED A. HARTLEY, JR., introduced H. R. 2044, to establish a United States Commission for the Promotion of Physical Fitness. The bill provides an appropriation for the functioning of such a Commission. In its preamble, the bill sets forth the facts that weakness in physical condition and lack of motor skill has attributed to great loss of life and material, to needless expenditure of funds, and that the safety, happiness, and general welfare of all our people demand that the abject failures of the past to provide suitable and adequate physical training shall not be permitted to continue or recur in the future. Such a program in effect prior to this present war would have saved thousands of lives and millions and millions of dollars.

Further, the bill recognizes that any sound plan for insuring a reasonable degree of preparedness inevitably calls for basic and universal training of our youth, both boys and girls, on a continuing and graded progression, beginning in the kindergarten and leading to participation in active recreation in later life. This physical fitness program—vague to few Americans—means that the task of physical education will center around conditioning for strength, endurance, and agility based on an adequate regimen of hygienic living. It should begin with—

(a) Medical examinations in the kindergarten and grade school.

(b) Disclosure of physical defects.

(c) Attention to those defects that are correctible.

(d) A program in the schools, colleges, and industry of gymnastics, calisthenics, and all kinds of sports to develop healthy bodies and sound minds.

Attaining physical fitness is a training or conditioning process. It may be developed naturally if vigorous activities are regularly a part of one's work or play. But if physical fitness does not result naturally from one's regimen of work or play, its achievement will require planned daily participation in conditioning or athletic activities. Remember these facts: Less than one-half of all the youth in this war have had adequate school preinduction physical fitness training. A recent survey by the Federal Office of Education revealed that prior to Pearl Harbor 49 percent of the boys and 53.3 percent of the girls in their last 2 years of high school did not have any physical-education program at all. These figures show the burden with which the American youth was confronted when sudden military needs demanded his strength, stamina, and agility in home camps and on foreign battle fronts. High-ranking military officials have constantly reiterated the need for physical fitness in the armed forces to insure the necessary strength and endurance. All have stressed for example, the dire need of teaching our youth to swim. This need is universal and imperative. Its importance was sadly proven in the African invasion—November 1942—where it is known that hundreds of lives would have been saved had any of these men been able to keep afloat for but 10 minutes.

To repulse that group of obstructionists and oppositionists who object to anything originating in Washington as Federal regimentation, the bill distinctly provides that the national commission shall not interfere with State's rights. In order to participate in this program each State must enact enabling legislation and match with State or local funds 50 percent of the Federal grant. The Federal Government does not appoint any State administrator. Instead, each State would appoint its own administrator of physical fitness.

Experts agree that had America adopted a physical-fitness program a decade ago one-half of the registrants in the present IV-F pool would be in the armed forces today, and very few married men with families—if any—would have been inducted. Also the present controversial work-or-fight legislation would not have been necessary.

I quote a recent conversation of Col. Leonard G. Rountree, Medical Director of Selective Service, with a wounded soldier back from Tunisia confined to an Army hospital: "Son," he said, "did we neglect anything in your civilian life or training that might have helped you avoid this injury?" "Colonel," the soldier replied, "I would still be in action if I could have run a little faster and a little farther. My buddies who could run faster and farther reached their fox holes before the German plane opened fire on us. I just couldn't make it. My legs gave out."

Let us examine, too, the civilian picture. A clinical test was made at the University of Illinois in which 1,000 men students participated. The result:

(a) Thirteen percent could not swim at all.

(b) Sixty-four percent could not swim 50 yards.

(c) Three and one-tenth percent could not chin themselves once.

(d) Twenty-five and nine-tenths percent could not chin themselves five times.

(e) Twenty-four and one-tenth percent could not jump an obstacle waist high.

(f) Forty-six percent failed the mile run in 7 minutes.

And mark you, these were hand-picked university students who should have been in tip-top physical condition.

Fellow Americans, let us awaken from our lethargy. Let us profit by our past lack of vision, foresight, and inaction. The Congress of the United States, with unanimity, has authorized appropriations of approximately $300,000,000,000 for the destruction of property and human life in this gigantic global war. Let us, with the same unanimity, appropriate the sum of $25,000,000—an insignificant comparable sum—as a sound investment in the future of American; an overall physical-fitness program. Facilities and equipment must be provided so that all Americans can enjoy their just heritage of being physically fit in peacetime as well as in time of war.

CHALLENGE TO CONGRESSMEN

Physical ability involving balance, flexibility, agility, strength, power, and endurance in a variety of performances sums up to motor fitness. Motor fitness emphasizes the more generalized gross and fundamental physical abilities which are dominated by development of the muscular energy and suppleness of the tissues and joints, including the aspects which are basically involved in athletic or work skills with the big muscles of the body rather than the finer low energy pressure skills. It means capacity to run, jump, charge, fall, climb, swim, ride, lift and carry loads, and endure long hours of continuous work.

In the clinical analysis taken at the University of Illinois, some 14.2 percent were adjudged by instructors to have poor—soft, flabby, or undeveloped physiques—and 50 percent could not make a hard abdominal wall to resist the fist pushed into it by an examiner.

How many Congressmen could chin themselves five times? How many Members could run 50 yards—don't mention the time—without resting for a half hour? How many can swim 50 yards? How many could stand a vigorous paddle ball game? In fact, how many Members actually visit the House gym?

Where we failed, do you not want the youth of the future generations to have the opportunity to build strong bodies? The startling statistics on the physical defects brought out as a result of the war clearly indicates that we must pursue a corrective course in the future.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry I missed the very first part of the gentleman's address. Therefore, it is possible my question has been answered in that portion of it. I as one Member of the House appreciate the fact that he has brought this measure before us. I think he is rendering a real service. I do not know any Member of the House who is better equipped by his own experience to bring this measure before us. Do I understand that the Commission provided for by this bill is not so much for the purpose that it itself would carry out a program but rather that it would set forth standards and objectives to be reached and attempt to coordinate the work of States and localities and the various agencies in the States and localities in reaching that objective in carrying out that program?

Mr. WEISS. That is the sole objective of our bill jointly introduced by my distinguished colleage from New Jersey, FRED HARTLEY, JR., and myself.

There are two States now which have legislation providing for programs of physical fitness. The State of New York

has already enacted legislation and they have a splendid program of their own. The State of Pennsylvania now has a bill before its legislature. The idea is to have each State enact enabling legislation and set up minimum standards in a program of physical fitness in the schools and in industry.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What would the Commission do to bring that about?

Mr. WEISS. The proposed legislation provides that where States do not have existing enabling legislation, the Governor of that State shall designate any agency to handle the program of physical fitness, until the legislature enacts enabling legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would grants be made to the State?

Mr. WEISS. Yes; section 11, page 7, of H. R. 2044 provides:

> Each State and Territory shall be required to match by State or local funds, or both, 50 percent of the appropriations authorized under this section.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Grants would not be made unless it was so matched; is that correct?

Mr. WEISS. Yes; that is a definite provision and providing further that State commissions set up minimum standards on physical fitness in order to secure the benefit of Federal grants.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I merely want to add this one thought, that at the present time during the war we are very much alive to this problem of physical fitness. I think it would be a very sad commentary if after we have ceased to ask the younger generation to protect our civilization in wartime we should forget about these things which will remain equally important after the war, to have a measure which is needed now from a very real and basic point of view. I hope that the gentleman's effort will be shared by enough Members of the House so that will not happen.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. This program which he envisages would not in any way retard the mental development of the youth of the Nation or would not result in any regimentation in effect, would it?

Mr. WEISS. That is the very thing the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman HARTLEY, and myself tried to avoid, in view of the statement made by a few of the news sports commentators in the country that for years professional physical culturists have attempted a program of regimentation, by the appointment of deputy administrators in the respective States, we absolutely avoid that possibility. Our bill in no manner interferes with the mental training of our youth because compulsory physical-fitness training will become a part of the daily school curricula beginning in the elementary grades and continuing in high schools and colleges. There will also be a program for men and women in industry.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is the point I wanted to clear up. I wanted to make it clear that this would not be forcing heavy physical exercises which the youth could not stand up under.

Mr. WEISS. Our bill does not set up a "Hitler youth movement" idea—it provides for building sound bodies and correcting physical defects existing in many of our youngsters in the elementary grades.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It would be sort of an advisory and educational program coupled with enough of incentive so that the youth of the country would improve their health and which would result in lasting benefits.

Mr. WEISS. That is exactly what we are trying to do.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is what the gentleman has in mind. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

FINAL BURIAL OF AMERICAN VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is as much of a disappointment to me as it is to the vast number of this audience that I am not able to extend my remarks at this time. However, I do not have a prepared address and for that reason it is going to be necessary for me to speak extemporaneously. My purpose in taking this time today is to introduce a bill which I think is necessary and which I think must be studied and considered by the House of Representatives with all possible speed after such study is undertaken. I regret I am not in a position to prognosticate, nor is anybody else in the country, as to the number of heroes who will have lost their lives in the battle fronts throughout the world in defense of America by the time the war ceases. Nevertheless, it is going to be necessary for us to peer into the future and to provide for some sort of plan to bring the bodies of those boys back so that they can be buried in their family plots, no matter how humble the home.

So I have today introduced a bill to provide for bringing back to the United States after the present war for burial in the United States the remains of persons who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States and who are now buried in foreign lands.

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the American Battle Monuments Commission, upon application of the mother or father (or if they be dead, the next of kin) of any serviceman or servicewoman who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States during the present war and who is buried in a foreign land, is authorized and directed, under such regulations as it may prescribe, to bring back, or to pay the necessary expenses of bringing back, to the United States, the remains of such serviceman or servicewoman for burial in the United States.
>
> SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.
>
> SEC. 3. The application provided for in section 1 shall be made within 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that my remarks are not contemplating in any way, shape, or manner the appropriation of money for the construction of a national cemetery in any State of the Union. I do not think the public is interested in the creation of national cemeteries at this time. According to figures which I have received from cemetery associations throughout the land, emphasis should be placed upon local cemeteries, so that the hundreds of thousands of remains of those who have died in battle can be brought back to their own local plots of ground and given burial. If it is necessary for the Government to pay for the purchase of a grave in a local cemetery, I believe we should provide for it. I hope the Congress is interested to the extent of appropriating money for the family to purchase a grave in the local cemetery.

As I have said I am not interested in bringing up the national cemetery issue. It is beside the point. I think the Congress will get to that subject before many days. But I simply want to emphasize that if we are going to inaugurate any kind of program after the war for bringing back the remains of the soldiers who have died in battle, then it is time we consider that proposition now. It is necessary if we are going to consider the problem to do so now and not wait for 2 or 3 years after the war when the enthusiasm for such a plan has run its course.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. While the gentleman from New York has no opposition to a national cemetery, I am sure he feels that the deceased veteran should be buried wherever his nearest of kin wish the body to be interred.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman. I know everybody is interested in this. I have had a great many letters on the subject.

This bill provides for a 5-year program of bringing those remains back, no matter where they happen to be buried, whether on the beaches of Normandy or far away Saipan, the far reaches of the Arctic or the little known Antipodes—wherever the World War has taken our beloved heroes. I know the people of the United States want to see them brought back; they want them to be brought back to rest in the fond soil of this their native land. They have every right to expect that such steps will be taken on the part of this Government.

After the war, this program can be instituted immediately. I do not know how much money it is going to cost. I will not advocate any stipulated sum at this time; but I do know that such a program will be in great demand on the part of the people of this Nation, on the part of the mothers and fathers and of the families of our servicemen who have sacrificed so much and who today are not even considering the question of bringing their remains back until after the war. It may take 2, or 3, or 4 years, but I have provided in this bill for a 5-year period within which to bring this program to a successful culmination.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I believe the gentleman from New York is very wise in providing a 5-year period, because he realizes, I am sure, as we all do, that immediately following this war we are going to be hard pressed for shipping facilities to transport foodstuffs, clothing, and equipment to the starving people of Europe and the other nations of the world.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Taking that fact into consideration, I extended the time to 5 years, because I realized the shipping facilities would be somewhat limited immediately after the war; but in view of the fact that we have built one of the greatest merchant marines and one of the greatest navies of all time—

Mr. SHORT. Not one of the greatest, but by far the greatest.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I stand corrected; I agree that it is the greatest Navy of all time. There will be plenty of room in these ships to place the remains of those boys who died in the defense of this great country; and I sincerely hope this will be accomplished. I hope there will not be opposition on the part of those who argue there are cargoes more precious to be carried to our shores than the remains of our heroes. I insist that this bill be given early consideration.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I am very sorry if I gave the gentleman to understand that I considered any cargo more precious than the bodies of our dead heroes; but I think perhaps we could keep the living from starving before we transfer the dead. The dead might be able to wait a little longer.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sure the gentleman will agree as he has already indicated in his remarks that a 5-year period would probably be long enough to work out the various phases of the problem and get the remains back. Much of the planning already has been done, and the money can be appropriated by the Congress very quickly. Many of the facilities are already set up for transporting the bodies back from the far reaches of the earth where our boys have done battle. So I have no hesitancy on the score of the ability of the authorities in our War Department and the Navy whose facilities will be called upon to carry out this act.

There is one other question I would like to discuss at this time in connection with the 5-year program. A little later on legislation should be introduced calling for the appropriation of enough money so that any family in the United States that has lost a member thereof in the armed forces in battle might purchase a grave in a local cemetery. I know that is where the majority of the people want their boys buried when their remains come back. They should be placed in that hallowed ground near what the soldier knew as his home. I want to see money appropriated to purchase a grave in the local cemeteries.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, some parents will prefer to have their sons and their daughters remain buried where they fell. The gentleman will recall that following the last war Congress provided funds making possible the journey of Gold Star Mothers to visit the graves of their sons in France. I wonder if the gentleman does not think we should have legislation similar to that a little later on in order that the wives, fathers, and mothers of these deceased veterans that they prefer to remain where they fell might make the trip?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. For the gentleman's information, I have already introduced a resolution in this session of Congress providing a pilgrimage for Gold Star Mothers and also fathers to the places where their sons fell and wherever they may be buried so that the chance will be given them to view the place where they fell and to visit that hallowed ground. I think the choice should rest solely with the individual family in America here. If they want to leave the remains in that far-away spot, and visit it, under the resolution I have introduced providing for such a pilgrimage, they can do so. On the other hand, they should have the opportunity of having those remains brought back to this country and they themselves should be permitted to decide whether they want the boys buried in a national cemetery or in their own local cemetery.

There has been a lot of argument as between the benefits of the national cemeteries and the local cemeteries. For my part I feel that the national cemetery will tend toward regimentation of the graves of our heroes. I have a pamphlet here, for instance, showing the pictures of these graves in national cemeteries and the monuments that have been erected. While I do not desire to take the credit away from the solemnity and the effect of the national cemetery, still to see those crosses, row after row of them, and to view the unrelenting type of grave, in my humble opinion, brings a feeling of sadness and remorse. Those graves are set out in regimented form. It is much more effective to see the grave in a family cemetery in the locality from which the soldier came, and I think the families ought to be allowed to provide graves in those cemeteries.

Mr. SHORT. While I have a great deal of sympathy for the gentleman's resolution, I cannot keep from feeling that it is rather ill-timed.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think it is rather timely.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the gentleman's resolution provides that we will have 5 years following the war to do this. Does not the gentleman feel that we should perhaps concentrate all of our attention and energies toward winning the war before we start considering the matter of taking care of graves? In other words, we must put first things first.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Can there be any doubt in the gentleman's mind as to the interest that the House and the Congress and the country have manifested in that subject?

Mr. SHORT. Let us win the war as soon as possible in order that there may be fewer to bring back when it is all over.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think we are all endeavoring to do that. I am sure, as far as the gentleman and I are concerned, we are united on that point, but nevertheless we must give sufficient time to it.

Mr. SHORT. That is true.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. And sufficient consideration.

Mr. SHORT. May I say to the gentleman that the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I happen to be a member, has had under consideration this subject and other allied subjects, but we will have to cross those bridges when we get to them.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is one reason I am so glad the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, is here today so that he has an opportunity to participate in this discussion. I think it is most timely. I think it is something that the entire House should consider immediately, just as soon as possible, because if we are going to inaugurate this 5-year program, we want to set it up and put it into effect just as soon as peace is declared. I join with him in the hope and prayer that the day of peace will come just as soon as possible. However, I am sure that we must set up the machinery now in order to put it into effect when the proper time comes. The point was made by another member of the Committee on Military Affairs the other day when I talked about this subject that this was done after World War No. 1; that those who wanted the remains of their boys brought back after World War No. 1 were granted that privilege. I do not know what type of legislation was brought to the floor of the House at that time, but I do know it is going to take legislation of this type now. It is going to take some definite measure in order to make that a law and put the machinery in motion so that those remains can be brought back. That is the reason I have introduced this bill today. We cannot go on and expect that this will be done unless some action is taken. I assume that some legislation of this kind was brought up at the end of World War No. 1, and I, for one, am not going to let grass grow under my feet in hesitating to bring forth a like measure at this time.

The hour is growing late, and I shall not take any more time. In closing, I want to reiterate my hope that action will be taken and that the House will consider it forthwith, and that the Committee on Military Affairs will study this bill carefully, and that they will come forth with some sort of recommendation for action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a memorial passed by the Arizona Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two brief articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GERMAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in the House a resolution directing the appointment of a special committee to make a complete investigation of the prisoner-of-war problem within the United States with a view that we will not only establish some definite policy but also improve our methods.

For your information, we have within the boundaries of the United States today almost 400,000 German prisoners of war. There are a negligible number of Japanese prisoners and, of course, the Italians are no longer considered prisoners of war. Therefore, when I hereafter speak of prisoners of war, I mean German prisoners of war. I have made a thorough study of this problem and I must say that I sincerely believe it has been the most outstanding mismanaged part of this war. Not long ago we had a rather spectacular escape from a camp located near Phoenix, Ariz. Twenty-five hardened Nazi fanatics dug a tunnel some 200 feet long and made their escape. After approximately 6 weeks, the last of these prisoners were apprehended. Among them was the notorious Captain Wattenberg, navigator of the *Graf Spee*, and more recently commander of a German submarine crew. He was the last one to be picked up and, incidentally, when he was found he had money in his possession which indicated that he must have received outside help.

I am particularly concerned about the situation surrounding the handling of these prisoners of war, not only because of the hazards of future escapes and the great consternation and fear that it throws into the citizens located near these camps, but I am also very much concerned because of the laxity and absence of policy in the handling of this most important phase of the war. I have in my possession many letters from people who live near, or have been connected with, the prisoner-of-war camps. These letters express fear on the part of our citizens when they are aware that desperate criminals are at large who would not hesitate to commit crimes of violence in order to obtain money and help to complete their escape either to Mexico or to some other place where they may successfully return to Germany. Particularly in Arizona we have many war plants and air-training fields, which are open to sabotage from these prisoners while they are at large. Of course, we use these war prisoners for farm labor. I think it is perfectly right for us to use the prisoners in various kinds of labor which would not endanger our war effort. However, there are instances, and I have documentary proof to the effect, where some of these war prisoners have been permitted to go unattended around airfields. I have one letter from a man in Ohio which states that he is afraid that his plane will be sabotaged, because he knows that German war prisoners go freely about the airfield where his plane is stationed.

I am more primarily concerned with the general lack of policy in the over-all picture of handling these prisoners than I am in specific instances of neglect in administration. I am informed by the War Department that only those in limited service are used in supervising the prisoner-of-war camps. Until recently the commanding officer over the camp at Papago Park, near Phoenix, Ariz., was a colonel who was too sick with arthritis to be stationed in any other place except in the warm climate of Arizona. I am informed that other members of the administrative staff and the guards and attendants under them are limited-service men, who, for various reasons, were not physically or mentally qualified to be in the Regular Army. Now, I realize that these men can be used to advantage in some work around the camps, but I maintain that the administrative personnel of the camps should be physically well and mentally capable men. The men who are employed to administer the functions of these agencies should have special training. Not only is there insufficient training but I have also been informed that many of the men in limited service who are used in guarding these prisoners are mentally incapable of being in the Regular Army. This may be all right in the case of a guard, but such incapables should never be in an authoritative administrative position.

The theory of calculated risk should never be used in those camps where desperate and fanatical Nazis are stationed. I am informed that regardless of the fact that the camp located near Phoenix, Ariz., confines some of the worst Nazis and is even known as the Alcatraz of all camps, only one out of every four guard towers are being manned. As a result of this inefficiency, the prisoners of war were able to dig a tunnel for some 200 feet under the very eyes of the guards. It took several months to dig this tunnel. The prisoners were able to dispose of all the dirt from the tunnel within the camp without being detected.

I think it is time that the War Department should see that the management of all these camps is checked and that only capable, experienced personnel in good health be in charge of the administration. I realize that it would not be wise for us to start a contest of cruelty with the Germans; it is evident that they would be the winners in this sort of competition. We have many American boys within the prison camps of Germany, and obviously we would not want to bring onto them any hardships. However, I think it is reasonable for us to use good common sense in the treatment of the German prisoners of war under our supervision. I am reliably informed that in many instances there is not only laxity but there is indulgence and pampering of the war prisoners.

I have in my possession letters from guards in one camp where the guards had to stand out in zero weather while the prisoners enjoyed a soccer game inside a heated field house. I am informed that the prisoners of war receive two packages of cigarettes a day while our boys in the service only receive one pack—if they are even able to get that.

With regard to food—I suggest that if you will look over the menu of a prisoner-of-war camp, it might make you think that you are in the Waldorf-Astoria. I see no reason why these prisoners of war should be fed better than our American soldiers.

I want to speak now on the matter of policy, or, rather, I should say the lack of policies. We are fighting a war in the attempt to overcome aggression and with a view of setting up some kind of a plan to prevent another war like we are having now within the next generation. From time to time we see in the press and we hear radio comments concerning the policies that will be imposed upon Germany after the war in order to destroy militarism in that country. It is my contention that it is high time for us to start now to instill in the heart and mind of every German prisoner of war a wholesome respect for this country and the principles of democracy.

However, in spite of our talk about what we will do to Germany, we are permitting these prisoners of war to develop a contempt for our people and our Government. I am informed that the guards are scoffed at and laughed at and that there are instances where the commanding officers do not champion the cause of the guards and instead even penalize the guards for reporting the impudent acts of the prisoners. This has been done in the presence of the prisoners, which only increases their disrespect for our country and our people. I have in my possession a letter from a guard, whose name I do not feel inclined to release at this time, which relates an incident wherein prisoners refused to work and even used violent language on the guard and when the guard reported the incident to the commanding officer, the prisoners were mildly reprimanded and, in the presence of the prisoners, the guard was ordered to be confined to barracks for 3 days because the German said that the guard had used curse words even though the German admitted that he had cursed him first. I am also reliably informed that prisoners have been seen displaying the swastika on Army trucks and even in one instance near Chandler, Ariz., they were seen to display an improvised flag on a truck while armed guards sat in the driver's seat. There are many instances that have been reported in the press and by letter of the laxity in the handling of these prisoners, but I presume the most outstanding failure on the part of the War Department has been the lack of any organ or newspaper or document to properly and uniformly inform the prisoners of war within our jurisdiction. Our German foe uses a newspaper which is known as the Overseas Kid to inform the prisoners of war within their jurisdiction. The only information that our American boys, who are war prisoners in Germany can receive must come through that newspaper and, naturally, it is colored with the German point of view. I am informed that Russia, Great Britain, and Canada likewise have a newspaper or documentary form of imparting information to their prisoners of

war. Up until now our War Department has not established a policy of properly informing the war prisoners under our control.

I realize that it would be difficult and almost impossible to democratize some of these German prisoners. However, I firmly believe that we owe it to our country and to the future generations to see that these war prisoners, who are now under our supervision, are properly informed through some kind of a uniform document which should be edited by a board of strategy of intelligence, or whatever we choose to call it, for the purpose of molding the opinion of the war prisoners. All of this laxity and lack of proper information has led to a feeling of disregard and disrespect for the camp officers and for the country in general. I am told that in the camp near Phoenix there is no proper segregation and that notwithstanding the fact that the camp commander was informed that there would probably be a break, that no extraordinary precautions were taken to stop it. Within the camp the fanatical Nazis have such a strong grip over the internal camp organization that any prisoner who would like to renounce the principles of the Nazi Government would not dare speak his mind because he would be tried by a Nazi secret court and executed. Many such executions have been carried out.

By contrast, Canada carries on a policy which has broken down the Nazi organization within the camps. I think we could well afford to take a lesson from the Canadian system. I am informed that in the Phoenix camp one Gustav Ender, holder of the Nazi-coveted Blutorden, known as the "order of the blood" and which is held only by those who were participants in the Munich beer-hall putsch of 1923, is the actual dictator of the camp. He told Captain Wattenberg, who was the spokesman for the Germans of the camp, what to do and what to say. Conditions were so tense and so uncontrolled that even the guards would not dare to go into certain compounds wearing a necktie for fear that they would be strangled with it. On the other hand, in Canada every prisoner of war is on an equal basis with every other prisoner and there is an intelligence service carried on within the camps which properly informs the commanding officer on everything that occurs and on the personality and conduct of every prisoner. In this way, it is possible to control the fanatics by segregation. I am told that within our camps we permit the maintenance of the regular German Army organization. We permit the officers to retain their rank socially, and we also permit the fanatical Nazi sergeants to maintain their grip and control of the rank and file of the prisoners. In contrast with this, in Canada all men are put on an equal footing and by this means the sergeants, who have formerly been the backbone of the fanatical Nazi military machine, are kept apart from the rank and file of soldiers. We have within our power the possibility of doing a great deal of good for the future generations of the world. If we use the right policies, it may be possible for us to send back to Germany some of these war prisoners, who will carry with them a respect for our Government and our people.

I want to compliment the War Department on its attempt to work these prisoners in productive enterprises for the war effort where there is no danger of sabotage. I think it is a fine thing that we are using these war prisoners to produce the food that is so sorely needed for our country and our allies. It is much better for them personally to keep them busy and, obviously, it is only just that we should use them because our American boys are having to work in Germany. However, if we employ improved policies, I maintain that we will get even greater effort out of these prisoners than we are getting now. I believe that the improper handling of the war prisoners within our country has become a national scandal. Therefore, I propose that a special committee be appointed to carry on a complete investigation of this entire problem. If the public has been misinformed and the War Department is unjustly criticized, then the public is entitled to know the truth and the War Department is entitled to be vindicated. On the other hand, if it is found that there are inadequate and improper methods, and there is a need for improved policies, this investigation will be well worth while. This committee should make a complete investigation and a full report. It should not be a sham and a shallow investigation. It should be gone into thoroughly and a report should be made back to Congress on what has been done, with recommendations of the committee for future improvement. As I previously stated, it is outrageous for us to be so simple-minded to permit a half-million Germans to go back to Germany, after this war is over, with a feeling of nothing more than contempt for us and our Government and our principles when we had, within our power, the possibility of creating something constructive and something worth while to prevent another World War.

There are a negligible number of Japanese prisoners, and of course the Italians are no longer considered prisoners of war, so when I speak of prisoners of war I mean German prisoners of war.

This has been brought forcibly to my attention recently because some 25 desperate German criminals escaped from the prisoner of war camp at Papago Park near Phoenix, Ariz. You probably read about this incident in the paper. Among the escapees was one Captain Wattenberg, former captain of the *Graf Spee*, who escaped from Argentina and was later apprehended commanding a German submarine.

This problem has become a national scandal. We have reason to feel that the War Department has not only made some grave and serious errors in administrative matters but also is suffering from a complete lack of over-all policy in trying to administer these war prison camps.

There has been no definite segregation of the Nazis from the anti-Nazis. Of course, it has become well known that the German prisoners of war are pampered. I have some specific instances which I wish to call to the attention of the House. One of them I think demonstrates the laxity with which these camps are being administered.

Not long ago in the small town of Chandler, Ariz., some 20 miles from Phoenix, a deputy sheriff stopped an Army truck which was carrying some German prisoners of war. It was being driven by armed United States Army guards. However, the prisoners of war were openly displaying an improvised Nazi flag. On other occasions trucks have been observed with the Nazi swastika painted on them.

In general this demonstrates the attitude on the part of the German prisoners of war throughout the country to the administrators over them. I have in mind a particular incident, and I have documentary proof of it. I have many letters in my possession which will bear out the things I am telling you. In this instance a guard in a prisoner of war camp was attempting to have some prisoners do some work. The prisoners refused and even cursed the guard. After the guard reported the three German prisoners involved to the administrative officer, that officer not only reprimanded the guard in the presence of the German prisoners but confined him to barracks for 3 days.

I also have in mind an instance where these prisoners have been permitted to go at large without being attended. It would not be so dangerous for the prisoners to go at large in the fields where they are working, but some of the camps are located near important war plants. We have in my State many flying fields and some important war plants. It would be possible for these prisoners to carry on sabotage there.

Some of the prisoners were at large for as long as 6 weeks in the recent escape at Phoenix, and there have been more than 1,200 escapes in the history of these camps in the United States. Many of the prisoners are still at large.

I have a letter from a gentleman in Ohio who is afraid to take his own plane off the flying field because German prisoners are admitted to the field and go about unattended. He states in his letter he has reason to believe that some of them may even sabotage his plane and consequently he may have a wreck and lose his own life. We have had many outstanding train accidents in this country. We have had many airplane wrecks in this country. I dare say that some of those have been brought about by escaped prisoners of war.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Would not this investigation you are referring to be an excellent subject for our new Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. It possibly could be. I feel that it is of sufficient importance to warrant the creation of a special committee and I have introduced a resolution for a special committee. I feel that if the War Department is so negligent as to permit some of the things

to go on that the general public has been informed are going on and which the press and radio have reported, a committee should investigate it; and if the War Department has been unjustly criticized it should be vindicated.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The thought just expressed has come to me also, that this is a matter over which the newly created Committee on Un-American Activities might take jurisdiction. But when I got similar reports, as my colleague reported them, from Phoenix and elsewhere in Arizona, I took the matter up with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and turned over to him certain correspondence. Chairman MAY notified me as long as authorization was continued to the Committee on Military Affairs that committee would take action in the case. I agree with my colleague, however, that somebody ought to do it, and if it is not done by the Military Affairs Committee, it will be done, I am sure by another committee.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I listened last night to Walter Winchell. He referred to the gentleman from Arizona and also to one or two of the incidents to which the gentleman has referred, namely, the transporting of certain German war prisoners who exhibited the Swastika or the Nazi flag. If that is true, it reveals not only the understandable but contemptible attitude of these Nazis and their haughty insolence and audacious arrogance, but at the same time it reveals an extreme negligence and an inexcusable lack of discipline on the part of our Army.

I agree with the gentleman from Arizona that if those charges are true, the ones responsible for such deplorable conditions should be properly punished. If they are not true, then they should be vindicated. I do feel I should say as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs that after receiving many complaints from different sections of the country we investigated certain instances and found out that the charges were really unwarranted and unfounded. While we have had a great many escapes, a few are unavoidable and are to be expected, but practically all of these prisoners have been captured and only a comparatively small number are still at large. I do not want the public to get the wrong impression from a statement that the gentleman made a few moments ago and I am sure he does not want the public to get the impression that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and our law-enforcement officials in this country have broken down in failing to prevent train wrecks and airplane crashes. That is a rather general blanket charge which the gentleman made. No doubt there is perhaps some question of saboteurs or escaped prisoners contributing to some of the sabotage that is going on, but I think the gentleman should be extremely careful in making a broad blanket charge unless we have specific and definite facts upon which to base those charges.

I will say to the gentleman from Arizona, realizing you have had so much trouble in your State, I want to congratulate you for bringing this matter before the Congress and the American people. I can assure the gentleman if he will turn over the letters, the data, the documentary evidence, and the proof that he has to our Committee on Military Affairs, action will be taken on it.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I wish to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. I am sure the Military Affairs Committee is very alert to the necessity of seeing that a thing of this kind is taken care of promptly. However, I felt that it was of such importance, even beyond the scope of our military jurisdiction because of certain matters which I will discuss later, I introduced a resolution providing for a special committee, because I think it is an over-all policy that should be considered, with recommendations. Not only for an investigation but for the laying down of a policy of handling these prisoners, for the future peace and security of this country.

I have many letters, as I mentioned to the gentleman. However, I would be reluctant to release the names on some of those letters, because some of them are guards within the prison camps, and obviously would be made subject to severe punishment. I know they have been confined to barracks because they reported malconduct of prisoners to their commanding officers. In that respect, I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that only those in limited service are permitted to participate in this program. It may be all right for those in limited service to be guards, if they are mentally and physically capable of being guards. But those in limited service are many times not only physically incapacitated but some of them are mentally incapacitated. I have in mind that the commanding officer at the camp where we recently had this outstanding escape was a sick man, so sick that he should not have been in the Army. He asked to be transferred to Phoenix, in order to enjoy the sunshine climate. He had arthritis. I am told there were other members of the staff who were too ill to be active in the service.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Under those circumstances the War Department more than the prisoners themselves is to be censured and condemned.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is right. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Naturally, being a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, if I had any prejudice it would be for the Army and the officers, but the gentleman well knows I am one member of that committee who does not believe in the infallibility of gold stars in a lot of braid.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is what I wanted to call attention to. Most certainly the administrative officers in these camps should be men who are well and who are mentally capable. That is something the War Department should check into very carefully.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I certainly endorse what the gentleman has said, and the need of it, but it seems to me that should be the function of the Army Intelligence. Has this been reported to the Army Intelligence and to the Inspector General's Department?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I myself and my colleagues have conferred with the Provost Marshal's office. They know of the letters I have. Of course, they have put into operation some improvements. They have promised to make other improvements. But if the gentleman will permit me to proceed, I will tell you some things that will clarify some things you have in mind.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is one point if you will permit a further interruption. The Inspector General certainly ought to immunize those who have factual evidence that would reveal indications of this kind in a camp. I would suggest to the gentleman from Arizona that when he further pursues this subject he ask for immunization of those men.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I understand they have removed the commanding officer at the Phoenix post, who was in charge at the time of this notorious escape.

I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that within Great Britain, Canada, Brazil, Russia, and even Germany there is a definite plan and policy for the treatment of war prisoners. They are in segregation. We have some segregation, but there is no segregation to separate from the Nazis those who would sympathize with democratic principles. Within the camp at Phoenix I have definite information that Captain Wattenberg, a notorious Nazi, was permitted to act as spokesman of the camp for several months. But even he did not run the camp. It was run by one Gustav Ender, who had the coveted Nazi decoration of the Order of Blutorden—that is, the Order of the Blood—which can be held only by those who participated in the 1923 Munich beer hall putsch. He wielded such a strong dictatorship over the camp that he even had secret trials of prisoners of war, of those who did not want to sympathize with the Nazis, and even executed some of the prisoners of war; yet nothing has been done to bring those executioners to judgment and punishment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In this country?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. In this country, within prisoner-of-war camps in this country. It has happened in other prisoner-of-war camps. There is no special training for the guards. Many of them have formerly been IV–F's; they are all limited-service men. As far as I am concerned, I would welcome bringing back some of the boys who have served on the battlefields of France and Germany and letting them become guards. I am sure they would have a sterner attitude.

Another thing I wish to call to the attention of the House is the fact that

in most other countries, Allied and foes alike, they have one instrument to inform the prisoners of war within their countries and that instrument, a newspaper, for instance in Germany is called the Overseas Kid. Naturally it is colored with Nazi propaganda. I am not proposing that we propagandize the German prisoners of war but I believe it is high time we did something to prevent another world war. We have within our jurisdiction some 400,000 or nearly a half million prisoners of war. We are doing nothing to educate them. I realize it is impossible to change some of them from their belief in nazi-ism, but a lot of them would like to know something about democracy. They ridicule the guards, they spit on them, they laugh at them. In one instance they kept throwing their baseballs over the fence, not once but many times, so the guards would have to chase the balls, for it was an order of the officer in charge that when the ball went over a fence a guard should get it and return it to the prisoners. These things have engendered in the prisoners a general attitude of defiance and contempt. Nothing is done to educate them to have respect and regard for our country and our principles.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. We all will agree, of course, that laxity should not be tolerated, and maudlin sympathy should not be put up with; but the gentleman from Arizona will admit that the handling of German prisoners or any other prisoners is a rather difficult proposition and that we must be reasonable in our treatment of them because of fear of reprisal on the part of Nazis, who have many of our men prisoners inside Germany.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for that observation and had intended to bring it out. Naturally, we would not want to get into a contest of brutality because we know who would win. Canada has a very good system of handling her prisoners. Canada has not gone into a program of brutality.

They merely use an educational process. They have one organ or one instrument or one newspaper written in German which the Nazis receive, giving all the information they are to receive. And I might call attention to another very important improvement they have made. Canada has segregated the dominating Nazi sergeants from the rest of the prisoners. In our camps we permit the sergeant, who is the backbone of the Nazi organization within the army, to remain in the camp with the rank and file soldier and any man who would like to renounce nazi-ism is afraid to do so because he might be executed. Canada, on the other hand, has introduced some improvements. They have their informers and if trouble is developing they immediately make a shift, they make a change, and have experienced a great deal of success in the last 6 months or year in the program.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I agreed with the gentleman's idea of educating these people to our methods of living insofar as the impracticability or impossibility of it is concerned; but it certainly has been demonstrated in Russia where many Nazi generals were taken prisoner. They were converted to the Russian way of life to the point where they revolted against their own German men who were fighting Russia at the time. If Russia has found a way, there is no reason why we cannot find a way.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I propose that this committee work out a plan and set up a board of strategy or a board of intelligence or whatever you want to call it, so that we will create an over-all plan in order that within a short time, within the next few months or year, or during the time we will have these German prisoners within our jurisdiction, we can bring these prisoners to the point where they will have some respect, some regard, for democracy. They feel we are soft, that we are subject to contempt, because we permit them to carry on an attitude of scorn toward us. After this board has set up a program, then we can do what some of the other countries have done. We do not want another war and we have it within our power to send back to Germany a half million or more Germans who might respect democracy, and who might feel that America has something instead of sending back a lot of men who will still carry an attitude of contempt for us.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman, as an attorney, would probably favor and has favored the segregation of criminals in our own penal institutions; that is, the juvenile delinquents separate from the hardened criminals. I suppose the gentleman has worked toward that end in handling our peacetime prisoners.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Yes; and I have in mind our present policy. Our present policy is one of calculated risk. We take 400,000 men and we keep them until the war is over and we work them. May I right here compliment the War Department on using these men in endeavors that do not endanger the war effort; for instance, on the farms, where we need them. But the program thus far is mere detention and does not take care of the internal problems and the post-war problems.

Mr. MURDOCK. We segregate our own peacetime prisoners because we do not want the younger prisoners contaminated by the older and hardened criminals. But the situation is far different and more serious in the case of prisoners of war. We are sending back these prisoners after the war and if we do not do something to educate them properly they will go back as fanatical Nazis ready to create a third world war. We ought at least to separate them into two classes while here.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Who knows but what we are harboring another Hitler in our prisoner-of-war camps right now? Right in line with the comment of my colleague from Arizona may I say that we have done a great deal of talking about preventing a third world war, we talk about what we are going to do to Germany, that we are going to demilitarize them, we are going to take away their heavy industry. But it is within our grasp now and we have the possibility of doing more than demilitarization could ever do; we have an example which has just been called to our attention a few minutes ago in reference to what Russia has been able to do by properly informing their prisoners of war. We are doing nothing to inform these prisoners within our jurisdiction.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman is right in pointing out that our psychological warfare has been the weakest and poorest perhaps in all the world.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. The best way to make these converts is through fair but firm treatment. Earlier in his remarks the gentleman mentioned a point that I think is significant, which he should perhaps elaborate upon or emphasize, and that is the extreme danger and risk that this country takes by having the War Department establish a prisoner-of-war camp near some strategic war plant or factory.

Last night, in his radio broadcast, Walter Winchell pointed out that it is contemplated establishing a prisoner-of-war camp near a huge powder factory in the State of Oklahoma. I do not know just where that is, but I am going to check up on it. I do not think that we should blame the prisoners for our own sheer stupidity. That thing, of course, should not happen. One prisoner who escapes could, with the light of a match, perhaps blow the whole thing to smithereens.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Missouri, because what we really need is an over-all strategic board to revise our entire program of handling these prisoners of war. If we had such a program we would never have any criticism. As I said earlier, if the War Department is not subject to criticism, then I think they should have a complete investigation to vindicate them, because there are not only many rumors but there are many incidents of mismanagement and lack of policy reported daily. I might call the attention of the House to the fact that these prisoners of war actually fare much better than our boys on the battlefield. I was told by the War Department that they were under the Geneva Convention; that they received the same food as our boys in the training camps. But if you look over one of the menus in a prisoner-of-war camp, you might think that you were in one of the most outstanding hotels in our country.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, at that point, the gentleman will agree that we are bound by the Geneva Convention.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I think we are probably one of the countries that

has tried to stay by it, and I am not suggesting that we break the Geneva Convention.

Mr. SHORT. We should not violate it because our enemies do.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. Imitate not the oppressor or borrow any of his ways.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I think we can establish a policy of firmness. I think we can establish a feeling among the prisoners of war that America is something more than to be held in contempt. It is a national scandal when radio commentators, newspapers, and the public at large, standing on the street corners, or wherever they may be, are talking about the mismanagement of the prisoner-of-war camps. It is high time that this Congress should do something to check up on the conditions that exist and recommend improvements, and in the event there have been mistakes made lay the blame where it should be placed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MEXICAN WATER TREATY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a portion of a statement made by the Attorney General of the State of California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Lowell Mellett, a former Assistant to the President, and Sumner Welles, erstwhile Under Secretary of State, have recently expressed, in syndicated news articles, the position of the State Department in reference to the pending Mexican Water Treaty so accurately that one could almost believe that the articles had been written, not by them, but by the Department instead. Both articles excoriated the State of California for opposing the treaty. Both articles presented the same misleading half-truths, carefully designed to support the treaty and equally carefully designed to make California appear petty and mean.

Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a very dark Senegambian in the wood pile. We of California are fighting a battle that is not new—it has been going on many years. Now certain dubious and indeed mysterious characters stick their necks out of that wood pile.

The principal character is one W. O. Jenkins—a very wealthy international soldier of fortune whose citizenship whether Mexican or American is undisclosed. His activities are shrouded in mystery between skyrocket bursts into the news, bursts that fade softly into the dark again as the sparks die away.

For nearly 13 years, from February 26, 1918, to November 30, 1930, W. O. Jenkins held the position of American consular agent at Puebla, Mexico. At that time he held extensive sugar lands in Mexico and was a local manufacturer.

By 1934 W. O. Jenkins was reported to be the second richest man in Mexico, and the owner of large haciendas and textile mills.

Early in 1944 he acquired title to 550,000 acres of land in the delta region of the Colorado River in Mexico. These lands were considered of little value because no water was available to irrigate them. They were taken by Jenkins in exchange for property in the United States appraised at $360,000, which values these exchanged lands in Mexico at about 65 cents per acre.

Mr. Jenkins appears thereby to have come into ownership of about two-thirds of the Mexican land in the delta of the Colorado River that may be benefited by the pending Mexican Water Treaty.

That treaty grants to Mexico the right in perpetuity to 1,500,000 acre-feet of water of the Colorado River, which is double the amount that she is entitled to. California is willing to agree to Mexico's right to 750,000 acre-feet, but not to twice 750,000.

How much is 750,000 acre-feet of water worth in the arid western regions. But first, what is an acre-foot of water. An acre-foot of water is the amount of water required that would cover an acre of land to a depth of 1 foot. There are 43,560 square feet in an acre and hence 43,560 cubic feet of water is an acre-foot of water.

I estimate that the space inside this Hall of the House of Representatives would measure about 7 acre-feet of water, if the Hall would hold water.

How much does an acre-foot of water cost the desert farmer? In the Imperial Valley of southern California, that great valley, irrigated with the water of the Colorado River, an acre-foot of water costs the rancher about 25 cents. On that basis the 750,000 additional acre-feet of water proposed in this treaty to be delivered annually to Mexico is worth nearly $200,000 per year—just as delivered water. Now, if you capitalize that amount at 4 percent because it is an annual gift in perpetuity, we find that the gift of an additional 750,000 acre-feet of water per year, forever, is worth $50,000,000, just as delivered water.

But that is not all it is worth by any means. The guaranteed right to that water called the water right is worth a lot more than the value of the water. The right to the water is worth several times as much as the water in fact. But supposing the right is only worth as much as the water itself, that would be an additional $50,000,000 or a total of at least $100,000,000, which is a conservative estimate of the value of this water delivery and water right which is proposed to be granted in perpetuity to Mexican landowners under the terms of this treaty.

But let us look at it another way. The value of raw desert land with no prospect of water being obtained for its irrigation is almost nominal. Some say it is worth 50 cents an acre, others have paid the Government as high as $2 an acre.

This 550,000 acres of Colorado River delta land was evidently acquired by the fabulous W. O. Jenkins for 65 cents per acre, a fair price for raw desert land with no water available to it.

How much is that land worth with water rights and water? One hundred dollars per acre? One hundred and fifty dollars per acre? Two hundred dollars per acre? God watered land is fairly worth more than that in Arizona and California.

Who knows what land with water rights is worth in Mexico where the Government has once before stepped in and expropriated land. But as irrigable land the Jenkins 550,000 acres becomes worth at least $100 per acre or $55,000,000. This treaty therefore may well profit Mr. Jenkins by more than $50,000,000—a neat sum. But the Jenkins 550,000 acres is only about two-thirds of the Mexican land that may be benefited by this water treaty. Who owns title to the other 250,000 acres or so? They have not been disclosed by the hearings now being conducted in the other body. But somebody has title no doubt—and those somebodies and Jenkins together stand to be benefited by this Mexican Water Treaty to the tune of more than $100,000,000.

So let us take cognizance of this W. O. Jenkins. Frankly, I am unable to learn much about him that is not published in the newspapers. The other day, the attorney general of California, testifying in a committee of the other body, quoted certain items from the New York Times that recalled to mind events of other days. I desire now to quote from that testimony of the attorney general of the State of California made on Thursday, February 8, 1945, as follows:

Back in October of 1919, when this incident that I am going to describe to you occurred, General Carranza was the President of Mexico, Woodrow Wilson was the President of the United States, and the Secretary of State was Mr. Lansing. Decades before the advent of the good-neighbor policy and years before the achievement of stable government in Mexico, relations between the United States and Mexico were strained. With a fear for the safety of United States oil and other holdings in Mexico, there were charges in this country of a Bolshevik menace below the border. In Mexico itself President Carranza was constantly alerted before the threat of armed opposition to his government, some of it of native inspiration and some of it said to be of United States derivation.

You will recall that in those days in certain quarters in our own country responsible public officials—at least, they were in responsible positions—would urge the annexation of Mexico. It was in this general atmosphere that Mr. Jenkins' kidnaping occurred. I will put that in quotation marks, because I think, when your memory is refreshed on this incident, it will convince you that it probably should be in quotation marks.

The best story of the incident is to be found in the New York Times of October 23, 1919, which was followed the next day by a column editorial calling the kidnaping an outrage and predicting a celebrated case in our relations with Mexico.

The news story of that date reported that W. O. Jenkins had been kidnaped on October 17 and held for ransom of $150,000 or 300,000 Mexican pesos.

During the next few months the case grew to front-page and banner headline proportions and brought the United States and Mexico to the brink of war.

Briefly, this is what happened: The State Department protested to the Mexican Government and demanded Jenkins' release and

payment of the ransom by the Mexican Government. In less than a week Jenkins was released, but his friends paid his ransom. However, that did not end the matter. Anti-Mexican sentiment in the United States, led by Senator Albert Fall, of New Mexico, kept the agitation going on, and the State Department then demanded that the Mexican Government reimburse Mr. Jenkins' friends. The Mexican Government's reply was very unexpected. Instead of sympathizing with Mr. Jenkins, the Mexican Government proceeded to arrest a Senor Mestre, who had arranged Mr. Jenkins' so-called rescue, and charged him with complicity in the kidnaping. Mexico further charged that Jenkins himself had hidden out on orders of the United States Government in order to provoke an international incident.

Mexican newspapers began charging that Jenkins owed the Mexican Government 200,000 pesos of revenue.

On November 15, 1919, Gov. Alfonso Cabrera, of the State of Puebla, arrested Jenkins. On November 21, Jenkins went to the Puebla jail.

The tension between the two countries mounted. United States newspapers claimed that the bandits were followers of Felip Diaz. Mr. George Summerlin, American Chargé d'Affaires in Mexico City, demanded Jenkins' immediate release. In a sharply worded note to President Carranza, the United States Government informed Mexico that it was surprised and incensed. Secretary Lansing made it clear that holding Jenkins would precipitate a break. There were estimates of the War Department, published in the papers at that time, that 450,000 troops would be needed in case of war.

In Congress, Senator Fall introduced a resolution to break relations with Mexico. A Senate subcommittee, investigating Mexican-United States relations, appointed Senator Fall as one of two Senators to confer with President Wilson about the Jenkins affair.

I think that is quite a historic incident. That was when Senator Fall went, as chairman of this committee, to call upon the President. Senator Fall said that the kidnaping was an affront to the United States.

Meanwhile, the Mexican Government was having its say. Mr. Jenkins, Mexico claimed, paid money to his abductors to assist them in overthrowing the Carranza government. In a public statement Governor Cabrera revealed that Jenkins did not need to languish in jail, where he was reported to be receiving friends and conducting his business in a large office in the prison. Jenkins, said Cabrera, insisted upon remaining in prison when he could ask for bail at any time and go free. However, Jenkins said that he refused to give bail for one cent.

When he was interviewed by one reporter for the New York Times, Jenkins admitted that he wanted to see Mexico straightened out. When asked if it was true that he had met with Senator Fall in New York shortly before the kidnaping, Jenkins replied that that was his own business.

As national tempers arose to the boiling point, Mr. Jenkins was released. One, J. Salter Hansen, it was reported, had paid his bail. Jenkins was indignant about this, and immediately sought reimprisonment; and the payment of this bail by Hansen, it was charged, was neither sanctioned by Jenkins nor by the State Department. Secretary Lansing said, "The Government has never thought of changing the policy of Jenkins in refusing bail."

There was a lot of inquiry as to who Mr. Hansen was. The newspapers were full of it. He was a friend of Cabrera; he had conspired with Cabrera in paying bail; he was a friend of Carranza, for whom he had tried to negotiate a loan of money from J. P. Morgan. There were all these stories, but his own story was that he had paid the bail to avoid war between the two countries; and now, said the Mexican Government, all ground for hard feeling between the countries was gone.

But Senator Fall, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, protested in the Senate. He said that the United States Government had once more issued an ultimatum only to abandon its position. He announced the formation of a subcommittee to investigate the possibility, he said, that Lansing or Wilson, in collusion with Mexico, had furnished Jenkins' bail. Mr. Lansing and President Wilson termed the story ridiculous.

In the Middle Ages they used to have wars with names. I suppose that if we had had a war at that time it would have been referred to as the War of Jenkins' Bail. But it did not come to pass.

The Mexican newspaper Excelsior reported that charges of sedition would be filed against Jenkins for his alleged delivery of arms and ammunition to his abductors, and the case went to the Mexican federal court.

On January 31, 1920, Governor Cabrera and Julio Mitchell, attorney general for the State of Puebla, arrived in Mexico City. During the next 10 months the case dragged on with intermittent moves by the Mexican Government to expel Jenkins as an undesirable alien and seize his property, because of his alleged dealings with rebels.

The testimony seemed to show that the payment of Jenkins' bail was, in fact, arranged by officials or ex-officials of the Mexican Government. Evidence was also presented to prove that Jenkins was in the United States a month before his "kidnaping" where, according to the attorney general of Puebla, he conspired with a group of interventionists.

One Brocopia Palacios, described as a rebel colonel, second in command to bandit leader Frederico Cordoba, stated that he had carried letters from Cordoba to Jenkins for the purpose of arranging the details of the abduction of Jenkins by Cordoba.

On October 6, 1920, a news story appeared in Washington to that effect that Mr. Jenkins had sent his family to the United States and was selling his Mexican holdings preparatory to quitting the country.

However, on December 5 of the same year, after the assassination of President Carranza, the case came to a sudden close. The Superior Court in Mexico City dismissed all charges against Jenkins and ordered his complete freedom and the return of bail furnished by Hansen.

Mr. Jenkins then kept out of the newspapers until September of 1925. At that time his life was reported threatened by members of the Mexican Agrarian movement. There was then no news about Mr. Jenkins until June of 1934, when, described as the former United States consul at Puebla and owner of the Atencingo Sugar Central, he was officially charged by the Mexican Ministry of Finance with having evaded taxes on alcohol. The finance ministry alleged that invoices carrying sales of alcohol had been carried in United States consulate envelopes for which diplomatic immunity from inspection was claimed.

Six months later there was another news item to the effect that Jenkins was reported to be facing a week-end stay in the Puebla jail on similar charges.

Mr. Jenkins next came into public observation in 1937 when Cardenas was President of Mexico.

On June 15, 1937, it was reported that the Mexican Agrarian Department had sent a group of engineers to survey Jenkins' estate from Atlixco in the State of Puebla southwest to the border of the State of Morelos. This included rich sugar-cane and rice-producing lands, also sugar mills, valued at $5,000,000. They were slated for distribution among peasants of 50 villages, following instructions of Cardenas who was acting on complaints of the peasants or peons there.

The New York Times of that date said:

"It is recalled that Mr. Jenkins time and again has been in trouble in Mexico in the last decade. First he was kidnaped by rebels on October 19, 1919, and was thus a cause of serious strain between Mexico and the United States. Recently during a trip President Cardenas made to the region, peons complained he was paying wages much lower than the minimum fixed by labor law regulations."

Mr. Jenkins has an interesting history—such as we may know it. He is interested in both the Mexican and American Governments—evidently. His activities almost brought war between us and Mexico once but the assassination of a Mexican President ended that feud quickly. He must have friends in the present Governments of both countries and he stands to profit greatly by the proposed Mexican Treaty. There must be others in the same position as he. Who are they? Mexican and American citizens have a right to know.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that Messrs. Lowell Mellett and Sumner Welles—two former American Government servants holding responsible positions, one as the second man in the State Department and one who sat anonymously at the right hand of the President—are now belaboring the State of California for its implacable opposition to the terms of the Mexican Water Treaty? Why is it that a division of the State Department itself will blandly present outrageously inaccurate testimony on the effect of this treaty upon the people and the State of California?

I note further that in this morning's paper Columnist Drew Pearson, well-known for his pipe lines into the State Department, has joined the howling chorus in attempting to demean the State of California in its efforts to preserve its rights and maintain the integrity of its contracts with the Federal Government. We now have quite a group of talent arrayed against us, all of which might well indicate that the State Department is getting anxious and fears that its game will be called on account of darkness.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that our own State Department officials are seemingly so anxious to impair the guaranteed rights of the people of 1 of the 48 sovereign States in order to provide special benefit to a fabulous American or ex-American soldier of great fortune and his associates. What is this all about, Mr. Speaker? We of California demand to know the truth. We, the citizens of a sovereign State of the United States, are entitled to know the truth and the whole truth. We only know that we are being hurt and damaged by our own Government and we do not know why.

Mr. Speaker, as the Mexican Water Treaty is not pending in this House, it probably would not be proper to demand here an inquiry into the undisclosed facts. But I heartily join my voice with the voices of the duly elected officers of my State in their demand for a full and complete investigation by the taking of testimony under oath and the disclosure of every interest, public and private, that stands to benefit.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion that we of California bear no ill will toward the great Republic of Mexico. We are a next-door neighbor of Mexico. We have lived on the border in amity and friendship ever since that border was established. Our citizens and Mexican citizens have crossed and recrossed our common border at will and without let or hindrance for now nearly 100 years.

Our great city of Los Angeles holds a greater population of Mexicans and persons of Mexican descent than any city in Mexico excepting only Mexico Distrito Federal, which is its beautiful capital and the equivalent in Mexico to our own District of Columbia.

The arts and culture of old Mexico are strongly reflected in the California of today, and we are proud of that influence upon our lives. One of the greatest of American motion-picture actors—Leo Carrillo—is a proud descendant of old Mexico. The sheriff of my county—Gene Biscailuz—is another, and there are many more.

In protesting our damage under the terms of this treaty, we stand firmly for our rights—and protest only the actions of our own Department of State, for it is our State Department that has failed to represent our interest.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman believe that the House of Representatives has any authority in the negotiations or the final approval of the treaty?

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe, of course, as I have stated several times before on the floor of the House, that the House of Representatives as a part of the Congress of the United States must be called upon to consider those portions of the treaty which come within the province of the House under the Constitution, namely, the disposition of property of the United States and likewise matters of appropriation and authorization for the building and use of structures. I believe that the treaty cannot be a valid and binding treaty until the necessary authorizations are obtained from the whole Congress.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman believe it advisable that the House should take such action and enter into the position that we are entitled to take part in it as Members of the House of Representatives?

Mr. HINSHAW. I have so stated before that I do, and it may be I shall ask the consideration of the House on that question again before very long.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by incuding a radio address by Mr. Stoddard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 375. An act to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 20, 1945, to begin public hearings on H. R. 693—a bill to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday, February 22, 1945.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on S. 63 and H. R. 1648, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, February 22, 1945, at 10 a. m., in executive session, for the consideration of report of the Post Office Department on parcel post.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the postwar ship-disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

222. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of $141,537.36 (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

223. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay a claim resulting from personal injury to an inhabitant of a foreign country, in the amount of $6,488.40 (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

224. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay a claim for damages in the sum of $97.50 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

225. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of $24,149.79 (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

226. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of $60,000, for the Department of State, for the fiscal year 1946, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

227. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations for the legislative branch, House of Representatives, fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $1,489,680 (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

228. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1945 (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

229. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $24,000 (H. Doc. No. 79); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

230. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $1,400, for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

231. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $25,000, for the Department of State; to the Committee on Appropriations.

232. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1945 and 1946 in an indefinite amount (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

233. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation under the Treasury Department for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $770.78 (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

234. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $45,000 (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

235. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment, amounting to $5,409,574.40 (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

236. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, amounting to $11,119.57, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

237. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $18,405.48, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest; to the Committee on Appropriations.

238. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation amounting to $2,995,579.47 to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent establishments (H. Doc. No. 88); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

239. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $45,945.88 (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

240. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

241. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

242. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of communications from the Treasury Department to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relating to personnel ceilings of Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Division of Disbursement, Bureau of Accounts; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

243. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to require a witness seeking immunity from prosecution under certain acts to claim his privilege against self-incrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2252. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 256. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head; with amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 2252. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2253. A bill to establish in the Veterans Administration a commissioned service consisting of physicians, surgeons, dietitians, nurses, and medical technicians; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2254. A bill to provide that where the rating of disability of a veteran of the World War as to an arm or leg is equal to the rating for amputation at any level, the loss of use of such extremity shall be considered as established, for statutory award purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 2255. A bill for the purpose of regulating the conditions of employment of mechanics and helpers at all Government navy yards, naval stations, arsenals, and other Government establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2256. A bill to authorize the naturalization and admission into the United States under a quota of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 2257. A bill to require the pay and allowances of personnel of the armed forces of the United States to be paid in United States currency or at a fair rate of exchange if in the money of any other nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2258. A bill to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war materials, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 2259. A bill to incorporate the Mothers of World War No. 2, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 2260. A bill to consider members of the armed forces, whose application for National Service Life Insurance was rejected for physical reasons and who thereafter die in a theater of combat operations, as having been granted such insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 2261. A bill to amend section 4915, title 35, section 63, of the United States Code, as amended by section 72a of the code, and for the protection of inventors and owners of patents and applications for patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2262. A bill to amend section 6 of the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 323), entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," and authorizing necessary appropriations; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 2263. A bill to amend section 16 of an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2017); to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2264. A bill to provide means for bringing back to the United States after the present war for burial in the United States the remains of persons who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States and who are buried in foreign lands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to declare a governmental policy in relation to the apprehension and punishment of war criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution establishing a Federal Tax Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution assuming national responsibility for the results of the Crimean conference as they affect members of the Polish armed forces serving today outside Poland; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 139. Resolution making H. R. 7, a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. Res. 140. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Military Affairs to investigate the exchange rates relative to pay of members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. Res. 141. Resolution to create a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the prison camps in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the United States Congress amend the laws and regulations covering the sale of surplus vehicles so that an honorably discharged veteran shall have the right to attend a sale of these surplus motor vehicles and have the right to bid thereon and buy as many of the vehicles as he shall need and be able to use in his enterprise and personal business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal-owned property in the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

for a resurvey of the present old-age and survivors insurance system with a view to expanding coverage and increasing the benefit structures thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 2265. A bill for the relief of owners of land and personal property of the Fort Knox area of Hardin County, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2266. A bill for the relief of land and personal property owners of Fort Knox area of Meade County, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Armas Ballard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2269. A bill for the relief of William A. Schumacher, M. D., and Magdalen M. Schumacher, his wife; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Westover; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2271. A bill for the relief of Henry Hobbs; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2272. A bill for the relief of Albert Shaw; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 2273. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn against the United States for the use of his invention in rifling guns during the last war in 1918 and thereafter by the Symington-Anderson Co. at Rochester, N. Y., said invention being shown and described in his Letters Patent No. 1,311,107, issued by the Patent Office of the United States on or about July 22, 1919, and conferring jurisdiction upon said Court of Claims to reopen and further adjudicate the claim of said Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention by companies or in ships other than the Symington-Anderson Co. in 1918 and thereafter which claim has heretofore been settled on the basis of the judgment of the Court of Claims of February 8, 1937; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

87. By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana: Memorial of Montana State Legislature commending the War Department and Navy Department for instituting and putting into operation the program of extending furloughs and leaves to our citizens serving as soldiers, sailors, and marines who have served the longest period of time overseas or in naval combat zones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

88. Also, memorial of Montana State Legislature to the Congress of the United States, petitioning for a resurvey of the present old-age and survivors insurance system with a view to expanding coverage and increasing the benefit structure thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

89. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of California Legislature concerning House Resolution No. 36, relative to control of ships' garbage; House Resolution No. 78, relative to urging Congress and the Director of Selective Service to grant all possible deferments of dairy labor; House Resolution No. 84, relative to California boat-building concerns; House Resolution No. 85; and House Resolution No 87; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

90. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the House Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our most gracious Lord, who hast the power to penetrate the profound mystery of being. Thy abundant mercy transcends all human affections. Thou dost not dwell in the dense haze of sullen skies to fill us with apprehension, but Thy blessed light falls upon every pathway, and Thy everyday blessing is cause for praise and gratitude. In the issues of our daily lives, in purpose and exalted idealism, lead us more and more to the heights of our powers and make us well worthy of a place in the councils of our Nation.

Like the sound of many waters, we hear the appeals of universal sorrow as we pray to Thee for the wounded and dying on home and foreign soil. O let a fellowship be born in us as we hold in remembrance those who are paying the full measure of sacrifice and devotion. Grant that the nations may feel that they are members one of another, seeking the things which are for the benefit of the whole world. Let Christian fraternity rest like a divine benediction everywhere. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE OF FELICITATION TO ADMIRAL NIMITZ

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of the House on Friday, February 16, 1945, he did on Monday, February 19, 1945, send the following message to Admiral Nimitz:

At the request of the House of Representatives, unanimously expressed, I send to you, the officers and men serving with you, and also the participating Air Corps, our grateful thanks and admiration for the great accomplishments during all operations, and especially those of the immediate past.

We salute you all and send warmest regards.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman's request?

Mr. VINSON. I am asking unanimous consent to call up a conference report and agree to it. It is a unanimous report in which the Senate recedes from its position. The bill is thus left in the exact form in which it was originally passed by the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does it contain any provision which would allow the construction of houses without regard to cost?

Mr. VINSON. It does not, because the Appropriations Committee is now considering a bill providing $29,000,000 dealing with that subject, and there is no need to put it in this bill. The Senate therefore receded from its position.

Mr. RICH. That is a good job.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

And agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
JAMES W. MOTT,
Managers on the part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Under the project "Miscellaneous structures and facilities" the Senate inserted "including housing for civilian employees." In conference this provision has been eliminated so that the project as agreed to by the conferees is the same as when the bill passed the House.

Amendment No. 2: The total provided by the bill was $10,000 in error. The conferees on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment so as to correct this error.

CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,
JAMES W. MOTT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain colloquy and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement from Mr. Sam Breadon, president of the St. Louis National League Baseball Club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Bretton Woods agreements and include therein a short editorial on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

ALLOCATION OF PRISONERS OF WAR FOR FARM LABOR

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MCKENZIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 40 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AUBREY WILLIAMS SHOULD NOT BE MADE HEAD OF R. E. A.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if there is one cause that is closer to my heart, and one for which I have fought more earnestly than any other, it is the cause of rural electrification.

It is the greatest and soundest program for the benefit of the American farmers that has ever been advanced in all the history of this country.

Like other real friends of rural electrification, I am profoundly disturbed by the proposal to put Aubrey Williams at the head of it. I believe it will do more harm to the cause of rural electrification than anything else that has ever been proposed.

We have had extreme difficulty in getting appropriations for rural electrification through this House, even when we had at the head of the R. E. A. a man in whom we all had the utmost confidence; and I fear that if the R. E. A. is placed in the hands of Aubrey Williams it will so shake the confidence of Members of the House that it may have the effect of paralyzing the whole R. E. A. program.

I hope the President will withdraw Mr. Williams' name, or that the Senate will reject him, and give us a man who has the confidence of everyone who believes, as I do, that we ought to electrify every farm home in America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, what I cannot understand about the gentleman from Mississippi is this: He is all the time talking about rural electrification, giving me advice to the effect that the farmers of Michigan are in need of the services of a Michigan T. V. A. or R. E. A., of being wet-nursed by the New Deal, but I find that in my State of Michigan 81.9 percent of the farms do have electricity while down in Mississippi only 16.4 percent of the farms have electricity. I find that 153,700 farms in my State of Michigan have electricity while down in Mississippi only 47,800 farmers have electricity. I find that the Consumers' Power Co., that the gentleman has talked about so much and which in the courts in behalf of my home town I fought for 10 years, furnishes more farms with electricity in my State of Michigan, as a matter of fact almost twice as many, as have electricity in the whole State of Mississippi.

While Mississippi not only has private power companies; has for several years had the benefit of the great T. V. A., financed by the Federal Treasury, on only 47,800 farms is there electricity; while the Consumers' Power Co., just one of the privately owned companies furnishing power in Michigan, serves 79,000 farms. Many others are served by Detroit Edison.

Can it be that the service furnished by the T. V. A. is so inferior or so costly that the people of Mississippi do not care for it or cannot afford to buy it? Has the gentleman ever considered the possibility that privately owned companies furnish better service at less cost than does the T. V. A.? The farmers of Michigan know a bargain when they see it and it is not in my mind to accept the conclusion that they are not getting the best at the least possible cost.

Mr. RANKIN. Is the gentleman for Aubrey Williams? If the Senate confirms him, we may never get the rest of our farms electrified.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That may be all too true. But perhaps in return for wrecking R. E. A., Aubrey will give your people a great uplift—an uplift of some kind, I do not know just what.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article entitled "Win, Lose, or Draw" by a great American, Grantland Rice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein extracts from speeches on George Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION OF THE PROGRESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 20, Rept. No. 181), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the progress of the war effort insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee with a view to

determining whether such effort is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically.

The Committee on Military Affairs shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO STUDY AND INVESTIGATE PRESENT SYSTEM OF MARKETING, ETC.

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 54, Rept. No. 182), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products, in their natural or processed form, from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer, as it affects farmers, the various types of middlemen, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers, with a view to ascertaining, among other things—

(a) The effectiveness of the present system of marketing, and the adequacy of present marketing facilities, with particular regard to the protection of farmers and consumers.

(b) The effect of transactions on the futures commodities exchanges upon such system and upon farmers and consumers.

(c) The existence of any practices in connection with the packing, packaging, grading, inspecting, storing, processing, transporting, distributing, or marketing of farm products, which adversely affect farmers and consumers.

(d) The existence of any practices in connection with the sale or distribution of insecticides and fungicides, fertilizer, farm machinery, and other farm supplies which adversely affect farmers.

(e) The adequacy of present facilities, local, State, and Federal, for (1) furnishing producers, distributors, and consumers with market reports and marketing information; (2) the development of standards and grades; (3) the inspection and certification of the quality and condition of farm products; (4) the development, analysis, and publication currently of information showing the costs of marketing farm products through the various channels of distribution; (5) the inspection of meat and meat products and the influence of such facilities on the marketing of livestock; (6) protecting producers, distributors, and consumers from unfair trade practices in the marketing of farm products.

(f) Assistance to producers and distributors in establishing improved systems of marketing.

(g) The present and prospective development of the types and methods of transportation for farm products, and the existence, if any, of discrimination in railway-freight or in motor-carrier rates on farm products in the various areas.

(h) The effect of price-support activities upon the marketing and distribution of farm products.

The committee shall report to the House from time to time the results of its studies and investigations, and in its reports the committee shall make such recommendations as it may deem proper, including recommendations with respect to any legislative action necessary to effectuate its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO CONTINUE STUDY AND INVESTIGATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 38, Rept. No. 183), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed to continue the study, inquiry, and investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purpose shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred upon it by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The committee shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

LEWIS KENNEY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1076) to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 221, an identical bill, for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson are hereby authorized to accept from the Government of the United States of Brazil such decorations, orders, medals, and emblems as have been or may be tendered them, hereby expressly granting the consent of Congress required for this purpose by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1076) was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 687) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is authorized to be appropriated and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money, which sums represent the value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost by the claimant as a result of war conditions:

Mary Ann Braswell, $42.50; John A. Bywater, $625; Frank C. Lee, $1,369; George R. Canty, $313.05; Eugene A. Mauret, $204; J. Dawson Kiernan, $2,250; Frank A. Keller, $3,000; Harry M. Donaldson, $3,276; Hooker A. Doolittle, $8,106; John W. Burnett, $338.76; Samuel Sokobin, $550; Leland C. Altaffer, $487.50; Myrl S. Myers, $252; Walter Smith, $1,210; Kenneth C. Krentz, $2,566; Frank P. Lockhart, $675; Frederick D. Hunt, $790; H. Lawrence Groves, $1,120; Carl O. Hawthorne, $2,504.35; Harry Kushner, $250; Richard H. Davis, $1,200; Robert W. Rinden, $781.50; Fong Chuck, $750; Addison Southard, $3,000; Robert S. Ward, $1,164; Marjory Mills, $2,100; Eleanor M. Shields, $500; Thomas A. Hicock, $3,500; C. Porter Kuykendall, $45; Charles H. Whitaker, $1,816.50; George M. Abbott, $100; Paul P. Steintorf, $2,880; Peter K. Constan, $120; Frances Whitney, $536; Karl L. Rankin, $800; J. Holbrook Chapman, $215; Robert S. Streeper, $4,811.35; Harold D. Robison, $8,800; Charles O. Thompson, $4,500; Jesse F. Van Wickel, $1,088; Thomas S. Horn, $1,432; John B. Ketcham, $6,550; R. Borden Reams, $120; Elizabeth Deegan, $509.50; Raymond Bastianello, $1,000; Candide R. DuBeau, $242.50; Wilbur J. Keblinger, $662; Paul J. Reveley, $3,250; Richard B. Haven, $325; Edwin S. Coleman, $1,106.65; John J. Meily, $179.85; W. Garland Richardson, $3,800; Paul W. Meyer, $1,000; Robert P. Chalker, $90; John Mundt, Jr., $650; Rudolph E. Zetterstrand, $439.70; and Hortense Uhlrich, $47.70.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES GAUDET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1719) to confirm the claim of Charles Gaudet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and

to section 18, township 11 south, range 5 east, containing forty-four and thirty-four one-hundredths acres, and section 21, township 12 south, range 5 east, Saint Helena meridian, Saint James Parish, La., containing one hundred and thirty-eight and fifty one-hundredths acres, together with all accretion, covered by the private claims of Charles Gaudet based upon a Spanish patent be, and the same is hereby, granted, released, relinquished, and conveyed in fee simple by the United States to the respective owners of the equitable titles thereto, and to their respective heirs and assigns forever, as fully and completely, in every respect whatever, as could be done by patents issued therefor according to law.

SEC. 2. That nothing contained in this act shall in any manner abridge, divest, impair, injure, or prejudice any right, title, or interest of any person or persons in or to any portion or part of the lands mentioned in said first section, the true intent of this act being to relinquish and abandon, grant, give, and concede, any and all right, interest, and estate, in law or equity, which the United States is or is supposed to be entitled to in said lands, in favor of all persons, estates, firms, or corporations, who, had the claim heretofore been confirmed, would be the equitable or true and lawful owners of the same by reason of long continuous possession under color of title with claim of ownership, or otherwise, under the laws of Louisiana, including the laws of prescription and limitation, in the absence of the said interest, title, and estate of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN T. COOPER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 76) for the relief of John T. Cooper.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of John T. Cooper, postmaster at Hartselle, Ala., in the sum of $179. Such sum represents a shortage in such account caused by the loss of such sum from the money-order cash drawer at such post office during the night of October 24, 1940.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGURDUR JONSSON AND THOROLINA THORDARDOTTIR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 314) for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. BARDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JULIA PETERSON MILLS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 234) for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

RUBEN M. HERREN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 242) for the relief of Ruben M. Herren.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $833.80 to Ruben M. Herren, of Route 1, Smyrna, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the United States because of personal injuries, including the value of lost time and hospital and physicians' bills, incurred in a collision with a truck operated by and under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, War Department, on September 25, 1942, on United States Highway No. 41, in Cobb County, Ga.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "$833.80" and insert "$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, SUMMERVILLE CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CHATTOOGA COUNTY, GA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 245) for the relief of the board of trustees, Summerville Consolidated School District, Chattooga County, Ga.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ESTATE OF DR. DAVID O. CLEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 257) for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the administrator of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased, formerly of Gloucester County, Va., the sum of $7,216 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for the value of a wharf located on the York River, approximately 3 miles from Gloucester Point, Va., built and owned by Dr. David O. Clements and destroyed in January 1918 by ice broken by United States Navy ice-breaking tugs in clearing the York River, used at that time as the base for the Atlantic Fleet: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD AWARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 432) to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of date November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., St. Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. MADDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

H. J. BLEXRUD ESTATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 791) for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. J. Blexrud estate, of Caledonia, Minn., the sum of $108.15, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for cost of replacing a damaged plate-glass window which was destroyed on April 9, 1941, in a building described as the ground floor of number 120 East Main Street, Caledonia, Minn., said premises being under lease to the United States of America for the exclusive occupancy, for office and storage space, of the Houston County selective service local board.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN P. HAYES AND ESTATE OF EDWARD P. McCORMACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 844) for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. LUTHER S. SYKES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 845) for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DAVID COWAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 853) for the relief of David Cowan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David Cowan the sum of $10,000, as compensation for and in full settlement of all claims for damages against the United States for injuries sustained by his daughter, Gilda Cowan, a minor, when, on April 28, 1934, a Navy Department trailer attached to the dirigible *Macon*, at Cpa Locka Flying Field, Miami, Fla., ran over her right leg: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "David Cowan the sum of $10,000, as compensation for and" and insert "the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $1,500."

Line 8, strike out "for damages."

Line 9, strike out "his daughter."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN H. BONNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 901) for the relief of John H. Bonney, the legal guardian of Daniel R. Bonney, a minor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BLANCHE E. BROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 906) for the relief of Blanche E. Broad.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Blanche E. Broad, of Beaver Falls, Pa., the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for personal injuries and losses sustained by her as a result of a fall in the Capitol of the United States of America in Washington, D. C., on May 31, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES H. DOUGHERTY, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 934) for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $135.62 to Charles H. Dougherty, Sr., of Ozone Park, Queens County, N. Y., being in full settlement of all claims against the United States by reason of extra labor above the legal day of 8 hours performed by Charles H. Dougherty, Sr., between the 8th day of March 1878 and the 20th day of September 1878, while employed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WINFRED ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 938) for the relief of Winfred Alexander.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Winfred Alexander, of Graysville, Tenn., the sum of $7,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Winfred Alexander against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on September 16, 1938, when the motorcycle he was driving was struck on United States Highway No. 27, near the intersection of such highway and Liggett Road in Sale Creek, Tenn., by a truck in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,000" and insert "$5,000."

At the end of the bill add the following:

"SEC. 2. Before payment is made under this act, Winfred Alexander is required to cancel judgment, together with cost of court rendered against the driver of the Government truck, Hobart Wilson, in the Hamilton County Circuit Court, of the State of Tennessee, on February 22, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. C. A. LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 941) for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. C. A. Lee, of Ivy, Tenn., administratrix of the estate of her deceased son, Ross Lee, the sum of $10,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for all loss and damages sustained by her on account of injuries sustained by the death of said Ross Lee, who was fatally injured in an accident by a United States owned truck (Civilian Conservation Corps) on October 9, 1937, between Reliance and Ivy, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "of", strike out the remainder of line 7 and all of lines 8 and 9, and on page 2 strike out lines 1 to 4 down to and including "Tennessee:" and insert the following: "$5,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for, and expenses incident to, the death of the said Ross Lee, who was killed by a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck, driven by Archie Carroll, an enrollee, between Reliance and Ivy, Tenn., on October 9, 1937.

"SEC. 2. Payment shall not be made under this act until the claimant has released all claims and judgment against the said Archie Carroll, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee,

administratrix of the estate of Ross Lee, deceased."

ESTATES OF ROBERT C. MEALS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following persons the amounts indicated:

(1) The administratrix of the estate of Robert C. Meals, of Shiremanstown, Pa., $15,992.50, for distribution as part of the personal estate of the said Robert C. Meals;

(2) The administratrix of the estate of Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, of Shiremanstown, Pa., $5,684.50, for distribution as part of the personal estate of the said Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret;

(3) Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, of Shiremanstown, Pa., $3,496.94;

(4) The guardian of Donald Meals, a minor, of Shiremanstown, Pa., $2,616.50; and

(5) The guardian of Betty Wrightstone, a minor, of Shiremanstown Pa., $4,043.50.

The payment of such amounts shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of a collision on November 25, 1939, on Trindle Road, near Carlisle, Pa., between an automobile driven by the late Robert C. Meals and a United States Army truck operated by a unit of the Pennsylvania National Guard. Such collision resulted in the death of the said Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, in personal injuries to the said Mrs. Margaret Meals, Donald Meals, and Betty Wrightstone, and in damage to personal property.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "appropriated", strike out the remainder of line 5 and all of lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, and on page 2 strike out all of lines 1 to 10 down to and including "$4,043.50" and insert the following: "to the estate of Robert C. Meals, the sum of $5,742; to the estate of Bessie Mae Morgret, the sum of $4,000; to the legal guardian of Donald Meals, the sum of $2,616.50; to Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, the sum of $2,996.94; to the legal guardian of Betty Wrightstone, the sum of $4,043.50."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STIERS BROS. CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of the Stiers Bros. Construction Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BARBARA HEALY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1157) for the relief of Barbara Healy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

THE CUBAN-AMERICAN SUGAR CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1239) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim, together with interest thereon, of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States for a refund of taxes erroneously and illegally assessed and collected as excess-profits taxes for the period from January 1, 1917, to September 30, 1917. That for the purpose of arriving at the correct determination of the tax for this period, the Court of Claims is to apply the method of computation under sections 201 and 203 of the Revenue Act of 1917, based upon the invested capital of the corporation amounting to $39,848,530.85, which was the invested capital of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. according to the decisions of the Board of Tax Appeals, all dated December 16, 1932, which decisions were based upon the stipulation entered into between the Cuban-American Sugar Co. and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, whereby it was agreed that the sum of $39,848,530.85 was the invested capital of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. for the calendar year 1917.

SEC. 2. In the proceedings upon such claims before the Court of Claims the United States shall not avail itself of the defense that the General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue acted without legal authority in making such stipulation of settlement.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, the form or any content or the time of filing of claims for the refund and alleged amendments thereto heretofore filed, or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and appeals from the payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL D. O'CONNELL AND ALMON B. STEWART

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1303) for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LEO EDWARD DAY AND PHILLIP TAMBORELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1324) for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the judgment entered in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida against Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello for the sum of $5,000 and costs on a bail bond which was forfeited on July 26, 1940, in a criminal proceeding against one Donald Fox in the said court is hereby reduced to the sum of $500 and costs.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 8, strike out "$500" and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. P. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1353) for the relief of J. P. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. P. Harris, Mystic, Iowa, the sum of $10,000, such sum to be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said J. P. Harris as the result of personal injuries received when struck by a Federal Civil Works Administration truck on December 20, 1933, in Mystic, Appanoose County, Iowa: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000, such sum to be" and insert "$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

F. L. GAUSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1360) for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to F. L. Gause, of Galveston, Tex., for property damage, personal injuries, and permanent disability to himself; and medical and hospital expenses incurred for himself and his two minor daughters; to pay the sum of $12,500 to the legal guardian of Rosalind Gause, a minor, for personal injuries and permanent disability; and to pay the sum of $1,500 to the legal guardian of Helen Gause, a minor, for personal injuries and permanent disability, as a result of a United States Army airplane crashing into the automobile in which they were riding on West Beach Road, Galveston Island, Galveston County, Tex., on February 21, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS T. KLAUDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1400) for the relief of Louis T. Klauder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis T. Klauder, of Moorestown, N. J., the sum of $3,750, in full satisfaction of his claims for compensation for engineering services rendered in connection with a Rural Electrification Administration project in Franklin County, Mass., known or designated as "Massachusetts 3 Franklin": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,750" and insert "$1,904 80."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDITH M. POWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1453) for the relief of Edith M. Powell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edith M. Powell the sum of $5,000, in full compensation and settlement for all claims and demands of Edith M. Powell growing out of, or arising from, injuries suffered in an accident on Government property near Newport in Lincoln County, Oreg., on or about August 2, 1926: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCKENBACH STEAMSHIP CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1484) for the relief of the Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

E. SULLIVAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1550) for the relief of E. Sullivan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. Sullivan, colonel, Air Corps, Army of the United States, the sum of $1,613.25, such sum representing stoppage in his pay on account of the embezzlement by E. J. Barricklow, a civilian employee, of public funds for which said E. Sullivan was held accountable as agent finance officer at Kelly Field, Tex., from June 1927 to June 1928.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, at the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS CINIGLIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1561) for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio, a minor, of 227 East Ruby Avenue, Palisades Park, N. J., the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries, medical, and hospital expenses sustained as the result of being struck by a United States Army Ford sedan No. 115702, on June 19, 1943, on State Highway Route No. 6 in Palisades Park, N. J.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL BAKER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1676) for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co. of Manchester, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Daniel Baker Co., Manchester, Clay County, Ky., the sum of $525.10, which sum represents the balance due the Daniel Baker Co. and is being withheld by the Government of the United States as part of the excess cost alleged to have been incurred by the United States by reason of the failure of the said Daniel Baker Co. to perform under contract No. Tps-40640, entered into on May 28, 1941, with the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department to furnish gasoline to certain governmental agencies during the period between July 1 through September 30, 1941.

It is further authorized and directed that the Daniel Baker Co. shall not be held liable or responsible on the claim of the United States against the said company in the amount of $101.21, or any part of it, which is alleged by the Comptroller General of the United States to be due the United States from the said company by reason of the alleged excess cost incurred by the United States due to the failure of the said company to perform under contract No. Tps-40640.

The said Daniel Baker Co. entered into contract No. Tps-40640, through its president, with the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department on May 23, 1941, with the mistaken impression that said contract only called for deliveries of gasoline to the governmental agencies included in said contract in Clay County, Ky., where the said company had a franchise from the Shell Oil Co., Inc., to sell and deliver their gasoline, and that the said company was unable at all times, including the contract period, to furnish gasoline elsewhere to fulfill the orders of the governmental agencies included in contract No. Tps-40640: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent

thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. I. WOOTEN, F. M. MALOY, AND MRS. ALETHEA ARTHUR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1757) for the relief of S. I. Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

HARRY TANSEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1758) for the relief of Harry Tansey.

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

HARRIET B. RICKARDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 312) for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

G. F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 315) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in an amount not to exceed $709.51, for items suspended or disallowed.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of former disbursing clerks of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, for items suspended or disallowed, not to exceed the amounts stated: M. V. Bates, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Lansing, Mich., $33,774.03; Ivan Carrico, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Charleston, W. Va., $8,376.77; W. F. Cramer, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, District of Columbia, $58.62; T. A. Dillon, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Indianapolis, Ind., $127.50; O. Kanngiesser, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Albany, N. Y., $21.47; D. E. Love, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Santa Fe, N. Mex., $93.80; L. S. McCracken, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, San Francisco, Calif., $234.70; S. S. Ogdon, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Jefferson City, Mo., $11.48; J. W. Reynar, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Raleigh, N. C., $300.08; F. R. Shaw, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Jefferson City, Mo., $55.01; L. V. Witcombe, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Harrisburg, Pa., $16,800.75.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and all former disbursing clerks operating under the Division of Disbursement for the amounts of all suspensions and disallowances raised and not covered by sections 1 and 2 of this act, or which may be raised, against the said chief disbursing officer and former disbursing clerks on account of payments made in accordance with vouchers certified by duly authorizing certifying officers during the period December 16, 1933, to March 31, 1942: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall certify that in his opinion there is no evidence of fraud on the part of the said chief disbursing officer or disbursing clerks in connection with such payments.

SEC. 4. No charge shall be made against the certifying officer responsible for the certification of vouchers pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order No. 6166, dated June 10, 1933, and any charge heretofore made against any such officer, shall be removed, for the amount of any payment for which credit shall be allowed under sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, where the head of the department or establishment concerned, or his duly authorized representative, shall certify to the Comptroller General of the United States that the payment appears to have been made without fraud on the part of the certifying officer.

SEC. 5. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of W. O. Woods, former Treasurer of the United States, and W. A. Julian, Treasurer of the United States, for sums not to exceed $1,164.93, and $63,334.51, respectively, representing unavailable items in their amounts as former Treasurer and Treasurer of the United States: *Provided*, That any recoveries heretofore or hereafter made in respect of any of the foregoing items, may, in the discretion of the Comptroller General of the United States, be applied to offset unavailable items of a similar character hereafter arising in the accounts of the former Treasurer and Treasurer, respectively, upon a showing that such unavailable items have occurred without fraud on the part of the former Treasurer or Treasurer.

SEC. 6. There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,224.08, of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of $30 shall be credited to the account of T. A. Dillon, former Treasury-State disbursing clerk, Indianapolis, Ind., disbursing symbol 40-01-30, to the extent necessary to adjust an overdraft resulting from an overpayment by check No. 6,432,824, dated August 23, 1938; (b) not to exceed the sum of $1,728.46 shall be credited to the Treasurer's account to the extent necessary to adjust unavailable items resulting from certain shortages, the amount of a check paid on a forged endorsement, the difference between the value of a stolen package of currency and the amount recovered, and the value of three checks which were lost in the office of the Treasurer of the United States after payment; and (c) not to exceed the sum of $8,465.62 shall be credited to the account of Edwin H. Dressel, superintendent, United States Mint, Philadelphia, Pa., to the extent necessary to adjust an unavailable item representing the contents of a bag containing gold coins the absence of which from a vault in the Philadelphia, Pa., mint, was discovered during February 1937, such coins having a face value of $5,000, and increment of $3,465.62 resulting from the reduction in the weight of the gold dollar.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 317) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer of the Treasury Department, for the sum of $1,000, base pay, and $48.30, overtime, a total of $1,048.30, paid by him to Dr. Paul S. Taylor, of Berkeley, Calif., as compensation in excess of $5,000, plus overtime, for personal services rendered during the period from July 1, 1943, to June 13, 1944, and to cancel any claims against the said Dr. Paul S. Taylor and the pay-roll certifying officers of the Department of the Interior for the excess compensation so paid.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is further authorized and directed to allow, out of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for salaries in the Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the claim of the said Dr. Paul S. Taylor for the sum of $375, base pay, and $18.11, overtime, a total of $393.11, representing the balance due him for compensation for personal services which he rendered during the period from June 14, 1944, to June 30, 1944, as a consulting economist of the Department of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AMY McKNIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 335) for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Amy McKnight, widow of George McKnight, a former employee of the War Department at Fort Peck, Mont., whose death on February 20, 1936, is alleged to have resulted from pneumonia contracted while in the performance of duty prior to February 12, 1936, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized to receive and consider her claim under the remaining provisions of the said act: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINO BELLO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 410) for the relief of Marino Bello.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. MILDRED RING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 949) for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Mildred Ring, who is alleged to have sustained injuries from undue exposures to low temperature weather and to have sustained injuries to her back while en route between Reno and Pyramid Lake, Nev., during the winter months of 1927–28, in line of her duties while employed as a field matron in the Indian Service, Department of the Interior, and her claim for compensation on account of all resultant, currently existing disabilities considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such claim with the United States Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Any monthly compensation which the said Mrs. Mildred Ring may be found to be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted, or such earlier date as the Commission, upon evidence submitted, may determine Mrs. Mildred Ring to be otherwise entitled to receive such compensation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORGAN CREAMERY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 952) for the relief of Morgan Creamery Co.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JOE KOOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of Joe Koor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of $930.41 to Joe Koor to reimburse him for the purchase price of shoes bought from the Government at salvage sale held November 23, 1938, at the West Virginia district, Civilian Conservation Corps, Charleston, W. Va., and for expenses incurred by the claimant in connection with the transaction.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out "and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of $930.41."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "to reimburse him for" and insert "of Indianapolis, Ind., the sum of $930.41, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of."

On page 2, at the end of the bill, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID HICKEY POST, NO. 235, AMERICAN LEGION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1034) for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion, of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of $292.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred in the buying and erecting in David Hickey Park, St. Louis, of a memorial monument, which later had to be removed from David Hickey Park, at the expense of said American Legion Post, No. 235, when such park was commandeered by the United States Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$292.50" and insert "$275."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. A. SMOOT, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1058) for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. TRIMBLE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LORENZO H. FROMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1136) for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lorenzo H. Froman, former owner of a certain farm consisting of one hundred and sixty-five acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., is, as such former owner, hereby authorized to bring suit against the United States of America to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses which he may have sustained or suffered as such owner by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgment for the amount of any such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owner of said farm, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONNA MAY McNULTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1230) for the relief of Donna May McNulty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donna May McNulty, Yreka, Calif., wife of Dr. Stanley McNulty, now reported to be a prisoner of Japan, the sum of $1,000. Such sum represents money due Dr. Stanley McNulty by the United States Naval Government of Guam or the Bank of Guam for dental services rendered by him to civilians on the island of Guam but collected and retained by the United States Naval Government of Guam: *Provided*, That in the subsequent settlement of the account of Dr. Stanley McNulty the aforesaid sum of $1,000 shall be charged to his account: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. E. ARMSTRONG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1263) for the relief of E. E. Armstrong.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MATHEW C. COWLEY, DECEASED, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 155 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky.; and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 150 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., are each, as such former owner or owners, hereby authorized to bring such suit or suits as each may respectively desire to so do against the United States of America, to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses, which they may have sustained or suffered, as such respective former owners, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgments for the respective amounts of such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owners of said farms, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitation: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM SWAN AND AILY SWAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1308) for the relief of Sam Swan and Aily Swan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sam Swan and Aily Swan, of Williamson, W. Va., the sum of $3,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Sam Swan and Aily Swan against the United States on account of damage to their home, owned jointly by them, caused by an explosion on October 13, 1941, in a stone quarry where blasting operations were being conducted by the Work Projects Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HYMAN L. SCHIFFER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1325) for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hyman L. Schiffer, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the refund of a bail bond posted for Frieda Schiffer, an alien, same being forfeited on March 13, 1940, when she failed to appear for deportation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNE LOACKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1396) for the relief of Anne Loacker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, to Anne Loacker, of Spokane, Wash., the widow of Leo G. Loacker, formerly a railway-mail clerk, an annuity equal in amount to the annuity which she would have been entitled to receive had the retirement of the said Leo G. Loacker become effective on November 1, 1941, and had he elected in writing, at the time of such retirement, to receive a reduced annuity equal to such reduced annuity payable after his death to the said Anne Loacker, as surviving beneficiary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. W. V. JUSTICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1483) for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. W. V. Justice, of Jackson, Miss., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries received by her on September 6, 1940, when the car which she was driving collided with a United States mail truck, at Jackson, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY B. TUCKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1485) for the relief of Henry B. Tucker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled, "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Henry B. Tucker, of Vicksburg, Miss., and the Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider under the remaining provisions of said act his claim on account of injury and disability alleged to have been incurred on or about April 8, 1940, while performing his duties as an employee of the United States Engineer Office, Vicksburg, Miss.: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIDELITY AND CASUALTY CO. AND THE BAUGH CHEMICAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1536) for the relief of the Fidelity and Casualty Co. and the Baugh Chemical Co.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

C. Y. WEBB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1546) for the relief of C. Y. Webb.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1793) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital, Florence, S. C., against the United States for damages arising from the failure of the United States to carry out a contract with the United States Army, November 16, 1942, to lease or purchase such hospital for the use of the Army. Such suit shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, and the liability of the United States in such suit shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases between private individuals.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "United States" and insert "Army officials."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "with the United States Army."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THULA B. WELLBORN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1837) for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $419.50 to Thula B. Wellborn, of Garland, Ark., in full settlement of all claims against the United States by reason of damages sustained by her as a result of being required by the Civil Service Commission of the United States and the Post Office Department of the United States to resign as a school teacher in Miller County, Ark., in order to be eligible to accept appointment as postmaster at Garland, Ark., and the failure to appoint her to the latter position after such resignation and her place as a school teacher having been filled by another after such resignation and it being too late for her to negotiate a contract for a teaching position elsewhere, and the aforesaid being the amount of salary that would have been earned by claimant as a school teacher under the contract of employment from which she was required to resign as above set forth: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, and it shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, either directly or indirectly, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the

money hereby appropriated in excess of 10 percent thereof for or on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1841) for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and recommitted to the Committee on Claims for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MAUGER CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1842) for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ANNA MATTIL AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1889) for the relief of Anna Mattil and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anna Mattil, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $1,250; to Mildred Reed, Coldwater, N. Y., the sum of $300; to John A. Mattil, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $300; to John H. Mattie, Sr., Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $250; to Edward Kolb, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $300; to Anna Fritz Starr, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $300; to Deloris Clow, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $300; to Julia Valentine, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $100; to the legal guardian of Betty Jane Mosher, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $750; to the legal guardian of Mary Ann Thesing, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $500; to the legal guardian of Marjorie St. John, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $1,500; to the legal guardian of George Mattil, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $1,000; and to the legal guardian of Susie Spier, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $750; to the legal guardian of Richard Ormsby, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $1,500; and to Richard Smith, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $250, in full settlement of all their claims against the Government of the United States for personal injuries sustained by them as the result of an explosion and fire caused by agents of the Bureau of Prohibition during a raid in the city of Rochester, N. Y., July 7, 1933: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Mattie" and insert "Mattil."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "the legal guardian of."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "a minor."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK LORE AND ELIZABETH VIDOTTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1910) for the relief of Frank Lore and Elizabeth Vidotto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Lore, the sum of $1,000; to pay the sum of $1,000 to Elizabeth Vidotto, both of Washington, D. C., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained, resulting from being struck by a motorcycle owned by the Economic Warfare Commission and driven by one Walter Williams, an employee of the said Commission, the said accident having occurred at the intersection of New York Avenue and Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., on the morning of November 8, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWIN FAIRFAX NAULTY AND LESLIE FAIRFAX NAULTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1949) for the compensation of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BEN GRUNSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2055) for the relief of Ben Grunstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ben Grunstein, Hudson County, N. J., the sum of $1,000. Such sum represents reimbursement by the United States to the said Ben Grunstein of an amount paid by him to the United States, in part satisfaction of a judgment had and taken against him in the sum of $2,500 as surety on a bond for the appearance on a day certain of Reuben Finn to answer criminal charges in the United States district court (said judgment having been entered as of record December 6, 1940), the said Reuben Finn having failed to appear on such day, but having been apprehended thereafter and, after conviction, confined to a Federal penitentiary.

SEC. 2. That the said Ben Grunstein is relieved permanently and unconditionally of the obligation to pay the United States any further sum or sums now owing thereto as a result of said judgment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER PAUL BACIC, CHARLES C. COX, H. FOREST HAUGH, AND LUTHER M. DURST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2063) for the relief of Peter Paul Bacic, Charles C. Cox, H. Forest Haugh, and Luther M. Durst.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. MADDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

SIGFRIED OLSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1566) for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co., his heirs or assigns, the sum of $48,562.35, as just compensation for actual cash losses necessarily incurred by him in the operation of two vessels to South America and return in the fall of 1941 in compliance with specific directions of the United States Maritime Commission, carrying in the interest of national defense cargoes specified and at rates designated by the Commission, out-bound and return: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. LUTHER J. HEAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 256) for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 to Dr. Luther Jerrell Head, of Penola, Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of his wife, Mrs. Lucy F. Head, who was killed as the result of an accident involving an Army truck on August 11, 1944, on Highway No. 2 in Virginia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating

the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$5,285."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by myself on January 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a Press Branch release from the Bureau of Public Relations by Maj. Flake L. McHaney, who comes from my home town in Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2252) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue without limitation during the afternoon, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2252, with Mr. PRIEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 hour.

Mr. Chairman, this is the tenth time in as many consecutive years it has been my responsibility to present to the House of Representatives the annual supply bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

I find that this tenth anniversary is conducive to reminiscence. The 10 years that have elapsed since I became chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee comprise one of the most eventful and colorful decades in the history of mankind. Ten years ago America was enjoying profound peace with all of the nations of the earth. Today America and our allies are at war with half of the world. The last 10 years have been an era of tremendous unforeseen expansion in nearly all of the branches of Government.

During that decade the two Departments covered by this bill—Treasury and Post Office—have experienced an enormous increase of activities in keeping with the trend of the times.

The total over-all personnel of the Treasury Department has grown from 65,866 in 1935 to 94,888 in 1945, an increase of 44 percent.

The total appropriations of the Government for the fiscal year 1935 were $7,527,559,327.66 and for 1945, $67,131,995,240.75, an increase of 900 percent.

The disbursing agencies of the Treasury Department handled 29,500,000 items of payments and collections in 1935. In 1945 the Division of Disbursements is handling 97,402,032 items, an increase of over 259 percent.

The public debt, like a great rolling snowball, has grown from $28,701,167,091.78 in 1935 to $232,407,816,310.38 in 1945, an increase of over 800 percent.

Meanwhile the operations of the Post Office Department likewise have expanded to gargantuan proportions.

The total number of persons in the Postal Service, regular and temporary employees, has grown from 275,000 in 1935 to 375,000 in 1945, an increase of 36 percent.

The number of pieces of mail handled in 1935 was 22,300,000,000 and in 1945 the number of pieces estimated to be handled is 37,000,000,000, an increase of 65 percent.

Postal revenues in 1935 amounted to $630,795,000. Postal revenues for the fiscal year 1945 are estimated at $1,270,000,000, an increase of 100 percent.

Postal expenditures in 1935 amounted to $700,597,000. Postal expenditures for the fiscal year 1945 are estimated at $1,149,000,000, an increase of 64 percent.

FROM RED TO BLACK

A major change in the postal picture during the last 10 years has been the transformation of the Postal Service from a deficit operation to a profit-making operation. In the fiscal year 1935 there was a postal deficit of $69,802,000. It is estimated that the current fiscal year 1945 will end with a postal surplus of $117,643,897. Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the reliability of the exact amount of postal surplus estimated for 1945 and 1946, the fact remains that during the last 10 years the Postal Service has gone from the bright red into the deep black, and that despite the fact that the Post Office Department is being compelled by specific statutes to lend itself as a vehicle to perform many services that have no relevancy whatever to carrying the mails. Theoretically, the Post Office Department is supposed to receive full reimbursement for these extraneous activities. Actually, it does not.

I have given you some percentage figures which I believe fairly well index the growth of business of the Treasury and Post Office Departments during the last 10 years. Now let us use the same yardstick in making a comparison of the growth in the appropriations for the two Departments.

The first Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill I presented to the House 10 years ago carried a total appropriation of $989,623,684, slightly under a billion dollars. This bill carries a total appropriation of $1,342,813,090, an increase of 36 percent over 1935. I think that is a very favorable comparison when placed by the side of our increase of 900 percent in total appropriations, 65 percent in the volume of mail handled by the Post Office Department, 100 percent in postal revenues; 64 percent in postal expenditures; 350 percent in Treasury disbursements and 800 percent in the public debt. For holding down the appropriations of the Treasury and Post Office Departments to such a comparatively low level in the face of mounting personnel, constantly swelling volume of work and sky-rocketing costs our subcommittee claims its modest share of credit.

CONSCIENTIOUS PUBLIC SERVANTS

It has been my good fortune that during all of the 10 years I have been chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee I have had on one side in the committee room the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] and on the other side the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

I am sure you will all agree with me that even if by nature I were a wild spender, I could not go far wrong, flanked as I am by those two strict economists. I compliment them on their fine record of service to our country. For the meticulous care with which they weigh the requirements of the Government, seeking means to eliminate every unnecessary and wasteful dollar of expenditures, I think Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. TABER are worth their weight in gold. Certainly they have saved their weight in gold, many times over, to the taxpayers.

To the other members of the subcommittees who joined it through the years, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. DWORSHAK, and more recently Mr. TIBBOTT, Mr. D'ALESANDRO, and Mr. KOPPLEMANN, I pay my tribute of appreciation for their earnest, efficient efforts to make the legislative product of our subcommittee conform to the highest standards of excellence. All of the members of our subcommittee have treated my deficiencies and shortcomings in a very Christianlike way, and for that I am grateful.

I wish also to express my appreciation to our able and resourceful clerk, Mr. Harvey. I think I can describe Mr. Harvey best in a single sentence by saying that he is the personification of all a committee clerk ought to be. Thank you, George, for your efficient service. Mr. Harvey's comprehensive knowledge of governmental affairs and his former experience as budget officer of the Federal Security Agency have given Mr.

Harvey unusual equipment for service with the Appropriations Committee, and I feel that we are very fortunate in having him as our clerk.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] will permit, I would like to make a brief statement to the House about the work of this committee and about the chairman of the committee. It is a tremendous job to go over intelligently and carefully estimates amounting to something over $1,300,000,000. I know of no man in the House who would tackle a job like that with such a fixed determination to do a thorough job as would the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]. For weeks we have met, and I say to the House there is not one item in this bill amounting to $50, to $100, or more, that the gentleman from Indiana has not investigated carefully and asked pointed questions of those presenting the estimates. He has done it with great fidelity and with a tremendous capacity for staying on the job and bringing out the information. Everyone on the committee marvels at his tenacity in addition to the intelligent job that he does. His reports to the House are an example of thoroughness on a bill which is almost unequaled on this floor. His knowledge of the Post Office and Treasury Departments as shown in his remarks is so broad that it would pay anyone to study the gentleman's remarks on these estimates. All of us are proud of the Post Office Department and the Treasury Department. The chairman of this committee gives you a picture of their present operations and much of the history of those Departments in the past, which is almost equal to a fine textbook. The House should be very grateful to the chairman of this committee. Let me say that Mr. LUDLOW's devotion to duty is not exceeded, if equaled, by any Member of this body. If there is another so devoted, it might well be the ranking member on the Republican side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]: The fidelity of those two gentlemen in their examinations and thoroughness is, in my humble opinion, an example for all of us to admire and follow. The gentleman from New York, Representative TABER, is the type of man who reflects great credit upon the Committee on Appropriations and the entire House of Representatives.

I hope, when the gentleman from Indiana presents his story on these estimates, the House will be attentive, for it can profit very much by listening to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and by very carefully studying his remarks as they appear in the RECORD.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, it is beyond my poor powers adequately to express my appreciation of the kind statement made by my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

THESE ARE SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS

In considering the bill before us making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments we should bear constantly in mind that these are departments that have one distinguishing characteristic in that they are created to furnish service to the people of the United States. Being service establishments they do not lend themselves readily to appropriation cuts, especially when the volume of work to be performed is at high tide. The great bulk of the appropriations carried in this bill is to pay for salaries for essential services. In boomtimes, like the present, vast numbers of checks have to be issued and cleared through the Treasury Department. Mail is being created in mountainous volume all over the country and, of course, the mail has to be carried, no difference how many persons must be employed to move it. In view of these elemental facts we of our subcommittee feel that we have done a good job in holding down this bill to the size here presented.

Members of the Appropriations Committee know that the preparation of an appropriation bill for action by Congress is a huge task. Approximately 1 year of my life has been spent in presiding at hearings on appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments. Every year we have before us the Department officials from the Cabinet heads down the long line of bureau chiefs. The hearings last many weeks and after that we proceed to the "marking up" process when, with the printed testimony before us for consultation, we fix the items of appropriations under the various heads or titles. We have conscientiously endeavored in writing this bill to eliminate every dollar that would represent waste or unnecessary expenditure without crippling any essential activity. We have recognized that government is not static and that provision must be made for reasonable growth and expansion.

BELOW BUDGET ESTIMATES

We bring you a bill that is $19,234,730 below the Budget estimates for the two Departments. We did not increase the Budget estimate in respect to any item and we reduced the Budget amount in 50 of the 113 appropriation items carried in the bill.

The total amount carried in the bill is $1,342,813,090, a decrease of $59,873,729 below the appropriations for 1945.

For the Treasury Department we have allowed $235,763,800, which is a decrease of $4,638,497 below the appropriations for the current fiscal year and a decrease of $10,748,300 below the Budget estimates.

For the Post Office Department we have allowed $1,057,049,290, which is a decrease of $55,185,232 below the appropriations for 1945 and a reduction of $8,486,430 below the Budget.

We eliminated the appropriation of $10,000 for the office of Fiscal Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury. The position is vacant and there is uncertainty about securing a suitable person to fill it. Our action was agreeable to the Treasury Department and was taken without prejudice to the right of the Secretary to fill the position when he can find a qualified prospect.

PENALTY MAIL CUT 10 PERCENT

We were called upon to deal with the perplexing problem of an appropriation for penalty mail for the various activities of the Treasury Department, the language submitted to us being as follows:

For deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of the Treasury Department as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364), $6,335,000.

This appropriation covers the cost of penalty mail up to 4 pounds package weight for the entire Department. The cost of mailing packages over 4 pounds in weight is paid for by separate specific appropriations to the various bureaus. These specific appropriations are small compared with the general departmental appropriation mentioned above, which covers the vast bulk of official mail.

There was great weight of evidence before our subcommittee showing that Public Law 364, the new penalty mail law, has proved a "phony" as far as correcting the ugly situation caused by abuses of penalty mail is concerned. Apparently it has neither reduced the volume of penalty mail nor changed the character of those mailings which have been regarded as obnoxious. All of the estimates submitted to us by individual bureaus showed that the officials had simply projected their experience of the past into the future and had submitted quantity estimates based on past mailings. This made it evident that the new law is getting nowhere as a corrective measure to curb the penalty mail evil, and indeed there were indications that the problem, instead of being alleviated, has been compounded by the added cost of administering the new law.

Under the circumstances it seemed to us that pending further consideration of the matter by the proper legislative committee, with a view either to the enactment of a new law or amendment of the existing one, there was little we could do except to make a horizontal cut in the appropriation, so we reduced the estimate by 10 percent, and we will expect that cut to be distributed through all of the bureaus and agencies of the Department. This reduced the Department's penalty mail estimate to $5,701,500, or $188,900 less than the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

FOREIGN FUNDS CONTROL

For the operation of the Foreign Funds Control we allowed $2,000,000 which is a reduction of $1,694,479 on a comparable basis below the appropriation for 1945. This activity is approaching the end of the fiscal year 1945 with an estimated unobligated balance of $900,000. The appropriation for 1945 was $4,000,000. The work of Foreign Funds Control is roughly divided into two programs—the program in the liberated areas and the programs for other controls. The estimate presented to us provided for a slight expansion in the program for the liberated areas, including three additional employees and $4,712 additional money, and for a sharp reduction in the other controls program which would elimi-

nate 187 employees and reduce the cost by $591,599.

We were impressed with the witnesses who spoke for Foreign Funds Control and their evident willingness to meet economy requirements. Orvis A. Schmidt, the director, advised us that the Bureau of the Budget considered their request and approved an estimate for $2,750,000. After it had done so, on the basis of new military developments and additional information from abroad the Foreign Funds officials returned to the Budget Bureau on their own initiative and voluntarily requested that the estimate that had been approved by the Budget be cut half a million dollars. This very unusual action impressed our subcommittee as being a very praiseworthy move and we were hopeful that the good example might become a little more infectious throughout the Government service.

The Foreign Funds activity now controls frozen property amounting to $8,500,000,000 belonging to the governments and nationals of 34 countries. You will find the break-down of the countries and the value of the frozen assets of each on page 223 of the hearings. Of these countries China is the only one that came under the freeze voluntarily and by request. The occupied countries for the most part were pleased to have the United States take action but they did not have an opportunity to request it. Although these foreign assets are well managed and conserved the United States has never received any pay for these services, so well performed, and it is not anticipated that it ever will. The control was established as a necessary move solely for the protection of the United States which assumed from the start to bear all of the cost.

In making a further reduction of $250,000 in the estimate it was our thought that the other controls are now so well systematized and the possibilities of further economies through the extension of the block system are so promising the estimate could stand this additional cut. We have no desire to do anything prejudicial to the excellent service that is being rendered and if new developments in the unpredictable military field should cause Foreign Fund Control to run into financial difficulties we will not be hostile to the consideration of a deficiency estimate.

AMERICAN-OWNED PROPERTY ABROAD

Incidentally, in the course of our hearings we were able for the first time to get the facts about the value of American-owned property in foreign countries. A census of American-owned property around the world has been completed and the summation is found for the first time on pages 224 and 225 of our hearings. It reveals that while foreign-owned property frozen in this country amounts to $8,500,000,000, the value of American-owned property in foreign countries is $4,850,000,000 in excess of that amount, or $13,350,000,000. Much of this American-owned property in foreign lands is under controls similar to that which we exercise over foreign funds. An interesting fact shown by the census is that there is more American-owned property in Germany than in any other country in the world. Its value is $1,290,000,000, or more than one-eleventh of all the property owned by Americans in all of the other countries. Next to Germany is the United Kingdom where American investments total $1,030,000,000. Americans own property valued at $90,000,000 in Japan and the Japanese-owned assets in America total approximately $150,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. How much property did the gentleman say Americans own in Japan?

Mr. LUDLOW. The American-owned property is valued at $90,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman have a list of the names of the ones who own that property?

Mr. LUDLOW. That was not developed in our hearings.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish the gentleman would get it and put it in the RECORD. It would be interesting, as well as informative.

Mr. LUDLOW. They just gave us the gross amount.

A note of encouragement to the Foreign Funds organization has come during the last few days from Paris. The United States Treasury representative there advises that our system is considered so good that the French are proposing to copy our machinery for their own controls within France. A recent problem of foreign-funds control relates to supplying our armed forces in combat zones with a sufficient supply of currency to use as they go along. This has appropriately been named "invasion currency."

"LOANED" EMPLOYEES DISAPPROVED

The Personnel Division submitted to us two estimates—one for $160,900 for its regular operations and another for $20,240 to pay the salary obligation of a block of 11 employees who have been doing regular work in that Division while carried on the pay roll of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Our subcommittee has not considered it good practice to carry regular employees of any activity on the pay roll of another bureau where their only connection is to draw their salary. Such procedure is always irregular, amounting to a personnel maladjustment. We expressed this view to Theodore F. Wilson, Chief of the Personnel Division, and our admonition was followed by the second estimate for $20,240 to transfer to his pay roll the 11 employees who are now being paid out of the appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. We did not allow the full amount of the second estimate but gave him a total of $164,000, or $4,000 above his appropriation for 1945 on a comparable basis. We are suggesting to him that there appears to be a considerable duplication of records in his bureau and that we believe that by abolishing such duplication he can save enough to absorb the cost above $4,000 of transferring the block of 11 employees to his roll. We hope this suggestion will work out satisfactorily and we believe that if it does it will abolish, as far as the Treasury Department is concerned, the unwholesome practice of carrying regular employees on the work roll of one office who draw their salaries from the pay roll of another office. At one time this was a widespread custom in the Treasury Department. It should not exist in any department in any degree. The Division of Personnel has a heavy work load. The number of employees of the Treasury Department is now 94,888, the all-time high, and over 12,000 of this increase has been in the last year.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CLERK

For the Office of Chief Clerk of the Treasury Department we allowed the Budget estimate of $286,000, an increase of $1,690 over the appropriation of 1945 on a comparable basis. This is one of the busiest offices in the Treasury Department and its duties are manifold. Frank A. Birgfeld, the Chief Clerk, is one of the oldest employees of the Department in point of service.

We allowed the Budget estimate of $452,000 to pay the salaries of the operating force of the group of Treasury buildings. The evidence before us showed that these buildings are not overstaffed and that operating costs compare favorably with the expense of operating comparable private buildings.

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

The Bureau of Accounts is a very busy focal point of the Treasury Department and we sought to implement it with the necessary funds to carry on its important activities by allowing it $734,000 for salaries and expenses as against a Budget estimate of $741,200. This will furnish the Bureau $29,000 more than it had in the current fiscal year, even if the overtime law is reenacted.

E. F. Bartelt, the Commissioner of Accounts, also administers the Government Losses in Shipment Act and he submitted to us some interesting figures showing how the Government benefits by that act. Back in 1938 Congress decided that the Government should do away with insurance and carry its own losses in shipment. Since that time the value of shipments reached the staggering total of $1,085,991,661,901 on which losses amounting to $103,547.74 were paid. If these shipments had been insured the premiums would have amounted to $10,468,679, so that Uncle Sam has saved $10,365,131.26 by being his own insurer.

DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT

For the Division of Disbursement, salaries and expenses, we allowed $4,700,000 against a Budget estimate of $5,013,800. The figure we approved will give the Bureau $246,155 more in 1946 than it has in 1945. This will enable the Director to build up his force toward an ultimate goal of 324 additional positions which he requested. This is one of the busiest offices in the entire Government. That the Director needs more personnel is shown by the rapid increase in his already staggering work load. It is estimated that his office will handle 95,601,200 items in the fiscal year 1946 as against 84,660,900

in the current year, an increase of 10,940,300 items. The Division of Disbursement was created by Executive order in 1933, taking over disbursing operations formerly conducted by 584 separate offices and establishments to which have since been added 100 more, making a total of 684 former activities now performed through the consolidated disbursement office. Guy F. Allen, the Director, submitted to us a tabulated statement of savings which he said have been effected by the consolidation, amounting to $1,613,330 to date.

We approved a change of two specific appropriations to indefinite appropriations. These are the appropriations known as "Refund of moneys erroneously received and covered" and "Payment of unclaimed moneys." As the obligations under these laws are statutory and must be paid, whatever they amount to, there seemed to be ample reasons to transfer them to the indefinite class so as to facilitate payments under them. In recent years we have changed internal revenue refunds and customs refunds and drawbacks to indefinite appropriations and these seemed to be of the same character.

PUBLIC DEBT SERVICE REORGANIZED

We approved a rearrangement of the public debt service, which involves quite a change in appropriation structure. As a result, a new title "Administering the Public Debt" takes its place in the annual appropriation bill. The new title is a consolidation of two annual appropriations "Salaries and expenses" and "Printing and binding" and the indefinite appropriation "Expenses of loans."

It is proposed that hereafter all of the expenses of operations and administration of the public debt shall be met from this one item. Believing that the consolidation is in the interest of simplification and good administration we set it up with an appropriation of $84,250,000 or $1,250,000 less than the Budget estimate.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I note that there is included an item of four and one-half billion dollars for interest on the public debt. This, of course, is one of the most important items in the bill. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that about 15 or 18 years ago that four and one-half billion dollars was the total cost for running the entire Government.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman is entirely correct. My memory harks back to that time.

This appropriation carries funds for the War Finance Division, which has charge of the sale of War bonds. The allotment for this Division for the fiscal year 1946 is $8,675,000, which is $4,937,652 less than the allotment for the current fiscal year 1945. One reason for this reduction is that there probably will be fewer bond drives in 1946 than 1945, only one being so far scheduled. Another reason is the large number of unpaid volunteer workers, estimated as high as 6,000,000. The number of salaried workers selling bonds is 521 in Washington and 1,720 in the field, a total of 2,241. At the present time 600,000,000 War bonds are outstanding in the hands of 85,000,000 individual holders.

REDEMPTIONS NOT ALARMING

When Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau was before our subcommittee, I asked him whether the extent of the redemption of War bonds is giving him any concern. His reply, found on page 55 of the hearings, was:

It is of some concern, but not alarming. The redemption figures for December fell off from November, but it does give us some concern. I do not think it has reached any dangerous proportion. I think the important figure to remember is that of all the bonds sold there is still about 88 percent, roughly, in the hands of the public; that is, of all the bonds we have sold they still hold 88 percent.

In October 1944 the first month after the banks were directed to cash War bonds, redemptions arose to $400,550,747.87 and cash receipts that month from the sale of bonds were $695,003,229.61. Since that time redemptions have gradually fallen off.

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

For the salaries and expenses of the office of Treasurer of the United States we allowed $4,600,000 which is $750,000 less than the total appropriated and allotted funds of that office for the present fiscal year. This major economy has been accomplished largely by a conversion from the use of paper checks payable in Washington to the use of card checks payable through the Federal Reserve banks as agents of the Treasurer. It is contemplated that during the fiscal year 1946, 215,000,000 such checks will be paid by the Federal Reserve banks, thus reducing the number of paper checks paid in Washington by a similar volume. There also will be some saving by the payment of United States Savings bonds by commercial banks. This new arrangement began on October 1 of last year.

This will result in a material reduction in the volume of bond payments in the Treasurer's Washington office. The Treasurer of the United States is the world's greatest paymaster. His watchful eye will control the functioning of 334,052,150 checks in the fiscal year 1946.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

For salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Customs we fixed the amount of $22,900,000 which, with estimated 1946 overtime of $4,350,000 brings the 1946 appropriation $680,000 above the total regular and supplemental appropriations of 1945 but still $250,000 under the Budget estimate. Paradoxical as it may seem, although American trade relations with a large part of the world have been cut off by the dislocations of war, customs entries and receipts showed a rapid rise last year when the entries numbered 2,273,914 as against 1,921,917 in the fiscal year 1943 and receipts were $431,252,168 as against $324,290,778. This was an increase of 351,997 in entries and $106,961,390 in receipts. A partial explanation is found in the fact that liquor importations were abnormal due to the distilling holiday in this country.

ELIMINATION OF COMPTROLLER ITEM CONSIDERED

Our subcommittee seriously considered the complete elimination of the annual appropriation for salaries of the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. This would be a revolutionary procedure, but there seemed to be reasonable justification for it, and the Deputy Comptroller, Mr. Upham, who came before us to represent the office was by no means hostile to the suggestion that the appropriation be stricken out. The national banks now pay all but a relatively minor part of the cost of the Comptroller's office in the form of an assessment which covers the salaries of national bank examiners, assistant examiners, and other personnel, their contribution being over $4,000,000 a year. To add to this burden the salaries item we carry annually in the appropriation bill, amounting next year to $278,530, would be of small consequence to the bankers and would not increase their assessment for years to come, if at all, as there is margin enough under the proceeds of the present assessment to cover the relatively slight increase. Inasmuch as the Comptroller's office with its 108 authorized positions, exists largely for the convenience and benefit of the banks, there seem to be good reasons why the banks should take over its pay roll.

I quote from pages 169 and 170 of our hearings, as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW. The largest part of the expense of running your office is paid out of the assessments on the banks?

Mr. UPHAM. Oh, yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Why should not this cost, inclusive of other expenses, be paid out of assessments?

Mr. UPHAM. Why should not the entire cost be charged against the banks?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. UPHAM. And no appropriation asked for it?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. UPHAM. Well, I suppose a number of things could be said on both sides of that question. Traditionally, of course, these expenses have come from appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. LUDLOW. It would be a violation of precedent running way back, would it not?

Mr. UPHAM. Yes, sir. If there were to be any change I suppose now would be the best possible time to do it, because the banks are in pretty top shape, with mounting assets and good earnings.

Mr. LUDLOW. How much would it increase the assessments if the total amount were assessed against the banks?

Mr. UPHAM. It would not have any effect on that, really. We assess the banks a percentage of their total resources. That is the way the law stipulates that we shall do.

As a matter of fact, at the moment I think we could absorb this under the receipts we get from the banks without any particular disturbance.

We finally decided that since the suggestion is new and may involve implications not visible on the surface, it should be deferred for further consideration and we passed it over without prejudice.

NO LOSS TO ANY DEPOSITOR IN 1944

It was brought out at the hearing that no national bank and only one State bank failed during the calendar year 1944, and that because of the bank-guarantee law there was no loss that year

to any depositor in the State bank that failed. Another interesting bit of testimony was that the assets of all national banks reached the all-time high last year, with a total of $70,400,945, as against $58,972,353 in 1943 and $44,718,965 in 1942. In 1934, 10 years ago, the national banks had total assets of $23,900,184.

INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

We reduced the budget estimate for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Internal Revenue from $121,840,000 to $120,000,000, which is approximately $2,623,204 below the appropriation for that Bureau in 1945. The salary stabilization law will expire by limitation on June 30, next, and until the intent of Congress is ascertained the Budget Bureau disapproved an estimate of $1,630,500 for the Salary Stabilization Unit, and no money is carried in this bill for it. If Congress reenacts the law, funds for its administration will have to be carried as a deficiency item. There are 49,820 positions in the Internal Revenue Service, including both Washington and the field, with 1,580 vacancies at the present time. We believed that in a personnel so large and with so many vacancies we would be justified in making a reasonable cut, based on the well-known difficulties of recruitment in the prevailing era of manpower shortage. Internal revenue collections in the calendar year 1944 were in excess of $42,000,000,000, an increase of 700 percent. Compared with 1939, the cost of collection per $100 in 1944—32 cents—was the lowest in the Bureau's history. The task the Bureau of Internal Revenue has to perform is monumental in size and scope, and it is doing a good job. We believe we have not cut the Bureau's estimate too deeply, but if we have it will know how to find the way to the door of the Deficiencies Subcommittee.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

We checked the estimate for "Salaries and expenses" of the Bureau of Narcotics allowing the full budget amount, $1,168,900, which will maintain the existing organization in statu quo, with the same number of positions. H. L. Anslinger, Director of the Bureau, is a painstaking official, alert in combating the evils of drug addiction, running down narcotic rings, and securing convictions for violating the antinarcotic laws. In 1944 there were 2,009 narcotic convictions as a result of his efforts. Heroin, once plentiful at $10 an ounce, is selling today in New York at $2,000 to $3,000 an ounce, and is only about 4 or 5 percent pure, Mr. Anslinger testified.

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING

We allowed $10,400,000 for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, only $71,000 below the Budget estimate. This Bureau has a very large production program and does work for many other Government agencies and some foreign countries on a reimbursable basis. It has lost 700 employees to the military service. It is having a great deal of trouble securing plate printers and other skilled laborers, and we believe the amount we have fixed will tide it over as well as could be expected in these trying times.

THE SECRET SERVICE

We approved substantially in full the Budget estimates for salaries of the Secret Service Division and for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes. Frank J. Wilson, Chief of the Secret Service, impressed us by his unquestioned efficiency, and, while there will always be counterfeiting, check forgeries, and the like, he appears to have the situation as well in hand as we could expect. There were 2,077 convictions in counterfeit cases in 1944 as against 1,484 in 1943. The responsibility resting on this Division for the protection of the President and the members of his family has presented a particularly difficult problem in recent times when the President has made not infrequent visits to foreign countries and the President's wife has established a record among First Ladies as a traveler.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

For salaries and expenses of the mints and assay offices, we allowed the full Budget estimate of $5,400,000 on a clear showing that any less amount would not permit the Bureau of the Mint to cope with the demand for coinage. The Bureau of the Mint went before the Budget Bureau with a request for $6,454,800. The Budget Bureau cut that request very drastically in the sum of $1,054,800, and directed that $786,000 of that cut should be chargeable to the manufacture of coins and $268,800 against requested equipment. There is a prodigious demand for coins, especially 1-cent pieces, and much of the equipment of the mints is old and worn-out. The Bureau has planned to produce 2,128,956,830 coins in fiscal year 1946, of which 1,383,956,830 will be 1-cent pieces. Under the circumstances, our subcommittee could not see its way clear to reduce this estimate even as much as a single dollar.

For salaries and expenses of the Procurement Division we approved $1,300,000 against a Budget estimate of only $30,000 more. This Bureau has duties of an important and complicated nature and needs the personnel to fill all of its authorized positions, but it has its manpower troubles, and we believe that the $30,000 cut can be absorbed by lapses which are inevitable.

SURPLUS-PROPERTY PROGRAM

To implement the surplus-property program, which appears for the first time in an appropriation bill, we approved $15,000,000—a cut of $5,750,000 below the Budget estimate of $20,750,000. This is a new activity and enters on an uncharted field. No one knows, or can know, at this time the extent of its future operations. All of the testimony as to the probable amount of the surplus property to be disposed of was nebulous and mere guesswork. All that is known is that it will be enormous, the figure of half a billion dollars being mentioned in a general way as the possible value of property to be marketed as surplus in the first year's operations. Our subcommittee has a great deal of confidence in John W. Pehle, who is to have charge of the disposal of surplus property for the Procurement Division. We believe that he will proceed in a sound and commonsense way to build up an organization to handle this problem. In an operation of such magnitude it is necessary to feel the way at the start. We believe the amount we have allowed will be enough for a safe and conservative beginning.

AN ASTOUNDING POSTAL PICTURE

When we took up for consideration the estimates of the Post Office Department we were confronted with an astounding picture. Accustomed as we have been for years to postal deficits, we could hardly believe our eyes when we read in the justification that postal surpluses of $117,643,897 and $265,214,280 are predicted for the fiscal years 1945 and 1946, respectively, and that there was an actual postal surplus of $37,768,028 in the fiscal year 1944.

Less than four decades ago the entire Postal Establishment was being run at an annual cost far below the predicted surplus for the year 1946. In 1912, for instance, total postal expenditures were $248,525,450. The surpluses envisioned by the Department do not include the nonpostal credits of $137,409,821 at regular postage rates for free mail and other services performed for other branches and agencies of the Government. Neither is credit taken for the handling of free soldier mail, estimated at $91,314,600 annually at regular postage rates, or for the secretarial services rendered to the Civil Service Commission in post offices, which is estimated to amount to over a million dollars annually.

SEEMED TOO GOOD TO BE TRUE

It seemed too good to be true and inquisitive members of our subcommittee were put on their mettle to discover whether there was a "catch" in it somewhere. Inquiries brought out that the 1946 estimate of surplus did not take into consideration the probability that Congress will enact the public laws conferring benefits on postal employees which will expire on June 30 next. Chief among these is Public Law 25, which allows temporary additional compensation of $300 a year to postal employees, of whom there are 273,038. According to the Department's estimates, reenactment of the additional compensation and overtime statutes would still leave a surplus of $147,647,322 for 1946.

GREAT INCREASE IN POSTAL REVENUES

The Department's rosy prediction is based on expanding volume of mail, plus additional revenue due to increases in postage rates authorized last year by Congress. There was a gain of 22.5 percent in postal revenue during the first 5 months of the present fiscal year, compared with the same period last year, and the increased income during fiscal year 1945 due to the raise in postage rates is estimated at $88,000,000. In arriving at postal surpluses the Department has not taken into consideration the transoceanic transportation and delivery of soldier mail by the Army and Navy, which is estimated to have cost about $25,000,000 a year, nor has it included the cost of handling mail by the War Shipping Administration.

While there may be a question as to the exactitude of the Post Office Department's estimates of its surpluses, it does seem clear that the Department has gone

out of the "red" and that at least until reverses set in it will be found in the deep "black."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I was very much interested in what the gentleman said a few moments ago about the amount of property owned by Americans in foreign countries. What was the amount the gentleman said Americans owned in Germany? I understood the gentleman to say it was several hundred million dollars.

Mr. LUDLOW. Oh, yes. American-owned property in Germany is valued at $1,290,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if the gentleman's committee could find out who owns that property. I think the American people have a right to know. They have a right to know what Americans own property in all of the enemy countries, and all other countries of the world, just when that property was purchased, what it consists of, and the names of the people who own it.

Mr. LUDLOW. Let me suggest to the gentleman that if he will take that matter up with the Foreign Funds Control I think he can get as much detail as he desires. We did not go into it exhaustively because it did not seem to be in line with our inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman will find that those who own that property in Japan are the people who sold Japan scrap iron and oil and other materials with which they are now killing our boys.

I think the American people ought to know who owns that property. They ought to know who owns that property in Germany, and they ought to know who owns all this vast amount of property in every other country of the world. I see from the hearings it totals more than $13,000,000,000.

I hope the gentleman's committee will go into it, get the names of the owners, and place them in the RECORD.

Mr. LUDLOW. If the gentleman from Mississippi will consult the hearings he will find considerable testimony on that which may be of interest to him; the testimony we took, however, does not give the names.

Mr. RANKIN. They have been talking of cartels and, of course, I am against cartels; everybody knows that I have been opposed to them, as I have opposed a high protective tariff. But if you can get the names of those individuals who own that property in Germany and Japan, in my opinion you will turn up some of the most crooked and disloyal international operators in the world.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. We were doing business in practically every country of the world when the World War came along. The outbreak of war naturally left many business transactions uncompleted in many countries and everything was frozen. That explains most of the amounts listed in the hearings on page 224. They represent the normal business operations which are always a little out of balance. Most of this money is just what was represented by uncompleted business transactions at the outbreak of the war.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the very ones who owned property in Germany and Japan, who were helping the German and Japanese military men get ready for war, will now be demanding that we restore this property to them when the war is over. I want to know who they are, and I hope the gentleman will put those names in the RECORD.

In my opinion, you will uncover some of the most dangerous warmakers in the world. I do not care how much they wrap the flag around themselves and prate about their patriotism, we are paying for their activities today with the blood of the young men from your district and mine, and I submit that we ought to get the names of every one of these and publish them and republish them. By so doing, as I say, there probably will be uncovered an international cabal which has not only promoted this war against us but will be promoting other wars when this one is over.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may interrogate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Would that be any worse than those who sold goods to Japan that led up to Pearl Harbor?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was either not in the Chamber or not listening when, I began this inquiry. I spoke about those individuals who had armed Germany and Japan. I say it is the same element that sold scrap iron, oil, and gas to Japan, the very material the Japs are using to kill our boys now. I think we ought to know who they are, because when this war is over they are going to be whining around for us to put them back into possession of their properties abroad.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. There may have been some of the things going on of which the gentleman from Mississippi speaks, but anyone knows that there is not anything underhanded or unlawful in owning property in foreign countries. We have in Canada $4,375,000 worth of American-owned property. I fail to see where there is any stigma attached to owning property in foreign countries. But the war came and stopped intercourse between us and many foreign countries. There may be some cases of the type to which the gentleman from Mississippi referred; but certainly the mere fact of doing business with foreign countries is nothing that has ever been considered underhanded.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Kentucky must see the difference between doing business in Germany and Japan and helping to build up the war machine against us, and doing business in a friendly country like Canada which has always been our friend and which has never quarreled with us and probably never will. I believe I can see a vast difference and I think we ought to know the name of every individual, every company that owned this property in both Germany and Japan.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. Before the gentleman leaves this subject, may I say that I think we ought to give some consideration to the German nationals and the Japanese nationals who owned property in the United States at the time this war occurred. I have had a bill during the Seventy-eighth Congress to take this property, sell it and with the proceeds to create a fund, out of which American citizens who had suffered damage as a consequence of enemy action, might be reimbursed. That bill did not make any progress in the last Congress for the reason that the administration could not make up its mind whether it was for or against the principle for which I contended. In the hope that it has progressed a little in its thinking, I am going to introduce it in this Congress within the next few days.

Mr. RANKIN. That property has been seized.

Mr. GEARHART. The property has been seized; other assets have been frozen. Title to the property, by operation of law, is now in the United States. My bill would authorize its immediate sale. The funds derived therefrom would be applied to the reduction of the damages suffered by American citizens as the result of enemy war action. Try though I have I cannot move the bill forward.

It is interesting to note that all of the opposition to my bill comes from one or the other of but two sources, from attorneys who have been in the employ, successively, of the Imperial German Government, the Weimar Republic, and the Hitler dictatorship, representing numerous German banks and business corporations, and by college professors who have, under examination in congressional hearings, admitted that they had been retained by German and Japanese interests to present the views of those who were opposed to the sale of seized alien-enemy property. Strange though it may seem, our German enemy never seems to lack defenders in our committee hearing rooms when the property interests of German citizens are involved, smug, prosperous, well-fed defenders at that. Yes, this might well be the subject for a congressional committee investigation, one which might be undertaken to our country's advantage by the very able committee that is conducting this proceeding.

Mr. RANKIN. One more suggestion. The last conversation I ever had with Cordell Hull was over this question of

maintaining peace among the nations of the earth as against a policy of intervention. Mr. Hull agreed with me that he was in favor of helping to maintain peace among the nations of the earth, but was absolutely opposed to the policy of intervention. You will find the gang who own this property in Germany and Japan are interventionists who will want the sons of the next generation to protect them in carrying on whatever business they propose to carry on in the other fellow's country. I take the position that when a man comes to the United States to do business he should come here and submit himself to the laws of our country. When an American goes to a foreign country he should do the same thing, not come here and whine, as they will after this war is over, and urge us to help them recover their property that has been used to help kill our young men in this war.

Mr. LUDLOW. May I say to the gentleman that I have a great deal of sympathy with his position.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Mississippi mentions the necessity for those individuals who come to our country to do business accepting the laws under which we operate. It might be a good idea to call the attention of the committee at this time to the fact that the War Department has not yet told the reason why Hans Wilhelm Rohl, a German noncitizen, could live in the United States of America for more than a quarter of a century, could do business here as a private contractor and get hold of millions of dollars worth of contracts with our Government to build defenses in the Pacific. I think that is a question that would be interesting to look into.

Mr. RANKIN. Without becoming an American citizen.

Mr. RANDOLPH. He is not a citizen, he has lived here a quarter of a century, and he held those contracts amounting to millions of dollars on work of really a secretive nature at Pearl Harbor and as yet there is no explanation why our Government should give a contract to a man who is not a citizen to do that kind of work.

Mr. RANKIN. I have been informed that some of the individuals who own this property in Germany and Japan also own a very great, if not controlling, interest in some of the big newspapers of this country. We might as well go into this thing and dig it up now, because these boys when they come back here with empty sleeves, with their legs off and eyes shot out, will want to know why we did not do it.

Mr. LUDLOW. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi, who is very able and resourceful, will go into this matter, because it should be brought out. I believe an inquiry by the gentleman directed to Mr. Schmidt, head of the Foreign Funds Control, will bring him a great deal of very interesting information if he will take up the matter.

Mr. RANKIN. This will involve probably the cartel question. It is very far-reaching. I just thought the gentleman's committee which dug up this information might go a step further and get the names of all these individuals and show what each one of them owns in these foreign countries, especially in the countries with which we are now at war.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I feel in fairness to others who wish to speak that I already have taken too much time, but I should like, sketchily, to present the remaining features of the bill.

PAY OF POSTAL WORKERS

I would like to begin my discussion of that part of the bill which pertains to the Post Office Department, by saying that all of the information I have obtained through my intimate association with the Post Office Department, as chairman of this Subcommittee on Postal Appropriations, convinces me that the postal workers have a perfect claim for increase of pay. I have never come into contact with a finer group of workers than the postal employees. They respond to the call of duty in all kinds of weather, and often under circumstances that are a test of men's souls, yet they go ahead unflinchingly in the performance of their duties. When I think of the small pay the postal employee receives in comparison with others who are beneficiaries of the high wages and inflated salaries of these times, I am impressed that he is the forgotten man. It has been 19 years since the basic pay of postal workers has been adjusted, and in that time the cost of living has risen enormously. I hope and believe that Congress is not going to lose any time in correcting this situation. I predict early passage of the bill to revise the pay of postal employees.

IMMENSITY OF POSTAL VOLUME

An idea of the immensity of the postal volume may be obtained from the fact that 34,209,065,289 pieces of mail were handled during the year ended March 31, 1944. This compares with 32,818,261,854 handled during the fiscal year 1943. One piece of mail out of every eight is carried free.

PENALTY MAIL DECREASE

Penalty mail, the free mail of the departments, and franked mail, the free mail of Members of Congress, registered a drop last year. Penalty mail decreased in dollar volume from $103,485,392 in 1943 to $102,945,096 in 1944, and franked mail from $1,157,122 to $1,069,495. The following extract from the hearings—page 26—is of interest:

Mr. LUDLOW. What is the explanation of the reduction in the dollar volume of penalty mail?

Mr. GARTLAND. We think that the debates in Congress and the inquiries that have been made about penalty mail are having a salutary effect. Every department and agency of the Government is now conscious of penalty mail, so it is being watched. We think this is having a good effect, even though there may not be shown a decrease in this current year. At the same time the expenditure might have been much larger. Congress now has a yardstick by which to measure the penalty mailings of each department and agency of the Government which it has never had before.

EMPLOYEES ON MILITARY LEAVE

About 50,000 postal employees are on military leave at this time, each one with a guaranty that he will get his former position back when he returns from the war. The department is suffering from a crippled manpower problem as a result of the departure of these 50,000 who have been supplanted by older and less efficient persons and in a good many instances by students taken from the schools.

The Post Office Department's estimates in the main were conservative and in line with Postmaster General Walker's determination to hold to the minimum of rigid necessity. Joseph F. Gartland, chairman of the Operating Board, who came before us representing Mr. Walker, said:

The Postmaster General wanted you to know that in presenting the estimates he has been mindful of your policy not to include items except those absolutely necessary for the efficient operation of the Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. The gentleman has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NO ADDITIONAL INSPECTORS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, in keeping with this policy the Department for the first time in many years refrained from asking for any addition to its force of post-office inspectors.

The Bureau of Accounts requested an appropriation of $523,700, an increase on a comparable basis of $233,002 over its appropriation for 1945. This estimate covered a proposed additional block of 12 permanent employees and 56 temporary employees for a period of 1 year, to bring the postal employees' retirement records up to date. There never has been a time when the retirement records have not been in arrears and our subcommittee recognizes the importance of making them current, but we did not feel that it is necessary to achieve this goal at one stride. We fixed the appropriation at $375,000 and gave the Bureau authority to employ not to exceed 3 temporary experts without regard to civil-service laws at a rate of $15,000 each per annum.

COMPENSATION TO POSTMASTERS

For compensation to postmasters we approved the full Budget estimate of $59,773,000. The salaries of postmasters are fixed on July 1 of every year and are based on receipts of the respective post offices during the preceding calendar year. The obligations must be paid and the annual adjustment of salaries is purely a mathematical calculation. The amount suggested by the Department was approved in toto by the Budget, and we agreed to recommend it in this bill as being the closest ascertainable approximation to meet the requirements.

NO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS

We disapproved an estimate for the appointment of 200 additional assistant postmasters. There are 2,955 post offices eligible for assistant postmasters which

do not have them at this time. The Department would like to appoint an assistant postmaster at every one of these offices as soon as possible, but our subcommittee, very properly I think, is reluctant to approve large accretions to permanent personnel.

CLERKS' ESTIMATE APPROVED

For clerks, special clerks, supervisors, and mail handlers at first- and second-class post offices we approved the full Budget estimate of $302,000,000. This is the largest item in the bill. It has been a long-standing policy to allow the estimate for clerks with the understanding that if it becomes necessary to employ additional clerks during the fiscal year the Department will do so and come to the Capitol for a deficiency appropriation. It is indicated that there will be a deficiency of $18,628,079 in the clerks' appropriation for the current fiscal year.

CONTRACT STATION SERVICE

For the establishment of contract station service we allowed $2,900,000, an increase of $200,000 over the appropriation for the present year. These stations usually are located in drug stores, department stores, or similar places. They are a great convenience to the public and a great saving to the Post Office Department, but they are costing more now because the contractors are having difficulty getting help. They cannot hire girls as they used to at $18 or $20 a week. So the number of stations has been decreasing and the annual rate has been going up. There are now 2,875 of these stations, and it is expected that the appropriation we have approved will permit the establishment of 200 more.

CLERKS AT THIRD-CLASS OFFICES

We very willingly approved the full Budget estimate of $11,492,000 for clerks at third-class post offices. The Budget had recommended to us the full amount requested by the Department. The salaries of these employees range from 14.3 cents to 32.8 cents an hour. As work in defense plants and private industry is readily available to them at 60 to 70 cents an hour, the service is being constantly disrupted by resignations. Under the law these clerks, of whom there are 15,000 or 16,000, must be paid not less than 75 percent of the standard allowance. Under the appropriation fixed those who have been paid below the standard rate will be raised to standard so that hereafter all will be on a 100-percent standard basis. There is much to be said in favor of legislation to give these employees a civil-service status with reasonable salaries. A proper comparison would be with village delivery carriers, who receive salaries ranging from $1,150 to $1,350 a year, while the top salary paid to clerks at third-class offices is only $800 a year.

For Village Delivery Service we recommend $375,000 as against an appropriation of $1,261,000 for the present fiscal year. This is a rapidly diminishing service, due to the fact that many communities that have had village delivery have qualified for city delivery. Of the amount appropriated for this year it is estimated $647,450 will be turned back into the Treasury. No village delivery services have been established since 1938, and there is no application for such service pending at the Department at this time. Whenever the receipts of a village delivery office reach $10,000 the community can qualify for city delivery.

CITY DELIVERY CARRIERS

For city delivery carriers, the second largest block of employees in the Postal Service, we allowed $172,000,000 against a budget estimate of $174,000,000. On December 31 there were 63,144 positions in this service, and 4,850 vacancies, with a very poor prospect for recruitment to bring the force up to full strength. In making the relatively small cut we were influenced somewhat by the fact that an unobligated balance of $9,222,900 for the fiscal year 1945 is indicated.

RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE

We now come to the Rural Delivery Service, for which we gave our sanction to the full Budget estimate of $93,598,000, which also has the Department's approval. On December 31 last there were 32,122 rural routes, with 32,052 carriers serving 7,917,031 families, and the service was widely and equitably distributed throughout the United States. We carry in the language of the bill a provision requiring not less than $200,000 of the appropriation to be spent for extensions and new service during the fiscal year 1946. Under this mandate the Department proposes the following program for 1946:

Extensions, existing routes	$175,000
Extensions, result of consolidations	50,000
New routes	175,000
Total	400,000

STAR ROUTE SERVICE

The Star Route Service is operating this year with an unobligated balance of $1,411,000 due partially to the fact that the Department overestimated the increase of obligations that would result from reletting the contracts in the second contract section on July 1 last. On the coming July 1, contracts will be relet in the first contract section and our subcommittee deemed it possible that the experience of the second section will be repeated there. The estimate presented for the Star Route Service, $19,500,000, represented an increase of $1,311,000 over actual expenditures for 1945. We reduced the amount to $19,150,000, believing that this cut of $350,000 is entirely justifiable by the picture that was presented to us. The States that are included in the first contract section where contracts are soon to be readvertised are Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia. The annual rate in that section on July 1 last was $3,975,541. The Post Office Department is lukewarm to a suggestion that the Star Route Service be abolished as a contract service and transferred to a salary system to be operated by regular civil-service employees, the same as other postal services. This change has been agitated for some time by the Star Carrier, the organ of the star-route carriers.

As a means of alleviating bad conditions that have long obtained in the Service, the Department does propose new legislation allowing the Postmaster General to renegotiate with the carrier at the end of the 4-year contract period for renewal of the existing contract for another 4 years; also permitting the Postmaster General to readjust the pay of a contractor when unforeseen conditions arise to make the pay inadequate. This arrangement existed during World War No. 1 and the Department states that it was satisfactory.

RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION

The railroad transportation and mail messenger service is running this year with an estimated deficiency of $8,000,000, and we gave approval to the full Budget estimate of $145,000,000, which is a decrease of $1,180,000 below this year's estimated obligations. The mails have to be moved and whatever space is required to move them must be purchased, so the amount appropriated in our regular bill is not vitally important as any excess of cost must be, and will be, provided in deficiency appropriations. The unpredictable item is the amount of emergency space that will be required. The emergency space requirement is larger now than ever before in the history of the Government. The Department set up $20,005,845 as the amount that will be necessary to pay for emergency service in 1946. The Budget Bureau reduced that amount $2,745,000. Emergency space is paid for at the same rates as regular space.

For transportation of foreign mails, except by aircraft, we allowed $400,000, the lowest appropriation in many years. The cost of this service has been drastically reduced due to an agreement entered into with the War Shipping Administration effective since July 1, 1942, whereby no compensation is paid by the Post Office Department for mails dispatched on vessels owned or operated by the War Shipping Administration. The appropriation for foreign mail transportation in 1940 was $3,250,000. The appropriation for 1945 was $575,000, and there will be an unobligated balance at the end of this year amounting to $199,708.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES DELINQUENT IN SETTLEMENTS

We eliminated from the bill a proposed appropriation of $1,500,000 for balances due to foreign countries on a showing that there is an available carry-over of $2,241,000 which can be used for that purpose. When it comes to making settlements that are due to the United States many countries, especially in Europe, have been very slow in putting their money on the barrel head. Portugal owed us $942,000, and after being behind in settlements over a year, a few days ago sent a check to the Department. Spain is over a year behind in her payments. Switzerland is a long way behind. Great Britain owes us $470,092.37. The State Department tries to assist in making these collections, but so far the delinquent European nations have proved themselves to be very skillful in resisting diplomatic pressure.

FOREIGN AIR MAIL

For foreign air-mail transportation we allowed $4,836,000, a cut of $1,000,000 below the Budget of $5,836,000. The amount spent under this appropriation during the first 5 months of the present fiscal year was only $1,867,000. A survey of military mail showed that members of the armed forces received 6.96 pieces of mail and sent 6.04 pieces of mail a week. That is 13 pieces of mail per week for each member of the armed forces, or 7,774,000,000 per year. Of the 13 pieces of mail handled per week for each member of the armed forces about 5.9 pieces were what is termed "free soldier mail." On the basis of 11,500,000 men in the service 3,043,820,000 pieces of this type of mail were handled in 1944. Had postage of 3 cents been paid thereon, revenue in the amount of $91,314,600 would have been paid thereon. However, a very large volume of the letters sent to soldiers go by air mail and pay the rate of 6 cents per half ounce.

The domestic air service is growing by leaps and bounds and our subcommittee was anxious to avoid doing anything that might cripple it. The Department asked the Budget for $43,315,000 to carry on this service during the next fiscal year. The Budget approved the request in full and we have incorporated that amount in this bill. This is an increase of $5,937,200 over all appropriations for 1945.

VAST GROWTH OF DOMESTIC AIR MAIL

The growing popularity of the domestic air mail service is evidenced by the astonishing rate by which the revenues from that source have increased, as shown by the following table of receipts from air mail:

1940	$19,000,000
1941	24,000,000
1942	53,000,000
1943	63,000,000
1944	103,000,000

The domestic air-mail service went out of the red into the black in 1943, when there was a profit of about $18,500,000.

The results of the increase of air-mail postage from 6 to 8 cents an ounce has confounded all of the prophets. The trend in the volume of air mail is still upward and revenues have been increased one-third. The additional domestic air-mail service planned for next year will be confined to starting service on routes that have already been certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

MANUFACTURE OF STAMPS AND STAMP PAPER

The Third Assistant Postmaster General and his associates came before us to justify an estimate of $6,750,000 for the manufacture and distribution of stamps and stamped paper. We allowed $6,500,000, which is an increase of $107,000 over all obligations for that purpose in 1945. The income from the sale of stamps and stamped paper is the backbone of postal revenues. In the fiscal year 1944 it was $787,835,823. The revenue from this source is estimated at $909,933,893 for the fiscal year 1945 and $969,153,000 for the fiscal year 1946. On account of the large number of new stamps the Philatelic Agency did a flourishing business last year. Its receipts were $2,028,467.13, compared with $594,599.78 in 1943, an increase of 241 percent. It was next to the best year in the agency's history, the peak being in 1935, when the receipts were $2,340,484.20. The Postal Savings System continues to meet with popular favor. Deposits on June 30, 1944, were $2,034,012,978, an increase of $478,603,036 over deposits on June 30, 1943.

STAMP-VENDING MACHINES

The Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General presented an estimate of $1,000,000 to purchase stamp-vending devices and omnidenomination machines. No estimates were presented for this purpose in 1944 and 1945. It was proposed to spend the money in the proportion of two-thirds for stamp-vending devices and the balance for omnidenomination machines, which issue a sticker or a label for any amount of postage up to the capacity of the machine, usually $9.99. The plan was to distribute these devices and machines in congested centers.

Our subcommittee realizes that these mechanical instruments are a convenience to the public and would be especially useful in these times of a dearth of manpower, but it was not entirely clear that priorities can be secured for their manufacture in the numbers contemplated. In view of these conditions, we thought that a conservative approach would be advisable and we allowed $500,000, or one-half of the amount requested.

I have tried to present some of the principal high lights of this large bill and I thank you for your patience.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides the funds to operate the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department. There is almost never a question involved with reference to the bill that relates to anything other than the amount of the funds that are required to handle properly the operations of these two departments. Having that in mind, the committee has gone over these estimates that have been submitted by the Budget and it has trimmed off the funds that it regarded as excess.

In some places perhaps they have not trimmed as much as I would like to see trimmed. In other places they have done a very good job. The total trimming on both bills runs just a little bit under $20,000,000. There are a very large number of items which could not be justified if we knew that the war in Europe was going to end before the 1st of July when these items become effective. On the other hand, looking at the situation which we face in connection with the war we would be bold if we undertook to say the war was going to be over before that date. Under the circumstances, we have to provide for a good many of these agencies with that in mind.

I am going through the bill rapidly and call attention to the items I believe could be cut down and curtailed to a marked extent, if the war was over. I believe the item of "Foreign funds control," amounting to $2,000,000, could be very largely eliminated. The Division of Disbursements, which has activities in connection with the war, could be curtailed. The item of "Administering the public debt," amounting to $34,250,000, could, in my opinion, be pretty well cut in two, if the war were over and we did not have to provide for bond drives and that sort of thing. But in this connection I want to call attention to this particular item and describe what has been done to it. I think what has been done to it is very largely the result of the examination that was given the public debt service a year ago when they were before the committee and the situations which were called to their attention with reference to the waste of funds. I am doing this particularly because I feel that when something of this kind happens where the Members of Congress are entitled to credit, it should be called to the attention of the general public. Here there has been a consolidation of the items relating to the production of bonds, their sale and disposition, and the payment of the bonds. Last year there were appropriations made involving practically $116,000,000 in two separate items, one for what they call the Bureau of the Public Debt and the other for administering the sale of Government bonds. They called that Expenses of loan. That item was $109,500,000. The other items involved a total of $6,800,000, or a total of nearly $116,000,000.

The total appropriation this year is $85,050,000, or a saving of more than $30,000,000, or more than 25 percent, in one appropriation. That has come almost entirely as a result of the hammering those people were given in the hearings of last year. We could not make the cut which we should have made last year without being accused of interfering with the war effort, but we did call attention to the facts and bring out the facts in such a way that the Department was obliged this year to come before the Budget with a program getting rid of a tremendous lot of waste and inefficiency. Every promoter was involved in this thing everywhere.

Other savings in this bill are minor as compared with that particular one. The Budget estimate submitted this time has been trimmed $1,250,000 in addition to the cut that was made on that particular item.

There are other items involved in the bill, like the Treasurer's office, that could be very markedly curtailed if the war were over. I call attention to these things on the floor because I believe there should be a record of it right out in front, where those who happen to be sitting in the Congress when the war is over may have those things before them, that they may take advantage of the opportunity.

I believe the activities of the Bureau of Internal Revenue could be very markedly reduced if the war were over.

The Bureau of Engraving and Printing is another item that could stand that sort of thing, particularly with reference to guard force.

There is another item to which I wish to call attention. It is not an item that relates to a saving that may be made after the war is over, although the activity should not extend too long after the war is over. That is the surplus

property disposal item. We have carried that item at $15,000,000. We have made a cut there of a little better than 25 percent under Budget estimates, because we felt they would have all the money they would need to carry on the activities that should be carried on.

We found a very peculiar situation that had existed, although we were advised that it had been corrected as of about January 1. I think attention should be called to it and that the Department should be warned that the committee intends to watch that situation very closely. Large items of surplus property have been turned over to this unit for disposition. The items turned over month by month have exceeded the amounts they have disposed of. They have what they carry in their inventory as $100,000,000 worth of stuff now. That is an inventory by themselves.

During the hearings we called attention to the situation and did everything that could be done to put pressure on them to get rid of those things immediately that are in scarce supply; that is, those things that were turned over to them, such as trucks, fire apparatus, and things of that character. We told them they should get rid of those things right away, that they should get rid of anything that was in short supply in this country right away, so that civilians would be as little handicapped in their lives as possible.

We found several things which I believe should be called to the committee's attention. For one of them, I shall have to go into other hearings to give you the whole story, but at the present time there are scattered over the country upward of $50,000,000 worth of trucks and fire apparatus that belong to the Office of Civilian Defense, a lot of it in territory where there is not the slightest danger of war damage and a lot of it in territory where the things are not needed; yet the Office of Civilian Defense has not turned them over to the Surplus Property Custodian, not a single truck, not a single piece of fire apparatus, to be disposed of to civilian units that do need it. This is a very serious situation, because at this time our local units cannot buy fire apparatus of any description from manufacturers, and they almost never, except in extreme cases, can get priorities for that purpose.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. What department of the Government would have the power to compel Mr. Martin, at the head of Civilian Defense, to turn this equipment over so that it could get into the hands of the public authorities that do need it?

Mr. TABER. I believe the Surplus Property Board created under the so-called surplus-property bill that was passed last fall could do that; I think they should do it. I do not believe this Congress should make any more appropriations for General Haskell and the rest of that crowd to operate the O. C. D. I think we should line that up and get rid of those things, such as fire apparatus. If fire apparatus is needed in the towns where it is presently located, well and good; let title be passed to the town authorities for a fair consideration on the basis of its present condition; and if it is not needed there, it ought to be turned in as surplus property so it can be placed where it is needed and will be used. I believe that every single thing they have ought to be liquidated and we ought to clean up on that activity. It has been an eyesore ever since it started and the further one gets into it the more sore the eye becomes. Now I am going to get into another matter, if I may, the question of the method of procedure on surplus-property disposal.

Mr. VURSELL. Before the gentleman gets into that will he permit another question or observation?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman will recall that last year I made a considerable investigation to see whether we might be able to terminate the services of civilian defense, and testified before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. VURSELL. They wanted to hang on and even made a request for $2,830,000. Most of the heads of civilian defense all over the United States said that agency could be done away with and, as I recall, it was reduced to $1,000,000.

Mr. TABER. An investigation of their own outfit by themselves showed that.

Mr. VURSELL. It was reduced to $1,000,000 and I think when this thing comes up again it should be wiped off the board.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. They had an enormous amount of stuff in warehouses. How much they have right now I could not tell you, but whatever they have is too much.

Now, I want to get into this other question with reference to surplus property to which I intend to call attention. It has been the custom down to right recently and I have not the exact date in my head—it is right around the 1st of the year—for this surplus property set-up to inventory their stuff at a certain price when they took it in from the war agency or whatever agency declared it surplus, and then when they sold the stuff to reduce the inventory price down to the figure for which the stuff was sold. So that you cannot get any idea what they received for the stuff anywhere near what they appraised it at themselves or not. Is my statement clear enough to be understood? That is the queerest way of doing business and keeping books I ever heard of.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Let me see if I understand the gentleman correctly. He means under their system they would always be getting 100 percent value for their stuff because they would appraise it for whatever they sold it?

Mr. TABER. They would adjust their inventory after they made the sale to the amount of the sale. For instance, if they had that penknife and they appraised it at $1 and sold it for 50 cents, they would thereafter change the inventory to 50 cents, so that the final inventory on the knife would be just the same as the price for which it was sold.

Mr. VURSELL. They balanced the budget that way.

Mr. TABER. They balanced their books that way. That is the queerest way of doing business I ever heard of. Maybe I have not had much experience with New Deal finances. That was a little bit beyond anything I had ever heard of, however.

They claim they have stopped that, but if they have not stopped it their necks ought to be wrung. There is no question in my mind but what they will be pretty well on their guard; however they still have more property coming in every day than goes out and right at a time when everything ought to be going out right away because of the enormous civilian demand there is and the lack of civilian supplies. I am hopeful they will do a little better on that sort of thing and get the stuff out, get it cleaned up, because that is what we passed that Surplus Property Act for. We passed that so that they could go ahead and do the job. That is what we in the Congress here want them to do.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. It has come to my attention that right at the present time there is so much surplus property coming in and being declared surplus that all the warehouses which have been up to this date available are now completely filled or almost completely filled with surplus property to the end that we now find ourselves in the position where the warehouses that have been housing these things that are not surplus are now so crowded that the necessary material is being stored outside in some places in order to make way for this surplus property.

The question is, Are we going to continue piling up surpluses and build new warehouses or are we going to start disposing of as much of this stuff as we can to make room for the things that are needed in the war effort, such as ammunition, food, clothing, and so forth? The thing that disturbs me and the folks in the Treasury Department today is this: We have this great surplus amount of goods. Just what are they going to do with it? Are they going to build, as I said before, great big new warehouses or are they going to dispose of it and not build any more warehouses.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe there is any occasion to build any more warehouses. Frankly, I think that we have come to the point where that should not be done any more. As I stated a moment ago, I feel that it is up to the Surplus Property Unit to immediately get busy and clean up that situation and reduce the inventory that they now have. They have more goods on hand now than they can get rid of in 6 months at the rate they have been going. Instead of doing as they have in the past, every item should be sold inside of 3 months from the day it is turned over to them.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The people who have this job of disposing of the surpluses are rather undecided as to just what and how much they should dispose of until the boys come back who, without a doubt, will want to buy some of these surplus goods, and they are going to feel that they are entitled to the chance of purchasing some of it.

Mr. TABER. What kind of surplus goods are there that they want to buy that would not exist after the war is over? I do not know what they would be. I cannot imagine. I cannot imagine how there would be such pressure as that. It would simply wreck the economy entirely if the Government should hang onto these goods. There are going to be so many trucks turned loose by the Army when the war is over that there will be plenty of them at the time these boys come back. Frankly, I do not know of any goods that the Army, or the Navy, or the entire defense agency could declare surplus that there will not be plenty of.

Mr. JENSEN. Only for this reason, that the goods that are made after the war is over, and sent out through the regular channels of trade will, without a doubt, be sold for maybe three or four times more than the goods that are now in storage and are declared surplus; that is, comparable goods.

Mr. TABER. But there will be so many things that the soldiers who come back will not be able to absorb. They will not be able to absorb 10 percent of the stuff that is left when the war is over. That is where your trouble is. That is why they should not keep the stuff, and that is why it is not in their interest to keep it because if we do, our markets will be destroyed and there will not be anything for the folks to do.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the attention of the House should be called to the fact that while we have these surpluses and we should get rid of them, the factories are working 24 hours a day making more of the same material; the very things we are selling as surplus now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

That is true to a large extent. This bill as a whole is way below what it will be ultimately, because we will have to add at least $20,000,000 to the Treasury's bill on account of the bonus bill or overtime pay bill or whatever they call it, when the time comes that that is renewed.

In the Post Office Department, because of all those different statutes, we shall be obliged to add practically $90,000,000. If that bill which passed the House last December becomes law, adding $300 or $400 to the salaries of clerks and carriers, we are going to add $90,000,000 to the Post Office expenses, so that we bid fair to add to this budget of $1,057,000,000 in the neighborhood of $180,000,000, making a total of $1,237,000,000. In my opinion, that will be way beyond the postal receipts, and I cannot see any possibility of a postal surplus.

Mr. Chairman, I think that gives the House a little picture of what I had in mind in connection with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill providing appropriations for the Post Office and Treasury Departments for the fiscal year 1946. The estimates and justifications submitted in support of the various items of appropriation contained in this bill have been most carefully scrutinized by the subcommittee and by the full Committee on Appropriations under the skillful leadership and direction of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW. May I say at the outset that it has been a great pleasure to serve upon this subcommittee because of the nonpartisan character of its work. The distinguished ranking minority member, the Honorable JOHN TABER, of New York, with his long years of association with the work of this subcommittee, is able to turn the spotlight of searching inquiry on almost all of the items contained in this bill. I would feel remiss in my duty if I did not advise the membership of the Congress of the splendid spirit of cooperation that has always existed upon this subcommittee and the intensely active part that the members have played in bringing this bill before you.

There are many things that I would like to discuss, but time will not permit. Generally, let it be said that the Post Office Department, from the Postmaster General down to the star route and rural carriers, is doing a magnificent job under tremendous difficulties. Despite all of the impacts of the war, despite all of the tremendously increased volume of mail, despite shortages of equipment and manpower, the Post Office Department has all in all performed in a most remarkable manner. The clerks and carriers have performed in accordance with the best traditions of the Postal Service, and are entitled to wage increases which have long been denied them. I sincerely trust that the Post Office and Post Roads Committee will promptly report a bill that will afford suitable and proper recognition to these faithful public servants.

Mr. COLE of Missouri rose.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I just want to tell the gentleman we have such a bill under consideration, and it will probably be reported out soon.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very happy to learn that that is the case.

The Post Office Department is truly a great service institution, the expenses of which are paid by the public through their purchase of postal services. There is an overwhelming demand upon the part of the public itself that the faithful and patient postal employees be given suitable and proper salary increases commensurate with the work which they are doing and with increases in the cost of living.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Adams	Ellsworth	Patterson
Andresen, August H.	Elsaesser	Peterson, Fla.
Bailey	Fogarty	Pfeifer
Baldwin, Md.	Fuller	Philbin
Barrett, Pa.	Gallagher	Phillips
Bender	Gardner	Plesser
Biemiller	Gearhart	Price, Fla.
Bishop	Goodwin	Reed, N. Y.
Blackney	Gorski	Rees
Bradley, Mich.	Granger	Rich
Brumbaugh	Gwinn, N. Y.	Richards
Buckley	Hays	Rivers
Burgin	Hébert	Robertson, Va.
Carnahan	Heidinger	Robsion, Ky.
Celler	Hinshaw	Rogers, Mass.
Chapman	Hoeven	Rogers, N. Y.
Clark	Johnson,	Rowan
Clements	Luther A.	Sadowski
Coffee	Jonkman	Shafer
Colmer	Kelley, Pa.	Sharp
Corbett	Kirwan	Sheridan
Courtney	LaFollette	Simpson, Pa.
Crawford	Landis	Somers, N. Y.
Curtis	LeFevre	Sumner, Ill.
Daughton, Va.	Lyle	Sumners, Tex.
Dawson	McGehee	Thomas, Tex.
Douglas, Calif.	May	Tolan
Douglas, Ill.	Morgan	Weichel
Eaton	Morrison	West
Elliott	Norton	Whitten
		Winter

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2252) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 339 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the Treasury Department, struggling with problems of a magnitude undreamed of a few years back, is in the over-all picture, staffed and manned by men and women of courage, rare intelligence, and distinction. I have nothing but praise for the manner in which the functions of this great department of government have been carried on. In my judgment, it is simply amazing that the Department has been able to attract and keep men of such outstanding character and ability. The tremendous problems of finance have been met with courage and fidelity. The people of the country are entitled to know that from the Secretary of the Treasury down through the long list of administrative assistants and heads of bureaus and agencies, the work of this great department of government has been met in a manner that should challenge the admiration of the people of the country, regardless of political affiliation. This department of government is again in the truest sense a pure service organization charged with the responsibility of administering the vast and complex problems of finance and public debt transactions. In the over-all picture, it is my profound judgment that they are doing a good job and that they are cooperating in a splendid manner on all

fronts in a supremely desperate effort to preserve the financial integrity of our Nation. The whole problem of Federal finance is so complicated and is such a labyrinth of detail and connected services that it terrifies the average man when attempting to understand it.

I shall not attempt to go into the intricacies of all of the agencies involved under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department. My attention has been challenged by one specific matter that I want to discuss in some detail this afternoon. The books of the Treasury indicate that as of December 31, 1944, there were $12,963,395,088.15 of par amount of securities issued by Government corporations or agencies guaranteed by the United States Government. Of this amount, the Treasury Department held $11,493,719,623.79. The balance of $1,469,675,464.36 is held by banks and individuals. Of this vast total of Government corporation securities outstanding, $1,841,982,378.13 represents the total par amount of securities issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Treasury Department holds $1,155,000,000 of these securities; $686,982,378.13 is held by banks or individuals. I was intrigued by this picture and in view of the fact that the Congress is about to pass upon a bill proposing to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for another 2 years and to extend its borrowing authority from three to five billions of dollars, I felt that it might be well, for the information of the Congress and the people of the United States, to discuss the history, background, and operations of this giant corporation.

How did the Commodity Credit Corporation come into being? The facts disclose that on October 16, 1933, the President issued Executive Order No. 6340, authorizing the formation of a corporation to be known as the Commodity Credit Corporation. In this Executive order, the President described the acute emergency existing in the country and listed the various legislative enactments of the Congress designed to provide the relief necessary to protect the general welfare of the people. These enactments so listed by the President are as follows:

1. The Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933.
2. The National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933.
3. The Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933, approved May 12, 1933.
4. Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, approved June 22, 1932.
5. The Federal Farm Loan Act, approved July 17, 1916.
6. The Farm Credit Act of 1933, approved June 16, 1933.
7. The Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932.

The Executive order further recites:

Whereas in order effectively and efficiently to carry out the provisions of said acts, it is expedient that a corporation be organized with such powers and functions as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of said acts: Now, therefore, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933,

It is hereby ordered, That an agency, to-wit, a corporation, under the laws of Delaware, be created, said corporation to be named the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Executive order directs that the capital structure shall consist of 30,000 shares of the par value of $100 each. It directs that the board of directors shall be composed of eight members and names them. It directs that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration form the Corporation and provide for such articles of incorporation and bylaws as they shall deem requisite and necessary to define the methods by which said Corporation shall conduct its business. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration were directed to subscribe for all of the capital stock amounting to $3,000,000. The order provided that the President would provide them with the funds necessary for their use out of an appropriation of $100,000,000 authorized by section 220 of Public, No. 67, Seventy-third Congress, known as the National Industrial Recovery Act, and made by the Fourth Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1933, approved June 16, 1933.

It will thus be noted that the President's power to issue such an Executive order had its genesis in Public, No. 67, Seventy-third Congress. Section 2 of that act, upon which the President relied as authority for the creation of this Corporation, reads as follows:

(a) To effectuate the policy of this title, the President is hereby authorized to establish such agencies, to accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, to appoint, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service law, such officers and employees, and to utilize such Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State, such State and local officers and employees, as he may find necessary, to prescribe their authorities, duties, responsibilities, and tenure, and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of any officers and employees so appointed.

(c) This title shall cease to be in effect, and any agency established hereunder shall cease to exist, at the expiration of 2 years after the date of enactment of this act or sooner if the President shall by proclamation, or the Congress shall by joint resolution, declare that the emergency recognized by section 1 has ended.

It is interesting to note at the outset that the authority to issue the Executive order providing for the creation of the Commodity Credit Corporation was based upon an act which the Supreme Court of the United States held to be unconstitutional in the case of *Schlechter et al.* v. *The United States*, decided on May 27, 1935, and reported in 295 United States 495. It is also worthy of note that following the decision of the Supreme Court just referred to, the President by Executive Order No. 7252, effective January 1, 1936, terminated the N. R. A. and all of its activities which had been set up pursuant to the provisions of Public, No. 67, Seventy-third Congress, known as the N. I. R. A. Act.

It is also interesting to note that although the authority for the original creation of the Commodity Credit Corporation no longer exists, the Commodity Credit Corporation continues as an agency of Government with constantly enlarged powers. Pursuant to the Executive Order No. 6340, articles of organization were filed in Wilmington, Del., as the basis for chartering a Delaware corporation to be known as the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is interesting to note that although the N. I. R. A. Act limited its own life and that of any corporation or agency organized pursuant to its authority to 2 years, that the articles of organization filed with the State of Delaware provide in paragraph 7 thereof that the corporation shall have perpetual existence. The corporate authority set out in the articles of incorporation is almost as broad as the universe. After reading these articles and the bylaws subsequently adopted to govern its actions, I can think of no act that this corporation could not legally perform. Thus, pursuant to an Executive order, a private corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, came into being. It was organized for the sole purpose of performing purely Federal functions.

The very thought of delegating to a private State corporation the performance of purely Federal functions has always raised in my mind a question as to the initial legality of the entire proceeding. I note that Mr. Robert H. Shields, Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, when testifying before the Committee on Banking and Currency in reference to H. R. 2725—superseded by H. R. 2869—a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, made this statement, appearing on page 116 of the hearings:

There may very well have been some doubt as to the validity of this Corporation in the beginning. That was recognized when the problem of extending the Corporation in 1935 was brought to the attention of this committee, but in 1935 the Congress recognized the extension of this Corporation with its Delaware charter and authorized the life of this Corporation to be continued as an agency of the United States for 2 years. When the matter was before this committee in 1935, I believe, a member of the committee raised a question as to the original validity of the establishment of this Corporation, and Mr. Stanley Reed, who was then general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I believe, indicated there might have once been some doubt as to the origin of the Corporation. When on January 31, 1935, the Congress continued the Corporation as it then existed as an agency of the United States, I do not believe from that time on there could possibly be any question as to the status of this Delaware Corporation as an agency of the United States to carry out all the powers that were incorporated by reference in the act of January 31, 1935.

Thus it will appear at the beginning that although the original incorporation of the Commodity Credit Corporation might have been successfully challenged as an illegal act, it is now contended by the Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture that Congress has cured that defect by recognizing it as a Federal agency and by ratifying the acts by which it was created. Whether this be true or not, a serious question arises at once as to the Federal-State relationship and the investment in a private State corporation of tremendous power in the performance of pure Federal functions.

It seems to me that at the very outset of this discussion we are confronted with the necessity for a thorough survey of

this field. Why should the Federal Government find it necessary to create such a large number of private corporations chartered under various State laws to perform pure Federal functions? One fact stands out—through the exercise of this facility Congress has lost a great deal of its power over the fiscal affairs of the Nation. An investigation should be instituted to determine what, if any, effect changes in the laws of the States chartering these corporations might have upon their operations. In view of the vast complexity of the private corporate structure involved in the transaction of Federal public business, it seems to me that this whole subject should be the basis of a far-reaching and searching examination. I am fully aware that the Byrd committee has gone into this matter to some extent and has recently issued a report. I am also aware that certain legislation is now pending which touches this general problem. I am also aware that the bill separating the R. F. C. from the Department of Commerce, in section 5, provides for some control by the General Accounting Office over all Government corporations. In my judgment, however, these activities are not sufficient to solve the vast and complex problems that have arisen due to the tremendous growth in recent years of this unusual facility of Government.

A mere inspection of the number and character of the corporations organized to carry on Federal public business should be proof in itself of the necessity for congressional examination into their activities. It may well be that there is no sound reason why State chartered corporations should be set up to perform pure Federal functions except that this vehicle provides a means for bypassing a large measure of congressional scrutiny. This is indicated in recent hearings on the Treasury appropriation bill when I asked Mr. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, this question:

Can you conceive of any reason why all these functions that are being performed by this Delaware corporation could not be performed by direct agencies of the United States Government?

His answer was:

I think, Mr. KEEFE, generally speaking, that some functions of the Corporation could be conducted by the regular agencies of the Government if Congress would give them the broad authority and flexibility that they give to the Corporation. It is provided by statute that a corporation can sue and be sued, and you would have to give to other agencies conducting the operations that authority. They exercise flexibility in the appointment of their personnel. Of course, they have not come under the General Accounting Office until more recent legislation provided for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in one or two other instances, I think.

Mr. KEEFE. They do not operate under the provisions of the Civil Service Act in the selection of their personnel?

Mr. BELL. No; as a rule, they do not. That is one of the instances I stated where they do exercise flexibility of control.

Mr. Chairman, I insert at this point a list of Government corporations as furnished by the Treasury Department:

SECTION III. GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS BY PRINCIPAL FEATURES

Government corporations may be divided into 3 general groups, as follows: (a) The 40 corporations whose activities are supervised by governmental agencies; (b) the 4 independently operated corporations; and (c) the 11 corporations in which the Government may have a proprietary interest or a contractual relation.

There follows a list of the Government corporations which fall within the groups indicated above as (a) and (b). Also set forth below are the principal features of all Government corporations. The enumeration list is set up on the present basis of functional control. The list by principal features follows the basis of financial control as shown in table 1 and table 2.

CORPORATIONS WITH SUPERVISING AGENCY

(If State-incorporated, with State of incorporation after each such corporation)

Agriculture: Commodity Credit Corporation (Delaware); Farm Credit Administration: Banks for cooperatives (1 central, 12 regional), Federal intermediate credit banks (12), Federal land banks (12), production credit corporations (12), regional agricultural credit corporations (1); Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (in liquidation); Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation (Delaware).

Commerce, Secretary of: Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Defense Plant Corporation, Defense Supplies Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, War Damage Corporation, Federal National Mortgage Association, RFC. Mortgage Company, The (Maryland); Disaster Loan Corporation; Inland Waterways Corporation: Warrior River Terminal Company (Alabama).

Interior: Virgin Islands Company, The (Virgin Islands).

Justice: Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

War: United States Spruce Production Corporation (in liquidation) (Washington).

Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (all Delaware): Institute of Inter-American Affairs, Institute of Inter-American Transportation, Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., Inter-American Navigation Corporation (in liquidation), Prencinradio, Inc.

Foreign Economic Administration: Cargoes, Inc. (Lend-Lease) (New York), Export-Import Bank of Washington (District of Columbia), Petroleum Reserves Corporation, Rubber Development Corporation (Delaware), United States Commercial Company.

War Production Board: Smaller War Plants Corporation.

National Housing Agency: Federal Public Housing Authority; Defense Homes Corporation (Maryland); Federal Home Loan Bank Administration; Federal home loan banks (12), Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Home Owners' Loan Corporation (in liquidation), United States Housing Corporation (in liquidation) (New York).

INDEPENDENT CORPORATIONS

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Panama Railroad Company (New York).

Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc. (Tennessee).

In addition to this long list, I am advised by the Comptroller General of the United States that there are some 10 additional corporations not listed therein. These are:

First. Colonial Mica, New Jersey corporation.

Second. Copper Recovery Corporation, Delaware.

Third. Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation, Delaware.

Fourth. Puerto Rico Cement Corporation, Puerto Rico.

Fifth. Smithsonian Institution, chartered under section 5579, R. S., as amended, 20 United States Code 41.

Sixth. Steel Recovery Corporation, Delaware.

Seventh. Textile Foundation, Inc., chartered by act of June 10, 1930, 15 United States Code 501.

Eighth. War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., no information available.

Ninth. War Hemp Industries, Inc., Delaware.

Tenth. War Materials, Inc., Delaware.

Thus it should be evident that the utilization of the vehicle of private State corporations as a facility for the transaction of Federal public business is growing by leaps and bounds; and unless something is done about it promptly, Congress will find itself quite impotent to deal effectively with the tremendous labyrinth of complications arising through the use of this method of transacting public business.

The Commodity Credit Corporation illustrates the character of this problem. Let us make further inquiry into its operations. After the first 2-year extension of its life, made pursuant to an act of Congress approved January 31, 1935, the President issued Executive Order No. 7174, in which he required certain agencies and instrumentalities of the United States to submit estimates to the Bureau of the Budget of expenditures for administrative expenses. Included in this list was the Commodity Credit Corporation. Thus, it is apparent that since 1935 Congress has passed upon requests of the Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditure of its own funds for administrative expenses.

It will also be noted that pursuant to Public Law No. 749, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, the Congress by legislative enactment provided that the Commodity Credit Corporation and certain other agencies should not incur any obligations for administrative expenses except pursuant to an annual appropriation specifically therefor. Thus it will be seen that the Congress itself recognized this Delaware corporation as a Federal agency by legislating in reference to it. The original capital structure was $3,000,000. This, however, did not provide sufficient working funds. Under the provisions of Public Law 489 of the Seventy-fourth Congress an increase in the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation of $97,000,000 was authorized. This law directed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to subscribe for and acquire this additional $97,000,000 worth of stock. The R. F. C. subscribed for this stock and paid $97,000,000 into the Commodity Credit Corporation. Funds for the purchase of this stock were provided by the issuance of notes of the R. F. C. Thus the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation was raised to $100,000,000. Three million of the stock was held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture, and ninety-seven million was held by the R. F. C. Thereafter, on March 22, 1938, the President by Executive order directed the R. F. C. to turn this stock over to the Secretary of the Treasury. He also

directed that the three million of stock also be turned over to the Secretary of the Treasury. Thus the R. F. C. by Executive order was stripped of this asset. Later the R. F. C. came to the Congress and secured legislative authority to write off this $97,000,000, together with many other items of investment held in its portfolio amounting to a total of $2,780,000,000. These assets were then transferred to the Treasury, and the loss to the R. F. C. was assumed by the Treasury.

We now find the entire $100,000,000 worth of stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation held by the Secretary of the Treasury. In the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to make loans on agricultural commodities. This law was approved February 16, 1938. Thereafter and on March 8, 1938, Public Law 442 of the Seventy-fifth Congress was passed, providing, among other things, that the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be maintained unimpaired at $100,000,000. It is very important to study this act carefully. It provided that all of the rights of the United States arising out of the ownership of stock in the Commodity Credit Corporation should be exercised by the President or such officer as he might designate. Thus is found authorization to the President to switch and transfer the stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation at will.

This law further provided for $500,000,000 of borrowing authority for the Corporation. Another very important provision is found in the authorization to the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion to purchase any obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation and to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. The Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, in substance provided that the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, is authorized to borrow from time to time on the credit of the United States, and to provide for the purchase, retention, or refunding of any outstanding bonds, notes, certificates of indebtedness, or Treasury bills. Public Law 442, Seventy-fifth Congress, simply extended this act so as to cover obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Thus we find, as a result of congressional action, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with $100,000,000 of capital structure and authority to issue its obligations up to $500,000,000, fully guaranteed as to payment of principal and interest by the United States Government. We also find the Corporation authorized to present its obligations directly to the Treasury for purchase, and authority given to the Treasury to purchase these obligations out of funds derived by or from the sale of securities issued pursuant to authority of the Second Liberty Loan Act, as amended.

Thus we find that the Congress on three different occasions has appropriated an aggregate of $215,522,768.29 in restoring impairments of the capital structure of this Corporation. It should be pointed out that in the years 1940 and 1942, the Corporation paid into the Treasury alleged surpluses aggregating $71,572,244.69, so that the net drain upon the Treasury was $143,950,523.60. It is interesting to note how these profits and losses are determined. Under Public Law 442 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, it was provided that the Secretary of the Treasury should make an appraisal of all the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation each year. The value of its assets was to be determined insofar as possible on the basis of "market prices at the time of appraisal." The law provided that in the event any such appraisal should establish that the net worth of the Corporation was less than $100,000,000, then the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the United States, was directed to restore the amount of such capital impairment by a contribution to the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of such impairment, and a continuing appropriation was made commencing with the fiscal year 1938 to take care of the matter. It is interesting to note in this connection that section 2 of Public Law 442 provides that in the event the appraisal should establish that the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation is in excess of $100,000,000, "such excess shall as soon as practicable after such appraisal be deposited in the Treasury by the Commodity Credit Corporation and shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Treasury is directed as soon as practicable to use any amount so deposited to retire an equivalent amount of the pubic debt, which amount shall be in addition to any other amount to be used for such purpose."

What an altruistic vision the legislators had in 1938. Evidently they conceived a vision of reduction of the national debt through utilization of the profits to be achieved through the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It might be well to inquire how much of the public debt was actually retired through the utilization of such methods. Public Law 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 1, 1941, changed the method by which the Secretary of the Treasury appraised the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation and provided that the appraisal of assets should be on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges or the average market prices of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less.

Thus, it will be noted that instead of appraising the assets of the Corporation on the basis of market value at the time of the appraisal in order to determine profit or loss, the value is now to be determined on the basis of cost, including 1 year of carrying charges or the average market prices during the 12-month period prior to March 31. This change in the law might have far-reaching effects in view of the tremendous stocks of cotton and other commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the market prices of which at present are far in excess of the cost. The use of such figures might disclose a large profit to the Corporation rather than any impairment of its capital and require payment of the profit into the Treasury of the United States. The amendment just referred to, it would seem, would tend to relieve the Corporation of this responsibility and make available to it increased funds in the operation of its subsidy programs.

On April 25, 1939, the President submitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. I, which became effective July 1, 1939. In this plan he transferred the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to the Department of Agriculture. Thus we find the Commodity Credit Corporation transferred lock, stock, and barrel to the Department of Agriculture, and on August 7, 1939, he issued an Executive order transferring the capital stock from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of Agriculture. Thereafter the record discloses many acts of Congress relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation—acts extending the life of the Corporation, providing funds for its administrative expenses, making appropriations for impairment of its capital structure, and providing for a broad expansive aid to agriculture. Finally, we find an Executive order dated October 3, 1942, No. 9250, in which the President recited:

> By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and particularly by the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and in order to control as far as possible inflationary tendencies and the vast dislocations attendant thereon, which threaten our military effort and our domestic economic structure, and for the more effective prosecution of the war, it is hereby ordered as follows.

Then follows provision for the creation of the Office of Director of Economic Stabilization with power to this office set forth in title 5, providing that the Director may direct any Federal department or agency, including but not limited to, the Department of Agriculture—including the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Surplus Marketing Administration—the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and so forth, to use its authority to subsidize and to purchase for resale if such measures are necessary to insure the maximum necessary production and distribution of any commodity or to maintain ceiling prices or prevent a price rise inconsistent with the purposes of this order.

Certainly, the President, in issuing this Executive order, left nothing out as the basis for his authority to issue it. He claimed it by virtue of authority in the Constitution and the statutes, particularly the Price Control Act of 1942. He claimed the authority as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Certainly, if the authority was not to be found in one place it could be found in another. Here, therefore, we find a direct order of the President directing the payment of subsidies. To those who have asked

where these agencies received their authority to pay subsidies, I call your attention specifically to this Executive order. You should bear in mind that the Commodity Credit Corporation is specifically included among the agencies that may be authorized by the Director of Economic Stabilization to pay subsidies. Thereafter, pursuant to Executive Order 9322, the Food Production Administration, the Food Distribution Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and Extension Service are consolidated within the Department of Agriculture and the Administration of Food Production and Distribution was consolidated under the direction and supervision of an Administrator; Judge Marvin Jones is that Administrator.

We now find that Judge Jones is also the directing head of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Thus, by Executive order, we find created the office of War Food Administrator, who has complete charge of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Extension Service, the Food Distribution Administration, and the Food Production Administration. All of the assets, powers, and duties of these organizations are in effect vested in one man, subject only to direction from the Director of Economic Stabilization. The Director of Economic Stabilization has the power to direct the Commodity Credit Corporation among other organizations to pay subsidies. The Commodity Credit Corporation has authority to pledge the credit of the United States to the extent of $3,000,000,000 under existing law and is asking authority to have that authority extended to $5,000,000,000. What a tremendous power over the lives and fortunes of the people of America is thus placed in the hands of one man.

Judge Marvin Jones, in consultation with the Director of Economic Stabilization, has power to control the economic life of the Nation. They may pay or deny subsidies. They can control the entire food program. They can purchase entire crops, regulate prices and profits, and control the markets of the Nation. Congress, by successive and cumulative acts, together with Executive orders of the President, has brought this situation into being. The responsibility, therefore, for the economic well-being of a large segment of our population rests in the hands of two men.

Let us take a specific case to illustrate this point: The War Food Administration is demanding increased production of milk. The O. P. A. has placed ceilings upon the price of milk and milk products. There is a tremendous demand for dairy products which, unless curbed in some manner, would cause inflationary price rises in the market places which the stabilization program seeks to prevent. Therefore Judge Jones, after consulting with and securing the approval of the Director of Economic Stabilization, decides that it is necessary to pay a subsidy to the producers of milk in order to insure maximum production and to maintain ceiling prices to the consumer. Judge Jones then determines how much the subsidy shall be. A variable schedule of payments is provided so that farmers in one locality get a specific subsidy payment and farmers in another locality get a different specified subsidy payment. For example, the farmers throughout the Nation at the present time are receiving subsidy payments which run from a low of 60 cents per hundred to a high of 90 cents per hundred pounds of milk produced. Under an order released February 14, 1945, the War Food Administration, with the approval of the Director of Economic Stabilization, announced tentative plans for the continuance of dairy production payments through the last 9 months of 1945. They proposed to pay from a low of 25 cents per hundred to a high of 55 cents per hundred in the months of April, May, and June, which represents a tremendous reduction as compared with the subsidy payments made in the same period last year. They proposed to pay from 35 to 65 cents per hundred during July, August, and September, and from October through December, 60 to 90 cents per hundred.

The payments from April through September for 1945 are substantially less than the amounts paid last year. What this will do to production remains to be seen.

As bearing upon this question, I shall insert at this point a letter received by me yesterday from Mr. William O. Perdue, general manager of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, located at the city of Fond du Lac, Wis. This is the largest milk cooperative in the United States. Mr. Perdue, who had some 9 years' experience in the Milk Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture, and who is now the manager of this great cooperative, is one of the outstanding authorities in this country on this subject. Because of this, his letter has great significance. His letter is as follows:

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE,
Fond du Lac, Wis., February 19, 1945.
Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing a copy of the official announcement of the dairy-production payments for April–December 1945.

First, may I say that Pure Milk Products Cooperative is the largest strictly bargaining milk cooperative in the United States. Our annual production for our members last year was well over a billion pounds of milk. Our members increased their production for 1944 better than 5 percent.

My interest here is for our members and the other producers of milk in Wisconsin and the Nation as a whole, as well as the problems of supplying the volume of milk needed to successfully meet the demands of our Nation.

I have a keen sense of responsibility and a burning desire to serve my country, so please bear these facts in mind as I bring this problem to your attention.

The War Food Administration has asked the producers of milk for this Nation to produce 120,500,000,000 pounds of milk for 1945. This will be a miraculous achievement if it can be done in the face of labor shortage for dairy farmers.

I am deeply concerned with this problem, and I know every Member of our Wisconsin congressional delegation is, too. I want to do all in my power to help provide Wisconsin's share of the milk needed, and I will, come what may. I know you can depend on the farmers to deliver the quota set for them. This is nothing new, however; this has been the case since the beginning of the year.

May I remind you that farmers didn't pledge to our Commander in Chief that they would not go on strike during the war? There was no need for such a pledge. Everyone knew they could depend on the farmer for all the food and fiber needed until he drops in his tracks trying to meet the quotas set. He is not now, and never has, given thought to strike. In view of these important facts, it seems to me he should have just a crumb off the table.

He has been deceived more in this war than any other segment of our society, while at the same time he has given as fully or more to the needs of our forces.

In 1941 he was promised a guaranty of good price for his milk. You remember how we encouraged him to produce. He did, and by October, November, and December of 1941 his price in Wisconsin had risen to $2.25 per hundredweight for manufactured milk use. Then came the first break of the solemn pledge. His price in the flush of the production fell to $1.72 per hundredweight, and after months of disastrous prices, the plan changed. I'll not take your time to review all the picture.

I will take you now to 1944, when we were still desperate for milk. After having been denied a fair price at the market place, farmers were subjected to either the taking of a subsidy, or quit. They were too loyal to their country to quit, so they took the subsidy, even though it was being announced by the War Food Administration month by month as to what the next month's rate of subsidy was to be.

During these heart-breaking times the O. P. A. decided to stop the normal rise in price for manufacturing dairy products—with a ceiling on various products, among which was the evaporated milk in cases.

The evaporating industry complained long and much about the ceiling on their products, but to no avail so far as O. P. A. was concerned. The manufacturers of evaporated milk claimed that the ceiling was too low and was causing them to pay about 15 cents per hundredweight too much to producers. By October of 1943 the price had risen in Wisconsin for milk deliveries to evaporated plants to $2.65 per hundredweight. By the latter part of February 1945 the price had reached $2.75 per hundredweight. Remember, all this time the buyers of this milk were still trying to get O. P. A. to increase their ceilings, but O. P. A. didn't. Then came the most ridiculous situation so far in the war. After at least two announcements to the contrary W. F. A. said they would raise the subsidy 15 cents per hundredweight to farmers. Almost simultaneously the evaporated milk industry cut the price to producers 15 cents per hundredweight. Then, by the end of April the W. F. A. cut the subsidy back to 35 cents per hundredweight for Wisconsin, or a reduction of 15 cents per hundredweight. This made a total of 30 cents per hundredweight decrease in the farmers' income for milk from April through August 1944—or a loss to the United States producers of $93,673,000, and to Wisconsin producers approximately $28,000,000.

Now we are confronted with this new scheme to further reduce the income of milk producers as related in this new announcement by the W. F. A. Let me say here that this announcement is filled with provisions, if's, and's, conditions, and tentative plans. It is the most evasive and noncommittal announcement yet made by our Government to farm people.

If the farmers could depend on the tentative schedules set forth in the announcement it would mean a reduction of over 14 cents per hundredweight for the second quarter of 1945 and 7½ cents per hundredweight for the third quarter. The fourth

quarter remains the same, but the first quarter of 1946 has no promise at all, or a reduction of 60 cents per hundredweight, or over $138,719,630.20 for the year ending March 31, 1946, as compared to the same period ending March 31, 1945. Add this loss to that incurred in 1944 of $93,673,000, and we have over $232,000,000 loss in income for the United States producer or over $30,210,000 to Wisconsin farmers.

May I again call your attention to the evasiveness of the announcement in the opening paragraph: "War Food Administration, etc., announces 'tentative plans' through the last 9 months of 1945." Then they go on to say: "Continuation of the program after June 30 is necessarily contingent upon the approval of Congress." Then, "and the specific rates—after June 30—must remain subject to later revisions in the event a sharp change in the war picture alters military requirements." The last provision is the most unkind cut of all. While farmers are being asked to produce 120,500,000,000 pounds of milk—the greatest ever produced in history—they are at the same time assured a revision—a cut if you please—will be forthcoming if the milk is not wanted. How in the name of decency can one justify such bold disconcern of the farmers' problem to meet the requirements? Industry and labor have not had any such threat of cut-back as this. Milk is a perishable product of human toil and its production takes planning over a long period of time. If not used it has no salvage value. Therefore the farmer is being asked to carry the entire burden of stock pile, and expected to stand the entire loss if not needed.

To remedy this situation I respectfully suggest that an amendment must be offered to the C. C. C. bill when it comes up for consideration. I understand that any money for subsidies on milk must come from the C. C. C. The amendment should say in effect that the rate of subsidy shall be uniform as among States and that the rate of payments shall be not less than the following—for the second quarter of 1945, 45 cents per hundredweight; third quarter, 60 cents per hundredweight; fourth quarter, 70 cents per hundredweight; and for the first quarter of 1946, 70 cents per hundredweight. It is imperative to the war effort, in my mind, that the program be announced for at least 12 months in advance. Then, if God is willing, farm people will meet the goals set for milk production for 1945–46 and at the same time will in a small way be compensated for their efforts.

Again, may I say that this report is made with a high sense of responsibility and a keen devotion to my country in this hour of great sacrifice on the part of peace-loving people all over the world.

Very truly yours,

WM. O. PERDUE,
General Manager.

The point I desire to make, however, is that Judge Jones, after consulting with the Director of Economic Stabilization, can say to the farmers of the country that they will receive whatever subsidy payment they determine. The result is that they exercise complete control over a substantial portion of the income of the farmers of the country. They do this allegedly by virtue of congressional delegation of authority. The farmer out on the farm, however, is looking to the Congress to protect his interest and to insure him a fair return for his labor. As the matter now stands, the determination as to what the farmer shall receive is in the hands primarily of Judge Marvin Jones—one man. This is indeed a tremendous responsibility and represents the deposit and delegation of a tremendous power and authority. Where does Judge Jones get the money to pay subsidies?

It will be understood that the milk production subsidy is only one that is being paid out of the Treasury of the United States. The facts in answer to this question are comparatively simple. Judge Marvin Jones is War Food Administrator. As such he is also in control of Commodity Credit Corporation. In consultation with the Director of Economic Stabilization, it is determined that a direct subsidy be paid to the producers of milk in this country. Thus, Judge Jones as War Food Administrator has authority to proceed. Judge Jones, War Food Administrator, talks to Judge Jones, directing head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and asks the Commodity Credit Corporation to furnish funds with which to pay a milk subsidy. Judge Jones, in effect the Commodity Credit Corporation, says to Judge Jones, War Food Administrator, "I will provide the money." Then he goes to the Treasury Department and deposits the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Treasury Department buys these obligations and credits the Commodity Credit Corporation with the amount purchased. A few of these obligations might be floated out to some banks or to individuals, but the bulk is taken over directly by the Treasury. Thus, the Commodity Credit Corporation has the money, the Treasury Department has its notes.

Where does the Treasury get the money to purchase these notes to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay this milk subsidy? Congress has given authority to the Treasury to purchase the obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It gets the money by taking it out of the general funds of the Treasury, by virtue of authority contained in Public Law 442, approved March 8, 1938. The authority is to be found in United States Code, title 15, section 713 (a–4). The Treasury contends that the Congress has authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation, a private Delaware corporation, to issue its obligations guaranteed as to payment of interest and principal up to the present authorized amount of $3,000,000,000. The Treasury further contends that they have continuing authority from the Congress to purchase these obligations up to June 30, 1945, or to such period as the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be extended. The Treasury contends that this authority represents a continuing appropriation by the Congress authorizing it to use the money obtained from the sale of bonds to the public to in turn purchase bonds or debentures or notes issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation and other Government agencies having similar authorities.

Let us assume that the Commodity Credit Corporation determines that it will need $500,000,000 with which to pay milk subsidies. The Treasury buys $500,000,000 worth of Commodity Credit notes and the Corporation receives a credit in this amount on the books of the Treasury against which checks may be drawn to pay the milk subsidy determined upon by the Director of Economic Stabilization and Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator. How does this money get out to the farmers? The answer is that checkbooks are printed bearing the printed signature of the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

These are sent out to the triple-A offices throughout the country. Triple-A committeemen are designated to issue the checks. A farmer comes in with his production records, submits them to the triple-A office and the check is made out for the amount of the subsidy. This check is good at any bank. Thus, hundreds of millions of dollars flow out of the Treasury of the United States in this manner, which Congress has not specifically authorized. The amount thus paid out, together with other types of subsidies, represents a direct loss to the Treasury. All that the Treasury has are the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Then, once a year, the Secretary of the Treasury appraises the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation in accordance with the formula heretofore referred to and advises that they have run into the red, several hundred millions of dollars. They then come to the Congress to appropriate the money to make good this deficiency. I am advised that they are about to ask the Congress to appropriate $256,764,881.04 in order to restore an impairment in the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of March 31, 1944. Thus, Congress makes good the loans.

In view of the fact that a large part of the subsidy program is not involved in the present computations of the Treasury Department, we will not know until March 31, 1945, what the loss has been in the past year.

Suppose Congress refused to make the appropriation? What would happen? I asked that question of Mr. Bell, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, and this is what he said:

Well, all it does is to cut down its borrowing authority. You see, they have the money through this borrowing authority and its capital stock, so what you do is just to take that much money out of the Corporation, and if you go on and on, and the losses continue, they could not go any further than the amount of money you have authorized them to spend.

Mr. KEEFE. It could ultimately lose the entire $3,000,000,000?

Mr. BELL. That is right, and the deficits would just accumulate on the books until it equaled all the funds made available to them; that is all.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, in effect, therefore, the money has already flowed out of the Treasury of the United States, has it not?

Mr. BELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. The money that has resulted in this impairment of capital?

Mr. BELL. That is right; yes sir. It has been spent.

Mr. KEEFE. The taxpayers' money has been spent?

Mr. BELL. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, what is bothering me is what becomes of the constitutional provision with respect to money flowing out of the Treasury of the United States without specific appropriations by the Congress?

Mr. BELL. You are speaking now of the amount of money that goes to the Corporation as a result of our purchases of stock or notes?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes, surely you resort to that finally. You purchase the notes and claim you have authority from the Congress to purchase them.

Mr. BELL. That is an appropriation.

Mr. KEEFE. You consider that to be an appropriation?

Mr. BELL. Yes, sir. We have an indefinite appropriation for the purchase of public-debt obligations of the United States, and this merely uses that vehicle for purchases of the obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That was first adopted by the Congress in the creation of R. F. C. in the act of 1932. It has been extended to other corporations, the Treasurer of the United States crediting funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation and to other corporations upon the purchase of their notes, then the Treasurer of the United States getting reimbursement through warrants approved by the Secretary and countersigned by the Comptroller General the same way he gets reimbursements for the public-debt obligations that he redeems or purchases. So it is an appropriation, and I think the constitutional provision is fully complied with.

It is clear, therefore, that the only limitation at the present time as to the amount of payment of subsidies is the amount of borrowing authority given to the Commodity Credit Corporation and the R. F. C. and other corporations organized pursuant to the R. F. C. Act as amended.

It seems to me that the Congress of the United States had better take some very definite action to determine this whole policy of subsidies. It is apparent to anyone that the little savings we can effect here on the floor of Congress are puny and infinitesimal compared with the losses that will ultimately arise as a result of this subsidy program for which there is no direct return to the Treasury. It seems to me that Congress should retrieve its authority and power in this regard and courageously face the issue, as it will be an important one in the postwar period. I am not arguing for or against the theory of subsidies. I realize full well that it is all involved in the stabilization program. It does seem to me, however, that Congress itself should determine after full hearings on the subject the type and character of subsidies that are to be paid. The Treasury of the United States must ultimately make good, and the people who pay the taxes expect their representatives in the Congress to exercise some control over the expenditure of public funds and not to leave the matter entirely to executive or administrative direction and control. Thus we have this picture before us. We are organizing one corporation after another under State laws and vesting in those corporations great, broad powers which I cannot believe were in the contemplation of the Congress at the time some of the legislation heretofore referred to was passed. The whole structure has become so involved and so complex that it is beyond the capacity of an individual Member of Congress to follow through and to thoroughly understand what is taking place.

It seems to me that it is almost silly to suggest that the General Accounting Office is auditing the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation when we have thousands of Triple A committeemen writing checks on the funds of the Treasury, the amount of which is determined by their own computations in the field.

If the Commodity Credit Corporation—a Delaware corporation, a private corporation subject to the control and law of the State of Delaware—can be invested with such tremendous Federal functions as are apparent here, it seems to me that the Congress, in order to retrieve some of its power, should abolish this scheme and vehicle and set up a direct Federal agency that would be directly under the scrutiny and control of the people's representatives.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, recently my able colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, addressed the House on the subject of The Military Order of the Purple Heart. Under present War Department rules, this decoration should be given only to members of the armed forces and civilians serving with the Army wounded as a result of enemy action. The gentleman from Missouri made a very moving plea that the value of this historic medal should not be debased in the eyes of the men who have received it by being improperly awarded. Surely the whole country and all the wearers of the Purple Heart, who are now legion, must applaud him for his patriotic insistence on this point.

However, my colleague went further. He suggested that this decoration is indeed today being unlawfully or indiscriminately bestowed.

In support of his argument he reported only two specific instances of the improper award of the Purple Heart. The first was to a dog. My colleague offered in evidence a news story written in 1943 by Hal Boyle, of the A. P., according to which a dog called Chips was decorated with the Purple Heart in Sicily. I have checked this story with the Adjutant General's Office. My colleague was not altogether in error. It is true that a war dog, called Chips, was decorated in this war—but not with the Purple Heart. He received, indeed, a Silver Star—the fifth highest War Department decoration. Let me read you Chips' citation:

GENERAL ORDERS NO. 79

AWARD OF THE SILVER STAR

Chips, 11–A, United States Army dog. Company I, xx Infantry: For gallantry in action. After landing on Beach Blue east of ——— ——— at about 0420 the morning of ——— July 1943, Chips and his handler advanced about 300 yards inland under a flurry of flares and tracer bullets. After maneuvering through machine-gun fire they approached what appeared to be a native grass hut. Suddenly a hidden enemy machine gun began firing from the hut on troops on the beach. Unhesitatingly, Chips wrenched his leash from his handler's hand, dashed into the hut, teeth bared, and vigorously attacked the enemy gun crew. After a few seconds the gun ceased firing, loud yelling could be heard, and out of the hut one of the crew came running, Chips tearing at his throat. The second crewman soon followed, his hands raised high in surrender. American soldiers quickly took charge of the prisoners. Chips' courageous act, single-handedly eliminating a dangerous machine-gun nest and causing surrender of its crew, reflects the highest credit on himself and the military service.

Now, an exaggerated enthusiasm for canines, which brings otherwise well-balanced people to confuse the place of our four-legged friends in the scheme of things with that of humans, is by no means a monopoly of the Roosevelt family. It can overtake even realistic and hardboiled G. I.'s and officers, as Chips' citation tends to prove. But certainly if one compares the doggish deeds of Chips with the adventures of Blaze, there can be no question as to which of those two—as sheer dog—deserves public approbation. Or compare the origin of the wounds of Chips the Warrior, wounds which he no doubt sustained in the military action for which he was decorated, with the origin of those sustained so recently by Fala the beau-gallant, when he was hospitalized at Walter Reed as the result of an ill-fated nuptial encounter.

Is there any doubt that if it were proper to award decorations to dogs, Chips was a worthy recipient? But is it proper? As my colleague so rightly insists, it is not. But did Chips ever really get that Silver Star? According to War Department files, he did not. A very short while later the award was revoked by the commander who had signed it. So, it was "Goodbye, Mr. Chips," for he did not go out—so to speak—in a blaze of glory. Chips got no air priority for his furlough. And further inquiry shows that his handler was not even recommended for the rank of jigadier-brindle.

The fact is, that with the single exception of Chips' decoration, later revoked, no canine in this war has ever been awarded a decoration. The Purple Heart, in short, is not going to the bow-wows. On this score Gen. George Marshall's orders today read:

1. The award of a War Department decoration to other than persons, that is, human beings, is prohibited.

2. If it is desired to recognize the outstanding services of an animal or a fowl, appropriate citation may be published in unit general orders.

I was a little bewildered myself at first about the inclusion of our feathered friends as potential heroes and heroines until I learned of the astounding aerial feats performed by carrier pigeons in this war, in certain places where mechanical communications have broken down.

In passing, I would say to my colleague from Missouri, that if animals were candidates for decorations—which they properly are not—I should certainly put the sturdy mule from his native State high on the list, for never was there a more popular animal with the G. I.'s—particularly in the Italian theater. Indeed, there would be far fewer Purple Hearts in Italy today, which is to say far fewer wounded men, had there been more Missouri mules to help bear the soldiers' burdens in the terrible Apennine Mountains.

Now, let us take up the second instance offered by my colleague of the purportedly improper award of the Purple Heart. This was to a U. S. O. camp shows entertainer named Jane Froman. He came

upon this story in a copy of the C. I. O. News, a not always reliable news source. Here I should like to read part of a telegram I recently received from Mr. Abe Lastfogel, the president of the U. S. O. Camp Shows, Inc.:

On behalf of 2,379 American men and women of stage, screen, radio, and the concert stage who have gone overseas in the past 3½ years, of their own choice and without being drafted, to serve in the best way they know how under the auspices of U. S. O. camp shows the men of the armed forces of the United States fighting at every American base in the world, we ask that you make publicly known to the Congress that no American entertainer during these 3½ years has ever received the Purple Heart or any other Army or Navy medal or citation.

Miss Jane Froman: Never was awarded the Purple Heart and never has claimed that she was. She was so seriously injured in the crash of the *Clipper* in Lisbon Harbor in February 1943 on her way to play before troops in the European theater of operation that she has spent 18 months in hospitals, had 18 major operations and is still on crutches. She was one of the first to volunteer her services to troops overseas and did so without pay.

None of the seven men and women of the American theater who have died in this service to their country was awarded a decoration. No American entertainer, no matter how long his or her service overseas with task forces of the United States, has been authorized to wear even an overseas ribbon, despite the fact that some of them have remained overseas for more than 2 years in this service playing front echelons, sometimes under enemy shell fire, as well as hospitals, rest areas, and service installations in interior zones. Most of the men who have gone overseas have been over draft age or classified IV–F, and all of the women have sacrificed comfort and safety to respond to the call of the Army and the Navy, through U. S. O. camp shows, to serve our fighting men. Furthermore, the Army and the Navy while giving fine care overseas to entertainers injured, wounded, or who are taken ill, have excluded and apparently must exclude from service hospitals in the United States entertainers suffering from injuries or illness incurred overseas in line of duty and requiring hospitalization when returned to the United States.

We are confident that from your own firsthand knowledge of what the services of the U. S. O. camp shows mean to the men of the Army and Navy on the fighting fronts you will respond to this earnest plea to correct a grave injustice to loyal Americans of the theater, of whom Maj. Gen. Stephen G. Henry, Assistant Chief of Staff, G–1, said as recently as February 5 in a public statement: "I have the greatest admiration for the response of the entertainment world to the need of our fighting men for the kind of amusement only they can bring. It takes courage to go overseas on a mission of this sort. These men and women have come a long way and endured many hardships just to bring Americans in uniform a few bright moments of pleasure. They are glowing evidence that America is just back there across an ocean which they will some day recross when the Germans are crushed and the Japs have been driven to final surrender. This is why these services of U. S. O. camp shows in entertaining the troops overseas have the most direct military importance in their contribution to soldier morale."

This is, indeed, the American actor's privilege, his duty, and his heritage; a soldier in greasepaint serving a free country and freedom-loving men. This service is the actor's imperishable memorial, and surely he deserves of his fellow citizens and his elected representatives a correct accounting of his stewardship.

Mr. Lastfogel, in speaking of the suffering so cheerfully endured by the very gallant Miss Jane Froman, could have added that in that same Clipper crash, Roy Rognan and Tamara, two other members of the U. S. O. unit, were killed, and lovely Gypsy Markoff, the accordion player, had her little hands so crippled that even after many operations she can today barely play her instrument, her only means of livelihood. The wife of Roy Rognan, Lorraine, and Grace Drysdale were also injured. As soon as they recovered they proceeded to return to the combat zones to entertain the troops.

Now I know that the gentleman from Missouri had not the slightest intention of belittling the courage of Miss Froman, or of disparaging the magnificent achievements of the U. S. O. camp people, in bringing some laughter and gaiety into the hard and sombre lives of our men overseas. On the contrary, he made in his speech what I believe is a very constructive suggestion, namely, that wherever the services of these people to our armed forces have occasioned great sacrifice, as they certainly did in the case of Jane Froman, or have been otherwise extraordinary, they might well be rewarded with some type of civilian decoration.

Though I have, as Mr. Lastfogel suggests, some first-hand knowledge of the fine work done by the men and women, great stars and small, who serve under the Army's special service section overseas, their best witnesses are the G. I.'s themselves.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Stars and Stripes in the E. T. O. of August 18, 1944:

ENTERTAINING G. I.'S

Soldiers in grease paint, the Army's Special Service Section calls them, and the girls and men of the U. S. O. Camp Shows in Normandy are proving their right to that name by entertaining thousands of G. I.'s daily within sound of the front-line guns.

From the leading stars to the little blonde chorus girl in the back row, these American troupers are living in Army tents, washing in their helmets, spending long hours at night in their slit trenches to escape flak and tracer bullets, and eating Army chow. And when the Army moves forward, they move too, in order to play to the men in rest camps near the front.

To G. I.'s who the day before were killing Germans the nostalgic things in a performance of a U. S. O. show bring back poignantly thoughts they had forgotten when they embarked on their mission of destruction, and give them a chance to laugh and relax.

"Never have we had such enthusiastic audiences as in Normandy, where the soldier response is electric and a bond of fellowship is generated throughout the entire area by a sort of mutual participation in the performance," declares the executive administrator of the U. S. O. Camp Shows in the E. T. O.

"The stars as well as the bit players all are filled with the exhilaration which accompanies a victorious Army and are wowing their audiences at every performance."

U. S. O. Camp Shows, which operate under the Army's Special Service Section, now have 20 shows playing in Normandy, and top flight artists are expected soon.

"We played on the beaches when we first arrived in France and now we are playing in every part of the American sector," a U. S. O. official explained. "To do it we had to cut our shows in England, which formerly played to 90,000 boys a week, down to six shows. But we are rapidly building up these shows to meet the needs of the hospitals and rehabilitation centers here."

To the troupers who are bringing joy and relaxation to the front-line G. I.'s, the Stars and Stripes extends a grateful tribute straight from the heart of the Army.

I also will ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a speech by Mr. Lawrence Phillips, executive vice president of the U. S. O. Camp Shows, Inc., delivered on February 5, which comprehensively outlines the whole story of these "soldiers in grease paint" who have carried song and cheer to our men on the far-flung battlefields of the world, and answers many of the questions that have been raised about them on the home front. No one who reads Mr. Phillips' account of the U. S. O. troupers can have any doubts about their military worth as morale builders. And everyone must admit that when it comes to sheer voluntary giving of self, once again in this war, as in the last, Hollywood and Broadway folk have proved that they are the most generous and responsive group in the world. For in most cases, their physical talents and their youth are their only capital, only assets, only means of livelihood, and they have given of them very prodigally.

But to return to the question of the award of the Purple Heart. I know that the gentleman from Missouri has not minded my pointing out that in the two instances he gave as abuses of this award he had been unnecessarily alarmed, because he had been misinformed. Moreover, the War Department records do not show a single instance of a civilian not serving with the Army who has received the Purple Heart. If the Purple Heart has fallen into disrepute, which I doubt completely, it is for some other reason than its improper award to civilians.

Now, I, too, have received one or two letters from G. I. Purple Heart wearers themselves who have joked a little at the suggestion that the Purple Heart is a decoration to be flaunted with any overweening pride. Shakespeare said, "He jests at scars who never felt a wound." But Shakespeare did not know the modern G. I. Many of them are made of such valiant stuff that they jest at scars who have felt many wounds. So naturally they would jest at any ribbon or medal awarded for those wounds. But underneath this superficial and feigned attitude of careless indifference to their own suffering lies a very realistic appreciation of what the Purple Heart really means. It means that the wearer has stopped cold with his very own flesh and bones some fraction of enemy action, has absorbed in his own body some part of the enemy's force. No matter how much he sometimes pokes fun at this decoration among his buddies, or makes light of it to his girl, or even conceals the fact that he has won it from his wife or mother, since they know that the Purple Heart is never won without some suffering, I believe that there is no G. I. in our Army who is not enormously proud of it when he has earned it on a battlefield, as the result of enemy action.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It so happens that I wear both the Silver Star and the Purple Heart from World War No. 1. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has served a very fine purpose in clarifying the status of the award of the Purple Heart. It was a pathetic situation to many of us to feel that it was being abused. I believe her reassurance that it is not is a very fine service to our men, and I say to her that I appreciate it.

Mrs. LUCE. I thank the gentleman for his commendation, as a wearer of these two great decorations, the Purple Heart and the Silver Star.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not anticipate that I shall consume all of the time granted to me. However, it seems proper to take a few minutes to make further reference to remarks I delivered on February 8, and especially with reference to H. R. 2036, which I have introduced for the purpose of limiting award of the Military Order of the Purple Heart to those members of our armed forces wounded by enemy action and authorizing creation of a suitable but entirely different award for those heroic civilians wounded or killed in a similar way.

As I pointed out in remarks previously made on this subject, civilians, war correspondents, to be specific, have been awarded the Purple Heart. This has been due to interpretation of the language of Executive orders providing that the Purple Heart can be awarded to those serving in any capacity with the armed forces and wounded by enemy action. The two words "any capacity" have been construed in the last few years to include civilians, and this is contrary to original practice and to the original idea of the Purple Heart, which was created by Gen. George Washington on August 7, 1782.

In making my previous remarks I pointed out that Hal Boyle, a reputable Associated Press war correspondent, had signed a news story in the fall of 1943 relating how the Purple Heart had been awarded to a dog. This incident at the time aroused so much controversy that I am told the War Department had the affair investigated and correction made. The news article referred to and which appeared in various papers in this country in September 1943 follows:

DOG GETS PURPLE HEART

(By Hal Boyle, Associated Press Writer)

WITH THE A. E. F. IN ITALY.—Chips is a G. I. battle dog whose weapons are a mouthful of sharp teeth. Attached to an infantry company as a patrol dog or scout, he has won the Purple Heart and has been recommended for the Silver Star for heroism displayed in saving the life of his trainer, Private John P. Rowell, of Seminary, Miss.

Members of the company were attacking a pillbox. Chips, a German shepherd, stormed the pillbox himself and dragged out the gunner by the seat of his pants. The dog was wounded in the scalp and suffered powder burns in the encounter.

"Chips is gentle and friendly with us," said Rowell, "but he doesn't like civilians. He doesn't care for Italians, in or out of uniform. When we go on patrol he warns us of snipers and ambushes."

The dog is 5 years old and was loaned to the Army by a man in Hicksville, L. I. Chips has his own Army rations and wears G. I. dog tag number 11-A. A thoroughgoing doughboy, he once blistered his paws keeping up with his comrades in a 56-mile march in 32 hours.

Having listened today to the reading of a citation about Chips by my friend the gentlewoman from Connecticut, and noting that it was dated some 2 months prior to the incident reported by Mr. Boyle and that Chips had the enemy by the seat of the pants in one incident and by the throat in the other, and other differences in the two stories, I must conclude that Chips was twice decorated, or so reported.

I am glad to say, Mr. Chairman, that the War Department, while doubtless sharing the admiration all of us have for this animal, nevertheless recognizes that it was improper to give either the Purple Heart or a Silver Star to a dog. Gen. George Marshall has issued an order preventing further awards to animals or fowls.

I was also shocked when I first learned that stories were widely current to the effect that a civilian night-club entertainer had been awarded the Purple Heart although not injured by enemy action. I made particular reference to a story appearing on page 5 of the C. I. O. News of January 15, 1945, which showed a picture of a wounded sailor in an affectionate pose with Mrs. Donald Ross, who prefers for professional purposes to be known as Miss Jane Froman. At the side of this picture, which I hold in my hand, there appears in large letters the following statement:

A COUPLE OF PURPLE HEARTS

Both Jane Froman and a sailor from one of the military hospitals in the New York area are recipients of the Purple Heart. Jane was awarded the Purple Heart because she was hurt when her plane crashed off Lisbon while she was touring camps.

Though newspapers do not often make mistakes, I attempted to verify with the War Department the incident in question. On January 18, 1945, I received the following letter from the Department:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1945.

HON. MARION T. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: Reference is made to your recent request by telephone for information as to whether the War Department has awarded the Purple Heart to Miss Jane Froman, who was injured in an airplane crash off Lisbon, Portugal, while en route overseas to entertain troops.

Authority has been delegated to overseas commanders to award the Purple Heart for wounds received in action and this authority includes the award to civilians wounded under like circumstances while serving in any capacity with the Army. No report of an award to Miss Froman has as yet been received from overseas and it appears that the circumstances attending her injuries were not such as would entitle her to the award under existing regulations.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT H. DUNLOP,
Brigadier General,
Acting The Adjutant General.

You will note from this letter that while the award is not denied it is made clear that no one in Washington is responsible for any such award. I so stated in my remarks in February 8. It is clear from the letter, however, that this award could have been made by an overseas commander without the knowledge of Washington authorities and that report of such an award could yet be received from overseas for the general says it has not as yet been received. Clearly such an award would be a violation of regulations if made as reported in the press.

Not content with the War Department explanation to me, which neither denies nor confirms the award, I have attempted to find out what act, if any, of Miss Froman has permitted such a story for so long to be so widely circulated as true. I called the editor of the C. I. O. News, which was the source of my information. He investigated the source of his story and illustration. Briefly he informed me that Miss Froman's picture was taken and the story to which I have referred in the News took place at the show, Salute to the Wounded, presented by the C. I. O. shipbuilding workers at New York City. Her picture was taken as a mere human interest sidelight to this worthy occasion which was the news. The photographer was given the information in the presence of Miss Froman, who then permitted her picture to be taken representing that she had been awarded the Purple Heart, and has not yet asked the publisher for a correction. Could she and her press agent have thought they were getting away with a fast one?

Be that as it may, certainly the editor, on the basis of the foregoing representation, and I, on this plus lack of repudiation of the story by the War Department, were entitled to refer in perfect good faith to the award as being a fact. Now the lady denies it is a fact. It is unfortunate that she has been tempted to permit these stories to grow from the time they first appeared in a national magazine. But I am now willing, even at this late date, to accept her word that she did not get a Purple Heart. However, I have neither time nor inclination to exchange personalities with this person and her press agent. In so doing I would be at a disadvantage as a gentleman and under the rules of this House. Instead, I want to commend her for entertaining some of the troops, congratulate her upon recovery from her unfortunate injuries, and take this opportunity to state that I have only the highest regard for the efforts of any entertainer who has expended the time and trouble to cheer up the troops abroad and sell war bonds at home. That is a bright page written in this war by the professional entertainers. Surely, no one will deny that. It is widely recognized. For example, Dinah Shore, another singer, was reported in Saturday's papers as the first entertainer in America to receive the Citizenship Medal awarded by the Veterans of Foreign Wars in acknowledgment of her U. S. O. work. Doubtless there will be others. I hope Miss Froman can eventually do something to be among them. I think

the Government might well provide an award in these cases to those the Stars and Stripes call "soldiers in grease paint."

THE POINT

Mr. Chairman, the point which I seek to establish is a simple one. As long as worthy civilians under present interpretation of the language of Executive orders have received and can continue to receive the Purple Heart, these stories, true or false, will be circulated to the effect that other civilians, too, have received the award and it is much easier to start such stories than to stop them. Therefore, the only reasonable thing to do is to make it clear by public law that no civilian is entitled to the Purple Heart, that it is reserved for wounded service men and women and that an appropriate but entirely different award should henceforth go to civilians wounded by enemy action.

It just seems to me that the man who carries a gun and advances his country's cause on the field of battle and who is wounded or killed is entitled to an award different from any given to civilians. That was George Washington's conception of the matter for the records do not show that he awarded the Purple Heart to civilians. In fact, it was never done until this present war. I am glad to be able to say that the recognized representatives of that great veterans organization known as the Military Order of the Purple Heart agree with me in this matter. I am glad to say that all letters I have received, and they have been many, from those who legally wear the Purple Heart, have been in full sympathy with this position which is incorporated into my bill, H. R. 2036, now before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives. I hope that this bill can be promptly considered upon its merits. My only interest, as the record shows, is to see an early victory in this war and proper recognition of those who in the armed forces have borne the brunt of sacrifice.

The following is one of the many favorable editorials in the press on the subject I have raised. It is from the Hartford Daily Courant, February 19, 1945. The Courant was established in 1764 and is said to be one of the oldest if not the oldest newspaper in this country. I am indebted to the gentlewoman from Connecticut for calling this editorial from her home town paper to my attention.

PURPLE HEART AWARDS

Representative MARION T. BENNETT, of Missouri, has done an excellent thing in protesting against the reckless abandon with which Purple Hearts are being distributed by military authorities. Among recent recipients were Jane Froman, blues singer injured when her Clipper plane crashed near Lisbon, and a dog named Chips who had performed an act of heroism.

Without belittling in the slightest the great contributions that may have been made by either Miss Froman or Chips, when the Military Order of the Purple Heart was created by Gen. George Washington, August 7, 1782, it was to be awarded to military personnel for unusual gallantry and singularly meritorious acts of extraordinary fidelity and essential service.

If it be thought desirable to have some suitable award to give to civilians, dogs, Red Cross workers and newspaper correspondents, then it would seem that a new award should be created. The present practice of bestowing Purple Hearts indiscriminately cheapens the award and makes it that much less valuable to those who have actually earned it through courage and gallantry.

The Purple Heart as originally conceived by General Washington was to be an insigne of such value that he said: "Should any who are not entitled to these honors have the insolence to assume the badges of them they shall be severely punished. On the other hand it is expected that those gallant men who are thus designated will on all occasions be treated with particular confidence and consideration."

That those who are members of the Military Order of the Purple Heart are aware of the cheapening of this award through careless distribution is shown by the support of that organization given to a recently introduced bill that would restrict the Purple Heart to those members of the armed forces who are wounded in action, or to their relatives posthumously. Such restriction is highly desirable. Representative BENNETT may have exaggerated somewhat when he said that a common joke in the services is that a Purple Heart is included with every first aid kit and may be awarded for the tiniest scratch, but continued promiscuousness in making these awards should not be permitted.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to discuss a matter that may not seem to be particularly dramatic but which I believe is of tremendous importance, namely, the national debt of the United States. But I believe I am going to do it from a little different point of view than that from which it is ordinarily discussed, for I am going to point out something I believe that can be done about it.

I may say, in the first place, that I do not think it is an answer to the national debt to say that we can solve the problem of the huge national debt that we are contracting as a result of this war by minor reductions in expenditures, for example, for the eradication of the Japanese beetle, or something like that. The national debt in June of 1944 was $201,000,000,000. The President's Budget estimate is that by June of 1946 that debt will be $292,000,000,000. Only big measures, only measures as large in conception as the problem is large, will suffice.

The bill before us today carries an item of $4,500,000,000 for interest alone upon the public debt. It is about that that I want to speak, and I want to do so from two points of view.

In the first place, at present the Federal tax revenues are running in excess of $40,000,000,000 per year. The reason those tax revenues are so large is twofold. First, because of the comparatively high rates in effect, though I think none too high for a period of war like the present; second, and more important, the tremendous rate of national wealth production and hence the tremendous base upon which the tax can be levied.

The fact of the matter is that if the production of wealth in the United States today could be continued after the war and if tax rates were kept where they are now, we could allow, let us say, for a Federal budget of even $18,000,000,000 per year, twice what it ever was before in peacetime, and have remaining $22,000,000,000 which would be sufficient even with a debt of $300,000,000,000 to pay the interest and have left over some $15,000,000,000 for debt retirement each year. At that rate the entire national debt could be paid off in about 20 years.

People say that is not possible, that we cannot maintain a wealth production as high as that. Perhaps not, but we should come as close to it as we possibly can and unless we at least approximate it we shall face troubles of the most serious sort.

Now the way we shall come close to it is by the pursuit of such policies as will make certain that we shall have within the United States a consumer purchasing power for goods which keeps pace with the power of the Nation to produce goods when all our people are employed.

Mr. Chairman, foreign trade is of great importance as a means of mutually exchanging goods to the mutual advantage of two or more nations, but foreign trade as a means of solving an unemployment problem, foreign trade as a means over a long period of time of trying to get rid abroad of a chronic surplus of production over consumption at home, is a delusion and a snare. For ultimately a nation cannot get paid by foreign countries for a chronic surplus of exports over imports. The only way such a nation can get paid is by taking ownership of the capital resources of these foreign countries, and to that too there is an end, and a tragic one.

The answer to our national debt is maintenance of high production and that high production can only come if we have a consumer purchasing power demand within the United States which is equivalent to our capacity to produce. We have tried to get that in the past. We have tried to get it throughout the years of our American history by an expansion of debt. That is how we have tried to get it. And the price of that method has been periodic collapses of the economy with unemployment, bankruptcy, and depression.

Economists will show on charts which cannot be questioned that every time we have had the curve of debt falling we have had the curve of production falling about three times as fast. Why? Because our money consists of debt to banks today and because in the absence of debt we do not and cannot put money into circulation; hence, if debt is reduced the volume of money shrinks, and since the average turn-over of a dollar is about three times per year, $1 of disappearing debt, which is $1 of disappearing bank credit, equals $3 subtracted from the circulating medium. Therefore, as I have tried to study this problem, one thing has become clear. It is that America must have the ability to keep in circulation constantly a sufficient volume of money to accommodate the producers in America with a corresponding consumer market, and that we must be able to do that without a constant increase of debt.

Contrary to general opinion, we have had a tremendous inflation since the war began. True, we have had price control, reasonably effective price control, so that the impact of that inflation has not been

felt by and large to anything like its full weight by the consumers of the Nation. Nonetheless, we have had up to date, since the fall of 1941, somewhere near a $60,000,000,000 inflation of our circulation medium. To use exact figures, as of last June 1944, all commercial banks owned seventy-five billions of interest-bearing direct or guaranteed Government securities. As of September 1941 they held twenty-two billions of such securities. In less than 3 years America had, therefore, an inflation of bank credit amounting to $53,000,000,000. And that bank credit—demand deposits created by bookkeeping entries on the books of banks—constitutes by far the most important factor in all America's money system. How did this inflation come about? It came about through the sale of interest-bearing Government securities to the commercial banks of this Nation, which purchased those securities through their war loan deposit accounts, by setting up deposits in those accounts which did not exist before, which were brand-new money, to the credit of the United States Treasury. When a bank purchases the bonds it sets up a war loan deposit account in amount equal to the face of the bonds. The ownership of the bonds passes to the bank. The Secretary of the Treasury acquires the right to draw checks upon that account. The bank draws interest from the date on which the bonds pass into its ownership, whether the Secretary draws any checks or not for several months. For many months the banks might be drawing interest on money which not only did not exist before it was created on their books but which the Government had not actually received from them at all up to that time. As of June 1944, $75,000,000,000 of brand-new money in the form of "invisible greenbacks"—demand deposits—had been created on the books of the banks for the sole and express purpose of buying Government debt. Upon this seventy-five billions of bookkeeping entries the American people, both today, tomorrow, and until that debt is discharged, will be liable for the payment of principal and interest out of hard tax dollars that must be provided by the sweat and production of the American people. I consider such a system economically unsound and morally indefensible.

Thomas Jefferson spoke against it and said:

> The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government, where it belongs.

Andrew Jackson spent his life working against this system. On Lincoln's birthday I quoted to the House his words against this system, as well as those of Thomas A. Edison. In 1935 Chairman Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, addressed the Ohio Bankers Association as follows:

> There is no political or economic power more charged with the general or social interest than the power to increase or decrease the supply of money. If the sovereign authority delegates this power to a particular group or class in the community as it has done in large part in this country, it divests itself of a part of its effective sovereignty. * * * The power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof has always been an attribute of a sovereign power. It was one of the first powers given to the Federal Government by the Constitutional Convention. The development of deposit banking, however, introduced into the economy numerous private agencies which have power to create and destroy money without being recognized as creators or destroyers of money by the Government or the people.

So the wartime inflation and a very considerable portion of the increase in the national debt are directly due to the creation of America's money not by the Government but by the banks.

It has been said by some people that the banks' assets today consist 80 percent of Government bonds. I do not know whether that is true or not, but here is a figure that I am sure of. In June 1941 the total assets of all banks were $87,000,000,000. In June 1944 the total assets were $138,000,000,000. The great bulk of those assets was acquired by the process of the creation of money and the purchase of Government bonds. The banks have gotten out of the banking business and are in the business of Government—the business of creating and destroying the money of the Nation. It is, I agree, as much the Government's fault as the banks that this is true.

I listened to the gentleman from Wisconsin this afternoon talking about the Commodity Credit Corporation. I was deeply interested in what he said. In my view the function of a bank is to accept deposits of money already in existence and to make loans and investments with that money. I do not think that is essentially a proper function of Government, but I do think it is a function of Government to be the only agency in the Nation that exercises the sovereign right to create every dollar that becomes a part of circulation medium, whether that dollar be a cash dollar or a credit dollar. The right to create money belongs to the Nation, and when alienated from the Nation, it gives to some private person or agency the power to levy taxes upon all the rest of the population of the Nation. He who can create money, he who exercises the privilege to create a dollar upon his books, can thereupon without giving any value in exchange demand from you and me and everybody else a dollar's worth of our labor or our wealth or indeed to demand from the Nation the payment of the dollar back with interest. No defense of such inequity can possibly be made.

One-third of our national debt today consists of these demand deposits or "invisible greenbacks" created by banks, upon which the American Nation must pay them interest. I go back to June 1944 for these figures, when the total national debt amounted to $201,000,000,000, and when on that same date the commercial banks of the Nation held about $68,000,000,000 of direct interest-bearing Government securities. On that same date the Federal Reserve banks, the 12 central Federal Reserve banks, held another $11,000,000,000 of interest-bearing Government securities. The 12 Federal Reserve banks are essentially privately owned banks, the same as the commercial banks which owned the $68,000,000,000. The total of those two figures was $79,000,000,000, well over one-third of the total national debt of the American people. So that when we get a debt of $300,000,000,000, all told, we shall in all probability find that at least one-third of that $300,000,000,000 debt amounts in truth to a net inflation of the money of the American people which has come about because the banks created money and bought Government bonds and Government interest-bearing notes with them.

I think that system ought to be stopped. People say we owe this debt to ourselves and therefore we do not have to worry about it. I do not agree at all.

Taking again the June 1944 figures, in addition to this $79,000,000,000 owed to the Federal Reserve banks and the commercial banks of the Nation, there was another $17,000,000,000 that was owed to the insurance companies of the Nation. There was $21,000,000,000 owed to the various Government trust funds. We get down to the very end and we find that of the $201,000,000,000 total national debt as of last June, only about $78,000,000,000 was in the hands of all the individuals in the country and all the nonfinancial corporations of the country. A conservative estimate of the amount of this that is held by the individuals, by the millions of people throughout the country, would probably bring this figure down to somewhere in the neighborhood of 35, 40, or 45 billions, and I do not know where those exact figures can be obtained. In any event, the percentage of this debt that is in the hands of people from whom, when interest upon the debt or principal is paid, that money will go out for the purchase of consumer goods in the markets of the Nation is not over 25 percent. Therefore, the problem of the national debt is a problem of tremendous severity. All the people owe it, but they don't owe it to themselves. They owe most of it to a comparative few.

What do I think ought to be done about it? I think the Government ought to get out of the banking business and the banks ought to get out of the governmental business of creating money. I think that banking in the United States ought to be divided into two distinct parts, demand deposit banking and savings and loan banking. I do not believe it is sound for people to deposit money in the bank and then have the only thing that they have in that bank be the bank's promises to pay if it can. And yet that is what most of the people's deposits consist of today. Most of the money that people believe they have in the banks is not there at all. It exists only as a figment of the imagination, because, under the fractional reserve system the banks need have only $1 of reserves for every $5 or $10 of demand deposits, depending on Federal Reserve regulations as to reserves. As a practical matter of course the Government of the United States will back up the banks and prevent them from failing, if necessary. Yes; the people are going to get their money back, they are going to get it back out of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation if their deposits are less than $5,000. Why? Because there is enough money in the Federal

Deposit Insurance Corporation to cover all the deposits if demand should be made for them? Not for a single moment. Only because, if necessary to make good on that guarantee, we might as a government have to create the money which the banks previously got paid by borrowers for creating, and which people believe they have in the banks, when they do not have it there at all.

I want to show the House the figures as of December 1944. This is going to be limited to the member banks of the Federal Reserve System for just a few minutes. The member banks of the Federal Reserve System had as of December 1944, $51,000,000,000 of demand deposits adjusted.

Those same banks had $16,000,000,000 of savings and time deposits.

Against these demand deposits the banks had last December $12,000,000,000 of reserves. That is to say, $39,000,000,000 of these demand deposits consisted of bank credit money created upon the books of banks but having no actual existence at all except as promises to pay depositors if not too many of them demand their money at once. There were $12,000,000,000 of them covered by reserves. There were then $67,000,000,000 of demand deposits, and savings deposits, standing as obligations of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System as of December 1944. Now those same banks held $65,000,000,000 of United States Government bonds and notes. Remember these are just Federal Reserve banks. They held $65,000,000,000 of Government securities.

They had also $1,000,000,000 cash. It is actually $1,400,000,000, but for the sake of using round figures we will say $1,000,000,000 in cash.

They had $12,000,000,000 of reserves with the Federal Reserve.

What is the total of that? The total is $78,000,000,000.

The total of demand deposits and savings is $67,000,000,000.

For the sake of comparison, I will say that the non-member banks at the same time had $8,200,000,000 of demand deposits, and $9,000,000,000 of Government securities corresponding to the $65,000,000,000—just so that we get the picture of this relationship.

I will proceed now and just talk about the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. These banks whose total deposit liabilities were $67,000,000,000, including saving deposits, had $78,000,000,000 of Government bonds and cash plus reserves, with the Federal Reserve Board. Just bear those figures in mind for a brief moment while I go ahead and make one more point.

As long as the banking system of the Nation creates the money of the Nation on the basis of somebody's debt, in order to get prosperity it is necessary to either have an increase of private debt or an increase of the public debt, one of the two. Because under the present system we cannot get money into circulation any other way. And if production increases as it must increase, if we are going to have full employment, the only way we can get an increased volume of money and thus maintain a stable price lead is by somebody going into debt to the banks. And if private debtors do not borrow, the Government will have to borrow and increase the national debt. If our debt is reduced, our money supply collapses. I want to end that. I want a system whereby when the whole Nation needs to increase the volume of money in circulation to keep pace with its own increase in production, an agency of the Congress can create that money and put it into circulation without a capital debt or interest charge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In order for such a system to be put into effect, it would not be necessary for the Government to print a lot of greenbacks. All that would be necessary would be for the privilege of creating the Nation's own credit to be exercised by a national monetary authority under a mandate passed in an act of Congress, instead of that privilege being exercised, as now, by some 15,000 separate private banks.

In order for such a scheme to be sound it would be necessary to put a stop to the present creation and destruction of the Nation's credit by the banking system. Sound banking requires in any case that every bank have its business divided so that one department would do the demand deposit business exclusively and would hold in trust for its depositors dollar for dollar 100 percent reserves against those demand deposits, so that the money people believed they had in demand deposits and which they use for cash would be, in fact, cash in the bank. The demand deposit department would thus be simply a warehouse of money. It could not possibly fail. No "run" could affect it. All the money of all the depositors would actually be there. Under such circumstances the banks would and should be paid fair and just service charges for the services performed by their demand deposit departments. This would be their source of income, a far more dependable one than they have possessed heretofore.

On the other hand, under this plan, the banks' real banking business would be their loan department and would consist of accepting savings deposits, lending and investing preexisting money, as they saw fit, in accordance with sound principles. How could we establish this 100 percent reserve system and what would be the effect on the national debt if we did? If we regard Government bonds in the hands of banks as the equivalent of cash, then, referring to the figures given, the banks have today $11,000,000,000 more of available reserves than they would need to cover all of the demand deposits and all of the savings deposits in the whole system. Of course, 100 percent reserves are not needed for savings deposits. Savings deposits really are not deposits but investments, where a man puts his money in a bank and tells the bank to invest the money for him; that he is not going to use it as cash; and that he will notify them a stipulated length of time before he will expect to draw it out.

We could require today 100 percent reserves behind every dollar of demand deposits without hurting the banks a bit—though a few might at first need some slight assistance. In the long run we would help the banks, because, under a 100 percent reserve system, no bank could possibly fail. The money they might require to pay their deposits would be there all the time, every day and every night. The stability of our money would be assured. We would no longer have the inflation and deflation of the invisible greenback, created by the banking system, alternate periods of the creation of too much of this "legalized counterfeit" money and periods of feverish calling of loans and the consequent destruction of billions of dollars of this money.

As to the national debt, one third of that debt—and it will be $100,000,000,000 before we are through—would, in effect, if we should adopt this policy, have been paid off. Not immediately, of course, but if Congress were to say that these Government bonds may be used temporarily as reserves behind demand deposits under a 100 percent reserve system, then they must be replaced with actual cash reserves at date of their maturity, to become thereby a part of the 100-percent cash reserve behind demand deposits. And the money needed to accomplish this would, of course, necessarily be created by a governmental agency without debt or tax to obtain it. It would not change the volume of our money in circulation at all. It would merely replace the bonds as reserves behind demand deposits in the banks. Here is the answer to one-third of the national-debt problem.

The answer to the rest of the national debt problem is that once we cut the knot of this iniquitous tie that binds our supply of money on the one hand to the debt of the people on the other, we can then for the first time be free to sustain ever-increasing production in our Nation; to make certain we can get that ever-increasing production, because we can keep the power to consume parallel with it. When we reach that point, then no longer will we have to depend upon deficit financing. Then no longer will we have to increase the national debt every time it is necessary to increase consumer buying power to keep pace with production, and if we have the means of maintaining a high level of production without further increasing debt we can, though not without effort and some sacrifice, service and pay off even so staggering a debt as the war has brought and will bring upon us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and that my remarks may be placed in the RECORD immediately following those of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening very interestedly to the last few speeches that we have heard. I found some of them so high I could not reach them, and one so deep that I will have to take more time to investigate it.

I come today, Mr. Chairman, in sort of a medley of thought. The first thing I want to do is to pay my respects and to express my deepest gratitude to the work and to the thinking and the fine efforts of the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson. On Sunday night I heard him over the radio making an appeal for what we might say is a national service act, but essentially it was an appeal to the Congress of the United States to give some power and authority that might not make the effort and the sacrifice that is being put into this war a one-sided affair; in short, that people who are not working and can work and are not physically capable of bearing arms shall be required to work, to produce the arms and materials necessary in this war.

I do not think it is an answer to his appeal that we have been doing pretty well or that in 1944 we did twice or three times as much as we did in 1941. That is not an answer. The only question is, Are we doing everything in the world we can do? If we are not then we need to follow the advice of our fine Secretary of War.

Mr. Chairman, I am still disturbed when I observe so many things that are calculated, if not intended, to cause us to lose some of the important, yea, vital things for which we fight. To be sure we were forced into this war. We had no alternative, but to enter. We, as everything we possessed or enjoyed, were threatened. It is and was in the beginning, so far as we are and were concerned, a war of self-preservation. As the war progressed, it became evident to us that in the fighting for our existence it became important that we secure a just and lasting peace. We were convinced that we could not go through such an ordeal again. We were unwilling that we should do less than guarantee to ourselves and our posterity that such a necessity would not again arise.

To accomplish complete victory and to make the guaranties a reasonable reality, we pledged ourselves, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. We could do no less than to determine, and declare, nothing less would be required of our foes than unconditional surrender. Men who would thrust the world into such a holocaust of war must be told and must be made to realize that men as they cannot be compromised with.

There is no place for compromise. Men now and future generations must know and know now, and continue to know, that there can be no half-way ground. To this end we fight, but when the fighting is over, to the sustaining of a just and lasting peace we must work also. In this work there must be unity, too, as unity is necessary in our prosecution of the war.

We must work to establish and maintain good will among men. We will do well to practice ourselves in this, we the people of this Nation among ourselves and we with our allies, and our allies with us. With that example of good will we can entertain the hope that such may obtain throughout the world.

We shall fight and keep fighting with all our might, and with increased determination and vigor till our foes are conquered. To maintain a just and lasting peace we shall be compelled to love peace and pursue it, practice and teach the doctrine of good will among men. And these things at no time forget or neglect. I have read and wish to read here, to be placed in the RECORD, if I may, an editorial by Mr. Paul Hunter, which I conceive to be a timely warning as well as a wise deliverance of a timely truth:

THE FATEFUL ROAD TO ANOTHER WAR

Events of recent months indicate the United Nations, like many individuals, find it difficult to stand prosperity. Successful prosecution of the war is having the odd effects of making more difficult the attainment of the goals for which the war is being fought.

Unity among the United Nations was forged during the dark days of the war. The darker the outlook the more unity grew. Now, as the shadows pass, the cement binding the United Nations together progressively weakens. In the dark days, certain principles now being derided as idealism formed the major adhesive power of this cement. There was a genuine desire to carry out the ideals which inspired the Atlantic Charter and to translate its principles into a stable and orderly world in which mutual trust, esteem, and generosity would be dominant. Fortified by this high thinking, the United Nations adopted systems of mutual aid and embarked on concurrent military action which to date have been uniformly successful.

Now ideals are losing their luster. We are told that only the soft-headed, who dimly perceive the facts of life, cherish them. The realists are shouldering their way to the front in all countries of the United Nations now that the danger of defeat has passed. The ties which bind us together weaken before our eyes as the cement of idealism crumbles.

If victory and success cause us to forget the ideals which drew the United Nations together, it is altogether likely this war will have been fought in vain. So-called realism and wily power politics cannot replace principle and idealism as cementing agents. We might just as well realize now that we are in danger of losing the orderly and peaceful world for which all mankind hopes.

If material interests are to be the sole motivating power behind the acts of the various members of the United Nations, we can be sure that disunity will grow. Mutual distrust, suspicion, and rivalry will increase, coalitions and alliances will multiply, and we will have the old balance-of-power politics all over again. We will be back to where we started and traveling the old road which has always led to war and always will.

It takes only half an eye to see that the United Nations are already proceeding down this fateful road at an accelerating pace. The political leaders of the free world must take immediate and positive steps to restore the harmony that prevailed when danger threatened and the future looked black. Good will, mutual trust, and generosity are the only cementing agents which will effectively bind the nations of the world together into an organization which will bring peace for all time.

PAUL HUNTER.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2252) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] be allowed to extend his remarks in two instances by printing two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] be allowed to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include therein the article referred to by him in his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] be allowed to revise and extend her remarks and include certain articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial on the gulf and merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] may have permission to extend his own remarks and include therein a copy of a letter written to the Provost Marshal General of the United States Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 21, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Wednesday, February 21, 1945, to begin public hearings on H. R. 693—a bill to clarify the application of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempted securities, and for other purposes.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday, February 22, 1945.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on S. 63 and H. R. 1648, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, February 22, 1945, at 10 a. m., in executive session, for the consideration of report of the Post Office Department on parcel post.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the postwar ship-disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

244. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 392. A bill to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; with amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 513. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the Allied countries during World War No. 2 or otherwise assist in the Allied war effort, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 578. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War No. 1, and members of the Regular Army, or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 669. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals; without amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 387. A bill to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 433. A bill to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; without amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 511. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 20. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 54. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; without amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 38. Resolution to continue the investigation by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries began under House Resolution 281, Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 391. A bill to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 185. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 386. A bill to amend the law relating to the authority of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to make arrests without warrant in certain cases and to search vehicles within certain areas; without amendment (Rept. No. 186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on Labor. H. R. 2232. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; without amendment (Rept. No. 187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2175. A bill to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes required in the war food production program; without amendment (Rept. No. 188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 214. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 205. A bill for the relief of Steve Hlass; with amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 945. A bill for the relief of Fred Clouse; with amendment (Rept. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 981. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 988. A bill for the relief of Bernice B. Cooper, junior clerk-typist, Weatherford, Tex., rural rehabilitation office, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee of Claims. H. R. 990. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila; without amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1016. A bill for the relief of Capt. Millard L. Treadwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1148. A bill for the relief of the Lawrence

Motor Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1260. A bill for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1558. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alma Mallette and Ancel Adkins; with amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Maj. William Peyton Tidwell; with amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2092. A bill for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 2274. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2275. A bill to give World War No. 2 veterans preference on lists on Government housing and Government-insured housing projects; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2276. A bill to prescribe a 2-year term of office for certain civilian officers in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2277. A bill to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2278. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1940, entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," so as to raise the fee for recording liens on automobiles in the District of Columbia and to establish a fee for the recording of releases of such liens; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2279 (by request). A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2280. A bill to amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to receiving of stolen public property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2281. A bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 2282. A bill to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2283. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 2284. A bill to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable prime contractors or of higher tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 2285. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant and convey to Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., certain lands of the United States in Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., for highway purposes and for ornamental park purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate and alleviate the excessive prices upon, and shortage of, farm machinery; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Jane Thayer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Susan S. Wiseman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Columbus Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Arnold Mecham; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Mary Galipeau; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2291. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

91. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pvt. (1st cl.) Larry Jacoby of the armed forces, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a constitutional amendment providing for election of President and Vice President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Beneath Thy mighty hand, O Lord, we humble ourselves and say, "Holy, Holy, Holy." We praise Thee for Thy marvelous goodness that pours from Thy infinite heart; all the days of our lives Thou hast been with us. Thy hand hast not smitten us, but hast borne with us more patiently than we have borne with others. Truly Thou art our God and we are the sheep of Thy pasture. Thou hast made life triumphant through the presence of our Heavenly Father upon earth. We bless Thee that we live under such broad skies and in a land so rich in abundance. As a people may we never fail Thee, but through love of virtue and zeal for knowledge may we pursue the things that make for national righteousness and unity and that edify mankind. Lay Thy hand of blessing upon our President and upon his efforts to lighten the destiny of those who sit in darkness. Fill us all with the desire to purify ourselves, to walk patiently, and to discharge our duties in accordance with Thy plan. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FELICITATIONS FROM COSTA RICA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

The Directors of the Constitutional Congress of the Republic of Costa Rica—

Whereas it is of fundamental importance for the idea of the unity of America to strengthen the bonds between the nations of the continent, especially today, when a common destiny finds us in close embrace fighting for the triumph of liberty and justice;

Whereas Deputy Licenciado don Francisco Fonseca Chamier, vice president of this chamber, is about to depart for Mexico and the United States of America: Be it

Resolved, To confer upon the deputy, vice president of the Congress, Licenciado don Francisco Fonseca Chamier, the authority of the Constitutional Congress of the Republic of Costa Rica to present to the Houses of the Republics of Mexico and the United States of America the cordial greetings of his Costa Rican colleagues.

Done in the city of San Jose, capital of the Republic of Costa Rica, on the 23d day of January 1945.

——— ———, *President.*
——— ———, *First Secretary.*
——— ———, *Second Secretary.*

L. M. MANROSS, *February 19, 1945.*

CACTUS ORDNANCE WORKS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WORLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter and an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix on three different subject matters and in each one to include a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made jointly by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER and myself in regard to proposals made at the International Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. O. S. Bledsoe entitled "Summary of Our Present Economic Situation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of the posts of the American Legion on the pauper's oath; also to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial from one of the Long Beach, Calif., newspapers regarding the coming conference at San Francisco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LT. DENNIS CHAVEZ, JR.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a poem by Dr. Levin Swiggett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON—A PEACE ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, 162 years ago come the 2d of next May, George Washington, then President, the anniversary of whose birth we observe tomorrow, writing to Alexander Hamilton with respect to his sentiments on a peace establishment, took occasion to say:

> It may be laid down as a primary position, and the basis of our system, that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a proportion of his property, but even of his personal services to the defence of it, and consequently that the citizens of America (with a few legal and official exemptions) from 18 to 50 years of age should be borne on the militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to the use of them that the total strength of the country might be called forth at a short notice on any very interesting emergency.

The years which have passed since then testify to the truth of what Washington said and demonstrate that in every republic the due cultivation of a proper military spirit among the great mass of people and a general diffusion of military information are indispensably necessary for the preservation of liberty.

A complete and generous education—

Said Milton—

> is that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously, all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war.

It really is passing strange that as of today we have not learned by experience through the years that Washington was right and that the safety of democracy does depend on a free citizenry trained and armed to defend itself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from Mr. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include the correspondence between myself and the Comptroller General, also the report submitted by the Comptroller General to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. Page L. Hawthorne, of Creston, Iowa, which appeared in the Iowa Union Farmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a newspaper article on the St. Lawrence seaway project, and in the other to include a column by Mr. Ernest Lindley, entitled "United States Rebuffed," which appeared in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Sunday Independent of February 18, 1945, written by a distinguished member of the Luzerne County, Pa., bar, Attorney Peter P. Jurchak.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an editorial from the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., February 14, 1945, entitled "The Crimean Agreement," and an English translation of a Polish-language news release issued by me on February 19, 1945, to certain Polish-language newspapers in the United States, entitled "Yalta Agreements Will Result in Third World War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has made some observations and called attention to a bill he has introduced, also making the charge that there is too much centralization of power here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to hear these charges made from time to time but they come from Members whose States or respective communities have received from that centralized power in Washington the appropriations and aid that they have urged and sought. Within the hour or two we will have before us the rivers and harbors bill which will authorize appropriations of $381,968,000 to improve the harbors and creeks in many of the States. Thus far I have not heard—nor do I expect to hear—a single kick or objection to these appropriations. We will also consider, in a few days, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, which proposes an increase in the capital stock of that corporation from three to five billion dollars to be used in supporting prices of agricultural commodities which prices, in the last few years, have been higher than the farmers of this country ever anticipated or dreamed of.

There is seldom a week that we are not called upon to aid the States in various

ways but on such days when the proposed beneficial legislation is considered I do not hear any complaints regarding these aids and appropriations.

I wonder how the gentleman feels about the proposal to increase the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation? As to his other thought, I agree with him. Let us have the names of all the Republicans that have been appointed by President Roosevelt to high positions in the various agencies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 142), as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speake.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MCCORMACK took the oath of office as Speaker pro tempore.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of persona' privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated a month ago that he would appreciate the courtesy if Members who intended to rise to a question of personal privilege would submit it to the Chair in advance.

However, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin to state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a newspaper article from the New York Times of February 19, 1945. This article contains a statement released by Pravda in Moscow, Russia, on Sunday, February 18, 1945. This article was printed in almost every daily newspaper in the United States. This article denounces me as a Fascist, and among its statements are the following:

"Mr. O'KONSKI." Pravda said, "had repeated a dirty insinuation of Fascist propaganda concerning liberated Poland."

Another statement from Pravda quoted in this article states:

"From the tribune of the House of Representatives he—"

Meaning me—

"spoke like Goebbels."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these statements are a reflection on my patriotism and loyalty and a reflection on my character as a representative of 300,000 good American people. I ask to be recognized to defend myself and answer these most derogatory attacks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is entitled to speak on the question of personal privilege under the statement made by him.

AN ANSWER TO PRAVDA

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 18, Pravda, the official newspaper of Soviet Russia assailed me for denouncing the Yalta Conference as the most dastardly crime of the ages. In typical Goebbels fashion, which Moscow always apes and emulates, Pravda stated:

O'KONSKI had repeated a dirty insinuation of Fascist propaganda concerning liberated Poland.

The official Soviet organ also stated:

From the tribune of the House of Representatives he spoke like Goebbels.

The article also states that—

The Polish Government in London had been acting in unison with Berlin.

These statements by Pravda are typical of the technique employed by Moscow to fool and confuse. Anybody not in 100-percent agreement with Moscow according to Moscow is a Fascist and a mouthpiece of Goebbels. Perhaps that is why Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt handed over all the loot to Stalin at Yalta because maybe they were afraid that they too might be called Fascists and mouthpieces of Goebbels if they even had a conscience that said "No" just once. Name calling in Moscow, like in Berlin, is a special stock in trade. The brand is identical. The technique is identical. Pravda apes Goebbels in every turn of the road. In fact Pravda out-Goebbels Goebbels in many instances.

Goebbel's technique is telling a big lie and telling it often enough so that people will believe it. Moscow's technique is of the same stripe. It is not I who talks like Goebbels. It is Moscow, through Pravda, that talks like Goebbels. To my mind, there is no difference between fascism, nazi-ism, and communism. All three are products of perverted minds. Fascism, communism, and nazi-ism to me are just different trade names of the same parcel.

With all my being, with all my heart and soul, I despise all three. The gears that make these three perversions tick are identical—make no mistake about that.

So when Pravda denounces me as a Fascist I laugh up my sleeve because, to me, such a reply smacks of fascism itself in its lowest form. Moscow, like Goebbels, has fooled millions with that kind of trickery. It took Munich to wise up the world to Goebbels. Likewise, it took Yalta to wise up the world to Pravda. The Goebbels-Pravda axis technique has fooled the world for too long. It still fools men in high places, "but you can't fool all the people all of the time."

Let us examine this Goebbels-Pravda technique of telling a big lie often enough so that people will believe it. I denounced the Yalta Conference as the crime of the ages. I denounced the selling out of Poland as a stab in the back to freedom-loving people everywhere. I stated that the crime conference at Yalta butchered the Atlantic Charter and threw it into the Black Sea. To these statements of truth Moscow in Goebbels style replied: "The Polish Government in London had been 'acting in unison with Berlin.'" This lie has been repeated so often by Moscow that resistance of the representatives at the Yalta Conference subsided. I might say parenthetically that this lie had the help of quite a bit of the mixture of vodka and red pepper which some of our own representatives had so deeply impressed on their own minds.

So now we have Pravda telling us that the reason Poland was sold down the river is because "Poland acted in unison with Berlin." This is perhaps one of the "strong" arguments used by Stalin which Mr. Byrnes referred to upon his arrival from the Conference. Reinforced by vodka and red pepper it was perhaps even stronger. Of all Pravda lies this one takes the prize. In Wisconsin we have the Burlington Liars' Club, which makes an annual award to the most ridiculous yarn of each year. I am submitting this Pravda statement to this organization and there is no question about who is going to get the prize for 1945.

Let us make an honest and decent review of the record of Poland and its Government in this bloody war. This record is written in history with the blood of 7,000,000 Poles who gave their lives in this war. It is a record of which Poland has every right to be proud. It is a record that has no equal among the gallant fighting Allies. "Poland acted in unison with Berlin." How stupid and low a statement for human beings to make!

Here is Poland's record of "acting in unison with Berlin." At 4:50 a. m. on September 1, 1939, swarms of German bombers appeared over Polish skies. The Second World War began. Poland had 200 tanks—Hitler had 4,200. Poland had only 377 planes—Hitler had 4,000. The ratio of fire-power was 1 to 72 in Hitler's favor. Hitler had 2,000,000 motor vehicles—Poland had a few horses. Poland's Army was outnumbered 5 to 1. Yet Poland did not yield. Poland was the first to fight back. Poland had no lend-lease from us. Poland was promised 100 bomber planes from Britain which she never got—but Poland fought on and stood alone against the Hitler hordes. Poland was promised 100 fighter planes from France which she never got—still Poland fought on. France and England hid in the Maginot line—still Poland fought on alone. Poland fought alone against the mightiest and most deadly war machine in the history of the world. Poles were mowed down like grass but they died with their boots on rather than collaborate with Hitler. For 17 days they fought back the criminal of the ages. Then what happened?

Moscow—yes; Moscow of all places. Those who accuse Poland of "acting in unison with Berlin." What did Moscow do when Poland was spilling its blood like water in those 17 days? It was Moscow and not Poland that "acted in unison with Berlin." Moscow, like a wolf holding its prey at bay, collaborated with Hitler and stabbed gallant Poland in the back. Now Poland had two of the largest military powers in the world against it. Did they give in? Not by a long shot. They still fought on. They fought on until October 5. Poland alone held

out longer against two mighty enemies than France with the help of England held out against Hitler.

These 37 days that Poland held out were precious days for the Allies. It gave them a chance to wake up. All decent people throughout the world owe a lasting debt of gratitude to the Poles for their courage in refusing to compromise with Hitler—even when stabbed in the back by Moscow.

With this kind of history written with Polish blood, Moscow now has the brazenness to say, "Poland 'acted in unison with Berlin.'" History shows it was Moscow and not Poland who "acted in unison with Berlin." Moscow was the first country in all of Europe to collaborate with Hitler, when Moscow thought she herself could get some good out of it. To have Moscow now present the argument that Poland collaborated with Hitler is enough to nauseate all decent and freedom-loving people. To tell these truths, Moscow says, is fascism and speaking for Goebbels. Moscow should know. No Pole has ever done business with Goebbels. Moscow has had that experience on more than one occasion. If Moscow thought its interests could be better promoted, it would do business with Goebbels again.

But all this is just a very small part of Poland's valor in this war and their constant refusal to collaborate with Hitler in any manner, shape, or form. Did Poland cease fighting after her country was overrun by Hitler and his satellite Russia? Not by any means. In all these more than 5 years of war wherever there was a German Hitler's army to fight against, Poland was there. What Poland? The Poland headed by the Polish Government in London, which Moscow wants liquidated. In more than 5 years Polish sailors, Polish soldiers, Polish underground, and exiled Poles from everywhere were loyal and obedient subjects of this government. What is the record of this Polish Government in London? Did it collaborate with Hitler at any time? Let us look at the record again written with blood of Polish soldiers on every battlefield.

Through the government in London for more than 5 years Poland still fought Hitler and his Fascist forces wherever they could be found.

After the battle for Poland came the battle for France. Through the Polish Government in London there was recruited an army of more than 70,000 Polish men who fought in France. In France the Poles defended the Saar sector of the Maginot line. When the northwestern French front broke, the Fourteenth French Army was ordered to abandon the Maginot line. The First Polish Division covered the retreat of the French Army. The Poles were always the last to surrender or run. On June 18 Marshal Petain applied for an armistice. At the request of the Polish Government in London, General Sikorski tried to save as many as he could and ordered General Duch of the Polish Army to fight his way to Switzerland. General Duch and the Polish Army did not even then stop fighting because they were engaged in a critical battle. In this battle 45 percent of the Polish Army in France was killed. Thus the Polish Army was the last to cease firing in the battle for France, This is what Moscow now calls "acting in unison with Berlin."

Poland's fight for their freedom and ours did not end in France. Here is how the Polish Government in London continued to act in unison with Berlin. In the spring of 1940 Great Britain and France planned to attack in Hitler-occupied Norway. Immediately when this became known the Polish Government in London was the first to apply for the inclusion of her troops in this dangerous expedition. Poland has always been the first one ready to help victims of Hitler's inhumanity. So a Polish army went to fight Hitlerism in Norway. The Polish Army was assigned the peninsula opposite the town of Narvik, Norway. This was the goal of the expedition. The Polish Army not only held its assignment but did more—it began an offensive which ended in the conquest of Ankenes. On the night of May 31 the Polish Army was called out of Norway and returned to France due to the critical situation in Flanders. Here again the Polish Army was the last to leave Hitler-occupied Norway. Read General Bithoart's statement about Poland's heroism at Narvik and Ankenes, and see how "Poland acted in unison with Berlin."

Let us go on. When it became evident that France would no longer resist the Germans and that her capitulation was but a matter of days, General Sikorski resolved to continue fighting side by side with the British ally.

On June 17, 1940, a British bomber came to Bordeaux to take General Sikorski to London.

On the following day, in the course of a dramatic conference at 10 Downing Street, General Sikorski arranged with the British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, the outlines of a new military agreement between Poland and Great Britain. At the same time the technical details were worked out for the transport of the Polish armed forces from France to the British Isles.

This is how a distinguished British writer, George Slocombe, relates the Sikorski-Churchill meeting—Sunday Express, July 14, 1940:

> "Tomorrow, I return to France," said General Sikorski gravely to the Prime Minister, "and I have to face my army. What am I to tell them?"
>
> "Tell them," replied Mr. Churchill, "that we are their comrades in life and in death. We shall conquer together or we shall die together."
>
> "That is all I wish to know," said General Sikorski.
>
> The two prime ministers, one the leader of a free Britain, the other of a martyred but still undying people, shook hands.
>
> "That handshake," General Sikorski told me yesterday, "meant more to me than any treaty of alliance or any pledged word."

That was the start of the collaboration between Poland and Great Britain, a collaboration which has not been one-sided. While Polish ships, including the new Polish trans-Atlantic liner *Batory* helped to evacuate British troops from Dunkerque, British transports called in ports of southern France, such as Rochefort, La Rochelle, Le Verdon, Bordeaux, St. Jean de Luz, and so forth, and took aboard the various units of the Polish Army.

The Polish Air Force, scattered throughout France, reported in its entirety. Three-fourths of the armored units, sappers, and liaison troops, plus all troops in the training camps, were successfully evacuated.

The work of embarkation in the southern ports was completed literally at the eleventh hour, with the Germans closing in on the southern ports of France and the French authorities demanding with increasing urgency that the Polish troops should lay down their arms.

All in all out of a total of about 80,000 Polish troops in France it was possible to save approximately 30,000 men up to the end of June.

Among the many thousands of Polish soldiers evacuated from France in the latter part of June 1940, approximately 8,000 flyers, among whom were various specialists and ranks had been brought to England. They came without a single plane, practically unfamiliar with the types of British aircraft. They were certain of a hospitable reception but they had to earn the confidence of their British colleagues.

The first Polish unit, Squadron 303, subsequently called the Kosciusko Squadron, was put into perfect fighting trim by August 31, 1940. Said squadron, together with Squadron 302, which was organized later, participated in all the major engagements with the German Air Force during the Battle of Britain.

According to official data, Squadrons 302 and 303 shot down 142 enemy planes with 23 additional probably destroyed, while Polish flyers serving in British squadrons shot down 77 plus 16 probables. All in all the Poles contributed to the destruction of 219 enemy planes and to the probable destruction of 39 additional craft. Accordingly every eighth German shot down over London had been accounted for by a Pole.

His Majesty King George VI personally visited the Polish squadrons to shake the Polish flyers' hands and to congratulate them on their victories.

George Saunders, the official historiographer of the Battle of Britain and one of the most popular British authors, characterized the fighting prowess of the Polish pursuit flyers:

> Among the pursuit flyers, the Poles are excellent. Their bravery is immense and their skill borders on the superhuman. The Poles have rendered signal services. They continue to render them and shall continue to do so until a triumphant and total victory shall irradiate their wings. We are beginning to know the Poles.

Until May 1, 1944, the official records of the Polish Air Force operating from British bases in the British Isles contains the following entries: Six hundred and twenty enemy aircraft actually destroyed, 167 probably destroyed, 214 badly damaged.

Polish bomber squadrons have taken part in 893 operations of a varied character in which a total of 7,056 sorties were made.

Lt. Col. Francis Gabreski, famous pilot ace, who has the highest score among American airmen in the European theater—he shot down 38 enemy planes—

was for some time in 1943 attached to the Polish Spitfire Squadron in Great Britain.

His opinion about Polish pilots is most favorable:

They distinguished themselves by the greatest bravery I have ever seen. Their spirit of comradeship is unequaled.

In addition to the combats to the constant patrol service above the sea together with the coastal command and to the escorting of Allied bombers, the Polish Air Force participated in military operations in Tunisia, Sicily, and in Italy.

The Polish Air Force at all times was fourth as to size among the United Nations—after the United States, Great Britain, and Russia—and consisted of 14 squadrons. It is larger than the combined air forces of France, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Belgium.

That is how the Polish Government "acted in unison with Berlin."

The next so-called unison with Berlin was at Tobruk. For 4 months the Poles defended Tobruk. Most of the time the Polish battalions occupied the extremely dangerous sector of the perimeter under the enemy's heavy fire, coming from Medauer Hill. Detachments in this sector were changed every 2 weeks because of close proximity to the enemy, the exposed position, and the ceaseless enemy fire exhausted the men in very short time. Polish forces defended this sector for 70 days, until the fortress was finally relieved.

At the end of 1941, General Auchinleck's offensive and the assault of the fortress' defenders finally broke the enemy's iron ring. Tobruk was free. It was the first fortress noted in the annals of this war which resisted all the attacks of the enemy.

After leaving Tobruk, the Carpathian Brigade took part in the pursuit of the enemy. During that pursuit the Poles dislodged the Axis forces from strongly fortified positions at El Gazala, 25 miles west of Tobruk. Here Polish infantry without cover charged the enemy across a flat terrain against concentrated artillery, mortar, and machine-gun fire. Although the attack was carried out almost entirely without any artillery support, it was very successful and culminated in capturing a great number of war prisoners and of huge supply stores.

During the entire Libyan campaign the enemy took only 14 Polish prisoners while the Carpathian Brigade took more than 1,800 German and Italian prisoners. This may serve to illustrate the stubbornness with which the Poles fought in Libya.

That, Moscow, is how the Polish Government in London "acted in unison with Berlin."

Poland's next stand against Hitler, which Moscow terms unison with Berlin, was in Italy. Let us review this act of heroism by a Polish army.

Previous battles for Cassino had taken place in the middle of January 1944—Americans being engaged—in the middle of February—Americans, Indians, and New Zealanders—and from March 15 to 28, when the Allies succeeded in capturing the railway station and in approaching within 300 yards of the monastery.

Despite the support of air forces on an unprecedently large scale—the largest ever used against a single objective—the Allies had to withdraw before the murderous fire of the Germans.

The monastery was the key to the defense of the area. To capture it the Poles struck first at the massif of Albaneta and heights 595 and 565, and captured them, repelling many counterattacks by the Germans.

The nature of the struggle is evidenced by the fact that ladders had to be used more than once and hand-to-hand fighting was frequent. The Germans believed their position is impregnable.

On May 16 the New York Times gave the following description of the first attack made by the Poles, an attack which ended in failure:

Polish troops * * * again were thrown against their old-time enemies at the opening of the offensive against the Gustav line * * * and have been in the thick of the fighting ever since.

Theirs was one of the most difficult of all sectors of this difficult front.

On May 17 the Poles renewed their assault on the slope of Mount Cassino, a simultaneous attack on the town of Cassino at the foot of the monastery being made by the Canadians. On May 18, after a desperate struggle, the Poles captured the abbey.

The fury and passion with which the Poles attacked the Germans were commented on by all who saw the struggle or its scene.

"The battle turned into a savage animal struggle," wrote the war correspondent of the British United Press. "Not a single able-bodied prisoner was taken by either side on the slopes leading to Abbey Hill," wrote another.

As a tribute to the British comrades of the Eighth Army, the Poles planted over Monte Cassino, beside their national flag, the British Union Jack.

Learning the success of the Polish Corps, His Majesty King George VI awarded General Anders the companionship of the Order of the Bath, one of the highest of the British decorations. At the same time Gen. Sir Harold Alexander sent the following message to Gen. Oliver Leese, commander of the British Eighth Army, to be handed to General Anders:

I shall be grateful if you will convey a special word of praise to General Anders on the magnificent fighting qualities and tenacity of his Polish troops displayed in capturing the fortress which the enemy considered impregnable. This is a proud day for Poland, and I salute the Polish flag which now flies proudly from the monastery fortress.

The United States Army also paid tribute to the Polish Second Corps. On August 1, 1944, Gen. Jacob Devers, when decorating General Anders with the Order of the Legion of Merit—degree of commander—said:

History will record the capture of the monastery hill by the Poles. * * * There are no fighting men superior to these soldiers, and there are no soldiers who have a more impelling reason, a greater incentive to destroy the enemy. Their homeland has been ravished. May it soon again become a free nation taking an important part in the affairs of the world at peace.

After 4½ months Monte Cassino had fallen to the Allies opening the way to Rome.

That is how the Polish Government "acted in unison with Berlin."

And even within Poland the fight was carried on in the underground. No conquered nation—I repeat—no conquered nation had as much contact with the underground as the Polish Government in London. Even after more than 5 years as victims of conquest, there were still 2,000,000 Poles on Poland ready to kill Nazis at every opportunity. The first Russian successes in eastern Poland were made with the help of the Polish underground—acting in unison, not with Berlin, but in unison with the Polish Government in London. What man or lady in this House does not know what happened at Warsaw? For 63 days the Polish underground held that tragic city alone and without material aid. Material aid was denied them. By whom? By our ally Russia just 25 miles away from Warsaw. Russia would not even permit our planes or British planes to land in Russia after we tried to fly some help to Warsaw. Ah, no! That gave Hitler a good chance to kill Poles loyal to the Polish London Government. The more of these Poles Hitler killed the less Russia would have to imprison and kill. In killing Poles, Moscow and Goebbels collaborated always and 100 percent.

And what reward was given to the Polish underground for the help they had given the Allies? They got more than a stab in the back. They got bullets in their heads. Why? Because they were Nazis? No. Because they were Facists? No. Because they were enemies? No. They were shot and are being shot today because they committed the "terrible sin" of being obedient to the Polish Government in London. Any Pole obedient to the Polish Government in London suffers that fate.

The Secretary of State, when these gallant Poles were holding Warsaw for 67 days, issued a note to the enemy country saying that those patriotic Poles holding Warsaw would be recognized as regular members of the Polish fighting army and must be treated as such. Unfortunately, the Secretary of State did not relay that same message to one of our allies, because they were not treated as such.

How long has this been going on? Ever since Goebbels and Moscow got together in 1939. Since 1939 Moscow has been killing Poles—our ally. Moscow has been killing Nazis only since 1941—2 years later. When the history of this war is written, we will learn that Moscow has directed the killing, starving, and imprisoning of more allies than it has Nazis. Yes; who is it that works in unison with Berlin?

Even today, after being stabbed in the back, wherever you find the Nazi enemy you will find Poland fighting against him. On land, on sea, under the sea, and in the skies you still find Poland chasing and killing Nazis—and Poland did

not get $10,000,000,000 of lend-lease. These Polish forces are led by the Polish Government in London. Not once has any Pole in actual fighting questioned the validity or loyalty of the leaders of that Government. This Government has been so widely supported that out of 35,000,000 Poles before the war not a single Nazi Quisling has been found in Poland in more than 5 years of this war. Just think of it. In more than 5 years of war, with all the crucifying that has taken place of Polish people, there is not one bit of evidence to show that one single Pole out of 35,000,000 ever collaborated with the Nazis. That is how Poland collaborates with Berlin. Even Goebbels, with all his lies, could not divide the Polish Nation. But what Goebbels could not do Moscow has done. Goebbels is not alone in believing in the crude and indecent policy of divide and conquer. That is Moscow's stock in trade, too. Moscow, with its Goebbels technique, has succeeded in dividing the Polish Nation. And in dividing the Polish Nation, Moscow, and not Poland, has been acting in unison with Berlin.

Yes; in spite of its tragic fate, Poland fought on. More than 7,000,000 Polish people, one-fifth of her population, has paid the supreme sacrifice for their freedom and ours. What country is there that can compare to this tragic fate? What was their reward? Promises, glowing, wordy tributes, and a stab in the back. On four previous occasions Poland has been severed. But on all four occasions it was by European powers. These four previous partitions were denounced by the civilized world as the crime of ages up to that time. But now we have an even greater crime. This time Poland has been partitioned by outsiders. And this time Poland has been severed, not by enemy countries, but by so-called allies. It is like going into your brother's home and then getting stabbed in the back by him. That is why this last partition at Yalta will go down as the most ghastly crime of all ages known to man or beast. This is the first time in the history of the world that allies met and divided the spoils of a fellow ally. Even the most cruel and inhuman militarists of the ages never stooped that low. Is it any wonder that De Gaulle snubbed the participants of this "poker game" at Yalta? Reviewing the fate of Poland at Yalta, is there any reason to believe that the Big Three, led and managed by the "Big One," can ever be trusted? De Gaulle, I am sure, wants no part of the crime conference at Yalta.

CONCLUSION

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, what I have said is an answer to Pravda's stupid charge that I am a Fascist and speak like Goebbels. All of us know who really is a Fascist and apes Goebbels. No less an authority than the Very Reverend Dr. W. R. Inge, former dean of St. Paul's and head of the Angelican Diocese in London, just last Sunday said: "You don't have democracy in Russia. What you have is closer to fascism than anything else." So I hurl the charge of speaking like Goebbels and spreading Fascist lies right back to Moscow, where it belongs and rightfully so.

But this is not all of the Fascist lies emanating from Moscow. The stupid lie that Poland "acted in unison with Berlin" is just a rare sample of their stupid Fascist propaganda. Other stupid lies which were such strong arguments at Yalta reinforced by vodka and red pepper are—

That Russia needs Polish soil to protect herself from future aggression.

That the Curzon line is a historic boundary submitted by neutral powers.

That the Polish Government in London represents Polish landlords.

That the Polish Government in London is not the choice of the Polish people.

That the Polish Government does not represent the Polish underground.

That Russia must be rewarded for her liberation of Poland.

These bits of Fascist-Communist-Goebbels propaganda lies are just as brazen and stupid as the one I disproved today. In future days I shall disprove all these other Fascist lies and schemes.

These lies and Fascist tricks might fool some of our leaders. But it will take more than vodka and pepper before the vast majority of decent, freedom-loving American people will believe them.

ALLIED UNITY

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the Member who has just preceded me. It seems to me that those of us who are Members of the House of Representatives of the United States have a very solemn obligation. We have the obligation to make no statement or to do anything on the floor of this House which is likely to contribute to disunity among the Allies who are fighting on our side. We are fighting not against Russia, ladies and gentlemen, we are fighting against Germany and Japan. The contributions that have been made by our allies in this war must be recognized; we should be praising these Allies, and be glad that they are battling by our side in the war against nazi-ism. The problem of the Polish settlement is an extremely difficult one. It is one that is going to call for the very best brains that the world has, and for careful, cool consideration. I doubt very much that appeals to emotions and to national prejudices made on the floor of this House are going to help the cause of unity or are going to help to solve the Polish problem. After all, we are interested primarily in world peace. Let us not lose sight of the main objective by becoming too engrossed in the details; let us put first things first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Speaker of the House announced that it would be his rule not to recognize requests for 1 minute speeches after the morning hour and after the chairman of a committee was in his place ready to proceed with the consideration of a bill. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] was on his feet seeking recognition at the time the gentleman who just spoke was recognized. I would like to propound the inquiry whether or not the incident that has just taken place is to be regarded as overruling the statement or the announcement of the Speaker a few days ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair does not feel the gentleman's inquiry constitutes a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair feels that the incident does not constitute a precedent as to overruling any expressions made by the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. The Chair, of course, did not know for what purpose the gentleman from California was seeking recognition. The gentleman from South Dakota is aware of the fact that at all times when it is possible for the convenience of Members, when the House is sitting as such, unanimous-consent requests for Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD are recognized. The gentleman from California asked for permission to proceed for 1 minute. There was no objection. The Chair feels, expressing the personal opinion of the present occupant of the chair, that the suggestion made by the Speaker, which was referred to by the gentleman from South Dakota, is an orderly one to follow. The present occupant of the chair shall govern himself accordingly in the future in connection with any request to address the House for 1 minute.

The Chair at this time will only recognize Members for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter sent to me by the Foreign Economic Administration in response to some questions I asked them in the RECORD on February 16.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio broadcast on the administration of the O. P. A. in the Territories.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the national film weekly Box Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California,

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain brief quoted material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2252) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall continue for 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2252, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, with Mr. PRIEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have an inquiry I would like to direct to the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill.

A few days ago we had under consideration a bill to appropriate some additional money for conducting an agricultural census. Yesterday I received in the mail a communication from the agricultural statistician in charge for the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., which reads as follows:

> We have recently published a bulletin for South Dakota containing the county data on livestock for the years 1924 to 1943, inclusive. The supply is limited and the publication should only go to those who have need for it. This notice is sent that you may request copy if you so desire. There is no charge. The county data covers numbers of animals of the different species, numbers of chickens, and numbers of hay-consuming and grain-consuming animal units.

When the appropriation item was considered the other day for the agricultural census we were told that the purpose of it was to enable the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, or the Bureau of the Census to go out and count the chickens and the different species of animals, the number of animals that consumed grain and hay, and so forth. Now I have this communication from the Department of Agriculture saying they already have them counted clear up through 1943, for which no special appropriation was required.

I want to know if I may have assurance from the chairman of this committee that in the pending appropriation bill we have no such proposed duplication of appropriations as the Congress was called upon to make in passing funds for the agricultural census the other day.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman of the information that he desires; that is that there is absolutely no duplication in this bill with respect to the activities mentioned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As far as the gentleman knows, there is no way in which we are making appropriations here to do something that is already being done under another appropriation?

Mr. LUDLOW. Absolutely not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the assurance of the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure, during the past 2 years, of serving on the Appropriation Subcommittee, handling appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments. In view of the fact that I am leaving that subcommittee for another assignment I should like at this time to join with my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], a member of the committee, who yesterday paid splendid tribute to the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

It has been by experience and observation, during the past 2 years, that those two colleagues of ours have done extremely conscientious work and have rendered faithful and devoted service in discharging their duties.

These particular departments of the Federal Government, of course, are service departments, and the members of the subcommittee do not have the same opportunity that is afforded other subcommittees to bring in colorful reports and indulge in controversies. Yesterday the chairman of the committee, in his comprehensive outline of the various items in this bill, made a statement which I think should be corrected at this time. It was not incorrect, but it was rather incomplete. The chairman stated that the total amount carried in the bill was $1,342,873,000, a decrease of $59,873,000 from the appropriations for 1945. That is partially true, but the chairman overlooked the fact that the funds carried in this bill make no provision whatsoever for the payment of overtime during the next fiscal year. Primarily, that is because the various overtime pay bills will expire on June 30 and, naturally, no authority exists for extension of those overtime payments in the fiscal year 1946.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There was no thought or purpose on my part of making a misstatement; it was just an oversight on my part to state that the bill did not carry overtime. I thank the gentleman for calling it to our attention.

Mr. DWORSHAK. My only purpose in doing so is that the record will show the true situation. As a matter of fact, considering the overtime factor, instead of showing a decrease of $59,000,000 under appropriations for 1945—taking into consideration the fact that 1945 funds which are now being currently used provide for the payment of overtime to Federal employees—the bill actually shows an increase of $67,276,000. Of this, the Treasury Department in 1946 will show an increase of $26,730,000, and the Post Office Department approximately $40,000,000. This comparison, of course, is on the assumption that the overtime pay legislation expiring on June 30 will be extended.

As I said a few minutes ago, these departments are essentially service agencies and their volume of business is governed largely by the volume of general business of the Federal Government. I have here a statement for the fiscal year 1944, prepared by the Post Office Department, breaking down the total expenditures for the fiscal year 1944 of $1,075,000,000, and I give you these figures in percentages so you may have a better understanding of how the appropriations for the Post Office Department are allotted: Salaries, during the year 1944, amounted to $805,000,000, or approximately 75 percent of the total appropriation. Transportation of things amounted to 18.3 percent of the total; travel, 2.91 percent; rents and royalties, 1.76 percent; supplies and materials, 1.28 percent; and communication service, printing, binding, every contractual service, equipment, refunds, and awards, compositely amounted to only 0.85 percent of the total.

The Post Office Department, on December 31, 1944, had 372,512 employees, compared with 350,004 on December 31, 1943, or an increase of 22,508 during the year.

The Treasury Department showed an increase in its personnel of 8,274, as it had 93,946 employees on December 31, 1944, as compared with 85,672 on December 31, 1943.

It is interesting to check reports issued by the United States Civil Service

Commission, showing the status of civilian employment in the executive departments, as follows:

December 31, 1941	1,620,900
December 31, 1942	2,810,871
December 31, 1943	3,007,000
December 31, 1944	3,309,000

During these 3 war years, civilian employment by the Federal Government has more than doubled, which is a remarkable condition in view of the fact that manpower requirements of the Nation have been greatly accentuated for war purposes.

Thus you can readily see that the old-line agencies like the Post Office Department are more stable than some of the recently created war agencies, and the salary schedules that were presented during the hearings are far more stable in the old-line agencies than are those in some of the war agencies.

If you will read the Official Register and note some of the salary standards which have been adopted by these war agencies, you will probably be amazed. There has been much criticism on the part of so-called career employees of the Federal Government in the Post Office, Treasury, and other departments because they have not enjoyed the same salary increases and the promotions in grade and from one grade to another. I checked recently and found instances in some of the war agencies where salaries had been increased 50 percent in the last 2 years. Of course, that same thing is not true of some of the old-line agencies.

AIR MAIL VOLUME INCREASES

During the hearings, the testimony of various witnesses developed some very interesting information concerning the status of domestic air mail, and I want to direct your attention to page 167 of the hearings and show you what increases there have been during the last 4 years.

This testimony shows that in 1940 the total pound-miles of domestic mail was 18,000,000,000, or an increase of 18 percent over the previous year. In 1941 the pound-miles carried were 22,000,000,000, or 19 percent over 1940. In 1942 the pound-miles carried had grown to 31,000,000,000, an increase of 40 percent over the preceding year. In 1943 there were 56,000,000,00 pound-miles carried, or an increase of 79 percent over the preceding year. This analysis shows that in the past 4 years there has been an increase of approximately 500 percent in the amount of domestic air mail carried.

During the hearing it was also developed that, while the Civil Aeronautics Board has been responsible for fixing the rates for carrying air mail which are paid by the Post Office Department, there may be some discrepancies in the estimates submitted for both domestic and foreign air mail. For instance, there was a tentative estimate of $1 as a rate for two new routes, one from Seattle, Wash., to Fairbanks, Alaska, and one across the Atlantic. The Navy Department has been carrying the mail on these two routes, but recently private carriers have taken over this responsibility. No rate has been set yet by the C. A. B., but the Post Office Department suggested the possibility of paying $1 a pound for carrying that mail.

We must recall that several years ago, when the air-mail traffic or business was in its infancy, it was the established policy of the Federal Government to subsidize air-mail carriers in order to create and expand routes and to encourage development and expansion of the aviation industry. In those days it was understood generally that subsidies were recognized as being necessary to build up this vast network of air-mail transportation. But in the hearings before our subcommittee a few weeks ago the testimony indicated that, while representatives of the Solicitor's Office were permitted to appear at the hearings conducted by the C. A. B. when these rates were established, it was obvious that the interest of the Government was not adequately taken care of.

We visualize in the post-war period a vast expansion even greater than this 500 percent which we have had in the domestic air-mail routes during the past 4 years and the question naturally arises in my mind, and I presume in the minds of many of you, whether the Congress has some joint responsibility to determine the fundamental factors upon which these air-mail rates are to be established.

The question is whether current rates still provide for subsidies, and whether there is any justification for subsidies when we know that, notwithstanding the restrictions on the use of planes, which have been diverted for war uses to the Army and the Navy, all of these carriers have been operating at maximum capacity. Air mail has actually been delayed, and sometimes it takes longer than regular mail, because of the lack of adequate facilities and planes. But I believe that Congress should face its post-war responsibility. It is true that the Post Office Department is showing a profit in the handling of this air mail; but certainly we should determine whether the C. A. B. and the Post Office Department are taking into consideration some of these elemental factors which may be of prime importance in the post-war period.

MAINTAIN RURAL SERVICE

Included in this bill is $93,598,000 for Rural Delivery Service. Although this figure is a decrease of about $14,000,000 under the 1945 appropriation, no provision is made in this measure for the special acts covering overtime pay. The total obligations of these items for the current year were $14,587,145. If these increases are carried through the next fiscal year, the appropriation for Rural Delivery Service will be approximately the same as during the current year.

Throughout the rural areas of this country there has been much concern regarding the possible curtailment of this mail service because of recruitment and other problems arising from the war. There have been many consolidations of routes, although during the first 6 months of this fiscal year there have been 1,859 extensions.

As of December 31, 1944, there were 32,052 rural carriers, and the average length of the routes was 44 miles. During 1944 there were 240 consolidations effected, and consequently the trend is toward longer routes. In most of these consolidations the patrons have objected because of anticipated poorer service. However, the First Assistant Postmaster General stated that no changes have been made without an investigation and recommendation by a post-office inspector.

When the question was asked during the hearings of the First Assistant Postmaster General whether the Department plans to minimize or curtail Rural Delivery Service, the reply was that this branch of the Post Office Service is given most careful consideration. This is gratifying to millions of rural patrons, in view of the fact that constant efforts are being made to improve postal service in the cities.

NO TIME TO GENERATE FEAR

Mr. Chairman, there has been much debate and discussion recently about the manpower situation of this country. This body is awaiting the action of the other body on a highly controversial bill which is designed primarily to boost the morale of our armed forces overseas.

The manpower situation is so acute at present that the prosecution of the war is being retarded, according to Secretary of War Stimson. In his address on Sunday evening, directed particularly to the families of servicemen, Mr. Stimson exemplified the highest Army tradition of "buck passing." This administration has frequently called the attention of the American people to the fact that the only thing we need fear is fear itself. There have been few occasions, during the past 4 years, when such an adroit effort to create fear and confusion has been made as by the Secretary in his efforts to present only one side of the current war program. Our fighting forces in the Pacific and elsewhere are serving heroically and magnificently. However, it cannot be said that at home war administration has been so efficient under the direction of the War Department and related Federal agencies. There have been widespread incompetence and inefficiency in the production program, with resultant waste of civilian manpower and extravagance involving many billions of dollars.

This is not the first instance wherein the War Department has attempted to influence civilians in a sphere outside of its own supervision. It is unfortunate that the War Department, which should operate entirely free from political influence, is subject to administration pressure and is frequently called upon to intervene in congressional affairs.

Within the past 6 months, one of the most pressing problems confronting the Congress has been reconversion from war to peacetime economy, largely as the result of the overly optimistic forecasts made by War Department representatives last summer. If there have been unnecessary turn-over of labor and shifting from essential to nonessential jobs, it is principally because many thousands of American workers were led to believe last fall that the war in Europe had about

ended and that it was time to seek permanent peacetime positions.

Because of this attitude on the part of the administration, machinery has been set up to dispose of surplus war supplies and equipment variously estimated at between fifty and one hundred billions of dollars. Obviously, a great deal of valuable production was involved in making these vast surpluses available. If the War Department is so efficient in estimating the productive needs of the Nation, why did the Quartermaster Corps and various other agencies involved in procurement, misdirect essential manpower in manufacturing supplies so greatly in excess of current requirements?

Reliable reports are available from every industrial city in this country, showing that there has been almost criminal hoarding of manpower in war production. Most contractors have been completely indifferent in recruitment of labor because of the vicious cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. There has been no incentive for war industries to operate efficiently and to release surplus labor for more essential uses. It is interesting to recall that the same War Department which is now seeking to place the responsibility upon Congress for the deplorable labor situation is the same War Department which, on June 6, 1941, addressed a letter to the House of Representatives, urging defeat of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] to outlaw cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

It was apparent in 1940 at the outset of the defense and war preparations in which this country engaged, that there would result a repetition of the universally condemned cost-plus contract system in vogue during the First World War. However, Under Secretary of War Patterson declared, on June 6, 1941, that "if the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract is forbidden by law, the program for Army and equipping our troops will be greatly retarded." At that time the Under Secretary gave assurances that such cost-plus contracts would be carefully checked. However, the record clearly discloses that there has been little restraint on profiteering; and if it were not for renegotiation, this Government would have lost many additional billions of dollars because of the ineptitude and inexperience of this same War Department in the operation of its procurement program.

The peak of civilian employment by the Federal Government in World War No. 1 was 918,000, covering all bureaus, agencies, boards, and departments engaged in civilian activities. On December 31, 1944, the War Department alone had civilian personnel amounting to 1,177,947. This means that the War Department currently is using almost 30 percent more civilian employees than were required to operate the entire civilian government at the peak of the First World War. The War Department also has 327,000 civil employees overseas.

Did Secretary Stimson make a report upon this unfortunate hoarding of civilian labor? Did he advise the American people on Sunday evening that the War Department's own inefficient use of civilian manpower has contributed greatly to the creation of the very situation which, he alleges, now justifies the adoption of drastic compulsory labor controls? Does the Secretary overlook the fact that small business and agriculture have been forced to operate with limited manpower during the past few years while the Federal Government increased its own civilian personnel during 1944 by 302,000?

The Secretary declared that shortages are now looming up as the inevitable result of failure of American democracy to function on the home front. It is bureaucracy, not democracy, which has failed to function. Is it justifiable to condemn the families of these servicemen when they have been eager and willing to produce the necessary munitions and equipment to insure a military victory?

Mr. Stimson also concludes that the enactment of a labor-draft bill is essential because it will be a signal to the men on the battle front that there is no longer to be discrimination against them on the home front. Every American knows that if there has been misdirection of our war program and misplacement of civilian manpower, these blunders have been committed by the administration, of which the Secretary is an integral part.

I am confident that neither Americans in combat zones nor Americans at home must be coerced or intimidated by fear in order to contribute to the best of their ability to winning this war. If Americans are seeking to destroy totalitarianism abroad, why should they adopt totalitarian methods at home, and, thus, repudiate the voluntary system which has enabled our country to play so vital a part in this war against the Axis Powers?

At this critical stage of the war, it would be far more effective for the Secretary of War to make a patriotic appeal to the American people for an all-out effort on the basis of voluntary service. Unity on the home front cannot be enhanced by using the Hitler technique of generating fear and making implications that this war will last longer unless the American people completely surrender their constitutional safeguards.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I am making my maiden speech today on the floor of the House and I feel a minute is probably too long. I probably would feel more at home in a Navy uniform, with the Navy boys here, or, I will say, just as a plain galleryite. In considering this bill making large appropriations of public funds, may I point out to the Congress and to the various Government departments that the members of the armed forces feel that it is not too much to ask a Government employee to do a full day's work for a full day's pay. In concluding, may I as a galleryite and probably an unreformed one, always looking around as they do when they come here, say, "Where is everybody?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, as this has been my first opportunity to serve as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Treasury, I should like at the outset to pay tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], who is always faithful in his duties and untiring in his efforts to render service; also to the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], whose conscientious efforts on appropriations are known to all Members of Congress. It is an arduous duty to sit daily through the hearings, listening to the justifications from the many executive heads of the Treasury, but this was greatly lightened by these two leaders and the other very able members of our subcommittee.

It is only natural that I should have some interesting and enlightening experiences, but I was particularly impressed with the responsibilities assumed by every member of our subcommittee and of their desire to bring the best possible bill to the floor of the House for your approval.

It has been said that the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives holds a veto power over legislation because it controls the purse strings, but it does not have the supervision over expenditures neither does it have control over the ever-expanding bureaus of our Government.

Hammering for appropriations comes not only from departments but also from organized movements among the people themselves for large Federal expenditures. Every Congressman's desk is flooded with propaganda for huge expenditures which mean a drain on the Treasury.

In the first place, I believe the people will insist that Congress must resist the demands of governmental departments—the bureaus and various other units that constitute the spending branch of the Government. Every year these bureaus make their appeals for funds, and many times ask for vastly more than is given them. Weeks are spent on the job of shaving this bureau here and that bureau there and bringing down the totals.

As we consider the investigation made for our subcommittee on the Post Office appropriation bill for 1946 and take a look at the amount spent for traveling expenses of the Post Office Department last year, there are reasons to believe corrections should be made in the bureaus of this Department. The amount expended in 1944 was $31,254,710—that was an increase of more than 3,000,000 over 1943 and almost 5,000,000 over that of 1940.

Now as we look further into the investigation which deals with the expenditures for long-distance telephone calls and other means of communication, we find that in 1944 the total amount expended for telephone, teletype, cablegram, and other communications total $851,076

which is an increase over 1940 of approximately $175,000.

I realize that there are undoubtedly many occasions when urgent or emergency business requires the use of long-distance telephone, cable, or teletype service, but it is of great concern that the Post Office Department is deviating from its policy by patronizing its competitors to a greater degree than necessary. The Department's mail facilities should be used in every possible instance. The bureau heads should be held responsible for the control of these policies.

We know that there may be some excuse for certain expenditures now because we are at war, and which would not be necessary in normal times; nevertheless, as we look ahead, there should develop a better understanding of economic questions than exists now. It is admitted, too, that these questions are difficult and disturbing, but conditions can be corrected if we have the will to face the issues and not depend too much on the future taking care of itself.

Our war effort has performed miracles, because enough Americans have adopted the attitude that what must be done, can be done. If our future effort requires further miracles, that should be faced in a similar way.

As we consider the testimony of those appearing before us from the Procurement Division, Treasury Department, having to do with surplus property, we were assured that every effort is being made to build up and retain a capable and efficient organization which will offer a high standard of service at the lowest possible cost. A further promise was made that they are confident that operations can be effected in the direction of substantial economies. Considering the fact that the agency handling surplus property is somewhat in its infancy, I believe it only fair to assume that those in authority will give some thought to conditions and be definite in their policy to protect the interest of the people of our country.

We know that it is imperative to our future economy to have Government regulation in the public interest and according to law. No real American economy can ensue if the directives in the spending branch of the Government are unnecessary or harmful. Overlapping of agencies and inefficiency in the bureaus of governmental departments if allowed to have the upper hand will ultimately strangle economic freedom.

Serious mistakes and muddling may bring on catastrophe. The country blundered after the last World War and prosperity was spotty and temporary. This blundering was well known to us 25 years ago when we were reconverting from a war of 19 months' duration. The present war will have lasted much longer, and our troubles will undoubtedly multiply manyfold. One of the surest ways of making many mistakes is to leave the Federal Government in a disorganized condition.

Those serving in our armed forces are entitled to return to their country and to a land which will encourage them in the development of free enterprise; to a country which stimulates men of all capacities to serve to the best of their abilities. They deserve to have a government of greater progress and greater freedom, and not a government of rigid bureaucratic control of all industry, all people, and eventually of everyone.

After hostilities cease, the role of government in business must be lessened in many areas of economy if our Government structure is to survive. We cannot as a progressive nation fall into totalitarianism, as this kind of system thrives by war and want.

I know that some political economists have said that it is rather a good thing for a nation to be in debt, because it keeps down extravagance. I realize that these political economists know more about such matters than I do, yet I do not accept their theory.

If we are to follow the theory of these political economists, what becomes of honesty, common sense, and honor? By our being billions of dollars in debt, does not lighten the burden of the poor, and the middle class. It certainly will not lighten the burden of business as it is necessary to show a profit if jobs are to be provided. As I see it, confidence must be restored in government if we are to face the difficult tasks in the post-war period.

The promise of the American way of life can be fulfilled in accordance with the purpose of the freedom of the Republic and without the destruction of individual freedom. I believe, deep in my heart, that the matter of appropriations is a fundamental basic one and of vital importance to the security and future of our country. I cannot believe that the continuing and control of the Commodity Credit Corporation left in the hands of a few men to manage with the changing directives of the Executive orders can be of future security and welfare of our country.

Here is a corporation authorized to issue its obligations guaranteeing payment to a limit of approximately $3,000,000,000. The Administrator of the Corporation has the authority to pay milk subsidies to compensate the farmer for the increased cost of operation. While speaking of subsidies, I am reminded of a letter which I received a few days ago from a Gold Star Mother, part of which I quote:

> People do not want subsidies. What they do want is a fair and honest price for their products, but they are forced to take the subsidies when they become effective in order to meet their ever-increasing taxes. The taxes, so many different kinds of them, must be paid even if we have to borrow the money to pay them. Do our boys who will be spared to come back want to come to a land of subsidies? We all can plainly see where this is leading. It is leading to trouble at home.

Now this lady, who has expressed not only her own views on government, but the thoughts of many others that the time has come for all those who still cherish American ideals and principles to rally to their defense without consideration or self-interest. The time is here to place the issue fairly and squarely before the American people, and to let them decide whether they desire to sanction a program which inevitably means revolutionary changes in our country and civilization. The truth is that Government control of our economic life and the regimentation of its citizens must end in destruction of individual liberty. For individual liberty cannot long survive the death of economic freedom.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

RURAL FREE DELIVERY PATRONS, THEY ARE ENTITLED TO SERVICE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Post Office Department is doing business at a profit and has accumulated a surplus of millions, which means that the people are paying more money for services than they should be in order to sustain the activities of that Department, as it is conducted. Government business should not be run on a profit basis, as against the service to which the people are entitled in return for the money they pay therefor. "Service" should be its motto.

The Post Office Department has no better friend in Congress than I am, but I am critical of its efforts to make a profit and to accumulate a surplus by depriving the patrons of established rural routes of the service to which they are entitled, especially in these days of lack of gasoline and rubber and other facilities necessary in order for them to get to post offices way off the rural routes.

The fact is the Department by rule of thumb is consolidating rural free delivery routes, suspending them, abolishing them all over the country to save money when they have a surplus and at a time when the patrons anxiously await the arrival of a letter from their boys and girls in the service, which letter is never delivered.

It would be, comparably, just as sensible for telephone companies to discontinue their service to the rural areas, by reason of the expense involved in the maintenance of the lines during these war days.

Moreover, the rural free delivery was established, as its name implies, especially in order to serve the rural communities now being deprived of such service in altogether too many instances, too many, in fact, to be enumerated. The cost of the Rural Free Delivery Service to be rendered to such rural community is obviously now the sole determinative of the question as to whether or not the service shall be continued or ended. The answer is, It is ended, and the people deprived of the service for which they have paid and to which they are entitled under the law. Such a situation should not be tolerated; such a policy should not be followed to make money, as against the contribution which the taxpayer makes, which entitles him to the service provided for by law.

I am in favor of extending, not crippling or curtailing service.

Some of this surplus for 1944 should have been expended to continue to render service to those very areas now deprived of it. The present policy and plan to restrict and consolidate and to

deprive areas of service is not justified. It should be discontinued.

Since the Post Office Department shows a profit of $37,768,028 for 1944, and brings to the Appropriation Committee an estimated surplus predicted at $117,643,897 for the fiscal year 1945, and an estimated surplus of $265,214,280 for 1946, it is obvious that we are paying too much for too little, and that those in the rural area are getting too little, too late, and not at all.

The representatives of the people in the rural areas should see to it that the money being appropriated for the support of the Postal Service and for the continuance of theirs, who live in rural areas, is expended for that purpose, and that they are not ruthlessly and wantonly deprived of mail facilities.

Let me say again the rural free delivery was originally established for the benefit of, and in order to render postal service to, people located in rural communities on rural routes; such routes as the Post Office Department has discontinued ruthlessly to save money in order to show a profit.

Really, now, the surplus is the measure of the inadequacy of the service rendered, when so many people entitled to service, for which they have paid, are deprived thereof.

The policy is penny-wise and pound-foolish. The rural resident should not be made the goat.

Another thing: I have experienced difficulty and unaccountable great delay in reaching patrons of these rural routes. I should not be deprived of my opportunity to communicate with my constituents who live on these rural routes. I should be able to reach them and to know that they will get their mail during these hectic days.

And again, the general public has some rights in these premises as well as do the patrons themselves.

Each person, on every one of these routes, as a taxpayer and a patron of the post office, is just as much entitled to the services of the post office, as is any person who lives on a route with say a thousand patrons.

It is time the rural public should be served and not damned.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time allotted this side to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I shall also, when we go back into the House, ask permission to include two letters in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the economic and social revolution continues in Puerto Rico. I propose to discuss for the next few minutes the particular phase of it in which all of our people are interested, although they pay very little attention to other phases which I shall not mention. The one to which I wish to direct my remarks has to do with the question and the supply of sugar, that sweet stuff we put in pies and cakes and coffee and tea.

Puerto Rico should deliver to us this year 1,100,000 tons of sugar or roughly 20 to 25 percent of that which the total population of this country will consume. But Puerto Rico may not deliver even half of that amount to us unless present conditions are materially changed because I am today informed that as the result of the strike of workers in the cane fields of Puerto Rico every mill in Puerto Rico has completely stopped harvesting the 1945 crop. The strike is the result of wage demands which the producers cannot meet without an increase in the price of sugar or an increase in the incentive payments which the growers receive from the Commodity Credit Corporation. Mr. Thoron of the Department of the Interior, which has supervision over Puerto Rico, and Mr. Goldsmith, the Federal Labor Conciliator, and Mr. Campos del Toro, Puerto Rican representative, chairman of the Insular Labor Relations Board, and almost every one else concerned, have agreed—have agreed, mind you—that the wage demands cannot be met by the producers unless they themselves receive a larger return from sugar. The costs of production of sugar in Puerto Rico have risen sharply since January 1942, when the O. P. A. established the current ceiling price of $3.74 per hundred pounds of raw sugar.

I might explain for the RECORD and for those who are interested that raw sugar, specified as 96 degree sugar, contains about 4 percent of impurities. It is a very dark brown product. Personally for eating I prefer to have raw sugar to refined sugar. The refined sugar is the white product. The raw sugar is shipped from Puerto Rico to our seacoast refineries and there it is put through the laundry, the impurities are washed out, and the result is white sugar, plus brown sugar, plus some little syrup.

Raw sugar is being purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation on a basis of about $3.74 per hundred pounds, and refined sugar is selling around 7 to 7½ to 8 cents per pound, whatever the price might be in the particular retail store where you happen to buy it. In January 1942 the O. P. A. set this price at $3.74 per 100 pounds. But we should bear in mind that the United States Government agencies have, over a period of months since 1942, performed certain functions which have created certain increased costs to the producing of sugar, in Puerto Rico particularly.

One is the failure of the O. P. A. to increase the ceiling price of sugar to compensate the growers for the increased cost of bags, fertilizer, and ocean freight. A second is the wage increases ordered by the War Food Administration payable to the workers in the sugarcane fields. A third is the withholding of fertilizer from the sugar industry of Puerto Rico. Other ill-advised actions by the Federal Government, these steps which have been taken by the Federal Government, have deprived the people of this country during the past 3 crop years of about 732,000 tons of sugar from our sugar field in Puerto Rico. At the same time we are going along here today on short rations of sugar both in the households and in the sugar-consuming manufacturing plants.

This morning I received this two-page letter from Chester Bowles, dated February 20, 1945, replying to my letter under date of February 9, at which time I was protesting against the situation which was developing in Puerto Rico and which I felt sure at that time would lead to the closing of all of the sugar mills. The Puerto Rican people are citizens of the United States, and that is one of our unorganized territories. We have no moral or legal or any other kind of right to treat the Puerto Rican people as they have been treated by the Federal agencies of this Government.

I have protested repeatedly and continuously during the last several years. Under date of February 9, I protested to Chester Bowles and I protested to the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This letter from Mr. Bowles, which I shall insert in the RECORD so that everyone will have his side of the story, in my opinion is an unsatisfactory reply to the questions which I raised and the protests I made in my letter of February 9. But as usual, Mr. Bowles takes the position that his responsibility is to hold down the prices; it does not make any difference at all whether you have the goods or not.

It would be a lovely thing if the goods were there, if we could walk into the grocery stores and see butter at 10 cents a pound, bacon at 5 cents a pound, coffee at 3 cents a pound, and so on down the line, but how would you feel if there were no supplies to purchase at those prices? I would rather be sure we had the supplies, even if we had to pay a few cents more for them. But instead of getting the additional supplies, all of the mills in Puerto Rico are closed. The sugar season is passing, the time of harvest is here. We either gather hay while the sun is shining or we do not have any hay fit to feed to the cattle. You either harvest sugar and prepare your lands for replanting during the harvest period or you have less sugar this year and still less next year as the result of not having planted at the proper time.

That is the way we have accumulated this shortage of 732,000 tons from Puerto Rico during the past 3 crop years, because we did not take time by the forelock and perform at the time we should have performed. There is no sense to these strikes in Puerto Rico.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The subject the gentleman is discussing is one that vitally affects many industries in Detroit. I have been receiving protests, especially from the great Saunders Co., that they do not have sugar enough to carry on their business. It means the employment of many people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is a universal shortage all over the United States, both in commercial cooking vessels and in household cooking vessels. It is caused by some of these cussed, infernal policies carried on by the Government agencies here in Washington. There is absolutely no excuse for all of them.

I have studied this sugar question minutely for 25 years, and the Puerto Rican end of it during that time. I charge the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Office of Price Administration, the Labor Department, the War Labor Board, and the War Food Administration with negligence of duty and maladministration in connection with the Puerto Rican sugar affairs. Anybody who wants to go into the details of it must, in my opinion, come to that conclusion when they know what they are studying about.

I think it is unfair to our people and to the Puerto Ricans, and I think it is time for these Federal agencies, including Governor Tugwell, of Puerto Rico; Mr. Munés Marin, of Puerto Rico, the island political administrator; and the Federal administrators here, to put their heads together and stop this strike and open those mills in Puerto Rico at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the House and the country should know that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], who now has the floor, has grown up with the subject of sugar from his early life and has been active in nearly every branch of that industry. I do not believe there is a man on this floor on either side of the aisle who is better qualified on the subject of sugar than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to this Puerto Rican trouble we have a situation in the States where sugar beets are grown, where beet sugar comes from. Just now the sugar-beet fields should furnish the people of this country with 1,875,000 tons of sugar per annum. I do not have any idea that you will get 1,100,000 tons. I am satisfied at this particular time of the year there will be a shortage this year of at least 700,000 tons of sugar from the beet sugar producing areas of the United States, which includes our great State of Michigan. Labor conditions are bad and growing worse on account of so many young farmers being inducted into the military forces.

The letters referred to follow:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1945.

The Honorable FRED L. CRAWFORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRAWFORD: I am pleased to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 9, which affords me an opportunity to explain the functions of this agency with respect to prices for the sale of raw sugar shipped to the United States from off-shore producing areas.

You are aware, of course, that the primary function of this agency is to stabilize commodity prices in order to prevent inflation. Maximum prices so established must be generally fair and equitable, and, for obvious administrative reasons, must be of general applicability. The existing maximum price of raw cane sugar of 96 degrees polarization, duty paid, cost, insurance, and freight, is $3.75 per hundredweight at buyer's receiving point.

Your specific question pertaining to an apparent offer by United States agencies to purchase raw sugar from the Cuban interests at higher prices than offered to Puerto Rican sugar interests can probably best be answered by the War Food Administration. The War Food Administration, operating through the Commodity Credit Corporation, acts as the purchasing agency on behalf of the United States, and in turn sells raw sugar to domestic refiners. In order to give the Commodity Credit Corporation greater latitude in discharging its duty of negotiating for the purchase of raw sugar from Cuba and Puerto Rico, purchases made by the Commodity Credit Corporation and sales to it have been exempted from price control. Such action was taken since rising costs in the producing areas since the establishment of price control has made it necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy at prices in excess of our maximum prices. Sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation to domestic refiners are restricted, of course, to the established maximum price. Any excess of the purchase prices over the established maximum selling prices is absorbed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Both the Cuban and the Puerto Rican raw sugar crops for 1943 and 1944 were purchased by that agency.

It is our understanding that the Commodity Credit Corporation will offer the Puerto Rican sugar interests an incentive payment of 40 cents per 100 pounds in addition to the maximum selling price for the 1945 crop. Negotiations for the purchase of the Cuban crop are still pending.

I trust that I have given you a full explanation of the functions of this office with respect to the purchase and sale of raw sugar. Please be assured that there is nothing in the structure of our price ceilings which is in any way discriminatory against the Puerto Rican sugar producers. Nor is there any attitude favoring the Cuban producers prevailing in this office. I shall be happy to assist in answering any further questions which may remain in your mind.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES, *Administrator.*

ASSOCIATION OF SUGAR
PRODUCERS OF PUERTO RICO,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1945.

Hon. C. JASPER BELL,
Chairman, Committee on Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BELL: The radiograms which you have received recently from the Farmers Association and the Association of Sugar Producers requesting an investigation of the handling of the Puerto Rican sugar situation by the Federal Government arise from two related developments.

One is the current strike, which has closed every sugar mill in Puerto Rico and completely stopped the harvesting of the 1945 crop. The strike is the result of wage demands which the producers cannot meet without an increase in the price of sugar or an increase in the incentive payments which the growers receive from Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Thoron, of the Interior Department; Mr. Goldsmith, the Federal Labor Conciliator; Mr. Campos del Toro, chairman of the Insular Labor Relations Board, and almost everyone else concerned have agreed that the wage demands cannot be met by producers unless they themselves receive a larger return from sugar.

Costs of sugar production have risen sharply since January 1942, when the O. P. A. established the current ceiling price of $3.74 per 100 pounds of raw sugar. As a result, almost all of the 14,000 small sugar growers in Puerto Rico lost money last year, and so did all but a few of the companies.

In spite of this fact and in spite of their stated desire to stimulate increased production of sugar, Commodity Credit has offered Puerto Rican sugar growers an incentive payment of only 40 cents per 100 pounds of raw sugar. They so far have refused to increase this offer, in spite of the fact that beet sugar growers are receiving a payment of $1 per 100 pounds, and cane growers in Louisiana are receiving a payment of 50 cents per 100 pounds and have been promised a payment of $1 per 100 pounds for the 1946 crop.

Failure of Commodity Credit to offer an incentive payment high enough to keep Puerto Rican growers out of the red is particularly serious because of the fact that the island's growers cannot afford to replant their fields when they lose money on the sugar being produced. When the fields are not replanted on schedule, the yield drops and the amount of sugar which Puerto Rico can produce to meet ration requirements in continental United States is bound to decline.

As a matter of fact, over the last 3 years a combination of factors, including (1) failure of the O. P. A. to increase the ceiling price of sugar to compensate growers for the increased cost of bags, fertilizer, and ocean freight, (2) wage increases ordered by the War Food Administration, and (3) withholding of fertilizer from the sugar industry and other ill-advised actions by the Federal Government, already have deprived United States consumers of 732,000 tons of sugar. This is equivalent to about 12 pounds per capita, or almost 50 percent of the current annual household sugar allowance.

The loss of 732,000 tons is established as follows: In 1942 Puerto Rico produced 1,143,000 tons of sugar. Considering the urgent need for sugar in the mainland United States and the surplus of labor in Puerto Rico and other factors, it certainly is reasonable to assume that the island would have increased its production over the 1942 level if it had not been for the obstacles which the Federal Government placed in the way of the sugar growers. However, instead of increasing, the island's sugar production has declined sharply from the 1942 level. In 1943 the production fell to 1,039,000 tons, a drop of 109,000 tons. In 1944 the production was 723,000 tons, a drop of 425,000 tons from 1942. The 1945 crop is estimated at 950,000 tons, a drop of 198,000 tons from 1942. Adding together the decreases for the 3 years, we arrive at a total of 732,000 tons, which the American consumer very well could have had, but did not receive because of the Federal policies mentioned previously.

Failure of Commodity Credit to offer Puerto Rican growers at this time an incentive payment sufficient to avert production losses and sufficient to permit them to stand the cost of replanting their fields means a still further loss of sugar in 1946, because production is certain to fall unless the replanting proceeds on a normal scale.

In addition, it appears that the current strike will continue indefinitely unless labor gives in or unless Commodity Credit either grants an additional incentive payment, out of which increased wages can be paid, or unless the Federal and insular governments can convince the labor unions in Puerto Rico that wage increases are not justified at this time in view of the reduced incomes of the Puerto Rican sugar growers.

As indicated in Mr. Roig's radiogram from Puerto Rico, the Association of Sugar Producers joins the Farmers Association in asking that the Committee on Insular Affairs investigate the Puerto Rican sugar problem and make suitable recommendations to the administrative agencies of the Government.

Very truly yours,

DUDLEY SMITH, *Director.*

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the opportunity of making a few observations rather apart from the appropriation bill which we are now discussing. The first observation I should like to make is that I am fearful

we are getting a little too far left from center. That statement has a rather familiar sound to the Members of this House. It was recently made by the President shortly after his inauguration. The thing that brings that to my mind is, first, the nomination by the President of Mr. Wallace for the powerful position of Secretary of the Department of Commerce. Many reasons have been given for such action. I think the President gave the best reason when he said in substance that he felt Mr. Wallace was entitled to most anything he wanted in the Government because of the very splendid services he had rendered in the recent campaign. In other words, again promulgating the old doctrine which comes down through the pages of the history of this country and other countries, "To the victor belong the spoils."

That is rather a far cry from the vaunted liberalism of the New Deal and the supposed strengthening of the Civil Service as one of our governmental institutions. There has been considerable discussion in the Senate, which at once voted no confidence in Mr. Wallace by the passage of the George bill. Some of them have charged that it was a major gesture of recognition of the efforts of the Sidney Hillman Political Action Committee. That the appointment was the P. A. C. political pay-off. Well, for good measure, you might throw in Mr. Browder, Mr. Bridges, and the rest of that motley gang. I indict these leaders separate and apart from the C. I. O. as an organization, because there are many splendid American citizens who have joined the C. I. O. in order to help better their general working conditions through collective bargaining. I hope that some day, because of the communistic leadership which has infiltrated itself into the C. I. O., those men who believe in the American principles of government as they have been handed down to us and which have contributed to the great success of this country, will find it necessary to leave that organization and again amalgamate themselves possibly with the American Federation of Labor.

Now, getting too far to the left again, comes the recommendation by the President of that social worker, Mr. Aubrey Williams, to head that great forward-looking Rural Electrification organization. Naturally, you would think in an appointment that has such power and such possibilities for the future development and good of this country there could be found among the old-line Democrats someone who had had experience, someone whose background would impel the Chief Executive to place in that important position such a man who is fitted by training to fill such a position, and to appoint a man who has the confidence of the people.

Some of the leading Democrats shouted "Red" again when his name was presented for consideration by that committee in the other body. To my mind, another illustration of probably moving a little too far to the left of center. A couple of days ago one of the leading Democrats of this House, a man who has served with distinction for years, a man who is respected for his Americanism, gave utterance to the thought that the record of Felix Frankfurter, one of the Justices of the Supreme Court ought to be the subject of investigation by the committee recently established in this House to investigate subversive activities. The gentleman went further, branding him as the Rasputin of this administration, and suggested that possibly they might find such evidence as would make impeachment necessary.

I wonder whither we are drifting in this country. We never had anything like this a few years ago. We did not have those problems to contend with. Our present leadership should discourage their growth, rather than to constantly encourage them and the evil influence that seems sure to follow.

Moving again to the left, there has been considerable publicity in the newspapers recently that an order has been promulgated by our military authorities giving the right of promotion to officers in the military service, to men who are known Communists, placing them in a position to pierce the veil of secrecy, and to know all the facts regarding our secret formulas and implements of warfare, devised by our scientists; giving them an opportunity to get into a position where, if perchance their love for communism is greater than their love for their own country and their own institutions, they might be able to wreak terrible harm to the military and the defense of our country. I submit this is another evidence of moving much too far to the left.

This is not Republican criticism. It comes from leading Democrats such as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House, the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman MAY, who seems to be alarmed if he is quoted correctly in the newspapers. He suggests that if they are going through with this thing they will be called before his committee so that the military leaders may be interrogated, and find out why it is necessary.

The gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman MAY, said in his opinion there are enough red-blooded Americans about whose patriotism there is no question to officer, staff, and lead the military forces of this country.

These are just some observations on matters that I think are giving great concern to the American people. I think and I know that they are giving great concern to the Members of this Congress. I believe it is a challenge to the Members of this House to attempt to take over as often and as much as they can so that they who have the responsibility directly as the representatives of the people shall do their full share in guiding the destinies of this Nation in the interest of the people they represent.

One of the previous speakers referred to the much-talked-of recent manpower bill. I was interested in reading an article from the American Meat Institute published in the paper the other day. This is an organization that should have the knowledge and the right to speak. In this article they stated there would be a drop of 38 percent in the meat supply for this Nation in the first quarter of this year, and they predicted further shortages as the year runs on. Yet, General Hershey and the President recently insisted on drafting practically all farm boys. Added to the difficulty of production has been the lack of farm machinery which is more acute this year than last. Unless agriculture is properly recognized we may find that we will go into such a serious decrease in food production that it will not only bring greater hardship to our people but might slow down the winning of the war.

To make matters worse, the President and Secretary of War Stimson are advocating the National Service Act that would probably take 1,000,000 more men out of the already thin line of farm production and civilian distribution forcing them into war plants that are overstaffed already as well as into war plants that are understaffed.

Secretary of War Stimson is as wrong in the position he takes in insisting on this draft bill now as he was 1 year ago when he insisted that the Congress should pass the short-ballot bill rather than the State-ballot bill which finally became law.

In his recent report he is forced to admit that of all of the soldiers who voted, 99½ percent chose the long ballot rather than the short ballot.

He is 99½ percent wrong in the position he takes now in favoring this draft bill.

The Army has over 1,000,000 civilians employed. The Army, of which he is its head as Secretary of War, is one of the worst hoarders and wasters of labor in the Nation today, yet, he makes no suggestion and apparently no effort to put his own house in order. It appears that he has heard his master's voice or has yielded to his persuasion in going on the radio in an attempt to alarm the fathers and mothers of this country, doubtless in the hope that they will put pressure on the Congress to pass an act that will cost the Government additional billions of dollars rather than to pass an act that will clear up the hoarding and wasting of labor and will get the production the Government needs without resorting to the totalitarian policies of a work-or-jail bill under the threat of heavy fines and jail sentences.

The general movement of this Government too far to the left of center is a challenge to the Members of Congress which they must meet and, in my judgment, ultimately will meet, before we reach the point where we will lose in fact the representative government in this country and the liberty it assures its people while our boys are making unheard of sacrifices on the battle fronts of the world in the belief they are helping to save such a government to which they can return when the war is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2252) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today two letters, one from Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator, O. P. A., and the other from Mr. Dudley Smith, director, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 127, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 127), as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on, as usual, I shall yield 30 minutes to the minority representative of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], or in his absence to any other minority member of the Committee on Rules who may desire time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of S. 35. It is the same bill that the House passed in the last session of the Congress. As I understand it was agreed to by the conferees, but unfortunately, during the last day or so of the sessions of the other body, due to perhaps too much conversation or debate, the bill was not called up and failed of passage. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing the gentlemen in the other body, because I never do; I only call attention to the situation.

This bill contains 291 projects. The total amount authorized is $381,968,332. Of the entire amount, as I understand, and so far as I have been able to ascertain, only $13,359,000 is urgent and required by the Army and the Navy at this time. As to most of the amounts authorized in the bill there is no real urgency and no appropriation need be made at this time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 25]

Baldwin, N. Y.	Eaton	LeFevre
Bender	Elsaesser	Luce
Bishop	Fellows	Morgan
Blackney	Fernandez	McMillan, S. C.
Bonner	Fogarty	Patman
Bradley, Mich.	Folger	Patterson
Brumbaugh	Gorski	Peterson, Fla.
Buckley	Granger	Price, Fla.
Burch	Griffiths	Rivers
Burgin	Gwinn, N. Y.	Robertson, Va.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays	Robsion, Ky.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Rogers, Mass.
Carnahan	Heidinger	Rogers, N. Y.
Celler	Hoeven	Rowan
Clark	Hollifield	Sheridan
Clements	Jennings	Sampson, Pa.
Colmer	Johnson,	Taylor
Corbett	Luther A.	Thomas, Tex.
Curtis	Kefauver	Towe
Daughton, Va.	Kelley, Pa.	Weichel
Davis	Kirwan	Weiss
Dawson	Knutson	Winter
Dingell	LaFollette	Wood
Dirksen	Landis	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call, 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, just as I started to speak, I was interrupted by a point of order of no quorum, which was made in good faith, I know, by the minority leader, because he felt that the——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot.

I know that the minority leader has the well-being and the interest of his party at heart, and that was the reason he made the point of order, because he did not wish to deprive the membership on that side, and even many on this side who were not present, of listening to information and the presentation of the cause of the great river and harbor bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say to the eloquent gentleman from Chicago that we wanted everybody in the House to hear his address and the charm of his voice. That is the reason I made the point of order.

Mr. SABATH. So I have been trying to impart this information to the membership of the House. The rule is an open rule. It provides for 2 hours' general debate and makes in order the Senate bill, as I stated before, which was unanimously agreed to by the conferences in the last session and passed by the House. As I stated, it provides for 291 projects at a cost of $381,000,000, but only $13,000,000 of this amount must and need be appropriated at this time. I am informed, and the report shows, that other projects should not receive appropriations until actually needed for war purposes. This bill includes nearly all those matters that the original bill provided for. The only exception is the Central Valley project of California, which has been eliminated and agreed to be taken out of the bill. It includes even the Warrior and Tombigbee project for an authorization of $6,750,000. The largest individual authorization is for the Alabama-Coosa River project, which calls for $60,000,000.

I am pleased that, due to the intelligence and hard work of our Democratic colleague from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN], a member of that committee, and due to the efforts of a new member from Illinois [Mr. LINK], provision has been made for three projects in the great State of Illinois, which I know are deserving and are actually needed. I congratulate both of these gentlemen on the splendid work they have done in bringing about the adoption of these projects.

However, this would have been impossible had it not been for the able, intelligent, and hard-working chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the young man who has reached the age of 84, who before he became chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was for many years a member of that committee, and who has been in public life for 57 years. I hope he will remain with us for many, many more years and will continue to bring in many rivers and harbors bills carrying projects, which are necessary, and will eliminate and oppose all those projects that are not deserving, as he has always done.

I am pleased also that this bill takes care of our neighboring States. Of the largest number of projects in the bill, 19 are given to Virginia, and 15 projects are given to Maryland. I fully appreciate that they are projects that have been approved by the Board of Engineers. In view that these 2 States have and are receiving so many benefits, I hope that their Representatives instead of opposing and criticizing all appropriations will, in the future, give consideration to and cooperate with other States that are further removed from the District of Columbia than their States.

This bill has been unanimously reported. It provides for all these projects, none of which, please understand, are in my district. I intended to speak on the St. Lawrence waterway project—which I am confident will eventually be approved—which will be of great benefit and a blessing not only to the Middle West but to the entire Nation. At some other time I hope I will be able to convince the Committee on Rivers and Harbors as to the desirability for the construction of this project and to obtain favorable action on it.

I am not going to detain the House any longer, expecting that the rule will be adopted and that the bill will pass, and that a vote of thanks may be extended to that great young man from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. MANSFIELD, whose eighty-fourth birthday we celebrated only a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 127 makes in order S. 35, the rivers and harbors omnibus bill, which is similar in almost every instance, to the measure which passed this body in the Seventy-eighth Congress in its closing days, was likewise passed by the Senate, and finally died in conference. As I understand it, the only deletion from the bill, or from the measure as agreed to by the conference committee between the House and the Senate, had been the reference to the Central Valley project in California. I wish the gentleman from Texas will correct me if I am in error in my understanding. May I ask the gentleman if that is correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman said it is identical with the House bill. As a matter of fact, it is the Senate version of the rivers and harbors bill. It is not the House bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I said identical with the bill as agreed to by the conference committee between the House and the Senate, with one exception. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITE. It has been very materially changed by the Senate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is the same bill as agreed upon by the conference committee except for the dropping of the Central Valley project in California.

I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas, if he will glance at page 50, line 10, as to whether or not this paragraph applies to the Florida ship canal or only to the barge canal which runs down along the coast to the southern part of the State where it connects with the cross-Florida Canal.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. There is nothing in the bill applying to either one of them.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, perhaps I can answer that question.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. That provision of the bill on page 50, beginning at line 10, refers to the Intracoastal Waterway.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Such was my understanding, that it was the canal connecting the Intracoastal Waterway with the cross-Florida Canal in the southern part of the State.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It is only a survey.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand it is only for the survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That is all it is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order 2 hours of general debate upon this measure, S. 35. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the House will adopt the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE WARRIOR COMES HOME

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, one million and a half Americans have already made the round trip from home to war and home again. Soon, we fervently pray, the 12,000,000-strong now valiantly serving on war fronts all over the world will be coming back to their families, to jobs and to normal life in the United States of America. These men constitute one-tenth of our population. I speak to you today as a Representative and as a member of a group of which I have the honor to be a part. I speak for the present and future veterans of World War No. 2.

In welcoming our troops home, this Nation faces a herculean project. Fitting this vast segment of our population back into rightful place in everyday American living is the greatest task to which we have ever set our hand. These men have had a sharp break in their lives. Their start in life was cut off. Careers were snapped. Education was halted. Bright hopes were broken. To weave the life of one man together and make it whole, is a job. To pick up the threads of more than 13,000,000 lives and make them into one shining piece calls for every ounce of resourcefulness, industry, and noble thinking which we possess.

Literally thousands of plans are being made to solve the lives of our veterans. Primarily there is the G. I. bill of rights, and out of it stems hundreds of enterprises—Government-sponsored, community-sponsored. Opportunities are weighed. Futures are planned. Jobs, homes, small businesses, education, compensation—all these are covered. States have their own special measures. New Jersey has its own small-business loan provision. Seventeen States have legislated for special veterans' employment preferences; 19 States for veterans' employment preference on public works; 17 States have bureaus to grant land-settlement benefits; 24 States have special benefits for disabled veterans.

It is safe to say that more than a half a million people are today actively employed in making plans for the return of the warriors.

No, the veteran is not the forgotten man. But there is something wrong with this picture. Frankly it is this. The man who helped swing the destiny of the world is not in on shaping his own world. Of all the millions of jobs that are being offered and dreamt up for the returning soldier, there is one job that no one is lining up for him. It is this. Placing the man who did the fighting on the policy boards of Government agencies that will decide the fighting man's lot. It is actually true that in all the plethora of plans for veterans of World War No. 2—in the disbursing of the millions that will be spent in his cause, there is no single legal provision that provides for the representation of one single veteran of World War No. 2 in the key posts that will decide his fortune now and for years to come.

At present there are eight Federal Government agencies ministering to the ex-serviceman. These are the over-all Retraining and Reemployment Administration, Selective Service System, Veterans' Administration, United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission, Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency, United States Civil Service Commission, Social Security Board, Army Emergency Relief.

Further there are the agencies which touch the life of the veteran in some fashion; for example, the United States Railroad Retirement Board, the Agricultural Advisory Boards of the Department of Agriculture, the Small Business Division of the Department of Commerce, the War Food Administration, the War Production Board, and the Department of Labor.

Programs cover the whole life of the veteran. Upon their interpretation depends the fate of his employment status, his claim for back pay, how his income tax will be handled, his medical attention, post-war hospital care, disability pensions, legal protection, jobs, and pensions for his dependents, allotments and allowances—his prospects for a small business of his own.

Who is going to administer these programs? Are the men who went to war going to have a voice in settling the many vital questions which will inevitably arise, or are they going to wait in office anterooms while others, who never shared their world, do the deciding for them?

We say there is nothing we will not do to pay our debt of honor to the men of this war. How are we going to prove that we really mean what we say? Here's a way to prove it. Let veteran representatives of World War No. 2 sit around those counsel tables where that

ruling about veterans' employment seniority shall be interpreted. Let that fine able ex-soldier whose own business career was interrupted, help decide how the knotty problem of granting small business loans to ambitious young veterans shall finally be resolved. Let that young fellow who lost his leg at Bastogne have his word to say on the moot point of compensation for the disabled.

I hereby offer that it be provided by law that veterans of World War No. 2 be represented on policy-making boards of Government agencies serving veterans in ratio to the number of men who served in the armed forces balanced against our civilian population. My figures give me that one-tenth of the population in the United States will have served in this war. Carry this ratio down. If you take one-tenth of the men who served in the armed forces, you get over a million men, and there you have your figure for a mathematically just representation of veterans to serve on boards that will sit in Washington, in every State, and in most of the cities of the Union to settle matters that concern the lives of our veteran population.

This would not be an idle gesture. It is the practical approach. The practical approach versus the theoretical approach—if we persist in leaving out of matters which concern veterans, the veterans themselves.

These men are qualified to do the job. The finest young men in this country went to war—the best in mind, the best in body. The boy who graduated with top honors from his university spaded his fox hole beside that clear-eyed young comer from the machinist's bench. The man who was slated for sales manager manned that Navy gun with the lithe-muscled youth who ran his father's farm. And, make no mistake about it, they dreamed their dreams out in the rain-lashed night. War added to their mental maturity—to their judgment. They are older men now—not much in years, perhaps, but tremendously so in experience and the things in life that make a man grow. They know what they want, and they know what other men want who went through the honor, the anguish, and the pain of war.

We hear that there is a great gulf between the men in the service and the men on the home front. Here, then, is a practical way to bridge that gulf. Let the soldier and the civilian sit down at the planning table together.

There is much to be ironed out. Let us not delude ourselves that the mere putting of the G. I. bill of rights on the statute books is going to settle once and for all the fortunes and fates of 13,000,000 men with as many different kinds of lives and problems.

Let us take the single question of veterans' employment status. When Congress wrote the law that drafted the serviceman out of his job, it also wrote the law to put him back. The intention of Congress is perfectly clear—to give the men back their jobs. But the employment of millions of veterans when American industry is making the great change-over from war to peace will demand more than good intentions. Ideally, G. I. Joe will be restored to his old job or to a position of like seniority status of pay. But circumstances will turn up tough, knotty questions. There is, for instance, veterans' status versus worker seniority status. In a recent industrial survey, 13 percent of a group of companies contacted said they had more stars on their service flags than the total number of workers employed before Pearl Harbor. Employment rolls have risen in individual firms from as low as 500 to as high as 3,400. And many of our servicemen were drafted from these higher levels of employment. What will happen in a case like this if employment rolls drop? Whose job is it?

Just how the problem of seniority versus veterans' rights is resolved will depend in the main on the state of the Nation when G. I. Joe returns. If jobs are hard to get, enforcement of veterans' priority seems certain to cause conflict. Who is going to resolve these questions?

It is questions like this America must face. And there is no precedent to guide us. In World War No. 1, less than 5,000,000 men served in the armed forces. In World War No. 2, that number is almost tripled.

In 1919 at the close of the war, all that the soldier got was insurance, disability benefits, and hospitalization. The only fellow who got to school had to have a service-connected disability or a vocational handicap.

But America has moved apace since those days. We have recognized and provided for the rights of the workingman, of the old, of the young, of the ill. And now with a program of benefits unmatched by any country in the world, we are recognizing the rights of the man who fights for his homeland.

But if we do not want our fighting men to consider all these fine plans for him as mere window dressing, this body should take steps here and now to see that it is written into the law of our land that the veteran be given adequate representation on those bodies which will decide how these programs will be administered.

And by this, I do not mean clerkships, guards' and custodians' jobs in Government agencies, which have already been earmarked for veterans. This is all very fine and laudable, and will, no doubt, be a boon to many. But these are not key posts and it is key posts of which I am speaking. What your composite veteran of World War No. 2 wants is a voice in his own destiny.

Public opinion shifts fast, as was evidenced last fall when during a wave of false optimism, almost the whole thinking of America was suddenly focused on reconversion and making a beeline for peacetime production and peacetime jobs. People forget fast. But the memory of the man who saw his best friend die in agony beside him—the memory of the man who lay helpless on the floor of a blazing tank—will be long. With all America geared to move forward, he will not be the one to look backward. But he will know that America could not move forward, if he and millions of his kind had not paid the price.

And that leads me to the main purpose of my addressing the House today. It is only plain and simple justice that the men and women who have borne the heat and the hell of battle in this war should have an important part in the government of the country they are risking their all to defend. But transcending even that is the desire of the average G. I., be he in the ranks of the enlisted men or in the commissioned personnel, to see that this war has not been fought in vain.

I wonder how many of my colleagues are aware of the deep thought that the men in uniform are giving to reports of the forthcoming peace conferences. They are asking, and properly so, how and by whom will their desires for world peace be represented. They feel that by their blood, and sweat, and tears they have earned the right to a place at the table when the peace talks begin. They want to, and in justice have every right to be, represented by those who have served with them, by representatives from an age group that looks forward with hope for many years of peace and prosperity.

This great lawmaking body had the courage to make my generation a fighting generation, a generation of world warriors. We challenge this body to demonstrate the same courage in making my generation a generation of crusaders for world peace.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the excellent speech he has made, which, I understand, is his maiden speech in the House.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If all those addresses which follow this one are as good, and if they strike directly at the duty of Members in this body, I think he is going to make a useful Member of the House.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. I, too, want to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN. I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the PM newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to confirm and to reiterate what the chairman of the Rules Committee has said on the rule, as well as the ranking Republican member of that committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

This rule should be adopted. It is an open rule. Anyone may offer an amend-

ment if they desire to this bill. However, I hope amendments will not be offered because this bill comes to the House from the Rivers and Harbors Committee with practically a unanimous vote of the members of both parties.

It is the same bill that passed the House of Representatives late in December; it is the same bill that passed the Senate of the United States in a very few minutes during the present session of Congress with very little debate and with a unanimous vote; it is the same bill that was agreed to by the conferees of both the House and the Senate in late December of last year, but which died in the Senate because sufficient time did not permit it to be taken up; therefore, we have practically the unanimous opinion of both the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives on the projects included in this bill. For that reason, I hope the bill will be passed by the House. The Senate has passed it and the Senate bill is in order. It will be the first time in 7 years we have had a river and harbor bill. It contains 291 projects in 24 States of the Union, involving $382,000,000 of authorizations. It is not a partisan bill and it is not a sectional bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to my chairman the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman might also say that the bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent since it has been reintroduced.

Mr. DONDERO. The chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors just reminds me that this bill passed the Senate of the United States by unanimous consent. Therefore, I take the floor at this time simply to urge that the rule be adopted and that when we go into the Committee of the Whole we will adopt the bill without any unnecessary debate on controversial projects not included in it and that no amendments will be offered to insure to the country a rivers and harbors bill, the first one since 1938.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Did the conferees remove from the bill that passed the House the provision regarding the Central Valley water project?

Mr. DONDERO. No; the conferees did not, but I understand that item was taken out by agreement with the California delegation.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I merely wish to say that I hope the rule is adopted and that the bill will pass. I intended to offer an amendment, but shall not, because I hope this bill passes unanimously. My amendment had to do with a flood disaster in my district in the State of Ohio.

Mr. DONDERO. That is a flood-control matter in the gentleman's district in the State of Ohio. I appreciate the magnanimous attitude of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That matter did not come before our committee.

Mr. DONDERO. The chairman of the committee just stated that that item did not come before our committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask the gentleman about the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterways project which was left out of this bill, which has been thoroughly surveyed and, as General Robins pointed out, approved by the Army engineers? I understand that some members of the committee are urging that this matter be carried over until a supplemental report, that is now being worked out by the Army engineers, is reported to the Congress. If that is done, what will be the gentleman's attitude upon it?

Mr. DONDERO. That project will have the same, fair consideration as far as I am concerned as any project that comes before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose the Army engineers report favorably on it, will the gentleman support it?

Mr. DONDERO. I would not be inclined to be against it if the Army engineers reported favorably, but as long as the report stands as it does, and the Senate of the United States having rejected the project twice, and the House of Representatives having rejected the project twice on roll call votes, it does not seem proper that the project should be again offered to the House because of its highly controversial nature and because of the report of the Army engineers.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, when the House defeated it we did not have the benefit of General Robins' statement. General Robins, who is now Assistant Chief of Army Engineers, was on the board that reported this project before, and his statement is one of the strongest in support of this project that I have ever seen come from the Army engineers on any project.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Mississippi 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire whatsoever to retard rivers and harbors development.

I will put my record up against anyone else in the Congress of the United States when it comes to working for the development of our inland waterways, from the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Columbia River.

But there are some things that ought not to be overlooked. I have a bill now pending before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for the development of regional authorities throughout the country to develop all the waterpower in the United States, in order that the American people may be able to live anywhere in the country and enjoy the benefits of our modern civilization in the years to come.

I pointed out the other day that the year I came to Congress we were using only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year in this country. When we attempted to create the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain private power interests told us that was enough; that we could not use any more. In 1943 we used 220,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or five and one-half times as much as we used in 1921. As I said on this floor some time ago, within less than 10 years after the close of this war we will more than likely be using half a trillion, or 500,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year; and long before the turn of the century it will require a trillion kilowatt-hours a year to supply the needs of the American people.

In those streams covered by the bill to which I refer there are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity now going to waste every year. That is equal to 115,000,000 tons of the finest bituminous coal. It would take that amount of the best bituminous to generate that amount of electricity.

Suppose coal were light enough to float, and 115,000,000 tons of the finest bituminous coal were floating down our rivers every year; you could not get to the bank of the stream for people salvaging that coal. Yet, we have 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, which is equal to 115,000,000 tons of the finest bituminous coal, going to waste every year, and we come along and quibble over these small projects, many of which are mere chicken feed.

I hope that bill comes before the House and is passed, at an early date, because, at the rate we are going, a hundred years from today our coal supply will probably be depleted. In less than a hundred years from today our gas and oil supply will likely be depleted. Unless we harness this great wealth of hydroelectric power and put it to work for the American people we are going to be damned by our descendants for not doing so.

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

I am not only for the projects in this bill but I am not willing to limit it to the projects in this proposed measure. I want to see all the water power in America developed. Besides, I want to see the navigational features developed. As I pointed out before, we have the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway to connect the Tennessee with the Tombigbee and with the Gulf of Mexico, which would shorten the distance from the Tennessee River to the Gulf of Mexico by 630 miles. It would cut the cost of every north-bound barge by about 50 percent. It would cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf of Mexico to Cairo, Ill., by about 50 percent. That means every barge that goes to St. Louis, to Cincinnati, to Louisville, to Wheeling, W. Va., to Pittsburgh, Pa., to Chicago, Ill., to Omaha, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, to Kansas City, and to all those points would enjoy these reductions.

My distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] told you last year that this project had not been approved by the Army engineers. As a matter of fact, we had the Army engineers survey this project for 2 or 3 years. It is the

most thoroughly investigated and tested project to be found anywhere in the United States. When they came back, after all those years of investigation, the Board of Army Engineers turned in a favorable report. But the opposition have based their arguments on the theory that the chairman of the board did not specifically approve it in his report. He was not the man who investigated it, but I will tell you who was. On that board was one of the ablest men who has ever been connected with the Army engineers, General Robins, who is now the Assistant Chief of Army Engineers. After this project was knocked out in the House last year General Robins went before the Senate committee and testified. They were asking then to get another report, and they are preparing a supplemental report now that will show a vast increase in savings because of the great increase in the traffic it would carry.

Among other things General Robins said:

Mr. Chairman, if I came up here and submitted a report recommending a project for slack water on the Mississippi between Cairo and New Orleans by building locks and dams on the Mississippi River itself at an estimated cost of $66,000,000, I think you would all stand up, take off your hats, and cheer.

In other words, General Robins tells the Senate committee that if he were to come up here and tell you that for $66,000,000 he could give you a slack-water route from New Orleans all the way to Cairo, Ill., you would stand up and cheer, because it is the swift current on the Mississippi River that prevents the upstream traffic and that costs the shippers of this country untold millions of dollars each year. Yet he says:

This alternate route on the Tombigbee we are recommending amounts to the same thing, only the locks and dams are to be built on the Tombigbee instead of the Mississippi. There is no greater tangible savings—

Listen to this, this is General Robins, Assistant Chief of Army Engineers, who is on the Board that made this report, speaking—

There is no greater tangible savings than that which will accrue from the Tennessee-Tombigbee route instead of the Mississippi for the upstream traffic.

And he goes on to say:

And taking into account all the changed conditions since the report came up before the committee, from the time we prepared it, there were additional tangible assets and savings that could be made. We can go back to the field—

Listen to this. He is doing this. He is going back to the field now and getting this information, which is cumulative and will show a greater demand and a greater justification for it than existed a year ago—

We can go back to the field and make another report and do all the work over again and hold hearings. And when the new report comes up before the committee you will have the same old argument in opposition to the project that you have had today.

Senator OVERTON. You are satisfied that the report would be along the lines you have just stated?

General ROBINS. Absolutely. And if this report can be attacked on account of some of the changed conditions since the report was written I do not see why it cannot be defended on account of other changed conditions.

That is the testimony of General Robins. That is the reason I am asking here for this amendment. It will not hurt this bill. All I am asking for here is that this amendment be inserted in this bill tomorrow when the measure comes up for consideration.

Now let us see what it will mean. That swift current of the Mississippi River is keeping traffic off the stream. All the levees you can build will not be worth a continental. You talk about your flood control on the Mississippi River. We have done more to control the floods on the Mississippi River by the building of the T. V. A. dams than all the billions of dollars that have been spent building levees. You can build levees from now until doomsday and all you will do will be to build up the bed of the river; and you will still continue to have floods.

I have some figures here to show what these savings will mean. I am going to insert them in the RECORD. I do not care to take up the time of the House right now. If there is any justification for any river and harbor bill at all, there is ample justification for putting this project in it. All that you will get from this supplemental report will be a report showing that it is more necessary now than it was when the original report was made.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a release by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech I made in Chicago, and I ask unanimous consent also to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] may extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of humility that a new Congressman makes his first address to the House. There are a good many new Members in this Congress, and there are likely to be more in the next. They are a factor that have come from the people, and their views should naturally have some influence.

I was elected as a Democrat. As all Members of this House know, the Democratic Party was formed under the leadership of two great Americans, Samuel Adams and Thomas Jefferson. Their idea was that the people should have faith in themselves, in their neighbors, in their country and its destiny. That party has lived from that day to this and is a strong factor in the political affairs of every State in this Union.

There have been many things, not only from Members on your side of the House but from Members on our side, that I personally do not like. I refer to the practice of coming up here and using the forum of Congress as a wailing wall, not unlike that of the ancient city of Jerusalem. I have heard men get up here in their hymns of hate, wailing and gnashing their teeth, and the only thing they have to offer is: "I hate the President. I hate the last Vice President. I hate this or that member of the President's Cabinet. I hate the administration. I hate the C. I. O. I hate labor." Nothing of permanence, or a definite principle, philosophy, or program do they offer.

When the Federalist Party, after showing their lack of faith in the people of this United States by their alien and sedition laws and other legislation, began that same program of negation, of finding fault, of crying and wailing, that party passed out of the picture.

The Whig Party had a similar experience; and I prophesy that if the Members on this side of the House do not join and give their talents—and I know they have talents—for the benefit of their country in this hour of need and join with the Democrats in the things we can unite on for the benefit of the people of these United States of America, they, too, will pass out of the picture in less than 4 years from today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. When the gentleman says "this party" he means the Republican Party? Is not that what the gentleman refers to?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The Republican Party. The gentleman is correct.

Let me state, also, that I have certain beliefs: I believe that the program of Jefferson has been carried out in this

country. I believe that every generation has found our country a better place to live in and to enjoy life. We have better standards of living. As Donald Nelson states, "America is the country of 'know how.'"

No man is perfect; there is not a man who makes no mistakes. Let us take the case of the present President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. No man can say that he has made no mistakes; and no person who has been President of the United States as long as he has but has done great things; and the greatest that has been accomplished under his administration is financial reform. The banks and the monetary institutions of our country are today in the best condition ever known in any country of the world. They lend money at lower rates of interest on every conceivable type of security and on better conditions to the people. That, my friends, is something I wish you would take into consideration when you fear for the postwar world. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should unite as far as we can on the things that are important. When we send men to a peace conference I do not want them to worry as to whether Russia or England will have sufficient influence and authority there; I want them to see that behind our delegates is the united voice of America. If this united voice is behind them, America will be able to secure a peace that will be lasting, and enduring, and based on American principles.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman states that today banks lend money at the lowest interest in the history of America. Is that right?

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is right.

Mr. SABATH. And that they have more money. Is not that perhaps the reason why these big bankers are against President Roosevelt? Because he made it possible for people to obtain loans at low rates of interest?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I could not tell why they oppose him.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know whether the gentleman has tried to borrow money from the banks, but as I understand it, if an ordinary human wants to borrow money from a bank he has to put up security for everything he wants to borrow, which was something not necessary a few years ago.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That was the case before the days of Roosevelt. Now, if one has a job, a steady salary, a good credit rating, if he pays his bills, he can go to a bank and borrow money for one-third the rate of interest that he can from any loan company.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to have the gentleman take me to his local bank. Maybe I could secure a loan there without security.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is making a very splendid speech. From another angle may I say with reference to banks that the banking system has been considerably strengthened as a result of legislation passed in the last 12 years, particularly through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act. As I remember it, in the period 12 years prior to 1932 there were over 13,000 banks in the United States that either failed or closed their doors, with total deposits in excess of $8,000,000,000, with a total net loss to the depositors of $1,700,000,000 plus. In the last 12 years the total loss of the banks, including members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, instead of $1,700,000,000 plus has been less than $100,000,000.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to see that the majority leader is now claiming credit for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The record will show that the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. VANDENBERG, proposed that act when the President was against it and that it went through with the cooperation of the Republicans.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has a very faint memory. The two men who were instrumental in the passage of that bill were not bankers. They were legislators. One was a late distinguished Member of this House from Alabama, Mr. Steagall, and the other the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. GLASS.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman maintain that Senator VANDENBERG did not propose it and that President Roosevelt opposed it when Senator VANDENBERG did propose the legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's memory is very faint.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota, who is making this speech in his 30 minutes' time?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to finish what I started to say, and that is, I believe we should quit worrying about America. We should believe in America. The fact that the banks are in the condition I have stated makes it certain that, for instance the railroads, and all needed lines can be furnished by private capital and that we have no fear of any need for the Government going into business in order to keep production at a high level. Furthermore, I believe that due to this condition these lines will be financed and I believe also the Government, the banking interests, the business interests, and labor must unite; then we will accomplish something for the American people that will give them a better life than they ever had.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Since the gentleman has made this speech I most heartily invite him to sit over on our side. I think he should do that.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No; I cannot cry, I cannot be sorry over the Government, I cannot believe that the Government is going to the dogs and I cannot believe that America will not succeed industrially and in every other way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman cannot believe that, why is he going back on the New Deal platform?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, the gentleman is.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No; I am not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is repudiating Government ownership and management.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. For the purpose of the RECORD, I do not believe any man in this House or any man that has ever been in Congress was so little that he could hate any person. We may not agree with the act of a man, but I do not believe anyone hates a person, whether he has ever been a President of the United States or not. Some acts might have been criticized. If acts of recent Presidents, for instance, Mr. Hoover, are criticized, it is far more fair that that be done now than to criticize them after they are dead and buried and cannot make a reply.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is true.

Mr. RAMEY. No one hates the person. We may criticize judgment. Anyone big enough to be President is big enough to admit he makes mistakes. Any President does. All Presidents have. We expect too much of persons. Any President is only another man in a great responsibility.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I believe all people should advocate principles rather than oppose somebody. With that, I will close.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, the gentleman has not been here very long as a Member, but if the gentleman has observed the RECORD since our country entered into war, why the support of the President for prosecuting the war has been unanimous from both sides; is that not true?

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that is the way it should be, so that the gentleman will probably modify something that he said in regard to the Republicans hating the President of the United States. He would modify his statement to that effect, would he not?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In amplification of some of the sentiment that has been so well expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, may I call his attention to the fact that there were 14,995 banks in 1940 and 14,598 banks in 1944; that the total deposits of those 14,995 banks in 1940 were $76,407,885,000 and the total deposits in the 14,598 banks in 1944 were $129,367,247,000, and of that total amount of tremendous deposit liability of these banks 69.7 percent was invested in United States Government bonds. Does that mean anything to the gentleman?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think it is a healthy condition.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I take it that the gentleman believes in the New Deal.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I believe in the New Deal.

Mr. HOOK. Is it not a fact that because of the program of the New Deal the condition of the country is such now that private enterprise can exist, private enterprise is existing, and that that was brought about because of the New Deal and in spite of those who were opposed to the New Deal who just now applauded the gentleman for his statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman ever read what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who just spoke, said of this administration and its agencies the last time he was down here, in the term just before he was defeated? Did he ever read that? Answer me, if the gentleman will. I wish the gentleman would read that some day and see what the gentleman said about it.

Mr. HOOK. Would the gentleman like to have me say it again?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I again congratulate the gentleman on his first speech. I think we all agree that it was a very fine contribution and a very tolerant expression of his views. I want to congratulate the gentleman not only as a Member, but as a Member on the Democratic side, because in his first speech to the House the gentleman has aroused the interest and the attraction of the brains of the Republican Party, as evidenced by the numerous requests for the gentleman to yield. The gentleman yielded to everyone, I think, and in fact his convincing reply to our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] flattened him in his chair.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I believe the best thing that can be done to keep stabilized employment is for each State to untax capital and buildings and concentrate all local taxation on the value of land, according to the theory of Henry George.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am exceedingly sorry that the distinguished majority leader had so little confidence in the first speech of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota that he felt it necessary to gratuitously interject himself into the gentleman's speech. The gentleman from Minnesota has very clearly indicated that he does not need the gratuitous interjections of the distinguished majority leader. He is perfectly able to take care of himself. I am surprised that the distinguished majority leader has felt compelled to take the gentleman from Minnesota under his wing, so to speak, and attempt to direct his thinking and to try to make out of his speech something that would conform to the thinking of the gentleman from Massachusetts rather than the thinking of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

The gentleman can take great pride in the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota flattened the gentleman from Wisconsin in his seat, but the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota knows that the facts which the gentleman from Wisconsin put into the RECORD are the real facts. I made no comment upon them at all except to say as I put them in the RECORD that they were put there for the purpose of adding emphasis to the things the gentleman from Minnesota had already said.

It comes with very poor grace from the smiling and smirking leader on the Democratic side to attempt to inject his personality into a situation in order to try to make a purely partisan advantage out of a situation that does not exist. I am surprised and astounded at the puny efforts of the distinguished majority leader this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very evident from the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin that what I said penetrated his pelt.

Mr. KEEFE. Below the belt, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. If anybody hits below the belt it is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. Repeatedly the gentleman has done that.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman from Minnesota believe that the interjection I placed in his speech was in any way an attempt to reflect upon the gentleman from Minnesota or in any way intended to belittle his speech or to belittle the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I did not take it so.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, the gentleman did not; so the gentleman from Massachusetts stands alone.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. As one of the gentleman's new colleagues, I wish to welcome him to the floor. I am in his opposition, but I want to say to him that he has had much the best of this debate so far; that I, as a new Member, am proud of him, as a new Member, and I cannot say as much of some of the others.

Secondly, may I say that as a former debating coach of one of the major colleges, I would have been glad to have the gentleman on the team. I first heard of the gentleman in the Pacific, a good many miles away, and I heard of him wrongly. The gentleman has much more intelligence and much more thought behind him than the papers have given him credit for having. I for one will welcome the gentleman and will listen to what he has to say on legislation in the future. I say that seriously.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HEIDINGER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), on account of official business.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday, February 22, 1945.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on S. 63 and H. R. 1648, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, February 22, 1945, at 10 a. m., in executive session, for the consideration of report of the Post Office Department on parcel post.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Friday, February 23, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., hearings will be continued before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill, H. R. 97, to

amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (with respect to patents). The hearings will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the postwar ship-disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

245. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of Harland Bartholomew & Associates against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

246. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a supplemental request for an increase in the estimates of personnel requirements, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 49, for the Bureau of the First Assistant Postmaster General for the quarter ending March 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

247. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a copy of the revised request for personnel needs during the third quarter of the fiscal year 1945 for the Federal Public Housing Authority; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

248. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration, transmitting the eighteenth report to Congress on lend-lease operations, for the period ended December 31, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

249. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 172 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 384. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien; without amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2122. A bill to extend to 6 months after the termination of hostilities the period during which females may be employed in the District of Columbia for more than 8 hours a day or 48 hours a week, under temporary permits; without amendment (Rept. No. 192). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1149. A bill for the relief of Dane D. Morgan; without amendment (Rept. No. 190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1630. A bill for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc., with amendment (Rept. No. 191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 2292. A bill to provide that F–1 loans under the regional agricultural credit corporation loan program shall be deemed to have been made upon the same terms and conditions as F–2 loans under such program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN:

H. R. 2293. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 in order to further the development of a strong Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 2294. A bill to provide a uniform code of descent of trust or restricted Indian estates and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2295. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to provide mustering-out payments to certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 2296. A bill amending the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salary and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath business committee and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2297. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr HOWELL:

H. R. 2298. A bill authorizing the State of Illinois to abandon the Illinois and Michigan Canal in Illinois, and to grant to the State of Illinois all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land comprising the right-of-way of the Illinois and Michigan Canal, as the same was routed and constructed through the public lands of the United States, in the State of Illinois, pursuant to the act of Congress of the United States of March 2, 1827, and in and to the 90 feet of land on each side of said canal, vested in the State of Illinois, pursuant to the act of Congress of the United States of March 30, 1822; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2299. A bill declaring to be citizens of the United States certain spouses of United States citizens serving honorably in the armed forces during the Second World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. Res. 143. Resolution providing for veterans' representation at peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. Res. 144. Resolution providing for participation by veterans in peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 145. Resolution to provide for a study of pay increases for white-collar workers; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for continuation of the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 2300. A bill for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2301. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Wexler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2302. A bill for the relief of Everett William Flake; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2303. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Charles J. Culligan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Clinton Construction Co. and others; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Arrais, also known as Joseph P. Arrais; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Gus Klockenkemper; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2308. A bill for the relief of Roy Jefferds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2309. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to reopen five eminent domain cases and correct the constitutional errors therein, if any, by additional judgments against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 2310. A bill for the relief of James A. Brady; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2311. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lois J. Miller Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

92. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of residents of Ulysses, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

93. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the general director of the functionaries of the Greek Parliament offices, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to procurement of credit of an American concern to supply shoes and clothing to the functionaries of the Greek Parliament offices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

94. Also, petition of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to proposed enlargement of reservation in that Territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God and ours, we pray today for the Nation that the fathers founded. We lift to Thee grateful hearts for the heritage that has come down to us, bought by other toils and other tears than our own. For great character that has been woven into our national fabric, blessed be Thy name. Help us this day with vivid vision to see them of old who feared Thy name and handed on to us the torch of the Nation's righteousness. Especially do we give Thee thanks for the unselfish service and the stainless record of that calm and courageous leader whose crystal spirit and whose calm sword were Thy instruments in laying the foundation of our state. As we cherish his deeds and repeat his farewell warning words, O God of hosts, lest we forget, repeat in us the faith which shone on his anxious countenance lifted in an agony of prayer from crimsoned ground where patriots bled. As in these tragic hours Washington's spiritual sons are dying for his creed on Europe's frozen fields and on the South Sea's barren rocks, hold us fast to our high trust; drive us to our knees for the inner strength that steadied him whose name we reverence this day. There may we, too, find the calming assurance—

"Conquer we must,
For our cause it is just,
And this be our motto,
'In God is our trust'."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 19, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, Washington's Farewell Address will now be read by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has heretofore been designated by the Chair to perform that duty.

Mr. SMITH advanced to the desk and said:

Mr. President and colleagues, I desire to express my appreciation of the honor of having been designated on this occasion to read Washington's Farewell Address. I call the especial attention of our audience today to the fact that this immortal document is addressed "To the people of the United States."

Thereupon Mr. SMITH read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But

as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the

mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealously, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my

own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I regard it as an exceedingly wise and fitting thing for the Senate to hear the wonderful address of George Washington read annually on the anniversary of his birth. I desire to pay an exceedingly short tribute to George Washington on this date commemorating his birth, not that he needs my tribute, but the country needs to be reminded of what we owe him and his associates.

Washington and his associates about 150 years ago created a Government and a Nation of people which together have become the greatest Government and the greatest Nation of people in the world.

Washington presided over the Convention that formed a Constitution for freemen, and we in this country have today the most perfect freedom of action, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of thought for all men and all women within our borders.

We are free to vote, we are free to work, we are free to make our own way in the world, we are free to aspire, we are free to rise, we are free to become educated, free to become learned, free to acquire a living for ourselves, and free to work and lay up a competency for our old age. We are in every possible sense the freest Nation of people in the world, and primarily due to the Constitution, Government, and laws under which we live.

Therefore, Mr. President, on this anniversary of the birth of Washington let us resolve with all the earnestness and sincerity of our nature to keep this almost perfect Government, this almost perfect Nation, and this almost perfect Constitution in their pristine integrity, so that we may continue in our marvelous growth, prosperity, and happiness under that Constitution's protecting aegis.

Let no one persuade us that it should be torn down or destroyed or weakened. Let no one persuade us there are other substitute constitutions or governments which are better. Let no so-called theorist, no wordy crack-pot, no commie, no commie fellow-traveler, no self-constituted Karl Marx turn us from our devotion to the clear, uplifting, and honest principles and policies of George Washington and his colleagues and his fellow workers in establishing the Government that is ours.

We have the greatest and most powerful Government and the best Government for all the people, the common man and the uncommon man, in all the world. We received it from Washington and his fellow Constitution makers in 1787. Let us ever revere the name of Washington, our great leader then, and keep inviolate the greatest instrument of human government ever created by mortal men.

Under this Constitution and the laws under it we have come from the last place among the nations of the world to the first and highest place among the nations of the world. Let us never, directly or indirectly, change or weaken the American policies established in that Constitution—policies that have brought us to our present greatness.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper;

S. 210. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938;

S. 213. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States Naval Ordnance Plant at Canton, Ohio;

S. 216. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.;

S. 218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California;

S. 219. An act to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy;

S. 221. An act to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil;

S. 315. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 317. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 335. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 129. An act to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants;

H. R. 197. An act to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps and for other purposes;

H. R. 242. An act for the relief of Ruben M. Herren;

H. R. 256. An act for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head;

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased;

H. R. 304. An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations;

H. R. 685. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest;

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course

of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions;

H. R. 697. An act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes;

H. R. 744. An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate;

H. R. 853. An act for the relief of David Cowan;

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of Blanche E. Broad;

H. R. 934. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

H. R. 941. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee, administratrix of the estate of Ross Lee, deceased;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor);

H. R. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring;

H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Joe Koor;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman;

H. R. 1230. An act for the relief of Donna May McNulty;

H. R. 1239. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased;

H. R. 1308. An act for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan;

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello;

H. R. 1325. An act for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer;

H. R. 1353. An act for the relief of J. P. Harris;

H. R. 1360. An act for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors;

H. R. 1396. An act for the relief of Anne Loacker;

H. R. 1400. An act for the relief of Louis T. Klauder;

H. R. 1453. An act for the relief of Edith M. Powell;

H. R. 1483. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice;

H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of Henry B. Tucker;

H. R. 1525. An act relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens;

H. R. 1527. An act to exempt the members of the Advisory Board appointed under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes;

H. R. 1531. An act to provide for the control of confidential business data submitted to the War Production Board;

H. R. 1550. An act for the relief of E. Sullivan;

H. R. 1561. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio;

H. R. 1566. An act for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.;

H. R. 1646. An act to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.;

H. R. 1705. An act providing for the appointment of a United States Commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1719. An act to confirm the claim of Charles Gaudet;

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1837. An act for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil and others;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of Frank Lore and Elizabeth Vidotto;

H. R. 2055. An act for the relief of Ben Grunstein;

H. R. 2252. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture; and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McKELLAR BY JAMES G. STAHLMAN

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. The article was published in the Nashville Banner, a newspaper published in Nashville, Tenn. It is an editorial written by the owner of the newspaper, Mr. James G. Stahlman, in his private column entitled "From the Shoulder."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE SHOULDER

(By James G. Stahlman)

Ingratitude
Is the basest trait
In human nature.
It's funny how it pops up now and then
In the most unexpected places.
That usually happens
Where somebody has been too kind
Or too considerate
Or too helpful
To somebody else.
The ingrate
Always picks on the fellow
Who has been his best friend.

Now that's exactly what
Appears to be happening
To KENNETH DOUGLAS McKELLAR,
Senior United States Senator
From Tennessee,
Dean of the Senate
And recently elected
Its President pro tempore.
Yes, sir; that's what it looks like.

I'm sure you've noticed
Where some politically prompted
People at the Highlander Folk School
Don't like McKELLAR's stand
On the nomination of Hank Wallace.
That same crowd
A very limited group in Memphis,
Didn't like it either.
They told McKELLAR
"The people of Tennessee" didn't like it, too.

Now that's taking in
Quite some territory
And about 3,000,000 people to boot.
So if I had my guess,
I'd say that of that number
At least nine-tenths of them
Agree with McKELLAR
And GEORGE
And the rest of the Democrats
Who have alined themselves
Against the Wallace nomination.

The dissenters at Highlander
Decided to organize P. A. C.
In Tennessee.
I thought Sidney Hillman
Had done that
During the last campaign.
Maybe not.
At any rate, the Highlander Communists,
And that's what they are—
Have set out to get McKELLAR's scalp
When he comes up for
Reelection in 1946.
Of course, that's going to be a tough job.
They might succeed
With the help of their fellow travelers
Here and elsewhere,
But we prefer to wait
Until the returns are in.
That will be plenty of time.

The strange part of all this is
That the Tennessee P. A. C.—
Highlander Communists to you—
Is representing itself
As representing labor sentiment
In Tennessee.
I can't believe it.
Organized labor can't be that dumb.

I'm not saying that
Some labor folks,
In addition to the P. A. C. crowd
Aren't against McKELLAR.
They probably are,
Largely on the hullabaloo
And whoopedoo generated by
McKELLAR's political enemies.
But no man who toils
In Tennessee
Can honestly be
Against McKELLAR
On the basis of his labor record.

That just can't be,
For McKELLAR's record in that regard
Has been consistently
Pro labor,
Sometimes so liberal
As to embarrass
And even offend many
Of his more conservative supporters.
McKELLAR has always been the friend
Of the laboring man.

Neither I nor the Banner
Has consistently agreed with McKELLAR
In lots of his pro-labor attitudes.
The disagreement has been honest.
But the thing that astounds me is
That anybody connected with any
Organized labor group
Could so forget McKELLAR's friendship for
And outstanding aid to labor
As to turn upon him now.

On their labor records,
McKELLAR's tops Wallace's
A hundred to one.
So if the Highlander Commies
Want to attack McKELLAR,
They should find some more plausible
And valid excuse.

If I were McKELLAR,
I wouldn't want Communist support,
And I'm sure he doesn't.
But that shouldn't cause the sound elements
Of organized labor
To turn against their best friend
In Tennessee public life.
I don't believe they will.
If they do,
It's another case of
"Biting the hand."

If there's any ingratitude
To be shown,
Let it remain with the Highlander Commies
And their fellow travelers
Who are endeavoring to speak
For organized labor.
Let organized labor speak for itself
When McKELLAR comes up
For reelection.
I think I know where my money will be.
And it won't be on the Commies.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from John C. Snowhook, of Santa Monica, Calif., praying for the enactment of certain legislation in connection with the monetary system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by citizens of the city of Rochester, N. Y., assembled at St. George's Hall, under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of Societies in the United States, condemning the enforcement of Russian imperialism and the imposition of Russian communistic principles among the Lithuanian people through a puppet Soviet-Lithuanian-Russian regime sponsored and approved solely by the Russian Soviet Government, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Del-Mar-Va Farm Equipment Association in the State of Maryland, favoring revision of the tax laws so as to provide equality of taxation in regard to cooperatives; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 70. A bill for the relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz; without amendment (Rept. No. 54);

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Ruiz; with amendments (Rept. No. 56); and

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Marggraf; without amendment (Rept. No. 55).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina; from the Committee on Claims:

S. 319. A bill for the relief of Dane D. Morgan; without amendment (Rept. No. 57).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 318. A bill for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 58); and

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 59).

By Mr. TAYLOR, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 321. A bill for the relief of James M. Hiler; without amendment (Rept. No. 60).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 288. A bill for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 61).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 530. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 62); and

S. 531. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 63).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 1752. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 64).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 19, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 591. A bill for the relief of Chesley Brazil; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James Arthur Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 593. A bill for the relief of Warrant Officer Wayne C. Proper; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 594. A bill for the purpose of regulating the conditions of employment of mechanics and helpers at all Government navy yards, and naval stations, arsenals, and other Government establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 595. A bill to improve salary and wage administration in the Federal service; to provide pay for overtime and for night and holiday work; to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 596. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Irene Scott Bassett a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 597. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. O'Brien; and

S. 598. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ellen Purdum; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. CAPPER also introduced Senate bill 599, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the provisions of the act of March 3, 1917, relating to supplementing the salaries of Federal officers and employees for services rendered to the United States.

This measure is in connection with the offer made by Collier's weekly to give $10,000 to the Senator who is adjudged to have done most for the United States during any one year. I think there is a law which now covers this, but in order to be absolutely certain, I am introducing this measure. I do not believe Collier's weekly can do this legally.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 600. A bill to amend the provisions of the act of March 3, 1917, relating to the supplementing of salaries of Federal officers and employees for services rendered to the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, so as to provide for benefits in the case of persons who die without having such insurance in force.

I might say that I have received letters from my State in cases where the parents thought their son was insured. Under my bill an investigation would be made and an amendment to the law provided whereby there would be recovery of insurance in case of death.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 601. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, so as to provide for benefits in the case of persons who die without having such insurance in force; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to exclude Government employees from jury service in the Federal courts. I do this for the reason that we have seen cases of the Government prosecuting defendants, and upon the juries would be found others in the employ of the Government. It does not seem fair to me that that should be the case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 602. A bill to exclude Government employees from jury service in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide that members of the armed forces shall not be discharged for disability until their rights to veterans' benefits shall have been adjudicated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 603. A bill to provide that members of the armed forces shall not be discharged for disability until their rights to veterans' benefits shall have been adjudicated; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the issuance of medals to the American nurses who were held as prisoners by the Japanese in the Philippine Islands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 604. A bill to provide for the issuance of medals to the American nurses who were held as prisoners of the Japanese in the

Philippines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for the issuance of civilian clothing to the members of the armed forces upon discharge. I might say that this is done by Great Britain, and I recommend it to the consideration of the proper authorities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 605. A bill to provide for issuance of civilian clothing to members of the armed forces upon discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LANGER. I introduce a bill denying the use of the mails to insurance companies which fail to comply with State laws.

Some insurance companies, particularly in the city of Chicago, have been advertising in the newspapers that for a penny a day, or 2 cents a day, or 3 cents a day, they would give a certain amount of protection. Then, when people have taken out this insurance, they suddenly find they are unable to get paid for disability they incur. I have taken this matter up previously with the Department of Justice, and there is no law covering the situation at the present time. Under my bill any insurance company would be prohibited, in the city of Chicago or anywhere else, from writing insurance in any State by mail unless it first had a deposit there to protect the policyholders in that particular State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 606. A bill denying the use of the mails to insurance companies which fail to comply with State laws; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 607. A bill authorizing the transfer for park purposes of certain lands located near Chesapeake and Nichols Avenue SW., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 608. A bill granting a pension to Constance Eager; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 609. A bill to amend the Missing Persons Act so as to provide for payment of interest on pay and allowances credited under such act to the accounts of members of the armed forces who become missing or are captured by the enemy; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate bill 610, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 611. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Arthur Dewitt Janes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 129. An act to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments;

H. R. 242. An act for the relief of Ruben M. Herren;

H. R. 256. An act for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head;

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased;

H. R. 791. An act for the relief of H. J. Blexrud estate;

H. R. 853. An act for the relief of David Cowan;

H. R. 906. An act for the relief of Blanche E. Broad;

H. R. 934. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

H. R. 941. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee, administratrix of the estate of Ross Lee, deceased;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor);

H. R. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring;

H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Joe Koor;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of Lorenzo M. Froman;

H. R. 1230. An act for the relief of Donna May McNulty;

H. R. 1239. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased;

H. R. 1308. An act for the relief of Sam Swan and Aily Swan;

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Leo Edward Day and Phillip Tamborello;

H. R. 1325. An act for the relief of Hyman L. Schiffer;

H. R. 1353. An act for the relief of J. P. Harris;

H. R. 1360. An act for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors;

H. R. 1396. An act for the relief of Anne Loacker;

H. R. 1400. An act for the relief of Louis T. Klauder;

H. R. 1453. An act for the relief of Edith M. Powell;

H. R. 1483. An act for the relief of Mrs. W. V. Justice;

H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of Henry B. Tucker;

H. R. 1550. An act for the relief of E. Sullivan;

H. R. 1561. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio;

H. R. 1566. An act for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.;

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1837. An act for the relief of Thula B. Wellborn;

H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil and others;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of Frank Lore and Elizabeth Vidotto; and

H. R. 2055. An act for the relief of Ben Grunstein; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 304. An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations;

H. R. 697. An act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 744. An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 685. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest; and

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 197. An act to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1646. An act to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1705. An act providing for the appointment of a United States Commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; and

H. R 1719. An act to confirm the claim of Charles Gaudet; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 2252. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 1525. An act relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens;

H. R. 1527. An act to exempt the members of the Advisory Board appointed under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Satutes;

H. R. 1531. An act to provide for the control of confidential business data submitted to the War Production Board; and

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1945, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIQUOR ADVERTISEMENTS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am reintroducing for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages and for other purposes.

In these days of war stress and strain when every available factor is being sought in an effort to bring about early and complete victory, I am convinced serious attention could most appropriately be given to restrictions of certain activities not conducive toward that end.

Not only the manpower involved in various phases of the liquor industry but also the grains, fruits, and sugar products used in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages could have a very direct bearing on our war effort if turned to that end.

One of the most powerful, if perhaps somewhat unrecognized, factors in our daily lives is advertising. When people read on streetcars or in magazines or on billboards in the immediate foreground advertisements repeating by subtle suggestion or positive statement or visual

impact that alcohol is a healthy, harmless, socially compulsory beverage, it does something to them. Especially is this true of ceaseless repetition of the same ideas by pleasant voices over the radio. Unless we are strongly resistant to suggestion, and most of us are not, we break down a little each time the defenses put up by our common sense, until we come unconsciously to accept ideas that our awakened judgment might reject.

In this connection I invite attention to an excerpt from the findings of the National Temperance and Prohibition Council at its annual session in Washington, D. C., January 17–18, 1945:

Church conferences and assemblies and other public-minded organizations and over a million individuals petitioned the Seventy-eighth Congress for the total exclusion of liquor from all military camps and for prohibition throughout the Nation until the war is over. They have asked also that at least the mass propaganda for alcoholic beverages be curtailed by the exclusion of liquor advertisements from the press and radio. Similar measures are being introduced in the new Congress and reasons are fast accumulating for their increased support. War demoralizes and this demoralization takes place first among the children, for their way of life is least fixed, and we are faced with a vast increase of juvenile delinquency. When liquor-using parents set the example and the pace the descent is often swift and disastrous. Judges now realize this fact and are calling the parents of delinquents to answer for themselves and for their children. Liquor must not be permitted to interfere with the war; even less must it be permitted to debase the coming generation for whose sake the war is being fought. We appeal to our representatives in Congress to initiate and seek the enactment of appropriate legislation for the remedying of the evils presented and the meeting of the needs of the war era. We further pledge our organizations to the intensifying of public sentiment for the support of such measures, and we appeal to all socially minded citizens to join in this patriotic endeavor.

Mr. President, it seems to me this is a factor which should have the serious consideration of the Congress and all other departments of Government, since the Government is most seriously urging industry and individuals to resurvey all their activities with a view to curtailing any phase of their program which is nonessential from the standpoint of the war effort. I earnestly appeal for early and favorable action on the proposed legislation.

The bill (S. 599) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ELIMINATION OF SLUM AREAS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, for many years I have been interested in developing some kind of practical program which would eliminate the slum areas in the District of Columbia and improve the welfare of the entire District. Earlier in the present session I introduced S. 98, but since that time the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has held numerous conferences with the District Commissioners, the Bureau of the Budget, other governmental agencies, and interested civic groups and individuals. As a result of this effort, I now introduce a revised measure on the same subject which I believe contains many constructive amendments to S. 98.

Mr. President, three basic features underlie the general principles embodied in this legislative proposal. It provides:

First. For the specific use planning of the project areas to be redeveloped in coordination with the comprehensive plans for the District of Columbia and its environs, subject to approval by the District Commissioners after a public hearing;

Second. For the acquisition and assembly of the land in redevelopment project areas by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency created for this purpose; and

Third. For the selling or the leasing of the redevelopment project areas to agencies or individuals, either public or private, who will carry out the redevelopment project area plan as a condition of the sale or lease.

Mr. President, this whole matter is one which has been receiving considerable study recently, and I am glad to most strongly urge this proposal for the improvement of housing conditions in Washington, D. C.

The bill (S. 610) to provide for the replanning of blighted and other areas of the District of Columbia and the assembly, by purchase or condemnation, of real property in such areas and the sale or lease thereof for the redevelopment of such areas in accordance with said plans; and to provide for the organization of, procedure for, and the financing of such planning, acquisition, and sale or lease, including the establishment of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT—PROPOSED CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 541

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I send forward a resolution, and as it is brief, I shall read it. It provides that the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 541) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce. This is a very important matter, which I shall not undertake to discuss at this time. I do not intend to call the resolution up today—I question whether I would be allowed to do so, under the rule—but I think that either on Monday, or certainly on Thursday, I shall ask the Senate to pass upon the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 83) is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 541) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution submitted by the Senator from North Carolina will be received and lie over, under the rule.

INVESTIGATION OF THE CIGARETTE SHORTAGE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the existing shortage of cigarettes.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee to be composed of ——— Senators appointed by the President of the Senate is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the existing shortage of cigarettes, for the purpose of ascertaining the causes of such shortage, and particularly the extent to which such shortage is attributable to black-market activities. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to legislation as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

SILLIMAN EVANS AND THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEEAN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to have something inserted in the RECORD; but before doing so I desire to make a few remarks.

Later I shall ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD one of the most unique letters which I have ever read. I shall not read it, but will ask Senators to examine it in the RECORD tomorrow. It is a letter from my friend, Mr. E. H. Crump, of Memphis, Tenn., to the Nashville Tennesseean, a newspaper which it is claimed is owned by one Silliman Evans.

The Nashville Tennesseean was founded approximately 30 or 40 years ago in Nashville, and in the late twenties or early thirties it got into very bad financial condition and borrowed money from a bank in New Orleans. Finally the R. F. C. had to take it over. The R. F. C. owned its bonds and stocks. It was put up for sale by one department of the Government, and allegedly bought by Silliman Evans, while holding a high place in the same department of Government. The sale was made under questionable circumstances, and apparently by devious methods, but I shall refer to those later.

When Evans reached Nashville he soon began filling the columns of the newspaper with the vilest, most untruthful,

and most denunciatory articles concerning Mr. E. H. Crump, of Memphis, and concerning me.

At the time he went to Nashville I knew little about him, and I suppose Mr. Crump knew less. Of course, he barely knew either one of us, and has never associated with us since that time so far as I can now recall. It is true that while he was here in the Post Office Department, I being chairman of the Post Office Committee of the Senate and he wanting favors, he avowed the most undying friendship for me; but when he left the Government and acquired the newspaper, his entire attitude toward me changed in almost the twinkling of an eye, and from that day to this he has literally filled his columns with dirty, venomous, corrupt, and the most damnable falsehoods ever printed concerning both Mr. Crump and me. He even had one of his editors, one Jennings Perry, a man I do not know and would not know if I should see him, write a book denouncing Mr. Crump and me. The book was filled with arrant and infamous falsehoods from beginning to end. Indeed, Mr. President, if there is a truthful statement in the book concerning either Mr. Crump or me, that statement was evidently made in error and not by design. The book did not sell well, and Evans then sent out copies with his compliments to persons whom he wanted to read it.

Shortly after he got to Nashville, so I am very reliably informed, he set up a barroom in one of the hotels there, and he now dispenses liquors free to all who care to come or who are invited. It is said that he himself stays drunk most of the time.

As to his mental capacity, a debate has been taking place in Tennessee ever since his arrival in that State. His friends, confined largely to the patrons of the free-liquor establishment which he maintains, say that he is suffering from an exaggerated ego. Others say that he is suffering from the "big head" caused by the gift to him of enormous Government wealth, and that such acquisition of sudden, unexpected, and undeserved wealth has turned his head. Others say that he is crazy. Still others say that he is just a plain natural-born liar incapable of telling the truth.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Please wait one moment. I have not finished with this man. [Laughter.] Unfortunately, he still lives in my State.

I shall not attempt to describe Mr. Evans further. I am leaving that to my friend Mr. Crump, whose letter I shall ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. If I were describing Evans, however, I should say that he is a cross between a jumping bobtailed jerboa and a drunken alley cat with a large admixture of mangy and flea-bitten dog thrown in. [Laughter.] If he should die and appear at the gates of Hades, I am quite sure the devil would not admit him if he knew about his foul, filthy, lousy, lying, and corrupt record in the Nashville Tennesseean.

I think I should say here, Mr. President, that I do not intend to defend myself against the falsehoods which have been published in the Nashville Tennesseean—incidentally, let me say they are published almost every day—for I am sure that no fair-minded man who knows me will believe them.

As to Mr. Crump, I wish to say that there is no finer man in our State, or in America, for that matter, than Mr. Crump. His father belonged to one of the oldest and best Virginia families at Fredericksburg. His mother was one of the loveliest women whom I ever knew. I knew her in her later years, and she was a very beautiful woman up to the time of her death at more than 90 years of age. She was highly educated and well informed. She was charitable, kind, and intelligent. She was one of the finest women in our country.

Mr. Crump married one of the leading society girls of Memphis who belonged to one of its best families, and is herself one of the most beautiful, attractive, and splendid of women. Mr. and Mrs. Crump's family life has been very beautiful, and their children are of the same kind as are their parents. Mr. Crump and all his family have been successful in business. They have stood at the very highest level in social life, as well as in financial life, and are good, honest-to-God American citizens. No man stands higher in Tennessee than does Mr. Crump. His word is his bond. His success has been remarkable. He is a natural leader of men. It is true he likes politics, but the only offices he has ever held have been the mayoralty of Memphis and for 4 years a Representative in Congress in Washington, both of which places he filled in the highest and most satisfactory degree. And in all his service and in all of his political activities he is as honest as the day is long, and everybody knows it except those who willfully do not want to know it. Why this drunken assassin of character should attack him and continue to attack him can only be accounted for on the theory that he thought he could make himself known by attacking such an outstanding man and citizen as Mr. Crump.

But before I close, Mr. President, in view of the devious and questionable sale of the Nashville Tennesseean by one department to an officer in the same department of government I wish to say that such transaction should be investigated. The Government owned and had in its possession, having taken it for debts, the stock and bonds of this newspaper and, of course, the Government had a large financial interest in the paper and in the sale of the property. It was the duty of the Government to get the largest possible price for that newspaper at that sale. As a matter of fact, there were persons not on the inside, not working for the Government, not "in the know," so to speak, who very much desired to bid on that newspaper, who had the money with which to buy it, and who were willing to give a higher price than was obtained from Evans; but somehow, in some way, they were kept from bidding on it. I have it on the highest authority that one and perhaps two other persons were willing to pay at least $800,000 for the newspaper which Evans bought for $600,000, and that these men were told that the Government was interested in Evans' getting the newspaper.

Under these circumstances I shall submit a Senate resolution to investigate this sale. If would-be reliable and honest bidders were kept from bidding to the Government's disadvantage and loss, then this sale should be set aside. Ordinarily, such a resolution would go to the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, of which I happen to be chairman, because the Post Office and Post Roads Committee has jurisdiction of certain subsidies which are given to newspapers and is, therefore, interested in the proper management of newspapers. However, in this case, the transaction having occurred in Tennessee, I am going to ask that my resolution which I shall submit later, be referred to a special or some other standing committee, and that such committee make a thorough examination and findings, and report the same to the Department of Justice for action, if any action be recommended.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Crump's letter to the Tennesseean be inserted as a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *January 29, 1945.*

THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEEAN,
Nashville, Tenn.:

If the city of Nashville should ever follow the lead of the progressive city of Memphis and inaugurate a campaign for the extermination of rodents, Silliman Evans, Jennings Perry, and Joe Hatcher will undoubtedly take to the tall timbers.

This trio of mangy bubonic rats are conscienceless liars who would stop at nothing in their unholy efforts to prejudice the good people of Tennessee against Memphis and Shelby County. They would not hesitate to assassinate the character of any man or set of men who dare to stand between them and their ambition to put a brass ring in the legislature's nose. They first tried to muscle in on Governor Cooper—that didn't go—then they tried other ways. They planned, contrived, and devised a comprehensive scheme to put the brass ring in his nose, but the Governor gave them the door.

Lies are the weapon of a rogue or a weakling. Liars will steal and rogues will murder, if necessary, to accomplish a nefarious purpose. They are cowards at heart, yellow to the core, and will take any unfair advantage that is theirs by reason of their control of a mediocre newspaper. We have no newspaper to defend us against the dagger thrusts which these bubonic rats plant in our backs, but there is not one of them who, either singly or all together, would meet us on the street, in the hotels, or elsewhere, and say the things to our faces that they have said in their scurrilous newspaper, behind our backs.

The honeymoon of this lying, corroding, crowd of murderers of character is over. Their swill barrel is empty; they have scraped the bottom of the garbage can. Yet it has availed them nothing.

Their influence has steadily diminished to the vanishing point. The mangy bubonic rats have lost election after election in Davidson County and over the State. The people know just how worthless they are—just how insincere. Yet they claim they bask in an aura of purity.

We believe in freedom of the press. Most everyone is for freedom of the press, but not for a lying press.

These rats enjoy the cowardly privilege of writing behind the lying sheets of the Tennesseean. They are without virtue who write lies for their own profit.

The cub reporter said the Chicago Sun would never go forward until Silliman Evans was kicked out. He did get out and that paper is going forward.

It was easy for Father Adam to name the hog, snake, elephant, skunk, and the hound dog, but when it came to the bubonic rat he evidently had a mental preview of Evans, Perry, and Hatcher.

Evans intoxicated himself with megalomaniac dreams of power in Tennessee. He has been sadly disappointed. It pained him terribly because he could not go as a delegate to the last Chicago convention—the canker of disappointment gnaws at his soul. He does a lot of pot licking in the social register's ear around the clubs. One subject that interests rat Evans most is rat Evans—his best judgment compels him to choose himself for anything. He is not motivated by any honest, sincere desire to promote any interest other than his own. He has a Nashville Congressman under his wing and he has aspired to corral a governor, United States Senators, and the legislature. He would like to sign, seal, and deliver them. He has tried bull whipping, browbeating, misrepresentation, and common ordinary lying, but he has failed all along the line. He would also like to be a little Jack Horner in Washington—it would tickle his vanity tremendously. Ventosity is his chief stock in trade.

The golden ball stands for the pawnshop—the stripes for the convict, and the cross for Christianity—Silliman Evans, Jennings Perry, and Joe Hatcher stand for the slimy, mangy bubonic rat. They will probably feel outraged—indignant at what I have to say. Why shouldn't any man have the same privilege in dealing with a newspaper as a newspaper has in dealing with him? But the newspaper doesn't subscribe to the age old story of "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." Every newspaper should only write the truth.

Rat Jennings Perry is full of trickery, has a taste for low intrigue, and is mortgaged to the devil. He is liable to be foreclosed before the legislature adjourns. He wrote a book, Democracy Begins at Home, filled with lies, sent it free of charge to the legislators. He will not sell enough copies to get back the cost of the cover. The insipid ass—the moron, wrote a lot of lying trash—high sounding words. He would like to deal in Greek philosophy, without knowing what he is talking about. He is the perfect example of the type of man who travels from the cradle to the grave without having been aroused from the state of invincible ignorance. Only a low, filthy scoundrel, pervert, degenerate, would write lies for profit. Perry is a sorry, unworthy, despicable character, a venal and licentious scribbler. He is a first-class fourth-class writer, absolutely devoid of integrity, doesn't know the meaning of the word. When a man practices the art of deception—lying for money—he may last a little while, but he cannot last long.

The next time Perry delves into Greek history, someone should tell him that Socrates taught Plato, Plato taught Aristotle, and Aristotle taught the world—he had perhaps the most amazing mind—the greatest capacity for obtaining and retaining knowledge than any man who has ever lived. Perry, to date, hasn't displayed enough knowledge of Greek to qualify him to open a restaurant. He might also inform himself first and write something in his high falutin' way about Homer, Dante, and Shakespeare; also Archimedes, Galileo, and Newton, who represented high human intellect in their period; but Perry writes unintelligently on any subject, just as one would expect of a wanderoo. He has the brains of a quagga.

Now we come to slimy rat, Joe Hatcher, who was tutored under the roguish eye of a former owner of the Tennesseean. He wrote that I had people going through the department stores in Memphis, asking them to send me congratulatory birthday telegrams. That was a low, contemptible, lying statement, absolutely destitute of the truth. This is a classic example of the thousands of lies he has written about us. He doesn't know what trustworthiness, genuineness, honesty of purpose is. Hatcher hasn't character. He has a low, filthy, diseased mind, lies by nature, and tells the truth by accident. He is full of ululation.

Rat Evans would give his right arm if he could lure Capitol Hill and the whole legislature into his luxurious quarters in the Hermitage Hotel, his laboratory in which fake schemes could be concocted and put into effect for his personal aggrandizement. He has the gall, loves glamor, gusto, immodest display of gaudiness, money, and everything that goes with a foul mind and a wicked heart, but the people have no confidence in him.

These low-life, lying scoundrels have been writing about us for years, filling their paper with dastardly, lying stories incapable of proof. They have been fighting mad because they couldn't handle us, and we have assisted in beating them in every State election.

I have been living with the people of Memphis and Shelby County, and many in the State have known me for a long time. In 43 years I have been elected 23 times myself and assisted in 79 general elections, a total of 102 elections without a defeat. Memphis is a great city; this city and county are well governed. There is more efficiency and less graft here than any place in America. No gambling houses, no slot machines, no hand books, policy numbers, or lottery. Any fair-minded, honest man who visits Memphis from any part of America will attest this fact.

Shelby County has always sent a lot of upstanding boys to the legislature. They are there now. No one can bribe or bully them and they are not there to vote for or against any bill for personal gain for anyone, but for the best interest of the State of Tennessee.

Mayor Walter Chandler, E. W. Hale, chairman of the Shelby County commission, and I requested that Attorney General Will Gerber and Guy Joyner look after Memphis and Shelby County's interest at the State Capitol.

On January 14 these rodents wrote a front-page political story in their office, but tried to camouflage it with a Washington dateline. They spoke of Guy Joyner and Will Gerber trying to block the reappointment of a United States marshal in west Tennessee. That was a deliberate lie. They further said that I forced Senator McKELLAR to step aside as national committeeman for Tennessee in my favor. There are 25 or more men who know that is a lie, and at least that many know that I wanted to resign as committeeman in 1940 and in 1944, as it requires too many long trips to Washington.

The rodents are very solicitous about my health and age—they are grieving terribly because I am enjoying good health and am vigorous and will be around here for a long time branding them as liars and proving it.

Memphis is a large, rapidly growing city—headed for 500,000 population. Memphis' growth has not been by mere accident but as a result of careful, painstaking, long-range planning, and the people are with us.

These cowardly bubonic rats will shortly come to the realization the game of politics—dealing with people and trying to browbeat them—cannot be played successfully. Politics is no Gypsy Love Song, or Abbott and Costello burlesque show, and they can't make it such.

E. H. CRUMP.

MILITARY AWARDS TO TENO RONCALIO

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the distinguished awards that have recently been given to a former member of the staff of the Senate Library, Capt. Teno Roncalio. I had the pleasure several years ago of recommending Captain Roncalio for appointment to a position in the Senate Library. He held that position from March 3, 1941, to May 2, 1942, when he resigned to enter the Army. He served in the Senate Library with exceptional ability and to the satisfaction of all Members of the Senate who had occasion to call upon him. Certainly his record was one of great efficiency as to all matters that came under my attention.

When he resigned his position to enter the armed service as a volunteer, he cut short his scholastic training in this city. He became an officer, rising in grade from second lieutenant to first lieutenant, and is now a captain. He is the holder of three distinguished awards. On June 24, 1944, the Bronze Star Medal was awarded to this former employee of the Senate. On July 4, 1944, he was awarded the Silver Star, and on August 1, 1944, he was granted the Combat Infantryman Badge.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this distinguished record in combat of a former employee of the Senate merits this notice during the session of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that the awards be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the awards were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, FIRST
UNITED STATES INFANTRY DIVISION,
A. P. O. 1, U. S. Army, June 24, 1944.

GENERAL ORDERS, NO. 27—AWARD OF BRONZE STAR MEDAL

Under the provisions of Army Regulations 600-45, September 22, 1943, as amended, and circular 66, headquarters, First United States Army, May 18, 1944, the following-named officers and enlisted men of the Eighteenth Infantry are awarded the Bronze Star Medal for heroic achievement in connection with military operations against the enemy in the initial assault on the northern coast of Normandy, France, June 6, 1944:

* * * * *

COMPANY A

* * * * *

Roncalio, Teno, second lieutenant, O1298441, Laramie, Wyo.

* * * * *

By command of Major General Huebner:

S. B. MASON,
Colonel, G. S. C.,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

LEONIDAS GAVALAS,
Lieutenant Colonel, A. G. D.,
Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS, FIRST
UNITED STATES INFANTRY DIVISION,
A. P. O. 1, U. S. Army, July 24, 1944.

GENERAL ORDERS, NO. 47—SECTION II. AWARD OF SILVER STAR

Under the provisions of AR 600-45, September 22, 1943, as amended, and in accordance with authority contained in paragraph

4, section I, circular 66, headquarters, First United States Army, May 18, 1944, the following-named officers and enlisted men are awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action:

* * * * *

Teno Roncalio, O1298441, first lieutenant (then second lieutenant), Company A, Eighteenth Infantry. For gallantry in action in Normandy, France, June 12, 1944.

Residence at appointment: Laramie, Wyo.

* * * * *

By command of Major General Huebner:

S. B. MASON,
Colonel, G. S. C.,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

LEONIDAS GAVALAS,
Lieutenant Colonel, A. G. D.,
Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS, EIGHTEENTH INFANTRY,
A. P. O. 1, U. S. Army, August 1, 1944.

GENERAL ORDERS, NO. 11

II. Under the provisions of War Department circular No. 186, dated May 11, 1944, the following-named officers and enlisted men are awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge, effective January 1, 1944, for exemplary conduct in action against the enemy:

Roncalio, Teno, second lieutenant, O-1298441.

* * * * *

By order of Colonel Smith:

DON O. CURRIER,
Captain, Infantry, Adjutant.

Official:

DON O. CURRIER,
Captain, Infantry, Adjutant.

LABOR SUPPLY ON FARMS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, we are all concerned about the great drain upon the labor supply on the farms of our country. In my opinion we have been confronted with a direct contravention of the Tydings amendment in the drafting of farm labor. In order that all Senators may read them, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, three letters which I have received from substantial farmers residing in the State of Indiana, which set forth the situation this draft problem presents.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANOLA STOCK FARM,
Economy, Ind.

Senator WILLIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to tell you of my problem, which is only one of many in Wayne County.

My farm consists of 320 acres, a dairy; also sheep, hogs, and the crops of corn, soybeans, wheat, oats, hay, and poultry.

I have 2 sons who help operate this farm, one 15 years old, a freshman in school, and a 19-year-old boy. The latter has received his induction papers for February 28. I asked the local board if they would defer him at least until school was out, but they refused. I then went to the State board, but they also refused.

I am telling you of my case, as I know it is best, but only last month about 40 boys were sent from this county and almost all of them farmed from 200 to 400 acres.

If Washington officials think farmers are going ahead just the same, they are in for a good fooling. If you have any knowledge of the farm situation, you know hiring help other than what we already have is impossible. As in my case I will have to reduce by half, and that is the general trend of those whose help has gone.

In the case of our local board, one of the members told me they had to take the farmers, as industry can get theirs deferred. If the Tydings amendment amounts to anything, why doesn't Congress see that it is enforced. We farmers are mighty tired of this and ready to quit. Maybe when food supplies get low enough, Washington will wake up, but already it is very late.

Can't something be done?

Sincerely,

WAYNE WILLIAMSON.

ALFA-KORN FARM,
Syracuse, Ind., February 12, 1945.

Hon. RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you in regard to the policies of Selective Service in our State as affecting farm boys between 18 and 26 years of age.

It seems to me, and to many others, queer about how this problem is being handled.

Just before these boys were called in for their physical examinations last Tuesday, February 6, we were told that it was not expected that these boys would be inducted into service immediately. However, in talking to our local board Friday, February 9, I was told to prepare for induction of my hired hand and partner, Eldon Watkins, who has been with me 8 years.

The board seemed to think that all boys in this age group who were not living on and managing their own farms would be called very soon. I also understand that our appeal board has been instructed to turn more or less a cold shoulder to any appeals being made on behalf of these boys. To my way of thinking this is very unnecessary and unfair. There is something very peculiar and hard to understand about the sudden haste of trying to get these farm boys into the Army.

This boy, Eldon Watkins, has been deferred continuously under the provisions of the Tydings amendment without any special request on my part except that I asked for his first deferment. He is now 23 years old and just received his class II-C deferment in December extending to June 13.

I am not seeking any special favors, but looking the situation squarely in the face. I think something should be done to stop this mad rush until this situation can be given a fair appraisal.

If all these young men are taken away from our community production will be given a terrible set-back. This boy combined 300 acres last year besides helping operate over 250 acres, raising 200 hogs and milking 10 cows. Our production will be cut back 75 percent if he is taken away.

They claim that our county has too many deferments in ratio with other counties of the State. I am not in position to know about this. However, I do know that Kosciusko County has 3,300 farms and is one of the largest counties in Indiana. Much of the floating labor in our community is employed, in the spring, summer, and fall, by city folks who come to the lake resorts. The wages and working conditions there are too attractive for them to even consider working in a harvest field or driving a tractor.

I am sure there are many people in this county who are of the same opinion as I, but it would be a great task indeed under present conditions to get their signature to a petition. Therefore, I am appealing to you, in person, to use your utmost influence to obtain a just consideration of this highly important question at once. I feel that delay will mean disaster.

Yours sincerely,

SHERMAN DEATON.

P. S.—Copy of this letter is being sent to Senator CAPEHART, also our Governor, Ralph Gates, of Indiana.

HAMILTON, IND., *February 15, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR: You folks in Washington have us country folks dizzy. We are almost as bad as Mrs. Roosevelt—don't know whether we are coming or going.

Is the Tydings amendment a law or a myth?

In a few weeks it will be time for us to put out our crops and get at our spring work, but will we have help to harvest our crops? What can we expect?

On one news broadcast General Hershey says by July 1 every able-bodied man under 26 will be in the Army and on the next broadcast someone will say all essential farm workers will be left at home. We know that isn't so, for they have just inducted our son in the service. He is now stationed at Camp Hood in Texas.

We farm 590 acres in Steuben County, Ind., and help look after and manage 440 acres in Williams County, Ohio, owned by the Edon Hoop & Lumber Co., in which we own a two-thirds interest; also, buy the timber and help to keep the mill going that manufactures bushel-basket material for fruit packages—another essential agriculture product.

Now, in my mind, if there is a boy in the country that is essential, my son should have filled that requirement because he looked after all of the machinery and kept it running, besides combining and picking corn for our neighbors—all the time he could spare from home. I have now two hired men—one hired since my son left—both under 26 and good boys to work, but neither qualified to go ahead and do the work my son did.

I don't know whether you are personally acquainted with our farming or not, but would like for you to check with such men as Clyde Carlin, Girt Gnagy, Juddy Gilbert, John Taylor, Paul Bachlor, Carl Redding, Cary Covell, or anyone that knows.

If it wouldn't be too much bother for you, wish you would take this matter up with CLIFF CLEVENGER, as my son lived in Edon and was drafted in Bryan, Cliff's home town.

He could ask such men as Bill Knepper, Russel Maxwell, Harlan Pool, Art Mauerhan, Gus Gephart, Charles Freyman, or anyone he cares to ask.

You know a father is a poor person to judge his own son, I would rather someone else did that and I guess they did, but I still think they made a mistake.

I look on an Army as a football team, composed of 11 men, but only 1 carrying the ball and he wouldn't get very far if it wasn't for the other 10.

Now I am not writing this letter to you to keep my son out of the Army (he is in the Army). I thought maybe some of these draft boards needed checking, because I know if they take boys out of agriculture all over the United States like my son, it will just be too bad.

They are making a mistake they will never forget, because it will just be impossible for the rest of us to raise enough food to go around, and it takes time to raise a crop; you can't do it overnight.

There are only a few days to put out a crop, a week too soon or a week too late is all wrong and lots of times will cut your crop in half.

I don't think there is anything personal in drafting my son because neither of us even knew who was on the board, neither did I go and try to get him deferred; that is their job and I sure don't begrudge them their job either. This draft business needs clearing up at once because there is no use in planting a crop if you can't harvest it, and planting time is just around the corner. I am not the only farmer that don't know where I am at. There are millions just like me.

Yours truly,

M. E. DEWIRE.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator would not yield the floor at this time and let us finish the routine morning business. I understand the Senator desires to address the Senate for about 15 minutes. As the Senator knows, under the rule of the Senate no Senator may speak more than 5 minutes until we finish the morning hour. I wonder if the Senator would not yield so that we may conclude the routine morning business.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am perfectly willing to do that. I had no intention of interfering with the morning hour.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF M. V. A. BILL (S. 555)—POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). There is on the desk Senate Resolution 78 coming over from a previous day.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 78, submitted by me calls for the discharge of the Commerce Committee from the further consideration of the so-called M. V. A. bill, Senate bill 555. I ask that the resolution go over for a week from next Monday. I make the request because of the fact that a number of Senators are absent who are very anxious to be present on the floor when that matter is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR WAR AIMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "Our War Aims," delivered by him at the Roosevelt-Truman-Wagner victory dinner at the Commodore Hotel, New York, on February 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PALESTINE AND THE "FOUR FREEDOMS"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "Palestine and the 'Four Freedoms'," delivered by him at the annual dinner of the Zionist Organization of Philadelphia, at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO YUGOSLAVIA BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "Tribute to Yugoslavia," delivered by Senator MURRAY at the Yugoslavia dinner, in New York, February 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLLABORATION OF CHINESE WITH ALLIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOWNEY

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him broadcast by the O. W. I. to the people of China, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY TODAY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FERGUSON

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address, delivered by Senator FERGUSON in Springfield, Ill., February 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURFEW ON ENTERTAINMENT PLACES—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM L. SHIRER

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the recent order imposing a midnight curfew on the Nation's entertainment places delivered by William L. Shirer on February 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LAW AND PEACE—POEM BY JAMES P. McGOVERN

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem, entitled "Law and Peace," written by James P. McGovern, and originally printed in the Journal of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE YALTA AGREEMENT—EDITORIAL FROM SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Crimean Agreement One of Mankind's Great Documents," published in the Salt Lake Tribune, of Salt Lake City, Utah, in the issue of February 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIBERATION OF PRISONERS ON LUZON—LETTER BY SGT. MILO MORTENSEN

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Sgt. Milo Mortensen and published under the heading "Mortensen helps liberate Japheld United States prisoners," in the Parowan Times, of Parowan, Utah, of the issue of February 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 626) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

THE TRAGEDY OF ALBANIA—LETTER FROM SERGEANT PRIFTI TO SENATOR MYERS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter which I received from a young man who is my next door neighbor, and who is now serving in the armed forces in Albania. It is a short letter, and I should like to read it for the information of the Senate:

JANUARY 18, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: It was in front of your house on a hot summer night last July, that I spoke to you about my parents. I volunteered to come overseas a third time so I could locate my parents.

Albania is free now, but what a terrible price she paid. Like Czechoslovakia, Albania, too, had its Lidice—my village birthplace—Borova.

Christmas I was hoping to be with my parents but instead I had a reunion with oblivion.

My parents, 31 of my immediate relatives, children, young girls, old women, and men were massacred and burned to death in the most brutal blood crime by the German barbarians—as reprisal. All the village population wiped out by the now world-famous German extermination methods. There's no end to their atrocities.

I am a citizen of America and so were my parents. I am left alone now with a brother in the Navy, and I swear now that we are not through with these twentieth-century barbarians that have brought humanity so much suffering, misery, and hardships. They shall pay for all that.

* * * * *

Most respectfully,

Sergeant PRIFTI.

HENRY WALLACE—EDITORIAL FROM THE COMMONWEAL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial published in the February 9 issue of the Commonweal, which is a well-known national weekly publication. The last sentence of the editorial is as follows:

It is our honest conviction that Henry Wallace is one of the few men in Washington who can successfully fight to protect the American institutions we cherish against the "wave of the future."

This editorial, as will be noted, concerns Mr. Wallace and in my opinion merits the serious consideration of every Senator. The name of Henry A. Wallace has taken the country by storm. Within the last month I have received in my office some 2,000 communications regarding his nomination. They have come from all sections of Pennsylvania—from farmers, miners, and businessmen, from labor, and the church. With few exceptions they say: "I urge you to vote to confirm the appointment of Henry Wallace for Secretary of Commerce."

Why are the people so concerned? Why do they express themselves thus?

It is because Mr Wallace is concerned about the future of America. His concern is for the welfare of all the people—the farmer, the steel worker, the miner, the businessman, and the storekeeper. It is because he joins with President Roosevelt in espousing an economic bill of rights for all the people. It is because he has a program which should guarantee to the people of America their full enjoyment of those economic freedoms. And it is because he believes that permanent peace can be built only upon a foundation of military and economic security.

Mr. Wallace's name has come to mean jobs after the war—a decent job at a decent wage. This is of great importance to my constituents. For in the State of Pennsylvania we have some 90,000 miners, 50,000 shipyard workers, 16,000 automobile workers, 300,000 steel workers, and 100,000 electrical workers. We are producing twice as much now as we did before the war; but most of this expansion is of war duration only. To guarantee a job for everyone after the war, a job for all of those boys who are fighting in the Pacific and in Europe, we must find ways of expanding our economy. We must increase our volume

of foreign trade and we must enlarge our industries at home; and Mr. Wallace has proven that he will work with the President to accomplish these ends.

He has demonstrated splendid administrative ability. He made a great Secretary of Agriculture, during a period when farmers were losing their crops and their farms. By initiating such projects as soil conservation, crop insurance, rural electrification, farm security, and the food-stamp plan Mr. Wallace saved farmers from economic ruin. It was at this time, too, that he supervised the lending of more than $6,000,000,000.

And, finally, Mr. Wallace is a practical man. He does not fear the future but boldly faces the problems of the future. He is no dreamer of idle dreams, but cries out to all of us: "Let us make America worthy of the dreams of all our fighting men."

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial from the Commonweal be published as a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENRY WALLACE

The fight over Mr. Wallace's appointment to the secretaryship of Commerce has during the last week reached a new low in misrepresentation and recrimination; Mr. Wallace's own attitude has been so frank and straightforward that one feels a notable increase in popular esteem for him. His statement before the Senate committee and his testimony after the statement were admirable. They showed that he possesses a true grasp of the economic problems which confront us and which will acutely confront us when the war is over. It is an unusual thing for the editors of any publication to see someone in Washington precisely stating, at a public hearing, the views on economic and social matters which those same editors have developed as their own. Often a partial agreement exists, but almost never total coincidence. Mr. Wallace's advocacy of genuine free enterprise—as distinguished from monopoly control—is what the Commonweal has advocated. Mr. Wallace's advocacy of reasonably full employment after the war we view as an essential goal, if we are to avoid social disorder and economic disintegration. Mr. Wallace's advocacy of a fuller and richer life for all the American people we likewise advocate. In a recent book, Chinese Wit, Wisdom, and Written Characters, reviewed 2 weeks ago in the Commonweal, there is a most significant quotation from Confucius: "First enrich the people, then teach them." As far as we can see, this is the only viable program for producing a better world—with the understanding, of course, that in the process we do not breed a nation of materialists. Mr. Wallace is no materialist.

The question of his ability to administer the vast lending powers of the Federal Government is surely answered in his own testimony on his activities in the Department of Agriculture. Lending small sums to hordes of separate individuals and achieving a higher repayment rate than did Mr. Jones with his large sums lent to relatively few corporations is something which no fair-minded person can dismiss.

Mr. Wallace's lending task as Secretary of Agriculture would certainly have been viewed as far the more dubious enterprise by any banker. The fact that he succeeded even better than Mr. Jones should, if there were no prejudice in the case, recommend him to the business community. That it does not recommend him is largely a matter of real hatred resulting from unscrupulous propaganda on the part of interested small groups throughout the country—principally, big farmers and monopolistic big business. That there should be an active National Businessmen's Committee for Wallace, including a number of pretty large-scale operators, bankers, and industrialists, should make it clear that Wallace was stating the simple truth when he said: "The current situation is not one of personalities, neither is it one of personal prestige."

These words, by the way, are from a speech given in New York, January 29, before the members of the Union for Democratic Action and under the auspices of the New Republic. Such a group would scarcely include any great number of Catholics, yet Mr. Wallace chose to play what can only be called an innocent prank upon his audience. In discussing the dangers of vast accumulated wealth in private hands, he said: "The measure of the power of this octopus is the extraordinary attack which is going on against me right now. With regard to financial power let me quote from a very experienced observer: 'In our days not alone is wealth accumulated but immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few; and those few are frequently not the owners but only the trustees and directors of invested funds who administer them at their good pleasure. This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the lifeblood to the entire economic body, and grasping, as it were, in their hands the very soul of production so that no one dare breathe against their will.'"

Mr. Wallace then coyly continued: "This is from a statement by one of the world's great leaders and I shall be interested in discovering which newspapers or radio man is the first to identify the author. The analysis, which was made in 1930, still fits. I have pondered many times on the significance of the statement as I have sat in the United States Capitol and watched the economic forces at work." Is it necessary to inform our readers that the author of this statement was Pius XI?

Not only do we see in Henry Wallace a man with very nearly precisely the same social ideals as our own, but we see in him a man deeply concerned for the spiritual in human life and a man who has broadened and grown thanks to his administrative experience. Many things he has done and said in the past we have disapproved; some thoroughly honest critics see in him a nascent totalitarian leader who intends to regulate the lives of every last American. But we believe that Mr. Wallace would himself be critical today of many of the things we criticized in the past; and we are confident that his character is such that the role of totalitarian leadership would be completely repugnant to him and therefore quite impossible. What we would fear much more is that if Mr. Wallace is relegated to private life, a far less desirable person, to whom great power without check or hindrance would be far from repugnant, might be given the job.

By the time these lines appear in print, the Senate may well have acted and Mr. Wallace may never be Secretary of Commerce. But we view this struggle as being of such major importance that we wish to express our approval of his appointment, at least for the sake of the record. It is our honest conviction that Henry Wallace is one of the few men in Washington who can successfully fight to protect the American institutions we cherish against the "wave of the future."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I could not hear clearly on this side of the Chamber how much the Senator said Mr. Wallace had saved the country by means of the food-stamp plan.

Mr. MYERS. I did not mention any particular amount. I said that Mr. Wallace was largely responsible for initiating the food-stamp plan.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is concluded. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND].

FREE COMMUNICATION AND EXCHANGE OF NEWS IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, all of us are interested in plans for keeping the peace; all of us want a future peaceful world; but I am not so idealistic or visionary as to believe that peace can only be won either by talking about it or by maintaining it by force of arms. History and common sense tell us that the surest way of keeping peace is to remove the causes of war, or at least, as many of those causes as reasonably may be eliminated.

I do not want to be understood as in any way detracting from or disparaging the monumental work now being done in connection with the formulation of a world organization to maintain the peace. I was in fact, if I may say so without drawing an invidious comparison, the first in this Chamber to introduce a resolution which proposed a comprehensive study of facts which would enter into the peace settlement. I was of the opinion that many controversial subjects such as boundary disputes could have been worked out more in keeping with American ideals as a part and parcel of our lend-lease assistance to the Allies before we were actually involved in the war. But that time and that opportunity have passed; so we must now proceed in accordance with conditions as they exist today. Boundaries always have been one cause of war, but there are others.

To remove these causes requires intelligent and realistic planning. I desire to speak briefly today, Mr. President, on one phase of this subject. It is one which, unfortunately, is neither dramatic nor eye-catching; it does not receive much publicity, but on the other hand, it is a very important problem and will become more important in the post-war program. Programs for 60,000,000 post-war jobs, or medical care for every citizen, or plans whereby this country will buy more from the world than it sells but at the same time maintain a high level of prosperity, or pronouncements as to just what the relationships should be between the major powers of the world, are all of general interest and easy to discuss. These are big things on which everybody has rather positive views. It is the little things that help shape these bigger things, however, and it has always seemed to me that if we went along, day by day, steadily plugging away at the little things, the big things would pretty well take care of themselves.

One of these little things which has big implications is the subject of communications—the exchange of information and news and intelligence between the peoples of the world and the nations of the world. In recent months, more and more of our important people have interested themselves in this subject. Our newspapers and press associations are attempting to dramatize the importance of a free, uncensored, communications system in the world as a means of helping prevent wars. For example, Mr. Kent Cooper, managing director of the Associated Press, has asserted time and again that it is vital that our Government insist that any final peace treaty between the powers guarantee that there shall be a free exchange of news between all lands. His idea is that if people know the truth, it will be difficult if not impossible for future would-be dictators or other leaders to take them into war. Mr. Cooper's thesis is based on the premise that there never has been any free exchange of news in the world. I think it is well to illustrate this briefly.

For example, correspondents of American newspapers or press associations in most countries, particularly European countries, always found it difficult, if not impossible, to send from those countries important stories which involved high policy of governments or powerful individuals. The story either was conveniently lost, garbled, delayed, or modified in transmission, or the correspondent might be politely told that it would be better not to send such a story, the underlying threat always being that the correspondent, the newspaper, or the press association would lose press privileges. This, in itself, is bad. It prevents the dissemination of important intelligence which serves to mold public opinion, not only in our own country, but also in other countries, including the very country in which the news originates, but whose people, of course, are denied the news.

But even worse, is a situation which effectively prevents the transmission and dissemination of American news to other countries. I reveal no secrets when I tell the Senate that with rare exceptions during the past three decades, the stories about America which got the play in Europe and in Asia were those which concerned gangster killings, spectacular murders, sex triangles, or stories of intrigue or crookedness in high places. In short, our European neighbors were fully informed as to the bad things about America, the American people, and our customs and conditions. The good—the progress in Government or science, the improvement in social or industrial conditions, the higher standards of living, and a thousand other things which have made our land, with all its faults and problems, the ideal place in all this world in which to live and of which to be a citizen, the things which would prove to people of other lands that democracy was a way of life so desirable that all men everywhere would want to emulate it—these things were little known and are not now known to most of the rest of the world.

I am not so naive, nor is Mr. Cooper, as to believe for one moment that we can require as a part of a peace treaty that every nation on earth guarantee to its own people absolute freedom of the press. There is the question of national sovereignty. We could not, even if we wanted to, tell other nations and governments that they must enact such national laws as would permit the fullest freedom of information. And even if this were possible or desirable, I know of no way by which we or other governments could require newspaper publishers to print all the news. Even here, that does not happen. But what Mr. Cooper, and others who are concerned with this problem, envisage is such a situation that at least there will be the fullest opportunity for the exchange of news between countries, relying on the fact that such an exchange eventually will expand the degree of free press that may exist. In short, it is the belief that in all countries there will be some high-minded, liberal souls who will see the merit of publishing, by press or radio, free, uncensored, and untrammeled news.

The real basis of this problem of a world-wide free press lies fundamentally in low rates for the transmission of news stories all over the world. It lies in equal rates for all press users of the same facilities. That is not the situation now, nor has it ever been. For example, American newspapers and press associations are obviously at a disadvantage when they must pay a higher rate for each word than newspapers of some other country simply because the transmission facilities are the property of the other country or of its nationals. Nor is the American press aided by the fact that American communications companies are forced into the position of bidding ruinously against each other for the favor of another country's business. In practically every case the foreign communication enterprise is either government-owned or government-dominated, and, in effect, the foreign government conducts an auction whereby the American companies bid against each other in granting the lowest rate to the foreign business. That is competition, but it is a kind of competition which has neither strengthened our communications industry nor helped the users of American transmission facilities, simply because that kind of competition has forced the adoption of unequal rates.

What we need is an international agreement which will bring the cost of transmitting press dispatches all over the world so low that newspapers in all countries will be able to meet the cost of using world-wide news. But long before we can even begin to make high-sounding demands at a peace table for a world-wide free press, we must formulate plans for the creation of a communications policy and a communications enterprise which will adequately represent American interests. The plain fact is that we have no such policy and no such enterprise now and never have had.

It is surprising and shocking to those who talk about the greatness of the United States, but there is no denial of the fact that the Nation which is the richest, the most powerful, and the greatest industrially and commercially and, therefore, the most concerned with foreign trade, has been and is now a third-rate power in communications.

Unfortunately the great majority of Americans are not very much concerned about this situation. The great majority of Americans take communications pretty much for granted, like the Postal Service, or water supply, or electricity. The vital importance of communications has never been sufficiently dramatized so that we can understand how much they enter into our daily lives.

But American business and commerce know something about the value of an effective, free, and economical communications service. And our military arms—the Army and Navy—also know something about its importance. This war has brought home to us as never before just how vital adequate communications are to the waging of war. I cannot hope to discuss, even briefly, the technical aspects of this problem; but I can say this much—that even had we had on December 7, 1941, a vast army, a two-ocean navy, and all the matériel necessary to maintain such military forces, we still could not have waged effective war, simply because we lacked the right kind of a communications system. The year that it took us to build an army and to ready our economy for war gave us time to build a vast communications empire—an empire made up in part of the facilities of our commercial companies, and in greater part of an entirely new system, the largest communications system in the world, but operated by the Army and the Navy. Much of this story is still necessarily untold, for reasons of wartime security, but some day it will be known. It is the reason why the Army and the Navy officers are seriously concerned today with the creation of an effective post-war American communications system, privately owned and operated, which will not leave this Nation in the lurch should disaster threaten again in the future.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize the importance of the problem before us. There is much concern about the post-war world—about our foreign trade, about world-girdling aviation routes, about our merchant fleet, about exporting the products of our mills and factories and farms. But none of this can be done without proper planning for communications.

Such planning must be intelligent, forthright, and farseeing. It must be based on the greatest good for our own Nation. It must give consideration to the fact that American communications must be as sovereign as it is possible to make them in this world, always giving consideration to the rights of other nations. It must take into consideration the fact that the radio spectrum, already overcrowded, will have to accommodate the requirements of other nations which, up to recent years, have not made fullest use of allocations. It must take into consideration that American communication companies, in dealing with other nations and their wholly owned or dominated communications companies, have been at an economic disadvantage in rate bargainings. It must take into consideration the vast investment in communications facilities

of the newest and finest type by the Army and the Navy, scattered all over the world, and the fact that our allies are already reluctant to hand back to us such equipments, even though we need them for expanding military operations.

I cite these facts, Mr. President, because increasing attention on the part of the Army and the Navy and other Government departments has been given to the matter of actively proposing and endorsing, as a first step, a plan for the creation of a single, integrated American communications company engaged in overseas or international traffic.

That is one view. There are others. But there is no disagreement over one fact, namely, that something must be done to improve American international communications.

Congress is not wholly unaware of this problem. We know that despite the magnificent wartime job which has been done, our international communications companies have not afforded an adequate peacetime communications system commensurate with this Nation's preeminent world position. Because of that fact, the Senate, more than a year ago, authorized a study to be made of this problem. That study grew in part out of the original investigation of domestic communications, and it resulted in legislation to make possible the merger of the two domestic telegraph companies. I think it is well to remind the Senate that the original recommendations, made nearly 4 years ago, called attention to the international communications situation and cited the need for action on it, even before Pearl Harbor. The current study of international communications has gone on since last April; important facts have been adduced. I hope, and I know that the other members of the committee studying the communications problem also hope, that we shall soon be able to move forward actively with legislative proposals which will give us an adequate post-war communications system.

REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, does the Senator desire to insert a matter in the RECORD?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to submit a conference report on Senate bill 340, a measure to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, and I desire to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. HILL. I do not desire to delay the Senator. Does he anticipate that consideration of the report will take very long?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am in hope that it will not take very much time at all.

Mr. HILL. Let me inquire whether the conferees are in unanimous agreement regarding the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. They are.

Mr. HILL. Was the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] a member of the conference committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. He was.

Mr. HILL. Was he in full accord with the report?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; he signed the report which I hold in my hand. All the the confereees have signed the report.

Mr. HILL. I knew that the Senator from Wyoming had some views which perhaps were different from those of the chairman of the committee and of other Senators on the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know that. In the last 2 days we have gone over his views and other views, and we have just concluded our considerations.

Mr. HILL. I take it that the Senator from Wyoming has signed the report and is agreeable to having it now considered; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. He has signed it in its present form, as I would file it.

Mr. HILL. Then, I suppose the Senator from Wyoming does not desire to be present when it is filed and considered. Does the Senator from Nevada know whether that is true?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have just parted with him in the room of the Committee on the Judiciary. He knew I was coming to the floor to move the consideration of the report. That is the only answer I can give.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not know what is contained in the report; but I do know there has been a widespread interest in its subject matter. It would seem to me that if the report is to be considered, other Senators who may not be familiar with the proceedings in the conference committee should be given notice and a quorum should be present, so that all Members of the Senate would be able to hear the Senator's explanation of the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, under the circumstances I do not think I can yield at this time for that purpose. Perhaps by the time I have concluded my remarks, which will not be very lengthy, other Senators will have entered the Chamber, and it will be possible to proceed with the consideration of the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then, Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield long enough to permit me to file the report and send it to the desk.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator that I hope to be able to proceed with consideration and disposition of the report this afternoon, if possible.

The report was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

"SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

"(b) No Act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such Act specifically relates to the business of insurance: *Provided*, That after January 1, 1948, the Act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the Act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the Act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by state law.

"SEC. 3. (a) Until January 1, 1948, the Act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the Act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the Act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct thereof.

"(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

"SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the Act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or the Act of June 5, 1920, known as the Merchant Marine Act, 1920.

"SEC. 5. As used in this Act, the term "State" includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 6. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected."

And the House agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

PHOSPHATE AND THE LAND—WHAT THEY MEAN TO THE FARMER AND OUR COUNTRY

Mr. HILL. Men—both laymen and experts—may differ in their predictions about the date of V-day in Europe and in the Pacific, but everyone agrees that victory is approaching. We have accepted as a current responsibility preparation for peace while we continue to

wage a war. Some problems of conversion from war to peace already have been considered in this body. Some decisions have been reached. But one major question has had little public discussion and no consideration here, in my judgment. No issue is more important to the security of our democracy. I refer to the future of our land—the soil—from which we feed our people and from which a large part of our population directly receives its income and its livelihood. It is this vital and challenging problem that I wish to discuss briefly today.

Of course, we have talked about the future of food production on this floor. The press is replete with official statements and forecasts about crops, the demand for and the supply of different commodities, and the prices at which they are to be sold. But nothing is said about the soil itself, the source from which the food derives its nourishment, and the fiber its strength.

After the First World War we had a severe and dramatic lesson. We learned at tragic cost what happens when we lost sight of the land and consider only the disposition of its harvests. We learned then that excessive cropping of the richest acres will exact its price in loss of soil fertility. Scientists and soil experts had known for a long time that the land would lose its power to produce unless the vital mineral and chemical elements—the phosphorus, potash, nitrogen, and the others—which are drawn from the soil in the growth of crops were constantly replenished. They warned us of disaster, if we continued to be concerned solely with food and not at all with soil, but we were reckless with the wealth of our new land. We paid little heed as a nation. We did nothing about it. And for the violation of Nature's law we paid dearly in loss of production, loss of income, and loss in the greatest of all our capital assets—the soil itself.

The danger faces us again. In the past 4 years the farmers of America have been called upon to produce unprecedented quantities of food. They have done a magnificent job. But let us not forget—what almost every farmer knows—that a heavy toll has been exacted from the fertility of every acre which has borne the burden of this huge production job. Once more we have been spending our capital. Unless something is done about it, and done now, the consequences of that abundant production will add to the costs and losses of this war long after the guns have ceased firing and the armies have been demobilized. I hope we have learned our lesson well enough so that this Congress will be willing to accept its responsibility to do something about it.

There is no excuse for inaction or delay. Whatever the situation was a quarter century ago, today we know what can be done to keep the soils of our Nation on the way to continued production with sustained and restored fertility. The experts knew how to do it on test plots and on experiment station farms 25 years ago. Today we know how it can be done in actual farming operations. That is the difference. We have learned through a practical demonstration carried on over a 10-year period by over 40,000 farmers in 29 States. These 40,000 farmers have been pioneering in a demonstration which, I firmly believe, is the most important development in American agriculture in our time. Cooperating with the T. V. A. in a Nation-wide experiment, these farmers have changed their whole farm management. They have increased their soil's fertility while increasing its production. They have restored the precious mineral phosphate to their land.

In April of 1943 here on the floor of the Senate I told the story of this magic mineral and described how it had changed the course of farming and restored fertility to the soil of more than 40,000 farms. An average of 17 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre had been used on these T. V. A. test-demonstration farms instead of the average use of 2 pounds per acre in the country as a whole. I described how as a result the farmers had increased their war food production from 30 to 60 percent, without any more manpower or more machinery, and without impoverishing their soil. I told how, in my section of the country, barren, eroded acres worn out with the production of cotton had been restored by the use of phosphate and lay green and fertile, supporting dairy cattle and meat animals. I cited results on actual farms where the quality as well as quantity of food—of eggs and milk—had been dramatically improved. I pointed out how the experience of these demonstrators, using the highly concentrated phosphatic fertilizer produced by T. V. A. at Muscle Shoals, had increased the demand for phosphatic fertilizer on the part of their neighbors who had watched the methods and the results achieved by demonstration farmers.

In the Tennessee Valley alone, as a result of intensive demonstration, the demand for phosphatic fertilizers from commercial sources had increased almost five times as much as the rate of increase for the country as a whole. It was a success story—the result of a new program of public education. There was only one discordant note in the story. I was obliged to point out that it would be impossible for the farmers of the country as a whole to apply the lessons learned by these 40,000 demonstration farmers because there was not sufficient phosphatic fertilizer being produced to meet the national need.

I urged then, nearly 2 years ago, that steps be taken to increase the production of phosphatic fertilizers in amounts sufficient to permit American agriculture to match the increasing drain upon the land fertility with the restoring powers of phosphate. I contended that a minimum annual supply of 3,400,000 tons of P_2O_5 should be made available, more than twice the amount the fertilizer industry then expected to distribute in 1943, in order to permit the farmers of the great Mississippi Valley, and the land to the east and south, to profit by the experience of the demonstration farmers. This I told the Senate in April 1943. To produce the minimum amount required, I urged the fertilizer industry to put its idle capacity to work. I urged that new plants be built. I called upon the War Production Board to release the critical materials needed to construct a new plant which Congress had authorized the T. V. A. to build a year before. That plant was ready to be built near Mobile, Ala., on the Gulf coast, within reach of the large reserves of Florida phosphate rock. Further, I urged that designs be prepared for the immediate post-war construction of plants in order to use the large deposits of phosphate rock in the West, lying in Montana, Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming. My conviction was then, as it is now, that there was and is a critical shortage of capacity to produce phosphatic fertilizer in this country.

The fertilizer industry, upon which the American farmer is completely dependent for his supply of soil minerals, disagreed with my position. Through its official spokesman, the Fertilizer Review, it proclaimed in pious voice and with imposing charts: "There is no shortage of phosphate; there is no need for more plants. We can supply all the farmer will buy."

What the fertilizer industry meant, of course, was that they were prepared to continue to supply the amount of phosphate the farmer had purchased in the past. They were heedless of the needs of the soil. They disregarded the evidence of the results obtained on 40,000 farms as well as the reports of the T. V. A., and were indifferent to the rising demand for more phosphate in the Tennessee Valley where the demonstrations of the use of the product produced by the T. V. A. at Muscle Shoals were most widely known.

But in October of 1943, just a few months after my speech on this floor, there came to my support an authoritative report from a special committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. That committee on preservation of phosphate resources and their national use included a group of distinguished agricultural and engineering scientists and educators, whose devotion to the public interest and the future of our Nation's soil and agriculture cannot be questioned. I want the Senate to know the names and affiliations of these men. They were: E. G. Peterson, chairman, president of Utah State College; R. M. Green, president of Colorado State College; C. A. Mooers, director, Tennessee experiment station, University of Tennessee; E. J. Iddings, dean of agriculture and director of Idaho experiment station and extension service, University of Idaho; and H. A. Curtis, dean of College of Engineering, University of Missouri.

This committee, composed of scientists, educators, and engineers, had been engaged in a study of phosphate supply for many months. Their report, which I laid before the Senate in the RECORD of February 10, 1944, carefully analyzes the results of the T. V. A. and land-grant college test-demonstration program and its bearing upon the adequacy of available phosphate fertilizers. I quote from the report of this distinguished committee:

Inasmuch as phosphorus is the key element in the conservation of soil fertility, the

correct use of an adequate supply of phosphatic fertilizer is fundamental to national welfare. The scope of the problem of supply is broad. Indications are that at least 80 percent of the soils of the United States are now deficient in phosphorus.

* * * * *

Taken as a whole, the results obtained on the 30,000 farms participating (i. e. at the time of this report) in the test-demonstration program are of unsurpassed importance in reducing to a quantitative basis the benefits which can come from the intelligent use of phosphatic fertilizers in a system of correct farm management.

The results emphasize the needs of a new approach to the whole problem of phosphate supply for agriculture. The situation is only confused by citing statistics of the sales of fertilizers as a measure of the agricultural need of phosphate. The quantity of phosphate necessary to maintain soil fertility, without which permanent agriculture is doomed, cannot be measured by the amount which the farmers have been able to buy under the unfavorable conditions which have prevailed in regard to supply and price.

On the test-demonstration farms mentioned above it has been shown that phosphate equivalent to 17 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre per year, in combination with lime, can be used advantageously and economically under good farm management. If this rate of application were made on only the farms in the humid areas of the United States, the total requirements would be for 3,400,000 tons of P_2O_5 per year. The fertilizer industry claims to have a production capacity of somewhere between 1,500,000 and 1,700,000 tons per year, although actual production in 1943, when phosphate is so desperately needed, will be only about 1,100,000 tons.

The committee goes on to say in its report:

The need of agriculture for phosphate should be measured by the amount necessary to maintain permanent agriculture, and it is time to cease measuring need in terms of what the fertilizer industry is prepared to sell.

It is obvious—

Says the committee—

that a very great expansion of phosphatic fertilizer production is needed if soil fertility is to be maintained in this country, and if farmers are to have the opportunity to use what they can effectively use.

After studying this report of these distinguished land-grant college scientists, engineers, and educators, I became more determined than ever that no time should be lost in doing something to remove the threat to the present and future productivity of our soil, which is the basis of our greatest private enterprise, namely, farming.

On June 23 of last year I introduced a bill, S. 2035, to provide for the formulation of a national fertilizer policy and program. I reintroduced the bill at the beginning of the present session of Congress, and it is now before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate.

In presenting my bill to the Senate for study and consideration, I again urged that Congress should recognize what farmers have known a long time, that the minerals which make soil fertile and food nourishing are being removed from the land at a greater rate than they are being replaced. I contended then, as I contend now, that Congress must realize that the individual farmer is powerless to do anything about it. He is at the mercy of the fertilizer industry. The only way he can replace the basic minerals such as phosphate and potash is through fertilizer, and for his fertilizer he is dependent upon a highly organized industry whose practices and pricing policies have never been based upon the need for restoring and conserving soil fertility.

Once more my efforts provoked a quick response from the fertilizer industry through its spokesman, Mr. Charles Brand, executive secretary of the National Fertilizer Association and editor of the Fertilizer Review. In the April-May-June issue of the Fertilizer Review, Mr. Brand editorially reiterated the industry's claim to be able to supply all the phosphate the farmer needs. He went on to say:

What is there about that great and fundamental field of private enterprise, the production and distribution of commercial fertilizers, that year after year allures certain vote-seeking politicians to attempt further invasion and regimentation?

What hope is there for American agriculture if such a contemptuous sentence represents the spirit in which this private enterprise is facing one of the major problems of the post-war world? The fertilizer industry, if it would, could permit the farmers of the South, the Middle West, and the East to restore to the land the phosphorus it needs and must have. It could do it at a profit. But the industry refuses to do it, and has the arrogance to regard public concern about a great national problem as an invasion of its vested right to produce the kind and amounts of fertilizer it prefers even if soil exhaustion is the price the Nation must pay. Actually, as we know from T. V. A.'s experience, the program I presented would expand the market of the fertilizer industry and lessen the risks of its purely business venture.

The bill I have introduced is no threat to any fertilizer manufacturer and distributor who feels an obligation to provide farm users with the minerals their land requires. It is no threat to any fertilizer manufacturer who is willing to move with the times, who has faith in the future of agriculture in this country. On the contrary, the national fertilizer policy bill is an invitation to the industry to prepare itself for a Nation-wide increase in the demand for such of their products as meet the needs of the soil. It is an invitation for the industry to take its share of responsibility and opportunity in making agriculture in this Nation permanently strong, productive, and prosperous. I should like to remind the fertilizer industry that its future, like the future of all of us, is dependent absolutely upon the future of American agriculture. I should like to emphasize that soil fertility is of the same concern no matter whether we have food surpluses or food shortages. Phosphate is the lever by which the farmer can change his cropping systems, diversify his agriculture, conserve his soil's capital to be responsive to the needs of future generations.

The fertilizer industry has been indifferent to the soil's need for phosphate. Its productive capacity, its advertising, its methods of distribution all reflect lack of concern for this essential factor in maintaining soil fertility. Even considered as businessmen, interested solely in their profits, the industry can take no pride in the accuracy of its estimates of the demands for phosphate. We have listened to its claims of abundance too long. Every soil scientist, and most farmers, would agree that there is a shortage, not an abundance, of phosphate measured by our national needs.

What are the facts with respect to actual current consumer demand? On August 14 last, more than a year after I endeavored to direct national attention to the shortage in phosphatic production, the War Production Board in an official announcement admitted that the fertilizer industry would be unable to meet the phosphatic fertilizer quota established for the current fiscal year, and would fail by 2,000,000 tons of superphosphate to meet the minimum requirement established by the War Food Administration. The announcement further stated that P. H. Groggins, Chief of the Chemicals and Fertilizers Branch of the War Food Administration, asserted at a meeting of the industry committee that from 7,250,000 to 7,500,000 tons of superphosphate are needed each year to replenish ingredients actually removed from the soil. And this estimate made no allowance for the vast additional amounts required for soil building. I wish to emphasize that we must make up for our years of neglect by rebuilding the fertility of millions of acres. We must have more than enough phosphate for current replacement.

Here was an admission from a new source that the fertilizer industry at this critical time could not even meet the anticipated demand, much less the acknowledged need for phosphate. I gain no consolation from this belated agreement with the prediction I made in the spring of 1943; but I welcome one encouraging development: This statement shows that Government officials close to the concerns of the industry itself are beginning to recognize what the land-grant college committee, the T. V. A., and at least the 40,000 test-demonstration farmers have known from actual and practical experience—that to maintain the soil's fertility, estimates of phosphate requirements must take account of the needs of the land and must not be solely concerned with the purchase records of the past. At long last, in August 1944 they began to talk of enough phosphate for soil building. This is a meager beginning toward a realistic method of establishing fertilizer requirements, but it leads me to hope that in time the War Food Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Production Board will join with the experts of the land-grant colleges, with the T. V. A., and with the demonstration pioneers in 29 States, and face the facts of soil depletion.

I have even found a further ray of hope in one of the industry's publications. In the American Fertilizer, September 9, 1944, there is an article by Mr. Vincent Sauchelli of the Davison Chemical Corporation, under the heading, "Phosphates: Present uses and future outlook in crop production in the United States—A challenging opportunity for the fertilizer industry." The article by

Mr. Sauchelli closes with these significant words:

We have given a broad, and necessarily general, survey of the present status and future outlook of the market possibilities of superphosphates. The consumption of this commodity can and should be increased. The need for more phosphorus on our crop lands and grazing lands has been convincingly demonstrated by experience and research. The post-war period is a challenge to the superphosphate industry to serve the Nation and itself in a positive and constructive way.

The time is short for consideration of this question. This is not a matter to be postponed. We need the declaration of a Government policy now on this basic problem. The problems of food supply, food production, and international trade in food and crops will be on the agenda of many conference groups which must meet to consider all the factors involved in the establishment of a fruitful and enduring peace. The place of phosphate in the restoration of a ravaged world must be the subject of discussions. The supplies of phosphate available before the war will be available again; but world requirements will most assuredly be much greater. The use of phosphate reserves will be a matter of vital concern to the farmers of Great Britain, of Russia, of China, of France, and most of the other countries. This is a question of vast importance to the peace and security of the world.

The farmers of Great Britain know the value of phosphate. When they plowed up their pastures which had been green for generations, to produce vegetables and grain during war years, they had to have more phosphate. This country supplied a substantial portion of their requirements. In 1940 the United States sent more phosphate to the British Isles than in the entire preceding 5-year period. The farmers of Holland and Denmark know the value of phosphate. Prior to the war enormous quantities of P_2O_5 were being applied to the soil of European countries, according to our standards. As long ago as 1928 records show that Holland was using an average of 40 pounds per acre, Denmark 20 pounds per acre. But neither country used as much as New Zealand, in the Pacific, where farmers specializing in the production of butter, treated their land with an average of 65 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre.

Likewise, the enemy countries, the Governments of Germany and Japan, know the value of phosphate. For years before the First World War Germany was one of our principal export customers. And in the 4 years prior to the present war, 1935–39, Germany and Japan took 26 and 20 percent, respectively, of our total exports of 6,000,000 long tons of phosphate rock and superphosphate.

What ideas and proposals will our Nation's representatives advance in these world discussions on this important subject? Will they seek eagerly to find ways to resume the practice of exporting our phosphate rock and fertilizer to whatever market will buy? Will our experts treat our Florida phosphate ores, for example, as of no greater national concern than any other commodity of trade? Will our American industry which mines the rock continue to press for greater and greater export of its raw materials because its domestic market is limited by the undersized capacity of fertilizer manufacturing plants, while at the same time American farmers cannot get one-half the quantity of phosphate their land admittedly requires? This was true before the war. Will it again be true? Will the American farmer be content with such a situation? Can he be blamed for abuse of his land when the industry which serves him limits his use of phosphate to the meager average of 2 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre while the industries of other nations provide their farmers with up to 65 pounds.

We face the prospect of being represented in conferences which must consider this important question without benefit of any expression of national policy to guide the decisions of our experts. For too long the only policy on this question has been the one adopted by the fertilizer industry, answerable only to its limited group of stockholders. For too long this essential resource of vital concern to our national life has been treated exactly like chewing gum and cigarettes, commodities to be produced and sold in whatever form and whatever amount and at whatever profit the traffic would bear.

Are the farmers of America content to see themselves represented by such a policy? Are the great farm organizations satisfied with such a record? How much longer will the farmers' representative organizations—the Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the National Farmers' Union—disregard the warnings of the experts and scientists of the land-grant colleges who have urged that something be done?

I should like to summarize the principal objectives of the bill, which provides an orderly process for the establishment of a national fertilizer policy and program. First, it directs the Tennessee Valley Authority to formulate and report to Congress, within 6 months after the passage of the proposed act, a national fertilizer policy and program; second, it authorizes the T. V. A. to acquire phosphate lands in Florida sufficient to supply the Mobile plant, which has been authorized, and the Muscle Shoals plant, which is in operation, with phosphate for a 50-year period; and third, it sets forth the policy which shall govern the operations of the Mobile phosphate plant after it is constructed by the Authority.

This country needs a policy and a program of action with respect to phosphate and our soils. The bill I have introduced presents for the consideration of the Congress an authoritative recommendation and plan. It is my intention to press forward in this vital matter.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers of the Army of the United States (honor graduates) for appointment in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bolitha J. Laws, of the District of Columbia, to be chief justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Ezra G. Allen to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert W. Rogers to be postmaster of Franklinville, N. Y.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That concludes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received February 22, 1945:

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Joseph Eakens James, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Joshua Asher Finkel, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Albert Carl Hegenberger, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

Second Lt. Ernest Hinds, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM FEBRUARY 20, 1945

Second Lt. Lamar Asbury Welch, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Jean Koke Lambert, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Ernest Conine, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. William Jones Williams, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Edmund Hand, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Verle Douglas Miller, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Frank Henry Stone, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Samuel Meyer Lipton, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Lucien Fairfax Keller, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Arthur James DeLuca, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Thomas Carlton Reddington, Field Artillery (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Paul Julian Maline, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Farwell Mitchell, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. James Virgil Johnston, Jr., Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Donald Norman Cameron, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Gene Richard Welch, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Charles Liggett, Signal Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. David Dorsey Hulsey, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).

Second Lt. Frank Clifford Healy, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Hunter Marion Brumfield, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Irvin Marshall Rice, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. James Byron Scherer, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Frederick Claus Zumsteg, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Kenneth Mace Gonseth, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. George Marcel Cummins, Field Artillery (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Raymond Elmer Smart, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Claude Esmond Bailey, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Andrew Lacock Cox, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Charles Parsons Clark, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Ferdinand Frederick Glomb, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Waldorf Barnes, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Carroll Bernard McElroy, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Francis Xavier Leary, Field Artillery (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Almon Louis Hugins, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Tom Billie Strother, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Numsen Lucke, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Calvin Aldrich Heath, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Robert John MacGregor Fyfe, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Clark Storey, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Joseph Thornell Stephens, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Joseph Olai Stensland, Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Adolph John Leocha, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Arthur Webster Hodges, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Corson Landrum Hilton, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Harold Vincent Maixner, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Richard Oliver Gordon, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).

Second Lt. Emery Ellis Bellonby, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Phillip Haines Baker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Robert Tuck, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. George Abbott Lucey, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Jack Carl Maldonado, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John William Barrett, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Thomas Kleberg Hughes, Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Jay Byron Mowbray, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Leslie Bereuter, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Carl William Plitt, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Arthur Martin, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Allen Coulter, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Walter John Rankin, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Richard Leo Dooley, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Elliott Arthur, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. George Thomas Mehalko, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Wiley Freeman Shaver, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Wilbur Craig Boyce, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Henry Gaston Mitchel 3d, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Clarence Frank Sills, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Thomas Glen Ferguson, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Niels Marius Dahl, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Daniel Francis Munster, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Timothy Hatter, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Wayne Harold Lee, Ordnance Department (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Joshua Logan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Fredrick Kenneth Hughes, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Leonard James Goodsell, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Marshall Owen Becker, Infantry, (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Kenny Walter Erickson, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Joseph Michael Williamson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. David Albert Gile, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. David Christy Warwick, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Joseph Szabo, Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Robert Harrison Zimmerman, Coast Artillery Corp (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Joseph Francis Dunn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lieutenant Willard Olcott Foster, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Edward Nicholas Wellems, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Kenneth Lee Garrett, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Robert McDonald Shannon, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Harold Easton Nelson, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Vitaly Kovalevsky, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Gordon Buford Patton, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Beal Kelly, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Walter Eugene Burrell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Louis Sweeney, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Walter Leroy Miller, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert James Morgan, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Arthur Ford, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Maurice Johnson, Signal Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Joseph Alva Ogle, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Henry John Schutte, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Clinton Fort Matthews, Signal Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Frank Fairfield Carr, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Carly Howard Schofield, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Thomas Larson, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Carl Peden Croninger, Cavalry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Henry John Muller, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. George Irvin Forsythe, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Robert Charles Forbes, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Edmund Francis Driscoll, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Maurice Katz, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Herbert Leonard Peavy, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Boylston Brooks Lewis, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Ernest Charles McInnis, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Maynard Clayton Raney, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. James Arthur Hebbeler, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Kenneth Loring Booth, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Joseph Briggs DeVennish, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. James Elmer Simmons, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. John William Jennings, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Gregory Jackson Skinner, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Vincent Louis Ruwet, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Myron Thorne Johnston, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Thomas Charles Conroy, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Joseph Louie Coleman, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Paul Millman Morrill, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Paul Frederick Lawson, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Hugh Porter Stubbs, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Elmer Schmierer, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frank Ovid Hamilton, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Albert Jones, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Maurice Clavelle Holden, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Warren Grant Leonard, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Robert Holmes Pettee, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Thielens Peeples, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Martin Jack Manhoff, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Paul V. Hannah, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Friedman, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard French Cox, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harry Babcock Brown, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jesse Melvin Charlton, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Sigman Regenstein, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Daniel Campbell Brawner, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Robert Frank Garner, Jr., Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).
Second Lt. George William Smith, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Ferson Tucker, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Nugent Courvoisie, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Carl Morrison Allen, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Cecil Crawford, Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. William Woodrow Cozad, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. George Herbert De Chow, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Howard Marquard Hansen, Signal Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John McAdams, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. George William Carter, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Callen Russell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Milton Clark Hess, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Thomas Furman Spencer, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lieutenant William Walter Sedr, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Donald Palmer Boyer, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Kenwood Ross, Ordnance Department (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Dayton Willis Eddy, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. George Edwin Bucklin, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Gilliland Renfro, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Viron Edward Bird, Finance Department (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Leo Martin Kane, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Kearns Muller, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jack Wesley Streeton, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Alton Davis Arnold, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. James Grover Holland, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Glenn B. Daughton, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jose Antonio Andino, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).
Second Lt. Raymond Geyer Jones, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ralph Scott Johnson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Warren Perkins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Edward George Uhl, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
Second Lt. Howell Edward Cobb, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Henry Koepcke, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Albert John Wetzel, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Louis Arthur Waple, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jack Helm Remele, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Elwood Kimball, Signal Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Edward McBride, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Rex Applegate, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Jesse Thomas, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arden Wirth Dow, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Frederick Allen Hippey, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Herman Martin Volheim, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Roger Jerome Aull, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Patrick Joseph Gibbons, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Walter Harvey, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. James Edward Hammer, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Victor Lee Cary, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. Clare Norton Lyke, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Allen William Rodeheffer, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas James Camp, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Locke Cheney, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Raymond Graham, Ordnance Department (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Wallace Erwin Bjornson, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jerald Morris Davies, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Anthony Pierre Bonnaffon, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Stuart Campbell Williams, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Thomas Raymond Cross, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Philip Clare Calhoun, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Ferdinand Herman Flick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. David Lane Aldinger, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Rorbach Fisk, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
Second Lt. Benjamin Paul Blasingame, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ben Lamar Anderson, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Orwin Clark Talbott, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Dunceith Beckett, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Woodburn Matheny, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Ira Christian Rumburg, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Robert Mayer Hamilton, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Elbridge Lee Snapp, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Leonard Charles Miller, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Second Lt. James Edwin Foley, Air Corps (temporary captain).

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Henry M. Briggs, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier, and until reporting for other permanent duty.
Capt. John Perry, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of October 1943.
Capt. Davenport Browne, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as assistant chief of staff (personnel) to commander, Western Sea Frontier, and until reporting for other permanent duty.
Capt. Paul F. Foster, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Assistant Naval Inspector General.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 22, 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Bolitha J. Laws to be Chief Justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Capt. Ezra G. Allen to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

POSTMASTER

NEW YORK

Albert W. Rogers, Franklinville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord God omnipotent reigneth, early will we seek Thee and pray that Thou wilt hear our humble prayer. We are Thine by creation and redemption, and we rejoice that all mortals over whom the skies bend are in the folds of the Father's love. Our times are in Thine hands; if there be things we cannot help, may we leave them to Thee without anxiety and unhappy contemplation, believing that all things work together for good to them who love the Lord.

Almighty God, today we honor him whose dust sleeps on the banks of yonder river; we praise Thee for the genius and sacrifice of our forefathers. Through faith in a God of justice they widened the bounds of freedom for all time. O keep us true to our trust and responsibility and animate us with the same power that the foundations of our Republic may remain secure to bless mankind forever; lead

us all up the hills of time until Christendom conquers and civilization triumphs through Christ, the sinner's friend. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to a special order agreed to on February 16, 1945, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] to read Washington's Farewell Address.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 26]

Baldwin, N. Y.	Elsaesser	Morgan
Barry	Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.
Beall	Folger	Norrell
Bender	Gardner	Norton
Biemiller	Gavin	Patman
Bishop	Gearhart	Patterson
Bolton	Gerlach	Peterson, Fla.
Boren	Granger	Pfeifer
Bradley, Mich.	Gregory	Pittenger
Brumbaugh	Griffiths	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Gwinn, N. Y.	Quinn, N. Y.
Buffett	Harless, Ariz.	Reed, N. Y.
Bunker	Havenner	Rivers
Burch	Hays	Robertson, Va.
Burgin	Heffernan	Roe, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Heidinger	Rogers, Mass.
Campbell	Herter	Rogers, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoeven	Rowan
Carnahan	Huber	Ryter
Celler	Johnson,	Sadowski
Clements	Luther A.	Sheridan
Coffee	Johnson, Okla.	Short
Colmer	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Ohio
Courtney	Keogh	Stockman
Curtis	Kirwan	Taylor
Daughton, Va.	Knutson	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	Kopplemann	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney,	Kunkel	Torrens
James J.	LaFollette	Towe
Delaney,	Landis	Vinson
John J.	Lane	Weaver
Dickstein	Latham	Welchel
Dirksen	LeFevre	Weiss
Durham	Luce	White
Eaton	McGlinchey	Winter
Ellsworth	Mahon	Woodhouse

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call, 323 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion by Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized to read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite

moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning,

ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.

Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealously, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country,

under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

COMMUNICATION FROM ADMIRAL NIMITZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

My heartfelt thanks for the message of congratulations just received from the House of Representatives to the officers and men of the United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas. We are enormously proud to have the confidence and encouragement of the House. There exists with us a keen awareness that our achievements can be traced back to those who were instrumental in providing us with the means to outshoot, outfight, and overpower the enemy. The victories we are winning in Japanese home waters had their genesis on Main Street and in the Halls of Congress.

We are profoundly grateful for this continued generous and enthusiastic support. Your heartening message was transmitted at once to everyone under my command.

C. W. NIMITZ,
Fleet Admiral, United States Navy, Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean Areas.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA-VIRGINIA BOUNDARY LINE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions adopted by a post of the American Legion in my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON MONUMENT, 1945

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to read to the House a short but profound and inspiring verse written by Eliot Marshall, of St. Joseph, Mo. It is entitled "Washington Monument, 1945."

Eternal shaft, agleam in wintry sun,
Or lightly veiled by summer's softening haze,
Inspire anew men's hearts with lofty aims
And heavenward direct their troubled gaze.

BURIAL CASKETS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Buckstaff Co., addressed to Dr. William Y. Elliott, vice chairman of the Office of Civilian Requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Right Reverend F. S. Legowski, of Toledo, together with a resolution adopted by the members of St. Anthony's parish, of Toledo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting and informative article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, relating to the function performed by infantry in this and other wars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

The was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from General Hines as well as a report on the G. I. bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been shocked by the revelation of the fact that the War Department has issued a directive to commission Communists in the United States Army and place them in key positions, in flagrant violation of law.

It is enough to make George Washington turn over in his grave.

In my opinion, nothing could be more dangerous than to place these Communists, who are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, in key positions, such as Intelligence and Communications, where they can get all the information they desire to help wreck the Government for which our boys are today dying by the thousands.

It was leaks such as this that enabled Von Runstedt to accomplish his terrific drive on the western front that hung so many crepes on the doorknobs of American homes.

This recent directive, issued by Gen. Robert H. Dunlop, contains this astounding language:

No action will be taken under the reference letter that is predicated on membership in or adherence to the doctrines of the Communist Party unless there is a specific finding that the individual involved has a

loyalty to the Communist Party as an organization which overrides his loyalty to the United States. No such finding should be based on the mere fact that the individual's views on various social questions have been the same as the views which the Communist Party may have advanced.

In other words, a Communist, who is sworn to destroy this Government and to use every possible means to that end, may lie himself into a commission where he can render the greatest harm to this Government and be the greatest danger to our fighting men on the various battle fronts.

I see that the Committee on Military Affairs proposed to investigate this proposition. There is very little investigation to be made, for the reason that the admissions made by the War Department itself, after the story was published, is ample justification for drastic action on the part of Congress.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LARCADE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very illuminating and interesting editorial from the Worcester Telegram.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE UPPER PENINSULA, MICH.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a magazine article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOOK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONTINUING INVESTIGATION BEGUN UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 98 BY INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 93), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee, or otherwise, to continue during the present Congress the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 98 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes such committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon such committee by House Resolution 98 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

THREATENED STRIKE IN MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to extend my remarks at this point, and to include certain letters on the subject I will discuss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PRICE of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address on juvenile delinquency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

INDIANA PASSES BILLION MARK IN SALE OF WAR BONDS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hearts of all Indianians thrill with pride over an announcement just made that Indiana has crossed the billion-dollar mark in its purchase of War bonds.

Indiana's purchases of the series E. War bonds—the $25 type—now total $785,307,000. Of the F and G types, larger denominations, Hoosiers have bought $208,002,000, making the State's total purchases to date $1,033,309,000.

Contracted purchases for the first 6 months of 1945 will boost the figure. Indianians are signed up to buy $177,595,000 worth of series E bonds and $34,759,000 of series F and G bonds.

The State last year bought $313,594,000 worth of the series E securities and $82,311,000 worth of the F and G types. Only 9 States of the 48 bought more series E bonds than Indiana.

Indiana's performance in connection with the last or Sixth War Loan is pointed to with special satisfaction and admiration by officials of the War Finance Division. Indiana's Sixth War Loan quota was $239,000,000 and subscriptions were $365,000,000, or 152 percent of quota. The State's quota of E bonds on the sixth drive was $68,000,000 and the sales were $75,000,000, or 110 percent of quota. Indiana's January 1945 sales of War bonds exceeded the quota by 8.8 percent.

Indiana's fine record of accomplishments in the sale of War bonds reflects the underlying patriotism of our people, but it also is an eloquent tribute to a modest Indiana citizen who, without any fanfare or blare of trumpets, has exercised his splendid executive capacity and indomitable energy in building up a bond-sales organization second to none in America, Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, State chairman of the Indiana War Finance Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Council Bluffs Nonpareil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Gen. G. M. Johnson, from his book But General Johnson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts from letters and newspaper items on the farm draft.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under date of February 19, 1945, but on the 16th of February a copy reaching me on the 17th, the C. I. O. caused to be circulated in Washington and throughout the country what they call a regular column for local union newspapers. It was entitled "Behind the Headlines in Washington," Irving Richter, national legislative representative, U. A. W.-C. I. O. It purports to give a report of the effect of the lobbying of the C. I. O. delegation, which visited us 2 weeks ago.

On page 2 there is the following statement:

The delegates from HOFFMAN'S district left for home determined to raise hell about the misuse of Government funds by the Congressmen.

That statement reflects upon the integrity of the Representative of the Fourth District from Michigan in his representative capacity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes the gentleman presents a question of personal privilege, and the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the pamphlet to which reference is made in the U. A. W.-C. I. O. release is one printed at private expense—not by the use of Government funds.

This, in part, is what the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has to say in its release dated February 19, 1945:

CLARE HOFFMAN handed the committee which went to see him a Fascist pamphlet called Join the C. I. O. and Build a Soviet America, written by Joseph Kamp, whose publications were named in the sedition indictment as "carrying out this conspiracy."

The pamphlet to which reference is made is the one I hold in my hand. It was written by Joseph Kamp. I commend it to all those who believe in America, who have no particular use for the Communists, who are in favor of constitutional government.

That much of the statement is true, that is, that the pamphlet was written by Joseph Kamp. It is also true that it

was referred to in the testimony in the grand jury investigation conducted by one William Power Maloney, who was referred to by the United States Supreme Court as being a pettifogging shyster. Now a pettifogger, according to Funk & Wagnalls, is said to be "an inferior lawyer, especially one chiefly employed on mean or petty cases, or resorting to small or tricky methods"; a shyster is "a lawyer who practices in an unprofessional manner; hence, anyone who conducts his business in a tricky manner."

So the U. A. W.-C. I. O. and its national legislative representative, one Erving Richter, are reduced to using as one of their tools, the handiwork, the products, the finished products, an indictment emanating chiefly from William Power Maloney, an inferior lawyer, chiefly employed on a mean or petty case and who, to get an indictment, resorted to small and tricky methods.

You will recall also that Maloney with his muckrake dragged in many other fine, loyal people and organizations, such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion.

I make reference to this for the reason that the young man who called upon me after the other C. I. O. delegates called but learned I was at a committee meeting was a good union official, a fine man. I did not hand out these pamphlets; gentlemen who said they represented the C. I. O. asked for them when they came to the office when I happened to be absent, so I am advised by the office force, and they were given these pamphlets; and any one of you gentlemen who wants one can have one. I bought them; I paid for them. I paid for sending out those that were sent out and distributed. I did not pay for them out of congressional salary, either; I paid for them with some money that I had before I ever came to Washington. I still have a little—not much, but a little; and I am going to buy some more of these pamphlets and hand them to folks. I only wish a million people could read a copy. What the C. I. O. does not like about it is the fact that I circulated maybe a few thousand in my district. The trouble is the pamphlet tells a little of the truth about the Communists and the C. I. O.

You know, there are all sorts of C. I. O. organizations just the same as there are all sorts of societies and all sorts of individuals. Some C. I. O. organizations are all right; some, the majority of their officers are all right, and some of them are just as crooked as the devil himself, and just as wicked, and just as bad; and Thomas himself, the president of the Detroit C. I. O.—I think it was—recently refused to attend a convention because he said it was controlled by Communists. The young man who came to my office was a fine young fellow. He had a good case. His point was that the workers in the southwestern part of Michigan were on a lower wage scale than workers doing the same kind of work in the eastern part of the State—Pontiac, Detroit, Flint, and around in there—and they are, and employers as well as employees want it raised. Naturally they want a wage increase. I told those men—union officials, mind you—2 years ago I met with a committee of them in the Vincent Hotel in Benton Harbor, Mich. I said: "Get your facts together. There is no question but that you should have an increase. Let me have the facts. I am your bargaining agent down in Washington whether you like it or not. You believe in this collective-bargaining program, and I am your bargaining agent, elected by a substantial majority. Now you get all your facts together and send them down to me. I will appear for you before the Board and do all I can to get favorable action." But the lawyer who represented the unions would not do it. Perhaps he was afraid I might really get some increase in wages for them, and he would not get the credit for it, because from that day to this—more than 2 years from the date of that conference—they never said a word about that wage increase to me, although I was here ready to help them, expecting if I did perhaps they might get a correct view of my attitude and give me support in the coming election. Unworthy thought? But you know how it goes; we like to do favors, and we like to receive them, especially when we think they are due us. So I said to this gentleman who called on me last week or the week before: "Now, I will go along with you on this thing, I will be glad to, but I wish when you do your lobbying you would stick to union activities. I wish you would confine your efforts to getting better working conditions and higher wages for those who are doing the work and not stick your nose into a hundred and one other problems which are not strictly labor questions or problems."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to some lawyer up there who claimed to represent the labor men in his district. Apparently this lawyer stopped the labor men from getting hundreds of thousands of dollars in additional wages that the gentleman from Michigan wanted to get for them?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know whether he stopped them or not, but I do know that he did not send the facts down here which I asked him to send.

Let me repeat, this young man—Walter T. Casebier—who came to my office, was all right. He was a fine, young American citizen. He is president of U. E. R. & M. W. of A., local No. 931. But he is in bad company, when he gets in with an outfit which puts out false statements. Here come these other fellows, like this man Richter, who is national representative of the U. A. W.-C. I. O., and who puts out this false release for all the local labor papers there, trying to lead members of the local unions to believe that I misused public funds. He sends it around to the congressional offices, and he sticks in here one lie after another. Some of the releases may be true, but I do not know how much of it is accurate. When he writes that both Michigan Senators agreed to this, that, or the other, I have no way of knowing about that and I do not care about it, but when he states over here that I misused Government funds to send out these pamphlets or for any other purpose, the truth is just not in him. So I will have to write to the president of this local in Benton Harbor, and I think they cover St. Joseph, too, and tell him, "Now, you have to get away from those fellows who are telling all those lies, because when you mix up three or four lies and send them out about me, I cannot stay up nights and work overtime to help you on this other feature." It takes too much of my time to expose those falsehoods your buddies print. I do not mean by that that I will not help that local and its members in spite of the lies they tell, in spite of all the rotten eggs they sling, and in spite of all the names they call. They cannot pry me loose from trying to do my best for the honest workers in that district, because that is my job and as long as I am here I am going to do it.

Then they go on in this release to say that they not only lobbied for the breaking of this wage scale, or perhaps not the breaking of that scale, but to secure an increase in wages for certain groups, but, this legislative representative goes further and says: "The delegates also lobbied for a permanent F. E. P. C., for the Gilmore - Wagner - Ferguson manpower bill and for the confirmation of Wallace."

Now, how and why are they interested in Wallace? Maybe they think Wallace is going to give them the 60,000,000 jobs. They do not realize that Wallace just spends tax money. That the men Wallace condemns are the ones who create—get that word "create"—the jobs and pay the wages out of sales.

THERE IS NO LIMIT

Mr. Speaker, there is apparently no limit to what some of the internationalists will do to aid other nations. We are now told that for its own safety the United States of America must sign up on some sort of a Dumbarton Oaks proposal, surrender a portion of its sovereignty, bind itself to aid in the settlement of the quarrels in which other nations, intent upon the preservation and extension of their own national interests, may become involved.

Some of the internationalists of this country are ready, not only to haul down the Stars and Stripes to run up in lieu thereof an international flag, but they are ready to strip America of her natural resources; of her material wealth, and they are also willing to sacrifice American youth—the young men of the United States of America — on battlefields throughout the world, provided they and the United States of America can have a place at the poker table of the power politicians of the world.

The Government founded by the forefathers; the principles enunciated by Washington; the outline of Government set forth in the Constitution are not sufficient for them nor, they think, for our people.

It will be noted if a careful survey is made that those who are most anxious to have us involved, yes entangled in world affairs who insist that the sons of America must be sent to do battle in every land, on every sea; on every island throughout the world, are those who themselves take no active part in the war. They shed no blood and seldom

does a drop of perspiration appear anywhere on them. They are principally engaged, as a rule, in telling other people how to carry on their business; how other people's quarrels should be settled or themselves making a profit out of the war.

There is no limit to which they will not go in selling America short; in aiding other nations, other people. Provided they themselves do not pay the bill, do the fighting.

It is well that those of us who believe in the United States of America, who if you please are nationalists, fight those who would surrender our independence, bind our youth ever to police duty throughout the world, fight them with their own weapons; adopt some of their methods.

If we are to have a united nations of the world, if that is to be forced upon us then we should at least be represented by someone who believes in this country; who is not determined to remake America; someone who places our interest first, who will not be a tool of any other nation or government.

A few days ago it was suggested that Felix Frankfurter should represent the United States of America on some world tribunal. Now, I have no confidence in the unsupported statements of a certain columnist who has been characterized as a chronic liar by the President.

I do find, however, that on the 1st day of June 1942 in the Detroit Free Press there appeared an article which has at least some semblance of truth. A portion of that article reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 31.—The entire British Empire was set just a bit agog last winter when the Australian Minister in Washington announced that Justice Felix Frankfurter had advised him to take a post in the British Cabinet. The Australian Government was especially agog.

To a lot of other people also it seemed queer that a Justice of the United States Supreme Court should be dipping his fingers into vital affairs of the British Empire.

I would like to know what business Frankfurter had to put his finger into that.

But to those behind the scenes in Washington this was no surprise at all. For today, as the Supreme Court winds up its current term, it is a fact that second only to the President himself, Justice Felix Frankfurter has more to do with guiding our destinies of war than anyone in Washington.

He does this through having put his own men in three key Cabinet posts; through being on intimate terms with the British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, and the Chinese Foreign Minister, T. V. Soong; and through having one of his old students, Dean Acheson, sit at the right hand of Secretary of State Hull.

Almost no move of major importance is made these days without Frankfurter having his finger in it. If the President is sending a mission to India to help the British settle their independence problems, Justice Frankfurter sits in on discussions. If an investigation is to be made of Pearl Harbor, Frankfurter recommends his friend Justice Owen Roberts—who is appointed.

UNCLE INTERNED BY HITLER

In addition to all reasons for being zealous about the war, Frankfurter has special, personal incentives. He was born in Austria, a country taken in one gulp by Hitler. And when he swallowed it, Hitler threw Frankfurter's aged uncle into a concentration camp. These factors, plus the persecution of his race, long before Pearl Harbor made Frankfurter one of the most energetic and effective promoters of intervention.

Several times his friends have suggested that a Supreme Court Justice should not meddle in the executive branch of the Government; that the Constitution created the judiciary as a check on the executive, not a collaborator; that he should not be quite so open in dashing back and forth between the British Embassy and the War Department.

However, nothing has daunted Frankfurter. Justices VanDevanter and Sutherland were criticized when they were consulted regarding Republican politics in Wyoming and Utah. But the blithesome, passionate, tireless Mr. Frankfurter considers himself in a different category.

CLOSE FRIEND STIMSON

The three key Cabinet members indebted to Frankfurter for their jobs are Attorney General Biddle, Secretary of War Stimson, and Secretary of the Navy Knox. In addition, Frankfurter put Dean Acheson in as Assistant Secretary of State, with an eye to taking Hull's place when he retires.

Knox was urged on Roosevelt by Frankfurter as a great political stroke to swing the Republicans into line and also the Middle West. The President, according to White House intimates, did not want Knox at first. He had been too bitter a critic while running for Vice President. But finally he yielded to Felix.

Biddle always has been a protégé of Frankfurter's, but has cooled toward him recently, remarking to friends that he was "too indiscreet to be trusted."

However, Felix's greatest influence is in the War Department. There two close and very dear friends are the Secretary of War and Undersecretary of War, while two of his students, John J. McCloy and Robert Lovett, are Assistant Secretaries of War.

Frankfurter and Stimson have been intimate friends for 30 years. When Stimson was district attorney of New York in 1906 he brought Frankfurter in as his assistant. Later when Stimson became Secretary of War under Taft he gave Frankfurter a job in the War Department. During the last war both men at first were in the Judge Advocate General's office of the Reserve Corps.

So it is not surprising that on occasion Cabinet officers have walked in on the Secretary of War unannounced, and found him with a little pad of paper taking down notes as Frankfurter talked.

And here last week we find that he is proposing himself, or some of his friends are proposing that he take the position of chief justice on this international court or tribunal—they call it the Security Council—which determines whether or not the armed forces of the United Nations should be used and how they are to be used. For example, it is within his power, in presiding over that court, to have a part in deciding whether 100,000 United States soldiers after the victory has been won, after the war is over, should be sent into Russia, should be sent to restore Poland, should be sent down into Greece to right things there. They want Frankfurter sitting on that court, or Frankfurter wants Frankfurter on that court—somebody does.

Maybe this chronic liar, so-called by the President, has his eyes to the keyhole; maybe he has ears to a crack somewhere so that he knows what he is talking about; I do not know.

Just a few days ago the War Department announced that it was going to accept Communists as officers in the armed services. In view of the foregoing statement that Frankfurter and Stimson have long been intimate friends and that Frankfurter has influence in the War Department, some of us are beginning to wonder whether the acceptance of the Communists as officers who can send our sons to death on foreign soil is due to Frankfurter's influence?

If I had my way the Congress would pass legislation which prevented our men in the armed service from obeying any order of any alien-born individual who, during the past 20 years, had been or now is a member of the Communist Party. Nor would I permit a single American youth to serve under a Communist or one who believed in the Communist doctrine.

The Selective Service Act was not passed to force men to die in support of the policies of the Communists.

If we are not fighting for the preservation of our own Government, for our own future liberty and happiness, for what are we fighting? Has the day come when it can be openly said that the doctrine of the Communists of Russia or the international policies of any other nation or people are to be the guide for our fighting men?

To me the thought of a Communist commanding my son or my grandson, having the power of life or death over him is abhorrent and if this Congress fails to take some action, the people will make themselves heard and felt in no uncertain manner.

I told you a few minutes ago something about what this gentleman who writes for the press had to say about Justice Frankfurter. Let me read you something of what a Mr. Roosevelt said about him. Here it is. When the I. W. W. was making trouble during the last war, President Wilson sent Frankfurter to investigate. He denounced the citizens who had taken care of the disturbance with the result that former President Theodore Roosevelt wrote him a public letter which said in part—I said "Mr. Roosevelt"; I mean Theodore Roosevelt. I hope you did not misunderstand me. This is Roosevelt, Theodore:

You are taking an attitude which seems to me to be fundamentally that of Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders in Russia. You are engaged in excusing men precisely like the Bolsheviks, who are also murderers and encouragers of murderers, who are traitors to their allies, to democracy, and to civilization, as well as the United States.

That was back in the last war, during the last war when the I. W. W. was making that trouble, and that is from the open, public letter which Theodore Roosevelt wrote describing the action of Justice Frankfurter, who now nominates himself or has his friends nominate him to be the presiding judge over this, they hope, World Court, which will control the destiny of our Nation for centuries to come.

I do not wonder that the C. I. O. does not like this little pamphlet. You remember I read from their circular sent out here on the 19th where they said that they were all for Wallace. Let me read you something that Wallace had to say, and which was quoted in this

booklet and to which they object. You get this point. Again I am wondering whether this recent order of the War Department permitting Communists to be officers in our armed forces was inspired by Mr. Frankfurter. You will note that a columnist back there in 1942 said that Frankfurter had an "in" with the War Department and with the administration.

You will recall that I just quoted from this columnist, whom the President described as a chronic liar, and I express no opinion about that, wrote that—

> So it is not surprising that on occasion Cabinet officers have walked in on the Secretary of War unannounced and have found him with a little pad of paper taking down notes as Frankfurter talked.

Now along 2 years later comes this order of the War Department permitting the Communists to become officers in our fighting forces.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I do not wish the gentleman to think that I am unkind, but I presume the columnist to whom he is referring is Drew Pearson, who writes the Washington Merry-Go-Round. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman will find it in the June 1 issue of the Detroit Free Press, in 1942. I assume that the name is there.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is it the Merry-Go-Round?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is entitled to draw his own inferences. I do not like to name men.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I only questioned the gentleman for the reason I believe the columnist whom he is referring to now as his authority is the same one who a few months ago referred to the gentleman from Michigan as the "flannel-mouthed gentleman from Michigan."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait; with what?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. With great gusto.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is that?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. He also referred to the gentleman from Michigan not so long ago as "the flannel-mouthed gentleman from Michigan."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; the rip-rooting, snorting, or something Congressman—he at least credited me with energy.

If the gentleman is correct about his assumption as to the identity of the gentleman who wrote what I just read, if that gentleman—and I speak of him as a gentleman—though some do not—if that gentleman and Walter Winchell and a lot of the other muckrakers will keep on, I think I can continue to be here quite a while, because anything that is recommended by any of them our people do not want. If the gentleman likes their society and their company, if he can smell any sweeter in a bottle with their label on it, he is welcome to the distinction.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman quoting that same person as his authority right now?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman can draw his own conclusions—it may be, it may be—that the story is true; it seems in the light of subsequent events to express some truth.

This lobby down here, these lobbyists, who you will note here said that they were down here to secure the confirmation of Mr. Wallace—now get what Wallace on one occasion had to say. Here it is, I hope my friend from Mississippi will get this:

> Those of us who realize the inevitability of revolution are anxious that it be bloodless and gradual instead of bloody and sudden. We believe that it can be bloodless and gradual if the makers of public opinion, if the politicians, if the pressure groups—

Is he referring to the F. E. P. C., the C. I. O., and the U. A. W.?—

> will only influence their millions of followers.

In other words, we are going to have a revolution, but he hopes it will be bloodless. I might say to the gentleman that if he starts a revolution, I just ask him before he does to look back into history and see, if he can, where there ever was a bloodless revolution when one side started to fight and to kill. Do Mr. Wallace and Mr. Frankfurter think that we will submit, without fighting, to having our liberty, our property, taken from us either by subterfuge or violence, without fighting back? And if there should come a revolution, where would we find Wallace and Frankfurter? Safe in the arms of Churchill or his successor?

I wonder if he thinks all Americans are going to quit, lay down, and roll over when the C. I. O. or the P. A. C. or the Communists start the fight? I reckon today just as in the days of old they are going to find farmers behind the fence rows and trees and they will find people in their homes in the towns and cities doing their share of fighting if those who hold with Wallace and Frankfurter venture to start the revolution which they think is to be bloodless.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HOOK. I do not know whether the gentleman has actually had contact with some of the outstanding members of the C. I. O.-P. A. C., but I want to call his attention to the fact that I have, and I am proud of it, and I want to call attention to the fact that the real men in the C. I. O. and the Political Action Committee are doing more to keep down the Communists than any other group in the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Of course, they are keeping them down, because they are tied around their necks, tied up with them, wrapped up with them, holding them down.

Mr. HOOK. And we hope to hold them down.

Mr. RANKIN. You will hold them down.

Mr. HOOK. And if the gentleman from Mississippi will quit his raving and ranting and get down and at least assist the good citizens of the C. I. O. he would probably be doing a service to this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Whenever I get down to the gentleman's level as it is reflected down here by this F. E. P. C. and Communists that he has been mixed up with——

* * * * *

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand those words be taken down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who has the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has already asked that the words be taken down. The Clerk will report the words.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order.

Mr. HOOK. Do I not have the same privilege?

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order. He cannot say anything until this day is over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The order of business is for the Clerk to report the words, as the Chair directs it.

The Clerk read as follows:

* * * * *

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, there was no blasphemous word used.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair rules the words out of order and they will be stricken from the RECORD.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What became of the request that the words be taken down?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already ruled on that. The words were stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield temporarily.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I asked the gentleman to yield that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I heard the words that were taken down and read. When one Member of this House so far forgets himself as to use either the language quoted or the language which the gentleman himself says he used, I would like to know whether it is in order for this House to enforce some discipline or whether the mere striking of such outrageous language from the RECORD is all that is going to occur today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks that is a matter for the House to determine by proper action.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. How does the House proceed to determine that question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It requires a motion or a resolution.

The gentleman from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The Member from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] must keep his seat the rest of the day and keep his mouth shut, under the Rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will proceed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, my point of order must be ruled on. I am speaking about the Member from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] on my left. He has just said he used the word "——— liar," and I do not intend for him to speak in this House again today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi. That is the rule. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] will be seated.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] can speak favorably of the P. A. C. and the C. I. O. If I am in error I will yield to the gentleman to correct me, but my recollection is that shortly after election, in any event between the time of the election and the assembling of the new Congress, the gentleman was quoted in an official publication of the C. I. O. as saying he attributed his election to the P. A. C. and the C. I. O. If I am wrong I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOOK. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says that is correct. Now, having been elected by the P. A. C. and the C. I. O., owing his election to those two organizations, I can understand, having accepted their support, that there is every reason why the gentleman should speak for and in their behalf. Of that I have no criticism, because it is for each Member to judge the course which he will follow.

The political action department of the C. I. O. located at 1729 F Street, NW., Washington 6, D. C., and 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich., puts out a news flash; on it R. J. Thomas is designated as international president and as stated a few moments ago, there were so many Communists in one branch of the C. I. O. that when called to assemble in convention, Thomas refused to attend because it was so apparent that the Communists would run the convention. Thomas may claim great credit for this action but not so long ago he ousted Homer Martin from the Detroit organization at a time when Martin was fighting Thomas because Thomas and his outfit it was charged by Martin, were hooked up with the Communist Party.

Another listed in this news flash is Walter P. Reuther, international vice president. Walter is the boy who, by the administration was deferred—saved from fighting abroad so that he might carry on his union activities. He is one of the leaders of the union which in Detroit have been involved in so many strikes in war industries. Walter is the gentleman who is listed in this little pamphlet "Vote C. I. O. and get a Soviet America," who, when in Russia, advised his friends in Detroit to "Carry on the fight for a Soviet America."

The fight has been carried on and those who would regiment us, establish a dictatorship, have gone a long, long way on the road toward their ultimate goal.

In this news flash of December 15, 1944, the political action department, under the head of "Fruits of victory" mention some of those they claim to have defeated. One line reads:

HOFFMAN of Michigan (we fought him and will again).

No doubt they will—I have had so much to say about their dirty work that it is not difficult to understand why they want me out of Congress.

Over on the last page under Signs of the Times I find these words:

Congressman-elect FRANK HOOK, of Michigan, received a wire from Newsweek asking him to what he attributed his election. He replied. "My victory due to P. A. C. Cleared it with Sidney."

Here from the book is a statement of Richard Romann, who was a press agent for Hillman. In summing up, he said this:

Political action is clicking because the P. A. C. boys have the know-how. After the bloody battles fought for industrial unionization, political organization is a picnic. In America political bosses never really saw the picture in terms of mobilizing the masses to really get rolling in political action. We have got to spread wide, solidify, and hit hard.

And here is what a gentleman, who was introduced by Sidney Hillman himself at one of his conventions, said—and do not forget this:

We want the labor movement to obtain physical control and ideological domination of this country. By "physical control" we mean the governing power, the power to make decisions and enforce them, the power to direct and govern, the power to control industry, the power to say who shall be in jail and who shall be out.

I do not like that. I have no particular objection to their exercising their constitutional prerogatives and putting me out of Congress, but I do not want them to put me in jail without any reason; I do not want them to use direct action which is the usual method of the Communist Party before it goes underground; I do not want them coming around in my district and telling the folks—oh, I do not mind if they tell the folks that I am a little bit off in the head, that I am some sort of a nut, that I am not bright, that I have not any sense, that I do not wash my face, or something like that. But I do not want them coming around in my district, I do not propose to have them coming around in my district, telling my people I am disloyal and unpatriotic. That is just one thing I do not propose to stand for if I can help it.

So they say here, as you have noted, and I call it to your attention, that what they propose to do is to take over this country.

I believe you gentlemen are all aware—these gentlemen over on the other side have been deluded, they are following a sort of illusion, delusion, or hallucination, I do not know which it is—and they believe they are not going to get what the P. A. C. and the C. I. O. have in store for them. You gentlemen know from the last campaign, so do they, the kind of false propaganda they put out; how they seek to destroy the confidence of the people in Congress.

The Communists, the P. A. C. with its millions of dollars for political corruption, the C. I. O., which has received special favors from the administration, and consistently the administration has aided the C. I. O. in its organizing campaigns; in its drives for membership; in its attempts to force the closed shop and the check-off upon employees and employers alike, always at the expense of the public, follow a well-planned course.

In the sit-down strikes of 1937 the Communists flying the flag of the C. I. O. and in control of some C. I. O. unions, resorted to the seizure of private property, to violence, and were upheld in both by the Roosevelt administration.

From that day to this those in charge of its political activities have never hesitated to carry on a campaign of abuse, of falsehood, of vilification against everyone who ventured with any show of success or persistency to disagree with any of the policies of either the C. I. O., the Communists, or the New Deal. Let anyone in this House so much as venture to raise his voice against any of the unfair or unlawful activities of any one of the three, and immediately a regiment of smear artists is turned loose on him.

It has always been the policy of the Communists to create disorder, to—when they dared—instigate violence, invite violence by unjustifiable attacks.

What has happened here today is something which may happen again and again in many of the communities, the cities of our country, if the P. A. C. and the Communists within it, if political pressure groups with millions of dollars at their command, are permitted to continue unchecked in their efforts to do away with constitutional government.

I doubt if there is a Member of this House who does not realize that the P. A. C. and the Communists are out to purge from Congress every single Member, no matter on which side of the aisle he sits, who has the courage to oppose their program.

What I cannot understand is why it is that intelligent men, and Congressmen are presumed to be intelligent, can fail or refuse to bring about an investigation of those organizations which repeatedly make serious charges against Members of Congress, against Congress as a whole. If those charges are true, then the people should be so advised and those of us who are guilty, if such there be, should be thrown out. If they are not true, then the makers of those charges should be

branded with the label which will show their true character. This I have said many times and unless the House takes action, it will be many times repeated.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker——

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON INSURANCE BILL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, may have until midnight tonight to file its report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, with Mr. JARMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be notified when I have consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us contains 291 projects for improvement, estimated to cost $381,968,332. These projects were all approved by both Senate and House in the preceding Congress in the bill H. R. 3961, which died on the calendar at the end of the Congress last December.

Ten projects in the bill, involving an expenditure of $13,259,600, are recommended by the military or naval authorities as being urgent in the war. Twelve other projects were considered of such urgency that they have already been completed out of the war funds appropriated to the Army or Navy. The President has recommended that they be authorized by Congress in order to be eligible for maintenance expenditures. I am advised that some of these projects are now in need of repairs.

Projects in the bill other than those urgent in the war effort are not to be eligible for appropriation until peace is established, when their construction will afford partial relief from an acute unemployment situation.

The projects in the bill already constructed with war funds and therefore requiring no expenditures except for annual maintenance are as follows: Portland Harbor, Maine; Weymouth Fore River, Mass.; Corlears Hook Reef, East River, N. Y.; Lake Montauk Harbor, N. Y.; New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway; Cold Spring Inlet, N. J.; Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea; Little River, Va.; Cleveland Harbor, Ohio; Morro Bay, Calif.; Oakland Harbor, Calif.; Keehi Lagoon, Hawaii.

The projects recommended by the military or naval authorities as urgent in the war are as follows:

Baltimore Harbor, Curtis Creek, Md	$150,000
St. Joseph Bay, Fla	225,000
Mobile Harbor, Chickasaw Creek, Ala	475,000
Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex	45,000
Harbor of Refuge, Port Lavaca, Tex	120,000
Mississippi River at Chain of Rocks	10,290,000
St. Mary's River, Mich., South Canal Bridge Island	1,412,000
St. Clair River, Mich	135,000
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, Calif	7,600
Ponce Harbor, P. R	400,000

The Chain of Rocks—mentioned in this list—is a menace to navigation in the Mississippi. All tows, in passing it, must use great care and caution. A large number of naval ships have been towed down over it for use in the war. Some of these ships are over 350 feet long and have draft of 17 feet. They include submarines, destroyer escorts, mine sweepers, and other types. Chester Thompson, in charge of the operation, had 360 of these ships in one contract to take from the Calumet district in Chicago to New Orleans.

To take ships of 17-foot draft 1,500 miles over a channel only 9 feet deep was a problem. They had to elevate them on steel pontoons until they had draft of only about 7 or 8 feet. Then they had great difficulty in passing the Chain of Rocks. Additional waters were released from Fort Peck dam to lessen the dangers. Last winter an ice condition interfered for a time with the release of water from the Fort Peck Reservoir. An additional discharge from Lake Michigan at Chicago was then secured for a time.

The Navy kept a detachment of the Coast Guard at the Chain of Rocks during the time the larger vessels were being towed. All these matters were considered as military secrets and not made public at the time.

In the last Congress the bill, H. R. 3961, passed the House on March 22 and passed the Senate December 12, 1944. Every project in the present bill was approved by both Senate and House in that bill, H. R. 3961. They were all accepted in conference and the conference report approved in both bodies, except the provision amending the reclamation law as applied to the Central Valley project in California. That provision is not embraced in the present bill. Neither does this bill contain any project or provision that has ever been objected to in either House or Senate.

All projects in the bill have been thoroughly studied by the Corps of Engineers and favorably reported by the Board and Chief of Engineers. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House and the Committee on Commerce of the Senate have held exhaustive hearings, giving them their unqualified approval and recommendation.

Realizing the urgency for this legislation the Senate Committee on Commerce, upon convening of the present Congress, reintroduced the bill, practically the same as H. R. 3961 in the last Congress as it was approved by the House in its action upon the conference report, leaving out the provision pertaining to the Central Valley reclamation project, and also omitting other provisions which were enacted in the recent flood-control bill, and which are now in the law.

It has been 7 years since a general river and harbor bill has been enacted. In former years, when the need for such legislation was not so urgent as it is at present, the Congress enacted such measures promptly. During World War No. 1, three river and harbor bills were enacted within the 2-year period of the Sixty-fifth Congress, 1917–18.

During the period between World War No. 1 and the depression which became effective about 1930, river and harbor legislation was enacted regularly, usually a bill about every other year. The authorizations, of course, were comparatively small, as they covered only a brief period of time. The thought then paramount in the minds of Congress and of the President was to pay off the war debt as rapidly as possible and to reduce current expenditures to a minimum.

During the depression from 1930 to 1935 no river and harbor legislation was enacted by Congress. A large public-works program was inaugurated which included among other things a number of large dams designed for both power and navigation. The National Recovery Act, passed in 1933, provided that no river or harbor project would be eligible under that act unless it had been authorized by Congress, or favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

The Parker Dam on the Colorado River between Arizona and California was under construction by the Public Works Administration. It had not been authorized by Congress, and the Supreme Court held that it had not received such favorable recommendation from the Chief of Engineers as contemplated by law. Its authorization was therefore nullified by this decision.

A river and harbor bill having passed the House in 1935, the Senate amended the bill by a provision for legalizing the Parker Dam. The Senate amendment also included provision for the legalization of the Grand Coulee, the Bonneville, the Fort Peck and the Tygart Dams, all being under construction at the time by the P. W. A. The bill, as amended, was passed by both Senate and House, and approved by the President.

The present bill, embracing no known controversial projects, and every project

included having heretofore been unanimously approved by both House and Senate, it was confidently hoped that it might pass both branches of Congress, and that no effort would be made to insert again amendments heretofore rejected that would lead to prolonged discussions and probable defeat of meritorious measures in the bill, many of them being urgent in the war effort.

If this bill should be enacted and out of the way, other measures will then be taken under consideration during the present session of Congress. The engineers now have projects under consideration upon which reports are expected at an early day. Under present law and regulations they are sent to the Budget, and to the governors of the States where the improvements are proposed, before they are submitted to Congress for final action. I am advised that a few favorable reports have already been received, and hearings are expected to commence within a few weeks. Controversial measures will also be taken up if and when desired by the proponents.

It is important that the post-war projects in this bill be enacted at once, so the engineers may proceed with the preparation of necessary detailed plans, specifications, and blue prints, and have them available as rapidly as the termination of hostilities will permit. The present unfinished backlog of authorized river and harbor improvements is approximately $170,000,000. This, added to the little more than $300,000,000 carried in the present bill, will raise the backlog to slightly more than a half a billion. We had a much larger backlog than that under the public-works program in 1935, the bill of that year alone carrying an authorization of $660,000,000.

An acute unemployment situation is expected to be in existence at the termination of hostilities. Millions of people are now in the military and naval service. Millions more are engaged in the war industries. It is a foregone conclusion that public works of various kinds will be needed to cushion the situation that will be brought about. Unless Congress provides useful and beneficial public works, others of doubtful utility, or of doubtful legal authority, may be resorted to as was done in the past.

Our river and harbor improvements are so thoroughly investigated, studied, and safeguarded by the Army engineers that it is seldom, if ever, that an error can be found in their reports. Their training is unsurpassed, and they are as nearly free from partiality and political influence as any class. I have been associated with their work for many years, and the more I become familiar with it, the more I am impressed with its accuracy, thoroughness, and importance.

Our river and harbor program has become practically free from the so-called pork-barrel practices that once prevailed, and from sectionalism and party politics. For many years the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has adhered to those high standards in the promotion of our water-borne commerce for the benefit of all the Nation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Do we understand correctly, then, that the provision in the bill we passed last year and which the Elliott amendment sought to eliminate has been left out of this bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Entirely.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. As the gentleman knows, I am very much interested in the project from Hartford, Conn., to Holyoke, Mass., on the Connecticut River. I feel that this bill ought to become law, and I will support it and vote for it. But I am interested, and I think others are who have projects that are not in this bill, in knowing what the purpose of the committee is with reference to further hearings on projects which are recommended by the Army engineers.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that we expect to have other bills in the present session. If any Member has a project that complies with the law and has a favorable report on it from the Chief of Engineers, we shall be glad to give him an impartial hearing.

Mr. CLASON. You expect to work toward another omnibus bill to be brought up sometime later in this Congress?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. We shall probably have several bills in this Congress. I may say to the gentleman that I have a project in my State in which I am very much interested, but I am leaving it out of this bill because I know it is entirely controversial. However, I think it is entirely justified. I did not put it into this bill and did not bring it before the committee for that purpose because I knew it would lead to controversy and delay or probably defeat the passage of this bill.

Mr. CLASON. The gentleman would expect projects like that to be brought up under later legislation?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Later legislation in the present session of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. I notice you have included this language:

> Waterway from Lake Erie, at or near Toledo, Ohio, to the southerly end of Lake Michigan by way of the Maumee River and the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., or other practicable route.

Does that refer to a survey that is to be made in connection with the investigation?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That is nothing more than a preliminary examination and survey requested by a former engineer, as I am informed. The matter has been under consideration in former years, as the gentleman probably knows.

Mr. GILLIE. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. We do not know what will be done about it. That is for some future Congress to determine. It is only an order for an investigation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman tell me about the Missouri River item of $6,000,000, from Sioux City to the mouth of the river?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. As the gentleman understands, we have a project of long standing for a 6-foot channel from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River, a distance of about 760 miles. It is embraced within two projects. First it is authorized up to Kansas City, or Quindaro Bend, right near Kansas City, about 375 miles. Later it was extended up to Sioux City, about 336 miles. Under this bill there will be a 9-foot project instead of a 6-foot project. The engineers testified that more than 90 percent of it has a depth of 9 feet or more at the present time. The work installed there to secure a 6-foot project has been much more successful than the engineers anticipated and they have actually obtained 9 feet on more than 90 percent of the distance.

Mr. STEFAN. What part will be 6 feet?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That depth prevails in different places.

Mr. STEFAN. Just in different places?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. This is not going to interfere in any way with the flood-control project we have authorized here?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Absolutely not. It is all in the same program. There is no conflict whatever.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. In your opinion will a 9-foot channel be of benefit to flood control to a greater degree than the 6-foot channel?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The engineers assure us that it will not interfere with flood control in any way and it may be beneficial.

Mr. JENSEN. I have not been so enthusiastic, as the gentleman knows, about the 9-foot channel. I think possibly the only reason I would accept the expenditure of $6,000,000, would be because I do feel, and I have talked with engineers who support my contention, the deeper the channel the greater the water-carrying capacity the channel will have and hence the more it will relieve a flood condition. Does the gentleman agree with me on that?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I do entirely. I will state further to the gentleman that one of the principal purposes of the works to be installed there is for bank stabilization. That river as you know has changed its course many times and this will save the banks and the works installed will be largely for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In the first section of the bill starting on line 6 is the following language:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control.

What is the chairman's version of the meaning of that language?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. If the gentleman remembers, we have had great controversies over many Senators contending for States' rights on these things, insofar as it is consistent with public policy. Of course, navigation on an interstate stream cannot be brought down to a State proposition entirely. But this is to recognize the States' interest insofar as it may be consistent with the purposes of the improvement.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to ask this specific question. What is the version of the chairman as to intrastate streams like the Sacramento River which is entirely in one State, and the San Joaquin River which is entirely in one State? Does that recognize the paramount right of the State to use the water for irrigation, for instance?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And for hydroelectric development?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes, sir; for all domestic consumption purposes. That is the way I understand it. It is the way I understand the agreement between the engineers and the reclamation authorities. May I inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if that was not his understanding of it?

Mr. JENSEN. That is as I understand it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. In section 3, on page 36, beginning at the first line of that section, that whole paragraph, as I understand it, is to give certain discretion to the engineers?

Do I understand that is to give the engineers discretion so that if a project or some locality is not particularly mentioned they can, under certain circumstances, take care of a given situation if it is demanded?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It is for emergencies. We have been appropriating heretofore $25,000. The Flood Control Committee has been doing likewise, but they increased that amount in the last bill, as I understand. The members of our committee, particularly the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], felt that $25,000 was not sufficient and that we should raise the limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to reiterate and confirm everything the chairman of our committee has said. I made a speech on this bill yesterday appealing to my colleagues to support it and pass it without amendment, because this bill has already passed the Senate, and both the House and Senate have agreed upon the projects which it contains. For the benefit of new Members on this floor, I want to present the House the able and efficient clerk of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors who has been with this committee for 43 years, Mr. McGann.

Mr. Chairman, there is very little more to be said after what the chairman has already stated in regard to this bill. It contains projects ranging from $442 to $60,000,000. It is nonsectional. It is nonpolitical. Projects in the far Northwest and projects in the far south in Texas, six of them, really include two-thirds of the entire bill. In my own State in Michigan there is only a little over $5,000,000, and those projects are many, many miles from my congressional district. So the bill comes here with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I hope it will have the unanimous approval of the House of Representatives and that we will pass it without further debate and further delay.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. How much of it is in the gentleman's district?

Mr. DONDERO. There is not 1 cent of projects in this bill for my congressional district.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I notice by the report that it calls for speedy action in order that sufficient funds may be allocated or appropriated for planning. Does this bill carry additional authorization for planning?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not understand that it does. It only covers authorizations for the 291 projects in the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Can the gentleman assure us that sufficient money will be available for planning, which I think is most important? In fact, I think that is the urgency of these items, to get the plans made.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, the gentleman understands all of these projects are for post-war work. None will be attempted except that they are directly essential to the war effort, until after the war ceases. I think the money that will be needed for planning, which is all done by the Army engineers, will be forthcoming when needed. About $40,000,000 has been appropriated to carry on river and harbor projects.

Mr. CARLSON. My only thought is that that is one thing that we should prepare for. We should provide sufficient funds to carry out the planning, which is essential to the program at this time and post-war.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think the gentleman need have any fear on that point.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], a member of the committee.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything that has been said by our able chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, and also by our efficient and capable colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], ranking minority member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

This bill, as has been stated a number of times, includes many projects which have received very careful consideration, not only by our Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the House, but also by the Committee on Commerce in the Senate. Each of the projects has also been voted upon and passed by this House and by the Senate in the last Congress when we had before us H. R. 3961 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. They were also approved by the Conference Committee in the last Congress, but owing to a controversy over another matter which has now been eliminated from this bill, the bill died with the Seventy-eighth Congress.

There are 291 projects in this bill, as has been said, and they cover a great variety of river and harbor developments throughout the United States. As a matter of fact I believe there is very little of this development work in my own particular district in the State of Oregon, but there are a number of projects in the Northwest and in Oregon itself outside of my district in which we of the Northwest are vitally interested. I believe this type of undertaking is one which should receive major consideration for post-war development, because these are projects which have been carefully scrutinized by the Corps of Army Engineers, which perhaps is one of the hardest headed, most intelligent and skilled groups of Government officials we have; and they have given their full approval to every one of these projects in addition to the approval that has been given to them by the committees and by the other body. I hope therefore, as was stated by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] that we may in a very short time have an opportunity to approve this bill and send it to the President for his signature. It is particularly necessary by reason of the fact that for a number of years, in fact, for more than the 6 years I have been on the Rivers and Harbors Committee we have not had a bill which has passed both Houses and received the approval of the President. This is the first omnibus bill since I have been on the committee that will be enacted into law as I am confident it will.

It has been asked if this is a pork-barrel bill, since it contains so many projects. I do hope the membership will understand the operation of the Rivers and Harbors Committee in putting together all these projects in one bill and the reasons for so doing. It is not for the purpose of currying favor with any Representative from a particular district that projects in his district are included, but this bill is framed to bring together all these projects which have for their purpose the improvement of our waterways and the development of our rivers and harbors throughout the United States in all districts so they may be considered together and save the time of the House; and it is for that purpose that these projects are put together in one bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman realizes, does he not, that this

would require 219 separate bills if we reported each project separately?

Mr. ANGELL. That is true, and the reason we include them in one bill is for the convenience of the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It would be impractical to get them considered in any one session of Congress.

Mr. ANGELL. That is true; and that is the major reason, as I was just saying, why under the procedure of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors all these projects are combined in one omnibus bill. To report each project in a separate bill would result in interminable delay and take up too much time of the House for the consideration of legislation from one committee.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Are not many of these projects purely maintenance projects, the extension of present projects through maintenance?

Mr. ANGELL. Some are maintenance projects, some are for projects already completed by the Army and Navy with funds we have given them for war purposes because they were urgent war projects.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the importance of this bill, as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee I desire now to discuss it in some detail with particular reference to the projects in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Chairman, S. 35 is a bill which has for its purpose authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors which is generally known as the river and harbor omnibus bill. The House companion bill is H. R. 1577, introduced January 17, 1945, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. A similar bill, H. R. 3961, was introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress and passed both Houses and was pending in a conference committee when the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned sine die. The controversy in the conference committee has been eliminated from the present bill as well as all controversial projects. The bill contains 291 projects, estimated to cost $381,968,332, all of which have been approved in the former bill by both the House and the Senate. All of these projects are for post-war development with the exception of 10 involving $13,259,600 which have been recommended by the Army or Navy as being needed for war purposes. Twelve other projects of an emergency nature have already been completed out of war funds appropriated for the Army or the Navy. It should be understood that with the exception of the projects needed for war purposes none of them will be eligible for appropriation until the war ends. Furthermore, every project in this bill has been surveyed and examined by the Corps of Army Engineers and favorably reported. In addition, they have the approval of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Committee of Commerce of the Senate.

These projects which are set forth in Report No. 63 of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, dated February 8, 1945, are located in the various sections of the United States where river and harbor development is needed. They are the type of projects which commend themselves for consideration in providing a post-war program for public works providing employment for veterans and war workers. This is true particularly because every project is based upon its own merits which has received, as I have said, the approval of the Corps of Army Engineers after full and complete study. They are projects which will provide for the permanent development of our country providing transportation, reclamation, and in many cases hydroelectric power. They are not the so-called boondoggling enterprises, many of which were engaged in after the last war mainly to provide made jobs. Furthermore, many of these projects have been under consideration for many years. The time has not been opportune or the funds available to proceed with actual construction work. For over 6 years during my service on the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, no omnibus bill providing for the construction of these essential rivers and harbors projects has received the approval of the Congress and the President. Many of you, my colleagues, who are interested in one or more of these projects located in your districts will, no doubt, take advantage of the opportunity to call to the attention of the House the merits of the respective projects in which you are interested.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to discuss the projects situated in my own State or in the Pacific Northwest, which are of equal importance to my State and to the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, which district is located on the Columbia River and which includes the Bonneville project. These projects which are of particular interest to Oregon are as follows:

Project	Document No.	Estimated Federal cost
Chetco River, Oreg.	H. 817, 77th Cong.	$190,000
Coquille River, Oreg.	H. 672, 76th Cong.	(1)
Umpqua Harbor and River, Oreg.	S. 86, 76th Cong.	55,000
Umpqua River, Oreg.	S. 191, 77th Cong.	34,000
Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.	S. 119, 77th Cong.	162,000
Depoe Bay, Oreg.	H. 350, 77th Cong.	214,000
Salmon River, Oreg.	H. 551, 76th Cong.	5,000
Bayocean Peninsula, Oreg.	In accordance with report on file in the office, Chief of Engineers.	120,000
Willamette River, Oreg.	H. 544, 75th Cong.	3,600,000
Snake River, Oreg., Wash. and Idaho.	H. 704, 75th Cong.	58,625,000
Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.	In accordance with report on file in the office, Chief of Engineers.	50,000
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to the mouth of Snake River, Oreg., and Wash.	S. 28, 76th Cong.	39,000
Do	H. 324, 77th Cong.	30,000
Columbia River, Oreg., and Wash.	H. 704, 75th Cong.	49,470,000
Columbia River between Vanvouver, Wash., and Bonneville, Oreg.	H. 218, 76th Cong.	45,000
Columbia and Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.	H. 341, 77th Cong.	12,000
Do	H. 630, 77th Cong.	81,000

[1] Maintenance only.

One of these projects in which my State is especially interested is the improvement of the Willamette River under House Document 544 of the Seventy-fifth Congress. This involves an estimated cost of $3,600,000. The plan recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers is for a modification of an existing project to provide for channel improvement and contraction works as may be necessary to secure with stream-flow regulation controlling depths of 6 feet in the Willamette River to the mouth of the Santiam River and 5 feet thence to Albany, and for the reconstruction and enlargement of the locks at Oregon City where the Willamette Falls are situated. The Willamette River runs through a rich agricultural district and this is an essential improvement to provide water transportation not alone for the farming areas but also for future developments of industrial enterprises in the area. A new plant for the production of alumina from clay is nearing completion in the vicinity of Salem and will benefit materially from this improvement.

There are two other projects to which I have called attention that I desire particularly to stress, namely, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., described in House Document 704 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, which has generally been known as the Umatilla Dam project but which under the terms of this bill will be known as the McNary Dam in honor of the distinguished service of the late Senator McNary of Oregon in sponsoring this project for many years. The other is the Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho, described in the same document, providing for the development of the Snake River by the construction of four dams and giving navigation from its confluence with the Columbia to Lewiston, Idaho.

Both of these projects are the result of the investigations and surveys by the Corps of Army Engineers made under authority of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act of January 21, 1927, and of later resurveys and investigations pursuant to resolutions subsequently passed including that of May 21, 1938. As the result of these investigations and surveys the Corps of Army Engineers, in House Document 704 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, made a comprehensive report after local hearings were had for the coordinated improvement of the Columbia and Snake Rivers from the Pacific Ocean to Lewiston, Idaho, by the construction of locks and dams on each stream, supplemented by open-river improvement between the pools of the proposed dams on the Snake. It was intended by this report that the proposed dams and the construction of the various improvements in the overall plan should be initiated at such times and prosecuted at such rate as the Congress from time to time thereafter should direct. Pursuant to this program the Congress heretofore authorized the construction of the Bonneville project which has now been completed, and certain river improvements, and the next steps in the program are the construction of the Umatilla Dam and the Snake River dams.

Referring to these two projects, Major General Schley, Chief of Engineers, in his report to the Secretary of War, May 26, 1938, said:

I therefore recommend that the general plans presented herein for the initial and ultimate development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers between the pool of the Bonneville Dam and Lewiston, Idaho, be accepted by the Congress as a general guide for future development of the waterway in the combined interests of navigation, irrigation, and the development of hydroelectric power, and that the Congress authorize from time to time such portions of the plan as it wishes to initiate, revised as may be needed at the time to meet changing conditions.

The report of the Army engineers shows that the ultimate plan presented by them provides for 9 feet of water minimum depth to Lewiston. They recommend as an initial step the construction of the Umatilla Dam which would bring deep water into the mouth of the Snake River, and four locks and dams on the Snake River which would bring 6 feet of water up to and a little past Lewiston. The two projects in this bill will accomplish that objective.

The Columbia River now has a 35-foot depth from its mouth to Portland and with a minimum depth of 27 feet from there to The Dalles, which is above the Bonneville Dam and below the site of the proposed Umatilla Dam. Three of the four proposed dams in the Snake, if generating facilities are installed, will provide 150,000 kilowatt generating capacity.

Gen. John J. Kingman, senior member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in the hearings on these projects before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, stated that Umatilla Dam would provide about 600,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power and would extend navigation to the mouth of the Snake River. The construction of Umatilla Dam would overcome the obstacles to navigation in the river presented by the Umatilla Rapids and Homly Rapids, which are now serious obstacles.

Mr. Chairman, in order to appreciate the full significance of the benefit to be derived from the construction of these projects for the development of the Columbia River and Snake River for the full utilization of the great volume of water therein contained for navigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric power, it is necessary to have some understanding of the territory served by these great waterways and the benefits that will flow from the construction of these public works.

As shown by the reports of the Army engineers, the Columbia River rises in British Columbia just north of the international boundary and flows northwest 195 miles, south 380 miles, west 110 miles, and south 205 miles to its confluence with the Snake River at Pasco, Wash.; thence westward 325 miles along the boundary between Washington and Oregon to the Pacific Ocean. The Snake River, its longest tributary, rises in western Wyoming and flows westward across Idaho and northward along the boundary between that State and Oregon and Washington to Lewiston, Idaho; thence westerly 139 miles in Washington to its mouth. Other important tributaries include the Clark Fork, which drains a large area in western Montana and enters the main stream near the international boundary; and the Kootenai, which lies largely in Canada and enters the Columbia from the northeast some 30 miles above the international boundary. The Columbia River watershed has an area of 259,000 square miles, including 39,000 square miles in Canada. It is generally rugged and precipitous, although many benches and flats exist throughout the basin. The largest of these is the Columbia Plateau, an area of rolling prairie bounded by the Columbia and Spokane Rivers on the west and north, the foothills of the Bitterroot Mountains on the east, and the Snake River Basin on the south. The mean annual precipitation exceeds 100 inches in places on the western slopes of the Cascade Mountains, decreasing to as little as 6 inches on the Columbia Plateau, and again increasing materially in the higher mountains of northern Idaho and Montana. Mean unit run-off varies from 2.91 cubic feet per second per square mile of drainage area at Castlegar, British Columbia, to zero for an area of 9,000 square miles in central Washington, averaging 0.85 cubic foot per second per square mile at The Dalles, 190 miles above the Pacific Ocean. Former glacial action in the northern part of the basin has created numerous lakes having a combined area of more than 1,000 square miles and a regulating capacity below average annual crest stage of some 9,000,000 acre-feet. The discharge of the Columbia at The Dalles has ranged from 35,000 to an estimated maximum of 1,170,000 cubic feet per second during the 60 years of record. That of the Snake at Riparia, 67 miles above Pasco, has ranged from 10,600 to 409,000 cubic feet per second. The low-water slope of the Columbia averages approximately 3 feet per mile in Canada, 2.3 feet per mile between the international boundary and the mouth of the Snake, and slightly less that 1 foot per mile in the section below. That of the Snake below Lewiston averages 2.8 feet per mile.

The Columbia River has been improved for deep-draft navigation from its mouth to Vancouver, Wash., a distance of 105 miles. From Vancouver to the foot of the gorge in which the river breaks through the Cascade Range the natural channel affords depths adequate for barge navigation at all stages. Improvement of this reach to provide a navigable channel 27 feet deep and 300 feet wide from Vancouver to the Bonneville Dam, a distance of 39 miles, was authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937. The Bonneville lock and dam, now completed, creates a pool with a navigable depth of 30 feet extending through the gorge to the foot of Fivemile Rapids at The Dalles. The improvements enable oceangoing vessels of moderate draft to ascend the river to The Dalles. Navigation around the falls and rapids extending 12 miles above The Dalles is afforded by The Dalles-Celilo Canal, a lateral canal 8 feet deep and 65 feet wide with locks 265 feet long, 45 feet wide, and 7 feet deep, having a total lift of 82 feet at low water and 51 feet at high water. From Celilo to the mouth of the Snake, 123 miles, the Columbia River lies in a narrow valley in places 1,000 feet below the surrounding plateau. The Umatilla Rapids have an average fall of 6.3 feet per mile over a length of 14,000 feet, with low and medium stage velocities of approximately 10 miles per hour. Navigation is further obstructed between Wallula and the mouth of the Snake by the Homly Rapids, which afford a controlling depth of but 4 feet above a 60-foot width in a tortuous channel with velocities ranging up to 8 miles per hour.

The Snake River is a swift-flowing stream in a deep and narrow valley. The fall at low water in the 139-mile reach below Lewiston totals 393 feet, three-fourths of which occurs through 56 rapids having a combined length of 45 miles and slopes of 3 to 12 feet per mile. The authorized project for improvement of this stream provides for blasting rock reefs, dredging and raking gravel bars, and the construction of contraction works with a view to securing a channel depth of 5 feet at low water from the mouth to Lewiston; and for removal of obstructive rocks and reefs between Lewiston and Johnsons Bar, a further distance of 94 miles. The present controlling depth to Lewiston is less than 1 foot over a width of 30 feet.

The areas potentially tributary to an effective improvement of the Columbia and Snake Rivers below Lewiston for barge navigation include parts of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana. Agriculture is the principal industry, the chief crop being grain raised by dry-farming methods on the high plateaus extending back from the rivers. Livestock raising is also a major industry. Limited areas of the benchlands bordering the streams are under irrigation. Lumbering is an important industry in northeast Washington, northern Idaho, and western Montana; while copper, lead, zinc, phosphate rock, and other minerals are mined in western Montana, and elsewhere in the region. The basin is served by four main transcontinental railways and numerous branch lines. Improved highways connect the principal towns of the basin and reach practically all major tonnage-producing areas.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that this whole interior country—the inland empire, as we call it, comprising eastern Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and some portions of the adjoining States—is an immense territory which drains down through the Columbia River to tidewater and then out into world-wide trade and commerce. It comprises one-tenth of the area of the United States. It is larger in area than France, and it abounds in immense natural resources. There are immense areas of land, suitable for agricultural development in eastern Oregon and eastern Washington, and Idaho. Wheat and other grains, hay, livestock, and great quantities of fruits and vegetables are raised in that region. Large quantities of sugar beets are also being raised for the production of sugar. A considerable portion of that territory is already irrigated, and many thousand

of acres—hundreds of thousands of acres, in fact—are susceptible of irrigation with waters from the Columbia and Snake when they are made available and when the additional lands are required to be brought under cultivation and irrigated.

In addition to that, there is a vast area covered with merchantable timber. I personally have had considerable experience in this field, because for some 20 years I was in the Land Survey Department of the Government, surveying portions of these lands in Washington, Idaho, and Montana. The finest stands of growing timber to be found anywhere in the world are in that area, not only in the eastern portion of this area, but along the western slope toward the Pacific Ocean, in Oregon and Washington. Much of these lands is owned by the Federal Government. Private operators also own large bodies of timber. But more than 50 percent of the lands in Oregon are owned by the Federal Government, so the Government is not only interested in this from the standpoint of developing the country as a whole, but also in developing its own properties.

Mr. Chairman, the Columbia River, and its tributaries, is a key to the opening up of the whole Northwest Pacific area which, as I have said, is an empire in its proportions containing one-tenth of the area of the United States. It not only furnishes cheap water transportation to the sea but it also furnishes water for irrigation as well as hydoelectric power. The Pacific coast has had the greatest increase in population since 1940 of any section of the United States, and it is destined to continue increasing in the same proportion for many years to come. This is due to the fact that it is still to a large extent in the process of development and contains all of the natural advantages which are necessary for the sustaining of a large and prosperous population. It has these immense natural resources in forests, minerals, nonmetallics, clays, hydroelectric power, water, equable climate, and fertile soil awaiting development by new settlers in the post-war era.

With the Columbia River open for ocean-borne commerce, the wealth of this immense territory lying between the Rocky Mountains and Pacific Ocean may be carried by cheap river transportation to tidewater in the port of Portland and from there to all of the ports of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I call to your attention the following statistics with reference to the part the Pacific coast area is taking in our agricultural, industrial, mining, and commercial developments:

Of the first 10 United States farm counties, 9 are on the Pacific coast.

Of the first 20 United States farm counties, 16 are on the Pacific coast.

Of the first 100 United States farm counties, 29 are on the Pacific coast.

Two-fifths of all United States lumber; two-fifths of all United States gold—in peacetime; one-third of all copper; one-twelfth of world production; one-sixth of all United States petroleum; one-sixth of all United States natural gas; one-seventh of all United States silver—in peacetime; one-fifth of the Nation's mercury; one-fourth of the tungsten; two-fifths of total United States fish catch—all sources—marine, rivers, lakes is in this area.

The following comparison of lumber production of the five leading States of the Union are interesting in this connection:

[Latest pre-war available figures, 1941, from U. S. Bureau of the Census]

State	Rank	Population (feet, board measure)
Oregon	1	6,346,165,000
Washington	2	5,239,224,000
California	3	2,331,040,000
Alabama	4	1,798,383,000
Georgia	5	1,522,311,000
Total United States		33,476,165,000

The Columbia River is the second largest river in the United States, but it is the largest in potential electric power. It has more than 40 percent, in fact nearer 50 percent, of the potential hydroelectric power in the United States. Much of that power is not needed at the present time, but all the electric power that is now being produced in that area is being utilized. A great portion of it is being used in the war industries, but that is true everywhere throughout the United States in these war days. We are devoting our manpower and our facilities everywhere in the United States, so far as is practicable, to the war industries. In the Northwest we are using this power in aluminum, shipbuilding, and metallurgical industries of various kinds. These industries needing large blocks of electric power have established modern plants in the Pacific Northwest. Unquestionably in the post-war period, if we are going to continue prosperous and to employ 10,000,000 soldiers who will be released and 20,000,000 people who will be released from the war industries, we must continue to operate these great plants. We will have the power, and it is the cheapest electric power to be found anywhere in the world. There is no power development anywhere that is producing power any cheaper than ours in this Columbia River area, by reason of the continuous, even flow of the immense volume of water in the Columbia River. If we combine this wealth of natural resources that we have in agriculture, minerals, metallics, clays, forestry, and plastic products, all of which we will need after the war is over, with this vast pool of hydroelectric power right at our door, with low-cost water transportation, we can insure prosperity to this area in the post-war period. This electric energy requires practically no cost of maintenance after generators are once installed, for it goes on indefinitely with a minimum of overhead cost. Above Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams are two big pools or lakes of water that are used when the water is low to help maintain prime power. So, the river keeps fairly uniform prime power the year round.

We on the west coast know that this Columbia and Snake Rivers development is a sound investment and not a boondoggling or wildcat scheme. The development of hydroelectric power on these rivers and the utilization of the water for irrigation and for navigation, and the dams for flood control, will eventually bring to the United States large revenues, more than we will ever put into it. The utilization of our natural deposits of minerals and other deposits and the products of forests and fields in connection with cheap hydroelectric power developed from the Columbia River and its tributaries will return to the Government manyfold the funds expended.

The Grand Coulee reclamation project lying just north of the Snake River contains 1,200,000 acres for agricultural utilization by reclamation, and the water is now available. The Grand Coulee Dam is already completed. It is the largest project of its kind in the world and is one of the projects in the over-all coordinated plan for the full use of the waters of the Columbia River. The hydroelectric power generated is used to pump water up out of the pool above the dam and up over the brow of the hill, where it is turned into the old bed of the Columbia River. This vast acreage with water will produce as well as any agricultural land anywhere in our country. It is rolling upland, consisting of a fertile volcanic ash soil. It is all lying there, ready, waiting for the time when the Federal Government feels that it is propitious to go ahead with the reclamation project. After the war, when we need additional land for our soldiers and men who will be released from war industries, we will have the water and the land available; all we need to do is build the conduits and irrigation ditches.

Some of the land is owned by the Government, but the Government in its program has frozen the values, so the private owners cannot take advantage of the water that is furnished and speculate on the land. The large owners have to turn in their landholdings at a certain fair appraisement, and they can utilize only a restricted acreage themselves and can get water to utilize only such portions of the land as is brought within the regulations laid down by the Government. So we have there the possibilities for an immense development.

The Columbia and the Snake projects in this bill will provide water transportation for this reclamation project at Grand Coulee. I know from first-hand information the possibilities of this inland empire, not alone from being reared in that country, but also from many years spent in the Federal service in making Government surveys in this area. I want to tell you, my colleagues, that I personally feel we will make no mistake in approving the projects for the construction of the dam at Umatilla and the dams on the Snake.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the Umatilla Dam project, I want to call to the attention of the committee that the engineers' report shows that the development will be amply justified economically, providing the power to be generated from the hydroelectric facilities to be installed is sold. Colonel Feringa, who presented the report to the committee, reported that all of the power now being generated by the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects is being utilized.

In the post-war period the utilization of our natural resources and reclamation of our farming areas in order to provide employment for our returning soldiers and laborers released from war activities should keep these projects working. This will require a large volume of electric energy.

The total load in the area served by Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants is, in round numbers, 2,000,000 kilowatts. Past history shows that this load is increasing at the rate of about 100,000 kilowatts per year. In the time required to construct a dam and power plant like the Umatilla project the normal load increase in the area would be about 300,000 kilowatts, and before 1950 should equal the capacity of the Umatilla project.

The Bonneville project is now in capacity production.

Congress has appropriated and authorized funds for nine main units at Grand Coulee. Six of these nine are in production. The limit of prime power capacity at Grand Coulee is in the neighborhood of a million kilowatts, and the authorized Grand Coulee construction is within one machine of the prime power capability of the Coulee Dam. The balance of the power at Grand Coulee is secondary power, which can be used during the high-flow season extending from June to October for irrigation pumping.

Mr. Chairman, it seems reasonable to predict there will be a demand in the next decade for not only all of the power generated by existing projects in the Northwest but by the Umatilla and Snake River projects as well. I trust this bill will meet with the full approval of this body and the Chief Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like the attention of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

The gentleman from Oregon asked unanimous consent that he might extend in his remarks certain tables. If those tables represent the gentleman's own work, were made by him, such consent may be granted in the Committee of the Whole. If such is not the case, it will be necessary for him to get that permission in the House.

Mr. ANGELL. They are my tables, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, without objection, the permission is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the hearing on the rule, I assured three members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee that I would not offer an amendment to the matter now before us which should pass by unanimous vote. I realize this is strictly a river and harbor bill. During the session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, in which there was a special flood bill, it was my intention also to offer an amendment but at that time I assured the chairman of the Flood Control Committee I would not offer an amendment for the imperative relief, thus waiting for a favorable report of the department. However, in the near future I shall ask for the relief which the flood sufferers, as well as those consecrated landowners in the Lake Erie section have been rightfully demanding since the early part of July of 1943. Immediately after that flood in the Lake Erie area, I went to the scene of this tragedy and covered as much of it as I could by foot and flew over the other part. I was most concerned as an appropriation bill had been passed for the relief of flood areas and had been assured that the amount of the appropriation bill of $10,000,000 had been passed for the relief of the flooded areas and, of course, felt happy that this would cover the situation.

Col. George R. Goethals, Chief, Civil Works Division, Office, Chief of Engineers, instructed the regional engineers to make a survey and their reports were that $110,000 would take care of the emergency relief and rehabilitation of the farm lands of those Howard Farms-Reno area, but after this report had been made the legal department reported that no flood had occurred. Well, this was beyond me in view of the fact that it had been said, "The inundation of the shore land was not a flood, but only a part of the process of shore erosion." I am placing in the record an editorial from that great newspaper the Toledo Blade, founded by David R. Locke, known as Petroleum V. Nasby. The editorial is as follows:

NO FLOOD AT RENO?

We don't know what the New Deal would call the deluge in the days of Noah, but in the considered opinion of official Washington there has been no flood in the Reno Beach and Howard Farms area—only progressive erosion.

Our best dictionaries give several definitions of the word "flood," among them this: "A body of water rising, swelling, and overflowing land not usually so covered."

Under the impact of wind from the northeast, Lake Erie rose and swelled and broke through the dikes and overflowed several thousand acres in eastern Lucas County "not usually thus covered."

We believed that newspaper reference to this condition as a flood, which ruined crops and drove 350 families from their homes, was justified by Noah—Webster.

Now is our face red? By inference, if not directly, Washington rebukes our editorial ignorance. "The inundation of the shoreland was not a flood, but only a part of the process of shore erosion."

Even the O. P. A. couldn't manufacture a more confusing explanation of a condition and not a theory which confronts us.

Go down to Reno, rent a rowboat, draw on your rationed rubber boots, and form your own opinion.

But this much seems certain. Not a dime from that fund of $10,000,000 appropriation is going to be available for the hundreds of disaster sufferers who have for a great many years paid property taxes to the State and the county—and income taxes to the Federal Government.

Congress adjourned too late to do anything about it. This flood occurred in the waters of Lake Erie, which reached the highest point that it had ever reached since 1890. Therefore, the only thing I could do was to go from one department to another and go begging. I even went to the President's Budget and even the President's secretary, Mr. Stephen Early, and he felt that the Budget should cover this. However, instead of going home during that recess of Congress, I remained in Washington, traveling from one department to another, begging, begging, begging; and yet at the same time every so-called flood along the rivers was taken care of, but because this happened at the lake nothing was done for us. At this time I want to thank Senator TAFT, who remained away from his home and spent approximately a week's time appearing before different men and different bureaus.

Let me direct your attention to the hurricane relief that had been granted on several occasions by this Congress, in fact, it had been granted to Senator Clark's constituents. What I cannot see is that a flood occurring from a river is a flood in truth and a flood occurring from a lake is not a flood. That does not sound very sensible but that is the policy of the general statutes of Congress. Our situation was an emergency and it is just as much an emergency as though this territory had been devastated by a tornado, plus the added problem of restoring farm lands. With Senator TAFT, I agree that within 10 years after this survey for beach erosion is made, the Congress will, in all likelihood, assume responsibility for the Great Lakes as it does for rivers. But that is no relief now.

As a result of the hurricanes and severe winds and lashing of the waves, the farm lands of the rich Howard Farms area were, as we know, completely or partially destroyed and I do know if you have a flood in Ohio along the Ohio River and there is hardship and people are put out of their homes, we have repeatedly appropriated moneys, disaster loans, and so forth, for temporary relief. We warned them that there was a likelihood that it would occur again and in October 1943 another flood occurred. Because of a second flood, a bill was introduced by Senator TAFT in the Seventy-eighth Congress, which was worded, to wit:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is hereby authorized to repair and reconstruct dikes and levees along the south shore of Lake Erie in the Rene-Howard Farms area, Jerusalem Township, Lucas County, Ohio, damaged in the extraordinary floods of July and October 1943, and to dewater and decontaminize the area affected in such manner as to make the land again suitable for cultivation in the year 1944. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose the sum of $110,000.

Hearing before the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate Colonel Goethals answered Senator OVERTON as follows:

Senator OVERTON. There was a statement to the effect that you had estimated the cost originally at $110,000. Was that to reconstruct or repair, or did you make such an estimate?

Colonel GOETHALS. Yes, sir; the first breach that caused the original overflooding occurred on the 27th of June, and promptly on that occasion our field engineers from the Detroit office went to the site and made an estimate to restore the dike to its original condition.

Senator OVERTON. When you say restore it to the original condition do you mean to repair the breach?

Colonel GOETHALS. Yes, sir; and restore it to the original section. The summer went

on and other storms occurred and, when a report was asked for on the pending bill, our engineers went back to the locality and found a great deal more damage had been done during the summer and that resulted in revised estimates.

Senator TAFT. What is that estimate?

Colonel GOETHALS. Two hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars.

Senator TAFT. What would that do?

Colonel GOETHALS. That would restore the protective features to the original condition as built.

Senator OVERTON. That would repair the breaks?

Colonel GOETHALS. Yes, sir.

Senator OVERTON. And where there were no breaks and the dike remained in its original condition, no money would be expended on that portion of it.

Colonel GOETHALS. That is right.

Senator TAFT. Would that restore the dike as described here, or would it be somewhat larger?

Colonel GOETHALS. Restore the one described in the record.

Senator TAFT. That is, restore how much of it?

Colonel GOETHALS. The dike would be restored to a height of roughly 9 feet to 11 feet above low-water datum, with a top width of about 20 feet. As I recall it, that is more or less the original structure.

Senator TAFT. You now estimate that would cost $265,000 to do that?

Colonel GOETHALS. Yes.

Senator TAFT. Have you got the equipment, and so forth, available to do that?

Colonel GOETHALS. The equipment would be a very small problem and would not be hard to get.

Senator TAFT. Would it be difficult to get the manpower to do the work?

Colonel GOETHALS. No, sir; because it is essentially a steam-shovel or dragline job, requiring few men in comparison to the cost.

Senator TAFT. Are you familiar with the dredge out there?

Colonel GOETHALS. In general, there is plenty of dredging equipment now looking for work on the Great Lakes.

Senator OVERTON. The Secretary of War states in the report submitted that there is now under investigation the question of preventing erosion on the shores of the coastal areas and along the shores of the Great Lakes, which investigation is being made pursuant to direction of the Congress.

In this testimony I directed the attention of the committee to the fact that had Congress granted the relief for the first flood the expense would have been $110,000. After the second flood the expense estimated by Colonel Goethals was $265,000. Thus had our plea been listened to the Government would have been saved the expense of $155,000. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, have not we been ethical too long, by keeping faith with the Flood Control Committee, as well as the Rivers and Harbors Committee, by yielding to rules that I am wondering if we have not to some extent betrayed these suffering people and our own Government in the conservation of its resources? Even yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and time and time again, Members have asked for millions for relief of hydraulic electric power, restoration of rivers and harbors, and the appropriations have been forthcoming.

Shall these farmers who have tilled the soil, who have sons in the service, the same as you and I, shall these home owners who have given everything they can give, shall these families who have said, "All right, take our boys," have to sit there and suffer while a Congress says, "Wait, wait, wait." It is not just. A gigantic flood is an act of God. It was no one's fault. Home owners have used pumps and have done what they could. Now we see some light. Under the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, we passed an act which reads as follows:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following-named localities, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on such drainage areas; the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes. * * *

Reno Beach, Lucas County, Ohio, with a view to protection of the Reno Beach-Howard farm area and adjacent areas from floods caused by frequent windstorms and from increases in the lake level of Lake Erie.

A public hearing on the subject of the above-quoted provisions of the act will be held in the city council chamber, room 316, of the Safety Building, Toledo, Ohio, on Tuesday, February 27, 1945, at 10 a. m., central war time. It is expected that consideration will be given to the views of local interests as to the location and extent of the need for flood-control measures.

May I respectfully direct your attention that this should be the first matter that should be passed by the Congress in regard to flood disaster and flood control and please do not shackle it or fetter it at that time. The sons in the armed services over yonder who are suffering there are pleading that you do not betray them by legal phrases as to whether a lake flood is a flood or not a flood, because a legal writer somewhere some place has found a new definition. Little children who wonder what Government is are on bended knees these nights saying "Oh, Lord, don't let Congress turn us down by one of these technicalities, man-made and inspired by self-righteousness and emotionalism." It is so easy for bills to be passed to take this census or to make that investigation, and now in the name of common justice let us carry on remembering that time is of the essence, so there may not be another flood while we quibble over the words "and" and "to" and argue about whether it is a preposition or a conjunction.

Our people are heartbroken and grief-stricken and will act Tuesday morning in the city council chamber. My duties require that I remain here. However, our office force will be there and you will soon hear of their actions, so in God's name let us act at once.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Detroit, Mich., February 12, 1945.

LIST TO WHOM NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING RELATIVE TO RENO BEACH, LUCAS COUNTY, OHIO, WAS SENT

Chief of Engineers, United States Army, Washington, D. C.

The Division Engineer, Great Lakes Division, Chicago, Ill.

Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Washington, D. C.

United States Lake Survey Office, Federal Building, Detroit, Mich.

Hon. Robert A. Taft, United States Senator, Washington, D. C.; Cincinnati, Ohio.

Hon. Harold H. Burton, United States Senator, Washington, D. C.; Cleveland, Ohio.

Hon. George H. Bender, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; Cleveland Heights, Ohio.

Hon. Homer A. Ramey, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; Toledo, Ohio.

Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.

Chairman, Flood Control Coordinating Committee, 315 Administration Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Commissioner of Public Roads, Public Roads Administration, Washington, D. C.

Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Authority, Washington, D. C.

American Power Boat Association, American Security Building, Washington, D. C.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Kuhns Building, Dayton, Ohio.

Director, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Central States Forest Experiment Station, 103 Fifteenth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

Director of Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.; Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

The Director, Geological Survey, Columbus, Ohio.

Hon. Frank J. Lausche, Governor of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

Ohio State Highway Department, Columbus, Ohio.

Ohio Department of Public Works, Columbus, Ohio.

Department of Conservation, State of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

State Drain Commissioner of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

Ohio State Planning Commission, Columbus, Ohio.

Mr. Virgil Cramer, 2625 Densmore Drive, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Raymond Hiltebrand, 921 Broadway, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Fred Hunt, 2612 Scottwood Drive, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Chester Early, Security Bank Building, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Benjamin Redding, 3909 Willys Parkway, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. William Donovan, 2222 Scottwood Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

Mrs. Opal Mundy, 2119 Scottwood Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

Mayor, Toledo, Ohio.

City of Toledo, Department of Public Service, Toledo, Ohio.

Postmaster, Toledo, Ohio.

Editor, Toledo Times, Toledo, Ohio.

Editor, Toledo Blade, Toledo, Ohio.

United States Coast Guard, Ninth Naval District, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. William H. Gould, State agent, Ohio Department of Public Works, 34 Birckhead Place, Toledo, Ohio.

Toledo Edison Co., Toledo, Ohio.

Ohio Bell Telephone Co., Toledo, Ohio.

United States Engineer Suboffice, United States Court and Customs Building, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. L. C. Sabin, vice president, Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Edward Evans, care of Lucas County Courthouse, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Louis Sanzenbacker, care of Lucas County Courthouse, Toledo, Ohio.

Dr. Reuben Hilty, care of Lucas County Courthouse, Toledo, Ohio.

Lucas County Sanitary Engineers Office, Lucas County Courthouse, Toledo, Ohio.

Lucas County Engineers Office, Lucas County Court House, Toledo, Ohio.

State of Ohio Highway Department, 1807 Madison Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Eugene Howard, Security Bank Building, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Charles Swartz, Reno Beach, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. George Briesacher, Reno Beach, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. Roger Van Hoose, Reno Beach, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. Claude Van Gunten, Reno Beach, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. Frank Corns, 819 Starr Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. George Franks, Howard Farms, care of Bono, Ohio.

Helen Lupica, 522 Buckeye Street, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. John Liebherr, 1219 Varland Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. William R. Miller, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mrs. Floyd Sevy, Howard Farms, Bono, Ohio.

Mr. Frank Wolf, Box 297, Rural Route No. 5, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Herbert Balduan, 829 Mason Street, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. William J. Hartnett, 2812 Broadway, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Carl Stoddard, Reno Beach, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. Isham Kelly, Reno Beach, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mrs. Hannah Rehard, 1613 Pool Street, Toledo, Ohio.

Mrs. Pauline Senn, 622 Woodruff, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Fred Siebert, 614 Southard, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Ralph Hartman, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. Norman Edgar, 644 Ansonia Drive, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. John Richacek, 2212 Consaul Street, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. A. Snyir, 2126 Consaul Street, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. John Szuck, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. Bernard Lempert, 401 Monroe Street, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. John Lewinski, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. Donald Benson, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. E. Cottrell, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. Sam Perriatt, 1841 Erie Street, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Charles Herman, Bono, Ohio.

Mr. Ferdinand Lehman, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Mr. John Hanson, Route No. 1, Curtice, Ohio.

Director, Lake State Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. Frank R. Reid, National Rivers and Harbors Reporter, 1147 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; 10 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Waterways Journal, Chemical Building, St. Louis, Mo.

River and Harbor Improvement Association, 914 Williamson Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. Attention: Andrew Hudson, Project Director.

H. R. Neely, Regional Manager, Civil Aeronautics Authority, Chicago, Ill.

Inter-Lake Yachting Association, 2323 Dime Bank Building, Detroit, Mich.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I see on the floor of the House the distinguished Senator who wrote this bill in the Senate, the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Mr. OVERTON, of Louisiana. I wish to read what he said when he presented this bill:

Among the projects which we have eliminated from the bill—projects which are controversial in their nature—is the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, in Alabama and Mississippi, which had an estimated Federal cost of $66,000,000. On January 2, 1945, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors adopted a resolution providing for a restudy and review of that project. Later on, in due course, a report on it will be made.

I wish to thank both of the very able and distinguished Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL] and the able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] for their cooperation with me in connection with that matter, and for agreeing not to offer, during consideration of the pending bill, either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, an amendment having to do with the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the chairman and the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee for their speedy action in bringing this bill to the House. As has been pointed out, it is the same bill that passed this body during the Seventy-eighth Congress, with the exception of a few amendments. I hope that this bill is passed here with as much unanimity as it passed the Senate a few days ago. It contains numerous projects which are of vital importance to the future development of this Nation; it provides for the development and expansion of one phase of our natural resources, the great rivers and harbors of America. Regardless of the section of the country in which these projects are located, the entire Nation will benefit by their development.

When this same bill was before the last Congress I called attention to the special importance to be attached to the projects on the Pacific coast, pointing out then that in the Pacific phases of the war and in the post-war period to follow that this section of the United States would play an increasingly important role. On the west coast we do not have as many fine rivers and harbors as in many other sections of the country, so it is unusually important that we develop the ones that we do possess.

This bill makes provisions for many such developments, including four, those at Monterey, Moss Landing, Morro Bay, and Santa Barbara, in the Eleventh Congressional District. The need for the early development of Moss Landing has already been pointed out by me several times on the floor of this House; its vital importance to the fishing industry in California can hardly be overestimated. The fact that both the War Department and the Department of the Interior have urged its early completion is in itself testimony to the need. I am glad, too, that the bill now before us calls for the Army engineers to study into the possibilities for the development of Monterey Bay. This harbor, centrally located in California between San Francisco and Los Angeles, has a wonderful future, and I feel confident that the study to be made by the Army engineers will be but the first step of many that will eventually culminate in a great port here.

May I point out also that there are several other harbor possibilities in this stretch of coast line between Los Angeles and San Francisco which will inevitably play an important role in west coast development and in the expansion of our Asiatic trade. I refer especially to Ventura, Port Hueneme, Santa Barbara, and Morro Bay, and it will be noted that the latter two are already included in the present bill.

Again I congratulate the chairman and members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee for their wise and farsighted action in bringing this bill before us early in this session, and I trust that those projects which will contribute to the war effort will be started in the very near future.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked on several occasions whether or not I intended to offer my amendment that was introduced in the last session of Congress to the river and harbor bill dealing with the 160-acre limitation. At this time I have no desire to introduce my amendment, although it is germane to this bill, hoping that through other legislation we can reach an agreement. If we cannot, at a later date I will appear before the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] is chairman, and at that time offer the same amendment that I did in the last session of the Congress, realizing at this time that the controversial nature of my amendment and others perhaps kept that legislation in the last session of Congress from being enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and to the membership of the House who stood by me in the closing days of the Seventy-eighth Congress when I offered my amendment. I see my friend here, the good Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is chairman of the subcommittee in the Senate that gave me and my people a lot of time so far as my amendment was concerned, and I think made it possible for my amendment to be included in the river and harbor bill that passed the House. I am thankful to both of those chairmen. They are fine gentlemen. I also thank the Members of the House for their cooperation on my amendment. My people are grateful because they are going to keep trying to work it out some way for this amendment to become law, because when the Central Valley project is complete, which means much to my people, it will be worked out in only one way and that is the American way. That is all we are asking.

I want to again thank the chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the fine Senator on the

floor at this time, as well as the membership of the House, for their very much appreciated cooperation.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], a member of the committee.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, for 10 years I have been a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I have watched with great interest as I have participated in the decisions of that committee the bills that have been brought forth, but during all of this decade I have never known of a bill to be brought out that had more merit to it than this bill, particularly coming at a time like this. Not only does this bill create a good deal of employment in the post-war period, but it is a type of employment that will yield rich dividends to the people of the United States in all of the years to come. I am certainly in favor of this bill, and I think it is one bill that ought to pass this House unanimously.

Before I close, may I say just this word? I think that this committee has been exceedingly fortunate to be working under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I know of no Member of this House who has a more distinguished record, or who is more loved by every member of this committee regardless of political affiliations, than the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Judge MANSFIELD].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As the ranking Republican member on that committee, I wish to confirm the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Missouri regarding our distinguished chairman.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the House for this splendid reception. I am grateful beyond expression. I rose, however, to make an announcement with reference to this bill. The chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], has been very generous indeed. Both he and the chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling this legislation, Mr. OVERTON, have assured me that when the supplemental report of the Army engineers comes in on the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, if it is as favorable as indications now appear that it will be, it will be inserted in the next bill, and will have their unqualified support.

It will give us people in the great Mississippi Valley a slack-water route for upstream traffic that will benefit everyone, every shipper, not only on the Mississippi and on the Tombigbee and on the Tennessee, but everyone on the Ohio River up to Louisville and Paducah, Ky., Wheeling, W. Va., Cincinnati, Ohio, and Pittsburgh, Pa.

It will also benefit everyone on the Mississippi from New Orleans north, including Cairo, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and St. Paul, as well as Chicago and all points on the Great Lakes. It will benefit everyone on the Missouri River—all the way up to Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux City.

The Army engineers are now working on it and assure me that the information they are now gathering will enable them to make a far more favorable report than the one they made a few years ago. I believe this new report will entirely eliminate all opposition to this great project.

I have no desire to delay this legislation. I have no desire to embarrass my distinguished chairman the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I have no desire to hamper any legislation that will furnish post-war employment, that will help to develop the rivers and the harbors of the Nation as they should be and as they must be in the years to come.

I am assured that we will have another rivers and harbors bill soon. I am urging the Army engineers to hurry up with this supplemental report in order that we may get this project into the next bill so that we may get the support of the gentlemen to whom I have referred today, as well as my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RODGERS], and all the other members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

In fact, I think when that report comes before the House this project will have the unanimous support of the Members of this body, and will also have the support of practically every Member of the Senate.

For these reasons I have agreed to withhold this amendment at this time, and support the bill as it now stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the rivers of the Nation through the construction of works of improvement, for navigation or flood control, as herein authorized, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as herein authorized to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes, of the waters of the Nation's rivers; to facilitate the consideration of projects on a basis of comprehensive and coordinated development; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users.

In conformity with this policy—

(a) Plans, proposals, or reports of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, for any works of improvement for navigation or flood control not heretofore or herein authorized, shall be submitted to the Congress only upon compliance with the provisions of this paragraph (a). Investigations which form the basis of any such plans, proposals, or reports shall be conducted in such a manner as to give to the affected State or States, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and, to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. If such investigations in whole or part are concerned with the use or control of waters arising west of the ninety-seventh meridian, the Chief of Engineers shall give to the Secretary of the Interior, during the course of the investigations, information developed by the investigations and also opportunity for consultation regarding plans and proposals, and to the extent deemed practicable by the Chief of Engineers, opportunity to cooperate in the investigations. The relations of the Chief of Engineers with any State under this paragraph (a) shall be with the Governor of the State or such official or agency of the State as the Governor may designate. The term "affected State or States" shall include those in which the works or any part thereof are proposed to be located; those which in whole or part are both within the drainage basin involved and situated in a State lying wholly or in part west of the ninety-eighth meridian; and such of those which are east of the ninety-eighth meridian as, in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, will be substantially affected. Such plans, proposals, or reports and related investigations shall be made to the end, among other things, of facilitating the coordination of plans for the construction and operation of the proposed works with other plans involving the waters which would be used or controlled by such proposed works. Each report submitting any such plans or proposals to the Congress shall set out therein, among other things, the relationship between the plans for construction and operation of the proposed works and the plans, if any, submitted by the affected States and by the Secretary of the Interior. The Chief of Engineers shall transmit a copy of his proposed report to each affected State, and, in case the plans or proposals covered by the report are concerned with the use or control of waters which rise in whole or in part west of the ninety-seventh meridian, to the Secretary of the Interior. Within 90 days from the date of receipt of said proposed report, the written views and recommendations of each affected State and of the Secretary of the Interior may be submitted to the Chief of Engineers. The Secretary of War shall transmit to the Congress, with such comments and recommendations as he deems appropriate, the proposed report together with the submitted views and recommendations of affected States and of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of War may prepare and make said transmittal any time following said 90-day period. The letter of transmittal and its attachment shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

(b) The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works herein authorized for construction, of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior, in making investigations of and reports on works for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall, in relation to an affected State or States (as defined in paragraph (a) of this section), and to the Secretary of War, be subject to the same provisions regarding investigations, plans, proposals, and reports as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section for the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. In the event a submission of views and recommendations, made by an affected State or by the Secretary of War pursuant to said provisions, sets forth objections to the plans or proposals covered by the report of the Secretary of the Interior, the proposed works shall not be deemed authorized except upon approval by an act of Congress and subsection 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and subsection 3 (a) of

the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended, are hereby amended accordingly.

SEC. 2. The following works of improvement of rivers, harbors, and other waterways are hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of national security and the stabilization of employment, and shall be prosecuted as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements, under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect: *Provided further*, That penstocks or other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission, and such recommendations shall be based upon consideration of the proper utilization and conservation in the public interest of the resources of the region:

Northeast Harbor, Maine: House Document No. 132, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Isle au Haut Thoroughfare, Maine; Senate Document No. 15, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Hendricks Harbor, Maine; Senate Document No. 40, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Portland Harbor, Maine; House Document No. 560, Seventy-sixth Congress; and the maintenance of Soldier Ledge Channel in Hussey Sound, Casco Bay, at a depth of 40 feet, in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Josias River, Maine; House Document No. 227, Seventy-sixth Congress; except that the useful work done on the project by local interests shall be accepted toward the fulfillment of the requirements of local cooperation;

Newburyport Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 703, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Gloucester Harbor and Annisquam River, Mass.; House Document No. 329, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Manchester Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 447, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Salem Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 701, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Marblehead Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 85, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Boston Harbor, Mass.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 28, 1943;

Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass.; House Document No. 394, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Weymouth Fore River, Mass.; House Document No. 291, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cohasset Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 425, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Duxbury Harbor, Mass.; Senate Document No. 115, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Chatham (Stage) Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 456, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Wellfleet Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 557, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Hyannis Harbor, Mass.; House Document No 98, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cape Cod Canal (Onset Bay), Mass.; House Document No. 431, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Nantucket Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 115, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Menemsha Creek, Marthas Vineyard, Mass.; House Document No. 365, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Wickford Harbor, R. I.; Senate Document No. 105, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I.; House Document No. 330, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Pawcatuck River, R. I. and Conn.; House Document No. 839, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Mystic River, Conn.; House Document No. 349, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Thames River, Conn.: House Document No. 367, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.; House Document No. 368, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Clinton Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 240, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Guilford Harbor, Conn.: House Document No. 149, Seventy-seventh Congress;

New Haven Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 307, Seventy-sixth Congress, except the further improvement of Quinnipiac River;

Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 819, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Norwalk Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 220, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Mianus River, Conn.; House Document No. 549, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Greenwich Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 125, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 14, 1942;

Jamaica Bay, N. Y.; House Document No. 700, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Jones Inlet, N. Y.; House Document No. 409, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Northport Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 109, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Peconic River, N. Y.; House Document No. 237, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Lake Montauk Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 369, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Orowoc Creek, N. Y.; House Document No. 126, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Passaic River, N. J.; House Document No. 430, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N. J.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 20, 1942;

Way Cake Creek, N. J.; House Document No. 624, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Compton Creek, N. J.: House Document No. 673, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Shark River, N. J.: House Document No. 102, Seventy-sixth Congress;

New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway; House Document No. 133, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Manasquan River, N. J.; House Document No. 356, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Toms River, N. J.; House Document No. 393, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cold Spring Inlet, N. J.; House Document No. 262; Seventy-seventh Congress;

Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea; House Documents Nos. 580; Seventy-sixth Congress, and 340, Seventy-seventh Congress; and the maintenance of enlarged channel opposite the Philadelphia Navy Yard in accordance with the report on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Delaware River at Camden, N. J.; House Document No. 353, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.; House Document No. 344, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Indian River, Del.; House Document No. 330, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Nanticoke River, Del. and Md.; Senate Document No. 69, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Susquehanna River, above and below Havre de Grace, Md.; Senate Document No. 67, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Baltimore Harbor and channels, Md.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 30, 1942; and channel in Curtis Creek in accordance with plans on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers;

Mill Creek, Md.; House Document No. 100, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Broadwater Creek, Md.; House Document No. 622, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cadle Creek, Md.; House Document No. 465, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Channel to Island Creek, St. George Island, Md.; House Document No. 99, Seventy-sixth Congress;

St. Catherines Sound, Md.; House Document No. 242, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Black Walnut Harbor, Md.; House Document No. 217, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Town Creek, Md.; House Document No. 219, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Duck Point Cove, Md.; House Document No. 241, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Lower Thoroughfare, Deals Island, Md.; House Document No. 238, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Crisfield Harbor, Md.; House Document No. 457, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pocomoke River, Md.; House Document No. 429, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Waterway on the coast of Virginia; House Document No. 268, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Occohannock Creek, Va.; House Document No. 223, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Oyster Channel, Va.; House Document No. 716, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Onancock River, Va.; House Document No. 358, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Tangier Channel, Va.; House Document No. 141, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cranes Creek, Va.; House Document No. 687, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Totuskey Creek, Va.; House Document No. 686, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Hoskins Creek, Va.; House Document No. 129, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Urbanna Creek, Va.; House Document No. 285, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Whitings Creek, Va.; House Document No. 582, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Broad Creek, Va.; House Document No. 381, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pamunkey River, Va.; House Document No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Appomattox River, Va.; House Document No. 223, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Hampton Creek, Va.; House Document No. 559, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Cape Charles City Harbor, Va.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 12, 1942;

Norfolk Harbor, Va.; House Document No. 224, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Little River, Va.; maintenance work in accordance with the report on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

James River, Va.; House Document No. 738, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.; House Document No. 117, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Chowan River, N. C., and Blackwater River, Va.; House Document No. 101, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pembroke Creek, N. C.; House Document No. 235, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Channel from Pamlico Sound to Rodanthe, N. C.; House Document No. 234, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Channel from Pamlico Sound to Avon, N. C.; House Document No. 316, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Rollinson Channel, N. C.; House Document No. 236, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.; House Document No. 239, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Neuse and Trent Rivers, N. C.; House Document No. 623, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay with Cedar Bay, N. C.; Senate Document No. 87, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Waterway connecting Pamlico Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N. C.; House Document No. 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, and Senate Document No. 247, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Channel from Back Sound to Lookout Bight, N. C.; House Document No. 746, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Beaufort Harbor, N. C.; House Document No. 334, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Inland waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, N. C., including waterway to Jacksonville, N. C.; House Documents No. 660, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 346, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington; House Document No. 131 and Senate Document No. 83, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Northeast (Cape Fear) River, N. C.; Senate Document No. 170, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to Winyah Bay, S. C.; House Document No. 327, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Winyah Bay, S. C.; House Document No. 211, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Beresford Creek, S. C.; House Document No 602, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Charleston Harbor, S. C.; House Document No. 156, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Shipyard River, S. C.; report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 11, 1942;

Abbapoola Creek, S. C.; House Document No. 97, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Russel Creek, S. C.; Senate Document No. 41, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Savannah Harbor, Ga.; House Document No. 283, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.; House Document No. 610, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to St. Johns River, Fla.; House Document No. 114, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Fernandina Harbor and Amelia River, Fla.; House Document No. 284, Seventy-seventh Congress;

St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean; House Document No. 322, Seventy-seventh Congress and Senate Document No. 230, Seventy-eighth Congress, and plans for the alteration of channel alinement on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers, with such modifications as he may deem advisable;

St. Johns River, Fla., Palatka to Lake Harney; House Document No. 603, Seventy-sixth Congress;

St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville, to Lake Harney; House Document No. 445, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla.: House Documents Nos. 261 and 336, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Canaveral Harbor Fla.; House Document No. 367, Seventy-seventh Congress;

St. Lucie Inlet, Fla.; House Document No. 391, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.; House Document No. 530, Seventy-eighth Congress;

New River, Fla.; House Document No. 553, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Miami Harbor, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 24, 1942, with such modifications, including rearrangement of the harbor facilities and turning basin, as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable;

Miami River, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 19, 1942;

Intracoastal Waterway from Miami to Key West, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Fla.; House Document No. 696, Seventy-sixth Congress; and in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 5, 1943;

Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River, Fla.; House Document No. 371, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Little Manatee River, Fla.; House Document No. 552, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Tampa Harbor, Fla.; Senate Document No. 16, and House Document No. 119, Seventy-seventh Congress, and Senate Document No. 183, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Anclote River, Fla.; House Document No. 243, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pithlachascotee River, Fla.; House Document No. 86, Seventy-seventh Congress;

St. Marks River, Fla.; House Document No. 345, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Intracoastal Waterway from Apalachicola Bay to St. Marks River, Fla.; House Document No. 442, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla.; House Document No. 342, Seventy-sixth Congress;

St. Josephs Bay, Fla.; Senate Document No. 17, Seventy-seventh Congress; and in accordance with the report on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers;

Watson Bayou, Fla.; House Document No. 555, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pensacola Harbor, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 3, 1943;

Alabama-Coosa River, Ala.: Initial and ultimate development of the Alabama-Coosa River and tributaries for navigation, flood control, power development, and other purposes, as outlined in House Document No. 414, Seventy-seventh Congress, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers with such modifications thereof from time to time as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable for the purpose of increasing the development of hydroelectric power; and that for the initiation and accomplishment of the ultimate plan appropriations are authorized in such amounts as Congress may from time to time determine to be advisable, the total of such appropriations not to exceed the sum of $60,000,000. The aforesaid authorization and approval shall include authorities for all powerhouses, power machinery, and appurtenances found to be desirable by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission;

Mobile, Harbor, Ala.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala. and Miss.; House Documents Nos. 276, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 382, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Dauphin Island Bay Channel, Ala.; House Document No. 333, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Bayou Coden, Ala.; House Document No. 824, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Bayou La Batre, Ala.; House Document No. 281, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Biloxi Harbor, Miss.; House Documents Nos. 258 and 326, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pass Christian Harbor, Miss.; Senate Document No. 214, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Bayou Galere, Miss.; House Document No. 112, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Bayous LaLoutre, St. Malo, and Yscloskey, La.; Senate Document No. 116, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to the Gulf of Mexico; House Document No. 215, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Algiers at New Orleans, La.; Senate Document No. 188, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La.; House Document No. 594, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Calcasieu River and Pass, La.; House Document No. 465, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway; House Document Nos. 428, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 383, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway to Harlingen, Tex.; House Document No. 402, Seventy-seventh Congress; the depths and widths to be the same as authorized for the main stem of the waterway in Public Law No. 675, enacted July 23, 1942;

Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway; Senate Document No. 248, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.; House Document No. 685, Seventy-sixth Congress, and Senate Documents Nos. 60 and 158, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Neches and Angelina Rivers, Tex.; Senate Document No. 98, Seventy-sixth Congress;

The improvement of the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, for navigation, flood control, and allied purposes is hereby approved and authorized in accordance with the reports contained in House Document No. 403, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Lavon Reservoir on East Fork of Trinity River, Tex.; House Document No. 533, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; House Documents Nos. 226 and 256, Seventy-sixth Congress; and in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 21, 1943;

Clear Creek and Clear Lake, Tex.; House Document No. 319, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex.; House Document No. 337, Seventy-sixth Congress: *Provided*, That the authorization is not to be construed as final approval for the improvement of Bastrop Bayou;

Channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca and Lavaca-Navidad Rivers, Tex., in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 10, 1943, and House Documents Nos. 314, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 659, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Guadalupe River, Tex.; House Document No. 247, Seventy-sixth Congress: *Provided*, That whenever any power project, not under Federal license, is benefitted by the Canyon Reservoir project, the Federal Power Commission, after notice to the owner or owners of such unlicensed project and after opportunity for hearing, shall determine and fix a reasonable and equitable annual charge to be paid to the United States on account of such benefits by said owner or owners or other recipients of such benefits;

Aransas Pass-Corpus Christi Channel, Tex.; House Document No. 544, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.; House Document No. 335, Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Document No. 347, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.; House Document No. 104, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers; House Document No. 231, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis: The existing project for lock and dam No. 2 is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendation in House Document No. 432, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis: The construction of lock and dam No. 26 at Alton, Ill., is hereby declared to be in accord with the project authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis; House Documents Nos. 103 and 547, Seventy-sixth Congress; 263, Seventy-seventh Congress; and 449, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis: The existing project is hereby modified to provide for remedial works in accordance with the recommendations of the district engineer in the report submitted in House Document No. 137, Seventy-sixth Congress, and for such remedial works or land acquisitions in any levee or drainage

district, with respect to which payments, remedial works, or land acquisitions were recommended in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 34, Seventy-fifth Congress, and authorized by the act of August 26, 1937, as the Chief of Engineers deems advisable, in addition to or in lieu of the payments, remedial works, or land acquisitions so recommended and authorized;

Illinois Waterway, Ill., and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Ind.; House Document No. 145, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth; House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Scioto River at Portsmouth, Ohio: Such works as the Chief of Engineers may find advisable to provide a harbor channel equivalent to that existing prior to initiation of the Portsmouth flood-control project; the cost of such works in no event to exceed $75,000;

Coasts of the Great Lakes; harbors of refuge for light draft vessels; House Document No. 446, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Baudette Harbor, Minn.; House Document No. 216, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Harbor at Knife River, Minn.; House Document No. 686, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Ashland Harbor, Wis.; House Document No. 337, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis.; House Document No. 228, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Green Bay Harbor, Wis.; House Document No. 95, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wis.; House Document No. 421, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.; Senate Document No. 29, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Racine Harbor, Wis.; House Documents Nos. 816, Seventy-seventh Congress, and 255, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Waukegan Harbor, Ill.; House Document No. 116, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.; House Document No. 233, Seventy-sixth Congress;

St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.; House Document No. 129, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich.; House Document No. 661, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Manistee Harbor, Mich.; House Document No. 380, Seventy-seventh Congress;

St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 14, 1944, and contained in House Document No. 679, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session;

St. Marys River, Mich.: The construction of a new hydroelectric power plant in accordance with the plan recommended in House Document No. 339, Seventy-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That only the first step of the recommended development, involving an installation of approximately 14,000 kilowatts at an estimated cost of $3,500,000, shall be constructed at this time, and no further development in addition to said first step shall be undertaken until hereafter authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the existing United States hydroelectric power plant at Sault Ste. Marie shall be abandoned upon completion of the new plant: *Provided further*, That the electric energy generated in the operation of said new plant shall be sold by the Secretary of War, and any surplus water available to the United States which is not required for the operation of facilities owned by the United States may be leased by the Secretary of War upon such terms and conditions as he shall determine: *And provided further*, That pending construction of the new United States plant he may also enter into such arrangements for continued operation of the existing Government plant and the use of water as he may deem advisable in the public interest;

St. Clair River at Southeast Bend, Mich.; the widening of the existing project channel, in accordance with alternative plan B, as outlined in the report of the district engineer in House Document No. 309, Seventy-seventh Congress, is hereby authorized;

Detroit River, Mich.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Sandusky Harbor, Ohio; House Document No. 328, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Lorain Harbor, Ohio; House Document No. 161, Seventy-seventh Congress; and in accordance with the report on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers;

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio; House Document No. 232, Seventy-sixth Congress; and the extension of the channel in the Cuyahoga River in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 14, 1942;

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio; House Document No. 321, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Erie Harbor, Pa.; protection of that portion of the peninsula south of the waterworks settling basins at an estimated annual cost of $15,000 is hereby authorized;

Erie Harbor, Pa.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 852, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Black Rock Channel and Tonowanda Harbor, N. Y.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 16, 1942;

Wilson Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 679, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Rochester Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 139, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Sackets Harbor, N. Y.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated January 6, 1944;

Cape Vincent Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 363, Seventy-sixth Congress;

San Diego Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 390, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Newport Bay Harbor, Calif.; Senate Document No. 138, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 348, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Morro Bay, Calif.; House Document No. 283, Seventy-seventh Congress; and further harbor development as desired by the Navy Department in accordance with the plans on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Monterey Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 266, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Monterey Bay (Moss Landing), Calif.; in accordance with the report on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Redwood Creek, Calif.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated November 3, 1941;

Oakland Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 466, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Oakland Harbor, Calif.; in accordance with the report on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Richmond Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 715, Seventy-sixth Congress;

San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, Calif.; House Document No. 217, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Noyo Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 682, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Crescent City Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 688, Seventy-sixth Congress, and the construction of an inner breakwater in accordance with the plans on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Chetco River, Oreg.; House Document No. 817, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Coquille River, Oreg.; House Document No. 672, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Umpqua Harbor and River, Oreg.; Senate Document No. 86, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Umpqua River, Oreg.; Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.; Senate Document No. 119, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Depoe Bay, Oreg.; House Document No. 850, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Salmon River, Oreg.; House Document No. 551, Seventy-sixth Congress;

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $120,000, to be immediately available as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for repairing damage to and checking erosion on the Bayocean Peninsula, in Oregon, caused by a storm in January 1939, in order to provide adequate protection to property on such peninsula and in Tillamook, Oreg.;

Willamette River, Oreg.: The construction of the New Willamette Falls lock and navigation works in accordance with the plan submitted in House Document No. 544, Seventy-fifth Congress;

Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho: The construction of such dams as are necessary, and open channel improvement for purposes of providing slack water navigation and irrigation in accordance with the plan submitted in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, with such modifications as do not change the requirements to provide slack-water navigation as the Secretary of War may find advisable after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and such other agencies as may be concerned: *Provided*, That surplus electric energy generated at the dams authorized in this item shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior for disposition in accordance with existing laws relating to the disposition of power at Bonneville Dam: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as conferring the power of condemnation of transmission lines;

Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to acquire lands and provide facilities in the States of Oregon and Washington to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of Bonneville Dam: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 may be expended for this purpose from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: *Provided further*, That such lands and facilities shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for the use and benefit of the Indians, and shall be subject to the same conditions, safeguards, and protections as the treaty fishing grounds submerged or destroyed;

Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to the mouth of Snake River, Oreg. and Wash.; Senate Document No. 28, Seventy-sixth Congress; and House Document No. 324, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.; the construction of the Umatilla Dam for purposes of navigation, power development, and irrigation in accordance with the plan submitted in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress: *Provided*, That surplus electric energy generated at said dam shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior for disposition in accordance with existing laws relating to the disposition of power at Bonneville Dam: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as conferring the power of condemnation of transmission lines: *Provided further*, That said dam shall be so constructed as to provide a pool elevation of 340 feet above sea level if a dam of that height is found to be feasible. In the design, construction, and operation of the Umatilla Dam adequate provision shall be made for the protection of anadromous fishes by affording free access to their natural spawning grounds or by other appropriate means. Studies and surveys necessary for fish protection shall be made by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and designs for structures and facilities required for fish protection shall be prepared in cooperation with that agency. Funds appropriated for the design, construction, or operation of said dam

shall be available for transfer to the Department of the Interior for the foregoing purposes. The aforesaid dam heretofore referred to as the Umatilla Dam shall when completed be named the McNary Dam in honor of the late Senator Charles L. McNary, and shall be dedicated to his memory as a monument to his distinguished public service;

Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and Bonneville, Oreg.; House Document No. 218, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Columbia and Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.; House Documents Nos. 341 and 630, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Baker Bay, Columbia River, Wash.; House Document No. 443, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Willapa River and Harbor, Wash.; House Document No. 481, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River to Aberdeen, Wash., to maintenance work in accordance with report on file in Office, Chief of Engineers;

Quillayute River, Wash.; House Document No. 218, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.; House Document No. 331, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Olympia Harbor, Wash.; House Document No. 699, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Tacoma Harbor, Wash.; House Document No. 124, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Stillaguamish River, Wash.; House Document No. 286, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Lake Crockett, Wash.; House Document No. 303, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Metlakatla Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 138, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Craig Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 558, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Meyers Chuck Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 222, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Wrangell Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 284, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Wrangell Narrows, Alaska; House Document No. 260, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Sitka Harbor, Alaska; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 14, 1944;

Skagway Harbor, Alaska; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 11, 1942;

Petersburg Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 670, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Port Alexander, Alaska; House Document No. 578, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Gastineau Channel, Alaska; House Document No. 325, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Elfin Cove, Alaska; House Document No. 579, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Seldovia Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 702, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Keehi Lagoon, Oahu, T. H.; House Document No. 379, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Port Allen Harbor, Hawaii; House Document No. 180, Seventy-seventh Congress;

San Juan Harbor, P. R.; maintenance of existing entrance channel and turning basin to Army Terminal;

Ponce Harbor, P. R.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 21, 1942; and

Fajardo Harbor, P. R.; House Document No. 280, Seventy-sixth Congress.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to allot not to exceed $300,000 from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for improvement of rivers and harbors, for removing accumulated snags and other debris, and for protecting, clearing, and straightening channels in navigable harbors and navigable streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of navigation or flood control. The paragraph in section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 25, 1912, relating to removal of temporary obstructions, as amended by section 3 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and section 3 of the River and Harbor Act approved October 17, 1940, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. That (a) the consent, permission, and authority granted to the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois to exercise jurisdiction over the navigable waters of Lake Michigan which lie within the following-described boundaries:

Beginning at a point at the intersection of the existing bulkhead along Lake Shore Drive in Chicago, Ill., with the existing pier which is parallel to and north of Ohio Street extended and south of Ontario Street extended; thence easterly along said pier to a point in a line parallel to and 350 feet easterly of said bulkhead along the Lake Shore Drive; thence northwesterly along said last-described line to a point in a curve of 200 feet radius and tangent both to said last-described line and to a line 350 feet southerly from the southerly side of and parallel to the shore arm extension breakwater extending into Lake Michigan from a point near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive; thence along said curve to a point in said line last described; thence easterly along said line to a point in a line at right angles with said shore arm extension breakwater at the eastern extremity thereof; thence northward along said last-described line to said shore arm extension breakwater; thence westward along said shore arm extension breakwater to the shore line; and (b) the right granted to said the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, to destroy the navigability of the above-described waters altogether; and (c) the right granted to said the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, to erect an additional breakwater to connect the said shore arm extension breakwater near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive with the shore line; and (d) the transfer of possession of said shore arm extension breakwater to said the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, and the obligation for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore arm extension breakwater by the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, all as provided for by the act entitled "An act granting to the Commissioners of Lincoln Park the right to erect a breakwater in the navigable waters of Lake Michigan, and transferring jurisdiction over certain navigable waters of Lake Michigan to the Commissioners of Lincoln Park," approved March 3, 1931, be rescinded.

The United States of America hereby resumes jurisdiction over the above-described waters and the above-described shore arm extension breakwater, and hereby discharges the Chicago Park District, successor to the superseded the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, from its liability for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore arm extension breakwater.

Said Chicago Park District shall signify its acceptance of this act by written notice to the Secretary of War within 60 days after the passage of this act, and this section shall become effective immediately upon its acceptance by said Chicago Park District. In the event of nonacceptance within 60 days this section shall become null and void.

SEC. 5. The Chief of Engineers may authorize the employment of physicians under agreement, to make such physical examinations of employees or prospective employees as he may consider essential, on a fee or regular employment basis, and all agreements heretofore entered into for such purposes are hereby validated, and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for reasonable payments heretofore made for such services.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made at the following-named localities, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That no preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate for new works other than those designated in this or some prior act or joint resolution shall be made: *Provided further*, That after the regular or formal reports made as required by law on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law: *Provided further*, That reports of surveys on beach erosion and shore protection shall include an estimate of the public interests involved, and such plan of improvement as is found justified, together with the equitable distribution of costs in each case: *And provided further*, That this section shall not be construed to interfere with the performance of any duties vested in the Federal Power Commission under existing law:

Beals Harbor, Maine.

Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

Macks Point, Searsport, Maine, with a view to the construction of a harbor.

Scarboro River, Maine, between Prouts Neck and Pine Point.

Bunganuc Creek, Maquoite Bay, Maine.

Cathance River, Maine.

Winterport Harbor, Maine.

Boothbay Harbor, Maine, particularly the Mill Cove area.

Cundys Harbor, Maine.

Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the pool at Biddeford.

For a continuous waterway between Portland, Maine, and Boston, Mass., inland where possible.

Waterway from Plum Island Sound to the Annisquam River, Essex County, Mass.

Ipswich River, Plum Island Sound, and Fox Creek, Mass.

Mattapoisett, Mass.

Channel from Buzzards Bay to Buttermilk Bay, Mass.

Fall River Harbor, Mass.

Mystic River, Mass.

Falmouth Harbor, Mass.

Channel to Hog Island, Hingham Bay, Mass.

New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbors and the Acushnet River, Mass.; particularly with a view to provide greater depth in the eastern portion of the anchorage basin and for the improvement of navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

Eightmile River, Conn.

Moriches Inlet, N. Y.

Centerport Harbor, Long Island, N. Y.

Shinnecock Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.

Peconic River, Long Island, N. Y.

At Smithtown, Long Island, N. Y.

The southern coast of Long Island, from the New York City line to Montauk Point, N. Y., with a view to the protection and improvement of the beaches along said coast, such examination and survey to be made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and the act entitled "An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States," approved June 26, 1936.

Nissequogue River, N. Y.

St. James Harbor, N. Y.

Fire Island Inlet, N. Y.

Saw Mill River, N. Y.

Bronx River, N. Y.

Westchester Creek, N. Y.

Hutchinson River, N. Y.

Steinway Creek, Astoria, N. Y.

Champlain Canal, N. Y., with a view to its improvement without taking title to said canal and its appurtenances.

Hudson River, N. Y., from Albany to New York City.

Hudson River, at or near North Germantown, Columbia County, N. Y.

Hudson River at the mouth of Endikill Creek, N. Y., with a view to constructing a small boat anchorage basin.

Mohawk River, N. Y.

Arthur Kill, N. Y. and N. J., between a point 1,000 feet north of the mouth of Smiths Creek and a point 1,000 feet south of Buckwheat Island.

Hackensack River, N. J.

Sandy Hook Bay, N. J., with a view to providing a channel to, and navigation improvements at, Leonardo.

Coast of New Jersey, from Sandy Hook to Cape May, with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along said coast, such examination and survey to be made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and the act entitled "An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States," approved June 26, 1936.

Salem River, Salem County, N. J.

Fishing Creek, Cumberland County, N. J.

Cheesequake Creek, N. J.

Schuylkill River, Pa., particularly with a view to providing a deeper channel.

Schuylkill River, Pa., to determine whether navigation conditions may be improved, and if the increasing cost of maintenance due to silting in the channels of the Schuylkill and Delaware Rivers may be lessened, and flood heights controlled, by the construction of impounding and settling reservoirs to prevent the encroachment of mining wastes.

Mispillion River, Del., up to Milford.

Waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del.

Ocean City Harbor and Inlet, and Sinepuxent Bay, Md.

Marumsco Creek, lower Somerset County, Md.

Websters Cove, Somerset County, Md., with a view to constructing a jetty in the project channel.

Twitch Cove and Big Thoroughfare River, Md., with a view to the construction of a boat basin at Ewell.

Pocomoke River, Md., from Old Rock Buoy to Williams Point.

Crisfield Harbor, Md.

Taylors Landing, Worcester County, Md.

Channel from Charlestown, Northeast River, Md., to Havre de Grace.

Channel from Havre de Grace, Md., to Red Point, via Stump Point and Carpenter Point.

Bear Creek and Lynch Cove, Md.

Deep Creek and Fresh Water Pond, Md.

Honga River and Tar Bay, including channel into and harbor in Back Creek, Hooper Island, Md.

Channel in Honga River, to the plant of White & Nelson, Hoopersville, Md.

Harbor at Public Landing, Worcester County, Md.

Cambridge Harbor, Md.

Rockhall Harbor, Md.

Ross Cove (Magothy River), Md.

Cambridge Harbor, Md.

Coxes Creek, tributary of Stony Creek, Md.

Channels to Lake Ogleton and Walnut Lake, Anne Arundel County, Md.

Walnut Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., lying between Bay Ridge and Arundel-on-the Bay.

Channel from Kent Island Narrows to Well Cove, Chester River, Md.

Port Tobacco Creek, Md.

Hellens Creek, Calvert County, Md.

Channel from Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md.

St. Patricks Creek, Md.

Big Kingston Creek, St. Marys County, Md.

Tanners Creek, St. Marys County, Md.

Parkers Creek, Calvert County, Md.

Chester River Channel, Md.

Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Md., with a view to providing a harbor for small boats.

Governor's Run, Calvert County, Md., with a view to providing a harbor for small boats.

Channel between Ramsey Bay and Chesapeake Bay, and other measures for the prevention of damage from erosion near the mouth of South River, Anne Arundel County, Md.

Area where Neale Creek, Md., empties into the Potomac River, with a view to removing the sand bar and providing a safe harbor.

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers and adjacent waters in and near the District of Columbia, with a view to attaining a comprehensive and coordinated improvement and development of such waters and their shores. In determining the recommendations to be made with respect to such improvement and development, consultations shall be had with, and consideration given to the recommendations of, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Potomac River and tributaries at and below Washington, D. C., with a view to elimination of the water chestnut.

Potomac River at and near Washington, D. C.

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers at and near Washington, D. C., with a view to providing a municipal sailing base.

Farnham Creek, Richmond County, Va.

Southwest side of Rappahannock River, in vicinity of Bowlers Wharf, Essex County, Va., to secure harbor of refuge and connecting channels.

Finneys Creek, Accomac County, Va., and the channel connecting said creek with Wachapreague Inlet and the Atlantic Ocean.

Jackson Creek, Westmoreland County, Va.

Bonum Creek, Westmoreland County, Va.

Kings Creek, Northampton County, Va.

Bransons Cove, lower Machodoc River, Va.

Taskmers Creek, Northumberland County, Va.

Davis Creek, Mathews County, Va.

Dyer Creek, Mathews County, Va.

Deep Creek, Accomac County, Va.

Browns Bay, Gloucester County, Va., and the channel connecting said bay with Mobjack Bay.

Parrotts Creek, Middlesex County, Va.

The Hague (Smith Creek), Va.

Southern Branch of Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor, Va.

Chuckatuck Creek, Nansemond and Isle of Wight Counties, Va.

Little Creek, Princess Anne County, Va.

Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay and connecting waters, Virginia, with a view to preparing a plan of improvement and estimate of cost, particularly to prevent shoaling, in the interest of shellfish production and navigation.

Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort, N. C., with a view to providing a side channel 12 feet deep through Pasquotank River and Albemarle Sound to Elizabeth City.

Channel from the Thoroughfare to Albemarle Sound, N. C., either by way of lower Cashie River, Middle River, and Bachelors Bay, or by way of any other route.

Purviance Creek, New Hanover County, N. C.

Little Pee Dee River, S. C., from junction of the Lumber River to the Great Pee Dee River, with a view to removing logs, debris, and other obstructions.

Santee-Congaree Buckingham Landing Site, S. C.

Jefferys Creek, Florence County, S. C.

Murrells Inlet, S. C.

Cooper River, S. C., from Charleston Harbor to the Pinopolis power plant.

Channel from the ocean through St. Helena Sound or through Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C.

North River, Ga.

St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.

St. Johns River, Fla., Palatka to Lake Harney.

Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, Fla., with a view to providing an auxiliary side channel from the Intracoastal Waterway near Titusville through, and easterly of, Merritt Island via Banana Creek and River, to, or near, Eau Gallie, Fla.

Side channels, or spur channels, leading from the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, Fla., to, and turning basins or harbors at, the various communities on or near the banks of said waterway, having particular reference to providing such improvements to and at Titusville, Flagler Beach, New Smyrna, Fort Pierce, and to the Lighthouse Service depot at Taylor Creek, adjacent to Fort Pierce Harbor.

St. Augustine Harbor, and vicinity, Florida.

Kissimmee River, Fla.

Jupiter Inlet, Fla.

Oklawaha River, Fla., from Lake Apopka through Lake Dora to Lake Eustis and adjoining waterways.

Oklawaha River, Fla., from Lake Eustis to Lake Griffin, and thence from Lake Griffin to Silver Springs Run.

Oklawaha River and its tributaries, Florida, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

For a system of interlocking open-river and canalized channels having a depth of 12 feet, and of suitable width, to be constructed through rivers and lakes, and by land cuts, as follows: From Palatka, Fla., to the Indian River at Sebastian, Melbourne, Eau Gallie, Cocoa, or such other locality as may be found most suitable; from Titusville westerly to the St. Johns River, thence to Lake Tohopekaliga; from Lake Tohopekaliga to Leesburg, on Lake Harris; from Lake Harris to the St. Johns River near Dexter Lake or alternately from Lake Harris to the Wekiwa River, thence to the St. Johns River; and from Lake Tohopekaliga via the Kissimmee River and Lake Okeechobee to a connection with the Okeechobee Cross-Florida Channel; all with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and water conservation.

Orange Lake Basin, Fla.

Wacasassa River and its tributaries, Florida, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

Channel and harbor at Everglades, Collier County, Fla.

Bakers Haulover Inlet, Fla.

Waterway from packing house and railroad terminal at Belle Glade, Fla., to Lake Okeechobee and to the Intracoastal Waterway through the Hillsboro and West Palm Beach Canals.

Peace River, Fla.

Channel to Pahokee, on Lake Okeechobee, Fla.

Lake Okeechobee and its tributary streams, Florida, with a view to removing the water hyacinth.

Fisheating Creek, Fla.

Channel from bridge at Bradenton, Fla., to deep water in Gulf of Mexico (Tampa Bay).

Channel from Tampa Bay to Safety Harbor, Fla.

Channel from Old Tampa Bay to Oldsmar, Fla.

Channel leading from Tampa Bay Channel directly north to the vicinity of Maximo Point near St. Petersburg, Fla.

Channel leading from Tampa Bay Channel directly north to the vicinity of Mullet Key and with a view to providing a protected harbor and turning basin.

St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla., to provide for a channel up to the depth of 30 feet from the main Tampa Bay ship channel past the port of St. Petersburg in front of the recreation pier.

Hillsboro Inlet, Fla., in the vicinity of Pompano.

Channels through Big Pass and Little Pass, from Clearwater Bay, Fla., to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico.

Sarasota Bay, Fla: Channel from Caseys Pass (Venice Inlet), through Dona Bay to the bridge on the United States Highway No. 41, including a turning basin at the eastern terminus of the channel.

Hudson River, Fla.

Suwannee River, Ga. and Fla., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and flood control.

Channel from the deep water in St. Joseph Sound to, and turning basin at, Ozona, Fla.

Chassahowitska River, Fla.

Crystal River, Fla.

Channel, turning basin, and improvements at Horseshoe, Dixie County, Fla.

Santa Fe River, from bridge on Federal Highway No. 41, near High Springs, to the Suwannee River, and from this bridge upstream to Camp Blanding, Kingsley Lake, Fla.

Waterways from Camp Blanding, Kingsley Lake, Fla., via Black Creek to St. Johns River, and (or) via Black Creek and Doctors Inlet to St. Johns River.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, to determine if existing project should be modified by constructing the waterway from Carrabelle, Fla., to Lanark, thence to Turkey Point, Alligator Harbor, Tide Creek, and Panacea.

Canal from St. Marks to Tallahassee, Fla.

Chipola River, Ala. and Fla., with a view to its improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, power, and other related purposes.

Waterway from the Intracoastal Waterway south across Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to a point at or near Deer Point Light.

La Grange Bayou, Fla.

St. Joseph Bay, Fla.

Aucilla River, Fla.

East Pass from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.

Bayou Texar, Fla.

Pensacola Harbor, Fla.

Entrance to Perdido Bay, Ala. and Fla., from the Gulf of Mexico to deep water in Perdido Bay, via the most practicable route.

Columbus, Ga., to Pensacola, Fla.: Waterway via Chattahoochee, Conecuh, and Escambia Rivers.

Waterway from the Escambia River to the Alabama River, Fla. and Ala.

Tombigbee River, Ala. and Miss., and canal connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers.

Tennessee, Tombigbee, and Mobile Rivers, with a view to securing a through waterway of 12 feet depth and suitable width between the Ohio River and the Gulf of Mexico.

Fly Creek, Fairhope, Ala.

Channel 40 feet deep, to serve as a deep-water outlet to the Gulf of Mexico from the harbors of Mobile, Ala., and Pascagoula, Biloxi, and Gulfport, Miss.

Pearl River, in the interest of flood control in Pearl River, Marion, Hinds, and Lowrence Counties, Miss.

Grand Bayou Pass, La., from the Gulf of Mexico to Buras and Empire.

Bayou Schofield, La., from the Gulf of Mexico to Buras and Empire.

Ship canal to extend from the Mississippi River at a point at or near the city of New Orleans, La., to the Gulf of Mexico, by way of the best available route or routes.

Barge channel in vicinity of Baton Rouge, La., extending from the Mississippi River through Devils Swamp or along its eastern edge.

Grand Bayou, connecting Bayou Boeuf and Bayou Chevreuil, La.

Barataria Bay and connecting channels, La., to provide a continuous waterway from the Gulf of Mexico to the Intracoastal Waterway.

Bayou Boeuf, La Fourche Parish, La.

Lake Pontchartrain, La., with a view to the construction of a seaplane base in the vicinity of New Orleans and with a view to the protection of the shoreline and repairs to the existing protective works on Lake Pontchartrain at Mandeville, La.

For flood control, irrigation, navigation, and drainage, and for the prevention of stream pollution and salt-water intrusion, on all streams and bayous in southwest Louisiana, west of the West Atchafalya Basin protection levee, and south of the latitude of Boyce; on all streams and bayous in Louisiana lying between the East Atchafalaya Basin protection levee and the Mississippi River; and on Amite and Tangipahoa Rivers and tributaries, Louisiana.

Mermentau River, La., from Grand Chenier to the Gulf.

Bell City drainage canal, La.

Bayou La Fourche, La., from the Gulf of Mexico to Leeville or to Golden Meadow.

Bayou La Fourche, La., from Donaldsonville to the Intracoastal Waterway, via Bayou Boeuf, Assumption Parish, or other streams, in the interest of navigation, flood control, beneficial uses of water, malarial control, prevention of stream pollution, and of the location of locks at the head of said bayou at or near Donaldsonville, La.

North Prong, Schooner Bayou, Vermilion Parish, La.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and connecting streams, lakes, and bays in Louisiana between Bayou Sale Ridge and the Calcasieu River in the interest of navigation, flood control, irrigation, and drainage, and for the prevention of stream polluton and salt-water intrusion.

The shore of Galveston Bay, Tex., with a view to preventing its erosion.

Galveston Bay and contiguous waters, Texas, with a view to providing a seaplane channel.

Pine Island Bayou, Tex.

Cedar Bayou Pass, Corpus Christi Pass, and Pass at Murdocks Landing, Tex.

Little Bay, Tex.

Sabine River and tributaries, Texas, in the interest of navigation, flood control, and other water uses.

Neches River and tributaries, Texas, in the interest of navigation, flood control, and other water uses.

Big Sandy Creek, Tex.

Cypress Creek, Tex.

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., with a view to further improvements in the interest of navigation and the prevention of damage by floods.

Dickinson Bayou, Tex.

Jones Creek, Tex., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and flood control.

Waterway from the Neches River, by way of Pine Island Bayou and extension, to Trinity River, Tex.

Double Bayou, Tex.

Colorado River, Tex.

Waterway from Alvin, Tex., to the Intracoastal Waterway.

Ouachita River, with a view to the construction of a dam at or near Rockport, Ark., in the interest of navigation, flood control, and the development of hydroelectric power.

Loosahatchie River, Tenn., from its mouth to the O. K. Robertson Road and including the area west of the Illinois Central R. R. and north of Wolf River, with a view to extending the navigation facilities of Memphis Harbor.

Mississippi River: Davenport (Iowa) harbor refuge.

Mississippi River at Cassville, Wis.

Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis.

Mississippi River at Alma, Wis.

Mississippi River at Maiden Rock, Wis.

Illinois and Mississippi Canal, Ill.

St. Croix River Basin, Minn. and Wis., including consideration of the construction of dam below the mouth of Kettle River.

Minnesota River, Minn., up to a point 10 miles above New Ulm, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and related purposes.

Red River of the North drainage basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

Missouri River in South Dakota and North Dakota.

Missouri River in Nebraska.

Allegheny River, up to Olean, N. Y.

Tofte Harbor, Minn.

Grand Portage Harbor, Minn.

Lake Kabetogama, Minn.

Waterway connecting Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, from Au Train Lake to Little Bay de Noc, Mich.

Harbor at mouth of Au Train River, Mich.

Shelldrake Harbor, Mich.

St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., with a view to providing facilities for light-draft navigation.

Harbor at St. Ignace, Mich.

Kenosha Harbor, Wis.

Mackinac Harbor, Mich.

Galien River, Berrien County, Mich.

Pine River, Mich.

Pinconning River, Mich.

Clinton River, Mich.

Waterway from Lake Erie, at or near Toledo, Ohio, to the southerly end of Lake Michigan by way of the Maumee River and the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., or other practicable route.

St. Marys River, Ohio and Ind.

Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio.

The coast of Lake Erie, with a view to the establishment of harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels for commercial and/or recreational purposes.

Harbor at Ballast Island, Ohio.

Vermilion Harbor, Ohio, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and related purposes.

Rocky River, Ohio.

The south shores of Lake Erie and of Lake Huron with a view to the establishment of harbors and harbors of refuge for light-draft commercial and fishing vessels and for recreational craft.

At or near North East, Pa., with a view to constructing a harbor of refuge.

Harbor at Hamburg Township, N. Y.

Little River (branch of Niagara River), at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Port Bay, N. Y.

Oswego Harbor, N. Y.

Chaumont River, N. Y.

At and in the vicinity of Henderson, N. Y., with a view to constructing a harbor.

At and in the vicinity of Sacketts Harbor, N. Y., with a view to providing additional harbor facilities.

Point Dume, Calif.

Santa Monica Harbor, Calif.

The coast of southern California, with a view to the establishment of harbors for light-draft vessels.

Pillar Point, Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, Calif.

Monterey Bay, Calif.

Area at and in the vicinity of South Basin, San Francisco, Calif.

Carquinez Strait and Alhambra Creek, Calif., with a view to providing harbor improvements at, and in the vicinity of, Martinez.

Noyo River, Calif.

Napa River, Calif.

Humboldt Bay, Calif.

Bays, inlets, and rivers along the coast of Oregon with a view to providing an adequate number of deep draft harbors.

Nelscott, Oreg., with a view to protection of the beach.

Harbor at Empire, Oreg.

Alsea Bay, Oreg., with a view to the construction of a harbor of refuge.

Coos Bay, Oreg.

Channel at Charleston, South Slough, Oreg.

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.

Nehalem Bay and River.

Columbia Slough.

Astoria, Oreg., with a view to the construction of a mooring basin for fishing boats within the harbor.

Willapa Harbor, Wash., with a view to providing a channel to, and turning basin at,

Tokeland Dock; also with a view to providing a mooring basin and breakwater at and near Nahcotta Dock, Nahcotta.

Grays Harbor, Wash., with a view to constructing a channel into Bay City.

Grays Harbor, Wash., with a view to providing a breakwater and other improvements at and near Westport.

Grays Harbor, Wash., with a view of providing a deep-sea fishing base at Hoquiam.

Friday Harbor, Wash.

Sitka Harbor, Alaska.

Cordova Harbor, Alaska.

Kodiak Harbor, Alaska.

Neva Strait and Olga Strait, Alaska.

Upper Kvichak River, Alaska.

Skagway Harbor, Alaska.

Valdez Harbor, Alaska, with a view to its improvement and particularly with respect to the expansion of facilities for harborage of small boats.

Cook Inlet, Alaska, with a view to improvement for navigation, providing harbor facilities for the city of Anchorage, and the development of hydroelectric power.

Anchorage Harbor, Alaska, with a view to its improvement, and with the view of determining the advisability of providing additional harbor facilities for small boats.

Kalaupapa Landing, Island of Molokai, T. H.

Kalepolepa Boat Harbor, Island of Maui, T. H.

Humacao Playa, Punta Santiago, P. R.

Arecibo Harbor, P. R., with a view to determining whether modifications in the authorized project would be desirable.

Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, V. I., with a view to improvement for navigation.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain as nearly as can be estimated the amounts of damages resulting to manufacturers on the Oswego River, by the improvement of the Oswego and Erie Canals by the State of New York in accordance with the project adopted by the River and Harbor Act, approved August 30, 1935.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. JARMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 127, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the opinion of Judge Kennedy in the Jackson Hole case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts from letters and newspapers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent on the subject of the pampering of German prisoners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 626. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 626. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the census of agriculture; and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 23, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Friday, February 23, 1945.

Business to be considered: To begin public hearings on S. 63 and H. R. 1648, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Friday, February 23, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., hearings will be continued before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill, H. R. 97, to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (with respect to patents). The hearings will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the postwar ship-disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

250. A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting the sixteenth report on the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

251. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

252. A letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission, transmitting a copy of a proposed bill to improve salary and wage administration in the Federal service; to provide pay for overtime and for night and holiday work; to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

253. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 93. Resolution to provide for the continuation of the investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 98 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2277. A bill to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2284. A bill to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost reimbursable contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost reimbursable

prime contractors or of higher tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; without amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs; without amendment (Rept. No. 195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 243. An act for the relief of Galen E. Walter; without amendment (Rept. No. 196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 249. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; with amendment (Rept. No. 197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 266. A bill for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.; without amendment (Rept. No. 198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee of Claims. H. R. 778. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 787. A bill for the relief of Murray B. Latimer; with amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 904. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Fred Lower; with amendment (Rept. No. 201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 980. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Stout; without amendment (Rept. No. 202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1069. A bill for the relief of Sidney B. Walton; with amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1150. A bill for the relief of Murphy & Wischmeyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1307. A bill for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1309. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRANAHAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1347. A bill for the relief of Lee Graham; without amendment (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1598. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay; without amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRANAHAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Robert Lee Slade; with amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Murray W. Moran; with amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2312. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend for 2 additional years the period during which veterans may apply for the guaranty of loans relating to homes, farms, and business property; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2313. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 2314. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Adele Nahas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 2316. A bill for the relief of Robert Fraley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2317. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia M. Kiser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mirtie Pike; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2319. A bill for the relief of J. B. Shropshire, Firemen's Insurance Co. of Newark, N. J., and Pacific Employers Insurance Co., of San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2320. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig, through his trustee in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2321. A bill for relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

95. By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

96. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of County Officers Association, State of New York, endorsing House bill 693 to amend the Securities Exchange Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

97. By the SPEAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of the city of Rochester, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a protest against the Russian Government stand in regard to Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

98. Also, petition of Christian Frederick Danielsen, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a protest against the War and Navy Departments' restrictive circular, Discharge of Subversives From Private Plants or War Department Plants, without revealing the nature or sources of its information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit of God and heart of love, by the words that bring us joy and peace and hope we know Thee to be our Father; in Thee do we put our trust, and may we never be ashamed. Keep Thou this truth in our hearts: "He that ruleth his spirit is better than he who taketh a city." In all situations enable us to quit ourselves like men, thus proving ourselves to be worthy of the calling and the dignity our country has bestowed upon us.

Blessed Lord, Thou who presents a perfect world tie of character, be Thou ever beside us in all our ways and remind us that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it. Hold us to the realization that the eternal elements of righteousness outrank all the material things for which men and nations strive. Never was the world's need so great in its throes of strife, sin, and questions. O Thou who didst come with the credentials of Almighty God, lift it out of the dust and sorrow that by Thy great goodness it may be governed and preserved evermore. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CONDUCT OF MEMBERS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the incident which occurred here on the floor yesterday I was very much in favor of prompt disciplinary action being taken. But upon reflection my mind has undergone considerable change. These are distressful times that call for tolerance, charity, and sympathy. To me, Mr. Speaker, the most

beautiful line in the Lord's Prayer is, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us."

When I offend, I apologize. I do it completely and absolutely. And when offended against, and apologies are offered, I accept them fully and completely.

The incident, of course, is one that the House cannot totally overlook. However, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances, if the participants, in the exercise of their good judgment, see fit to offer apologies to the House, they ought to be accepted and the incident forgotten. After all, forgiveness, not wrath, is man's best attribute. We have got to live here on the floor together. We ought, for the sake of our own happiness, live in amity and peace. If there are rare incidents where we cannot love one another, we can at least respect and act civilly toward one another.

I am informed that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] has expressed the intention of offering his apologies. If he should do that I am sure that the fine sensibilities and gallantry of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] would prompt him to do likewise and in similar spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope, in the event that this is done, the House will take no disciplinary action as regards either participant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to apologize to this body for the unseemly events of yesterday, which, I am sorry to say, were inconsistent with the high repute which this House has maintained, and I hope will always maintain, in the Nation's regard. I regret my part in it and the remark made by me violating the rules of the House. I hold in highest esteem the traditions of this Chamber and subscribe, and always expect to subscribe, to the rules requiring each Member to maintain debate on a level consistent with the dignity of the Nation which we represent.

High tempers, I agree, are unseemly in the consideration of great issues. It is to my great regret that I lost mine amidst circumstances for which I ask and hope I receive some extenuation from the generous Members of this body.

I was unduly aroused because of remarks which were made which I felt cast an unfortunate reflection upon my constituency. There is still a further consideration to which I respectfully request the attention of my colleagues. All of us, in addition to being honored by our membership here, are perhaps unfortunately fashioned of flesh and blood.

I ask, in petitioning the House to forgive my infraction of its rules, that it bear in mind the necessity of enforcing upon all Members these fundamental rules of human comity, no matter how adroitly some would seek to impinge upon the rights of others by violating the canons of fundamental decency and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, in tendering my apology to the House I desire to make it just as broad as any Member would desire.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief statement.

Of course, I regret the incident that occurred here on yesterday. I merely did what any other gentleman would have done under the same circumstances. If I were to apologize to anyone, it would be to the House for the disturbance the incident caused the membership of this body, for whom I have the highest regard.

I did not violate the rules of the House in what I said. I know the rules of the House, and I know the rules of common decency. Had I violated the rules of the House, there was a way to call me to order and to have the words stricken from the RECORD.

A great American general has been quoted by one of his men who fought under him as having said that he would not give a darn for any soldier who went into battle expecting to come out alive. Any man who thinks more of his political or his personal life than he does of his country or his own self-respect is not fit to sit in the Congress of the United States.

If I have offended the membership of this body, I am sorry; but I was not responsible for what occurred on yesterday, and, as I said, I did what any gentleman would have done under the same circumstances.

I make this statement so that you may know exactly how I feel; and I want to thank the majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle for their splendid attitude toward me in this matter.

I find great consolation in those immortal lines—

Thrice is he arm'd that hath his quarrel just,
And he but naked, though lock'd up in steel,
Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business and other special orders of the day I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next I may address the House for 20 minutes following the legislative program of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 106

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 106, to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort, the Flannagan resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address and a letter written by Mr. Trimble, Clerk of the House of Representatives. I have an estimate from the Public Printer which indicates that the matter exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing, and that the cost of printing will be $124.80.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding the articles exceeding the limit, without objection the unanimous-consent request will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

UNITED STATES MARINES

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES MARINES

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, America waits with bated breath further news as to the progress of the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Marine Divisions on the tiny island of Iwo Jima. I was a member of the Naval Affairs group that visited the forward areas of the Pacific in December—just 2 months ago. Shortly before Christmas we were privileged to spend a day with the marines of the Fourth Division.

Already our marine casualties on that island fortress of Iwo Jima are greater than in any battle in this war, and perhaps in all marine history. Not for one moment would I detract from the contribution that the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, and the Coast Guard, and all the rest have made in the defense of America, but I want to say this special word this morning for the American marine.

At Guadalcanal, the Gilberts, Tarawa, Cape Gloucester, New Britain, the Marshalls, Roi, Namur, Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Saipan, Tinian, Guam, the Palaus, and the Philippines, they have already blazed pages for the books of history that time will never erase. Today as they fight against the fanatics of Japan on this tiny 8 square miles of hell the hopes and the prayers of the American people and of free people all over the world are with them.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the American marine has given new meaning to those

famous words: "Never have so many owed so much to so few." May God speed their victory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a study made by Surveys, Inc. for Look magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Joseph H. Deckman, entitled "Rents—Public Versus Private," which appeared in the February 1945 issue of the Homebuilders Monthly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a report on the purchase of E bonds by the citizens of North Dakota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a table showing the farm wages in every State of the Union in 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders for today I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

O. P. A. PROPAGANDA

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. continues to flood the mails with its "superduper" propaganda. Here is exhibit No. 1: Nine letters, some of them four pages in length, single spaced, legal size—all these letters to one businessman over a period of 5 weeks' time—with inventory and income-tax report, added to the other usual business demands on a man's time. How, I ask you, could anyone find time or opportunity to read this propaganda? With a paper shortage and important mail to be considered, the O. P. A. had better absorb some of their own advice and assist us in relieving the paper shortage and the mail service by cutting down and cutting out much of this foolish letter-writing propaganda.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter written by one of my constituents on the subject Unity on What? and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the North Central Dairy Sales Cooperative at Mansfield, Ohio, on February 9, 1945, and at the annual meeting of the Richland County Farm Bureau Association at Mansfield on February 15, 1945.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

"WORK, FIGHT, OR GO TO JAIL" LEGISLATION

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, bearing on the general subject of manpower shortages, may I say that I am reliably informed that the Alabama Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., located at Mobile, Ala., has recently discharged some 8,000 employees who must find employment elsewhere.

Manpower problems have assumed major importance in recent weeks, due to the administration's demand for the enactment of so-called "work, fight, or go to jail" legislation. Evidence is conclusive that serious labor shortages exist in spotty areas throughout the country. The administration proposes to meet these shortages by transfer of labor from one spot to another. Those who are most familiar with the problem point to the fact that most of these manpower problems could easily be cured by sensible shifting and allocation of work, rather than shifting of labor. For example, Baltimore is a critical labor area, especially in the shipyards. There is a surplus of shipyard workers in the New York area and in the Gulf area. Is it not possible to transfer contracts for the construction and repair of ships from Baltimore to New York or to the Gulf, and thus relieve the critical labor situation in Baltimore and provide work in the areas where there is an oversupply of labor? Would this not be more sensible than to shift labor populations from one area to another?

As bearing on this general subject, may I say that I am reliably informed that the Alabama Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., located at Mobile, Ala., has recently discharged some 8,000 employees who must find employment elsewhere. This is due to curtailment of their production schedules. The same situation is to be found in other Gulf shipbuilding areas. In fact the Maritime Commission indicates that they expect at least 165,000 shipyard workers will be discharged in the next fiscal year. These workers have been recruited from areas all over the country. In the Mobile yards many of the workers were recruited from the State of Mississippi. Many of these workers, I may say, are returning home.

As rather amusing proof of this fact may I call attention to the want-ad columns of a recent issue of the Mobile Press Register published at Mobile, Ala. I hold a clipping taken from a recent issue of that paper which is rather significant. I quote:

> Terminated—For sale, one pair of shoes. Going back to Mississippi just like I came 7—8821.

I offer this interesting and significant want ad without further comment.

A DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was more than gratified this morning to see so many come out to listen to the Chaplain offer prayer at this session of the House. Some time ago I introduced a resolution asking for a joint meeting of the House, the Senate, the President, and other

bodies of the National Capital whereby we would have 1 day's session of prayer. I feel that when the people in all the churches of this land are asking divine guidance and prayer for the Congress, the President of the United States, and all those in an official capacity, certainly nothing would be more fitting than we doing it ourselves. I have asked the Committee on Rules for a rule on that resolution, but up to this time they have not seen fit to grant it. I hope that they will grant a rule. I feel it will be to the everlasting praise of the Members of the Congress and the people of this country if that resolution is adopted. Seems to me we need it. The Golden Rule should enter into our every activity. God can and will aid us if we but ask Him to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FARM DRAFT SITUATION

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter concerning the agricultural worker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, if there is a single Member of this body who does not realize the urgent need for congressional action to clear up the current confusion on the farm draft situation, I wish he could have read my morning mail. I received a score of letters protesting the actions of just one local selective-service board in drafting essential agricultural workers in defiance of the Tydings amendment. This is not an isolated case, and this is not the only morning my mail has been so preponderantly devoted to the farm-labor crisis. For weeks now evidence has been presented on the floor of this House almost daily showing the dangerous extent to which our farm-labor supply is being depleted. Congress realized that you cannot win a war without food and so expressed itself by passing the Tydings amendment, which we thought would protect our food-production program. We thought the law was clear and strong, but it is now obvious that Congress must act again. Directives have gone out to local selective-service boards which have influenced them to ignore the law and the intent of Congress, and it is up to us to pass a law which will not allow any misinterpretation. I hope and urge that the legislation which has been introduced to put a stop to the draining of young, able-bodied farm workers off the farms will receive immediate, favorable action by the Congress. The following letter shows clearly the urgency of the situation and the dangers to our food-production program of delay on the part of Congress in taking the necessary action:

FEBRUARY 21, 1945.

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Member of Congress, Indiana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: We are becoming very much concerned about the matter of sufficient help on these farms because of the directives recently issued from Washington. Statements in the press say that by July 1 at least one-half of the remaining boys between the ages of 18 and 25, inclusive, will have been inducted into the service. This being true I just cannot see how it is going to be possible to reach the food goals that have been set for 1945. Much reference has been made to the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act. The amendment provides that essential farm workers are not to be inducted where replacements are not available. This law is now in effect. General Hershey, through the press, says local draft boards are to observe it. It seems that the local draft boards, in many instances, are not observing it and the boys seem to continue to be taken regardless of their essentiality to the agricultural industry.

It seems that the Tydings amendment means little or nothing to the agricultural industry if it cannot be enforced. If the boards are not to take heed to the intent of the law. I know there are some instances where there are those of draft age who may be hiding under the skirts of agriculture, and I think this is all wrong and such, if they are able-bodied men, should be inducted, and if such are not able-bodied they should be required to remain in agricultural pursuits for the duration of the war. We have some neighboring boards, in Ohio, where politics seem to be the issue. The Selective Service Board is affiliated with one party and the War Board with another. They do not seem to cooperate in such matters but seem to be working not at all in harmony, as would be their reasonable service. The Selective Service Board seems to be disregarding the Tydings amendment. In such instances it is next to impossible to get any deferments for boys engaged in agricultural pursuits. * * *

The farmers last year worked long hours to produce what they say was the largest production in history. They did not work 8 hours per day, with time and one-half for overtime and double time for holidays and Sundays, but from daylight until dark, and many of them mounted lights on their tractors and worked during the dark hours of the night. Many of them overtaxed themselves and are now having auction sales and quitting the farms. Under these existing conditions I cannot see how the production will be available this year if they take another one-half of the boys between now and July 1. Many of these farmers are men who are well up in years and they just cannot stand up under these long hours. Some of them are middle-aged men and are breaking down working at it. These farmers, I firmly believe, are doing this because of their patriotism and because they do not want to let the boys down who are in the service and more especially those who are far out on the fighting fronts, fighting for something, we are sometimes wondering just what.

Agriculture needs experienced men. It takes men who know how to operate farm machinery and implements such as are used in agriculture today. Besides, we must not forget that this machinery is old and will not stand the strain of inexperienced help; therefore much more is the need for leaving these most essential and experienced boys on these farms. A farmer does not spring up overnight. It takes years of experience to make farm help that is valuable. If it keeps one man busy to show another how to do a job then he might as well do the work himself, save the aggravation, and leave what he cannot do go undone, which condition will exist before long and in many instances exists at the present time. I do not care if they are frozen on these agricultural jobs. I think that would be as it should be. I think they should be compelled to stay in agriculture for the duration of the war.

There is much that could be said relative to this matter. I do think that it is a serious situation and one that something should be done about. * * *

Just what is our policy anyway and who knows what it is all about?

I leave this question with you in closing, and beg to remain,

Sincerely yours.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting to the House today for the Committee on Education a report which was made as a result of House Resolution 592 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and House Resolution 63 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, known as the McCormack resolution. I believe the Members of the House will find this to be a very interesting study. It was made by a group of leading educators of the country, representative of all types of schools, areas, and so forth. Do not confuse this report with the so-called Federal aid bill or any other bill pending in Congress. This report deals with the emergency situation existing in the various colleges of the country. I think we should give careful study to the problem of keeping the colleges of the country open and ready to receive the students provided for in the so-called G. I. bill rather than take a chance on letting them close and then be confronted with an emergency that might justify some to call for a college-construction program by the Federal Government.

I want to thank the advisory committee for the fine work done by them. They have rendered a great and patriotic service to the Committee on Education, to the Congress, and the Nation. The names of the gentlemen who served on the committee, are as follows: Cloyd H. Marvin, chairman, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.; Charles Anderson, Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; William Couper, Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.; Herman L. Donovan, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.; Walter C. Eells, Association of American Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.; Calvert Ellis, Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa.; Herbert Herring, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Rev. William

Murphy, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.; Homer P. Rainey, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Robert Stewart, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; Herbert Smith, Willamette College, Salem, Oreg.; Roscoe L. West, Trenton State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.; Francis J. Brown, New York University, director of study and executive secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Puerto Rico World Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FARM DRAFT SITUATION

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of my good friend and distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], who is one of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, I should like to report to the House that yesterday the Committee on Military Affairs reported out a resolution which we hope and think will correct the situation with respect to the classification of agricultural registrants. This resolution will force the draft boards to comply with the Tydings amendment and carry out the intent of Congress in classifying farm registrants. I think it will be very helpful in straightening out the confusion that exists now among the draft boards with respect to the interpretation of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Can the gentleman tell us when we may expect this resolution on the floor for consideration?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I should like to take it up now. However, that is up to the Committee on Rules. I am told that that committee looks with favor upon the resolution and may report it soon. I hope so.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I may state for the information of the House that the Senate has incorporated this resolution as a part of the work-fight bill which it reported out recently.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I hope if the Senate passes a bill that the amendment referred to by the gentleman from Missouri remains a part of it. However, we should not delay consideration of this resolution because the Senate is considering substantially the same measure as an amendment to the work-or-jail bill which probably will die in that body. The situation on the farms of America is desperate, and forthright and immediate action is imperative.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain newspaper articles and editorials, and further to extend my remarks and include an address by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 138.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized and directed, as a whole or by subcommittee, to inquire into and investigate the official conduct of Albert W. Johnson and Albert L. Watson, district judges of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, to determine whether in the opinion of said committee the said judges or either of them have been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor which in the contemplation of the Constitution requires the interposition of the constitutional powers of the House. Said committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the House.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress, at such times and places in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer the customary oaths to witnesses, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this matter was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary on which there are two Members from the State of Pennsylvania, one a Republican and the other a Democrat. As I understand, it is the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is a unanimous report of the committee, I am able to say.

Mr. MICHENER. It affects the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the same resolution was passed about a year ago and an investigation was begun but not finished.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is the same resolution which was passed and acted on in the last Congress. The investigation was not completed. This is to make it possible for the Committee on the Judiciary or the subcommittee of that committee to complete the investigation begun in the last Congress.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why could not the investigation have been completed last year? It seems to me that is a long time to take to investigate the judges.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It was not completed last year. I think we had a very good subcommittee working on it. They did not complete it and did not make a report.

Mr. RICH. How long do you think it is going to be before it is completed?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. In my judgment it will not take very long now. The investigation was pretty well gone into last year.

Mr. HANCOCK. The resolution was not passed until rather late in the session.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not remember the time, but I do know the committee did not complete its work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a year or two ago the smear bund was busy trying to destroy Gen. George S. Patton, accusing him of all kinds of inhumanity to his men. That charge has been given the lie by practically every soldier who has come back from Europe who has served under General Patton. The other day, according to the press:

Sgt. Carroll Jewell, of Cedar Rapids, Nebr., who is now convalescing at the Camp Carson Hospital in Camp Carson, Colo., related how a machine-gun bullet smashed into his shoulder during the Third Army breakthrough last summer.

An officer rushed over and straightened the sergeant's arm pinned beneath him. It was General Patton.

I wonder how that comports with all that slimy propaganda we heard over the radio and through the smear-bund press trying to destroy one of America's greatest soldiers?

This young man goes on to say:

He pitched right in as though he were a medic and applied pressure to an artery to halt the bleeding and told me, "Don't worry, sergeant, everything will come out all right."

The sergeant continued:

That's one thing I like about that guy. He was right up there with us while hell was poppin'.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

DEFERMENT OF FARM WORKERS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the Chair, I took up with the leadership of the minority side of the House the question of a unanimous-consent request for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 106, commonly known as the Flannagan resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain to the House what the Flannagan resolution is?

Mr. MAY. I want to make the request first and then I will explain it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that House Joint Resolution 106 may be made in order next week, to be taken up under the rules of the House when the leadership is able to do so; that 1 hour of general debate be had on the resolution, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the ranking minority member of that committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill is so that the House may know?

Mr. MAY. The Selective Training and Service Act, section 5 (k), commonly known as the Tydings amendment, provides for the deferment of farm workers. There has been a question raised as to the proper construction of that provision of the act or at least the construction being placed upon it by the Director of Selective Service. The resolution undertakes to and does place an interpretation on section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act, which is claimed to be the construction that was intended by the Congress, and I believe it is what the Congress intended. It was reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs without amendment, and the purpose of this unanimous-consent request is to get it disposed of as promptly as possible.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the Lemke resolution was reported out by the Rules Committee some days ago. The Lemke resolution is a concurrent resolution and reiterates what the intent of Congress was when it adopted the Tydings amendment. It also sets up a committee of six to investigate the interpretation of the Tydings amendment. As I understand the Flannagan bill it writes into law what the Lemke resolution suggests is the intent of Congress. What I am interested in is, when is the gentleman from Kentucky going to call up the Flannagan bill, if his request is granted?

Mr. MAY. I will say to the gentleman that my request contains the statement that I would take it up at the pleasure of the leadership of the House. It is my purpose to take it up at the very first opportunity.

Mr. MICHENER. The Lemke resolution comes from the Rules Committee. Therefore it cannot be delayed more than 7 days after being reported. If the chairman of the Rules Committee does not call it up within the 7 days then any member of the Rules Committee can call it up. In this case, time is of the essence. I do not want to consent to something that will sidetrack something else. We want assurance that the Flannagan bill will be brought up expeditiously and disposed of.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The Lemke resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a concurrent resolution and proposes that a committee of three Members of the House and three Members of the Senate be appointed to make an investigation relative to the matter. In accordance with ordinary practice and procedure the Rules Committee has prepared a resolution for the consideration of the resolution which either has been or will be filed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

The resolution reported by the Committee on Military Affairs will take effect immediately upon its passage, whereas the Lemke resolution may delay action by the House for a long while, because we know that joint committees generally take their time.

Immediate action is demanded and urged. I myself believe there is justification for it, because only this morning I noticed that the general average of men still on the farms, men between 18 and 25 for each State, which should be about 4 percent, was in the case of the State of North Dakota 25 percent. Surely they can have no complaint from that State. What applies to his State applies to half a dozen others.

Later I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the table of figures as it applies to all the States in the matter of men in the age group 18–25 who are still on farms. I believe this table will prove that those who claim that States with large city populations are enjoying the advantage will find that the contrary is true.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, answering my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, I may say that the Rules Committee is well aware of his position and his belief that legislation of this kind is not required.

I make this reservation because the Rules Committee some days ago ordered the Lemke resolution reported, but the unusual thing has happened and the resolution has not yet even been reported by the committee to the House, and the 7-day period begins to run only from the time the resolution is reported to the House.

Inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has brought this matter up this morning and our distinguished chairman states that if this committee is given just a little more time, it will report the Lemke resolution. We are interested in knowing that definite action will be taken soon. In the meantime, these boys are being taken from the farms, right or wrong, but in line with the Tydings amendment, as understood by General Hershey. Time is important and certainly the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs should not ask permission to bypass the rules of the House and leave the matter in the discretion of the majority leadership, in which event the 7-day rule would not apply. I favor the consideration of the Flannagan bill at the earliest opportunity. The Flannagan bill will result in a law with all that a law implies. The Lemke resolution is not a law, simply expresses an intent and provides for the appointment of a committee. The bill and the resolution each require action by the House and the Senate. The Flannagan bill requires the signature of the President.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest first that the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee is attempting to juggle my resolution out of existence because he does not correctly state the effect of the resolution. The resolution contains two parts.

The first part defines clearly what the Tydings amendment is, and I will read it so that the gentleman and the Members will understand it in the future. It reads as follows:

> That in order that there may be no further misinterpretation of the will and the desire of the Congress in enacting subsection K, section 305, title 50, United States Code, commonly known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, Congress reaffirms the necessity to our war effort of said subsection K and again expresses its will and desire that the local selective-service board, in classifying the registrant, observe subsection K and concern itself solely with the registrant's essentiality to an agricultural occupation or endeavor and to the question of whether or not a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

Why ignore that part of the resolution? I am for the Flannagan resolution, but I am not for this juggling. My resolution is effective when passed. Mr. Flannagan's will have to go to the President, and he may veto it; then we will be nowhere unless we have both.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONFERENCE REPORT—REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

"SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

"(b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such Act specifically relates to the business of insurance: *Provided,* That after January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

"SEC. 3. (a) Until January 1, 1948, the Act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the Act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the Act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct thereof.

"(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

"SEC. 4. Nothing contained in Act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the Act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or the Act of June 5, 1920, known as the Merchant Marine Act, 1920.

"SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 6. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected."

And the House agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

It was the purpose on the part of the managers of the House to have the agreement between themselves and the managers on the part of the Senate to state in as clear language as possible that a moratorium be granted to the insurance business from the operation of the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, until January 1, 1948, leaving the taxing and regulatory powers of the several States fully protected.

The principal difference between the conference report and the bill as it passed the House lies in the inclusion of the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, in the moratorium provision, and making clear the intention of the Congress that the acts of boycott, coercion, and intimidation are subject to the operation of the suspended statutes even during the moratorium period.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDUCT OF MEMBERS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I regret again to bring up the incident that occurred on yesterday, but as I was engaged with the gentleman from Georgia in the preparation of a resolution of censure, I do not want my position on the matter to remain obscure or misunderstood. I feel today as I felt yesterday, that there should be a resolution of censure. I think that, regardless of who the person may be, when language of the type that was used yesterday on the floor of this House is used by a Member, the House cannot ignore it without lowering the dignity and the standing of the House in the country.

I regret very much that no further action was taken on the matter. I was endeavoring to obtain recognition by the Chair to offer a resolution of censure, and would have done so had the Speaker recognized me.

FARM DRAFT SITUATION

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this 1 minute to discuss very briefly the Lemke resolution and the so-called Flannagan resolution which was reported yesterday by the Committee on Military Affairs.

May I say for the information of the membership of the House that this is just one more instance where Congress is embarrassed and humiliated by executive misinterpretation of statutory law. All that the Flannagan resolution does is simply to say that the Congress meant what it said when it passed the Tydings amendment, which has been ignored or misconstrued.

Mr. Speaker, food and fiber are the primary weapons of war. We are threatened with shortages of both. Today men are being drafted from farms into our armed services in clear violation of the law. This is not the fault of Congress but of enforcement officials. Such nefarious practice must stop, and stop now.

I think it is high time that we started some impeachment proceedings against certain executive officers of our Government in order to put an end to this nonsense.

The only difference between the Flannagan resolution and the Lemke resolution is that the President can veto the Flannagan resolution, but he cannot veto the Lemke resolution because it is a concurrent resolution which must be passed by both Houses, and the President's signature is not required. I am in favor of both resolutions but I prefer the Lemke resolution. It will achieve quicker and better results.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, without discussing the merits of the Flannagan resolution or the Lemke resolution, let the House remember that it passed a resolution continuing the life of what is known as the Smith committee which has jurisdiction to investigate and determine at any time whether the executive branch of the Government has administered laws passed by the Congress as the Congress intended. If there ever was a committee that has 100-percent jurisdiction over the subject covered in the Lemke resolution it is the Smith committee. It is in operation. It has money. Why does it not go ahead and make an investigation if one is necessary without setting up another committee?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do this in view of the great courtesy shown by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. May I ask the gentleman this: Does the Smith committee have authority to investigate the actions of those in the War Department or the Navy Department or in the armed forces who are charged with unlawful action?

Mr. COCHRAN. They have absolute jurisdiction to determine whether or not any executive branch of the Government——

Mr. HOFFMAN. The War Department and the Navy Department?

Mr. COCHRAN. The War Department and the Navy Department are exceeding their authority.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. I hope that when the Smith committee starts out to hold an investigation of the officials connected with the War or Navy Departments the gentleman will not come in with a resolution stating that we are exceeding our authority.

CONDUCT OF MEMBERS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I was not on the floor yesterday but from all accounts the incident which occurred was regrettable. However, today, I was impressed and greatly pleased at the manly stand taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] in apologizing to the House in the manner in which he has, and the statement by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I also wish to commend and approve the action of the Speaker pro tempore and other Members as to the manner in adjusting this unfortunate occurrence, believing that by so doing it is to the best interest, standing, and reputation of the House. And especially do I congratulate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] for his forthright and statesmanlike suggestion that has helped to bring this about. Therefore, I am pleased that after thoughtful consideration and reflection no Member has undertaken to introduce a resolution of censure, because if one had been introduced another would have been offered for the purpose of censuring the other gentleman as well.

TRANSFER OF INDUSTRIAL WORKERS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to my troubled mind this morning and wish to remind you that similar events may occur in your own districts, and then your minds also may become troubled. My city is in the throes of a desperate situation. As their Congressman I am supposed to do something about it. A directive has been issued by the War Manpower Commission to force workers from one or more plants to work in certain others which are engaged in the manufacture of tire cord. The workers simply refuse to obey, following the decision of their union leaders. The constitutionality of the directive is questioned. We have made earnest appeals to the War Manpower Commissioner, Mr. McNutt, to suspend the order.

We realize that tire cord must be produced at once and in the greatest possible quantities. However, it does seem that patriotic appeal should and would bring about the result desired, if a little time would be allowed before too drastic action is taken. This city has made a continued and splendid record of production of needed military supplies and the workers fail to understand why such punitive action is so hastily taken.

I am informed that under the War Powers Act a directive has been issued that gives complete authority to the Commissioner.

We can only hope that moderation and conciliatory attitude will prevail on both sides of this serious controversy.

I trust my colleagues will not be called upon to endure a similar situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ARGENTINA

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to read in yesterday's newspapers that the subject of Argentina had been discussed briefly at the opening session of the Inter-American Conference in Mexico City. A motion to discuss the Argentine issue early in the conference was immediately voted down and the entire matter is scheduled to come up later on the agenda.

I, for one, hope that this important and vexing question will not be relegated to the wastebasket, but that it will be brought out in the open and given the utmost consideration by the countries of the Western Hemisphere that are now striving to obtain some semblance of coordination and unity for future pan-American relations.

The ghost at the banquet, the thorn in the flesh, the fly in the ointment, the real problem child of the Western Hemisphere is the present Argentine Government and its failure, up to the present time, to cooperate with the United Nations in the war against Germany and Japan. It is about time for the Pan American Union to take official and drastic action in an effort to bring this one recalcitrant nation to time. Nonrecognition by the United States and verbal brickbats are not enough.

On December 6, 1944, I addressed a letter to Secretary of State Stettinius on the subject of our relations with Argentina. I wanted to know why, in view of the failure of the present Argentine Government to cooperate with the United Nations, the United States should continue its trade relations with that government. On December 13, the Secretary replied in a letter which I include herewith:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
December 13, 1944.

The Honorable JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of December 6 on the subject of our relations with Argentina.

The Department has consistently maintained the position that the United States should not enter into normal diplomatic relations with the Fascist military clique which at this time is in control of the Government of Argentina. The pro-Axis record of this regime is, I am sure, too well known to require detailed elaboration. Until it is conclusively demonstrated by unequivocal acts that there has been a fundamental change of Argentine policy in favor of the cause against the Axis and in support of inter-American unity and common action, this Government is not in a position to take any action calculated to benefit or strengthen that regime.

As regards our economic relations with Argentina, the Department has been and continues to be guided by the consideration that the urgent requirements of the war effort must take precedence over all others. Continued trade with Argentina, therefore, has been subject to that consideration and to the practicability of using alternative sources of supply.

I am enclosing as of interest to you in this regard a copy of a statement by former Secretary Hull of July 26, setting forth the position of this Government on the Argentine problem, together with a copy of the President's statement of September 29 on this same subject.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

Now, let me refer to that portion of the Secretary's letter relating to economic relations. Mr. Stettinius states unequivocally that continued trade with Argentina has been subject to the urgent requirements of the war effort and to the practicability of using alternative sources of supply.

Mr. Speaker, I do not for one minute question the sincerity of the Secretary's statement, but I find it hard to reconcile with the facts in view of the rapidly increasing number of commodities which we are today purchasing from Argentina. A glance at the figures compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, in the Department of Commerce, will disclose that the balance of trade has moved rapidly in favor of Argentina since 1940, the last year that the balance was in favor of the United States. In 1944, for instance, it is now estimated that this country's imports from the Argentine will be six times the value of our exports.

We have all noticed, I am sure, an increasing number of items and commodities on store shelves that are not essential to the war effort, that can be obtained elsewhere, and that are marked "Made in Argentina." Why should this be? Why should the United States continue to assist in financing a government that has steadfastly refused to join with us against a common enemy?

With these questions in mind, I accordingly addressed a communication to Secretary Stettinius on January 25, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent to include it in my remarks at this point:

JANUARY 25, 1945.

Re RPA 711.35/12–644.

Hon. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will supplement our previous exchange of correspondence concerning this country's relations with Argentina.

In your letter to me dated December 13, 1944, you stated: "The Department has consistently maintained the position that the United States should not enter into normal diplomatic relations with the Fascist military clique which at this time is in control of the Government of Argentina." With this statement I heartily agree. The present Government in Argentina has not only failed to cooperate with the United Nations in resisting the Axis Powers, but has recently severed connections with the Pan American Union.

You also stated in your communication that under existing circumstances: "* * * this Government is not in a position to take any action calculated to benefit or strengthen that regime." I respectfully submit, Mr. Secretary, that this expressed attitude on the part of the United States should be immediately implemented by the imposition of economic sanctions against the present Argentine Government, not only by our country, but by the United Nations as a whole. Further efforts at conciliation and appeasement will not only threaten pan-American unity, but may seriously impair the future solidarity of the nations which have combined their efforts to rid the world of the malignant influence of Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini.

On September 29, 1944, President Roosevelt, in a prepared statement relating to Argentina, had the following to say: "The Argentine Government has repudiated solemn inter-American obligations on the basis of which the nations of this hemisphere developed a system of defense to meet the challenge of Axis aggression. Unless we now demonstrate a capacity to develop a tradition of respect for such obligations among civilized nations, there can be little hope for a system of international security, theoretically created to maintain principles for which our peoples are today sacrificing to the limit of their resources, both human and material."

To the foregoing statement I heartily subscribe, but I am forced to ask what steps are being taken to put our country's avowed policy into effect. A glance at the existing trade relations between the United States and Argentina will disclose that the balance of trade is becoming more and more favorable to this South American country which refuses to join with other nations in the Western Hemisphere in helping to defeat Germany and Japan. An ever-increasing volume of American dollars is being poured into a country which is headed by the very type of government we are trying now to eradicate elsewhere in the world.

Mr. Secretary, there is no rhyme or reason to the continuance of such a policy. The United Nations hope to demonstrate to the world that international unity and cooperation can insure a just and lasting peace, once the present war has been won. Such a peace can only be guaranteed if the civilized nations of the world demonstrate their ability to combine their political, economic, and military resources to prevent the rise of Fascist influences in the future. How can we hope to demonstrate the necessary unity then, if we cannot demonstrate it now?

The United States has no quarrel with the Argentine people. Our disagreement is with the present Government clique. I fully realize that the imposition of economic sanctions would place our country in the position of having to insure the continued delivery of certain commodities to countries that now obtain them from Argentina. This may mean temporary sacrifice, both at home and abroad, but if the desired results can be obtained, the sacrifices will not have been made in vain.

In view of the foregoing, may I therefore earnestly suggest that immediate steps be taken by our Government, and by our allies, to force the Argentine Government to come to terms.

A reply at your convenience will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON.

Now, Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt, former Secretary of State Hull, and the present Secretary of State have emphatically and repeatedly denounced the military clique which presently controls the Argentine Government. Conferences with State Department officials disclose that every possible effort, short of the imposition of economic sanctions, are being exerted to bring the Argentine Government to terms. The results so far have not been too encouraging.

In reply to a letter which I addressed to the Department of Commerce concerning the continued importation of Argentine goods that are not essential to the war effort, I have just recently received the following reply:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE,
Washington, February 9, 1945.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In accordance with your request, I am sending you certain statistics showing United States imports from Argentina, by groups and principal commodities, for the years 1940–43, and January–September 1944. The answer to your query is contained in these statistics. I am enclosing them, although I am informed that comparable data were recently furnished your office by Mr. Frank Waring.

It is true, as your letter implies, that certain manufactured and other products "not absolutely essential to the war effort" have been, and are now being, imported from Argentina. This is so because imports of certain products of this character are not governed by General Imports Order M–63 of the War Production Board and War Food Order No. 63 of the War Food Administration. In recent months a number of commodities have been removed from these lists on trade routes where the shipping situation was no longer sufficiently stringent to necessitate their inclusion. United States flag ships do not call at Argentine ports. Trade with that country, therefore, is carried on in vessels over which the United States Government exercises no control. In fact, a substantial proportion of the trade is carried by ships flying the Argentine flag. Consequently, private iterests in the United States are free to purchase and import the type of products to which you refer, provided they can secure shipping space from foreign companies.

I trust that this information will be satisfactory for your purposes. Should you require additional data, Mr. Waring will be happy to call and discuss the matter with you.

Sincerely yours,

AMOS E. TAYLOR, *Director.*

It becomes apparent, therefore, that in order to carry out the announced policy of this country toward Argentina's failure to cooperate with the United Nations, stricter and more far-reaching controls must be established and maintained. This is a matter on which every interested agency of the Government should immediately center attention so that the highly desirable results can be obtained.

This fact can be clearly illustrated by a perusal of the answer to my letter of January 25, addressed to the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
February 20, 1945.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 25 addressed to the Secretary of State concerning the policy of this Government with respect to Argentina. This has been discussed with you by Mr. Avra M. Warren, Director of the Office of American Republic Affairs. You raise the question as to the economic policy of this Government with regard to existing trade relations between the United States and Argentina.

With the intensification of the military prosecution of the war and with the continued liberation of peoples in both Europe and Asia, the need for essential materials on the part of the United States and the United Nations is steadily increasing. Consistent with the policy of the United States to obtain such materials for the prosecution of the war and the maintenance of the civilian war economy from whatever world sources are available, the United States has in the past and is continuing to purchase certain essential materials from Argentina, particularly to relieve critical shortages of vegetable fats and oils, leather, tanning materials, and certain metals.

There is no intention on the part of this Government to purchase from Argentina materials not essential for the war effort or for the maintenance of the civilian war economy.

With respect to the policy of this Government toward exports to Argentina, the export of capital goods will be kept at its present minimum level.

The above policy represents no change from the economic policy which has been followed since the rupture of relations with Argentina. It implies absolutely no change in our political policy toward Argentina. It is designed to implement that policy and to bring closer the day of complete victory.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the Inter-American Conference in Mexico City will not ignore the Argentine issue. This is a time for unity of action and a practical demonstration of what results can be obtained by international cooperation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

JURISDICTIONAL STRIKES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I read from the press of the 23d:

EIGHT HUNDRED YANKS DIED IN SINKING OF JAP SHIP BY UNITED STATES BOMBERS—STORY TOLD HERE BY NAVY OFFICER, ONE OF TWO WHO "CAME BACK ALIVE"

An estimated 800 Americans died on a Japanese "voyage of death"—an ocean counterpart of the infamous "death march of Bataan"—Navy Lt. George K. Petritz, 27, of Ottawa, Ill., disclosed at a press conference yesterday.

Petritz, former student at Notre Dame and Marquette universities, is one of two men known to have escaped from the Japanese when the ship was bombed and sunk by American planes last December off the coast of Bataan.

He found a haven with Filipino guerrillas and when liberating American naval forces found him he was taken aboard an American warship and flown here.

"The word went around that we were being shipped to Japan," he said. "On December 13 the 1,600 of us were marched through Manila to the pier and put aboard a Japanese transport."

Petritz said 800 men were jammed into two small holds forward and 800 into a third hold.

"I was placed in the third hold, the larger one," he continued. "It wasn't any bigger than a large room. The ceiling was just high enough for me to stand erect and I'm 6 feet 4 inches. When we were all jammed in there we just simply couldn't breathe.

"The only way to get enough air was to climb the ladder to the deck. But that was an invitation to quick death, for Jap guards stood at the ladder and would—and did—fire into us when we tried to approach it."

Lack of oxygen quickly began to take its toll. The weak died and the strong were near collapse before the end of the first day. There were no toilet facilities, and the heat and the stench were terrific.

BOMBS REALLY SAVED MANY

"The bombing by the American planes started the next morning, December 14," he continued. "It kept up intermittently all day. I don't know how many bombs hit the ship.

"The bombing began again the next day—our third day out of Manila—and while the bombs killed some of us they really saved many of us. I don't think more than 10 percent of us would have survived in those holds."

When it was evident the ship was going to sink the Japs headed for the beach and the Americans were allowed to scramble out of the holds, over the side, and into the sea.

A short time ago there was an account in the press of another incident similar to that, except that in that case the ship was destroyed by a submarine with a loss of something over 700 lives. Also in the press of the 23d, the same date, I find this picture of what is happening down on the island of Iwo, where it is stated that 90 marines every hour are listed as casualties.

I call your attention to these two news items just as a matter of comparison with two others. I have one here under date of February 22, Chicago:

DODGE STRIKE CURES B–29 ENGINE OUTPUT

Production of engines for B–29 superfortresses has been seriously hampered by the strike of electricians and helpers at the Chicago Dodge plant. The strike, which started Monday with a strike of 67 electricians, today numbered 349 electricians, helpers, and oilers in all 3 shifts.

That is one. Here is another under date of the 23d, last night's paper:

STRIKE CLOSES JONES, LAUGHLIN

PITTSBURGH, February 22.—The sprawling plants of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation here were completely shut down today as a strike spread through the entire works with 8,500 workers idle in defiance of a back-to-work order issued yesterday by C. I. O. President Philip Murray.

The strike began Tuesday morning when the company hired an outside firm, employing A. F. L. workers, to construct a shell line in the Pittsburgh works. Maintenance workers, protesting the A. F. L. craftsmen, left their jobs. About 3,000 men were immediately made idle. The strike grew progressively worse with late-shift workers leaving their jobs until J. & L. plants on both sides of the Monongahela River were completely down.

Production loss resulting from the strike will be 6,000 tons of steel daily, the company estimated.

In a telegram from Washington, addressed to officers of Locals 1843 and 1272 of the C. I. O. United Steelworkers, Murray said, "The unauthorized walk-out was a flagrant violation of the contract and your international organization's no-strike commitments."

The C. I. O. president warned local union officers that unless they accepted his back-to-work order the international C. I. O. organization would take disciplinary action.

The strip mill, which makes armor plate, and the bar mills, producing shell steel, were down, as were the open hearths, blast furnaces, coke works, and the sintering plant.

The head of the C. I. O. has ordered them back to work. The Communists sowed the seed in the C. I. O. organization, with the consent of the leadership, and now the country and our armed forces are reaping the whirlwind, and apparently all that Philip Murray, head of the C. I. O., can do will not stop the strike. Note:

The strike began Tuesday morning when the company hired an outside firm, employing A. F. of L. workers, to construct a shell line in the Pittsburgh works.

Maintenance workers protesting the A. F. of L. craftsmen left their jobs.

Do you get the point? There is no dispute between the employers and the employees. It is a jurisdictional dispute between the C. I. O. and A. F. of L as to which union shall have jurisdiction, collect the dues. When A. F. of L. members in good standing came onto the grounds of that company to construct a conveyor line, the C. I. O. workers walked out.

While on Iwo Island in the first few hours of the battle, up to 6 p. m. yesterday, 644 marines, boys of these United States of America, with homes, wives, parents—yes, and some with children—died, while 560 are missing and 4,168 are wounded; 8,500 C. I. O. workers, living in comfort, under shelter, good beds, 3 meals a day, no one shooting at them, bombing them, they—8,500—walk out, causing a loss of 6,000 tons of steel a day. And every hour while they were out, while they were working—during the last few days 90 marines an hour have been killed, wounded, or missing—while the marines give their lives to make the jobs safe and continuous, the workers walk out. What a tragic situation.

And this Congress sits here and refuses to enact legislation which would in any way penalize those who, while our men are falling over there at the rate of 90 an hour, walk out, 8,500 of them. And we fail to force the Executive to take action which might be taken under the law as now written.

What excuse have we? If we have any, I hope someone will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman that there is another special order. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania may address the House for 5 minutes following the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 10 minutes following the other special orders already entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

AMERICAN RED CROSS ABROAD

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate time for the Congress to salute the American Red Cross. As this humanitarian organization's yearly drive for funds begins millions of G. I.'s on our

fighting fronts are prepared to bear testimony in its behalf.

When I was in London early last summer during the worst part of the robot blitz, I came to see first hand what the Red Cross really does in its many fields of activity for our servicemen. I shall always remember its ministrations to those injured by the robots. There will always live with me the memory of Red Cross girls caring for our flyers as they returned from missions across the Channel. The results of their work in the hospitals in northern England and Scotland were inspiring and I like to recall the programs of entertainment conducted throughout the United Kingdom and Iceland.

One night when the robots, or doodlebugs as they are called by our G. I.'s, were coming thick and fast, I was attending a meeting at the Red Cross Mostyn Club in London. Periodically a nearby hit and explosion could be both heard and felt. One of the G. I. songsters asked Club Director Bill Cruise, of Passaic, N. J., for the microphone and started singing new words to an old tune. The words were as follows: "I'll keep going my way, you keep going your way, doodlebug stay away from my door."

It was at this particular party that Sgt. Franklyn B. Roberts, of Paterson, N. J., in my district, said to me, "Congressman, if it were not for the American Red Cross I think many of us boys would go crazy."

Today I have a letter from Sergeant Roberts who is now in Paris. He writes in part:

> I am very happy to learn that you have quoted my sentiments in regard to the Red Cross. Since coming to France it has become more evident that this organization is truly the soldier's friend. It gives him plasma, treats, entertainment, relaxation, and always seeks to emphasize the homey atmosphere.

Speaking of his billet in Paris, Sergeant Roberts goes on to say:

> We are now billeted in a large, modernistic, dormitory type of building. In the lobby there is a large plaque bearing the name of Walter E. Edge (former Ambassador to France). It is a daily reminder of New Jersey and home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES BETWEEN A. F. OF L. AND C. I. O.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because of statements made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] relative to jurisdictional strikes between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. If those two organizations want to differ, that is all right with me, but when they differ and it slows up war production and prevents guns, shells, and ammunition being sent to the boys across the seas, then it seems to me the Congress is derelict in its duty if it does not take some action that will prohibit such capers as that going on in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress should take immediate action because we are having these strikes, industry and production is being held up, and dire consequences are bound to follow. It may be that sometimes it is the fault of industry, I do not know, but no matter where the fault lies it is the duty of the Congress to see that those boys who are giving even their lives over there in our fight for America, American liberty, American independence, and freedom shall have the necessary supplies and weapons to win the war. That is our duty to our boys. Nothing should interfere with that; nothing, I say.

We at home should not permit such things to go on, and I say it is high time that the Congress take action.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States will be held accountable for these happenings; the President of the United States is going to be held accountable for these shortages and strikes; therefore, the action we take will speak louder than words. I hope we will get some action, and get it promptly. Every minute of delay means additional deaths at the front.

You may inquire, "Why do you not do something?" If I had the authority and the influence that some Members of this House have to bring up legislation on the majority side, I should have that matter discussed before this very day is over. We would have action. You permit the majority to have the power to say what legislation will come in here for consideration, but we on the minority sit over here and have not much opportunity to do or say anything. The people named you their majority; the responsibility is yours.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are several laws upon the books already which would in a measure cure this situation if they were enforced.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that statement. It is up to the Chief Executive to enforce the laws, but he will not enforce many laws that are on the books. I am glad the gentleman brings that up because it is a welcome addition to what I have to say.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I made the same point the gentleman does but perhaps I was negligent in not stating that we should, as the gentleman said this morning, start impeachment proceedings against some of those in the administration who disregard the laws and fail to enforce them.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if I were a lawyer I would start immediately, but not being a lawyer, in my opinion I would be the wrong individual to start such proceedings. I hope a number of good lawyers will get together and take this matter up so that we will get some action. Let us get it started at once. I insert a statement from Frank R. Kent, from today's Evening Star, that is very pertinent to my remarks:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—C. I. O. SPEECH CITING NO-STRIKE PLEDGE CALLED HYPOCRITICAL STATEMENT

(By Frank R. Kent)

For sheer blatancy and wholehearted ignoring of facts, the new school of labor politicians seems to excel. An excellent example was given a few days ago, when Reid Robinson, a C. I. O. vice president and aide to Sidney Hillman, addressed the World Trade Union Congress in London.

After Mr. Robinson had described the great crusade in the last campaign and told of the C. I. O.'s determination not to rest until Henry Wallace is securely installed as Secretary of Commerce, he dwelt heavily upon the tremendous contribution of the C. I. O. to the war effort, proudly proclaiming that "6,000,000 C. I. O. workers have given an unconditional pledge of no strikes while the war lasts."

Then he solemnly declared: "And that pledge has been kept in spite of great provocation and frequent injustices." The other delegates to the World Trade Congress must have been impressed. Almost anyone would have been who did not know the facts. But the facts stamp that assertion as wholly false.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND RELEASED FROM PLEDGE

Among the facts that Mr. Robinson did not mention was that at the moment he was talking the C. I. O.'s United Auto Workers' Union, the largest union in the world, was voting whether to continue that no-strike pledge or to abandon it. The result of that vote is still awaited. And on last Tuesday, February 20, the C. I. O. Textile Workers' Union officially released 100,000 members in 53 mills from the no-strike pledge, denounced the War Labor Board, Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Vinson. And, defying an order from the C. I. O. president, Mr. Murray, 8,500 workers of the Jones-Laughlin Steel Corporation in Pittsburgh went out on strike, shutting down all vital war production there.

So far, not even a word of protest or explanation has come from these breast-beating C. I. O. leaders, Mr. Murray and Mr. Hilman, who have been trading on their no-strike pledge for 3 years, bellowing about labor's patriotism and their support of the President's war program. Another fact Mr. Robinson ignored was that, as reported by the United States News, "there were 5,000 strikes in 1944, which is more than for any year since records began to be kept in 1916."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include editorials and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of announcing the program for next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, Monday next is District of Columbia day. The Committee on the District of Columbia informs me that it will call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 2122) to extend the Overtime Work Act in the District of Columbia.

There will be called up following that bill House Resolution 20, to continue an investigation by the Military Affairs Committee; House Resolution 38, to continue an investigation by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; House Resolution 54, to continue an investigation on the part of the Committee on Agriculture; and House Resolution 93, to continue an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Of course, if those are not all finished on Monday, they will be continued on Tuesday. If a rule is granted or if unanimous consent is given on Tuesday, House Joint Resolution 106, known as the Flannagan resolution, will be brought up. It deals with the deferment of farm workers.

On Wednesday and Thursday the deficiency appropriation bill will be considered. If rules are granted for the nurse draft bill, H. R. 2277, and S. 298, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, in time, they may be considered next week, if time is available.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the acting majority leader a question? Does the gentleman not feel it is very important that the resolution regarding the farm labor situation be brought to the floor at the very earliest possible date, and can he not do something to help see that that resolution is brought on the floor of the House?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I just stated that it was the purpose to bring up the resolution on Tuesday if we can get unanimous consent or a rule.

Mr. RICH. I do not believe any Member of the Congress will prevent the gentleman from bringing that resolution up on the floor of the House.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman probably was not on the floor, but the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] tried to get unanimous consent and it was objected to by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper;

S. 210. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938;

S. 213. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States Naval Ordnance Plant at Canton, Ohio;

S. 216. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.;

S. 218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California;

S. 219. An act to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy;

S. 221. An act to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil;

S. 315. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 317. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 335. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House (under its previous order) adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

254. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

255. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

256. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

257. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the National Defense Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of provisions for retirement of wing commanders of the Air Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

258. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education. Report pursuant to House Resolution 63. Resolution on the effect of certain war activities on colleges and universities (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. House Joint Resolution 106. Joint resolution to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 2322. A bill to provide for the issuance of the Mexican Border Service Medal to certain members of the Reserve forces of the Army on active duty in 1916 and 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2323. A bill to extend the Federal Aid and Highway Acts to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 2324. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a requisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 2325. A bill to extend the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to officers honorably discharged from the Army under Public, No. 259, Sixty-seventh Congress, June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2326. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 2327. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the payment of dependents' allowances in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2328. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2329. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2330. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5 each year as George Washington Carver Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 146. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2232, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed,

color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 147. Resolution to censure Representative FRANK HOOK, of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. Res. 148. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide the mode of referring to female Members of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2331. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Grant Logan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr., to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2333. A bill for the relief of Albemarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, Ephriam Daniels; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2334. A bill granting a pension to Ida E. Strickler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 2335. A bill for the relief of Albert E. Severns; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2336. A bill for the relief of Osborne E. McKay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2337. A bill for the relief of H. H. Hood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 2338. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert F. Wascher, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2339. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

99. By Mr. HAVENNER: Resolution by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, Calif., endorsing the request by the President for Federal appropriation of $78,115,000 to assist cities in their post-war plans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

100. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: House Joint Memorial No. 6 of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to approve and pass the minimum measures for the benefit of the merchant marine as submitted by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

101. By the SPEAKER: Petition of United Steel Workers of America, C. I. O., Local Union No. 1010, East Chicago, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to disapproving of any further appropriations for the Dies committee; to the Committee on Accounts.